

PINDARIC ENCOMIUM AND ISOKRATES' *EVAGORAS*

WILLIAM H. RACE

Vanderbilt University

Isokrates mentions Pindar by name only once, at *Antid.* 166, when he complains how paradoxical it is that Athens once rewarded Pindar with ten thousand drachmas for a single verse of praise,¹ whereas she has treated him ill although he has eulogized (ἐγκεκωμιακότι) the city and its ancestors more often and much better than did Pindar. The choice of the word ἐγκεκωμιακότι shows that he considers himself to have been engaged in the same genre as the older poet of praise. Indeed, his rivalry with the encomiastic poets is most clearly spelled out in the introductory sections of his *Evagoras*, where he claims to be the first to write a prose encomium of a man's *arete*: ἀνδρὸς ἀρετὴν διὰ λόγων ἐγκεκωμιάζειν (8). But throughout the *Evagoras* Isokrates reshapes the outmoded poetic tradition to the demands of new conditions in the fourth century.² In the following pages I wish to examine in some detail the *Evagoras* and show how thoroughly Isokrates adapts the materials, themes, and even forms of the poetic tradition represented by Pindar.³ At the end I will compare the form and themes of the entire treatise with one particular Pindaric ode. We shall begin in each instance with a passage from the *Evagoras*

¹ The expression in question is 'Ελλάδος ἔρεισμα (*fr.* 76.2). All other versions of this anecdote mention one thousand drachmas; Isokrates' is undoubtedly a rhetorical exaggeration.

² For a sketch of how outmoded Pindaric encomium had become in the early fourth century, cf. Plato, *Lysis* 205CD. The two main influences, both developments in prose, on Isokrates' new type of encomium are historiography (cf. also Xenophon's *Agesilaus*) and philosophical theory (cf. φιλοσοφία at *Evag.* 81).

³ Similarities between Isokrates' works, particularly his *Evagoras*, and Pindar's odes to Hieron have long been recognized, but no one, to my knowledge, has examined in any detail the relationship between these two authors. E. Conrotte, "Pindare et Isocrate: Le Lyrisme et l'Eloge Funèbre," *MB* 2 (1898) 168–87, makes a beginning, but is too digressive and superficial to be of much help. W. Jaeger, "The Prince's Education" in *Paideia* III, tr. G. Highet, (Oxford 1944) 84–105, notes the origins of the Cyprian discourses not only in the earlier gnomic poets, but also in the Pindaric encomium. More importantly, E. L. Bundy, in demonstrating the rhetorical nature of many passages in the epinicians, calls attention to a number of parallels with Isokrates. Cf. E. L. Bundy, *Studia Pindarica* (Berkeley 1962) 18–19, 45 n. 32, and "The 'Quarrel Between Kallimachos and Apollonios,' Part I: The Epilogue of Kallimachos's *Hymn to Apollo*," *CSCA* 5 (1972) 59 nn. 59 and 60, 65 n. 71, and 82 n. 100. Also important is A. M. Miller, "N. 4.33–43 and the Defense of Digressive Leisure," *CJ* 78 (1983) 215–17, who examines the close relationship of *Panath.* 74–87 and *Nem.* 4.33–43.

because Isokrates often spells out in more expansive prose a topic that is merely sketched by Pindar.⁴

I. The first *prooimion* (1–4)⁵

Isokrates' debt to the poetic tradition is evident from the very beginning of the work, for it opens with a full-scale priamel (1–2):

(1) Ὅρων, ὦ Νικόκλεις, τιμῶντά σε τὸν τάφον τοῦ πατρὸς οὐ μόνον τῷ πλήθει καὶ τῷ κάλλει τῶν ἐπιφερομένων, ἀλλὰ καὶ χοροῖς καὶ μουσικῇ καὶ γυμνικοῖς ἀγῶσιν, ἔτι δὲ πρὸς τοῦτοις ἵππων τε καὶ τριήρων ἀμίλλαις . . . (2) ἡγησάμην Εὐαγόραν . . . εὐμενῶς μὲν ἀποδέχεσθαι καὶ ταῦτα . . . πολλὸν δ' ἂν ἔτι πλείω χάριν ἔχειν ἢ τοῖς ἄλλοις ἅπασιν, εἴ τις δυνήθειν περὶ τῶν ἐπιτηδευμάτων αὐτοῦ καὶ τῶν κινδύνων ἀξίως διελθεῖν τῶν ἐκεῖνον πεπραγμένων.

Pindar's use of priamels to begin odes or to introduce a subject is well documented and needs no elaboration here.⁶ In keeping with the tendency of Greek prose in general and Isokrates in particular, this priamel is a full elaboration of the earlier models and contains *all* the standard elements found in poetic examples: a *general category* (τιμῶντα), *various examples* (τῶν ἐπιφερομένων . . . χοροῖς . . . μουσικῇ . . . γυμνικοῖς ἀγῶσιν . . . ἵππων τε καὶ τριήρων ἀμίλλαις), a *summary word* that links all the foil terms (ταῦτα and τοῖς ἄλλοις ἅπασιν), a *capping particle* (δ'), an *indication of superiority* (ἔτι πλείω), and the *subject of ultimate interest* (εἴ τις δυνήθειν . . . ἀξίως διελθεῖν).

This opening priamel culminates in the individual (τις) who would most please Evagoras by adequately recounting his character and deeds. Isokrates then uses yet another priamel to single out the genre of encomium and to assert the superiority of the written word over the other forms of tribute because of its greater ability to provide lasting fame.

⁴ For the procedure of moving from the more elaborate prose examples to the more compact poetic versions, cf. W. H. Race, "Some Digressions and Returns in Greek Authors," *CJ* 76 (1980) 2–8.

⁵ The opening consists of three *prooimia*; cf. Schol. ad 1 (Dindorf).

⁶ An obvious parallel is the opening of *Ol.* 11, where the priamel culminates in μελιγάρυες ὕμνοι (4) that bear witness to great achievements (μεγάλαις ἀρεταῖς) (6). Cf. E. L. Bundy, *Studia Pindarica* (above note 3) 4–10 and W. H. Race, *The Classical Priamel from Homer to Boethius* (Leiden 1982) 73–81. Behind this priamel is the question, "By what means would Evagoras most like to be honored?" A similar question opens the hymnal priamel at *Isth.* 7.1–3:

Τίνι τῶν πάρος, ὦ μάκαιρα Θῆβα,
καλῶν ἐπιχωρίων μάλιστα θυμὸν τεδὼν
εὐφρανας;

In the Isokratean passage, the words εὐμενῶς and χάριν suggest similar passages in hymns that seek what the god most favors. Another example of a priamel that caps various activities at a celebration with poetic performance is the priamel at Hom. *h. Apol.* 153–57, where the list of impressive sights at the Delian festival culminates in the singing of the Delian maidens.

(4) αἱ μὲν οὖν δαπάναι τῶν μὲν τοιούτων οὐδὲν ἐξεργάζονται, τοῦ δὲ πλούτου σημείον εἰσιν· οἱ δὲ περὶ τὴν μουσικὴν καὶ τὰς ἄλλας ἀγωνίας ὄντες, οἱ μὲν τὰς δυνάμεις τὰς αὐτῶν, οἱ δὲ τὰς τέχνας ἐπιδειξάμενοι, σφᾶς αὐτοὺς ἐντιμωτέρους κατέστησαν· ὁ δὲ λόγος εἰ καλῶς διέλθοι τὰς ἐκείνου πράξεις, αἰμνηστον ἂν τὴν ἀρετὴν τὴν Εὐαγόρου παρὰ πᾶσιν ἀνθρώποις ποιήσειεν.

As in the previous priamel, the preponderance of plurals in the lists helps to set off the unique and superlative quality of the climactic term. Like the opening priamels of Pindar's poems this one singles out the genre (ὁ λόγος), the subject (Evagoras),⁷ and the epideictic intention (αἰμνηστον . . . ποιήσειεν). There is also a sense of ring-composition that closes off this first *prooimion*, obvious in the recurrence of the priamel form and in the expressions εἰ . . . δυνηθείη . . . ἀξίως διελθεῖν . . . πεπραγμένων (2) and εἰ καλῶς διέλθοι τὰς ἐκείνου πράξεις (4).

II. The second *prooimion* (5–7)

Having thus expressed his intention to immortalize the *arete* of Evagoras in a speech, Isokrates pauses in the second portion of the introduction (5–7) to consider a problem created by his choice of subject matter: the praise of contemporaries (ἐπαινεῖν τοὺς ἐφ' αὐτῶν ἄνδρας, 5). Whereas eulogists ought to praise men among those who are acquainted with them (ἐν εἰδόσι, 5) so that they will have to say true things about them (ταῖς ἀληθείαις ἐχρῶντο, 5) and thereby encourage the young to emulate them, in fact, they prefer to treat heroes who fought at Troy and even earlier ones in their hymns and tragedies.⁸ As a result, the young are discouraged from ever receiving adequate praise for their deeds. And the basic reason for this situation is envy (6):

τούτων δ' αἴτιος ὁ φθόνος . . . οὕτω γάρ τινες δυσκόλως πεφύκασιν, ὥστ' ἥδιον ἂν εὐλογομένων ἀκούσιεν οὕς οὐκ ἴσασιν εἰ γεγόνασιν, ἢ τούτων, ὅφ' ὧν εὖ πεπονθότες αὐτοὶ τυγχάνουσιν.

This frequent rhetorical maneuver, whereby an author amplifies the importance of his work and engages the sympathies of the audience by citing obstacles to the success of his performance, is appropriately called a *Hindernismotiv* by German scholarship. In contrasting his present work, which must stick to the facts (since it is presented ἐν εἰδόσι, 5) and is therefore particularly vulnerable to envy, with the compositions of poets who enjoy the advantages

⁷ Very Pindaric is the prominent display of the name in the climactic statement (τὴν ἀρετὴν τὴν Εὐαγόρου), what Bundy called a name cap.

⁸ Here Isokrates is careful not to disparage praising legendary heroes *tout court* (he praises them frequently himself and will shortly do so in the *Evagoras*); rather he rejects the major poetic genres: epic, hymns, and tragedy. In this light, the passage functions as a *recusatio*, a device that became standard to justify the introduction of a new genre or style.

of treating old themes, Isokrates recalls two Pindaric passages in which the poet dwells on the difficulties of praise in his own time.

The first is the opening of *Isth.* 2, where Pindar contrasts the poets of olden times—who, he says, wrote spontaneous love poetry whenever a beautiful boy took their fancy—with the modern encomiastic poet who must work under the charge of being a hireling and whose muse demands that he keep to his contract.⁹ But the difficulty of laboring under such conditions is compensated for in this case because of the conspicuous glory of Xenokrates, whose victories, Pindar asserts in *litotes*, are well-known (οὐκ ἄγνωτ' αἰείδω, 12). And after listing the victories of Xenokrates and his family, which culminate in his brother Theron's Olympic victory and for which the two have won "immortal honors" (ἀθανάτοις . . . τιμαῖς, 28–29),¹⁰ the poet can then proceed to the fame of the house itself (cf. οὐκ ἄγνωτες . . . δόμοι, 30) with the confident "The way is not uphill or steep when one brings the praises of the Helikonian maidens to the homes of famous men" (33–34).¹¹ And finally, he ends the poem by calling Thrasyboulos "my dear host" (48). The point of all this is that Pindar can maintain the warmth and spontaneity of the earlier love poets (he is, after all, addressing the young Thrasyboulos) as well as perform the proper function of a poet of praise in a debased age.¹² We shall return to *Isth.* 2 at the end of the article.

Isokrates specifies as φθόνοϛ the reluctance of some (τινες) in his audience to accept his praises (6), for they resent praise of contemporaries and only wish to hear about the exploits of mythological figures. He rejects their attitude with the following statement (7):

οὐ μὴν δουλευτέον τοὺς νοῦν ἔχοντας τοῖς οὕτω κακῶς φρονοῦσιν,
ἀλλὰ τῶν μὲν τοιούτων ἀμελητέον, τοὺς δ' ἄλλους ἐθιστέον ἀκούειν,
περὶ ὧν καὶ λέγειν δίκαιόν ἐστιν.

Although it is complicated by a long exemplum, *Nem.* 8.19–42 treats the same issue. After singling out Deinis and his father Megas as subjects of praise in line 16, Pindar hesitates to proceed (19–21):

⁹ Cf. F. J. Nisetich, "Convention and Occasion in *Isthmian* 2," *CSCA* 10 (1977) 133–56 for a full discussion of the opening of this ode and its relationship to the rest of the poem.

¹⁰ Cf. ἀθάνατον μνήμην at *Evag.* 3.

¹¹ Here the Helikonian maidens (the spirit of freely given praise where it is truly deserved) replace that mercenary Muse (Μοῖσα . . . φιλοκερδής, 6), who represents the materialistic dependency to which encomiastic poetry is particularly subject.

¹² Cf. E. L. Bundy, "Quarrel" (above note 3) 88 n. 109: "We need an essay on the ancient and modern in Pindar intended to reveal his thought on how the central tradition is or ought to be preserved and developed . . . One might well begin with a discussion of the commercialization of art and morals as these are viewed in *I.* 2 where, attacking the journalism of his day, Pindar mourns the loss of spiritual values to the sphere of the practical will, yet in truth welcomes the change as having forced on the artist with a conscience a more universal and less purely egoistic definition of value. What envy he has of the impulsive singers of old is thus rejected." Isokrates, too, is engaged in the process of preserving and developing the central tradition.

ἵσταμαι δὴ ποσσὶ κούφοις, ἀμπνέων τε πρὶν τι φάμεν.
 20 πολλὰ γάρ πολλὰ λέλεκται, νεαρὰ δ' ἐξευ-
 ρόντα δόμεν βασάνῳ
 ἐς ἔλεγχον, ἅπας κίνδυνος· ὄψον δὲ λόγοι φθονεροῖσιν.

I stand on light feet and draw breath before saying anything,
 for many things have been said in many ways, but to discover new ones
 and give them to the touchstone
 for testing involves great risk, for words are dessert to the envious.

Here Pindar hesitates to praise a contemporary man, in spite of his eagerness to do so (ποσσὶ κούφοις, 19). Although many themes have been treated in a variety of ways,¹³ there is great danger when one devises (ἐξευρόντα) new subjects, for they are subject to the envy of the audience—who, the word ὄψον suggests, take particular delight in criticism. After citing the example of Ajax's treatment at the hands of Odysseus and the Greeks (23–34), the poet opens the final triad with a forceful rejection of such envious conduct as he has just described and initiates his positive program (35–36):

35 εἴη μή ποτέ μοι τοιοῦτον ἦθος,
 Ζεῦ πάτερ, ἀλλὰ κελεύθους
 ἀπλόαις ζωᾷς ἐφαπτοίμαν . . .

May I never have such a character,
 Father Zeus, but let me tread
 straight paths of life . . .

This passage is the rhetorical equivalent of the Isokratean one. Both authors are defending their coming praise against the potential ravages of φθονεροί.¹⁴ The grammatical form of the transitions from fear and hesitation to confidence is very similar. Isokrates' οὐ μὴν δουλευτέον . . . ἀλλὰ (7) duplicates the movement of the Pindaric εἴη μή ποτέ μοι . . . ἀλλὰ, while in both cases, the same word characterizes the conduct they are rejecting: τοιοῦτον (*Nem.* 8.35) and τοιούτων (*Evag.* 7).

Isokrates labels those (including himself) whose attitude is correct as τοὺς νοῦν ἔχοντας, for they recognize their just obligation to give praise where it is due (δίκαιον). Likewise, at *Nem.* 8.40–42 Pindar ends his hesitations with the observation that ἀρετὰ sprouts up like a tree “when it is raised

¹³ For the *praeteritio* of old (παλαιά) themes implicit in this passage, cf. A. M. Miller, “*Phthonos and Parphasis: The Argument of Nemean* 8.19–34,” *GRBS* 23 (1982) 113, who aptly compares *Pyth.* 8.21–34. The present treatment of this poem is greatly indebted to his analysis of its rhetorical and logical argument.

¹⁴ This is, of course, a common theme, especially prominent in Perikles' funeral oration, both at the beginning (2.35.2) and at the end, when he returns to the living relatives and points out that because of envy their achievements will be judged inferior to those of the dead, since the living incur envy because of rivalry (φθόνος γὰρ τοῖς ζωῶσι πρὸς τὸ ἀντίπαλον, 2.45.1). Cf. A. M. Miller, “*Phthonos and Parphasis*” (above note 13) 114.

up to the liquid air among men who are wise and just” (ἐν σοφοῖς ἀνδρῶν ἀερθεῖς ἐν δίκαιοις τε πρὸς ὑγρόν / αἰθέρα, 41–42). The words σοφοῖς and δίκαιοις find their equivalents in Isokrates’ τοὺς νοῦν ἔχοντας and δίκαιον.¹⁵ They portray the proper attitudes of the poet and his audience toward his task of praising *arete*.

III. The third *prooimion* (8–11)

To sum up briefly, the first introductory section singled out the genre and the subject. The second dealt with the problem posed by the subject matter (praise of a contemporary) and the consequent envy which it may evoke in some of the audience. The third introductory section (8–11), also hesitatory, presents yet another obstacle to the success of the speech. Not only does Isokrates propose to praise a contemporary but he intends to do so in prose (διὰ λόγων, 8), a difficult task (χαλεπόν, 8),¹⁶ he tells us, which no writer has ever before attempted (οὐδεὶς πώποτ’ . . . ἐπεχείρησεν, 8).¹⁷ This choice once again puts him at a great disadvantage vis-à-vis the poets, because they can employ many decorative elements (πολλοὶ κόσμοι, 8) in treating their themes, whereas he must use plain prose (τῶν ὀνομάτων τοῖς πολιτικοῖς, 10) and can only employ strictly relevant arguments (τῶν ἐνθυμημάτων τοῖς περὶ αὐτὰς τὰς πράξεις, 10).¹⁸

In the following sections (9–10) he gives three instances of the κόσμοι that the poets enjoy: (1) the representation of gods interacting with humans, (2) use of figurative language, and (3) meter. In spite of these advantages, he chooses to go ahead with the present work and offers the following justification (11):

ὅμως δὲ καίπερ τοσοῦτον πλεονεκτούσης τῆς ποιήσεως, οὐκ ὀκνητέον, ἀλλ’ ἀποπειρατέον τῶν λόγων ἐστίν, εἰ καὶ τοῦτο δυνήσονται, τοὺς ἀγαθοὺς ἄνδρας εὐλογεῖν μηδὲν χειρόν τῶν ἐν ταῖς ᾠδαῖς καὶ τοῖς μέτροις ἐγκωμιαζόντων.

¹⁵ For δίκαια/δίκαιος as defining the encomiastic propriety of giving true praise where it is due, cf. *Pyth.* 9.95–96 (αἰνεῖν . . . / παντὶ θυμῷ σύν τε δίκῃ καλὰ ρέζοντ’) and *Nem.* 3.29 (ἔπεται δὲ λόγῳ δίκας ἄωτος, “ἔσλὸν αἰνεῖν”). The latter passage is discussed more fully below, p. 152.

¹⁶ χαλεπόν is the standard prose word signalling a *Hindernismotiv*; cf. Aristotle, *Rhet.* 3.14.1415a2 and the opening of Perikles’ “Funeral Oration” at Thuk. 2.35.2, just one of many examples.

¹⁷ Although Choirilos may have begun his epic with a claim to be the first to treat his subject, to my knowledge this is the first extant example of this topic, best known in the versions by Lucretius (1.926–27), *avia Pieridum peragro loca, nullius ante trita solo* and Milton (*PL* 1.16), “Things unattempted yet in prose or rhyme.”

¹⁸ The propensity of encomiastic poetry to digress for the sake of embellishment is illustrated by the anecdote about Simonides’ encomium of Skopas, which contained a long digressive portion on the Dioscuri: *in quo multa ornandi causa poetarum more in Castorem scripta et Pollucem fuissent* (Cicero, *De Orat.* 2.352).

The form of this argument is familiar from the discussion of the previous section. ὅμως δὲ . . . ἀλλ' is the equivalent of Isokrates' οὐ μὴν . . . ἀλλά (7) and of Pindar's εἴη μή ποτέ μοι . . . ἀλλά (*Nem.* 8.35). In terms of rhetoric, all three passages define the proper subject, audience, and treatment, and do so by dramatizing the author's own struggles with his project.¹⁹ But the most striking formal and substantive parallel in Pindar is at *Nem.* 4.33, when Pindar suddenly interrupts his catalogue of Aiakids and expresses three reasons for curtailing it: first is encomiastic relevance (τεθμός, 33), second is the short time at his disposal (ὥραί τ' ἐπειγόμεναι, 34), and third is his own desire to celebrate the festive occasion of the ode (ἱϋγγι δ' ἔλκομαι ἦτορ νεομηνία θιγέμεν, 35). However, in the following lines (36–38) he rejects all three considerations (which he sums up as “conspiracies”):

ἔμπα, καίπερ ἔχει βαθεῖα ποντιάς ἄλμα
μέσσον, ἀντίτειν' ἐπιβουλίας· σφόδρα δόξομεν
δαΐων ὑπέρτεροι ἐν φάει καταβαίνειν·

Nevertheless, although the deep salt sea holds you
by the waist, resist its conspiracies; we shall be seen
to arrive in the light triumphant over our foes.

Isokrates, too, lists three major obstacles to his successful composition, and like Pindar, he rejects them all with a “nevertheless, although” (ὅμως δὲ καίπερ = ἔμπα, καίπερ) and states that in spite of the great advantages of his poetic rivals, he will succeed in his endeavor: μηδὲν χειρὸν is litotes for the Pindaric σφόδρα . . . ὑπέρτεροι, while the δαΐων in Pindar are specified in Isokrates as τῶν . . . ἐγκωμιαζόντων. Ironically, Isokrates is using the very form of this argument against the poets who employed it in the first place.²⁰

¹⁹ As Bundy, “Quarrel” (above note 3) 59 n. 59, points out, “Such hesitatory interludes can achieve great power, since they can directly portray the actual process of thought in arriving at its goal.” He later refers to the introduction of the *Evagoras* as an instructive example and rightly notes that the effectiveness of such topics in Isokrates “is often dulled through lack of intellectual power and precision.” Cf. also *Studia Pindarica* (above note 3) 13 n. 37 and 38 n. 11. These hesitations also attest to the character (cf. ἦθος at *Nem.* 8.35) of the speaker, who shows himself to be a champion of a just but difficult cause. For the ethical persuasiveness of Isokrates' hesitation to praise Agamemnon in the *Panathenaicus*, cf. W. H. Race, “*Panathenaicus* 74–90: The Rhetoric of Isocrates' Digression on Agamemnon,” *TAPA* 108 (1978) 181–85.

²⁰ For a penetrating analysis of the Pindaric passage, cf. A. M. Miller, “*N.* 4.33–43” (above note 3) 202–20. As he demonstrates, the φοβονερά δ' ἄλλος ἀνὴρ βλέπων represents the kind of eulogist who would stint the Aiakids of their full glory. Similarly, in *Pyth.* 1.81–85, Pindar rejects three considerations that would curtail his forthcoming praise. As Miller (213) paraphrases the passage: “The laudator breaks off his praise of Hieron to extol the virtues of brevity, which are to forestall criticism (μῶμος), avoid tedium (κόρος), and allay envy (φθόνος); *nevertheless* (ἀλλ' ὅμως), because it is better to be envied (for greatness) than pitied (for insignificance), the laudator proceeds with his encomium under the guise of an extended *parainesis*.” Similar is *Nem.* 10.19–20, on which see Miller (213). Ruth Scodel has pointed out to me that the overstatement in Pindar's ἐπιβουλίας (“conspiracies”) is matched by Isokrates' πλεονεκτούσης (11).

IV. Evagoras' ancestry (12–18)

The first topic of the encomium proper (cf. *πρῶτον*, 12) is Evagoras' ancestry. In the following sections (12–18) Isokrates sketches in true Pindaric fashion the line of the Aiakids, which culminates in Teukros, who colonized Cyprus and was the progenitor of Evagoras.²¹ Of course this sketch of ancestral achievements serves a clearly eulogistic purpose, but for Isokrates as for Pindar, the Aiakids, each with his own claim to fame, furnish the paradigms for the present generation to follow. For example, Aiakos is praised for his *εὐσέβεια* (14) and for bringing timely relief (*ἀπαλλαγὴν*, 14) to the Hellenes; Peleus is praised for his fight against the Centaurs, for the dangers (*κινδύνους*, 16) he faced, and for his marriage to Thetis, whose son Achilles is praised for fighting against the barbarians. It is no accident that Evagoras is later praised for his *εὐσέβεια* (39), for the dangers (*κινδύνους*) he faced (35, 36, 65), for his relief to Athens (*ἀπαλλάξουσιν*, 54), and for his campaigns against the barbarians (58–64), a subject that frequently calls forth heroic models in Isokrates.²²

V. Evagoras' rise to power: vaunts and justifications (23–40)

In the following sections (23–32) Isokrates recounts how Evagoras gained the throne of Salamis. After pausing to remark that what he has already said is sufficient to convey the scope of Evagoras' *arete* and of his accomplishments, he nonetheless (*οὐ μὴν ἀλλ'*, 33) claims that he can reveal (*δηλώσειν*, 33) even more clearly (*ἔτι σαφέστερον*, 33) the nature of his achievements by issuing a comprehensive statement (34):

τοσούτων γὰρ τυράννων ἐν ᾧ παντὶ τῷ χρόνῳ γεγεννημένων οὐδεὶς
φανήσεται τὴν τιμὴν ταύτην κάλλιον ἐκείνου κτησάμενος.

This type of summary evaluation by which an author attests to the superlative quality of his subject can usefully be called a “vaunt,” or even more specifically, a superlative vaunt.²³ The language of these vaunts is extremely

²¹ This catalogue of Aiakids is similar in structure and intention to that of *Nem.* 4.25–69. Cf. also *Nem.* 3.32–63.

²² Three prominent examples are Agamemnon (*Panath.* 76–83), Theseus (*Helen* 23–37), and Herakles (*Philip* 109–12), all of which are accompanied by elaborate justifications that emphasize their importance and attest to Isokrates' character. For an analysis of the *Helen* as a statement of Isokrates' Panhellenism, cf. G. Kennedy, “Isokrates' *Encomium of Helen*: a Panhellenic Document,” *TAPA* 89 (1958) 77–83. In keeping with the primarily symbouleutic intention in Isokrates' speeches and with the increasing historicism of the fourth century, his mythical *paradeigmata* are much more transparently applicable to the addressee. Pindar is more interested in capturing the spirit than the letter of the comparison.

²³ The term “vaunt” was invented by Bundy, *Studia Pindarica* (above note 3), *passim*, who used it to refer to any direct praise of the victor. In my *The 'Vaunt' in Pindar* (Diss. Stanford

stylized, generally consisting of a negative (usually οὐ or μή), an indefinite pronoun (τις), and a comparative adjective or adverb.²⁴ Such vaunts mark the high point of the praise and frequently serve to conclude topics. Since they make a strong claim, they often call forth elaborate justifications and assurances. Such is the case here, but in order to prove the validity of his sweeping statement, Isokrates resorts to another *Hindernismotiv* (34):

εἰ μὲν οὖν πρὸς ἕκαστον αὐτῶν τὰς πράξεις τὰς Εὐαγόρου παραβάλλοιμεν, οὐτ' ἂν ὁ λόγος ἴσως τοῖς καιροῖς ἀρμόσειεν οὐτ' ἂν ὁ χρόνος τοῖς λεγομένοις ἀρκέσειεν· ἦν δὲ προελόμενοι τοὺς εὐδοκιμωτάτους ἐπὶ τούτων σκοπῶμεν, οὐδὲν μὲν χεῖρον ἐξετάωμεν, πολὺ δὲ συντομώτερον διαλεχθῆσόμεθα περὶ αὐτῶν.

Isokrates could not possibly examine every single instance. He gives two reasons: generic inappropriateness (οὐτ' ἂν ὁ λόγος ἴσως τοῖς καιροῖς ἀρμόσειεν) and lack of time.²⁵ These are precisely the two reasons Pindar gave at *Nem.* 4.33–34 (see above, p. 137):

τὰ μακρὰ δ' ἐξενέπειν ἐρύκει με τεθμός
ὥραί τ' ἐπειγόμεναι . . .

But generic constraint prevents me from lengthy accounts and the pressing hours . . .

Isokrates' πρὸς ἕκαστον . . . παραβάλλοιμεν = Pindar's τὰ μακρὰ . . . ἐξενέπειν; his καιροῖς = Pindar's τεθμός; and his χρόνος = Pindar's ὥραι. So, because of these restrictions, Isokrates decides to select (προελόμενοι) only the most salient examples for comparison, thereby making his point just as well (οὐδὲν χεῖρον) and more briefly (συντομώτερον). This rhetorical tactic

1973) I use the expression "superlative vaunt" to refer to those vaunts that assert the superiority of the subject over all others, what Isokrates at *Panath.* 123 terms καθ' ὑπερβολὴν τινας ἐπαινεῖν. Comprehensive statements such as this one are actually variations of a summary priamel because the οὐδεὶς could easily be expanded into a list of examples—precisely what Isokrates declines to do in the following section (34).

²⁴ The following table will make clear the similarities.

Ol. 1.104: μή τιν' . . . κυριώτερον
Ol. 2.93–94: μή τιν' . . . ἀφθονέστερον
Pyth. 2.60: ἕτερόν τιν' . . . ὑπέρτερον
Nem. 6.25: ἕτερον οὐτίνα οἶκον . . . πλεόνων
Ol. 13.31: οὐπω τις πρότερον
Pyth. 1.49: οἶαν οὐτίς Ἑλλάνων
Bacch. 3.63–65: [ο]ὔτι[ς] . . . πλείονα
Bacch. 8.22–25: οὐτίς . . . π[λεῦ]νας
Evag.: οὐδεὶς . . . κάλλιον

²⁵ For καιρός as a term for what is appropriate to the occasional nature of a genre, especially when the main issue is undue length, cf. Bundy, "Quarrel" (above note 3) 82 n. 100 and J. R. Wilson, "KAIROS as 'Due Measure,'" *Glotta* 58 (1980) 181–83 and 199–200. For other examples in Isokrates, cf. τῶν καιρῶν at *Helen* 29 and ἀκαιρίαν at *Ep.* 2.13.

is as old as Homer, who prefaces his catalogue of Greeks with the statement that he could not possibly name them all, but instead will list the leaders and give the numbers of their ships.²⁶ But Pindar also used the same topic. As Bundy has shown,²⁷ Isokrates' justification is very close to the one Pindar advances at *Pyth.* 9.76–79:

ἀρεταὶ δ' αἰεὶ μεγάλαι πολύμυθοι·
βαῖα δ' ἐν μακροῖσι ποικίλλειν
ἀκοᾷ σοφοῖς· ὁ δὲ καιρὸς ὁμοίως
παντὸς ἔχει κορυφάν.

Great deeds always call forth many stories;
but to elaborate a few items among long subjects
is what wise men like to hear, for appropriate selection
conveys the gist of the whole just as well.

Here the adjectives πολύμυθοι and μακροῖσι convey the same sense as τὰ μακρά in *Nem.* 4.33 and πρὸς ἕκαστον at *Evag.* 34: there is a great deal of potential material to treat and it will take a long time to treat it fully.²⁸ In both *Evag.* 34 and Pindar *Pyth.* 9.78, the issue turns on the word καιρὸς. Although in the former case it refers to the propriety inherent in the occasional nature of Isokrates' encomium and in the latter to the selection of details consonant with that occasion, the basic sense of the word, "the proper amount at the right time and place,"²⁹ accommodates both meanings. Isokrates is concerned that a case-by-case examination will not suit the demands of the occasion (τοῖς καιροῖς ἀρμόσειεν); that is, it will be inappropriate to his encomiastic speech.³⁰ In the following sections (35–38), Isokrates follows his

²⁶ *Il.* 2.488–93. Cf. also *Od.* 4.240–42, where Helen cannot name all (πάντα) the trials of Odysseus, but (ἀλλ') selects one (τόδ') that typifies (οἶον) his character. Fittingly it is the occasion on which he disguised himself as a beggar to reconnoitre Troy. Likewise, at *Philip* 110 Isokrates cannot relate all the relevant deeds of Herakles, so he chooses one accomplishment (μίαν πράξιν) to elaborate.

²⁷ Cf. Bundy, *Studia Pindarica* (above note 3) 17–19. D. C. Young, "Pindar, Aristotle, and Homer: A Study in Ancient Criticism," *CA* 2 (1983) 156–70, gives added support to Bundy's interpretation of ὁμοίως as "just as well," of παντός as "of the whole," and of κορυφάν as "spirit," and links this passage with the advice that Aristotle gives at *Poetics* 18.1456a10 ff.

²⁸ For μακρός in other contexts where an excessive amount of material is concerned, cf. *Ol.* 13.41, *Pyth.* 4.247, *Pyth.* 8.30, *Nem.* 10.46, *Isth.* 6.56, and Bacch. 10.51.

²⁹ Cf. J. R. Wilson, "KAIROS" (above note 25). For the basic meaning of the word in fifth-century drama, cf. W. H. Race, "The Word καιρός in Greek Drama," *TAPA* 111 (1981) 197–213.

³⁰ Elsewhere Isokrates shows similar concern for generic propriety. At *Panath.* 85–86 he defends his long digression on Agamemnon against those who would criticize him for disregarding proper measure (τῶν καιρῶν ἀμελεῖν, 85) by asserting that he is more concerned about his subject's merit than about achieving proper proportion (συμμετρίαν) or avoiding complaints about inappropriateness (ἀκαιρίαν) in his speech. Likewise, at *Ep.* 2.13, he has so much to say (πολλὰ δ' ἔχων εἰπεῖν) that he fears the impropriety (ἀκαιρίαν) of exceeding the limits of an

critical pronouncements by selecting one primary historical example, namely Kyros, with whom to compare Evagoras. By surpassing the example of Kyros, whom Isokrates claims to be the most admired of historical rulers (if not of all time) for his rise to power, Evagoras will *a fortiori* surpass all others as well. Although the fairness of his actual comparison is open to question,³¹ he is at least true to his rhetorical principles.

At the end of his comparison Isokrates reiterates his vaunt with greater assurance and goes on to defend it (39):

εἰ δὲ δεῖ συντόμως καὶ μηδὲν ὑποστειλάμενον μηδὲ δέισαντα τὸν φθόνον,
ἀλλὰ παρρησίᾳ χρησάμενον εἰπεῖν, οὐδεὶς οὔτε θνητὸς οὔθ' ἡμίθεος
οὔτ' ἀθάνατος εὐρεθήσεται κάλλιον οὐδὲ λαμπρότερον οὐδ' εὐσεβέστε-
ρον λαβὼν ἐκείνου τὴν βασιλείαν. καὶ τούτοις ἐκείνως ἂν τις μάλιστα
πιστεύσειεν, εἰ σφόδρα τοῖς λεγομένοις ἀπιστήσας ἐξετάζειν ἐπιχει-
ρήσειεν, ὅπως ἕκαστος ἐτυράννευσεν. φανήσομαι γὰρ οὐκ ἐκ παντὸς
τρόπου μεγάλα λέγειν προθυμούμενος, ἀλλὰ διὰ τὴν τοῦ πράγματος
ἀλήθειαν οὕτω περὶ αὐτοῦ θρασέως εἰρηκώς.

Once again this vaunt is cast in formulaic language. And, like many Pindaric examples, it is surrounded by justifications that allay the potential disbelief of the audience. An instructive example is the end of *Ol.* 2, where the poet praises the generosity of Theron (89–100);³²

90 ἐπὶ τοι
 Ἀκράγαντι τανύσαις
 αὐδάσομαι ἐνόρκιον λόγον ἀλαθεῖ νόφω,
 τεκεῖν μὴ τιν' ἑκατόν γε ἐτέων πόλιν
 φίλοις ἄνδρα μᾶλλον
 εὐεργέταν πραπίσιν ἀφθονέστερόν τε χέρα
95 Θῆρωνος. ἀλλ' αἶνον ἐπέβα κόρος
 οὐ δίκᾳ συναντόμενος, ἀλλὰ μάργων ὑπ' ἀνδρῶν,
 τὸ λαλαγήσαι θέλων
 κρυφόν τε θέμεν ἐσλῶν καλοῖς
 ἔργοις· ἐπεὶ νάμμος ἀριθμὸν περιπέφευγεν,
 καὶ κείνος ὅσα χάρματ' ἄλλοις ἔθηκεν,
100 τίς ἂν φράσαι δύναίτο;

epistle (ἐπιστολῆς συμμετρίαν) by making it the length of a treatise (λόγου μήκος). At *Philip* 10 occur the same two words, *καῖρόν* and *σύμμετρον*, which define the length of speech proper to the occasion.

³¹ Isokrates indulges here one of the most common sophistic tricks of comparison by which superiority in one particular is taken to prove overall superiority. Since Isokrates is the only ancient source for Kyros' execution of Astyages, he is not above suspicion of having invented it to enhance Evagoras' εὐσεβεία.

³² I give here Turyn's text with Snell-Maehler's numbering. The word *κόρος* has both an active sense (the excess that produces tedium) and a passive sense (the tedium produced by excess). Here *κόρος* is active and personified (cf. the personification of *φθόνος* at *Ol.* 8.55); it exceeds just limits and is eager (θέλων) to prattle and consequently [for consequential (or inferential) τε, cf. Smyth 2968] makes obscure its subject. For an extended treatment of the

Yes,
 bending the bow at Akragas,
 I will proclaim a statement on oath with a truthful mind,
 that no city within this century has produced
 a man more beneficent
 to his friends in his affections and more generous of hand
 than Theron. But enough. Praise is subject to excess that produces
 tedium when it does not keep to just limits, but at the hands of
 greedy men eagerly prattles on and obscures
 good men's noble
 deeds, for sand escapes calculation
 and who could recount all the kindnesses
 that man has done for others?

Besides the obvious formal similarity between the two vaunts, each is accompanied by strong guarantees. Isokrates holds nothing back and vouches for the truth of his statement (τὴν τοῦ πράγματος ἀλήθειαν); Pindar swears that he is telling the truth (ἀλαθεῖ νόω, 92). The boldness and confidence of Pindar's declaration implicit in the phrase αὐδάσομαι ἐνὸρκιον λόγον (92) is broken down into several aspects by Isokrates: συντόμως καὶ μηδὲν ὑποστειλάμενον μηδὲ δέισαντα τὸν φθόνον, ἀλλὰ παρρησίᾳ χρησάμενον.³³ Both eulogists refuse to descend to the level of the particular to justify their claims. Isokrates challenges any listener to test the truth of his assertion by comparing all other examples. Pindar, too, could attempt to list Theron's benefactions, but it would be completely counterproductive. For one thing, it would be excessive and tedious (cf. κόρος, 95) and would consequently obscure (cf. κρυφόν, 97) the glory of his subject's merit. For another, it would be impossible, since the number (cf. ὅσα, 99) of Theron's kindnesses is without limit.

When Isokrates declares that he has no fear of φθόνος but will speak out in all frankness, he employs a rhetorical tactic that occurs throughout the poetic tradition, for such declarations often signal a vaunt. They can take two forms, depending on the locus of the φθόνος. When the φθόνος is on the part

rhetoric of this passage, cf. W. H. Race, "The End of *Olympia* 2: Pindar and the *Vulgus*," *CSCA* 12 (1979) 251–67.

³³ Many of the terms in Isokrates' passage have counterparts in Pindaric contexts where high praise is at issue. For example, speaking briefly and comprehensively to the point (συντόμως εἰπεῖν) is paralleled at *Ol.* 13.98, where the poet declines to list the victories of the Oligaihidai at the Isthmian and Nemean games, but is content to sum them up (παύρῳ ἔπει θήσω φανέρ' ἀθρό'). Likewise, at *Isth.* 6.58–59 he gives the barest details of Pytheas' and Euthymenes' victories (τὸν Ἀργείων τρόπον / εἰρήσεται που κὰν βραχίστοις). Cf. *Paneg.* 106, where Isokrates says that he has no need to praise Athenian democracy at length (διὰ μακροτέρων ἐπαινέιν) because he can reveal its worth in a few words (συντόμως δηλώσαι).

The concept of holding nothing back (μηδὲν ὑποστειλάμενον) is paralleled in Pindar by expressions such as παντὶ θυμῷ at *Pyth.* 9.96 and μηκέτι ῥίγει at *Nem.* 5.50. The same word (ὑπέσται) occurs at *Isth.* 2.40, where in a metaphor from sailing Pindar declares that no breeze ever caused Xenokrates to "hold back" the sail of his hospitality.

of the eulogist it denotes *withholding* praise.³⁴ When the φθόνος is felt by the audience it denotes *displeasure*,³⁵ which can express itself as *disbelief*³⁶ or *criticism*.³⁷ Although criticism is Isokrates' immediate concern, disbelief becomes an issue shortly. This forestalling of any adverse reaction in the audience finds an equivalent at *Ol.* 8.53–55, where Pindar introduces the trainer Melesias for extended praise.

τερπνὸν δ' ἐν ἀνθρώποις ἴσον ἔσσεται οὐδέν.
εἰ δ' ἐγὼ Μελησία ἐξ ἀγενεῖων
κῦδος ἀνέδραμον ὕμνω,
55 μὴ βαλέτω με λίθω τραχεῖ φθόνος.

No one thing will be equally pleasant for men.
But if I review in my hymn the glory of Melesias
in youths' events,
may no ill-will strike me with a rough stone.

Here Pindar too is concerned with his audience's pleasure (τερπνόν, 53; cf. ἥδιον at *Evag.* 6). In this instance, however, Isokrates' version is much more compact than that of Pindar, who employs a negative expression and personifies φθόνος as one who throws rough stones.³⁸ But the rhetorical topic is identical. In spite of the litotes, Pindar is certain of the favorable reception that will greet his high praise of the trainer in the following verses (56–66); indeed, Alkimedon has won for him the thirtieth major victory in his training career.

Then, after issuing his sweeping statement,³⁹ Isokrates challenges any τις who may not be convinced to conduct his own survey to determine the truth of his claim. This appeal to any member of the audience to gainsay the truth of a vaunt also appears in Pindar, most strikingly in the second person

³⁴ The notion of "holding back" on the part of a eulogist is evident in the "stinter" (φθονερὰ βλέπων) at *Nem.* 4.39. Pindar also uses negative expressions involving φθόνος to convey the idea of full and unreserved praise. For example, μὴ φθονεραῖσι γνώμαις at *Isth.* 1.44 and μὴ φθόνει at *Isth.* 5.24 both express the need for a fitting "vaunt" (κόμπον) in praise of achievements. For a survey of such passages in Pindar and Bacchylides that eschew φθόνος (holding back) in favor of full praise, cf. W. H. Race, "Negative Expressions and Pindaric ΠΟΙΚΙΛΙΑ," *TAPA* 113 (1983) 108–10.

³⁵ Cf. *Evag.* 6 (quoted above p. 134), where φθόνος characterizes those in the audience who are by nature irritable (δυσκόλως πεφύκασιν) and find it more pleasurable (ἥδιον) to listen to *laudatores temporis acti*.

³⁶ Cf. *Thuk.* 2.35.2, where φθόνος in the audience (φθονοῦντες) leads to disbelief (ἄπιστοῦσιν).

³⁷ For displeasure (φθόνος) expressed as criticism (μῶμος), cf. *Ol.* 6.74, *Pyth.* 1.82, and *Bacch.* 13.202. The most famous example occurs at the end of Kallimachos' *Hymn to Apollo*, where Φθόνος and Μῶμος are personified.

³⁸ For the importance of the adjective τραχεῖ, cf. W. H. Race, "Negative Expressions" (above note 34) 110 note 44.

³⁹ The confidence he has gained as a result of comparing Evagoras with Kyros allows him to expand this vaunt over the earlier version at 34.

at *Nem.* 9.32–37 after his praise of the Aitnaians in general and Chromios in particular:

ἐντί τοι φίλιπποί τ' αὐτόθι καὶ κτεάνων
 ψυχὰς ἔχοντες κρέσσονας
 ἄνδρες. ἄπιστον ἔειπ'·
 αἰδῶς γὰρ ὑπὸ κρύφα κέρδει κλέπτεται,
 ἃ φέρει δόξαν. Χρομίῳ κεν ὑπασπί-
 ζων παρὰ πεζοβόαις ἵπποις τε ναῶν τ' ἐν μάχαις
 35 ἔκρινας, ἂν κίνδυνον ὀξείας αὐτᾶς,
 οὔνεκεν ἐν πολέμῳ κείνα θεὸς ἔντυεν αὐτοῦ
 θυμὸν αἰχματὰν ἀμύνειν λοιγὸν Ἐνυαλίου.

Yes, they are horsemen there and men
 whose souls are masters of their
 possessions. Unbelievable are my words,
 for the valor that brings fame is secretly
 stolen by gain. Had you borne Chromios' shield among
 the shouting infantry and cavalry and in sea battles,
 you would have judged, during the danger of the fierce battle-cry,
 that the goddess Valor urged on his warrior spirit
 in battle to ward off the onslaught of Ares.

If anyone should disbelieve his boast that Chromios and the men of Aitna care more for valor (αἰδῶς, 33) than for possessions (κτεάνων, 32) and more for fame (δόξαν, 34) than for gain (κέρδει, 33), then he need only have been in the thick of battle next to Chromios when the goddess Αἰδῶς herself spurred him on.⁴⁰ This appeal by the author to any listener to test the truth of his assertion by conducting his own empirical examination is also implicit in Pindar's challenge at the end of *Ol.* 2 (quoted above p. 141): τίς ἂν φράσαι δύναίτο.⁴¹

Finally, Isokrates refers to the boldness (θρασέως) of his sweeping pronouncement.⁴² In a similar fashion, Pindar at the end of *Ol.* 9.107–12 speaks out plainly and boldly about the virtues of Epharmostos:

⁴⁰ Here αἰδῶς is the military virtue that consists of valor in battle, of staying in the ranks and not shaming oneself by faint-hearted efforts or, even worse, by desertion. This quality brings fame to the warrior, whether he lives or dies. Cf. the epigram attributed to Simonides (*A.P.* 7.514):

Αἰδῶς καὶ Κλεόδημον ἐπὶ προχοῇσι Θεαίρου
 ἀενάου στονόεντ' ἤγαγεν εἰς θάνατον,
 Θρηικίῳ κύρσαντα λόχῳ πατρὸς δὲ κλεωννόν
 Διφίλου αἰχμητῆς υἱὸς ἔθηκ' ὄνομα.

Aidos led (cf. ἔντυεν at *Nem.* 9.36) the warrior (cf. αἰχματὰν at *Nem.* 9.37) Kleodemos, who gained fame for his father (cf. δόξαν at *Nem.* 9.34).

⁴¹ Cf. also *Nem.* 7.68–69 after his praise of Thearion: μαθὼν δέ τις ἀνερεῖ, / εἰ πὰρ μέλος ἔρχομαι ψάγιον ὄαρὸν ἐννέπων. Of a similar nature is *Pyth.* 2.58–61: εἰ δέ τις . . . λέγει.

⁴² Isokrates refers to his vaunt as μεγάλα λέγειν, an expression Pindar also uses in a similar context at *Nem.* 6.26–28. After having claimed that the Bassidai had gained more boxing crowns than any other family in Greece, he expresses the hope that his “boast” may hit the mark: ἔλπομαι / μέγα εἰπὼν σκοποῦ ἅντα τυχεῖν.

σοφαίαι μὲν
 αἰπειναί· τοῦτο δὲ προσφέρων ἄεθλον,
 ὄρθιον ὥρυσαι θαρσέων,
 110 τόνδ' ἄνερα δαιμονία γεγάμεν
 εὐχειρα, δεξιόγυιον, ὀρώντ' ἄλκάν,
 Αἶαν, τεόν τ' ἐν δαιτί, 'Ιλιάδα,
 νικῶν ἐπεστεφάνωσε βωμόν.

The ways of artful wisdom
 are steep. But in presenting this athletic achievement
 boldly shout straight out
 that with divine help this man was born with
 quick hands, nimble legs, determination in his look,
 and at your feast, Aias, son of Ileus, the victor
 has placed another crown on your altar.

Here σοφαίαι (artful elaborations)⁴³ are rejected (cf. μὲν) on the grounds that they require effort (literally they are “steep,” αἰπειναί). Since he has already run through the career of Epharmostos (a *periodonikes*!) that has culminated in this Olympian victory, he can confidently sum up his qualities in a few words. The words ὄρθιον ὥρυσαι imply the straightforward, clear declaration of Isokrates' παρρησία χρησάμενον εἰπεῖν, while his θαρσέως εἰρηκώς is paralleled by Pindar's ὥρυσαι θαρσέων.⁴⁴ By rejecting σοφαίαι, Pindar

⁴³ For σοφία as technical skill in the arts, cf. *Ol.* 7.53 (artistic skill), *Pyth.* 3.54 (medical skill), and *Nem.* 7.23 (poetic skill). In *Ol.* 9 these σοφαίαι correspond to Aristotle's ἐντεχνοὶ πίστεις at *Rhet.* 1.2.1355b36 which must be devised by the speaker, in contrast to ἀτεχνοὶ πίστεις which consist of factual givens that can be presented directly without argumentation. Here τοῦτο ἄεθλον means “this athletic achievement,” namely, this Olympic victory that has crowned Epharmostos' spectacular career (detailed in 83–99). His deeds speak for themselves, and the athlete's own natural abilities (cf. 110–11) can be matched by the poet's natural directness (cf. πυῶ, 100) in praising them.

Cf. the very similar development at *Bacch.* 8.19–25:

γαῖ δ' ἐπισκῆπτων χέρα
 20 κομπάσομαι· σὺν ἀλα-
 θεΐαι δὲ πᾶν λάμπει χρέος·
 οὔτις ἀνθρώπων κ[αθ'] Ἑλλά-
 νας σὺν ἄλικι χρόνῳ[ι
 παῖς ἑὼν ἀνὴρ τε π[λεῦ]-
 25 νας ἐδέξατο νίκας.

Like Pindar, Bacchylides offers his vaunt (κομπάσομαι, 20; cf. μηδὲν ὑποστειλάμενον at *Evag.* 39 and αὐδάσομαι at *Ol.* 2.92) on oath and testifies to its truth (ἀλαθεΐαι, 20–21; cf. ἀλήθειαν at *Evag.* 39 and ἀλαθεῖ νόφ at *Ol.* 2.92). In all these cases, the author offers a straightforward evaluation of the subject's career. In each case the vaunt itself is cast in the conventional negative.

⁴⁴ An identical treatment of the topic occurs in *Bacch. fr.* 20C 19–24:

τέχνη[ι] γε μὲν εἰσ[ι]ν ἅπα[σαι]
 20 μυρία[ι]· σὺν θεῶι δὲ θ[ε]α[ρ]σῆ[σας] - -
 οὔτις ἀνθρώπων ἔ[τερον] καθορᾶι
 λε[ύκι]ππος Ἄω[ς]
 τόσσ[ο]ν ἐφ' ἀλικία[ι]
 φέγγος κατ' ἀνθρώπ[ους] φέρουσα . . .

espouses the same virtues as Isokrates, namely brevity (συντόμως) and straightforwardness (παρρησίᾳ), the same qualities that he claimed for himself in *Ol.* 2.⁴⁵

To round off this section on Evagoras' acquisition of power, Isokrates pauses to amplify the importance of his subject by stressing the greatness of kingship (40):

Εἰ μὲν οὖν ἐπὶ μικροῖς διήνεγκε, τοιούτων ἂν καὶ τῶν λόγων αὐτῷ
προσῆκεν ἀξιοῦσθαι· νῦν δ' ἅπαντες ἂν ὁμολογήσειαν *τυραννίδα καὶ*
τῶν θεῶν ἀγαθῶν καὶ τῶν ἀνθρωπίνων μέγιστον καὶ σεμνότατον καὶ
περιμαχητότατον εἶναι. τὸν δὲ τὸ κάλλιστον τῶν ὄντων κάλλιστα
κτησάμενον *τίς ἂν* ἢ ποιητῆς ἢ λόγων εὐρετῆς *ἀξίως* τῶν πεπραγ-
μένων *ἐπαιέσειεν*;

Of all blessings, tyranny is the greatest.⁴⁶ Pindar uses the same argument in praise of Hieron at *Ol.* 1.113–14:⁴⁷

†ἄλλοισι δ' ἄλλοι μεγάλοι· τὸ δ' ἔ-
σχατον κορυφοῦται
βασιλεῦσι. μηκέτι πάπταινε πόρσιον.

Men are great in various ways, but the
ultimate crown belongs to
kings. Look no further.

Isokrates' καὶ τῶν θεῶν ἀγαθῶν καὶ τῶν ἀνθρωπίνων μέγιστον is the formal equivalent of Pindar's summary priamel: †ἄλλοισι δ' ἄλλοι μεγάλοι . . . τὸ δ' ἔσχατον, for behind both lies the question, "What is the highest station for a mortal?"⁴⁸ In both cases, the vaunt serves the rhetorical function of concluding the praise.

Once again the devices of art (and detailed argument) are set aside (cf. μέν, 19) in favor of a comprehensive evaluation of Hieron's achievement, which the poet makes bold (θ[α]ρσῆ[σας]) to utter with divine inspiration and approval (σὺν θεῷ). Although the text is incomplete, the conventional form of the vaunt (οὔτι]ν' . . . τόσσ[o]ν) is apparent.

⁴⁵ For an account of Pindar's espousal of comprehensiveness (cf. ἐς τὸ πᾶν, 85), brevity (cf. παγγλωσσίᾳ, 87; κόρος, 95) and clarity (cf. κρυφόν, 97) at the end of *Ol.* 2, cf. W. H. Race, "Olympia 2" (above note 32).

⁴⁶ Like Pindar, Isokrates uses the terms τυραννίς (τύραννος) and βασιλεία (βασιλεύς) almost interchangeably. For the former, cf. *Evag.* 26, 27, 28, 31, 34, 46, and 63; for the latter, 18, 19, 20, 25, 30, 32, 35, 36, 39, 41, 43, 58, 63, 64, 69, 71, and 78. For the alternation of these two terms in vaunts to Hieron, cf. *Ol.* 1.114 (βασιλεῦσι) and *Pyth.* 3.85 (τύραννον).

⁴⁷ This similarity is pointed out by E. Conrotte, "Pindare et Isocrate" (above note 3) 180.

⁴⁸ The ἀγαθῶν could well have been listed. This is a frequent prose form of priamels. Cf. above notes 6 and 23.

VI. Evagoras' rule (41–72)

In the succeeding sections Isokrates praises the character of Evagoras' reign and adduces as his most convincing proof (μέγιστον τεκμήριον, 51) the fact that many outstanding Greeks left their homes to dwell in Cyprus because of the benevolence of his rule. Both the substance of the argument as well as the form is paralleled in Pindar. For example, in praise of Aiakos' rule, Pindar says (*Nem.* 8.7–12):

ἔβλασεν δ' υἱὸς Οἰνῶνας βασιλεύς
 χειρὶ καὶ βουλαῖς ἄριστος. πολλὰ νιν πολ-
 λοὶ λιτάνευον ἰδεῖν·
 ἄβοατὶ γὰρ ἡρώων ἄωτοι περὶ ναιετάοντων
 10 ἦθελον κείνου γε πείθεσθ' ἀναξίαις ἐκόντες,
 οἳ τε κρανααῖς ἐν Ἀθάναισιν ἄρμοζον στρατόν,
 οἳ τ' ἀνὰ Σπάρταν Πελοπηιάδαί.

And a son was born as king of Aigina,
 preeminent in strength and counsel. Many men frequently
 begged to see him,
 for without summons the greatest of the neighboring heroes
 willingly and gladly would submit to his kingship:
 both those who ordered the host in rocky Athens,
 and those in Sparta who were descended from Pelops.

Pindar gives just two examples that sketch the whole (cf. πολλὰ . . . πολλοί, 8),⁴⁹ for in this instance he is not interested in concentrating on one particular example. Isokrates, however, does wish to treat one special case, and therefore uses a summary priamel to single out the most important immigrant to Cyprus (51–52):

ὧν τοὺς μὲν ἄλλους ὀνομαστί διελθεῖν πολὺ ἂν ἔργον εἴη· (52)
Κόνωνα δὲ τὸν διὰ πλείστας ἀρετάς πρωτεύσαντα τῶν Ἑλλήνων τίς
οὐκ οἶδεν . . .

There is a priamel in Pindar on precisely the same topic. In order to praise the reign of Opos in *Ol.* 9, Pindar lists those aliens who came to settle in his country (67–70):

ἀφίκοντο δὲ οἱ ξένοι
 ἔκ τ' Ἀργεος ἔκ τε Θη-
 βᾶν, οἱ δ' Ἀρκάδες, οἱ δὲ καὶ Πισᾶται·
 υἱὸν δ' Ἀκτορος ἐξόχως τίμασεν ἐποίκων
 70 Αἰγίνας τε Μενoitιον.

⁴⁹ Athens and Sparta form a doublet of the two strongest states on either side of Aigina, the one on the mainland, the other in the Peloponnesos, the one a democracy, the other an hereditary kingship.

And foreigners came to him
 from Argos and from Thebes,
 and some from Arkadia and still others from Pisa.
 But the son of Aktor and Aigina he honored most of the settlers,
 Menoitios.

Whereas Isokrates simply declines to name any of the settlers (τοὺς ἄλλους) because of their large number, Pindar sketches the range of the immigrants by a geographical survey that includes three areas of the Peloponnesos and Thebes on the mainland.⁵⁰ Both then forcefully introduce their crowning example (Κόνωνα δέ = υἱὸν δ' Ἄκτορος . . . Μενόϊτιον)⁵¹ and both indicate the superiority of their individual subject over all the other settlers (πρωτεύσαντα = ἐξόχως). The two authors even develop the ensuing theme in similar fashion. Pindar goes on to praise the companionship in battle of Menoitios' son Patroklos and Achilles, when they alone faced the mighty Telephos as he was routing the Greeks at Troy (70–79), while Isokrates praises the friendship of Konon and Evagoras, which resulted in the Battle of Knidos that freed Athens from the dominance of Sparta (53–57).

VII. The concluding vaunt (70–72)

In the following sections (58–69) Isokrates completes his praise of Evagoras by outlining his deeds of war against the Persians and by summing up his achievements. Once again he ends this topic with a superlative vaunt by declaring Evagoras the equal of any previous hero (72):⁵²

ὥστ' εἴ τινες τῶν ποιητῶν περὶ τινος τῶν προγεγενημένων ὑπερβολαῖς
 κέχρηται, λέγοντες ὡς ἦν θεὸς ἐν ἀνθρώποις ἢ δαίμων θνητός,
 ἅπαντα τὰ τοιαῦτα περὶ τὴν ἐκείνου φύσιν ῥηθῆναι μάλιστ'
 ἂν ἀρμόσειεν.

Such concluding vaunts, whereby the author makes a sweeping comparison with all previous examples, later became a standard topic of prose encomia, as can be seen by Menander Rhetor's prescription of the "comprehensive comparison" (τὴν τελειοτάτην σύγκρισιν, 376.31 Sp.) at the end of the

⁵⁰ Pindar stresses the large number of settlers through the plurals (οἱ) and the wide geographical range of their cities, thus making the introduction of the single person the more striking.

⁵¹ Pindar withholds the proper name Menoitios for climactic effect. He also effectively withholds the name of the mother, Aigina, both because she is more famous than Aktor, and because she completes the geographical catalogue.

⁵² We saw (above p. 133) that Isokrates framed the first *prooimion* with priamel whose similar wording recalled poetic ring-composition. Here he frames his final praise with vaunts. This concluding one echoes (but with considerable intensification) the one at 70: ὥστ' εἴ τινες τῶν προγεγενημένων δι' ἀρετὴν ἀθάνατοι γεγόνασιν, οἶμαι κάκεινον ἤξιῶσθαι ταύτης τῆς δωρεᾶς. Cf. also the two vaunts at 34 and 39.

section of praise in a βασιλικὸς λόγος just before the epilogue. Pindar comes closest to the example of Isokrates at *Pyth.* 2.58–61, where he claims that Hieron's wealth and honor surpass those of all previous Greeks:

εἰ δέ τις
ἤδη κτεάτεσσιν τε καὶ περὶ τιμῇ λέγει
60 ἑτερόν τιν' ἂν 'Ελλάδα τῶν πάροιθε γενέσθαι ὑπέρτερον,
χαύνα πραπίδι παλαιμονεῖ κενεά.

If anyone
now claims that when it comes to wealth and honor
any other man in Hellas of those who came before surpassed him,
with an empty mind he wrestles in vain.

Although Isokrates makes his claim in positive terms⁵³ whereas Pindar uses a negative expression, the similarity of the wording is clear: εἴ τις = εἴ τις and τινος τῶν προγεγενημένων = τιν' . . . τῶν πάροιθε γενέσθαι.

VIII. The conclusion (73–81)

This encomium of Evagoras is framed by addresses to his son Nikokles at the beginning (1–11) and end (73–81), and in a fashion reminiscent of poetic ring-composition, Isokrates returns to the beginning where he had contrasted the physical splendor of the funeral dedications and musical and athletic displays with his own gift of a speech, which is capable of immortalizing *arete* (ἀείμνηστον ἂν τὴν ἀρετὴν . . . ποιήσκειν, 4). In sections 73–74 he reiterates the primacy of speech over physical memorials, but this time the contrast specifically involves statues:

ἐγὼ δ', ὦ Νικόκλεις, ἡγοῦμαι καλὰ μὲν εἶναι μνημεῖα καὶ τὰς τῶν σωμάτων εἰκόνας, πολὺ μὲντοι πλείονος ἀξίας τὰς τῶν πράξεων καὶ τῆς διανοίας, ἃς ἐν τοῖς λόγοις ἂν τις μόνον τοῖς τεχνικῶς ἔχουσι θεωρήσειεν. (74) προκρίνω δὲ ταύτας πρῶτον μὲν εἰδῶς τοὺς καλοὺς κάγαθοὺς τῶν ἀνδρῶν οὐχ οὕτως ἐπὶ τῷ κάλλει τοῦ σώματος σεμνυνομένους ὥς ἐπὶ τοῖς ἔργοις καὶ τῇ γνώμῃ φιλοτιμουμένους· ἔπειθ' ὅτι τοὺς μὲν τύπους ἀναγκαῖον κατὰ τούτοις εἶναι μόνοις, παρ' οἷς ἂν σταθῶσι, τοὺς δὲ λόγους ἐξενεχθῆναι θ' οἷόν τ' ἐστὶν εἰς τὴν 'Ελλάδα καὶ, διαδοθέντας ἐν ταῖς τῶν εὐφρονούντων διατριβαῖς, ἀγαπᾶσθαι παρ' οἷς κρεῖττόν ἐστιν ἢ παρὰ τοῖς ἄλλοις ἅπασιν εὐδοκιμεῖν.

Although the topic of the superiority of poetry over the representational arts in depicting character later becomes a commonplace,⁵⁴ Isokrates may well

⁵³ Isokrates here employs a common variation of vaunt whose basic structure consists of "if anyone, then x" (cf. *Pyth.* 3.86: εἴ τιν' ἀνθρώπων).

⁵⁴ The opening of *Nem.* 5 is the earliest example of the topic I can find. Cf. Dem. 61.15–16, Horace, *C.* 4.8, and *Ep.* 2.1.248–50:

have had a Pindaric *locus* in mind, for his treatment is essentially an elaboration of the opening of *Nem.* 5 and could well serve as a commentary on it.

Οὐκ ἀνδριαντοποιός εἰμ', ὥστ' ἐλινύσοντα ἐργά-
 ζεσθαι ἀγάλματ' ἐπ' αὐτὰς βαθμίδος
 ἐσταότ'· ἀλλ' ἐπὶ πάσας
 ὀλκάδος ἔν τ' ἀκάτῳ, γλυκεῖ' ἀοιδά,
 στεῖχ' ἀπ' Αἰγίνας διαγγέλλοισ', ὅτι
 Λάμπωνος υἱὸς Πυθέας εὐρυσθενῆς
 5 νίκη Νεμείοις παγκρατίου στέφανον . . .

I am not a sculptor, constrained to fashion stationary
 statues that stand on their own bases;
 but rather, go forth, sweet song, on board every ship and
 in every boat
 from Aigina and announce that
 Lampon's mighty son Pytheas
 has won the crown in the pankration at Nemea . . .

Of particular interest is Isokrates' point that statues must remain only where they are set up, whereas words can travel all over the Hellenic world. Pindar dramatizes the mobility of song by envisioning it as being carried across the sea from Aigina. The doublet "on board every ship and in every boat," by sketching the range of boats from the large mercantile cargo carriers to small craft, amplifies the dispersion of the news. Also Sandys' translation of διαγγέλλοισ' (3) as "spreading abroad the tidings" captures the force of the prefix δια-, which is echoed by διαδοθέντας at *Evag.* 74.

Having established the written word as the most effective means of recording and disseminating a man's *arete*, Isokrates states the ethical purpose of his eulogy (76–77):

(76) ὦν ἔνεκα καὶ μᾶλλον ἐπεχείρησα γράφειν τὸν λόγον τοῦτον, ἡγούμενος καὶ σοὶ καὶ τοῖς παισὶ καὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις τοῖς ἀπ' Εὐαγόρου γεγόνόσι πολὺ καλλίστην ἂν γενέσθαι ταύτην παράκλησιν, εἴ τις ἀθροίσας τὰς ἀρετὰς τὰς ἐκείνου καὶ τῷ λόγῳ κοσμήσας παραδοίῃ θεωρεῖν ὑμῖν καὶ συνδιατρίβειν αὐταῖς. (77) τοὺς μὲν γὰρ ἄλλους προτρέπομεν ἐπὶ τὴν φιλοσοφίαν ἐτέρους ἐπαινοῦντες, ἵνα ζηλοῦντες τοὺς εὐλόγονμένους τῶν αὐτῶν ἐκείνοις ἐπιτηδευμάτων ἐπιθυμῶσιν, ἐγὼ δὲ σὲ καὶ τοὺς σοὺς οὐκ ἄλλοτρίοις παραδείγμασι χρώμενος ἀλλ' οἰκείοις παρακαλῶ, καὶ συμβουλεύω προσέχειν τὸν νοῦν, ὅπως καὶ λέγειν καὶ πράττειν μηδενὸς ἥττον δυνήσῃ τῶν Ἑλλήνων.

Herein lies the seriousness of epideictic poetry and prose. By gathering together achievements (τὰς ἀρετὰς) and by adorning them in speech (τῷ λόγῳ

nec magis expressi voltus per aenea signa,
 quam per vatis opus mores animique virorum
 clarorum apparent.

Here *mores animique* are equivalent to the Isokratean τρόπους and διανοίας at *Evag.* 75. Later examples include Martial 7.84, 10.32, *A. P.* 4.4, and the anonymous *epikiedion* (D. L. Page, *Greek Literary Papyri*, pp. 554–56, lines 12–20).

κοσμήσας) one provides ethical models (παραδείγμασι) for the next generation to follow.⁵⁵ We shall return later to the word κοσμήσας. First, however, we must consider further the relationship of examples which are "foreign" (ἀλλοτρίοις) and "at home" (οἰκείοις).

In 77 Isokrates contrasts the cases of others (τοὺς ἄλλους) for whom one must provide the models of strangers (ἐτέρους) with the situation of Nikokles and his family, who have a model right at home.⁵⁶ The same motif occurs at *ad Dem.* 8–9. After praising *arete* for the heroic qualities it inspires, he adduces the examples of Herakles and Theseus, who won lasting fame for their toils. But he suddenly breaks off further discussion of them (9):

οὐ μὴν ἀλλὰ καὶ τὰς τοῦ πατρὸς προαιρέσεις ἀναμνησθεὶς οἰκεῖον
καὶ καλὸν ἔχεις παράδειγμα τῶν ὑπ' ἐμοῦ σοι λεγομένων.

The more remote examples of Herakles and Theseus yield to the nearer one, Demonikos' father, a "home example" (οἰκεῖον . . . παράδειγμα).⁵⁷ He will furnish a more appropriate model because he is part of the family.⁵⁸

A model for both of these examples appears at *Nem.* 3.19–32. After praising Aristokleidas for his wrestling victory at Nemea, Pindar says that one cannot go beyond the Pillars of Herakles (19–21). Then, by means of a relative clause (ἃς, 22), Pindar digresses on the distant journeys of his favorite hero.⁵⁹ After spending several lines on Herakles' western travels, he suddenly stops with the following self-exhortation (26–32):

θυμέ, τίνα πρὸς ἀλλοδαπὰν
ἄκραν ἐμὸν πλόον παραμείβει;

⁵⁵ The phrase προτρέπομεν . . . ἐπαινοῦντες (77) well expresses Isokrates' combination of epideictic and symbouleutic intentions here and throughout his writings. At *Rhet.* 1.9.1367b37 ff. Aristotle points out the reciprocal relationship between praise and counsel: "what you might suggest in counselling becomes encomium by a change in the phrase." He then quotes Isokrates to prove his point: "For instance, the statement that 'one ought not to pride oneself on goods which are due to fortune, but on those which are due to oneself alone,' when expressed in this way, has the force of a suggestion; but expressed thus, 'he was proud, not of goods which are due to fortune, but of those which were due to himself alone,' it becomes praise" (J. H. Freese, tr.). Cf. *Evag.* 45, where the statement is used to praise, and *Panath.* 32, where it is advisory. Pindar also frequently alternates from advice (often gnomic) to praise.

⁵⁶ Note the switch from the generalized plural (ἄλλους . . . προτρέπομεν . . . ἐτέρους) to the specific singular ἐγὼ δὲ σέ, an instance of what Bundy called a pronominal cap, where the author and his subject are juxtaposed. This stylistic trait descended from hymnal form through lyric to prose.

⁵⁷ Isokrates uses the same topic in the *Philip*, but this time he justifies the relevance of his digression on the exploits of Herakles (109–12) by the fact that Philip claimed Herakles as his ancestor. Thus he can say (113), "you have no need to follow alien examples but have before you one from your own house" (μὴ δεῖν ἀλλοτρίοις χρῆσθαι παραδείγμασιν, ἀλλ' οἰκεῖον ὑπάρχειν).

⁵⁸ The word οἰκεῖον has both senses, "appropriate" and "part of the family."

⁵⁹ Pindar loves to digress on Herakles, especially as a model of ultimate achievement, and he often dramatically breaks off his account in order to come closer to "home." A good example is *Ol.* 9.29–41.

Αἰακῷ σε φαμί γένει τε Μοῖσαν φέρειν.
 ἔπεται δὲ λόγῳ δίκας ἄωτος, “ἔσλόν αἰνεῖν”,
 30 οὐδ’ ἀλλοτρίων ἔρωτες ἀνδρὶ φέρειν κρέσσονες·
 οἴκοθεν μάτευε. ποτίφορον δὲ κόσμον ἔλαχε
 γλυκύ τι γαρυμέν.

My heart, to what foreign
 headland are you making my course go astray?
 To Aiakos and his race I bid you bring the Muse.
 Attendant upon speech is the essence of justice:
 “praise the good,”
 but it is not better for a man to desire foreign things.
 Seek at home, for you have a fitting adornment
 to sing in sweet song.

The οὐδ’ (30) is *adversative*,⁶⁰ and qualifies the general proposition of encomiastic propriety (δίκας ἄωτος, 29) that one should praise the good man. On that principle, Pindar’s preceding praise of Herakles is justified. There is, however, a nearer claim on his attention, for the ode is about a descendant of Aiakos. For that reason, the impulse of his θυμός (26) to praise Herakles (who, after all, is a Theban hero dear to his heart), further expressed as desire (ἔρωτες, 30), is diverting him from his voyage (ἐμὸν πλόον, 27).⁶¹ Prominently displayed in the negative and positive assertions of his task in lines 30–31 are two key words: ἀλλοτρίων and οἴκοθεν, recalling the same words in Isokrates’ passages (*Evag.* 77 and *ad Dem.* 9). Especially close is the latter, where Isokrates turns from Herakles and Theseus as exemplars of virtue to the model of Demonikos’ own father.⁶²

Pindar calls his native theme a ποτίφορον κόσμον (31), a “fitting adornment.” And while Isokrates had complained in the introduction of the *Eva-goras* that the poets had the advantage of many verbal adornments (πολλοὶ κόσμοι, 8), he ultimately seeks to rival the poets by producing a comparable adornment in prose (τῷ λόγῳ κοσμήσας, 76). The poet and the orator have

⁶⁰ The οὐδ’ is rhetorically equivalent to the οὐ μὴν ἀλλά at *ad Dem.* 9 (whose full meaning is “nevertheless [although these other examples could serve as models], you have a noble example at home”). On this passage and its relationship to *Nem.* 4.33 ff. as part of the encomiast’s programmatic “scale of relevance,” cf. A. M. Miller, “*N.* 4.33–43” (above note 3) 206.

⁶¹ Pindar also uses the image of the πλόος in returning to his proper subject at *Pyth.* 11.39 and *Nem.* 4.70. Here the word ἀλλοδαπὴν (26) reinforces the notion of ἀλλοτρίων (30) and labels his praise of Herakles as digressive. For a discussion of the “linear” journey of the poem in its course of praise, whose destination is the celebration of the present victory, cf. W. H. Race, “Digressions and Returns” (above note 4) 4–6.

⁶² In the case of Philip (cf. above note 57), the οἰκεῖον παράδειγμα is Herakles; in Demonikos’ case it is his own father, while for Aristokleidas in *Nem.* 3, it is his Aiakid ancestors (Αἰακῷ . . . γένει τε, 28), beginning with Peleus, who is introduced immediately after the deliberations: παλαιαῖσι δ’ ἐν ἀρεταῖς / γέγαθε Πηλεὺς (32–33). In two places, Pindar combines the Pillars of Herakles motif with the word οἴκοθεν (*Ol.* 3.43–44 and *Isth.* 4.11–12), indicating that the example of Herakles is—in its largest sense—οἰκεῖον in these cases.

precisely the same goal, to praise the ἀρετή inherent in their models, those more distant, but especially those closer to home, who provide an even greater inspiration.

In the closing sections of the *Evagoras* Isokrates urges Nikokles to imitate the example of his father that he has just presented, and ends the entire treatise with a sentence that strongly recalls Pindar's advice in *Pyth.* 2 to Hieron (*Evag.* 81):⁶³

ἔστι δ' ἐπὶ σοὶ μὴ διαμαρτεῖν τούτων· ἂν γὰρ ἐμμένης τῇ φιλοσοφίᾳ
καὶ τοσοῦτον ἐπιδιδῶς ὅσον περ νῦν, ταχέως γενήσῃ τοιοῦτος οἷόν σε
προσῆκει.

After his extravagant praise of Hieron at *Pyth.* 2.57–71, Pindar turns to counsel him with the famous exhortation: γένοι', οἷος ἔσσι μαθῶν (72) and proceeds to advise the king on the need to beware those things that are most destructive of effective leadership and which plague kings: slander, flattery, deviousness, and envy. Since Nikokles is looking toward his maturity, Isokrates places greater emphasis on the future and on what the young man may become; Pindar, however, is addressing Hieron at the height of his power and therefore is concerned with the present and what the king already is. Otherwise, the correspondence between the two phrases is very close: γένοι' = γενήσῃ, οἷος ἔσσι = τοιοῦτος οἷόν σε προσῆκει. The last word in the Pindaric version, μαθῶν, even finds its equivalent in φιλοσοφία, a word which, along with παιδεία, Isokrates uses to describe his program of political and ethical education.⁶⁴

IX. The *Evagoras* and *Isth.* 2

Our analysis has shown that from the beginning to the end of the *Evagoras* Isokrates uses a multitude of features found in Pindar's epinicians. To conclude, I wish to compare briefly the overall structure of the *Evagoras* with one of Pindar's odes, *Isth.* 2, which exhibits a number of striking thematic and formal resemblances.

For one thing, both works celebrate the ἀρετή of a dead man (Xenokrates and Evagoras) and are addressed to their sons (Thrasyboulos and Nikokles). We have already seen that both begin with an elaborate statement about the difficulties of writing praise in the present age.⁶⁵ But in spite of the obstacles—

⁶³ This resemblance is noted by R. Stoneman, "The Ideal Courtier: Pindar and Hieron in *Pyth.* 2," *CQ* 34 (1984) 44 n. 6.

⁶⁴ Cf. *Philip* 152: γνωσθεὶς οἷος εἰ and the elaborate variation of the Pindaric γένοι' οἷος ἔσσι μαθῶν at 114: ἔστι δέ σοι πεισθέντι τοῖς ὑπ' ἐμοῦ λεγομένοις τυχεῖν δόξης, οἷας ἂν αὐτὸς βουληθῇς.

⁶⁵ Later examples that begin with the problems of praising virtue in a degenerate age include Theokritos, *Id.* 16 and Tacitus' *Agricola*.

or better, because of the challenge they present—both authors succeed in praising the deeds and character of their subjects. Furthermore, both end with an exhortation to the son to use the present work as a guide in order to continue the family tradition and not to allow the father's ἀρετή to suffer eclipse. Here is the ending of *Isth.* 2.43–48:

μή νυν, ὅτι φθονεραὶ
 θνατῶν φρένας ἀμφικρέμανται ἐλπίδες,
 μήτ' ἀρετὰν ποτε σιγάτω πατρώων,
 45 μηδὲ τοῦσδ' ὕμνους· ἐπεὶ τοι
 οὐκ ἐλινύσοντας αὐτοὺς ἐργασάμαν.
 ταῦτα, Νικάσιππ', ἀπόνειμον, ὅταν
 ξεῖνον ἐμὸν ἡθαῖον ἐλθῃς.

Therefore, since envious hopes hang about men's minds,
 let him [Thrasyboulos] never keep silent his father's
 excellence
 nor these hymns, for I assure you
 that I did not fashion them to remain stationary.
 Impart these words to him, Nikasippos,
 when you visit my dear host.

His father's excellence (ἀρετὰν . . . πατρώων, 44) provides Thrasyboulos the οἰκεῖον παράδειγμα which he must strive to imitate in the face of men's inclination to harbor envious expectations (φθονεραὶ ἐλπίδες, 43),⁶⁶ and by proving them ineffectual, he will “never silence” (μήτ' . . . ποτε σιγάτω, 44) his inherited excellence⁶⁷ nor belie the praise given in Pindar's songs (τοῦσδ' ὕμνους, 45). He further qualifies his songs by saying, “I did not fashion them to remain stationary” (οὐκ ἐλινύσοντας αὐτοὺς ἐργασάμαν, 46), that is, that like statues they should stand as mute testimony to bygone achievement.

Although Pindar does not specifically mention statues here, we can be certain of the reference by comparing the opening of *Nem.* 5 (quoted above, p. 150): the similarity of the two expressions ἐλινύσοντας . . . ἐργασάμαν (*Isth.* 2.46) and ἐλινύσοντα ἐργάζεσθαι (*Nem.* 5.1) shows that Pindar is talking in each instance about statues and asserting the superiority of the spoken word over stationary images. We have seen that both Pindar (*Nem.* 5.1–5) and Isokrates (*Evag.* 74) make the point that statues must remain only

⁶⁶ These φθονεραὶ ἐλπίδες (expectations based on envy) characterize a pessimistic strain in men that leads them to expect less of each generation (cf. the proverbial “most sons are worse than their fathers” at *Od.* 2.277). Closely related is the φθόνος at *Evag.* 6, which inclines men to appreciate only the *arete* of former times and to devalue contemporary achievements, thereby discouraging the young from aspiring to success.

⁶⁷ Cf. *ad Dem.* 11, where Isokrates says that he is providing Demonikos a παράδειγμα so that he can emulate his father's excellence (ζηλωτὴν τῆς πατρῶας ἀρετῆς). Nisetich (above note 9) 155 note 64 demonstrates that the word πατρώων at *Isth.* 2.44 underscores the fact that Xenokrates' *arete* is inherited by his son.

where they are set up, whereas words can travel all over the Hellenic world. At the end of *Isth.* 2, Pindar's remark about his hymns not being stationary follows an impressive geographical survey that characterizes the extensive liberality of Xenokrates, which traveled (metaphorically) from Phasis to the Nile (40–42), and is followed by the command to Nikasippos to impart his words to Thrasyboulos when he goes to visit him—all of which vividly demonstrates the mobility of language.⁶⁸

Thus, in terms of *structure* (a eulogy of a father framed by addresses to the son), *themes* (the advantages of earlier writers, the difficulty of praising contemporaries, the problems of φθόρος, the superiority of poems over statues), and *intention* (exhortation to the next generation to maintain the high standards of paternal achievement), the two works show remarkable similarities of design and detail.

In conclusion, I hope to have shown that Isokrates was a careful reader of the eulogistic tradition in general and of Pindar in particular, and that he readily adapted the basic forms of Pindaric encomium to his larger program of reforming the political and ethical life of Hellas. In terms both of style and intention, Isokrates comes the closest of subsequent Greek authors to Pindar's achievement. Although numerous other points of comparison with Pindar's works can be found throughout the Isokratean corpus, particularly in his gnomic works, his address to Philip, and his epideictic speeches, the present discussion should suffice for demonstrating the close relationship of the two authors.⁶⁹

⁶⁸ It is impossible to determine the actual identity (or function) of Nikasippos (whose name is tantalizingly significant in this ode celebrating equestrian victories), but here he represents the ability of song to travel abroad, to celebrate *arete*, and to encourage its continuation in the next generation that is willing to receive the song's message (cf. ξείνον ἐμὸν ἡθαῖον, 48).

⁶⁹ Cf. for example, *ad Dem.* 48 with *Pyth.* 1.87–88; *ad Dem.* 49 with *Ol.* 1.54–64, *Pyth.* 2.25–41, and *Pyth.* 3.19–58 (for Tantalos, Ixion, Koronis, and Asklepios as τῆς τύχης προδότες); *ad Dem.* 50 with *Pyth.* 1.94–98 (for positive and negative examples of conduct); *ad Nik.* 13 with *Pyth.* 2.72; *Philip* 150–51 with *Ol.* 1.106–15; *Busiris* 38–40 with *Ol.* 1.52–53 and *Pyth.* 2.52–56; *Antid.* 130 with *Nem.* 7.23; *Ep.* 2.13–14 with *Nem.* 10.19–20; and *Ep.* 6.11 with *Pyth.* 11.52. Overall, there is a remarkable resemblance between Pindar and Isokrates as they attempt to persuade—through examples, exhortations, and warnings—the great political and military leaders of their respective eras to use their power and wealth for the benefit of their fellow Greeks.