

ALCIDAMAS OF ELAEA IN PLATO'S *PHAEDRUS**

In Bk. 3 of the *Institutio oratoria*, Quintilian gives a list of the Greek *artium scriptores* of the classical epoch (1.8ff.). It contains a controversial entry: '...et, quem Palameden Plato appellat, Alcidas Elaites' (1.10).¹ The historicity of the rhetorician and sophist from Elea named Alcidas, Gorgias' pupil, is of course beyond doubt;² scholars disagree only as to the 'quem Palameden Plato appellat'.

Modern exegesis³ connects this phrase with the well-known passage in the *Phaedrus* referring to 'the Eleatic Palamedes' (τὸν Ἐλεατικὸν Παλαμήδην), who 'has an art of speaking (τέχνη sc. λέγοντα), such that he can make the same things appear to his audience like and unlike, or one and many, or again at rest and in motion' (261d).⁴ Surprisingly, it has been neglected that a Palamedes occurs at 261b too, in the lines which immediately precede, and form a unity with, 261d.

If the 'Plato appellat' is to be believed at all and interpreted as pointing to a work of Plato the philosopher,⁵ the two interdependent paragraphs of the *Phaedrus* (261b and d) really seem the best candidates for the source of Quintilian's note on Alcidas–Palamedes.⁶ Other references to Palamedes in the *corpus Platonicum* as we have it today are much less likely to be taken for a personal allusion to Alcidas;⁷ on the other hand, it is both difficult and (as we shall try to show) unnecessary to assume that Plato's name dropped into Quintilian's text by a simple oversight⁸ or was

* The author owes warm thanks to Professor John Buckler, as well as to the editors and the specialist referee of the *Classical Quarterly*. All of them commented on an earlier version of the present paper and corrected many errors of its English. ¹ *Elaites A, Eleites B*.

² See on him *Alcidamante: Orazioni e frammenti*. Testo, introduzione, traduzione e note a cura di G. Avezzù (Rome, 1982), with an exhaustive bibliography (pp. xxxiii–xli). From the most recent scholarship note Ch. Eucken, *Isokrates. Seine Positionen in der Auseinandersetzung mit den zeitgenössischen Philosophen* (Berlin–New York, 1983), pp. 121–32, and N. D. Demetriades' edition of Alcidas' 'On those who compose written speeches, or on Sophists' (Athens, 1987; *non vidi*).

³ *T* 15 (pp. 4 and 70) Avezzù (*supra*, n. 2). Cf. R. Förster, *Rh. Mus.* 30 (1875), 322f.; J. Adamietz, *M. F. Quintiliani Institutionis Oratoriae Liber III*, mit einem Kommentar (Munich, 1966), 71 ('261a' is a misprint for 261d), and the *apparatus (ad loc.)* and *indices* in the main editions of Quintilian (L. Radermacher, Teubner, 1907¹; H. E. Batler, LCL 1920¹; R. Faranda, Torino, 1968; M. Winterbottom, OCT 1970¹; J. Cousin, Budé 1976¹).

⁴ The translation by R. Hackforth (*Plato's Phaedrus* [Cambridge, 1952]), which is quoted also *infra*, for 261b–c, 274c–d and 275a–d.

⁵ So far as we can see, nobody has thought of the Philosopher's oral joke or a verse by Plato Comicus. Those possibilities are to be ruled out, for several reasons. Note that *Inst. or.* (Bk. 3 as well as the other books) frequently cites the *corpus Platonicum* as 'Plato' *tout court*.

⁶ Significantly, the next paragraph of *Inst. or.* (3.1.11, on Antiphon, Polycrates, and 'Theodorus Byzantius, ex iis et ipse quos Plato appellat logodaedalos'), which continues the topic of 1.10 (cf. Förster [n. 3]), refers to the *Phaedrus* (266e) too. I do not share the conviction of modern philologists that the plural form *logodaedalos* used there reveals 'dass Quintilian von Cic. *orat.* 39 abhängt' (Adamietz [n. 3]).

⁷ *Apol.* 41b; *Resp.* 7.522d; *Leg.* 3.677d; *Ep.* 2.311b.

⁸ The solution proposed by G. L. Spalding and some others, including Avezzù (n. 2), p. 70 (with refs.). Förster (n. 3), 333 justly remarked that the words 'quem Palameden Plato appellat' should not be taken 'für ein späteres Einschiebsel' as they correspond too well with the occurrences of Palamedes' symbol in both the *Phaedrus* and Alcidas' production. Besides, that athetesis would spoil the rhythm of Quintilian's phrase.

cited from a pseudo-Platonic dialogue lost to us.⁹ With its focus on the problems of the written word and of the art of oratory, and with its various veiled references to contemporaries,¹⁰ the *Phaedrus* presents quite a plausible context for an allusion to the author of (*inter alia*) a *περὶ τῶν τοῦς γραπτῶς λόγους γραφόντων ἢ περὶ σοφιστῶν*.¹¹ The circumstance that he was also credited with an *Ὀδυσσεὺς κατὰ Παλαμῆδους προδοσίας*¹² may have given additional point to the *Phaedrus*' comparison (*εἰκασία*)¹³ of Alcidas with Palamedes,¹⁴ a comparison which was primarily based upon certain Palamedean features in the Eleatic rhetorician's theory and activity.¹⁵

To this it can be, and has been, objected that *Phaedr.* 261d hints in fact at a member of the Eleatic school of thinkers, most probably Zeno.¹⁶ The objectors' argumentation should not be ignored. The *Ἐλεατικόν* (*loc. cit.*) is derived from the ethnic *Ἐλεάτης*, pertaining to Zeno's native city, not from *Ἐλαίτης* (Alcidas' Elea);¹⁷ the teaching

⁹ Though Alcidas may have been referred to, explicitly or implicitly, in certain non-extant Platonic apocryphs in various connections. Cf. C. W. Müller, *Die Kurzdialoge der Appendix Platonica. Philologische Beiträge zur nachplatonischen Sokratik* (Munich, 1975), pp. 148 n. 5, 185 n. 2, on the *καιρός* theme.

¹⁰ At least three of them are cast in the mythological form too: 261c (Nestor = Gorgias; Odysseus = Thrasymachus/Theodorus), 269a (Adrastus ~ Pericles; *infra*, text and n. 57). Thamus (274d ff.), though bearing the true name of the historical potentate (*infra*, n. 72) and the title of an (ancient) Egyptian king, is nevertheless a god at the same time. Cf. also below, n. 58, and *Symp.* 215b ff.

¹¹ Fr. B 22.15 Radermacher = 1 Avezzù. Characteristically, even some of those students of the fourth-century theories of rhetoric who omit to cite, or discard, the testimony of *Inst. or.* 3.1.10 on *Phaedr.* 261d are of an opinion that the *Phaedrus* must contain allusions to Alcidas (e.g. W. Steidle, *Hermes* 80 [1952], 285–96; Eucken [n. 2], pp. 130–2).

¹² Fr. B 22.16 Radermacher = 2 Avezzù.

¹³ Cf. *Meno* 80c; *Symp.* 221c.

¹⁴ That point has been stressed as early as Förster (n. 8).

¹⁵ The *Odysseus* of Alcidas attacks Palamedes whereas Gorgias, with his *Apology of Palamedes*, was on the opposite side. Those differences were immaterial in the case of sophists, willing to speak and/or write *in utramque partem*.

¹⁶ The list which follows offers some select (mostly recent) references, classified under four headings: (a) the commentators of Quintilian; (b) the commentators of the *Phaedrus* and the Platonic scholars; (c) the students of Alcidas and rhetoric; and (d), the students and editors of the fragments of Zeno and Eleatic philosophy. (a) Adamietz (n. 3); Cousin (n. 3), 254. (b) G. J. De Vries, *A Commentary on the Phaedrus of Plato* (Amsterdam, 1969), pp. 204f.; W. K. C. Guthrie, *A History of Greek Philosophy*, iv (Cambridge, 1975), p. 407 with n. 2; C. J. Rowe, *Plato: Phaedrus* (Warminster, 1988²), p. 196; L. Brisson, *Platon, Phèdre* (Paris, 1989), p. 222 n. 335. (c) J. Brzoska, *RE* i (1894), 1533 s.v. Alcidas; H. Auer, *De Alcidasantis declamatione quae inscribitur Ὀδυσσεὺς κατὰ Παλαμῆδους προδοσίας* (Diss. Münster, 1913), p. 33 with n. 2; Eucken (n. 2), pp. 11 with n. 40, 61 with n. 56. Cf. Förster (n. 3), 331f.; Avezzù (n. 2), p. 70. (d) D-K⁶ 29 A 13; M. Untersteiner, *Zenone. Testimonianze e frammenti* (Florence, 1963), pp. 56–60, no. 13; Guthrie, op. cit. ii (Cambridge, 1965), p. 83; G. Vlastos, *JHS* 95 (1975), 150–5; J. Barnes, *The Presocratic Philosophers* (London, 1982²), pp. 236 and 618 n. 14; G. S. Kirk–J. E. Raven–M. Schofield, *The Presocratic Philosophers* (Cambridge, 1983²), p. 278 no. 329. Two scholars retained the identification of Plato's Palamedes with an Eleatic (Megarian) philosopher but proposed (without adequate reasons, see Untersteiner and Guthrie, *loc. cit.*; F. M. Cornford, *Plato's Theory of Knowledge* (London, 1935¹), p. 177 n. 1) candidates other than Zeno: H. v. Arnim, *Platos Jugenddialoge und die Entstehungszeit des Phaidros* (Leipzig–Berlin, 1914), pp. 193f. (Euclides or a pupil of Euclides) and P. Friedländer, *Platon*, iii² (Berlin, 1969), pp. 234f. (Parmenides). Still less convincingly, K. Joël, *Geschichte der antiken Philosophie*, i (Tübingen, 1921), p. 459 n. 1, thought of Gorgias. It should be noted that the majority of the scholars listed under (b) and (d) do not mention Quintilian's testimony, which tends to be forgotten by recent students of the *Phaedrus*.

¹⁷ Steph. Byz. s.v. *Ἐλαία πόλις τῆς Ἀσίας Αἰολική... ἐστὶ καὶ ἑτέρα Ἰταλίας διὰ τοῦ ἐ φιλοῦ Ἐλέα, ἐξ ἧς Ἐλεάται. τῆς δὲ προτέρας Ἐλαίται.*

that 'can make the same things appear ... like and unlike, or one and many, or again at rest and in motion' forms, according to Plato and others,¹⁸ the salient feature of Eleatic philosophy. Some ancient commentators on the *Phaedrus* consequently identified 'the Eleatic Palamedes' with Zeno.¹⁹ Negligible exceptions apart,²⁰ moderns follow them, rejecting, or passing over in silence, the testimony of *Inst. or.* 3.1.10.²¹ It is explained away as a slip of Quintilian or his source(s) – the result of a confusion of two (allegedly) similar adjectives ('Ελεατ./'Ελαιτ.) made in the course of a hasty reading of the dialogue. Plato's reason for associating Zeno with the Palamedes-like speakers attacked in the *Phaedrus* has been sought²² in the tradition recorded in a fragment of Aristotle's *Sophist*: 'Zeno was inventor of dialectic, as Empedocles was of rhetoric.'²³ Aristotle's pairing of these *πρώτοι εύρεταί* accords with his thesis that 'rhetoric and dialectic alone of all the arts prove opposites';²⁴ later writers go as far as to proclaim Zeno the champion of eristic.²⁵ All this has been found to be in harmony with Socrates' critique of antilogic in the same page of the *Phaedrus* which cites 'the Eleatic Palamedes' (261c–e).²⁶

However, the *communis opinio* – seeing in *Phaedr.* 261d an allusion to Zeno which leaves no place for Alcidamas – raises difficulties of two orders.

First, the *Institutio oratoria*, Bk. 3, though not free from diverse imperfections, should be trusted in principle. Its historical chapter devoted to the fifth and fourth centuries compiles good sources, going back to Theophrastus and/or Aristotle,²⁷ which may well have included reliable information about Plato's judgement of Alcidamas. Quintilian, for his part, was a man of wide erudition, who had probably read Alcidamas²⁸ and certainly had an intimate knowledge of Plato's works, especially the *Gorgias* and the *Phaedrus*²⁹ as the handbooks of all the critics of the rhetoricians' art. This is not to say that he or his source must have been right in detecting Alcidamas behind Plato's Palamedes; however, the hypothesis of misidentification rests on too fragile foundations. It seems a desperate solution to claim that he committed, or reproduced, while dealing with a passage of the famous dialogue subtitled *περί καλοῦ*, a faulty substitution of 'Ελαίτης for 'Ελεατικός. That 'slip' would have presented his memory of the *Phaedrus* in a poor light indeed – of the dialogue's spirit as well as letter. For, Socrates' words at 261d, 'like and

¹⁸ *Parm.* 127e ff. (of Zeno himself); *Soph.* 242d ff. Kirk–Raven–Schofield (n. 16), pp. 263–79.

¹⁹ Herm. Alex. *ad Phaedr.* 261d (p. 225 Couvreur); schol. *ad loc.* (p. 85 Greene); Diog. Laert. 9.25 (with Diels' unavoidable emendation). Cf. Apul. *Apol.* 4.387.

²⁰ F. Nietzsche proposed (in a letter of June, 1868) to emend the 'Ελεατικόν of *Phaedr.* 261d into an 'Ελαιτικόν (cf. Avezzi [n. 3], p. 70) and thus rehabilitate *Inst. or.* 3.1.10; a similar conjecture, producing an 'Ελαίτην, has been mentioned and rejected by W. H. Thompson, *The Phaedrus of Plato* (London, 1868), p. 97.

²¹ *Supra*, n. 16. The editors of the *Institutio oratoria* whose *apparatus* (*ad* 3.1.10) cites *Phaedr.* 261d need not be supposed to believe that Quintilian is right there. Adamietz and Cousin are in fact explicit in denying that (n. 3).

²² Thus Guthrie, De Vries, Vlastos, Barnes *et alii* (n. 16).

²³ Fr. 65 R.³ = Diog. Laert. 8.57 and 9.25 (R. D. Hick's translation, LCL); cf. Sext. *Adv. math.* 7.6.

²⁴ *Rhet.* 1.1.11f. p. 1355 A (transl. J. H. Freese, LCL).

²⁵ Epiphanius 3.11; Ps. Galen, *Hist. philos.* 3.

²⁶ G. B. Kerferd, *The Sophistic Movement* (Cambridge, 1981), pp. 59–67.

²⁷ Cf. 3.1.13 (fr. 139 R.³). F. Sehmeyer, *Beziehungen zwischen Quintilians 'Institutiones oratoriae' und Ciceros rhetorischen Schriften* (Diss. Münster, 1912), pp. 18f.; Adamietz (n. 3), pp. 9, 13, 71; Cousin (n. 3), pp. 116f.

²⁸ Auer (n. 16), p. 33 with n. 2 (on Cic. *Tusc.* 1.116).

²⁹ Avezzi (n. 3), p. 70. Cousin's *index* ([n. 3], t.VII p. 273) registers 8 quotations from the *Phaedrus*, 12 from the *Gorgias*.

unlike...one and many...at rest and in motion', contain a reference to Zeno (the Eleatic) so transparent that every admirer of Greek wit and literature must have understood it.³⁰ Turning to the language of that paragraph, a banal confusion of Zeno's *origo* with Alcidas' could be ascribed only to a quite superficial reading of 261d6, improbable in the case of a teacher who insists so much upon the *studia sapientiae* (12.2–4, cf. 1.10 *et passim*) and the *recte loquendi/scribendi scientia* (1.44–7), since the ctetic 'Ελεατικόν is both phonetically different from, and longer than, the 'Ελαίτην;³¹ as Elea, according to our evidence, had no philosophical or rhetorical school of any importance, there was no reason for the ancient reader of the *Phaedrus* to postulate an 'Ελαιτικόν in 261d.³² On the other hand, if the *Elaites* of *Inst. or.* 3. 1.10, is taken for Quintilian's own note, introduced to individualize Alcidas, rather than for a deformation of Plato's 'Ελεατικόν, it becomes all the more difficult to follow the moderns' contention that the gloss on Palamedes–Alcidas should be attributed to the glossator's casual reading of the *Phaedrus*. At this juncture already, we are led to envisage the possibility that Quintilian and/or his *auctor(es)* correctly understood 261d as alluding to Alcidas *in addition* to Zeno – in other words, that the two branches of ancient commentaries on the passage – Quintilian³³ versus the writers enumerated *supra*, note 19 – should be treated as complementary rather than contradictory.

Second and specifically, 'the Palamedes' of 261d cannot be separated from the Palamedes who figures in the same context as the author of the treatise, or treatises, on the *rhetoric* theory; Zeno and the prominent Eleatics – unlike Alcidas³⁴ – never belonged to the series of such theoreticians.³⁵ We must quote:

(*Socrates asks Phaedrus*) 'What? Are you acquainted only with the 'Arts' or manuals of oratory (*Τέχναι*)³⁶ by Nestor and Odysseus, which they composed in their leisure hours at Troy? Have you never heard of the works of Palamedes (*τῶν δὲ Παλαμῆδους*)?' (261b). (*Phaedrus replies*) 'No, upon my word, nor of Nestor either, unless you are casting Gorgias for the role of Nestor, with Odysseus played by Thrasymachus or maybe Theodorus' (261c).³⁷

In the sequel, Plato broadens his notion of the public speaker, as well as his treatment of the origins, manifestations and impact of the *rhetorike*. That is done in several directions but a master of cyclic (or spiralic) composition such as Plato does not forget to return, sporadically, to the 'Arts', Gorgias, Thrasymachus and

³⁰ Cf., e.g., on the Roman side, Cicero, *Lucullus* 129 (+ 118, on Xenophanes); Seneca, *Ep.* 88, 44. Quintilian cites, in addition to the *Phaedrus*, some further works (though not the relevant passages) which contain clear references to Zeno's basic ideas: see 3.8.9, for Isocrates' *Helen*, and 3.4.10, for Plato's *Sophist*.

³¹ *Aliter*, Avezzi (n. 3), p. 70.

³² For a different view, F. Nietzsche (n. 20). The fact that Plato uses the ctetic here instead of the ethnic (ancient authorities wishing to distinguish our Zeno from his homonyms call him of course *ὁ 'Ελεάτης* – for refs. see Vlastos [n. 16], 158 n. 107; it is an understandable imprecision that Hackforth translated 261d 'Palamedes of Elea') tends to be overlooked (for an exception, Avezzi [n. 3], p. 70). However, it makes the interpretation proposed *infra* (text and nn. 54–8) all the more natural.

³³ See also below, n. 40.

³⁴ Frr. 12–15 Avezzi.

³⁵ Plato in the *Parmenides* and the best informed witnesses on Zeno in general speak of him as an author known for one treatise only, and its content was such that it could not have been equated with a rhetorical 'Art'.

³⁶ In the sequel, we shall write the term (and its translation) with an initial capital, whenever it is certain that it denotes the manual of rhetoric, not rhetoric itself or a 'science' in general.

³⁷ De Vries (n. 16), p. 204 (*ad loc.*): Thrasymachus and Theodorus 'are known as theoreticians of rhetoric'; 'properly speaking, Gorgias wrote no *τέχνη*... yet, his masterpieces sometimes passed as *τέχναι*...'

Theodorus of 261b–c.³⁸ Neither does he omit to remind the reader of Palamedes mentioned at 261b. Thus he provides us with a clue, albeit indirect, to the hero's real identity;³⁹ Quintilian, Quintilian's source(s) and, probably, some other representatives of ancient erudition⁴⁰ used it to discover Alcidas in the background. The fact that Socrates or Phaedrus never gives 'the Palamedes' a historical name (which the latter does in the case of 'Nestor' and 'Odysseus') shows that the mythonym disguises a topical person, whose mask is partially retained out of the Scholarch's tact – political or otherwise.⁴¹

'Palamedes' reappears for the first time as early as 261d. Plato's decision to attribute to him a *τέχνη* (d6) supports the other indications⁴² contained in the text of the *Phaedrus* that the two Palamedes (261b, d) represent one and the same member of Gorgias' group of rhetoricians,⁴³ i.e. Alcidas (the heir to Gorgias' school)⁴⁴ if Quintilian's gloss be accepted. At 261b, *Τέχνας* clearly means 'the manuals of oratory'. Several lines below (261c10), the word recurs in a function which widens it to an abstract 'art' or 'science' (cf. e2) but preserves much of the concrete meaning of the 'rhetoric manual' found at 261b.⁴⁵ The core of that concrete meaning is less marked but still extant in 261d6. Thanks to Plato's skilful formulation of the phrase – intentionally ambivalent, as the word in question could and probably would have been omitted otherwise – the *τέχνη* permits of two translations: 'scientifically'⁴⁶ (the dative of manner) and 'with his manual'⁴⁷ (the instrumental dative which is not preceded by the article as the *τέχνη* is sufficiently defined by the two foregoing

³⁸ *Phaedr.* 266c–e; 267a, c–d; 269d–e; 271a–c; 275c.

³⁹ Thompson (n. 20), p. 96; L. Robin, *Platon. Oeuvres complètes*, t.IV 33: *Phèdre* (Paris, CUF, 1933³), pp. 63f. n. 3.

⁴⁰ For Plutarch, see the end of the present paper. It may be useful also to point out *Παλαμήδης Ἐλεατικός*, the somewhat shadowy author of three lexicographic works and a commentary of Pindar – none of them extant (C. Wendel, *RE* xviii [1942], 2512f.). Though the historicity of his 'ethnic' is accepted by many modern scholars (in addition to Wendel's article see G. Radke, *RE* viii A [1958], 2402; Avezzù [n. 3], p. 70), Förster (n. 3), 339 must be right in assuming a pseudonym coined in reference to *Phaedr.* 261d. However, Förster is less convincing when he explains it as an allusion to the 'Manier' of Palamedes–Zeno 'Worte, welche in Form oder Bedeutung nichts gemeinsames haben, als gleich erscheinen zu lassen'. Zeno may have been the lexicographer's *exemplum* in method, not in the topic itself, which was closer to the interest in language typical of Alcidas and the sophists in general (cf. fr. 16ff. and pp. 92ff. Avezzù). The same holds true of that Palamedes' work on Pindar, which recalls Alcidas' *Certamen Homeri et Hesiodi* (fr. 5–7 Avezzù). We should prefer the hypothesis that the inventor of the pseudonym really knew that *Phaedr.* 261d (+b) refers to Alcidas in addition to Zeno.

⁴¹ By the mid-sixties of the fourth century (the probable date of the *Phaedrus*, cf. *infra*, n. 72), Gorgias, Theodorus and Thrasymachus must all have been dead. Alcidas – the author of the *Messeniacus* – was still active in 366/5 (our n. 81).

⁴² The themes of 'law courts'/'law suits' (261c, d) and 'public harangues' – both reminiscent of Palamedes 'at Troy' and fourth-century Athens alike – connect 261b–c with d–e. The Palamedes of 261d has his 'audience' (*τοῖς ἀκούουσι*), which would not have been quite an appropriate expression for the readers of Zeno in the time of Socrates/Plato.

⁴³ In his attempt to rehabilitate the whole of 'the Eleatic Palamedes', Vlastos (n. 16), 155 interprets Socrates' words at 261b as implying that 'Palamedes' was 'an orator of a different stripe from both Nestor–Gorgias and Odysseus–Thrasymachus'. But the names of Troy, Nestor–Gorgias, Odysseus–Thrasymachus/Theodorus, as cited in 261b–d, do not allow us to isolate Palamedes from his company. His being a victim of Odysseus does not affect that conclusion (cf. Plat. *Ep.* 2.311b).

⁴⁴ Robin (n. 39) translates it 'Art' (with a capital letter); De Vries (n. 16) notes: 'the word is entirely ambivalent'.

⁴⁶ Thus Rowe (n. 16), p. 93.

⁴⁷ 'Avec un art' Brisson (n. 16), p. 145. Hackforth's 'art of speaking' has the advantage of preserving both the meanings within the same expression.

occurrences of the term). The ambiguity was necessary to make the transition⁴⁸ from the political theme of 'law courts' and 'public harangues' (261a-e) to the philosophical theme of 'resemblance and dissimilarity' (261eff.) less abrupt. Analogous procedures are common in Plato.

Evidently, the composite formula 'the Eleatic Palamedes' unites the two themes and the two passages. Its second part refers to Palamedes (Alcidamas) of 261b and pertains to the *Realpolitik* of Plato's dialogue. Its first part refers to Zeno as Alcidamas' philosophical model and announces the theoretical discussion of 261eff. The *Eleatikos* tells us nothing more than that certain ideas and methods of Alcidamas' production were derived from the Eleatic (i.e. Zenonian) heritage; the adjective consequently reveals the spiritual, not the geographical, affinities of 'the Palamedes'. This bisection of 'the Eleatic Palamedes' into the Zenonian and the Alcidamantean, philosophical and political, halves can help us the better to understand Plato's opinion of Zeno's doctrine. Judging from the *Parmenides*,⁴⁹ Zeno was a thinker, superior to mere sophists.⁵⁰ The context of *Phaedr.* 261d contradicts this by associating 'the Eleatic Palamedes' with Gorgias, Theodorus and Thrasy-machus (261b), but the unfavourable implications of that grouping bear on Alcidamas' practical policy much more than on Zeno's dialectic.

Comparable formulae, constructed from an anthroponym and a metaphoric ethnic, are met with in various authors, either dealing with the history of philosophical schools or aiming at special literary effects: *Ἰππόδαμος Σάμιος*,⁵¹ *Σωκράτης ὁ Μήλιος*,⁵² *Λεύκιππος Ἐλεάτης* or *Ἀβδηρίτης*.⁵³ The essence, if not the form, of such expressions is paralleled by a number of Platonic passages. The *Ἐλεατικὸν ἔθνος* is used in the *Sophist* (242d) to denote the large tribe of monist 'thinkers', coming from all parts of the Greek world and ranging from the archaic poets to Parmenides, Zeno and Melissus;⁵⁴ the dialogue's Eleatic stranger calls Parmenides his 'father' (241d), in a patent reference to their philosophical, not familial, relationship. Similar cases are *Theaet.* 179e, where Homer⁵⁵ figures as something of a parent of the flux-doctrine of Heraclitus and 'the Ephesians',⁵⁶ and the *Phaedrus* itself (270a), where the Adrastus-Pericles pair is cited to remind of Pericles' particular capacity as the famous author of the *logoi epitaphioi*.⁵⁷ If the Aristophanes of the *Symposium* chose to give Socrates both the name of Marsyas, as Alcibiades will do in the same dialogue (215bff.), and (in an allusion to Socrates' alleged debt to Diagoras' atheism) the ethnic 'Melian', as is actually done in the *Nubes* 830, the resultant 'Melian Marsyas'

⁴⁸ On 261d6, οὖν, see De Vries (n. 16), p. 204; on d10, ἀπα, Vlastos (n. 16), 153 n. 68.

⁴⁹ Esp. 126a-128e; to the essentially same effect (i.e. a considerate treatment of Zeno), *Soph.* 216a and Aristotle's fr. 65 R.³ (*supra*, text and n. 23).

⁵⁰ Vlastos (n. 16), 131-61; cf. Barnes (n. 16), pp. 236, 294f.

⁵¹ *Schol.* Aristoph. *Eq.* 327a-e (ed. D. Mervyn Jones et N. G. Wilson, pp. 81f.), of Hippodamus the Milesian (Thurian). Here, the *Samios* means Pythagorean (cf. Stob. *Flor.* 4.1.93 Hense): E. Fabricius, *RE* viii (1913), 1734.

⁵² Aristoph. *Nub.* 830 with *schol.*, in an allusion to Socrates' contacts with Diagoras ὁ Ἀθεος (T 6 A, B Winiarczyk).

⁵³ Diog. Laert. 9.30, Simplic. *Phys.* 28.4 *et alii*, of Leucippus the Atomist. His real *origo* was probably Miletus; 'Abdera' and 'Elea' will have reflected his philosophical relations with Democritus and Zeno respectively, rather than his travels (J. Stenzel, *RE* xii [1925], 2266; Guthrie [n. 16], ii.384 with n. 1).

⁵⁴ Guthrie (n. 16), v (Cambridge, 1978), p. 137 with n. 2.

⁵⁵ Cf. 152e, 160d, 180c-d. Guthrie (n. 16), i (Cambridge, 1962), pp. 410, 450.

⁵⁶ τοῖς περὶ τὴν Ἐφεσον. Again, the name need not be taken - with e.g. Guthrie (n. 55), pp. 410f. n. 2 - in its strict geographical meaning; it is probable that the whole phrase includes Cratylus, an Athenian.

⁵⁷ S. Dušanić, *Aevum* 66 (forthcoming).

– imaginary but analogous to the Platonic metaphor of *Ἰάδες καὶ Σικελαὶ Μοῦσαι* (*Soph.* 242d–e)⁵⁸ – would have been a faithful doublet of our ‘Eleatic Palamedes’.

It may prove instructive to ask why *Phaedr.* 261d cites Zeno, of all the pre-Socratic philosophers with relativist messages and/or inexact methods of argumentation,⁵⁹ as the inspirer of Alcidas.⁶⁰ Our answer is that Plato (*loc. cit.*) had on his mind a specific bond linking Alcidas to Zeno, not only with its politico-topical⁶¹ but also with its philosophical implications. In his *Physikos*, Alcidas wrote – with approval, it seems – of Zeno’s mathematico-physical studies.⁶² Judging from the *Phaedrus*, Zeno’s mathematical proofs will have deeply influenced the sophistic reasoning of Alcidas’ *Τέχνη*, and induced him to argue, in the Eleatic fashion, that ‘the same things’ can be ‘like and unlike, or one and many, or again at rest and in motion’. Those mathematical proclivities of Alcidas – evidently no secret to fourth-century Athenians – would provide the natural explanation for Plato’s use of the eloquent mythonym at 261b and d. Though Palamedes sometimes embodies an abstract symbol of *polymathia* and inventiveness,⁶³ he is, originally and predominantly, an innovator in the narrower field of numbers and related sciences.⁶⁴ It is in the light of that fact that the two paragraphs of the *Phaedrus* should be examined. Hermias of Alexandria came near to the corresponding interpretation of 261b and d when he noted *ad alterum locum* (p. 225 Couvreur) that the hero’s being *καὶ ἀριθμῶν καὶ κύβων καὶ πολλῶν ἄλλων εὐρετής* had constituted the rationale of Plato’s identification of Zeno with Palamedes. Plato protested against ‘theories which rest their proof upon plausibility ... both in geometry and everywhere else’ as early as the *Phaedo*.⁶⁵

Hermias’ commentary on 261d helps us to detect one more reference that the *Phaedrus* makes to ‘Palamedean’ matters. It is found in the celebrated episode concerning Thamus (274c ff.), which is linked with the allusions in 261b–d through its mathematical facets; the related topic⁶⁶ of ‘collection and division’ (especially 265d–266b; 271a–c; 273d–e) makes it possible for Socrates to preserve, and underline, the continuity of the conversation which incorporates the two passages. In the episode, a major role is given to Theuth, who ‘invented number and calculation,

⁵⁸ The ‘Sicilian Muses’ probably means, besides Empedocles, Alcmaeon (cf. Isocr. 15.268. A. Patzer, *WJA* 10 [1984], 45, cited after *Ann. Phil.* 55.229 no. 3610), though a Crotoniate.

⁵⁹ That Plato saw in such messages and/or methods the characteristic of Alcidas’ spiritual father(s) may be deduced from the cumulation of the three salient elements of p. 261: sophists (b–c), antilogic (c–e), the ‘like and unlike... one and many... at rest and in motion’ (d).

⁶⁰ If it had been Plato’s wish to trace the philosophical roots of a branch of rhetoric through an abstract analysis (that is, one less influenced by the politico-prosopographical factors of the mid-360s) of the history of ideas, he would have cited – several reasons favour that conjecture – Empedocles rather than Zeno.

⁶¹ The topicality of ‘the Palamedes’ was assumed, with good reason, by Von Arnim (n. 16), who, however, identified the hero with a Megarian.

⁶² Diog. Laert. 8.56 (= fr. 8 Avezzi), as contrasted by Ps. Plut. *Strom.* 5. Cf. Brzoska (n. 16), 1538; D. O’Brien, *JHS* 88 (1968), 94–6. On the contrary, Avezzi (n. 2), p. 70 denies the thesis that Alcidas had ‘un qualche interesse specifico per la filosofia eleatica’.

⁶³ Plat. *Leg.* 3.677d and *Ep.* 2.311b; *schol.* Plat. *Phaedr.* 261d (p. 85 Greene). Cf. Vlastos (n. 16), 154f.; Guthrie (n. 16), iv (Cambridge, 1975), pp. 76f.; Avezzi (n. 2), p. 70.

⁶⁴ Plat. *Resp.* 7.522d; *Gorg. Palam.* 30; Alcidas, *Odysseus* 22 and 25 (fr. B 22.16 Radermacher = 2 Avezzi).

⁶⁵ P. 92d (transl. H. Tredennick); cf. *Theaet.* 162e. The evidence of fr. 9 Avezzi implies that Alcidas’ *Physikos* manipulated such proofs.

⁶⁶ It is no simple coincidence that the *Sophist* and the *Politicus*, which pay such close attention to the method of diaeresis, have the visitor from Elea and the mathematicians (Theodorus and Theaetetus; Socrates the Younger was also a ‘geometer’) among their *dramatis personae*.

geometry and astronomy, not to speak of draughts and dice, and above all writing' (c–d); Thamus' interlocutor is thus represented as something of Palamedes' *interpretatio Aegyptiaca*.⁶⁷ Thamus discusses the 'arts' of Theuth, especially the art of writing, which is rejected as producing 'no true wisdom...but only its semblance' (275a–b). The same judgement is passed against 'anyone who leaves behind him a written manual (*Τέχνην...ἐν γράμμασι*), and likewise anyone who takes it over from him' (275c), another point of contact between 261b–d and the Thamus digression. This time, Plato does not condemn the numbers and letters as an instrument of a false logic in the Eleatic sense. His critique is psychological: they are nothing more than 'a recipe for reminder', impotent to tell the truth, which is a fruit of inspiration and comes 'from within men themselves' (275a–d).⁶⁸ The two directions – logical and psychological – of Plato's critical analysis of the complex phenomena exemplified by Lysias and (we think) Alcidas are unified through Socrates' praise of the philosophical Eros and his cognates.⁶⁹ The little we know of Alcidas' *opus* gives us sufficient reasons to believe that on both counts – his adherence to Eleatic mathematics and the sophists' propaganda against emotionalism – Alcidas well deserved Plato's implicit condemnation.⁷⁰ After all, these two aspects of the rhetoricians' literature attacked in the *Phaedrus* were interdependent in many ways, doubtless subject to a synoptic evaluation (cf. 249b–c *et passim*).

To conclude with a remark concerning the purpose of the *Phaedrus* as a whole. Like the other dialogues of Plato, it is more than a theoretical treatise. It offers political messages too, along the lines of Plato's Atticocentric Panhellenism, shaped by his moral and intellectual aristocracy and his sympathy for a traditional Lacedaemon.⁷¹ These messages are consistent with Plato's attitude to, and place in, the Athenian practical politics of the moment (the *Phaedrus* is best put in the second half of 365 B.C.);⁷² after all, two of the leading men among the Athenian *politeuomenoi* of the period, Timotheus and Chabrias, were Plato's friends, relatives and supporters in matters of public relevance.⁷³ When the *Phaedrus* is viewed from that angle, Plato's critique of Alcidas is more than likely to reveal political aspects in addition to the philosophical. Two details should be noted here.

(a) The much-debated end of the *Phaedrus* defends Isocrates as a rival of Lysias.⁷⁴

⁶⁷ Cf. Guthrie (n. 64), p. 410 n. 1; G. R. F. Ferrari, *Listening to the Cicadas. A Study of Plato's Phaedrus* (Cambridge, 1987), pp. 280f. n. 21.

⁶⁸ On the value of 'god-sent madness' in general, 243e–245c.

⁶⁹ Pp. 252eff. (the Eros of wisdom), 277b–c (the method) and 279a–c (the psychology).

⁷⁰ Lysias' *Erotikos* and Alcidas' *Encomium for Naïs the courtesan* (T 1 Avezzù, cf. p. 67 and Eucken [n. 2], 121 n. 1) must have had much in common. Cf. *Phaedr.* 235e–236a (ε7: ἐγκωμιάζειν); 240b3 (ἐραίραν), and Avezzù (n. 2), pp. 90f. (on T 4 and fr. 8: 'Alcidas the Cynic').

⁷¹ The *Phaedrus* as a mirror of Athenian politics: S. Dušanić, *RSA* 10 (1981), 1–26, and *Aevum* 66 (forthcoming).

⁷² For that date, consonant with the stylometric evidence, see the articles referred to in the preceding note. At the moment of the final redaction of the *Aevum* article, I was still unaware of the support Alcidas' *Messeniacus* – as interpreted here – may provide for dating the *Phaedrus* in the summer–autumn of 365. My crucial argument was that 274d cites Thamus in his capacity of an Egyptian king (cf. *supra*, n. 10); now, Thamus or (a better evidenced name-variant) Tachos acceded as the co-ruler of Nectanebos I only in 366/5.

⁷³ Philochorus (*FGrHist* 328) fr. 223 Jac.

⁷⁴ The compliments to Isocrates at 278eff. should not be taken as ironic, despite the contentions to the contrary by many modern students of the dialogue and of the relations between Isocrates and the Academy. For the sincerity and political inspiration of that chapter see *RSA* 10 (1981), 16ff. and C. Bearzot, *Platone Te i 'moderati' ateniesi* (Milan, 1981), pp. 89–91 (both studies contain a bibliography on the problem).

Their rivalry concerned their engagement in speech-writing and consequently will have been coloured politically,⁷⁵ though the ultimate argument of the defence as presented by 'Socrates' seems to be the innate 'philosophical instinct' of 'Isocrates' mind.⁷⁶ Actually, there are good reasons to believe that the verdict of 'Socrates' against Lysias was inspired *inter alia* by Plato's attitude to the Athenian political situation of 366–365 B.C. He approved of the pro-Spartan and anti-Persian inclinations shared by Isocrates and Timotheus, a pupil of the orator, in those eventful years.⁷⁷ If active then (we are ignorant as to the exact date of Lysias' death), Lysias was bound to side with their opponents;⁷⁸ his party friends – notably Callistratus, formerly a *lakonizōn* – opted against Sparta in the Peloponnesian conflicts of the moment.⁷⁹ As the author of the *Messeniacus*, which obviously pleaded for the helots' cause⁸⁰ and probably polemized against the philolaconian *Archidamus* of Isocrates,⁸¹ Alcidas must have stood with Lysias and Callistratus rather than Isocrates and Timotheus. Plato, on the contrary, preferred a Peloponnese peaceful, pro-Athenian, pro-Spartan and barbarophobe; he did not accept the programme of Messenia's liberation⁸² or, in general, of an aggressive freedom.⁸³ All that formed part of theoretical discussions aroused by the Peloponnesian problem. There are indications that Callistratus tried to find a justification for his political opportunism in a philosophy traceable back to Zeno; a comic poet said of him *ἐν δ' ἔστιν καὶ πολλά*, 'one thing it (he) is, yet many'.⁸⁴ This reminds us of the *Realpolitik* implications of the reference to 'the Eleatic Palamedes' at 261d.

(b) The digression on Thamus and Theuth (274c ff.) clearly displays topical traits. Its explicit compliments to the oracles of Ammon (in Siwa and the Egyptian Thebes) and their offshoot at Dodona,⁸⁵ as well as the implicit criticism of contemporary Delphi,⁸⁶ should be stressed in that connection. During the 360s, the former sided

⁷⁵ On Antisthenes' pamphlet *Περὶ τῶν δικογράφων*: Δεσίας ἡ Ἱσογράφης see RSA 10 (1981), 18–20.

⁷⁶ For Isocrates, 'philosophy' means intellectual culture in general, leading to right political action, but in the *Antidosis* – and probably even earlier than that speech – he was ready to grant (Plato's) dialectic some value in the same field. Significantly, Isocr. 15.235 resembles the praise, in the *Phaedrus* (270a; cf. *Alc.* 1.118c), of Pericles' collaboration with Anaxagoras.

⁷⁷ Note the symbolic choice of the *Phaedrus*' Lysias to stay at the house of Epicrates and Morychus (227b, with Hermias' commentary *ad loc.*). Epicrates was obviously one of the two Athenians 'who received Persian bribes from Timocrates (*Hell. Oxy.* 7.2 Bart.; Paus. 3.9.8)' (J. K. Davies, *Athenian Propertied Families, 600–300 B.C.* (Oxford, 1971), p. 181). Timotheus and Isocrates opposed the current expansion of Persia: Demosth. 15.9 and *Vit. X or.* 837c. Sparta, Thamus-Tachos and the rebel satraps pursue the same policy: Isocr. 6.62f.; Xen. *Ages.* 2.27. Cf. also Isocrates' *Ep.* 9 (possibly apocryphal).

⁷⁸ His speeches *Πρὸς Τιμόθεον* (373 B.C.) and *Πρὸς Ἀρμόδιον* (371 B.C.) attest to his supporting the anti-Timotheus group of Callistratus and Iphicrates (*Aevum* 66, forthcoming). On *Phaedr.* 227b see the preceding note.

⁷⁹ Callistratus' embassies to Arcadia and Messenia, probably in 366/5, are on record (R. Sealey, *Historia* 5 (1956), 197).

⁸⁰ Arist. *Rhet.* 1.13 (1373b18) with *schol.* (p. 74 Rabe) = fr. 3 Avezzù (pp. 36f.).

⁸¹ Avezzù (n. 2), pp. 82f. The *Archidamus* was published in 366 or the very beginning of 365; the *Messeniacus* must have followed it immediately (still within 366–365 according to Avezzù).

⁸² That is, clearly, the message of Bk. 3 of the *Laws* (S. Dušanić, *History and Politics in Plato's Laws* (Belgrade, 1990), pp. 367–70). Cf. *Symp.* 209d.

⁸³ *Leg.* 3.698b; *Ep.* 8.354d. For Plato's solution of the problem of slavery and freedom in its psychobiological form and universal relevance see *Phaedr.* 256b.

⁸⁴ Eubulus in the *Sphingokarion* (fr. 106, line 4 Kassel–Austin). Cf. S. Dušanić, *Chiron* 10 (1980), 140f.

⁸⁵ 275b–c. See my paper referred to *infra*, n. 90.

⁸⁶ Compare 275b (οἱ νέοι) and c (ἀληθῆ; τίς ὁ λέγων καὶ ποδαπός) with 244a–b (διὰ μανίας; τὴν Ἑλλάδα; ἡργάσαντο [the aorist!]).

with a Panhellenic and anti-Persian *entente*,⁸⁷ whose chief components were Athens, Sparta, Dionysius II, the Anatolian rebels against Susa, and Thamus' (Tachos') Egypt. Delphi however tended to favour, in the service of its narrow interests, Artaxerxes and Epaminondas' Boeotia⁸⁸ – that is, to be selfish and uninspired, in Plato's psychological terminology.⁸⁹ The interdependence of the psychological and political elements in the episode of 274c ff. seems to have been well understood by Plutarch. His famous 'description' of Thamus' announcement of the Great Pan's death (*Mor.* 419a–e) is best interpreted as a humorous paraphrase, developed through free additions, of *Phaedr.* 275b–c – to be exact, of the allusions to a historical potentate (King Thamus ~ Tiberius) and the *syngeneia* linking Dodona with Ammon's oracles (the geographical framework of the announcement) made by Plato in that passage.⁹⁰ The *Πρὸς Ἀλκιδάμαντα* recorded in the Lamprias Catalogue of the titles of Plutarch's works (under no. 69a)⁹¹ may be also connected with the two chapters of the *Phaedrus* (261b, d and 274c ff.) dealt with in the present article. True, the only, and rather unreliable, clues to the contents of this lost essay of the Chaeronean⁹² are the rare anthroponym cited in its title and the fact that no. 69a belongs, within the 'Lamprias', to a group of titles whose works share related subjects; in all of them, Plutarch analyzed, with a special interests in psychologico-political questions, Plato's and the Academics' teachings on the *mantike*.⁹³ But these clues seem nevertheless worthy of note. Quintilian's gloss on *Phaedr.* 261b, d makes the identification of the Alcidas of 'Lamprias' no. 69a with the Eleaean sophist attractive enough, though no modern scholar has envisaged it. In its turn, the identification tends to support the otherwise vulnerable argument derived from the thematic unity of the writings cited in 'Lamprias', nos. 69–71. If Alcidas and Plato disagreed on the matter of prophecies as a point in their wider philosophical and political differences, Plutarch – a Platonist, an historian and a student of the oracular art – was likely to know that.⁹⁴ In any case, he denounces the Megarian underestimation of the Academy's concept of Socrates' *daimonion*, which was central

⁸⁷ Led by Timotheus (*Talanta* 12/13 [1980/1], 7–29), it had a bearing on the oracular policy too. The so-called *Demotic Chronicle* shows that Thamus–Tachos had a special interest in anti-Mede prophecies. The same may be said, on the basis of Athenian inscriptions, of Chabrias and Cratinus (Timotheus brother?).

⁸⁸ The Thebes–Messenia–Artaxerxes axis: Xen. *Hell.* 7.1.27 and 33–8, *et al.* Delphi–Epaminondas–Messenia: M. Sordi, 'Propaganda politica e senso religioso nell' azione di Epaminonda', *Contributi dell' Ist. per la storia antica*, ii (Milan, 1974), pp. 50–3; H. W. Parke–D. E. Wormel, *The Delphic Oracle*, i (Oxford, 1956), pp. 248–53 (esp. 250f., on Paus. 4.26.4). Alcidas' compliments to Epaminondas and Pelopidas: fr. 11 (from the *Physikos*) Avezzù (pp. 54f. and 91).

⁹⁰ S. Dušanić, 'Plato and Plutarch's Fictional Techniques: the Death of the Great Pan', *RhM* (forthcoming).

⁹¹ Separated by K. Ziegler from no. 69: *Περὶ Σωκράτους δαιμονίου πρὸς Ἀλκιδάμαντα* (the reading of the *Venetus*).

⁹² Though the 'Lamprias' is not always reliable, the evidence examined in the paper cited below, n. 94, makes us accept the no. 69a.

⁹³ Nos. 69–71 (in F. H. Sandbach's edition and translation, LCL): (69) 'On the Sign of Socrates'; (69a) 'Against Alcidas'; (70) 'In Defence of Plato's *Theages*'; and (71) 'That the Academic Philosophy allows for the Reality of Prophecy' (on the political aspects of the discussion of Socrates' prophetic power in no. 70 [which is lost for us, like the treatises of nos. 69a and 71] see my note from *Teiresias*, Suppl. 3 (1990), pp. 65–70). The essays whose titles are cited under nos. 63–8 also deal with the philosophy of Plato and the Academy but their topics are the doctrinal history of the School (nos. 63–4) and the ontological themes centred on the *Timaeus* (nos. 65–8) respectively.

⁹⁴ S. Dušanić, 'Plato's *Phaedrus*, Plutarch's *Against Alcidas*, and the Athenian Oracular Policy of the 360s B.C.' (forthcoming).

to the School's doctrine of the prophetic soul (*De Genio* 581a).⁹⁵ That criticism of Plutarch's may have had something to do with the Zenonian parentage of Alcidamas as alluded to in *Phaedr.* 261d.

University of Belgrade

SLOBODAN DUŠANIĆ

⁹⁵ Cf. *Phaedr.* 242b–c. On Socrates' divine sign in the Academic tradition, J. M. Rist, *Phoenix* 17 (1963), 13–24.