

ISOCRATES, THE CHIAN INTELLECTUALS, AND THE POLITICAL CONTEXT OF THE *EUTHYDEMUS**

Dedicated to all victims of war in the Balkans

I

IN a brief digression near the end of the *Euthydemus* (305 b ff.), Socrates describes one of his anonymous critics, who rejects philosophy in general but imagines himself to be both an accomplished thinker and a successful *politikos*. Clearly, the portrait is that of Isocrates. The similarity between Isocrates' real character and Plato's stylization is so pronounced¹ that we are tempted to describe 305 b ff. as one of Plato's intentional anachronisms (the dramatic date of the dialogue is earlier than the death of Alcibiades, 275 b). The portrait includes several noteworthy points. First, 305 b-c refers to Socrates' opponent as a writer of forensic speeches. To judge from the tone of the entire passage, which is not markedly hostile to the anonymous person (cf. 306 c 6 ff.), that would be an unfair description of Isocrates if written after the publication of the *Panegyricus* c. 380 BC.² Second, Plato defines the unnamed person as both a speechwriter and a practical politician (306 b: ἡ πολιτικὴ πρᾶξις 'the statesman's business').³ The latter part of the definition does not square with Isocrates' career as schoolmaster and political adviser or, later on, as the author of political pamphlets. Unless it is assumed that 305 b ff. aims at Isocrates' dealing with *Realpolitik*, he would not have deserved Socrates' criticism that he 'partakes' of two different things. In that case, the same reproof for being 'the border-ground between philosopher and politician' might have been addressed to Plato himself as a dialectician and, concerning his other activities, as the head of the Academy and the author of such political dialogues as the *Gorgias*.⁴ Finally, Socrates' remark at 305 d, 'For they' (the unnamed person's type) '... find that, when caught in private conversation (ἐν δε τοῖς ἰδίοις λόγοις), they are cut off short by Euthydemus and his followers (ὑπὸ τῶν ἀμφὶ Εὐθύδημον κολούεσθαι)', is most easily explained if we suppose that there really were 'private conversations' between Isocrates and Euthydemus' circle, and not only indirect polemics such as known through the former's speeches such as *Against the Sophists*. We are tempted to think that the οἱ ἀμφὶ Εὐθύδημον participated in the debate with Isocrates in their double

* This paper could not have been written without the generous grant of the Institute for Advanced Study in Princeton, where I had the privilege of working, during 1997/8, on Plato's dialogues and Greek history of the early fourth century. I owe warm thanks to Professor Christian Habicht for his kind and manifold help, as well as for his comments on an earlier version of the paper. The referees and Editor of the Journal gave useful advice on form and substance, and for this I am very grateful. I should also like to express my gratitude to Mrs Julia Bernheim, who has typed a part of the text, and improved the English at many points.

¹ In addition to the unnamed person's Isocratean traits dealt with in the present paper, note the psychological and stylistic details referred to by R.S. Hawtrey, *Commentary on Plato's Euthydemus* (Philadelphia 1981) 190 f.

² The contrast between Isocrates' image in the *Euthydemus* and the importance of his political speeches, especially the *Panegyricus* as the most developed and the first published, has already been noted. Several attempts to explain it away were unsatisfactory (see Eucken (n.9) 48 f.). Simply, the *Euthydemus* is best taken to have antedated the *Panegyricus*. Two conclusions may emerge from previous studies of the dialogue's chronology: stylometric evidence suggests a position in the later group of Plato's early writings; its doctrinal and diverse literary features betray its close affinity (which tends also to imply proximity in time) with the *Charmides* (W.K.C. Guthrie, *A history of Greek philosophy*, vol. IV: *Plato the man and his dialogues: earlier period* (Cambridge 1975) 266) and the *Meno* (U.v. Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *Platon* [II], *Beilagen und Textkritik*, Berlin 1962³, 154; Hawtrey (n.1) 8 ff.).

³ The translation of the *Euthydemus* cited in the present paper is by W.R.M. Lamb (LCL).

⁴ The Academics strictly distinguished those who had 'an active part in politics' from the political advisers of the type of a Thales or an Anaxagoras (*Hp. Ma.* 281 b-d). Actually, these latter were not considered to have been politically engaged at all.

capacity as Chians (271 c, cf. 288 a) and eristics, although of course less literal interpretations of Socrates' remark are also possible.⁵ The famous chapter of the *Phaedrus* which deals with Isocrates and Lysias (278 e-279 b) presents contemporaries with a similar example of Platonic references, where Socrates' comparison of the two men relies on the facts of Athenian public life,⁶ not just on the orators' literary similarities and differences.

All three points of the Isocrates digression in the *Euthydemus*, taken together, suggest that 305 b ff. refers to his early stay at Chios as attested by Pseudo-Plutarch.⁷ (There is no good reason to doubt the biographer's veracity here; as emphasized by F. Blass and K. Münscher, among other scholars, a Chian stay for Isocrates c. 393 BC would agree perfectly with the political undertakings of Conon, father of Isocrates' intimate friend Timotheus, after the battle of Cnidus.)⁸ The first point tends to posit c. 380 BC as a *terminus ante quem* for the publication of the *Euthydemus*. The second will have reflected the diversity of Isocrates' activities on the island, which combined the teaching of rhetoric with an atticizing legislation and, probably, a corresponding party-policy. Regarding the third, the place of Pseudo-Plutarch's comment on the distinction made by Isocrates between the 'contentious speeches' and the λόγοι πολιτικοί—the comment falls between the two phrases which expressly deal with the Chian period of Isocrates' life—indicates that his teaching at Chios resulted *inter alia* in disputes with the local eristics.⁹ If we are to believe the *Euthydemus*, the Athenian did not always win those confrontations. The disputes may have occurred in private meetings of influential people and touched upon political issues; the former inference comes from *Euthd.* 305 d (ἐν δὲ τοῖς ἰδίοις λόγοις), the latter from the apocryphal *Vita*'s mention of the λόγοι πολιτικοί in the same sentence which refers to the critical treatment of eristic by Isocrates. His delicate political position at Chios may have even caused, or prompted, his decision to leave the rich Ionian city when the situation changed at the end of the first decade of the fourth century (Conon died in 392, Sparta renewed her aggressive operations in the Aegean in 391).

It seems that the political aspect of the Isocrates episode in the *Euthydemus* should be connected, on a more theoretical level, with the problem of βασιλική τέχνη discussed at 291 b ff. Both the adjective βασιλικός¹⁰ and the Alcibiadean connotations of the art that attracts

⁵ Hawtrey (n.1) 193 (cf. 25) argues persuasively for a fourth-century element in the portraits of Euthydemus and Dionysodorus but does not connect it with Chios itself. He is inclined to identify it with the Megarian School.

⁶ S. Dušanić, *Aevum* 66 (1992) 33 ff., on the rivalry between Lysias and Isocrates concerning Iphicrates' trials of 373 and 371, which inspired the author of the *Phaedrus* to confront the two orators.

⁷ *Vitae X or.* 4, 6-8 = *Mor.* 837 b-c: διαμαρτάνων δὲ τῆς προαιρέσεως, τούτων μὲν ἀπέστη σχολῆς δ' ἡγεῖτο, ὡς τινὲς φασι, πρῶτον ἐπὶ Χίου, μαθητὰς ἔχων ἑννέα· ὅτε καὶ ἰδὼν τὸν μισθὸν ἀριθμοῦμενον εἶπε δακρύσας ὡς 'ἐπέγων ἑμαυτὸν νῦν τούτοις πεπραμένον'. ὠμίλει δὲ τοῖς βουλομένοις, χωρίσας πρῶτος τοὺς ἐριστικοὺς λόγους τῶν πολιτικῶν, περὶ οὓς ἐσπούδασε. καὶ ἀρχᾶς δὲ καὶ περὶ τὴν Χίον κατέστησε καὶ τὴν αὐτὴν τῆι πατρίδι πολιτεῖαν.

⁸ F. Blass, *Die attische Beredsamkeit*, II (Leipzig 1892²) 16 f. (with bibl.); K. Münscher, *RE* 9(1916) s.v. 'Isokrates 2' 2170 f.; G. Mathieu, the Budé *Isocrate*, I (Paris 1928¹), p. II (with some reservations); B.S. Strauss, *Athens after the Peloponnesian War. Class, faction and policy, 403-386 BC* (Ithaca (New York) 1986) 129. Conon and Chios after Cnidus: Diod. 14.84, 3; Conon and Isocrates: Isoc. 9.51-7.

⁹ Apart from Pseudo-Plutarch and the *Euthydemus*, we have no evidence of eristic in Chios but, as often observed, it may have been transplanted from Thurii, another domicile of the two brothers and/or their followers. Its spiritual father in southern Italy may have been either an Eleatic or Protagoras, who, as is well known, was the Thurian legislator c. 444/3 BC. Socrates' claim that Euthydemus and Dionysodorus are new in eristic (272 b) can be interpreted in a variety of ways, most plausibly perhaps as a reference to the Isocratean beginnings of their fourth-century correlates. In any case, Isocrates' *Against the Sophists* (1-8 and 20, cf. Ch. Eucken, *Isokrates. Seine Positionen in der Auseinandersetzung mit den zeitgenössischen Philosophen* (Berlin & New York 1983) 18 ff.), completed c. 390 BC, attests to his early interest in, and experience with, the activities of the eristics.

¹⁰ Hawtrey (n.1) 189 f.

Clinias¹¹ tell us that Socrates, not unexpectedly, envisages here a form of enlightened monarchy or aristocracy. It is obviously meant as an antidote to the combination of eristic and militant demagogy which the two Chians bring to Athens.¹² Similar messages are conveyed by the chronologically close *Charmides*, which combines an aristocratic topic (σωφροσύνη), socially distinguished *dramatis personae* and a symbolic reference to Βασίλη (153 a) as a personification of the βασιλική.¹³

Now, the Isocrates of *Euthd.* 305 b ff. contrasts—although to a lesser degree than do the eristics—with the antidemocratic implications of the work. In Socrates' description, he is a popular figure.¹⁴ To the attentive readers of 305 d and 306 b his pro-Athenian, pro-Cononian activity at Chios must have also suggested the idea of a democratic orientation, if we are right in postulating that the passage alludes to his activity of c. 393 BC. That circumstance may help us better to understand a facet of Isocrates' *Helen*, unfortunately impossible to date with precision. The beginning of the speech, as has long been recognized, criticizes the doctrines of the sophists and Plato's school—specifically, the *Euthydemus*; the criticism largely replies to the topics of eristic and Isocrates himself in that dialogue.¹⁵ However, the anti-Plato polemic in the *Helen* appears to have gone further, affecting the aristocratic comments on βασιλική τέχνη as found in the *Euthydemus* and the *Charmides*. The rhetor's long *excursus* on Theseus (21-39) insists upon the advantages of a king who was, essentially, 'a popular leader' (§37). The eulogy of a democratic Theseus belongs of course to a well-known *genre* but, with regard to the attention *Helen* 1-7 pays to Plato and eristic (one of Plato's targets), it is *a priori* likely to be connected with the 'kingly art' theme of the *Euthydemus* and *Charmides*. Developing this working hypothesis, we should assume that the author of *Helen* 21-39 defended the notion of a democratic monarch against Plato's double censure, within the same dialogue, of himself and his allies in opposing a patrician conception of the political art. Both the censure and the defence (which intended to show, *inter alia*, the differences between the programmes of Isocrates and the eristics) are notable for the prominent place they have received in the *Euthydemus* and the *Helen* respectively; this tends to suggest topical background, linked to the issues of practical policy.¹⁶ As I shall try to show (*infra*, section III), one of them bore upon Attic-Chian relations of the late 380s. In the light of several pieces of neglected evidence, it lends some support to the preceding deductions.

¹¹ *Infra*, text and notes 98 ff.

¹² Eristic and demagogy: *R.* VI 498 e ff. The aggressiveness of the Chian brothers in the dispute and in other matters: *Euthd.* 295 b-c, 296 a. Their sea-affinities also betray a 'democratic' mentality; Socrates playfully refers to them as a maritime danger: 293 a (with L. Méridier's comment *ad loc.* (the *Budé Platon*, tome V 1 (Paris 1949) 176 n.1)). Even Socrates' and Ctesippus' oath 'O Poseidon' at 301 e and 303 a expresses the two Athenians' ironic and temporary identification with the maritime profile of the Chian sophists. 'O Poseidon' is otherwise never encountered in Plato's dialogues; as is well known from the *Timaeus-Critias* and the *Laws*, Plato had no sympathy for the Poseidonic values of the popular religion.

¹³ On Basile, H.A. Shapiro, *ZPE* 63(1986) 134-6; on the symbolic τόποι of Plato's proems, *infra*, n. 96. The wide conception of *sophrosyne*, which characterizes the discussion in the *Charmides*, makes that notion almost coincident with the 'royal art' of *Euthd.* 290 c ff. (Guthrie (n.2) 157). The important rôle of Critias in the *Charmides*, dependent on the principal theme of the dialogue, seems to have been criticized by Isocrates in the *Helen* 32 f. Though modern students of Isocrates have failed to consider that possibility, his anonymous opponents of the Thesean ideal of a democratic king are best identified with the Critias of the anti-oligarchical tradition (among other crimes, such tyrants 'despoil the temples of the gods', which recalls *Areopagiticus* 66). Critias and Alcibiades were probably contrasted to Theseus as early as Polycrates' *Accusation of Socrates* (A.-H. Chroust, *Socrates, man and myth. The Two Socratic Apologies of Xenophon* (London 1957) 97).

¹⁴ Note 305 c, παρὰ πολλοῖς, παρὰ πάντων; 305 d, παρὰ πάντων.

¹⁵ Hawtrey (n.1) 26 ff.; Eucken (n.9) 45 ff.—both with refs.

¹⁶ It is not without interest that Isocrates does not name Theseus in the *Panegyricus* (56 ff.). *Helen* 5 (περὶ τὰς πράξεις ἐν αἷς πολιτευόμεθα) discloses something of his opportunism.

II

The hypothesis put forward here opens up the question of what could induce Plato to return to the matter of Isocrates' stay at Chios so many years (a decade, approximately) after it ended. Both the *Euthydemus* and Isocrates' reaction to it were inspired, I think, by the conclusion of a defensive Attic-Chian alliance in the summer of 384, a date which—despite all the uncertainties of the Platonic chronology—corresponds rather well to the place the *Euthydemus* has in the sequence of dialogues as reconstructed in most works of reference. Although Plato does not say why Euthydemus and Dionysodorus visited Athens, their presence is best explained if connected in some way with the Chian embassy of 384. By itself, such a connection would not be implausible. Sophists in general were widely used as envoys of their states.¹⁷ Furthermore, several pieces from the *corpus Platonium* have similar dramatic frameworks, although only implied: one or more of the interlocutors are on a diplomatic mission at the time of the dialogue, and the themes of the conversation harmonize with the political features of the moment.¹⁸ The example of the *Gorgias* may be singled out here. Its dramatic date should be set at 427 BC (two [meaningful] anachronisms notwithstanding), the year of Gorgias' coming to Athens as a member of Leontini's famous embassy (Diod. 12.53.2-5; 54.1). This explains, on the one hand, the presence of the dialogue's eponym in Athens; on the other, the importance that the phenomena of the Athenian ἀρχή have received in Socrates' argument with Callicles. Plato obviously considered the embassy of 427, and its diplomatic success, dangerous events in the sad history of Athenian imperialism, events foreshadowing 415 (cf. *Menex.* 242 d-243 a) as well as later misfortunes of the Greek world. Hence the prediction about Alcibiades at 519a, and the critical (if mainly indirect) references to the Sicilian Expedition in the *Timaeus-Critias* (the person of Hermocrates), and the apocryphal *Theages* (129 c-d) and *Eryxias* (392 c).

There are prosopographical indications to sustain this interpretation of the topicality which Isocrates' early contacts with Chian politicians and intellectuals seem to have regained in about 384. Epigraphically recorded,¹⁹ the alliance of 384 was planned—and the developments of the early 370s justified that plan—as an important step in the Athenians' effort to restore their Maritime Confederacy of the fifth century. The immediate characteristics of the Chian initiative and the Athenian answer to it, resulting in the bilateral decision, are clear enough. As one of its editors said of the document's main body, 'The Athenians, eager to avoid the suspicion and hostility of Persia and Sparta, are at pains to emphasize the fact that this alliance constitutes no infringement by the Chians or themselves of the Peace of Antalcidas, which the Great King, the Athenians, the Spartans and the other Greeks swore to observe' (lines 6-12; cf. 17-24), but rather that the proposals made by the Chian envoys at Athens were "favourable to the Athenian

¹⁷ D. Kienast, *RE Suppl.* XIII (1973) s.v. 'Presbeia' 590 ff.; Ch. Habicht, *Hellenistic Athens and her Philosophers* (Princeton (David Magie Lecture) 1988) 12 f.

¹⁸ Cf. A.E. Taylor, *A Commentary on Plato's Timaeus* (Oxford 1928) 25 f. (on the *Timaeus-Critias*); S. Dušanić, *History and Politics in Plato's 'Laws'* (in Serbian with an English summary) Belgrade 1990) 363 f. (on the *Laws*). In the final analysis, the explicit 'ambassador' elements in several letters of [Socrates] (II, III, VI 1, VII 3) go back to the 'diplomatic' frameworks of the fourth-century Socratic dialogues; if the authors of these latter dialogues other than Plato were better preserved, we should have been able to interpret Plato's corresponding indications with more certainty (see e.g., on the *Meno*, J.S. Morrison, *CQ* 35 (1941) 76 with n.1). I hope to discuss these questions in a book referred to below, n. 113. For some ancient comments on Plato's fictional techniques, see n.53.

¹⁹ *IG* II² 34 = *Syll.*³ 142 = M.N. Tod, *GHI* II 118 = J. Pouilloux, *Choix d'inscriptions grecques* (Paris 1960) 98-100 no. 26 = *St. V.* II² 384. In English translation: P. Harding, *From the End of the Peloponnesian War to the Battle of Ipsus* (Cambridge 1985) 44-6 no. 31. *IG* II² 35 (it has not preserved the lines which interest us here) seems to be a somewhat later copy of no. 34, not just a duplicate; on the problem, S. Accame, *La lega ateniese del secolo IV a. C.* (Roma 1941) 9-13, and J. Cargill, *The Second Athenian League: Empire or Free Alliance?* (Berkeley 1981) 52.

demos, to all Greece and to the King” (lines 13-5).²⁰ This attitude of the two parties, leaning toward Persia—even Persophile—and indeed anti-Spartan,²¹ explains the choice of the first-named of the Athenian envoys to Chios (lines 39 ff.): Cephalus of Collytus, the well-known rhetor, demagogue, opposed to the Thirty Tyrants, βουλευτῶν, and probably among those who received the Persian bribe at the onset of the Corinthian War.²² Needless to stress, all the aspects of his public life must have been disliked by Plato, especially his democratic radicalism, venality and readiness to accept Achaemenid help to organize inter-Greek hostilities.²³ Another ambassador in Cephalus’ team, Aesimus, had had a part in the democratic restoration of 403 which may attest to a character and political position similar to that of Cephalus.²⁴

The whole enterprise of 384, smacking of Cephalus-like motives, must have appeared ominous in the eyes of the conservative, Panhellenic patriot and moralist that Plato was.²⁵ Chios was a prosperous island and the Athenian masses evidently looked forward to the tangible benefits which the new pact, and the Confederacy it announced, promised them.²⁶ An interesting fragment of Antiphanes’ *Philomētor*—undatable but best interpreted as a comment on the Attic-Chian *rapprochement* of 384 BC—seems to say as much: ἐμμητρον ἄν ἦι τὸ ξύλον, βλάστην ἔχει· / μητρόπολις ἔστιν, οὐχὶ πατρόπολις <πόλις>· / μήτραν τινὲς πωλοῦσιν ἡδιστον κρέας· / Μητρῶς ὁ Χιός ἐστι τῶι δήμῳ φίλος.²⁷ Whether referring to the *demos* of Athens or (less plausibly) to the *demos* of Chios, line 4 throws an indirect light upon some political implications of the *Euthydemus*, which criticizes the democratic attitudes of both Isocrates and the two Chians, apparently within a ‘diplomatic’ context. Plato’s decision to refer in the dialogue to Isocrates’ stay in Chios appears justified, or becomes quite clear, if contemporary Athenians are taken to have known that the teacher of rhetoric and the Chian

²⁰ Tod, *GHI* II, 51.

²¹ Anti-Spartan in the long term but also with regard to the current policy of Agesilaus in the east, which suddenly became hostile enough towards the Great King (Diod. 15.9,5; cf. my comments in: P. Roesch, ed., *Colloques int. du CNRS ‘La Béotie antique’* (Paris 1985) 227-35). In that sense, lines 12 ‘the Spartans’ and 14-15 ‘to all Greece’ are little more than diplomatic formulae in a cautious text (cf. R. Seager, ‘The King’s Peace and the Second Athenian Confederacy’, in: D.M. Lewis, J. Boardman, S. Hornblower, M. Ostwald, eds., *CAH VI*² (1994) 163 f.); what mattered for the Athenian radical politicians of the day was the good will of Artaxerxes II (on Cephalus’ medism of the 380s see my paper (p. 233 with n.64) just referred to). And, of course, Sparta could not have been popular among the Athenians, even the moderate ones, after Mantinea’s dioecism. Their mood can be sensed from their favourable treatment of refugees sharing anti-Spartan attitudes, and from their policy in Chalcidice (Xen. *HG*. 5. 2, 15 ff. 34; cf. *St.-V.* II² 250).

²² W. Kroll, *RE* XI (1921) s.v. ‘Kephalos 3 (von Kollytos)’ 221 f. (= *PA* 8277). See *PCG* VII 519 f. no. 201 with comm. = *Plu. Mor.* 801 a (Plato, *inc. fab.*): βόσκει δυσώδη Κέφαλον, ἐχθίστην νόσον.

²³ Cf. Plato’s verdict on Ismenias, a potentate resembling Cephalus in political aspects: *Men.* 90 a and *Rep.* 1. 336 a (the passages analyzed in my article cited above, n.21).

²⁴ *PA* 311.

²⁵ In Plato’s hierarchy of political factors, the character of leading men comes before the quality of ‘the laws and the customs’ (*Ep.* VII 325 c, d).

²⁶ According to the general opinion recorded by Diodorus (15.23, 4, on cleruchies) and mirrored in the Charter of the Second Confederacy, it was the Athenians’ expectations of material gain which compromised their attempts of the late 380s to restore the Maritime League.

²⁷ *PCG* II 442 no. 219 = *Ath.* III p. 100 d. The comedy has been usually and justly thought to reflect a period of specially close relations between Chios and Athens after the Corinthian War (Antiphanes staged his first play about 385 BC). The years 384 and 377 (the Chians’ contribution to the formation of the Second Confederacy) are obvious candidates (J.M. Edmonds, *The Fragments of Attic Comedy*, II (Leiden 1959) 278 f. no. 220, with nn.; T.B.L. Webster, *Studies in Later Greek Comedy* (Manchester 1959) 39 and 53); the former seems more likely for a variety of reasons, but the difference is not very material for our purpose. The first to see that Μητρῶς in line 4 means Μητροδωρος was A. Meineke, *Fragmenta Comicoorum Graecorum*, III (Berlin 1840) 129 f. (cf. also *infra*, n.41). In Webster’s opinion (*loc. cit.*, 39), the political accents of the *Philomētor* probably resembled those of the *Philothēbaios*, written by the same poet.

promoters of the 384 alliance were in some measure collaborators, thanks to the bonds going back to Isocrates' activities, as a teacher and as Conon's man, in the island c. 393 BC.

Here, the decree of the alliance can help. It ends with the list, partly damaged, of the Chian envoys then in Athens: Οἰδε ἐπρέσβευον Χίων· Βρύων, Ἀπε[*c.* 8 letters]ριτος, Ἀρχέλαος (lines 42-3).²⁸ Of the four names, the second will be restored Ἀπε[λλήης], according to J. Kirchner's suggestion,²⁹ or perhaps Ἀπε[λλᾶς]; both forms are common in the prosopography of Chios.³⁰ Practically speaking, no alternative restoration, shorter or longer, seems possible.³¹ This means that the name of the third envoy should read [*c.* 4 letters] ριτος. If, with J. Kirchner and H. Bengtson,³² we assume a composite name ending in κριτος—certainly the simplest case expected—the restoration should be slightly modified into [*c.* 3 letters] κριτος. A literary fact, overlooked by the epigraphists, further narrows down our choice. A certain Bruon wrote the biography of the Chian Theocritus, rhetor as well as sophist, whose *floruit* belonged to the epoch of Philip II and Alexander.³³ The biographer's name, not a very common one, and the Chian origin of his hero, tend to identify him as a homonymous grandson of the Bruon (I) who visited Athens as ambassador in 384.³⁴ The next step is quite tempting, although, to my knowledge, it has never been made. Theocritus, whose *Life* was written by Bruon (II), will have owed his name to the person figuring as the third-cited envoy of Chios in the document of 384. True, Theocritus is not a rare anthroponym³⁵ but, in view of both epigraphical³⁶ and prosopographical³⁷ indications, the participation in the embassy seems very likely for Theocritus (I), who by virtue of his age and name is best equated with an elder relative (paternal uncle or uncle's father?) of Bruon (II)'s Theocritus (II). Although Stobaeus' testimony has remained neglected in our main works of reference,³⁸ this Theocritus (I) is on

²⁸ I have not seen the stone but have been able, thanks to Professor Christian Habicht's kind assistance, to consult its squeeze which is preserved in the collection of the Institute for Advanced Study at Princeton. The accepted reading of lines 42-3 is certain.

²⁹ In *Syll.*³ 142 (he actually read Ἀπε[λ]/[λήης] but the squeeze shows Ἀπε[---] as printed in *IG, GHI* II, and *St.-V.* II). Kirchner's restoration of the name has been followed e.g. by P.M. Fraser and E. Matthews, in the first volume of the British Academy *LGPN* (s. Ἀπε[λλήης], Chios 5).

³⁰ In the *LGPN* I (s. nn.), Ἀπελλᾶς is cited with five attestations from Chios, Ἀπελλήης with fifteen.

³¹ Ἀπελλικῶν (three attestations in Chios according to the *LGPN* I) would leave little space ([*c.* 2 letters] ριτος) for the next name.

³² *Aliter*, Tod *ad GHI* II 118: 'In line 43 all editors give κριτος but a name such as Ἀδήριτος is also possible (*I.G.* XII (8). 171.24); other names ending in ἥριτος, -άρτιος are listed in Bechtel, *H.P.* 195'.

³³ Biography: D. L. V 1, 11 and Did. *In D.* VI 44. Theocritus: R. Laqueur, *RE* V A (1934) 2025-7 (no.2) and H. Berve, *Das Alexanderreich auf prosopographischer Grundlage, II: Prosopographie* (München 1926) 176 f. no. 364.

³⁴ P. Foucart, *Étude sur Didymos d'après un papyrus de Berlin* (Paris 1906) 126 f.; Laqueur (n.33) 2025.

³⁵ But not frequent among the Chians: *LGPN* I s.v. registers only one Theocritus in Chios, our Theocritus (II).

³⁶ It fits in the lacuna exactly. Besides, the choice is less wide than one would have thought: of all the names ending in -κριτος and having a length of nine letters (some fifteen examples in F. Dornseiff & B. Hansen, *Rückläufiges Wörterbuch der griechischen Eigennamen* (Berlin 1957) 290), only two (excluding Theocritus) are found in the anthroponymy of the island as collected in the *LGPN* (Διόκριτος and Ἡρόκριτος, each with one attestation only).

³⁷ Notably, as the father of a philosopher, he is likely to have been a learned man himself and thus a suitable candidate for an important diplomatic task. Let us note, à propos of the possibility that Bruon and [Theoc]ritus were relatives (cf. *infra*), that embassies have been known which consisted of two brothers or a father and a son (Kienast (n.17) 528). It hardly needs mentioning that Metrodorus (I)'s father, Theocritus (I) was much older than, and consequently not the same as, Theocritus (II).

³⁸ W. Nestle, *RE* XV(1932) s.v. 'Metrodoros 14' 1475, wrote on the Democritean from Chios: '... Sohn des Redners und Isokratesschülers Theokritos...', without citing the evidence. Nestle's description of the Democritean's father Theocritus (of whom nothing is actually known except his name and the fact of Metrodorus' parentage) probably stemmed from the nineteenth-century conflation (endorsed by Fr. Susemihl, *Philologus* 60 (1901) 188-91) of two Metrodori, the Democritean and Isocrates' pupil (the latter has however rightly received a separate article in the *RE* 15 (1932) 1482 (s.v. 'Metrodoros 24'), by O. Schissel), into one person. From the *Suda* (s. *Theokritos*) we

record in the Ἐκλογαί I 304 as the father of the famous Chian atomist Metrodorus (I).³⁹

Further prosopographical data seem to corroborate what has just been said of the two Theocriti and the events of 384. Metrodorus (I) had a Chian homonym and (roughly) a contemporary; this Metrodorus (II), a *pupil of Isocrates*, taught Theocritus (II).⁴⁰ The double repetition of names—two Theocriti, two Metrodori—implies family links between the Chians to whom we attribute a notable rôle in the Attic-Chian negotiations of 384, [Θεδκ]ρυτος (the inscription) and Μητροδωρος (the Μητρῶς of Antiphanes' fragment quoted above). The latter, probably the same as Metrodorus (II),⁴¹ may have accompanied the embassy of 384 as its adviser or in another way contributed to the birth of the alliance.⁴² Bruon's biography of Theocritus (II) probably reflected close connections between Bruon (I) and both Metrodorus (I) and Theocritus (I). This supports the preceding conjecture that the Chian ambassadors of 384 and their companions/allies included a core of relatives, intellectuals and party friends who had entertained close relations, and collaborated politically along pro-Athenian lines,⁴³ with Isocrates after c. 393 BC.⁴⁴ Their diplomatic initiative would fit in with the importance of the occasion, its Cononian preliminaries, and Cephalus' position at the head of the Athenian embassy.

On the other hand, such a state of affairs would explain Plato's (thinly veiled) criticism of Isocrates in the *Euthydemus*. The rhetor's tutoring of Metrodorus (II) obviously went hand-in-hand with his propagating of pro-Athenian and anti-Spartan policies, conducted by Conon, which resulted in Metrodorus (II)'s acceptance of, or his consistently adhering to, the same line.⁴⁵ No doubt, Isocrates remained in touch with his Chian pupils during the 380s.⁴⁶ Some of them, Metrodorus (II) particularly, may have evolved in the direction of eristic,⁴⁷ both in philosophy and in public activities, or may have taken classes with two masters simultaneously—

know of the latter Metrodorus ((II) in our numeration) that he was an *Isokratikos* and a teacher of Theocritus the rhetor, who had nothing Democritean about him; these facts strongly militate against the identification of the two Metrodori, cf. Berve (n.38) and F. Wehrli's comment on Hermippus' fr. 78 (= Ath. I 21 c) in *Die Schule des Aristoteles. Texte und Kommentar*, Supplb. I: *Hermippos der Kallimacheer* (Basel & Stuttgart 1974) 33 and 89 f. Coincidences which impressed Sussemlahl and some others resulted from the Greek practice of repeating personal names within single families, or related families, or families entertaining friendly relations (the well-known type of homonymy, usually uniting grandfathers and grandsons).

³⁹ Μητροδωρος Θεοκρίτου Χίος τὰ ἀδιατρετα καὶ τὸ κενόν.

⁴⁰ *Supra*, n.40. As Schissel noted, Metrodorus (II) must have been both Isocrates' pupil and Theocritus (II)'s teacher in Chios itself, as pupil in 393 and as teacher in the years immediately following.

⁴¹ Despite the unanimous opinion of the editors of the fragment, who since Meineke identify Μητρῶς with the atomist.

⁴² Cf. Kienast (n.17) 540 (ἀκόλουθοι et sim.). Alternatively, Metrodorus (II) may have been the mover of the corresponding decree of the Chian assembly.

⁴³ The collaboration continued, one may presume, the political, social and party (family) positions of some pro-Athenian Chians of the later fifth century. In the context of 'historical' themes to be dealt with *infra* (Section III), the two pro-Athenian Chians bearing the name of Ion should be pointed out: the famous man of letters (whose parent bore the eloquent name of Xuthus!) and the father of the politician killed by Pedaritus (Th. VIII 38, 3).

⁴⁴ A Metrodorus (from Chios?) wrote an Ἰωνικά at an unknown date (*FGrHist* 43F 3 = Plu. *Mor.* 694 a-b). F. Jacoby was inclined to ascribe it to the atomist (comm., p. 522); however, considering Isocrates' historical interests, Metrodorus (II) seems a more likely guess.

⁴⁵ The family tradition (cf. n.43) of Metrodorus (II)'s Ἀττικισμός may have contributed to his decision, of course. The anti-Macedonian attitudes of Theocritus (II) (Str. XIV 1, 35, cf. Foucart (n.34))—probably shared by his biographer Bruon (II)—were compatible, to say the least, with a pro-Athenian, radically democratic orientation of their ancestors and themselves.

⁴⁶ Isocrates notes (XV 93, cf. Ps.-D. LII 14) that the first pupils he had in Athens remained his friends into his old age.

⁴⁷ Cf. n.9 above. What is known of Theocritus (II)'s character and activities (Laqueur (n.33)) would accord with such an evolution of his teacher.

Isocrates and a sophist of Euthydemus' ilk. Regardless of that hypothetical influence of eristic on his pupils (*Euthd.* 305 d, ἐν δὲ τοῖς ἰδίοις λόγοις, perhaps points to it), Isocrates' contacts with the ultrademocratic Chios made him partly responsible in the eyes of the Plato-like conservatives for the alliance of 384. From their point of view, the differences between the two radical policies toward Persia (Cephalus' medism and Isocrates' conquest of the East) mattered little. Of course, Plato's criticism of Euthydemus-Dionysodorus and, less severely, of Isocrates was not inspired only by *Realpolitik* motives. Plato was convinced that wrong policies and imperfect methods of thinking formed a unity, and that conviction can be felt behind the pages of the *Euthydemus* which deal with the problem of the βασιλικὴ τέχνη.⁴⁸

Despite the seriousness of the problem, the *Euthydemus* sounds playful in many respects. That impression owes much to the nature of the two Chian brothers as depicted by Plato. A number of questions concerning their biographies and the realism of the *Euthydemus*' dramatic setting cannot be entirely avoided here. The eponym must have been an historical person; Aristotle's testimony is decisive.⁴⁹ As several commentators on the dialogue have already remarked, it is less easy to be sure about Dionysodorus, whose historicity is not incontestably confirmed. His character of Euthydemus' *alter ego* serves Plato's dramatic purposes so well⁵⁰ that his complete portrait, or some of its chief traits,⁵¹ may have been simply constructed⁵² by an author who did not hesitate to invent the names and other attributes of certain of his *dramatis personae*.⁵³ If the person and name of Dionysodorus are taken to have been created by Plato for that occasion, both elements of the Platonic fabrication may have alluded to Metrodorus (II). In this case (a mere possibility), the fictitious Dionysodorus will have resembled his historical model on two counts: the second part of his name, and his status of 'brother' (mimicking the relationship between Metrodorus (II) and the families of Theocritus (I) or of Bruon). Regarding Euthydemus, it is difficult and unnecessary (in view of the existing evidence) to assume that this fifth-century sophist lived long enough⁵⁴ to be directly connected with the diplomatic events of 384. Rather, Plato's reason for using him as the symbol of a Chian mission to Athens in 384 is probably founded on a similar, and earlier, mission in which he was engaged,⁵⁵ and/or on his fifth-century contacts with the notables who became

⁴⁸ See Section IV.

⁴⁹ *SE* 20, p.177 B 12 ff. and *Rh.* II, p.1401 A 26 ff.; cf. also *Pl. Cra.* 386 d. Hawtrey (n.1) 13.

⁵⁰ Hawtrey (n.1) 13 f.

⁵¹ Including their being ὀπλομάχοι (271 d, 273 c, e; cf. 290 b ff. and *Xen. Mem.* 3.1, 1 (based on Plato)).

⁵² Wilamowitz (n.2) 155 (who eventually accepted Dionysodorus' historicity); H. Keulen, *Untersuchungen zu Platons Euthydem* (Wiesbaden 1971) 16 f.

⁵³ Scholarly controversies persist on this point but, in my opinion, many fictional names are to be found in the *corpus Platonium*, to serve the philosopher's purpose (maliciously labelled ψευδολογία by Isocrates (12 78; 246) and Athenaeus (V 215 d ff.); cf. *FGrHist* 115 [Theopompus] F 529 and Plato himself (*Rep.* 3 414 b ff.: 'noble lie')) of such devices as anachronisms, topographical 'inexactitudes', factographical 'mistakes'. Plato seems to describe the dual structure of his own writings when he attributes to Socrates the 'adapting' ('versification') of 'Aesop's fables and 'The Prelude' to Apollo' (*Phaedo* 60 c ff., transl. H. Tredennick). The former will have symbolized what might be termed the 'politico-allusive' aspect of Plato's dialogue, the latter its dialectical essence (below, Section IV). It is significant that, in the opinions of Cebes and Socrates, the 'Aesop's fables' of the *Phaedo* had a special interest for Euenus the Parian (61 b, cf. 60 c ff.), believed to have invented ὑποδήλωσις and related techniques (*Phaedr.* 267 a). The obvious inference that Socrates' 'Aesop' in the *Phaedo* connotes fictional literature was made as early as Plutarch (*Mor.* 16 c).

⁵⁴ Socrates describes Euthydemus and Dionysodorus as old men (271 b). They (or Euthydemus alone, if Dionysodorus existed as Plato's literary device only) probably were founder-colonists of Thurii (271 c, see also A.E. Taylor, *Plato. The Man and his Work* (London 1926¹) 91 n.1).

⁵⁵ Cf. 273 e: his (and Dionysodorus') first visit to Athens (? in the spring of 412 or c. 393).

ambassadors in 384.⁵⁶ Plato's readers, better informed of Euthydemus than we are today, were able to understand the proper meaning of his partly anachronistic rôle in the dialogue—all the more so since the anachronism of the Isocrates digression pointed in that direction.

III

There is one more detail in the *Euthydemus* which the first readers of the dialogue were likely to associate with Attic-Chian political relations. At 302 b-d, Socrates reports a part of his conversation with Dionysodorus thus: 'Then—after a very ironical pause, as though he (Dionysodorus) were pondering some great matter—he proceeded: "Tell me, Socrates, have you an ancestral Zeus (Ζεὺς Πατρῶιος)?" Here I suspected the discussion was approaching the point at which it finally ended, and so I tried what desperate wriggle I could to escape from the net in which I now felt myself entangled. My answer was: I have not, Dionysodorus. "What a miserable fellow you must be", he said, "and no Athenian at all, if you have neither ancestral gods, nor shrines, nor anything else that denotes a gentleman!". Enough, Dionysodorus; take care what you say; not so fast with your reprimands, I said. For I have altars and shrines, domestic and ancestral, and everything else of the sort that other Athenians have. "Then have not other Athenians", he asked, "their ancestral Zeus (Ζεὺς ὁ Πατρῶιος)?" None of the Ionians, I replied, give him this title, neither we nor those who have left this city to settle abroad (τῆσδε τῆς πόλεως ἀπωικισμένοι): they have an ancestral Apollo ('Απόλλων Πατρῶιος), because of Ion's parentage. Among us the name "ancestral" (πατρῶιος) is not given to Zeus, but that of "houseward" and phratry god ('Ερκειος δε καὶ Φράτριος), and we have a phratry Athena ('Αθηναία Φρατρία). "That will do", said Dionysodorus; "you have, it seems, Apollo and Zeus and Athena". Certainly, I said.'

The passage has been much discussed. It has been found clumsy or ironical or a fruit of Socrates' tendency to imitate 'the logical tricks of the Sophists by denying in one sense what was true in another.'⁵⁷ Its treatment of a somewhat bizarre subject (within the context) has been considered proof that Dionysodorus or Euthydemus published a collection of sophisms which included one similar to that of *Euthd.* 302 b-d.⁵⁸ Modern commentators, in this connection, have remarked with good reason that the 'fooling about Ζεὺς Πατρῶιος and 'Απόλλων Πατρῶιος ... in itself has no relevance for [the course of Plato's dialogue]'.⁵⁹ Plato could indeed have formulated Dionysodorus' question of 302 b 4-5 in a manner resembling that of d 4-5 and proceeded directly from 302 b 4-5 to the 'Πάνυ ἦν δ' ἐγώ' of d 5, omitting the Zeus Patroos/Apollo Patroos episode altogether. His decision to keep it in the dialogue shows that it possessed, for the Academy and its friends, an importance that probably transcended their interest in the hypothetical book of the shadowy Chian sophist. A prominent feature of Plato's allusive art was to underline his comments on matters of political topicality and relevance by emphasizing the comments' formal incongruity with the main line of conversation. The emphasis took the form of demonstrative anachronisms, 'unnecessary' digressions of the type of *Euthd.* 302 b-d, and similar devices.

Now, at 302 c-d the Ionianism of Socrates as well as that of the Athenians at large is

⁵⁶ On the doctrinal level too, the *Euthydemus* of the dialogue may have been given certain features corresponding, anachronistically, with the fourth century (above, n.8).

⁵⁷ E.H. Gifford, *The Euthydemus of Plato* (Oxford 1905) 62. Cf. M. Canto, *L'intrigue philosophique. Essai sur l'Euthydème de Platon* (Paris 1987) 289 f. n. 214.

⁵⁸ Wilamowitz (n.2) 155 f.; K. Praechter, *Philologus* 87(1932) 122 f.

⁵⁹ Hawtrey (n.1) 181; cf. Praechter (n.58) 122.

emphasized, and Athens' famous claim⁶⁰ to be the Ionians' mother-city is referred to as an historical fact. Both traits of the passage show that its real purpose was to point out Attic-Ionian relationship rather than a cult phenomenon pure and simple. A parallel line in the *Ion* supports this inference.⁶¹ Besides, Socrates' stress here upon the ethnic implications—the Attic-Ionian συγγένεια to be exact—corresponds with what we know of the Athenians' attitude to the worship of Apollo Patroos from (at least) the fifth century onwards.⁶²

We are entitled to assume that the 'Socrates' of 302 b-d expresses Plato's opinions and messages to the reader. Ionian sentiment was strong in Plato. Several indications suggest that conclusion: his sympathy for the Athenian defence of the Ionian cause in 499⁶³ and later,⁶⁴ his (implicit) acceptance of the traditional image of Attica as an Ionian land,⁶⁵ his wide use of ionicisms. As to this last, the form ἀρχιερέως at *Laws* 12.947 a-b should be particularly noted. The title belongs to the eponymous magistrate of Magnesia, who is chief priest of Apollo and of Helios at the same time.⁶⁶ Hinting at the Ionian Apollo, the ionicism can be taken as a *sui generis* variation on *Euthd.* 302 b-d, all the more so as a neglected passage of the *Republic* (4. 427 c) connects *Euthd.* 302 b-d with the mention of Apollo's and Helios' ἀρχιερέως in the *Laws*. And of course there is nothing ironic or casual about *Laws* 12.947 a-b or *Rep.* 4 427 c.

Plato's Ionianism had three interdependent aspects. First, it was obviously inspired by his family memories: Solon (Perictione's ancestor) was proud to sing of Attica as 'the eldest land of Ionia';⁶⁷ Ariston's pedigree reached back to Codrus, whose younger son Neleus led the Ionian migration to Asia Minor. If the opening scene of the *Charmides* has been well described as 'a glorification' of Plato's family connections⁶⁸—a description certainly suggested by its prosopographical characteristics—Plato's decision to put Βασίλη, with her Codrid and Neleid traits,⁶⁹ in the immediate vicinity of Taureas' palaestra illustrates the debt his Ionian feelings owed his own forefathers. Second, it had Panhellenic overtones, well illustrated by the historical themes of the *Menexenus*.⁷⁰ Third, it was aristocratic. The high position of Apollo Patroos, with his Ionian attributes, in the Athenian pantheon must have been on account of the Attic nobility.⁷¹ In most cities of the Dodecapolis, the Codrid and Neleid traditions connoted

⁶⁰ On which, J. Alty, *JHS* 102 (1982) 8 with nn. 42-4, 9 with n.46; S. Hornblower, *A Commentary on Thucydides*, II (Oxford 1996) 72 f.

⁶¹ 541 d (of Ephesus).

⁶² Hdt. I 147 ('Απατούρια). See, in addition to J. Alty's able article (n.60), P.J. Rhodes, *A Commentary on the Aristotelian Athenaion Politeia* (Oxford 1971) 66 ff., Ch. W. Hedrick, *AJA* 92 (1988) 185-210 (esp. 202-8), and H. Knehl et al., in: W. Eder, ed., *Die athenische Demokratie im 4. Jahrhundert v. Chr.* (Stuttgart 1995) 475-514, esp. 479 ff. 549 ff.

⁶³ *Menex.* 240 a ff. See also, on Eretria, *Laws* 3 698 c-d and, especially, 693 a (cf. Hdt. VI 119,4 and Ps.-Plato's epigrams nos. 9-10 [in the numeration of E. Diehl, *Anth. Lyr. Gr.*] which though apocryphal were based, like the other Platonic epigrams, on Plato's dialogues as well as his lost biographies—some of whose elements deserve credence); the 'Athens and Eretria' connotes here, of course, Aristagoras' ἄποικοι argument cited by Herodotus, 5. 97 (Alty [n.60] 4 n.20).

⁶⁴ *Menex.* 245 b-e ('the Greeks of the continent' means essentially the Ionians [cf. And. 3.15: τὰς ἀποικίους, Aspasias's compatriots]).

⁶⁵ What is said in the *Critias* of the southern boundary of the antediluvial Athenians' territory (110 d: 'at the Isthmus') automatically recalls Plu. *Thes.* 25, 3 (ἐν Ἴσθμῶν; Ἴωντα). Cf. Hornblower (n.60) 68 f.

⁶⁶ M. Piérart, *Platon et la cité grecque. Théorie et réalité dans la Constitution des 'Lois'* (Brussels 1973-4) 320-3, who justly remarks (321 f. with n.46) that the ionicism attracted the attention of ancient grammarians.

⁶⁷ *Ath. Pol.* 5, 2.

⁶⁸ Thus J. Burnet, *Greek Philosophy: Thales to Plato* (London 1914¹) 169, cited by Guthrie (n.2) 155.

⁶⁹ *IG* I³ 84 (of 418/7 BC).

⁷⁰ E.g. 245 b-d.

⁷¹ W. Aly, *RE* XVIII (1949) s.v. 'Patroioi theoi' 2258.

monarchy or oligarchy.⁷² Conversely, Plato did not approve of the social, ideological and political attitudes of those Athenians who refused to identify with the Ionian heritage. These included the promoters of the egalitarian autochthony propaganda,⁷³ and the followers of Cleisthenic programmes. Plato, conservative and supporter of the Ionian dudodecimal patterns, objected to Cleisthenes, both as an opponent of Athens' Ionianism⁷⁴ and as the author of democratic and decimal reforms resulting in an anti-historical mixture of the Attic population.⁷⁵

Anti-Ionian attitudes, however, were not restricted to the circle of the Athenian demagogues. They also occurred in other parts of the Ionian world,⁷⁶ especially in the main islands of the east Aegean. Chios will have been in their number, judging from the popularity of those foundation-legends of the city which did not follow the Neleid tradition.⁷⁷ The phenomenon must have been complex. The main contributing factors probably originated in the close connections between Chian and Athenian democrats during the fifth and fourth centuries—particularly in the time of the ἀρχή. Thanks to the Atticism of many of its leading men, the Chios of the classical epoch tended to favour stories about Theseus as the father of its founder Oinopion.⁷⁸ These stories postulated an Attic-Chian συγγένεια as the Neleid stories did but, unlike these,⁷⁹ they failed to insist upon Chios' Ionianism.⁸⁰ Ascribing the foundation of their city to a son of Theseus had the advantage, from the democratic Chians' standpoint, of deriving the συγγένεια in question from the people's hero *par excellence*.⁸¹ Also, that version of the island's ἀρχαιολογία made the Chians' link to Athens more intimate than, and independent from, the link the other Ionians claimed for themselves. No doubt, the ideologists of the ἀρχή approved of both points.⁸²

This substitution of Theseus for Neleus inevitably affected the status of Apollo Patroos in Chios.⁸³ When Euthydemus and Dionysodorus, quite ignoring Apollo Patroos, speak of Zeus

⁷² P. Carlier, *La royauté en Grèce avant Alexandre* (Strasbourg 1984) 433 ff.

⁷³ Cf. V.J. Rosivach, *CQ* 37 (1987) 302-5. The name of the Atlantid king (of the third generation!) Autochthon (*Crit.* 114 c) expresses Plato's protest against the political misuse of the myth about the 'earthborn Athenians'.

⁷⁴ Hdt. 5 69, 1.

⁷⁵ Various elements of the constitutional teaching in the *Timaeus-Critias* and the *Laws* suggest that conclusion: P. Lévêque et P. Vidal-Naquet, *Clisthène l'Athénien* (Paris 1964) 97 f. 141-3; Dušanić (n.18) 322.

⁷⁶ Hdt. I 143, 3.

⁷⁷ Carlier (n.72) 433. Cf. M.B. Sakellariou, *La migration grecque en Ionie* (Athènes 1958) 186 ff. and *passim*.

⁷⁸ Ion *ap.* Plu. *Thes.* 20, 2 (Oinopion, son of Theseus and Ariadne); cf. Zenis *ap.* Ath. 13. 77, p. 601 f. (Minos gives Theseus his daughter Phaedra in marriage; this 'doit être rapproché de la version qui faisait de Thésée et d'Ariane les parents d'Oinopion' [Sakellariou (n.77) 188]). Both authors were Chians and writing about the island's history (Ion in the fifth, Zenis in the fourth [?] cent. BC); the former was also a pronounced Atticophile. They offer, obviously, 'une histoire inventée' (Sakellariou [n.77] 205). Jacoby (*CQ* 41 [1947] 6 f.) attributed it to Pherecydes; in any case, Ion was not alone in assigning to Oinopion a Thesean lineage (Plu. *loc. cit.*: 'some say'; 'among these is Ion of Chios' [transl. B. Perrin, LCL]). On Oinopion in Pausanias (7. 4, 8) and a Chian inscription, Ch. Habicht, *Class. Ant.* 3 (1984) 44 f.

⁷⁹ Chios as a member of the Neleid Dodecapolis: *Marm. Par.* 27; Paus. 7. 2; Ael. *VH* 8. 5; *Suda s.v.* 'Ιωνία. Cf. *supra*, nn. 43-44.

⁸⁰ Pausanias significantly closes his extract from Ion's Χίου Κτίσις (where the foundation of Chios was attributed to Theseus' son Oinopion: *supra*, n. 78) with the following comment: 'However, he (Ion) gives no reason why the Chians are classed with the Ionians' (7.4, 10; transl. W.H.S. Jones, LCL).

⁸¹ On Theseus as a democrat (Cleisthenian [Jacoby (n.78) 6 and n.6; K.W. Ararat, *OCD*³ 1509] etc.) see e.g. H. Herter, *RE Supplb.* XIII (1973) *s.v.* 'Theseus 1' 1216 ff.

⁸² Athens' exceptionally favourable treatment of Chios in the fifth century was largely a matter of tactics: T.J. Quinn, *Athens and Samos, Lesbos and Chios: 478-404 BC* (Manchester 1981) 38-49. Cf. Th. VI 85, 2.

⁸³ Modern commentators on the *Euthydemus* usually mention a Chian *lex sacra* of the fourth century, *Syll.* 3 987, where Zeus Patroos figures as the god of the phratry of the Clytidae. The *lex* obviously derived from the aristocracy whose religious (and political?) allegiance was not Ionian in Plato's conception of Ionianism. Cf. Sakellariou (n.77)

Patroos in his capacity as ancestral god, they do it with their Chian experience in mind—or, more exactly, with Plato's claim of what the experience of Ionian ultrademocrats must be.⁸⁴ From that point of view, Euthydemus' and Dionysodorus' disregard of Apollo Patroos is more than a realistic detail of the dialogue. It is a device to show where the two sophists stand in the world of politics. Aggressive and sea-oriented, they are complete opposites to a peaceful landed gentleman of Crito's type.⁸⁵ On the other hand, that device will have alluded, precisely, to the Attic-Chian contacts of c. 384, naturally assumed to have cited 'palaeohistorical' arguments (among others) in favour of the new alliance.⁸⁶ Theseus was probably invoked in that context rather than Neleus. The second verse of Antiphanes' fragment might perhaps be interpreted as ridiculing the manipulation of the theme of a Thesean πατρόπολις in 384. The possibility deserves even more attention if Antiphanes' *Mētras* is equated with our Metrodorus (II) and Metrodorus the author of the Ἴωνικά of *FGrHist* 43 F3. To venture a further conjecture, the Ἴωνικά in question may have underlined the intimate ties linking Chios to Athens, in the sense of the democratic συγγένεια just mentioned.⁸⁷

The *Helen's* polemic against *Euthydemus* is again relevant here. A point of Isocrates' praise of Theseus, Poseidon's son,⁸⁸ was, it appears, a protest against Plato's aristocratic conception of the βασιλική τέχνη—more specifically an answer to Plato's criticism of a Poseidonic policy for which Isocrates himself was partly responsible. With regard to the Chian context of allusions, in the *Euthydemus*, to Isocrates as a *Realpolitiker*, the *Helen's* Theseus was also capable of reminding contemporaries—especially those interested in the treaty of 384—of Oinopion and the island's ἀρχαιλογία,⁸⁹ though neither topic is explicitly referred to in paragraphs 21-39. It is the end of the speech, with its historical lessons, which suggests this assumption. At 67-8, Isocrates writes: '... owing to Helen ... we are not the slaves of the barbarians ... after that war' [the Trojan war] 'our race expanded so greatly that it took from the barbarians great cities and much territory'.⁹⁰ In the same paragraphs, he implies that one of the results of the Greek victory over Priam's 'Asia' and the ensuing migrations⁹¹ was that the 'Carian' predominance over, even presence in, 'the islands' disappeared for ever. All this seems to have pointed to Oinopion and Chios among others, however, without citing the anthroponym or the toponym. In his triple capacity as participant in the Trojan War, leader of the Greek colonists in Chios and founder of a local kingdom which eventually expelled the

201 ff.

⁸⁴ As Hawtrey (n.) 183 glosses Socrates' and Dionysodorus' exchange of pieces of knowledge (and ignorance) of Apollo Patroos, '... as a native of Chios, and so an Ionian himself, Dionysodorus might have been expected to know all this'.

⁸⁵ *Euthd.* 291 e, cf. 306 e.

⁸⁶ Whether the text lost in the *lacuna* of lines 5 ff. of *Syll.*³ 142 contained some reference to the Chians' status of Athens' συγγενείς or ἄπιοκοι is hard to say. Inscriptions concerning Attic-Ionian diplomatic contacts in the fourth century (M. Dreher, *Hegemon und Symmachoi. Untersuchungen zum Zweiten Athenischen Seebund* [Berlin & New York 1995] 128-31; cf. Ch. Habicht, *Athens from Alexander to Antony* [Cambridge Mass. 1997] 69 with n.1) allow that possibility.

⁸⁷ *Supra*, n.44. Metrodorus could probably write, in a conciliatory manner, about the Chians as Ionians and Theseus' Oinopion's children at the same time (cf. n.80).

⁸⁸ X 18 (cf. 23).

⁸⁹ Poseidon too had his place in Chian foundation-legends, one which tended to assimilate Oinopion with him (Sakellariou [n.77] 186 [particularly text to n.4]).

⁹⁰ Transl. L. Van Hook (LCL).

⁹¹ Scattered evidence suggests that ancient mythographers and historians (drawing mainly from the Νόστοι) believed in waves of Greek colonization of the Aegean and, especially, the West immediately following the fall of Troy. Chios may have been included in the complex of such stories of the Greek 'expansion', to judge e.g. from the κρήνη Ἐλένη cited by Stephanus of Byzantium's Ἐλένη.

Carians from its vicinity,⁹² Oinopion fits the context quite well; the fourth-century readers of the *Helen*, accustomed to Isocrates' allusive style,⁹³ may very well have read Oinopion's name between the lines. And such readers were likely to know more about the differences, quite instructive in this matter, between the political programmes of Isocrates and of Plato. The laudatory picture, in the *Helen*, of the aftermath of the Trojan War obviously reflected Isocrates' ideal of the anti-Persian crusade, and the same may be assumed for the support he provided to the Attic-Chian *rapprochements* of c. 393 and 384. Despite his barbarophobia, however, Plato was against the imperialist policy in principle, an attitude which many of his dialogues after *Gorgias* argue for, including the *Euthydemus*, and which inspired his opposition to Bruon's, (?) Metrodorus' and Cephalus' initiatives.

IV

If *Euthydemus* 305 b ff. is correctly understood as Plato's allusion to the stay of Isocrates at Chios c. 393 BC, various aspects of the dialogue suggest that its political context should be situated during the Attic-Chian relations of 384, relations which resulted in the alliance recorded by *Syll.*³ 142. The 'Ionian' passage 302 b-d deals with a historico-religious theme that must have been rather widely discussed at the time of the conclusion of the alliance. Independent prosopographical data on Isocrates' early teaching at Chios tend to connect 305 b ff., the rôle of Euthydemus and Dionysodorus as *dramatis personae*, the list of the Chian envoys in *Syll.*³ 142, and an interesting fragment of Antiphanes' Φιλομήτωρ. Some messages in the *Helen* throw light on the topical facets which Plato's analysis of the βασιλική τέχνη displays in the *Euthydemus*, with its critical references to Isocrates and the Chian affairs. Finally, the interpretation of the *Euthydemus* as proposed above postulates that foreign ambassadors play a major part in the dialogue's conversation; such dramatic frameworks—illustrating the historico-political dimension of Plato's writings but not explicitly delineated—are often found in the *corpus Platonicum*.

All this throws some light on the structure and purposes of the dialogue as a whole. It is both more serious⁹⁴ and more specific than a farcical account of a discursive eristic demonstration. As already perceived by Xenophon (*Mem.* IV 2, 11), the 'royal art' presents the salient theme of the discussion. On the purely philosophical level, the βασιλική τέχνη remains without a satisfactory definition. In this regard, the *Euthydemus* resembles several dialogues of Plato, especially the *Charmides* and *Meno*, with their negative analyses of notions which have more or less overtly political connotations (ἀρετή and σοφροσύνη respectively). A number of elements of the *Euthydemus*, however, may be studied as a separate, but functionally coherent layer of the work, one revealing the importance of something that might be termed the exoteric intentions of the author (*supra*, Sections I-III). Many other pieces from the *corpus Platonicum*,

⁹² Oinopion in the Trojan War: Alcid. *Od.* 20 (ed. Radermacher, *Artium Scriptores*, 145) (perhaps written at approximately the same time as the *Euthydemus* and the *Helen*). True, Oinopion does not occur in Homer but probably did in a poem of the Cycle, e.g. the Ἴλιου Πέρσις.—Leader of the colonists: Sakellariou (n.77) 187.—Oinopion's descendants' triumph over the Carians (and the Abantes) in Chios: Ion *ap.* Paus. 7.4, 9 (the name of the Greek king of the period, Hector, tended to date the event, according to some authors, to the generation of Oinopion's sons).

⁹³ Cf. S. Perlman, *Historia* 6. (1957) 311 n. 36.

⁹⁴ Hawtrey (n.1) 15 rightly observed: '... despite the extreme politeness with which Socrates treats Euthydemus and Dionysodorus, he is always firm with them... There is frivolity and good humour on the surface; below, all is in earnest'. Cf. 272 e (the intervention of Socrates' sign).

the *Meno* and the *Charmides* included, the *Phaedo* and the *Timaeus-Critias* most obviously,⁹⁵ have analogous dual structures (the discussion of which, among the ancients, produced instructive controversies);⁹⁶ the composite structure of the *Laws* seems to have inspired Plato's explicit distinction between the 'Second' and the 'Third' polities at 5. 739a ff.⁹⁷ Conceivably, the elements expressing the author's 'exoteric' intentions tend to convey Plato's lessons in a more direct manner than the dialogues' theoretical parts, which tend to remain inconclusive in many cases. In the *Euthydemus*, these lessons stemming from the 'exoteric' layer of the work concern two interrelated fields: education and *Realpolitik*.

Socrates' protreptic discourses at 278e ff. and 288d ff. are usually and justly interpreted as an implicit defence of Socratic teaching. The second discourse, which brings in the problem of the βασιλική τέχνη and suggests the conclusion that the τέχνη in question must be some sort of knowledge of good and evil, tends to sustain that interpretation through eloquent prosopographical detail. The crucial point in the explanation of the general's art—a significant branch of the 'royal art'—has been made by the young Clinias (290c ff.), who by virtue of his name and familial heritage recalls Alcibiades (275 a),⁹⁸ himself the paradigm of a promising statesman and the most famous among Socrates' followers. That surprising contribution of 'Clinias' to the philosophical dispute probably reminded the fourth-century reader of the Academy, too, which became the heir of the Socratic circle. Ctesippus' rôle in the dialogue—and, specifically, Socrates' remark about him at 290e—seems to underline this implicit reference of the *Euthydemus* to the educational successes of the Academy: bearing a name typical of the family of that Chabrias (*PA* 15086) who was Plato's relative, friend, and supporter in matters of public relevance,⁹⁹ 'Ctesippus'—obviously an unhistorical person¹⁰⁰—was able to personify the continuity linking a group of Socrates' companions to Plato's school.

Seen through the eyes of the writer of the *Euthydemus*, Alcibiades and Chabrias had much in common as πολιτευόμενοι. Both were brilliant opponents of an ultra-democratic Athens.¹⁰¹ Throughout his life, Plato shared their aristocratic predilections—which presupposed a number of parallel attitudes, including patriotic judgements about foreign affairs—and the dialogues ranging from the *Gorgias* to the *Laws* show that his aristocratism deeply influenced his teaching at the Academy. A whole series of details in the *Euthydemus*, which implicitly

⁹⁵ On the *Phaedo*, above, n. 53.—Commenting upon the 'conjunction of metaphysics and politics' in the twin-dialogues, R. Stalley, 'The Politics of the *Timaeus*' (in: [T. Calvo-Martínez, ed.] *Preliminary Papers for the IV Symposium Platonicum*, Granada 1995) has justly stated that 'one of the main purposes of the account of the universe in the *Timaeus* is to provide the metaphysical underpinning for Plato's political and ethical theory'—in the final analysis, for the Platonic description and history of Atlantis, with its fourth-century traits.

⁹⁶ See Procl. *In Rem publ.* 16-19 Kroll (352 f.), on the symbolical role of πρόσωπα, καιροί, and τόποι (i.e. the elements constituting the most prominent part of what we have called the dialogues' 'Realpolitik layer') in the προοίμια of the Platonic writings. Cf. id., *In Alc.* 103 a (18 f.), for the long-lasting debate concerning the respective rôles of ψυχαγωγία and ιστορία in the shaping of those three products of Plato's dramatic expression which, according to Proclus, 'are dependent on the theme of the dialogues as a whole'. In my opinion, such elements blended historical facts of an edifying sort and the psychagogic fiction; their relationship with the purely philosophical parts cannot be fully understood if viewed as a simple contrast 'between literary form and philosophic content' (cf. Guthrie [n.2] 2 f.) rather than a pyramidal phenomenon recalling the two polities of the *Laws*.

⁹⁷ Dušanić (n.18) 381.

⁹⁸ Cf. *ibid.* 365 (on the Clinias of the *Laws*). Xenophon (*Mem.* I 3, 8 and 10) calls the young Clinias the son of Alcibiades (not Axiochus), which is probably a deliberate 'mistake', intended to underline Clinias' Alcibiadean nature.

⁹⁹ *FGrHist* 328 F 223.

¹⁰⁰ J.K. Davies, *Athenian Propertied Families, 600-300 BC* (Oxford 1971) 338 (no. 8886) and 336 (no. 8823).

¹⁰¹ Chabrias' patriotism and talents: D. 20. 75 ff.; Diod. 15.29, 2; Plu. *Phoc.* 6, 2 etc. Chabrias as victim of the *invidia vulgi*: Corn. Nep. 12.I 3, 2; cf. D.L. 3. 24.

criticize the sea-orientation, radically democratic mentality and aggressive spirit of the Chian eristics and their party allies in Athens,¹⁰² conform to Plato's political programme. The little that is known of Chabrias' activities in the period which witnessed the publication of the dialogue points in the same direction.¹⁰³ There is no need to emphasize the fact that Plato's disapproval of imperialism on the one hand and his doctrines, philosophical as well as pedagogical, on the other were unifiable and united through his psychology,¹⁰⁴ according to which the souls of the state and the individual are the natural rulers of the body and bodily appetites. That postulate received much attention as early as the *Gorgias*.

It appears striking that the *Euthydemus* does little explicitly to harmonize the purely philosophical with the 'exoteric' messages. Of course, these latter can be interpreted as applying the former to practical use. The passage 288b ff. connects criticism of eristic with the Socratic effort to understand the nature of the 'royal art': the eristic methods of reasoning, or disputing at least, connote (and lead to) bad politics,¹⁰⁵ for they exclude the very possibility of distinguishing between false and correct opinions, mistaken and right actions.¹⁰⁶ Some other passages seem to suggest that the *Meno's* comments (97a ff.) on the merits of the ὀρθὴ δόξα find ramifications of a kind in the *Euthydemus*.¹⁰⁷ And, in the final analysis, the parts of the *Euthydemus* expressing the Socratic demand for a definition and Plato's opinions on practical policy, respectively, may be taken to complement each other in more than one respect. They are complementary with regard to method, themes, quality of thought, and degree of reality. As to this last point, the emotional aspects of Plato's theory of Forms may be stressed here—to be exact, his need to combine epistemological and moral aims through that complex doctrine.¹⁰⁸ Nevertheless, if the *Euthydemus* is read as an exclusively philosophical or a conventionally protreptic work, one centred on the notion of the βασιλικὴ τέχνη, its structural unity displays remarkable defects, both on the literary and the dialectical side. Such a work, presumably, would have paid less attention, and given less space, to certain aspects of the Chian eristic. Very probably, it would have omitted the digressions on Socrates' Ionianism and Isocrates' politico-educational idiosyncrasies. As we have it, the *Euthydemus*, sporadically comical and digressive, recalls some pieces of Attic dramatic poetry, whose techniques (it is well known) influenced Plato's art and ἡθοποιεῖα in general.

To judge from the foregoing pages, it was Plato's interest in topical events of public importance that inspired those features of the *Euthydemus* and many other dialogues which tend to 'spoil' the expected unity of his composition. Not only the content of the dialogue's 'Realpolitik layer' but also the choice of the dialogue's main subject seem to have depended on such topical matters; in this regard, Clinias' βασιλικὴ τέχνη will have corresponded to the Theseus themes current in Athens c. 384 BC (Attic-Chian relations; Isocrates' *Helen*). Analogous eloquent connections with their political contexts may be demonstrated, I believe, for most of Plato's dialogues; their chronology—as determined on stylometric criteria—is difficult to understand otherwise and, in any case, does not seem to reflect Plato's evolution of a purely philosophical or pedagogical order. I am inclined therefore to qualify the *Euthydemus*, like many

¹⁰² Above, nn. 12, 22 f., 85.

¹⁰³ See my article (231) referred to above, n.21.

¹⁰⁴ To say nothing of its basis in Plato's character.

¹⁰⁵ Cf. *Phd.* 115 e (and Guthrie's comment [n.2] 244).

¹⁰⁶ Cf. *Rep.* 6. 498 e ff.

¹⁰⁷ E.g. 306 d (Isocrates' 'coming near to wisdom').

¹⁰⁸ Though the question is a notoriously difficult one, I follow those scholars who conclude from 301 a-c (Socrates' famous statement concerning beauty and the beautiful) that Plato refers there, by no means accidentally, to his doctrine of Forms.

other writings in the *corpus Platonicum*, as a two-level *political* protreptic, whose (graded) unity¹⁰⁹ has inevitably remained incomplete or, rather, dependent on the limitations of the *genre*, which demanded that Plato include much topical material and treat it with discretion. On what might be called Clinias' and Ctesippus' level, the *Euthydemus* was to serve as a comment about the dangerous events of c. 384, composed for the politically minded Academics and Plato's friends among the best πολιτευόμενοι such as Chabrias and Timotheus. On what might be called the Socratic level, its intention was to explain—or, rather, indicate—the philosophical basis of Plato's advice on a topical crisis; the apparently negative outcome of the search for the definition of βασιλική τέχνη results from the Scholarch's psychagogic method rather than his own hesitation about the solution of the problem. Both layers were necessary in a school of philosophy and politics, scientific and practical alike,¹¹⁰ that the Academy seems to have been during Plato's lifetime.

* * *

To conclude, some brief chronological and exegetic observations on the dialogues of the 380s. If the *Euthydemus* reflects the events of the summer of 384 in such a complex way, it is likely to have been written and published as early as 384/3 itself. This squares well enough with diverse indications that it is close to the *Meno*;¹¹¹ the latter work, judging from its specific reference to Ismenias and Polycrates (90 a) as well as other political hints, may have been composed c. 383.¹¹² The *Charmides* seems to have been published immediately after, in view of similar evidence;¹¹³ Isocrates, who worked slowly, was able to join his criticism of the *Euthydemus* and the *Charmides* within one speech, the *Encomium of Helen*. The eloquent anachronism of 305 b ff. shows that the *Euthydemus* belongs to that series of Plato's dialogues of the 380s which treat topical themes of a political character (a feature usually neglected by modern Platonic scholars) on two interconnected chronological planes: Socratic and Platonic. A common characteristic of the series, intentional and emphatic anachronisms, formally warns the reader of the importance which the latter plane has for the message of the entire composition. Two examples are especially instructive. Plato used the developed anachronism of the *Menex*. 242 c ff. to expound his judgment of Greek policy leading to the King's Peace in the form of a λόγος Σωκρατικός; the *Menexenus* is best dated c. 386/5 BC. In the *Symposium*, the anachronistic mention (193 a) of Mantinea's dioecism of 385/4 (winter) underlines other references to Arcadian matters which give a special colour to that dialogue. Between the *Symposium*, datable to the early 384, and the *Euthydemus*, a place must be found for the *Protagoras*,¹¹⁴ whose crucial anachronism concerns the death of Hippias (315 b-c).

SLOBODAN DUŠANIĆ

University of Belgrade

¹⁰⁹ Most evident in the choice of the dialogue's principal theme, as realized by Proclus and his predecessors in their analyses of the Platonic prologues in general (above, n.96).

¹¹⁰ See *Politicus* 272d ff. for an attempt by Plato to explain that *Realpolitik*, despite its chaotic events, can be studied scientifically, too.

¹¹¹ Above, n.2.

¹¹² Dušanić (n.21) 229 n.24.

¹¹³ As argued in my book in preparation, entitled 'The birth of the Academy. Plato's dialogues and Greek politics, 390-375 BC'. What follows concerning the dating and political interpretation of the *Charmides*, the *Menexenus*, the *Symposium*, and the *Protagoras*, summarizes the book's analysis.

¹¹⁴ Cf. Ch. H. Kahn, *OSAPh* 6 (1988) 75 ff. 98 f.