The Sophisticated Obstacle: The Cynic Critique of the Polis on Eudaemonist Grounds

Matthew Ewy | Department of Philosophy, Rollins College

For the political philosophers of classical Greece, the polis set the horizon within which the question of the 'good life' could be constructed and more importantly interrogated. Plato's *Republic* outlines and argues for an ideal city on the premise that the soul cannot achieve justice apart from a justly ordered state, and his *Laws* legislates for a second-best city on the same assumption. Against this tradition stood the Cynics — Diogenes of Sinope, his teacher Antisthenes, and his followers Crates of Thebes and Hipparchia — whose deliberate poverty and theatrical defiance of convention constituted a standing rebuttal to the claim that flourishing requires political order. This paper argues that the Cynic critique succeeds on the classical tradition's own terms. If justice names the conditions under which human beings are most capable of achieving eudaimonia, then life outside the institutional structures of the city-state provides better conditions for virtue, and therefore for justice teleologically understood, than life within them. The just city, on this reading, is not the apex of human achievement but its most sophisticated obstacle.

The question this paper takes up is a live one in the scholarship, though its two halves are distinctly a challenge to combine. One debate concerns whether Cynicism contains a positive political philosophy at all. Schofield treats Cynic cosmopolitanism as essentially negative, a rejection of existing cities with little constructive content, and locates the first genuine cosmopolitan politics in Zeno's Stoicism (Schofield, ch. 3). Against this deflationary account of the Cynic philosophy, Moles argues that Diogenes' cosmopolitanism carried substantive ethical commitments (Moles 105–20), Desmond reconstructs a Cynic politics of poverty and freedom (Desmond 77–131, 184–208), and Husson contends that Diogenes' lost *Politeia*, attested by Philodemus and Diogenes Laertius, was a deliberate philosophical rival to Plato's *Republic* rather than a doxographical fiction (Husson 23–41; Diogenes Laertius 6.80).

A second debate, descending from Foucault's final lectures, concerns Cynic parrhesia as a political practice. Foucault made the Cynic's true life central to his genealogy of truth-telling (Foucault 157–66), and Gardner has developed this into a reading of Diogenes as an immanent critic of the polis (Gardner 128–34). A third body

of work, running from Popper and Morrow through Bobonich, concerns the character of the persuasion Plato's *Laws* prescribes, and it bears directly on any critique of that dialogue's regulatory apparatus (Bobonich 365–88).

Moles establishes that Cynic cosmopolitanism carried positive ethical content, but his question is what the Cynics held rather than whether what they held defeats Plato. Desmond reconstructs a Cynic politics of poverty and freedom in its own terms, treating the Cynics as an object of historical reconstruction rather than as a party to an argument with the Academy. Husson comes closest, since establishing the *Politeia* as a deliberate rival to the *Republic* implies that the two positions are commensurable, but her case is philological and textual, and she does not carry the rivalry into an evaluation of which side wins.

What none of these debates has produced, accordingly, is an evaluation of the Cynic position against Plato on a standard Plato himself accepts. That is the contribution of this paper: an internal critique, culminating in an argument that the regulatory apparatus of Plato's *Laws* is limited by its own teleological measure, and limited in a way that the most rationalist reconstruction of that dialogue makes sharper rather than softer. The Cynic challenge in this paper therefore is not an eccentric provocation from outside the tradition but a defeater generated from within it.

Justice as a Teleological Standard

Justice, as I understand it here, is not merely the arrangement of legal codes or the equitable distribution of resources. It denotes the institutional and normative conditions under which human beings are most capable of achieving genuine flourishing (eudaimonia), understood not as pleasure or social stability but as "an activity of the soul in accordance with virtue" (Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics* 1098a16–17). A candid methodological note is required. Plato explicitly connects justice to the soul's flourishing. The Cynics, by contrast, left no theory of justice in the Platonic manner, and I do not attribute one to them. What follows therefore needs a standard of comparison, and the choice of standard determines whether the critique is genuinely internal or only appears to be.

The obvious candidate is a shared conception of eudaimonia, and it will not serve. A Platonist may grant that both traditions prize flourishing while denying that they mean the same thing by it. Platonic flourishing is the harmonious ordering of a complex soul crowned by knowledge of the Forms; Cynic flourishing is autarkeia and life according to nature, deliberately stripped of theory. If those are different targets, then showing that the Cynic attains Cynic flourishing outside the city shows nothing

about Platonic flourishing, and the internal critique is external after all. Nor is the difficulty removed by retreating to the formal criteria of *Nicomachean Ethics* 1097b–1098a — that flourishing is an activity of the soul in accordance with virtue, self-sufficient, and choiceworthy for its own sake. Those criteria are Aristotle's, and importing them to adjudicate between Plato and the Cynics is precisely the move a Platonist should refuse. The bridge must be built from something Plato himself accepts.

He supplies it. In the *Laws* Plato holds that virtue is unconditionally good for its possessor, good regardless of what other things he has or lacks, and that virtue is both necessary and sufficient for happiness (*Laws* 631b–d, 660e–661e, 874d). Bobonich, whose reading of the dialogue I engage at length below, documents this commitment and treats it as fundamental to Plato's justificatory structure, noting that the ultimate end of all laws and social institutions in Magnesia is the production of the greatest possible happiness for the citizens (Bobonich 378–80). The commitment is not incidental. It is what allows Plato to justify the entire legislative apparatus, since every institution must be defended by showing how it furthers that end.

Grant Plato this and the comparison becomes tractable without any assumption that the two schools agree about what virtue consists in. If virtue suffices for happiness, then the polis is necessary for eudaimonia only insofar as it is necessary for virtue. Plato's case for the city must therefore be a case about the conditions of virtue, and it is exactly that: the city supplies material security and moral formation, and without such formation individual justice is nearly impossible. The question dividing Plato from the Cynics is accordingly narrower and sharper than a dispute about the content of the good life. It is whether the institutional-coercive order is a condition of becoming virtuous. That question can be posed in terms both sides accept, because it does not require them to accept the same account of virtue, only to agree that whatever virtue is, the dispute concerns what its acquisition requires.

Two consequences follow. First, the Cynics need no theory of justice for the argument to proceed. They need only the claim, which no source disputes, that their way of life is the truest path to the good, together with a demonstration that this claim is coherent and the life livable. Second, the burden of the paper is correspondingly specific. It is not to show that Diogenes achieved Platonic flourishing, which would require the equivalence I have just disclaimed. It is to show that Plato's necessity claim about the conditions of virtue fails by his own lights. Whether the Cynics possessed a positive conception of justice is a further question, and one I return to below.

Three Senses of "Polis"

The Cynic position is easily caricatured, and the caricature must be dismantled before the argument can proceed. "Polis" conflates at least three things: first, the human community as such — language, cooperation, shared deliberation; second, the economic and commercial infrastructure of the city — its markets, surplus, and exchange; third, the coercive institutional order — laws, borders, citizenship classes, magistracies, and the authority to compel. The Cynic target is the third sense alone. This distinction answers Aristotle's famous objection in advance. Aristotle declares that man is by nature a *zoon politikon* and that the one who lives outside the city is "either a beast or a god" (Aristotle, *Politics* 1253a); on this view the Cynic has not transcended the human condition but fallen below it. But the objection equivocates between the first and third senses. The Cynics do not deny human sociality — Diogenes taught in the marketplace and engaged constantly with others (Diogenes Laertius 6.20–81; Kuin 86–88). What he rejected was the claim that the coercive institutional form of the city-state is the natural expression of human sociality rather than its distortion. The Cynic is not the isolated beast of the *Politics*; he is a human being who has found a way to be social without being political.

One refinement of the third sense is needed, since it bears the argument's weight. The objectionable feature of the institutional order is not naked compulsion narrowly construed — the sword behind the law — but something wider: the formation of the soul by an order the person did not choose and cannot contest. Plato's own city works largely through means other than force, and a Platonist may fairly protest that the load-bearing mechanism of Kallipolis is formation rather than compulsion. The Cynic target includes this. What he opposes is soul-shaping without standing to contest it, whether it proceeds by the threat of the magistrate, by the curated song, or by argument the citizen is not free to reject. Each installs a disposition in a person who was given no purchase on it. This is the sense of "polis" that Plato claims is necessary for flourishing, and it is this sense the Cynic denies.

The distinction also sharpens the thesis against a subtler objection. The same evidence from Moles that supports the reconstruction above might suggest that the Cynic quarrel is only with strong states like Kallipolis rather than with minimal association as such. I concede the point, and the concession costs nothing. A voluntary community of the virtuous, held together by shared recognition of the good and not by compulsion, is precisely not a polis in the third sense. It is, as we shall see, Zeno's city of the wise — a distinct idea born from the Cynic tradition and transformed in the Stoic

school of thought. The Cynic challenge is to institutional-coercive political architecture, and it is that architecture which Plato claims is necessary for flourishing.

Plato's Case for the Polis

Plato's *Republic* provides the most foundational account of the just political order. Justice is structural harmony: as the soul achieves its proper condition when reason governs spirit and appetite, the state achieves justice when each class performs its proper function, so that "each does his own work" (*Republic* 433a–b). The account rests on three premises.

First, human beings are "not self-sufficing but full of wants" (369b), so that flourishing requires a division of labor no individual can supply alone.

Second, virtue is knowledge, and knowledge requires the leisure that only an organized city provides, since the philosopher accesses truth because the producer class frees him from material concern. This premise is stated in its *Republic* form. As will emerge below, Plato's position in the *Laws* differs in a way that matters for the argument, and the difference is one his modern defenders have documented rather than one I am imposing.

Third, and most fundamentally, the external order of the city shapes the internal order of the soul. Without proper institutional formation individual justice is nearly impossible, and even the philosopher who has glimpsed the Forms must return to the cave, since isolated virtue corrupts in an unjust environment (519c–521b). The polis thus supplies two essential goods — material security and moral formation — and flourishing becomes inextricable from political life. The human being, on this account, is constitutively incomplete outside the city.

Diogenes as Normative Exemplar

The Cynic reply begins with a figure, and the figure requires methodological care. Diogenes reaches us almost entirely through chreiai, pointed anecdotes compiled centuries after his death by Diogenes Laertius, Plutarch, and others, and the historical record is, as Kuin emphasizes, full of holes (Kuin 4–6). I therefore do not present Diogenes as an empirical datum, a documented case of flourishing outside the city. He functions instead as a normative exemplar, in precisely the way Plato's Socrates functions: a philosophically constructed model whose argumentative force is independent of biographical accuracy. The construction is not built on sand even where individual anecdotes are legendary, since the philosophical commitments that constitute the exemplar — autarkeia, the priority of *physis* over *nomos*, and the reduction

of needs to what nature supplies — are attested across the tradition independently of any single story. It is those commitments, and not the pithos or the encounter with Alexander, that the argument requires.

What the exemplar shows is that the Cynic way of life is a coherent object of choice. Plato's premise is a necessity claim, so a coherent counter-model would defeat it, but coherence alone invites the reply that many things are describable without being livable by beings constituted as we are. The Cynic tradition answers this in practice. Crates and Hipparchia abandoned wealth and citizenship to take up the life, and a school formed around it and persisted (Diogenes Laertius 6.85–98). Whatever the status of any particular anecdote, the existence of practitioners over generations is evidence that the model is livable and not merely statable, and livability is what Plato's necessity claim denies.

The exemplar must also survive against another objection: Diogenes was not materially independent of the city. His pithos stood near the agora, and he lived on alms and dinner invitations (Kuin 86–88). If self-sufficiency means producing one's own sustenance, Diogenes fails the test. But this mistakes the Cynic claim. Autarkeia is a psychological and moral condition — the reduction of needs to what nature supplies easily, and indifference to everything else — not agricultural self-provision (Diogenes Laertius 6.37, 6.44). The Cynic uses the city's surplus without being constituted by its institutions. He takes bread from the marketplace but no identity from the citizen rolls, no obligations from the law courts, and no measure of the good from convention. When Alexander offered him anything he wished, Diogenes asked only that he stand out of his light (Plutarch, *Life of Alexander* 14), which is to say that the most powerful ruler in the world could not augment his needs. The city, for the Cynic, is a stage and a granary; it is not a soul-forming necessity. That is the precise point at issue with Plato, whose claim was never merely that cities are materially convenient but that they are morally constitutive. The dependency objection, properly analyzed, concedes the trivial claim and leaves the crucial one refuted.

The Cynic Counter-Politics: Zeno, the Lost *Politeia*, and Cosmopolitan Justice

The Cynics did not merely live an alternative way of life; they wrote one. Diogenes composed a *Politeia* of his own, a fact preserved by Philodemus and the catalogues in Diogenes Laertius and defended as authentic by Husson (Husson 23–41; Diogenes Laertius 6.80). The challenge to Plato was thus textual and deliberate rather than merely performative. Its fullest development came through Zeno of Citium, who composed his *Republic* on the dog's tail, that is, while still under the influence of the Cynic Crates (Sellars 8). Zeno's community is held together by virtue and by shared

recognition of the good, with no legal or compulsory mechanism doing the work, and its doctrines follow from the Cynic ideal of living according to nature (Sellars 17). This is where Schofield's deflationary reading comes under pressure. If Zeno's community follows from the Cynic ideal of living according to nature, then the constructive content Schofield locates in Stoicism was inherited rather than invented, and the negativity he ascribes to the Cynics is a feature of the surviving evidence rather than of the position itself.

What is philosophically significant about Zeno's *Republic* is its diagnostic function. On Sellars' reading, the text operates as an argument rather than a blueprint: every institution the actual city requires — law courts, currency, temples — testifies to the vices its citizens have not overcome (Sellars 8–9). This reading can be pushed further than Sellars takes it, though the further step needs a premise the Platonist will contest. Suppose every civic institution is a remedy for vice. A Platonist may reply that designing an effective remedy is itself an achievement of practical reason, so that institutional complexity measures excellence after all, as a well-run hospital measures medical skill rather than the prevalence of disease. The analogy fails at the point that matters. Medicine aims at health, and its success is the patient's restoration to a condition in which the physician is no longer needed. Plato's institutions do not aim at their own dissolution. Kallipolis is designed to persist, its formative apparatus operating in perpetuity on each generation, because on Plato's account the conditions producing the need never lift. An institution whose success condition is its permanence is not a cure. What it measures is the depth of the failure it manages.

The diagnosis extends to Plato's epistemic premise, and here the standard established above does the work. Plato ties virtue to knowledge and knowledge to the leisure that only an organized city provides, so that the philosopher can contemplate because the producer feeds him. The premise is meant to establish that the city is necessary for virtue and thereby, given that virtue suffices for happiness, necessary for eudaimonia. Whether it establishes this depends entirely on what kind of knowledge virtue requires.

The difficulty is that Plato's own answer changes, and the *Laws* answers in a way that undercuts the premise. In the *Republic*, knowledge is required for the possession of any virtue in the full sense. In the *Laws*, as Bobonich argues at length, Plato abandons that claim while continuing to hold that some sort of true belief, rationally justified, is necessary for virtue; he freely attributes unqualified virtue to citizens who lack philosophic knowledge, and he never confines ordinary citizens to a merely popular grade of virtue (Bobonich 380 n. 59, 384). The Magnesian citizen becomes virtuous by

receiving and grasping the reasons contained in the preludes, not by ascending to the Forms.

This is a substantial concession, and it costs Plato the epistemic premise. If virtue requires rationally justified true belief about how one should live rather than theoretical wisdom, then what the division of labor secures is no longer what virtue needs. The leisure of the producer class purchases contemplation of the Forms; it does not purchase the citizen's grasp of a practical argument about how to act, which is available to anyone capable of following one. The Cynic can therefore accept Plato's late position without alteration and observe that it no longer supports the conclusion Plato drew from it. He does not need a rival epistemology of his own. He needs only to note that Diogenes' askesis is a method of acquiring rationally held convictions about how to live, tested in practice, and that on the *Laws*' own account of what virtue requires there is nothing further the city must supply.

A Platonist may reply that the preludes themselves are the mechanism by which citizens come to hold justified true beliefs, so that the city remains necessary as the deliverer of the arguments even if not as the guarantor of leisure. This is the strongest form of the epistemic premise and I take it seriously, since it is what Bobonich's reading makes available. But it relocates the necessity claim rather than defending it. The question is no longer whether the city underwrites the leisure that theoretical knowledge demands. It is whether the specific manner in which Magnesia delivers its arguments produces convictions the citizen can call his own. That is the question the final section takes up, and it is there that the Platonic project encounters its own limits.

Here the question of Cynic justice, deferred above, can be answered. The Cynics do have a conception of justice, though it is deflationary and relocated. Justice is a property of persons rather than of institutions, and it consists in living according to nature: physis over nomos. When Diogenes declared himself kosmopolitēs, a citizen of the world (Diogenes Laertius 6.63), the claim was not merely a rejection of Sinope and Athens. As Sellars notes, it affirmed allegiance to the law of nature over the conventions of any city (Sellars 5), and as Moles argues, it carried positive content, committing the Cynic to a moral community grounded in shared rationality rather than shared territory and recognizing no authority higher than virtue (Moles 105–10). Diogenes Laertius preserves the deflationary thesis in a single line, that the only true commonwealth is the one in the cosmos (6.72). Justice, so conceived, needs no architecture. The Platonic question "what institutional order is just?" receives the Cynic answer that the question is malformed, since institutions of justice are remedial responses to vice, at best palliative and at worst a means of entrenching the dependency they claim to cure. This is a rival

theory rather than the absence of one, and it is what allows the Cynic challenge to target justice and not merely virtue.

Parrhesia as the Practice of Virtue

The instrument of Cynic justice is parrhesia, fearless and unlicensed speech. Foucault, in his final lectures, made Cynic parrhesia the hinge of his genealogy of truth-telling, reading the Cynic's scandalous life as the true life that indicts the existence of others (Foucault 233–34). My use of the concept is narrower and eudaimonist rather than genealogical. Parrhesia matters here because of its function in the economy of virtue. Gardner captures that function precisely: Diogenes' practice operates as an immanent critique, exposing from within civic life the gap between what the city claims to value and what it rewards (Gardner 130–35). Parrhesia is not incidental to Cynic flourishing but constitutive of it. The Cynic achieves virtue by continually testing himself and others against the standard of nature, and this testing requires the freedom to speak and act without the constraints political life demands. The critique requires an audience, and so it requires the city, though as stage rather than as source. The Cynic diagnosis is medical in form and inverted in content: the polis manages the symptoms of vice while preventing recovery.

The *Laws* and the Limits of the Platonic Project

If the *Republic* is Plato's ideal, the *Laws* is his concession to reality, and it is here that the internal critique bites hardest. The second-best city regulates its boundary with radical strictness. Citizens under forty are prohibited from traveling abroad, and those permitted are only the most established and virtuous (*Laws* 950a–951c). Expression fares no better. Musical and poetic performance must be judged by magistrates trained in virtue rather than by audience pleasure. Pleasure is explicitly rejected as a criterion of correctness, since citizens delight in what corrupts them (659c–660a), and Athens' instability is attributed to the elevation of audience judgment over normative standards (700a–701b). The soul of the citizen is to be protected by the state's control of what it may hear, see, and encounter.

The critique must be stated with care, because two powerful replies stand ready and the crude version of the objection walks into both. The crude version runs: a citizen conditioned into virtue by the state is a puppet made to act well rather than a genuinely virtuous agent.

The first reply is that the puppet image is Plato's own. In the *Laws* he pictures the human being as a divine puppet pulled by competing cords and urges that we yield to the golden cord of calculation and law (644d–645c). He embraces the charge of

producing puppets and asks only that we be pulled by the right string. Nor is the appeal to conditioning a weakness he has overlooked. The developmental orthodoxy that he and Aristotle share holds that habituation is the precondition of virtue rather than its enemy, since we become just by doing just acts long before we can give an account of them (Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics* 1103a31–b2). The *Laws*' regime of regulated travel, art, and thought is, in this view, the systematic form of the moral education every virtue ethics requires. "You make puppets" is Plato's self-description, willingly owned.

The second reply is more recent and more damaging, since it denies the picture of Magnesia on which the crude objection depends. On Bobonich's reading, the persuasion Plato prescribes in the *Laws* is rational persuasion. The preludes are characterized as teaching, citizens are to be given good epistemic reasons for the beliefs they adopt, and the governing analogy is the free doctor who gives his patient an account rather than the slave doctor who issues commands and hurries off (Bobonich 373, 380). Against Popper's charge of lying propaganda and Morrow's and Stalley's milder claim that the preludes work on the emotions, Bobonich shows that Plato's own language throughout the relevant passages is the language of argument, teaching, and learning. Bobonich further confronts the censorship directly and defuses much of its apparent force. Because the whole of the *Laws* serves as a school text, and because the dialogue itself stages an extended argument with an imagined atheist, the citizens are exposed to views the lawgiver rejects, and they receive a public statement of how their inquiry has been limited and why. Magnesia thereby satisfies a publicity requirement that the *Republic*, with its noble lie, conspicuously fails (Bobonich 377–78).

I accept this reading. The Cynic critique that follows is not the charge that Plato bewitches his citizens, which Bobonich has answered, but a narrower charge that Plato's own account of rational persuasion generates. It has three parts.

Consider first the standing of the citizen who remains unpersuaded. Bobonich grants that law in Magnesia retains its penalties and that Plato will apply force to those whom the preludes fail to convince (Bobonich 382). The prelude therefore reaches the citizen as an argument he is invited to accept and required in any case to obey. This matters for the tradition's own account of virtuous action. An action is virtuous only when the agent chooses it for its own sake and acts from a firm and unchangeable disposition (*Nicomachean Ethics* 1105a28–33), and choosing an act for its own sake requires that not performing it be a live option the agent has considered and set aside. Where compliance is guaranteed independently of assent, the argument's success or failure changes nothing about what the citizen will do. Rational justification of this kind

establishes that the lawgiver has reasons. It does not establish that the citizen has them, in the sense of reasons on which his conduct actually turns.

Consider next what Magnesia excludes. On Bobonich's own account of the censorship, what is kept out is a false opinion likely to appeal strongly to the emotions and desires of the citizens and thereby to undermine their capacity for rational reflection (Bobonich 378). That description picks out precisely the material against which a disposition would be tested: the foreign example, the seductive song, the unlicensed argument. Bobonich and the Cynic agree, then, about what the city removes, and disagree about whether the removal is a benefit. Plato's position is that a soul protected from such appeals is better placed to reason well. The Cynic position is that a disposition which has never met them has not been shown to be firm and, more strongly, has not been made firm, since the alternative it was never offered cannot have been rejected. What Magnesia produces remains arrested at habituation and never ripens into the self-owned hexis the standard demands. A golden cord that moves an agent who could never have resisted it produces the motions of virtue without the endorsement that would make them his own. The Cynic, by contrast, forges virtue through exposure to hardship, temptation, and the full disorder of unregulated life. Diogenes' askesis is training in the open, under conditions the trainee does not control (Kuin 95–99). Where Plato removes the test, the Cynic is nothing but the test.

The deepest difficulty is one Plato creates for himself, and it emerges most clearly on Bobonich's reconstruction rather than in spite of it. Bobonich shows that Plato does not ground his advocacy of rational persuasion in the special status of what is known or in the value of the psychic states of those who know it. He grounds it in the status of the citizen. Because the citizen is free, the state ought to secure his rational agreement and foster his powers of rational understanding; a free person is benefited by exercising those powers and by reaching a rational understanding of the bases of his own action; and it is his freedom that makes his virtue depend upon his rational capacities (Bobonich 386–87). Bobonich calls this the first attempt in Western philosophy to explicate individual freedom in terms of the capacity for rational inquiry.

The relocation anticipated above therefore arises here. If the city's necessity rests on its delivery of arguments rather than on its provision of leisure, then everything turns on whether arguments delivered under Magnesian conditions become the citizen's own. It is Plato's own justification of persuasion that supplies the standard by which they do not. Grant that principle, and the regulatory apparatus becomes self-limiting. If virtue depends on the exercise of rational capacities, and if the exercise of those capacities is what the citizen's freedom consists in, then the systematic restriction of that exercise

cannot be neutral with respect to virtue. Plato may reply, as Bobonich does on his behalf, that the restrictions serve rational inquiry by removing what would corrupt it, so that the disagreement concerns the best means to rational reflection rather than its value.

The reply is available, and it is not foolish. But it cannot be extended indefinitely without cost. Rational deliberation requires access to competing ideas, including dangerous ones, and a soul that has never encountered a challenge to its beliefs has not chosen them in any sense that would distinguish it from a soul that was simply given them. Where Plato holds that unchecked expression corrupts the soul, the Cynic holds that foreclosing the confrontation between convention and nature corrupts more thoroughly, because that confrontation is what independent moral judgment is made of. The *Laws* does not engineer the impossibility of eudaimonia. It constrains, by the measure Plato himself supplies, the very capacity on which the flourishing it aims at depends. This is the sense in which the Cynic challenge operates from within: it borrows nothing the tradition does not already grant, and on this final point it borrows the premise from Plato's own justification of persuasion.

Objections and Conclusion

The strongest Platonic reply is that Diogenes is an exception, that radical self-sufficiency is a path for the philosophically extraordinary rather than a generalizable account for ordinary human beings. The objection has force, but it concedes too much, and Plato's own text shows why. In the *Republic* he grants that the best natures are the ones a corrupt city ruins most thoroughly (491d–495b), and that in every actually existing city the true philosopher, finding no community fit for him, withdraws from political life and keeps himself pure, like someone sheltering under a wall from a storm (496d–e). Plato therefore concedes the decisive point himself. Absent the ideal city, which has never existed, the philosopher's road to flourishing runs away from political life rather than through it. The necessity claim is not unconditional even in Plato; it holds only relative to Kallipolis. Diogenes is then no alien counterexample but an instance of Plato's own displaced philosopher, who has converted the sheltering withdrawal into a positive way of life. The exception, so understood, is the form Plato's own rule takes under real conditions.

Plato's claim is, after all, a necessity claim: the human being is constitutively incomplete outside the polis. If even one coherent human life can flourish without the city, the necessity claim is unsound as stated, and the *Republic*'s foundation shifts from philosophical premise to empirical generalization, one the tradition never defends as such. The Cynic has, moreover, a diagnosis of the exception's rarity. The city produces the dependency it then claims to remedy, since citizens habituated from birth into

institutional reliance never develop the capacities whose absence is later cited as proof that the city is necessary. This developmental claim should be stated in its modest and falsifiable form, lest it collapse into an unfalsifiable dogma that explains away every non-flourishing outsider as merely habituated. The claim is not that no one flourishes within cities, nor that everyone would flourish without them. It is that institutional dependency is largely produced rather than natural, a claim for which the existence of even a few who develop otherwise is evidence, and which predicts that such lives will be difficult and uncommon rather than impossible. Were human beings not so habituated, Diogenean independence might prove far less exceptional than it appears.

A second objection holds that the Cynic merely parasitizes the polis he condemns. The three-sense distinction answers it. The Cynic depends on human community and on the city's material surplus, but Plato's argument rests on neither. Plato's polis is a soul-forming coercive order, and it is that order, and not sociality or the marketplace, which the Cynic shows to be unnecessary for virtue and, in its *Laws* form, corrosive of it.

A third objection deserves separate treatment, since the foregoing argument invites it. If Magnesia's citizens are formed by a regime they cannot contest, the Cynic's askesis is also a formation, chosen under conditions the chooser did not select and sustained by a school with its own orthodoxies. Why does one count as testing and the other as conditioning? The answer lies in what each regime does with the alternative. Magnesia's design removes competing possibilities from the citizen's horizon before he can entertain them. Cynic askesis proceeds in the agora, in continuous contact with the conventions it rejects, and the Cynic's rejection of those conventions is renewed daily against their standing availability. Diogenes could have taken Alexander's offer. That the offer was live is what makes the refusal his.

If eudaimonia is the standard by which justice must be measured, then the state-centered models of the *Republic* and the *Laws* fall short of it. They secure compliance where they aimed at virtue. The Cynic alternative is not the absence of justice but its relocation, from the constitution of the city to the constitution of the person, and from nomos to physis.

Justice, properly understood, does not require an elaborate political architecture. It requires a human being with the courage to live according to nature, and the freedom to do so.

Works Cited

Aristotle. *Nicomachean Ethics*. Translated by Terence Irwin, 2nd ed., Hackett, 1999.

———. *Politics*. Translated by C. D. C. Reeve, Hackett, 1998.

Bobonich, Christopher. "Persuasion, Compulsion and Freedom in Plato's *Laws*." *The Classical Quarterly*, vol. 41, no. 2, 1991, pp. 365–88.

Desmond, William. *Cynics*. U of California P, 2008.

Diogenes Laertius. *Lives of Eminent Philosophers*. Translated by R. D. Hicks, Loeb Classical Library, Harvard UP, 1925. 2 vols.

Foucault, Michel. *The Courage of Truth: The Government of Self and Others II; Lectures at the Collège de France, 1983–1984*. Edited by Frédéric Gros, translated by Graham Burchell, Palgrave Macmillan, 2011.

Gardner, Darren. "Cynicism as Immanent Critique: Diogenes and the Philosophy of Transvaluation." *Polis: The Journal for Ancient Greek and Roman Political Thought*, vol. 39, no. 1, 2022, pp. 123–48, https://doi.org/10.1163/20512996-12340358.

Husson, Suzanne. *La République de Diogène: Une cité en quête de la nature*. Vrin, 2011.

Kuin, Inger N. I. *Diogenes: The Rebellious Life and Revolutionary Philosophy of the Original Cynic*. Basic Books, 2025.

Moles, John L. "Cynic Cosmopolitanism." *The Cynics: The Cynic Movement in Antiquity and Its Legacy*, edited by R. Bracht Branham and Marie-Odile Goulet-Cazé, U of California P, 1996, pp. 105–20.

Plato. *Laws*. Translated by Trevor J. Saunders. *Plato: Complete Works*, edited by John M. Cooper, Hackett, 1997, pp. 1318–1616.

———. *Republic*. Translated by G. M. A. Grube, revised by C. D. C. Reeve. *Plato: Complete Works*, edited by John M. Cooper, Hackett, 1997, pp. 971–1223.

Plutarch. "Life of Alexander." *Lives*, vol. 7, translated by Bernadotte Perrin, Loeb Classical Library, Harvard UP, 1919.

Schofield, Malcolm. *The Stoic Idea of the City*. Cambridge UP, 1991.

Sellars, John. "Stoic Cosmopolitanism and Zeno's *Republic*." *History of Political Thought*, vol. 28, no. 1, 2007, pp. 1–29.