

SOCRATES AND THE DAUGHTER OF ARISTIDES

LEONARD WOODBURY

CONCERNING THE MARRIAGE of Socrates our earliest and best sources, Plato and Xenophon, tell a single tale. His wife was Xanthippe, who was the mother of his children, Lamprocles, Sophroniscus, and Menexenus. Xenophon and the later tradition represent her as a shrew who made difficulties for Socrates in his domestic life, though without disturbing his habitual equanimity.¹ Plato, whose concern is with philosophy rather than biography, concentrates his attention on Socrates' conversations away from home in the masculine society of the gymnasiums, the market-place, and great private houses. For this reason he has no occasion to take note of Socrates' relations with his wife.² But his account in the *Phaedo* of the last day of Socrates' life is an exception to this rule. The dialogue begins when the friends arriving at the prison at dawn find Xanthippe with a child already there (60a) and it ends with a last meeting between Socrates, his children, and the women of his household (*αἱ οἰκεῖαι γυναῖκες*) just before the poison is administered (116a-b). The impression that the reader readily receives is that Xanthippe is a member of the *οἶκος*, the wife of Socrates, and the mother of his children.³ These domestic details are included because they are necessary to the occasion but they are given only passing mention because they are irrelevant to the philosophical purpose of the dialogue. The scant attention given here to Socrates' private life is, in general, evidence only for Plato's literary purposes, not for Socrates' personal relations with members of his family. What it does show is that he was typically Athenian in the exclusion of his women-folk from the male society in which he chiefly lived and typical of himself in

¹According to Antisthenes in Xenophon's *Symposium* (2.10), she was *χαλεπωτάτη*; cf. Lamprocles in *Mem.* 2.2.7; Diog. Laert. 2.36-37. Afterwards there was a multiplication of anecdotes that narrated the difficulties that Socrates had with her, but it has been shown that these, instead of providing material for a biography of Xanthippe, are told to illustrate the qualities of Socrates: see H. Dörrie in *RE* 2.18 (1967) 1 335-1342, s.v. Xanthippe.

²An allusion to Socrates' relations with Xanthippe has been found in the woman of *Rep.* 8. 549c-d. See the note of J. Adam *ad loc.* and D. Harvey in *CQ* n.s. 20 (1970) 64, note 4.

³Cf. J. Burnet, *Plato's Phaedo* (Oxford 1925) on 60a2 and 116b2 and pp. 12-13 below. It is agreed that Lamprocles was the eldest son, and that Sophroniscus and Menexenus were younger. Sophroniscus, named after the paternal grandfather, was presumably second; this justifies Burnet's conjecture, "possibly Lamprocles was called after his maternal grandfather." If so, Xanthippe, who was certainly Lamprocles' mother, was herself the daughter of a Lamprocles.

his devotion to philosophy, which fell within the purview of that society. In particular, Xanthippe certainly appears holding his son, and is the only woman in the little group who is named, presumably the chief of the women of his household. No one who relied upon the evidence of Plato and Xenophon could ever doubt that Xanthippe, and Xanthippe alone, was Socrates' legitimate wife at the time of his death, and presumably earlier. This being the case, it must strike us with considerable force, as it struck ancient scholars,⁴ that the comic poets, for all their many references to him and their demonstrable taste for personal scandals, made no mention of any other union.⁵

That a different story was current later in the fourth century is shown by several surviving accounts of a controversy that was carried on in the school of Aristotle concerning Socrates' domestic arrangements, and in particular his relation with one Myrto, who is variously described as the daughter, daughter's daughter, or great-granddaughter of Aristides, son of Lysimachus, called "the Just."

The truth of this story has generally been denied, in antiquity by Panaetius, Athenaeus, and Plutarch and in modern times by most scholarly opinion. It has been defended from time to time, most recently by J. W. Fitton in *CQ* n.s. 20 (1970) 56–66.

The most detailed of our sources is Diogenes Laertius in his *Life of Socrates* (2.26), who knows three different opinions:

(1) Aristotle said that he took two wives (*δύο γυναῖκας αὐτὸν ἀγαγέσθαι*), first Xanthippe, who became the mother of Lamprocles, then Myrto, the daughter of Aristides the Just, whom he took without a dowry (*ἄπροικον λαβεῖν*), who was the mother of Sophroniscus and Menexenus;

(2) others said that he married (*γῆμαι*) Myrto first;

(3) some said that he had both at the same time (*ἀμφοτέρως σχεῖν ὁμοῦ*), among them Satyrus and Hieronymus of Rhodes.⁶

By comparison with this learned and well-articulated source the generalised reports of Athenaeus (13. 555d–556a) and Plutarch (*Arist.* 27) do not come off very well. According to the former, Aristotle in his *On Nobility*⁷ gave the key-note to a choir of four voices, Callisthenes of

⁴Athen. 13. 556a.

⁵The evidence of Diogenes, like that of other authorities, gives no support to the view of H. Dörrie in *RE* 2.18 (1967) 1340, that Aristotle referred to an earlier marriage to Myrto. On the chronological possibilities, see pp. 12 ff. below.

⁶Satyrus, who seems to be Diogenes' source (see notes 14 and 42 below), presumably cited Hieronymus for the Athenian decree permitting bigamy which Diogenes goes on to report. Satyrus' interest in the subject is shown by his attention to the domestic troubles of Euripides, who was also to be accused of bigamy. See Aul. Gell. *Noct. Att.* 15. 20. 6; but two successive wives in the *Vita* and *Suda*.

⁷Fr. 93 Rose; pp. 58–59 Ross.

Olynthus,⁸ Demetrius of Phaleron,⁹ Satyrus "the Peripatetic," and Aristoxenus of Tarentum,¹⁰ who said that Socrates had two legitimate wives (*γαμετὰς γυναικας*), evidently at the same time. These were Xanthippe and Myrto, the daughter of Aristides (not Aristides the Just, for chronology does not permit this, but his grandson). Plutarch is equally indiscriminating about his sources but a little more informative about details. He says that Demetrius of Phaleron, Hieronymus of Rhodes, Aristoxenus, and Aristotle—if indeed *On Nobility* should be included among Aristotle's genuine works—relate that Myrto, the granddaughter of Aristides, lived with (*συννοικῆσαι*) the wise Socrates, though he had another "wife" (*γυναικα μὲν ἑτέραν ἔχοντι*) and that he took her in (*ἀναλαβόντι*) when, because of her poverty, she was living as a widow and in need of the necessities of life.¹¹ The discrepancies between Plutarch's and Athenaeus' versions are obvious and significant of confusion in some degree in these sources. Moreover, Plutarch's report may seem to suggest that Socrates' motive, according to Aristoxenus, was charity towards an

⁸124 F 43 and 48 *FGrHist*. Because Callisthenes is cited by Plutarch (*Arist.* 27) as his authority for a granddaughter of Aristides named Polycrita, F. Jacoby doubts that he is rightly given by Athenaeus as witness for Socrates' bigamy.

⁹228 F 45 *FGrHist*; fr. 94 Wehrli.²

¹⁰Fr. 57 Wehrli.²

¹¹*ταύτην δ' ἀναλαβόντι χηρέουσιν διὰ πένιαν καὶ τῶν ἀναγκαίων ἐνδεομένην*. J. W. Fitton in *CQ* n.s. 20 (1970) 57, note 4 quotes a suggestion by John Gould that διὰ πένιαν modifies ἀναλαβόντι and gives Socrates' reason for marrying. He himself proposes tentatively to read ἐνδείαν. But, apart from the unusual word-order in the first case, poverty is an odd reason to give for Socrates' act, and the emendation produces a superfluous tautology. J. Pépin in *Aristote: Cinq Oeuvres Perdues: De la richesse*, etc. (by J. Aubonnet et al. in *Publ. de la Fac. des Lettres et Sc. Hum. de Paris-Sorbonne*, Sér. "Textes et Documents" 17 [Paris 1968]) 117, 118 and note 2 renders, "qui ne trouvait pas de mari à cause de sa pauvreté." This gives a satisfactory sense, except that χηρέω does not seem to be cited for this meaning. For this reason I prefer to follow B. Perrin in the Loeb edition of Plutarch ("because her poverty kept her a widow") and R. Flacelière and E. Chambry in the Budé ("elle restait veuve à cause de sa pauvreté"). Because of her poverty Myrto was in need both of another husband and of the necessities of life. Cf. Plut. *Arist.* 1.1–2 on the story that Aristides left at his death *θυγατέρας δύο πολλὸν χρόνον ἀνεκδότας δι' ἀπορίαν γενομένης*, and 27.6 about the granddaughter of Aristogeiton *ἀνδρὸς ἀπορούσαν διὰ πένιαν*. According to another story in Plutarch (*Cim.* 4.7) Elpinice lived with her brother Cimon at a time when she was unable, because of her poverty, to make a suitable marriage; at Dem. 59.8 the girl who is *ἄπρικοις* is *ἀνεκδοτος*. "Girls who had no dowry could not get married, and therefore to marry a girl without a dowry, or with only a very small one, was to do her a very great honour . . ."; W. K. Lacey, *The Family in Classical Greece* (London 1968) 108. That marriages were sometimes made without a dowry only proves the rule: A. R. W. Harrison, *The Law of Athens: Family and Property* (Oxford 1968) 49. The dowry of a widow was normally safeguarded (Harrison 56–57), and a widow without a dowry would be at the same disadvantage in this respect as a dowerless girl who had never married.

indigent widow of distinguished ancestry, whereas our principal source for Aristoxenus, as will appear, views the act in a different light.

At first sight Diogenes appears to be more exact, as well as less comprehensive, in citing authorities and this impression is immediately confirmed by further consideration. Diogenes states clearly that Myrto was the daughter of Aristides, according to Aristotle. Athenaeus seems to know the same report and to make an explanatory addition to it, that this Aristides was the grandson of the Just, in order to overcome chronological difficulties in Aristotle's account.¹² Furthermore, one of the Peripatetic controversialists, Demetrius of Phaleron, attacks the opinion, which is implied in Aristotle's story, that Aristides was too poor to provide a dowry for his daughter's marriage. He adduces evidence to support his denial of the opinion that Aristides was poor, died in poverty, and left his daughters unprovided for. Only Plutarch's omnibus report, which combines Aristotle with three of his pupils, states that according to Aristotle Myrto was Aristides' granddaughter. To one of those pupils, Demetrius, Plutarch attributes the story of Myrto's poverty, which Demetrius, if he was quite consistent in his denials, should not have held to be true.¹³ The comparison indicates that Plutarch is less accurate and Athenaeus more interpretative than Diogenes in reporting on the principal sources.

This judgment justifies the acceptance of the detailed account of Aristotle that Diogenes provides and distinguishes from competing versions.¹⁴ Aristotle said that Socrates "married" first Xanthippe and

¹²Myrto is called Aristides' daughter and Socrates' second "wife" also in the *Suda s.v. Σωκράτης*, but his granddaughter and Socrates' wife at the same time as Xanthippe in Sen. *De matr.* fr. 62 Haase and Hieron. *Contra Iovin.* 1.316b (23.291 Migne), as well as in Plutarch and in our sources for Aristoxenus (see pp. 17 ff. below). Cf. R. Hanslik in *RE* 16.1 (1933) 1167–1169, s.v. Myrto 2.

¹³For a useful discussion of Plutarch's use of Demetrius, see I. Calabi Limentani (ed.), *Vita Aristidis* (Florence 1964) xviii–xxi, who however thinks, in spite of *Arist.* 1.1–2, that Demetrius acknowledged the poverty of Aristides' descendants, as reported by Plutarch, *Arist.* 27. See note 40 below.

¹⁴J. Pépin in *Cinq Oeuvres* 129 agrees that the version attributed by Diogenes to Aristotle (marriage, poverty, daughter of Aristides) is closest to Aristotle and the earliest form of our tradition; so also F. Wehrli, *Die Schule des Aristoteles*² 10 (Basel and Stuttgart 1969) 41–42. Only the statement that Xanthippe was the first wife is held by Pépin not to be Aristotle's (following the early Zeller and V. Rose). Cf. also H. Dörrie in note 5 above. J. W. Fitton in *CQ* n.s. 20 (1970) 57–58 strangely prefers Athenaeus and Plutarch to Diogenes. His reasons seem to be two. First, the number of Peripatetics who are named as authorities for the two generalised versions: Fitton goes so far as to say that "the mainstream view was that Socrates had two wives at once." But, apart from the evident jumbling of details by Athenaeus and Plutarch, there is Diogenes' testimony, which attributes to Aristotle the story of two successive marriages; it cannot be simply dismissed. The rejection by Panaetius, Athenaeus, and Plutarch of the whole story of two marriages confirms the evidence of Plato and Xenophon, and reveals the "main-

then Myrto, the daughter of Aristides; whom he took without a dowry; the former bore him Lamprocles and the latter, Sophroniscus and Menexenus. Where this report differs from the generalised versions given by Athenaeus and Plutarch, we should attribute the differences to their jumbling of a number of different sources. The attribution to Aristotle of a charge of "bigamy" against Socrates, which we find in Athenaeus and Plutarch, should therefore be put down to this cause.

Both our compendary authorities attribute the information to the *On Nobility*, but Plutarch is doubtful of the authorship of the work, though on grounds unknown to us. The opinions of modern scholars rather incline towards acceptance but no decisive test of authenticity is available.¹⁵ However, this is not of great importance for the present purpose. If the work was not by Aristotle, it was presumably a product of some member of his school, where, according to Athenaeus, it was responsible for the controversy that ensued among his pupils after its appearance. It is evident that certain improbabilities in the Aristotelian account were called into question and differences of detail proposed and

stream" as something more like a Peripatetic backwater. Secondly, Fitton argues that "Athenaeus and Plutarch would have seized on Aristotle as witness if Aristotle had innocuously said that Socrates married twice." This is to attribute to the authors of these two doxographical summaries more critical power than they give proof of. It is likely that Satyrus is responsible for making or reporting the jumbled summary in at least one case; that is suggested by the occurrence of his name in Athenaeus' list and also by the coincidence that he is named in two passages in which we are told about the decree (Diog. Laert. and Athen.; cf. Wehrli, *Sch.d.Arist.*² 10.41-42) and may well be the source of the third (Aul. Gell. *Noct. Att.* 15.20.6). As both Athenaeus and Plutarch know Panaetius' rejection of the whole story, it may be that he influenced at least the somewhat fuller account in Plutarch; cf. J. Pépin in *Cinq Oeuvres* 126 and note 6; I. Calabi Limentani, *Vita Arist.* xxi; R. Flacelière and E. Chambry in the Budé Plutarch p. 9, who hold that Panaetius was Plutarch's source, except for Demetrius of Phaleron. With regard to this point, see the opposing argument of A. Grilli in *SIFC* n.s. 29 (1957) 69, who argues that Plutarch cannot have had the works of Demetrius before him; for, if he had, he would not have cited that writer's Life of Aristides (fr. 74 Wehrli²) instead of his Life of Socrates (*Arist.* 1.). But his reference to this work is comprehensible, if he cited it from Panaetius, who was interested in Aristides only in so far as his circumstances were relevant to Socrates' marriages.

Panaetius was able to deal directly with Demetrius' arguments (*Arist.* 1.6), but nothing gives us good reason to believe that Athenaeus and Plutarch were writing with the works of these Peripatetics in front of them; Athenaeus indeed implies that he has not Hieronymus at hand (perhaps because Hieronymus was known to the tradition through Satyrus), though he says that he will procure a copy. If this is the true explanation, Athenaeus and Plutarch were not in a position "to seize on Aristotle as witness" against the summaries. Their concern, in any case, was to follow Panaetius in rejecting the story, not to tidy up details of its history. For another example of Plutarch's unsatisfactory use of his sources, see note 40 below.

¹⁵Cf. e.g. W. D. Ross's *Aristotelis Fragmenta Selecta* (Oxford 1955) *Praefatio* v.

defended. We seem to see Demetrius of Phaleron, in particular, engaged in the attack.

The chief improbability in the story is, of course, to be found in its chronological implications. The great Aristides died about 467. His daughter could hardly have been more than a year or two years younger and was almost certainly a good deal older than Socrates himself. If she became Socrates' second wife and the mother of Sophroniscus and Menexenus, who appear in the *Phaedo* as very young at the time of their father's execution in 399, she was capable of bearing children in her seventh or a later decade. A second difficulty is that Plato shows us Xanthippe, not Myrto, with the children in the prison on the last day. It is not surprising that the story came under attack.

There were some, we are told by Diogenes, who made Myrto the first wife of Socrates. By this change it may have seemed possible to avoid the two difficulties just mentioned, for the marriage could be dated early enough to make it plausible and Myrto might be relieved of the necessity of bearing Socrates' children in her old age. Diogenes does not name those who put this version forward, and we do not know who they were, though we cannot quite exclude the possibility that Demetrius of Phaleron and Callisthenes, who reported on the descendants of Aristides, were among them.¹⁶ The story is nevertheless unlikely to be true. In the year of Socrates' death there were three children, of whom one was a youth, the others still younger.¹⁷ Xenophon (*Mem.*2.2.1) names the eldest Lamprocles, describes him as *νεανίσκος* and has him say of his mother that no one could put up with her bad temper (2.2.7: *χαλεπότητα*). But Xanthippe was notoriously difficult: Antisthenes in Xenophon's *Symposium* (2.10) calls her *χαλεπωτάτη* and later stories that illustrate this quality cluster round her name. According to Plato and Xenophon therefore Xanthippe was the mother of Lamprocles and she must have been married about 420 or not much later. It is a negative confirmation that Aristophanes, who would have delighted in sallies at the philosopher's difficulties with a shrewish wife, never mentions her in the *Clouds* of 423 but represents Socrates as if he were unmarried.¹⁸ The two young children, who must be

¹⁶By implication Diogenes excludes Aristotle, Hieronymus, and Satyrus from the number of the "others" who said that Myrto was Socrates' first wife. Aristoxenus is known from other evidence to be excluded also. This leaves Callisthenes and Demetrius still available. We might exclude Demetrius as well, if we could trust the reports of Athenaeus and Plutarch, but these two sources, in addition to their other defects, show themselves indifferent to the chronological problem and inferences with regard to it must be hazardous. For doubts about Callisthenes, see note 8 above.

¹⁷*Apol.* 34d6: *εἰς μὲν μενράκιον ἤδη, δύο δὲ παῖδια*; *Phaedo* 116a-b: *δύο γὰρ αὐτῷ νιῆς συμκροὶ ἦσαν, εἰς δὲ μέγας*; cf. 60a and 116b, d, Xen. *Mem.* 2.2.

¹⁸W. K. C. Guthrie, *A History of Greek Philosophy* 3 (Cambridge 1969) 385, note 3 wonders whether the wife of Strepsiades, who enjoyed a superior social station, had a

Sophoniscus and Menexenus, were born somewhat later, presumably after about 410. Xanthippe is found holding one, by implication the youngest, at *Phaedo* 60a, as if she were his mother.¹⁹ None of Socrates' known children can, it seems, be attributed to Myrto in a marriage before about 420.

The evidence of Plato's *Laches* now becomes relevant. The dramatic date of the dialogue is after the battle of Delium of 424 (181b) but before Laches' death in 418 and while he is still pre-occupied by public affairs (187a-b).²⁰ Lysimachus, the son of Aristides, is distinctly elderly, being of an age when men spend most of their time at home (180d, 189a), and regards Socrates as a member of a younger generation (180d). In his circumstances he is as different from Socrates as in his age, for not only was he permitted to indulge himself (*τρυφᾶν*, 179c-d) when he was a youth, but he now has a house (179b, 180d, 181c, 201c), and he is able to contemplate sending his son to a sophist, whereas Socrates was notoriously unable to attend more than a one-drachma lecture (*Crat.* 384b; cf. *Lach.* 186c). Though he may possibly have met Socrates at some time much earlier (187e) and has heard his name mentioned (180e), it is not until he meets Socrates that he realises that he is the son of his old friend and fellow-demesman, Sophroniscus. He invites Socrates to visit him and be on close terms with him, now that he is recognised as a *πατρικὸς φίλος* (180e and 181c). It is impossible to suppose that Plato believed, or expected to find readers who believed, that Lysimachus (or his sister) belonged to Socrates' generation, was in financial need, or was connected with him by marriage. The evidence of Plato is clear and it is altogether against a marriage to Myrto before about 420.²¹ But the implication of

taste for names in -ippus, and proposed "Xanthippus" for their son (*Nub.* 46 ff., 61 ff.), may have been modelled on Xanthippe. He thinks that the proposed name may have "brought the house down" but also (not quite consistently) that Aristophanes may have had scruples about ridiculing the wife of a friend on the stage "without disguise." Cf. now the comments of K. J. Dover, *Aristophanes: Clouds* (Oxford 1968) xxv-xxvi, who notes that "there was nothing unusual about names beginning with Ἰππο- or ending in -ἴππος (in *IG* ii². 1951.441 [Athens, IV in.] we even find a slave called 'Xanthippos')." On Xanthippe's social position, cf. pp. 21 ff. below. The suggested transfer seems too complex for the comic stage.

¹⁹J. W. Fitton in *CQ* n.s. 20 (1970) 64 points out that the child held by Xanthippe at *Phaedo* 60a is said to Socrates', not hers. But in fact this indicates that the child which is in her care is legitimate. Cf. the opposite implication when children are said to be the mother's: *Dem.* 59.56, 63, 67, 72, 82, etc. In one of the anecdotes about Xanthippe (*Diog. Laert.* 2.37) Socrates is made to say, *καὶ μοί . . . Ξανθίππη παιδία γεννᾷ*.

²⁰Cf. A. E. Taylor, *Plato: The Man and His Work* (New York 1936) 58.

²¹It is not possible, I think, to draw any firm inferences concerning Socrates' marriages from references to the mediocrity of Aristides' descendants in *Meno* 94a, *Theaet.* 150e-151a, and *Theag.* 130a-e. J. Pépin in *Cinq Oeuvres* 123, arguing against Zeller's use of these texts, writes: "les mots un peu acides par lesquels le philosophe dépeint les

Lamprocles' age requires that Xanthippe was married at about that time and her presence with the children in the prison argues that she remained his wife until his death. Versions of the story that require two successive marriages, no matter what their order, are incompatible with the testimony of Plato and Xenophon.

So great are the improbabilities that Aristotle, or one of his pupils, must be judged quite uncritical, if he related the story as a piece of history. In fact, the work from which the story came was not concerned either with biography or with history. Its subject was the nature of nobility and we know from another source (*ap. Stob. Ecl.* 4.29.25; *Arist. fr.* 92 Rose; pp. 57–58 Ross) that in it Aristotle attributed to Socrates the view that nobility consists in descent from a good family, as Aristides' daughter owed her nobility to her father's excellence.²² Aristotle presumably refers to some part of the lost Socratic literature, in which the seed may have germinated from which the story grew. It is certain that in this fragment he makes illustrative use of the excellence of Aristides' family. If this was the tenor of the disputed Aristotelian passage, there is merit in the suggestion of F. Wehrli,²³ that the dialogue imagined a fictitious marriage between the humble Socrates and the impoverished daughter of Aristides in order to demonstrate that nobility, whether theirs or their offspring's, could not be diminished by circumstances. Plato's mention of a relation between the families of Sophroniscus and Aristides in the *Laches*²⁴ and between Socrates and Aristides' grandson and namesake in the *Theaetetus* (151a; cf. *Lach.* 179a and *Theages* 130) may have provided an historical genesis for the story. That some such

descendants d'Aristide n'empêchent en rien qu'il ait été leur parent par alliance, surtout s'il est censé ne plus l'être au moment où il les prononce." The mediocrity of Aristides' descendants was no doubt a commonplace. If it is mentioned less openly at the earlier dramatic date of the *Laches*, this is because it is introduced by Lysimachus, the son of Aristides; this has nothing to do with a marriage to Myrto before 420. The Socrates of Plato, unlike those of some later writers, does not impute very much to descent from the Just.

²²J. Luzác, *Lectiones Atticae: De διαγμίῃ Socratis* (Leyden 1809) 95 attempted to assimilate this fragment to the story of a marriage to Myrto by emending Aristotle's text to read as follows: οἱ μὲν γὰρ τοὺς ἐξ ἀγαθῶν γονέων εὐγενεῖς εἶναι νομίζουσι, καθάπερ καὶ Σωκράτης. διὰ γὰρ τὴν Ἀριστείδου ἀρετὴν καὶ τὴν θυγατέρα γεγαμηκέαι (γενναίαν εἶναι *codd.*).

²³F. Wehrli, *Sch.d.Arist.* 2.2.66.

²⁴On the *Laches*, cf. A. E. Taylor, *Varia Socratica* (Oxford 1911) 61–62 and J. Pépin in *Cinq Oeuvres* 130–131 (with bibliography). Pépin notes that Zeller used the *Laches* for the opposite purpose, to show that Socrates, "à un âge déjà avancée, n'entretenait aucune relation personnelle avec les descendants d'Aristide." But Socrates was not so very advanced in age at the dramatic date of *Laches* (not far from 420) and it is one thing to say that the passage may have been the historical seed from which the story grew and another to say that it does in fact provide evidence for the truth of something in the story. On *Laches*, cf. also note 21 above.

anecdote, invented, reported, or alluded to by the author and used for purposes of illustration rather than of biography, was found in the work is the most probable explanation of the problem of Myrto. It would not be by any means the only anecdote of the kind that flourished at this period and won the notice or acceptance of Peripatetics.²⁵

Once published, the story became involved in controversy, which, so far as we can tell, had the effect of making the story appear *vero* as well as *ben trovato*. It appears from the opening chapter of Plutarch's Life of Aristides that an attack was launched by Demetrius of Phaleron on the story of the poverty of Aristides and his daughters, which is implied by Aristotle. According to Plutarch, Demetrius in his *Socrates* also stated that the two daughters of Aristides received from the state at his instigation an allowance of half a drachma a day, which he later, in the time of his own administration, increased to a drachma. For chronological reasons these women, if they were descended from Aristides, cannot have been his daughters and must have belonged to some later generation of his family. The most likely explanation is that Demetrius is not accurately reported by Plutarch. Similarly, stories were current in the fourth century, which cohere very well with contemporary reports of Aristides' poverty,²⁶ about decrees providing for grants of money and land in Euboea to his son Lysimachus²⁷ and for the provision of a dowry and public maintenance for his daughters.²⁸ Chronology is again an obstacle to credibility, as is the testimony of Plato, and it is remarkable that we first hear of these decrees in Demosthenes in 355, at a time when we begin to hear of a whole series of forged decrees referring to events of the years 490–450. The conclusion drawn by the writer of the latest history of the family concerning grants to Aristides' children is that "beyond much doubt these decrees are fabrications."²⁹ They were probably "fabricated like the others in order to display the power and the influence, the *φιλανθρωπία* and *χρηστότης* (Plut. *Arist.* 27.7) of the Athenian demos." Finally, Callisthenes reported, according to Plutarch, that Polycrita, the daughter of Lysimachus and granddaughter of Aristides, was voted maintenance at the public expense. Difficulties arise also in connection with this story, such that Polycrita has recently been excluded from the family altogether.³⁰ In fact, the whole story of the public subventions made to Aristides' descendants must be regarded with deep suspicion. If

²⁵See, e.g. *Phoenix* 21 (1967) 161 and A. Momigliano, *The Development of Greek Biography* (Cambridge, Mass. 1971) 68–69.

²⁶See Dem. 23.209 and Aeschin. 3.258.

²⁷Dem. 20. 115; Plut. *Arist.* 27.2.

²⁸Aeschin. 3. 258; Plut. *Arist.* 27.2; Nepos, *Arist.* 3.3.

²⁹J. K. Davies, *Athenian Propertied Families 600–300 B.C.* (Oxford 1971) 51.

³⁰Davies, *Ath.Prop. Fam.* 50–51.

Demetrius attacked it, as well as the legend of Aristides' poverty, he is likely to have had good reason for doing so and if, as seems likely,³¹ Panaetius made use of Demetrius in constructing his refutation of the allegation of Socrates' marriage to Myrto, he was justified in his action. Aristoxenus, as will appear, seems to have made no use of the story of Myrto's poverty.

The chronological problem presented by Myrto's date of birth may also have been investigated by Demetrius, who looked into the dates both of Socrates and of Aristides. In any case, the problem was solved at a stroke by Aristoxenus, who substituted daughter's daughter (*θυγατρίδῃ*) for daughter (*θυγάτρη*) of Aristides, and by Athenaeus, who identified Myrto's father as the grandson and namesake of the Just. The unnamed critics who held that Myrto was Socrates' first, and not his second, wife were presumably inspired by a desire to remove this same difficulty. Chronological flexibility is also achieved by the variant that gives Socrates two "wives" at the same time: this is attributed on good authority to Aristoxenus, Hieronymus, and Satyrus and is attributed also to others by the omnibus reports of Athenaeus and Plutarch: to Demetrius by both, to Callisthenes by Athenaeus alone. Hieronymus was able to cite an Athenian decree, which must have been convenient for his purpose, that permitted Athenians to marry a woman who was a citizen and to beget children from another (*γαμῆν μὲν ἄσπῃν μίαν, παιδοποιεῖσθαι δὲ καὶ ἐξ ἑτέρας*).³² For us the final outcome of the question is given by the generalised and coarsened accounts provided by Athenaeus and Plutarch, which agree that Socrates had two "wives." Though the process of abbreviation and assimilation of differing views has gone a little further in Athenaeus than in Plutarch, it may very well be due, at least in part, to Satyrus, who is mentioned by the former. Both Athenaeus and Plutarch state that this story was refuted by Panaetius (in his *On Socrates*),³³ whom they presumably follow in disbelieving it.

³¹See note 14 above.

³²On the decree, see Appendix II below.

³³Panaetius fr. 131–133 van Straaten.² J. W. Fitton in *CQ* n.s. 20 (1970) 56 writes that Panaetius argued against the bigamy of Socrates "by the expedient of assuming two characters of the name Socrates" and dismisses this as a "last-ditch contention." But in the dependent note 4 he appears to mean that his statement is an inference from Schol. Aristoph. *Ran.* 1491: fr. 134 van Straaten,² in which Panaetius is said to have held that Aristophanes' jeer at Socrates' chatter *περὶ ἑτέρου Σωκράτους . . . λέγεσθαι*. He adds a reference to Aelian's distinction (*Var. Hist.* 12. 19) between Sappho and a courtesan of the same name. It is obvious that the second text proves nothing for Panaetius and the first nothing for Panaetius' argument against Socrates' bigamy. It is fair to say that Panaetius distinguished between homonyms and used such distinctions as an argument in this very question. For, according to Plutarch (*Arist.* 1.6; fr. 131 van Straaten²), he rejected the use by Demetrius of Phaleron of some choregic tripods bearing the name "Aristides." See *IG* 2². 3027 and J. K. Davies, *Ath. Prop. Fam.* 53. He argued that the

A special interest attaches to the part played in the controversy by Aristoxenus: he is the earliest source for the alleged bigamy and his account is most fully reported. In addition to Athenaeus and Plutarch, we have longer reports, preserved in parallel versions by Cyril of Alexandria (*Contra Julian.* 6.185) and Theodoretus (*Graec. affect. curat.* 12.174), of the *Φιλόσοφος ιστορία* of Porphyry (Aristox. fr. 54a and b Wehrli²). This writer is quoted as naming his sources for the life of Socrates. He follows Aristoxenus, who had it from Spintharus, who knew Socrates, though elsewhere (*Contra Julian.* 6.208; Aristox. fr. 51 Wehrli²) Cyril mentions a preference for Menedemus, a pupil of Plato, on the grounds that he was older and less prejudiced than Aristoxenus. According to the latter Socrates was very persuasive in voice, speech, and personality, but was uncontrollable both in word and in deed when angered.³⁴ His sexual desires were strong, but did not lead him to offend, as he resorted to married wives/women or to prostitutes only. He had two wives/women at the same time, Xanthippe, who was a citizen but rather common, and Myrto, the daughter's daughter of Aristides, son of Lysimachus.³⁵ He took Xanthippe in a sexual union, from which Lamprocles was born, but Myrto by a marriage that produced Sophroniscus and Menexenus. Theodoretus then goes on to tell of quarrels between the two women and of attacks that they made on Socrates, who merely laughed at them.³⁶ And Porphyry, no doubt following Aristoxenus, said that Socrates was sometimes quarrelsome, abusive, and violent in company.

According to Athenaeus, Aristoxenus was one of those who took their

bearer of this name could not have been the Just and to this purpose made use, as Plutarch informs us, of lists of choregic victors, the evidence of the lettering of the inscription, and the date of the poet whose name was also inscribed. For Panaetius as Plutarch's source in his use of the archon lists, see F. Wehrli, *Sch.d. Arist.*² 4.65. It is true that Plutarch goes on (1.7) to say that Panaetius' argument should be inspected more closely, but he does not himself do this, and it seems clear that the arguments used are respectable in kind. We do not know that Panaetius disposed of the story of the bigamy by means of a distinction of homonymy; but, if he did, his use of the same argument in another aspect of the same problem gives no ground for despising his conclusion. Cf. also J. Pépin in *Cinq Oeuvres* 126.

³⁴It is thought by H. Dörrie in *RE* 2.18 (1967) 1341 that Aristoxenus' version of Socrates' sexuality, which is very different from that presented in the Platonic *Symposium* and *Phaedrus*, is nevertheless developed out of a passage such as *Symp.* 216d.

³⁵Aristoxenus' account is used by A. D. Winspear and T. Silverberg, *Who Was Socrates?*² (New York 1960) 40–41, 53, to support the notion that Socrates' two "marriages" mark his rise in the social scale.

³⁶The many anecdotes told in later antiquity about Socrates' relations with his wife/wives evidently have as their purpose the illustration of traits of his character, such as his imperturbable superiority to circumstances, and hence have little claim to be reliable historical evidence of his domestic life: see H. Dörrie in *RE* 2.18 (1967) 1337 ff., especially 1342. The Socratic equanimity, which is amply supported in the texts, does not accord at all well, as Dörrie points out, with Aristoxenus' charge of *ὑβρις*.

“key-note” from the Aristotelian story. In fact it is evident that his version removes some of the improbabilities that were to be discovered in that story by the pupils of Aristotle. In particular, the chronological difficulty is removed, if Myrto was not the daughter (*θυγάτηρ*), but the daughter’s daughter (*θυγατριδῆ*) of Aristides.³⁷ The change is small and easy, but it signifies a greater awareness of historical possibilities than is shown by the Aristotelian version. This is to be attributed to the more critical attitudes that were called forth by controversy among the Peripatetics of the kind that we see reflected in our sources. The point thus confirms what Athenaeus has to say concerning the relation between Aristotle and Aristoxenus, for it is scarcely credible that the true relation was the opposite. This would require us to believe that the Aristotelian work presented a rival version containing an obvious chronological improbability after Aristoxenus had published his more sophisticated account.

Again, it was seen that a dispute concerning the alleged poverty of Aristides and his daughters arose in the fourth century, when Demetrius of Phaleron attacked the allegation. The dispute was still of interest to Plutarch when he wrote his *Life of Aristides*, though he believed that he could, with the help of Panaetius, refute the arguments of Demetrius. The Aristotelian statement that Socrates took Myrto without a dowry (*ἄπρoικος*) presupposes her poverty. Aristoxenus, on the other hand, gives her a more established status than Xanthippe, saying that Socrates took her in marriage (*γαμηθεῖσαν*), whereas he entered into a more informal union with Xanthippe.³⁸ As a marriage normally implied a betrothal (*ἐγγύη*), a giving away (*ἐκδοσις*), and a dowry (*ποίξ*), it may be that Aristoxenus abandoned the motif of poverty, which was not essential to his purpose, and was thereby enabled to meet objections of the kind raised by Demetrius against it. It is certain that Porphyry, our best and fullest source for Aristoxenus, does not attribute this detail to him.

It appears that the controversy concerning the question of the poverty of Aristides and his daughters aroused interest in the fate of his descendants. Enquiries were made, and Callisthenes claimed to have tracked down a granddaughter, Polycrita,³⁹ and Demetrius reported on a descendant, a certain Lysimachus who was a diviner of dreams, his mother, and her sister.⁴⁰ We know of no successful searches in connection

³⁷Aristoxenus is followed by Plutarch in his summary and by Seneca fr. 62 Haase.

³⁸Cf. Appendix I below.

³⁹J. K. Davies, *Ath. Prop. Fam.* 50–51 inclines to the view that Callisthenes derived this alleged granddaughter from a fifth-century gravestone (*IG* 1². 1040) bearing the names of Lysimachus and Polycrita.

⁴⁰According to Plutarch (*Arist.* 27.4–5) this Lysimachus was remembered by Demetrius as *θυγατριδoῦς* of Aristides, and Demetrius himself was responsible for a decree giving three obols a day to his mother and sister, a pension which he increased during his

either with Myrto or with her children, and Aristoxenus makes the same assertion as Aristotle, that she was the mother of Sophroniscus and Menexenus. Her relation to Aristides therefore remained in doubt. Aristotle said that she was a daughter and this opinion was known to Athenaeus, who took the trouble to correct it. Aristoxenus made her a granddaughter and his variant survived in the generalised notice provided by Plutarch on the matter. Athenaeus interpreted the Aristotelian tradition as meaning that she was the daughter of another Aristides, who was the grandson of the Just. No one is reported to have denied her existence, but there was evidently no means of determining who she was. The arguments adduced against her poverty are general and circumstantial. On the point of Myrto's identity Aristoxenus' version enjoyed the peculiar advantages and disadvantages that are entailed in maintaining an hypothesis that is neither verifiable nor falsifiable.

The status of Myrto is another point of difference. Aristotle said no more than that she was Socrates' second wife, though without a dowry. This statement is consistent with the purpose of the *On Nobility*, in which it could serve to illustrate an hereditary nobility which was recognised by Socrates in spite of the obscuring circumstances of poverty. Aristoxenus however said that Socrates had two wives/women at the same time⁴¹ and endowed Myrto with a more regular status than Xanthippe enjoyed. It is possible that he was encouraged to assume the simultaneous existence of

own régime to a drachma a day. But the great Aristides died about 467 and Demetrius did not rule Athens until 318/7. It is chronologically impossible that he gave a pension to Aristides' daughters a century and a half after Aristides' death, and it is incredible that Demetrius thought that he had done so or expected to find readers who would accept such a story. Unless therefore *θυγατρίδος* can be pressed to mean "a descendant in the female line," Plutarch or his text is unreliable. But see note 13 above. One has the impression that Plutarch, who quotes from Demetrius immediately after the story of Myrto, is using Demetrius, probably through Panaetius (see notes 13 and 14 above), to defend the view that Aristides was poor (*Arist.* 6.1) against Demetrius' attack (*Arist.* 1). It remains possible that Demetrius did not contradict himself in this way and that the chronological difficulty has been caused by Plutarch's, or his source's, use of his texts. Cf. however J. K. Davies, *Ath. Prop. Fam.* 52, who concludes that Demetrius is seen "to telescope the relationship of this Lysimachus to Aristides (I)," i.e. the Just, and "to angle his charitable act—which can be perfectly well be historical—so as to accord with the story implied by the fabricated decrees" (cf. Dem. 20.115; Aeschin. 3.258; Nepos, *Arist.* 3.3). But I do not see how Demetrius could have been so grossly mistaken or so obviously incredible about the ages of the people with whom he was dealing or about the authenticity of his own legislation. Davies identifies this Lysimachus with a man of the same name and deme, who is known from a curse-tablet (*SDAW* [1934] 1037, no. 15a, line 5) and adds that "he could perfectly well be a member of the family (or have claimed to be)."

⁴¹Aristoxenus was followed by Hieronymus and Satyrus *ap.* Diog. Laert., Plutarch, Athenaeus, Porphyry, Seneca fr. 62 Haase, Lucian, *Halcyon* 8, *Socr. Ep.* 29.3 Hercher. Cf. note 12 above.

two different unions by the alleged fifth-century decree permitting such double cohabitation and procreation that was later published by Hieronymus. In any case, the change had a number of advantages for him. It eased the chronological stringency, by not restricting the marriage as closely to Socrates' last years as was done by the Aristotelian version. And by making the arrangements legally defensible he made his story less offensive to current opinion, which upheld the respectability of Socrates too firmly for him to upset it, than it would have been in other circumstances. By giving a preferred status to Myrto he was able also to add to the plausibility of the story of her marriage to the socially undistinguished Socrates. It must have seemed that the granddaughter of Aristides, if she was to become part of a *ménage à trois*, must have had a superior and more assured position than was given to the humble Xanthippe. The latter, for her part, was too well established in the tradition to be given a casual or servile status. Aristoxenus therefore balances her position as a free citizen against her lack of family (πολῆτιν καὶ κοινοτέραν πως). Finally, the new version did not require the implication of poverty, which was open to attack, and was therefore preferable also in this respect to the Aristotelian account. But it could also serve Aristoxenus' purpose of denigration by changing Socrates' motive from charity to lechery.⁴²

The purpose of Aristoxenus in what he wrote concerning Socrates and Plato was, it seems generally agreed, largely depreciatory. To be sure, he balanced censure with praise, as was noticed by Plutarch, who interpreted this practice as an instance of cunning malice.⁴³ No matter whether this imputation is true or false, Aristoxenus seems to have possessed sufficient judgment to recognise what was incontrovertible in the favourable picture of Socrates that was presented by Plato and other Socratics. He had an early source also in the shadowy Spintharus, who may have been his father and is said to have known Socrates.⁴⁴ But Aristoxenus'

⁴²J. Pépin in *Cinq Oeuvres* 127 suggests that Hieronymus, by bringing forward his decree, proposed a third motive, civic patriotism. But the decree is cited as permitting, not enjoining, "bigamy" and the inference goes too far beyond the evidence. It does not cohere easily, as Pépin agrees, with Hieronymus' hostility to Socrates or with his interest in "les difficultés conjugales des grands hommes": see F. Wehrli, *Sch.d. Arist.*² 10.42 and G. Arrighetti in *Stud. Class. e Or.* 3 (1953/1955) 111 ff., 120, and 122. It would be equally possible, and no more venturesome, to conjecture that Hieronymus used the decree to prove, against doubters, that Socrates' alleged "bigamy" was legally possible.

⁴³Plut. *De malign.* *Herod.* 9.856c; Aristox. fr. 55 Wehrli²: ἐγγὺς δὲ τούτων εἶσιν οἱ τοῖς ψόγοις ἐπαίνους τινὰς παρατιθέντας, ὥς ἐπὶ Σωκράτους Ἀριστόξενοσ, ἀπαίδευτον καὶ ἀμαθῆ καὶ ἀκόλαστον εἰπών· ἀδικία δ' οὐ παρῆν. On the malice of Aristoxenus in regard to Socrates and Plato, see *Phoenix* 25 (1971) 302-303 and A. Momigliano *The Development of Greek Biography* (Cambridge, Mass. 1971) 74-75.

⁴⁴J. Pépin in *Cinq Oeuvres* 128 is negative about Spintharus: "dans sa *Vie de Socrate*, il (Aristoxenus) invoque, sans doute par pur artifice, la témoignage de son père Spintharus qui aurait fréquenté personnellement le philosophe."

hostility was so well known that Porphyry, as reported by Cyril, preferred the authority of Menedemus, who was less prejudiced as well as earlier in date. He professed to distinguish an early, disorderly period in Socrates' life before he was tamed by the influence of philosophy, though we have no reason to believe that he could have possessed reliable information on these obscure years more than a century before he wrote. Certainly Spintharus could not have known Socrates very long before the execution, if he was of an age to be thought to be Aristoxenus' father, and it is noticeable, and disquieting, that so much of what Aristoxenus has to report in dispraise of Socrates purports to belong to the earliest years of his life.⁴⁵ He chided Socrates for his lack of education and polish, but this characterisation seems to be an inference from his humble birth, very possibly reinforced by an unfavourable comparison with the example of his own hero, the Pythagorean Archytas.

The testimony of Aristoxenus, in this matter as in other matters regarding Socrates, demonstrably comes from a hostile and unreliable witness, who is unsupported by better witnesses. It might be condemned, as often in the past, on this ground alone. In this paper I have sought to add a new argument for condemnation, one that arises from a criticism of our sources and an inspection of historical, and especially chronological, possibilities. The version of Aristoxenus is likely to be a revision made with malice of an illustrative anecdote in Aristotle, possibly deriving from the Socratic literature, and constructed in such a way as to remove from it details that inhibited its credibility. It remains incredible nonetheless.

UNIVERSITY COLLEGE, TORONTO

APPENDIX I

ARISTOXENUS ON THE STATUS OF XANTHIPPE

Aristox. fr. 54 Wehrli²: καὶ τὴν μὲν Ξανθίππην προσπλακέσαν λαβεῖν (Theodoretus; περιπλακέσαν λαθεῖν Cyril), ἐξ ἧς εὐντῶ λαμπροκλῆς ἐγένετο, τὴν δὲ Μύρτῳ γαμηθεῖσαν (Theodoretus; γάμῳ Cyril), ἐξ ἧς Σωφρονίσκος καὶ Μενέξενος. Theodoretus's λαβεῖν is obviously preferable to Cyril's λαθεῖν and is accepted by Wehrli and Fitton. Similarly, γαμηθεῖσαν gives a better balance with the other participle than Cyril's ungainly γάμῳ, as Fitton

⁴⁵Contrast J. W. Fitton in *CQ* n.s. 20 (1970) 59 and note 6, who accepts as reliable Aristoxenus' account of Socrates' early life. I have argued in "Socrates and Archelaus," *Phoenix* 25 (1971) 299-309 against Aristoxenus' story of Socrates' connection with Archelaus at the age of "about seventeen."

agrees, though he prints γάμφ. περιπλακείσαν however is preferred for its sense by Fitton on the ground that *LSJ* reports περιπλέκομαι, but not προσπλέκομαι, in the sense, "have intercourse with." But Lampe's *Patr. Gk. Lex.* recognises προσπλέκω and the sense "be united with; ref. sexual relations . . ." and cites this passage in addition to others. This makes unnecessary Fitton's ingenious conjecture that περιπλακείσαν is a correction of the corrupt προσπλακείσαν, and that this in turn derives from Aristoxenus' πρὸς παλλακείαν, for which he gives the sense "for concubinage," though without examples of the use of this phrase. Porphyry appears to report προσπλακείσαν from Aristoxenus and to be faithfully reproduced by Theodoretus. Cyril's version owes something to carelessness and unfamiliarity, something perhaps also to his own sexual preoccupations in dealing with Socrates. According to Porphyry, as reported by his witnesses, Aristoxenus said of Socrates, ἡ γὰρ ταῖς γαμεταῖς ἢ ταῖς κοιναῖς χρῆσθαι μόναίς. Cyril (*Contra Julian.* 7.226b: 76.845 Migne) paraphrases coarsely, συνεφύρετο γυναιξί, Μυρτῷ τε φημι Ξανθίππῃ, συνεπλέκετο δὲ καὶ ταῖς ἐταιριζόμεναίς. So, in reporting Aristoxenus, he preferred "he embraced her secretly" to "he took her to live with him." In another paraphrase (6.186a: 76.785 Migne) he shows the same attitude and verbal preference but gives also a hint of his understanding of Xanthippe's status: (Socrates) ὅς γε, δυοῖν αὐτῷ γαμεταῖν, οὐδ' ἐν κόσμῳ τάχα που συνηρμοσμέναιν, συνεπλέκετο καὶ ἄλλαις, αἰσχροῖς δηλονότι καὶ μισθαρνοῦσι γυναικόις κτλ. He is obviously uneasy about his source's statement that both γυναικες were γαμεταί and wishes to cast doubt on it; his version of Porphyry would have had the same effect by contrasting a γάμος with a clandestine affair. By contrast, Theodoretus's προσπλακείσαν λαβεῖν signifies a more open and stable sexual union. The woman who entered into such an informal arrangement might very well be loosely called γαμετή, even if the law took a different view of her. Athenaeus (13.555d) spoke in this way when he attributed two γαμετὰς γυναικας to Socrates.

The textual question aside, it seems clear that Porphyry understood Aristoxenus to be distinguishing in this passage between Myrto, who was γαμετή, and Xanthippe, to whom he attributed some inferior status. On the other hand those who report on Aristoxenus could loosely describe both women as γαμεταί. In Attic law, a marriage (γάμος), created by ἐγγύη, ἔκδοσις, and προίξ (or by ἐπιδικασία) was distinguished from a union with a free woman, even if she cohabited with the man and bore him children. In general, such a woman did not become a member of the οἶκος, was not subject to the man's κυριεία, had no προίξ (though she might bring a trousseau), was excluded from the ἀγχιστεία, and was the mother of νόθοι. Even if permanently established within the household and the mother of children, she was deemed a παλλακή and, though protected by the Solonian law of homicide on the same terms as a legitimate wife, she

possessed diminished rights by comparison with a *γαμετή*. The law seems then to make a clear distinction, though it may be doubted whether it was never obscured in the actual conditions of Athenian society by the ambiguity of the word *γυνή*. Cf. Appendix II below.

In the case of Socrates more than usual doubt was introduced when Hieronymus brought his decree forward. He appears to have presented its text in a form that permitted an explanation of Myrto's status: she cohabited with him, bore his children, and might be thought to be his *παλλακή*. What the decree then did was to give fuller recognition to her status within Socrates' household than a *παλλακή* normally enjoyed. Though the law might continue to distinguish such an enhanced status from that implied in a *γάμος*, common opinion might very well confuse the two relationships. It is therefore not surprising to find that Athenaeus, in his rather imprecise summary, says that the law permitted a man to have two *γυναῖκας* and that Socrates had two *γαμετὰς γυναῖκας*. It is more surprising to find that Aristoxenus, in his more detailed account, appears to have spoken in the same way. It is prudent to conclude that, if he said that Socrates took Xanthippe *προσπλακέισαν*, he intended to attribute to her, not the status of *παλλακή* as normally understood, but the enhanced status of quasi-marriage such as that which seems to have been provided by Hieronymus' decree. This, although we do not know that the decree was known to him. On this understanding of the situation, he would not have wished to distinguish sharply between a *παλλακή* and a *γαμετή*. A certain legal elasticity was necessary, both for Aristoxenus and for Hieronymus-Plutarch, if the thesis of "bigamy" was to be made credible.

If the argument followed here is correct, Aristoxenus differed from the source followed by Plutarch in using the formula of the decree to explain the position of Xanthippe, not that of Myrto. It is possible without rashness to conjecture his reason for this interpretation. In the context as given by Porphyry he shows himself careful to contrast the two women (*Ξανθίππην μὲν πολίτιν καὶ κοινοτέραν πως, Μύρτω δὲ Ἀριστείδου θυγατριδὴν τοῦ Λυσιμάχου*). The difference in their social positions is emphasised, though Aristoxenus cannot deny that Xanthippe was a *πολίτις* and not a *ξένη*. To put the contrast so strongly is to recognise the improbability that the granddaughter of Aristides had a status in Socrates' household that was inferior to the humble Xanthippe's. The improbability is removed if the relative position of the two is held to be the reverse of that, as it is in the following sentence, which shows the same balanced contrast of *μὲν* and *δέ*. This variant is found only in Aristoxenus, and his motive for introducing it must have been the same as that for his change from daughter to granddaughter of Aristides, to make the story more plausible. The existence of the alternative version in Plutarch, and perhaps Aristoxenus' concession of Xanthippe's freedom and citizenship, show the truth of

Fitton's remark (65), that "Xanthippe was established in Socrates' menage earlier and more solidly than Myrto." It is significant that in the two authorities about whose views on "bigamy" we can form some clear idea, Aristoxenus and Hieronymus-Plutarch, the freedom and citizenship of Xanthippe are acknowledged and her domestic status is too firmly established to be regarded as more than very slightly irregular.

APPENDIX II

THE "BIGAMY" DECREE

Athen. 13. 556a-b cites the decree and promises to provide a copy of Hieronymus' book when he has obtained one; he appears therefore to depend on Satyrus, the most recent authority whom he mentions (see notes 6 and 14 above). Diog. Laert. 2.26, after attributing to Hieronymus and Satyrus the story of Socrates' "bigamy," goes on to say that "they say" (φασι) that the Athenians passed the decree and that Socrates took advantage of the freedom that it permitted. Aul.Gell.*Noct.Att.* 15.20.6 gives, as one explanation of Euripides' misogyny, his experience of bigamy, which was permitted by an Athenian decree. Satyrus is not mentioned but, given his interest in Euripidean scandal and Athenian bigamy, may well be the source here as well (cf. F. Wehrli, *Sch.d. Arist.*² 10.41-42). The *Suda* s.v. *λειπανδρεῖν* λ377 Adler reports the decree and Socrates' bigamy in terms very close to those used by Diogenes. The evidence gives considerable support to the assumption that Hieronymus published the decree, which was made known to our surviving authorities by means of Satyrus. Shortage of manpower is given (as by Diogenes, Athenaeus, and the *Suda*) as the reason for the passage of the decree.

Hieron. *ap.* Diog.Laert. 2.26 and Athen. 13.555d; fr. 44-45 Wehrli;² Athenaeus' report of the decree (ἐξεῖναι καὶ δύο ἔχειν γυναῖκας τὸν βουλόμενον) agrees with his version of the story, that Socrates was a bigamist (δύο γαμετὰς γυναῖκας). Diogenes, on the other hand, characteristically gives a more detailed report (γαμεῖν μὲν ἀσπὴν μίαν, παιδοποιεῖσθαι δὲ καὶ ἐξ ἑτέρας) which fits Plutarch's version, that Myrto lived with (συνοικῆσαι) the wise Socrates, though he had another "wife" (γυναῖκα μὲν ἑτέραν ἔχοντι). "If Diogenes is following at all closely the wording of the decree the second partner is expressly not a γυνή γαμετή:" A. R. W. Harrison, *Law of Ath.: Fam.and Prop.* 16, note 3. If we follow Diogenes and Plutarch, who are in any case generally preferable to Athenaeus in this matter, it is possible to think that Hieronymus used his decree to explain Myrto's position: though already married to Xanthippe, Socrates was permitted by the decree to cohabit with Myrto and have children from her.

Scholarly opinion with regard to the authenticity of the "bigamy" decree is divided. It is accepted by J. H. Lipsius, *Das attische Recht* 2.2 (Leipzig 1912) 479 ff., by H. Buermann in *Jahrb.f.klass.Philol.* Suppl. Bd. 9 (1877/8) 567 ff., J. W. Jones, *The Law and Legal Theory of the Greeks* (Oxford 1956) 185 and Harrison 17, but rejected by Zimmermann, *De nothorum Athenis condicione* (Mederici 1886) 10 ff., W. G. Becker, *Platons Gesetze und das griechische Familienrecht in Münch. Beitr. zur Papyrusforschung* 14 (1932) 84-85, and W. Erdmann, *Die Ehe im alten Griechenland* ib. 20 (1934) 99 ff. and in *RE* 18.2 (1949) 228-229 s.v. Παλλακή. For the most recent opinions pro and contra, with bibliographies, see Harrison 16-17 and H. J. Wolff in *Zur griechische Rechtsgeschichte* ed. E. Berneker (Darmstadt 1968) 647, note 81. Buermann's theory, that the decree provided for a legitimate concubinage seems now to be generally rejected and outright bigamy is held to be out of the question, though it is by no means clear what was the status of the second female partner. Harrison 17 says that what the decree did was "to give a more formal status" to certain "informal unions" with παλλακαί, who were normally not admitted into the οἶκος and whose children were excluded from the ἀγχιστεία. Erdmann (1934) 100 and *RE* 228 accepts the legitimation by decree of children born outside formal marriage. It is possible also to think that the effect of the decree was to relax the Periclean law of citizenship in favour of the children of such unions. What is certain is that the decree seemed to provide a legal justification of what passed, in Satyrus' hands, for the "bigamy" of Socrates and Euripides. Though it cannot be excluded that the existence of this decree supported the story of Socrates' bigamy from the time when it was first alleged by Aristoxenus, it is a fact that we hear nothing of the decree until Hieronymus published it in the next century and that its terms give support to Plutarch's version of the story (see note 42 above). The likelihood of forgery must be conceded to be serious.