Christophoros Kondoleon's Model of Military Oratory and its Tradition

Juan Carlos Iglesias-Zoido

THIS ARTICLE analyses an unusual Renaissance model of military oratory based on the rhetorical theory of the λόγος ἐσχηματισμένος. The analysis proceeds in three steps. First, an overview of the ancient exhortative referents most widely used in the Renaissance, with a special emphasis on historiographic and epic speeches. Second, an introduction about the life and works of Christophoros Kondoleon, a Greek humanist of the sixteenth century who lived in Italy and France, focusing on his Ἐκλογὴ παρὰ τῶν ὁμηρικῶν ἐπῶν περὶ ἀρίστου στρατηγοῦ καὶ στρατιώτου, *Anthology of Homeric Passages concerning the Best General and Soldier* (*Vat.gr.* 1352). Third, a study of the section devoted to the general as orator (*Ekl.* 61–70). This investigation will examine both the Homeric speeches selected by Kondoleon as exemplary for the general, especially those uttered by Agamemnon in Book 2 of the *Iliad*, and the influence exerted by the rhetorical theory of the λόγος ἐσχηματισμένος upon this anthology. The analysis of this section of Kondoleon's Ἐκλογή brings to the fore the existence of a rhetorical model of military speech which allows us to study the lens through which a sixteenth-century Greek erudite viewed the Homeric speeches as exhortative examples, thus highlighting the manner in which he read, selected, and reinterpreted certain epic passages with the rhetorical tradition in mind.

1. *Renaissance models of military oratory*

Military oratory becomes an important literary genre in sixteenth-century Europe. Influenced by the Classical tradition, authors of all kinds wrote military speeches, in verse and in

Greek, Roman, and Byzantine Studies 61 (2021) 85–109

prose, about ancient and contemporary subjects.[1] When one thinks of the most influential Graeco-Roman models of these military exhortations during the Renaissance, historical characters such as Alexander, Hannibal, or Caesar readily come to mind as the clearest, most basic referents.[2] All of them were admired and revered by the Renaissance man, who looked, in their feats and leadership, for a mirror which allowed him to draw opportune comparisons with his present.[3] Given the

[1] Cf. P. Burke, *The Renaissance Sense of the Past* (London 1969) 106: "Characters, battles and speeches tended to assume stereotyped forms, just as painters tended to imitate classical gestures and poets to follow classical *topoi*." On this intellectual context see further J. R. Hale, *War and Society in Renaissance Europe, 1450–1620* (London 1985); D. Potter, *Renaissance France at War: Armies, Culture and Society, c.1480–1560* (Woodbridge 2008) 199–203.

[2] On military oratory from the Antiquity to the Renaissance see J. Albertus, *Die paraklêtikoí in der griechischen und römischen Literatur* (Strassburg 1908); J. R. E. Bliese, "Rhetoric and Morale: A Study of Battle Orations from the Central Middle Ages," *Journal of Medieval History* 15 (1989) 201–226; M. H. Hansen, "The Battle Exhortation in Ancient Historiography: Fact of Fiction?," *Historia* 42 (1993) 161–180; W. K. Pritchett, "The General's Exhortations in Greek Warfare," in *Essays in Greek History* (Amsterdam 1994) 27–109; J. R. E. Bliese, "Rhetoric Goes to War: The Doctrine of Ancient and Medieval Military Manuals," *Rhetoric Society Quarterly* 24 (1994) 105–130; M. H. Hansen, "The Little Grey Horse. Henry V's Speech at Agincourt and the Battle Exhortation in Ancient Historiography," *ClMed* 52 (2001) 95–116; W. K. Pritchett, *Ancient Greek Battle Speeches and a Palfrey* (Amsterdam 2002) 1–80; J. C. Iglesias-Zoido, "The Battle Exhortation in Ancient Rhetoric," *Rhetorica* 25 (2007) 141–158; J. C. Iglesias-Zoido (ed.), *Retórica e historiografía: la arenga militar en la historiografía desde la Antigüedad hasta el Renacimiento* (Madrid 2008); K. Yellin, *Battle Exhortation. The Rhetoric of Combat Leadership* (Columbia 2008); R. F. Miller, *In Words and Deeds. Battle Speeches in History* (Hanover 2008); finally, a good and up-to-date overview of this issue over the past decade is offered by J. E. Lendon, "Battle Description in the Ancient Historians Part II: Speeches, Results and Sea Battles," *G&R* 64 (2017) 145–167.

[3] Michel de Montaigne admired Caesar for unifying the military and literary ideals, and advised his readers to read Caesar in the same way as leaders in war such as "the great Alexander [read] Homer; Scipio Africanus, Xenophon": "Of the Most Outstanding Men," in *Complete Works* (London 1958) 572. On this issue, it is sufficient to take into account the

historicity of these military leaders, turning to the speeches handed down by Greek and Roman historiography as reference sources was unavoidable.[4] The contributions of Arrian of Nicomedia, Polybius, Livy, or Quintus Curtius to this genre had preserved for posterity the words which the bravest generals of Antiquity would have uttered to exhort their troops and, ultimately, achieve the victories that immortalised them.[5] Indeed, the historical importance and rhetorical usefulness of these speeches explain the editorial success of the anthologies of *contiones* during the Renaissance.[6]

However, these historical leaders were not the only exhortative model available, for there was another literary genre which offered renowned examples of ancient military oratory:[7]

number of times these historical characters (Caesar, Alexander, etc.) are cited as exemplary speakers by the Renaissance authors of the *artes historicae*: see V. Pineda, "La preceptiva historiográfica renacentista y la retórica de los discursos: antología de textos," *Talia dixit* 2 (2007) 95–219.

[4] On the characteristics of the speeches in ancient historiography see C. W. Fornara, "The Speech in Greek and Roman Historiography," in *The Nature of History in Ancient Greece and Rome* (Berkeley 1983) 142–163, and J. Marincola, "Speeches in Classical Historiography," in *A Companion to Greek and Roman Historiography* (Malden 2007) 118–144. On the speech in Renaissance *artes historicae*: V. Pineda, "La arenga en los tratados historiográficos de la alta Edad Moderna," in *Retórica e historiografía* 199–228.

[5] On the popularity of the works of these ancient historians in the Renaissance and the reasons behind their success see P. Burke,"A Survey of the Popularity of Ancient Historians, 1450–1700," *History and Theory* 5 (1966) 135–152, and, more recently, the reassessment of the data by F. C. Jensen, "The Popularity of Ancient Historians 1450–1600," *The Historical Journal* 61 (2018) 561–595.

[6] See J. C. Iglesias-Zoido and V. Pineda (eds.), *Anthologies of Historiographical Speeches from Antiquity to Early Modern Times. Rearranging the Tesserae* (Boston 2017).

[7] On battle exhortation in epic (with special attention to *epipolesis*) and the connections between epic and historiographical models see D. Carmona, *La escena típica de la epipólesis: de la épica a la historiografía* (Rome 2014). On this issue in Renaissance epic see B. Médiel, *Renaissance de l'épopée: la poésie épique en France de 1572 à 1623* (Paris 2004) 365–371.

characters from Homeric epic such as Achilles or Hector, or from Roman epic such as Aeneas,[8] as well as the examples set by writers like Lucan, who masterfully mixed both genres in his historical epic.[9] Therefore, the speeches written in dactylic hexameter were highly appreciated as a learned source for composing harangues in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries.[10] Let us remember that, in a literary culture governed by the aesthetics of *imitatio*, epic poetry offered both the most venerable *exempla* of this kind of speech and the most brilliant and intricate rhetorical constructions.[11] If Homer's allocutions provided the thematic foundation for the historiographical development of military rhetoric, manifested as παρακελεύσεις in Greek and *cohortationes* in Latin,[12] the exhortative speeches of writers like Lucan were among the highest manifestations of this kind of oratory.[13]

[8] For example, on the conversion of Virgil the ancient poet to Virgil the Renaissance rhetorician, see C. Kallendorf, *In Praise of Aeneas: Virgil and Epideictic Rhetoric in the Early Italian Renaissance* (Hanover 1989), and *Printing Virgil: The Transformation of the Classics in the Renaissance* (Leiden 2019) 8–9.

[9] Pierre de Bourdeille (1540–1614) offers a highly valuable testimony of the importance of Lucan's military exhortations as a rhetorical model in the Renaissance: "Épître dédicatoire à Marguerite de Valois, reyne de France et de Navarre, sur les harangues militaires," in L. Lalanne, *Œuvres complètes de Pierre de Bourdeille* X (Paris 1881) 4–8. This author also translated in prose and commented on two of Lucan's harangues and offered these speeches to the French Queen as exemplary exhortations. See M. Lazard, *Pierre de Bourdeille, seigneur de Brantôme* (Paris 2014).

[10] See R. Radouant, "L'éloquence militaire au XVI[e] siècle," *Revue d'Histoire Litteraire de la France* 18 (1911) 503–552, at 524–525.

[11] On *imitatio* in the historiographical genre during the Renaissance see N. Struever, *The Language of History in the Renaissance. Rhetoric and Historical Consciousness in Florentine Humanism* (Princeton 1970) 40–100 and 144–162, and E. W. Cochrane, *Historians and Historiography in the Italian Renaissance* (Chicago 1981).

[12] See E. Keitel, "Homeric Antecedents to the *cohortatio* in the Ancient Historians," *CW* 80 (1987) 153–172. Cf. Médiel, *Renaissance de l'épopée* 366.

[13] See G. H. Goebel, "Rhetorical and Poetical Thinking in Lucan's Harangues (7.250–382)," *TAPA* 111 (1981) 79–94, and J. Farrell, "Towards

Henceforth, whether they were written by historians like Livy or epic poets like Homer, the military harangues in their works were an unavoidable referent for a wide array of Renaissance authors.[14] The speeches used for inspiration were overwhelmingly exhortations which preceded either the most famous victories or the most infamous defeats: Alexander before Issus and Gaugamela, Caesar in Gaul, or Hannibal in the crucial moments of the campaign in Italy.[15] The exhortative speeches uttered in different circumstances that were not directly associated with the crowning moments of a given general, even when linked to the management and leadership of troops, were less frequently used by Renaissance authors. This paper analyses an example of the latter kind. More precisely, the goal is to study an epic model of military oratory for generals based on the λόγος ἐσχηματισμένος or *oratio figurata* as featured in a key passage of an anthological work, the Ἐκλογή of Christophoros Kondoleon. This passage (*Ekl.* 61–70) reveals the influence exerted by the Classical rhetorical tradition on the elaboration of an unusual model for military exhortation that is based on the speeches uttered by Agamemnon in Book 2 of the *Iliad*.

2. *Christophoros Kondoleon and the Ἐκλογή (Vat.gr. 1352)*

Christophoros Kondoleon was a Greek humanist, born at the turn of the fifteenth century in the walled city of Monem-

a Rhetoric of (Roman?) Epic," in W. J. Dominik (ed.), *Roman Eloquence: Rhetoric in Society and Literature* (London 1997) 131–146.

[14] Analyses of specific texts and authors: R. Ch. Hassel, "Military Oratory in *Richard III*," *Shakespeare Quarterly* 35 (1984) 53–61; Hansen, *ClMed* 52 (2001) 95–116; J. C. Iglesias-Zoido, "Cómo componer una arenga militar en el XVI: Ronsard y la arenga del Duque de Guisse (1553)," *Logo* 4 (2003) 91–104, "Lope y la arenga militar," *Anuario Lope de Vega* 18 (2012) 114–145, and "Las arengas de Alfonso VIII en la *Estoria de España*," *Bulletin Hispanique* 118 (2016) 407–430; Th. Conley, "*Cicero hunnicus*: Miklos Oláh's Eloquent Attila," *Rhetorica* 24 (2006) 275–301; S. Rupp, *Heroic Forms: Cervantes and the Literature of War* (Toronto 2014) 31–62.

[15] See J. C. Iglesias-Zoido, "The Pre-Battle Speeches of Alexander at Issus and Gaugamela," *GRBS* 50 (2010) 215–241.

vasia, under Venetian rule at the time. Meschini, Piasentin and Pontani, and Panou have studied his little-known life and career,[16] attested by testimonies of contemporaries in Italy and France during the first half of the sixteenth century: Arsenios Apostolis (ca. 1468–1535),[17] Niccolò Ridolfi (1501–1550),[18] and Pope Paul III (1468–1549)[19] provide information about his time in Italy, while Guillaume Pellicier (1490–1568) gives evidence of his activities in France.[20] The rest of the information about his career comes from the palaeographic analysis of specific manuscripts, identified as his works, which enable us to locate his labour in known intellectual environments, such as the circle of Apostolis or that of Pellicier.[21] The principal takeaway of above is that his life was a restless attempt to achieve a stable professional position that would allow him to develop his humanistic career, just like many of his contemporaries. In this sense, his stay in France is not a minor fact for

[16] A. Meschini, *Cristoforo Kondoleon* (Padua 1973) 3–49; M. Piasentin and F. Pontani, *Cristoforo Kondoleon. Scritti Omerici* (Leuven 2018) v–viii; N. Panou, "Kontoleon, Christophoros," in M. Sgarbi (ed.), *Encyclopedia of Renaissance Philosophy* (Springer online 2020).

[17] Apostolis was a Cretan erudite who lived in Monemvasia at the beginning of the fifteenth century. He taught at the 'Collegio Greco' of Rome in 1518 and provided Greek manuscripts to the circle of Aldo Manuzio. On the cultural context see D. J. Geanakoplos, *Greek Scholars in Venice* (Cambridge [Mass.] 1962) 167–200 and 259 ff.

[18] Ridolfi was a cardinal who owned one of the best libraries of his time; see D. Muratore, *La biblioteca del Cardinale Niccolò Ridolfi* I–II (Bari 2009).

[19] Kondoleon wrote to the Pope a letter urging that he open an ambitious school for Greek and Italian students: Meschini, *Cristoforo Kondoleon* 75–80.

[20] Pellicier wrote a letter to Jean du Bellay, dated 7 August 1536, in which he gives information about Kondoleon's attempts to settle in the court of king Francis I: L. Dorez, "Une lettre de Guillaume Pélicier, évêque de Maguelonne au Cardinal Jean du Bellay," *Revue des Bibliothèques* 4 (1894) 232–240.

[21] See A. Cataldi Palau, "Les copistes de Guillaume Pellicier, évêque de Montpellier (1490–1567)," *S&C* 10 (1986) 199–237; A. Cataldi Palau, "Un gruppo di manoscritti greci del primo quarto del XVI secolo appartenuti alla collezione di Filippo Sauli," *CodMan* 12 (1968) 93–124.

the topic studied here, given the importance of the Homeric poems in the court of Francis I, interpreted by authors like Budé as a guide for political and military behaviour.[22]

The analysis and interpretation of one of his writings conserved in *Vat.gr.* 1352, the *Ἐκλογὴ*, have been carried out taking into account both this manuscript and other compositions of Homeric themes authored by him.[23] The Ἐκλογή is an autograph text, dated between 1550 and 1560, and is conserved in the same manuscript as other brief dissertations which analyse various moral and allegorical uses of the Homeric poems.[24] All of these have been recently edited and translated into Italian by Piasentin and Pontani under the significant title *Scritti Omerici* (2018).

The necessary and unavoidable study of the context of this anthology of epic texts, together with the marked moralizing and allegorical purposes of the works copied in *Vat.gr.* 1352, have sometimes conditioned the interpretation of this Ἐκλογή as a whole, without taking into account specific aspects of its content that are of particular interest. That is, the study and analysis of the content of this anthology have been determined, in my opinion, by the dissertation that begins the manuscript (ff. 3r–13r), which offers philosophical appreciations, influenced by Aristotle, about the meaning of virtue (ἀρετή) in ruling. The first of these works has in modern editions the title "Tractatio est moralis ex Homeri locis," which G. Amati considered to be a mere description of its content;[25] the most recent edition of

[22] See Ph. Ford, "Homer in the French Renaissance," *Renaissance Quarterly* 59 (2006) 1–28; M. Bizer, *Homer and the Politics of Authority in Renaissance France* (Oxford 2011) 40–45.

[23] For the codicological characteristics of the manuscript see Piasentin and Pontani, *Scritti Omerici* viii–xii.

[24] *Tractatio moralis ex Homeri locis* (ff. 3r–13r), Ζητήματα καὶ λύσεις ἐκ τῶν ὁμηρικῶν ἐπῶν εἰλημμένα (ff. 80r–100v), Εἰς τὴν τῆς Ἰλιάδος πρόθεσιν (103r–110r), Εἰς τὴν τῆς Ὀδυσσείας πρόθεσιν (112r–120r), and Εἰς τὴν τοῦ Ἀγαμέμνονος πανοπλίαν ἀλληγορικὴ ἐξήγησις (121r–132r).

[25] *Inventarium codicum Vaticanorum Graecorum* 993–2160 (BAV, Sala Cons.

the text has consolidated such 'description' as its definitive title. Almost like a proem,[26] this text places the preoccupations of the Greek erudite within a long tradition of monographs which offer advice to the ruler following the Homeric example, such as those attributed to Porphyry or Philodemus of Gadara.[27] This context has led earlier scholars to emphasise above all the moralizing and allegorical purposes of the works copied in the first part of the manuscript.

Consequently, the Ἐκλογή has been interpreted by critics as an anthology of epic passages with a moral purpose: this anthology belonged to a group of "Homeric writings," and, with the figures of the general and the soldier in mind, was elaborated with the goal of providing rulers ethical advice and exhortations to virtue, which a contemporary reader would have found useful.[28] This purpose would justify the distribution of its material between three spheres which, "according to the philosophers" (παρὰ τοῖς φιλοσόφοις), concerned the goods of men: soul, body, and external elements.[29] The purposes and structure of the anthology have also been linked to the diffusion

Mss., no. 323, vol. II).

[26] It is preceded in the manuscript only by a brief text: (ff. 1r–2r) *Praefatio in Jani Lascaris epigrammatum explicationem*. See Meschini, *Cristoforo Kondoleon* 73–74, for edition and characteristics.

[27] See especially Philodemus *De bono rege*, preserved in *P.Herc*. 1507 and edited by T. Dorandi, *Filodemo, Il buon re secondo Omero* (Naples 1982), where, using Homeric examples, the author offers advice on how to be a good leader and how to avoid being a bad one. For an updated vision see J. Fish, "Some Critical Themes in Philodemus' *On the Good King According to Homer*," in J. Klooster et al. (eds.), *Homer and the Good Ruler in Antiquity and Beyond* (Leiden 2018) 141–156.

[28] See F. Pontani, "*On the Good King according to Homer*: A Sixteenth-Century Treatise by Christophoros Kondoleon," in *Homer and the Good Ruler* 239–258.

[29] *Ekl*. 6, Ἐπεὶ δὲ παρὰ τοῖς φιλοσόφοις τὰ τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἀγαθὰ εἰς τρία – ψυχὴν καὶ σῶμα καὶ τὰ ἐκτός – διῄρηται. Cf. Pontani, in *Homer and the Good Ruler* 246: "The epics provide us with paradigms in each of the three fields of human nature singled out by Aristotle." See Arist. *Eth.Nic*. 1098b13 and *Pol*. 1323a25.

in Europe of the commentaries of Eustathius of Thessalonica, who decisively influenced the sixteenth-century exegetes of the Homeric texts, especially in France and Italy, where Kondoleon pursued his career. Indeed, it has been pointed out correctly that these commentaries, full of moralizing and allegorical elements, exerted a direct influence on the composition of Kondoleon's Ἐκλογή.[30]

From my point of view, without rejecting the evident moralising and philosophical aspects nor the influence of Eustathius highlighted by the text's editors, it is possible to carry out a complementary analysis of one section of the Ἐκλογή devoted to the figure of the general as orator (*Ekl.* 61–70). Such an analysis sheds new light on another Classical influence, namely the role which the rhetorical tradition plays in the elaboration of this section of the anthology in order to offer a model of military oratory.

This analysis is grounded on two pillars. First, the implications of the title of this dissertation chosen by Kondoleon from a rhetorical and oratorical point of view: since ancient and Byzantine times, the term ἐκλογή has been used to refer to anthologies of texts and speeches taken from literary works with different purposes.[31] In the context of the Byzantine culture of συλλογή, these anthologies constituted new kinds of compositions in the editing process, which involved the reproduction, distribution, and grouping of a number of texts that shared a common nature, and which were selected for their

[30] F. Pontani, "*Captain of Homer's Guard*: the Reception of Eustathius in Modern Europe," in F. Pontani et al. (eds.), *Reading Eustathios of Thessalonike* (Berlin 2017) 199–226, and Piasentin and Pontani, *Scritti Omerici* vii.

[31] So for example the title *eklogai rhetorikon logon* in P.Vindob.gr.inv. 39996: R. Otranto, *Antiche liste di libri su papiro* (Rome 2010) 3, and E. Puglia, "Gli inventari librari di PVindob. Gr. 39966," *ZPE* 123 (1998) 78–86, at 82, who provides a full discussion of the title in this papyrus, considered a florilegium of orators or speeches, probably created with a didactic function or as a working tool by the anonymous compiler.

rhetorical, ethical, or didactic application.[32] Kondoleon demonstrates his knowledge of such terminology in a key passage (*Ekl.* 5): he affirms that, because everything concerning the soul and the body of the best general is analysed with precision and wisdom in Homer, he has gathered (ξυλλέξαντες) and arranged (ξυντετάχαμεν) all the dispersed passages (τὰ διεσπαρμένα).[33] Accordingly, he declares that he has made a selection of texts, aimed at being useful (ὠφέλειαν) for both war and peace times.[34] In my view, considering that a very important part of the selected Homeric passages are direct-style speeches, there is a rhetorical background that cannot be ignored and that connects some sections of this selection with other types of anthologies of speeches that were widely read and used in the Renaissance. For example, the term ἐκλογή was also used in Byzantine manuscripts and printings throughout the Renaissance as a title of anthologies of speeches, taken from the works of historians like Polybius, which exerted a great influence on rhetorical instruction at the time.[35] Therefore, Kondoleon's specific terminological choice could not be independent of such

[32] See P. Odorico, "La cultura della *sylloge*," *ByzZeit* 83 (1990) 1–21, and "Cadre d'exposition/cadre de pensée – la culture du recueil," in P. van Deun et al. (eds.), *Encyclopedic Trends in Byzantium?* (Leuven 2011) 89–107; A. Németh, "Excerpts versus Fragments," in A. Grafton et al. (eds.), *Canonical Texts and Scholarly Practices* (Cambridge 2016) 253–274; and P. Manafis, *(Re)writing History in Byzantium: A Critical Study of Collections of Historical Excerpts* (London 2020).

[33] Ὁποῖον δ' εἶναι δεῖ κατὰ ψυχὴν καὶ σῶμα τὸν ἄριστον στρατηγὸν καὶ στρατιώτην ἐν τοῖς ἔπεσι τοῦ Ὁμήρου ἀκριβῶς καὶ σοφῶς κατεσπούδασται· ἐξ ὧν ξυλλέξαντες τὰ πρὸς τὸν ἄριστον στρατηγὸν καὶ στρατιώτην ξυντείνοντα, λόγῳ τὰ διεσπαρμένα ὁμοῦ ξυντετάχαμεν.

[34] ἡγούμενοι τοῖς τὰ πολεμικὰ μετερχομένοις γενησομένην ἐκ τούτων μιμουμένοις οὐ μικρὰν τὴν ὠφέλειαν, καὶ μὴν καὶ τοῖς τὰ εἰρηνικὰ καὶ ἀκίνδυνα πράττουσιν.

[35] See Iglesias-Zoido and Pineda, *Anthologies*. The most important Byzantine example is the *Excerpta de Legationibus* / *Eklogai peri presbeion*. These are the only preserved sections of the Ἐκλογαί, the anthologies of historiographical speeches composed in the tenth century on behalf of Constantine VII Porphyrogenitus, and which were part of the *Excerpta Constantiniana*.

precedents, and it points to the plausible rhetorical perspective in some sections of his treatise like the passages studied in this paper. Moreover, we can see that this Ἐκλογή is a work in progress—as hinted by those parts where the selection of speeches is paired with brief excursuses (as if grouped for some later development) or by its abrupt ending. In sections like these, devoted to the figure of the general as orator, the selection of Homeric passages also becomes a draft for a rhetorical anthology rather than a selection of texts with only ethical purposes.

Second, the data obtained from the analysis of the anthology. In addition to the Homeric passages on the body and the soul, reinterpreted through a moralizing lens which provided ethical models of behaviour for both soldiers and generals,[36] an important part of the content of the Ἐκλογή is a selection of speeches in direct style, mostly extracted from the *Iliad*.[37] Moreover, there is a clear tendency in the selected passages: Kondoleon prefers speeches uttered by Agamemnon. Not only do those speeches present monologues of this Homeric hero, but they also enable the comparison between the words of the best general and those of a soldier, thanks to the interventions of Achilles, Thersites, Odysseus, Nestor, or Diomedes.[38] In this sense, the distribution of the Homeric characters (πρόσωπα) in *Ekl.* 9 between those who are "dominant" (ὑπερέχοντα), such as

[36] *Ekl.* 10 and 11, where Agamemnon's and Thersites' appearances are compared through a moralizing lens: one is similar to Zeus and the other has a more shameful body.

[37] Only three passages are from the *Odyssey*: *Od.* 2.276–277, 18.66–69, and 20.17–18.

[38] *Il.* 1.121–129 and 1.148–151 (exchange between Agamemnon and Achilles in *Ekl.* 26.7–12 and 14–16); *Il.* 2.110–141 and 2.289–290, 286–288, 308–316, and 318–319 (speeches by Agamemnon and Odysseus in *Ekl.* 61–62); *Il.* 2.224–242 (Thersites' speech in *Ekl.* 53); *Il.* 4.257–263, 297–300, 338–340, 370–400, and 412–417 (passages of the *epipolesis*, where there are exchanges between Agamemnon and Idomeneus, Nestor, Odysseus, and Diomedes in *Ekl.* 83, 79, 48, 71, and 101); *Il.* 11.15–45 (exchange between Agamemnon and Diomedes in *Ekl.* 96).

Agamemnon and Odysseus, and those who are "dominated" (ὑπερεχόμενα), such as Achilles or Thersites, is crucial.[39] Thus, although the cited passages are varied and used for different purposes, a thread that runs through the anthology is found in the figure of the Achaean commander-in-chief as both the exemplary general and a "dominant" character. In addition, Agamemnon had to be particularly attractive as an historical referent for a Greek born in Peloponnesian Monemvasia.[40]

Thus the content forces us to look beyond the dismissive comments of Meschini, who considered that the Ἐκλογή was a simple *cento* which gathered Homeric passages and had no intrinsic value.[41] On the contrary, this anthology has been

[39] See in this sense the influence of 'Agamemnon's encomium', developed by Isocrates in *Panathenaicus* 74–87, where he presents Agamemnon as the Homeric hero *par excellence*, the king who united the Greeks under the same flag and prevailed over the Trojans—a very particular vision of a Homeric character who is controversial, yet who has been used as a referent for leaders who must unite different communities against a foreign threat or enemy. In this respect, see W. H. Race, "*Panathenaicus* 74–90: The Rhetoric of Isocrates' Digression on Agamemnon," *TAPA* 108 (1978) 175–185, on the idea of the encomium used to prop up the figure of Philip of Macedon, and the possible objections to this hypothesis. One way or another, the rhetorical tradition presents the figure of Agamemnon as a model for kings. See Dio Chrys. 2.66–68 (the ideal leader who protects his flock from wild beasts), Liban. *Decl.* 6.6 (Agamemnon as leader of the Greeks because of a Hellenic sense of decency), the rhetorical exercises (encomium and invective) preserved in Doxopatres *Comm. Aphthon.* 9 (Waltz II 456–60 and 476–478; cf. C. A. Gibson, "The Anonymous *Progymnasmata* in John Doxopatres' *Homiliae*," *ByzZeit* 102 [2009] 83–94), or the funerary speech of John III Ducas, authored by Akropolites (P. Wirth, *Opera* [Stuttgart 1978] 28).

[40] The figure of Agamemnon was used by the Spartans as a symbol for the unification of the Greeks under the leadership of Sparta: P. A. Rahe, *The Grand Strategy of Classical Sparta: The Persian Challenge* (New Haven 2015) 28. And a symbol that could be reused during the Renaissance, when the figure of the Mycenaean king was perceived in a more favourable light (see H. D. Brumble, *Classical Myths and Legends in the Middle Ages and Renaissance: A Dictionary of Allegorical Meanings* [London 1998] ad loc.), especially in the context of the conflict between Christendom and the Ottoman Empire.

[41] Meschini, *Cristoforo Kondoleon* 22.

thoroughly thought through: Kondoleon's selection of Homeric oratory, focused on the figure of Agamemnon, should be analysed together with other Renaissance anthologies where Homer is the foundation, and which present and compare different oratorical styles—for example, Leonardo Bruni's *Orationes Homeri*, a work that was thoroughly read and copied all through the Renaissance.[42] The core of Bruni's anthology is the episode of the Embassy (πρεσβεία) in *Iliad* 9, where Ajax, Phoenix, and Odysseus utter speeches to persuade Achilles to re-join the fight; each of the speakers exemplifies a different oratorical style. These *orationes* were translated into Latin by Bruni at the beginning of the fifteenth century, and were widely disseminated all over Europe in various textual formats and languages—they were even printed, as the 1523 Nuremberg edition of Brassicanus exemplifies.[43] Noticeably, and notwithstanding both their rhetorical weight and their influence on the humanistic culture of the time, those speeches are excluded from the Ἐκλογή of Kondoleon, for he focuses on the figure of Agamemnon.[44]

These are the pillars on which my approach is grounded,

[42] P. Thierman, *Die Orationes Homeri des Leonardo Bruni Aretino: Kritische Edition der lateinischen und kastilianischen Übersetzung mit Prolegomena und Kommentar* (Leiden 1993).

[43] *Leonardi Aretini viri undecunque docti tres orationes in triplici dicendi genere, ex Homero in Latinam linguam erudita quadam metaphrasi conversae* (Nuremberg 1523) (see Iglesias-Zoido and Pineda, *Anthologies* 8).

[44] I have not found in Kondoleon's Ἐκλογή other key Homeric passages usually reinterpreted through the lens of later rhetoric. For example, there is no reference to such an important passage as *Il.* 3.209–224 (Antenor's speech), where the oratory of Ulysses and Menelaus is compared, immortalized as the most important foundational passage for the later analysis of different styles of speaking. See R. Hunter, "The Rhetorical Criticism of Homer," in F. Montanari et al. (eds.), *Brill's Companion to Ancient Greek Scholarship* I (Leiden 2015) 673–705, at 687–689. In this sense, on the rhetorical importance of this passage see schol. *Il.* 3.212, where Menelaus, Odysseus, and Nestor appear compared to Lysias, Demosthenes, and Isocrates as representatives of the three oratorical styles.

and which bring us to the concrete matter I seek to analyse. In addition, I consider that some of the Homeric speeches chosen by Kondoleon because of their exemplarity for the general demonstrate the influence of a rhetorical tradition that extolled Homer, especially because this tradition considered that the poet gave each of his characters the most appropriate words (οἰκεῖοι).[45] The analysis that follows highlights the influence which that rhetorical tradition exerted on Kondoleon, thus offering a reading complementary to the moralizing and allegorical agenda underlined by previous scholarship. I believe that Kondoleon was well acquainted with this rhetorical tradition, because he used the Homeric poems as a source for the oratorical technique of the general. Unavoidably, this interpretative line must focus on the passage devoted to why it is a necessity for a general to be the best orator.

3. *The general as orator, exemplified by Agamemnon in Iliad 2: a model based on the λόγος ἐσχηματισμένος*

The idea of the general as an excellent orator appears time and again in the tradition of Greek polemology.[46] For example, Onasander's *Στρατηγικός* begins by describing (1.1) the qualities that the perfect general must possess, highlighting the importance of speaking in public (λέγειν δ' ἱκανὸν).[47] Further on (1.13–16), he underlines how the harangue (παρακέλευσις)

[45] As Theon *Progymn.* 60.27.30 Spengel signals when analyzing *prosopopoeia*. On Homer and the rhetorical tradition of antiquity see Hunter, in *Brill's Companion to Ancient Greek Scholarship* I 686 ff., and R. Hunter, *The Measure of Homer: The Ancient Reception of the Iliad and the Odyssey* (Cambridge 2018) 136–193, in addition to the essays in S. Dubel et al. (eds.), *À l'école d'Homère. La culture des orateurs et des sophistes* (Paris 2015), and *Homère rhétorique. Études de réception antique* (Turnhout 2018), on the 'Rhetorical Homer' up to the Renaissance.

[46] On the general as orator see B. Campbell, "Teach yourself how to be a general," *JRS* 77 (1987) 13–29; Bliese, *Journal of Medieval History* 15 (1989) 201–226; and D. Paniagua Aguilar, "La arenga militar desde la perspectiva de la tradición polemológica grecolatina," *Talia dixit* 2 (2007) 1–25.

[47] Other Classical sources on this topic are Xen. *Cyr.* 1.20–24, *Mem.* 3.3.10–15; Cic. *De imp. Cn. Pomp.* 36–48.

uttered by the general before a battle incites the soldier to scorn the dangers (τῶν δεινῶν καταφρονεῖν) and to crave all the positive elements derived from victory (τῶν καλῶν ἐπιθυμεῖν). The general is presented as the key player who, by raising morale, is more useful to an army than the doctor: while the latter takes care of physical wounds, the general encourages those who are almost in despair, because he can free the ψυχή from ἀθυμία.[48] Analogously in Latin, an author as influential in Western tradition as Vegetius underscores why a general must be able to deliver persuasive harangues to encourage his troops (*Mil.* 3.9.13, 3.12.3, 3.25.10).[49] In Byzantine times, this motif is the raison d'être of works like the *Rhetorica militaris* attributed to Sirianus Magister, where a similar image of the general is offered and, from a markedly rhetorical perspective, some rules for composing effective military harangues are explained.[50]

Kondoleon follows suit in the Ἐκλογή, in which he devotes paragraphs 61–70 to analyse through a Homeric lens whether the best general must be the best orator as well, as he makes explicit at the beginning and at the end of this section:

61: Ἀλλ' ἔτι καὶ ῥήτορα δεῖ εἶναι· δεῖ γὰρ αὐτὸν δημηγορεῖν καὶ πείθειν εἰδέναι.

70: ὥστε καὶ ῥήτορα τὸν στρατηγὸν εἶναι δεῖ τὸν ἄριστον.

61: But the general must also be an orator; in fact, he must be able to speak in public and convince.

70: So that the excellent general must also be an orator.

Because of the antecedents cited above, a humanist reader would have expected that the Homeric speeches selected to exemplify rhetorical models would be some of the numerous harangues found in the *Iliad*, where Homer highlights the behaviour of men in combat.[51] However, Kondoleon is consistent

[48] Cf. Paniagua Aguilar, *Talia dixit* 2 (2007) 1–25.

[49] Cf. Bliese, *Rhetoric Society Quarterly* 24 (1994) 110–111.

[50] See I. Eramo, *Siriano. Discorsi di guerra* (Bari 2010) 21–23, for a study of the passages in Byzantine manuals in which the necessity for the general to be a good orator is highlighted.

[51] Cf. Keitel, *CW* 80 (1987) 154–160, and Carmona, *La escena típica*.

with the initial exposition of his anthology, and thus he has other plans in mind. For in fact, already in *Ekl.* 4 he emphasizes how anyone interested in tactics and stratagems can learn thanks to the works of the historians (the best source for military harangues) and those who compiled stratagems (with indirect references to authors like Polyaenus).[52] He opts not to follow the precedent of the polemological tradition; instead, he chooses two speeches from a particular episode in *Iliad* 2, Agamemnon's πεῖρα, to illustrate the oratorical skills of the general. Following the principles that guided his selection, of these two he reproduces in its entirety Agamemnon's speech to the assembly of the Achaeans (*Il.* 2.110–141, in *Ekl.* 61). In this passage, the king, after long years of combat without a breakthrough, tries to assess the morale of the troops by exhorting them to abandon the fight against the Trojans—when his true goal is to continue the fight. In addition, this speech finds a contrapuntal parallel in the one uttered by Odysseus, who, understanding the true purpose of the Achaean king, exhorts the very same men to stay and fight to the final victory.

It is remarkable about this section that Kondoleon does not choose some of the canonical harangues uttered by Agamemnon, such as the decisive *epipolesis* of Book 4 (*Il.* 4.223–421): remarkable, since he selects that episode in other sections of the Ἐκλογή, including the one that follows the one discussed here, where the case is made for the orator to be both a philosopher and well acquainted with history (*Ekl.* 71: Ῥήτωρ δ' ἀγαθὸς καὶ πείθειν οὐ δύναται γενέσθαι εἰ μὴ καὶ φιλόσοφος καὶ ἱστορικὸς καὶ πολλῶν πραγμάτων ἔμπειρος εἴη).[53] An interest in this *epipolesis*, on the other hand, is motivated by the rhetorical utility of the past (thanks to the use of historical examples in this speech) rather than by the use of exhortative techniques.

[52] *Ekl.* 4: Τὰ μὲν οὖν τακτικὰ καὶ τὰ ξυνετὰ καὶ λαμπρὰ στρατηγήματα ἐν τοῖς ἱστορικοῖς καὶ τοῖς αὐτῶν ἐκλογὴν ποιησαμένοις παντὶ μαθεῖν ἔξεστι βουλομένῳ.

[53] *Il.* 4.223–225 in *Ekl.* 55; 4.257–263 in *Ekl.* 83; 4.297–300 in *Ekl.* 79; 4.370–400 in *Ekl.* 71; 4.412–417 in *Ekl.* 101.

Let us turn then to the section devoted the general as orator. After the opening statement (61: Ἀλλ' ἔτι καὶ ῥήτορα δεῖ εἶναι· δεῖ γὰρ αὐτὸν δημηγορεῖν καὶ πείθειν εἰδέναι), a mere διό φησιν gives way to Agamemnon's unabridged speech to the Achaean assembly (*Il.* 2.110–141). It is followed by various significant passages of Odysseus' complementary intervention (*Il.* 2.289–290, 286–288, 308–316, and 318–319, in *Ekl.* 62 and 63), which are gathered with an observation on how they can encourage the troops to go on fighting.[54] The rest of the section consists of brief commentaries on the terminology of the Homeric verse, in order to highlight the subtlety of Agamemnon's speech (*Ekl.* 54–70). Indeed, Kondoleon offers a kind of 'translation' of what Agamemnon truly meant in his allocution to the troops. For instance, the following points are 'exegetically' emphasized. First, how Agamemnon subtly stresses the shame (*Il.* 2.219, *Ekl.* 64: αἰσχρὸν ἐστι ἀναχωρεῖν ἀπράκτους) that would be brought upon the soldiers if they were to come home after long years fighting in vain (cf. *Ekl.* 68: ἀπράκτου τοῦ ἔργου). Second, how the verb "flee" (*Il.* 2.140: φεύγωμεν, *Ekl.* 69) is employed with a double intention, so that it sharply stresses cowardice (δειλίαν) and fear (φόβον) as the most shameful elements (αἴσχιον) for a general. Third, how the expression ὡς ἂν ἐγὼ εἴπω (*Il.* 2.139) uncovers the real intention of the speech, which is to encourage the troops to stay and fight even if the king seems to suggest the contrary (*Ekl.* 70: καὶ δοκῶν ὁ λόγος ἐπανήξειν πείθειν, προτρέπει μένειν καὶ καρτερεῖν). The final sentence, headed by the conjunction ὥστε, marks the end of the passage (70: ὥστε καὶ ῥήτορα τὸν στρατηγὸν εἶναι δεῖ τὸν ἄριστον), after demonstrating how a valuable general should be able to deliver a speech full of subtleties like Agamemnon's.

The motives behind the selection and commentary on the oratorical texts in this section (*Ekl.* 61–70) can be better grasped if we take into account the attention devoted to Aga-

[54] *Ekl.* 63: διὸ ἐν τῷ τοῦ Ὀδυσσέως λόγῳ ἀναπτύσσει μέχρι τίνος φέρειν καὶ πότε ὑπέσχετο καὶ κατένευσεν τὸ Ἴλιον πορθήσειν.

memnon's speech (*Il.* 2.110–141) by the earlier rhetorical tradition, together with its interpretation as an exemplary case of the kind of speech needed to salvage a compromised situation; this is what is called a λόγος ἐσχηματισμένος or *oratio figurata*.[55] The λόγος ἐσχηματισμένος is an allocution whereby the orator tries to persuade the audience to do exactly the contrary of what he apparently advocates.[56] This rhetorical tactic drew the attention of many ancient writers, who valued the argumentative possibilities which this rhetorical *tour de force* offers, a mixture of remarkable contextual factors which places both the

[55] In this sense, as Hunter, *Brill's Companion to Ancient Greek Scholarship* I 692, points out, "Rhetorical criticism is fundamentally the examination of why the characters of literature act and speak as they do; it is not limited merely to the formal analysis for speeches into their constituent parts." This is the driving force behind testimonies such as Arist. fr.366 Gigon = 142 Rose discussing whether this speech is εἰκός and concluding that Agamemnon had no other choice if he wanted to salvage the expedition. For other rhetorical analyses of this speech see E. F. Cook, "Agamemnon's Test of the Army in *Iliad* Book 2 and the Function of Homeric *Akhos*," *AJP* 124 (2003) 165–198, and S. Dentice di Accadia, "La 'Prova' di Agamennone: una strategia retorica vincente," *RhM* 153 (2010) 225–246.

[56] In recent years, since the influential work of F. Ahl, "The Art of Safe Criticism in Greece and Rome," *AJP* 105 (1984) 174–208, critics have studied this kind of speech and analyzed its characteristics and evolution throughout the ancient rhetorical tradition. See B. Schouler, "Le déguisement de l'intention dans la rhétorique grecque," *Ktèma* 11 (1986) 257–272; D. A. Russell, "Figured Speeches: Dionysius" *Art of Rhetoric* VIII–IX," in C. W. Wooten (ed.), *The Orator in Action and Theory in Greece and Rome* (Leiden 2001) 156–168; M. Heath, "Pseudo-Dionysius *Art of Rhetoric* 8–11: Figured Speech, Declamation and Criticism," *AJP* 124 (2003) 81–105; P. Chiron, "Le *lógos eskhematisménos* ou discours figuré," in G. Declercq et al. (eds.), *La parole polémique* (Paris 2003) 223–254, and "Les rapports entre persuasion et manipulation dans la théorie rhétorique du discours figuré," in S. Bonnafous et al. (eds.), *Argumentation et discours politique* (Rennes 2003) 165–174; L. Pernot, "Il non-detto della declamazione greco-romana: discorso figurato, sottintesi e allusioni politiche," *Papers on Rhetoric* 8 (2007) 209–234, "Greek *Figured Speech* on Imperial Rome," *Advances in the History of Rhetoric* 18 (2015) 131–146, and *L'art du sous-entendu. Histoire-Théorie-Mode d'emploie* (Paris 2018), esp. ch. 2; B. M. C. Breij, "*Oratio figurata*," in G. Ueding (ed.), *Historisches Wörterbuch der Rhetorik* X (Berlin 2011) 1297–1302.

speaker and the audience in a situation that was especially noted in scholarly environments: it gives rhetoricians a perfect occasion to enlighten their students on how to make their case in unusual situations, either out of the necessity to be particularly tactful (εὐπρέπεια) or because the circumstances could endanger the discursive act, rendering it risky (ἀσφάλεια). In addition, the *oratio figurata* was used in the context of *meletai*, as it was a tool that allowed one to measure the extent of the oratorical virtues and skill of a sophist, as Philostratus exemplifies when referring to the skills displayed by Scopelian (*VS* 1.21.51): ἄριστος μὲν οὖν καὶ σχηματίσαι λόγον καὶ ἐπαμφοτέρως εἰπεῖν.

Within the Classical rhetorical corpus, the analysis of the argumentative guidelines for this kind of speech plays an important role in works that were widely known during the Renaissance, and were edited together in Aldo Manuzio's 1508 edition of *Rhetores Graeci*, which I think could have influenced Kondoleon.[57]

What seems to be the oldest study of this kind of rhetorical speech is found in a treatise of Demetrius, included by Manuzio in 1508 among the *Rhetores Graeci* under the title *De interpretatione*.[58] In this manual, known today as *De elocutione*, the rhetorician devotes a long section (240–304) to the study of the vehement style, also called δεινός.[59] It is well known that a λόγος δεινός is a speech that aims at intimidating and perturbing the audience with feelings of shame or fear. Therefore, this style is the most suitable for an orator who wants to exert his influence and power over an audience, a goal acutely suitable for a military commander. As Demetrius points out (287), there are several occasions in which such display of power can only be done in a concealed and subtle way, owing to the risk of the

[57] See M. Sicherl, "Die Aldina der *Rhetores Graeci* (1508–1509) und ihre handschriftichen Vorlagen," *ICS* 17 (1992) 109–134.

[58] Sicherl, *ICS* 17 (1992) 109–134; *Rhetores Graeci* (1508) 545–573.

[59] See G. M. A. Grube, *A Greek Critic: Demetrius On Style* (Toronto 1961), and Ahl, *AJP* 105 (1984) 176–179.

situation (ἀσφάλεια) or to simple *decorum* (εὐπρέπεια). It is in these cases that the orator must utter a λόγος ἐσχηματισμένος. Given his examples, taken from philosophers like Plato (see *Phd.* 59B–C), Demetrius seems to consider that this kind of speech is a sort of concealed moral criticism, whose goal is to modify the mistaken or undesired conduct of the audience. Using it, the orator can mask the true purposes of the speech, not revealing these to the audience, which reacts and does exactly the contrary to what is apparently advocated.

Another well-known author of the Imperial period, Pseudo-Hermogenes,[60] also insists on this play of ambiguity in one chapter of his Περὶ μεθόδου δεινοτήτος, where he aims to show "how, in saying the contrary to what is intended, one can achieve what is truly desired without contradicting the former" (22 [Spengel III 443.14). Thus, the orator offers smoke and mirrors in his speech, whereby vices such as cowardice (κακία) are treated as if they were ἀρεταί. It is then not surprising to find that the kernel of this chapter is an analysis of Agamemnon's speech at the beginning of *Iliad* 2 (110–141), the very same in which he proposes to his soldiers to abandon Troy and return home. Pseudo-Hermogenes underlines that the true intent of the Achaean king is precisely the contrary of what he seems to suggest, and a detailed analysis of the speech demonstrates how his real purpose is to maintain the siege. The speech would showcase its true colours by pointing out how the wood of the ships is rotten—and thus sailing back is not possible (135)—or how returning home having fought for nothing (121: ἄπρηκτον πόλεμον) would bring great shame on them (cf. *Ekl.* 68), especially as the enemy was inferior in numbers (120–122).

Pseudo-Dionysius of Halicarnassus, an Imperial rhetorician widely read during the Renaissance, displays the same argumentative line with the same Homeric example. In two brief treatises attributed to him, repurposed as chapters 8 and 9 of

[60] See A. Patterson, *Hermogenes and the Renaissance* (Princeton 1970); Sicherl, *ICS* 17 (1992) 112; *Rhetores Graeci* (1508) 149–160.

his *Ars Rhetorica*, is found the most detailed discussion of the λόγος ἐσχηματισμένος.[61] This rhetorician takes Agamemnon's speech in *Iliad* 2 to be a prime example of the third kind of figurative σχῆμα, that is, a speech where the real goal of the speaker is the opposite of what he apparently advocates.[62] In both treatises there is a detailed analysis of the argumentative processes behind the words of the Achaean leader.[63] Thus, in one case (319.15–322.15 U.-R.) and the other (327.19–330.25), this speech is used to exemplify the λόγος ἐσχηματισμένος that must be uttered if a situation is deemed to be dangerous. Pseudo-Dionysius gives the following advice. Above all, the orator must make sure that the arguments that apparently support his point are weak, and he must provide reasons in the course of the speech for the listener to do precisely the contrary to what is proposed. In addition, the orator must adopt an emotional tone, full of πάθος (322.16), so that the *actio* induces the audience to suspect that the arguments provided are caused by an emotional seizure, and thus are not reasonable. This explains the careless criticism which Agamemnon directs at Zeus (cf. *Il.* 2.111–112), a perfect example of apparent irrationality in argumentation induced by the heat of the moment.

Given the interest that Agamemnon's speech elicited among rhetoricians as a model for λόγος ἐσχηματισμένος, it is not surprising to find that it became the subject of wide scholarly debate during Imperial times.[64] After all, it was a speech well

[61] *Rhetores Graeci* (1508) 461–502. See K. Schöpsdau, "Untersuchungen zur Anlage und Entstehung der beiden pseudodionysischen Traktate *Peri eschematismenon*," *RhM* 118 (1975) 83–123; P. Chiron, "Quelques observations sur la théorie du discours figuré dans la *technè* du Ps.-Denys d'Halicarnasse," *Papers on Rhetoric* 3 (2000) 75–94; and A. Dentice di Accadia, *Ps. Dionigi di Alicarnasso: I discorsi figurati I e II (Ars. Rhet. VIII e IX Us.-Rad.)* (Pisa 2010). Cf. Sicherl, *ICS* 17 (1992) 119.

[62] See the introduction of the edition by Dentice di Accadia, *Ps. Dionigi di Alicarnasso*. Ps.-Dion. Hal. *Ars rhetorica* 8.2 = 296.3–5 U.-R.: τρίτον σχῆμά ἐστι τὸ οἷς λέγει τὰ ἐναντία πραχθῆναι πραγματευόμενον; 9.2 = 324 U.-R.

[63] Dentice di Accadia, *RhM* 153 (2010) 225–246.

[64] Sopatros IV 103.2–15 Walz. In this sense, see Schouler, *Ktèma* 11

known to every reader of the *Iliad*, given its importance for the development of the plot. After Achilles' abandonment of the Achaean camp, this is the most complete exposition (*Il.* 2.110–141), and the one most analysed by rhetoricians—especially because of the capital importance of the immediate persuasive effect which this speech has on the Achaean soldiers (142–143), who are not able to appreciate the subtlety of the message delivered. Only the intervention by Odysseus and Nestor saves the situation with counterexamples of exhortative oratory.

This speech is found yet again in a privileged position at the core of another text widely read by Renaissance humanists,[65] which was included in the introduction of Homer's *editio princeps* of Florence in 1488, and which has common ground with Kondoleon's Ἐκλογή, as has been previously pointed out.[66] This is the treatise entitled *De Vita et Poesi Homeri* by Pseudo-Plutarch, which has an important section devoted to the analysis of Homer as a model for rhetoric (2.161–175), akin to Kondoleon's argumentative line.[67] It is important to remember that one of the main goals of this part of the Ἐκλογή is to instruct the general not only with examples of conduct, but more importantly with oratorical models. In the case of *De Vita*, this is accomplished by analysing precisely the same speech of Book 2 in a way that is closely related to what Kondoleon does in his Ἐκλογή. The author of *De Vita* already points out the

(1986) 266, and Schöpsdau, *RhM* 118 (1975) 83–123, who considers it a "Musterbeispiel."

[65] See Ford, *Renaissance Quarterly* 59 (2006) 9, who considers the importance of this work as it marks "the privileged position which Homer occupied in the ancient world as the source of all the sciences and all the philosophical schools." Ford also remarks that the admiration expressed by Alexander the Great was crucial in reinforcing Homer's reputation in Renaissance France as a military strategist.

[66] See Pontani, in *Homer and the Good Ruler* 247–250, and Piasentin and Pontani, *Scritti Omerici* xxviii–xxix.

[67] J. J. Keaney and R. Lamberton, *[Plutarch] Essay on the Life and Poetry of Homer* (Atlanta 1996); M. Hillgruber, *Die pseudoplutarchische Schrift De Homero* II *Kommentar zu den Kapiteln 74–218* (Stuttgart 1999).

great complexity of Agamemnon's rhetorical strategy, to such an extent that it needs a complementary counterpoint—Odysseus' intervention—to achieve its oratorical goal (2.166, transl. Keaney and Lamberton):

> Then what? In what follows, when Agamemnon has the dream that brings him hopes from Zeus and orders him to arm the Greeks, does he not use the rhetorical craft, saying to the crowd just the opposite of what he actually thinks, to test their motivation, rather than impose upon them by forcing them to fight on his behalf? He himself in fact speaks in a manner that pleases them (ἀλλ' αὐτὸς μὲν πρὸς χάριν λέγει), but someone else who has power to persuade them will turn them back to stay and fight, since this is in fact what the king had wanted all along (τοῦτο τῇ ἀληθείᾳ τοῦ βασιλέως θέλοντος). When he speaks to the people, however, he indicates that he wants just the opposite (καὶ γὰρ ἐν οἷς δημηγορεῖ ἐμφαίνει ὅτι τοὐναντίον βούλεται). Odysseus takes up the task and speaks with appropriate directness (παρρησίᾳ τῇ πρεπούσῃ χρώμενος), winning over the leaders with gentle words (τοὺς μὲν ἀρίστους λόγοις προσηνέσι πείθων) and forcing the underlings in their confusion to obey the leaders (τοὺς δὲ ὑποδεεστέρους καταπληκτικῶς ὑπακούειν τοῖς κρείττοσι ἀναγκάζων).

This ancient interpretation of the rhetorical content of Agamemnon's speech, which requires the complementarity of Odysseus' intervention to achieve a true exhortative effect on the Achaeans, is precisely what explains the selection made by Kondoleon, since it provided him a perfect example of how a leader had to use "pleasing words" with his soldiers, while another "terribly forces" them to follow suit. After all, as the humanist himself affirms (*Ekl.* 9), both orators are models of generals, unlike Thersites or Achilles who are models of soldiers.

Given the common ground between these passages and Kondoleon's method, I consider that these rhetorical texts, widely read and divulged during the Renaissance, explain Kondoleon's selection of Agamemnon's speech as a model of λόγος ἐσχηματισμένος in the context of his discussion of the general as the best orator. Thus, the Greek humanist, by choosing

this kind of speech backed by a long rhetorical tradition, opts to support his considerations with a complex exercise of persuasion. If these passages are analysed from this perspective, the reasons which Kondoleon had in *Ekl.* 62 for choosing Agamemnon's speech, together with Odysseus' words as counterpoint to those of the Achaean hegemon, become clear: both provided him an archetype of "dominant" figures who impose their will on the "dominated" thanks to their oratorical skills. Finally, it must be stressed that this Homeric passage is crucial for Kondoleon, and not only in this particular case. On the contrary, it is a recurrent point of reference throughout the Ἐκλογή, whereby he illustrates other concrete aspects on matters concerning the figures of the general and the soldier.[68]

4. *Conclusions*

Although many aspects of his life and career remain unknown, the works of Christophoros Kondoleon are nevertheless a valuable testimony both for the history of ideas and for the study of Classical Tradition in the context of Renaissance humanism. More precisely, his works make possible the analysis of the perspective with which a sixteenth-century Greek erudite approached the study of the Homeric poems, stressing how he could have reinterpreted certain passages for various purposes. In addition, because he was a Greek émigré to western Europe, his intellectual activity took into account a previous tradition (materialised in the importance of scholia and commentaries) for purposes which were products of his time (such as moral instruction or rhetorical training).[69]

In this paper we have studied the important influence which the Graeco-Roman rhetorical tradition exerted on Kondo-

[68] *Il.* 2.110–141 and 2.289–290, 286–288, 308–316, and 318–319 (speeches by Agamemnon and Odysseus in *Ekl.* 61 and 62); *Il.* 2.224–242 (speech by Thersites in *Ekl.* 53); *Il.* 2.344–345 and 362–363 (speech by Nestor in *Ekl.* 78 and 79); *Il.* 2.369–374, 381–385, 391–393 (second intervention of Agamemnon in *Ekl.* 78, 81, and 82).

[69] See H. Lamers, *Greece Reinvented: Transformations of Byzantine Hellenism in Renaissance Italy* (Leiden 2015) 1–27.

leon's Ἐκλογή, especially in the section devoted to the general as the best orator (61–70). These passages, in my view, are clearly influenced by Kondoleon's commanding knowledge of the rhetorical tradition of Homer as oratorical model for the general. Indeed, contrary to what could be expected (that is, the advocacy for other well-known exhortative models, such as those found in the Classical and Byzantine polemological treatises), the rhetorical tradition pulls Kondoleon towards the model of the λόγος ἐσχηματισμένος as the most suitable for a general; consequently, this leads him to the figure of Agamemnon.

The limited circulation of the manuscript which contains the Ἐκλογή signals this work as an exercise in erudition which, given its present state, seems to be unfinished. However, this unfinished character, seen in passages like the one on the general as orator (where sometimes ideas and concepts are presented as if they were cues for future reworkings), has the benefit of offering a testimony to Kondoleon's work process. Thus it offers the possibility to analyse the lens through which a sixteenth-century Greek erudite approached the Homeric poems, reinterpreting select passages against the background of the rhetorical tradition.[70]

September, 2020

Grupo de Investigación 'Arenga'
Universidad de Extremadura
10.075 Cáceres, España
iglesias@unex.es

[70] This paper is related to the Research Project FFI2015-64765-P and the Research Group 'Arenga' (HUM-023). I would like to thank Dr. Filippomaria Pontani for his kindness in providing, in the darkest days of the pandemic we are suffering, a copy of some of the studies on Kondoleon cited in this paper. My thanks also to the *GRBS* anonymous referees for their helpful comments. Remaining deficiencies are mine alone.