

## PLATO'S ACADEMY, ELIS AND ARCADIA AFTER LEUCTRA: SOME OBSERVATIONS

The reform of the Elean constitution carried out by Plato's pupil Phormion is an established fact; however, certain important aspects of Phormion's legislation have never been fully understood by modern historians or Platonic scholars. Controversies persist about the chronology, as well as the socio-political and philosophical intentions, of the Academician's measures<sup>1</sup>. To restate our view on the matter<sup>2</sup>, we believe that Phormion inaugurated a régime of moderate democracy in Elis, which lasted from 371 till, approximately, 365 B.C. His law-making, similar in many respects to that of Aristonymos in Arcadia in the same year, was made possible by the Spartan defeat at Leuctra. The ensuing *Koine Eirene*, organized at Athens by the Athenian statesman and general Timotheos, and/or by the *politeuomenoi* of Timotheos' group, provided a convenient occasion for various contacts leading to Phormion's engagement, despite the fact that the Eleans eventually refused to swear adherence to that Peace. Both Phormion and Aristonymos were exponents of the so-called Panathenian policy in the South, a policy devised by Plato and conducted by Timotheos, Plato's relative, friend, and ally in the conflicts of Athenian public life. The collaboration of the Academy and Timotheos with those Eleans who were ready to defend their city's independence of Sparta had its precedent in the collaboration of Socrates and Alcibiades with the Peloponnesians of an analogous orientation. That continuity — ideological, political and prosopographical — explains some enigmatic features of Attico-Peloponnesian relations in the late classical period.

From the complex of historical problems raised by the foregoing reconstruction of Phormion's undertaking and its background, we have chosen, for the present meeting, to examine a few salient points<sup>3</sup>.

The nature of the Elean régime of 371–365 B.C. comes first. If our dating and description of Phormion's reform are correct, the process of democratization of Elis must have recommenced immediately after Leuctra. H. Swoboda has already made such an

assumption, postulating that the changes in foreign policy tended to provoke, in the Peninsula of that epoch at least, parallel changes in internal organization. The whole of Swoboda's survey of the history of the Elean constitution in the V–IVth centuries is adapted to that postulate. According to him, the Elean moderate democracy of 471 B.C. remained in power till the end of the war of 402–400<sup>4</sup>. The oligarchy imposed in 400 was overthrown after Leuctra. The democrats of 371 retained their dominance till the Arcado-Elean hostilities in 365/4, when an oligarchic régime seems to have been restored; in any case, the Elis of 362/1 was certainly oligarchical<sup>5</sup>.

Swoboda's account of the constitutional evolution of Elis, though convincing enough in its main lines, has not been universally accepted. Two alternative views should be noted here. K. J. Beloch supposed that the oligarchy of 400 B.C. ruled till the late 360's

1. See e.g. A. Wörle, *Die politische Tätigkeit der Schüler Platons* (1981) 112–114; H.-J. Gehrke, *Stasis. Untersuchungen zu den inneren Kriegen in den griechischen Staaten des 5. und 4. Jahrhunderts v. Chr.* (1985) 54f. note 18, 56 note 24, 365 note 1, and the works referred to in my articles on Phormion (*infra*, note 2). Similar controversies are met with in the case of Aristonymos. For instance, our thesis that his legislation was in harmony with Timotheos' Peloponnesian policy has been criticized on several grounds (none of them decisive, we believe): J. Roy, *Historia* 23, 1974, 507; C. Bearzot, *Platone e i "moderati" ateniesi* (1981) 72 note 125; Gehrke, *op. cit.*, 105 note 1, 154 note 8, 156 note 23, *et al.*

2. A Contribution to the Constitutional History of Fourth-Century Elis, *Rec.trav.Fac.phil.Belgrade* XI-1, 1970, 49–64; L'Académie de Platon et la paix commune athénienne de 371 av. J.-C., *REG* 92, 1979, 319–347. A. Wörle was unaware of both the articles, H.-J. Gehrke of the latter.

3. For a more detailed analysis see: Plato's Academy, Elis and Arcadia after Leuctra. A Chapter in the History of Attico-Peloponnesian Relations (in preparation).

4. On the (disputed) chronology of Agis' expeditions against Elis, K. J. Beloch, *Griechische Geschichte*, I<sup>2</sup> 2 (1913) 185f.; III<sup>2</sup> 1 (1922) 17f., 19 note 1; Gehrke, *op. cit.*, 53 note 7; E. I. McQueen — C. J. Rowe, *Méthexis* 2, 1989, 1–13.

5. H. Swoboda, Elis (no. 1), *RE* V (1903) 2428f., cf. 2403.

and after; he envisaged no possibility of a post-Leuctran interval of democracy there<sup>6</sup>. In a recent important book, H.-J. Gehrke goes further, denying the historicity of both the constitutional turning-points which interest us — that of 400 and that of 371 alike. In Professor Gehrke's opinion, the democracy of 471 governed Elis, without any interruption, till "die Wirren im Krieg mit Arkadien (365/4)"<sup>7</sup>. His doubts as to the *coup d'état* of 371 are based upon the fact that our sources do not mention it explicitly; Beloch did not give his reasons for his scepticism on the same point.

Now, several arguments may be cited in favour of Swoboda's picture of Elis in the critical years of 400 and 371 B.C.<sup>8</sup>. Some of them have already been adduced in our previous studies, but none seems conclusive<sup>9</sup>. The purpose of the following analysis is to show that two events — neglected or misunderstood by modern scholarship — prove, clearly though indirectly, that there was indeed a democratic revolution in post-Leuctran Elis. We hope that their interest goes beyond the framework of a short episode in Elean history.

The former of the two is alluded to in Tertullian's *Apologeticum*, in a list of misdeeds (mainly political) committed by pagan philosophers: ... *et Hippias, dum civitati insidias disponit, occiditur*<sup>10</sup>. Controversial<sup>11</sup>, Tertullian's note is best taken as a reliable testimony of the death of the Elean sophist Hippias in civil strife. This may be supported by a novel explanation of data on Isocrates' marriage with Plathane, the widowed daughter<sup>12</sup> of a Hippias, the "sophist" and "rhetor". Isocrates adopted her youngest son, Aphareus (the future tragic poet), who "cannot have been born later than 380; ... it is therefore unlikely that Plathane's second marriage postdates 380"<sup>13</sup>. If the natural identification of Plathane's father with the Elean polymath is accepted<sup>14</sup> — and the eloquent, as well as rare, name of Aphareus<sup>15</sup> favours this though, to my knowledge, it has never been introduced into the discussion of the matter — it must be assumed that Plathane, an Elean, possessed the right of *epigamia* in Athens. Otherwise, the whole arrangement involving her, Isocrates, and Aphareus (a citizen of Athens!) would have been legally impossible.

The only way we see to reconcile all these pieces of evidence would be the following reconstruction of certain developments in Attico-Elean relations of the early fourth century. During the Corinthian War or immediately after, a *coup d'état* was attempted in Elis

against the radically oligarchical and pro-Spartan régime created in 400 B.C.<sup>16</sup>. The revolutionaries did not succeed. Some, like Hippias, were killed. Some were banished ἐπ' ἀττικισμῷ or simply fled to Athens. The Athenians rewarded the most prominent families of the refugees with *politeia* and *epigamia* (the women's *civitas*, in practical terms, meant little more than *ius conubii* then), which was a normal fea-

6. *GG* III<sup>2</sup> 1, 19 note 1, 201. Similarly, J. Roy, *Historia* 20, 1971, 573.

7. *Op. cit.*, 53-55 (cf. S. Perlman, *CIQu* 58, 1964, 74f.). To Professor Gehrke's objection (p. 54 n. 12: "... bezeugt ist, daß die Demokraten bzw. Thrasydaios es waren, die den Frieden mit Sparta erreichten...") to Swoboda's interpretation of the consequences of the war of 402-400 it may be answered, with Beloch, that the oligarchy was imposed on the Eleans "bald nach dem Frieden mit Sparta" of 400 B.C. (*GG* III<sup>2</sup> 1, 19 note 1).

8. Cf. below, notes 16 and 22.

9. Two such arguments deserve perhaps special attention: a) Plutarch (*Mor.* 1126 C) cites the legislations of Aristonymos (Arcadia), Phormion (Elis) and Menedemos (Pyrrha) together, in a single phrase; as Aristonymos' laws certainly belong to 371, and Menedemos' very probably, the same date will have been likely for Phormion's (democratic) reform too; b) the committee of 12 Hellenodicae (368 B.C.) is best understood as reflecting Phormion's theoretical conceptions. On the other hand, it is doubtful whether the amnesty inscription Solmsen-Fraenkel, *Inscr.gr. ad inl. dial. sel.* 53 should be attributed to the period of the Academician's measures and/or its various features (provisions, the dialect and the dating formula) explained by them.

10. 46, 16. J.-P. Waltzing's *apparatus* (CUF) has *et Hippias* edd.: *Ycthyas* F, *ichthydías* P.

11. See e.g. M. Untersteiner, *Sofisti. Testimonianze e frammenti*, III (1954), 74 no. 15 comm.

12. Not Hippias' widow herself, as stated in the less reliable part of the tradition. See *PA* 1184.

13. J. K. Davies, *Athenian Propertied Families, 600-300 B.C.* (1971) 247. Fiehn, Plathane, *RE* Supplb. VIII (1956) 502, puts the marriage "um 380".

14. Thus e.g. E. Wellmann, Hippias (no. 10), *RE* VIII (1912) 1706. *Contra*, Münscher, Isokrates (no. 2), *RE* IX (1914) 2154, Davies (*loc. cit.*) *et al.*

15. It belongs to the group of the "Heroennamen als Menschennamen" and connotes the anti-Spartan legends of Messenia-Pisa-Elis. The choice of such a name for Hippias' grandson may have had something to do with the grandfather's historico-genealogical studies (cf. Plato, *Hipp.Mai.* 285 D-E). In any case, it is not without a parallel in the index of *IvO* (e.g. Charops, Oxylos, Telemachos).

16. It was actually unpopular in more than one respect. Cf. Xen. *Hell.* III 5, 12 and Diog. Laert. II 9, 1 (συνεῖλω τῇ πατρίδι, of the fate of Phaedon and Elis caused by the events of 402-400). The same conclusion might follow from a change (?) in the early fourth century (before 396), of the status of the Elean *mastroi* / Ὀλυμπικὴ βουλή (according to the kind communication by Professor P. Siewert).

ture of the international diplomacy of the period. Plathane with her sons obviously ranked among the notables worthy of these privileges, a conjecture to explain not only her second marriage but also Apha-reus' status of adoptive son of Isocrates and an Athenian citizen. Politically and socially speaking, there would be nothing strange in her decision to marry Isocrates, since the teacher of rhetoric, as an intimate friend of Timotheos, must have been close to the atticophile Peloponnesians<sup>17</sup>. Various references to Hippias in Plato's dialogues of the 380's (*Hippias Minor*, *Hippias Maior*, *Protagoras*) actually seem to reflect the topicality of the Elean political problem and Hippias' role in it<sup>18</sup>. Plato's portrait of Hippias, though ironically painted, betrays nevertheless the Academy's interest in the Elean situation. Those of the portrait's features which may be labelled posthumous are chronologically relevant — that is to say, they make it probable that Hippias' death occurred c. 385 B.C. A testimony of Diodorus, usually set aside, tends to support this dating. According to the Sicilian, Antialcidas' peace, with its autonomy clause, provoked serious conflicts within certain Greek states — primarily the states of the Peloponnese<sup>19</sup>, to judge from the context, consecrated to the Mantinean *διοικισμος*, of the Diodorean mention of these *staseis*<sup>20</sup>. The abortive *coup d'état* of Hippias probably belonged to the same series of troubles.

In any case, the dissensions which cost Hippias his life imply that pre-Leuctran Elis was ruled by oligarchs, not the friends of democratic Athens. Attempts of an analogous nature, based again upon the principle of autonomy inherent in the notion of *Koine Eirene*, were to be made after the Common Peaces of 375 and 371 too<sup>21</sup>. The Athenian conference of 371, an outcome of the Spartan defeat, offered quite favourable conditions in that respect. This time, the Elean democrats must have been victorious; Beloch's opinion that the laws of 400 B.C. lasted till the late 360's should be discarded and a revolution postulated, resulting in the constitutional discontinuity (the summer/autumn of 371). Such a conclusion follows from our general assessment of the new balance of power and the characteristics of Phormion's reform<sup>22</sup>. It is corroborated by a precise piece of evidence on the second of the two events alluded to in the introduction to our paper.

Relating the preliminaries to the peace congress held at Susa in 367, Xenophon lists the envoys of the cities of the Boeotian block thus: ... ἀναβαίνουσι

Θηβαίων μὲν Πελοπίδας, Ἀρκάδων δὲ Ἀντίοχος ὁ παγκρατιαστής, Ἡλείων δὲ Ἀρχίδαμος· ἠκολούθει δὲ καὶ Ἀργεῖος<sup>23</sup>. Moderns disagree as to the Ἀργεῖος. The majority of them qualify it as the ethnic of an anonymous ambassador from Argos; others see in it the personal name of an Elean accompanying Archidamos. Xenophon's language strongly recommends the latter interpretation — especially his usage of the technical term ἀκολουθέω, which in analogous expressions denotes the counsellor(s) of ambassadors<sup>24</sup>. Archidamos' adviser was obviously the people's champion of Elis, mentioned again at the *Hel-lenica* VII 4, 15-16. Judging by the political option of Argeios and the importance of the meeting at Susa, the Elean régime of 367, which sent Argeios with Archidamos to Artaxerxes' court, must be defined as democratic. This simple inference — so far rarely or never made — indirectly confirms the thesis that Elis had a democracy during the period of 371-365.

What has just been said on the years 386, 375 and 371 as landmarks in the history of the Peloponnesian conflicts in the early decades of the fourth century brings us back to the phenomenon of continuity in Attico-Peloponnesian relations touched upon at the beginning of the present report. Timotheos and the Academy played notable roles in this, as did their forerunners, typically embodied in Alcibiades and Socrates, late in the fifth century. Timotheos' operations around Zacynthos in 374, and the name *Arkadia*, epitomizing a part of his programme, which he gave to the fortress of the Zacynthian democrats then, reveal that he was concerned with Elis too. Strategically situated between the island and the centre of the Peninsula, and one of the contributors to

17. See *infra*, note 25, on Hieronymos. Cf. Isocr. IV 126.

18. This subject is studied in my forthcoming book: *The Birth of the Academy...*

19. Cf. Diod. XV 40, 1, of the analogous events in 375-374.

20. XV 5; cf. J. Roy, *Klio* 55, 1973, 137f., whose fine analysis of Diodorus' accounts of the Peloponnesian revolutions in the first half of the fourth century tends to be, in the present author's opinion, too sceptical on this point.

21. Diod. XV 40; Xen. *Hell.* VI 5, 3; 5 and Isocr. VI 64-69. Cf. Roy, *loc. cit.*, 139, and *Historia* 20, 1971, 569f.; H. Schwartz, *RhM* 44, 1889, 175 (Xen. *Hell.* VI 1, 17, implies i.a. Elis?).

22. Cf. also Isocr. VI 66 (the εὐδαιμονέστατοι probably includes the Eleans).

23. *Hell.* VII 1, 33 (ἠκολ.] ἐβουλήθη B, a *lectio facillior*).

24. Cf. e.g. Thuc. IV 118, 6 (D. Kienast, *Presbeia*, *RE* Suppl. XIII [1973] 540). See also L. Breitenbach's commentary *ad Xen.*, *l.c.*

Mnasippos' fleet (Xen. *Hell.* VI 2, 3), she was bound to attract the attention of Timotheos. After Antialcidas' peace, Athens sheltered the enemies of an aggressive Lacedaemon from Mantinea, Elis and Thebes. They collaborated politically among themselves, as well as with many Athenians - statesmen (Plut. *Pel.* 6, 2f.; 7, 1), and intellectuals from the circles of Plato and Isocrates<sup>25</sup>. A friend of both scholars and a *boiotiazor*<sup>26</sup>, Timotheos must have been instrumental in every move that held out hope of the refugees' regaining their cities; the atticocentric Panhellenism of the Common Peaces of 375 and 371 (the latter in that year), with their postcedents, is especially instructive in that respect<sup>27</sup>. Through his father Conon<sup>28</sup>, the Athenian *strategos* was also something of a successor to Alcibiades. The possibility should be allowed that Timotheos' western campaigns of 375-374 had Alcibiades' Peloponnesian engagement as a propaganda model and source of personal alliances. Plato's *Banquet* significantly comments upon 416 B.C. as a prefiguration of 385 B.C. in Panathenian activity in the South, which implies that Conon's son was given a part in it as early as the mid-380's<sup>29</sup>.

Two elements of that continuity should be pointed out in some detail. First, the personage of Phaedon. As a pupil of Socrates and a friend of Simmias and Cebes, he was probably close to Plato and Timotheos too. His (lost) dialogues dealt i.a. with certain problems of Athenian and Spartan policies, evidently attesting to his esteem for Alcibiades' memory. His public life harmonized with those literary sympathies, for he had opted with the patriots, against the pro-Spartan faction, in the war of 402-400<sup>30</sup>, returning home probably as late as 371, when Phormion's reform guaranteed the safety of the atticophile Eleans.

Second, politically eloquent names tend to support our deductions. Their neglected testimonies demand an exhaustive discussion, but since we are bound to be brief, we shall choose only a small number of such anthroponyms and treat them rapidly. Judging from the putative age of *Argeios*, one of the leaders of the Elean democrats, in the 360's, we may attribute his birth and name to the epoch of the anti-Lacedaemonian alliance formed by Argos, Elis, Mantinea and Athens in 420 B.C. The contribution of Alcibiades to the same events of 420-416, obviously approved by *Argeios*' father<sup>31</sup>, reminds us of all the other indications linking the Eleans of 371-365 with the Athens of Socrates and young Plato. Among many analogous examples, *Parrhasios* in Arcadia<sup>32</sup> and *Eutresios*

in Athens<sup>33</sup> — both the names are likely to have reflected the conflicts of 420-416 — may be cited. Thebes, the other major factor in the anti-Laconian block of V-IVth centuries, was no exception. Though perhaps born some years after the *rapprochement* of Boeotia with Argos, Corinth and Elis of 421, *Pelopidas* was given a name that well illustrates this opposi-

25. S. Dušanić, *The Arcadian League of the Fourth Century* (1970) 289 (Plato and the Mantinean Lastheneia; Isocrates and the Arcadian federalist Hieronymos). Simmias, Cebes and Phaedon — not to speak of other intermediaries — may have introduced the Boeotian and Elean emigrés to the Academy. Cf. *supra*, text and note 17; *infra*, text and notes 29ff. Phormion and Aristonymos probably belonged to this group of the anti-Laconians resident in Athens.

26. La Béotie antique, *Coll.int. du CNRS* 1985, 233 note 61.

27. Cf. Isocr. XV 110; Corn. Nep. *Timoth.* 2.

28. The story of the so-called Chreocopidae (Plut. *Sol.* 15, 7) discloses a political alliance formed by Alcibiades, Conon and Callias (cf. Davies, *op. cit.*, 12, 255 and 506). It probably came into being in 407 B.C., when the Peloponnesse figures again as an important factor in Attico-Spartan relations.

29. S. Dušanić, *Rec.trav.Fac.phil.Belgrade* XVI A, 1989, 9-30.

30. The date of Phaedon's enslavement has been much debated (and the fact itself has been sometimes doubted, without good reason, cf. McQueen - Rowe, *loc. cit.*, 13-18, with bibl.). Other indications apart, the strong expression συνεάλω τῇ πατρίδι in Diogenes Laertius (see above, note 16) presupposes that the sale of Phaedon into slavery coincided with a very serious crisis in the history of his city, a crisis which — within the given period — can be identified only with Agis' war. The Suda article (Φ 154) may be decisive here if our emendation ὑπ' Ὀπουντίων (ληφθῆναι) is accepted. More attractive, formally at least, than the emendations proposed so far, it is based upon Diodorus (XIV 17, 9), who informs us that Opus Acroriae sided with the Spartans after 402. — Cf. *REG* 92, 1979, 327f.

31. The name of *Argeios* connotes Argos (a democratic, anti-Spartan and pro-Athenian power, devoted to Alcibiades), whether it is taken as an "Einzelname aus dem wirklichen Ethnikon" or — the less plausible alternative — an item in the group of the "Namen aus der Heroenwelt als Menschennamen". If Ἄργεϊος Κλεινίου, the Elean ambassador cited with distinction in Chremonides' decree (*St.-V.* III 476, line 58; c. 266 B.C.), was a descendant of the *Argeios* figuring in Xenophon — which is possible, to say the least (for an Elean example of the traditionalism in the name-giving within great families see *IvO* 415, with comm.) — the name of the ambassador's father, recalling Alcibiades' line, may attest to the Alcibiadean connections of the whole house and, particularly, of the man who christened Xenophon's *Argeios*.

32. Solmsen-Fraenkel, *Inscr.gr. ad inl. dial. sel.* 2, line 3; cf. *BCH* 92, 1978, 348f. L. Dubois (*Recherches sur le dialecte arcadien*, II [1986] 133ff. no. 1) is wrong in maintaining the interpretation of the *Parrhasios* as a simple ethnic.

33. A *sobriquet* of Autolykos in Eupolis, frg. 64 (Kassel-Austin).

tion to a Peloponnese dominated by the Spartan Heraclidae. And, conversely, the presence of an *Eleios* among the Athenians who defended the Theban *émigrés* of 382–379<sup>34</sup> shows the strength of connections in the Athens-Thebes-Elis triangle, connections inspired by a fear of Sparta. To conclude this with a word on *Phormion* the legislator: his name was obviously a common one but, as the name of a political man, may also have contained a political message. Was it to declare his family's respect for the Athenian admiral *Phormion*, victor in several famous battles in the West and the eponym of some Acarnanian notables<sup>35</sup>? In certain respects, these victories, mainly won at the beginning of the Peloponnesian War, adumbrated what Alcibiades and, later on, Conon and Timotheos were to do for the independence of the Peloponnese, the Corinthian Gulf and the adjacent lands — Elis with Cyllene included.

Achaea comes in here, and not only because of the twin-theme of our Colloquium. There are signs that the politically-minded Pythagoreans of a branch of the Order, after their return to their land of origin (c. 450 B.C.), were active along the same anti-Laonian lines in the Peloponnese, Thebes and Athens<sup>36</sup>. Socrates and Plato, with their debts to Pythagoras' philosophy, must have been in contact with them<sup>37</sup>. In any case, Chairon need not have been the earliest member of the Academy from Achaea. Timotheos'

campaigns of 375–373 seem to have been coordinated with certain Panhellenic plans of Plato bearing on Achaea, Ionia and Magna Graecia. But these plans deserve a separate analysis.

SLOBODAN DUŠANIĆ

34. Din. I 38: 'Ἡλίου *vulg.* ἡλίου NA; 'Ἡλείου Reiske (cf. *PA* 6400-6402), according to N. C. Conomis' ed. (Bibl. Teubn.). Like *Argeios* (*supra*, note 31), *Eleios* is a name implying the friendship (*προξενία vel sim.*) for the eponymous city or hero.

35. *PA* 14958 (died c. 428 B.C.; his fame outlived him for many years). M. J. Osborne, *Naturalization in Athens*, III-IV (1983) 44.

36. The roles of Simmias, Cebes and the other Pythagoreans in Plato's *Phaedon* and Plutarch's *De genio Socratis* allude to their political, not only philosophical, attitudes, though that aspect of the two writings has not been sufficiently elucidated. Epaminondas as a pupil of Philolaos and/or Lysis (c. 400 B.C.): K. von Fritz, Philolaos, *RE Supplb.* XIII (1973) 453-484; Stenzel, Lysis (no. 2), *RE XIV* (1928) 64f. (cf. P. Lévêque – P. Vidal-Naquet, *Historia* 9, 1960, 307f.).

37. Plato was a teacher of two Pythagorizusae, Lastheneia from Mantinea and Axiothea from Phlius; on Plato and Philolaos see Diog. Laert. III 6. The name of the Arcadian assembly, οἱ Μύριοι, devised by Aristonymos in 371, probably goes back to the Pythagorean models. A precedent might be found in Socrates' collaboration with Diagoras of Melos, who advised Nikodoros, the Mantinean reformer of 423 (see my article referred to above, note 29). Diagoras' surprising decision to seek refuge in Pellene (415/4; Ernst Meyer, Pellene [no. 1], *RE XIX* [1937] 361) should be explained as a sign of his connection with the Pythagoreans of Achaea.

## RÉSUMÉ

# L'ACADÉMIE DE PLATON, ELIS ET L'ARCADIE APRÈS LEUCTRES: QUELQUES REMARQUES

La législation de Phormion d'Elis, élève de Platon (Plut. *Mor.* 805 et 1126C) n'a pas été suffisamment comprise par les historiens modernes ou les spécialistes de Platon. Quatre points semblent importants pour la reconstitution de l'affaire: a) la date de la réforme de Phormion, b) ses effets constitutionnels et son attitude à l'égard des conflits des partis politiques éléens; c) sa place dans la politique péloponnésienne de certains milieux politiques athéniens; et d) sa relation avec la législation d'Aristonymos en Arcadie. Les conclusions essentielles de notre analyse peuvent être résumées ainsi:

Malgré les récentes réserves H. Swoboda a probablement raison de penser au changement du régime oligarchique éléen en démocratie, immédiatement après Leuctres. Le rôle d'Argeios en 367 av. J.-C. (Xen. *Hell.* VII 1, 33) confirme indirectement la thèse selon laquelle Elis avait un régime démocratique entre 371–366 av. J.-C. L'expression de Xénophon (*loc. cit.*) ἡκολούθει δὲ καὶ Ἀργεῖος fait apparemment allusion au "leader" populaire d'Elis – mentionnée de nouveau en 4, 15-16 – et non pas à une personne anonyme, originaire d'Argos.

Les mesures législatives de Phormion qui conduisent à la constitution démocratique (Plutarque le compare avec Ephialtes!) doivent être attribuées au

début de ce *quinquennium*, probablement pendant l'été ou l'automne de 371. Des considérations variées historico-épigraphiques tendent à appuyer une telle datation, particulièrement l'argument concernant la relation étroite entre les démocraties en Elis et en Arcadie après Leuctres; cette dernière fut inaugurée, pendant la seconde moitié de 371, par un autre législateur de l'Académie, Aristonymos.

Les architectes de telles relations ont trouvé des appuis à l'Académie de Platon. Celle-ci s'est ralliée non seulement un grand nombre de politiciens Athéniens (Timotheos était le plus important parmi eux) prêts à mener une politique active dans le Péloponnèse mais aussi les réfugiés d'Elis et de Mantinée qui instaurèrent, après Leuctres et contre le gré d'une Sparte agressive, des régimes démocratiques dans leurs cités.

La collaboration de l'Académie et de Timotheos avec les démocrates Eléens et Arcadiens a son précédent dans la collaboration de Socrate et d'Alcibiade avec les Péloponnésiens qui avaient les mêmes opinions politiques. Cette continuité — idéologique, politique et prosopographique — peut expliquer certains aspects énigmatiques, des relations attico-péloponnésiennes pendant la dernière phase de la période classique.