In a recent paper at the Melbourne Conference of the Australian Society for Classical Studies in February 1985 Douglas Kelly of the Australian National University advanced a fascinating theory about the purpose underlying the composition of Xenophon's *Hellenica*. In this he strove to account for the strongly personal tone recent translators and some commentators have noted in Xenophon's narrative as embodying his side of an early fourth century phase of historical and political polemic whose rival positions appear to have perished.

To Kelly, very significant of this situation was Xenophon's tendency to introduce digressions full of matter extraneous to the main narrative he had in hand. Particularly striking to Kelly's mind was the extended reference, which we find in Book VII, to the resolute behaviour of the Phliasians in time of crisis. Also symptomatic was the important role which Xenophon gives to his friend the Phliasian leader Procles, and the great weight our author attaches to this man's speeches at Athens in Book VI and in Book VII. It is Kelly's view that Xenophon's preference for treating those topics, regarding which alone he had the evidence from personal autopsy, which Cawkwell stresses, is an incomplete and inadequate explanation for the cavalier neglect of many important items in the historical era covered by the *Hellenica*. To prove this point Kelly shows that the omission of vital information is as striking in Xenophon's account of the campaign of Agesilaus, on which he was personally present, as in other narratives where he could not have been an eyewitness. To Kelly these omissions all share one common explanation; they were not controversial, but are common ground accepted by all historians, whether pro-Athenian, pro-Spartan or pro-Theban. Nineteenth century scholarship divided the publication of the *Hellenica* into three phases. First, Book I, and either all of II or as far as II, iii, 10, where the annalistic method is abandoned, were written to complete the unfinished work of Thucydides which Xenophon presumably published with his own additions before leaving to join Cyrus in Asia in 401. On the view of Rosenstiel supported by the linguistic studies of Underhill it was assumed that

3. Discussed also Cawkwell pp.43-4: *Hellenica* VII.ii–iii.
Books III–V.i.36 were published at Scillus before 373 B.C., and that the rest of the work was completed and published at Corinth at about 357 B.C.\textsuperscript{8} With this view Cawkwell is in total disagreement, seeing everything after II, iii, 10 as written in Corinth late in life after the \textit{Agesilaus} was completed in 359 B.C.\textsuperscript{9} But on either view the section after II, iii, 10 must be late enough to have been composed against a background of other work — now lost — by Theopompus, Ephorus, Philistus and the Oxyrhynchus historian as well as the writings of the oligarchical Athenian constitutional expert Androtion.\textsuperscript{10}

As Cawkwell emphasises, Xenophon writes from experience and about his friends' achievements rather than from analysis of sources.\textsuperscript{11} Kelly's idea however, does seem consistent with the view that Xenophon wrote I–II,iii,10 before 394, while Theopompus and Cratippus carried their continuations of Thucydides down to 394 and must have written later than that date.\textsuperscript{12} Moreover, the nineteenth century view that Xenophon published Thucydides' work must be held most improbable, despite suggestions in later sources.\textsuperscript{13} Certainly the material of \textit{Hellenica} III–IV,iii could be designed as in part a 	extit{riposte} to the two other historian's coverage of the period to 394 B.C., as Kelly suggests.

But Kelly's view could have major implications for the study of the philosophy of the era as well as its political history, and that issue is the main point of this paper.

After the King's Peace of 386 Xenophon settled on his estates at Scillus just outside Olympia, lands probably granted to him at some stage after the battle of Coronea in 394 through the good offices of Agesilaus.\textsuperscript{14} From the tone of his account of Procles' role in the troubles at Phlius in 384 it seems that this friend of Agesilaus had also for some time been a friend of Xenophon.\textsuperscript{15} Thus our writer is likely to have been in constant contact with philo-Laconian Phliasians from 394 onwards. If the Phliasian internal politics and military exploits helped mould his treatment of the history of his times,\textsuperscript{16} did Phliasian influence also affect Xenophon's philosophical writings? If so, we have a possible explanation for some of the oddities evident in the \textit{Phaedo}, particularly once we assume that the world of post-Socratic philosophical writing was as polemical as that in historical circles seems to have become. Does such a
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hypothesis shed any light on why Plato elected to make Echecrates of Phlius the interlocutor of his Phaedo dialogue; and Phaedon of Elis, Xenophon’s relatively near neighbour only twenty miles away, serve as the narrator of the dialogue which occurred on the last day of Socrates’ life? The possibility at least deserves examination.

From Diogenes Laertius we know that the Pythagoreans of Phlius had some significance at the end of the fifth century and into the early years of the fourth, quite apart from the fact that Plato makes one of their number, Echecrates, the auditor of his Phaedo. ‘For they were the last of the Pythagoreans, whom Aristoxenus also knew — Xenophilus the Chalcidian from Thrace and Phanton the Phliasian and Echecrates and Diodes and Polymnastus — all also Phliasians. They were pupils of Philolaus and of Eurytus of Tarentum.’

Whether the Phliasians influenced the position of Xenophon or not, it is likely that the influence of their Tarentine teacher and the generally elitist politics of the school would have made these particular Pythagoreans part of that pro-Spartan faction in Phlius to which Xenophon’s friend Procles belonged. The importance of the Theban Pythagoreans trained by Philolaus like Simmias and Cebes in the Phaedo of Plato should not lead us to the conclusion that all Pythagoreans in this era were pro-Theban simply because the Theban leader Epaminondas was also a Pythagorean. That there was a controversy among the surviving Socrates regarding the implications of the enigmatic teachings of their master is a priori probable, and the tradition of a rivalry between Plato and Xenophon handed down by Aulus Gellius, surely must derive from an earlier source. Though Plato is once mentioned by Xenophon, Xenophon’s name is nowhere found in Plato, and this omission cannot but be significant. If Xenophon in fact wrote his Cyropaedia in emulation of Plato’s Republic, Books I–II, which Gellius made Favorinus assert were published before the rest of the work was completed, then Xenophon might have had his rival’s work before him when he settled at Scillus permanently in 386 B.C. to enjoy the leisure of a cultured country gentleman. Though it has been argued that the Ecclesiazusae of Aristophanes owes much to the Republic, it seems to look beyond the few social reforms advocated in

17. Phaedo, 57a1–3.
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I—I. It is not unreasonable that lost political works by other Socrates, Antisthenes the Cynic and the hedonist Aristippus,27 may have been available to the poet in 392 rather than early drafts of the Republic, and that ideas like sharing of all property and sex equality were common to all the Socrates. It seems a priori likely that Plato’s unpleasant experience in Syracuse led to a desire to write what T. G. Tucker28 called ‘the proem to the Republic’ when he opened his school at the Academy, and it could well have appeared in 386 B.C.

Cawkwell does this discussion good service by exploding some modern conventional wisdom about Xenophon’s philosophical writings. For instance, the passage in Memorabilia (III, v, 1) often adduced to prove it belongs to the writer’s final period ‘does no such thing, and nothing forbids us putting it in the Scillus period. Perhaps too the the Education of Cyrus belongs there — save for its bitterly disillusioned last chapter which dates itself to the late 360’s.’29 So it was seemingly at Scillus, five miles from Olympia and only some twenty miles from Elis where the Socratic pupil Phaedo lived and taught, that Xenophon composed his Socratic works. Contact and discussion between the two men seems very hard not to presuppose. As Cawkwell again notes regarding Xenophon’s work in that place, ‘Perhaps among his earliest tasks was the vindication of the memory of Socrates. By the late 380’s and the 370’s much had been written about him.’30

As we have seen, Plato had meanwhile returned from his visits to the Pythagoreans of Italy and to Dionysius’ court in Syracuse and opened the Academy in 387–386, possibly after the indignity of being ransomed by his friends from the slave market of Aegina, whither he had been consigned by the Sicilian tyrant.31 After his early writings at Megara, the Corinthian War followed by his travels abroad must have diverted Plato’s energies from writing till he settled down as a philosophy teacher in Athens. Following Cornford, we would regard the ‘early’ works composed in Megara as constituted by the Apology, Crito, Laches, Lysis, Charmides, Euthyphro, Hipppias Minor, Protagoras, Gorgias and Ion. These we assume were all written while he was participating in the School of Eucleides.32 If we accept Guthrie’s view33 that there is no need to assume that Xenophon’s Apology was written before Plato’s composition of the same title, and share Hackforth’s view that Plato’s piece was written no earlier than 394 B.C.,34 still Xenophon’s work may date to that year and so have appeared by 393 at the latest when its author was in
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Sparta, and in a position to consult the Pythagoreans of Phlius who had received eye witness reports of the master's last days. If we assume Xenophon was as keen on a polemical treatment of philosophy as Kelly feels he was in his approach to historical writing, our author may well have written this pamphlet to correct Plato's work because it failed in his eyes to give enough emphasis to the deliberate purposefulness of Socrates' decision to die. Were this the case, the Crito, which belonged to the same era in the view of most critics except Ryle, would then have to be viewed as an answer accepting the justice of Xenophon's stricture and correcting the deficiency, and written either in Plato's last days at Megara or during a lull in his Corinthian war service.

When Xenophon settled at Scillus in 386 B.C. he turned to writings on philosophical themes, as we have seen, and the Memorabilia, our author's account of a number of Socratic conversations, may well have appeared before 380 B.C. Burnet takes to task those advocates of Xenophon who claim he is a better source than Plato for the 'historical' Socrates. It is true that Xenophon could not have been present at his Symposium dialogue, as he claims: but one of his Phliasian Pythagorean friends well might have been: in 421–420 B.C. Athens was officially at peace with all Peloponnesian states. Again, though Xenophon cannot have been present as he asserts during the Oeconomicus dialogue when Socrates heard the report of the Battle of Cunaxa in which the author himself had taken part, his neighbour and probable informant Phaedon of Elis almost certainly would have been present at any discussion shortly after the date of that battle. In these circumstances it is important to remember that Sir David Ross stresses the view that Ethics were the main element of Phaedon's teaching in the School of Elis. The more practical and less ironical cast of Xenophon's portrait of Socrates may well be a combination between Xenophon's memory of the man and Phaedon's own recollections of his teacher. The fact that Xenophon never mentions the Phliasian Pythagoreans does not, as he believes, prove Burnet's view that they were not informants, and the lack of any mention of Phaedon may serve rather to confirm our suspicion that he was actually Xenophon's main inside informant. In many respects Plato's Phaedo is an answer to the Memorabilia; it shows mystical and scientific interests in Socrates' character which the Xenophontic discussions play down. If we share Zeller's suspicion that Plato's alleged absence is a fiction, the dialogue is a deliciously urbane and witty
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work, where one of the informants of Xenophon, Phaedo, has Plato’s view of the truth put into his mouth so as to correct the misunderstandings of Xenophon’s other Peloponnesian informants, Echecrates and his friends!

Of course the Memorabilia is in no sense a riposte to the Crito: the Apology dispute was over, at least on this view of the putative controversy. Xenophon deigns to mention Plato once only, as the brother of Glaucon. In this context Xenophon has Socrates rebuke Glaucon for hoping to create a richer city by war, and for showing incompetence in household management. This seems to recall Republic 373d

"With our new luxuries . . . the territory which was formerly enough to support us will now be too small."
"That is undeniable."
"If we are to have enough for pasture and plough, we shall have to cut a slice off our neighbour’s territory . . . ."
"The consequence is inevitable."
"And that will lead to war, Glaucon, will it not?"
"It will."

This brings us sharply back to the now discredited view of Aulus Gellius, and suggests that any first draft of Rep. I–II published fairly soon after the opening of the Academy in 387 B.C. must at least extend beyond 373d. Such a work, whether called Thrasy Machus (on Justice) or not, would presumably end with the Dog Analogy for the Guardians at about 376d6. From this standpoint the attack on Glaucon’s ‘bad housekeeping’ would be a rebuke for his desire for extravagant comforts in 372d4–e1. Further, for a hunting man like Xenophon it will seem ridiculous to plan a discourse on training human ‘dogs’ without prefixing one on training their master. Hence perhaps Gellius’ words: Xenophon inclito illi operi Platonis, quod de optimo statu reipublicae civitatisque administrandae scriptum est, lectis ex eo duobus fere libris, qui primi in vulgus exierant, opposuit contra conscripsitque diversum regiae administrationis genus, quod Παιδείας Κύρου inscriptum est.* Further incentive to a desire to describe Cyrus as an ideal Just King in contrast with the ideal Unjust King Gyges described by Glaucon in 359b6–60b6 would be provided by the need to show that the education of a king like Cyrus had been totally unlike such current Greek ethical education as Adeimantus stigmatises in Republic
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362d2–367d5, a curriculum which could only end in making more rulers like Gyges.

On this basis, then, one may hazard a suggestion that both Memorabilia in part and Cyropaedia in toto were responses to Republic I–II and part of a continuing controversy between Xenophon and Plato. Yet perhaps the actual role of Xenophon is as a spokesman, and the real dispute over the meaning of Socrates’ teaching lay between Plato and Phaedon of Elis. If so, the Phaedo is in its conception a masterpiece of wit and dramatic irony, as well as being the most moving of all Plato’s writings.

POSTSCRIPT

The implications of this hypothesis do not end here. Xenophon is said by Burnet to include a ‘clumsy plagiarism’ from the Phaedo in his Apology.47 But in the world of such urbane exchanges between the Laconising Xenophon and Plato who admired the best features of Spartan life as we postulate, a quite different explanation is possible. First, the intervention of Apollodorus breaks the continuity between the summary of Socrates’ defence in 24–27 and his remarks regarding his prosecutor Anytus in 29–31. I therefore suggest that Xenophon re-issued his Apology after reading Plato’s Phaedo and was so moved by its conviction that he makes Socrates comfort the impulsive grieving Apollodorus of Plato’s dialogue with a gesture used in that work to remind Xenophon’s friend Phaedon that tomorrow he must mourn for Socrates by cutting his hair. Xenophon salutes his rival by admitting that for him Plato has turned Socrates’ death into victory. This to me is one reason for this insertion in Xenophon’s revised issue of his Apology.

Another explanation is open for those who believe Xenophon’s Symposium was published before Plato’s. In the Symposium of Plato Apollodorus plays the same narrating role as Phaedon does in the Phaedo. In the latter dialogue the affectionate gesture by Socrates in stroking Phaedon’s long hair (89b2) would then be Plato’s graceful acknowledgement of Xenophon’s criticism in Apology and Memorabilia (largely owed to Phaedon) which had led Plato to expand his position in the Phaedo. Xenophon’s insertion of a similar gesture by Socrates to Apollodorus in his re-issued Apology would then be a similarly gracious admission that Plato’s Symposium had been a great advance on his own.

47. The text of Xenophon reads in Greek: τὸν δὲ λέγεται καταψησαντα αὐτοῦ . . . ἐπιγελάσαι.