

# The rhetoric of Athenian praise and panhellenism

How the two seemingly different parts of the *Panegyricus* can be connected

Research Master thesis

Classics and Ancient Civilizations

Leiden University

Marloes Velthuisen

S1356917

[m.velthuisen@umail.leidenuniv.nl](mailto:m.velthuisen@umail.leidenuniv.nl)

Supervisor dr. C.C. de Jonge

Second reader prof. dr. I. Sluiter

25-06-2018

23,623 words

# Table of contents

|  |    |
|--|----|
| Introduction.....  | 2  |
| Political Climate.....   | 2  |
| Isocrates' rhetoric and education .....                                  | 3  |
| Isocrates' evolvement of rhetoric from sophistry and oral tradition..... | 4  |
| Isocrates' education .....   | 7  |
| Identity .....   | 8  |
| Athenian identity.....   | 10 |
| Greek identity.....  | 11 |
| Panegyricus.....   | 12 |
| Setting of the <i>Panegyricus</i> .....                                  | 12 |
| Structure of the <i>Panegyricus</i> .....                                | 13 |
| Thesis.....  | 13 |
| Chapter 1: Rhetoric and Athenian identity .....                          | 15 |
| The purpose of the first part of the speech .....                        | 16 |
| Myth .....   | 17 |
| Isocrates' presentation of material.....                                 | 20 |
| Wars .....   | 23 |
| Defence of criticism.....  | 26 |
| Hardship inflicted by barbarians and strife with Sparta.....             | 28 |
| Chapter conclusion.....  | 29 |
| Chapter 2: Rhetoric and panhellenism.....                                | 31 |
| Reasons for Persian danger.....  | 32 |
| Call for the expedition.....   | 34 |
| Present opportunity .....  | 37 |
| Current situation .....  | 40 |
| Summary of arguments.....  | 41 |
| Epilogue.....  | 44 |
| Chapter conclusion.....  | 45 |
| Conclusion .....   | 46 |
| Bibliography.....  | 50 |

## Introduction

In what way can the two seemingly different parts of Isocrates' *Panegyricus* be regarded as contributing to a specific goal? This is the question that my thesis will address. On the one hand, Isocrates seems to praise Athens and desire Athenian hegemony, while on the other hand the *Panegyricus* also advocates panhellenism. This thesis will argue that these two seemingly different parts of the speech can be seen as coherent and do in fact contribute to one goal, by researching Isocrates' use of rhetorical strategies.

To understand Isocrates' position in the politics of his time, this introduction will provide general information on Isocrates, who was a rhetorician and teacher and who set up his own school of rhetoric in Athens, after he had been a logographer for some years.<sup>1</sup>

## Political Climate

During the Persian Wars (490-479 BC) Athens was Persia's main rival. However, Sparta played a significant part in the Greek victory and Athens was destroyed. When the war was over, Athens presented itself more and more imperialistically, of course to great Spartan dissatisfaction. In the time of Isocrates (436-338 BC), Athens found itself in a difficult political position, since its rival Sparta was the victor of the Peloponnesian war (431-404 BC) that followed Greek internal strife. The question then was whether Sparta would maintain hegemony, whether Athens could make itself great again and compete with Sparta or whether some middle ground could be established (the last option not being very likely).<sup>2</sup> Various cities struggled for hegemony over Greece, as is clearly explained by Papillon: "Persia also played a major part in Greek politics in this period, notably with the King's Peace – also called the Peace of Antalcidas – when it negotiated a treaty with Sparta identifying which cities would be independent and which would be under Spartan, Athenian, or Persian control. Isocrates seizes the opportunity presented by the confusion in these years to propose a solution: the way to relieve the stresses on the Greek city-states is to induce them to give up their animosity toward each other and join in a unified campaign against Persia."<sup>3</sup> This laid the basics for the idea of panhellenism, for all the

---

<sup>1</sup> For detailed biographies of Isocrates, see for example Benoit 1984, 109-111, Norlin 1954, ix-xlvi and Usher 1990, 1-14. Modern scholars, but also already ancient writers, disputed the number of works attributed to Isocrates and how to categorise them. See Too 1995, 10-35 for an elaborate discussion.

<sup>2</sup> Jaeger 1959, 132 posits: "Mochte der imperialismus, wenn er den unvermeidbar war, sich gegen andere Völker kehren, die auf einer tieferen Stufe der Bildung standen und von Natur die Feinde der Griechen waren." In his ground-breaking work, Jaeger researched education, not politics. This citation sums my points up nicely, but Jaeger is not an authority on Athenian politics. It also seems that he merely thought this upcoming idea of panhellenism was logical, for he does not give any evidence for this. For a discussion of the sentiments of the time based on primary and secondary literature, see for example Bringmann 1965, 19-20.

<sup>3</sup> Papillon 2004, 24-25. Also Cartledge 1997, 32: "Conquering Sparta and a resurgent Athens vied, all too successfully, for barbarian Persian financial support in their attempts to secure an Aegean hegemony. The upshot was a diplomatic victory for Great King Artaxerxes II that Xerxes would have envied. By the terms of the King's Peace (386) all the Greeks of Asia were once more consigned to Persian suzerainty, while the Greeks of Europe

Greeks to unite against barbarian Persia, one of the themes of the focal text of my thesis, Isocrates' *Panegyricus*.

Isocrates' rhetoric and education

Against this political background of a growing sentiment of panhellenism Isocrates' education evolved. Jaeger explains this relation between a sense of Greekness and education clearly: "Das neue griechische Empfinden ist ein Erzeugnis der Kultur und Bildung. Doch die griechische Paideia empfängt ihrerseits einen bedeutenden Kraftszuwachs dadurch, daß sie sich mit dieser panhellenischen Zeitströmung erfüllt."<sup>4</sup> Isocrates thus tried to establish this idea of panhellenism through education, which was based on rhetoric.<sup>5</sup> As to the substance of his speeches, Isocrates does not merely incorporate mythological and historical narratives, but makes them part of the way he presents himself, of his identity, and thus of the things that he propagates.<sup>6</sup> For Isocrates, stories play an important part in the portrayal of (Athenian) identity, as will be shown in chapter one.

This thesis posits that rhetoric plays an important role in the *Panegyricus*, as it is the medium through which Isocrates sets out his ideas about Athens and panhellenism, giving language a social (or even moral) obligation, as will also be touched upon below.<sup>7</sup> Isocrates could use this social function of language to engage his Athenian public for his cause, whether that is Athenian hegemony or panhellenism, the two themes of the *Panegyricus* that will be explored in this thesis.

---

were implicated willy-nilly in a diplomatic settlement containing a barely veiled threat of renewed Persian military intervention, if only by proxy. It was against that depressingly familiar background of inter-Hellenic strife that the Panhellenist refrain was taken up [...]."

<sup>4</sup> Jaeger 1959, 134. As with the previous citation of Jaeger, this citation also relies on his psychological interpretation of the Greeks' thoughts.

<sup>5</sup> Rhetoric had to fulfil the following qualities, according to *Against the Sophists* 13: Μέγιστον δὲ σημεῖον τῆς ἀνομοιότητος αὐτῶν· τοὺς μὲν γὰρ λόγους οὐχ οἷόν τε καλῶς ἔχειν, ἢν μὴ τῶν καιρῶν καὶ τοῦ πρεπόντως καὶ τοῦ καινῶς ἔχειν μετάσχωσι. – "This is the greatest sign of dissimilarity of these things; for speeches cannot be beautiful, if they do not take part in opportunity and fittingness and newness." (my translation).

<sup>6</sup> Haskins 2004a, 11: "The Isocratean use of literacy transforms the mythopoetic logos into a discourse that engenders, rather than merely serves, the rhetor's political identity."

<sup>7</sup> Haskins 2004a, 14: "Rhetoricians are concerned [...] with the social function of language."

## Isocrates' evolvment of rhetoric from sophistry and oral tradition

Before Isocrates' time, rhetoric was mainly used by sophists, travelling teachers.<sup>8</sup> This section will not comment upon Plato's role involving education, but it has to be noted that Isocrates worked in a milieu of competing schools and sophists. Isocrates' rhetoric had quite a different goal than that of the sophists (who merely taught rhetoric, which meant to speak persuasively, to anyone who paid enough money)<sup>9</sup> from whose oratorical practices Isocrates' rhetoric developed. With his rhetoric Isocrates seeks to persuade his audience of his cause, as he explains in the introduction to his *Panegyricus* (6, 14):

“Ἔως δ’ ἂν τὰ μὲν ὁμοίως ὥσπερ πρότερον φέρηται, τὰ δ’ εἰρημένα φαύλως ἔχοντα τυγχάνη, πῶς οὐ χρή σκοπεῖν καὶ φιλοσοφεῖν τοῦτον τὸν λόγον, ὃς ἦν κατορθωθῆ, καὶ τοῦ πολέμου τοῦ πρὸς ἀλλήλους καὶ τῆς ταραχῆς τῆς παρουσίας καὶ τῶν μεγίστων κακῶν ἡμᾶς ἀπαλλάξει; [...] Ἐγὼ δ’ ἦν μὴ καὶ τοῦ πράγματος ἀξίως εἶπω καὶ τῆς δόξης τῆς ἑμαυτοῦ καὶ τοῦ χρόνου, μὴ μόνον τοῦ περὶ τὸν λόγον ἡμῖν διατριφθέντος, ἀλλὰ καὶ σύμπαντος, οὗ βεβίωκα, παρακελεύομαι μηδεμίαν μοι συγγνώμην ἔχειν, ἀλλὰ καταγελαῖν καὶ καταφρονεῖν· οὐδὲν γὰρ ὅ τι τῶν τοιούτων οὐκ ἄξιός εἰμι πάσχειν, εἴπερ τῶν ἄλλων μηδὲν διαφέρων οὕτω μεγάλας ποιοῦμαι τὰς ὑποσχέσεις.<sup>10</sup>

But so long as the situation remains the same as before, and what has already been said is inefficient, how is it not necessary to examine and philosophise about this argument, which, if it is successful, will deliver us from war among each other, from our present confusion, and from our greatest evils? [...] If I fail to speak worthily of the matter, of my own reputation and of the time, not only that spent on the speech but the whole period that I have lived, I prescribe you to have no sympathy, but to ridicule and look down upon me; for I deserve to suffer all those things, if I make such great promises when I am in no way distinguishable from the others.<sup>11</sup>

In the first part of this citation, Isocrates posits that his predecessors who spoke on the same subject have not done this well. Therefore, according to Isocrates, the need for the subject of the speech is still present, so he will persuade his audience of his cause, using a rhetorical question to confirm the need for his speech. A few paragraphs later (14), Isocrates is even more convinced of his own ability to persuade his audience, for he urges the audience to contradict him if he does not do a good job. All

---

<sup>8</sup> For a detailed discussion of the identity of sophists, see for example Guthrie 1971, 27-54, Jarratt 1998, 81-117, Pernot 2005, 10-23.

<sup>9</sup> Jarratt 1998, xv. Jarratt 1998, xv also explains that the sophistic practice came into existence with the rise of democracy, because it became necessary for citizens to persuade an audience of their point of view.

<sup>10</sup> The edition used for all of Isocrates' texts in this thesis is that of Mandilaras 2003a, 2003b.

<sup>11</sup> All translations of the *Panegyricus* are adapted by me from by Usher 1990. Adaptations primarily consist of more literal translations.

these aspects are used by Isocrates to underscore his claim of ability and to engage his audience's attention for the speech.

Isocrates attacks the sophists on the fact that they teach rhetoric like it can be done in a fixed way.<sup>12</sup> But according to Isocrates, saying the right thing at the right time (καιρός) is what makes rhetoric proper,<sup>13</sup> as can also be seen in the citation above, where Isocrates sees the need for his speech in the fact that his predecessors have not succeeded in their task to persuade the audience and that the occasion for the speech is still present. Isocrates himself can of course showcase this use of καιρός by urging that now is the best time for an expedition against Persia.<sup>14</sup>

Rhetoric came from an oral tradition.<sup>15</sup> It follows that there is a discrepancy between the utterance of a speech and the writing and reading of a speech. The ideal was that a speech was uttered *extempore*, made up on the spot, however, for political speeches it was not as necessary to be *extempore*.<sup>16</sup> With the rise of literacy, the shift from orality to literacy can be seen as a shift from *mythos* to *logos*.<sup>17</sup> The connection between oral and written speech can also be seen in Isocrates, as is commented upon by Haskins: "Isocrates retains the oralistic emphasis on the act of speech and its social impact. But literacy permits him to strengthen the link between the linguistic act and the rhetor's political identity."<sup>18</sup> This use of a written document for the purposes of an oral utterance contributes to the establishment of Isocrates' identity.<sup>19</sup> As was thought earlier, Isocrates wrote his speeches merely to compensate for the fact that he was not strong enough to present the speeches himself.<sup>20</sup> Haskins, however, makes a strong argument for the idea that Isocrates "pursued writing with a dual goal of shifting the focus of contemporary rhetorical practices from their traditional sites to a broader political forum and crafting his own distinct civic identity."<sup>21</sup>

---

<sup>12</sup> In *Against the Sophists* 12 Isocrates criticises anyone who teaches that rhetoric consists of fixed parts, for, according to Isocrates, the opposite should be said of λόγος. Isocrates utters the same criticism in *Antidosis* 183-184. See also Cole 1991, 71-94 on the development of the *techne* of rhetoric. On Isocrates on the *techne* of rhetoric see also Ford 1993, 41-44.

<sup>13</sup> Heath 1989, 30-31. See for example *Against the Sophists* 16, where Isocrates expounds the idea of καιρός.

<sup>14</sup> This Isocrates puts forth in *Panegyricus* 9: Αἱ μὲν γὰρ πράξεις αἱ προγεγενημέναι κοινὰ πᾶσιν ἡμῖν κατελείφθησαν, τὸ δ' ἐν καιρῷ ταύταις καταχρήσασθαι καὶ τὰ προσήκοντα περὶ ἐκάστης ἐνθυμηθῆναι καὶ τοῖς ὀνόμασιν εὖ διαθέσθαι τῶν εὖ φρονούντων ἰδίῳν ἐστίν. – "For the deeds of our ancestors are left common to us all, but to use them at the right time and to ponder the right arguments to each and to compose well with words, that is inherent in the wise."

<sup>15</sup> For the development of oral culture to oratory, see for example Kennedy 1963, 3-9.

<sup>16</sup> Hudson-Williams 1951, 71. Hudson-Williams 1951, 73: "Isocrates in fact applies the methods normally used for *extempore* political speaking to literary composition."

<sup>17</sup> Jarratt 1998, xxii-xxiii, who explains this as the difference between stories (myths) passed down orally versus spoken or written discourse that incorporated a logical factor. For the transition from *mythos* to *logos* see also Jarratt 1988, 31-61.

<sup>18</sup> Haskins 2004a, 16.

<sup>19</sup> For instances where Isocrates comments upon the fact his texts are written, see Too 1995, 119-127.

<sup>20</sup> For example by Jaeger 1959, 110-111, who bases this on *Panathenaicus* 10 and *To Philip* 81.

<sup>21</sup> Haskins 2004a, 16. On the same subject see also Haskins 2004b. By doing this, Isocrates opens up the field of political rhetoric, as Haskins 2004a, 81 explains: "Isocrates articulates the collective identity of his audience in a

Isocrates did not recite his own speeches before gatherings,<sup>22</sup> but instead wrote the speeches, which then circulated. While Isocrates thus did not have the advantages of making speeches before a live audience, the circulation of his written speeches had its advantage as well, as is clearly explained by Haskins:

“He appreciates the potential of oral performance even as he disdains the uses to which demagogic orators put it. [...] While Isocrates loses the advantage of oral performance (such as improvisation and immediate audience feedback), he gains something that only writing can grant: time. Removed from traditional sites of public deliberation with their pressures to pass judgement soon after a speech was over, written rhetoric benefitted from a slower pace of reading and a possibility of rereading.”<sup>23</sup>

For Isocrates it must have been an advantage that his text circulated in Athens, where he would not be subject to much negative feedback. If he would have uttered his speech at a festival, where Greeks of multiple city-states would gather, Isocrates’ praise of Athens would have been met with more resistance. Because of the fact that Isocrates’ work circulated to be read, the question what his intended audience was, arises. Looking at the focal text of this thesis, the *Panegyricus*, it seems that the intended audience could have been anyone who had some political influence, since it is clear that the text advocates political or even military action against the Persians.<sup>24</sup>

---

fashion that bridges the gap between the aristocratic and democratic ethos as well as the split between Athenian and pan-Hellenic self-understanding.” This addressing of an Athenian and panhellenic audience can also be seen in the *Panegyricus*. As Poukakos 1997, 4 explains, it was Isocrates who turned rhetoric into political discourse.

<sup>22</sup> Norlin 1954, xxx.

<sup>23</sup> Haskins 2004a, 20.

<sup>24</sup> Poulakos 2004, 80 comments upon this issue well: “Spoken rhetoric could address only a small circle of people at a time, a circle defined by the radius of the orator’s voice. But since texts can travel further than the human voice, Isocrates’ written addresses can be said to have aimed simultaneously at a geographically broader audience, one that included distant readers throughout the Hellenic world. Even so, the low level of literacy in the fourth century suggests that the number of people addressed by his message must have been quite limited. Isocrates seems less concerned with this than with the fact that speaking to the masses is virtually useless when it comes to serious projects like panhellenism.” This last comment agrees with my view of Isocrates’ audience, for the masses of simple citizens were probably not as concerned with panhellenism as higher political figures, who were indeed literate. Isocrates must have felt that speaking to the masses would not have made a difference in the political climate.

## Isocrates' education

Isocrates' education was based on rhetoric, which had to be understandable for everyone and had to incorporate a moral, political sense.<sup>25</sup> Therefore, the purpose of the *Panegyricus* was that it “der Mitwelt die Fähigkeit seiner Schule beweisen sollte, nicht nur dem sittlichen Leben des einzelnen, sondern der gesamten Nation der Griechen in einer neuen Sprache neue Ziele zu weisen.”<sup>26</sup> Not only did Isocrates incorporate moral teaching for the individual Athenian, he was also concerned with the whole of the Greek people, as can also be seen in the focal text of this thesis, in which Isocrates addresses the Athenians, but also advocates panhellenism. Isocrates himself says that he writes political discourse,<sup>27</sup> but also links his rhetoric to philosophy.<sup>28</sup>

For Isocrates, the above mentioned *καίρος* was important, just as the soul of the student, for Isocrates' aim in teaching was the following: “Not to neglect the technical aspects of rhetoric, but to play down their importance and to link them indissolubly to practical experience and to the character of the student.”<sup>29</sup> So for Isocrates, the students themselves were more important than to the sophists.<sup>30</sup>

---

<sup>25</sup> Jaeger 1959, 126: “Der Vorteil der Rhetorik ist es dagegen, daß sie ganz politische Bildung ist. Sie muß nur einen neuen Weg, eine neue Haltung finden, um auf diesem Gebiet eine geistige Führerrolle zu erringen. Der älteren Rhetorik ist viel versagt geblieben, weil sie sich der Tagespolitik als Instrument anbot, statt sich über sie zu erheben. Hier kündigt sich bereits die Zuversicht an, das politische Leben der Nation mit einem höheren Ethos erfüllen zu können.” For an elaborate overview of the development of Isocrates' rhetoric, see Jaeger 1959, 105-130.

<sup>26</sup> Jaeger 1959, 130.

<sup>27</sup> *Antidosis* 45-47, *Panathenaicus* 1-2. Also Kennedy 1963, 182-184, Too 1995, 114.

<sup>28</sup> *Antidosis* 270-271. Jaeger 1959, 131 comments as follows: “Isokrates sieht, daß die erzieherische Überlegenheit der Philosophie in dem Besitz eines höchstens sittlichen Zieles liegt.” See also Benoit 1990, 254, Haskins 2004a, 14, Morgan 2004, Poulakos 2004, 56-62 and Timmerman 1998.

<sup>29</sup> Ford 1993, 43.

<sup>30</sup> Because everybody contains the ability to use language, the teacher's role should be to develop this “natural endowment” in the students (Ford 1993, 46-47). *Nicoles* 9: Οὐδὲν τῶν φρονίμως πραττομένων εὐρήσομεν ἀλόγως γιγνόμενον, ἀλλὰ καὶ τῶν ἔργων καὶ τῶν διανοημάτων ἀπάντων ἡγεμόνα λόγον ὄντα καὶ μάλιστα χρωμένους αὐτῷ τοὺς πλεῖστον νοῦν ἔχοντας ὥστε τοὺς τολμῶντας βλασφημεῖν περὶ τῶν παιδευόντων καὶ φιλοσοφούντων ὁμοίως ἄξιον μισεῖν ὥσπερ τοὺς εἰς τὰ τῶν θεῶν ἔξαμαρτάνοντας. – “We shall find that nothing of the things that are done sensibly happen without speech, but that of all deeds and thoughts speech is the leader and that those who have the most sense use it mostly; in order that those who dare to slander the educators and philosophers alike deserve to be hated just as those who do wrong to the sanctuaries of the gods.” (translation adapted from Norlin 1954, 81). *Λόγος* is thus a leader, a notion that emphasises *λόγος* as “influencing conduct and shaping reflection” (Haskins 2004a, 89). In other words, *λόγος* has the power to make “individuals into citizens” (Poulakos 1997, 25). See also Poulakos 2004, 70-74 on *λόγος*.



## Identity

In the *Panegyricus* the theme of identity is significant, because Isocrates focusses both on Athenian and Greek identity.<sup>31</sup> This identity does not merely exist, but it is created by Isocrates.<sup>32</sup> In the following citation Isocrates explains his view on Greek identity (50):

Τοσοῦτον δ' ἀπολέλοιπεν [ἡ πόλις ἡμῶν] περὶ τὸ φρονεῖν καὶ λέγειν τοὺς ἄλλους ἀνθρώπους, ὥσθ' οἱ ταύτης μαθηταὶ τῶν ἄλλων διδάσκαλοι γεγόνασιν καὶ τὸ τῶν Ἑλλήνων ὄνομα πεποιήκε μηκέτι τοῦ γένους, ἀλλὰ τῆς διανοίας δοκεῖν τεκμήριον εἶναι καὶ μᾶλλον Ἑλληνας καλεῖσθαι τοὺς τῆς παιδείσεως τῆς ἡμετέρας ἢ τοὺς τῆς κοινῆς φύσεως μετέχοντας.<sup>33</sup>

Our city has left behind the other men regarding thinking and speaking so much, that Athens' pupils have become the teachers of the others and the city has made the name of the Greeks seem to be no longer a sign of race but of mental attitude, and those who take part in our education are rather called Greeks than those who take part in a common nature.

According to Isocrates, one can be considered Greek not by race, but by education.<sup>34</sup> Isocrates thus signals a change in what it means to be Greek, because before his time, race was apparently the common denominator. As Walbank rightly notes: "Isocrates gives the term [Hellene] a cultural value; but he cannot be regarded as initiating a wider concept of Hellas."<sup>35</sup> Isocrates confines Greekness to Athenian education (τῆς παιδείσεως τῆς ἡμετέρας), which on the one hand forges a connection between being Greek and Athenian, while on the other hand there is still friction, because it is clear that Isocrates writes this as an Athenian ("our education").

To fully understand the way in which Isocrates' *Panegyricus* functions, the notion of identity has to be investigated. This will be done here, starting from the following premise, formulated by Konstan: "In themselves, however, common traits, whether recognised as such or not, do not constitute an ethnic self-awareness. Rather, ethnicity arises when a collective identity is asserted on the basis of shared characteristics. It is necessary, accordingly, to inquire why, and under what circumstances, ethnic claims are rhetorically mobilised."<sup>36</sup> Thus, the purpose here is to investigate in what way Isocrates uses identity to underscore his purpose of convincing his audience that a

---

<sup>31</sup> The term 'identity' is described by Too 1995, 1 as being a member of a certain community.

<sup>32</sup> Too 1995, 1 explains that "Isocrates constructs a language within which he proceeds to fashion and authorise his own identity."

<sup>33</sup> This passage is widely debated in scholarly literature. See for example Buchner 1958, 54-56 or Raymond 1986, 154. The latter explains that Isocrates might say this because a shared culture could be the basis for a shared expedition. The passage is also discussed in chapter one.

<sup>34</sup> Jüthner 1923, 36: "Isokrates möchte den Namen "Hellene" einengen auf den Begriff "attisch gebildeter Griechen"."

<sup>35</sup> Walbank 1951, 46.

<sup>36</sup> Konstan 2001, 30.

panhellenic expedition against Persia is necessary. While the propagation of these different forms of identity (Athenian versus Greek) seems contradictory, it can be explained: “Both the novel appropriation of myths of autochthony in Athens and the appeal to a Panhellenic identity based on shared genealogy and other traits appear to reflect the emergence of a new ethnic discourse that constituted, at least in part, the terms in which struggles over social allegiances would be played out.”<sup>37</sup> This citation from Konstan clearly portrays the problem of identity in Greece and at the time of Isocrates’ writings this struggle of allegiance. Thus the two forms of identity come together, but the distinction between the two can also be easily explained, because in the development of Greece, there was not one ruler who ruled over the nation, but rather were the city-states ruled individually.<sup>38</sup> This is acknowledged by Isocrates in the following citation (80-81):

Τὸν αὐτὸν δὲ τρόπον καὶ τὰ τῶν ἄλλων διώκουν θεραπεύοντες, ἀλλ’ οὐχ ὑβρίζοντες τοὺς Ἕλληνας καὶ στρατηγεῖν οἰόμενοι δεῖν, ἀλλὰ μὴ τυραννεῖν αὐτῶν καὶ μᾶλλον ἐπιθυμοῦντες ἡγεμόνες ἢ δεσπότες προσαγορεύεσθαι καὶ σωτῆρες, ἀλλὰ μὴ λυμεῶνες ἀποκαλεῖσθαι, τῷ ποιεῖν εὖ προσαγόμενοι τὰς πόλεις, ἀλλ’ οὐ βίᾳ καταστρεφόμενοι, πιστοτέροις μὲν τοῖς λόγοις ἢ νῦν τοῖς ὄρκοις χρώμενοι, ταῖς δὲ συνθήκαις ὥσπερ ἀνάγκαις ἐμμένειν ἀξιοῦντες, οὐχ οὕτως ἐπὶ ταῖς δυναστείαις μέγα φρονοῦντες ὡς ἐπὶ τῷ σωφρόνως ζῆν φιλοτιμούμενοι, τὴν αὐτὴν ἀξιοῦντες γνώμην ἔχειν πρὸς τοὺς ἡττοὺς ἢ περὶ τοὺς κρείττους πρὸς σφᾶς αὐτούς, ἴδια μὲν ἄσθη τὰς αὐτῶν πόλεις ἡγούμενοι, κοινὴν δὲ πατρίδα τὴν Ἑλλάδα νομίζοντες εἶναι.

And in the same way they [i.e. the Athenians] managed the things of the others, caring for but not insulting the Greeks, and being of the opinion that they must be their general but not their tyrant, and rather desiring to be addressed as leaders than as masters and as saviours but not to be called destroyers, moving towards the cities by doing well but not subduing them by force, using words more faithful than oaths today, thinking it worthy to be true to treaties like necessities, being not so greatly minded towards domination as striving for a life of sound mind, thinking it worthy to be of the same mind towards the weaker as the stronger towards them themselves, regarding the distinct cities as cities of their own, but thinking Greece to be their common fatherland.

This is one of Isocrates’ characteristic periods, covering two full paragraphs. Nevertheless it is very clear, primarily because of the neat composition of subordinate clauses structured in a parallel manner, all containing a participle. By using this structure Isocrates is able to strengthen his argument, setting up antitheses to underscore Athens’ virtues, which is necessary because of Athens’ past, as Usher comments: “Isocrates’ language reflects the controversy surrounding the Athenians’ treatment

---

<sup>37</sup> Konstan 2001, 35.

<sup>38</sup> Heuss 1946, 29-31. See Heuss 1946 for a detailed discussion of the development of Greece (primarily focussing on the archaic period), also with regards to identity.

of their allies in the Delian League. His description fits the circumstances of its foundation and its early aims.”<sup>39</sup> Operating within the Delian league, Athens behaved imperialistically towards its allies. Isocrates’ goal in this citation is to show in what way Athens has been good and beneficial towards its allies, while Athens’ conduct will not have been perceived as such by other states. Therefore the argument in this passage is a clear example of Isocrates’ propaganda of Athens.<sup>40</sup>

## Athenian identity

Isocrates portrays Athenian identity in various ways (always focussing of Athens’ prospected leadership in the expedition against Persia), of which autochthony is an important aspect,<sup>41</sup> as is illustrated by the following citation (23-25):

Ὁμολογεῖται μὲν γὰρ τὴν πόλιν ἡμῶν ἀρχαιοτάτην εἶναι καὶ μεγίστην καὶ παρὰ πᾶσιν ἀνθρώποις ὀνομαστοτάτην· οὕτω δὲ καλῆς τῆς ὑποθέσεως οὔσης, ἐπὶ τοῖς ἐχομένοις τούτων ἔτι μᾶλλον ἡμᾶς προσήκει τιμᾶσθαι. Ταύτην γὰρ οἰκοῦμεν οὐχ ἐτέρους ἐκβαλόντες οὐδ’ ἐρήμην καταλαβόντες οὐδ’ ἐκ πολλῶν ἐθνῶν μιγάδες συλλεγόντες, ἀλλ’ οὕτω καλῶς καὶ γνησίως γεγόναμεν, ὥστ’ ἐξ ἧσπερ ἔφυμεν, ταύτην ἔχοντες ἅπαντα τὸν χρόνον διατελοῦμεν, αὐτόχθονες ὄντες καὶ τῶν ὀνομάτων τοῖς αὐτοῖς, οἷσπερ τοὺς οἰκειοτάτους τὴν πόλιν ἔχοντες προσειπεῖν. Μόνοις γὰρ ἡμῖν τῶν Ἑλλήνων τὴν αὐτὴν τροφὸν καὶ πατρίδα καὶ μητέρα καλέσαι προσήκει.

For it is agreed that our city is the most ancient and the greatest and the most famous for all men; the hypothesis being so beautiful, because of the things that follow from this it is fitting that we are honoured even more. For we live in this place, not having thrown others out nor finding it desolate nor gathering mixed groups from many tribes, but we are so honourable and genuine, that we have spent all our time possessing that from which we sprang, being autochthonous and able to address the city with those names that we use for our closest ones. For it is fitting for only us of the Greeks to call the city nurse and fatherland and mother.

In the citation above Isocrates explains in what way, in his view, Athens is able to lay claim to autochthony of the Greek land: the Athenians were there first.<sup>42</sup> He states this in a clearly set up argument, starting with the statement that there is no doubt about it. He then gives reasons for his statement, using many negations to emphasise his points. With this argument Isocrates tries to strengthen the Athenian claim to leadership of the expedition against Persia, because much esteem

---

<sup>39</sup> Usher 1990, 167.

<sup>40</sup> Walbank 1951, 52: “He is undoubtedly rounding off a highly elaborate period with a striking formulation. Such a formulation may be concerned with propaganda rather than factual accuracy.”

<sup>41</sup> Usher 1990, 155 notes that this is a “frequently made claim” and that it occurs “at similarly early points” in various speeches.

<sup>42</sup> See Poulakos 1997, 84 for a discussion of Isocrates’ use of the fatherland in his argument.

could be gained from the age and origin of a city. Isocrates' argument is that if Athens can claim it has occupied the land from the very beginning and was there first, the benefits of having Athens as leader of the expedition are underscored. However, Athens also had Ionian ties, as Hall explains, and the Athenian autochthony is not undoubted.<sup>43</sup> This shows that Isocrates is careful in selecting and shaping the material he uses to convey his argument.

## Greek identity<sup>44</sup>

Aspects that contributed to a feeling of Greekness include language, religion and myth.<sup>45</sup> Isocrates makes use of these common features in his speech. The united Greek language makes sure that Isocrates' work could be distributed and read in different city-states, while in his speech (primarily in the first part of the speech) he uses myths as *exempla* for his arguments (see chapter one), just as the destruction of sanctuaries. Paragraph 50, as cited above, could also be counted as what Isocrates would call Greek identity. Opposed to these aspects that contribute to a sense of Greek identity are the aspects of Persian identity in paragraph 150, in which Isocrates describes negative Persian character traits like lack of discipline and courage.<sup>46</sup>

A significant way of establishing Greek identity is by contrasting Greeks with barbarians.<sup>47</sup> The conduct of barbarians is set against the ideal of the Greeks' way of life.<sup>48</sup> This also shows in the citation above, because Isocrates values education more than race as a binding factor. Jüthner explains this as follows: "Also nicht um eine Ausdehnung des Begriffes "Hellene" auf Barbaren mit griechischer Kultur

---

<sup>43</sup> Hall 1997, 51-56.

<sup>44</sup> For a clear overview of early literature on the subject of Greek identity, see Walbank 1951, 41-45. Significant early works include Beloch 1912, Droysen 1836, Grote 1846, Meyer 1902, Stier 1945. The sum of all these works concludes that the Greek city-states were neither completely separate nor were they deeply connected (Walbank 1951, 56-57). For a detailed overview of the early development of Greek identity, see especially Beloch 1912, 67-144 and for ethnicity within a broader scope, see Hall 1997, Isaac 2004, 257-303, Rosenbloom 2001 and Vlassopoulos 2013.

<sup>45</sup> Heuss 1946, 29-3. On language especially see for example Beloch 1912, 67-69.

<sup>46</sup> *Paneg.* 150: Οὐ γὰρ οἶδόν τε τοὺς οὕτω τρεφομένους καὶ πολιτευομένους οὔτε τῆς ἄλλης ἀρετῆς μετέχειν οὔτ' ἐν ταῖς μάχαις τρόπαιον ἰσθάναι τῶν πολεμίων. Πῶς γὰρ ἐν τοῖς ἐκείνων ἐπιτηδεύμασι ἐγγενέσθαι δύναιτ' ἂν ἢ στρατηγὸς δεινὸς ἢ στρατιώτης ἀγαθός, ὧν τὸ μὲν πλεῖστόν ἐστιν ὄχλος ἄτακτος καὶ κινδύνων ἄπειρος, πρὸς μὲν τὸν πόλεμον ἐκκελυμένος, πρὸς δὲ τὴν δουλείαν ἄμεινον τῶν παρ' ἡμῖν οἰκετῶν πεπαιδευμένος; – "For it is not possible that those who are brought up and governed like this to not take part in another excellence nor to set up a trophy in battles over their enemies. For how could a fearsome leader or a good soldier be born in their ways of living, the most being a disorderly crowd and unexperienced in dangers, faint with regards to war, brought up for slavery more than our own slaves?"

<sup>47</sup> The terms βάρβαρος, meaning 'non-Greek' or 'foreign' and βάρβαροι, 'all non-Greek-speaking peoples' (LSJ s.v. βάρβαρος) are preceded by the Homeric βαρβαρόφωνος 'speaking a foreign tongue' (Hom. *Il.* 2.867: Νάσσης αὖ Καρῶν ἠγήσατο βαρβαροφώνων – "Nastes again ruled the non-Greek-speaking Karians" (my translation)). See Cartledge 1993, 36-62 for an overview of Greek attitudes towards barbarians.

<sup>48</sup> Stier 1945, 82 illustrates the polarisation between Greeks and barbarians: "Wie dieses mit Intelligenz, Kultur un Zivilisation, mit Freiheitsliebe und ihrem heilsamen Gegengewicht, der griechischen Sophrosyne, ausgestattet wird, so wird jenes mit allen Gebrechen und Lastern versehen, die solchen Tugenden entgegengesetzt sind."

handelt es sich bei Isokrates, sondern mit Gegenteil um eine Einengung auf Griechen mit attischer Bildung, und diese Umdeutung mag bei dem Verfechter der panhellenischen Idee allerdings zunnächst überraschen."<sup>49</sup> What Isocrates thus tries to do is to exclude barbarians from the Greek sophisticated education, and moreover Greeks who do not comply with the Athenian education (Jüthner's last remark). In a panhellenistic cause, this is not desirable.

One idea about the opposition of Greeks and barbarians is uttered by Konstan: "The oppositional style of defining Greeks as culturally distinct from barbarians may, indeed, have emerged initially more in response to Athens' new imperial projects and claims to Greek hegemony toward the beginning of the fifth century than to the need (largely after the fact) to forge a Panhellenic unity in the face of the Persian invasion."<sup>50</sup> This is not necessarily the case for Isocrates. While the first part of his speech primarily concerns Athenian hegemony, the main purpose of the *Panegyricus* is the establishment of a panhellenic expedition against the barbarians.

Panegyricus

### Setting of the *Panegyricus*

The title of the speech that is the focus of this thesis suggests that the place of action is a panhellenic festival. A panhellenic festival was the ideal venue for Isocrates to advocate panhellenism, since such a festival enforced a truce in hostilities.<sup>51</sup> However, not all scholars agree to the setting of the panhellenic festival.<sup>52</sup> Based on the latter's arguments, I believe that the speech would indeed not have been performed at such a festival, but the imagined setting is perfect for a panhellenic speech,<sup>53</sup> because a festival enhances relations between city-states that are necessary to form a panhellenic bond against the enemy.<sup>54</sup>

---

<sup>49</sup> Jüthner 1923, 36.

<sup>50</sup> Konstan 2001, 36.

<sup>51</sup> Jaeger 1959, 134-135.

<sup>52</sup> For example Poulakos 1997, 78 (basing this comment on Norlin 1954, 119) thinks "It is doubtful that the oration was ever intended to be delivered at a festival, given its length." This does not mean, however, that Poulakos thinks it was not known by a large audience, since he mentions the text's circulation (Poulakos 1997, 78). A much earlier expression of the thought that the *Panegyricus* was not performed for a panhellenic audience but for an Athenian audience is uttered by Hudson-Williams 1949, 68, who adds the following footnote (Hudson-Williams 1949, 68 n. 5): "It is primarily addressed to an Athenian public although naturally, like other Isocratean λόγοι, it was also meant for wider circulation in the Greek world," so as not to exclude the panhellenic goal of the speech. Another argument is that Isocrates does not address the audience in his speech (Hudson-Williams 1949, 69), but I dismiss this argument, for Isocrates does address his (imagined) audience, for example in *Panegyricus* 188: Καὶ μὴ μόνον ἀκροατὰς γενομένους ἀπελθεῖν. – "And you should leave here not as mere hearers."

<sup>53</sup> This idea is also uttered by Kennedy 1963, 189: "The choice of imaginary situation and the title are expressions of the nature of the subject, which finds Greece in a contest of excellence with the barbarian. There is thus a real union of subject and form [...]."

<sup>54</sup> Isocrates' *Panegyricus* 43 confirms this by praising the custom of truce and concord at the festivals. Poulakos 1997, 20 explains this passage in the following manner: "The passage refers to the kind of intercommunal exchanges practiced among Greek city-states during Panhellenic festivals. With praying as with sacrificing, with

## Structure of the *Panegyricus*

Here follows a schematic overview of the structure of the *Panegyricus*.<sup>55</sup>

|         |   |
|---------|---|
| 1-14    | Introduction  |
| 15-20   | Statement of main proposition                       |
| 21-132  | Praise of Athens, why Athens should lead the Greeks |
| 133-169 | Panhellenism  |
| 170-189 | Epilogue  |

### Thesis

As can be seen in the overview above, Isocrates praises Athens and the city's claim to hegemony in the first part of the *Panegyricus*, while in the second part he advocates panhellenism, the need for Greek city-states to unite against the barbarians. This thesis will be a quest to explain how these two seemingly different aspects within the speech might unite, primarily examining the rhetoric Isocrates uses to convey his point of view.

For a long time Isocrates was "in the background", somewhere behind Plato and Aristotle and in a group with the Attic Orators.<sup>56</sup> This changed when scholars like Jaeger and Kennedy renewed scholarly interest in Isocrates' work.<sup>57</sup> Nevertheless, around the change of the 18<sup>th</sup> to the 19<sup>th</sup> century, some scholars researched Isocrates. Kessler, for example, briefly researched the theme of panhellenism in Isocrates' corpus,<sup>58</sup> and other scholars from this period include Drerup and Wilamowitz-Moellendorf.<sup>59</sup> In recent years, scholars that have significantly contributed to Isocratean scholarship include J. Poulakos, T. Poulakos, Usher and Too.<sup>60</sup> There are some scholars who have touched upon the specific problem posed in this thesis, but none of them provide a systematically researched solution. One of the least likely solutions is the fact that Isocrates took ten years to compose his *Panegyricus*.<sup>61</sup> This would indeed be unlikely, because "Such a hypothesis would make

---

speaking to one another as with competing against one another, participants approach the various events of the festival as an occasion to safeguard and renew common bonds or, as the passage puts it, to revive old friendships and establish new ties."

<sup>55</sup> This overview is from Usher 1990, with minor adaptations.

<sup>56</sup> Poulakos 1997, 1. See Poulakos 1997, 1-5 for a more detailed explanation of Isocratean scholarship.

<sup>57</sup> Jaeger 1959, Kennedy 1963. This of course does not mean that there was no scholarly work on Isocrates before. For overviews of earlier literature on Isocrates see for example Buchner 1958, 12-13 or Kessler 1911, 1-5. I want to single out Sandys' thorough commentary here, which intends to help students to read the *Panegyricus* (Sandys 1899).

<sup>58</sup> Kessler 1911.

<sup>59</sup> Drerup 1895, Wilamowitz-Moellendorf 1893.

<sup>60</sup> For example Poulakos 2004, Poulakos 1997, 2004, Usher 1974, 1990, Too 1995.

<sup>61</sup> Usher 1990, 19.

Isocrates a bad editor, however, who could not clean up the discrepancies through the body of the text.”<sup>62</sup> Norlin thinks that the general subject of the *Panegyricus* is the need for panhellenism against the barbarians, but merely mentions the difficult question of leadership for this expedition.<sup>63</sup> Kennedy mentions the dual goal of the text, but does not problematise this.<sup>64</sup> Jaeger links the discrepancy to Isocrates’ education, but does not make clear why Athens should lead the united Greeks.<sup>65</sup> One of the most useful contributions to solving the discrepancy is Too, who ascribes the discrepancy to Isocrates’ tension between being both Athenian and Greek, but this still does not make the solution to the posed problem clear.<sup>66</sup> This thesis will re-examine the problem by a close reading of the *Panegyricus* and the use of scholarly literature on Isocrates and the *Panegyricus*. In the first chapter, the first part of the speech (1-132) will be examined, in which Isocrates emphasises Athens as leader of the united Greeks. In the second chapter, the theme of panhellenism (132-189) will be explored. This will lead to a conclusion that explores how the two themes that are discussed in the previous chapters might fit together. All in all, this thesis will argue that the two parts of the *Panegyricus* can be united by examining Isocrates’ rhetorical strategies.

---

<sup>62</sup> Papillon 2004, 27.

<sup>63</sup> Norlin 1954, 117.

<sup>64</sup> Kennedy 1963, 189.

<sup>65</sup> Jaeger 1959, 140: “Er erscheint auf ersten Blick als eine ungeheure Paradoxie, daß Isokrates diese übernationalen Kulturmission seines Volkes gerade aus Anlaß einer überschwenglichen Kundgebung des Nationalstolzes ausspricht, aber dieser scheinbare Widerspruch löst sich auf, sobald wir die übernationale Idee des Griechentums, seine allgemeingültige Paideia, auf das praktisch-politische Ziel der Eroberung und Besiedelung Asiens durch die Griechen beziehen.”

<sup>66</sup> Too 1995, 129: “I suggest that, as an Athenian author invoking what appears to be a panhellenic ideology, he is caught up in a complicated tension that exists in being both Athenian and Greek.” This is also proposed by Papillon 2004, 27.

## Chapter 1: Rhetoric and Athenian identity

This chapter will examine the first part of Isocrates' *Panegyricus* (1-132), in which he praises Athens for past deeds. In this part of the speech Isocrates makes clever use of several rhetorical strategies to establish Athens' role as leader of an expedition against Persia. However, the theme of panhellenism is already planted within this part of the speech. Besides characteristics of style, like long and winding sentences and the use of clusters of rhetorical questions, Isocrates purposefully chooses *exempla*, which can be mythological or historical. These *exempla* are narratives of past events which have the purpose to underscore how the situation should be in the present, as is commented upon by Poulakos:

“According to Isocrates, then, good judgements of action are reached by an interplay of the general character of past cases and the particular character of present instances. Athens' claim to hegemony in the present is illuminated by past cases, mythical and historical moments when Athens assumed the position of leadership and guided all of Hellas to a better place. The *Panegyricus* offers a variety of such moments, a multiplicity of fictional and factual histories.”<sup>67</sup>

The selection of *exempla* of course involves the omission of events that do not serve Isocrates' purpose that well (*inventio* in the rhetorical scheme).<sup>68</sup> This chapter will show in what way Isocrates makes use of the *exempla* he chooses. Usher asks the question whether Isocrates aims for “sole Athenian leadership” in the expedition against Persia.<sup>69</sup> In this chapter I try to make clear that he does, but that Isocrates also plants some seeds for the second part of the *Panegyricus*, in which he advocates panhellenism for a joint Greek expedition against Persia.

Here follows an overview of the text (1-132), so the context of the passages examined in this chapter will be clear.

|       |   |
|-------|---|
| 1-20  | Introduction of theme                               |
| 1-2   | Rhetoric and sports                                 |
| 3-4   | Isocrates the confident speaker <sup>70</sup>       |
| 5-6   | Present need for his speech <sup>71</sup>           |
| 7-11  | Isocrates' views on good oratory                    |
| 12-14 | Isocrates' position within the oratorical tradition |

---

<sup>67</sup> Poulakos 1997, 81. Buchner 1958, 38-41 discusses the difference between ἡ ἡγεμονία and ἡ ἀρχή.

<sup>68</sup> On *inventio*, see for example Lausberg 2008, 146-147. The purpose of an *exemplum* principally is to prove a point the speaker tries to make (Ueding 1992, 61). On *exempla*, see also Lausberg 2008, 227-235.

<sup>69</sup> Usher 1990, 154.

<sup>70</sup> *Paneg.* 4: Ἐλπίζων τοσοῦτον διοίσειν ὥστε πώποτε μηδὲν τοῖς ἄλλοις δοκεῖν εἰρησθαι περὶ αὐτῶν. – “Hoping to going to differ so much that it seems that nothing was ever said about these things by others.” Thus Isocrates endorses the literary *topos* to stand out from one's predecessors.

<sup>71</sup> See the introduction for the theme of καιρός.



|         |  |
|---------|--|
| 15      | Topic of <i>Panegyricus</i>                                |
| 16-20   | Strife between Athens and Sparta <sup>72</sup>             |
| 21-132  | Encomium of Athens   |
| 23-25   | Athens is the oldest city                                  |
| 26-33   | Athens' benefits to other cities                           |
| 34-37   | War  |
| 38-50   | Greek identity   |
| 51-98   | Wars and deeds of Athenian ancestors                       |
| 99      | Why Athens should have leadership (rhetorical questions)   |
| 100-118 | Defence against criticism                                  |
| 119-132 | Hardship endured because of barbarians; strife with Sparta |

The purpose of the first part of the speech

In the introduction of his *Panegyricus*, Isocrates states the purpose of his speech (15):

Περὶ δὲ τῶν κοινῶν, ὅσοι μὲν εὐθύς ἐπελθόντες διδάσκουσιν, ὡς χρὴ διαλυσαμένους τὰς πρὸς ἡμᾶς αὐτοὺς ἔχθρας ἐπὶ τὸν βάρβαρον τραπέσθαι, καὶ διεξέρχονται τὰς τε συμφορὰς τὰς ἐκ τοῦ πολέμου τοῦ πρὸς ἀλλήλους ἡμῖν γεγενημένας καὶ τὰς ὠφελείας τὰς ἐκ τῆς στρατείας τῆς ἐπ' ἐκεῖνον ἐσομένας, ἀληθῆ μὲν λέγουσιν, οὐ μὴν ἐντεῦθεν ποιοῦνται τὴν ἀρχήν, ὅθεν ἂν μάλιστα συστήσῃ ταῦτα δυνηθεῖεν.

About the public matters, so many as instruct us immediately when they come forward to speak, that it is necessary that we resolve the hostilities against each other to turn them against the barbarian, and who go through the misfortunes that have arisen for us from the war against each other and the benefits that will be from the expedition against him [i.e. the Persian king], they speak truthfully, but they do not make the beginning thence, from where they could best organise these things.

This citation makes it clear that Isocrates' goal in the speech is to establish a feeling of panhellenism, which must be used to overcome the Persians. In order to achieve this goal, Isocrates explains, Athens and Sparta must reconcile. He underscores this argument by stating that there are many misfortunes because of the Greek internal strife and that there will be benefits from a war against Persia. By saying this, Isocrates leaves out that there could also be benefits from the Greek internal war and drawbacks from the Persian expedition. This is a rhetorical strategy to emphasise one's argument in order that

---

<sup>72</sup> Welles 1966, 18. The speech was meant to be circulated not only in Athens, but throughout Greece.

the audience will be more inclined towards it. However, after the introduction this goal seems to be lost out of sight for most of the first part of the speech, for Isocrates says the following (21):

Τοῦτο μὲν γὰρ εἰ δεῖ τούτους ἐφ' ἑκάστῳ τιμᾶσθαι τῶν ἔργων τοὺς ἐμπειροτάτους ὄντας καὶ μεγίστην δύναμιν ἔχοντας, ἀναμφισβητήτως ἡμῖν προσήκει τὴν ἡγεμονίαν ἀπολαβεῖν, ἥπερ πρότερον ἐτυγχάνομεν ἔχοντες.

So if it should be that in each activity those who possess the greatest experience of things and greatest power should be honoured, it is indisputably fitting for us to regain the leadership which was formerly ours.

With the forceful language of this citation (ἀναμφισβητήτως ἡμῖν προσήκει) Isocrates aims to convince his audience of the truth of his argument. To support this, Isocrates uses many examples as arguments why Athens should lead the Greeks, both mythical and historical. As a “fundamental claim”,<sup>73</sup> Isocrates posits that Athens is the most ancient city, after which he sets out to enumerate various arguments as to why Athens is the best choice for the leadership.

By stating the goal of the *Panegyricus* in the introduction of the speech, but then focussing on praise of Athens and advocacy of the city's leadership, Isocrates is able to prepare his audience for a panhellenic expedition that is led by Athens.

## Myth

Isocrates commences his long praise of Athens with the claim that the Athenians have always occupied the same land from which they sprang.<sup>74</sup> Thus Isocrates commences his praise with the oldest historical example possible. From this inborn quality Isocrates shifts to examples of what Athens has meant to others. Isocrates announces that he will emphasise the deeds that were prominent and pass over the ones that were small (27).

As the first Athenian service to others, Isocrates reports the story of Demeter (28), who gave the city fruits and mystic rites, which Athens did not keep from others (29). This story can be categorised as mythical, which Isocrates confirms, but for which he also apologises. Nowhere else in the *Panegyricus* does Isocrates apologise for or even comment upon his use of myth. This might be because there is a thin line between myth and history in the minds of the ancient Greeks. Mythical stories that are anchored in the minds of the people might not be different from historical stories in

---

<sup>73</sup> *Paneg.* 23: Οὕτω δὲ καλῆς τῆς ὑποθέσεως οὐσης. – “The assumption being so beautiful.”

<sup>74</sup> *Paneg.* 24: Οὕτω καλῶς καὶ γνησίως γεγόναμεν, ὥστ' ἐξ ἧσπερ ἔφυμεν, ταύτην ἔχοντες ἅπαντα τὸν χρόνον διατελοῦμεν. – “We are so noble and genuine, that we continued to possess all the time the same land from which we sprang.” Usher 1990, 155 gives evidence for the correctness of Isocrates' claim. By using the words καλῶς καὶ γνησίως to describe the origin of the Athenian people, Isocrates wants to establish Athenian identity positively and authoritarian.

the collective memory.<sup>75</sup> However, a myth can more easily be shaped to the purpose of the author,<sup>76</sup> which might be the reason that Isocrates goes back to this mythical past in his speech. Isocrates calls the story of Demeter μυθώδης ὁ λόγος,<sup>77</sup> on which Usher makes an important and illustrative comment:

“Isocrates almost seems to be apologising to readers who have accepted Thucydides’ distinction between fanciful stories and proper history. But myths had their uses. They could be adapted to embody a moral message and so have educational value; they could serve the highest literary purposes, as they do in some of Plato’s dialogues; and their very antiquity made them seem to some to deserve respect both for their own sakes and because the early poets celebrated them in some of the finest verse. Isocrates seems to have assimilated all these influences in varying degrees, but was acutely aware that myths could be abused.”<sup>78</sup>

So, the use of myth is beneficial for Isocrates, for he wants to convey a moral message in his philosophy and education (see the introduction). The antiquity of the story of Demeter that Isocrates tells, ensures that his audience will respect the story.<sup>79</sup> It is thus useful for Isocrates to distinguish between myth and history in these paragraphs, as the myth kick-starts his monologue about Athenian virtues. In other passages that contain myth there is no advantage for Isocrates to emphasise that a certain narrative is a myth.<sup>80</sup> Isocrates narrates the myth of Demeter as follows (28-29):

Δήμητρος γὰρ ἀφικομένης εἰς τὴν χώραν ἡμῶν, ὅτ’ ἐπλανήθη τῆς Κόρης ἀρπασθείσης, καὶ πρὸς τοὺς προγόνους ἡμῶν εὐμενῶς διατεθείσης ἐκ τῶν εὐεργεσιῶν, ἃς οὐχ οἷόν τ’ ἄλλοις ἢ τοῖς μεμνημένοις

---

<sup>75</sup> Fentress and Wickham 1992, 25 offer a useful description of collective memory: “An expression of collective experience: social memory identifies a group, giving it a sense of its past and defining its aspirations for the future.” The component of the future is important for Athens’ aspirations of leadership. For elaborate discussions of (collective) memory, see for example Assmann 2011, 15-69, Cubitt 2007, Fentress and Wickham 1992 or Halbwachs 1992. Grethlein 2010, 9 explains how “considerable efforts are made to bridge the gap between past expectations and experiences in order to be able to project new expectations onto the future.” See also Cartledge 1993, 18-35 for the relation between myth and history and examples thereof.

<sup>76</sup> Jaeger 1959, 136.

<sup>77</sup> *Paneg.* 28. ‘Legendary, fabulous’ (LSJ s.v. μυθώδης). See also Sandys 1899, 58.

<sup>78</sup> Usher 1990, 155.

<sup>79</sup> So also Isocrates says himself (30): Πρῶτον μὲν γὰρ ἐξ ὧν ἂν τις καταφρονήσειε τῶν λεγομένων ὡς ἀρχαίων ὄντων, ἐκ τῶν αὐτῶν τούτων εἰκότως ἂν καὶ τὰς πράξεις γεγενῆσθαι νομίσειεν· διὰ γὰρ τὸ πολλοὺς εἰρηκῆναι καὶ πάντας ἀκηκοέναι προσήκει μὴ καινὰ μὲν, πιστὰ δὲ δοκεῖν εἶναι τὰ λεγόμενα περὶ αὐτῶν. – “Firstly, someone could scorn the story because the things said are so ancient, from these things one could logically believe that the things happened; for it is fitting that, because many have told and all have heard it, the things that are said about them are believed not to be new but to be reasonable.”

<sup>80</sup> This is also noted by Usher 1990, 156, who says that after the myth of Demeter Isocrates “does not distinguish between myth and history, and readily relies on ancient traditions.” The role of myth is thus only explicated by Isocrates at the beginning of his praise, after which he allows the border between myth and history to blur.

ἀκούειν, καὶ δούσης δωρεὰς διττὰς, αἵπερ μέγιστα τυγχάνουσιν οὔσαι, τοὺς τε καρπούς, οἱ τοῦ μὴ θηριωδῶς ζῆν ἡμᾶς αἴτιοι γεγόνασι, καὶ τὴν τελετήν, ἣς οἱ μετέχοντες περὶ τε τῆς τοῦ βίου τελευτῆς καὶ τοῦ σύμπαντος αἰῶνος ἡδίους τὰς ἐλπίδας ἔχουσιν, οὕτως ἡ πόλις ἡμῶν οὐ μόνον θεοφιλῶς ἀλλὰ καὶ φιλανθρώπως ἔσχεν, ὥστε κυρία γενομένη τοσοῦτων ἀγαθῶν οὐκ ἐφθόνησε τοῖς ἄλλοις, ἀλλ' ὧν ἔλαβεν, ἅπανσι μετέδωκεν.

When Demeter came to our land, when she wandered after Kore had been taken away, and after she became well-disposed towards our ancestors because of their good deeds, which cannot be heard by others than the initiated, and after she has given two gifts, which are the greatest, the fruits of the earth, which are the reason that we do not live in a beastly manner, and mystic rite, the participants of which have more pleasant hopes of the end of life and of all of lifetime, our city was not only so dear to the gods but also loving of mankind, that she, being the master of so many good things, did not refuse them to others, but gave to all a share of the things she received.

This myth is a clear instance of Isocrates' use of an *exemplum* to illustrate his purpose. The myth narrates a situation in the past that must be pursued in the present. Demeter becomes benevolent towards the Athenians after they have been of service to her. For that they receive Demeter's good graces: the Athenians receive the first fruit and mystic rite. These gifts are not kept by the Athenians, but shared with the other cities, thus placing them in Athens' dept. Isocrates uses the myth to show that Athens can be this benevolent to other cities again. The dept to be paid by other cities is the aid in the expedition against Persia, which is led by the bringer of good: Athens.

Poulakos states the purpose of Isocrates' use of mythical and historical examples as follows:

"The mythical and historical narratives he recounts are not designed to invoke the authority of precedents as much as they are intended to redefine hegemony in ways that would eradicate, as much as possible, all connotations of imperialism and tyranny that the notion of Athenian hegemony would be certain to stir in the allied city-states."<sup>81</sup>

Poulakos thus sees that the goal of Isocrates' use of myths is contradictory. On the one hand the examples are used to establish Athenian hegemony, while on the other hand negative associations of that same hegemony in the past must be forgotten. Isocrates thus uses the myth of Demeter in a complex rhetorical way. The selection of this *exemplum* serves a dual goal: it enforces Athens' authority by showing how other city-states have been dependant on Athens, while Isocrates cannot overemphasise Athens' claim to hegemony, since that would not appeal to the audience. Isocrates

---

<sup>81</sup> Poulakos 1997, 82.

(Athens) needs the other cities in the expedition against Persia. Therefore, the narrative of Demeter plants a seed for the theme of panhellenism, while praising Athens.

Isocrates' presentation of material

After explaining how Athens gave the first gift (the gift of the first fruit) to the other Greeks, which Isocrates names one more time in an elaborate way (34),<sup>82</sup> Isocrates moves on to other benefits that Athens has bestowed upon others. Isocrates carefully sets the scene of hardship that Greece had to endure (34-35):

Περὶ δὲ τοὺς αὐτοὺς χρόνους ὁρῶσα τοὺς μὲν βαρβάρους τὴν πλείστην τῆς χώρας κατέχοντας, τοὺς δ' Ἕλληνας εἰς μικρὸν τόπον κατακεκλειμένους καὶ διὰ σπανιότητα τῆς γῆς ἐπιβουλεύοντάς τε σφίσιν αὐτοῖς καὶ στρατείας ἐπ' ἀλλήλους ποιουμένους καὶ τοὺς μὲν δι' ἔνδειαν τῶν καθ' ἡμέραν, τοὺς δὲ διὰ τὸν πόλεμον ἀπολλυμένους, οὐδὲ ταῦθ' οὕτως ἔχοντα περιεΐδεν, ἀλλ' ἠγεμόνας εἰς τὰς πόλεις ἐξέπεμψεν, οἱ παραλαβόντες τοὺς μάλιστα βίου δεομένους, στρατηγοὶ καταστάντες αὐτῶν καὶ πολέμῳ κρατήσαντες τοὺς βαρβάρους.

Around the same time she [i.e. Athens] saw that the barbarians possessed most of the land, and that the Greeks were enclosed in a small place and that, because of the lack of land, they plotted against themselves and made expeditions against one another, and that they perished, some because of everyday needs, others because of war. And she did not accept these things to be like this, but she sent leaders to the cities, who, after they had taken up those most in need of livelihood, became generals of them and overcame the barbarians in war.

Isocrates carefully builds up this passage. By first setting the scene of hardship, the reader is drawn into the situation and is convinced that Greece needs to be saved from the barbarians. Then none other than Athens comes to the rescue. Isocrates introduces his *exemplum* of a barbarian attack by an unclear time-reference (34): “around the same time”, which is an indication that Isocrates is not precise and has thus possibly reshaped the facts. Isocrates speaks of barbarians, who here denote the Ionians who migrated “from the Greek mainland to Asia Minor”,<sup>83</sup> but this is not clear from Isocrates' text, which also gives the impression that Isocrates is vague on purpose. Another explanation could be that everyone in his audience would have known what he meant. In paragraph 37 Isocrates also clearly chooses his words, for he calls Athenian leadership “more ancestral” (πατριωτέραν), and not more

---

<sup>82</sup> *Paneg.* 34: Περὶ μὲν οὖν τοῦ μεγίστου τῶν εὐεργετημάτων καὶ πρώτου γενομένου καὶ πᾶσι κοινοτάτου ταῦτ' εἰπεῖν ἔχομεν. – “So, about the greatest and first and common to all of the kindnesses this I had to say.”

<sup>83</sup> Usher 1990, 156. Usher explains in the same note: “The time was the eleventh and tenth centuries BC; the barbarians were unnamed tribes inhabiting northern Greece, Thrace and the Asiatic seaboard (not the Persians, whose empire had not yet been formed).”

ancient, because he knows the latter would not have been correct.<sup>84</sup> Isocrates makes Athens claim all the credit for the Greek salvation.<sup>85</sup> Isocrates' use of this passage is clearly explained by Usher:

“He has introduced the Ionian migration to serve as a precedent for Athenian leadership in a war against the barbarians, and wishes to give the impression of ubiquitous Athenian presence at the foundation of the Ionian cities. Of course, the most glorious precedent for a Greek war against the barbarians was the Trojan War, but tradition assigns a minor role to the Athenians in that war, so Isocrates omits it here and disparages it later (83).”<sup>86</sup>

From these paragraphs it becomes clear that Isocrates shapes his material to fit his rhetorical purpose.<sup>87</sup> What catches the eye first is the way in which Isocrates presents his narrative, but what is equally important is his rhetoric of omission, for he leaves out a significant event in warfare: the Trojan war. He does this deliberately, for this war does not fit Isocrates' purpose here, which is to show the indebtedness of other states to Athens. The narrative first and foremost illustrates why Athens should be the leader of the expedition against Persia, but at the same time it plants another seed of the thought of panhellenism, because the other cities will have to pay their debt to Athens by aiding in the upcoming expedition. That is why Isocrates elects to discuss the establishment of Ionian cities instead of the Trojan war, since Athens was not very important in that war.<sup>88</sup>

In the same way as shown above Isocrates deals with the subject of legislation. Also with this subject, Isocrates posits the facts in such a way as to aid his goal. Isocrates narrates as follows (39):

Παραλαβοῦσα γὰρ τοὺς Ἕλληνας ἀνόμως ζῶντας καὶ σποράδην οἰκοῦντας, καὶ τοὺς μὲν ὑπὸ δυναστειῶν ὑβριζομένους, τοὺς δὲ δι' ἀναρχίαν ἀπολλυμένους, καὶ τούτων τῶν κακῶν αὐτοῦς

---

<sup>84</sup> Usher 1990, 157 names “the earlier claim of Minos and his thalassocracy centred on Crete”.

<sup>85</sup> Buchner 1958, 49 also acknowledges Isocrates' manipulation of events: “Die Kolonisation der griechischen Frühzeit, an der fast alle Stämme mitwirkten, wird hier als Werk der Athener hingestellt.”

<sup>86</sup> Usher 1990, 157.

<sup>87</sup> Grethlein 2010, 14 explains how in deliberative oratory “the past is not expounded in a continuous narrative, but selected events are chosen to buttress specific arguments.” Grethlein 2010, 126 expounds on this: “In deliberative speeches the grip of the present is even stronger – here, the past is not the main focus and is not unfolded in a continuous narrative, but references to select events help the orator to argue specific points in the present.”

<sup>88</sup> In *Paneg.* 83 Isocrates refers to the Trojan war: Πῶς γὰρ ἂν γένοιτο σύμμετροι τοιοῦτοι ἀνδράσιν, οἳ τοσοῦτον μὲν τῶν ἐπὶ Τροίαν στρατευσαμένων διήνεγκαν, ὅσον οἱ μὲν περὶ μίαν πόλιν ἔτη δέκα διέτριψαν, οἱ δὲ τὴν ἐξ ἀπάσης τῆς Ἀσίας δύναμιν ἐν ὀλίγῳ χρόνῳ κατεπολέμησαν, οὐ μόνον δὲ τὰς αὐτῶν πατρίδας διέσωσαν, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὴν Ἑλλάδα σύμπασαν ἠλευθέρωσαν; – “For how could they be in measure with such men, stand out so much from those who fought at Troy, that as the latter spent ten years over one city, they subdued the power of all Asia in little time, and they not only saved their fatherland, but also freed the whole of Greece?” This passage on the Trojan war can be seen as another hint at the theme of panhellenism to come in the second part of the speech.

ἀπήλλαξε, τῶν μὲν κυρία γενομένη, τοῖς δ' αὐτὴν παράδειγμα ποιήσασα· πρώτη γὰρ καὶ νόμους ἔθετο καὶ πολιτεῖαν κατεστήσατο.

For after having associated with oneself the Greeks who lived without laws and inhabited scattered places, some having been maltreated by dominations, others ruined by anarchy, she delivered them from those evils, after having become the master of some, having made herself an example to them; for she was the first to establish laws and lay down a constitution.

Isocrates thus presents Athens as the bringer of legislation,<sup>89</sup> but he does not utter this statement before he has set the scene again by showing the contradiction with states that lived lawlessly (39). With this antithesis Isocrates emphasises the Athenian accomplishment of implementing laws.<sup>90</sup> However, “Historically, Isocrates wavers between remoter and more recent times, and reverses the probable order of events. It seems clear that a form of constitution existed before the laws were codified by Dracon.”<sup>91</sup> Thus, Isocrates again presents Athens in the most advantageous way, while omitting the crucial information that it cannot have been the case that the states lived without any rules. By presenting his narrative in this way, Isocrates emphasises again the crucial role that Athens played in the development of other cities, for which they should be indebted to Athens. Just as with the *exempla* above, the purpose here is to show Athens’ superiority, but already touching upon the theme of panhellenism. This combination of purposes is also visible in one of the most famous passages of the *Panegyricus* (50, also cited in the introduction):

Τοσοῦτον δ' ἀπολέλοιπεν [ἡ πόλις ἡμῶν] περὶ τὸ φρονεῖν καὶ λέγειν τοὺς ἄλλους ἀνθρώπους, ὥσθ' οἱ ταύτης μαθηταὶ τῶν ἄλλων διδάσκαλοι γεγονάσι καὶ τὸ τῶν Ἑλλήνων ὄνομα πεποίηκε μηκέτι τοῦ γένους, ἀλλὰ τῆς διανοίας δοκεῖν τεκμήριον εἶναι καὶ μᾶλλον Ἑλληνας καλεῖσθαι τοὺς τῆς παιδείσεως τῆς ἡμετέρας ἢ τοὺς τῆς κοινῆς φύσεως μετέχοντας.

Our city has our city left behind the other men regarding thinking and speaking so much, that Athens’ pupils have become the teachers of the others and the city has made the name of the Greeks seem to be no longer a sign of race but of mental attitude, and those who take part in our education are rather called Greeks than those who take part in a common nature.

---

<sup>89</sup> Norlin 1954, 140 agrees with this statement: “The tradition is probably correct that Athens was the first city to set her own house in order and so extended her influence over Greece. The creation of a civilised state out of scattered villages is attributed to king Theseus [...]” For the first sentence, however, Norlin does not provide evidence.

<sup>90</sup> Usher 1990, 157.

<sup>91</sup> Usher 1990, 157, who also explains this more elaborately.

In this utterance Isocrates justifies Athenian leadership by claiming that Athenian culture and mindset is the “highest form of Hellenism.”<sup>92</sup> This claim also eliminates Greek states with a body of thought different from Athenian allies. All the states that share in this Athenian culture can be included in the rhetoric of panhellenism. However, this idea of ‘Greekness’ is uttered from an Athenian point of view. This is also made clear in the phrasing of the passage, for the words ἡ πόλις ἡμῶν clearly posit Isocrates and his audience as Athenians.

## Wars

As noted above, Isocrates implements the rhetorical strategy of letting his audience forget Athens’ past imperialism. In the next part of the speech (51-99) he discusses various wars that Athens has fought, starting with the statement that Athens waged war not only for its own good, but certainly also for the sake of its allies.<sup>93</sup> By narrating two myths (about Adrastus and the sons of Heracles) Isocrates illustrates Athenian superiority.<sup>94</sup> The way in which Isocrates describes the two myths underscores his purpose to establish the Athenian claim to hegemony clearly. Isocrates narrates that Adrastus asked Athens to aid him in recovering the bodies of his fallen warriors at Thebes (55) and that the sons of Heracles came to Athens asking for its help to fight against Eurystheus (56). Having narrated both stories to the point of supplication, Isocrates asks a rhetorical question (57):

Τίς γὰρ ἂν ἰκετεύειν τολμήσειεν ἢ τοὺς ἥττους αὐτῶν ἢ τοὺς ὑφ’ ἐτέροις ὄντας, παραλιπὼν τοὺς μείζω δύναμιν ἔχοντας, ἄλλως τε καὶ περὶ πραγμάτων οὐκ ἰδίων, ἀλλὰ κοινῶν καὶ περὶ ὧν οὐδένας ἄλλους εἰκὸς ἦν ἐπιμεληθῆναι πλὴν τοὺς προεστάναι τῶν Ἑλλήνων ἀξιοῦντας;

For who would dare to supplicate either those who are lesser than themselves or who are subject to others, neglecting those who have greater power, especially in issues that are not private but common and for which none other would be likely to care except those who deserve to be the chief power of the Greeks?<sup>95</sup>

Isocrates first makes sure his audience is drawn into the story and the characters’ need for help, which is then given by Athens, as confirmed by the rhetorical question in the citation above. These *exempla*

---

<sup>92</sup> Usher 1990, 161.

<sup>93</sup> *Paneg.* 53: Πολὺ τῶν ἄλλων ἀκριβέστερον εἰδότες τὰ συμβαίνοντ’ ἐκ τῶν τοιούτων ὁμῶς ἠρούμεθα τοῖς ἀσθενεστέροις καὶ παρὰ τὸ συμφέρον βοηθεῖν μᾶλλον ἢ τοῖς κρείττοσι τοῦ λυσιτελοῦντος ἕνεκα συναδικεῖν. – “While we knew more accurately than others what would happen from these sort of things we nevertheless chose to help the weaker ones against our interest rather than do injustice with the stronger ones for profit.”

<sup>94</sup> Isocrates does not, like with the myth of Demeter earlier, explicate that these stories are myths, because it is not useful for Isocrates to distinguish between myth and history here (see also the myth of Demeter above). Just as with the Demeter myth, the message that Isocrates wants to convey with the present two myths is a moral one: Athens helps those who come as suppliants.

<sup>95</sup> Buchner 1958, 69: “Er besagt, daß sich die ἰκετεύοντες an die Stadt wenden, die die größte Macht hat. An sich sollte er sich auf beide Beispiele beziehen, in Wirklichkeit paßt er nur zur Herakliden-Erzählung; denn nur dort (56) ist vom Helfen-Können die Rede, während es sich im Adrastus-Passus mehr um das Helfen-Wollen handelt.”



from the past serve the rhetorical strategy to show how the situation should be in the present, according to Isocrates. Athens will aid those who come to it for help, which places these cities in its debt. To pay the debt, the cities that received aid from Athens should give back by joining in the expedition, which must be led by Athens. The rhetorical question leaves the audience with no other possible opinion than that Athens should claim hegemony, because of the *exempla* narrated before.

The myth of the sons of Heracles serves best to confirm the indebtedness to Athens, now drawing Sparta into the narrative, which has Athens to thank for its prosperity, according to Isocrates (61):

Πολλῶν δ' ὑπαρχουσῶν ἡμῖν εὐεργεσιῶν εἰς τὴν πόλιν τὴν Λακεδαιμονίων περι ταύτης μόνης μοι συμβέβηκεν εἰπεῖν· ἀφορμὴν γὰρ λαβόντες τὴν δι' ἡμῶν αὐτοῖς γενομένην σωτηρίαν οἱ πρόγονοι μὲν τῶν νῦν ἐν Λακεδαίμονι βασιλευόντων, ἔκγονοι δ' Ἡρακλέους, κατῆλθον μὲν εἰς Πελοπόννησον, κατέσχον δ' Ἄργος καὶ Λακεδαίμονα καὶ Μεσσήνην, οἰκισταὶ δὲ Σπάρτης ἐγένοντο καὶ τῶν παρόντων ἀγαθῶν αὐτοῖς ἀπάντων ἀρχηγοὶ κατέστησαν.

Of the many benefactions that exist in the city of the Lacedaemonians because of us I have decided to speak of this alone; for making the salvation that was for them by us the starting-point the ancestors of the present kings in Lacedaemon, descendants of Heracles, returned to the Peloponnese, held Argos and Lacedaemon and Messene, became the founders of Sparta, and became the founders of all the present good fortunes for them.

Thus a significant argument as to why Athens deserves the leadership is that Athens is the reason for Sparta's good fortunes, because Athens aided the sons of Heracles. This is the first time in the speech that Sparta is mentioned, and its existence is based on Athenian help. Although Sparta occupies the leading position in Greece at the time of this speech (see the introduction), Isocrates tries to place Athens on a higher level than Sparta by using his narrative in this way.

To stress Athens' moral high-ground even more, Isocrates shows all the good deeds and attitudes of the Athenian ancestors (75-81), to prepare the audience for the Athenian victory over the barbarians.<sup>96</sup> "These are a 'minor subject' compared with the wars, both mythical and historical, and Isocrates invests them with a highly artificial style."<sup>97</sup> Examples of this artificial style are the *παρίσωσις*, *παρομοίωσις* and *antithesis*,<sup>98</sup> all of which contribute to Isocrates' rhetorical strategy of style. Dionysius of Halicarnassus<sup>99</sup> criticises Isocrates' use of these stylistic features:

---

<sup>96</sup> Usher 1990, 167.

<sup>97</sup> Usher 1990, 165.

<sup>98</sup> In many instances Isocrates accomplishes these stylistic features with elaborate periods containing clauses that are structured in a parallel way through the use of participles. See for example *Paneg.* 93-95.

<sup>99</sup> *Isoc.* 14.

Τῷ γὰρ μὴ ἐν καιρῷ γίνεσθαι μηδὲ ἐν ὥρᾳ ταῦτα τὰ σχήματα προσίστασθαι φημι ταῖς ἀκοαῖς. [...] Καὶ τί δεῖ τὰ καθ' ἕκαστα διεξιόντα μηκύνειν; ὀλίγου γὰρ ἅπας ὁ λόγος ὑπὸ τῶν τοιούτων αὐτῷ κεκόμψευται σχημάτων).<sup>100</sup>

Because these figures are not used at the right moment nor season I say that he offends the ears. [...] And why is it necessary to dwell, going through all these things? Because nearly the whole speech is refined by him through such figures.

However, when examining the *Panegyricus* from a rhetorical point of view, this artificial style is highly useful to Isocrates, because in this way he elevates the “minor subjects” to significant aspects of his rhetoric of Athenian appraisal, as Usher correctly posits: “He is idealising an earlier age of Athenian history, and for this a style remote from everyday usage is appropriate.”<sup>101</sup>

Isocrates describes events of the Persian War (83-97),<sup>102</sup> always emphasising the significant role that Athens played while not downgrading Sparta.<sup>103</sup> In paragraphs 90-91 Isocrates even describes how Athens and Sparta fought together, a facet that can be seen as a hint to the theme of panhellenism in the second part of the speech. Isocrates concludes the following (98):

Τοσοῦτον γὰρ ἡ πόλις ἡμῶν διέφερεν, ὅτ' ἦν ἀκέραιος, ὥστ' ἀνάστατος γενομένη πλείους μὲν συνεβάλετο τριήρεις εἰς τὸν κίνδυνον τὸν ὑπὲρ τῆς Ἑλλάδος ἢ σύμπαντες οἱ ναυμαχήσαντες, οὐδεὶς δὲ πρὸς ἡμᾶς οὕτως ἔχει δυσμενῶς, ὅστις οὐκ ἂν ὁμολογήσειε διὰ μὲν τὴν ναυμαχίαν ἡμᾶς τῷ πολέμῳ κρατῆσαι, ταύτης δὲ τὴν πόλιν αἰτίαν γενέσθαι.

For our city stood out so much, when it was unharmed, that after it had been laid waste it provided more triremes to the danger looming over the Greeks than all who fought in sea-battle. But no-one was so hostile towards us, who could not agree that we surmounted in the war because of the sea-battle, and that of this our city was the cause.

This is a rhetorically clever piece, which again enforces Athens' claim to leadership by concluding that Athens has been the strongest and most beneficial in defeating the enemy.<sup>104</sup> Isocrates tries to leave his audience no other choice than to believe that Athens was indeed the greatest in the war. This

---

<sup>100</sup> Translation adapted from Usher 1974, 137, 141.

<sup>101</sup> Usher 1990, 166. For a detailed analysis of 76-79 see Buchner 1958, 78-87.

<sup>102</sup> See also Buchner 1958, 95-108 or Welles 1966, 18 for a concise walkthrough.

<sup>103</sup> Usher 1990, 169 explains that Isocrates might have written his narrative in this way because “he wishes to maintain the ἀγών motif, which requires the portrayal of comparable warlike zeal, even at the risk of historical distortion; or political, because Isocrates was hoping that *Paneg.* would be read by Spartans as well as Athenians; or both.” Also Buchner 1958, 99.

<sup>104</sup> Usher 1990, 172 names this “a form of comparative argument”. Usher 1990, 173 summarises the use of the above citation concisely: “The comparison is effective because its general conclusion is sound, while rhetorically it rounds off the argument strongly and prepares for the ἀνακεφαλαίωσις or summary of arguments.”

*exemplum* again illustrates the situation as it should be in the present, namely that Athens should be the leader of the Greeks. To confirm this even more, Isocrates' summary of arguments (99) consists of a list of rhetorical questions, which all come down to Isocrates' point of view that Athens should lead the Greeks, leaving the audience with no other opinion.<sup>105</sup>

#### Defence of criticism

Μέχρι μὲν οὖν τούτων οἶδ' ὅτι πάντες ἂν ὁμολογήσειαν πλείστων ἀγαθῶν τὴν πόλιν τὴν ἡμετέραν αἰτίαν γεγενῆσθαι καὶ δικαίως ἂν αὐτῆς τὴν ἡγεμονίαν εἶναι, μετὰ δὲ ταῦτ' ἤδη τινὲς ἡμῶν κατηγοροῦσιν ὡς, ἐπειδὴ τὴν ἀρχὴν τῆς θαλάττης παρελάβομεν, πολλῶν κακῶν αἴτιοι τοῖς Ἑλλησι κατέστημεν καὶ τὸν τε Μηλίων ἀνδραποδισμόν καὶ τὸν Σκιωναίων ὄλεθρον ἐν τούτοις τοῖς λόγοις ἡμῖν προφέρουσιν. (100)

So up to these things I know that all would agree that our city was the cause of most benefits and that the hegemony should rightly be hers, but then some accuse us, that when we took hold of the rule of the sea, we became causes of many evils for the Greeks and they bring forward in these speeches the enslavement of the Melians and the destruction of the Scionians.

After having once again inferred Athens' greatness, Isocrates now grants various criticisms of Athenian policy (100-118) in the years 478 to 404 BC, from the founding of the Delian league to Athens' defeat in the Peloponnesian War.<sup>106</sup> However, by defending Athens against the allegations, Isocrates seizes the opportunity to establish Athens' beneficial position. He does this by focussing on "performance and results rather than on strict justice,"<sup>107</sup> for he names economic growth (103), the laying down of the same laws for all allies (104, 106) and the waging of war against oligarchies (105).<sup>108</sup> Useful for his cause, Isocrates leaves out that all of these actions were most beneficial to Athens itself, as well as the

---

<sup>105</sup> Strikingly, Isocrates leaves out events after the battle of Salamis, which was the most glorious fight for the Athenians in the Persian War. This is of course done on purpose, for this section of praise is followed by a defence of criticism Athens might endure. The praise (preceding and following the section of criticism) can soften the blow (Usher 1990, 173).

<sup>106</sup> Usher 1990, 173. See also Welles 1966, 20-21 on how Isocrates might have processed the Peloponnesian War. Wilamowitz-Moellendorf 1893, 381 writes about *Paneg.* 100-114 and states that "ohne diese Bearbeitung der öffentlichen Meinung wäre die Stiftung des zweiten Seebundes schlechthin undenkbar gewesen." Wilamowitz-Moellendorf comes to this conclusion by logical reasoning of historical events, but does not convincingly prove this with passages from the *Panegyricus*; he cites merely one place in the text. (Wilamowitz-Moellendorf 1893, 380-384, esp. 389). Buchner 1958, 137-142 aptly invalidates the view that Isocrates' goal was the founding of the second league with various arguments. See also Bringmann 1965, 28-46, Drerup 1895, 638-639, 644-646, Meyer 1902, 370-372.

<sup>107</sup> Usher 1990, 174.

<sup>108</sup> Buchner 1958, 115 rightfully notices the following about Isocrates' treatment of oligarchies: "Isokrates stellt also zwar die Demokratie der Oligarchie gegenüber, vermeidet es aber, die Demokratie deutlicher zu charakterisieren und damit festzulegen und abzugrenzen; er beschreibt lediglich ihr Gegenstück, die Oligarchie, schildert diese aber als radikale, d.h. so, daß sie nicht nur der eigentlichen Demokratie, sondern auch der gemäßigten Oligarchie entgegengesetzt zu sein scheint."

fact that he does not hide Athenian imperialistic policy anymore, but only acknowledges it by showing all its benefits for Athens' allies. Isocrates openly talks about Athens' colonial system,<sup>109</sup> but also in this instance he leaves out that the greatest benefit of this policy was to Athens.<sup>110</sup>

In this section of defence against criticism, Isocrates also refers to Sparta indirectly, by mentioning Spartan allies (110):

Τοιούτων τοίνυν ἡμῶν γεγενημένων καὶ τοσαύτην πίστιν δεδωκότων ὑπὲρ τοῦ μὴ τῶν ἀλλοτρίων ἐπιθυμεῖν τολμῶσι κατηγορεῖν οἱ τῶν δεκαρχιῶν κοινωνήσαντες καὶ τὰς αὐτῶν πατρίδας διαλυμηνάμενοι καὶ μικρὰς μὲν ποιήσαντες δοκεῖν εἶναι τὰς τῶν προγεγενημένων ἀδικίας, οὐδεμίαν δὲ λιπόντες ὑπερβολὴν τοῖς αὐτοῖς βουλομένοις γενέσθαι πονηροῖς.

Now although we have been of such character and have given so much proof that we do not wish for the possessions of others, those who were part of the decarchies and harmed their fatherlands dare to accuse us, and making the injustice of their forbears seem small, however leaving no space to exceed them for those who wish to be bad hereafter.

The subject of this citation are states that are under Spartan control,<sup>111</sup> which is why Usher comments the following about this citation: "Nothing reminds us more of Isocrates' purpose of conciliating Spartan opinion than this choice of Sparta's puppets rather than Sparta herself as the leading critics of Athenian imperialism."<sup>112</sup> I do not fully agree with this explanation, for I do not believe that this is Isocrates' sole purpose here. In all of the preceding examples I name above, Isocrates is always working to show why Athens is the sole best choice for leadership, so it is not logical that Isocrates switches to Spartan conciliation without addressing that theme first. Secondly, in the citation above Isocrates clearly denigrates the Spartan allies for being unjust and harmful. Since Usher calls the states "Spartan puppets", all that these states do would be under Spartan control and obligation. Therefore the citation above reflects poorly on the Spartan states as well as on Sparta itself, which is why it cannot be that this is Isocrates' way of appealing to Sparta. This interpretation is strengthened by the following paragraphs (110-118), in which deeds of the Thirty at Athens (and other states) are described,<sup>113</sup> which is of course an allegation against Spartan regime. However, it is plausible that Isocrates is again planting

---

<sup>109</sup> *Paneg.* 107: Ὑπὲρ ὧν προσήκει τοὺς εὖ φρονοῦντας μεγάλην χάριν ἔχειν πολὺ μᾶλλον ἢ τὰς κληρουχίας ἡμῖν ὀνειδίζειν, ἅς ἡμεῖς εἰς τὰς ἐρημουμένας τῶν πόλεων φυλακῆς ἕνεκα τῶν χωρίων, ἀλλ' οὐ διὰ πλεονεξίαν ἐξεπέμπομεν. – "Through these things it is fitting that people who think well have great gratitude towards us, much more than taunt us for our colonies, which we sent to empty cities for guard of the areas, but not for gain."

<sup>110</sup> This is also noted by Bringmann 1965, 40-41 and Usher 1990, 176.

<sup>111</sup> Sandys 1899, 105.

<sup>112</sup> Usher 1990, 177.

<sup>113</sup> Usher 1990, 178: "The subject is unspecified, but the Thirty at Athens fit the catalogue of atrocities described, and some of Isocrates' readers would have had first-hand experience of these." See also Bringmann 1965, 41-42, Buchner 1958, 122-134 or Norlin 1954, 188-189.

a seed of the theme of panhellenism here. Since the goal of the whole speech is to set up a panhellenic expedition and since the second part of the speech is concerned with exactly this theme of panhellenism, Isocrates tries to make sure that his audience is not negligent of that theme by addressing Sparta.

#### Hardship inflicted by barbarians and strife with Sparta

After the preceding period of beneficial Greek leadership there followed a period in which Athens was not the leader, which was the cause of Greek hardship, according to Isocrates.<sup>114</sup> For under the leadership of others the barbarians inflicted much harm upon the Greeks (119).<sup>115</sup> Isocrates recalls some of these hardships (120-121) and then blames Sparta (122), accusing the city of enslaving Greeks and betraying them to the barbarians. These accusations once again establish Athens as the better leader, for these misfortunes did not happen under Athens' watch. Isocrates also names the reason for the change of leadership, but does not think this is just (123): "And then they were vexed, because we justly saw fit to rule over them." (Καὶ τότε μὲν ἡγανάκτου, ὄθ' ἡμεῖς νομίμως ἐπάρχειν τινῶν ἤξιοῦμεν). By emphasising that Athens' imperial conduct was just, Isocrates denigrates Sparta, for the latter's anger at Athens was ungrounded. To illuminate Sparta's maltreatment even more, Isocrates goes on to explain the hardships of the Greeks inflicted by the barbarians under Sparta's rule (123-124), concluding the following (125):

Ἵν τίνας ἄλλους αἰτίους χρὴ νομίζειν ἢ Λακεδαιμονίους, οἱ τοσαύτην ἰσχὺν ἔχοντες περιορῶσι τοὺς μὲν αὐτῶν συμμάχους γενομένους οὕτω δεινὰ πάσχοντας, τὸν δὲ βάρβαρον τῆ τῶν Ἑλλήνων ῥώμῃ τὴν ἀρχὴν τὴν αὐτοῦ κατασκευαζόμενον;

Who else must be named as cause of these things than the Lacedaemonians, who, having such strength, allow those who are their allies to suffer horrible things, and the barbarian to construct his empire with power of the Greeks?

By wrapping his accusation in a rhetorical question, Isocrates' purpose becomes even clearer. By explaining how Sparta has failed to deliver the Greeks from the barbarian evil, Isocrates again places Athens above Sparta in the question of leadership. After the citation above Isocrates continues to

---

<sup>114</sup> *Paneg.* 119: Ἄμα γὰρ ἡμεῖς τε τῆς ἀρχῆς ἀπεστερούμεθα καὶ τοῖς Ἑλλησιν ἀρχὴ τῶν κακῶν ἐγίγνετο. – "For at the same time we lost leadership and that was the beginning of the misfortunes for the Greeks."

<sup>115</sup> Isocrates names many examples of this in 119 and 120 and gives the following proof (120): Μάλιστα δ' ἂν τις συνίδοι τὸ μέγεθος τῆς μεταβολῆς, εἰ παραναγνοίη τὰς συνθήκας τὰς τ' ἐφ' ἡμῶν γενομένας καὶ τὰς νῦν ἀναγεγραμμένας. – "Someone would see the greatness of the change best, if one would compare treaties made in our time and those written down now." For the use of official documents in historical narrative, see Welles 1966.

denigrate Sparta by explaining how Spartan mentality has changed for the worse (125-126)<sup>116</sup> and how Sparta fails as leader (127-128). All of the above is meant to make Athens seem the best choice of leader for the expedition at hand. However, Isocrates wants his audience to believe otherwise (129):

Καὶ μηδεὶς ὑπολάβῃ με δυσκόλως ἔχειν, ὅτι τραχύτερον τούτων ἐμνήσθην, προειπὼν ὡς περὶ διαλλαγῶν ποιήσομαι τοὺς λόγους· οὐ γὰρ ἵνα πρὸς τοὺς ἄλλους διαβάλω τὴν πόλιν τὴν Λακεδαιμονίων οὕτως εἴρηκα περὶ αὐτῶν, ἀλλ' ἵν' αὐτοὺς ἐκείνους παύσω, καθ' ὅσον ὁ λόγος δύναται, τοιαύτην ἔχοντας τὴν γνώμην.

And let nobody assume that I am discontented, because I have recalled these things rather harshly, after having said, that I shall make the words about reconciliation; for I have not spoken like this about these things to slander the city of the Lacedaemonians towards others, but to stop them themselves, so much as a speech is able to, they who are of such heart.

This statement is not completely sincere. For the most part, this description does not fit the speech up to this point, because Isocrates' main goal has been to show Athens' superiority. It is probable to believe that Isocrates merely claims that he seeks to placate Sparta, but he does this with a reason nonetheless. By saying this, Isocrates may still try to win Spartan aid in the upcoming expedition, thus planting another seed of the theme of panhellenism, while enforcing Athens' superiority by reproaching Sparta's deeds and advising Sparta on how it should behave (130).<sup>117</sup>

## Chapter conclusion

In this chapter I have argued that Isocrates presents Athens as the best choice for the leadership in a joint Greek expedition, by on the one hand constantly showing Athens' past virtues and on the other hand elaborating on hardship that had to be endured during Sparta's reign over Greece. However, the general goal of the *Panegyricus* must not be lost out of sight. Because he will advocate a panhellenic expedition in the second part of his speech, Isocrates needs to prepare his audience for this. He does this by subtly hinting at panhellenism throughout this first part of the speech, for example by using narratives of myth, Greekness and war for this purpose. Thus these paragraphs have a dual goal: to

---

<sup>116</sup> Usher 1990, 184 correctly notes that: "Isocrates lumps these examples of Spartan foreign policy together to achieve maximum critical effect, ignoring their differences."

<sup>117</sup> That this statement above is strategic becomes even clearer when reading the following two paragraphs, because there Isocrates utters more criticism of Sparta, with which he ends the part of the speech about Athens' praise. The main criticism comes down to the following, *Paneg.* 131: Ἐπεὶ καὶ τοῦτ' ἔχομεν αὐτοῖς ἐπιτιμᾶν, ὅτι τῇ μὲν αὐτῶν πόλει τοὺς ὀμόρους εἰλωτεύειν ἀναγκάζουσι, τῷ δὲ κοινῷ τῷ τῶν συμμάχων οὐδὲν τοιοῦτον κατασκευάζουσι, ἐξὸν αὐτοῖς τὰ πρὸς ἡμᾶς διαλυσαμένοις ἅπαντας τοὺς βαρβάρους περιοίκους ὅλης τῆς Ἑλλάδος καταστήσαι. – "Then we also have this criticism against them, that for their own city they force their neighbours to be Helots, but for the league of allies they prepare no such thing, while it is possible for them to resolve their issues with us and make all the barbarians subjects of the whole of Greece."

establish Athenian superiority and plant the seeds for the theme of panhellenism. Isocrates achieves this goal by using various rhetorical strategies, like asking rhetorical questions, but especially by using *exempla*. Isocrates is careful in choosing his material. He emphasises Athens' accomplishments and passes over events that reflect poorly on the city's worth. By using examples of past endeavours, Isocrates shows how the situation must be in the present, drawing the audience into his narrative and leaving no doubt about the fact that Athens should lead the panhellenic expedition.

## Chapter 2: Rhetoric and panhellenism

As the previous chapter focussed on Isocrates' praise of Athens and the strife between Athens and Sparta, the present chapter examines the way in which rhetoric functions to establish a sentiment of panhellenism in the *Panegyricus*.<sup>118</sup> The most important of these strategies is Isocrates' use of rhetorical questions, which Isocrates uses with the aim of ensuring the audience's compliance with his intentions. Thematically the second part of the speech seems to differ from the first part, which makes the speech seem to consist of two separate parts. Nevertheless, just as the hints to the theme of panhellenism in the first part of the speech, the second part of the speech refers back to the first part, as will be shown in this chapter. Building on the seeds that were planted in the first part of the speech (1-132), the second part (133-189) now openly concentrates on panhellenism. In order to transit from the subject of the first part of the speech to the theme of panhellenism, Isocrates states the following (133):

Ἦγοῦμαι δ' εἴ τινας ἄλλοθεν ἐπελθόντες θεαταὶ γένοιτο τῶν παρόντων πραγμάτων, πολλὴν ἂν αὐτοὺς καταγνῶναι μανίαν ἀμφοτέρων ἡμῶν, οἷτινες οὕτω περὶ μικρῶν κινδυνεύομεν, ἐξὸν ἀδεῶς πολλὰ κεκτῆσθαι, καὶ τὴν ἡμετέραν αὐτῶν χώραν διαφθείρομεν ἀμελήσαντες τὴν Ἀσίαν καρποῦσθαι.

I think that, if people coming from abroad would be spectators of the present matters, they would condemn the great deal of insanity of us both [i.e. Athens and Sparta], we who risk so much over little things, while it is possible to have so much without anxiety, and we ruin our own land, after neglecting to reap the crops from Asia.

With this paragraph, Isocrates leaves the first part of his speech behind, in which he presented Athens and Sparta as opponents. However, as I have argued in the first chapter, Isocrates has not been neglecting the theme of panhellenism in the first part of the speech, but now this becomes the one and only subject for the remainder of the speech. By suggesting, in the citation above, what could have been, while in fact the two states are fighting each other, Isocrates is able to turn to the theme of panhellenism. As observed by Usher, expediency (συμφέρον) and possibility (δυνατόν) are two of the major themes of the second part of the speech, in which Isocrates sets out to explain why the Greeks have to undertake an expedition against Persia once more.<sup>119</sup> The theme of expediency can be found

---

<sup>118</sup> On how Isocrates creates concord and benevolence among his audience in general, see de Romilly 1958.

<sup>119</sup> Usher 1990, 185-186: "With Athens and Sparta to become allies instead of adversaries, and the justice of their cause and of Athenian leadership established, the two main topics are those of expediency (συμφέρον) and possibility (δυνατόν). Of these the first is the more complex. It is subjective, in that argument centres upon the points of view of different parties; and the concept of expediency (or 'advantage') carries with it such qualifications as shorter and longer term, the timing of action, and the effects of changing circumstances. It was also felt to overlap with δίκαιον in the important sense that other parties which might be needed as allies took



in the fact that the goal of the expedition would be to rid Greece of Persian hostility and danger, as explained throughout the *Panegyricus*, but especially in paragraphs 134-159, 174, 182 and 197. The possibility of the expedition is made clearest in paragraphs 160-169.

An overview of the second part of the speech will serve to make the broad context of the discussed paragraphs clear:

|         |   |
|---------|---|
| 133-137 | The states' own foolishness   |
| 138-139 | Others' opinion of the Persian king   |
| 140-143 | How the king made war on his own account  |
| 143-145 | Other matters that speak for the king   |
| 146-149 | Bad conduct of Persia   |
| 150-156 | Reasons for Persian behaviour: aspects of barbarian society, attitudes and conduct                    |
| 157-159 | Natural hostility   |
| 160-169 | Present opportunity   |
| 170-178 | Leaders and current policies  |
| 179-182 | Current standings with the king   |
| 183-184 | There must be an expedition   |
| 185-186 | Forces  |
| 187-189 | Conclusion: Greek internal strife must be ended and Persia must be attacked for the benefit of Greece |

### Reasons for Persian danger

At the start of the second part of the speech, Isocrates spends quite some time justifying the expedition that he urges the Greeks to undertake. First of all, he explains how the situation could have come so far that the Persians pose a threat to Greece. The first paragraphs of this part of the speech are therefore dedicated to display the Greeks' own responsibility for the present situation (133-137), as shown in the following citation (134):

Καὶ τῷ μὲν οὐδὲν προϋργιαίτερον ἐστὶν ἢ σκοπεῖν, ἐξ ὧν μηδέποτε παυσόμεθα πρὸς ἀλλήλους πολεμοῦντες· ἡμεῖς δὲ τοσούτου δέομεν συγκρούειν τι τῶν ἐκείνου πραγμάτων ἢ ποιεῖν στασιάζειν ὥστε καὶ τὰς διὰ τύχην αὐτῷ γεγενημένας ταραχὰς συνδιαλύειν ἐπιχειροῦμεν.

---

serious account of the justice of a state's actions in deciding whether or not to aid their cause. The other topic, possibility, is mainly concerned with strategy, tactics and logistics, and its objectivity is qualified only by the judgement of the counsellor. Henceforth Isocrates concentrates on constructive arguments directed towards the success of the Panhellenic Expedition rather than rhetorical set-pieces containing criticism and historical description."

To him [i.e. the Persian king] nothing is more useful than to observe, why we never stop waging war on each other; but we are so far from bringing something of his affairs into confusion or revolutionising, that we aid his cause to put an end to the disturbances that happened by chance in his empire.

Thus the first and foremost blame is Greece's, because of the relentless feud amongst its city-states, primarily of course Athens and Sparta. The rivalry between these two city-states has been diligently covered by Isocrates in the first part of this speech. Now, as it turns out, what he has said before has to be seen in a bad light, for it is the reason that the barbarians have been thriving and now pose a threat to Greece.<sup>120</sup> As opposed to many instances in the first part of the speech, here Isocrates does not use an *exemplum* (see chapter one) to show how he thinks the present situation must be dealt with, but instead he observes what has been happening and blames the Greeks themselves. By putting the blame on the Greeks' shoulders he tries to motivate his allies, for the ones that made the mess will have to clean it up. It might seem an odd way to motivate one's allies by blaming them for past transgressions (see also the first part of the speech, where Isocrates blames and attacks Sparta). It is difficult to imagine how the audience of the speech must have reacted to these allegations. Perhaps the reason Isocrates argues in this way is that he can thus accentuate the present need and urgency for the expedition. By showing how things went awry before, Isocrates is able to emphasise the necessity of a positive result now.

---

<sup>120</sup> *Paneg.* 137 describes the present situation: Διαπέπρακται γὰρ ὁ τῶν ἐκείνου προγόνων οὐδείς πώποτε τήν τε γὰρ Ἀσίαν διωμολόγηται καὶ παρ' ἡμῶν καὶ παρὰ Λακεδαιμονίων βασιλέως εἶναι, τὰς τε πόλεις τὰς Ἑλληνίδας οὕτω κυρίως παρείληφεν ὥστε τὰς μὲν αὐτῶν κατασκάπτει, ἐν δὲ ταῖς ἀκροπόλεις ἐντειχίζειν. Καὶ ταῦτα πάντα γέγονε διὰ τὴν ἡμετέραν ἄνοιαν, ἀλλ' οὐ διὰ τὴν ἐκείνου δύναμιν. – “For he has accomplished what none of his predecessors ever has; for it is agreed upon by us and the Lacedaemonians that Asia belongs to the king, and he has taken possession of the Greek cities with full authority so, that he destroys some of them, and builds citadels in others. And all these things happened because of our own foolishness, but not because of his power.” Usher 1990, 187 sees paragraphs 136-137 as a negative instance of the theme of *συμφέρον*, because Isocrates would be stating what could have been. In this cited passage this can be seen in the fact that the Persian king has taken hold of Asian cities, which might not have been the case if the Greeks would have stopped their arguing sooner.

## Call for the expedition

Because of the danger that Persia poses, Isocrates calls for panhellenism (138):<sup>121</sup>

Καίτοι τινές θαυμάζουσι τὸ μέγεθος τῶν βασιλέως πραγμάτων καὶ φασὶν αὐτὸν εἶναι δυσπολέμητον, διεξιόντες ὡς πολλὰς τὰς μεταβολὰς τοῖς Ἑλλησι ποποίηται. Ἐγὼ δ' ἠγοῦμαι μὲν τοὺς ταῦτα λέγοντας οὐκ ἀποτρέπειν, ἀλλ' ἐπισπεύδειν τὴν στρατιάν· εἰ γὰρ ἡμῶν ὁμονοησάντων αὐτὸς ἐν παραχαῖς ὦν χαλεπὸς ἔσται πρὸς τὸ πολεμεῖν, ἧ̃ που σφόδρα χρή δεδιέναι τὸν καιρὸν ἐκεῖνον, ὅταν τὰ μὲν τῶν βαρβάρων καταστῆ καὶ διὰ μιᾶς γένηται γνώμη, ἡμεῖς δὲ πρὸς ἀλλήλους ὥσπερ νῦν πολεμικῶς ἔχωμεν.

Yet some wonder at the greatness of the king's matters and say that he is hard to wage war on, going through how he has made many changes for the Greeks. But I think that those who say this do not turn away from the expedition, but urge it on; for if he will be hard to wage war on when we are of one mind and he is in disorder, that time must surely be feared, when the case of the barbarians is set in order and they are of one mind, but we are hostile towards one another like we are now.

In this passage, Isocrates compels to his (potential) allies, by stating that the barbarian king will be even harder to defeat when he is no longer in disarray. Therefore, the Greeks must act now and undertake the expedition. The way in which Isocrates tries to get this message across to his audience is with an *a fortiori* argument.<sup>122</sup> The present opportunity is presented in a semi-negative way: it is already difficult to fight the barbarian now, but it will be even harder to win if the Greeks prolong their strife and the barbarian gets his situation in order. With this statement, Isocrates thus aims to leave his audience no other possible opinion than that it is a good idea to undertake the expedition against Persia as quickly as possible. The citation above shows the theme of expediency, which is primarily implicit, for no actual advantage of the expedition is named. However, expediency can be seen in the negative presentation of the need for the expedition. If the Greeks will not fight the Persians at this point, their hardship will be even greater. Even more than expediency, this passage illustrates the theme of possibility clearly. Since the barbarians are still in disarray, Greece's chance for an expedition is now.

In the second part of the speech, Isocrates uses many examples to support his statement that the Persians are inferior to the Greeks (140-156). This collection of arguments can be called *amplificatio*, which is used here to overwhelm the audience with a multitude of examples, so that the

---

<sup>121</sup> The term is not actually used by Isocrates, but it captures his purpose beautifully. The term πανέλληνες is first found in Hom. *Il.* 2.530: Ἐγχεῖη δ' ἐκέκαστο Πανέλληνας καὶ Ἀχαιοῦς. – “With the spear he had surpassed all the Hellenes and Achaeans” (my translation), LSJ s.v. For further discussion of the term see Perlman 1976, 1-6 or Stier 1945, 87-90. For a discussion of the name Ἕλληνες, see also Stier 1945, 73-93, who explains the connotation of the name in classical and Christian times.

<sup>122</sup> Usher 1990, 187.

audience will be more easily persuaded to follow Isocrates' intention.<sup>123</sup> All of these paragraphs portray the theme of expediency, for the (successful) expedition would ensure that the Persians cannot attack Greece again, as they have been shown to do in Isocrates' lengthy narrative of Persian attacks. However, in this narrative the Persians are mainly portrayed as inferior to the Greeks, since they have been unable to finish their expeditions successfully. Therefore all the instances of battle with the Persians that Isocrates narrates in these paragraphs serve as *exempla*, because they show how the present situation should be, but also because they underscore the extra step Greece has to make to eliminate the Persian threats: Greece should be on top and Persia must cease to pose threats. The paragraphs thus serve a dual goal.

In trying to convince his audience of the need for the expedition, Isocrates recalls the opinion of some, who believe the Persian king to be very powerful (see also the first sentence of the citation above). By now discussing the Persian war from the point of view of the Persians, Isocrates refers back to the first part of the speech. Isocrates ridicules this believe by showing that the Persian king has had difficulty in his expeditions (140-142), and of course chooses his material wisely, as is clearly explained by Usher: "Note the rhetorical rather than chronological order of events: these are 'examples' (παραδείγματα, 143) of the King's prowess, and Isocrates aims to achieve maximum effect by placing the King's best exploits first, so that by disparaging them he may, by comparison (or *a fortiori*) roundly discredit his less successful campaigns."<sup>124</sup> Having thus implemented the rhetorical strategy of selecting and shaping material (*inventio*), Isocrates concludes that his audience cannot maintain the believe that the Persian king is extremely powerful (143-144):

Καὶ ταῦτ' ἐστὶ τὰ βασιλικώτατα καὶ σεμνότατα τῶν ἐκείνων πεπραγμένων, καὶ περὶ ὧν οὐδέποτε παύονται λέγοντες οἱ βουλόμενοι τὰ τῶν βαρβάρων μεγάλα ποιεῖν. Ὡστ' οὐδεὶς ἂν ἔχοι τοῦτ' εἰπεῖν, ὡς οὐ δικαίως χρῶμαι τοῖς παραδείγμασιν, οὐδ' ὡς ἐπὶ μικροῖς διατρίβω τὰς μεγίστας τῶν πράξεων παραλείπων· φεύγων γὰρ ταύτην τὴν αἰτίαν τὰ κάλλιστα τῶν ἔργων διήλθον.

And these are the most regal and august of his achievements, about which those who want to make the deeds of the barbarians great never cease to speak. Therefore nobody could say this, that I do not use examples

---

<sup>123</sup> Lausberg 2008, 145 describes the term *amplificatio* more generally: "Im Hinblick auf das Parteiinteresse nimmt das auf *res et verba* bezügliche *aptum* die Form der *amplificatio*. [...] Die *amplificatio* ist eine im Parteiinteresse vorgenommene gradmässige Steigerung des von Natur aus Gegebenen durch die Mittel der Kunst." The essence of *amplificatio* is thus the gradual increase of arguments. The purpose of this rhetorical strategy is clearly explained by Ueding 1992, 1.445: "Die *amplificatio* ist ein Verfahren, einem Argument oder dem Teil einer Rede mit Worten oder Gedanken zusätzliches Gewicht zu geben, so daß sie an Überzeugungskraft und affektiver Wirkung gewinnt." This is exactly the way in which Isocrates uses this rhetorical strategy: he gives his argument more body by using a multitude of example to support his argument, with which he intends to persuade his audience.

<sup>124</sup> Usher 1990, 189.

rightly, nor that I spend time on the small things, leaving the greatest of his achievements behind; for fleeing this accusation I have gone through the most glorious of his campaigns.

Because this passage is full of negations (οὐδέποτε, οὐδεὶς, οὐ, οὐδ') and because of the parallel construction (οὐ, οὐδ'), Isocrates tries to convince his audience with forceful language. This is emphasised by the use of many superlatives in the argument (βασιλικώτατα, σεμνότατα, μεγίστας, κάλλιστα). By discussing a few examples of barbarian expeditions under the king, Isocrates tries to prove the people who admire the king wrong. He leads his audience through this narrative, by which he shows that the Persian king is not as powerful as some believe. Isocrates has shown "the most glorious of his campaigns", which turn out not to be glorious. However, Isocrates obviously leaves out Persia's earlier successes in the Persian war. By narrating in this way, Isocrates is able to conclude that nobody can reproach his reasoning. This is strengthened by two later paragraphs (154-155), which pose several rhetorical questions that serve to remove any doubts whether Greece should undertake the expedition that might still linger with the audience (155):

Καίτοι πῶς χρή τὴν τούτων φιλίαν ἀγαπᾶν, οἱ τοὺς μὲν εὐεργέτας τιμωροῦνται, τοὺς δὲ κακῶς ποιοῦντας οὕτως ἐπιφανῶς κολακεύουσιν; Περὶ τίνας δ' ἡμῶν οὐκ ἐξημαρτήκασιν; Ποῖον δὲ χρόνον διαλελοίπασιν ἐπιβουλεύοντες τοῖς Ἑλλησιν; Τί δ' οὐκ ἐχθρὸν αὐτοῖς ἐστὶ τῶν παρ' ἡμῖν, οἳ καὶ τὰ τῶν θεῶν ἔδη καὶ τοὺς νεῶς συλᾶν ἐν τῷ προτέρῳ πολέμῳ καὶ κατακάειν ἐτόλμησαν;

Then how is it necessary that we desire the friendship of those [i.e. the Persians], who avenge their benefactors and flatter those who do them wrong so openly? Whom of our people have they not harmed? What time have they left an interval when plotting against the Greeks? Who of our people is not an enemy to those, who dared to pillage and burn the abodes and temples of the gods in the earlier war?

Isocrates uses the rhetorical questions to underscore the possibility for an expedition that has not arisen.<sup>125</sup> Rhetorical questions function to draw the audience into the narrative,<sup>126</sup> because a rhetorical question is not meant to be answered explicitly.<sup>127</sup> According to Isocrates, all of the rhetorical questions above have to be answered (not as in a conversation, but tacitly within one's mind, within

---

<sup>125</sup> Usher 1990, 192 rightly comments as follows: "In such semi-religious arguments the theme of possibility lies close to the surface: in the present case, the Persians have raised the odds against themselves by their impiety. They not only deserve to be attacked: they are also more vulnerable than they would otherwise be, because they are both hated by the gods and, partly as a consequence of that hatred, cannot readily find reliable allies. All that is needed is to keep the memory of their misdeeds alive, as the Ionians have done (156), and to choose the right time (καιρός) to attack them."

<sup>126</sup> Lausberg 2008, 379: "Als Figur wird die Frage benutzt, wenn sie ihrer eigentlichen dialogischen Funktion entkleidet und als Mittel des Pathos oder der Schärfung der Gedankenabfolge in die Rede hineingenommen wird."

<sup>127</sup> Ueding 1992, 3.445-446.

the line of argument) in a manner that agrees with the statement that an expedition has to be undertaken. Rhetorical questions can be used in multiple manners,<sup>128</sup> but in the questions above, Isocrates aims at the audience's empathy and feelings, because he asks about the harming of people, trying to trigger an emotional response from the audience.

### Present opportunity

Isocrates presents the present opportunity (καιρός) as one of the most important reasons for the expedition against Persia, of which Isocrates speaks in the following manner (160):

“Ὅστε μοι δοκεῖ πολλὰ λίαν εἶναι τὰ παρακελυόμενα πολεμεῖν αὐτοῖς, μάλιστα δ’ ὁ παρῶν καιρός, οὐ σαφέστερον οὐδέν. Ὅν οὐκ ἀφετέον· καὶ γὰρ αἰσχρὸν παρόντι μὲν μὴ χρῆσθαι, παρελθόντος δ’ αὐτοῦ μεμνηῖσθαι. Τί γὰρ ἂν καὶ βουλευθεῖμεν ἡμῖν προσγενέσθαι, μέλλοντες βασιλεῖ πολεμεῖν, ἔξω τῶν νῦν ὑπαρχόντων;

Therefore it seems to me that the exhortations to wage a war against them are very numerous, but most important is the present opportunity, nothing is more clearer than this. This must not be dismissed; for it is shameful not to use the present opportunity, and to remember it when it has passed. For what could we want to be added for us, planning to wage war against the king, besides what we have now?

In this citation Isocrates again tries to leave his audience no choice but to agree with his statement that the expedition must be set up immediately. Not only does this become very clear in his use of the *adiectivum verbale* ἀφετέον, but also through the rhetorical question at the end. Another rhetorical question follows the one in this citation in the following paragraph (161) to underscore its rhetorical purpose even more: “Have not Egypt and Cyprus stood away from him, and have not Phoenicia and Syria through war been ruined, and has not Tyre, of which he had high thoughts, been seized by his enemies?” (Οὐκ Αἴγυπτος μὲν αὐτοῦ καὶ Κύπρος ἀφέστηκεν; Φοινίκη δὲ καὶ Συρία διὰ τὸν πόλεμον ἀνάστατοι γεγόνασιν; Τύρος δ’ ἐφ’ ἧ μὲγ’ ἐφρόνησεν, ὑπὸ τῶν ἐχθρῶν τῶν ἐκείνου κατεῖληπται;). A few sentences later these rhetorical questions are followed by yet another rhetorical question, which Isocrates answers himself (162): “Since there are such bases of operation and so much war has befallen Asia why is it necessary that the things that might happen are all too diligently examined? For where they are the lesser of small groups, it is not unclear, how they would manage, if they are forced to wage war against us all.” (Καὶ τοιούτων ὀρμητηρίων ὑπαρξάντων καὶ τοσούτου πολέμου τὴν Ἀσίαν

---

<sup>128</sup> Ueding 1992, 3.447-449 describes eight uses, which I cite here with the original German terms: elenktisch, logisch-argumentativ, didaktisch-textgliedernd, pathetisch, amplifizierend, paränetisch-polemisch, replizierend, ästhetisch. I believe Isocrates uses rhetorical questions mostly in a pathetic way, for he tries to affect his audience. Another important use for Isocrates is ‘logisch-argumentativ’, because Isocrates often uses rhetorical questions as a conclusion to an argument.

περιστάντος τί δεῖ τὰ συμβησόμενα λίαν ἀκριβῶς ἐξετάζειν; Ὅπου γὰρ μικρῶν μερῶν ἦπτους εἰσὶν, οὐκ ἄδηλον, ὡς ἂν διατεθεῖεν, εἰ πᾶσιν ἡμῖν πολεμεῖν ἀναγκασθεῖεν.). Furthermore, Isocrates posits that it is shameful to think otherwise, which is an indirect insult to anyone in his audience who might think differently. As already mentioned in the introduction and in this chapter, *καῖρός* is an important theme for Isocrates. It represents not only the present possibility for the expedition, but also the need, which Isocrates shows in the following paragraph (163), where Isocrates explains that if the Greeks do not act now, the barbarian king will gain strength, which is of course not desirable for the Greeks. The situation that Isocrates imagines in this paragraphs functions as a negative example, on which Isocrates can continue to build his case. He does this by narrating another negative *exemplum* (164):

Διὸ δεῖ σπεύδειν καὶ μηδεμίαν ποιεῖσθαι διατριβήν, ἵνα μὴ πάθωμεν, ὅπερ οἱ πατέρες ἡμῶν. Ἐκεῖνοι γὰρ ὑστερίσαντες τῶν βαρβάρων καὶ προέμενοι τινὰς τῶν συμμάχων ἠναγκάσθησαν ὀλίγοι πρὸς πολλοὺς κινδυνεύειν, ἐξὸν αὐτοῖς προτέροις διαβᾶσιν εἰς τὴν ἡπειρον μετὰ πάσης τῆς τῶν Ἑλλήνων δυνάμεως ἐν μέρει τῶν ἔθνῶν ἕκαστον χειροῦσθαι.

Therefore it is necessary to make haste and not make delay, in order that we do not suffer, like our fathers. For they, after they had come later than the barbarians and had deserted some of their allies, were forced to face danger with few men against many, while it was possible for them, with an earlier crossing to the mainland with all the power of the Greeks, to subdue each of the nations one by one.

The meaning of this *exemplum* is very clear: the Greeks must not make the same mistake in the present as their forebears did in the past.<sup>129</sup> By using the *exemplum* in a negative way, Isocrates shows how, in his opinion, the present situation must not be, as opposed to a ‘regular’ or positive *exemplum*. The scenario that Isocrates outlines is one of an easy victory over the Persians, for the Greeks will quickly assemble a large army that will attack the little forces of the Persians.<sup>130</sup>

In the first chapter I have explained how the seeds of the theme of panhellenism are planted. Throughout his narrative of Athenian leadership, Isocrates does not neglect Athens’ allies and refers to them, for he needs them for the panhellenic expedition against Persia. Thematic references to the second part of the speech can be found in the first part of the speech. The citation above illustrates this, because the mentioning of ancestors refers to the narratives of past wars fought by the ancestors

---

<sup>129</sup> Usher 1990, 196 tries to date this vague reference by Isocrates as follows: “The Persians confronted the Greeks for the first time when Cyrus and his general Harpagus occupied the Ionian cities after overrunning Lydia. A Panhellenic army should have crossed to Asia around the time of Cyrus’ capture of Sardis in 546 BC if his ambitions were to have been seriously challenged. But Isocrates is thinking of the Ionian Revolt of 500-494 BC.” However, Usher does not give evidence or a reason for his last comment. Isocrates can just as well be referring to the instance Usher names first.

<sup>130</sup> Buchner 1958, 144 calls the expedition a “Präventivkrieg”, for this expedition must prevent worse suffering because of the Persians.

in the first part of the speech. Just as Isocrates has planted the seeds of the theme of panhellenism in the first part of the *Panegyricus*, he refers back to the first part of the speech concerning the question of leadership of the Greeks (166):

Πολὺ δὲ κάλλιον ἐκείνῳ περὶ τῆς βασιλείας πολεμεῖν ἢ πρὸς ἡμᾶς αὐτοὺς περὶ τῆς ἡγεμονίας ἀμφισβητεῖν.

And it is much nobler to wage war on him for his kingdom than to fight amongst each other about the leadership.

In this citation Isocrates makes a reference to the first part of the speech (after which a few more references will follow, as explicated below). The reference in this citation is to the general subject of the first part of the speech, in which he presents Athens as the best choice for the leadership of the Greeks, thus again a thematic reference. Now, however, Isocrates states that the discussion is mute. He acknowledges that the question of leadership must not stand in the way of the expedition against Persia. He has of course made very clear that he thinks that Athens should be the leader of this joint expedition (see chapter one). Not only should Athens be in command of the forces at sea, but also of the land forces. This is made clear by the fact that Isocrates solely mentions previous expeditions on land.<sup>131</sup> Usher argues that Isocrates' utterance in the citation above is logical: "He [i.e. Isocrates] has tried to emphasise naval operations in the expedition by focussing on the maritime cities (163), but a full-scale invasion would leave little work for a fleet to do; and recent successful land operations against the King had been led by Spartan generals. It is hence natural that Isocrates, in some frustration, should propose to set aside discussion of the topic of the leadership."<sup>132</sup> While I agree with the first part of this utterance, I do not believe that Isocrates mentions this citation above in frustration. For the greatest part of the speech up till now Isocrates has worked to explicitly show why Athens deserves the leadership. For him to be frustrated here because of Spartan successes does not agree with this.

When Isocrates has forcefully made his point by showing the evils that might otherwise occur, as has been seen in the past, he seemingly discredits himself (169):

Ἴσως δ' ἂν καὶ τῆς ἐμῆς εὐηθείας πολλοὶ καταγελάσειαν, εἰ δυστυχίας ἀνδρῶν ὄδυροίμην ἐν τοῖς τοιοῦτοις καιροῖς, ἐν οἷς Ἰταλία μὲν ἀνάστατος γέγονε, Σικελία δὲ καταδεδούλωται, τσαῦται δὲ πόλεις τοῖς βαρβάροις ἐκδέδονται, τὰ δὲ λοιπὰ μέρη τῶν Ἑλλήνων ἐν τοῖς μεγίστοις κινδύνοις ἐστίν.

---

<sup>131</sup> Buchner 1958, 146.

<sup>132</sup> Usher 1990, 196.



Maybe many might laugh at my silliness, if I should lament the misfortunes of men in such times, in which Italy is ruined, Sicily enslaved, and so much cities given up to the barbarians, and the remaining parts of Greece are in the greatest dangers.<sup>133</sup>

Here, just as in the citation from paragraphs 143-144, Isocrates emphasises the necessity of his statement (that an expedition must be set up presently) by using a superlative (here *μεγίστοις*). In this citation Isocrates paints the picture of an endangered Greek world, which he has not yet done for a negative purpose. Earlier in the speech Isocrates has used the present situation to underscore his advocacy of the need for an expedition. Now, however, he brings up the point that this advocacy might be silly, because perhaps there is no possibility for the Greeks to defeat the Persians. This citation is thus contrasted with the reason for the speech which is explained in the preceding paragraphs on the one hand, but on the other hand it strengthens Isocrates' case even more, because it is set against the paragraphs that follow, in which the incompetence of the present leaders is discussed. Thus the citation is placed in a rhetorically strategic way.

#### Current situation

Before summarizing his arguments,<sup>134</sup> Isocrates briefly comments upon the policies of the current leaders (170):

Θαυμάζω δὲ τῶν δυναστευόντων ἐν ταῖς πόλεσιν, εἰ προσήκειν αὐτοῖς ἡγοῦνται μέγα φρονεῖν, μηδὲν πῶποθ' ὑπὲρ τηλικούτων πραγμάτων μήτ' εἰπεῖν μήτ' ἐνθυμηθῆναι δυνηθέντες.

I wonder at those who hold power in the cities, that they think that it is fitting for them to be proud, although they have never been able to speak nor think deeply of so great matters.

With this citation Isocrates again connects the different parts of the *Panegyricus*, for the word *θαυμάζω* refers to the first sentence of the speech, in which Isocrates introduces the idea of panhellenism by mentioning panhellenic festivals.<sup>135</sup> Isocrates openly attacks the current leaders and places them opposite himself, who, as implied, is able to ponder upon such great matters very well. By means of this rhetorical phrase, Isocrates thus puts himself in a strong position, actually stating that

---

<sup>133</sup> For clarity's sake I add Usher's explanation of the context of the citation (Usher 1990, 197): "The reference is to the operations of Dionysius I of Syracuse, who expanded into Italy and in Sicily conceded Acragas, Himela, Gela and Camarina to the Carthaginians."

<sup>134</sup> Paragraphs 173-186 (Usher 1990, 197).

<sup>135</sup> Usher 1990, 197. *Paneg.* 1: Πολλάκις ἐθαύμασα τῶν τὰς πανηγύρεις συναγαγόντων καὶ τοὺς γυμνικοὺς ἀγῶνας καταστησάντων, ὅτι τὰς μὲν τῶν σωμάτων εὐτυχίας οὕτω μεγάλων δωρεῶν ἤξιωσαν. – "I have often wondered at those who bring together the festivals and those who established athletic games, that they thought success of the body worthy of great gifts like this." Panhellenic festivals are also mentioned in paragraphs 43-44.

his advice is better than the present leaders' conduct.<sup>136</sup> He even states that he is compelled to utter his opinion about the matter (171):

Νῦν δ' οἱ μὲν ἐν ταῖς μεγίσταις δόξαις ὄντες ἐπὶ μικροῖς σπουδάζουσιν, ἡμῖν δὲ τοῖς τῶν πολιτικῶν ἐξεστηκόσι περὶ τηλικούτων πραγμάτων συμβουλεύειν παραλελοίπασιν.

But now those who are in greatest esteem are busy with small matters, and have left it to us who stand apart from politics to deliberate upon matters so great.

By saying this, Isocrates aims to ensure that nobody can resent him for giving a speech about this topic and trying to persuade his audience of his opinion on the expedition, because according to him the matter is of the utmost importance. He thus places the need for the speech in the hands of the current leaders, for it is because of their bad conduct that Isocrates is compelled to urge for an expedition against Persia. This gives Isocrates more freedom to put his opinion upon the matter forward and to try to convince his audience.

#### Summary of arguments

Isocrates clearly marks the section of the summary of arguments as follows (173):

Ἔστι δ' ἀπλοῦς καὶ ῥάδιος ὁ λόγος ὁ περὶ τούτων· οὔτε γὰρ εἰρήνην οἷόν τε βεβαίαν ἀγαγεῖν, ἢν μὴ κοινῇ τοῖς βαρβάροις πολεμήσωμεν, οὔθ' ὁμονοῆσαι τοὺς Ἕλληνας, πρὶν ἂν καὶ τὰς ὠφελείας ἐκ τῶν αὐτῶν καὶ τοὺς κινδύνους πρὸς τοὺς αὐτοὺς ποιησώμεθα.

My speech on these matters is simple and easy; for it is not possible to lead a steady peace, when we do not wage a common war against the barbarians, nor is it possible that the Greeks are of one mind, before we make our gains from the same source and make our battles against the same.

To make sure that his audience listens to his following statement, Isocrates introduces it as 'simple and easy', as a *captatio benevolentiae* for this particular argument.<sup>137</sup> To support this, the statement is structured in a parallel way, signalled by οὔτε - οὔθ'. By using this structure, Isocrates clearly marks his arguments for panhellenism in this citation: he excludes the possibilities of lasting peace and of Greek unity, without the panhellenic expedition. Isocrates thus makes clear once more that he strongly advocates panhellenism, for that is the only means to defeat the barbarians once and for all. This is another reference to the first part of the speech, because in paragraph 15 Isocrates states the same

---

<sup>136</sup> Usher 1990, 197 clearly explains how Isocrates does this: "Now as then [i.e. in the first sentence of the speech, see previous footnote] he represents himself as the outsider, appealing to thinking men while exposing the intellectual poverty of those in power."

<sup>137</sup> On *captatio benevolentiae* in general, see for example Ueding 1992, 2.121-123.

purpose (see chapter one), which is of course fitting for both parts of the speech. In paragraph 15 he states the purpose of his speech, to now refer back to this in the summary of his arguments. Because *variatio delectat*, Isocrates does not use the same words.

In the summary of arguments, the themes of expediency and possibility are also revisited, while the theme of justice is elaborated on mostly.<sup>138</sup> The citation above shows, besides the statement of the purpose of the speech, the theme of expediency. Isocrates implies that it is beneficial to embark on an expedition against the Persians, but he does not give explicit reasons as to why this would be beneficial. However, after hearing the complete speech, his audience must have been able to fill this in. Because the reasons why an expedition will be beneficial are implicit, Usher explains Isocrates' intention as follows: "A war against the barbarians is expedient for Greece because it will unite her in a concerted effort to relieve her poverty, which is the main cause of interstate wars and internal revolutions."<sup>139</sup> Usher thus links the reason for this specific expedition to a generally applicable reason for expeditions. The explanation is plausible, but probably not the only reason. The greatest benefit for Greece will be more general: if the expedition is successful, the Persians will no longer pose a threat to Greece. Within this falls Usher's explanation of poverty. Isocrates mentions poverty (174): "When the poverty concerning our lives has been taken away, that ends friendships and leads family towards hostility and brings all men into a state of war and strife" (Τῆς ἀπορίας τῆς περὶ τὸν βίον ἡμῶν ἀφαιρεθείσης, ἣ καὶ τὰς ἐταιρείας διαλύει καὶ τὰς συγγενείας εἰς ἔχθραν προάγει καὶ πάντας ἀνθρώπους εἰς πολέμους καὶ στάσεις καθίστησιν). Bringmann clearly explains this citation as follows: "Der zitierte Passus macht deutlich, inwiefern die Kriegsbeute die Eintracht der griechischen Staaten sichert: Persiens Reichtum soll die Not in Griechenland, welche die Ursache für Bürgerkrieg innerhalb der Polis und für Krieg unter den Staaten ist, beseitigen."<sup>140</sup> This explanation agrees with my interpretation that poverty falls within a broader scope of hardship (whilst being one of the main reasons for this hardship).

To expound upon the theme of justice, Isocrates discusses the peace treaty between Greece and the Persian king and its consequences. By use of a proposal Isocrates introduces the topic (175):

Ἀλλὰ γὰρ ἴσως διὰ τὰς συνθήκας ἄξιον ἐπισχεῖν, ἀλλ' οὐκ ἐπειχθῆναι καὶ θᾶπτον ποιήσασθαι τὴν στρατείαν.

But maybe it is fitting to restrain because of the treaty and to not hasten and make the expedition too quickly.

---

<sup>138</sup> Usher 1990, 197.

<sup>139</sup> Usher 1990, 197.

<sup>140</sup> Bringmann 1965, 22.

Based on the whole of the speech, the answer to this indirect question must obviously be negative.<sup>141</sup> By starting the section about justice with this rhetorical question, Isocrates immediately draws his audience into the narrative, obliging the audience to follow his opinion and arguments. His statement is underscored by a lengthy discussion of reasons why it is just to undertake the expedition (175-181), in which Isocrates uses several rhetorical questions to strengthen his argument.

Besides the themes of expediency and justice, possibility is also revisited by Isocrates (185-186),<sup>142</sup> but only after the themes of expediency and justice have been commented upon in a combined manner by Isocrates (182-184).<sup>143</sup> The culmination of rhetorical questions in these paragraphs again underscores Isocrates' argument, for he tries to leave his audience no room to diverge from his opinion (as explained above). Thus, the rhetorical questions are a strong means to lead the audience to the desired opinion. To strengthen this even more, Isocrates answers his questions (which concern the question against whom Greece's expedition must be aimed) as follows (184): "Surely they [i.e. the Persians] are liable to all these [i.e. charges]" (Οὐκοῦν ἐκεῖνοι πᾶσι τούτοις ἔνοχοι τυγχάνουσιν ὄντες).

In one of the last paragraphs before the end of the speech, Isocrates comes back to the theme of panhellenism (185):

Τίς γὰρ οὕτως ἢ νέος ἢ παλαιὸς ῥάθυμὸς ἐστίν, ὅστις οὐ μετασχεῖν βουλήσεται ταύτης τῆς στρατιᾶς τῆς ὑπ' Ἀθηναίων μὲν καὶ Λακεδαιμονίων στρατηγουμένης;

For who is so indifferent, either young or old, that he will not wish to take part in this expedition led by Athenian and Lacedaemonian generals?

Isocrates here asks a rhetorical question that can hardly be answered, with which he aims that his audience cannot refute his argument.<sup>144</sup> What is striking is the fact that Isocrates casually mentions this joint leadership (Athens and Sparta are juxtaposed in the citation), as if it is not debateable and everyone (young and old alike) must agree. However, this refers back to the first part of the speech, in which Isocrates discusses at length why Athens should have the leadership in the expedition. As has been shown, in the first part of the speech seeds were planted of the idea of panhellenism, in which

---

<sup>141</sup> Usher 1990, 197 calls this "rhetorical anticipation [...], by which an argument or objection is proposed in order to rebut it."

<sup>142</sup> Also already briefly in *Paneg.* 182: Ἡμᾶς δ' ὅλης τῆς Ἑλλάδος ὑβριζομένης μηδεμίαν ποιήσασθαι κοινὴν τιμωρίαν, ἐξὸν ἡμῖν εὐχῆς ἄξια διαπράξασθαι. – "[It is shameful] that, when all of Greece is insulted, not a single common revenge is made, while it is possible for us to accomplish the things to be wished." This citation shows the themes of both justice and possibility.

<sup>143</sup> I here diverge from Usher's division of the themes (Usher 1990, 197), who divides as follows: "The themes of expediency (συμφέρον) (173-174), justice (δίκαιον) (175-184) and possibility (δυνατόν) (185-186)." Buchner 1958, 149 goes a step further and divides paragraphs 183-184 in a more detailed manner: "Der ersten (183) geht es nur um das δίκαιον, der zweiter (1. Hälfte von 184) nur um das συμφέρον, der dritten (2. Hälfte von 184: ἐπὶ τίνος δὲ κτλ.) um das δίκαιον und das συμφέρον."

<sup>144</sup> Ueding 1992, 3.447 names this use of the rhetorical question 'elenktisch'.

light this citation must be read. As already shown in numerous instances in this chapter, rhetorical questions are used to underscore Isocrates' argument. This is also the case in the citation above, which is followed by a whole paragraph (186) of rhetorical questions that focus on the praise the victorious Greeks would receive after the expedition.

## Epilogue

The last three paragraphs of the speech (187-189) form an epilogue after the summary of arguments. This epilogue begins with a striking statement (187):

Οὐ τὴν αὐτὴν δὲ τυγχάνω γνώμην ἔχων ἔν τε τῷ παρόντι καιρῷ καὶ περὶ τὰς ἀρχὰς τοῦ λόγου. Τότε μὲν γὰρ ὥμην ἀξίως δυνήσεσθαι τῶν πραγμάτων εἰπεῖν· νῦν δ' οὐκ ἐφικνοῦμαι τοῦ μεγέθους αὐτῶν, ἀλλὰ πολλὰ με διαπέφευγεν ὧν διανοήθην.

I do not have the same opinion in the present time as around the beginning of the speech. For then I thought to be able to speak worthily of the matters; but now I do not reach at their greatness, but many things of which I thought have escaped me.

This citation contains an explicit reference to the first part of the speech, in which Isocrates posits the themes of his speech. It is most likely that Isocrates is referring to paragraph 14, in which he states that his audience should ridicule him if he does not speak worthily of the subject,<sup>145</sup> thus making another reference to the first part of the speech. In the citation above, Isocrates claims that he has not said everything he should have, but he does not expound upon the topics that he has neglected. This is not the first time Isocrates discredits himself (see above). By disregarding his own position in the advocacy of the theme Isocrates emphasises the importance of the argument itself. In addition he here connects the two parts of the speech explicitly.

In the second to last paragraph (188), Isocrates calls for panhellenism once more, since this is what his audience must remember:

Καὶ μὴ μόνον ἀκροατὰς γενομένους ἀπελθεῖν, ἀλλὰ τοὺς μὲν πράττειν δυναμένους παρακαλοῦντας ἀλλήλους πειρᾶσθαι διαλλάττειν τὴν τε πόλιν τὴν ἡμετέραν καὶ τὴν Λακεδαιμονίων.

And [it is necessary] not to leave as mere hearers, but as men able to act, calling upon each other to try to reconcile our city and that of the Lacedaemonians.

---

<sup>145</sup> This is also seen by Usher 1990, 200.

In saying that the cities must be reconciled, Isocrates tries to influence his audience by not naming the city Athens, but calling it "our city". By doing this he ensures his (Athenian) audience feels included in the purpose of the speech, while it makes the contrast with the Spartans sharper. In this way Isocrates again refers back to the first part of the speech, where the strife between Athens and Sparta is evident and Isocrates calls Athens "our city" numerous times. However, what prevails in this citation is the need for panhellenism.

#### Chapter conclusion

In the second part of the speech the seeds that were planted in the first part are now fully developed into the theme of panhellenism. Because Isocrates sees that Athens needs allies for an expedition against Persia, he refers to them and their use in the first part of the speech, to set up the theme of panhellenism that flourishes in the second part of the speech. While the two parts of the speech seem to be separated at first glance, this second part of the speech refers back to the first part numerous times. The main function of some of Isocrates' rhetorical strategies is not to combine the two parts of the speech, because many are used by Isocrates to make his point about panhellenism. To convince his audience of his purpose of setting up a panhellenic expedition against Persia, Isocrates mainly uses rhetorical questions. These greatly help Isocrates to try to draw his audience into his narrative and subscribe to his opinion about the expedition. Other means that contribute to this goal are for example (negative) *exempla* and *amplificatio*, with which Isocrates overwhelms his audience in order that the audience is compelled to follow Isocrates' reasoning.

## Conclusion

In this thesis I have discussed the problem of coherence in Isocrates' *Panegyricus*. This problem entails the two different parts of the speech, paragraphs 1-132 on the one hand and paragraphs 133-189 on the other, which seem to be disconnected on a thematic level. The first part of the speech discusses Athenian virtues at length, stating that it is Athens that should be the leader of a panhellenic expedition against Persia, while the second part of the speech openly advocates panhellenism. This seems like a strange discrepancy, for Isocrates presents a specific goal in his *Panegyricus*, which the whole speech serves, according to him. Isocrates explains his goal as follows, while also identifying (a part of) his method (16-17):

Τῶν γὰρ Ἑλλήνων οἱ μὲν ὑφ' ἡμῖν, οἱ δ' ὑπὸ Λακεδαιμονίοις εἰσὶν· αἱ γὰρ πολιτεῖαι, δι' ὧν οἰκοῦσι τὰς πόλεις, οὕτω τοὺς πλείστους αὐτῶν διειλήφασιν. Ὅστις οὖν οἴεται τοὺς ἄλλους κοινῇ τι πράξειν ἀγαθὸν, πρὶν ἂν τοὺς προεστῶτας αὐτῶν διαλλάξῃ, λίαν ἀπλῶς ἔχει καὶ πόρρω τῶν πραγμάτων ἐστίν. Ἀλλὰ δεῖ τὸν μὴ μόνον ἐπίδειξιν ποιούμενον, ἀλλὰ καὶ διαπράξασθαί τι βουλόμενον ἐκείνους τοὺς λόγους ζητεῖν, οἵτινες τῷ πόλει τούτῳ πείσουσιν ἰσομοιρῆσαι πρὸς ἀλλήλας καὶ τὰς θ' ἡγεμονίας διελέσθαι, καὶ τὰς πλεονεξίας, ἃς νῦν παρὰ τῶν Ἑλλήνων ἐπιθυμοῦσιν αὐταῖς γίνεσθαι, ταύτας παρὰ τῶν βαρβάρων ποιήσασθαι.

For some of the Greeks are under our power, others under that of the Lacedaemonians; for the governments, by which they govern their cities, divide most of them like this. So whoever thinks that the others will do something good together, before he has reconciled their leaders, is all too simple and far removed from things. But it is necessary that he who does not only make a demonstration but wants to accomplish something looks for those words, which will persuade the two cities to share equally with each other and to divide the leaderships, and to procure from the barbarians these advantages, which they now desire to be for themselves from the Greeks.

In this citation, Isocrates announces that he will try to reconcile Athens and Sparta, which are presented as opposites in the first sentence of this citation. Then, Isocrates states that he wants a joint leadership of Athens and Sparta together in an expedition against a mutual enemy: Persia. However, after the introduction the speech is seemingly divided into two parts. In the first part of the speech Isocrates argues that Athens should have the sole command over the Greek forces. This leads to an “awkward tension in the question of leadership of the unified Greeks.”<sup>146</sup> Nevertheless, the ultimate goal of the *Panegyricus* is made clear in the citation above: the two cities must be reconciled in order to be able to set up a successful expedition against Persia, to rid Greece of Persian danger once and for all. As enumerated in the introduction to this thesis, various scholars have touched upon this

---

<sup>146</sup> Papillon 2004, 26.

seeming discrepancy, but none of them have found a satisfying answer as to why the speech is set up in this way. The most plausible observation up till now is by Too, who thinks the discrepancy can be attributed to Isocrates' struggle between being both Athenian and Greek. This nevertheless is a sound observation, because I believe that Isocrates shows both his Greek identity as well as his Athenian identity. This can also be seen in the citation above, where Isocrates presents himself as an Athenian with the word ἡμῖν. While being an Athenian Isocrates still advocates panhellenism, so Athenian and Greek identity are not entirely compatible for Isocrates.

By researching the two parts of the speech, I have observed that both parts refer to one another. This is attained through the use of several rhetorical strategies. There are, however, rhetorical features that establish a connection between the two parts of the speech, but some also merely function to underscore Isocrates' argument within one part of the speech. An example of the latter is Isocrates' frequent use of rhetorical questions. At multiple places in the second part of the speech Isocrates makes extensive use of this rhetorical feature, uttering question after question, sometimes filling more than a paragraph solely with rhetorical questions. All of the questions are supposed to force the audience to comply with the reasoning of the argument, whether that is a single point Isocrates tries to make or the acceptance of the panhellenic expedition. In the first part of the speech, the most important rhetorical strategy that Isocrates employs is the use of *exempla*. These serve to underscore Isocrates' advocacy of Athens as a leader of a panhellenic expedition. He uses these *exempla* to present the situation as he thinks it should be in the present, because the *exempla* show how in the past things have gone awry for the Athenians or Greeks in general. By using this rhetorical strategy, Isocrates tries to make sure that his audience does not have a choice but to agree with his reasoning.

However, Isocrates not only employs rhetorical strategies within both parts of the speech, but more significantly also to connect the two parts. These are the key to answering my main question whether any connection between the parts can be found. I am aware of the fact that a modern sense of unity is different from the ancient view, when it was normal that a written or spoken piece consisted of multiple subjects.<sup>147</sup> However, I feel that there must be a sense of unity or conformity in the *Panegyricus*, because Isocrates himself states the purpose of his speech, as cited above, as a single goal. The explanation I offer for this discrepancy is that, while praising Athens' abilities as a leader, in the first part of the speech numerous seeds are planted by Isocrates to subtly introduce the theme of panhellenism already, that will come to full fruition in the second part of the speech, in which Isocrates also refers back to the first part. On the other hand, the second part of the speech refers back to the first. Both of these aspects I will illustrate with several examples (which are also discussed in chapter

---

<sup>147</sup> Heath 1989, 1-11.



one and two). An illustrative example of a planted seed of the theme of panhellenism is Isocrates' use of the myth of Demeter. In this myth Isocrates describes how Demeter became well-disposed towards the Athenians and gave them important benefits, which afterwards Athens did not keep from other city-states in Greece. Therefore, as Isocrates presents it, numerous city-states have flourished because of Athens' gift, wherefore they must acknowledge their dependency on Athens. Nevertheless, Isocrates cannot overstate this dependency and insult the other city-states, because he needs them to join in the panhellenic expedition against Persia. More examples of Isocrates planting seeds of the theme of panhellenism in the first part of the speech include the first sentence of the speech, in which Isocrates refers to panhellenic events. This is striking, because in this way Isocrates makes sure that panhellenism is the first thing that his audience hears, openly addressing the theme and thus creating a sense of togetherness at the start of his speech. Less out in the open the theme of panhellenism can be detected in the famous paragraph 50, where Isocrates presents his views on Greekness. However, Isocrates being an Athenian, what it means to be Greek is mirrored to Athenian values. Nevertheless this passage clearly includes the whole of Greece (in any case anyone who complies with the Athenian education) and can thus be rendered a hint to the theme of panhellenism. Within the theme of war examples can also be found. In paragraph 83 Isocrates mentions the Trojan war, which was a panhellenic expedition. Isocrates compares the conduct of the Greeks in the Persian war to this earliest panhellenic war, which implies that in Isocrates' time, Greece must once again fight together against the enemy. This idea is uttered again a few paragraphs later (90-91), in which Athens and Sparta jointly fight against Persia. All of these examples can thus be seen as seeds of the theme of panhellenism that are planted by Isocrates, in order that the first part of the speech is not disconnected from the second part. To underscore the connection between the two parts, the second part of the speech also refers to the first part. Thematically, the theme of war is picked up again in paragraphs 140-149, in which Isocrates describes the Persian war from the point of view of the Persians, as opposed to that of the Greeks in the first part of the speech. The point of view of the Persians is continued with paragraph 150, in which Isocrates describes the character and organisation of the Persian people, referring to paragraph 50 of the first part of the speech mentioned above. In my opinion the most striking example can be found in paragraph 170. Here, Isocrates explains that he is puzzled by the current leaders, and he uses the word *θαυμάζω*, which is a direct link to the first sentence of the speech, where Isocrates uses the word *ἐθαύμασα*, because these are the only instances of the verb in the first person singular. With this reference Isocrates creates a circle, because he refers to the first part of the speech, to a sentence that is about panhellenism, just like the second part of the speech. In this way this last example beautifully illustrates the way in which the two parts of the *Panegyricus* are connected.

It is inevitable that there is still friction between the two parts (especially in our modern opinion), but with this thesis I have shown that the discrepancy between the two parts of the speech

is slighter than it appears at first sight. By using the rhetorical strategies enumerated above, Isocrates manages to subtly connect the two parts of the speech. Therefore, the *Panegyricus* can be seen as contributing to Isocrates' stated goal (as mentioned above): a panhellenic expedition against Persia.

## Bibliography

- Allen, T.W., Monro, D.B. (eds.) (1920), *Homeri Opera. Tomus I. Iliadis Libros I-XII Continens*, Oxford.
- Assmann, J. (2011), *Cultural Memory and Early Civilization. Writing, Remembrance, and Political Imagination*, Cambridge.
- Beloch, K.J. (1912), *Griechische Geschichte. [Erster Band. Die Zeit vor den Perserkriegen. Erste Abteilung]*, Strassburg.
- Benoit, W.L. (1984), 'Isocrates on Rhetorical Education', *Communication Education* 33, 109-119.
- Benoit, W.L. (1990), 'Isocrates and Aristotle on Rhetoric', *Rhetoric Society Quarterly* 20, 251-260.
- Bringmann, K. (1965), *Studien zu den politischen Ideen des Isokrates*, Göttingen.
- Buchner, E. (1958), *Der Panegyrikos des Isokrates. Eine historisch-philologische Untersuchung*, Wiesbaden.
- Cartledge, P. (1993), *The Greeks. A Portrait of Self and Others*, Oxford.
- Cartledge, P. (1997), 'Historiography and Ancient Greek Self-Definition', in Bently, M. (ed), *Companion to Historiography*, London, 23-42.
- Cole, T. (1991), *The Origins of Rhetoric in Ancient Greece*, Baltimore.
- Cubitt, G. (2007), *History and Memory*, Manchester.
- Drerup, E. (1895), 'Epikritisches zum Panegyrikus des Isokrates', *Philologus* 54, 636-653.
- Droysen, J.G. (1836), *Geschichte der Nachfolger Alexanders*, Hamburg.
- Fentress, J., Wickham, C. (1992), *Social Memory*, Oxford.
- Ford, A. (1993), 'The Price of Art in Isocrates. Formalism and the Escape from Politics', in Poulakos, T. (ed.), *Rethinking the History of Rhetoric. Multidisciplinary Essays on the Rhetorical Tradition*, Boulder, 31-52.
- Grethlein, J. (2010), *The Greeks and their Past. Poetry, Oratory and History in the Fifth Century BCE*, Cambridge.
- Grote, G. (1846), *A History of Greece. Volume II*, London.
- Guthrie, W.K.C. (1971), *The Sophists*, Cambridge.
- Halbwachs, M. (1992), *On Collective Memory. [Edited, Translated, and with an Introduction by Lewis A. Coser]*, Chicago.
- Hall, J.M. (1997), *Ethnic Identity in Greek Antiquity*, Cambridge.
- Haskins, E.V. (2004a), *Logos and Power in Isocrates and Aristotle*, Columbia.
- Haskins, E.V. (2004b), 'Logos and Power in Sophistical and Isocratean Rhetoric', in Depew, D., Poulakos, T. (eds.), *Isocrates and Civic Education*, Austin, 84-103.
- Heath, M. (1989), *Unity in Greek Poetics*, Oxford.
- Heuss, A. (1946), 'Die archaische Zeit Griechenlands als geschichtliche Epoche', *Antike und Abendland* 2, 26-62.

- Hudson-Williams, H.L. (1949), 'Isocrates and Recitations', *Classical Quarterly* 43, 65-69.
- Hudson-Williams, H.L. (1951), 'Political Speeches in Athens', *Classical Quarterly* 1, 68-73.
- Isaac, B. (2004), *The Invention of Racism in Classical Antiquity*, Princeton.
- Jaeger, W. (1959), *Paideia. Die Formung des griechischen Menschen. [Dritter Band]*, Berlin.
- Jarratt, S. (1991), *Rereading the Sophists. Classical Rhetoric Refigured*, Carbondale.
- Jüthner, J. (1923), *Hellenen und Barbaren. Aus der Geschichte des Nationalbewußtseins*, Leipzig.
- Kennedy, G.A. (1963), *The Art of Persuasion in Greece. A History of Rhetoric. [Volume I]*, Princeton.
- Kessler, J. (1911), *Isokrates und die panhellenische Idee*, Paderborn.
- Konstan, D. (2001), 'To Hellenikon Ethnos. Ethnicity and the Construction of Ancient Greek Identity', in Malkin, I. (ed.), *Ancient Perceptions of Greek Ethnicity*, Washington, 29-50.
- Lausberg, H. (2008), *Handbuch der literarischen Rhetorik. Eine Grundlegung der Literaturwissenschaft*, Stuttgart.
- Liddell, H.G., Scott, R. (1968), *A Greek-English Lexicon*, Oxford.
- Mandilaras, B.G. (ed.) (2003a), *Isocrates. Opera Omnia. [Volume II]*, München.
- Mandilaras, B.G. (ed.) (2003b), *Isocrates. Opera Omnia. [Volume III]*, München.
- Meyer, E. (1902), *Geschichte des Alterthums. [Fünfter Band. Das Perserreich und die Griechen. Viertes Buch. Der Ausgang der Griechischen Geschichte]*, Stuttgart.
- Morgan, K. (2004), 'The Education of Athens. Politics and Rhetoric in Isocrates and Plato', in Depew, D., Poulakos, T. (eds.), *Isocrates and Civic Education*, Austin, 125-154.
- Norlin, G. (1954), *Isocrates. [Volume I]*, Cambridge Mass.
- Papillon, T.L. (2004), *Isocrates II*, Austin.
- Perlman, S. (1976), 'Panhellenism, the Polis, and Imperialism', *Historia. Zeitschrift für Alte Geschichte* 25, 1-30.
- Pernot, L. (2005), *Rhetoric in Antiquity*, Washington.
- Poulakos, J. (2004), 'Rhetoric and Civic Education. From the Sophists to Isocrates', in Depew, D., Poulakos, T. (eds.), *Isocrates and Civic Education*, Austin, 69-83.
- Poulakos, T. (1997), *Speaking for the Polis. Isocrates' Rhetorical Education*, Columbia.
- Poulakos, T. (2004), 'Isocrates' Civic Education and the Question of Doxa', in Depew, D., Poulakos, T. (eds.), *Isocrates and Civic Education*, Austin, 44-65.
- Raymond, J. de (1986), 'Isocrate et le Langage', in Joly, H., *Philosophie du Langage et Grammaire dans l'Antiquité*, Grenoble, 153-163.
- Romilly, J. de (1958), 'Eunoia in Isocrates or the Political Importance of Creating Good Will', *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 78, 92-101.
- Rosenbloom, D. (2011), 'The Panhellenism of Athenian Tragedy', in Carter, D.M., *Why Athens? The Reappraisal of Tragic Politics*, Oxford, 353-382.

- Sandys, J.E. (ed.) (1899), *Isocrates. Ad Demonium et Panegyricus*, London.
- Stier, H.E. (1945), *Grundlagen und Sinn der griechischen Geschichte*, Stuttgart.
- Timmerman, D.M. (1998), 'Isocrates' Competing Conceptualization of Philosophy', *Philosophy and Rhetoric* 31, 145-159.
- Too, Y.T. (1995), *The Rhetoric of Identity in Isocrates*, Cambridge.
- Ueding, G. (1992), *Historisches Wörterbuch der Rhetorik. [Band 1. A-Bib]*, Darmstadt.
- Ueding, G. (1992), *Historisches Wörterbuch der Rhetorik. [Band 2. Bie-Eul]*, Darmstadt.
- Ueding, G. (1992), *Historisches Wörterbuch der Rhetorik. [Band 3. Eup-Hör]*, Darmstadt.
- Usher, S. (ed.) (1974), *Dionysius of Halicarnassus. Critical Essays. [Volume I]*, Cambridge Mass.
- Usher, S. (1990), *Greek Orators III. Isocrates. Panegyricus and To Nicocles*, Oxford.
- Vlassopoulos, K. (2013), *Greeks and Barbarians*, Cambridge.
- Walbank, F.W. (1951), 'The Problem of Greek Nationality', *Phoenix* 5, 41-60.
- Welles, B.C. (1966), 'Isocrates' View of History', in Wallach, L. (ed.), *The Classical Tradition. Literary and Historical Studies in Honor of Harry Caplan*, Ithaca, 3-25.
- Wilamowitz-Moellendorf, U. von (1893), *Aristoteles und Athen. [Volume II]*, Cambridge.