Isocrates' *Encomium of Helen* and the New Myth in the Dialogues of Plato

What was only announced in the proemium to the Helen*, namely a strict adherence to the concepts of Socratic and Platonic philosophy, was fully applied to the main body of the encomium, with Socrates' sharp critique of the old myth, along with his depiction of the successive forms of decline of an ideal, aristocratic type of government in the* Republic*, providing a guiding principle to the orator in his noble effort to elaborate on the key concepts of the philosophy of Socrates and Plato. The very fact that in the main body of his work Isocrates so heavily relied on the new myth, as used in Socrates' discourses on love in the* Phaedrus *and the* Symposium*, speaks volumes about the unity of the encomium and its philosophical aspect as well.*

Introduction: Isocrates' Method and Socrates' Ideas on Portraiture

In order to fully comprehend what has long been a subject of dispute, namely the unity of Isocrates' *Encomium of Helen*, it was necessary to shed light on many puzzles appearing in its proemium, an issue dealt with in our previous study[1] to which the present one is a sequel. The very fact that Isocrates' attitudes towards relations between rhetoric and philosophy in the proemium to the *Helen* – in which he, albeit enigmatically, declared himself a follower of Socratic-Platonic philosophy, adhering to principles of the new rhetoric in the *Phaedrus* – were consequently applied to the main body of the encomium speaks volumes about the immanent coherence of his work.

How faithfully Isocrates adhered to the aforementioned principles in terms of their practical application to a wide variety of literary and rhetorical genres can be inferred from the fact that the idea of supplanting the old myth through a new one[2] essentially based on the postulates of ethical philosophy, as advocated

[1]"Sophistic, Eristic and Philosophy in Isocrates' Proemium to *Helen*," *Athens Journal of Philosophy* 4 (1924). https://doi.org/10.30958/ajphil.

[2]According to B. Manuwald, "Platon als Mythenerzähler" in M. Janka, C. Schäfer (eds.), *Platon als Mythologe: Neue Interpretationen zu den Mythen in Platons Dialogen* (Darmstadt: WBG 2002), 58–59, the new myths in the dialogues of Plato can be divided into two groups on the basis of a purely formal criterion such as the narrator and his attitude towards the subject matter of the narrative, i.e. myth. The myths recounted not by Socrates but by other participants in the dialogues make up the first group consisting of Protagoras' myth of the origins of living things (*Protagoras*), Aristophanes' myth about eros as mutual love endeavouring to combine two to one and heal the human sore (*Symposium*), Diotima's myth of Eros (*Symposium*), mythical eschatology recounted by the Eleatic Stranger in the *Statesman*, eschatology of the same kind, depicted by Timaeus in the dialogue named after him and Athenian's mythical eschatology dealing with divine justice and destiny of souls in the *Laws*. The myths recounted by Socrates himself belong to the second group that can be divided into two subgroups depending on whether Socrates himself heard them retold by others, as was the case with mythical eschatologies in the dialogues *Gorgia*s, *Timaeus*, *Phaedo* and *Republi*c or tells them to his interlocutors by presenting them as his own creation, as is otherwise the case with myth of the winged chariot in the *Phaedrus*. For a thorough summary of the myths, cf. T. Kobusch, "Die Wiederkehr des Mythos: Zur Funktion des Mythos in Platons Denken und in der Philosophie der Gegenwart" in G. Binder, B. Effe (eds.), *Mythos: Erzählende Weltdeutung im Spannungsfeld von Ritual, Geschichte und Rationalität* (Trier: Ruhr Universität Bochum 1990 – *Bochumer Altertumswissenschaftliches*

for by Socrates in the third and fourth book of the *Republic* (386a–445e), was fully applied to the encomium, with the new myth thus assuming characteristics of a major strategic factor for literary creativity and state-building,[3] as we will see shortly.

In full accordance with Socrates' sharp critique of the old myth and its use in poetry, Isocrates decided to supplant the old myth of Helen through a new one and thus faced the biggest challenge consisting in selecting from the legend of Helen as a glorious and yet shameless woman[4] all her positive character traits, no matter how few in number they were, so as to be in a position to not only fuse it all into one harmonious whole but also to sing a hymn to so controversial a women execrated by the poets as the cause of countless woes to the Greeks. It has been impossible to achieve this specific aim in mind without calling upon philosophy for help, which explains special importance attached to it in the proemium as well as Isocrates' express intent of identifying his own rhetoric with philosophy in the *Antidosis.*[5] In saying that it would have been impossible to achieve this specific aim in mind without calling upon philosophy for help, we mean above all the fact that, in full accordance with the method of Socratic-Platonic philosophy,[6] it was necessary to have first created an idealized image of Helen before bringing a very few number of her positive character traits that can be found in myth and legend into harmony with the mentioned idealized image, which in itself, in Isocrates' view, best serves compelling national and educational interests.[7]

As this was an impossible undertaking, Isocrates had to turn toward philosophy and to regard Helen as the embodiment of the idea of beauty on earth, so as to be in a position to sweep all her negative character traits under the carpet

Colloquium 2), 13–32 and T. A. Szlezák, *Platon lesen* (Stuttgart-Bad Cannstatt 1993). For the full and detailed explanation of the myths, cf. K. A. Morgan, *Myth and Philosophy from the Presocratics to Plato* (Cambridge: University Press 2000), K. F. Moors, *Platonic myth: An Introductory Study* (Washington DC: Klinck Memorial Library 1982) and G. Cerri, *Platone sociologo della communicazione* (Milano: Mondadori 1991).

[3]The very fact that Isocrates freely paraphrases the theses put forward by Socrates in his depiction of the successive forms of decline of an ideal, aristocratic type of government in the eight and ninth book of the *Republic* can serve as proof of this, as will be shown below.

4. Cf. Aeschylus, *Agamemnon* 689 where she is characterized as "Ship's hell" (˜lšnaj), "Man's hell" (˜l£ndroj) and "City's hell" (˜lšptolij).

[5]41, 50, 147, 162, 170, 175, 176, 181, 183, 195, 205, 209, 215, 243, 247, 250, as opposed to 8 instances in which the author identifies as sophist (148, 155, 168, 197, 203, 220, 235, 237). In this connection, it is to be noted that what Isocrates means by Sophistic is Socrates' identification of his own philosophy with a noble and true-born art of sophistry in the *Sophist* (231b: *genei gennaia sophistike*).

[6]What is being referred to here are *synagoge* (perceiving the scattered particulars and bringing them together in one idea) and *diairesis* (dividing again by classes what was naturally brought together in one idea), as advocated for by Socrates in the *Phaedrus* (265d–e).

[7]Cf. *Helen,* 6, where his strong dislike for the exponents of ancient sophistic and eristic comes to expression on account of the fact that they care nothing at all for either private or public affairs and "take most pleasure in those discourses which are of no practical service in any particular" (toÚtoij m£lista ca…rousi tîn lÒgwn o*f* mhdὲn prÕj ἓn cr»simoi tugc£nousin Ôntej). In this connection, it should be noted that all translations of the passages from the *Helen* are by L. van Hook (LCL).

because, among other things, the Beauty itself and thus Helen as its earthly incarnation had already been granted a status of the good of special relevance for the aforementioned national and educational interests under the influence of the theory of beauty, expounded by Socrates in both the *Phaedrus*[8] and the *Symposium.* Thus the aforementioned theories of beauty along with Socrates' sharp criticism of the old myth of Theseus and Peirithous attempting dreadful rapes of Helen in the third book of Plato's *Republic* (391c–d) provided the starting point for Isocrates' shaping a new myth of Helen, open for other concepts and ideas which could only be derived from philosophy, as will be shown below.

In order to achieve this specific aim in mind, Isocrates needed helpful practical guidance which can only be provided by the legend of Socrates in Xenophon's *Memorabilia.* What is being referred to here are Socrates' conversations with the major exponents of fine and plastic arts of his own age, Parrhasius the painter (3, 10, 1–5) and Cleito the sculptor (3, 10, 6–15), with the philosopher's explanation of Parrhasius' art having special relevance for unravelling secrets of Isocrates' method essentially based on *montage*, as will be shown below. It is Socrates' view of Parrhasius' pictorial technique that Isocrates was particularly receptive to because, among other things, he could create an idealized image of Helen only through the application of the mentioned painter's technique to literature, namely a technique that was lauded by Socrates in Xenophon's *Memorabilia*, as will be seen shortly. Truth be told, Isocrates, as demonstrated in our previous study,[9] used this same method in the proemium, the only difference being that the selection of patterns for the main body of the encomium was, for the reasons mentioned, considerably more difficult due to, among other things, the fact that he was presented with a greater challenge in the latter.

Socrates explains the idealism of Parrhasius' art by pointing to his method of *montage* consisting in carefully selecting from among many single persons the most beautiful parts of their body and elaborately combining them into a harmonious whole[10] as a necessary prerequisite for making an idealistic portrait and,

[8]What is being referred to here is the myth of the winged chariot (246b–256e) and especially 251a–b.

[9]Especially the second and the third section entitled "Isocrates' most Cherished Ideals against the Background of Zeno's Dichotomies and Stilpo's Eristic" and "Isocrates' Play on Contrasts and the Principles of the New Rhetoric in the *Phaedrus*."

[10]*Memorabilia*, 3, 10, 2: kaˆ m¾n t£ ge kal¦ e‡dh ¢fomoioàntej, ™peid¾ oÙ ·£dion ˜nˆ ¢nqrèpJ perituce‹n ¥mempta p£nta œconti, ™k pollîn sun£gontej t¦ ™x ˜k£stou k£llista oÛtwj Óla t¦ sèmata kal¦ poie‹te fa…nesqe. Lucian was so impressed with the conversation between Socrates and Parrhasius that he could not but use it as a basis for his dialogues, *Essays in Portraiture* (*Imagines*) and *Essays in Portraiture Defended* (*Pro imaginibus*). Painting a portrait of Panthia with words is represented in the former (17) as if the greatest exponents of fine and plastic arts shared the task of portraying with each other and, consequently, shaped that part of her figure in the elaboration of which they were deemed peerless. Panthia's reaction to her portrait (*Essays in Portraiture Defended,* 10) deserves to be mentioned in this connection, as evident from her words that she, while commending both an artist's skill in modelling and the idea of the portraits, does not recognize the likeness and is not worthy of such compliments, not by a great deal, nor was any other mere woman. Therefore she absolves the authors (Polystratus, Lycinus = Lucian) from honouring her thus, and pays her homage to their patterns (*archetypa*) and models (*paradeigmata*). It should also be noted that, along with Polygnotus, Euphranor, Aetion, Apelles, Praxiteles, Alcamenus, Pheidias and

consequently, an idealistic art of special relevance for the aforementioned compelling national and educational interests, on which he had set his heart.[11] That part of the discussion between Socrates and Parrhasius, with the great philosopher giving the painter advice as to how he should above all aspire to represent the invisible in his paintings such as the states of mind, as reflected in the face and the attitudes of the body (whether still or in motion) of a truly beautiful, good and lovable character,[12] could hardly escape Isocrates' attention.

Socrates' advice regarding the importance of representing the invisible in portraiture proved invaluable to Isocrates, in so far as it offered a perfect solution for the making of his own poetics, as is evident from the fact that he was very well aware of his own shortcomings when it comes to creatively discovering ways in which to elaborate on the concepts of Socrates and Plato's philosophy[13] as a necessary prerequisite for elevating his own rhetoric to the heights of philosophy, as expected by Socrates in the *Phaedrus* (279a). In other words, he was forced to adopt Parrhasius' technique and to select, instead of the most beautiful parts of the body, chosen from among many truly good and lovable persons, the most beautiful concepts of the philosophy of Socrates and Plato so as to paraphrase them in such a way that makes them almost unrecognizable.

Simply put, Isocrates relocated Socrates' ideal about the need to represent the invisible in portraiture from the painting to another medium such as literature, as a consequence of which the ideal itself had to suffer distortion, or rather inversion, in so far as Isocrates, instead of representing the invisible in art, was hell bent on making his own models and patterns invisible, quite contrary to his followers in the

Lysias (*Essays in Portraiture*, 6–7), Socrates is represented as an exemplary painter and included in the canon of visual arts, created by Lucian in the aforementioned work (17): "We shall require many models […] and one, like herself (scil. Panthia), Ionic, painted and wrought by Aeschines, the friend of Socrates, and by Socrates himself, of all craftsmen the truest copyists because they painted with love," as translated by A. M Harmon (LCL).

[11] *Memorabilia,* 3, 10, 5 (Socrates to Parrhasius): "Now which do you think the more pleasing sight, one whose features and bearing reflect a beautiful and good and lovable character, or one who is the embodiment of what is ugly and depraved and hateful?," as translated by E. C. Marchant (LCL). Cf. Aelian's account (*Historical Miscellany*, 4, 4) of a law at Thebes which commands artificers, both painters and sculptors, to make the figures as good as may be, i.e. to create an idealized image of them. This law menaced to those who mould or paint them not well a pecuniary mulct.

[12] Ibid., 3, 10, 3–5 (Socrates to Parrhasius): tÕ piqanètaton kaˆ ¼diston kai filikètaton kaˆ poqeinÒtaton kaˆ ™rasmiètaton ¢pomime‹sqe tÁj yucÁj Ãqoj; À oÙdè mimhtÒn ™sti touto; [...] ¢ll¦ m¾n kaˆ tÕ megaloprepšj te kaˆ ™leuqšrion kaˆ tÕ tapeinÒn te kaˆ ¢neleÚqeron [...] kaˆ di¦ toà prosèpou kaˆ di¦ tîn schm£twn kaˆ ˜stètwn kaˆ kinoumšnwn ¢nqrèpwn diafa…nei.

[13] Isocrates seems to have shared Socrates' critical attitudes towards his overall abilities in the *Euthydemus* (304d–306c), where he is described as the border-ground between philosopher and politician, instead of being regarded as a philosopher.

period of the Second Sophistic who openly pointed[14] or made clear allusions to their role models.[15]

What we deal with here is the deepest enigma in so far as the researcher is forced to draw far-reaching conclusions about Isocrates' method and his conception of Sophistic from the slightest allusions in the text of his encomium. It is this very wording ("drawing conclusions from the slightest indications") that we encounter in Philostratus' *Imagines*[16] or, to be more precise, in his description of the painting representing the Titan Atlas sustaining the burden of heavens and Heracles who earnestly desires his task, to judge from his state of mind, as indicated by the eager look on his face, the club thrown on the ground, and his hands that beg for the task.[17] Socrates' attitudes to the painting are also reflected in the description of the exhausted figure of Atlas showing, according to Philostratus, high degree of skill, in so far as the shadows on his crouching figure run into one another, and do not darken any of the projecting parts but they produce light on the parts that are hollow and retreating.[18] This description of the painting technique applied to the depiction of the exhausted figure of Atlas proved very valuable to us in so far as it provided the more suitable analogy for Isocrates' approach applied to the encomium and characterized by the shadows emerging from his assertions and formulations.

What we come across in Philostratus' description of another painting surpassed all expectations, in so far as the above mentioned Socratic ideal about

[14]Cf. Dio's assertion in his *Eighteenth Discourse* (*On Training for Public Speaking*), 13 that no branch of literature "could possibly be pleasing to the ear if it lacked the Socratic grace, just as no meat without salt will be gratifying to the taste," as translated by J. W. Cohoon (LCL). Cf. also his *Sixtieth Discourse* (*Nessus or Deianeira,* 10) in which Dio fully equates his own method with that of Socrates, which in itself speaks volumes about his attitudes towards oratory, his loyalty to the philosopher's testament in the *Alcibiades* and, above all, his adherence to the new myth (kaˆ g¦r ™ke‹noi (scil. koropl£qoi) tÚpon tin¦ paršcontej Đpo‹on ¨n phlÕn e„j toàton ™mb£lwsin, Ómoion tù tÚpJ tÕ e‡doj ¢poteloàsin: kaˆ tîn filosÒfwn ½dh tinèj toioàtoi gegÒnasin, éste Đpo‹on ¨n màqon À lÒgon l£bwsin ›lkontej kaˆ pl£ttontej kat¦ t¾n aØtîn di£noian çfšlimon kaˆ filosof…v pršponta ¢pšdeixan: oŒon d¾ m£lista ¢koÚomen Swkr£th genšssqai).

[15]Cf. Aristides' second oration *A Reply to Plato: In Defense of Oratory*, 434 in which he dons the mask of pretence by presenting his own palinode as Plato's, falsely implying that it is the latter and not himself that *here* (scil. in the myth retold by Socrates at the close of the *Gorgias*) clearly defines as the champion of truthful speech the thing that he *there* (scil. in the main body of the dialogue) called flattery, which gave rise to the assertion that he himself is now 'saying the same thing as Plato about oratory although the people may have thought that he was disagreeing," as translated by M. Trapp (LCL).

[16]2, 20, 2: gšgraptai dè Đ mèn ¢peirhkèj, æj *f*drîti sumb£llesqai, ĐpÒsoj ¢p' aÙtoà st£zei, brac…onÒj te xune‹nai tršmontoj {...]. The meaning "drawing conclusions from the slightest indications" is derived from the context in so far as the sweat trickling from Atlas and his trembling hand can be regarded as being the slightest indications of Atlas' labour. The Titan is represented as exhausted, to judge by all the sweat that trickles from him and to infer from his trembling arm.

[17]Ibid.: dhlo‹ dè toàto ¼ te Đrm¾ toà prosèpou kaˆ tÕ ·Òpalon katabeblhmšnon kaˆ a*f* ce‹rej ¢paitoàsai tÕn «qlon.

[18]Ibid.: a*f* dè toà "Atlantoj skiaˆ sof…aj prÒsw: oØtwsˆ g¦r toà sunizhkÒtoj sump…ptous… te ¢ll»laij kaˆ oÙdèn tîn ™kkeimšnwn ™piqoloàsin, ¢ll¦ fij ™rg£zontai perˆ t¦ ko‹l£ te kaˆ e„sšconta.

the need to represent the invisible in portraiture such as emotions and feelings, is fully reflected in it. What is being referred to here is the description of the painting entitled *Ariadne*, in which it is said that there are countless characteristics of Ariadne's lover Dionysus for those who wish to represent him in painting and sculpture by depicting which even approximately the artist has captured the god,[19] in so far as the ivy clusters, a horn just springing from the temples and a leopard are the clear marks, or rather symbols of the god.[20] But what is very difficult to achieve is a skill to characterize Dionysus by love alone,[21] i.e. by something beyond picture, such as his amorous feelings at the moment when he, drunk with love, comes to the side of Ariadne,[22] something that can be accomplished only by conceptual or symbolist painter.

Thus we have found yet another useful analogy as it enabled us to better understand Isocrates' technique developed for concealing his patterns, a technique that is so complex and enigmatic that it might be compared to the efforts aimed at painting Dionysus' amorous feelings on canvas. It is indicative that Philostratus uses the terms *symbolon*,[23] s*ymballesthai*[24] and *syneinai*[25] to describe the mentioned painting technique in the *Imagines*, thus suggesting that he declared himself to be the proponent of symbolism not only in art but also in literature.

How much popular Socrates' ideas on portraiture were in the period of the Second Sophistic can be inferred from the three instances of their visualisation in Lucian's *Essays in Portraiture* (*Imagines*),[26] *Essays in Portraiture Defended* (*Pro imaginibus*)[27] and *The Dead Come to Life or the Fisherman* (*Piscator*), with the last mentioned one having a special significance for us due to one of the author's very

[19]*Imagines*, 1, 15, 2: oÙd' ¢pÒcrh tÕn zwgr£fon ™paine‹n, ¢f' ïn k¨n ¥lloj ™paino‹to: ·£dion g¦r ¤panti kal¾n mὲn t¾n 'Ari£dnhn gr£fein, kalÕn dὲ tÕn Qhsša, DionÚsou te mur…a f£smata to‹j gr£fein À pl£ttein boulomšnoij, ïn k¨n mikroà tÚcV tij, Èrhke tÕn qeÒn. All translations of the passages from Philostratrus' *Imagines* are by A. Fairbanks (LCL).

[20]Ibid.: kaˆ g¦r o*f* kÒrumboi stšfanoj Ôntej DionÚsou gnèrisma, k¨n tÕ dhmioÚrghma faÚlwj œcei, kaˆ kšraj ØpekfuÒmenon tîn krot£fwn DiÒnuson dhlo‹ kaˆ p£rdalij Øpekfainomšnh aâ toà qeoà sÚmbolon [...].

[21]Ibid.: […] ¢ll' oátÒj ge Đ DiÒnusoj ™k mÒnou toà ™r©n gšgraptai.

[22]Ibid.: […] ¡lourg…di te ste…laj ˜autÕn kaˆ t¾n kefal¾n ·Òdoij ¢nq…saj œrcetai par¦ t¾n 'Ari£dnhn Đ DiÒnusoj, meqÚwn œrwti [...].

[23]Cf. n. 20. It is worth noting that in the Greek novel *ainigma* and *drama* are used as synonyms for *symbolon*, as can be inferred from Macrembolites' romance *Hysmine and Hysminias* (2, 8, 2) in which they are also used in a purely pictorial context: œcw sou, tecn‹ta, tÕ a‡nigma, œcw sou tÕ dr©ma. Cf. also Aelian's account in his *Historical Miscellany* (*Varia historia*), 14, 15 of the painter Pauson's pictorial technique, in which it is compared to the discourses of Socrates. The painter being desired to make a picture of a horse tumbling on his back, drew him running. And when he who had bespoken the picture was angry that he had not drawn it according to his directions, the painter said: "Turn it the other way, and the horse which now runneth will roll upon his back," as translated by N. G. Wilson (LCL). So Socrates, in Aelian's view, did not discourse downright, but if his discourses were turned, they appeared very right. For he was unwilling to gain hatred of those to whom he discoursed and for that reason delivered the things enigmatically and obliquely.

[24]Cf. n. 16. Cf. also *Imagines* 1, 1, 1 (Scamander): sumb£lwmen Ó ti noe‹.

[25]Cf. n. 16.

[26]Cf. n. 10.

[27]10.

honest admissions that what really matters the most in literary creativity is not so much his method of *montage* as the philosophical concepts on which it is based (6),[28] which in itself might explain why Isocrates turned toward philosophy and identified his own rhetoric with it.

What distinguishes Isocrates from the major exponents of the Second Sophistic is his strong inclination for hiding his patterns and models,[29] something that was an object of interest for almost all intellectuals of his own age, as can be inferred from Diogenes Laertius' assertion (IV 2) that Speusippus was the first to unravel and divulge the secrets of his art. And what kind of secret that was can be inferred from the fact that it was very hard, even through the application of, so to speak, microscopic technique, to find out what Isocrates actually meant by 'philosophy,'[30] to say nothing about other secrets of his art including his allusive method.

Paradoxically enough, it turned out that Isocrates managed to achieve all the essential goals by using of a simple method of reducing his models and patterns beyond all recognition, so as to be in a position to elaborate on and paraphrase them, in full accordance with his message conveyed at the close of the encomium, saying that he looks upon his own work as an ideal model for others to compete with him within the framework of the same conceptions and ideas (69),[31] just as he himself made efforts to "compete" with the concepts of Socratic and Platonic philosophy, as will be seen in more detail below.

Isocrates was very well aware that a great success in literature could hardly be achieved through the use of this simple method unless the main body of the encomium follows a multi-layered structure being similar to that already used in the proemium. That is the reason why the main body of encomium follows the aforementioned structure, with the encomia of Helen, Theseus and Paris interweaving, mutually enriching each other and thus providing new meaning to an ancient legend, in full accordance with Philostratus description of the dual nature of the centaur, in which it is said that a horse and the human body are combined in such wise as to elude the eye of the observer who should try to

[28] aÙt¦ goàn ¤ fhmi taàta, pÒqen ¥lloqen À par' ¹mîn (scil. filosÒfwn) labën kaˆ kat¦ t¾n mšlittan ¢panqis£menoj ™pide…knumi to‹j ¢nqrèpoij; o*f* dè ™painoàsi kaˆ gnwr…zousin ›kaston tÕ ¥nqoj Óqen kaˆ par' Ótou kaˆ Ópwj ¢nelex£mhn, kaˆ lÒgJ mèn ™mè zhloàsi tÁj ¢nqolog…aj, tÕ dè ¢lhqej Øm©j kaˆ tÕn leimîna tÕn Ømšteron [...]. Which philosophers are meant is evident from the fact that in this passage from the *Piscator* (*The Dead Come to Life or the Fisherman*) Lucian employs the concept of poet as a bee fleeting from flower to flower as well as that of the garden of letters, as elaborated by Socrates in both the *Ion* (534a–b) and the *Phaedrus* (276d) respectively.

[29] As may be inferred from the above, Philostratus, more than any other major exponent of the Second Sophistic, adopted Isocrates' method, as is evident from his enigmatic narrative in the *Lives of the Sophists.*

[30] Cf. n. 5.

[31] Àn oân tinej boÚlwntai taàta dierg£zesqai kaˆ mhkÚnein, oÙk ¢por»sousin ¢formÁj, Óqen `Elšnhn œxw tîn e„rhmšnwn ›xousin ™paine‹n, ¢ll¦ pollo‹j kaˆ kaino‹j lÒgoij ™nteÚxontai perˆ aÙtÁj. In this connection, it should be noted that Macrembolites takes the same attitude to his novel *Hysmine and Hysminias* (11, 22, 4) as Isocrates to his encomium, regarding it as a model for others to compete with him within the framework of the same conceptions: ka… tij tîn ÑyigÒnwn katarrhtoreÚsei taàta kaˆ æj ¢q£natJ st»lV to‹j lÒgoij ¢ndri£nta caklourg»sei kat£cruson.

detect where the human body ends and that of a horse begins and what might be considered genuinely human in the centaur's hybrid form.[32]

The Structure of the Encomium

Proemium aside, Isocrates, faithfully adhered to the structure of the genre, which in itself gave the delusive impression that there is no noteworthy difference between his encomium and the other representatives of the genre, as a result of which his work was regarded as being quite an ordinary writing. This was mainly due to the fact that his covert allusions in both the proemium and the main body of the encomium were not noticed by the scholars in previous research on the subject.

Isocrates fully observed rules of the genre by telling his praise of Helen in chronological order, [33] as is evident from the fact that he starts his encomium with talking about *genos*, i.e. with the beginning of the family of Helen referred to as the only daughter of Zeus (16: ple…stwn g¦r ¹miqšwn ØpÕ DiÕj gennhqšntwn mÒnhj taÚthj gunaikÕj pat¾r ºx…wse klhqÁnai). As proof of this, he cites the fact that Theseus, "reputedly the son of Aegeus, but in reality the progeny of Poseidon, seeing her not as yet in the full bloom of her beauty, but already surpassing other maidens, was so captivated by her loveliness that he, accustomed as he was to subdue others, and although the possessor of a fatherland most great and a kingdom most secure, thought life was not worth living amid the blessings he already had unless he could enjoy intimacy with her (18)."

There follows what is crucial in understanding of the entire work, namely the praise of Theseus (23–37), a lengthy digression structured in accordance with *aretai,* i.e. the cardinal virtues (*andreia*, *episteme*, *eusebeia*, *sophrosyne*) and essentially based on comparison between Theseus and Heracles. Then the story is told about how Alexander Paris, when he was appointed judge in strife among the goddesses for the prize of beauty, and when the kings and potentates of that time "disdained the wedlock at home and went to Sparta to woo Helen," chose to live with Helen before all else, thereby neglecting the proferred gifts of Hera and Athena and giving rise to so great a war between Europe and Asia (38–51) or, to be more precise, the greatest of all wars in the violence of its passions, with Isocrates' condemnation of

[32]*Imagines,* 2, 2, 4: ¢ll¦ †ppon ¢nqrèpJ sumbale‹n qaàma oÙdšn, sunale‹yai m¾n kaˆ ˜nîsai kaˆ diadoànai ¥mfw l»gein kaˆ ¥rcesqai kaˆ diafeÚgein toÝj ÑfqalmoÝj e„ tÕ tšrma toà ¢nqrèpou ™]lšgcoien.

[33]According to D. Russell, "Encomium" in S. Hornblower, A. Spawforth, E. Eidinow (eds.), *The Oxford Classical Dictionary* (Oxford: University Press 2012, 4th edition) "a well-defined rhetorical structure" of the encomium "developed early exemplified by the praises of Eros in Plato's *Symposium* (esp. Agathon's speech), Isocrates' obituary of Evagoras and Xenophon's *Agesilaus*. This pattern proved adaptable to the praises of cities; it also influenced the development of biography," with the theory appearing also in the 4th century B.C. in the *Rhetorica ad Alexandrum*. It should also be noted that, according the same author, some poems of Simonides, Pindar and Bacchylides were classed as encomia by Alexandrinian scholars, with prose encomia beginning to appear in the fifth century B.C. and not always being a serious substitute for poetry, but more *jeux d'esprit*, i.e. *paignion*. It is this term that Gorgias, Isocrates' rival, used to describe his *Helen*, with the sophist Polycrates going so far as to praise salt and mice, to Isocrates' utter amazement (*Hel.*, 12).

all those authors who reviled Alexander's choice ending this segment of his encomium (45–48) and being yet another digression from the central narrative theme.

Thereafter follows the praise of beauty and its power over gods and men (52–60), which in itself explains the deification of Helen and her acting as a goddess, which is why it is duty of those "who have great wealth to propitiate and to honour her with thank-offerings, sacrifices and processions," as distinguished from the philosophers who "should endeavour to speak of her in a manner worthy of her merits" (61–66).

The story concludes with the epilogue (67–69) in which it is said that much of what could be utilized for the praise of Helen has necessarily been left unsaid on account of the greatness of her personality. This is evidenced by the fact that it was because of her that the Greeks "became united in harmonious accord, organized a common expedition against barbarians and Europe set up a trophy of victory over Asia for the first time," with Isocrates thus announcing the unity of the Greeks as a major theme of his political discourses, inspired by Socrates' political testament in the *Alcibiades,* briefly discussed in our previous study.

In order to identify well-concealed allusions and, consequently, to "detect" Isocrates' paraphrases of the key passages from Plato's dialogues *Phaedrus, Symposium* and *Republic,* it was necessary to notice a central idea around which the overall narrative of the encomium revolves. Despite its being well-hidden at the very beginning of the encomium, we have managed to notice the aforementioned idea, something that could not be achieved without doing a lot of repeated reading of the same text, namely that of the third and fourth book of Plato's *Republic*.

Essentially, this means that anyone with an ambition to fully grasp the encomium's structure and its final message should keep fresh in mind, among other things, the whole content of the mentioned books of the *Republic*, which in itself is a telling indication of the challenges facing research on Greek literature. The finding itself is heavy with meaning, as evidenced by the fact that the aforementioned third book of the *Republic* provided the starting point for Isocrates' narrative, namely the book in which Socrates levels sharp criticism at Homeric poetry while at the same time putting forward his theses on a new literature developing in tune with the spirit of his ideal state, that is, the one ruled by the philosopher king.

All this assumes greater significance in the light of the fact that in none other than the aforementioned book of the *Republic* we come across the subdivision of poetry (392d–394d), based on the criterion of narrating person and rightly deemed important for the poetics of the Greek novel,[34] as is evident from the fact that the

[34]What is being referred to here is the division of poetry in the third book of the *Republic*, as reflected in both Cicero (*On Invention* 1, 27) and the author of the *Rhetorica ad Herennium* (1, 8, 12–13) and applied to the third type of narrative which was not used in a cause actually pleaded in court and was designed solely as a convenient practice or, to be more precise, school exercise for "handling the first two types more advantageously in actual causes." This scholastic type, called *drama*, *dramatikon*, *plasmatikon* or *argumentum*, is, in its turn, divided into the two subtypes (*genus in negotiis* and *genus in personis positum*), with the latter further subdivided into three subtypes according to the criterion of a speaking person: *genus enarratiuum* (the author himself is speaking), *genus imitatiuum* (characters acting on the stage are speaking) and *genus commune* (both the author and the characters acting on the stage are the speakers). The other two

above-mentioned subdivision was widely reflected in manuals of Greek and Latin grammar and rhetoric of classical, late antique and Byzantine period.[35] This evidence suggests the assumption that the trend to use the third and fourth book of the *Republic* for the making of a new poetics may be considerably influenced by Isocrates and his *Helen* clearly inspired by Socrates' attitudes to literature in the aforementioned poetological books of the *Republic*, as will be shown below. It would, after all, fit in well with the orator's aspiration to become one of the first executors of Socrates' political and literary testament in the *Alcibiades*.

Socrates' Ideas on the New Myth and Isocrates' Encomium

What we deal with here are the opening passages from the third book of the *Republic* in which Socrates, except for expressing his disapproval of depicting the realities in the underworld,[36] levels sharp criticism at the representations of gods and heroes in Homeric poems, with the men of repute showing feelings of fear and terror, bursting into wailings,[37] lamentations and laughter,[38] wholeheartedly praising carousals and the bounteous tables laden with bread and meat as the fairest thing in the world,[39] and moreover craving for money and gifts.[40] It is just in this part of his conversation with Adeimantus that Socrates categorically states that both of them will affirm the tales of such a kind to be lies, and won't suffer the youth of an ideal state ruled by the philosopher king to believe that Achilles, the son of goddess and of the most chaste of men, was of so perturbed a spirit as to be affected with two contradictory maladies, the greed that becomes no free man and overweening arrogance towards gods and men. Likewise, they won't believe this or suffer it to be said that Theseus, the son of Poseidon, and Peirithous, the son of Zeus, attempted such dreadful rapes, nor that any other child of a god and hero would have brought himself to accomplish the terrible and impious deeds that they now falsely

types of narrative are those used in actual causes on which a decision is to be rendered, with the first type consisting in "setting forth the facts so as to win the victory" and the second "entering into a speech as a means of winning belief or incriminating the adversary or effecting a transition or setting the stage for something" (*aut fidei aut criminationis aut transitionis aut alicuius apparationis causa*), as translated by H. Caplan (LCL). Cf. K. Barwick, "Die Gliederung der Narratio in der rhetorischen Theorie und ihre Bedeutung für die Geschichte des antiken Romans," *Hermes* 63 (1928), 282, C. W. Müller, "Chariton von Aphrodisias und die Theorie des Romans in der Antike," *Antike und Abendland* 22 (1976), 116 as well as our study "Rohde's Theory of Relationship between the Novel and Rhetoric and the Problem of Evaluating the Entire Post-Classical Greek Literature," *Athens Journal of Humanities and Arts* 2023, 10 (3), 193–220.

[35]Cf. A. Rostagni, *Aristotele e aristotelismo nella storia dell'estetica antica: origini, significato, e svolgimento della 'Poetica'* (Torino: Bottega d'Erasmo 1955), 223ff.

[36]386b: t¢n "Aidou ¹goÚmenon eἶna… te kaˆ dein¦ eἶnai o‡ei tin¦ qan£qou ¢deÁ œsesqai[...].

[37]387d: kaˆ toÝj ÑdurmoÝj ¥ra ™xair»somen kaˆ toÝj o‡ktouj toÝj tîn ™llog…mwn ¢ndrîn [...].

[38]389a: oÜte ¥ra ¢nqrèpouj ¢x…ouj lÒgou kratoumšnouj ØpÕ gšlwtoj ¥n tij poiÍ, ¢podektšon [...].

[39]390a: poie‹n ¥ndra tÕn sofètaton lšgonta æj doke‹ aÙtù k£lliston eἶnai p£ntwn, Ótan - par¦ ple‹ai ðsi tr£pezai s…tou kaˆ kreiîn [...].

[40]390e: oÙdὲ tÕn toà 'Acillšwj paidagwgÕn [...] ™painetšon æj metr…wj œlege sumbouleÚwn aÙtù dîra mὲn labÒnti ™pamÚnein to‹j 'Acaio‹j [...].

relate of them.[41] Then Socrates takes an even stronger stance by saying that both of them must constrain the poets either to deny that these are the deeds of heroes or that they who performed them are the children of gods, but not to make both statements (391d: ¢ll¦ prosanagk£zwmen toÝj poiht¦j À m¾ toÚtwn aÙt¦ œrga f£nai À toÚtouj m¾ eἶnai qeîn pa‹daj, ¢mfÒtera dὲ m¾ lšgein).

This gave occasion to Socrates for his heavy involvement in the matter of poetry and poetics, as is evident from his warning to the poets not to attempt to persuade the youth that the gods are the begetters of evil, and that heroes are no better than men, given that such utterances are both impious and false, as proved by the impossibility for evil to arise from gods.[42] And at the end of this part of his argumentation Socrates points to the pernicious effect of such myths and fables on the well-being of a city-state ruled by the philosopher king, in so far as every man will be lenient with his own misdeeds if he is convinced that such are and were the actions of the near-sown seed of gods, close kin to Zeus, which is why, in his view, such tales must be put down lest they breed in the youth great laxity in turpitude.[43]

It is none other than this Socratic reference to the myth of the abduction of Helen by Theseus and Peirithous and its pernicious effect on the education of the youth that inspired Isocrates to such an extent that he decided to further elaborate on it in full accordance with the spirit of Socrates and Plato's philosophy so as to emphasize both the strategic significance[44] of the theses put forward in the third book of the *Republic* and his own role of the faithful executor of Socrates' political and literary testament in the *Alcibiades*, something that was perhaps yet more important to him than the elaboration of ideas derived from the archetype.

In writing his encomium, Isocrates was most likely inspired by the emblematic scene from the prologue to the *Phaedo*, in which Socrates is represented as having recourse to both the poetic paraphrase of a comic prose model such as Aesop's fable and a sublime hymn to Apollo[45] as soon as his prison chains were unfastened,[46] thus blending together, on the last day of his life, the serious and

---

[41] 391c–d: [...] mhdὲ t£de [...] ™îmen lšgein, æj QhseÝj Poseidînoj ØÕj Peir…qouj te DiÕj érmhsan oÛtwj ™pˆ dein¦j ¡rpag£j, mhdὲ tin' ¥llon qeoà pa‹d£ te kaˆ ¼rw tolmÁsai ¨n dein¦ kaˆ ¢sebÁ ™rg£sasqai[...]

[42] 391d: mhdὲ ¹m‹n ™piceire‹n pe…qein toÝj nšouj æj o*f* qeoˆ kak¦ gennîsin, kaˆ ¼rwej ¢nqrèpwn mhdὲn belt…ouj [...] oÙk Ósia taàta oÜte ¢lhqÁ [...].

[43] 391e: kaˆ m¾n to‹j ge ¢koÚousin blaber£: p©j g¦r ˜autù suggnèmhn ›xei kakù Ônti, peisqeˆj æj ¥ra toiaàta pr£ttous…n te kaˆ œpratton o*f* qeîn ¢gc…sporoi [...] ïn ›neka paustšon toÝj toioÚtouj mÚqouj, m¾ ¹m‹n poll¾n eÙcšreian ™nt…ktwsi to‹j nšoij ponhr…aj.

[44] Cicero, *On the Orator* 2, 94, seems to point to none other than this dimension: *ecce tibi est exortus Isocrates, magister iste oratorum omnium, cuius e ludo tamquam ex equo Troiano meri principes exierunt; sed eorum partim in pompa partim in acie inlustres esse uoluerunt. atque et illi Theopompi, Ephori* […] *multique alii naturis differunt, uoluntate autem similes sunt et inter se et magistri; et hi qui se ad causas contulerunt, ut Demosthenes, Hyperides* [...] *etsi inter se pares non fuerunt, tamen sunt omnes in eodem ueritatis imitandae genere uersati*.

[45] 60d: perˆ g£r toi tîn poihm£twn ïn pepo…hkaj ™nte…naj toÝj toà A„sèpou lÒgouj kaˆ tÕ e„j tÕn 'ApÒllw proo…mion kaˆ ¥lloi tinšj me ½dh ½ronto [...].

[46] 60b–c: æj ¥topon […] œoikš ti eἶnai toàto Ö kaloàsin o*f* ¥nqrwpoi ¹dÚ: æj qaumas…wj pšfuke prÕj tÕ dokoàn ™nant…on eἶnai, tÕ luphrÒn, tÕ ¤ma mèn aÙtë m¾ 'qšlein parag…gnesqai tù ¢nqrèpJ, ™¦n dš tij dièkV tÕ ›teron kaˆ lamb£nei, scedÒn ti ¢nagk£zesqai ¢eˆ lamb£nein kaˆ tÕ ›teron, ésper ™k mi©j korufÁj ¹mmšnw dÚ' Ônte [...] ésper oân kaˆ aÙtù moi œoiken: ™peid¾ ØpÕ toà desmoà Ãn ™n tù skšlei ¢lgeinÒn, ¼kein d¾ fa…netai ™pakolouqoàn tÕ ¹dÚ.

the laughable in an amazing combination of polar opposites. Socrates' characterization of his artistic endeavours as making music speaks volumes about the true nature of his paraphrase, as can be inferred from his assertion that what he was working at on the last day of his life was only a popular kind of music regarded as being a simplification of, or a specific supplement, to the greatest kind of music such as his philosophy.[47]

Isocrates was very well aware that he was not fully capable of following in the footsteps of his great master in so far as he was not so poetically gifted to either achieve the mentioned daemonic combination of the serious and the laughable[48] or to contemplate pure, perfect forms collected together in the place beyond heaven (hyperouranion).

Thus Isocrates was left with no alternative other than what was characterized by Socrates as a popular kind of music, that is, paraphrase, albeit with some limitations due to his natural abilities. And, indeed, in a key passage from the *Antidosis* Isocrates labels his literary creativity or rather "philosophy" as a music,[49] omitting at the same time the qualifier 'popular' so as to conceal his dependence on the emblematic scene from the *Phaedo*. It is the limitations just mentioned that essentially determined the true nature of Isocrates' popular music in so far as its classical, Socratic type such as the poetic paraphrase of a prose model had to be left aside and replaced with some kind of surrogate such as a prose paraphrase of prose patterns, or rather ideas mainly derived from the philosophy of Socrates and Plato. It might serve as a further explanation for why Isocrates was so inspired by the emblematic scene from the *Phaedo* and why he regarded his own art of paraphrasing as a popular music, something that sheds further light on his tendency to call his own rhetoric philosophy.

It is precisely this characteristic of Isocrates' method that further supports the assumption that Socrates' criticism directed at the close of the *Euthydemus* at an unnamed orator staying in the border-ground between philosopher and politician applies to Isocrates[50] who, far from seeing anything polemical or unpleasant in that, regarded it as an objective judgment on his own abilities, very

[47]61a: […] kaˆ ™moˆ oÛtw tÕ ™nÚpnion Óper œpratton toàto ™pikeleÚein, mousik¾n poie‹n, æj filosof…aj mèn oÜshj meg…sthj mousikÁj, ™moà dè toàto pr£ttontoj. nàn d' [...] œdoxe crÁnai, e„ ¥ra poll£kij moi prost£ttoi tÕ ™nÚpnion taÚthn t¾n dhmèdh mousik¾n poie‹n, m¾ ¢peiqÁsai aÙtù ¢ll¦ poie‹n.

[48]What is involved here is not only the mixture of the sublime and the laughable but also a fruitful tension between *mythos* and *logos*, poetry and dialectic, the music of images and the music of speech, as pointed out by G. Reale, *Platone, Fedone: introduzione, traduzione, note e apparati* (Milano: Bompiani 2000), 294: "Si tenga presente che Platone costruisce il *Fedone* (come del resto non pochi dialoghi) appunto sfruttando in modo sistematico la feconda tensione fra mito e *logos*, poesia e dialettica, musica di immagini e musica di discorsi. In un certo senso, l'impianto del *Fedone* è addirittura paradigmatico. I due grandi blocchi di ragionamento dialettico sono seguiti da due grandiosi miti."

[49]47–48: [...] oÞj (scil. Isocratis orationes) ¤pantej ¨n f»saien Ðmoiotšrouj eἶnai to‹j met¦ mousikÁj kaˆ ·uqmîn pepoihmšnouj. See among other passages from Eunapius' *Lives of the Philosophers and Sophists* the following (501–502) modelled on the *Phaedrus*, 271d: ésper oân t¦ k£llista kaˆ glukÚtera tîn melîn prÕj p©san ¢ko¾n ¹mšrwj kaˆ pr®wj katarre‹ (scil. Chrysanthii oratio) [...] kaˆ [...] p©sin Ãn ™narmÒnioj, kaˆ tosaÚtaij diafora‹j ºqîn ™nšprepe kaˆ kaqhrmÒzeto.

[50]Cf. *Euthydemus,* 304d–306c.

well-aware that he was left with no possibility other than to join in the mission of popularizing his master's legacy and putting it into practice in his political course of action, in keeping, one would say, with the spirit of Socrates' political and literary testament in the *Alcibiades*.

As it was very hard to notice a guiding principle in the conception of the main body of the encomium, so it was very difficult to detect in it echoes of some of the central theses put forward by Socrates in the *Phaedrus*, such as those used by Isocrates to develop his lines of argumentation when it comes to explaining the importance of beauty for not only the life of every individual and every poet but also for the well-being of every state, society and nation. Incapable though he was of achieving greater effect by combining together, like his great master, the music of images and the music of speech, Isocrates was nonetheless fully able to elevate the paraphrase to new heights by the most careful elaboration of the basic concept of philosophy, which in itself was not at all an easy endeavour, as evidenced by the fact that, largely due to that, his encomium assumed characteristics of a popular music.

The Place beyond Heaven in the *Phaedrus* and Isocrates' Popular Music

What is being referred to here are the key theses on beauty, put forward by Socrates in his great discourse on love in the *Phaedrus*, with the philosopher holding a view that beauty as Being shone in brilliance among realities in the place beyond heaven, or rather *hyperouranion*,[51] and that "since we came to earth we have found it shining most clearly through the clearest and sharpest of our senses" such as sight,[52] and that none other of the realities on the top of the vault of heaven can be seen by the mentioned sense, including Wisdom "which would arouse terrible love, if such a clear image of it were granted as would come through sight."[53] As a result of this "beauty alone has this privilege, and therefore it is most clearly seen and loveliest" among all the realities in the place beyond heaven.[54]

What comes across in Isocrates' encomium is a well-hidden paraphrase of Socrates' theses on beauty, with the orator passing over in silence an unbreakable bond between beauty and the place beyond heaven and speaking only of beauty as manifested in this world, and Helen as its embodiment, as is evident from his assertion that Helen "possessed beauty in the highest degree," and that "beauty is of all things the most venerated, the most precious, and the most divine," and for

[51] 250b: k£lloj dè tÒt' Ãn „de‹n lamprÒn, Óte sÝn eÙda…moni corù makar…an Ôyin te kaˆ qšan (scil. e‡domen) [...] ¿n qšmij lšgein makariwt£thn, ¿n çrgi£zomen ÐlÒklhroi mèn aÙtoˆ Ôntej kaˆ ¢paqe‹j kakîn Ósa ¹m©j ™n ØstšrJ crÒnJ Øpšmenen.

[52] 250d: perˆ dè k£llouj [...] met' ™ke…nwn te œlampen Ôn, deàrÒ t' ™lqÒntej kateil»famen aÙtÕ di¦ tÁj ™nargest£thj a„sq»sewj tîn ¹metšrwn st…lbon ™nargšstata. Ôyij g¦r ¹m‹n Ñxut£th tîn di¦ toà sèmatoj œrcetai a„sq»sewn. In this connection, it should be noted that translations of the passages from the *Phaedrus* are by H. N. Fowler (LCL).

[53] Ibid.: […] Î (scil. Ôyei) frÒnhsij oÙk Ðr©tai – deinoÝj g¦r ¨n pare‹cen œrwtaj, e‡ ti toioàton ˜autÁj ™nargèj e‡dwlon pare…ceto e„j Ôyin „Òn – kaˆ t«lla Ósa ™rast£.

[54] Ibid.: nàn dè k£lloj mÒnon taÚthn œsce mo‹ran, ést' ™kfanšstaton eἶnai kaˆ ™rasmiètaton.

precisely that reason "most highly esteemed, because it is most beautiful of ways of living."[55]

That the mentioned theses advocated by Socrates in the famous passage from the *Phaedrus* are freely interpreted by Isocrates can be inferred from other attitudes he took towards beauty in the same context of his encomium, in which it is said that "many things which do not have any attributes of courage, wisdom or justice will be seen to be more highly valued than any one of these attributes," or rather virtues, "yet of those things which lack beauty we shall find not one that is beloved."[56] And, lastly, an attentive reader will learn how against his will Isocrates betrayed his heavy dependence upon the theses advocated by Socrates in his great discourse on love in the *Phaedrus* by saying that all of the mentioned attributes, or rather virtues, are despised, except in so far as they possess in some degree the outward form of beauty, and that, in keeping with that, every one of them can be most highly esteemed only if permeated by beauty.[57] This was already implied at the very beginning of the main body of the encomium, in which it is said that Zeus, devoted though he was most of all to Heracles and the sons of Leda, showed his preference for Helen and her beauty, as compared with Heracles and his strength of body,[58] namely a beauty that was able to overpower and bring into subjection to it the strength itself of Theseus (18),[59] Heracles' closest rival.

Yet another key thesis advocated by Socrates in the *Phaedrus*, namely that "he who is newly initiated, who beheld many of those realities in the place beyond heaven, when he sees a godlike face or form which is a good image of beauty, shudders, at first, and something of the old awe comes over him, and, as he gazes, he reveres the beautiful one as a god, and if he did not fear to be thought stark mad, he would offer sacrifice to his beloved as to an idol or a god,"[60] is also reflected in the encomium (56), with Isocrates freely interpreting it lest his heavy dependence upon the patterns in the *Phaedrus* should be recognized as such.

These results are fully confirmed by yet another instance of Isocrates' obvious dependence on Socrates' theses on beauty in the *Phaedrus*, as is evident from his view that "while we are jealous of those who excel us in intelligence or in anything

---

[55]*Helen*: 54: eÙlÒgwj dè k¢ke‹noi (scil. qeo…) toàt' œgnwsan, k¢gë thlikaÚtaij Øperbola‹j œcw cr»sasqai perˆ aÙtÁj: k£llouj g¦r ple‹ston mšroj metšscen (scil. `Elšnh), Ö semnÒtaton kaˆ timiètaton kaˆ qeiÒtaton tîn Ôntwn ™st…n.

[56]Ibid, 54–55: ·®dion dè gnînai t¾n dÚnamin aÙtoà (scil. k£llouj): tîn mèn g¦r ¢ndr…aj À sof…aj À dikaiosÚnhj m¾ metecÒntwn poll¦ fan»setai timèmena m©llon À toÚtwn ›kaston [...] tîn mèn g¦r ¥llwn ïn ¨n ™n cre…v genèmeqa, tuce‹n mÒnon boulÒmeqa, peraitšrw dè perˆ aÙtîn oÙdèn tÍ yucÍ prospepÒnqamen: tîn dè kalîn œrwj ¹m‹n ™gg…gnetai, tosoÚtJ me…zw toà boÚlesqai ·èmhn œcwn, ÓsJ per kaˆ tÕ pr©gma kre‹ttÒn ™stin.

[57]Ibid.: tîn dè k£llouj ¢pesterhmšnwn oÙdèn eØr»somen ¢gapèmenon ¢ll¦ p£nta katafronoÚmena, pl¾n Ósa taÚthj tÁj „dšaj kekoinènhke, kaˆ t¾n ¢ret¾n di¦ toàto m£list' eÙdokimoàsan, Óti k£lliston tîn ™pithdeum£twn ™st…n.

[58]Ibid., 16: spoud£saj dè m£lista perˆ te tÕn ™x 'Alkm»nhj kaˆ toÝj ™k L»daj, tosoÚtJ m©llon `Elšnhn `Hraklšouj proÙt…mhsen éste tù mèn „scÝn œdwken, ¿ b…v tîn ¥llwn krate‹n dÚnatai, tÍ dè k£lloj ¢pšneimen, Ö kaˆ tÁj ·èmhj aÙtÁj ¥rcein pšfuken.

[59]Cf. n. 33.

60*Phaedrus*, 251a: Ð dè ¢rtitel»j, Ð tîn tÒte poluqe£mwn, Ótan qeoeidè prÒswpon ‡dV k£lloj eâ memimhmšnon ½ tina sèmatoj „dšan, prîton mèn œfrixe ka… ti tîn tote ØpÁlqen aÙtÕn deim£twn, eἶta prosorîn æj qeÕn sšbetai, kaˆ e„ m¾ ™ded…ei t¾n tÁj sfÒdra man…aj dÒxan, qÚoi ¨n æj ¢g£lmati kaˆ qeù to‹j paidiko‹j.

else, unless they win us over by daily benefactions and compel us to be fond of them, yet at first sight we become well-disposed toward those who possess beauty, and to these alone as to the gods we do not fail in our homage."[61] As if this wasn't enough, Isocrates further continues to freely interpret Socrates' theses by saying that "we submit more willingly to be the slaves of such beautiful ones than to rule all others, and that we are more grateful to them when they impose many tasks on us than to those who demand nothing at all."[62]

The Secrets of Isocrates' Art of Paraphrasing

But Isocrates was very well aware that greater effect cannot be achieved by using technique of amplification unless it is based on a method solely capable of giving it magical powers. That method is mentioned only once in Isocrates' oeuvre, which made it extremely hard to detect, because, among other things, the author alluded to it where we would expect it the least, namely in his highly unusual, and moreover well-concealed palinody in the *Panathenaicus*. What we mean by 'highly unusual' is the fact that the mentioned palinody, as was otherwise the case with that of Aristides in his *First Platonic Discourse* (or. 2) entitled *A Reply to Plato: In Defense of Oratory*,[63] sits somewhere at the end of the discourse, "buried" under a fair amount of evidence provided by Isocrates in the central part of his lengthy discourse, which is why it continuously escaped the attention of the scholars.

In the mentioned palinode,[64] Isocrates' pupil, most probably Theopompus, speaks out his opinion on the *Panathenaicus* by pointing to the reception it is

[61] *Helen*, 57: to‹j dè kalo‹j eÙqÝj „dÒntej eânoi gignÒmeqa, kaˆ mÒnouj aÙtoÝj ésper toÝj qeoÝj oÙk ¢pagoreÚomen qerapeÚontej [...].

[62] Ibid.: ¼dion douleÚomen to‹j toioÚtoij À tîn ¥llwn ¥rcomen, ple…w c£rin œcontej to‹j poll¦ prost£ttousin À to‹j mhdÈn ™paggšllousin. It can also be noticed that, except for this addition, we encounter in the same context (56) Isocrates' variation on the same theme such as the superiority of beauty over all virtues: kaˆ to‹j mèn kat¦ sÚnesin À kat' ¥llo ti prošcousi fqonoàmen, Àn m¾ tù poie‹n ¹m©j eâ kaq' ˜k£sthn t¾n ¹mšran prosag£gwntai kaˆ stšrgein sf©j aÙtoÝj ¢nagk£swsi [...].

[63] Aristides takes it one step further, placing his fairly brief and almost unnoticeable palinode at the very end of his lengthy *Reply to Plato* and donning the mask of pretence by presenting his own palinode as Plato's, falsely implying that it is the latter and not himself that here (scil. in the myth at the close of the *Gorgias*) clearly defines as the champion of truthful speech the thing that he there (scil. in the main body of the mentioned dialogue) called flattery (441: oÙkoàn ¹ palinJd…a kaˆ d¾ faner£. ¿n g¦r ™ntaàqa eἶnai kolake…an fhs…n, ™ke‹ m¾ kolake…an eἶnai, ¢ll¦ toà ¢lhqÁ lšgein proest£nai safÎj oØtwsˆ dior…zetai), which gave rise to the assertion that he himself is now "saying the same as Plato about oratory although the people may have thought he was disagreeing (taÙt¦ ¥ra Pl£twni nàn ¹me‹j lšgomen perˆ ·htorikÁj, dokoàntej ™nant…a).

[64] We come across it at the height of the discourse or, to be more precise, in a passage in which Isocrates' masterful, erudite and controlled expositions start to assume features of *drama*, and what is being referred to here is a moment when the author, due to his having spoken of Sparta with, as it seemed to him, extreme bitterness and the lack of moderation, faces a dilemma as to whether to burn what he had written or use a palinode, just like Socrates did in the *Phaedrus,* to recant what he had said (232: oÙ g¦r metr…wj ™dÒkoun moi dieilšcqai perˆ aÙtîn (scil. Lakedaimon…wn) oÙd' Ðmo…wj to‹j ¥lloij, ¢ll' Ñligèrwj kaˆ l…an pikrÎj [...] éste poll£kij Ðrm»saj ™xale…fein aÙtÕn À katak£ein meteg…gnwskon, ™leîn tÕ gÁraj toÙmautoà kaˆ tÕn pÒnon tÕn perˆ tÕn lÒgon gegenhmšnon).

most likely to get from the audience and saying that "the discourse will appear to be ingenuous and easy to comprehend to all those who read it casually, though to those who scan it thoroughly and endeavour to see in it what has escaped all others it will reveal itself as difficult and hard to understand, packed with history and philosophy, and filled with all manners of devices and fictions – not the kind of myths and fictions which, used with evil intent, are wont to injure one's fellow-citizens, but the kind which, used by the cultivated mind, are able to benefit or to delight one's audience"[65] – and the community as a whole, if we may add.

In this palinody, we encounter key terms and phrases such as the ones that follow: "discourse packed with history and philosophy and filled with all manners of devices and fictions (*pseudologia*)," "cultivated mind," a kind of myth and fictions "not used with evil intent" but, quite to the contrary, "being able to benefit the whole community" in full accordance, it seems, with the theses advocated by Socrates in the *Republic*. What we deal with here are terms containing Isocrates' poetics on a small scale and further explaining what has been said in our previous study about his attitude towards philosophy and his strong desire for being recognized as a philosopher.

All this gives rise to the question as to what the origin of this daemonic combination of history, philosophy and myth might be, although the appearance of the term 'philosophy' in the mentioned combination already suggested the answer to the question, but what is still lacking is a clear evidence that confirms the assumption.

It is none other than Dio Chrysostom's *Fifty-Fifth Discourse*, or rather his short essay on Homer and Socrates that provides this evidence, namely an assay in which the author goes so far as to advocate the thesis on the near total similarity between these two creative colossi of the literary world, as demonstrated by the fact that they both possessed unrivalled skills at blending together myth, fable and history,[66] and moreover an unparalleled ability to make

[65] *Panathenaicus,* 246: [...] proelÒmenon dš se sunqe‹nai logon [...] to‹j mὲn ·vqÚmwj ¢nagignèskousin ¡ploàn e‡nai dÒxanta [...] to‹j d' ¢kribÍj diexioàsin aÙtÒn [...] calepÕn fainÒmenon kaˆ duskatam£qhton kaˆ pollÁj mὲn *f*stor…aj gšmonta kaˆ filosof…aj [...] kaˆ yeudolog…aj, oÙ tÁj e„qismšnhj met¦ kak…aj bl£ptein toÝj sumpoliteuomšnouj, ¢ll¦ tÁj dunamšnhj [...] tšrpein toÝj ¢koÚontaj. T. L. Papillon, "Isocrates and the Use of Myth," *Hermathena* 161 (1996), 14) speaks of Isocrates' making a distinction between the adjective *mythodes* and the noun *mythos*, with the latter – unlike the former charged with being useless – regarded as beneficial, whereas it would make more sense to speak of the new and old myth, in so far as the wording "myths and fictions which, used with evil intent, are wont to injure one's fellow-citizens" points, as it seems, to the old myth. That's why Isocrates in his *Helen*, as Viideman, *Creating rhe Ancient Rhetorical Tradition* (Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press 2021), 69 put it, "focuses only on those aspects of her representation that can be wholeheartedly praised, and avoids getting caught up with topics that associate her with negative fame," with N. Livingstone, *A Commentary on Isocrates' Busiris* (Leiden: Brill 2001) sharing almost the same view on the issue and talking about the 'pure genre' of the encomium. Cf. also S. Zajonz, *Isokrates' Enkomion auf Helena: Ein Kommentar* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht 2002), 145.

[66] *On Homer and Socrates*, 11: "Omhroj di£ te mÚqwn kaˆ *f*stor…aj ™pece…rhse toÝj ¢nqrèpouj paideÚein [...] kaˆ Swkr£thj poll£kij ™crÁto tù toioÚtJ [...].

similes and comparisons (*On Homer and Socrates*, 9). The only difference being that Dio failed to include philosophy into this daemonic combination, which can be explained by the fact that, under the influence of his great master, Socrates, he regarded the mentioned combination as a very philosophical way of expressing oneself.[67]

Lucian's attitudes towards his own method of *montage* essentially based on archetype,[68] i.e. Homeric, Socratic or Platonic concepts, shed further light on why the mentioned daemonic combination of history, myth and fable was regarded as having magical powers. When Lucian implicitly establishes a close relationship between the aforesaid method and the life in eternity,[69] we can clearly see that he is fully inspired by Isocrates' palinody in the *Panathenaicus,* in which blending together the categories of narration such as history, myth, fable and philosophy is directly equated with immortality.[70] Thus a stylistics and history of ideas-related timeline crystallized once again, starting from Socrates' political testament in the *Alcibiades,* passing through the oeuvre of Xenophon and Isocrates, the testament's first executors, and leading up to the major exponents of the Second Sophistic such as Dio, Lucian and Philostratus. This concordance between Isocrates and the aforementioned major exponents of the late Greek renaissance of the second century A.D. speaks volumes about his influence on it.

This breakthrough into Isocrates' poetics brought out a secondary result which is of the greatest significance for fully understanding the praise of Helen*,* in so far as it turned out that Theopompus' critical judgment on the *Panathenaicus* is fully applicable to the encomium so that it can rightly be said that the *Helen* "will appear to be ingenuous and easy to comprehend to all those who read it casually, though to those who scan it thoroughly and endeavour to see in it what has escaped all

[67]Cf. n. 14. In this connection, it is worth mentioning that the myths in the dialogues of Plato are deeply rooted in the tradition of the new myths, in which the new religiousness, cultivated in the western Greek colonies of Sicily and southern Italy, found its expression, with this new spirituality appearing for the first time in the poems of Empedocles and having its origin in Pythagoreanism, as pointed out by T. Ebert, "'Wenn ich einen schönen Mythos vortragen darf …': Zu Status, Herkunft und Funktion des Schlussmythos in Platons Phaidon," in M. Janka, C. Schäffer (eds.), *Platon als Mythenerzähler: Neue Interpretazionen zu den Mythen in Platons Dialogen* (Darmstadt: WBG 2002), 254.

[68]Cf. Lucian, *Prometheus es in verbis*, 3.

[69]The very fact that in Lucian's view (*Prom. verb.* 3) originality (inventiveness) as a method – otherwise diametrically opposed to *montage*, and symbolized by Promethean clay figures becoming living creatures as soon as Athena breathes into the mud – is closely connected with life in time, necessarily implies that *montage,* or rather paraphrase, is the only approach capable of bestowing immortality upon the author.

[70]*Panathenaicus*, 260: doke‹j g£r moi zîn mèn l»yesqai dÒxan [...] par¦ ple…osi dè kaˆ m©llon Ðmologoumšnhn tÁj nàn ØparcoÚshj, teleut»saj dè tÕn b…on meqšxein ¢qanas…aj, oÙ tÁj to‹j qeo‹j paroÚshj, ¢ll¦ tÁj to‹j ™pigignomšnoij perˆ tîn dienegkÒntwn ™p… tini tîn kalîn ærgwn mn»mhn ™mpoioÚshj. What transpires from this passage is Isocrates' attempt to subject philosophy to the categories of literature, as reflected in Cicero's philosophical oeuvre, according to O. Gigon, "Nachwort" in: *Cicero, Gespräche in Tusculum* (München und Zürich: Artemis & Winckler 1992 6th ed.), 417: "Die Philosophie genügt sich nicht selbst. Sie ist literarischen Kategorien unterworfen und verfolgt literarische Absichten. Historisch ist Cicero von Isokrates abhängig; aber diese Abhängigkeit ist kein partikularer Zufall. Sie ergibt sich aus der geistigen Situation Ciceros."

others it will reveal itself as difficult and hard to understand, packed with history and philosophy, and filled with all manners of devices and fictions." What is involved here is the aforementioned daemonic combination as the only method[71] that could benefit or delight the community as a whole, but, unfortunately, that has gone largely unnoticed in previous research on the subject.

It is therefore no wonder that Isocrates chose Helen and the Trojan war as the theme of his encomium if we take into account the fact that the aforesaid topics contain a perfect combination of history, myth and fable that were blended into organic unity in Homeric poems to such an extent that it was difficult even for an experienced eye to determine where myth ends and history begins and what is mythical in what appeared at first sight to be a historic event – in full accordance with Philostratus' description of Centaur's dual nature, as shown on the painting. But Isocrates was very well aware that such a combination of myth and history can truly be called "daemonic" only with the inclusion of philosophy, which in itself explains his conception of the encomium essentially based on the theses on beauty, as advocated by Socrates in his great discourses on love in the *Phaedrus* and the *Symposium*, if, for a moment, we put aside the aforementioned philosopher's sharp critique of the old myth in the opening passages from the third book of the *Republic.*

What was applied to the proemium, namely a technique of covert allusions essentially based on a careful *montage* of the patterns derived from the philosophy of Socrates, Plato and Aristotle was not fully applicable to the encomium due to the very nature of the genre, in so far as a higher degree of creativity was now required for Isocrates to prove himself as a great author and to create, almost at the very beginning of his literary activity, a work which might roughly be comparable to the *Phaedrus.* In other words, Isocrates could employ a method used in the proemium only to a certain extent, which means that the guiding idea of his encomium, i.e. Socrates' theses on beauty, put forward in his discourses on love in the *Phaedrus* and the *Symposium*, had to be well concealed so as to make it possible for him to abandon himself to the paraphrase of the aforementioned theses and to finally round off his subtle approach with the inclusion of his own ideas in the whole. Isocrates fully realized his ideas and for precisely this reason his encomium is, unlike the other representatives of the genre, a great achievement of literary mimesis, because of, among other things, the emergence of a peculiarly modern poetic sensibility in a typically scholastic genre.

A Modern Poetic Sensibility in the Encomium: Dying for the Beauty and Helen as its Earthly Incarnation

[71]It should be said that Prohaeresius employed the same method characterized by Eunapius as "transferring contemporary events into the depths of mythical time" (*Lives of the Philosophers and Sophists*, 492: tacÝ m£la metšsthsen e„j tÕn ¹rca‹on Ôgkon t¦ gignÒmena). It should also be noted that Prohaeresius' zeal to imitate Socrates' life down to the last detail went so far as to induce him to spend cold winters in Gaul barefooted and clad in a tiny threadbare cloak (492) as well as to drink nearly freezing water of the Rhine regarded as being the height of luxury (492), with the obvious aim of surpassing his master's legendary achievement during his military episode in ice-cold Potideia (Platon, *Symposium*, 220b).

What we deal with here is no ordinary creativity but one owing to which Isocrates reached the heights of poetry, as can be inferred from one of his key concepts such as *dying for the beauty*, which shows a great similarity with a modern poetic sensibility. Helen and her beauty, according to Isocrates, drove not only the Greeks and the barbarians, but also the gods to undergo hardships of that expedition so much so that the latter "did not dissuade even their own children from joining in the struggles around Troy,[72] thinking it more honourable for them to die fighting for the daughter of Zeus than to live without having taken part in the perils undergone on her account" and thus to be lacking in such a horrible, unique and above all wonderful experience.[73] Even more importantly, they showed their children the way in so far as they themselves "engaged in a far greater and more terrible struggle than when they fought the Giants; for against those enemies they had fought a battle in concert, but for Helen they fought a war against one another."[74]

In the same context we encounter yet another concept which shows a great similarity with modern poetic sensibility such as *remaining in a foreign land to grow old there just for the sake of beauty*, i.e. Helen, a concept worked out so well that it could rightly be regarded as worthy of Isocrates' great master. When Isocrates says that "although the Trojans might have rid themselves of the misfortunes which encompassed them by surrendering Helen, and the Greeks might have lived in peace for all time by being indifferent to her fate, neither so wished,[75] but quite to the contrary, "the Trojans allowed their cities to be laid waste and their land to be ravaged, so as to avoid yielding Helen to the Greeks,[76] and the Greeks chose rather to remain and grow old in a foreign land and never to see their own again, than, leaving her behind, to return " to their dear native land,[77] we can clearly see that Helen became guarantor of happiness of not only the entire states but also the entire continents such as Europe and Asia. Thus the personality of Helen, as interpreted by Isocrates, assumed characteristics of a cosmic entity shrouded in magic and mystery and thus, in a certain sense, became an earthly incarnation of the beauty on the top of the vault of heaven (*hyperouranion*), as depicted in the *Phaedrus*.

But there is much more to this than meets the eye. In saying that, we mean above all the fact that we will gain a firm understanding of these concepts

[72]*Helen*, 52: toioàtoj d' œrwj ™nšpese tîn pÒnwn kaˆ tÁj strate…aj ™ke…nhj oÙ mÒnon to‹j "Ellhsi kaˆ to‹j barb£roij ¢ll¦ kaˆ to‹j qeo‹j,ést' oÙdὲ toÝj ™x aÙtîn gegonÒtaj ¢pštreyan tîn ¢gènwn tîn perˆ Tro…an [...].

[73]Ibid., 53: [...] Ómwj aÙtoÝj sunexèrmhsan kaˆ sunexšpemyan, ¹goÚumenoi k£llion aÙto‹j eἶnai teqn£nai macomšnoij perˆ tÁj DiÕj qugatrÕj m©llon À zÁn ¢poleifqe‹si tîn perˆ ™ke…nhj kindÚnwn.

[74]Ibid.: aÙtoˆ g¦r polÝ me…zw kaˆ deinotšran ™poi»santo par£taxin tÁj prÕj G…gantaj aÙto‹j genomšnhj: prÕj mὲn g¦r ™ke…nouj met' ¢ll»lwn ™macšsanto, perˆ dὲ taÚthj prÕj sf©j aÙtoÝj ™polšmhsan.

[75]Ibid., 50: ™xÕn dὲ to‹j mὲn ¢podoàsin `Elšnhn ¢phll£cqai tîn parÒntwn kakîn, to‹j dὲ ¢mel»sasin ™ke…nhj ¢deîj o‡ke‹n tÕn ™p…loipon crÒnon, oÙdšteroi taàta ºqšlhsan.

[76]Ibid.: ¢ll' o*ƒ* mὲn perieèrwn kaˆ pÒleij ¢nast£touj gignomšnaj kaˆ t¾n cèran porqoumšnhn, éste m¾ prošsqai to‹j "Ellhsin aÙt»n [...].

[77]Ibid.: o*ƒ* d' Åroànto mšnontej ™pˆ tÁj ¢llotr…aj kataghr£skein kaˆ mhdšpote toÝj aØtîn „de‹n m©llon À 'ke…nhn katalipÒntej e„j t¦j ˜autîn patr…daj ¢pelqe‹n.

reminiscent of a modern poetic sensibility only if we notice well-hidden montage of other concepts derived from the philosophy of Socrates and Plato and used in what seemed to be a digression loosely connected to the main body of the encomium, namely the praise of Theseus and his *aretai*.

To tell the truth, it was none other than Isocrates himself that gave occasion to others to interpret the mentioned praise as a digression, by saying that he perceives that he is being carried away beyond the proper limits of his theme, something that makes him afraid that some may think he is more concerned with Theseus than with the subject matter which he originally chose. Just this seemingly honest admission shows more than anything else how subtle Isocrates' art is, as evidenced by the fact that it was designed to meet one purpose and one purpose only, to conceal the author's heavy dependence on the ideas derived from both the *Republic* and the *Symposium*, and it was so well done that even an experienced eye could hardly detect a trace of it in the encomium of Isocrates. In saying that, we mean above all the fact that Isocrates made his patterns unrecognizable by following them in their highly abridged version so as to be in a position to enlarge on them, as a result of which they could not be detected without doing a lot of repeated reading of the same text, to say nothing of keeping fresh in mind almost the whole content of the relevant books of both the *Symposium* and the *Republic.* What we deal with here is a hardly detectable art of paraphrasing, as a result of which Isocrates' statements about his own art of speaking are as a rule taken too literally, thus creating a highly distorted image on not only his work but also the entire literary periods.

Isocrates' Allusive Technique at its Best: The Ladder of Love and other Socratic Concepts in the *Helen*

What Isocrates' allusive technique and art of paraphrasing looks like in practice can be shown on the example of his rephrasing of the theses on the ladder of love, as advocated by Socrates in his discourse in Plato's *Symposium*, namely a discourse that is essentially based on the new myth. Out of six stages of the ladder of love in the philosopher's discourse such as "climbing aloft, as on the rungs of a ladder, from one to two,[78] and from two to all beautiful bodies,"[79] from all beautiful

[78]Plato, *Symposium*, 210a: de‹ g¦r tÕn Ñrqîj „Ònta ™pˆ toàto tÕ pr©gma ¥rcesqai mèn nšon Ônta „šnai ™pˆ t¦ kal¦ sèmata, kaˆ prîton mèn, ™¦n Ñrqîj ¹gÁtai Ð ¹goÚmenoj, ˜nÕj aÙtÕn sèmatoj ™r©n kaˆ ™ntaàqa genn©n lÒgouj kaloÚj [...].

[79]Ibid., 210b: œpeita dè aÙtÕn katanoÁsai Óti tÕ k£lloj tÕ ™pˆ ÐtJoàn sèmati ¢delfÒn ™sti, kaˆ e„ de‹ dièkein tÕ ™p' e‡dei kalÒn, poll¾ ¥noia m¾ oÙc ›n te kaˆ taÙtÕn ¹ge‹sqai tÕ ™pˆ p©si to‹j sèmasi k£lloj. "But next he must remark how the beuaty attached to this or that body is cognate to that which is attached to any other, and that if he means to ensue beaty in form, it is gross folly not to regard as one and the same the beaty belonging to all," as translated by H. N. Fowler (LCL).

bodies to the beauty of soul,[80] from the beauty of soul to that of institutions,[81] from beautiful institutions to the beauty of learning,[82] from the beauty of learning "to that particular study which is concerned with the beautiful itself and that alone,"[83] we encounter only two in Isocrates' praise of Theseus in the *Helen*, namely the first (ensuing beauty of form, or rather body, i.e. that of Helen)[84] and the fourth (contemplating the beautiful as emerging in the institutions and laws).[85] The covert allusion to the fourth stage of the ladder of love does clearly indicate that, in the author's view, Theseus assumed characteristics of an ideal ruler in full accordance with the concept of the philosopher king,[86] as proposed by Socrates in Plato's *Republic*, all the more so since the mythical hero, unlike other men who had won renown, was not, as Isocrates put it, lacking in any virtue.[87]

What served as a model for Isocrates to depict tyrannical rule as the exact opposite to Theseus' democracy disguised as monarchy was Socrates' account in the ninth book of the *Republic* of how the tyrannical man develops from the democratic type, with a youth bred in his democratic father's way rejecting beliefs held from boyhood about the honourable and the base and being overmastered by the opinions newly emancipated and released, namely opinions that formerly, when he was under the control of his father, were freed from restraint only in sleep. As a result of this he is now continuously and in waking hours what he rarely became in sleep, refraining from no atrocity of murder nor from any food or deed, with Eros who dwells in him as a tyrant living in utmost anarchy and lawlessness and," so to speak, "urging the polity of him in whom he dwells to dare anything and everything in order to find support for himself and the hubbub of his henchmen."[88]

[80]Ibid., 210b–c: met¦ dè taàta tÕ ™n ta‹j yuca‹j k£lloj timièteron ¹ge‹sqai toà ™n tù sèmati, éste kaˆ ™£n [...] tij [...] smikrÕn ¥nqoj œcV, ™xarke‹n aÙtù kaˆ ™r©n kaˆ k»desqai kaˆ t…ktein lÒgouj toioÚtouj kaˆ zhte‹n, o†tinej poi»sousi belt…ouj toÝj nšouj [...].

[81]Ibid., 210c: […] †na ¢nagkasqÍ aâ qe£sasqai tÕ ™n to‹j ™pithdeÚmasi kaˆ to‹j nÒmoij kalÕn kaˆ toàt' „de‹n Óti p©n aÙtÕ aØtù suggenšj ™stin, †na tÕ perˆ tÕ sîma kalÕn smikrÒn ti ¹g»shtai eἶnai [...].

[82]Ibid., 210c–d: […] met¦ dè t¦ ™pithdeÚmata ™pˆ t¦j ™pist»maj ¢gage‹n, †na „dV aâ ™pisthmîn k£lloj [...].

[83]Ibid., 210d–e: […] ¢ll' ™p„ tÕ polÝ pšlagoj tetrammšnoj toà kaloà kaˆ qewrîn polloÝj kaˆ kaloÝj lÒgouj kaˆ megaloprepe‹j t…ktV kaˆ diano»mata ™n filosof…v ¢fqÒnf, ›wj ¨n ™ntaàqa ·wsqeˆj kat…dV tin¦ ™pist»mhn m…an taÚthn, ¼ ™sti kaloà toioàde.

[84]Cf. n. 33.

[85]*Helen,* 31: […] t¾n dè ¥llhn ¢ret¾n kaˆ t¾n swfrosÚnhn œn te to‹j proeirhmšnoij kaˆ m£list' ™n oŒj t¾n pÒlin diókhsen (scil. ™pede…xato).

[86]Ibid., 36: tosoÚtou d' ™dšhsen ¢kÒntwn ti poie‹n tîn politîn ésq' Ð mèn tÕn dÁmon kaq…sth kÚrion tÁj polite…aj, o*f* dè mÒnon aÙtÕn ¥rcein °x…oun, ¹goÚmenoi pistotšran kaˆ koinotšran eἶnai t¾n ™ke…nou monarc…an tÁj aØtîn dhmokrat…aj.

[87]Ibid., 21: nàn dè tîn mèn ¥llwn tîn eÙdokimhs£ntwn eØr»somen tÕn mèn ¢ndr…aj, tÕn dè sof…aj, tÕn d' ¥llou tinÕj tîn toioÚtwn merîn ¢pesterhmšnon, toàton dè mÒnon oÙd' ˜nÕj ™nde© genÒmenon, ¢ll¦ pantelÁ t¾n ¢ret¾n kths£menon.

[88]*Republic*, 574d–e: kaˆ ™n toÚtoij d¾ p©sin, § p£lai eἰcen dÒxaj ™k paidÕj perˆ kalîn te kaˆ a„scrîn, t¦j dika…aj poioumšnaj, a*f* newst„ ™k doule…aj lelumšnai, doruforoàsai tÕn ”Erwta, krat»sousi met' ™ke…nou, a*f* prÒteron mèn Ônar ™lÚonto ™n ÛpnJ, Óte Ãn aÙtÕj œti ØpÕ nÒmoij te kai patrˆ dhmokratoÚmenoj ™n ˜autù: turanneuqeˆj dè ØpÕ ”Erwtoj, oŒoj Ñlig£kij ™geneto Ônar, Ûpar toioàtoj ¢eˆ genÒmenoj oÜte tinÕj fÒnou deinoà ¢fšxetai oÜte brèmatoj

Isocrates passes over in silence an unbreakable bond between Eros living in utmost anarchy and lawlessness in a youth bred in his democratic father's way and tyranny, and speaks only of the newly made tyrant's political course of action by rephrasing Socrates theses put forward in the eighth book of the *Republic* where it is said that the aforementioned tyrant "when he has come to terms with some of his exiled enemies and has got others destroyed and is no longer disturbed by them, is always stirring up some war so that the people may be in need of a leader."[89] The same is also true of Socrates' assertions in the mentioned book of the *Republic* that the newly made tyrant plots against all those brave, great-souled, wise and rich "whose enemy he must necessarily be until he purge the city,"[90] offending by such conduct the citizens and thus ending up having "the greater need of more and more trustworthy bodyguards"[91] for whose feeding "he will spend both sacred treasures in the city as long as they last and the property of those he has destroyed, thus requiring smaller contributions from the populace."[92]

This is reflected in Isocrates' theses that those who seek to rule their fellow-citizens by force are themselves the slaves of others,[93] that those who keep the lives of their fellow-citizens in peril themselves live in extreme fear,[94] and are forced to make war, on the one hand, with the help of citizens against invaders from abroad, and, on the other hand, with the help of auxiliaries against their fellow citizens.[95] and that Theseus saw them despoiling the temples of the gods,

---

oÜte œrgou, ¢ll¦ turannikÎj ™n aÙtù Đ "Erwj ™n p£sV ¢narc…v kaˆ ¢nom…a zîn […] tÕn œcont£ te aÙtÕn ésper pÒlin ¥xei ™pi p©san tÒlman […]. Cf. also 572e–573a: […] Ótan d' ™lp…swsin o*f* deinoˆ m£goi te kaˆ turannopoioˆ oátoi m¾ ¥llwj tÕn nšon kaqšxein, œrwt£ tina aÙtù mhcanwmšnouj ™mpoiÁsai prost£thn tîn ¢rgîn kaˆ t¦ ›toima dianemomšnwn ™piqumiîn, ØpÒpteron kaˆ mšgan khfÁn£ tina [...]. Translations of the passages from the *Republic* are by P. Shorey (LCL).

[89]Ibid., 566e: Ótan dš ge prÕj toÝj œxw ™cqroÝj to‹j mὲn katallagÍ, toÝj dὲ kaˆ diafqe…rei, kaˆ ¹suc…a ™ke…nwn gšnhtai, prîton mὲn polšmouj tin¦j ¦eˆ kine‹ †n' ™n cre…v toà ¹gemÒnoj Đ dÁmoj Ï. See also Aristotle, *Politics*, 5, 9, 5 (1313b28): œsti dὲ kaˆ polemopoiÕj Ò tÚrannoj, Ópwj ¥scolo… te ðsi kaˆ ¹gemÒnoj ™n cre…v diatelîsin Ôntej.

[90]Ibid., 567c: Ñxšwj ¥ra de‹ Đr©n aÙtÕn t…j ¢ndre‹oj, t…j megalÒfrwn, t…j frÒnimoj, t…j ploÚsioj kaˆ oÛtwj eÙda…mwn ™st…n, éste toÚtoij ¤pasin ¢n£gkh aÙtù, e‡te boÚletai e‡te m», polem…ù e‶nai, ›wj ¨n kaqÇrV t¾n pÒlin.

[91]Ibid., 567d: «r' oân oÙcˆ ÓsJ ¨n m©llon to‹j pol…taij ¢pecq£nhtai taàta drîn, tosoÚtJ pleiÒnwn kaˆ pistotšrwn dorufÒrwn de»setai; Cf. Aristotle, *Politics*, 5, 8, 7 (1311a): […] tÕ tÕ tšloj (scil. tyrannidis) e‶nai ploàton (oÛtw g¦r kaˆ diamšnein ¢nagka‹on mÒnwj t»n te fulak¾n kaˆ t¾n truf»n) [...].

[92]Ibid., 568d: dÁlon Óti, ™£n te *f*er¦ cr»mata Ï ™n tÍ pÒlei, taàta ¢nalèsei, Ópoi potὲ ¨n ¢eˆ ™xarkÍ t¦ tîn ¢podomšnwn, ™l£ttouj e„sfor¦j ¢nagk£zwn tÕn dÁmon e„sfšrein.

[93]*Helen,* 32: Đrîn g¦r toÝj b…v tîn politîn ¥rcein zhtoàntaj ˜tšroij douleÚontaj [...].

[94]Ibid.: [...] kaˆ toÝj (scil. b…v tîn politîn ¥rcein zhtoàntaj) ™pik…ndunon tÕn b…on to‹j ¥lloij kaqist£ntaj aÙtoÝj perideÎj zîntaj [...]. Cf. *Republic*, 578a: 'Must not such a city, as well as such a man , be full of terrors and alarms."

[95]Ibid.: […] kaˆ poleme‹n ¢nagkazomšnouj met¦ mὲn tîn politîn prÕj toÝj ™pistrateuomšnouj, met¦ d' ¥llwn tinîn prÕj toÝj sumpoliteuomšnouj [...] What we deal with here is probably an echo of Socrates' thesis in the poetological, fourth book of the *Republic* (422–423a) that each one of other cities, unlike the one he is depicting, is many cities (states), not a city, as there are two at least at enmity with one another, the city of the rich and the city of the poor, with each of the two containing in itself many others.

putting to death the best of their fellow-citizens, distrusting those nearest to them and living lives no more free from care than do men who in prison await their death.[96]

From what has been said so far we could see quite clearly to what extent Isocrates derived ideas from the philosophy of Socrates and Plato when writing his encomium, which cannot be said of his rigorous, systematic approach to selecting, elaborating and bringing the mentioned ideas into a harmonious whole.

More than anything else, the mentioned approach helps us gain an understanding of the true nature of Isocrates' "philosophy," as evident from the fact that the new myth, as used in Socrates' discourses on love in both the *Phaedrus* and the S*ymposium*, was the main reason why he so heavily relied on the mentioned dialogues, all the more so since the principles of the new rhetoric (*diairesis*, *synagoge*), of great significance for his own art of speaking, are given in broad outline in the former. What was only announced in the *Phaedrus*, namely a method with the two aforementioned opposite, alternating principles was further elaborated in the dialogues *Sophist*, *Euthydemus* and *Statesman,* which explains why Isocrates when composing his proemium to the *Helen* was highly dependent on the concepts developed in the aforesaid dialogues, with Socrates' sharp critique of the old myth, along with his depiction of the successive forms of decline of an ideal, aristocratic type of government in the *Republic,* providing a guiding principle to the orator in his noble effort to elaborate on the key concepts of the philosophy of Socrates and Plato.

All this, along with the key words of both Socrates' political testament in the *Alcibiades* and the *Gorgias, epimeleia*[97] and *gymnastike*[98] respectively, explains why in his self-interpretation in the *Antidosis* Isocrates identifies his own sophistic with training of the intellect (*phroneseos askesis = gymnastics of the mind*),[99] as opposed to the sophistic of his rivals, indulging in shocking,

[96]*Helen*, 33: […] œti dè sulîntaj mèn t¦ tîn qeîn, ¢pokte…nontaj dè toÝj belt…stouj tîn politîn, ¢pistoàntaj dè to‹j o„keiot£toij, oÙdèn dè ·vqumÒteron zîntaj tîn ™pˆ qan£tJ suneilhmmšnwn.

[97]Cf. *Antidosis,* 210–211 where Isocrates' rhetoric is characterized as *melete*, *epimeleiai* and *philoponiai,* or, in other words, gymnastics (*phroneseos askesis*), as opposed to that of his rivals, denoted as *teratologiai*, that is, mental juggling, with the two first mentioned terms (*melete*, *epimeleiai*) being also the keywords of Plato's *Alcibiades* and Xenophon's *Memorabilia*, which points to the conclusion that they were derived from Socrates' political testament in the aforementioned dialogue.

[98]Cf. *Gorgias,* 465c where the famous analogy is drawn between beauty care, gymnastics, sophistic and legislation on the one side, and cookery, medicine, rhetoric and justice on the other (as beauty care is to gymnastics, so is sophistic to legislation, and as cookery is to medicine, so is rhetoric to justice), with the true rhetoric, in Isocrates' view, thus ending up being essentially identical to the gymnastics. It is also worth mentioning that the same analogy is reflected in Aristides' *Reply to Plato* (or. 2, 215), with the expression gumnasqèn kaˆ ponÁsan in the *Antidosis* (210) providing a clue to Isocrates' understanding of Sophistic.

[99]*Antidosis,* 209.

amazing narratives (*teratologiai*)[100] and thus resembling Lucian's completely black Bactrian camel or, in other words, a freak.[101]

Conclusion

Close analysis of Isocrates' encomium has shown that what was announced in the proemium was fully applied to the main body of the work, that is, a strict adherence to the basic tenets and concepts of Socratic-Platonic philosophy, as evidenced by the fact that Isocrates heavily relied on the theory of love, as expressed through the new myth in both the *Phaedrus* and the *Symposium.* What was only announced in the former, i.e. the principles of the new rhetoric (*diaireseis*, *synagogai*), was fully applied in the dialogues *Sophist, Statesman* and *Euthydemus* that in their turn served as models for Isocrates to conceive his proemium. The very fact that Socrates' sharp critique of the old myth, along with his depiction of the successive forms of decline of an ideal, aristocratic type of government in the *Republic,* provided a guiding principle to the orator in his noble effort to elaborate on the key concepts of Socratic-Platonic philosophy speaks volumes about the encomium's philosophical nature, unity and coherence. More importantly, what we deal with here is the first attempt in the intellectual history at subjecting literature to the categories of philosophy, as advocated for by Socrates in the poetological books of the *Republic*, something for which supplanting the old myth through a new one was a necessary prerequisite.

References

Barwick, Karl. "Die Gliederung der Narratio in der rhetorischen Theorie und ihre Bedeutung für die Geschichte des antiken Romans." *Hermes* 63 (1928): 261–287.

Brodersen, Kai (ed.). *Ailianos: Vermischte Forschung*. Berlin: De Gruyter, 2018 (Sammlung Tusculum).

Caplan, Harry (ed.). *Anonymus: Rhetorica ad Herennium*. Cambridge Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1954 (Loeb Classical Library).

Cerri, Giovanni. *Platone sociologo della communicazione.* Milano: Mondadori, 1991.

Chambry, Émile (ed.). *Platon: La Republique*. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1932 (Collection Budé).

Cohoon, James Wilfred (ed.). *Dio Chrysostom: The Eighteenth Discourse (On Training for Public Speaking).* Cambridge Massachusetts: Loeb Classical Library, 1939.

Croiset, Maurice. (ed.). *Platon: Alcibiade*. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1920 (Collection Budé).

____. (ed.). *Platon: Gorgias*. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1923. (Collection Budé).

Crosby, Henry Lamar (ed.). *Dio Chrysostom: The Sixtieth Discourse (Nessus or Deianeira).* Cambridge Massachusetts: Loeb Classical Library, 1946.

[100]Ibid.: 284–285. In this connection, it is also worth mentioning that Isocrates when referring to the ancient sophists in the *Helen* means those of the older generation almost immediately preceding his own time, and not, as some believe, Presocratic philosophers.

[101]*Prometheus es in verbis,* 4.

Ebert, Theodor. "'Wenn ich einen schönen Mythos vortragen darf …': Zu Status, Herkunft und Funktion des Schlussmythos in Platons Phaidon." In Markus Janka–Christian. Schäfer (eds.) *Platon als Mythenerzähler: Neue Interpretazionen zu den Mythen in Platons Dialogen.* Darmstadt: WBG, 2002.
Ferroni, Lorenzo–Macé, Arnaud (eds.). *Platon: Ion*. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 2018.
Fowler, Harold North (ed.). *Plato: Theaetetus, Sophist*. Cambridge Massachusetts: Loeb Classical Library, 1921.
Gigon, Olof. "Nachwort." In: *Cicero, Gespräche in Tusculum* (München und Zürich: Artemis & Winckler 1992 6th ed. (Sammlung Tusculum).
Harmon, Austin Morris (ed.). *Lucian: Essays in Portraiture.* Cambridge Massachusetts: Loeb Classical Library, 1925.
____. (ed.). *Essays in Portraiture Defended*. Cambridge Massachusetts: Loeb Classical Library, 1925.
____. (ed.). *The Dead Come to Life or the Fisherman* (*Piscator*). Cambridge Massachusetts: Loeb Classical Library, 1921.
Hicks, Robert Drew (ed.). *Diogenes Laertius: Lives of Eminent Philosophers*. Cambridge Massachusetts: Loeb Classical Library, 1925.
Hubbell, Harry Mortimer (ed.). *Cicero: On Invention*. Cambridge Massachusetts: Loeb Classical Library. 1949.
Jaerisch, Peter (ed.). *Xenophon: Erinnerungen an Sokrates*, 4th ed. München und Zürich: Artemis Verlag, 1987(Sammlung Tusculum).
Kilburn, K. (ed.). *Lucian: To One who Said "You're a Prometheus in Words*" (*Prometheus es in verbis*). Cambridge Massachusetts: Loeb Classical Library, 1959.
Kobusch, Theo. "Die Wiederkehr des Mythos: Zur Funktion des Mythos in Platons Denken und in der Philosophie der Gegenwart." In Gerhard Binder–Bernd Effe (eds.). *Mythos: Erzählende Weltdeutung im Spannungsfeld von Ritual, Geschichte und Rationalität.* Trier: Ruhr Universität Bochum (*Bochumer Altertumswissenschaftliches Colloquium* 2), 1990.
Lamb, Walter Rangeley Maitland (ed.). *Plato: Laches, Euthydemus*. Cambridge Massachusetts: Loeb Classical Library, 1952.
Livingstone, Niall. *A Commentary on Isocrates' Busiris.* Leiden: Brill, 2001.
Manuwald, Bernd. "Platon als Mythenerzähler" In Marcus Janka–Christian Schäfer (eds.). *Platon als Mythologe: Neue Interpretationen zu den Mythen in Platons Dialogen.* Darmstadt: WBG, 2002.
Marcovich, Miroslav (ed.). *Eustathius Macrembolites: De Hysmines et Hysminiae amoribus libri XI*. München und Leipzig: Teubner, 2001.
Moors, Kent F. *Platonic myth: An Introductory Study.* Washington D.C.: University Press of America. 1982.
Morgan, Kathryn A. *Myth and Philosophy from the Presocratics to Plato.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000.
Müller, Carl Werner. "Chariton von Aphrodisias und die Theorie des Romans in der Antike." *Antike und Abendland* 22 (1976): 115–136.
Norlin, George (ed.) *Isocrates: Antidosis.* Cambridge Massachusetts: Loeb Classical Library, 1929.
____. (ed.). *Panathenaicus*. Cambridge Massachusetts: Loeb Classical Library, 1929.
Nüßlein, Theodor (ed.). *Cicero: Über den Redner* (*De oratore*). Berlin: De Gruyter, 2011 (Sammlung Tusculum).
Papillon, Terry. L. "Isocrates and the Use of Myth." *Hermathena* 161(1996): 9–21.
Rackham, Horace (ed.). *Aristotle: Politics*. Cambridge Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1932 (Loeb Classical Library).

Reale, Giovanni. *Platone*, *Fedone*: *introduzione, traduzione, note e apparati.* Milano: Bompiani, 2000.
Robin, Léon. (ed.). *Platon: Phedre*. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1964 (Collection Budé).
Rostagni, Augusto. *Aristotele e l'aristotelismo nella storia dell'estetica antica: origini, significato e svolgimento della* Poetica. Torino: Bottega d'Erasmo, 1955.
Rufener, Rudolf (ed.). *Platon: Symposium*. Düsseldorf und Zürich: Artemis Verlag, 2002 (Sammlung Tusculum).
Russell, Donald. "Encomium." In: S. Hornblower, A. Spawforth, E. Eidinow (eds.), *The Oxford Classical Dictionary* (Oxford: University Press 2012, 4th edition).
Schönberger, Otto (ed.). *Philostratos: Die Bilder*. München: Ernst Heimeran Verlag, 1968 (Sammlung Tusculum).
Szlezák, Thomas Alexander. *Platon lesen.* Stuttgart-Bad Cannstatt: Frommann-Holzboog, 1993.
Trapp, Michael (ed.). *Aelius Aristides: A Reply to Plato: In Defense of Oratory*. Cambridge Massachusetts: Loeb Classical Library, 2017.
van Hook, Larue (ed.). *Isocrates: Helen*. Cambridge Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1945 (Loeb Classical Library).
Vicaire, Paul (ed.). *Platon: Phédon*. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1983 (Collection Budé).
Viidebaum, Laura. *Creating the Ancient Rhetorical Tradition.* Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 2021.
Wright, Wilmer. Cave (ed.). *Philostratus: Lives of the Sophists*. Cambridge Massachusetts: Harvard University Press 1921 (Loeb Classical Library).
____. (ed.). *Eunapius: Lives of the Philosophers and Sophists*. Cambridge Massachusetts: Harvard University Press 1921 (Loeb Classical Library).
Zajonz, Sandra. *Isokrates' Enkomion auf Helena: Ein Kommentar*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 2002.
Zimmermann, Bernhard (ed.). *Aischylos: Agamemnon*. Zürich und Düsseldorf: Artemis & Winckler, 1996 (Sammlung Tusculum).