Krakowskie Studia z Historii Państwa i Prawa
2018; 11 (3), s. 393–411
doi:10.4467/20844131KS.18.026.9052
www.ejournals.eu/Krakowskie-Studia-z-Historii-Panstwa-i-Prawa

Marcin Niemczyk
University of Rzeszów

I Advise War. I Advise Peace: Polemological Thought in Rhetorical Speeches of the Classical Period

Abstract

Polemology, as a science of studying war, is in the interest of representatives of most fields and academic disciplines. In a special way, this kind of reflection should be sought at the very source of Europe's culture, that is, in the political and legal thought of Ancient Greece. In turn, part of this research should be the study of rhetorical speeches of the classical period, whose goal was to create incentives to war, or which, on the contrary, advised making peace.

Given the above, the aim of this article is to attempt to look at the war rhetoric as an issue at the crossroads between different disciplines. The incentive for such an approach is given by the so-called counselling speeches about war and peace by such speakers as, for example, Lisias, Aeschines, Isocrates, Cleon, Diodotus, Andocides, and Demosthenes. It is also worth noting that funeral speeches by such eminent personages as Gorgias, Lisias, Plato, Demosthenes, Pericles, and Hyperides also constituted part of the war rhetoric of Ancient Greece. These speeches are not only a manifestation of rhetorical art, but as they refer to such ideas as freedom, democracy, Panhellenism, or just war, they become a valuable source material for scholars dealing with rhetoric, as well as for historians of political and legal doctrines.

Given the above, the author's intention is to show manifestations of polemological thought in the rhetorical speeches of the classical period (mainly in the political exciters) and to verify the hypothesis about the existence of common research areas for students of rhetoric and political and legal doctrines. In the professional literature there are clear deficiencies in such an approach. This article is therefore also trying to encourage an increased interest in research on war and the rhetoric of war, in particular through the prism of the history of political and legal doctrines.

Keywords: war, peace, rhetoric, polemology, rhetorical speeches.

Słowa kluczowe: wojna, pokój, retoryka, polemologia, mowy retoryczne.

War or peace? This is a dilemma before which people have been standing for centuries, and their choice has never been easy. Advising concerning war has always been an intriguing, and often profitable, occupation both for military people and for politicians. Advising concerning peace, although often less spectacular and less lucrative, also has always been an important part of social communication. That is the way it used to be, but

it is probably also this way today, and that is why the considerations in this respect have a timeless and universal value.

Given the above, it is not surprising that research into the genesis, nature, and objectives of war are within the realm of interests of representatives of most academic fields and disciplines. The hierarchical structure and specific timelessness of this kind of reflection prompts one to seek answers to these questions which are already to be found at the very source of European culture, that is, in the political and legal thought of ancient Greece. It seems that an especially fascinating part of this search should be the research on rhetorical speeches of the classical period, whose objective was to create incentives to war on the one hand, or, on the contrary, to advise in favour of making peace.[1] It is also worth noting that the funeral speeches by such authors as Gorgias, Lysias, Plato, Demosthenes, Pericles, and Hyperides constituted a significant component of the war rhetoric of Ancient Greece. These speeches are not only a manifestation of rhetorical art, but as they refer to such ideas as freedom, democracy, Panhellenism, or just war, they have become a valuable source of material for scholars dealing with rhetoric, as well as for historians of political and legal doctrines.

Given the above, the author's intention is to show manifestations of polemological thought in the rhetorical speeches of the classical period and to verify the hypothesis about the existence of common research areas for rhetoric and political and legal doctrines. There are clear deficiencies in this approach in the professional literature, and the present text is also an attempt to encourage increased interest in research into war, in particular through the prism of rhetoric and the history of political and legal doctrines.

The term "polemology" used in the title requires an adequate explanation. It should be etymologically derived from two Greek words: *πόλεμος* [pólemos] – war, dispute, fighting and *λόγος* [logos]– reason, science, explanation. It was created by the French sociologist and economist Gaston Bouthoul [1896–1980], the author of a work entitled *Polemology. Sociology of Wars* (*Traité de polémologie. Sociologie des guerres*) published in Paris in 1970. In accordance with the assumptions of polemology, learning about the nature of war is to be the basis for acting for the implementation of peace, and the research on war itself is interdisciplinary and is not limited to learning about the art of war. Therefore, polemology focuses *i.a*. on methodological, doctrinal, technical, sociological, economic, demographic, and psychological issues.[2] Since, as M. Howard writes, war has always been a part of human fate, it is impossible to undertake research into this phenomenon in isolation from the environment in which it is waged.[3] Such a holistic approach justifies the author's assumption about the possibility of looking for common research areas concerning war and peace for both political and legal doctrines as well as for rhetoric.

---

[1] The "classical period" used in the title is related to the narrow understanding of the term and refers to the 5th and 4th centuries B.C. For more about different meanings of the word "classical" see W. Tatarkiewicz, *Dzieje sześciu pojęć* (*A Story of Six Concepts*), Warszawa 2012, pp. 209–218.

[2] M. Huzarski, *Wiedza o polemologii* (*Knowledge of Polemology*) [in:] *Metodologiczna tożsamość polemologii* (*Methodological Identity of Polemology*), M. Huzarski, B.M. Szulc (eds.), Warszawa 2010, pp. 16–17.

[3] M. Howard, *Wojna w dziejach Europy* (*War in the History of Europe*), Wrocław 2007, p. 5.

Professional literature indicates that considerations about war and security and peace have an almost unlimited epistemological plane.[4] Since the beginning of time, war has therefore been a popular subject for consideration, both for practitioners and for theoreticians.[5] It was not much different in the Ancient Athens of the classical period, where discussions about war and peace constituted an immanent part of the busy socio-political life. The history of Ancient Greece is to a large extent the history of continuous wars.[6] Even then one could see the anticipation of the political dimension of war and peace, which Carl von Clausewitz identified by writing that "war is not merely a political act, but also a real political instrument, a continuation of political commerce, a carrying out of the same by other means".[7] In that sense, war is therefore the sphere of activities under which violence is legitimised to achieve political goals.[8] The military reality of Ancient Athens and the importance of this issue also probably led Aristotle, to write in the 1st Book of *Rhetoric* that one of the five most important issues which are discussed by everyone and which are the subject of advisors' public speeches is war itself.[9]

The directness of Athenian democracy meant that it was a system based on discussion, although due to the number of participants in the Ecclesia – the People's Assembly, the public dialogue was often significantly impeded. It should also be remembered that only a small minority of speakers took the floor by speaking or by suggesting draft resolutions. This minority, traditionally called "speakers", *ρήτορες* [rhétores] by the Athenians, is identified today with the term "politician". It is not a particularly accurate term because in Ancient Greek there is no equivalent for the word "politician", though, it also appears in Polish translations of rhetorical speeches of the classical period.[10] *Ρήτορ* [rhétor] meant the initiator, or someone who supports or opposes, initiatives proposed by others. Sometimes, the term *χω πολιτευόμενος* [ho politeuómenos] was used synonymously. It meant a person who was actively exercising their civil rights. Otherwise,

[4] K. Drabik, *Zagadnienia ontologiczne wojny, bezpieczeństwa i pokoju w poglądach wybranych myślicieli* (*Ontological Issues of War, Security and Peace in Views of Selected Thinkers*), Warszawa 2011, p. 213.

[5] M. Marszałek, *Wojny nieregularne. Przeszłość i przyszłość. Doświadczenia i wnioski* (*Irregular Wars. Past and Future. Experience and Conclusions*), Warszawa 2016, p. 18.

[6] E. Kozerska, T. Scheffler, *O wojnie i pokoju* (*On War and Peace*) [in:] *Wojna i pokój. Wybrane zagadnienia prawno-historyczne* (*War and Peace. Selected Legal and Historical Issues*), eds. E. Kozerska, P. Sadowski, A. Szymański, Opole 2013, p. 14.

[7] C. von Clausewitz, *On War*, https://www.clausewitz.com/readings/OnWar1873/BK1ch01.html#a (access:12.03.2018). See also: S. Górka, *Doświadczenie wojen napoleońskich w życiu i myśli Carla von Clausewitza do roku 1815* (*Experience of the Napoleonic Wars in Life and Thought of Carl von Clausewitz to Year 1815*), "Politeja" 2013, Vol. 3, pp. 53–83; M. Marszałek, *Wojny nieregularne. Przeszłość i przyszłość. Doświadczenia i wnioski* (*Irregular Wars. Past and Future. Experience and Conclusions*), Warszawa 2016.

[8] A. Zwoliński, *Wojna. Wybrane zagadnienia* (*War: Selected Issues*), Kraków 2003, p. 16.

[9] Aristotle, *Retoryka* (*Rhetoric*), Warszawa 2014, p. 58, 1359 b.

[10] For example, Demosthenes in his oration wrote a sentence of timeless validity: "The principal, however, (if you consider rightly) you will find arises from those persons [translated as "politycy [politicians]" in the Polish translation], who rather choose to flatter you, than offer you those salutary counsels, your circumstances require." Demosthenes, *The Third Oration against Philip* [in:] Demosthenes, *Orations of Demosthenes*, London 1757, p. 248, https://archive.org/details/orationsofdemost01demo (access: 12.01.2018).

the word *δημαγωγός* [demagogós] was used. However, it had an ambiguous, positive--pejorative meaning.[11]

The importance of speeches, including counselling speeches, resulted from Hellenistic tradition dating back to the archaic era. Even then, the Greek culture was a typical culture of the spoken word. In his introduction to his selection of Demosthenes' speeches, R. Turasiewicz even writes that the Greeks, without knowing the art of writing for a long period of time, in a special way developed a sensitivity to the spoken word. They were to experience aesthetic pleasures by listening to speakers and admiring their ingenuity, virtuosity of vocabulary, wealth of imagination, and gestures.[12] It can therefore be said that there was a cult of a living word there, and the speakers were listened to with pleasure.[13] Therefore, the power of the spoken word, not without reason, was described by Gorgias in *Encomium of Helen*, as "a powerful potentate, who with frailest, feeblest frame works wonders. For it can put an end to fear and make vexation vanish; it can inspire exultation and increase compassion."[14]

The sources and the importance of the power of counselling speeches can be found in Homer's poems: *The Iliad* and *The Odyssey.*[15] Admittedly, in Homer's stories there is no apotheosis of war as a social phenomenon, but it is already clearly noticeable that soldierly virtues: bravery, courage, strength, and honour gain an ethical confirmation, which will be repeatedly mentioned later in rhetorical speeches.[16] But it was only the Athenian expansiveness, the struggle for domination in the Hellenic world and the development of the democratic system that became the cause of the dynamic development of political counselling speeches. Their special manifestation were speeches about war or peace. Rhetorical orations related to polemology can be called exciters [Lat. *excito – I move*, *excite*, *awake*]. They are a typical example of counselling speeches, since they relate to the future, and because the primary objective of the speakers is to encourage or discourage a specific action. Exciters, whose subject is war, can be divided into two types: the political and the martial. A political exciter, usually delivered by a politician, was to

[11] M.H. Hansen, *Demokracja ateńska w czasach Demostenesa* (*The Athenian Democracy in the Age of Demosthenes*), Warszawa 1999, p. 270.

[12] R. Turasiewicz, *Wstęp* (*Introduction*) [in:] Demosthenes, *Wybór mów* (*Selected Speeches*), Wrocław 2005, p. LXXIII.

[13] S. Skimina, *Istota i rola retoryki w starożytności (Nature and Role of Rhetoric in Antiquity)*, "Meander" 1947, Vol. 4–5, p. 209.

[14] L. Van Hook, *The Encomium of Helen*, *by Gorgias*, "The Classical Weekly" 1913, Vol. 16, p. 123.

[15] In *The Iliad* there are examples of typical counselling speeches, especially by Nestor, but there is also an interesting example of a hypocritical counselling speech. This applies to Agamemnon, who spoke in front of the army in such a way that it seemed that he advised them to return home, although in reality his goal was quite the opposite. We read, "Listen to what I say: Let everyone – come back. It's time to hurry up to your beloved homeland. When it's hard to be happy at the victory over Troy". Homer, *Iliad*, Wrocław 2004, p. 35. In *The Odyssey*, an advisory thread often appears, also from the gods. Acting in disguise, Athena advised Telemachus, "Come now, give ear, and hearken to my words. On the morrow call to an assembly the Achaean lords, and speak out thy word to all, and let the gods be thy witnesses. As for the wooers, bid them scatter, each to his own; and for thy mother, if her heart bids her marry, let her go back to the hall of her mighty father". Homer, *Odyssey*, Wrocław 2004, pp. 17–18. For more on Homer's influence on the development of rhetoric see: M. Tkacz, *Homer a klasyczna teoria retoryki* (*Homer and a Classic Theory of Rhetoric*), "Meander" 2001, Vol. 1–2, pp. 41–53.

[16] J. Borgosz, *Drogi i bezdroża filozofii pokoju* (*Roads and Sideways of the Philosophy of Peace*), Warszawa 1989, pp. 11–12.

convince listeners to initiate a war, or to maintain or make peace. In turn, a battle exciter, was most often delivered just before the clash of troops, and the speaker was the commander, who, in this way, wanted to raise the morale of his soldiers. Due to the above-mentioned purpose of this text, the main subject of further considerations will be only those speeches, whose main theme was war or peace. This category includes both proper counselling speeches and funeral speeches delivered in honour of soldiers who died in the war. The speeches whose subject was the Panhellenic idea of unifying Greek poleis to fight the common enemy form a somewhat separate category. The uniqueness of these speeches is therefore based on their dual task. On the one hand, they encouraged peace (among the Greeks) and on the other, they encouraged war (with the common enemy).

Demosthenes

The growing power of Philip II of Macedon was a special canvas for the subject of war in rhetorical speeches of the classical period. Among the Athenian speakers, whose literary immortality was guaranteed by the speeches given in connection with the activities of Philip II of Macedon, was Demosthenes. The rhetorical triptych, his Philippics, allows effectively to depict the entire oratory talent of the Athenian speaker who was fluent in applying all three tonal styles.[17] These speeches also contain a clearly polemological subject matter. For in each of the speeches it is possible to find the elements of a call to belligerent activities, specific political and military solutions, and references to values which were threatened by the growth of Macedonian power. The first of the speeches delivered against Philip was also a special one in Demosthenes' life. Never before had he spoken at the Ecclesia prior to all other speakers. He began his speech in a typical way, indicating why he was speaking and why he was not waiting until others had spoken first. However, after a short introduction, he expressed in concrete words both hope for improvement of the political situation of Athens and a reprimand for those gathered. He pointed out to the Athenians that they had evaded the fulfilment of public tasks, which, in his opinion, caused an exceptionally bad situation for their polis.[18] Such an unambiguous position was one of the characteristic features of Demosthenes' style – he was not afraid to criticize publicly the inhabitants of Athens whenever the good of the state was at stake.[19]

By completing the basic function of a counselling speech, Demosthenes in his orations called on his listeners to take concrete action. In "The First Oration against Philip"

---

[17] L. Rzymowska, *O języku Demostenesa w świetle uwarunkowań komunikacji politycznej w Atenach w IV w. p.n.e.* (*On the Language of Demosthenes in the Light of the Conditions of Political Communication in Athens in the 4th c. B.C.*), "Biuletyn Polskiego Towarzystwa Językoznawczego" 2004, Vol. 60, p. 169.

[18] Demosthenes, *The First Oration against Philip* [in:] Demosthenes, *Orations…*, p. 48.

[19] Demosthenes said straightly, "But if an orator could in reality, as in words, pass over whatever might be offensive to his Audience, all popular Orations should be formed only to please. But when this pleasing art of speaking, if not in some measure profitable, is in fact pernicious, it is shameful, O men of Athens, to delude yourselves, and by rejecting what may perhaps be disagreeable, to be for ever too late in all your operations". Demosthenes, *The First Oration against Philip* [in:] Demosthenes, *Orations…*, p. 71.

he spoke using these words, "When therefore, o men of Athens, when will you act, as your glory, your interest demands? When some new event shall happen? When, in the name of Jupiter! some strong necessity shall compel you?"[20] It is important to remember that among these calls, Demosthenes' speeches also contain not only a general idea of action, but also specific guidance as to what kind of actions they are supposed to be. Very often these were pieces of advice relating directly to the preparations and war activities suggested by the speaker. He encouraged the Athenians to abandon any excuses allowing them to avoid involvement in war affairs. He called on the wealthy to make voluntary additional donations to feed the war budget, on the youth to fight in the ranks of the army, and on all residents to believe in the need to rely on themselves and not wait for action from others.[21]

In 349 B.C. the attention of the Athenians, gathered at the Ecclesia, focused on the question of the inhabitants of Olynthus, a city on the Peninsula of Chalcidice. The attack of Philip II of Macedon forced them to offer the Athenians the conclusion of a defensive alliance and to summon them for help. However, the complex nature of the earlier relations between Athens and Olynthus did not allow for an easy answer. A discussion and the argumentative force of Demosthenes was needed. In his three orations he advised the Athenians in favour of the military support of Olynthus' inhabitants; he polemicized with representatives of the political party advocating peace, and presented specific solutions to fight the Macedonian aggressor effectively. The first of these speeches emphasized the relationship between the fate of Olynthus and the fate of Athens, the second one showed the weaknesses of the Macedonian state, and the third one was a kind of programme that allowed for the strengthening of Athens' military forces.[22] It is worth emphasizing that the specificity of the solutions proposed by Demosthenes also referred to the sphere of law. In *The Third Olynthiac* we can find a specific piece of advice on legal solutions and the legislative process. Interestingly, in the part which concerns the statement about the existence of law inflation in Athens, one can see a very current and timeless call to the need to reduce the amount of unnecessary regulations. Demosthenes advised:

> You may constitute Magistrates for the preservation and inspection of our laws, yet suffer not those Magistrates to enact any new laws. Indeed, they are already abundantly sufficient. Let them repeal those, which are at present prejudicial; or, to speak plainly, those, which regard the theatre and the army. Some of these distribute the military funds in theatrical entertainments for our loiterers at

[20] *Ibidem*, p. 53. In a similar vein, he spoke in *The Third Olynthiac*, saying, "However, if even now, laying aside these pernicious customs, you will yourselves enlist in your army; if you will act in a manner worthy of your own dignity, and employ your national strength in acquiring foreign advantages." Demosthenes, *The Third Olynthiac* [in:] *idem*, *Orations…*, p. 167.

[21] Demosthenes, *The First Oration against Philip* [in:] *idem*, *Orations…*, p. 51, Similarly, he called in *The First Olynthiac*, "Convinced of this truth, o men of Athens, and strongly reflecting upon all other circumstances of importance, you should with cheerfulness, with ardour, give your whole attention, if ever, certainly now, to the war; bringing in your contributions with alacrity; marching yourselves to the field, and leaving nothing, that concerns the public welfare, neglected. For there is no longer either reason left, or excuse for irresolution and inaction." Demosthenes, *The First Olynthiac* [in:] Demosthenes, *Orations…*, pp. 107–108.

[22] R. Turasiewicz, *Demostenes* (*Demosthenes*), Kraków 1992, p. 35.

> home. Others protect in impunity whoever refuses to enlist, and consequently render them, who would willingly perform their duty, less animated in the performance.[23]

Speaking of a theatre fund, Demosthenes takes a critical stance towards the Athenian "peace faction" represented by Eubulos, who, from about 355 B.C., was the manager of this fund and an informal manager of foreign policy.[24]

The rhetorical efforts of the speakers at the Ecclesia can also be a source of polemologic knowledge on the tactics of war. By advising the Athenians to help the inhabitants of Olynthus, Demosthenes presented a classical principle of conducting warfare as far as possible from the home territory. He therefore spoke directly of the necessity to move the war away from their native land, as well as of the need to direct it towards the country of Philip II of Macedon. In his opinion, such an expedition would also be an opportunity for young people to gain wartime experience, so that in this way they could become fearsome defenders of their native land in the future.[25] In *The First Oration against Philip* Demosthenes also presents military realism, saying directly that the Athenians have no way of raising an army that could face Philip in the open field. Therefore, he advises the use of hit-and-run tactics with a small army, consisting of both citizens and mercenaries. Therefore, he criticizes the concentration of the military force of the state only on mercenary troops, which had been a relatively common practice since the time of the Peloponnesian War. He was saying quite ironically that since mercenary troops fight without the participation of the Athenians, they can only win victories over friendly or allied countries.[26]

Demosthenes was also familiar with other secrets of the art of war, which had already been described by Sun Tzu, in the oldest known textbook of the art of war.[27] Therefore, the Athenian speaker perceived the necessity to include in the war preparations the whole geographical condition of the country which was to be the theatre of war. Advising this approach, he praised Philip II of Macedon for his ability to use the blowing winds and changing seasons, which would give him an advantage over the Athenian armies.[28]

---

[23] Demosthenes, *The Third Olynthiac* [in:] *idem*, *Orations…*, p. 150. The Athenian festival fund (θεωρικων [theorikon]) was established by Pericles and originally allowed payment of 2 obols for citizens to purchase a ticket to the theatre. From the middle of the 4th century B.C. it was a kind of separate treasury to which in time of peace all state income surplus was paid. Public works were also financed from this fund. Accordingly: M.H. Hansen, *Demokracja…*, p. 376.

[24] T. Babnis, *Polityczne plany Demostenesa w jego mowie „W obronie mieszkańców Megalopolis"* (*Political Plans of Demosthenes in His Oration "For the Megalopolitans"*), "Nowy Filomata" 2014, Vol. 2, p. 164. For more about Eubulos, including his relationship with Demosthenes, see: G. Cawkwell, *Eubulus*, "The Journal of Hellenic Studies" 1963, Vol. 83, pp. 47–67, htpps://doi:10.2307/628453 (access: 15.01.2018).

[25] Demosthenes, *The First Olynthiacs* [in:] *idem*, *Orations…*, p. 119.

[26] Demosthenes, *The First Oration against Philip* [in:] *idem*, *Orations…*, pp. 61–62.

[27] Sun Tzu wrote: "The art of war, then, is governed by five constant factors, to be taken into account in one's deliberations, when seeking to determine the conditions obtaining in the field. These are: (1) The Moral Law; (2) Heaven; (3) Earth; (4) The Commander; (5) Method and discipline. The Moral Law causes the people to be in complete accord with their ruler, so that they will follow him regardless of their lives, undismayed by any danger". Sun Tzu, *Art of War*, http://classics.mit.edu/Tzu/artwar.html (access: 22.01.2018).

[28] As he said, "[Philip is] waiting for the North-East winds in summer, and the violence with which they blow in winter, he makes his attacks, when we are unable to sail out of our harbours to oppose him". Demosthenes, *The First Oration against Philip* [in:] *idem*, *Orations…*, pp. 65–66.

Therefore, once again, he counselled against the use of mercenary troops, because their actions would always be late, and instead, he advised using a regular army on standby.[29]

Political realism in international relations

The war orations from the classical period were also a source for development of the idea of political realism in the theory of international relations. In this context it is essential to mention two dialogues. The first took place during the meeting of the Ecclesia in the year 428 B.C. where the counselling speeches discussed the issue of the departure of the Mytileneans from the ranks of the Athenians' allies. The Athenian army, under the strategist Paches, captured the rebellious city, and thanks to Cleon's speeches, it was decided that all men in the rebellious city would be killed, and that the women and children would be sold into slavery. Thanks to the efforts of the deputies from Mytilene who were present in Athens, it was decided, however, to discuss this matter once again. Then, Cleon and his interlocutor, Diodotus, took the floor again. In the end, the cruel decision was changed, but it was not the death of a thousand citizens of Mytilene that survived in historical consciousness, but the oratories presented in this matter. Cleon, defending the original version of the resolution, argued by referring to the concept of collective guilt and justice based on the idea of retribution.[30] He said therefore,

> The Mytileneans to have been honoured by us on the same footing as the rest, and in that case they would not have come to such a pitch of insolence; for in other instances, as well as theirs, man is naturally inclined to despise those who court him, and to respect those who do not stoop to him. But let them even now be punished as their crimes deserve; and let not the guilt attach to the aristocracy, while you acquit the commons.[31]

In turn, Diodotus, opposed the proposed severity and maintained that not only would such a punishment fail to stop other poleis from rebellion, but it would prolong their resistance to the limits, while the effort expended in the destruction of Mytilene would reduce Athens's income.[32] Therefore, he argued with these words:

> We must not, therefore, commit ourselves to a false policy through a belief in the efficacy of the punishment of death, or exclude rebels from the hope of repentance and an early atonement of their error. […] Confess, therefore, that this is the wisest course, and without conceding too much either to pity or to indulgence, by neither of which motives do I any more than Cleon wish you to be influenced, upon the plain merits of the case before you, be persuaded by me to try calmly those of the Mytileneans whom Paches sent off as guilty, and to leave the rest undisturbed. This is at once best for the future, and most terrible to your enemies at the present moment; inasmuch as good policy against an adversary is superior to the blind attacks of brute force.[33]

---

[29] *Ibidem*, p. 66.

[30] M. Walzer, *Wojny sprawiedliwe i niesprawiedliwe* (*Just and Unjust Wars*), Warszawa 2010, p. 47.

[31] M. Gumkowski (ed.), *Wielkie mowy historii* (*Great Speeches of History*), Vol. I, Warszawa 2006, pp. 28–30.

[32] N.G.L. Hammond, *A History of Greece*, Warszawa 1994, pp. 427–428.

[33] M. Gumkowski (ed.), *Wielkie…*, pp. 34–35.

The second of the rhetorical examples of political realism, in which there is no room for ethical nuances, can be found in the statements of Athenian deputies spoken to the authorities and prominent citizens of Melos. This text, contained in book V of the *History of the Peloponnesian War* by Thucydides, is known by the name of the Melian dialogue. Although the inhabitants of Melos were Lacedaemonic colonists, they wished to remain neutral during the Peloponnesian War. However, the Athenians gave them an ultimatum: they were to join the Maritime Union, or the island was to be destroyed. In view of the refusal of the inhabitants of Melos, the Athenians fulfilled their threat, and ultimately, the army under the command of Philocrates captured the city. Consequently, all the captured men were murdered, and the children and women were sold into slavery. Considering the contemporary realities, the cruelty of the fate of the Melians is not exceptional. On the other hand, the rhetorical message of the Athenian deputies was rather unique. They rejected all moral considerations and scruples, and openly proclaimed the view that violence was just, and that the law of the strongest results from the law of nature.[34] The Athenian deputies therefore advised the inhabitants of Melos not to follow a poorly conceived sense of honour and ambition, and nor to hope in any forthcoming help from their ally Sparta. They also rejected the proposal of friendship from the Melians, saying directly that other poleis allied with Athens would perceive such declarations of friendship as a sign of weakness, while enmity between them would be a demonstration of their power. The words of the Athenians were full of merciless realism,

> Since you know as well as we do that right, as the world goes, is only in question between equals in power, while the strong do what they can and the weak suffer what they must […] Of the gods we believe, and of men we know, that by a necessary law of their nature they rule wherever they can. And it is not as if we were the first to make this law, or to act upon it when made: we found it existing before us, and shall leave it to exist for ever after us; all we do is to make use of it, knowing that you and everybody else, having the same power as we have, would do the same as we do.[35]

The polemological aspect of the rhetoric of the classical period is also evident in the speeches that deal with advising in favour of peace. A special place in this regard is taken by the speeches given in connection with the conclusion of the so-called Peace of Philocrates between Athens and Macedon. Interestingly, Demosthenes, the uncompromised enemy of Philip II, gave a speech in defence of the peace. The speech titled *On Peace* which he delivered in 346 B.C. is another demonstration of the rationalism and political pragmatism in Demosthenes' thinking, since he saw that in its current situation, the preservation of peace was in line with the Athenian political interest. Pointing to his total impartiality in public activities, he advised the Athenians to follow the principle that the desire to win new allies, increase the state's income, or give it any other favour cannot come at the expense of peace, even though the treaty is not particularly beneficial for them.[36] In this speech, Demosthenes also expressed the conviction that the preservation of peace would give the Athenians more benefits and fewer disputes and arguments, and

---

[34] R. Turasiewicz, *Tukidydes* (*Thucydides*), Wrocław 1987, p. 44.

[35] Thucydides, *History of the Peloponnesian War*, http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus%3Atext%3A1999.01.0200 (access: 22.01.2018).

[36] As he said: "It does not mean that it is a peace worthy of you or especially beneficial for you. But whatever would be there, it would be more appropriate to your current state interests not to make it at all, rather than to break it now, because the numerous losses that we have suffered mean that today we would have

that in Athens's current situation, the undertaking of actions leading to the outbreak of war would be a manifestation of blindness and political naivety.[37]

The peace, concluded in 346 B.C., between Macedon and Athens, became the source of many political and legal disputes. It is enough to mention that the Ecclesia accused its main author, Philocrates, of treason and accepting a bribe from Philip II. Philocrates fled from Athens before the trial began, but he was sentenced to death *in absentia*. Equally serious was the case of Aeschines, one of the most important Athenian politicians, who, by insisting that Philip II had no hostile intentions towards Athens, was accused of being philo-Macedonian. Aeschines was an excellent speaker, which made him one of Demosthenes' most powerful political adversaries. Both politicians were part of the Athenian delegation which was sent to meet Philip II, and regarding the events connected with this political mission, Demosthenes brought legal proceedings against Aeschines for betrayal of the deputy mission, *παραπρεσβεια* [parapresbeia], accusing him, too, of accepting a bribe.[38] Aeschines gave his defence speech, recalling the story of the deputy mission to Philip, and also attacking Demosthenes directly, calling him a bastard, a liar, and an effeminate libertine. He also admitted to have stood for making peace with Philip, but only because in his opinion it would have been much better choice than war. Arguing for peace, he spoke in such a way that his words gained timelessness. He said that during a war some people grow richer from the state coffers and "peace does not feed laziness".[39] He also noticed the interdependence between the preservation of the state of peace on the one hand, and the possibilities of development of and the survival of the democratic system on the other. He expressed his disdain for the supporters of the war party in Athens, accusing them of pushing the polis into the dangers of war, and at the same time accusing them of inciting the people while avoiding direct involvement in warfare themselves. As he said: "[These men are] trying to put an end to the peace, wherein lies the safety of the democracy, and in every way fomenting war, the destroyer of popular government".[40] At the end of his speech, he argued that the acquittal of the supporters of peace and state security would gain the polis many collaborators ready to expose themselves for the benefit of the entire state.

Another example of a rhetorical encouragement to make peace, this time with Sparta, is Andocides' oration *On the Peace with the Lacedaemons*. Andocides, one of the ten most prominent Attic speakers, supposedly delivered it in 392 or 391 B.C., although there are also voices that question his authorship of this text. From the very first sentence of his speech, Andocides expressed his conviction that the Athenians should understand that it is better to make peace on fair terms than to fight a war. Then, convinced that one should use the examples of the past to understand better the future, he presented the history of the peace treaties concluded by the Athenians and the benefits they derived

to wage war with greater risk and in much more difficult conditions than then." Demosthenes, *On Peace* [in:] *idem*, *Orations…*, pp. 179–180.

[37] *Ibidem*, pp. 187–188.

[38] W. Lengauer, *Wstęp* (*Introduction*) [in:] Aeschines, *Mowy* (*The Speeches of Aeschines*), Warszawa 2004, pp. 119–120.

[39] Aeschines, *The Speeches of Aeschines*, London 1919, p. 283.

[40] *Ibidem*, p. 297.

from them.[41] He also saw the relationship between the conclusion of peace and the permanence of the Athenian political system, saying that the war would bring about the overthrow of democracy. He also believed that a state should only resort to war when harm is done or when it is helpful to a victim. Therefore, he asked:

> Why are we to continue fighting? To free Athens? She is free already. To be able to build ourselves walls? The peace gives us that right also! To be allowed to build new triremes, and refit and keep our old ones? That is assured us as well […]. So, if we have no reasons for prolonging the war, no enemy to fight, and no resources, why should we not make every effort to secure peace?[42]

Andocides ended his speech by addressing the gathering and stressing that the choice belonged to them, and that each speaker in the debate becomes a deputy who has the power to make peace or initiate a war. In the last sentence, he called on the voters to make a choice that they would never regret in the future.[43]

Panhellenism in speeches

In the list of rhetorical speeches of the classical period, a special place is occupied by those whose goal was a kind of hybrid approach consisting of encouraging the conclusion of peace among Greeks in order to fight a common enemy. Speeches of this kind were written and delivered in connection with the development of Panhellenic ideas, which assumed strengthening the military forces of poleis by abandoning the feuds between them and uniting them in the face of shared threats.

Perhaps the first speech where this kind of idea is expressed is the *Olympic Speech* by Gorgias of Leontinoi. It has survived to the present day only in a small fragment, but it is also described by the Sophists' biographer Philistratus, a philosopher, who mentions that Gorgias called for reconciliation among the Greek poleis which were then at war. He even used the term *ομοφωνία* [homofonia – unanimity, unity, compatibility of views, unison], which was used to describe relationships in a family or polis. However, in Gorgias' speech, this term referred to relations between Greek city-states, and acquired a new, more universal, and broader meaning.[44] In the same spirit, another *Olympic Speech* was written by Lysias. Being a logographer by profession, Lysias, was valued for writing in beautiful and simple language, which was considered a model of Attic eloquence.[45] The author of this speech urges the Hellenic people to live in a universal harmony under the auspices of the Lacedaemons and sees a danger threatening the Greeks on two sides: from the tyrant Dionysius I of Syracuse and from the Persians. Although

---

[41] Andocides, *Minor Attic Orator*s, London 1941, pp. 499–509, https://archive.org/details/L308MinorAtticOratorsIAntiphonAndocides (access: 20.02.2018).

[42] *Ibidem*, pp. 509–511.

[43] *Ibidem*, p. 531.

[44] R. Turasiewicz, *Życie i twórczość Lizjasza. Początki praktyki i teorii retorycznej* (*Life and Work of Lisias: Beginnings of Rhetorical Theory and Practice*), Kraków 1999, p. 284.

[45] S. Stabryła, *Historia literatury starożytnej Grecji i Rzymu* (*History of Literature of Ancient Greece and Rome*), Wrocław 2002, p. 91.

Lysias probably did not deliver the speech himself, and it was written for an opponent of the rule of the tyrant of Syracuse, the Panhellenic idea is clearly visible in it.[46] The following appeal can be read in it,

> We ought therefore to relinquish our mutual warfare, and with a single purpose in our hearts to secure our salvation; to feel shame for past events and fear for those that lie in the future, and to compete with our ancestors, by whom the foreigner, in grasping at the land of others, was deprived of his own, and who expelled the despots, and established freedom for all in common. […] Let us not wait for forces of both our foes to advance upon ourselves, but while there is yet time let us arrest their outrage.[47]

Panhellenic ideas were also manifested in the works of Isocrates, who remained faithful to them until the end of his life, even though, as S. Schneider writes, no one would call this speaker a man of constant and unshakeable convictions.[48] Several times, for instance, he changed his opinions as for who should lead the Greek army against Persia. Initially, it was Athens, then Sparta, and finally Macedon under Philip II.[49] This apparent change of hope associated with Panhellenic unity was only an expression of the conviction that such a unification is possible only when there is an appropriate "guiding factor".[50] It does not change the fact that Isocrates' entire thesis is somehow permeated with politics and is a manifestation of his political thought, at the heart of which was always the wellbeing of democratic Athens.[51] Panhellenic ideas were already included in *Panegyricus*, over which the work lasted for a few or even several years, starting from 392 B.C. Isocrates wrote directly about his intentions, "I […] am justified by a twofold motive in devoting most of your attention to these points: […] that we may put an end to our mutual rivalries and unite in a war against the barbarian".[52] And another extract,

> What I have to say on these points is simple and easy: It is not possible for us to cement an enduring peace unless we join together in a war against the barbarians, not for the Hellenes to attain to concord until we wrest our material advantages from one and the same source and wage our wars against one and the same enemy.[53]

The idea of peace between the Athenians and the whole world can also be found in the oration *On Peace*, which can be regarded as a political treatise whose uniqueness also

---

[46] R. Turasiewicz, *Wstęp* (*Introduction*) [in:] Lisias, *Mowy* (*Orations*), Kraków 1998, p. 254.

[47] Lisias, *Olympic Oration* [in:] *idem*, *Orations*, London 1930, pp. 687–689, https://archive.org/details/lysiaslamb00lysiuoft (access: 15.03.2018).

[48] S. Schneider, *Isokrates wobec politei ateńskiej Arystotelesa* (*Isokrates to Athens politei of Aristotle*), Kraków 1895, p. 23.

[49] A. Ryś, *Wizerunek „wybawcy" Hellady u Isokratesa* (*An Image of the "Saviour" of Hellas in Isocrates*), "Symbolae Philologorum Posnaniensium Graecae Et Latinae" 2009, pp. 64–65.

[50] H.I. Marrou, *Historia wychowania w starożytności* (*A History of Education in Antiquity*), Warszawa 1969, p. 139.

[51] K. Tuszyńska-Maciejewska, *Izokrates jako twórca parenezy w prozie greckiej* (*Isocrates as the Creator of Parainesis in Greek Prose*), Poznań 2004, pp. 195–196. Isocrates' political commitment is also openly noticeable in the letter written just before his death to Philip II. Being ninety-eight years old, Isocrates once again demonstrates his Panhellenic ideas in this letter. L. van Hook, *Isocrates: in three volumes*, Vol. 3, London 1945, pp. 403–407.

[52] Isocrates, *Panegyricus*, p. 131, https://archive.org/details/L209IsocratesIDemonicusNicockles PanegyricusPhilipArchidamus (access: 16.03.2018).

[53] *Ibidem*, p. 231.

stems from the fact that Isocrates drops there his moderate style and allows himself to be outraged and even bitter in order to give the oration a specific tone.[54] Panhellenic ideas accompanied Isocrates constantly, although, as mentioned above, they are expressed in a variety of different versions, including in the speech *Panathenaicus*, published at the end of his life, which T. Sinko even called his "political testament".[55] Isocrates was ninety-seven at the time, and the basic content of this speech is a review of Greek history from the perspective of Athens and Sparta, and in particular the events that took place between the invasion of Xerxes and Isocrates' times.[56]

Funereal speeches

A particular example of the speech whose subject was linked to the issues of war and peace, was the Athenian *επιτάφιος λόγος* [epitáfios lógos]. Funeral speeches played an important political role because, thanks to them, the art of speaking, gaining an official rank, experienced a certain legitimacy in Athens.[57] And although, as N. Loraux writes, they were closer to speeches appropriate for aristocratic societies, they were political speeches "marked with the seal of democracy".[58] The speeches of this kind, which in the Aristotelian classification are categorised as epideictic oratory, had their own specific composition arrangement.[59] Thus, they included praise of ancestors and of the political system of Athens and the character traits of its inhabitants, historical and mythological references to the Athenian polis, the usual lamentation of the dead, and consolation.[60]

The tradition of delivering these speeches goes back at least as far as the Persian Wars and is closely linked with the Athenian funeral ritual. The cult of the dead in ancient Greece played a vital role in the social life, becoming a bonding element not only to the family but the entire polis.[61] A description of a collective funeral organised from national funds, is owed to Thucydides, who describes the Athenian burial ceremony dedicated to the heroes who died in the first year of the Peloponnesian War.[62] It is worth emphasizing

---

[54] J.F. Dobson, *The Greek Orators*, New York 2015, p. 97.

[55] T. Sinko, *Literatura grecka* (*Greek Literature*), Vol. 1, part 2, Kraków 1932, p. 692.

[56] W.E. Thompson, *Isocrates on the Peace Treaties*, "The Classical Quarterly" 1983, Vol. 33 (1), p. 78.

[57] K. Tuszyńska-Maciejewska, *Platon a retoryka. Od krytyki do modelu* (*Plato and Rhetoric: From Criticism to the Model*), Poznań 1996, p. 86.

[58] N. Loraux, *The Invention of Athens: The Funeral Oration in the Classical City*, New York 2006, p. 45.

[59] Aristotle also sees a connection between praise and counselling speeches, writing that what forms the basis of a counselling speech becomes praise if it is expressed in a different linguistic form. Aristotle, *Rhetoric…*, p. 81.

[60] K. Tuszyńska-Maciejewska, *Słowo wstępne (Preface)* [in:] Plato, *Menexenus*, Wrocław 1994, p. IX. For information on the funeral rituals of the Greeks and funeral speech structure see also: A. Wypustek, *Rytuał pogrzebowy Greków w starożytności w świetle epigramów nagrobnych* (*Greek Funerary Ritual in Antiquity in the Light of Grave Epigrams*), „Zeszyty Naukowe Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego", „Studia Religiologica" 2009 (42), p. 29, and J. Herrman, *The Athenian Funeral Orations*, Indianapolis 2004, pp. 5–7.

[61] B. Bravo, E. Wipszycka, *Historia starożytnych Greków. Do końca wojen perskich* (*History of Ancient Greeks. Until the End of the Persian Wars*), Warszawa 1988, p. 324.

[62] L. Winniczuk, *Ludzie, zwyczaje, obyczaje starożytnej Grecji i Rzymu* (*People, Customs, Habits of Ancient Greece and Rome*), Warszawa 1985, p. 460.

that the task of presenting an epitaph was assigned to the speaker elected at the Ecclesia, and that this was a manifestation of a special recognition from the Athenian people.[63] Undoubtedly, the best known funeral speech is the one delivered by Pericles, whose content we know thanks to Thucydides. A known Hellenist, Ulrich von Wilamowitz, called it even slightly maliciously a funeral speech in honour of Athenian democracy.[64] It is not only a source of information about Pericles' rhetorical artistry, but also, or perhaps above all, is the most extensive example of praise for the Athenian system. The speaker clearly indicates that one of the reasons for the power of the state is a systemic form adopted by the Athenians, which is based on three distinct pillars: equality, freedom, and the rule of law. Pericles begins the characteristics of democracy by indicating that it is a system based on the majority of citizens and by expressing a belief that it is not the result of imitation of foreign laws; on the contrary, it is rather the Athenians that are a model for others. He further argued about the equality of citizens before the law, and the rule according to which poverty or an unknown origin does not interfere with the attainment of honours in the service of the homeland. In Pericles' opinion, freedom commands the Athenians to respect the privacy of citizens and respect their interests without the danger of scornful looks from their fellows. According to Pericles, forbearance in private life relates to the respect for law in public life and obedience to the current power and law, especially unwritten.[65] He continued:

> Nor are these the only points in which our city is worthy of admiration. We cultivate refinement without extravagance and knowledge without effeminacy; wealth we employ more for use than for show […]. Our public men have, besides politics, their private affairs to attend to, and our ordinary citizens, though occupied with the pursuits of industry, are still fair judges of public matters; for, unlike any other nation, regarding him who takes no part in these duties not as unambitious but as useless.[66]

These words clearly show that for the Athenians civic membership was considered the only remarkable relation and would dominate over other types of interpersonal relations.[67] However, considering the elitist character of Athenian democracy, one should, of course, object to the treatment of Pericles' characteristics as a real reflection of the political image of Ancient Athens. In the professional literature, one can also find voices that this speech, at least in part, was arranged by Thucydides to present a more general lecture on democracy.[68] However, the ideas indicated by Pericles that form the foundations of a democratic public order, remain up-to-date, which undeniably makes this speech

[63] This was also in the case of a funeral speech delivered by Demosthenes in honour of soldiers killed in the Battle of Chaeronea. Demosthenes was granted this honour even though he was accused of having run away from the battlefield himself. Plutarch wrote about him that, "He left his position on the battlefield and escaped disgracefully, having abandoned his weapon […]." Plutarch, *Cztery żywoty. Lizander, Sulla, Demostenes, Cyceron* (*Four Lives. Lysander, Sulla, Demosthenes, Cicero*), Warszawa 1954, pp. 138–139.

[64] J. Baszkiewicz, F. Ryszka, *Historia doktryn politycznych i prawnych* (*History of Political and Legal Doctrines*), Warszawa 1970, p. 36.

[65] Thucydides, *History…*, p. 149. The spokesperson of the democratic equality of citizens was also Gorgias, in his Funeral Speech. Accordingly: J. Gajda, *Sofiści* (*Sophists*), Warszawa 1989, p. 129.

[66] Thucydides, *History…*, p. 151.

[67] Ch. Meier, *Powstanie polityczności u Greków* (*The Rise of Politics among the Greeks*), Warszawa 2012, p. 294.

[68] C. Mielczarski, *Sofiści i polityka* (*Sophists and Politics*), Warszawa 2010, p. 151.

timeless. Until contemporary times, other funeral speeches authored by Gorgias, Lysias, Plato, Demosthenes, and Hyperides have also been preserved, in whole or in fragments. But it is Pericles' speech, despite some dissimilarities with those of the others [e.g. lack of a lamentation], which is a specific point of reference in terms of structure, style, and axiological message.

The above-mentioned counselling speeches fully correspond to the characteristics presented by Aristotle. As he wrote in *Rhetoric*, the aim of a counselling oratory is to incite benefit or harm, and the speaker presents in it a thing recommended as better than the one he advises against.[69] Calling for the initiation of war, or the preservation or establishment of peace, ancient speakers always showed that the position they proposed was in the interests of the whole polis. In Athens, there were plenty of people with extraordinary abilities, who at the same time wanted to devote themselves to politics, although it should be remembered that the remuneration they received was rather symbolic, and the risks that they were exposed to were real indeed.[70] The discussed speeches, in accordance with the Aristotelian characteristics, also carried out the goal of bringing goodness and happiness, typical of a counselling speech. Due to the political decision-making system in Athens, they concerned debatable matters because, as Aristotle writes, "no council is given for matters that are or will become inevitable or are or will be impossible."[71] Furthermore, the analysis of these speeches easily convinces that the speakers used typical rhetorical means of persuasion, which referred to logical, ethical, and emotional arguments.

The history of human thought contains many answers to questions about the nature of war.[72] Following the thought of Heraclitus of Ephesus, one can assume that the ancient belief in this area to a large extent accurately reflects the philosopher's belief that "War is the father and king of all: some he has made gods, and some men; some slaves and some free".[73] However, in harmony with Heraclitean philosophy, it should be remembered that these opposites complement each other, so when we talk about war, we must also remember peace. The particularly significant nature of both these phenomena has made them the subject of lively discussion since ancient times, and our knowledge of ancient disputes in this area comes mainly from the reading of rhetorical orations. For these reasons, it seems that research into the achievements of the classical period speakers is still worth undertaking. The multidimensionality of their achievements also encourages one to reach for new research fields, such as those that allow the search for connections between rhetoric and political and legal thought. Rhetorical speeches of the classical period, whose subject matter is war or peace can be analysed through the prism of the style, ways of argumentation, but also purpose of the given speech. This means that these studies can be conducted by representatives of various fields and disciplines: philologists, historians, anthropologists, and historians of ideas. While from the linguistic or historical point of view, the achievements of ancient speakers seem to have been

---

[69] Aristotle, *Rhetoric…*, p. 55, 1358 b.

[70] M.I. Finley, *Grecy* (*The Greeks*), Warszawa 1965, p. 75.

[71] Aristotle, *Rhetoric…*, 1359 a.

[72] J.J. Piątek, *Wojna – wyzwanie dla historyka* (*War – a Challenge for a Historian*) [in:] *Wojna jako przedmiot badań historycznych* (*War as a Subject of Historical Research*), ed. K. Olejnik, Toruń 2006, p. 62.

[73] Heraclitus of Ephesus, *Zdania* (*Sentences*), Gdańsk 2005, p. 22.

largely examined, this area of research still awaits an in-depth analysis by historians of political and legal doctrines. Among the admiration for the style of ancient masters, analyses of the used topoi, figures, and rhetorical tropes, and the skilful use of questions, exclamatory sentences, requests, and praise, one can find huge amounts of extremely valuable information for learning about the development of political and legal thought. This applies in particular to the understanding of such ideas as freedom, equality before the law, rule of law, *raison d'état*, or service to the homeland. The rhetorical speeches can also complement our knowledge derived from ancient philosophical treatises which consider some forms of the political system, democracy in particular. Reaching for rhetorical statements seems to be even more necessary because the great philosophers of Ancient Greece such as Socrates, Plato, and Aristotle spoke of democracy in a critical way. Obtaining the full spectrum of assessments from ancient times regarding the system that is so common in the civilization of the Western world today seems to be indispensable, also for the contemporary debate on democracy. Finally, as the examples of rhetorical speeches mentioned above indicate, they can be an intriguing source of knowledge in the field of polemological thought. They discuss the actions taken to prepare for war, but also field tactics as such, and finally the actions of the state vis-à-vis the dead soldiers and their families.

The persuasive effectiveness of counselling speeches of the classical period deserves a separate study, although in this context it is worth returning once again to Demosthenes, with whose death this great political expression of democracy also went to the grave.[74] After his death, the Athenians founded a bronze statue in his honour, and on its pedestal, they placed an inscription that fully reflected his invaluable merits. The inscription said: "If thy strength had only been equal to thy purposes, Demosthenes, never would the Greeks have been ruled by a Macedonian Ares."

Doradzam wam wojnę. Doradzam wam pokój. Myśl polemologiczna w mowach retorycznych okresu klasycznego

Streszczenie

Polemologia, jako nauka zajmująca się badaniem zjawiska wojny, znajduje się w obszarze zainteresowań przedstawicieli większości dziedzin i dyscyplin naukowych. W sposób szczególny refleksji tego rodzaju wypada poszukiwać u źródeł europejskiej kultury, czyli w myśli politycznoprawnej starożytnej Grecji. Z kolei częścią tych poszukiwań powinny być badania nad tymi mowami retorycznymi okresu klasycznego, których przedmiotem było budowanie zachęty do wojny lub przeciwnie, w których doradzano zawarcie pokoju.

Uwzględniając powyższe, celem artykułu jest próba spojrzenia na retorykę wojenną jako na zagadnienie z pogranicza różnych dyscyplin naukowych. Przesłanką do takiego ujęcia są mowy doradcze o wojnie i pokoju takich mówców, jak Lizjasz, Ajschines, Izokrates, Kleon, Diodotos, Andokides czy Demostenes. Warto również zauważyć, że częścią wojennej rzeczywistości retorycznej starożytnej Grecji były także mowy pogrzebowe (Gorgiasza, Lizjasza, Platona, Demostenesa, Peryklesa, Hyperidesa). Mowy te stanowią nie tylko przejaw sztuki retorycznej, ale odwołując się do takich idei,

[74] J. Łanowski, M. Starowieyski, *Literatura Grecji starożytnej w zarysie. Od Homera do Justyniana* (*An Outline of the Literature of Ancient Greece: From Homer to Justinian*), Warszawa 1996, p. 118.

jak demokracja, wolność, panhellenizm czy wojna sprawiedliwa, są cennym materiałem źródłowym także dla historyków doktryn politycznoprawnych.

Zamiarem autorskim jest ukazanie w mowach retorycznych okresu klasycznego (głównie w ekscytarzach politycznych) przejawów myśli polemologicznej oraz weryfikacja hipotezy o istnieniu wspólnych pól badawczych dla retoryki oraz doktryn politycznoprawnych. W literaturze przedmiotu można bowiem dostrzec wyraźne braki w zakresie takiego podejścia. Artykuł jest zatem także próbą zachęty do zwiększonego zainteresowania badaniami nad wojną i retoryką wojenną, w szczególności poprzez pryzmat historii doktryn politycznoprawnych.

Bibliography

Aeschines, *The Speeches of Aeschines*, London 1919.

Andocides, *Minor Attic Orator*s, London 1941, https://archive.org/details/L308MinorAtticOratorsIAntiphonAndocides (access: 20.02.2018).

Aristotle, *Retoryka* (*Rhetoric*), Warszawa 2014.

Babnis T., *Polityczne plany Demostenesa w jego mowie „W obronie mieszkańców Megalopolis"* (*Political Plans of Demosthenes in His Oration "For the Megalopolitans"*), "Nowy Filomata" 2014, Vol. 2.

Baszkiewicz J., Ryszka F., *Historia doktryn politycznych i prawnych* (*History of Political and Legal Doctrines*), Warszawa 1970.

Borgosz J., *Drogi i bezdroża filozofii pokoju* (*Roads and Sideways of the Philosophy of Peace*), Warszawa 1989.

Bravo B., Wipszycka E., *Historia starożytnych Greków. Do końca wojen perskich* (*History of Ancient Greeks. Until the End of the Persian Wars*), Warszawa 1988.

Cawkwell G., *Eubulus*, "The Journal of Hellenic Studies" 1963, Vol. 83, htpps://doi:10.2307/628453 (access: 15.01.2018).

Clausewitz C., *On War*, https://www.clausewitz.com/readings/OnWar1873/BK1ch01.html#a (access: 12.03.2018).

Demosthenes, *Orations of Demosthenes*, London 1757, https://archive.org/details/orationsofdemost01demo (access: 12.01.2018).

Dobson J.F., *The Greek Orators*, New York 2015.

Drabik K., *Zagadnienia ontologiczne wojny, bezpieczeństwa i pokoju w poglądach wybranych myślicieli* (*Ontological Issues of War, Security and Peace in Views of Selected Thinkers*), Warszawa 2011.

Finley M.I., *Grecy* (*The Greeks*), Warszawa 1965.

Gajda J., *Sofiści* (*Sophists*), Warszawa 1989.

Górka S., *Doświadczenie wojen napoleońskich w życiu i myśli Carla von Clausewitza do roku 1815* (*Experience of the Napoleonic Wars in Life and Thought of Carl von Clausewitz to Year 1815*), "Politeja" 2013, Vol. 4.

Gumkowski M. (ed.), *Wielkie mowy historii* (*Great Speeches of History*), Vol. I, Warszawa 2006.

Hammond N.G.L., *A History of Greece*, Warszawa 1994.

Hansen M.H., *Demokracja ateńska w czasach Demostenesa* (*The Athenian Democracy in the Age of Demosthenes*), Warszawa 1999.

Heraclitus of Ephesus, *Zdania* (*Sentences*), Gdańsk 2005.

Herrman J., *The Athenian Funeral Orations*, Indianapolis 2004.

Homer, *Iliad*, Wrocław 2004.

Homer, *Odyssey*, Wrocław 2004.

Hook L., *Isocrates: In Three Volumes*, Vol. 3, London 1945.
Hook L., *The Encomium of Helen*, *by Gorgias*, "The Classical Weekly" 1913, Vol. 16.
Howard M., *Wojna w dziejach Europy* (*War in the History of Europe*), Wrocław 2007.
Huzarski M., *Wiedza o polemologii* (*Knowledge of Polemology*) [in:] *Metodologiczna tożsamość polemologii* (*Methodological Identity of Polemology*), ed. M. Huzarski, B.M. Szulc, Warszawa 2010.
Isocrates, *Panegyricus*, https://archive.org/details/L209IsocratesIDemonicusNicocklesPanegyricusPhilipArchidamus (access: 16.03.2018).
Kozerska E., Scheffler T., *O wojnie i pokoju* (*On War and Peace*) [in:] *Wojna i pokój. Wybrane zagadnienia prawno-historyczne* (*War and Peace. Selected Legal and Historical Issues*), ed. E. Kozerska, P. Sadowski, A. Szymański, Opole 2013.
Lengauer W., *Wstęp* (*Introduction*) [in:] Aeschines, *Mowy* (*The Speeches of Aeschines*), Warszawa 2004.
Lisias, *Olympic Oration* [in:] *idem*, *Orations*, London 1930, https://archive.org/details/lysiaslamb00lysiuoft (access: 15.03.2018).
Loraux N., *The Invention of Athens. The Funeral Oration in the Classical City*, New York 2006.
Łanowski J., Starowieyski M., *Literatura Grecji starożytnej w zarysie. Od Homera do Justyniana* (*An Outline of the Literature of Ancient Greece: From Homer to Justinian*), Warszawa 1996.
Marrou H.I., *Historia wychowania w starożytności* (*A History of Education in Antiquity*), Warszawa 1969.
Marszałek M., *Wojny nieregularne. Przeszłość i przyszłość. Doświadczenia i wnioski* (*Irregular Wars: Past and Future. Experience and Conclusions*), Warszawa 2016.
Meier Ch., *Powstanie polityczności u Greków* (*The Rise of Politics among the Greeks*), Warszawa 2012.
Mielczarski C., *Sofiści i polityka* (*Sophists and Politics*), Warszawa 2010.
Piątek J.J., *Wojna – wyzwanie dla historyka* (*War – a Challenge for a Historian*) [in:] *Wojna jako przedmiot badań historycznych* (*War as a Subject of Historical Research*), ed. K. Olejnik, Toruń 2006.
Plutarch, *Cztery żywoty. Lizander, Sulla, Demostenes, Cyceron* (*Four Lives. Lysander, Sulla, Demosthenes, Cicero*), Warszawa 1954.
Ryś A., *Wizerunek „wybawcy" Hellady u Isokratesa* (*An Image of the "Saviour" of Hellas in Isocrates*), "Symbolae Philologorum Posnaniensium Graecae Et Latinae" 2009.
Rzymowska L., *O języku Demostenesa w świetle uwarunkowań komunikacji politycznej w Atenach w IV w. p.n.e.* (*On the Language of Demosthenes in the Light of the Conditions of Political Communication in Athens in the 4th c. B.C.*), "Biuletyn Polskiego Towarzystwa Językoznawczego" 2004, Vol. 60.
Schneider S., *Isokrates wobec politei ateńskiej Arystotelesa* (*Isokrates to Athens politei of Aristotle*), Kraków 1895.
Sinko T., *Literatura grecka* (*Greek Literature*), Vol. I.2, Kraków 1932.
Skimina S., *Istota i rola retoryki w starożytności (Nature and Role of Rhetoric in Antiquity)*, "Meander" 1947, Vol. 4–5.
Stabryła St., *Historia literatury starożytnej Grecji i Rzymu* (*History of Literature of Ancient Greece and Rome*), Wrocław 2002.
Sun Tzu, *Art of War*, http://classics.mit.edu/Tzu/artwar.html (access: 22.01.2018).
Tatarkiewicz W., *Dzieje sześciu pojęć* (*A Story of Six Concepts*), Warszawa 2012.
Thompson W.E., *Isocrates on the Peace Treaties*, "The Classical Quarterly" 1983, Vol. 33 (1).
Thucydides, *History of the Peloponnesian War*, http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus%3Atext%3A1999.01.0200 (access: 22.01.2018).
Tkacz M., *Homer a klasyczna teoria retoryki* (*Homer and a Classic Theory of Rhetoric*), "Meander" 2001, Vol. 1–2.

Turasiewicz R., *Demostenes* (*Demosthenes*), Kraków 1992.
Turasiewicz R., *Tukidydes* (*Thucydides*), Wrocław 1987.
Turasiewicz R., *Wstęp* (*Introduction*) [in:] Demosthenes, *Wybór mów* (*Selected Speeches*), Wrocław 2005.
Turasiewicz R., *Wstęp* (*Introduction*) [in:] Lisias, *Mowy* (*Orations*), Kraków 1998.
Turasiewicz R., *Życie i twórczość Lizjasza. Początki praktyki i teorii retorycznej* (*Life and Work of Lisias: Beginnings of Rhetorical Theory and Practice*), Kraków 1999.
Tuszyńska-Maciejewska K., *Izokrates jako twórca parenezy w prozie greckiej* (*Isocrates as the Creator of Parainesis in Greek Prose*), Poznań 2004.
Tuszyńska-Maciejewska K., *Platon a retoryka. Od krytyki do modelu* (*Plato and Rhetoric. From Criticism to the Model*), Poznań 1996.
Tuszyńska-Maciejewska K., *Słowo wstępne (Preface)* [in:] Plato, *Menexenus*, Wrocław 1994.
Walzer M., *Wojny sprawiedliwe i niesprawiedliwe* (*Just and Unjust Wars*), Warszawa 2010.
Winniczuk L., *Ludzie, zwyczaje, obyczaje starożytnej Grecji i Rzymu* (*People, Customs, Habits of Ancient Greece and Rome*), Warszawa 1985.
Wypustek A., *Rytuał pogrzebowy Greków w starożytności w świetle epigramów nagrobnych* (*Greek Funerary Ritual in Antiquity in the Light of Grave Epigrams*), „Zeszyty Naukowe Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego", „Studia Religiologica" 2009, Vol. 42.
Zwoliński A., *Wojna. Wybrane zagadnienia* (*War: Selected Issues*), Kraków 2003.