That argument must be rejected, however. Caesar went to Nicomedes not, as Plutarch claims, to flee Sulla, but to procure a fleet for his commander Minucius Thermus (Suet. *Iul.* 2). It is not likely that the pirates would have captured him as he was returning in force with a fleet in 80, but rather as he set out on his mission to Bithynia in 81.[8]

Although Polyaenus appears to have preserved the most accurate account of the date and circumstances of Caesar's capture by pirates, Plutarch offers the best version of how he later defeated and punished his captors. Polyaenus claims that, upon handing over ransom money to the pirates at Miletus, Caesar gave a banquet for them and drugged their wine. When they subsequently fell asleep, he and his companions killed them all with swords that they had smuggled into the pirate camp along with the food and money (*Strat.* 8. 23. 1). Plutarch says that Caesar procured some local ships and captured the pirates in a battle off the island of Pharmacusa, where they had held him, near Miletus. He further reports that Caesar took the captive pirates to Pergamum in Asia where he eventually had them crucified (*Caes.* 2. 3–4).

Plutarch seems to be preferable to Polyaenus on these points. Suetonius (*Iul.* 4. 1) and Valerius Maximus (6. 9. 15) both connect Caesar's capture with the island of Pharmacusa. Although Polyaenus was probably correct that Caesar was captured off the island of Lesbos, where his commander Minucius Thermus was besieging Mytilene (*Strat.* 8. 23. 1), Caesar may well have been held on an island named Pharmacusa, as Plutarch claimed. This name, which is closely related to the verb φαρμακόω (to drug), could easily have suggested the stealthy stratagem that Polyaenus attributed to Caesar. Polyaenus is fond of using drugged wine as an example of a crafty trick (5. 10. 1 and 6. 3–7. 43). One can easily imagine how the story suggested itself to him when he read of the island of Pharmacusa in connection with Caesar and the pirates.[9]

Plutarch's report that Caesar took the captive pirates all the way from Pharmacusa to Pergamum for crucifixion also makes good sense.[10] Pergamum was the capital of the province and was within easy communication of Mytilene, where Caesar's superior was overseeing a siege. It would have been appropriate for Caesar to have brought his captives there for proper punishment, while he set about to fulfill the mission which Minucius Thermus had assigned him and which the pirates had so rudely interrupted.[11]

ALLEN M. WARD

UNIVERSITY OF CONNECTICUT

8. One might also wish to argue that Caesar's adventure with the pirates is more likely to have happened when he was involved in campaigns aimed directly at them in 78 or again in 73. After participating in Thermus' triumph, he had returned to the East in 78 under P. Servilius Isauricus on a campaign against Cilician pirates. He did not stay long enough, however, to have become involved in an incident such as the one under discussion (Suet. *Iul.* 3). In 73 he served on the staff of M. Antonius Creticus during another pirate war. Again, however, his service lasted too short a time for an episode such as this one to have occurred, since he returned to Rome upon hearing of his co-optation into the college of pontiffs (Vell. Pat. 2. 43. 1). Cf. *MRR*, II, 113, 115, n. 6.

9. Cf. J. Melber, "Ueber die Quellen und den Wert der Stratägemensammlung Polyäns: Ein Beitrag zur grieschische Historiographie," *Jahrbücher für klass. Philologie*, Suppl. XIV (1885–86), 674–81. Herrmann (n. 3), p. 585, is correct in arguing that, just because the trick was used by others before Caesar, it does not mean that Caesar could not have used it. Nevertheless, the nature of the name Pharmacusa makes the story too pat in this case.

10. Crucifixion is the punishment mentioned by all other sources that specify the punishment (Vell. Pat. 2. 42. 3; Suet. *Iul.* 74; Val. Max. 6. 9. 15; Aur. Vict. *De vir. ill.* 78).

11. I should like to thank Professor Thomas A. Suits of the University of Connecticut and Professor William C. McDermott of the University of Pennsylvania for several helpful comments and suggestions.

## ON SEPARATING THE SOCRATIC FROM THE PLATONIC IN *PHAEDO* 118

It may be expecting too much of human nature to hope that any scholarly controversy of this sort will ever be settled, but I would like to point out an important but frequently neglected distinction in order to clarify a perennial issue which revives whenever the last part of Plato's *Phaedo* is discussed in print. The passage in question reads:

*Ἤδη οὖν σχεδόν τι αὐτοῦ ἦν τὰ περὶ τὸ ἦτρον ψυχόμενα, καὶ ἐκκαλυψάμενος—ἐνεκεκάλυπτο γάρ—εἶπεν—ὃ δὴ τελευταῖον ἐφθέγξατο—Ὦ Κρίτων, ἔφη, τῷ Ἀσκληπιῷ ὀφείλομεν ἀλεκτρυόνα· ἀλλὰ ἀπόδοτε καὶ μὴ ἀμελήσητε* [*Phaedo* 118].

In discussing this passage, we can and must distinguish carefully between what Socrates said and what Plato wrote. Almost all scholarly attention to this passage has been devoted (consciously or unconsciously) to the meaning of *Socrates'* words; the moral, philosophical, and religious implications which scholars have found in this sentence are diverse and often astonishing. No one, I am sure, would be more amazed by the majority of these interpretations than Plato, because there are three words which point out exactly what *he* meant. These words are εἶπεν, ἐφθέγξατο, and ἔφη. By these three clear and indisputable verbs of saying heaped up in a most emphatic repetition, Plato emphasizes that this quote contains the last words of the historical Socrates. Whatever the relationship between this historical Socrates and the character in other parts of Plato's dialogues, Plato would have felt a need for this emphasis on the authenticity of the quote in a work which was explicitly a second-hand account of Socrates' death.[1] At the same time, the repetition dramatizes Phaedo's emotions in describing the moment and may even reflect his (or someone else's) care in communicating to Plato the fact that these were the exact words. It is possible that Plato had in mind some philosophical interpretations of his own for Socrates' words, but he makes no attempt to communicate them to his readers, either here or anywhere else. Thus we need not concern ourselves with reconciling Socrates' words with any aspect of Plato's philosophical system, and we can consider the question of Plato's meaning settled.

These comments are not meant to inhibit discussion about the lofty heights or obscure depths of Socrates' meaning in these famous last words. A judicious summary of views from ancient times through the beginning of this century can only be found in an old Danish journal;[2] because this survey is filled with original-language quotes from other ancient and modern commentators, it is worth the trouble to look it over, even for those without access to the Danish comments. I shall not attempt to review all the more recent views here, but two of the most unlikely call for comment. René Gautier has suggested that all of Socrates' words in the last part of *Phaedo* are meaningless: he has been sent on a "bad trip" by the hemlock.[3] But the standard pharmacologies mention no hallucinatory effects of hemlock; rather, it is a powerful depressant.[4] W. H. D. Rouse suggests that the offering might be for *Plato's* recovery.[5] It would not be out of character for Plato to have suppressed a part of Phaedo's account of the conversation in the prison which contained some discussion of his own illness[6] and a promise of a votive offering for his recovery by Socrates, but if he has done this, he has also eliminated any possibility of proving Dr. Rouse's suggestion. Nevertheless, this theory remains about as well founded as any other. Regardless of which interpretation one prefers, it is essential to keep in mind that these are Socrates' words, quoted by Plato, not Plato's invention, and stand alone as our best-attested verbal contact with the historical person.

JAMES R. BARON

COLLEGE OF WILLIAM AND MARY

1. Cf. *Phaedo* 57A–59B.

2. J. L. Heiberg, "Sokrates' sidste ord," *Oversigt over det kgl. danske videnskabernes selskabs forhandlinger* (1902), pp. 105–16. A thousand thanks to Annelise Olson of Williamsburg, who prepared an English summary of the Danish parts of the article for me.

3. R. Gautier, "Les dernières paroles de Socrate," *RU*, LXIV (1955), 274 f.

4. Cf. "Conium" or "Coniine" compounds in P. G. Stecher (ed.), *The Merck Index of Chemicals and Drugs* (Rahway, N.J., 1968), p. 282. Plato's account gives no hint of the nausea and possible convulsions associated with large doses of hemlock, unless one takes ἐκινήθη (118A12) as more than just a dying twitch. The convulsions should occur early in the action of the drug, not at the final moment.

5. W. H. D. Rouse, *Great Dialogues of Plato* (New York, 1956), p. 521.

6. Cf. *Phaedo* 59B.