

# HYPERBOREUS

---

STUDIA CLASSICA

ναυσι δ' οὔτε πεζὸς ἰὼν κεν εὐροίς  
ἔς Ἑπερβορέων ἀγῶνα θαυμαστὰν ὁδόν

(Pind. *Pyth.* 10. 29–30)

EDITORES

NINA ALMAZOVA SOFIA EGOROVA  
DENIS KEYER ALEXANDER VERLINSKY

PETROPOLI

**Vol. 20**

**2014**

---

BIBLIOTHECA CLASSICA PETROPOLITANA  
VERLAG C.H.BECK MÜNCHEN

# ΧΑΡΑΚΤΗΡ ΑΡΕΤΑΣ

---

Donum natalicium  
BERNARDO SEIDENSTICKER  
ab amicis oblatum

---

BIBLIOTHECA CLASSICA PETROPOLITANA  
PETROPOLI  
MMXV

## CONSPECTUS

Carmen natalicium .....	5
Vorwort .....	7
 WOLFGANG RÖSLER	
Die Hikesie des Phemios und die Bedeutung von ἀὐτοδίδακτος in der <i>Odyssee</i> (22, 344–353) .....	11
 THERESE FUHRER	
Teichoskopie: Der (weibliche) Blick auf den Krieg .....	23
 GERSON SCHADE	
Archilochus, 196a <i>IEG</i> <sup>2</sup> .....	42
 NINA ALMAZOVA	
When Was the Pythian Nome Performed? .....	56
 MICHAEL GAGARIN	
Aeschylus' Prometheus: Regress, Progress, and the Nature of Woman ...	92
 OLIVER TAPLIN	
A Couple of Conjectures that Point to Hands in Sophocles .....	101
 VICTOR BERS	
“Dame Disease?”: A Note on the Gender of Philoctetes' Wound .....	105
 JENS HOLZHAUSEN	
“Fürchten oder Lieben?” Zu Sophokles, <i>Oidipus Tyrannos</i> , Vers 11 ....	109
 PATRICIA E. EASTERLING	
Σεμνός and its Cognates in the Sophoclean Scholia .....	120
 ISTVÁN BODNÁR	
A Testimony of Oenopides in Pliny .....	126
 KLAUS HALLOF	
De epigrammate Coe aetatis classicae .....	137
 RALF KRUMEICH	
Silen und Theater. Zu Ikonographie und Funktion des betagten Halbtieres in der attischen Vasenmalerei des 5. Jhs. v. Chr. ....	139
 ALEXANDER VERLINSKY	
Lysias' Chronology and the Dramatic Date of Plato's <i>Republic</i> .....	158
 NORBERT BLÖSSNER	
Platons Demokratiekapitel (Pl. <i>Rep.</i> 555 b 4 – 562 a 3) und das sokratische Argument .....	199

---

Статьи сопровождаются резюме на русском и английском языке  
Summary in Russian and English

BERND MANUWALD	
Bürger als politische Akteure. Überlegungen zur allgemeinen Politikkompetenz bei Platon und Aristoteles	225
ECKART E. SCHÜTRUMPF	
Aristotle on the Philosophical Nature of Poetry. The Object of <i>Mimesis</i> According to <i>Poet.</i> 9	244
WIDU-WOLFGANG EHLERS	
<i>Libertino patre nati</i>	274
DENIS KEYER	
<i>Venimus ad summum Fortunae</i> : Prosperity and Flourishing of Arts in Horace ( <i>Epist.</i> 2. 1. 32–33)	279
ALEXANDER GAVRILOV	
Who Wrote the <i>Encheiridion</i> of Epictetus?	295
FRITZ FELGENTREU	
Κτήμα ἐς ἄει. Überlegungen zu Eigentum und Historiographie in den Plinius-Briefen	317
CARLO M. LUCARINI	
Emendamenti a Svetonio	331
PETER HABERMEHL	
Origenes' Welten Frühchristliche Kosmologie im Spannungsfeld zwischen Platonismus und Heilsgeschichte	350
ELENA ERMOLAEVA	
A School Ancient Greek Epic Parody from Kellis	370
REINHART MEYER-KALKUS	
Deklamation im antiken Theater und im 18. Jahrhundert. Die Re-Interpretation von Melopoie und Rhythmopoie durch Abbé Dubos und Gotthold Ephraim Lessing	383
STEFAN REBENICH	
Eduard Schwartz und die Altertumswissenschaften seiner Zeit	406
DANIEL P. TOMPKINS	
What Happened in Stockholm? Moses Finley, the Mainz Akademie, and East Bloc Historians	436
Bernd Seidensticker Schriftenverzeichnis	453
Hyperborei vol. XI–XX conspectus	462
Hyperborei vol. XI–XX auctores alphabetico ordine dispositi	472
Key Words	481
Правила для авторов	484
Guidelines for contributors	486

## LYSIAS' CHRONOLOGY AND THE DRAMATIC DATE OF PLATO'S *REPUBLIC*

In this paper I will discuss anew two related issues – the chronology of the orator Lysias' life and the dramatic date of Plato's *Republic*. The following notes were instigated by C. Planeaux's recent arguments in favor of 429 BC as date of the first celebration of the festival of Bendis in Attica, which plays a role in the dramatic framing of the conversation in the *Republic*.<sup>1</sup> I find Planeaux's reasoning in general persuasive, but, as I hope to show, not all of his arguments are conclusive. I will also readdress the chronology of Lysias and argue that the date of his birth (459 BC) and the date of his departure from Athens to Thurii (444/3 BC) are sound, contrary to what is practically the unanimous view. This part of my reasoning is independent of my argument about the dramatic date of the *Republic*, but I will also contend that 429 BC as the dramatic date does not undermine the credibility of ancient biographers of Lysias.

There are four ancient accounts of Lysias' biography: Dionysius of Halicarnassus, Pseudo-Plutarch, Suda and Photius – the two former being the most detailed and the two latter dependent on them (see further for some difficulties in this regard). According to Dionysius (*Orat. vet. Lys.* p. 8. 5 ff. Us.–R.), Lysias was born in Athens in the family of Cephalus, a metic from Syracuse; “at the age of fifteen he left Athens for Thurii together with his two brothers in order to take part in the *apoikia*, which was sent by the Athenians and the Greeks in the twelfth year before the Peloponnesian War”, i.e. in 444/3 BC; he lived then in Thurii as its citizen until the Athenian fiasco in Sicily and afterward was banished from Thurii with the other three hundred, having being accused of allegiance to Athens; he then returned to Athens during the archonship of Callias in 412/11 BC at the age of 47. Dionysius does not relate Lysias' life further, but later in coming to a discussion of the genuineness of some of Lysias' speeches he assumes that he died at the age of eighty, i.e. in 379 BC. Pseudo-Plutarch (*Vit. X. Orat.* 4, 835 c) gives basically the same chronological account, but

---

<sup>1</sup> Planeaux 2000/2001.

adds certain complementary or divergent details, of which some at least go back to Lysias' speeches, now lost:<sup>2</sup> (1) Cephalus, citizen of Syracuse, settled in Athens *following an invitation by Pericles*; (2) Lysias, born in Athens in 459/8, left Athens for Thurii at the time of its founding, in 444/3, *with his older brother Polemarchus* (he also had two other brothers Euthydemus and Brachyllus)<sup>3</sup> "in order to acquire a land property there"; (3) the brothers left Athens after Cephalus' death. Contrary to Dionysius, Pseudo-Plutarch continues the story beyond Lysias' return to Athens in 412/11 BC and reports the important facts concerning his remaining days, the death of his older brother Polemarchus, executed by the Thirty in 404/3, Lysias' active role in the struggle for restoring the democracy, and his failure in attaining Athenian citizenship in reward for that as well as the divergent opinions concerning the date of his death. There is one important additional chronological detail in one of Lysias' speeches (*Adv. Erat.* 12. 4), namely his father Cephalus was persuaded by Pericles to settle in Athens and lived there thirty years, presumably until his death.

Some words are necessary on the mutual relations of ancient biographical accounts of Lysias. The most ancient of these, that of Dionysius, had an ancient and respectable tradition behind it; his outline of Lysias' biography stops at his return to Athens; Pseudo-Plutarch drew upon various sources, including Dionysius, and the lost treatise of Caecilius of Caleacte, Dionysius' contemporary;<sup>4</sup> based on Lysias' speeches, Pseudo-Plutarch reports the events relating to Lysias' life in 404/3 and to his failure in attaining citizenship after the restoration of democracy; he adds more exact chronological details in comparison with Dionysius, but these are mostly a list of Olympiads and archonts on the basis of Dionysius' narrative; the value of his information beyond that of Dionysius is debatable;<sup>5</sup> a short biographical entry in *Suda*, which goes back immediately to Hesychius of Milet, corresponds to that of Dionysius; and

---

<sup>2</sup> The biographical details from Lysias' *Against Hippotherses* were certainly used, as the comparison with the preserved fragment shows (*POxy* 1606); see Dover 1968, 40 f., who regards this speech as the source of the additional information in Ps.-Plut.

<sup>3</sup> Brachyllus, as it was recognized long ago, is a mistake, which goes back to [Dem.] 59 *Adv. Neaer.* 22 – Lysias married his nephew, who was Brachyllus' daughter. Brachyllus was in fact the husband of Lysias' sister.

<sup>4</sup> On his relation to Dionysius see Todd 2007, 6 n. 21; 8 n. 28; Pseudo-Plut.'s reference to οἱ περὶ (836 a 8) need not be interpreted to mean that they were joint founders of a rhetorical school, as Todd understands it; it is rather a simple reference to their writings in the periphrastic form.

<sup>5</sup> See Todd 2007, 8 n. 29.

the latest, in the *Library* of Photius, is very close to Pseudo-Plutarch, but in one place occasionally also uses Dionysius.<sup>6</sup>

These accounts taken together result in the following biographical outline: Lysias' father, a citizen of Syracuse, settled in Athens about 460 BC on Pericles' invitation (the earliest possible and simultaneously latest date for Pericles' attaining political prominence, which thus indicates Lysias' birth as having already taken place in Athens) and died there about 430 BC. Lysias, born in 459 BC, went to Thurii as a colonist together with his brothers at the city's founding in 444/3 and returned to Athens in 412/11 BC when the supporters of Athens in Thurii were exiled as a result of the Athenian defeat in 413 BC.

But one detail in Pseudo-Plutarch – that Cephalus' sons left Athens for Thurii after Cephalus' death – destroys this biographical account. It cannot be harmonized with another Pseudo-Plutarch's entry that this happened in 444/3, Thurii's founding date, since as we have seen it follows from Lys. 12. 4 that Cephalus could only have died about 430 BC.

The difficulty was noticed long ago and many proposals were brought forward to remove this contradiction. The earliest with which I am familiar was made in 1831 by K. Fr. Hermann, the famous scholar of Plato and antiquities, in the course of a debate on the dramatic date of Plato's *Republic*, in the introductory talk to which a very old Cephalus takes part as well as his sons Polemarchus, Lysias and Euthydemus, the latter two as the *personae mutae*. Hermann argued against G. Stallbaum's dramatic date of 436 BC in favor of a date circa 430 BC (330 in the text is a misprint), one of his arguments being that it is the latest possible date for Cephalus' presence at the conversation;<sup>7</sup> granted that according to Lys. 12. 4 his father came to Athens due to the invitation extended by Pericles and lived here thirty years, his arrival had to be about 460 at earliest (Pericles attained his position in Athens no earlier than this date) as well as very close to this date since Lysias had already been born in Athens in 459 BC. Hermann was confident that Lysias went to Thurii in 444/3 at the age of fifteen and that Pseudo-Plutarch was simply wrong in his statement that Cephalus

---

<sup>6</sup> Against Schöne's view (1871) that Ps.-Plut. used the better biographical source, only an excerpt of which was used independently by Dionysius and Photius, Seeliger 1874, 17–22, endorsed the older and now prevailing theory that Ps.-Plut. used Dionysius and that Photius drew mainly on Ps.-Plut. Ps.-Plut. apart from Dionysius used other sources, among them probably Caecilius of Cale Acte. It was debated whether Photius uses Pseudo-Plut. or his immediate source – see Todd 2007, 10 with n. 35; I agree with Todd that the first option is more likely.

<sup>7</sup> His other argument in favor of ca. 430 BC was that the inauguration of the *Bendideia*, which provides the scenic frame for the conversation in the *Republic*, should also have taken place closer to this time (see further).

died before 444/3. He also explained Lysias' presence in Athens during the conversation in the *Republic* (the dramatic date 430 BC) by his visit from Thurii to the parental home.<sup>8</sup>

This proposal, which in my view deserves careful attention, has today been entirely forgotten – and understandably so since it was later abandoned by Hermann himself. In his second approach to the problem Hermann argued again in favor of 430 BC as the dramatic date of the *Republic*, but now against A. Boeckh's much later date of 411/10 BC.<sup>9</sup> Hermann preserved the main components of his interpretation (Cephalus arrived in Athens in 460 BC and died in 430 BC), but in order to better coordinate Lysias' presence at the conversation of the *Republic* with the dramatic date of it, he now proposed that Cephalus' sons left Athens for Thurii not at the time of its founding in 444/3 (it was merely a false inference of Lysias' biographers, who found in their sources only a note that he went to Thurii), but after Cephalus' death, as according to Pseudo-Plutarch, namely after 430 BC. It was improbable, according to Hermann, that Lysias went to Thurii at the age of fifteen and that he could not attain citizenship there at this age. One should suppose instead that Cephalus himself contributed to the founding of Thurii with his money and obtained landed property there, but did not go to Thurii himself; after his death his sons inherited his property, went to Thurii and received citizenship there. With this an intriguing admission has been introduced (and which is mostly accepted still today), namely that there was a new supply of Athenian colonists to Thurii somewhat later than 430 BC.<sup>10</sup> I will return later to an analysis of the validity of this admission, but it should be noted here that not only is there no trace in Ps.-Plut. of any awareness that the brothers went to Thurii at the later date, but on the contrary he states explicitly that it happened in the archonship of Praxiteles, i.e. in 444/3 BC.

---

<sup>8</sup> Hermann 1831, 651 f.

<sup>9</sup> Hermann 1839, 8–10. The additional arguments in favor of 429 BC were: (1) the plausible date for Cephalus' leaving Syracuse was 460 BC (because of the unrest in Syracuse); (2) (as in his earlier proposal) the Thracians, who according to *Rep.* 327 a formed a procession at the festival of Bendis, could only be mercenaries sent to Attica in 430/29 BC.

<sup>10</sup> Hermann now decisively denied Hoelscher's view (which he himself previously held) that this note was added by Ps.-Plut. *ex ingenio*, and argued that on the contrary Ps.-Plut. alone preserved the statement of his source in the proper form (ἐπεὶ δὲ τὴν εἰς Σύβαριν ἀποικίαν τὴν ὕστερον Θουρίους μετονομασθεῖσαν ἔστειλεν ἡ πόλις, ὄχετο σὺν τῷ πρεσβυτάτῳ ἀδελφῷ Πολεμάρχῳ (ἦσαν γὰρ αὐτῷ καὶ ἄλλοι δύο, Εὐθύδημος καὶ Βράχυλλος), τοῦ πατρὸς ἤδη τετελευτηκότος, ὡς κοινωθήσων τοῦ κλήρου, ἔτη γεγονῶς πεντεκαίδεκα, ἐπὶ Πραξιτέλους ἄρχοντος). This means, according to Hermann, that Lysias went to Thurii in order to inherit his father's land property there (κλήρος) while other scholars, both ancient and modern, wrongly related this to the initial distribution of land in Thurii (p. 9 n. 12).

Soon after that Fr. Vater took the next step and proposed that Lysias' date of birth, 459 BC, was itself a misconstruction.<sup>11</sup> Using the evidence of Lys. 12. 4 (Cephalus was invited to Athens by Pericles and lived there thirty years), Vater estimated that that he arrived no earlier than in 469 BC (?) when Pericles grew famous (all too early) and thus died no earlier than 439 BC, while also pointing out, like Hermann (whose work was unknown to him), that this makes it impossible to admit both that Lysias came to Thuri in 444/3 and that this happened after his father's death. He adduced a battery of arguments to prove that the second horn of this dilemma was right and that Lysias and his brothers went to Thuri not at the time of its founding, but with the later group of colonists after 439 BC. Provided that the traditional reading – that he was fifteen years old at the time of his departure – is correct, then 459 BC cannot be his date of birth; according to Vater, it had been attained by reckoning backward from the falsely assumed date of the departure for Thuri at the age of fifteen. This is no place to discuss Vater's positive proposal – 421/20 BC for both the departure and the dramatic date of the *Republic*;<sup>12</sup> accordingly 436 BC for Lysias' birth – which was rightly rejected;<sup>13</sup> but I will later return to his arguments in

---

<sup>11</sup> Vater 1843, esp. 186–193. Vater (1810–1854? 1866?), pupil of Boeckh, whom he respectfully but sharply criticized on many points in this essay, was at that time, after receiving his doctorate in Halle, a professor in Kazan' (1840–1854?), having been appointed by the Russian government on the recommendations of Boeckh and A. v. Humboldt.

<sup>12</sup> In arguing against Boeckh's dramatic date of the *Republic*, Vater pointed out that Cephalus could not have lived until 411/10 because he died before Lysias' departure for Thuri; and along lines of the tradition, Lysias was born in Athens not in Syracuse, i.e. after the arrival of his father in Athens. Vater's immediate purpose was to prove that Ps.-Plut. was wrong in making Andocides fifteen years younger than Lysias.

<sup>13</sup> Vater's negative arguments (p. 190) against Lysias' birth in 459 BC are ingenious but unconvincing: (1) according to Lys. 12. 19, Melobius, who came to arrest Polemarchus in 404/3, rips the coiled earrings from the ears of his wife (τῆς γὰρ Πολεμάρχου γυναικὸς χρυσοῦς ἐλικτῆρας, οὗς ἔχουσα ἐτύγγανεν, ὅτε τὸ πρῶτον ἦλθον εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν, Μηλόβιος ἐκ τῶν ὄτων ἐξείλετο). This should prove that they were recently married (Polemarchus' wife is *still* in her bridal gown) and that Polemarchus, the elder brother of Lysias, could not have been close to sixty at that time; it is debatable who is the subject of ἦλθον in this sentence, but if it is Polemarchus' wife rather than Melobius (for a convincing case see E. Bortwick 1990, 44–46), it still does not prove the recent marriage. The point is the sentimental value of the rings, which would be much more, if it is not recent; of course nothing could prevent Polemarchus from marriage even at the age of sixty or so. (2) Clitophon's sharp rejoinder to him in the *Rep.* 340 a 3 might or might not imply that both are young men; but the impossibility of their being young is only borne out by Vater's view that the dramatic date of the *Republic* is 421/20 BC, which is by no means certain and depends on his circular argumentation in favor of Lysias' later departure for Thuri.

support of the notion that Lysias did not go to Thurii in 444/3, because these arguments were welcomed and are still effective even if Vater's work itself is not cited.

In his third and last proposal, impressed by some of Vater's arguments in favor of Lysias' later date of birth, Hermann accepted his view that Lysias' birth in 459 BC was the wrong combination of his biographers, but proposed his own, an earlier one, 444/3 BC, based on the dramatic date of the *Republic* which he argued for, 430 BC (Lysias was still in Athens at this date) and on the age of fifteen at which he left Athens for Thurii (thus in 429/8 BC). Hermann thus removed the most plausible element of his construction – Cephalus' arrival in Athens about 460 BC, which was reckoned on the assumption that Lysias was born in 459. Hermann still believed that Cephalus died soon after 430 BC, but the only argument remaining was Hermann's dramatic date of the *Republic* (Cephalus is depicted as very old in this dialogue), which itself was under fire by Boeckh. Having accepted that all the dates of ancient tradition were based on the false assumption that Lysias and his brothers left Athens in 444/3,<sup>14</sup> Hermann thus ruined his most important argument in favor of 430 BC as the dramatic date of the *Republic* and on which was based his newly proposed date of 444 BC as that of Lysias' birth. It is not surprising that this last attempt of Hermann's, which compromised the ancient chronology of Lysias, also contributed to the siege on Boeckh's dramatic date of 411/10 BC, which simply ignored the dates of Cephalus' life. There is no notice taken in the latest discussions of Lysias' chronology of Hermann's earliest interpretation as based on the reliability of the traditional date of birth, 459 BC, and on a rejection of Ps.-Plutarch's note that he went to Thurii after Cephalus' death.

Having a large influence on the debates regarding Lysias' chronology was the work of F. Blass, who endorsed the negative aspect of Vater's proposal that Lysias' date of birth in 459 BC derives from a misunderstanding of his statement that he was fifteen when he went to Thurii – it was taken in the sense that it happened in 444/3 BC.<sup>15</sup> Blass also came down in favor of a "construction" in which Dionysius (he was, as Blass believed, the source of Pseudo-Plutarch) does not mention Lysias' date of birth explicitly and that when he defines Lysias' age at the time of his return to Athens in 412/11 he does this without great confidence. Both arguments are unpersuasive: (1) Dionysius, without saying explicitly when Lysias was born, assumes everywhere, both in Lysias' biography and otherwise,

---

<sup>14</sup> Hermann 1849, 15 n. 30. This note in the re-edition of Hermann's work of 1828 is in fact an addition made in 1849.

<sup>15</sup> Blass 1868, 332 f.

that this date was 459 BC, as Blass himself admits (*Lys.* 1, p. 8. 13–17; 12, p. 20. 23 – 21. 2; *Isocr.* 1, p. 54. 5 U.–R.);<sup>16</sup> (2) the potential mode and the verb εἰκόζω that Dionysius uses on account of Lysias’ age at his return to Athens in 412/11 BC<sup>17</sup> figured also later as evidence in favor of Dionysius being aware that Lysias’ date of birth was only a construction. But it would be awkward if Dionysius (who everywhere assumes that Lysias was born in 459 BC, without giving any indication that he regards this as uncertain) now maintained the age of Lysias upon his return on the same tacit assumption that he was born in 459 BC and on the information that he returned in 412/11, and came to the view that the inference is uncertain. A glance at the parallel account of Ps.-Plut. suggests a more plausible explanation of ὡς ἂν τις εἰκόσειεν. Ps.-Plut. makes a specification: in the archonship of Callias, who followed Cleocritus, it was in fact another Callias who was an archon in 406/5 BC; there is no doubt that Dionysius’ “Lysias was then in his forty-seventh year” is asserted with the same purpose, namely in order to avoid confusion with the homonymous later archon, and the εἰκόζω in the potential mode signals only that it is an inference, but of course the most plausible one, which shows that Dionysius is certain that Lysias was born in 459 BC.

Blass did not accept Vater’s argument that Lysias was born in 432 BC since it made him younger than Isocrates (born 436/5 BC according to the unanimous tradition), contrary to the evidence of Plato’s *Phaedrus*.<sup>18</sup> Blass also did not give much weight to Hermann’s considerations as to the dramatic date of the *Republic* because of Plato’s notorious anachronisms, and he preferred to leave Lysias’ chronology vague – Cephalus arriving in Athens no earlier than 460 BC and thus dying after 430 BC; Lysias, who left Athens at the age of fifteen, *after the death of his father*, should have been born after 445, but sufficiently earlier than 436 BC (Isocrates’ date of birth); he thus attained as midpoint the date of 440 BC.<sup>19</sup>

---

<sup>16</sup> Seeliger 1874, 19 rightly noticed, that 459 BC as Lysias’ date of birth was traditionally maintained before Dionysius (see below), but thought that Dionysius omitted it because he had his doubts. In fact omission of the explicit date of birth is more naturally explained by the brevity and incompleteness of biographical outlines in Dionysius’ essay, which was primarily an assessment of Lysias as writer; Dionysius wrote another, now lost treatise devoted to the question as to the authenticity of his speeches, and his questions regarding chronology were also presumably treated in detail in that work.

<sup>17</sup> *Lys.* p. 8. 13–17: καὶ παραγενόμενος αὐθις εἰς Ἀθήνας κατὰ ἄρχοντα Καλλίαν, ἑβδομον καὶ τετραρακοστὸν ἔτος ἔχων, ὡς ἂν τις εἰκόσειεν, ἐξ ἐκείνου τοῦ χρόνου διετέλεσε τὰς διατριβάς ποιούμενος Ἀθήνησι.

<sup>18</sup> Blass 1868, 333.

<sup>19</sup> *Ibid.*, 334.

Yet Blass later changed his view in response to the work of F. Seeliger who rejected, as had Hermann in his earliest proposal, the evidence of Ps.-Plut. that Cephalus was already dead when Lysias went to Thurii; and in relying on Boeckh's dramatic date of the *Republic*, 411 BC, he derived an absurd chronology – Cephalus arriving in Athens in 440 and dying in 410; Lysias was born before 440, in Syracuse, not in Athens.<sup>20</sup> Blass in his review of Seeliger's dissertation agreed with his proposal regarding Ps.-Plut., but of course not with his chronology in general.<sup>21</sup> In the later editions of his work Blass abandoned the reliability of this Pseudo-Plutarch's note, which he had earlier defended, in assuming that Pseudo-Plutarch used a more detailed version of Dionysius' biography of Lysias than we today have.<sup>22</sup> He now admitted that Cephalus arrived in Athens soon before 446 BC and died about 416. It is curious that this new date of Cephalus' death was based on a somewhat naïve assumption that Plato, who depicted Cephalus so vividly, had known him personally, i.e. the latter could have died no earlier than 416 BC. Lysias was accordingly born after 446 (but earlier than 436, Isocrates' birth) and went to Thurii after 431 at the age of fifteen long before his father's death.<sup>23</sup> It is in this way that Blass attains dates like 444/3 BC (Hermann) or 446 BC (Susemihl).<sup>24</sup>

With Blass a sort of orthodoxy has been maintained concerning the wrong chronological "construction" of Lysias' biographers.<sup>25</sup> The following studies of Lysias' biography all start from the premise that his date of birth in ancient tradition, 459 BC, is a wrong inference from the reliable evidence that he went to Thurii at the age of fifteen and based on the false assumption that it happened in the time of Thurii's founding, namely in 444/3 BC. Before we examine the merits of this theory, let us consider what made scholars believe that 459 BC could not be the right date.

K. Dover's main argument against Lysias' date of birth as early as 459 BC is as usual that his departure for Thurii in 444/3 after the death of his father had Cephalus arriving in Athens before 474/3, and this is incompatible with Pericles' invitation to him. He believes that one can rely on the fact that he was fifteen years old when he went to Thurii (in fact it is

---

<sup>20</sup> Seeliger 1874, 17–22.

<sup>21</sup> Blass 1874, 730.

<sup>22</sup> Blass 1887, I, 341 with n. 4. Cf. Blass 1868, 334.

<sup>23</sup> Blass 1887, I, 343. Blass was not much interested in what the dramatic date of the *Republic* was; he found it implausible that Plato had a certain date in view, which would be recognizable only to scholars, and he tried to pedantically accommodate to such a date persons and circumstances, which were unknown and uninteresting to his readers.

<sup>24</sup> Blass 1887, I, 345.

<sup>25</sup> It was confirmed by authority of the *Realencyclopädie*; see Plöbst 1927, 2533.

the sole reliable date, according to him) and thus dates the departure later and also doubts 412/11 BC as the date of return to Athens because it is incompatible with the role he plays in Plato's *Phaedrus* and the *Republic*. He builds the following chronology: Cephalus arrived in Athens between 450 and 445, thus dying between 420 and 415 (this keeps him alive at the dramatic date of the *Republic*, between 420 and 415, according to Dover); Lysias was born about 445, went to Thurii about 430 and returned to Athens between 420 and 415, this again corresponding to the alleged dramatic date of the *Republic* and also to the *Phaedrus* with its dramatic date 418–416 BC, in which Lysias is mentioned as being on a visit to Athens from Piraeus.<sup>26</sup> I will discuss Lysias' mention in the *Phaedrus* and the *Republic* later because they do not bear on Lysias' date of birth; but for now I will discuss what makes Dover suspect this date as part of the frequently mentioned "construction" of ancient biographers.

Dover discussed in detail a passage from Apollodorus, *Against Neaera* [Dem. 59] 21–22, delivered at the trial of Neaera, the former hetaira, who was accused of illegally exploiting her status as wife of an Athenian citizen. In this speech evidence is cited, which is intended to prove that she was a hetaira and a foreigner – that many years ago she was transported to Athens from Corinthus for some time by Lysias together with her older companion Metaneera, Lysias' mistress, whom he wanted to initiate into the Eleusinian mysteries (both Metaneera and Neaera were the girls of a famous Nicareta); Lysias' mother was still alive at the time of the affair. Neaera, who was very young and had just started her career at the time of this affair, was thus between twelve and thirteen years old<sup>27</sup> and was prosecuted between 343 and 340 BC.<sup>28</sup> Dover reckons that the affair could have taken place about 380 BC at the latest; so by placing his date of birth at 459 BC, Lysias would have been about eighty years old and his mother a minimum of one hundred years old, which is implausible.<sup>29</sup>

---

<sup>26</sup> Dover 1968, 42.

<sup>27</sup> συνηκολούθει δὲ καὶ Νέαιρα αὐτῆι, ἐργαζομένη μὲν ἤδη τῷ σώματι, νεωτέρα δὲ οὖσα διὰ τὸ μήπω τὴν ἡλικίαν αὐτῆι παρεῖναι, see Kapparis 1999, 214 f. on the difficulties of the text, which he rightly finds exaggerated by scholars. I take it that at that time Neaera was younger than most hetairai when they started their activity, and this serves as an explanation why the speaker called her "too young" for her profession.

<sup>28</sup> Kapparis 1999, 28.

<sup>29</sup> Dover 1968, 34–38. With his dating of Neaera, Dover nevertheless noticed that the age of Lysias and his mother as according to traditional chronology, even if suspect, is not entirely impossible; and Kapparis 1999, 211, is inclined to admit that this is possible. Davies 1971, 587, following Dover, felt that we should even increase the age of Lysias' mother because Lysias had the older brother Polemarchus – but it is unknown whether Polemarchus and Lysias had the same mother. We shall see that these difficulties are in fact overstated.

Surprisingly all of Dover's argument regarding Neaera's age in the late 340s hinges on the interpretation of one sentence ([Dem.] 59. 21), which leads him to the conclusion that Neaera was still a seductive woman at the time of her trial and that Lysias' transporting of Metaneera (and Neaera with her) should thus be dated no earlier than 380 BC:

ὅταν δὲ ἐπὶ τῆς ἀπολογίας ἦτε, μνημονεύοντες τὴν τῶν νόμων κατηγορίαν καὶ τὸν ἔλεγχον τὸν τῶν εἰρημένων, τὴν τε ὕψιν αὐτῆς ἰδόντες, ἐνθυμείσθε τοῦτο μόνον, εἰ Νέαира οὐσα ταῦτα διαπέπρακται.

Dover's interpretation of the sentence is however open to question. He believes that by these words Apollodorus is trying "to reduce the proverbial susceptibility of jurors to the charms of women". But Dover rightly points out that Apollodorus' purpose was to prove that Neaera lived with Stephanus illegally as his married wife, while the defense argued that she was his concubine. This consideration goes against Dover's interpretation of the questionable sentence: what reason would there be for Apollodorus to remind the jurors that Neaera is still beautiful, even if she was?<sup>30</sup> On the contrary, if with these words he was stressing her respectable looks and old age, it would strengthen his case that she was his legal wife and thus breaking the law.<sup>31</sup> Hence the most plausible meaning of Apollodorus' words is that which Dover denies to them – never mind that she looks like a respectable old woman, remember what she has done in the past – and are thus irrelevant for Neaera's life dates as well as for those of Lysias.

Further information in Apollodorus on the later visits of Neaera to Athens does not give sufficient support for a reliable chronology<sup>32</sup> because her being transported to Athens by Lysias could have been considerably earlier than these events. But there is the more relevant evidence, which Dover surprisingly does not mention. In Philetaerus' *Kynagis*, staged between 370 and 365, Neaera, together with two other girls of Nicareta, is described as having already "rotted away" in her profession

---

<sup>30</sup> Dover probably thought that Apollodorus' mention of Neaera's beauty – albeit granting that it undermined his own line of defence – was necessarily true; but it is a *petitio principii* since his argument that they have just this meaning depends entirely on the assumption that it was unprofitable to stress her beauty.

<sup>31</sup> See Todd 2007, 10, who doubts Dover's inference that Neaera is depicted as a still seductive woman and thinks that these words mean "that she is still dangerous despite seeming old and harmless". This perhaps goes too far; the speaker is asking people to only pay attention to her former deeds in their relevance to the matter at hand.

<sup>32</sup> See Dover 1968, 36; her visit during the Panathenaea could not have been in 378 BC (Dover, *ibid.*; Kapparis 1999, 24), but in 382 or even 386 BC – see below.

(fr. 9.5 K.–A.);<sup>33</sup> in reckoning with all kinds of comic exaggeration, one cannot escape the inference that she could hardly have been born later than between 405 and 400 BC. Her being transported to Athens by Lysias at the age of about thirteen would have thus happened between 392 and 387 BC; and this is compatible with Lysias' birth in 459/8 as well as with that of his mother (in 477 BC, say) who could still then be alive.

In his investigation of Lysias' biography, U. Schindel also presumes that 459 BC as the date of birth and 444/3 BC as the date of departure for Thuriï cannot be true. He defends the reliability of Ps.-Plutarch's note that Lysias went to Thuriï after the death of his father, he rejects the relevance of Cephalus' and Lysias' presence at the *Republic* conversation since there is no reliable dramatic date for it, and he attempts to define the beginning of Cephalus' thirty years in Athens in assuming that he was expelled from Syracuse, but not under Gelon's tyranny (died 478 BC), as an anonymous source of Ps.-Plutarch reports, because it would then have him arriving in Athens too early for Pericles to have invited him; instead he has him arriving later, between the earliest possible date for Pericles and end of the Syracuse tyranny, i.e. between 475 and 465 BC; Cephalus thus died between 445 and 435, and Lysias who left Athens for Thuriï at age fifteen would then have been born between 457 and 447 BC, earlier than previous scholars had thought.<sup>34</sup> This attempt, though learned, is not ultimately persuasive;<sup>35</sup> but it is remarkable in that it shows that the reasons which impelled Vater to bring forward the idea of "construction" are not regarded as valid ones by contemporary scholars who yet share Vater's idea and, second, that there is practically no reliable evidence which would put Lysias' date of birth later than ancient tradition maintains. Schindel's mode of argumentation cannot rule out that the traditional date of birth 459 BC and the departure in 444/3 are after all correct.

Two later treatments of the problem share equally the view that Lysias' traditional date of birth 459 BC is an incorrect inference. J. K. Davies believes that it cannot be true on two grounds – because it contradicts

---

<sup>33</sup> οὐχὶ Λαΐς μὲν τελευτῶσ' ἀπέθανεν βινουμένη, / Ἴσθμιάς δὲ καὶ Νέαϊρα κατασέσηπε καὶ Φίλα; See Kapparis 1999, 44, on this passage.

<sup>34</sup> Schindel 1967, 32–52.

<sup>35</sup> Despite all the erudition applied to consideration of the possible date and circumstances of Cephalus' banishment, these are still uncertain, for granted that the report of banishment under Gelon is correct, Cephalus could have been banished from Syracuse before 478 BC, but come to Athens only later, e.g. about 460 BC, on the invitation of Pericles. Ps.-Plut. adduces this report as an alternative to the main version, according to which Cephalus came on Pericles' invitation; he might be aware that the banishment contradicts Pericles' version – thus is it risky to admit with Schindel (p. 50 f.) the scribe's error Γελῶνος instead of Ἰερῶνος; I will return to the significance of Gelon for Lysias' biographers.

Ps.-Plutarch (Lysias went to Thurii in 444/3 after Cephalus' death) and, following Dover, because of the evidence of [Dem.] 59. 22 that Lysias' mother was still alive in 380 (see above). Davies proposes Lysias' birth as earlier than 436 BC (Isocrates' birth); Cephalus, who lived in Athens for thirty years, thus arrived in Athens somewhat earlier than 451 and died before 421 (Davies assumes as correct Ps.-Plut.'s statement that Lysias went to Thurii after his father's death in the age of 15).<sup>36</sup>

In the introduction to his valuable recent commentary on Lysias 1–11 (to my knowledge it is the latest treatment of the problem) S. Todd asserts that the unreliability of the traditional date of birth “is uncontentious”;<sup>37</sup> he says that Dionysius makes it clear that the date of birth, 459 or 458, depends on the process of inference (fifteen years old at the time of his departure for Thurii in 444/3), which is simply not the case (Dionysius does not mention this date in his biography of Lysias, but simply implies it as certain, and there is no sign of an inference), and that Dionysius emphasizes the hypothetical status of the result,<sup>38</sup> i.e. ὡς ἄν τις εἰκόσσειεν, on which see above.<sup>39</sup> However, although he ultimately finds the ancient chronology of Lysias' life unreliable, he adduces no sufficient grounds for dating Lysias' birth later than 459 BC.<sup>40</sup>

It is in fact entirely possible that Lysias' date of birth was reckoned backward from the “epochal” date of the founding of Thurii in 444/3 BC and on the basis of Lysias' statement in one of his lost speeches that he was fifteen when he went to Thurii. But does it mean that this reckoning was a false combination? The arguments against the reliability of Lysias' departure for Thurii in 444/3 start from the observation that this contradicts the statement in Pseudo-Plutarch that Cephalus had already died by the

---

<sup>36</sup> Davies 1971, 587 f.

<sup>37</sup> Todd 2007, 10.

<sup>38</sup> *Ibid.*, 8.

<sup>39</sup> Todd (*ibid.*, 12) notes that Lys. 12. 4 (Cephalus was invited by Pericles and lived there thirty years) is hardly compatible with the statement of Ps.-Plut. that Lysias left Athens in 444/3 *after his father's death*: this would mean 474/3 or earlier for Cephalus' coming to Athens (Pericles was too young about 475 BC). Remarkably Todd recommends a sceptical attitude toward the exactness of Lysias as concerns the invitation by Pericles rather than to Pseudo-Plutarch. But of course Lysias deserves confidence, and Cephalus' death about 444/3 would make his presence in the introductory talk of the *Republic* an anachronism, both blatant and unexplainable.

<sup>40</sup> Todd (*ibid.*, 10–11) recognizes the difficulties of reconciling the dramatic dates of Plato's *Republic* and the *Phaedrus* with Lysias' biographical dates (see further on this), but he admits that Plato is prone to anachronisms and so he does not recommend, as does Dover, a modification of Lysias' date of return to Athens in order to accommodate it to the dramatic dates of the dialogues. He also does not believe that the implications of the Metanaera – Neaera affair undermine Lysias' chronology of tradition.

time that his sons went to Thurii. It is true that if Cephalus came to Thurii on Pericles' invitation, thus hardly earlier than 460 BC, and lived in Athens thirty years until his death, i.e. 430 or later, then he had to still be alive in 444/3. But should we for this reason sacrifice Lysias' departure in 444/3 BC or rather Pseudo-Plutarch's note that his father died before his departure? Scholars have for the most part preferred the first option, or like Blass (in his last interpretation) they have rejected both pieces of evidence. It is much sounder from a methodological point of view to doubt the reliability of Pseudo-Plutarch's note. First of all the supposition that Lysias with his brother (or brothers) went to Thurii not in 444/4 but considerably later is gratuitous since there is no evidence for an additional supply of people from Athens to Thurii. Vater's positive argument in favor of the later colonists can be reduced<sup>41</sup> to a mention of *Θουριομάντεις* in *Arsph. Nub.* 332 (423 BC; the second redaction we possess was between 420 and 417 BC). Vater believed that it hints at Thurii's search for new colonists and at the activities of oracle-mongers related to it at this time.<sup>42</sup> But in fact the most plausible explanation of *Θουριομάντεις* is given by *Schol. Arsph.* ad loc.: it is a hint that Lampon, who took the leading role in founding Thurii in 444/3 (Diod. 12. 10. 4), was in fact a *μάντις* (he famously predicted Pericles' siege over Thucydides, the son of Melesias, *Plut. Per.* 6) and continued to play a prominent role in Athenian politics of the 420s (he was one of those who signed the peace of Nicias, *Thuc.* 5. 19. 2; 24. 1) – and was as such a *κωμωδούμενος* (see *Arsph. Aves*, Cratinus etc.; *Athen.* 344 e).<sup>43</sup> The hint in Aristophanes thus does not prove that there were new Athenian colonists to Thurii in the 420s or thereabouts.<sup>44</sup>

On the contrary, the arguments can be adduced in favor of the view that there were only two waves of Athenian colonists to Thurii, soon

---

<sup>41</sup> He referred also to the war of Thurii with Taras in 444, soon after the founding of Thurii, and *στῶσαι* at Thurii in 434 BC; but even if there were losses at that time it does not prove that there were new colonists and even less that they were Athenian colonists.

<sup>42</sup> Vater 1843, 197.

<sup>43</sup> See Obst 1924, 581.

<sup>44</sup> The passage of *Andoc.* 4. 11–12, the speech of the debatable date and authorship, which Vater ascribed to Phaeax, does not suggest, *pace* Vater 1843, 197, that there were new colonists on the alleged date of the speech, 417–415 BC, and thus the Athenian ones: Alcibiades is here accused of a doubling of the allies' tribute, which made many of them abandon their cities and settle in Thurii. The reliability of this report as concerns the "doubling" is dubious (see Meritt, Wade-Gery, McGregor 1950, 350 f.), but even if there is something historical in the migration of displeased allies to Thurii, it would rather show that Thurii would not tolerate the colonists of Athens. *Andoc.* 4 contains several serious anachronisms and was written, in all probability, after 403 BC; see Heftner 2001, 39–56 (p. 45 f. on *Andoc.* 4. 11 f.).

before and about 444/3, and Lysias and his brothers were a part of the second of them.<sup>45</sup> At first the citizens of the Sybaris, destroyed by Croton in 448/7,<sup>46</sup> invited the Spartans and Athenians to send the colonists and to reestablish the town with them; only Athenians accepted the invitation and sent the colonists, with a squadron of ten ships, encouraging the people from other states to participate in the colony, which had the old name Sybaris (446/5). In the newly founded state the bloody struggle between the Sybarites and the newcomers soon broke out again, ending with the destruction or expulsion of the former; after that, in all probability, the second Athenian expedition was sent (Diodorus mentions one only) and the new town, Thurii, was founded (444/3 or 443/2) near the former Sybaris, and many new colonists from Greece were invited "because of much good land" at the site (Diod. 12. 11. 2); but it was not said that the colonists came afterwards from Athens.<sup>47</sup> It is clear that Athens badly needed people, and loyal ones, when the newly founded city, which was to promote Athenian imperial interests in the West, was endangered by a host of enemies; but just this invitation of foreign participants may suggest that Athens' own human resources were limited.<sup>48</sup> It is entirely plausible that Cephalus decided to send his young sons to take part in an endeavor, which both served the interests of their new motherland and promised considerable advantages for the family – acquiring land and citizenship which they could not obtain in Athens, possibly developing the father's business at the new place and in a privileged position especially if Cephalus, Pericles' friend, contributed materially to sending the colony.<sup>49</sup> On the contrary, the chances of young men obtaining land and citizenship

---

<sup>45</sup> Our main and almost single source for the founding of Thurii is Diod. 12. 9–11; on Pericles' role see Ehrenberg 1948 and further, especially on chronology, Andrews 1978, 6–8.

<sup>46</sup> It was the second destruction of Sybaris by Croton, the first being in 511/10 BC, after which Sybaris was restored (453/2 BC), Diod. 11. 90. 3; 12. 10. 2.

<sup>47</sup> The sequence of events in Diodorus is confused, but Strabo (6. 263) helps to restore them to the right order (see Ehrenberg 1948, 156 f.).

<sup>48</sup> See Brunt 1993, 115 f. The preeminent role of Athens in founding Thurii follows unambiguously from Diodorus' account and was established by Ehrenberg 1948, 149 ff.; see Graham 1968, 36.

<sup>49</sup> This should answer the question asked by Vater – why did Cephalus' sons abandon the most prosperous and cultural city of Greece for a remote and unsafe city if their father was still alive? According to the tradition, not always reliable, the outstanding persons (Protagoras, Herodotus, Hippodamus, Empedocles) went to Thurii at the time of her founding; in any event the city soon became culturally prominent (see prosopography of the famous Thurians, Pappritz 1891, 66–68). One should also take into account that the family lost a chance for obtaining Athenian citizenship for succeeding generations after Pericles' citizenship law of 451/50 BC.

in Thurii at the later date seem minimal – Thurii soon became a flourishing city (Diod. 12. 11. 3).<sup>50</sup>

Furthermore there was an internal struggle in Thurii in 434/3 BC as to whether Athenians or Peloponnesians should be regarded as the *ktistes* of the colony, the Delphic oracle dictating that Apollo should be regarded as the *ktistes*; the response settled the issue and put an end to the struggle (Diod. 12. 35. 3).<sup>51</sup> The scholarly opinions vary as to how one might evaluate this event in terms of Athenians' positions in Thurii at the time;<sup>52</sup> but even if the pro-Athenian party was strong enough to claim the rights of Athens *before* the oracle's response, it is clear that the attempts to invite the new colonists from Athens afterward would only provoke a new stasis, of which we do not hear.<sup>53</sup> Thucydides reports (7. 33. 5–6) that the enemies

---

<sup>50</sup> On the privileged position of the first colonists in general, see Graham 1968, 59 f.; Diodorus' evidence for Thurii (12. 11. 2) can be added to his examples that they participated on equal terms in both political matters and with respect to property, which was one of their privileges; Hermann presumably felt this difficulty and was urged to propose that Cephalus acquired land in Thurii at the time of her founding, which was in turn inherited by his sons who went to Thurii after his death (see above); this supposition flies in the face of the evidence.

<sup>51</sup> Diod. 12. 35; see Kagan 1969, 165 f.

<sup>52</sup> The moderate position of Graham 1964, 198, who regards the oracle's response as "setbacks to Athenian intentions", seems nearest the mark. Kagan 1969, 165 f. sees this event as signaling the city's transition to the side of Athens' enemies, but this does not follow from Diodorus' narrative; Pappritz 1891, 62, who argued against the view that Athenians lost their influence in Thurii after 434/3, could only point to the aforementioned passage in the [Andoc.] 4. 11–12, which was previously employed by Vater (see above n. 44); but even if reliable, it does not disprove a loss of control over Thurii on part of the Athenians – on the contrary it implies an anti-Athenian attitude in Thurii (against Pappritz, see Busolt 1897, 537–538 with note 4).

<sup>53</sup> Dorieus of Rhodes, who tried to raise a revolt on the isle and to detach it from Athens, was put on trial and condemned to death in Athens, but fled to Thurii where he became a citizen (Xen. *Hell.* 1. 15. 19; Paus. 6. 7. 4); he later led a squadron from Thurii against Athens in 412/11 (Thuc. 8. 35. 1). Dorieus was thrice in succession an Olympic victor in the *pankration* (Paus. *loc. cit.*, cf. *Syll*<sup>3</sup> 82); according to Thuc. 3. 8, the second victory was at Ol. 88 (= 428 BC), the first, accordingly, in 432 BC, and the third in 424 BC. Thucydides calls him Rhodian, but according to Pausanias he was proclaimed as a Thurian victor (presumably all three times). Pausanias' reliability was denied on the grounds that the enemy of Athens could not obtain Thurian citizenship before the city's detachment from Athens after the defeat at Syracuse in 413 BC, i.e. when Lysias was expelled with the other supporters of Athens (Dittenberger, Purgold 1896, no. 153, col. 266; Swoboda 1905, 1560). But Pausanias might have been more exact and had more information on Olympic victors than Thucydides, who may have had Dorieus' origin in view and not his actual citizenship (see Hornblower I, 1981, 390; cf. Graham 1964, 104 f.; 167 f.; 179, on those cases where ethnicity refers to a person's origin and not to their actual citizenship or residence). Granting

of Athens were expelled from the city in summer 413 BC, shortly before arrival of the Athenian squadron of Demosthenes and Eurymedon, and he implies that the military treaty between the two cities was impossible before this, thus showing that Athenian positions were not strong in the city.<sup>54</sup> The following participation of Thurii in the expedition against Syracuse (Thuc. 7. 35. 1) was not voluntary, but urged on them by circumstance, as Thucydides points out (7. 57. 11), i.e. by Athenian support for the pro-Athenian party. The subsequent exile of supporters of Athens in 413 BC, after its defeat at Syracuse, was the natural outcome of their temporary ascendancy due to Demosthenes' support. Thus far the arrival of new colonists from Athens between 430 and 421 BC is not only unattested, but unsupported by the overall picture of Athenian positions in Thurii in the initial phase of the Peloponnesian War.

Taking the above into account, it is far more sound methodologically to sacrifice the detail, which is reported by Pseudo-Plutarch (but not by Dionysius), that Lysias left Athens for Thurii after his father's death rather than to suspect his date of birth, 459 BC, of which there was no doubt in the tradition, and the date of his departure, 444/3, reported by Dionysius and Pseudo-Plutarch himself. The reliability of Pseudo-Plutarch's information on Lysias, which has no parallel in Dionysius, was defended by Schindel, but in fact a large part of it is mistaken.<sup>55</sup> We should take into account that Pseudo-Plutarch (as also Dionysius) for some reason does not mention

---

citizenship to Dorieus in Thurii would then serve as evidence for the weakening of Athenian positions as early as 432, i.e. soon after the *ktistes* affair; cf. Van Gelder 1900, 80.

<sup>54</sup> Graham's (1964, 198) assertion that "Thurii's behavior in the Peloponnesian War shows that the pro-Athenian party were in the ascendant there until the Athenian defeat in Sicily" (see earlier, even more radically, Papritz 1891, 64 f.) is thus indisputably correct only for the time after the appearance of Demosthenes. The facts Graham marshals (the friendly reception given to the Athenians in Thurii in 415 BC [Diod. 13. 3. 4] and Gylippus' failure to win over the city in summer 414 BC [Thuc. 6. 104. 2]) depend in all probability on small forces of Peloponnesians at this time (see Thuc. 6. 104. 3) rather than on pro-Athenian sympathies in Thurii (see Dover 1968, 43; Dover, Brunt 1993, 116 n. 20 point to Thuc. 6. 44. 2, who contrary to Diodorus states that in the beginning of the Sicilian expedition it was Thurii, like the other cities on the Italian coast, which maintained a hostile neutrality vis-à-vis Athens). The whole course of events before the anti-Athenian stasis in 413 BC cannot be restored and the attitude probably depended on the temporary ascendancy of the Athenian and anti-Athenian parties; but Alcibiades' flight to Thurii in 415 BC and the failure of Athenians to find him there (Thuc. 6. 61. 6–7) implies that supporters of Athens did not prevail in Thurii at the time.

<sup>55</sup> See Dover 1968, 39 on the inaccuracies of this piece of Ps.-Plut.

thirty years of Cephalus' dwelling in Athens (Lys. 12. 4), although he obviously used Lysias 12 in compiling Lysias' biography (835 c 3–4, f 3).<sup>56</sup>

Thus Pseudo-Plutarch (or his source), contrary to the modern historians, could believe simultaneously that Cephalus was invited by Pericles to Athens and that he died earlier than Thurii's founding in 444/3. But even in knowing what yielded this mistake, we are still in no position to determine what compelled him to commit it. It might have simply been a wrong inference from the evidence that Lysias went to Thurii with his older brother Polemarchus, but not with his father (it can in fact be explained by Cephalus' will to continue his successful business in Athens). Another possibility is that it was an inference made by Lysias' biographers from that introductory scene of the *Republic*, in which Cephalus is depicted as very old and all three of his sons are presented as being in his house – this could be understood as Polemarchus and Lysias not having yet left Athens for Thurii and that this happened soon after when their father died. Nobody today would believe that the introductory scene of the *Republic* might depict the events as early as 444/3 BC or even a bit earlier, but Lysias' ancient biographers need not take into account all sequences of such a chronology; one should not forget that the dramatic date of 444/3 was defended by a number of modern scholars in the first decades of the nineteenth century before it was refuted by Boeckh (see further). It is also possible that the report in Ps.-Plutarch stems from a source he used, according to which Cephalus was banished from Syracuse by Gelon (835 c 5–6, see above), i.e. before 478 BC; this would mean that he died about 448 BC, before the founding of Thurii.<sup>57</sup>

But whatever might be one's preferred explanation of this mistake on the part of Pseudo-Plutarch, there are many reasons, as I have tried to show, for denying the reliability of the detail that Cephalus was dead when his sons left Athens for Thurii rather than doubting the attested date of their departure, 444/3 BC, and inventing instead the later date and the circumstances under which the brothers could have moved to Thurii not

---

<sup>56</sup> This curious omission is understandable – there was no fixed starting point for the beginning of Cephalus' life in Athens; he was invited by Pericles, but – although it is plausible that it happened when Pericles attained the city's outstanding position – there has been obviously no fixed date in tradition for Pericles' rise.

<sup>57</sup> It is impossible that vice versa the version about Gelon should have been wrongly inferred from the statement that Cephalus died before 444/3 (thirty years back from 444/3 would not give the biographers the time of Gelon's rule). It is true that Ps.-Plut. seems to treat this version as an alternative to Cephalus' arrival in Athens on Pericles' invitation, but this would not have prevented him from inserting the remark on Cephalus' death before 444/3 as a main version because he did not take into account Lysias' words that his father had lived in Athens for thirty years.

at her founding, but much later. Some scholars find a support for these attempts in the introductory scene of the *Republic*; they believe that since it is indubitably related to the date later than 444/3 it then testifies to the fact that the brothers left Athens for Thurii later than this date. But granted that the dramatic date is 429 BC, it is entirely possible that Polemarchus is present in his house and depicted as a permanent resident of Athens not because he had not yet left Athens, but because he had already returned in order to replace his old father in the family business. The presence of Lysias is not a serious obstacle for this date. Socrates reports that when they arrived at the house of Cephalus, they *found* there Lysias and Euthydemus as well as other guests (328 b) and he thus mentions them "along with the visitors". Boeckh and other scholars after him explained this remark by positing that Lysias at this date (411 BC, the dramatic date of the *Republic*, as according to Boeckh) had already returned to Athens from Thurii and was living in his own house in Piraeus, as was the case in 404 BC.<sup>58</sup> But another explanation, as proposed by Hermann, who argued in favor of 429 BC as the dramatic date, is equally plausible, namely that Lysias came from Thurii to visit his father as well as his brother Euthydemus.<sup>59</sup> Provided that this is correct we thereby get a chronologically plausible picture – the conversation takes place in 429 BC; Cephalus is still alive, having arrived in Athens thirty years before, but will soon die; Lysias, born in 459/8, is thirty years old and is on a visit from Thurii; Polemarchus, who was already old enough in 444 BC to be a guard for Lysias (thus born not later than 464 BC) has already returned from Thurii to take care of his father's business, somewhat earlier than 429 BC, since he is close to Socrates and is fond of philosophy (*Phaedrus*); he is about thirty-five.<sup>60</sup>

Take another difficulty of Lysias' chronology as related to the mention of him in the *Phaedrus*. Here he is active in Athens as an already famous rhetorical writer and much admired by young Phaedrus. The dramatic

---

<sup>58</sup> Boeckh 1838/1874, 443 f.; Adam 1902/1963, I, 3 ad loc.

<sup>59</sup> According to Dion. Hal. *De Lys.* p. 8. 5 f. Us.–Rad., Lysias went to Thurii with both his brothers Polemarchus and Euthydemus. We do not know when Euthydemus returned to Athens or whether he returned at all; but there is no reason to doubt Dionysius' testimony for Euthydemus together with Nails 2002, 151, for all three brothers might have gone to Thurii in 444 BC in order to obtain civil rights there, and Euthydemus might have already been dead in 411 when members of the Athenian party were exiled from Thurii.

<sup>60</sup> In the *Republic* (328 b) Polemarchus is depicted as the owner of the house in which the conversation takes place: he thus returned at least some time earlier than 429 BC, presumably when his father grew old and could no longer manage the family business himself (it is not clear, *pace* Nails, 2002, 251, that Polemarchus is the owner of Cephalus' house).

date of this dialogue is before 415 BC, because it was in this year that Phaedrus of Myrrhinus, son of Pythocles, fled into exile for profaning the mysteries and his property was confiscated;<sup>61</sup> he did not return before “the recall of the exiles” urged by the Spartans in 404, and it is implausible that the conversation in the *Phaedrus* should have taken place in that short period between his return in 404 and the death of Polemarchus (who according to *Phaedr.* 257 b was alive) under the Thirty in 404/3.<sup>62</sup> In fact the dramatic date of the dialogue might have been considerably earlier than 415.<sup>63</sup> Now, according to Dover, Lysias’ presence in Athens before 415 BC contradicts Dionysius’ chronology of him and makes any exact dramatic dating of the *Phaedrus* impossible.<sup>64</sup> Dover is right that Socrates speaks in the *Phaedrus* of Lysias in terms appropriate to someone who lives in Attica but not in Athens, and this shows that Plato depicts him as a resident of Piraeus, as he in fact was after his return to Athens from Thurii in 411 BC.<sup>65</sup> But is it sufficient to undermine either the credibility of Lysias’ biographical tradition or the supposed dramatic date of the *Phaedrus*? In both cases I think not. Phaedrus’ exile related to profaning the mysteries was chronologically fixed and was in all probability also fixed for Plato, so that the dramatic date before 415 BC is transparent. Socrates’ reply concerning Lysias, on the contrary, is open to various interpretations. One cannot exclude the possibility that Lysias could have rented the house and lived long in Piraeus while yet remaining a citizen of Thurii; but of course it is possible that Plato simply did not know the exact date of Lysias’ return

---

<sup>61</sup> The identity of Plato’s Phaedrus of Myrrhinus, son of Pythocles, with Phaedrus mentioned by Andoc. 1. 15, who was denounced for parodying mysteries, has been beyond doubt since discovery of the records of the sale of property of those who were condemned for impiety in 415 BC, where both the patronymic and demotic of Phaedrus coincide with those in Plato (*SEG* XIII. 17. 112 = *IG* I<sup>3</sup> 421–430); see Dover 1968, 32, and further Nails 2002, 19; 233.

<sup>62</sup> As Dover 1968, 33 noted, 268 c implies that both Sophocles and Euripides are still alive (both died before 404 BC); one may add that Polemarchus’ devotion to philosophy (257 b) was more likely before 415 than circa 404.

<sup>63</sup> Phaedrus, a young man in this dialogue, figures as an adolescent in *Prot.* 315 c (the dramatic date is about 433/432); see Nails 2002, 233.

<sup>64</sup> Dover 1968, 41 f.; he further proposes that Lysias returned in the late 420s (p. 43); see the survey of proposed dramatic dates Nails 2002, 314.

<sup>65</sup> Dover 1968, 33. ΣΩ. Καλῶς γάρ, ὦ ἑταῖρε, λέγει. ἀτὰρ Λυσίας ἦν, ὡς ἔοικεν, ἐν ἄστει. ΦΑΙ. Ναί, παρ’ Ἐπικράτει, ἐν τῆδε τῇ πλησίον τοῦ Ὀλυμπίου οἰκίᾳ τῇ Μορυχίᾳ. One might try to exploit the fact that Lysias came to Athens not from Piraeus, but from a more distant place like Thurii; but this is a hopeless attempt, as Dover rightly maintains: ἐν ἄστει *vel sim.* practically always designates the town as opposed to country, as in *Phaedr.* 230 d 5, *Leg.* 844 c 5, 881 c 5, etc., and for the specific opposition ἐν ἄστει – ἐν Πειραιεῖ, see Plat. *Ep.* 324 c 6, and this is often the case in Thucydides and Demosthenes.

to Athens from Thurii or did not in fact *care* to know, seeing as how Lysias' presence was important to a fictional conversation in the *Phaedrus*. If Isocrates' date of birth, 436/5 BC, according to Ps.-Plut. *Vit. Orat.* 836 f, is reliable, then the dramatic date of *Phaedrus* would be not much earlier than 415; Lysias, who is depicted in the *Phaedrus* as older than Isocrates and already in bloom of his gift, might thus have been born in 459, as according to Dionysius' chronology.

It should be noted that there is no trace of hesitation concerning Lysias' date of birth in antiquity – Dionysius and Pseudo-Plutarch, who both drew on various sources, take it to be 459 BC.<sup>66</sup> Moreover there is additional evidence that this date was firmly maintained: Dionysius assumes that Lysias died at the age of eighty, i.e. in 379/8 or 378/7 BC (p. 21. 1–2 U.–R.), but Pseudo-Plutarch (836 a 3–6) reports of conflicting views on his age at the time of his death – 86 (i.e. 373 BC), 76 (383 BC) and more than eighty (after 379 BC); but remarkably this did not lead to related divergences concerning the date of his birth. This shows that Lysias' date of birth was maintained independently of his date of death.<sup>67</sup>

Thus far, as I have tried to show, there are no grounds to suspect Lysias' chronology of ancient tradition – born in 459 BC, went to Thurii in 444/3. Provided that the previous reasoning was correct we should not rely on Ps.-Plutarch's note that Cephalus died when Lysias went to Thurii; we can thus only approximately define his arrival in Athens as having occurred before 459 BC (Lysias had already been born in Athens), and *shortly* before this date, because Pericles would not have been important enough to invite him to Athens earlier than 460 BC. We thus attain the date of Cephalus' death (after thirty years in Athens) as having been no earlier than 430 BC and not much later than 429 BC. Let us now look at the dramatic date

---

<sup>66</sup> Ps.-Plut. even adduces this date twice (835 c 3; 836 a 19), which does not do him much honor as a compiler, but suggests that he found it in two different sources.

<sup>67</sup> It is also clear that Lysias' age at the moment of death was not directly attested by any single source; in all probability it varied in the tradition depending on how his date of death was determined, and the most plausible basis for this were the latest dates mentioned in his speeches. The variations arose owing to the dubious authenticity of certain speeches. 383 BC, the earliest date of death, could be counted on the basis of *Lys.* 10. 4, which was delivered on "the twentieth year" after the restoration of democracy (Dover 1968, 44). The later date, 373 BC, may be explained by varying views of the genuineness of two speeches in defence of Iphicrates ascribed to Lysias. According to Dionysius (*Lys.* 20. 15 – 21. 19), the first was written later than 372/1 and the second later than 356/5; both were atheized by him on stylistic and chronological grounds, but were regarded as genuine by Ps.-Plut., or rather by his sources; the authenticity of the earlier speech was defended by Paul of Mysa (Todd 2007, 478 f.), and a ground for this might be the assumption that Lysias died at the age of 86, because the speech was in fact delivered in 373 (not 372/1) BC; see Kirchner I, 1901, 513.

of Plato's *Republic*, in the introductory conversation, to which a very old Cephalus plays an important role as a charming person and as one of the most memorable of Plato's characters.

The dramatic date of Plato's *Republic* is a notoriously vexing subject. From the very beginning the debates about it were closely connected to an equally contested chronology of Lysias, who is present as a *persona muta* at the conversation, which takes place in the house of his father Cephalus. This conversation from the *Republic* takes place during the *Bendideia*, the festival in honor of the Thracian goddess of Bendis. According to Socrates, who is narrator of the conversation, he had gone down to Piraeus from Athens together with Plato's brother Glaucon to see the first celebration of the festival. He admired the processions – one of Thracians, another of Athenian citizens – offered up a prayer to the goddess, and was ready to return to Athens when he was stopped by Polemarchus, son of Cephalus and the other men, Adeimantus among them, Plato's other brother, who made Socrates stay for other parts of the festival of which he was unaware, namely the horse-torch race and the pannychis. The company continued on to Polemarchus' house to await the evening's entertainment, and they found there the old Cephalus, his other sons Lysias and Euthydemus, the orator Thrasymachus and a number of other people. Here is where the conversation about the essence of justice takes place.

In his three essays published between 1838 and 1840, A. Boeckh proposed what would for a very long time be the widely accepted dramatic date for the *Republic* – 411/10 BC.<sup>68</sup> Part of his argument was based on the commonly held assumption at the time that the *Republic*, the *Timaeus*, the *Critias* and the unwritten *Hermocrates* formed a tetralogy. Following Proclus (*In Tim.* 1, p. 9. 2), Boeckh believed that conversation regarding the best state – which Socrates mentions at start of the *Timaeus* as having taken place the day before and which then briefly resumes – was precisely the conversation of the *Republic*.<sup>69</sup> Boeckh thus tried to find the same dramatic date for both the *Republic* and the *Timaeus* and *Critias*.<sup>70</sup> It was recognized only after Boeckh's death that Proclus (*in Tim.* 1, p. 26. 10–18; see also *Schol. in Plat. Remp.* 327 a) was wrong and that the *Lesser Panathenaea* could not immediately follow the 19<sup>th</sup> of Thargelion, which was when the *Bendideia* were celebrated. For other

<sup>68</sup> Boeckh 1838/1874; 1839/1874; 1840/1874.

<sup>69</sup> Boeckh 1838/1874, 440–443.

<sup>70</sup> Boeckh argued that the dramatic date of the *Timaeus* and *Critias* and, accordingly, of the *Republic* should be no later than 409 (the death of Hermocrates, one of the interlocutors in the *Timaeus* and *Critias*). It is surprising how Boeckh could believe that Hermocrates, who defeated the Athenians in Syracuse in 413 BC, is depicted as peacefully talking in Athens in 411–410 BC.

reasons it is also clear that Plato never purported that the conversation mentioned in the *Timaeus* is the same as that depicted in the *Republic* (the interlocutors in the *Timaeus*, who according to this dialogue were present at the previous day's conversation, do not take part in the conversation of the *Republic*), instead referring to another, a fictional one, which merely had similar content.<sup>71</sup>

Boeckh's first essay was directed against the notion that the dramatic date of the *Republic* was as early as ca. 444 BC or Ol. 85 = 440–437 BC – these dates now entirely rejected and forgotten, but at the time favored by some scholars and reckoned mainly on the basis of Cephalus' and Lysias' chronology wherein the conversation takes place before Cephalus' death and Lysias' departure for Thurii.<sup>72</sup> Those who believed that the dramatic date of the *Republic* was the 440s BC had to admit that Glaucon and Adeimantus of the *Republic* were not Plato's brothers (Plato himself was born in 429 BC or so), but their homonymous older relatives.<sup>73</sup>

Boeckh's dramatic date of 411/10 BC followed from refutation of the dubious assumption of an alternative Glaucon / Adeimantus, he insisted that Glaucon and Adeimantus were Plato's brothers who, according to evidence presented by Suda, were younger than Plato; the conversation in which they play so considerable a role could thus not have had a dramatic date earlier than 411/10 BC (p. 449). Boeckh's second argument was the presence of Lysias at the conversation in the house of his father; because his presence cannot be explained *before* his departure for Thurii (444/3 BC), he should have been depicted as having already returned to Athens from Thurii in 412/11 BC (p. 443). Both the dramatic date of the 440s and the supposition

---

<sup>71</sup> This was shown by Hirzel 1895, 256–257 n. 1, who relied on the work of Aug. Mommsen 1864, 129 ff., as concerns the Athenian festivals (the Lesser Panathenaea were celebrated annually on the same date as the Great Panathenaea, the 28 of Hekatombaion; see Deubner 1933/1966, 23, and on possible grounds for Proclus' mistake, p. 30). Hirzel pointed out that the conversation which is recapitulated in the *Timaeus* was held by the same interlocutors as those of this dialogue – Socrates, Critias and Hermocrates (see *Tim.* 17 a 2, b 2, c 4 etc.) – and not by the interlocutors of the *Republic*.

<sup>72</sup> Most scholars preferred the dramatic date as being somewhere just before 444/3, because Lysias, according to his biographers, went with his brothers to the newly founded Thurii in 444/3 when he was fifteen, and according to Ps.-Plut. *Mor.* 835 d 10–11 (see above), this occurred after the death of his father Cephalus. 440–436 BC was proposed by F. C. Wolff 1799, 7 n., which was followed by G. Stallbaum 1825, 8; they relied on the corrupted text Ps.-Plut. 835 c 5, according to which Lysias was born in Ol. 82, 2 = 451/50; this contradicts the name of archon which Ps.-Plut. himself adduces for this year and the chronology he follows in general; the mistake was committed by a scribe rather than Ps.-Plut. himself; see Boeckh 1838/1874, 448.

<sup>73</sup> The proposal regarding the older Adeimantus and Glaucon was made by F. Ast and then endorsed by K. F. Hermann.

about an alternative Glaucon and Adeimantus were effectively refuted by Boeckh.<sup>74</sup> But his later date of 411/10 BC entailed the difficulty that Lysias' father Cephalus, who takes part in the *Republic* conversation, was long dead by 411 BC and as early as 444/3 BC according to Pseudo-Plutarch. Boeckh had to cast doubt on this tradition and suppose that Cephalus was still alive in 411 BC, against not only Pseudo-Plutarch's evidence, which, as we have seen, is dubious, but also any plausible chronology of Cephalus and Lysias.<sup>75</sup>

Boeckh's arguments won almost universal approval, but we might rescue from oblivion the views of his opponent K. F. Hermann, who was official loser in this debate.<sup>76</sup> It was already before appearance of Boeckh's first essay that Hermann had rejected Stallbaum's dramatic date of 436 BC, which was based on a mistake (see n. 72), proposing instead a date shortly before 430 BC (330 BC in Hermann's text is a misprint). Hermann's reasoning was closely connected to his views of Lysias' chronology: he believed that Lysias was born in Athens in 459/58 BC, that his father settled in Athens on an invitation from Pericles, thus shortly before this date, and then according to Lys. 12. 4 he died some thirty years later about 430; Lysias thus went to Thurii in 444/3 BC and *not* after the death of his father, as according to Ps.-Plut. 835 d 4–5. The *Republic* thus depicts Cephalus shortly before his death, so that the dramatic date can be only around 430 BC; the presence of Lysias, who should have been in Thurii as of 444/3, is not therefore an anachronism, since he might have simply been on a visit from Thurii to his father's house – a perfectly reasonable scenario (see above). Second, one might plausibly connect the introduction of the *Bendideia* with the pact the Athenians made with the Thracians in 431 BC (Thuc. 2. 29) and with the arrival soon after of Thracian mercenaries to Athens – an argument which later arose again in the discussion on the date of the *Bendideia*, though the fact that Hermann was its progenitor has been forgotten.<sup>77</sup>

---

<sup>74</sup> Boeckh 1838/1874, 437 ff.

<sup>75</sup> Boeckh 1838/1874, 448 f.

<sup>76</sup> It is perhaps useful to note certain details of the Boeckh–Hermann polemics regarding the dramatic date. Hermann first made his proposal in Hermann 1831; Boeckh responded in Boeckh 1839/1874; this followed by Hermann 1839 against Boeckh, which was answered by Boeckh 1840/1874 (the editorial note in Boeckh's *Kleine Schriften*, p. 474 n. 3, is misleading – Hermann's essay of 1839 was *not* reedited in Hermann 1849). There is a survey by E. Bratuschek of the polemics after 1840 as incited by an attack on both theses in Boeckh 1874, 490–492.

<sup>77</sup> Hermann 1831, 651 f. His reference to mention of the *Bendideia* in Aristophanes' fragment *Lemniae* (see further) offers nothing in terms of chronology, because *pace* Hermann it is unclear as to whether it features there as a *new* festival.

Hermann's proposal of the dramatic date 430 BC was combined with the supposition, earlier made by F. Ast, that Glaucon and Adeimantus of the *Republic* cannot be Plato's brothers, which made it an easy mark for Boeckh.<sup>78</sup> In his second essay of 1839, now having become aware of Hermann's paper, Boeckh defended his dramatic date of 411/10 against Hermann's 430 BC. He again refuted the idea of the alternative, older Glaucon and Adeimantus, but now focusing specifically on Hermann's own arguments by arguing that (1) the age of the interlocutors fails to calibrate with 430 BC; this, as we shall see, is correct for Glaucon and Adeimantus only; (2) Cephalus could arrive in Athens not ca. 460 BC, before Lysias' birth, but later and then die, accordingly, at a date later than 430 BC, because Lysias might have been born (contrary to his biographers) before his father moved to Athens – that is to say, in Syracuse. This latter notion can be rejected out of hand.<sup>79</sup>

It is not necessary to follow this debate any further, since the main and weighty arguments in favor of two concurring dramatic dates were already adduced at this stage. As I have tried to show, Hermann proposed a very reasonable chronology for Cephalus and Lysias that made Cephalus' presence at the conversation any time after 430 BC an anachronism.<sup>80</sup>

---

<sup>78</sup> The attempts to show that Ariston and Glaucon of the *Parmenides* are not Plato's brothers, but his older homonymous relatives (Schleiermacher, and after him, K. F. Hermann) are misleading, although the *Parmenides* provides evidence that Plato had a step-father and half-brother. The frame conversation in this dialogue has the dramatic date after 404 BC, and Antiphon, the half-brother of Adeimantus and Glaucon, had the homonymous grandfather Antiphon (*Parm.* 126 e 8); Pyrilampes, Plato's uncle from his mother's side (*Charm.* 158 a 2), had the father Antiphon too; the statements of Plut. *Mor.* 484 f and Procl. *In Parm.* 126 b, that the younger Antiphon was Plato's brother – i.e. that he was a son of Pyrilampes, who married Plato's mother – are thus a combination, but the most plausible one, based on the evidence at their and our disposal.

<sup>79</sup> The testimony of Timaeus of Tauromenium, which seemingly supports this notion, does in fact prove that Lysias was never a resident of Syracuse (Cic. *Brut.* 63: [Lysias] *est enim Atticus, quoniam certe Athenis est et natus et mortuus et functus omni civium munere, quamquam Timaeus eum quasi Licinia et Mucia lege repetit Syracusas*); the law of Licinius and Mucius (95 BC) did not envisage the expulsion of foreigners, but only prosecution of Italics who migrated to Rome and illegally assumed the rights of Roman citizens (see Cic. *Off.* 3. 47 with Badian 1958, 297; Sherwin-White 1973, 110 f.; 140). Thus Timaeus' claim rather implies that even though Lysias was born in Athens, he remained a Syracusan citizen by virtue of his parentage. An appropriate place for this note in Timaeus might be the founding of Thurii (see Laqueur 1936, 1094, on Timaeus as a probable source for Diod. 12. 9–11), because thereafter Lysias was already a Thurian and not a Syracusan citizen.

<sup>80</sup> As has been shown, Hermann weakened his case in later works, proposing at first that Lysias went to Thurii not in 444/3, but in 430, when his father died – so

Boeckh's proposal carried the day while Hermann's was almost entirely forgotten.<sup>81</sup> The anachronism relating to Cephalus' presence ignored by Boeckh was noticed by scholars, but they were prepared to tolerate it.<sup>82</sup> Later proposals view the anachronism relating to Cephalus as unavoidable. 407 BC was recently proposed by S. White on the basis of Thrasymachus' alleged visit to Athens in this year; but even if the visit did in fact take place, his proposal is not convincing.<sup>83</sup> D. Nails supposes that the *Republic* has two dramatic dates, one of 424 (or 421) BC, corresponding to the first book, which was originally a separate dialogue (the '*Thrasymachus*'), and another of 429/8, corresponding to the '*Proto-Republic*', which comprised books 2–5 of the later *Republic*, still without Adeimantus and Glaucon; later it was reworked, Plato's brothers were added, and any dramatic date before ca. 411 BC became inappropriate<sup>84</sup> – a combination of old theories either unproved or refuted long ago.<sup>85</sup>

---

as to make his presence at the *Republic* conversation more plausible (Hermann 1839, 8–10) – and then yielding to Vater's view that Lysias' birth in 459/8 BC was a "construction" of his biographers (Hermann 1849, 15 n. 30).

<sup>81</sup> Boeckh's dramatic date was accepted by G. Stallbaum in the second edition of Plato's *Republic* (Stallbaum 1858, cxii), abandoning his earlier view, and by many other Platonic scholars to follow.

<sup>82</sup> Jowett-Campbell 1894, 2 f., who pleaded for Boeckh's dramatic date of 411/10 BC, noted that the presence of Cephalus at the conversation contradicts Ps.-Plut., who says that Cephalus had died before Lysias settled in Thurii (444/3 BC), but they then dismissed this evidence, because it is contradicted by Lys. 12. 4 (Cephalus' thirty years of life in Athens) and because Plato did not bring great "accuracy" to "such a minute detail"; they did not notice that Cephalus anyway should have died much earlier than 411/10 (see above). Other evidence for dating they cited (referring to living persons such as Prodicus and possibly Protagoras, 10. 600 c) is in fact compatible with the much earlier dramatic date than that proposed by Boeckh.

<sup>83</sup> White 1995, 324–326; his proposal is top-heavy with assumptions – that *Thrasymachus* B 1 DK is a speech delivered by Thrasymachus in his capacity as Chalcedon's emissary to Athens (see contra Yunis 1997, 58–66), that this took place in 407 BC, and that Plato depicts Lysias as visiting Athens in this year. On his belief that the persons and circumstances of the *Republic* correspond to the year 407 BC see further; White admits that the presence of Cephalus – "who was all but certainly dead by 410, and probably by 420" – is an anachronism (p. 326). As against White see Nails 2002, 89.

<sup>84</sup> Nails 2002, 324–326.

<sup>85</sup> Although the theories of the composition of the *Republic* just mentioned still have supporters today, nobody supposed before that Plato fused the old versions together in such a sloppy manner as to leave two (or even three) dramatic dates simultaneously. Nails also surprisingly resuscitates (p. 426) the old theory that the *Republic* and the *Timaeus* – *Critias* have the same dramatic date, although she is aware that Socrates could not have referred in the *Timaeus* to the conversation of the *Republic* as having been the day before (see above n. 71). She does not say why she believes that the dramatic date of the *Timaeus* – *Critias* is August 429 BC.

Moors arrives at the disappointing view that the contradictory nature of our evidence is such an irreconcilable problem that the *Republic* will remain “a timeless dialog”, which is “removed from the temporal restraints which shackle all actual events”.<sup>86</sup> But this contradicts Plato's careful setting of the scene in the *Republic*, with exact indications to the time of the talk, the circumstances which prompted it, the persons who took part, including the numerous *personae mutae*.

Nevertheless, one attempt to manage the chronological difficulties related to the dramatic date should be specially mentioned. J. Burnet and after him A. Taylor proposed a date of 421 BC, so as to eliminate the anachronism related to Cephalus. They argued against Boeckh that Plato's brothers were actually much older than it is usually thought and that Polemarchus and Lysias are depicted *before* their departure for Thurii (following the “low” chronology of Lysias). This proposal cannot be accepted, for there is no special reason for choosing 421 BC; this date is also too late for Cephalus' death (see above).<sup>87</sup> This attempt nevertheless shows that the setting of the dialogue might yet fit a much earlier dramatic date than after 411/10; and the suggestion regarding Adeimantus and Glaucon deserves the further consideration.

There is one indication in the dialogue itself as to its dramatic date, however, which is independent both of Lysias' biography and the age of the interlocutors. Socrates starts his story about the justice conversation, having gone from Athens to Piraeus the day before, so as to pray to the goddess and watch the festival, since it was being celebrated for the very first time (327 a):

Κατέβην χθὲς εἰς Πειραιᾶ μετὰ Γλαύκωνος τοῦ Ἀρίστωνος προσευξόμενος τε τῇ θεῷ καὶ ἅμα τὴν ἑορτὴν βουλούμενος θεάσασθαι τίνα τρόπον ποιήσουσιν ἅτε νῦν πρῶτον ἄγοντες, καλὴ μὲν οὖν μοι καὶ ἡ τῶν ἐπιχωρίων πομπὴ ἔδοξεν εἶναι, οὐ μὲντοι ἦττον ἐφαίνετο πρέπειν ἢν οἱ Θοῤῃκες ἔπεμπον. προσευξάμενοι δὲ καὶ θεωρήσαντες ἀπῆμεν πρὸς τὸ ἄστυ.

Socrates and Glaucon, having accomplished this, were set to return to Athens when they encountered a group consisting of Polemarchus, Adeimantus, Glaucon's brother and some others who tried to prevent them

<sup>86</sup> Moors 1987, esp. 22–23.

<sup>87</sup> Burnet 1914/1950, 206–209; 351; Taylor 1928, 15–17; 1960, 263 f.; they adduce no specific reason for choosing just this date, only that the peaceful set of the talk fits the time after the Peace of Nicias; note that both Burnet and Taylor still assumed that the *Republic* has the same dramatic date as the *Timaeus* – *Critias*, showing no awareness of Hirzel's opposing argument (see n. 71).

from leaving. Now Adeimantus, in order to hold Socrates, told him that there would be a horse-torch race in honor of the goddess and a nocturnal celebration, *pannychis*, to follow (328 a).<sup>88</sup>

Καὶ ὁ Ἀδείμαντος, Ἄρά γε, ἦ δ' ὄς, οὐδ' ἴστε ὅτι λαμπὰς ἔσται  
 πρὸς ἑσπέραν ἀφ' ἵππων τῇ θεῷ;  
 Ἄφ' ἵππων; ἦν δ' ἐγὼ καινόν γε τοῦτο. λαμπάδια ἔχοντες  
 διαδώσουσιν ἀλλήλοις ἀμιλλώμενοι τοῖς ἵπποις; ἦ πῶς λέγεις;  
 Οὕτως, ἔφη ὁ Πολέμαρχος. καὶ πρὸς γε παννυχίδα ποιήσουσιν,  
 ἦν ἄξιον θεάσασθαι· ἐξαναστησόμεθα γὰρ μετὰ τὸ δεῖπνον καὶ τὴν  
 παννυχίδα θεασόμεθα. καὶ συνεχόμεθά τε πολλοῖς τῶν νέων αὐτόθι  
 καὶ διαλεξόμεθα.

The entire company is invited by Polemarchus to his house to have a dinner before the evening celebrations; but they get caught up in their discussion of justice, and the celebrations are forgotten.

There is no doubt that the goddess in question is Thracian Bendis and that the festival is in her honor (*Bendideia* are mentioned later in the conversation, 354 a),<sup>89</sup> but the date of the event depicted in the *Republic* became the subject of continuous debate.

Relying on first mention of the Bendis shrine as being in Piraeus in Xen. *Hell.* 2. 4. 11 (in describing the events of 404/4), Boeckh argued that the *Bendideia* were inaugurated no earlier than 411; he believed that Plato depicted a first celebration of the *Bendideia*, which he himself watched in 411 BC (p. 449).<sup>90</sup> Ironically much more credible epigraphic evidence was discovered, which spoke – though not conclusively – against this date. The terminus a. q. for the acceptance of Bendis in the pantheon of Athenian state gods, 429/8 BC, became known in the 1860s when it was noted (according to the decrees of Callias of 434–433 BC, *IG I* [1873] p. 93, fr. K, 4 = *IG I*<sup>2</sup> 310, 207 = *IG I*<sup>3</sup> 383, 143) that in the treasurers' records of other gods Bendis is mentioned as one of those gods whose

<sup>88</sup> For a list of works on the problem of introducing the Bendis cult to Attica, see Planeaux 2000/2001, 165 n. 2.

<sup>89</sup> Adam 1902/1963, 1, 62, still seriously considered the older view that Athena is here meant (this supposition was related to the already refuted attempts [see n. 71 above] of harmonizing the dramatic date of the *Republic* with that of the *Timaeus*, whose conversation takes place during the festival honoring Athena [*Tim.* 21 a; 26 e]); later epigraphic findings proved that the festival described by Plato is that of Bendis; according to the lexicographers, Bendis seems to have been mentioned in Aristophanes' *Lemniae* simply as μεγάλη θεός (Hesych. μ 456; Phot. p. 251. 7 = fr. 384 K.–A.).

<sup>90</sup> Boeckh noted that even if the shrine existed before 411 BC, it would not necessarily follow that the festival was also celebrated, since it could have been a shrine of Bendis' private *thiasos*.

treasures were housed on the Acropolis;<sup>91</sup> it also proved that the temple of Bendis in Piraeus mentioned by Xenophon in relation to the events of 404/3 and dated by Boeckh close to 411 BC – his dramatic date for the *Republic* – in fact existed as a state shrine much earlier, in 429/8 BC. Nevertheless the inaugural date of the festival itself remained a matter of debate. Aug. Mommsen maintained that the cult was first introduced in 429 BC and considered whether the introductory part of the *Republic* implies introduction of the cult (and the festival of Bendis), which in such a case should then be dated 429 BC, or whether the torch-horse race and the pannychis were only later accretions to the festival; he finally came down on the side of the latter option with the reference to Plato's text – mistakenly so, as will be seen, and apparently because of the then prevailing dramatic date of the *Republic*, namely 411 BC.<sup>92</sup> From Mommsen stems the later popular idea that the *Republic* depicts not the inauguration of the festival, but the first celebration of it in expanded form.

Later, in his fundamental research on the Attic *orgeones*, W. Ferguson supposed (as earlier K. F. Hermann, whose work had already been forgotten by this time) that introduction of the Bendis cult likely took place in 431 BC on occasion of the treaty concluded by Athens with Sitalces, the king of the Odryseans.<sup>93</sup> Ferguson nevertheless continued to believe that the festival depicted by Plato was only first inaugurated ca. 411/10 BC (the whole celebration, not only new elements of it, as according to Mommsen) once more because of Boeckh's proposed dramatic date for the *Republic*.<sup>94</sup>

The situation changed again in 1941 when N. Pappadakis published three fragments of the inscription with the decree (or the decrees) of the Athenian ekklesia; although badly damaged they mentioned the festival in honor of Bendis, the offerings of victims, the pannychis, the procession

---

<sup>91</sup> Evidence of the epigraphic fragment was duly employed for the very first time by Aug. Mommsen 1898, 490, in dating introduction of the cult. The date and significance of these inscriptions were discussed by Kirchhoff 1865 (p. 32 on Bendis), who was later principal editor of the *IG I*. Three dates for introduction of the state cult of Bendis were discussed before this and all of them based on the alleged dramatic date of the *Republic* – 445/4 (Bergk), 420–417 (Vater) and 429 (Hermann 1858, 419). Neither Hermann (d. 1855), nor Boeckh (d. 1867) could have made use of this evidence, which shifted the balance in favor of Hermann's date. Nilsson's attribution (1955, 833 with n. 5) of the account of the other gods' treasures to *IG II*<sup>2</sup> 1496 A a 86; b 117 (= *Syll*<sup>3</sup> 1029, 22 f.) is a slip: this is the sacrificial inscription from the years 334/3–331/30 BC, which mentions the Bendis celebration as being a state festival.

<sup>92</sup> Mommsen 1898, 490 with n. 4.

<sup>93</sup> Ferguson 1944, 97 f.; Planeaux 2000/2001, 169 n. 14. Ferguson 1944, 97, noted that this implies that Bendis already had the *hieron* at this time, from which the treasures were withdrawn.

<sup>94</sup> Ferguson 1944, 97.

and the statue of the goddess (Pappadakis, *Eph. Arch.* 3 [1937] 808–823 [*non vidi*] = Sokolowski, *LSS* 6 = *IG* I<sup>3</sup> 136 [M. Jameson]). The decree was interpreted as a *lex sacra* regulating the goddess' ceremonies as they related to her being accepted as the official Athenian divinity.<sup>95</sup> Mention of the πολέμιος points to a date some time after 431/30 BC, the beginning of the Peloponnesian War, and that of the κολακρέται, the magistrates which were abolished in 411 BC, to some time before this latter date.<sup>96</sup> Nilsson in his discussion of the new inscription proposed a date between 431 and 429 BC (the first mention of Bendis among the state gods) for the festival's first being introduced.<sup>97</sup> Afterward Ferguson, correcting his earlier view, argued that the date should be exactly 430/29 BC. He interpreted the ἐνδεκάτει (fr. B, 11) as the 11<sup>th</sup> day of the prytany; relying on W. Dinsmoor's and B. Meritt's reconstructions of the Athenian prytany year he calculated that the 19<sup>th</sup> of Thargelion (date of the Bendis festival and, according to Ferguson, that of its official introduction into Attica) can coincide with the 11<sup>th</sup> day of the tenth prytany between 431 and 429 BC only in 430/29 BC.<sup>98</sup>

This date coincided with Herrmann's dramatic date for the *Republic*, which, however, was unknown to Ferguson. The latter continued to believe that the dramatic date was some time around 411 BC and thus supposed that Plato had perpetrated an anachronism in depicting the first introduction of the festival as late as this year (Ferguson was certain that both Plato's depiction and the new decree could refer only to introduction of the festival and not to its modification).<sup>99</sup> Ferguson's date for the new inscription and introduction of the festival was approved by Nilsson,<sup>100</sup> but it was placed in doubt by A. Raubitschek (*SE* X, 64 b). J. Bingen threw into question the basic premise of Ferguson's calculations – he proposed that the decree enforced introduction not of the public cult of Bendis, but of a new expanded form of its festival as supplemented by the pannychis (together with the horse-torch race) and that it lent organization to the priesthood of Bendis (p. 35) and thus generally returning to the

---

<sup>95</sup> Nilsson 1955, 833.

<sup>96</sup> Ferguson 1948, 132 f.

<sup>97</sup> Nilsson 1942/1960.

<sup>98</sup> Ferguson 1948, 145–147.

<sup>99</sup> Ferguson 1948, 152.

<sup>100</sup> Nilsson 1951, 46 with n. 20; Nilsson 1955, 833 with n. 4. Note that Nilsson in this latter work asserts that the introductory scene of the *Republic* depicts features of the festival, which were mentioned in the discovered inscription and that Plato's indication that the festival was being celebrated for the first time on the dramatic date of the dialogue is not an anachronism. Nilsson thus believed, contrary to Ferguson, that 429/8 BC was in fact the dramatic date of the *Republic*, although his reference to Cephalus, who died *before the Thirty* as the foundation for this, is a slip; it is relevant that Cephalus died before the Four Hundred, i.e. before 411 BC, Boeckh's dramatic date.

view of Aug. Mommsen. The positive evidence in favor of the later date was, according to Bingen, the missing stoichedon-style in the inscription, which occasionally occurs in the public documents of 412–405 BC, and mention of Pasiphon as secretary, who is probably identical to the *strategos* of 410/9 (p. 36). He further noted (p. 37) that after 421 BC in the prescripts the mention of the eponymous archon becomes frequent and (provided that the decree should in fact be dated after 421 BC) the initial letters preserved fit only the name of Cleonymus, the archon of 413/2 BC.<sup>101</sup> Bingen's date was approved by M. Jameson in his re-edition of the decree (*IG I<sup>3</sup> 136*) and by certain other scholars.<sup>102</sup>

It thus appears that Ferguson's bold restorations are unacceptable and his chronological reconstructions based on Merritt's and Dinsmoore's reckonings are uncertain; but Bingen's arguments based on the form and the style of the inscription carry ultimately no conviction either.<sup>103</sup> Planeaux, who most recently readdressed the issue, argued forcibly in favor of 429/8 BC. He is absolutely right that, *pace* Aug. Mommsen and Bingen, the introductory scene of the *Republic* depicts inauguration of the festival and not the introduction of new elements into it.<sup>104</sup> Socrates' words (327 a 2) indicate that he wanted to see the festival, because it was being celebrated *for the first time* and not because there were certain new elements being introduced. It follows from the next sentence that the main content of the festival, which Socrates so admired and which was obviously the main objective of his trip (327 a 3), was the processions of Thracians and Athenians (*viz.* the Thracian and citizen worshippers of Bendis) – they were thus inaugurated on the dramatic date of the dialogue. We can therefore dispense with the notion that the festival had already existed in some form prior. Socrates' surprised reply upon Adeimantus' mention of the horse-torch race in the evening *καίνόν γε τοῦτο* (328 a 3) was taken by Mommsen and other scholars as a sign that only this part of the festival was new.<sup>105</sup> But Mommsen does not cite the earlier sentence (327 a 2), which clearly indicates that the main content of the festival, the processions, were also being introduced for the first time when Socrates attended the *Bendideia*. Socrates does not therefore oppose the horse-torch

---

<sup>101</sup> Bingen 1959, 35–37.

<sup>102</sup> Parker 1996, 172 n. 68.

<sup>103</sup> See Planeaux 2000/2001, 184.

<sup>104</sup> See Deubner 1932/1966, 220.

<sup>105</sup> See also Schindel 1967, 42–43, who concurs with Bingen's 413/2 date for the inscription and who is prepared to regard this as the dramatic date of the *Republic* (he admits that the presence of Cephalus at such a late date is an anachronism, but finds this typical of Plato). He must attribute to Socrates' words earlier in the conversation – *ἄτε νῦν πρῶτον ἄγοντες* (327 a 1–3) – the sense that they are about introduction of the *modified* form of the festival and thus contrary to their apparent meaning.

race and pannychis as new additions to the procession and the sacrifice accompanied by prayer; instead he notes the novelty of the torch-race on horseback, as a kind of competition, which had in fact rarely been staged.<sup>106</sup>

Hence Plato gives no support for the view that there was any introduction of new elements to the festival; he depicts the festival as being inaugurated with two processions, the sacrifice, the horse torch race and the pannychis.<sup>107</sup> But Planeaux did not prove conclusively that the festival in honor of Bendis was inaugurated around 429 BC; it is possible that this inauguration occurred later than Bendis becoming the state divinity circa 429 BC.<sup>108</sup> At this point it is time to bring in more epigraphic evidence for the introduction of Bendis, namely the decree of the orgeones of Bendis in Piraeus edited in the archonship of Polystratus (240/39 BC),<sup>109</sup> which regulates their relations with the Athenian orgeones of the same goddess, who now wish to erect the temple of Bendis in Athens (*IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1283 = Sokolowski, *LSCG* 46). The decree mentions the earlier privileges granted by the Athenian people to the Thracians (the only foreigners granted such privileges, ll. 4 f.)<sup>110</sup> and entailing the right to landed property (ἔγκτησις) and to build the ἱερόν (according to the response of Dodona's oracle) and the right to stage a procession from Prytaneion to Piraeus. There is no doubt that the landed property and the right to build the shrine were granted before 429 BC (the shrine itself already existed by this date), but the word order in this sentence leaves uncertain whether the procession (and the festival along with it) was inaugurated at the same time, and likewise according to the oracle, or whether this happened later and under other circumstances; it is further mentioned in the decree that the right and duty to hold the procession from the Prytaneion to Piraeus was granted in accordance with *the law of the state* (ll. 10 f.); this law could have been made at the time when the oracle's response was received as well as somewhat later.

As already indicated, the earlier badly damaged decree or decrees (*IG* I<sup>3</sup> 136 = *LSS* 6) mention the procession, the pannychis, the statue of the goddess and the sacrifice; the oracle is mentioned in l. 17, but it is unclear

<sup>106</sup> See Ferguson 1944, 97 (a Thracian innovation); Planeaux 2000/2001, 174 n. 30.

<sup>107</sup> I agree here entirely with Planeaux 2000/2001, 178 (cf. 173 f.), whose argument is however slightly different. Kloppenborg, Ascough 2011, 128, agree that Plato describes the inauguration of the festival, but believe “that Plato's suggestion in *Resp.* 327AB... that the *Bendideia* was a new introduction ca. 411 BCE is a mistake”, thus taking 411 BC as the indisputable dramatic date of the *Republic*.

<sup>108</sup> For instance see Mikalson 1998, 149: “in the *Republic* the festival, not the cult is new”.

<sup>109</sup> For the debatable date of Polystratus see Osborne 2009, 96–98.

<sup>110</sup> On the difficulties of μόνοις see Planeaux 2000/2001, 171; Kloppenborg, Ascough 2011, 24 f.

whether it gives the same response as in *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1283*. The ἔγκτησις and the ἱερόν do not appear in the *IG I<sup>3</sup> 136*; it can thus be supposed that they were granted at an earlier date than the pannychis, the procession and other parts of the ceremony mentioned in this inscription, and that the festival was inaugurated later than 429 BC.

Planeaux's arguments thus far are not conclusive and there is no certainty that the festival in honor of Bendis depicted in the introductory scene of the *Republic* was in fact inaugurated around 429 BC. There are nevertheless certain considerations in favor of this date, which follows both from the history of the cult of Bendis and from details of the dialogue. In general, as many scholars admit, the date of ca. 429 BC for inauguration of the *Bendideia* is more plausible than 411 or so. It would have been strange had the Athenians *not* held the spectacular processions of Thracian and Athenian citizenry in honor of a foreign goddess immediately upon establishing her cult – when Athens had great hopes for Thracian assistance – but at some later date when these hopes had already evaporated.<sup>111</sup> It is of course also uncertain whether the oracular response from Dodona mentioned in the 260 BC decree (*IG II<sup>2</sup> 1283*) with regard to the granting of land and the right to build a shrine is the same one as mentioned in the mutilated text of the fifth-century decree, *IG I<sup>3</sup> 136* (it seems that the latter is related rather to selection of priests for the new cult); there could thus be several oracular responses pertaining to establishment of the cult of Bendis. Nevertheless, the series of responses so close in time to each other during establishment of the cult is a more plausible scenario than that wherein they would be separated by sixteen years or so; moreover the decree of the fifth century (*IG I<sup>3</sup> 136*) was not solely related to inauguration of the festival, as proponents of its later date hold, but to regulations pertaining to the cult itself – which also favors the view that the festival was established close to 429 BC, the date of the acceptance of Bendis as the state goddess.<sup>112</sup>

---

<sup>111</sup> Moors 1987, 10 with n. 22 adduces grounds for the implausibility of the festival's inauguration about 411/10 BC; but he also finds that it might well have been introduced in the late 420ies, before the Peace of Nicias.

<sup>112</sup> Sokolowski 1962, 22, in considering both views – that the inscription refers to the founding of the new cult rather than accretions to it – notes that the prescriptions concerning the religious ceremonies and the priesthood suggest that we have here the founding of the cult. He also believes that the later inscription, which mentioned the privileges of Bendis' worshippers, referred solely to the decree of the *IG I<sup>3</sup> 136*; see also Lupu 2009, 82: "The battered Athenian decree on the cult of Bendis, *LSS 6 (IG I<sup>3</sup> 136; 413/2?)*, has been interpreted as just such a case [introducing a new cult] or, alternately, as intending to bolster an already existing cult. As far as this can be judged, the various aspects of the cult herein mentioned are consistent with foundational documents. But the date, if it is correct, is too late for this".

Hence there are certain reasons for preferring the date of ca. 429 BC rather than that of circa 410 BC. It should be added that the arguments in favor of the latter date in large measure depend on Boeckh's dramatic date for the *Republic*, whereas the arguments in favor of the former are independent of it.

Now to the dramatic date of the *Republic* itself. First of all the one great advantage in defining the dramatic date of the *Republic* as early as circa 429 BC is that it abandons the anachronism of Cephalus partaking in the conversation since he was certainly dead by 411 and in all probability much earlier. Further, Socrates' conversation with Cephalus as a man who is much older than himself accords more with a circa 429 date, when Socrates was some forty years old, than does a date of 411 when he was closer to sixty.<sup>113</sup> Moreover, Cephalus refers to the people with whom Socrates usually holds philosophical talks as νεανίσκοι (328 d 5), apparently including Polemarchus, who was born earlier than Lysias.<sup>114</sup> If Lysias' 459 BC date of birth, as according to tradition, is correct, as I argued, νεανίσκος would be much a more appropriate word for Polemarchus in 429 BC than after 411 BC.

Charmantides of Paeania, who is mentioned only once and is present as a *persona muta*, was certainly member of a propertied family that sustained its wealth over several generations in the fifth and fourth centuries BC.<sup>115</sup> He is relevant for the dramatic date, because he can be identified with a treasurer of Athena of 427/6 (*PA* 15501) rather than with his homonymous grandson (*PA* 15502), who would not have been able to take part in the conversation even had it been held as

---

<sup>113</sup> Boeckh 1838/1874, 440 argued that Socrates, though depicted as younger than Cephalus, might have easily been a man in his early sixties, but at 328 e 2–3 he distinguishes himself not only from *very* old persons, but those who are simply considered old.

<sup>114</sup> ὦ Σώκρατες, οὐδὲ θαμίξεις ἡμῖν καταβαίνων εἰς τὸν Πειραιᾶ. χρῆν μέντοι. εἰ μὲν γὰρ ἐγὼ ἔτι ἐν δυνάμει ἢ τοῦ ῥαδίως πορεύεσθαι πρὸς τὸ ἄστυ, οὐδὲν ἂν σὲ ἔδει δεῦρο ἰέναι, ἀλλ' ἡμεῖς ἂν παρὰ σὲ ἦμεν· νῦν δὲ σε χρὴ πυκνότερον δεῦρο ἰέναι. ... μὴ οὖν ἄλλως ποιεῖ, ἀλλὰ τοῖσδέ τε τοῖς νεανίσκοις σύνισθι καὶ δεῦρο παρ' ἡμᾶς φοῖτα ὡς παρὰ φίλους τε καὶ πάνυ οικείους. Boeckh 1840/1874, 475 f., argued against Hermann that Cephalus with παρ' ἡμᾶς sets himself together with his sons as residents of Piraeus in opposition to the young men who are the residents of Athens; but Hermann was right that νεανίσκοι includes Polemarchus: παρ' ἡμᾶς refers to Cephalus alone as ἡμεῖς in 328 d 1 does, because it is opposed not to the residents of Athens, but to those, who, in contrast to Cephalus, are able to share Socrates' company in Athens. We are not in a position to determine, who exactly of those who are present are regarded as this regular company of Socrates, but Polemarchus was certainly one of them.

<sup>115</sup> Davies 1971, 573 f.

late as 410 BC.<sup>116</sup> Socrates met him not at the festival itself as one of Polemarchus' companions, but only in Cephalus' house, and there is no hint at his age, but he could be a member of approximately the same generation as Polemarchus and Lysias, viz. born (by traditional dating) about 460 BC.<sup>117</sup>

Niceratus, son of Nicias, could not have been born later than 439 BC (he was trierarch at Samos in 409 BC) and should have been born earlier than this date. Nails assigns his date of birth to the period from 445 to 439,<sup>118</sup> but he might have been even older, since Xenophon in the *Symposium* depicts him as recently wed (2. 3; 8. 3),<sup>119</sup> the dramatic date of the *Symposium* is 422. He thus could easily have been born ca. 445 BC though no later (his father, the famous Nicias, was born no later than 475 BC) and could therefore have been present as a *persona muta* in the conversation on the dramatic date of 429 BC.

But does this mean that the dramatic date of 429 BC is thus established beyond a doubt? Relying on both the results of Planeaux's paper and on some other arguments, Lampert recently made a case for the dramatic date of the *Republic* as 429 BC;<sup>120</sup> but he does not take in account all difficulties, and it would be unfair to the ghost of Boeckh to dismiss them.

One of the difficulties with 429 BC is the age of Plato's mother Perictione. She was certainly the mother of both Adeimantus and Glaucon, as Boeckh rightly maintained, Glaucon bearing the name of Perictione's father Glaucon; and in *Parm.* 126 b 1, Antiphon, Perictione's son by Ppyrilampes, is said to have the same mother as both Adeimantus and Glaucon. If the two of them were born about 450, then Perictione should have been born 468 at the latest. After Ariston's death (no earlier than 427, since Plato was born in 428/7), Perictione married Ppyrilampes (who was

---

<sup>116</sup> Lewis 1955, 19; Thompson 1965, 148–156; Develin 1989, 125.

<sup>117</sup> There is no reason to date his birth ca. 500 BC, as Nails 2002, 89, does. If his grandson was active about 365 BC, he himself could have been born about 460 BC. The *tamiai* of Athena were elected from the *pentakosiomedimnoi* by lot, and Charmantides could have been rather young at the time of his service.

<sup>118</sup> Nails 2002, 211.

<sup>119</sup> Nails supposes that Xenophon is anachronistic on this point, but it follows only from her presupposing a date of birth for Niceratus that is a bit too early. Having maintained the date of birth of his grandson, Niceratus II, as 389/8 (p. 29), Lewis 1955 pointed out that his father Nicias II, son of our Niceratus, should have them married very early (he was born about 413 BC), and he surmised that early marriages were typical of this family (p. 30, see further Davies 1971, 406, who supposes that Nicias II married one or two years before 390 BC). It is thus possible that Niceratus really married in 422 BC, approximately at the same age as his son.

<sup>120</sup> Lampert 2010, 405–409. He accepts "low" chronology for Lysias and supposes that he left Athens for Thurii in 429 BC.

53 in 427) and they had a son Antiphon who was thus not born earlier than 426. Perictione would therefore have been more than forty when she gave birth to Antiphon. This is not entirely impossible.<sup>121</sup>

The age of Adeimantus and Glaucon was (along with the date of Lysias' return to Athens) Boeckh's main defense of 411 BC as the dramatic date.<sup>122</sup> A part of his argument is flawed, for Boeckh relied on the version that Plato was the oldest of three brothers (Suda),<sup>123</sup> which cannot be true,<sup>124</sup> since it is clear from the *Apology* 34 a, that Adeimantus was older than Plato – at the trial of Socrates he is depicted as a person who might persecute Socrates *loco parentis* if his teaching were harmful to his brother Plato; Plato was born in 428/7 or 427/6 BC.<sup>125</sup> Davies places Adeimantus' birth in the year 430 at earliest and admits that he might indeed have been five years older;<sup>126</sup> but he could in fact have been even older and might have been born about 450 BC.

But the main difficulty with the early dramatic date is Glaucon. According to Xen. *Mem.* 3. 6. 1, when Glaucon was less than twenty years old, he was dissuaded from the *προστατεῦειν τῆς πόλεως* by Socrates who was well disposed toward him personally and also “because of

<sup>121</sup> Cf. Lampert 2010, 408 f.

<sup>122</sup> Zeller 1873/1910, 125, said in defense of Boeckh's date that if we with Hermann admit 429 BC as the dramatic date, Adeimantus and Glaucon could be not Plato's brothers, but their homonymous relatives.

<sup>123</sup> Boeckh 1838/1874, 438 f.

<sup>124</sup> It is usually supposed that Suda's version appeared in relation to the story that Perictione conceived Plato from Apollo before her marriage.

<sup>125</sup> Apollodorus' date for Plato's birth, 428/7 BC (see D. L. 9. 2–3 with Hipp. *Ref.* 1.8.13, *FGrHist* F 37) corresponds to the indication of Hermodorus, Plato's pupil (D. L. 9. 6 with 2. 106), that Plato left Athens for Megara when he was 28 and after Socrates' death in 399; Hermodorus might rather seem to imply 427/6 for Plato's birth, but this does not undermine the credibility of Apollodorus (discrepancies of one year are usual in the transmission from one text to another; see Jacoby 1902, 285); Jacoby 1902, 304–312 leaves the question open as to whether 428/7 or 427/6 is right. In fact Hermodorus' evidence might imply the same date as Apollodorus: if Plato was born in Thargelion in 428/7, he was still 28 years old at the time of Socrates' death in Anthesterion or Elaphebolion of 399 BC (for the date see Jacoby 1902, 285 with n. 3). Nails 2002, 243–247, casts doubt on Apollodorus' date and argues in favor of Plato's birth being in 424/3, but her main argument – that Plato did not take part in the battles at Arginusae in 406 and at Aegospotami in 405 (after the age of twenty the Athenians were liable for military service abroad) – carries little conviction: he might have been somewhere else; moreover, the sole report we have of Plato taking part in military expeditions (Aristoxenus ap. D. L. 3. 8) is chronologically absurd, as Nails herself admits, and thus hardly material for the *argumentum e silentio*.

<sup>126</sup> Davies 1971, 332.

Charmides (Glaucón's uncle) and Plato".<sup>127</sup> This implies that Glaucón was younger than Plato because Plato became Socrates' pupil at the age of twenty, according to D. L. 9. 6.<sup>128</sup> Xenophon's note might not be correct, as some scholars have suspected.<sup>129</sup> But Xenophon's words are simply not sufficiently exact to yield any chronological inferences: Xenophon only says that Socrates was well-disposed toward Glaucón because of Charmides and Plato – but although this might well have meant that his relationship to them impelled him to dissuade Glaucón, it could also simply point to an important concomitant circumstance – the long term Socrates' kindly feeling to Glaucón. In this case Xenophon simply summarily adduces the reasons for this feeling, the friendship with Charmides and Plato, and taking no heed of just when Socrates' relations with both actually began.<sup>130</sup>

I would thus cautiously endorse the notion that Plato's brothers were about twenty years older than he and that the setting the conversation in the *Republic* in 430–429 BC (probable date of the inauguration of the *Bendideia* and the *terminus circa quem* for Cephalus' death) entails no important anachronism.<sup>131</sup>

Alexander Verlinsky  
*State University of St. Petersburg;*  
*Bibliotheca Classica Petropolitana*  
 verlinsky@mail.ru

---

<sup>127</sup> Γλαύκωνα δὲ τὸν Ἀρίστωνος, ὅτ' ἐπεχείρει δημηγορεῖν, ἐπιθυμῶν προστατεύειν τῆς πόλεως οὐδέπω εἴκοσιν ἔτη γεγονώς, τῶν ἄλλων οἰκειῶν τε καὶ φίλων οὐδεὶς ἐδύνατο παύσαι ἐλκόμενόν τε ἀπὸ τοῦ βήματος καὶ καταγέλαστον ὄντα· Σωκράτης δέ, εὖνους ὦν αὐτῷ διὰ τε Χαρμίδην τὸν Γλαύκωνος καὶ διὰ Πλάτωνα, μόνος ἔπαυσεν.

<sup>128</sup> Boeckh 1838/1874, 439; Kirchner 1901, I, 199, 3088; Moors 1987, 13 f.

<sup>129</sup> Burnet 1914/1950, 207.

<sup>130</sup> Glaucón, the participant of the frame conversation in the *Symposium* who was 'a boy' (173 e) in 416 BC, the date of Agathon's first victory at the Lenaea, is often considered as Plato's brother (for instance, Moors 1985, 14 f., but see contra Lampert 2010, 411). Yet he is depicted as being distant from Socrates during the frame conversation of the dialogue, which takes place short before Socrates' death, and this contradicts not only the *Republic* where he is Socrates' younger friend, but, more importantly, Xenophon who tells that Socrates was well disposed to Glaucón and talked with him.

<sup>131</sup> The date of the Battle of Megara, which made the sons of Ariston famous, cannot be a certain indication, because Athens was often in conflict with its neighbour. On Boeckh's dramatic date, 411/410 BC, the only plausible one is that of summer 409 (or 410) BC at Megarian Kerata; Burnet, 1914/1950, 207 proposed that of 424 BC. I suppose it could be some battle during the invasion of Megarid by Athenians in the summer of 431: the invasions repeated every year after that, but the number of Athenian troops participating in that summer was enormous (Thuc. 2. 31).

## Bibliography

- J. Adam, *The Republic of Plato, Edited with Critical Notes, Commentary and Appendices*. Vols. I–II, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. With an Introduction by D. A. Rees (Cambridge 1963, 1902).
- A. Andrewes, “The Opposition to Perikles”, *JHS* 98 (1978) 1–8.
- E. Badian, *The Foreign Clientelae* (Oxford 1958).
- J. Bingen, “Le décret SEG X 64 (Le Pirée 413/2?)”, *Revue belge de philologie et d’histoire* 37 (1959) 31–44.
- F. Blass, *Die Attische Beredsamkeit von Gorgias bis zu Lysias* (Leipzig 1868).
- F. Blass, [Rev.:] Seeliger, *Jenaer Literaturzeitung* 1874, 730.
- F. Blass, *Die Attische Beredsamkeit* I<sup>3</sup> (Leipzig 1887).
- A. Boeckh, “De tempore quo Plato *Rempublicam* peroratam finxerit, dissertatio I” (1838), in: idem, *Gesammelte kleine Schriften* IV (Berlin 1874) 437–449.
- A. Boeckh, “De tempore quo Plato *Rempublicam* peroratam finxerit, commentatio II” (1839), in: idem, *Gesammelte kleine Schriften* IV (Berlin 1874) 450–470.
- A. Boeckh, “De tempore quo Plato *Rempublicam* peroratam finxerit, commentatio III” (1840), in: idem, *Gesammelte kleine Schriften* IV (Berlin 1874) 474–492.
- E. Bortwick, “Two Emotional Climaxes in Lysias’ Against Eratosthenes”, *CW* 84 (1990) 44–46.
- P. Brunt, *Studies in Greek History* (Oxford 1993).
- J. Burnet, *Greek Philosophy: Phales to Plato* (London 1950 = 1914).
- G. Busolt, *Griechische Geschichte* I. 1 (Gotha 1897).
- J. K. Davies, *Athenian Propertied Families 600–300 BC* (Oxford 1971).
- L. Deubner, *Attische Feste*. 2. durchges. und erw. Aufl. von B. Doer (Berlin 1966; 1932).
- R. Develin, *Athenian Officials 684–321 BC* (Cambridge 1989).
- W. Dittenberger, K. Purgold, *Inschriften von Olympia* (Berlin 1896).
- K. J. Dover, *Lysias and the Corpus Lysiicum* (Berkeley – Los Angeles 1968).
- V. Ehrenberg, “The Foundation of Thurii”, *AJP* 69 (1948) 149–170.
- W. S. Ferguson, “The Attic Orgeones”, *HThR* 37 (1944) i–iv, 61–140.
- W. S. Ferguson, “Orgeonika”, in: *Commemorative Studies in Honor of T. L. Shear*, *Hesperia*. Suppl. 8 (1948) 130–162.
- A. J. Graham, *Colony and Mother City in Ancient Greece* (New York 1964).
- H. Heftner, “Die pseudo-andokideische Rede ‘Gegen Alkibiades’ ([And.] 4) – ein authentischer Beitrag zu einer Ostrakophoriedebatte des Jahres 415 v. Chr.?” , *Philologus* 145 (2001) 39–56.
- K. F. Hermann, [Rez.:] G. Stallbaum, *Platonis Dialogos selectos ...* vol. III, Sect. I und II, *Allgemeine Schulzeitung* 1831, Abt. 2, nr. 81–82, Sp. 641–656.
- K. F. Hermann, *Disputatio de Reipublicae platonicae temporibus* (Marburg 1839).
- K. F. Hermann, “Die Rede des Lysias in Plato’s *Phädrus*”, in: idem, *Gesammelte Abhandlungen und Beiträge* (Göttingen 1849) 1–21.
- K. F. Hermann, *Lehrbuch der griechischen Antiquitäten*. Tl. 2. Hg. von K. B. Stark (Heidelberg 1858).

- R. Hirzel, *Dialog I* (Leipzig 1895).
- S. Hornblower, *Commentary on Thucydides I* (Oxford 1981).
- B. Huß, *Xenophons Symposium: Ein Kommentar*, Beiträge zur Altertumskunde 125 (Stuttgart – Leipzig 1999).
- F. Jacoby, *Apollodoros Chronik*, Philologische Untersuchungen 16 (Berlin 1902).
- B. Jowett, L. Campbell (eds.), *Plato's Republic, The Greek Text Edited, with Notes and Essays: Vol. II. Essays* (Oxford 1894).
- D. Kagan, *The Outbreak of the Peloponnesian War* (Ithaca – New York 1969).
- K. A. Kapparis, *Apollodoros' 'Against Neaira' [D. 59]* (Berlin – New York 1999).
- A. Kirchhoff, "Bemerkungen zu den Urkunden der Schatzmeister 'der anderen Götter'", *Abhandlungen der Königlich Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin, Philol. und hist. Abhandl. 1864* (Berlin 1865) 1–56.
- J. Kirchner, *Prosopographia Attica [PA] I–II* (Berlin 1901–1903).
- J. S. Kloppenborg, R. S. Ascough (eds.), *Greco-Roman Associations: Texts, Translations, and Commentary. Volume I: Attica, Central Greece, Macedonia, Thrace* (Berlin – New York 2011).
- D. Lewis, "Notes on Attic Inscriptions (II): XXIII. Who Was Lysistrata?", *ABSA* 50 (1955) 1–36.
- L. Lampert, *How Philosophy Became Socratic* (Chicago 2010).
- R. Laqueur, "Timaios (3)", *RE* 6A 1 (1936) 1076–1203.
- E. Lupu, *Greek Sacred Law: A Collection of New Documents (NGSL)*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. with a Postscript (Leiden 2009).
- B. D. Meritt, H. T. Wade-Gery, M. F. McGregor, *The Athenian Tribute Lists III* (Princeton, NJ, 1950).
- J. D. Mikalson, *Religion in Hellenistic Athens* (Berkeley etc. 1998).
- A. Mommsen, *Heortologie: antiquarische Untersuchungen über die städtischen Feste der Athener* (Leipzig 1864).
- A. Mommsen, *Feste der Stadt Athen im Altertum* (Leipzig 1898).
- K. Moors, "The Argument against a Dramatic Date for Plato's *Republic*", *Polis* 7 (1987) 6–31.
- D. Nails, *The People of Plato: A Prosopography of Plato and Other Socratics* (Indianapolis–Cambridge 2002).
- M. P. Nilsson, "Bendis in Athen", in: *From the Collections of the Ny Carlsberg Glyptothek III* (1942) 169–188 = *Opuscula Selecta III* (1960) 55–80 (pages according to the re-edition).
- M. P. Nilsson, *Cults, Myths, Oracles, and Politics in Ancient Greece* (Lund 1951).
- M. P. Nilsson, *Geschichte der griechischen Religion I<sup>2</sup>* (München 1955).
- E. Obst, "Lampon," *RE* 12. 1 (1924) 580–581.
- M. J. Osborne, "The Archons of Athens 300/299–228/7", *ZPE* 171 (2009) 83–99.
- R. Pappritz, *Thurii, seine Entstehung und seine Entwicklung*. Diss. (Berlin 1891).
- R. Parker, *Athenian Religion* (Oxford 1996).
- C. Planeaux, "The Date of Bendis' Entry into Attica", *CJ* 96 (2000/2001) 165–192.
- M. Plobst, "Lysias (13)", *RE* 13. 2 (1927) 2533–2543.
- U. Schindel, "Untersuchungen zur Biographie des Redners Lysias", *RhM* 110 (1967) 32–52.

- F. C. Seeliger, *De Dionysio Halicarnassensi Plutarchi qui vulgo fertur in vitis decem oratorum auctore*. Diss. (Leipzig 1874).
- A. W. Sherwin-White, *Roman Citizenship* (Oxford<sup>2</sup> 1973).
- F. Sokolowski, *Lois sacrées des cités grecques. Supplement [LSS]* (Paris 1962).
- F. Sokolowski, *Lois sacrées des cités grecques [LSCG]* (Paris 1969).
- G. Stallbaum, *Platonis dialogos selectos recensuit et commentariis in usum scholarum instruxit, vol. III sect. I continens Politeiae libr. I–V* (Gotha–Erfurt 1825 [<sup>2</sup>1858]).
- H. Swoboda, “Dorieus”, *RE* 5 (1905) 1560–1561.
- A. E. Taylor, *A commentary on Plato’s Timaeus* (Oxford 1928).
- A. E. Taylor, *Plato: The Man and His Work* (London 1960 = <sup>4</sup>1937 [<sup>1</sup>1926]).
- W. E. Thompson, “Prosopographical Notes on Athenian Treasurers”, *Hesperia* 34 (1965) 148–156.
- S. C. Todd, *A Commentary on Lysias, Speeches 1–11* (Oxford – New York 2007).
- H. Van Gelder, *Geschichte der alten Rhodier* (Haag 1900).
- Fr. Vater, “Rerum Andocidearum pars II”, *JbbPhilPädag*, Suppl. 9 [= *Archiv für Philologie und Pädagogik*] (1843) 165–223.
- S. A. White, “Thrasymachus the Diplomat”, *CP* 90 (1995) 307–327.
- Fr. C. Wolff, *Republik oder Unterredung vom Gerechten*. Tl. I (Altona 1799).
- H. Yunis, “Thrasymachus B1: Discord, Not Diplomacy”, *CPh* 92 (1997) 58–66.
- E. Zeller, “Über die Anachronismen in den platonischen Gesprächen [1873]”, in: idem, *Kleine Schriften* I (Berlin 1910) 115–135.

In the first part of the paper the author argues that Lysias’ biographic dates as according to ancient tradition (Dion. Hal. *Orat. vet. Lys.* p. 8. 5 ff. Us.–R.; Ps.–Plut. Vit. X or. 835 c) – birth in 459/8 BC and the departure for Thurii in 444/3 – which are regarded as untrustworthy by the vast majority of scholars – are indeed reliable. The author argues that the note of Ps.–Plut. that Lysias’ father Cephalus died before this departure, which provoked various revisions of Lysias’ chronology, is itself a mistake. Cephalus’ arrival in Athens cannot be dated much earlier than 460 BC, because he was invited to Athens by Pericles, nor much later than this date, because Lysias had already been born in Athens; since Cephalus lived in Athens for thirty years (Lys. 12. 4), he accordingly died around 430 BC.

In the second part of the paper the author readdresses the related subject of the dramatic date of Plato’s *Republic*. The participation of Cephalus at a very advanced age in the introductory talk thus implies a dramatic date sometime around 430 BC, as according to the proposal of K. F. Hermann, nowadays entirely forgotten after its refutation by A. Boeckh who pleaded for a date of 411/10 BC. An additional argument for the ca. 430 date is provided by the initial celebration of the festival in honor of the Thracian goddess Bendis, during which the conversation takes place. The most plausible date for the inauguration of this festival is ca. 430 BC for the following reasons: Bendis became the state divinity no later than 429 BC; the decree that regulates the worship of Bendis (*IG* I<sup>3</sup> 136) and mentions the pannychis and the procession, which also feature in the *Republic*, should be certainly dated

after 431 BC, the outbreak of the Peloponnesian War; contrary to attempts to date the decree 413 BC – based in part on the alleged later dramatic date of the *Republic* and in part on the assumption that the decree concerns the expanded form of the festival and not its initial introduction – there are considerable reasons in favor of the date ca. 430 BC: Socrates' words in the *Republic* unambiguously show (1) that he was present at inauguration of the festival and (2) that the procession and the pannychis were already in place; accordingly there is no reason to suppose any later accretions to the festival, as C. Planeaux rightly argued. It is further implausible that the celebration was inaugurated much later than Bendis becoming the state divinity, i.e. than 429 BC; moreover, friendly relations with Thrace were important for Athens in the late 430s and early 420s – but not in the 410s. Contrary to the opinion of A. Boeckh and many scholars after him, the various ages of the dramatis personae of the *Republic* do not contradict the circa 430 date, provided one admits that Plato's brothers Adeimantus and Glaucon were some twenty years older than he (i.e. were born about 450 BC).

В первой части статьи доказывается, что биографические даты Лисия, сообщаемые античной традицией (Dion. Hal. *Orat. vet. Lys.* p. 8. 5 ff. Us.–R.; Ps.-Plut. *Vit. X or.* 835 c) – рождение в 459/8 г.; отъезд из Афин во вновь основанные Фурии в 444/3 г., – заслуживают доверия, вопреки практически единодушному взгляду современных ученых; напротив, указание Псевдо-Плутарха, что Кефал, отец Лисия, умер до его отъезда, которое и вызвало различные варианты пересмотра хронологии Лисия, представляет собой ошибку. Приезду Кефала в Афины нельзя датировать намного ранее 460 г., так как он был приглашен в Афины Периклом, и намного позднее этой даты, так как Лисий родился уже в Афинах; его смерть, соответственно датируется примерно 430 г., так как Кефал прожил в Афинах тридцать лет (*Lys.* 12. 4).

Во второй части рассматривается связанный с первым вопрос о драматической дате платоновского *Государства*: участие Кефала, находящегося в преклонном возрасте, во вступительной беседе предполагает драматическую дату незадолго до 430 г., в соответствии с предположением К. Ф. Хермана, которое было отвергнуто и забыто после критики А. Бека, доказывавшего, что драматическая дата диалога – 411/10 г. Дополнительным доводом в пользу 430 г. служит впервые устраиваемое празднество в честь фракийской богини Бендиды, во время которого происходит беседа в *Государстве*. Наиболее правдоподобная дата для учреждения этого праздника – около 430 г.: Бендида вошла в число государственных божеств не позднее 429 г.; постановление народного собрания (*JG* I<sup>3</sup> 136), определяющее детали культа, в котором упоминаются *παῦνοχίς* и процессия, фигурирующие также в *Государстве*, относится несомненно ко времени после 431 г., после начала Пелопоннесской войны; вопреки попыткам датировать этот документ 413 г., основанным отчасти на поздней драматической дате *Государства* (ок. 411 г.), а отчасти на предположении, что постановление относится не к учреждению праздника как такового, но к его расширенной форме, есть основания датировать его примерно 430 г.: слова Сократа отчетливо показывают, (1) что он

присутствовал на первом праздновании и (2) что процессия и *παννυχίς* были частью уже первоначального праздника. Таким образом (как верно констатировал К. Пфане), нет оснований предполагать какое-либо позднее расширение программы праздника, и весьма вероятно, что постановление относится к его первоначальному учреждению. Невероятно, далее, что само это учреждение произошло много позднее, чем превращение Бендиды в государственное божество (не позднее 429 г.); кроме того, дружественные отношения с Фракией были важны для Афин в конце 430-х – начале 420-х гг., но не в 410-е гг. Возраст участников беседы в *Государстве*, вопреки мнению Бека и его последователей, не противоречит драматической дате около 430–429 гг., если допустить, что братья Платона, Адимант и Главкон, были примерно на 20 лет старше его, т. е. родились ок. 450 г.