

Reapportioning Honors: Intertextuality in *Against Leptines*

Mitchell H. Parks

ALLUSION AND INTERTEXTUALITY are well established as critical tools for studying many areas of Greek and Roman culture. Nonetheless, in Classical Greek prose, intertextuality has been slow to catch on, especially as regards the Attic orators.¹ These texts, however, represent a dense network of interrelated actors, modes of speech, and social concerns and therefore demand to be read as being in conversation with each other and with their wider cultural context.² Demosthenes' speech *Against Leptines* presents a useful test case for several

¹ Examples of intertextual interpretations of Classical Greek prose include C. Pelling, *Literary Texts and the Greek Historian* (London 2000) 61–67; V. J. Gray, *Xenophon's Mirror of Princes: Reading the Reflections* (Oxford 2011) 119–178; M. Zelcer, "Reading the *Menexenus* Intertextually," in H. Parker et al. (eds.), *Speeches for the Dead: Essays on Plato's Menexenus* (Berlin 2018) 29–49; and several contributions in G. Danzig et al. (eds.), *Plato and Xenophon: Comparative Studies* (Leiden/Boston 2018). The corpora of *epitaphioi logoi* and Socratic texts in particular should be low-hanging fruit for this sort of analysis. Nonetheless, the state of the field is not so distant from Fowler's observation two decades ago ("On the Shoulders of Giants: Intertextuality and Classical Studies," *MD* 39 [1997] 13–34, at 26) "that there is a tendency at times for intertextual criticism to concentrate on poetic literary texts to the neglect first of prose, sub-literary, and non-literary texts, and second of other types of cultural production."

² In this article I employ "read" and "reader" generically, to refer to any moment when the text is consumed and to any consumer of the text, including listeners, such as the jury and bystanders at a trial or the auditors at a recitation.

Greek, Roman, and Byzantine Studies 60 (2020) 242–261

Article copyright held by the author(s) and made available under the
Creative Commons Attribution License

CC-BY <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>

reasons. For one, it is well served by the recent commentaries of Kremmydas and Canevaro, in addition to Canevaro's article elucidating the case's procedure.³ The speech also has at its heart a political question that gives it a starring role in one of the most dynamic fourth-century conversations: how can Athens balance the desires of powerful individuals against the interests of the collective *dêmos*?

In brief, the situation: Athens at this moment, in 355/4 BCE, found itself in financial need, and the estates of wealthy individuals represented a useful source of revenue. Leptines therefore proposed a law, which subsequently passed, that eliminated grants of *ateleia*, exemption from liturgies and other forms of taxation, granted by the state as an honor for public benefactors (Dem. 20.29).⁴ As Demosthenes argues, however, in his attempt to repeal and replace Leptines' law, the loss in revenue from the exemptions is balanced by the exhortative function of honors: their availability inspires a productive rivalry among the elite that ultimately benefits the *dêmos*.⁵ With the advantage of hindsight, one can see in this speech a constellation of concerns that

³ C. Kremmydas, *Commentary on Demosthenes Against Leptines* (Oxford 2012); M. Canevaro, *Demostene, Contro Leptine: introduzione, traduzione e commento storico* (Berlin 2016). The former focuses more on the rhetoric of the speech; the latter, on its historical context. Canevaro interprets the procedure in detail in "The Procedure of Demosthenes' *Against Leptines*: How to Repeal (and Replace) an Existing Law," *JHS* 136 (2016) 39–58.

⁴ For an overview of these grants in relation to this speech see Kremmydas, *Commentary* 43–45, and Canevaro, *Demostene* 55–56. These grants were among the most prestigious honors at Athens: D. T. Engen, *Honor and Profit: Athenian Trade Policy and the Economy and Society of Greece, 415–307 B.C.E.* (Ann Arbor 2010) 187–188.

⁵ This is more or less a paraphrase of 20.108, but it is also a key theme of the entire speech: 20.5–7, 39, 154. See in particular S. D. Lambert, "What Was the Point of Inscribed Honorific Decrees in Classical Athens?" in *Sociable Man: Essays on Ancient Greek Social Behaviour in Honour of Nick Fisher* (Swansea 2011) 193–214, at 195–196, along with M. Domingo Gygas, *Benefactions and Rewards in the Ancient Greek City: The Origins of Euergetism* (Cambridge 2016) 222; for the bird's-eye view of honors at Athens see E. A. Meyer, "Inscriptions as Honors and the Athenian Epigraphic Habit," *Historia* 62 (2013) 453–505.

will occupy Athenian writers and policy makers for the next several decades: powerful individuals, especially in the era of the rise of Philip II,⁶ are potentially dangerous to the *dēmos* and should be subordinated to it, but their willing cooperation is essential to the state's financial health. Demosthenes' stance in this trial anticipates the expansion of honors for individuals in the coming years, as Engen, Domingo Gygax, and others have documented.⁷

In addition to looking forward, one can also look backward. The tension between individual and collective was not unique to this period; indeed, it was foundational to the Athenian democracy, many institutions of which were designed to restrain the influence of the elite. Whether these restraints actually worked is another matter: they proved more open to contestation and renegotiation than was the case with the institutions that kept women, foreigners, and enslaved persons out of political power,⁸ and fourth-century orators exaggerate the degree to which the fifth-century *dēmos* controlled ambitious individuals.⁹ Nonetheless, as Ferrario has shown, the social and intellectual landscape of fourth-century Athens did indeed assign more and more weight to the impact of the individual in public affairs.¹⁰

⁶ As it happens, 20.61–63 constitutes “the earliest mention of Philip in the Demosthenic corpus” (Kremmydas, *Commentary* 301).

⁷ An important concurrent phenomenon is the expanding economic inequality at Athens in the fourth century, as described by C. Taylor, *Poverty, Wealth, and Well-Being: Experiencing Penia in Democratic Athens* (Oxford 2017) 180–193. On the resulting evolution of the euergetic system see especially Domingo Gygax, *Benefactions and Rewards* 248–249.

⁸ Indeed, the fourth century witnessed an increase in exclusionary institutions: see, e.g., R. F. Kennedy, *Immigrant Women in Athens: Gender, Ethnicity, and Citizenship in the Classical City* (New York 2014) 20.

⁹ This is exemplified by the discourse surrounding the Eion herms: Dem. 20.112, Aeschin. 3.183–185. Cf. Dem. 13.20–22, as well as 23.196–199 (with Domingo Gygax, *Benefactions and Rewards* 241–242), and contrast Din. 1.75.

¹⁰ S. B. Ferrario, *Historical Agency and the ‘Great Man’ in Classical Greece* (Cambridge 2014) 229: “Athenian historical discourse during the earlier fourth century, both literary and public-symbolic, demonstrates a growing focus

Two texts in particular stand out not only as products of this ideological shift, but also, arguably, as contributors toward it: these are the *Agesilaus* of Xenophon and the *Evagoras* of Isocrates.¹¹ In addition to being foundational for the later flourishing of the rhetorical genre of encomium, these texts are the only fourth-century encomia that share three features: (1) they are stand-alone, which is to say, not subsumed within a larger text;¹² (2) they are in prose, as opposed to poetry, where authors were given more license;¹³ and (3) they are dedicated to recently deceased individuals.

What is astounding about this last characteristic is that, in praising a contemporary instead of a mythological figure,¹⁴ unapologetically and in prose, these texts oppose themselves to the traditional Athenian suspicion of elevating an individual and, concomitantly, to the exclusive praise for the collective

upon the agency of individuals. Xenophon emphasized the role of the individual in history-making actions; Demosthenes and Aeschines argued that public perceptions of the dependence of the democratic group upon its leaders can give rise to the reality of that dependence. During the same period, a burgeoning of public commemoration for individuals, particularly in the form of honorific decrees, likely contributed to an increasing recognition of categorized or stratified access to historical memory.”

¹¹ On the relationship of Xenophon’s works to contemporary public policy see G. J. Oliver, “Before ‘Lykourgan Athens’: the Origins of Change,” in V. Azoulay et al. (eds.), *Clisthène et Lycurgue d’Athènes: autour du politique dans la cité classique* (Paris 2011) 119–131, at 121–123.

¹² Passages of praise of contemporaries can be found within other works of literature, but the context makes the praise less bold, since the wider narrative does not necessarily support unqualified admiration, as with the praise of Nicias (Thuc. 7.86.5) or Cyrus the Younger (Xen. *An.* 1.9). Contrast also the Socratic *apologiai*, which have an undeniable commemorative/praising function, but one made more excusable by the forensic framework, a technique which Isocrates employs to great effect in the *Antidosis*, a text close in date to *Against Leptines*; cf. Isoc. 10.14–15.

¹³ See especially Isoc. 9.10–11.

¹⁴ Contrast, e.g., Isocrates’ *Helen* or *Busiris*, or the encomia of Eros offered in Plato’s *Symposium*; cf. contemporary paradoxical encomia of salt and bees (Isoc. 10.12, Pl. *Symp.* 177B).

found in the funeral orations. Not only must each encomium argue that its subject is praiseworthy, but each must also contend that praising an individual is itself a worthwhile endeavor.

This is the chief reason why they can be productively placed in dialogue with *Against Leptines*: they are that speech's immediate predecessors—in the case of the *Agésilas*, by half a decade at most¹⁵—in claiming that praise can further, rather than harm, the cause of the collective. Demosthenes in fact gives praise frequently in this speech: he rehearses how past honorands earned their exemptions, and these sections of the speech effectively constitute miniature encomia.¹⁶ Like many passages in the orators, these mini-encomia are supported by texts to be read aloud to the jury, in particular the decrees that granted the honorands their exemptions.¹⁷ The speech is therefore overtly intertextual: it expects to be judged not only against the audi-

¹⁵ The *Agésilas* likely dates from shortly after the eponymous king's death in 359. On the dating of *Against Leptines* (355/4): Kremmydas, *Commentary* 33–34; Canevaro, *Demostene* 8–11. It is of course possible that the text of this speech attained its 'published' form well after the date of the trial itself; in that case, all references in this paper to the date of the text should be understood to refer to the date of the historical setting constructed by the text, rather than of its composition/dissemination.

¹⁶ In much of what follows, references to "Demosthenes" should be understood as shorthand for "the speaker constructed by the text." Throughout this paper, I have attempted to sidestep considerations of authorial intent, because this seemed to me the best way to achieve logical consistency within this article. J. Farrell, "Intention and Intertext," *Phoenix* 59 (2005) 98–111, at 107, provides, with reference to Vergil, what I consider an agreeable model for incorporating the author into the picture: "I see the process of assessing these allusions as unfolding according to a procedure that the author sets in motion, but that he cannot fully control."

¹⁷ Dem. 20.35 (decrees for Leucon), 20.44 (decree for Epicerdes), 20.54 (decree for the Corinthian exiles), 20.63 (decrees for the Thasians and Byzantines), 20.70 (decrees for Conon), 20.78 (account of the ships, cities, and money seized by Chabrias, as well as his trophies), 20.86 (decrees for Chabrias, artfully delayed at 20.84). In addition, at 20.32 the speaker himself rattles off figures from the records of the *sitophylakes*. These texts largely do not survive.

ence's collective memory of the events described, but specifically against these decrees, which support the praise lavished by the speaker on his subjects by reminding the audience of their own past acts of praise. While one could argue that these decrees are the most important texts in the intertextual web constructed by the speech, or even the sole texts of relevance, to do so would flatten Demosthenes' argument about the necessity of praise and honor to the running of the *polis* by allowing only one kind of model, the state's own positive praise. *Against Leptines* deploys the earlier literary encomia, by contrast, in order to suggest how and to whom one should *not* give praise. In this article, I examine two particular passages of *Against Leptines*—the one in praise of the Corinthian exiles (20.51–54) and the one in praise of Conon (67–74)—in order to demonstrate how reading this speech intertextually with the literary encomia can bring out new meanings.

1. *Rivaling Agesilaus*

The miniature encomia occupy about a third of the entire text of *Against Leptines*: first come foreign benefactors, followed by native-born Athenians. Among the foreign benefactors, the most striking inclusion is the pro-Athenian faction at Corinth at the outset of the Corinthian War.¹⁸ For their conduct after the battle at Nemea in 394, these Corinthians earned honors from the Athenians, but eventually found themselves exiled from Corinth. Demosthenes describes their actions with a massive periodic sentence (20.52–53), of which I have underlined what I consider to be the crucial portion for the present argument:¹⁹

τὰ μὲν οὖν ἄλλ' ὅσα χρησίμους ὑμῖν ἑαυτοὺς ἐκεῖνοι παρέσχον,
ἔάσω· ἀλλ' ὅθ' ἡ μεγάλη μάχη πρὸς Λακεδαιμονίους ἐγένεθ' ἡ ἐν
Κορίνθῳ, τῶν ἐν τῇ πόλει βουλευσαμένων μετὰ τὴν μάχην μὴ

¹⁸ Although the deeds of Epicerdes of Cyrene have just been evaluated in similar terms in the mini-encomium (20.41–48) right before this one, what makes the passage about the Corinthians striking is the vividness of the historical narrative. Hypothetically, the text could have delivered an image of Epicerdes dramatically making his offer of aid at the Athenians' time of need—cf. the hyperbolic example of Plut. *Alc.* 10.1–2—but instead Demosthenes reserves this elaboration for the Corinthians.

¹⁹ Throughout, translations are my own unless otherwise indicated.

δέχεσθαι τῷ τείχει τοὺς στρατιώτας, ἀλλὰ πρὸς Λακεδαιμονίους ἐπικηρυκεύεσθαι, ὁρῶντες ἠτυχηκυῖαν τὴν πόλιν καὶ τῆς παρόδου κρατοῦντας Λακεδαιμονίους, οὐχὶ προὔδοκαν οὐδ' ἐβουλεύσαντ' ἰδίᾳ περὶ τῆς αὐτῶν σωτηρίας, ἀλλὰ πλησίον ὄντων μεθ' ὅπλων ἀπάντων Πελοποννησίων ἀνέφξαν τὰς πύλας ὑμῖν βία τῶν πολλῶν, καὶ μᾶλλον εἶλοντο μεθ' ὑμῶν τῶν τότε στρατευσαμένων, εἴ τι δέοι, πάσχειν ἢ χωρὶς ὑμῶν ἀκινδύνως σεσῶσθαι, καὶ εἰσέφρουον τὸ στράτευμα, καὶ διέσωσαν καὶ ὑμᾶς καὶ τοὺς συμμάχους.

Well, I will skip over all the other ways in which they made themselves useful to you. But when the great battle against the Lacedaemonians happened, the one in Corinth, even though those in the city had decided, after the battle, not to receive your soldiers within the wall but rather to send ambassadors to the Lacedaemonians, these men, seeing that your city was in a state of misfortune and that the Lacedaemonians controlled the avenue of escape, did not betray you nor even did they deliberate individually about their own safety, but, even with all the Peloponnesians in arms close by, they opened the gates for you in spite of the majority, and they chose to suffer, if need be, at the side of those of you who served on that campaign, rather than staying safe apart from you, without risk, and they let your army in, and they kept you and your allies safe.

In sum, this sentence narrates the reason for the honors: after Athens and its allies—Corinth and other states—lost the battle at Nemea to the Spartans, the pro-Athenian faction among the Corinthians gave the Athenian forces shelter within their walls, against the wishes of the majority of their fellow Corinthians.

In this conflict, Athens, Corinth, and other states, backed by Persian resources, had made an alliance to attempt to topple the Spartan hegemony. From a Persian perspective, at any rate, the formation of the alliance was an almost immediate success, because it forced the Spartan king Agesilaus II to end his empire-building campaign in Asia Minor and return home. The Greek allies, for their part, were less successful: Sparta quickly won two large engagements, first at Nemea and then, after the return of Agesilaus, at Coroneia in Boeotia. For Xenophon, the battle of Coroneia is the pinnacle of success for Agesilaus: indeed, it was,

in his words, “unlike any other battle fought by our contemporaries.”²⁰ Even more laudable, though, was the fact that Agesilaus had chosen to give up the potential glories of the Asian campaign and return home in the first place. This choice occasions the most elaborate periodic sentence (1.36) in the narrative portion of the encomium:²¹

ἄξιόν γε μὴν καὶ ἐντεῦθεν ὑπερβαλλόντως ἄγασθαι αὐτοῦ, ὅστις ἄρχων μὲν παμπόλων ἐν τῇ ἡπείρῳ πόλεων, ἄρχων δὲ καὶ νήσων, ἐπεὶ καὶ τὸ ναυτικὸν προσῆψεν αὐτῷ ἢ πόλις, ἀύξανόμενος δὲ καὶ εὐκλεία καὶ δυνάμει, παρὸν δ’ αὐτῷ πολλοῖς καὶ ἀγαθοῖς χρῆσθαι ὅτι ἐβούλετο, πρὸς δὲ τούτοις τὸ μέγιστον, ἐπινοῶν καὶ ἐλπίζων καταλύσειν τὴν ἐπὶ τὴν Ἑλλάδα στρατεύσασαν πρότερον ἀρχήν, ὅμως ὑπ’ οὐδενὸς τούτων ἐκρατήθη, ἀλλ’ ἐπειδὴ ἦλθεν αὐτῷ ἀπὸ τῶν οἴκοι τελῶν βοηθεῖν τῇ πατρίδι, ἐπείθετο τῇ πόλει οὐδὲν διαφερόντως ἢ εἰ ἐν τῷ ἐφορείῳ ἔτυχεν ἐστηκῶς μόνος παρὰ τοὺς πέντε, μάλα ἔνδηλον ποιῶν ὡς οὔτε ἂν πᾶσαν τὴν γῆν δέξαιτο ἀντὶ τῆς πατρίδος οὔτε τοὺς ἐπικτήτους ἀντὶ τῶν ἀρχαίων φίλων οὔτε αἰσχρὰ καὶ ἀκίνδυνα κέρδη μᾶλλον ἢ μετὰ κινδύνων τὰ καλὰ καὶ δίκαια.

Indeed, it is also appropriate to admire him, to an extreme degree, for what he did next: although he was the ruler of very many mainland cities, and ruler of islands, too, once his city had bestowed its fleet to him as well; and although he was waxing in both glory and might; and although he could readily make use of vast resources however he wished; and, the greatest factor on top of those, although he planned and expected to abolish the empire that had earlier campaigned against Hellas—nonetheless, he was mastered by none of these things, but, when the order came to him from the officials at home to aid his homeland, he obeyed his city no differently than if he happened to be standing in the ephors’ court, one man against the five of them, making it very clear that he would take neither the whole earth in exchange for his homeland, nor his acquired friends in exchange for his original

²⁰ Xen. *Ages.* 2.9 (= *Hell.* 4.3.16): οἴα οὐκ ἄλλη (sc. μάχη) τῶν γ’ ἐφ’ ἡμῶν.

²¹ B. McCloskey, “Xenophon the Philosopher: *E Pluribus Plura*,” *AJP* 138 (2017) 605–640, at 616, also identifies this as “the climax of Xenophon’s *Agesilaus*,” both for its placement and because of the particular virtue being praised.

ones, nor shameful gains without risk rather than, along with risks, what is noble and just.

Both this sentence from the *Agesilaus* and the one from *Against Leptines* end, in the underlined portions, with a statement of choice between alternatives and a rejection of the path “without risk,” which both texts express using forms of ἀκίνδυνος at the climax of the sentence.²²

The concept of virtuous risk is not uncommon in passages of heightened rhetoric,²³ and therefore the antithesis of risk and safety in these two passages might seem to be merely a *topos*. The closeness of the parallel can be supported by contrasting these passages with perhaps the most linguistically similar contemporary prose passage, from Lysias’ *Against Philon*: “He thought it was better for him to continue his life without risk than to save his city by taking a risk like the other citizens.”²⁴ Despite the similar antithesis, this passage exhibits neither the elaborate structure nor the chronological coincidence of the events narrated, and is, in addition, a passage of blame rather than praise.²⁵ Admittedly, if one senses only a *topos* and not a verbal echo of

²² Other verbal echoes include forms of δέχομαι, κρατέω, and στρατεύω. Each of these words individually is perhaps to be expected in such a context, but the aggregation of echoes works to tie the two passages more closely together.

²³ See, e.g., Hdt. 7.50.3, Thuc. 1.144.3, and Lys. 1.45 for risk in a statement of extremes.

²⁴ Lys. 31.7: ἡγησάμενον κρείττον εἶναι αὐτὸν ἀκινδύνως τὸν βίον διάγειν ἢ τὴν πόλιν σφῆξιν ὁμοίως τοῖς ἄλλοις πολίταις κινδυνεύοντα.

²⁵ See also Thuc. 3.40.4, 3.56.5 (situationally similar to Dem. 20.52–53 but lacking the historical synchronism), and 5.107.1 (a passage to which Xen. *Ages.* 1.36 may act as a rebuttal), as well as Xen. *Hell.* 6.5.47, a passage in which Procles of Phleious—whose citizens are later praised corporately by the narrator (*Hell.* 7.2.1–23) in terms not unlike those of *Against Leptines* here—persuades the Athenians to assist Sparta in 370/69; Procles in this passage uses the Heracleidae as an *exemplum*, perhaps with allusion to the rhetoric of risk at Eur. *Heracl.* 503–506. The risk/lack of risk antithesis is also frequently employed in favor of the riskless path, instead of the risky one: e.g., Xen. *Mem.* 1.2.10.

the *Agesilaus* in the *Against Leptines* passage, poetry of praise does provide suggestive parallels.²⁶ For some portion of the ancient audience—perhaps even the majority—this passage will have had no more than an encomiastic flavor, familiar from both old-fashioned praise poetry and more recent honorific decree proposals. Nonetheless, the shared language of risk-taking combines with the shared notion of standing by existing allies²⁷ and the overall structure of these two encomiastic passages to make it plausible to put Dem. 20.52–53 and Xen. *Ages.* 1.36 into intertextual dialogue with each other.

Above all, the parallels prompt the reader to consider what is *not* parallel between the situations. The texts each choose an honorand from the same historical moment, but their characteristics are in binary opposition to each other. Even a reader aware of, but not deeply familiar with, Xenophon's work could discern that *Against Leptines* was making the kind of encomiastic gestures associated with the *Agesilaus* while praising very different subjects; for a reader more familiar with the *Agesilaus*, the oppositions make the contrast all the more forceful.

For instance, whereas Xenophon underscores the uniqueness of Coroneia, for Demosthenes, near the start of the quoted passage, Nemea is “the great battle” against the Spartans (20.52).²⁸ From there follow several oppositions that consistently make the Corinthian exiles appear more praiseworthy, especially from the perspective of the Athenian judges whom the speech constructs as its audience: the Corinthians were the Athenians' allies, not their enemy, in the conflict in question; they were on the losing

²⁶ See Pind. *Ol.* 6.9–12 and *Pyth.* 4.185–188; cf. Eur. fr.1052.5–9.

²⁷ This controversial aspect of Agesilaus' career is a principal concern of the encomium, as at Xen. *Ages.* 2.21, which comes as close to blame for the honorand as this text ever does; for Plutarch's *Life of Agesilaus*, as well as its mate, the *Life of Pompey*, φιλεταιρία crosses the line into moral flaw (Plut. *Ages.* 5.1, *Pomp.* 39.4, *Comp. Ages. Pomp.* 1.4).

²⁸ On the actual magnitude of the battle at Nemea, which was indeed perhaps the largest land battle fought among Greek forces, see Kremmydas, *Commentary* 286; Canevaro, *Demostene* 284.

side and in dire straits themselves;²⁹ they were defending themselves against the Spartans' pre-emptive assault on the allied forces; and they defied their own city, in contrast to how Xenophon praises Agesilaus for what one might instead simply call resisting the urge to disobey. In this regard, *Against Leptines* rewrites the *Agesilaus*, making Xenophon's praise seem cool or even ironic by contrast. The Corinthians, as it turns out, are the ones who took the real risks, the kind for which honors are both the motive force and the natural result according to the logic of the speech as a whole, in which risk is a major preoccupation.³⁰ The intertextual encounter puts these texts into an agonistic relationship, out of which the Demosthenic passage emerges as the encomium that is itself more praiseworthy, because of its more suitable choice of honorand.³¹

The most important binary here, however, is that of the individual against the collective. Throughout the speech, Demosthenes argues that individuals can be praised in order to benefit the collective, and that the Athenian *dēmos* is particularly well positioned to make use of this.³² The Corinthian exiles are an

²⁹ Some years later, Hypereides (*Against Diondas* 176v.11–13) expressly ascribed moral badness to the Spartan victory at Nemea, as opposed to the moral goodness of Thermopylae, where the Spartans played a role closer to that of these Corinthians.

³⁰ See 20.10, 49, 82, 144–145, and especially the climax of the speech, 166: “If some crisis ever occurs, you will not be at a loss for people who will be willing to take risks on your behalf” (κἄν τις ἄρ' ἔλθῃ ποτὲ καιρός, οὐκ ἀπορήσετε τῶν ἐθελήσόντων ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν κινδυνεύειν).

³¹ Although the verbal parallels point toward the *Agesilaus*, the emphases of this passage of *Against Leptines* regarding the honorand can also be brought out by contrast with the *Hellenica*. In that text, the aftermath of Nemea omits this episode (*Hell.* 4.2.23), and later the pro-Athenian faction at Corinth is unfavorably contrasted with Agesilaus in terms of how they treat suppliants: compare *Hell.* 4.3.20 (= *Ages.* 2.13) with *Hell.* 4.4.3. Kremmydas, *Commentary* 289, calls the Demosthenic version “simplistic,” but it can also be read as intentionally silent on blameworthy matters, as is customary in praise-texts.

³² Key moments are 20.15, 36, and especially 105–111, a comparison of Athenian, Spartan, and Theban policies.

undifferentiated group, like the Athenian dead in the *epitaphioi logoi*. Rather than being out of line with the rest of his argument, this collective anonymity is useful because the speaker will eventually move on to discussing individual Athenian benefactors, the riskiest sort of person for Demosthenes to introduce, given Athenian norms about praise.³³ If his individual Athenian benefactors prove themselves useful on the model of these Corinthians, then logically it must be worthwhile to praise them as well.

2. *Rivaling Evagoras*

Demosthenes delivers two miniature encomia of native Athenians: the generals Conon (20.67–74) and Chabrias (75–86). To mark the transition, he makes the ostentatious wish “that the best and largest number of benefactors should be our own citizens,”³⁴ and then, to discuss Conon in particular, he cites oral history to back his claims. He had done this at the outset of the passage about the Corinthian exiles, as well, in the sentence immediately preceding the passage quoted above: there he said “I am compelled to tell you these things as I myself have heard them from you, the older among you.”³⁵ Compare this to how he introduces Conon: “as it is possible to hear from some among

³³ The Corinthian entry is unique in the list of benefactors for containing no named individuals. Although this is not the first mini-encomium in the speech, Demosthenes does flag the Corinthian exiles as the first of his personal contributions to the evidence: one of his co-prosecutors, Phormion, had already discussed the previous examples of foreign benefactors (20.51, on which see Canevaro, *Demostene* 281–282). The complete series, including those Phormion had treated, is nonetheless important to the analysis of this passage: Kremmydas, *Commentary* 242–243, identifies ring composition in the construction of the series as a whole.

³⁴ 20.67: καὶ ἄνδρας ἀρίστους καὶ πλείστους εὐεργέτας τῆς πόλεως πολίτας εἶναι. Transl. E. M. Harris, *Demosthenes, Speeches 20–22* (Austin 2008) 42; contrast Kremmydas, *Commentary* 113.

³⁵ 20.52: ἀναγκάζομαι δὲ λέγειν πρὸς ὑμᾶς ταῦτα ἃ παρ’ ὑμῶν τῶν πρεσβυτέρων αὐτὸς ἀκήκοα.

you who are from the same generation.”³⁶ These are the only mini-encomia introduced with a formula like this, and I believe that this suggests an *intratextual* link, alerting the reader to expect some connection between these two passages. Indeed, they may each function as what might be called a *pre-Alexandrian* footnote.³⁷ These remarks, on the surface level, invoke the society’s historical memory, as transmitted orally, but they may also signal that the text is engaging with a predecessor.³⁸ In the case of the Corinthian exiles, the predecessor was Xenophon’s *Agesilaus*; for Conon, it is the other member of the pair of encomia, the *Evagoras* of Isocrates.

Conon, too, is the subject of a massive periodic sentence (20.68), which includes the formula just mentioned:

οὗτος γάρ, ὡς ὑμῶν τινων ἔστιν ἀκοῦσαι τῶν κατὰ τὴν αὐτὴν ἡλικίαν ὄντων, μετὰ τὴν τοῦ δήμου κάθοδον τὴν ἐκ Πειραιῶς

³⁶ 20.68: ὡς ὑμῶν τινων ἔστιν ἀκοῦσαι τῶν κατὰ τὴν αὐτὴν ἡλικίαν ὄντων.

³⁷ See S. Hinds, *Allusion and Intertext: Dynamics of Appropriation in Roman Poetry* (Cambridge 1998) 1–3, for an overview of the so-called ‘Alexandrian footnote’. Canevaro, *Demostene* 305, notes the similarity of the formula but invests it with other meanings (283–284); cf. Kremmydas, *Commentary* 286, 310.

³⁸ Regarding oral history in this sort of citation see J. Ober, *Mass and Elite in Democratic Athens* (Princeton 1989) 181: “Allusions to the memory of the older citizens or of one’s own ancestors allowed the orator to avoid assuming the role of an educated man instructing his inferiors.” Both of these moments in *Against Leptines*—indeed, 20.52 is one of two Demosthenic passages cited by Ober on this point—can be read in this light and therefore contribute to the construction of the youthful speaker’s ethos. That said, this need not be their only function: the text both reproduces, mimetically, its original performance in court and exists as a literary entity within a network of texts. On the one hand, it may be true that Demosthenes did hear about these events from his elders or, at any rate, is rhetorically manipulating the familiarity of the events: see G. Maltagliati, “Persuasion through Proximity (and Distance) in the Attic Orators’ Historical Examples,” *GRBS* 60 (2020) 68–97, at 84–86. On the other hand, it may also be true that the text points the reader toward its literary ‘elders’. It is noteworthy that Ober’s other Demosthenic citation is 19.249, a context in which the speaker has not only been alluding to, but indeed citing, the *Antigone* as a key text for his construction of Aeschines: citation of oral history and citation of literature there work in harmony.

ἀσθενοῦς ἡμῶν τῆς πόλεως οὔσης καὶ ναῦν οὐδεμίαν κεκτημένης, στρατηγῶν βασιλεῖ, παρ' ὑμῶν οὐδ' ἠντινοῦν ἀφορμὴν λαβῶν, κατεναμάχησεν Λακεδαιμονίους καὶ πρότερον τοῖς ἄλλοις ἐπιτάττοντας εἶθισεν ἀκούειν ὑμῶν, καὶ τοὺς ἀρμολογῆστας ἐξήλασεν ἐκ τῶν νήσων, καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα δεῦρ' ἔλθων ἀνέστησε τὰ τεῖχη, καὶ πρῶτος πάλιν περὶ τῆς ἡγεμονίας ἐποίησε τῇ πόλει τὸν λόγον πρὸς Λακεδαιμονίους εἶναι.

For this man—as it is possible to hear from some among you who are from the same generation—after the return of the *dēmos* from Peiraeus, when our city was weak and possessed not a single ship, by serving as general for the King, and without getting any kind of initial investment from you, defeated the Lacedaemonians at sea and made people who earlier gave orders to others get used to listening to you, and he drove the harmosts out of the islands, and after that, when he arrived here, he rebuilt the walls, and he was the first, regarding the hegemony, to make it a matter of our city against the Lacedaemonians once more.

The structure of this sentence marks it out, like the passage about the Corinthian exiles, as a special set-piece. And just as *Against Leptines* praises these Corinthians as opposed to their enemy, Agesilaus, so too does it both parallel and subvert the *Evagoras*.³⁹ That text is dedicated to the deceased king of Salamis on Cyprus. His claims to fame, according to Isocrates, were re-Hellenizing his city, causing trouble for Persia, and participating in the defeat of the Spartans at Cnidus in—again—394 BCE, chronologically between the battles at Nemea and Coroneia. The principal engineers of this victory had been the pair Conon and the Persian satrap Pharnabazus, but Isocrates downplays Persian involvement and instead ascribes the victory to the pair Conon and

³⁹ By highlighting a subversive intertextual encounter between texts, I do not mean to imply some sort of enmity between the authors themselves: contrast the more biographical methods and conclusions of G. O. Rowe, “Anti-Isocratean Sentiment in Demosthenes’ *Against Androtion*,” *Historia* 49 (2000) 278–302. I also do not intend to suggest that *Against Leptines* subverts itself, as in a Straussian reading. Instead, compare how W. H. Race, “Pindaric Encomium and Isocrates’ *Evagoras*,” *TAPA* 117 (1987) 131–155, sees the *Evagoras* itself as engaging with Pindaric encomium.

Evagoras.⁴⁰ Conon's presence in Isocrates' encomium is not, however, primarily due to this victory. Instead, Isocrates tells us both how highly Conon thought of Evagoras and also how great Conon himself was (9.52–57). Conon thus becomes a sort of 'expert witness' for Evagoras' virtue.⁴¹

Both Isocrates and Demosthenes, then, nest a miniature encomium in praise of Conon within a larger text. Is that parallel, along with the 'pre-Alexandrian footnote', a sufficient justification for reading these texts as meaningfully entangled? Scholars have often tried to prove that the *Evagoras*, rather than oral history, was Demosthenes' specific source for his version of events at 20.68.⁴² In my opinion, the presence of the *Evagoras* in this passage of *Against Leptines* has been both over- and underrated: the details of events in the *Evagoras* are largely irrelevant to *Against*

⁴⁰ In doing so he follows the commemorative practice already established at Athens by the dedication of portrait statues of these two, whereas other Greek cities had honored Conon and Pharnabazus: see P. Gauthier, *Les cités grecques et leur bienfaiteurs* (Athens 1985) 96; cf. J. L. Shear, *Polis and Revolution: Responding to Oligarchy in Classical Athens* (Cambridge 2011) 281. Presumably honoring Pharnabazus—let alone Artaxerxes—at Athens was, given the propagandistic cachet of Athenian enmity towards Persia, out of the question; for another interpretation of this omission see N. Luraghi, "Documentary Evidence and Political Ideology in Early Hellenistic Athens," in H. Börm et al. (eds.), *The Polis in the Hellenistic World* (Stuttgart 2018) 209–227, at 223.

⁴¹ This is the same technique as is used, hyperbolically, in the *Helen*, with Theseus as 'expert witness' (10.18–37)—as was clear to Aristotle, who pairs these texts (*Rh.* 1399a). Cf. Dem. 20.71, where other cities fill the role of internal evaluators, as well as Isoc. 15.101–139, where the career of Conon's son Timotheus vouches for the worth of the speaker himself.

⁴² Kremmydas, *Commentary* 309, collects the relevant scholarship; cf. Canevaro, *Demostene* 305, who deems the two narratives "totalmente indipendenti." For his part, Kremmydas writes, "The similarities between the two have been exaggerated. In Isokrates 9 Evagoras of Cyprus takes some of the credit for Konon's success at Knidos, whereas here that victory is credited solely to the Athenian general. Dem.'s praise for Konon is outright, whereas in the *Evagoras* it is only indirect since that speech seeks to praise the Cypriot ruler." Kremmydas is correct regarding each of these differences between the texts, but it is precisely the elision of Evagoras and the promotion of Conon to the primary honorand that gives this intertext meaning against the broader canvas of *Against Leptines*.

Leptines; rather, what is most relevant is how the characterization of the Cypriot king in *Evagoras* is transformed into praise for the Athenian Conon in *Against Leptines*. In other words, the latter text configures the praise of Conon according to the matrix established by Isocrates' praise of Evagoras, with whom Conon was closely associated in the memory of the audience.

There are numerous correspondences between the narrative portion of the *Evagoras* describing the subject's kingship (Isoc. 9.47–69) and this one sentence of *Against Leptines* describing Conon's deeds (Dem. 20.68). To start with, this sentence recapitulates the actions of Conon in the form of a catalogue; a similar catalogue forms a prominent part of the *Evagoras* narrative (Isoc. 9.66–69). In terms of content, the achievements of Conon can be mapped onto those of Evagoras point by point: I list these in the order of *Against Leptines* 20.68, quoted above. First, Evagoras' city Salamis, just like Conon's Athens, is initially weak and without triremes (Isoc. 9.47). Later, as a result of the actions of each honorand, Sparta is defeated at sea: Isocrates' Λακεδαιμόνιοι μὲν κατεναυμαχήθησαν ("the Lacedaemonians were defeated at sea," 9.56) is parallel to κατεναυμάχησεν Λακεδαιμονίους in *Against Leptines* (Conon "defeated the Lacedaemonians at sea," Dem. 20.68). This verbal parallel may seem unremarkable at first glance, especially as both phrases refer to the same historical event, but in both texts the battle at Cnidus is, surprisingly, boiled down to just this noun and this verb, with no further narrative. Next, just as Conon realigns power structures at Cnidus ("made people who earlier gave orders to others get used to [εἶθισεν] listening to you," Dem. 20.68), so too does Evagoras eventually fight the Persians so doggedly that they reverse their "usual" (εἶθισμένων, Isoc. 9.63) methods of making treaties: each text expresses the reversal of fortune with a form of the verb ἐθίζω.⁴³ In both texts, the Spartans are ejected from

⁴³ Cf. Isoc. 9.47 and 68 for reversals of fortune similarly phrased; the notion of reversal of fortune is prominent again at the end of *Against Leptines*, as well (20.161–162).

their recent acquisitions, and each hero builds walls for his city (9.47).⁴⁴ Finally, both texts emphasise that Athenian hegemony was once again possible: τῶν συμμάχων ἡγεμὼν κατέστη (Athens “was appointed hegemon of the allies,” Isoc. 9.56, cf. 68) is parallel to περὶ τῆς ἡγεμονίας ἐποίησε τῇ πόλει τὸν λόγον πρὸς Λακεδαιμονίους εἶναι (“regarding the hegemony, he made it a matter of our city against the Lacedaemonians once more,” Dem. 20.68).

These correspondences do not constitute a citation of the *Evagoras* for facts about Conon: instead, this passage condenses how the *Evagoras* praises its main honorand. To take one more example, in each text the narrative of Cnidus is followed by a mention of the extraordinary honors that the subject received at Athens, including a portrait statue.⁴⁵ The crucial point of contact, however, is not the fact of this parallel in itself, but the importance of material honorific practices to both texts. As with the *Agesilaus*, *Against Leptines* here reverses its model. The climax of the *Evagoras* is a discussion of how statues are inferior to written texts when it comes to communicating virtue.⁴⁶ In *Against Leptines*, by contrast, the valence of statues is not negative, but positive: they are a permanent reminder of the goodwill of the Athenians, encouraging others to accomplish similar deeds (20.69, cf. 120). They therefore complement the liturgical exemption that Demosthenes is trying to preserve.

Conon’s statue was in fact the first set up in the Agora in honor of a contemporary since the Tyrannicide group, a novelty emphasized by the speaker: “For this reason the Athenians back then not only gave him the exemption, but also set up a bronze portrait statue of him, just as for Harmodius and Aristogeiton—

⁴⁴ Conon’s wall-building also forms the basis of an extended *comparatio* (Conon vs. Themistocles) at Dem. 20.72–74, a technique of encomium found at both Isoc. 9.37–38 (*Evagoras* vs. Cyrus the Younger) and Xen. *Ages.* 9.1–5 (*Agesilaus* vs. the Persian king). For Aristotle, this technique was especially associated with Isocrates (*Rh.* 1368a).

⁴⁵ Dem. 20.69–70; Isoc. 9.57.

⁴⁶ Isoc. 9.73–75; cf. Xen. *Ages.* 11.7.

a first!”⁴⁷ *Against Leptines* engages here not only with the *Evagoras*, but also with the space of the Athenian *polis*, supporting its praise of Conon by reference to the daily reality experienced by the judges.⁴⁸ What Demosthenes does *not* mention is another aspect of the landscape of the Agora: as Isocrates notes, the Athenians put up a statue of Evagoras right next to that of Conon (9.57). Ideologically, this statue lessened the departure from precedent by making sure that Conon did not stand as an individual receiving honor, but rather as part of a team, a new pair of Tyrannicides, which constituted an extension of democratic norms, rather than an innovation.⁴⁹ Why, then, does *Against Leptines* erase Evagoras, when he could easily have been listed among the foreign benefactors and when he logically deserved mention alongside Conon, especially regarding their statues? I

⁴⁷ 20.70: διόπερ οὐ μόνον αὐτῷ τὴν ἀτέλειαν ἔδωκαν οἱ τότε, ἀλλὰ καὶ χαλκῆν εἰκόνα, ὡπερ Ἄρμοδίου καὶ Ἀριστογείτονος, ἔστησαν πρώτου. The text continues, “For they considered that he, too, had put an end to no minor tyranny when he abolished the empire of the Lacedaemonians” (ἠγοῦντο γὰρ οὐ μικρὰν τυραννίδα καὶ τοῦτον τὴν Λακεδαιμονίων ἀρχὴν καταλύσαντα πεπαυκέναι). This language is also Isocratean, though not from the *Evagoras*: these are the same terms in which Conon’s victory is described in the *Panegyricus* (Isoc. 4.154), where Conon is paired with Themistocles, just as at Dem. 20.72–74. Cf. Isoc. 5.104.

⁴⁸ On Athenian “statue culture” (for the phrase see G. J. Oliver, “Space and the Visualization of Power in the Greek Polis: The Award of Portrait Statues in Decrees from Athens,” in P. Schultz et al. [eds.], *Early Hellenistic Portraiture: Image, Style, Context* [Cambridge 2007] 181–204, at 182); Gauthier, *Les cités grecques*; Engen, *Honor and Profit* 164–168; Shear, *Polis and Revolution* 274–281; J. Ma, *Statues and Cities: Honorific Portraits and Civic Identity in the Hellenistic World* (Oxford 2013) 3–5; Domingo Gygas, *Benefactions and Rewards* 124–138; V. Azoulay, *The Tyrant-Slayers of Ancient Athens: A Tale of Two Statues* (Oxford 2017).

⁴⁹ Gauthier, *Les cités grecques* 97; Shear, *Polis and Revolution* 178, 255–256, 277–279, 283; cf. Oliver, in *Early Hellenistic Portraiture* 197; Meyer, *Historia* 62 (2013) 482. For Aristotle, the ‘first-ness’ of the Harmodius and Aristogeiton monument itself constitutes a reason to praise the two men depicted (*Rh.* 1368a): if this was a *topos* in fourth-century rhetoric, that would add even more significance to Demosthenes’ emphasis on Conon’s own ‘first-ness’.

will suggest two reasons. First, the speech's intertextual bond with the *Evagoras*, as with the *Agesilaus*, is an agonistic one: subverting its predecessors entails scrubbing away overt references to those texts. Second, the mini-encomium of Conon as a singularly heroic individual sets up the next one, the last and most important in the series, praising the recently deceased Chabrias. Because he has just died and his legacy is not yet secure, he is the speech's riskiest subject, but also its essential one, since Demosthenes is representing the interests of Chabrias' son Ctesippus in this trial.⁵⁰ In order to condition the audience's reception of Chabrias, the speech presents Conon first, an earlier and therefore less controversial figure whose praise could easily be fitted into the matrix for praising an individual provided by the *Evagoras*.⁵¹

3. Conclusion

In its engagement with both encomiastic models, *Against Leptines* deploys the same methods of praise, and it even partakes in their memorializing function: just as the *Agesilaus* and *Evagoras* stand as monuments to their subjects, so too would the text of *Against Leptines* serve as a guarantor for the memory of its various honorands, even if their honors should be repealed. Like the other encomia, it becomes a monument more lasting than physi-

⁵⁰ Dem. 20.1, 75. See further Kremmydas, *Commentary* 35–36; Canevaro, *Demostene* 33–34. Dem. 20.78 is representative of the hyperbolic praise lavished on Chabrias in this speech in an attempt to shut out, as it were, alternative versions of his career.

⁵¹ There may be further engagement with the *Evagoras* in regard to the father-son relationship: unlike the *Agesilaus*, which omits mention of Agesilaus' son Archidamus, the *Evagoras* is framed as an address to the honorand's son Nicocles. Just as the *Evagoras* binds a son's future activity to his father's posthumous praise, so too does Ctesippus' fortune in *Against Leptines* hinge on continued praise and honors for his father. By contrast, Conon's son Timotheus is not mentioned in the mini-encomium of his father (20.68–74): prosecuted by *eisangelia* in 356/5, Timotheus was perhaps still too controversial in 355/4 (R. Sealey, "Athens after the Social War," *JHS* 75 [1955] 74–81, at 74, 78).

cal memorials.⁵²

Nonetheless, *Against Leptines* subverts each model by applying those methods to a new subject, a subject who is in each case closely connected, historically, with the original honorand. The choice of a group of Athenian allies over a Spartan king, and then of an Athenian general over an ally, demonstrates the speaker's ability to judge the audience's interests. The speech thereby casts its speaker as someone whose praise not only follows recently established precedents for the praise of individuals, but also surpasses those examples in aligning with the values of the Athenian *dēmos*.⁵³ Implicit in both the *Agesilaus* and the *Evagoras* is the argument that the praise of individuals is beneficial to the *polis*, but neither of their authors took the risk of applying that argument to hypercompetitive democratic Athens. *Against Leptines*, when read intertextually with those encomia, emerges as enthusiastically willing to assume that risk. In doing so, it becomes a harbinger of honorific practices in both the literary and political life of late-fourth-century Athens.⁵⁴

March, 2020

Department of Classics
Knox College
Galesburg, IL 61401
mhparks@knox.edu

⁵² Cf. 20.64 and especially 35–37, where the speaker claims that if the honors are rescinded, the columns on which they are inscribed will change function, blaming the Athenians instead of praising the honorands.

⁵³ For another example of the construction of Athenian values in this speech see N. Fisher, “‘Let Envy Be Absent’: Envy, Liturgies, and Reciprocity in Athens,” in D. Konstan et al. (eds.), *Envy, Spite and Jealousy: The Rivalrous Emotions in Ancient Greece* (Edinburgh 2003) 181–215, at 198–199.

⁵⁴ I am grateful to the reviewers and editors of *GRBS* for their feedback and assistance with this article and to my colleague Hilary J. C. Lehmann, not only for her comments, but also for delivering an earlier version of this paper in my absence at the 2019 Society for Classical Studies annual meeting.