**Abstract:**
Socrates' burial is dismissed as irrelevant in *Phaedo* 115c-e although it was discussed by Plato's older contemporaries. In Antisthenes’ *Kyrsas* there is a visit to Socrates' tomb by a lover of Socrates who receives advice in a dream sequence while sleeping over Socrates' grave. The dialogue is an explanation of Socrates' spiritual message continuing after death. Plato underplays its imagery by lampooning Antisthenes and his work (*Phd.* 81b-82e) and precludes him from an active role in the *Phaedo*. Similar is the exclusion of Euclides of Megara whose fragment of a Socratic dialogue depicting Apollodorus and an unnamed Megarian to justify care for the remains of the dead. Similar mistaken notions explain *Kyrsas* who does not distinguish the living Socrates from the dead one. In spite of these disputes, Euclides, Antisthenes and Plato each attempted to present Socrates’ moral influence as a force that continued after his death.
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1 Introduction

Crito’s concern with the details of Socrates’ burial are dismissed by Plato as unworthy of philosophical discussion (*Phd. 115c-e*), the grounds given being: that ‘Socrates’ whom Crito once knew will have departed to a better place leaving behind remains of no consequence for burial.¹ In complete contrast to this, we hear of a dialogue ascribed to Plato’s older contemporary, Antisthenes of Athens, describing an imaginary visit to Socrates’ grave where his tomb is central to the philosophical discussion and scenery of the dialogue.² Here a lad named *Kyrsas* is portrayed as a lover of Socrates but harboring misconceived notions of Socratic eros although finally recalled to his senses in a dream dialogue while asleep over Socrates’ grave.³ In the first section of this paper, I will analyze this episode for its Antisthenean characteristics suggesting that we regard it as an educative “parable” showing how Socrates’ spiritual message continued even after his death. In the last section, I will examine its relationship with the *Phaedo* with emphasis on Plato’s attempts to undermine the moral point of Antisthenes’ parable by closely lampooning his message (*Phd. 81b-82e*) before the section where he dismissed any meaningful discussion of Socrates’ burial (115c-e). We will finally consider whether Plato’s lampoon can also explain how Antisthenes was completely precluded from an active role in the *Phaedo* although particularly mentioned as present at the scene (*Phd. 59b*). A final question will also be raised concerning Antisthenes’ older contemporary, Euclides of Megara, who was also precluded from participation in Plato’s dialogue although similarly mentioned in its introduction (59c). Just as with Antisthenes, Euclides seems to

¹ *Phd.* 115d; cf. Cic. *Tusc.* I. 103. Crito was rebuked for his concern with how to bury Socrates (Luz (2022), xx-xx).


³ *Suda* Σ 829.
have discussed care for the dead in a manner different from Plato. Late imaginary accounts of Socrates’ burial may well reflect this tradition since they are fictitiously associated with Euclides’ name. I will thus attempt to analyze the serious philosophical purpose of Antisthenes’ narrative concerning Socrates’ grave (taphos) and stela in spite of Plato’s personal reservations.

2 The question of Socrates’ tomb.

It should have been clear to an ancient reader that some minimal form of taphos for depositing Socrates’ remains was required however Crito decided to resolve the issue in reality. When discussing this very subject, Xenophon recalls a logos portraying Socrates giving his eldest son, Lamprocles, a lesson on filial duty adding that any child who does not furnish a burial for his departed parents is morally deficient and even punishable by law. It is true that Xenophon does not portray Socrates tendering advice regarding his own burial specifically, but this is easily understood from the context given that he lectures his own son on filial upkeep of a parent’s grave. If this was the original context of this logos, then its origin is best understood as derived from a literary reference to Socrates’ burial and tomb where the philosopher’s advice to his son was incidentally mentioned. It is uncertain on which sources Xenophon precisely drew for this logos but the adjacent passages in the previous and following memoirs borrow themes that reflect both Antisthenes and Euclides of Megara.

4 An extract from a lost Socratic dialogue portrays an early Megarian of Apollodorus’ generation discussing Socrates’ differentiation between body and soul but justifying discussion of care for the dead (Stob. IV. xxxv.33 vol. V.2, Hense pp. 863-64). See Luz (2022), xxx-xxx.

5 Ps. Soc. Epist. xiv was previously assigned to Aeschines (SSR VIA 102. 75-85; Malherbe (1977), 252) but it presupposes Euclides as its imaginary author (xiv.9: ἐγώ καὶ Τερψίων) and alludes to Aeschines only incidentally (Bolzan (2009), 44, 268-270, 272, 298).

6 Socrates’ family’s grave is also presupposed in Plutarch’s fictitious dialogue De Gen. Soc. 590a where a youngster asked permission to be interred with Socrates’ son Lamprocles.

7 Cf. Xen. Mem. II. 2.13 (ἐὰν τις τῶν γονέων τελευτησάντων τοὺς τάφους μὴ κοσμήῃ) referring to a the legal obligation for the upkeep of the deceased’s grave (καὶ τούτῳ ἐξετάζῃ ἢ πόλεις ἐν ταῖς τῶν ἁρχόντων δοκιμασίαις).

8 1) Socrates scolds Chaerectes’ sibling rivalry (Xen. Mem. II.3.1-3) teaching brotherly love (16-17) that is a central theme in both Antisthenes (Symp.iv. 35, 43) and Euclides (Doering (1972), fr. 10A-F); 2) Socrates immediately discusses friendship with Antisthenes himself (Mem. II.5.1-5); 3). Throughout Mem. II, Xenophon introduces various Socratic logos circulating in his time (5.1) citing only one as based on “hearing” Socrates (4.1) that could also be derived from "hearsay".
We shall examine the case for Antisthenes below, but we should particularly note Euclides as a known author of Socratic \textit{logoi} including a serio-comic discussion of death and burial.\textsuperscript{9} Xenophon’s source may well have originated in the same Socratic dialogue that we mentioned above where an early Megarian of Apollodorus’ generation defended the theme of care for the remains of the dead.\textsuperscript{10} Perhaps recalling this tradition is Ps-Socratic letter (XIV) that imaginatively reconstructs details of Socrates’ funeral ascribing the account to Euclides himself.\textsuperscript{11} Aside from the funeral theme, the tomb itself is the subject of an equally fanciful account discussed in another Ps-Socratic letter (XVII) where the grave is facetiously described as an object of outlandish pilgrimage by lovers of Socrates.\textsuperscript{12} This theme is reflected in three additional sources where Socrates’ tomb is made a literary and philosophical \textit{topos} handed down from earlier Socratic writers.\textsuperscript{13} Although each of these sources belongs to a separate literary genre, a number of common motifs stand out:

1. The supposed arrival of stranger(s) from abroad hoping to consort with Socrates but on hearing of his death sought out his grave.\textsuperscript{14}

2. An outbreak of licentiousness resulting from the abrupt cessation of Socrates’ moralizing influence with youths smitten by Spartan (same-sex) desires, chiefly for Socrates.\textsuperscript{15}

\textsuperscript{9} His Socratic dialogues were re-handled by Plato (\textit{Theaetet}. 143a-c) and he is known for mocking a bereaved father who invited Death to visit him on the loss of his son (Doering (1972), fr. 12) recalling the style of “Megarian mockery” (\textit{γέγονεν Μεγαρικός}).

\textsuperscript{10} Stob. IV. xxxv.33 vol. V.2, Hense pp. 863-64.

\textsuperscript{11} \textit{Ps. Soc. Epist}. xiv was previously assigned to Aeschines (SSR VIA 102. 75-85; Malherbe (1977), 252) but it presupposes Euclides as its imaginary author (xiv.9: \textit{ἐγὼ καὶ Τερψίων} and alludes to Aeschines only incidentally (Bolzan (2009), 44, 268-270, 272, 298).

\textsuperscript{12} \textit{Ps. Soc. Epist}. xvii. 2-3, 9-10 (Koehler); SSR VIA 102 ll. 75-85; IH I ll. 9-14; Prince (2018), 20B; Trapp (2003), 29 n. 118, 119.

\textsuperscript{13} It is mentioned: 1. incidentally in Celsus (in Origen \textit{Contra Celsum} IV.59); 2. Liban. \textit{Decl}. I. 174-175; 4. \textit{Suda} lexicon (Σ 829 s.v. Σωκράτη l. 60). On the background, see: Prince (2018), pp. 74-75; Kennedy (2017), 183; Brancacci (2003). 266.

\textsuperscript{14} Liban. \textit{Decl}. I. 174-175 (οἱ Ξένοι καταπλέουσι μὲν ὡς συνεσόμενοι τάναρί, τεθνείται δὲ εὐρόντες ζητόντος τὸν τάφον); \textit{Ps. Soc. Epist}. xvii. 1 ll. 17.3 (ὅρκε γὰρ τις κατε’ ἔρωτα Σωκράτους συγγενεῖσθαι αὐτῷ…. διαπωθόμενος δὲ ὅπου εἶναι ὁ τάφος); \textit{Suda} Η 829 l. 60 (ὁς συνεσόμενος ἦλθε Σωκράτει’ ὁ καθηδονήσας παρὰ τὸν τάφον).

\textsuperscript{15} \textit{Ps. Soc. Epist}. xvii. 1 ll. 17-23 (Ἀφεδρομόμον πάθος); \textit{Suda} Η 829 cites the example of Kyrsas’ lust for Socrates without ever having seen him; Libanius criticizes Socrates’ erstwhile lovers (\textit{Decl} 1.1.36.5 οὐχ ἔως τοὺς ἔρωτας αὐτοῦ νεανίσκους;) and the loss of his moralizing voice (175.1 ἔρημον δὲ τὸ ἄστυ τῆς ἔκεινου φανῆς; also 2 1.36).
One of these sources give details of a weird story concerning a visit paid to Socrates’ tomb by a lad with the Doric name of Kyrsas although allegedly Chian by family (Suda Σ829). He was said to have come to Athens with a lust for Socrates (κατ’ ἑρωτα Σωκράτους) in order to consort with him (ὡς συνεσώμενος/ συγγενέσθαι αὐτῶ) without ever having met him. On hearing of the philosopher’s death on arrival in Athens, the lad hunted out his tomb (τὸν τάφον/ τῇ στήλῃ) where he cried and conversed with the stone (ὁμιλησεν/ διελέγετο) till sleep overcame him (κοιμηθείς) and he beheld a dream (ὄναρ ὀφθείς) conversing with an unnamed presence. Having passionately made love to Socrates’ dust, he immediately sailed off to Megara at dawn.

The Suda gives the lad the singular Doric name of Kyrsas reflecting his ties with Doric Megara. However, Kyrsas may have been not so much a personal name as a pejorative description of him as a Doric sleazy youngster (κορσάνιος). Thus although the lad is said to be of Ionic Chios by origin (Χῖος τὸ γένος), his name and return home to Megara mark him out as one of those several Doric youths criticized by Libanius for seeking out Socrates’ tomb (1.1.174). The literary origin of the Suda’s account is clarified by Cicero who refers to a dialogue by Antisthenes entitled KYPACAC comparing it not uncritically to other compositions by that philosopher. Taking up this lead, modern scholars have suggested that we identify the Kyrsas with a composition once listed in the 10th volume of the Hellenistic catalogues of Antisthenes’ works under the

16 In Ps. Soc. Epist. xvii.3 ll. 11-22, he returns to Doric Megara (ὁγετο ἀπιῶν Μέγαρας). Similarly, Suda Σ 829 gives him a Doric name (Κυρσάς) although making him Chian by origin (cf. Ep. xvii.1 l. 10.) and he sails off back home (ἀπέλπισεν δὲ εὐθὺς ἐκιόνος).  
17 Ps. Soc. Epist. xvii.3 ll. 11-22 (Kohler); Bolzan (2009), 295-297, 302-30); Suda Σ 829 Σωκράτη (SSR 1D2 ll. 39-42); Prince (2018), fr. 84c.  
18 Ps. Soc. Ep. xvii.3 ll. 11-22: πολλοῦ φιλήσας τὴν ἐπὶ καιμένην αὐτῷ κόννη, πολλὰ δὲ περισσασάμους πάσῃ φιλότητι. ἄγετο ἀπιῶν Μέγαρας.  
19 Suda Σ 829 Κύρσας δὲ τὶς ὄνομα; Ps. Soc. Ep. xvii.3 ll. 1 describes him simply as a νεανίσκος. The contributors to Suda On Line (https://www.cs.uky.edu/~raphael/sol/sol-cgi-bin/search.cgi) n. 11 note ‘Kyrsas’ as not known elsewhere as “a proper name”.  
20 1) Galen 19.116.5 on “κορσάνιον = πρωκτόν” (anus); 2) Suda K 2780 Doric κυρσάνιοι = “youngsters and worthless (εὐτελεῖς) people”; κυρσάνιος = “worthless (εὐτελεῖς) vegetable” (viz. “cheap cabbage”).  
21 Cicero’s criticism is that like his other compositions the Kyrsas was more sharp (acutum) than learned (ad Atticum xii. 38a = 279). Almost all codd. of Cicero read KYPACAC similar to Suda Σ 829 with no manuscript testimony to justify emending it to Κύρσας Β’ (apparatus ad loc. in: Shackleton Bailey (1966) Kasten (1980); also: SSR VA84, IV n. 31).
erroneous title of ἡ ἑρώμενος ("Lord or the Besotted"). However, the latter can be explained as an easy misreading of ἡ ἑρώμενος that many scholars accept today. Its secondary title is also appropriate in this context if we translate it as Kyrsas or the Besotted since the lad in the Suda is said to lust after Socrates. We may also surmise that such a composition dwelt on similar ethical and Socratic themes as the other dialogues of Antisthenes listed alongside it in that Hellenistic volume of his compositions.

From a literary point of view, the content of the Kyrsas does indeed show several characteristics typifying the style of Antisthenes' philosophical dialogues: a narrated drama interspersed with dialogue but structured episodically, thus not always describing events within the same chronological or contextual framework. In this case, the account opens with Kyrsas' quest to find Socrates followed by his arrival in Athens, his subsequent search for the tomb, followed by Kyrsas' dream sequence and ending with his return to Megara. Much may have been narrated indirectly while at least the lad's interaction with Socrates' tomb would seem to have been in dialogic format. A parallel example is Antisthenes' lost dialogue Hercules or On Strength narrated in part by Antisthenes himself but interspersed with short episodes of reported dialogue between Prometheus and Hercules - and between Achilles and Chiron's pupils. Another example is his Alcibiades composition where Antisthenes describes not only episodes from Alcibiades' youth, but also separate conversations concerning the latter's army duty (Fr. 200), the immorality of his middle age and a discussion concerning Cyrus (Fr. 141A). In contrast to Plato, these dialogues were then not confined by the chronological strictures of a single conversation. This episodic structure reminds us more of Xenophon's Socratic Memorabilia than Plato's dialogues and means that

22 In D.L. VI.18 are preserved two inexplicable titles ἡ ἑρώμενος and ἡ κατάσκοποι (Lord or the Beloved, Lord or the Spies) with the copyist's emendation of ἡ κατάσκοποι (Dorandi (2013), p. 418 ap. crit. 232-236). Previous scholars conjectured an unattested 4th-5th volumes of Antisthenes' Cyrus (Kóρος δ' ε'; SSR IV n. 31 pp. 295-299) or an unknown Cyrus in Love and Cyrus or Spies (Goulet-Cazé (1999), 696 n.1, 698 n.1, 770 n. 3).
23 Prince (2018), Fr. 41A 72, Fr 84b p. 304; Brancacci (2003, 261-262). For older arguments see: Kennedy (2017), 38, CD5; Caizzi (1966), 86.
24 In D.L. VI.18 it was meant to follow Antisthenes' Hercules dialogues and precede his Menexenus, Alcibiades and Archelaus.
the *Kyrsas* could well have been a brief episode narrated in a longer composition. We have no way of knowing whether Antisthenes narrated this serio-comic scene in the *Kyrsas* himself - or whether it was meant to be told by some other character in the dialogue.  

Contextually, a presupposition of the narrative is that Socrates’ grave was a known site in Athens since the lad was not meant to have stumbled on it by accident, but made enquiries where the grave would be found (Ps. Soc. Epist. xvii. 3.5: διαπυθόμενος ὁ ὕποπο ἐη ὁ τάφος). Moreover, he presumably was given directions on setting out (προσελθὼν) to find it prior to his dialogue with Socrates’ stela (διελέγετο τῇ στήλῃ). The action itself is imagined to have occurred a substantial time after Socrates’ burial since it refers to the Antisthenean motif of Athenian remorse for Socrates’ execution that concluded with the supposed prosecution of his accusers, Anytus and Meletus (2.5).  

Although later anecdotes make Antisthenes personally responsible (αἴτιος) for Anytus’ exile and Meletus’ execution, this is merely an imaginative reconstruction of literary themes aired in his dialogues.  

There he described imaginary encounters with Pontic lads in the Piraeus, on one occasion spitefully directing them to Anytus’ home. It is thus interesting to note that Kyrsas here returns to Megara by sea (ἀπέπλευσε; Suda Σ829) and presumably was one of similar foreign (ζένοι) lads who sailed to Athens (καταπλέωσι) to hunt out Socrates (DL VI.9-10). The Kyrsas episode thus shares the common Antisthenean serio-comic theme of encounters in Piraeus and a post-mortem quest for Socrates. However, in the case of Kyrsas, the lad does not...

---

26 Unlike Plato – but resembling Xenophon - Antisthenes would sometimes interrupt the flow of his dialogue in persona (sometimes described as αἰτίος) in order use his authorial position to clarify the moral discussed (Luz (2019), 135).

27 Ps. Soc. Epist. xvii.2; Liban., Decl. 1.1.175. When answering Celsus’ literary s, Origines also refers to the discussion of Socrates’ burial and tomb in the context of Anytus’ deserved death (Cels. IV. 59.12).

28 Anytus’ somber end is implied as early as Xen. Apolog. 31-32. Both he and Meletus were allegedly condemned to death without trial (Diod. Sic. xiv.37.7) with Anytus fleeing to Pontic Heraclea where he was supposedly stoned to death (D.L. II.43; Them. Or. II. 239c).

29 Antisthenes could thus be only indirectly responsible for Anytus’ condemnation. Moreover, since Antisthenes’ encounters with Pontic lads who came to seek out Socrates was a recurrent theme in anecdotes (D.L. vi.9-10, Dorandi, 100-105 &n.), their origin has been thought to be derived from one of his lost dialogues (Prince (2018), pp. 74-74; Luz (2015), 201-202; SSR VA21). Anytus’ execution in Pontic Heraclea seems to belong to a similar literary motif.

30 Brancacci (2003), 267-268 suggests that the scene is a more serious theme either copied from the *Phaedo* or Plato’s source for a description of Socrates’ pupils present at his execution. However, the serio-comic style is completely different.
enter Athens itself but rather makes enquiries concerning the tomb at the city gates (περὶ τὰς πύλας τοῦ ἁστεος; Ps. Soc. Epist. xvii.3.5).

In view of its pungent subject matter, the depiction of an act of physical eros with Socrates’ remains – whether they were supposedly bones or cremated dust - was likely to have been the subject of serious criticism in a later section of this work. We may assume this not only from the moral context of the tale itself, but also from the criticism raised in our sources that report this story.31 In that sense, the correction of the lad’s mistaken understanding of eros could well be expected at one point of the composition. So much can also be understood from Antisthenes’ fragments where he calls physical eros an evil of nature (τὸν τε ἐρωτα κακίαν φησι φύσας) and a disease (νόσος) induced by ignorance.32 By contrast, Kyrsas is said not only to have been incited by lust (κατ᾽ ἐρωτα) for Socrates but also to have arrived in Athens already excited with pleasure (ὡς δὲ ἡδομένῳ αὐτῷ; Ps. Soc. Epist. xvii 3.4) and continued to be excited even after hearing of the philosopher’s death. Antisthenes’ often repeated witticism that he would rather go mad than enjoy himself (μανείην μᾶλλον ἢ ἡσθείην) is often misinterpreted as anti-hedonistic in principle although the brunt of his criticism was against physical erotic pleasure that needed correction.33 I would thus suggest that Kyrsas’ correction would have been an expected finale of this episode, perhaps, as we shall see, narrated in his dream-sequence over Socrates’ grave.

To a certain extent, the introduction to the story concerning the lad’s Doric (viz. Spartan) desire to sleep with Socrates reminds us of Alcibiades’ attempt to seduce Socrates in Plato’s Symposium (218b-219d, 220a). However, it is less of a copy of Plato than an allusion to a similar situation associated with Antisthenes’ own sympotic compositions. In the Greco-Roman dialogue preserved in PFlor 113 are cited two adjoining

31 1. his pejorative name κύρσας (sleazy; above, n. 20); 2. Ep. xvii 4.1-5 on the adverse reaction of the Athenians to the lad’s necrophilia;
3. Libanius’ criticism of Spartan pathos (above, n. 15).
33 SSR VIA 120, 122A-H, 123A.
The first describes Socrates’ failure to teach Alcibiades who had abandoned him for nightly (synoptic) trysts with others. The second describes Antisthenes’ similar situation concerning an unnamed ward of his own who had abandoned him for rival suitors (anterastai) at sumptuous symposia (Fr. 175). Both Socrates and Antisthenes are here described as having failed to persuade a pupil to grasp the educative meaning of eros.

In each case, their protreptic arguments have lost effect when the companion escaped beyond the teacher’s sphere of influence. In the Kyrsas, the lad is obviously beyond the sphere of the dead Socrates but nonetheless experiences a vocal revelation while asleep over his tomb. That this revelation was protreptic in nature may be inferred from two literary references in our text. The lad is described as attempting to embrace the dust of Socrates with signs of physical love (Ps. Soc. Epist. xvii. 3):

"Much embracing (the stela) with all tenderness"

πολλὰ δὲ περισσασάμενος πάσῃ φιλότητι.

This line appears to be a cento based on the erotic elegies of Theognis of Megara:

"With many embraces and love".

πολλοῖς ἀσπασμοῖς καὶ φιλότητας ἔχω (860)

Similarly, Kyrsas kisses Socrates’ dust that settled on him:

φιλήσας τὴν ἐπὶ κειμένην αὐτῷ κόνιν.

In Theognis, we find the lover masquerading as a rider lying tossed in the dust (κείμενον ἐν κονίῃ) by the boy, his steed (1268). In our dialogue, the role is reversed with the boy lying rejected in the dust of his eromenos, Socrates.

---

34 Both anecdotes are not only contextually parallel but also adjoin each other in our source (PFlor 113). On Antisthenes and his ward, see Prince (2019), Fr. 175, pp. 565-567; on this and the immediately preceding anecdote on Socrates and Alcibiades, see: Luz (2015), 197-203; Luz (2014), 14-17.

35 Socrates explains his failure to educate Alcibiades since his rivals dismantle (ἀναλόουσι) the thread of his moral arguments (logoi) like Penelope’s web at the times when Alcibiades was out of his presence at nocturnal trysts. Similarly, Antisthenes’ unnamed ward forgets his master’s teaching when away at decadent symposia with rival suitors (anterastai).
As we know, Antisthenes devoted five books to the protreptic power of persuasion that closed with two final books on themes from Theognis. While the first three of this series (Protreptics 1-3) were devoted to cases of virtue, they were supplemented by two final books (Protreptics 4-5) that discussed Theognis’ poetic attempts to persuade his erstwhile lover, Kyrnos of Megara, to return to him. We will recall from Theognis’ elegies how Kyrnos betrayed Theognis’ trust and love despite the poet's protreptic attempts to restore him to the virtue of good company. While Theognis’ poetry was often cited at real symposia for its erotic and sexual imagery, it also served Antisthenes as a prop for explaining his own moral, often anti-hedonistic critique. The figure of Kyrsas thus appears to be mockingly described in a cento borrowed from Theognis’ lines on Kyrnos since both these lads of Megara, Kyrsas and Kyrnos, are infatuated with an unbalanced eros. This point would possibly suggest that the Kyrsas episode was narrated in a section of Antisthenes’ Protrepticus and in particular, in the last 2 books concerning Theognian motives.

I would thus suggest that the relationship between the Kyrsas episode and Antisthenes' concept of protreptic argument in moral discourse can be deduced from the language of our fragment as well as its contents. In fact, Kyrsas’ motivation for consorting with Socrates out of lust (κατ’ ἔρωτα) recalls Antisthenes’ description of Hercules seeking the wise Centaur Chiron first out of lust (κατ’ ἔρωτα), but finally in order to obtain a natural education (Fr 92A-B). Among the fragments of this same work, Achilles is also described as the subject of Chiron’s educational system founded on eros with his initial attraction to the path of virtue through physical desire (Fr. 95). Similarly, Antisthenes’ own love for Socrates proves the basis of philosophical eros and

38 I would thus connect this episode with Antisthenes’ protreptic ethical works and not with his writings On Dying, On Life and Death and On What is in Hades (fr. 41A 42-44) as sometimes suggested (Brancacci (2003), 259-260).
friendship between them. In this context, the point of the Kyrsas narrative would have an underlying educative purpose confirming Socratic love as eros between kin spirits of the soul. Kyrsas himself has initially misunderstood this. In that, he resembles both Alcibiades in Plato’s Symposium as well as the lad discussed in the fragments of Antisthenes’ own sympotic fragment mentioned above. However, in contrast to a Platonic context where Socrates masquerades as the erastes of a prospective pupil, in the fragments of Antisthenes, the pupil acts as Socrates’ erastes, vying for his attention.

We should finally discuss the lad’s dream (ὄναρ) where, according to Suda Σ 829, Kyrsas “spoke” to Socrates’ grave (ὁμιλησεν παρὰ τὸν τάφον). This is also reflected in Ps. Soc. Epist. xvii where the Megarian lad held a conversation with the tomb-stone (διελέγετο τῇ στήλῃ) over which he slept. Kyrsas was thus not merely a passive witness to a spectral annunciation as in Socrates’ dream premonition of death (Crito 44a-b) - or a passive recipient of spectral instruction as in those delivered Socrates in prison (Phd. 60d-e). Instead, Kyrsas is supposed to have imagined that he actively participated in a dialogic conversation in his dream. Moreover, the latter was both a visual as well as a vocal experience (ὁμιλησεν ὡμίλησεν) in Homeric mode like the vision of Patroclus’ psyche dreamt by the sleeping Achilles “similar in appearance and voice” to what his friend had once been (Il. xx.iii. 65-67). It is thus not coincidental that the scholiast to this line in Homer adds that Antisthenes derived from it (ἐντεῦθεν) the notion that souls were similar in shape (ὁμοσχήμων) to the bodies that once encompassed (περιέχουσι) them (Fr. 193). It is thus likely that it was to Antisthenes that Libanius referred when he mentioned “those philosophers” who believed that the shades had a voice just as did Patroclus (II.1.21.

---

39 SSR VIA 99, 134: only the good is worthy of love (ἀξιέραστος) and the moral are his friends. Similarly: Xen. Symp viii.3-6 (Antisthenes is the erastes of Socrates) while the Pontic neaniskoi are in pursuit of Antisthenes (D.L. vi. 3, 9, 10; Luz (2015), 201).

40 In spite of the scholiast’s ἐντεῦθεν, Antisthenes probably did not accept the passage simpliciter (Prince (2018), 665-666). In Plato’s view, this would have made the soul or its shade not only sensed but also materialized (Brancacci (2003), 268-269). The question to be pondered is whether Plato’s non-sensual and μοσχήμων soul (Phd. 78d, 80b, 83c) is a response to Antisthenes’ semi-materialistic όμοσχήμων soul or the subject of the latter’s criticism.
1-7) and that Socrates’ voice would not be silenced after death (II.1.27, 32-34). In Homer, the voice that Achilles heard was protreptic in nature in that Patroclus’ shade stirred him on to do his duty and bury him. Similarly, the voice from Socrates’ tomb protreptically restored Kyrsas to his senses as we see from the closing lines of the Suda where the lad relinquishes all intentions of sleeping with Socrates and, on wakening from the dream, returned to Megara (Σ 829) presumably a better person. This, as we have seen, was underpinned by the protreptics of the Theognian centos examined above.

We are not told about whom Kyrsas dreamt, but granted his “longing” for Socrates and his address to his grave, then it is likely that he was meant to have spoken either to Socrates himself or the latter’s daimon. However, in contrast to the well-discussed theme of Socrates’ own dreams we rarely hear of dreams about Socrates. Of note is one mentioned incidentally in Themistius’ commentary on the Aristotelian lemma that dreams are only imagined sensation accompanied by opinion and longing (pothos). In this context, Themistius adds his own example to explain the lemma where someone who thinks that he sees Socrates risen from the dead and though asleep he beholds the master as when “I longed to find a book”. He thus explains dreaming about Socrates in reference to his emotional longing (ἐπόθουν) for the subject of the dream. More specifically, Libanius touches on this motif when he prays (II. 1. 39.5): “be not silent, Socrates, but speak to us in our dreams just as the gods do now” (μὴ σιώπα καὶ δὲ τ’ ὀνείρον ἡμᾶν λάλει, Σώκρατες, ός νῦν οἴ θεοί). We thus may suppose that while sleeping on Socrates’ tomb, Kyrsas dreamt of a voice that held an imaginary Socratic dialogue with him. Nevertheless, in a partial sense, the Homeric theme of Achilles’ love for the dead Patroclus is still a literary prototype for that of Socrates and Kyrsas: Patroclus’ dream appearance led to Achilles’ arousal to perform the funerary rites for his friend. Although the address to the sleeping Kyrsas was obviously made long after Socrates’

41 In Crito 44a-b, Plato compares Socrates’ passage to the afterlife to Achilles’ return home to Phthia (Il. ix.363) whereas Antisthenes expanded on the theme of Achilles’ dream of Patroclus. See also Mariscal (2019), 123, 137; Vázquez (2019), 82-86.
42 Cf. the youngster seeking to be interred with Socrates’ son, Lamprocles hoping to encounter Socrates’ daimon (Plu. De Gen. Soc. 590a (21); 579d-e; cf. Apul. De Deo 20.23-26).
43 Them. In PN V.6. 29 (copied in: Mich. In. PN 62). The example of dreaming about Socrates was not in the original lemma (Aristot. De in Som.458b) but Themistius added it perhaps from Antisthenes whom he quotes at length elsewhere (SSR VA96).
burial was over, an imagined voice of Socrates or his daimon could still be supposed to arouse the lad to understand the meaning of virtue better. The final line in the Suda (Σ 829) could possibly indicate this: that Kyrsas enjoyed only this of the philosopher (τοῦτο μόνον ἀπολαύσας τοῦ φιλοσόφου) – viz. sleeping on his tomb – and then returned to Megara without having cohabited with him in the end.\footnote{While Ps. Soc. Ep. xvii.3 ll. 11-22 ends with his embracing the stone, we have seen that this is couched as a cento in an attempt to re-educate the lad.}

3 The Kyrsas and the Phaedo

The primary question to be considered is the relationship between the Kyrsas and Plato’s Phaedo. We should first consider the sub-textual implications of Plato’s serio-comic description of dead souls haunting graveyards. Having discussed the release of virtuous souls to the next world (Phd. 81a), Socrates expands on the fate of sensual souls weighed down by communion and association with the body (ὁμιλία τε καὶ συνουσία τοῦ σώματος; 81b). Such a soul is forever dragged back to the world of light where it is said to “roll around memorials and graves” (περὶ τὰ μνήματα τε καὶ τῶν τάφων κυλινδουμένη) visible as shadowy apparitions (φαντάσματα) and images (εἴδωλα) as such souls possess (81c-d).\footnote{I am grateful to Prof. Nickolas Pappas for drawing my attention to this passage.} At variance with the philosophy of the previous sections of the Phaedo concerning the unity (μονοειδής) and indivisibility of the soul based on its insensible and conceptual nature (78d, 80b, 83e), the above passage stands out as a facetious lampoon of what is alleged (ὡσπερ λέγεται; 81c) by others regarding the appearance of shades in the graveyard. It also scornfully mocks a person who is not a true philosopher (μὴ φιλοσοφήσαντι; 82c) but a mere lover of learning whose own soul similarly “rolls around in every ignorance” (82e) affected by philosophy on a non-professional level (ἀτεχνῶς). During all of this tirade, Plato continued to maintain Antisthenes’ silence throughout the Phaedo although the latter’s presence was noted at its beginning (59b). However, even if Antisthenes was permitted a post facto response, the presuppositions of the Kyrsas would not have been the place to set them out given that its aims were protreptic and ethical rather than metaphysical. It would make better sense if this composition

44 While Ps. Soc. Ep. xvii.3 ll. 11-22 ends with his embracing the stone, we have seen that this is couched as a cento in an attempt to re-educate the lad.

45 I am grateful to Prof. Nickolas Pappas for drawing my attention to this passage.
served as a catalyst for Plato’s critique of an “ignorant” philosopher who imagined that the soul was of similar-shape (ὁμοσχήμονας) to the bodies that enclosed them (Fr. 193) rather than being uniform (μονοειδής) like the conceptual. Having lampooned the philosophy of this dialogue where Kyrsas has converse and association (ὀμιλία τε καὶ συνουσία) with the spirit, Plato then dismissed this theme as unsuited for serious philosophical speculation altogether (Phd. 115c-e). I would thus suggest that the Kyrsas was written before Plato’s Phaedo rather than later, leading Plato to lampoon Antisthenes’ “non-philosophical” and “non-professional” notions (82b-c) and thus precluded him from participating freely in his own composition on Socrates’ death.

Euclides is another case of a philosopher who was noted as present with Socrates at his execution (Phd. 59b) but precluded from participation in the dialogue. Let us leave aside the question whether Plato’s depiction of Crito’s rebuttal for concern with Socrates’ burial (Phd.115c-e) could in anyway illuminate or be illuminated by the parallel account in “the alternative version” of this scene where Apollodorus is rebutted by Socrates on very similar grounds. It is sufficient to turn to Stobaeus’ testimony concerning a lost Socratic dialogue that once presented Apollodorus’ summary of a contemporary Megarian who justified concern for the remains of the dead with an argument that was later dismissed in Phd. 115c-e. If I am correct, Plato’s lampoon of Antisthenes’ ideas and his dismissal of Euclides’ argument for care of the dead, lead him to formulate these closing scenes of the dialogue in the way that he did.

Another avenue for comparing these texts is to examine their rebuttal of the argument for identifying the body of the departed with its (former) owner. The discussion in the Phaedo argues for the total separation of body and soul with Socrates consequentlymocking the misconception of “burying Socrates” since the true Socrates would have left this world. The distinction between Socrates the man and ‘Socrates’ the body is also presupposed in Apollodorus’ citation of the unnamed Megarian in Stobaeus’ extract. In its first (Socratic)

46 Apollodorus is rebuked for concern with Socrates’ funerary attire (D.L. II. 35 = SSR ID (35); Ael. Var. Hist.I. 16. 4-5 (= SSR IC142) on the same grounds as Crito who shows concern with the details of Socrates’ funeral (Phd. 115c-e). See: Luz (2022), xx-xx.

47 Stob. IV. xxxv.33 vol. V.2, Hense pp. 863-64; Luz (2022), xx-xx.
section, the Megarian argues that we feel least sorrow when we are convinced that men (οἱ ἄνθρωποι) are other than their body but does this without presupposing Plato’s metaphysical arguments that Crito was accused of refusing to accept (Phd. 115c-d). It is important to note that precisely the same presuppositions underlie the discussion in Antisthenes’ Kyrsas as well. Like Apollodorus and Crito, Kyrsas has the mistaken belief that Socrates’ physical ashes are somehow still to be identified as the living ‘Socrates’ and thus continue to be an object of desire. Kyrsas is not only excited when seeking out Socrates on arrival in Athens, but continues to be excited even after hearing of the philosopher’s demise when he kissed and embraced the spot where his dust lay. His behavior is certainly more extravagant than that of Apollodorus (D.L. II. 35) but learns his lesson in the dream.

Finally, the Kyrsas story could on one level be taken as making mockery of Euclides himself. Anyone who read Antisthenes’ account of a Megarian lad making a journey to Athens out of love of Socrates would immediately recall the case of the historical Euclides journeying from Megara to Athens in order to be with Socrates. However, while the literary figure of Kyrsas may sub-textually mock the personal history of Euclides, Kyrsas’ conversion to Socratic morality before returning to Megara a better lad could suggest that Antisthenes had a more positive outlook on Euclides’ conversion to Socrates’ philosophy. As the lad apparently adopted protreptic advice delivered in his sleep, the implication would be that as a Kyrsas prototype Euclides had also corrected his former self through Socratic example.

Although Plato listed both Euclides and Antisthenes attending Socrates on the day of his execution, his dismissal of the burial theme in the Phaedo would make sense as a serious rejection of both of their earlier serio-comic accounts. His own reference to the light side of Socrates’ last day (Phd. 59a) is much more delicate than

48 Literally he embraced the dust lying over Socrates (πολλοῦ φιλήσας τὴν ἑπὶ κεμένην αὐτῆς κόνιν, Ps. Soc. Ep. xvii.3 ll. 11-22), but since we do not know if he had been cremated, it could refer to the dust intended the remains themselves.

49 Although Euclides’ alleged infiltration into Attica in drag in order to visit Socrates illegally (Doering (1972), test. 1; SSR IIA2) is probably fiction (SSR V pp. 33-36; Doering (1972), 72-75), this does not negate a journey to attend Socrates at his death (Phd. 59b-c).
these earlier less sophisticated writers. The three major Socratic philosophers, Euclides, Antisthenes and Plato had one purpose in common: the promotion of Socrates’ moral teaching for future generations. This was achieved through the composition of Socratic dialogues each in his own style and with his own philosophy. The Phaedo is supported by an elaborate metaphysical argument for establishing the immortality of the soul and its continuation in the after-life. Neither Euclides nor Antisthenes has need for these eschatological assumptions but rather makes a case solely on the protreptic effect of Socrates’ example and his ability to transform physical eros into philosophical love even after death. If Kyrsas returned to Megara a better lad by imaginatively discoursing with Socrates' spirit or daimon while asleep over his tomb, then Antisthenes could have closed his dialogue, much as did Plato, recording how Socrates’ memory would be treasured by his friends and disciples down through the generations and that his spirit still spread his moral influence over us for the good.
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