

SOCRATES AND ARCHELAUS

LEONARD WOODBURY

DIODEGENES LAERTIUS (2.23) includes in his *Life of Socrates* a paragraph on his campaigns and travels abroad. He mentions three battles (Potidaea, Delium, and Amphipolis) which are named by the Platonic Socrates in the *Apology* (28e)¹ as the occasions on which he proved his obedience to the orders of the commanders whom the state had placed in charge. He knows, also from Plato,² of the prize of valour that Socrates won at Potidaea but resigned to Alcibiades, and the trance into which he fell for a whole day and a night, as well as the coolness and determination that he showed in the retreat from Delium. But this clear testimony is obscured by his own bad memory and judgment or his reliance on an inferior source. For he has it that it was Xenophon, and not Alcibiades, whose life was saved by Socrates, and at Delium, not Potidaea, although Xenophon cannot have been more than a child in the year of that battle.³ He says also that Socrates had to go to Potidaea by sea because the land-route was interrupted by the war; but the siege commenced in 432 before the war began.⁴ Then, after diverting to cite Aristippus on Socrates' love for Alcibiades, he concludes with three statements concerning his travels. The first is attributed to a

¹J. Burnet, in his note *ad loc.* in his edition of the *Euthyphro*, *Apology*, and *Crito* (Oxford 1924), doubted whether Amphipolis can be the famous battle of 432, in which both Cleon and Brasidas fell, chiefly on the ground that only 1200 hoplites were sent out on that occasion (Thuc. 5.2.1), and Socrates, at his age, was unlikely to be required in so small a force. He also felt some difficulty in the order of battles, as Delium (424) preceded Amphipolis. This latter difficulty, at least, was not removed by his suggestion that an earlier fight of 437/436 is referred to. His argument does not lack weight in a calculation of general probabilities. But the natural interpretation of Plato's words, which has priority over other considerations, is that Socrates is referring to the well-known battle; he certainly left himself open to misunderstanding, if he intended any other meaning. (W. M. Calder, III, in *Phronesis* 6 [1961] 83–85, argues well against Burnet.) Furthermore, it seems probable that the order of battles, which no one can make chronological, is determined by stylistic purposes. (See Burnet's note on the variation of prepositions in the phrase, *καὶ ἐν Ποτιδαίᾳ, καὶ ἐν Ἀμφιπόλει καὶ ἐπὶ Δηλῷ*. He points out that *ἐπὶ* is more appropriate to Delium, because it was not a town but a precinct and temple of Delian Apollo and compares Xen. *Mem.* 3.5.4: *ἐν Λεβαδείᾳ ... ἐπὶ Δηλῷ*.) It would have been stylistically awkward to preserve chronology by writing *καὶ ἐν ... καὶ ἐπὶ ... καὶ ἐν...* Instead Plato puts the two *ἐν*'s in chronological order, followed by *ἐπὶ*.

²*Symp.* 220c–e and *Chrm.* 153a–c; *Lach.* 181b and *Symp.* 220e–221b. Antisthenes *ap.* Athen. 5.216b has the award of the prize, wrongly, after Delium. See also I. Düring, *Herodicus the Crateteian: A Study in Anti-Platonic Tradition* (Stockholm 1941) 41–46.

³Strabo 9.2.7 has the same story.

⁴This account may have its origin in Thuc. 1.61, who implies that the Athenians crossed the Thermaic gulf on their way to Potidaea: see A. W. Gomme's comments in *A Historical Commentary on Thucydides* 1 (Oxford 1945) 218.

fifth-century writer, Ion of Chios, presumably in his book of memoirs, entitled *Visits* ('Επιδημιαί). According to this source Socrates when young visited Samos together with Archelaus (νέον ὄντα εἰς Σάμον σὺν Ἀρχελάῳ ἀποδημῆσαι: *FGrHist* 260 F 11; fr. 11 von Blumenthal). Secondly, Aristotle is cited as authority for a visit to Delphi (fr. 2 Rose). Lastly, the first book of the *Memorabilia* of Favorinus is given as authority for a journey to the Isthmus.

This last triad of sources seems to have been collected to correct another statement by Plato (*Cri.* 52b; cf. *Phdr.* 230 c-d), that Socrates never left the city to attend any festival (except once at the Isthmus), nor to go anywhere else whatsoever, except to go on campaigns. The clause concerning a visit to the Isthmus has inferior authority in the MSS, being omitted by BW and added in the margin by w. It is known to Diogenes from his immediate source Favorinus, not from the *Crito*, and if we had any trust in his critical method we should be able to infer that he did not find it in his text of Plato. If it is an interpolation, as seems not unlikely, it must be early, for it was read by Athenaeus (5.216 b). The report of a visit to Delphi, which is attributed to Aristotle, cannot be reconciled with the words of the *Crito*. It has sometimes been explained as an inference made by Aristotle from a passage such as *Phdr.* 229e, in which Socrates says that he cannot yet know himself as the Delphic inscription enjoins;⁶ or the inference may have been made by Diogenes himself or his source from a dialogue in which Aristotle made a similar statement.

Because of the critical uncertainties that occur in this passage it is impossible to feel a strong confidence in what Diogenes reports to us, without external corroboration from Ion. In addition, his report is so scanty that it must have been abbreviated, with what judgment we cannot determine, and no context for it is provided. There is little scope for interpretation, but the following points are relevant to any attempt.

First, it seems likely that Diogenes supposed that Ion's testimony made an addition or correction to what Plato reports concerning Socrates' travels. Secondly, although νέος is too indefinite to be very much help in chronology,⁶ it points to a period earlier than that depicted in the Platonic dialogues, of which the earliest dramatic dates occur just before the outbreak of the Peloponnesian war.⁷ It may be significant that Plato uses the same word of Socrates in speaking of his first acquaintance, long ago,

⁶Cf. Arist. fr. 1 Rose and see A. E. Taylor, *Varia Socratica* (Oxford 1911) 65; H. Maier, *Sokrates* (Tübingen 1913) 81, n. 1; and J. Burnet's note on *Crito* 52b5.

⁶On the organisations of the νέοι see C. A. Forbes, *NEOI: A Contribution to the Study of Greek Associations* (Middletown, Connecticut 1933) 2: "The word νέοι refers to youths older than the ephebi, ranging from a minimum age of nineteen or twenty years to an indeterminate maximum." Cf. also *LSJ s.v.* Forbes admits (5) that the "literary sources often confound *neoi* with *ephebi*."

⁷As in the *Protagoras* and *Charmides*. The special conditions of the *Parmenides* required a quite exceptionally early occasion, near the middle of the century.

with the doctrine of Anaxagoras, who was the teacher of Archelaus (*Phd.* 96a), and even with the old Parmenides himself (*Prm.* 127c). Thirdly, Ion's verb ἀποδημέω may be used of military service abroad (*Ar. Lys.* 101), and is not confined to peaceful travel. Fourthly, Ion shows himself in his stories concerning Pericles and Sophocles well acquainted with the campaign against Samos of 440.⁸ In that year Socrates was about twenty-eight or twenty-nine, not too old to be called νέος.⁹ Finally, by a doxographic tradition going back to Theophrastus, Socrates is held to be the pupil of Archelaus.

As it is impossible to determine exactly what Ion said and meant, we cannot deal decisively with his testimony. The prudent course is to reconcile so far as may be the plain sense of Diogenes' brief report with the clear and authoritative evidence offered by Plato. This is commonly done by assuming that Ion referred to the campaign of 440, in which Pericles commanded a large Athenian force against the Samian rebels led by the philosopher Melissus.¹⁰ Socrates' presence on Samos while in military service is evidently consistent with the explicit and well-attested exception made in the *Crito*; it may be made consistent with the statement of the *Apology* concerning Socrates' experience in battle on one of several assumptions: that Samos was too remote to be mentioned to a jury in 399; that it was unknown to Plato, who was born more than a decade later and gives exact information only from the later thirties, shortly before his own birth; or that, though Socrates served in the Samian campaign, he took no part in a pitched battle on the island such as the three which he finds it appropriate to mention in his defence. It is not important for our present purpose to determine which of these assumptions is most likely to be true. What is important is to see that the statement of the *Apology* cannot be intended to give a complete list of Socrates' campaigns or to imply that he never marched out of the city on military service before the Potidaean campaign of 432. It is on general grounds unlikely that any able-bodied man of his time reached his late thirties before being called out to serve on some campaign or other.¹¹ Then, Socrates' concern in this passage is not only

⁸See "Sophocles among the Generals," *Phoenix* 24 (1970) 209–224.

⁹This is denied by F. Jacoby in *CQ* 41 (1947) 10, but *LSJ* cites Xen. *Mem.* 1.2.35 for ages up to 30 and *SIG* 589.38 (second century B.C.) of a use in opposition to παῖδες and ἐφηβοί. Cf. note 6 above.

¹⁰The assumption is sometimes rejected, as by F. Jacoby in *CQ* 41 (1947) 9–11; M. Pohlenz in *Hermes* 81 (1953) 432, n. 2; W. M. Calder, III, in *Phronesis* 6 (1961) 83–85; and W. K. C. Guthrie, *A History of Greek Philosophy* 2 (Cambridge 1965) 339, n. 3.

¹¹The evidence for the war years is of course plentiful and cogent. The Athenians began the war by invading the Megarid πανδημεῖ (*Thuc.* 2.31.1) and afterwards repeated their incursions πανστρατιᾷ twice a year until they took Nisaea in 424 (2.31.3 and 4.66.1); they were out πανδημεῖ at Tanagra (3.91.4) as well as at Delium (4.90.1). Aristophanes, in speaking of the command to appear for active service equipped with three days' rations (*Ach.* 197; *Pax* 151, 312, 716), does not imply that this was an unusual event.

to remind the jury of his military service to the state in war. His principal purpose is to illustrate his obedience to authority, whether that be the city's or the god's. His refusal to abandon the post given him by the city's generals was most strikingly displayed by his participation in the close actions of great pitched battles such as the three that he mentions. His point would have been blunted by a longer list that included raids across the borders or brief and irregular skirmishes. Whatever Plato's reason for omitting Samos may have been (and this cannot have been its lack of importance), it was probably not because he thought that Socrates had during the course of his life marched out for those three battles only.

A less common way of dealing with the problem is to identify Ion's Socrates with the Socrates of Anagyrus who was one of the generals of 441/440.¹² This has the merit of removing all conflict with Plato and may, for all that we know, be right, but it seems much less likely. Why did Ion think it worthwhile to record this fact concerning a not very distinguished soldier who, as everyone knew, went with all his colleagues to Samos (Thuc. 1.116.1; Androtion 324 F 38 *FGrHist*)? Diogenes Laertius certainly thought that the report concerned the philosopher and is able to quote it, presumably from his secondary source, as one of a cluster of authorities on his foreign travels. The general cannot have been less than thirty in 441/0 and is very likely to have been older; it seems neither correct nor appropriate to call him *vēos*.¹³

Thus far our good and early sources; what follows is of a very different kind. Aristoxenus of Tarentum, a pupil of Aristotle, suffered from anti-Platonism in a virulent form, and his malicious industry in sifting the residual gossip of the age was turned also against Socrates, because he was the teacher of Plato.¹⁴ He is our source for a number of unsavoury reports concerning Socrates' irascibility, money-making, sexual appetite, and marriages.¹⁵ As is often the case with stories of this kind, it is impossible, for lack of other evidence, to determine in every case whether the charges that they make are true or false, though the probabilities seem often to

¹²This course was taken by J. Kirchner in *PA* 13102 and was once approved by Wilamowitz, though later rejected in *Platon* 1 (Berlin 1920) 97 and n. 4. The latest proponent is W. M. Calder, III, in *Phronesis* 6 (1961) 83–85.

¹³Ion died in 422/421: see Ar. *Pax* 832–837, and cf. F. Jacoby in *CQ* 41 (1947) 1. By that time Socrates was middle-aged and a well-known public figure, as we learn from the *Clouds*. It was worthwhile for Ion to include in his memoirs in that decade a story concerning the youth of Socrates. Who was then interested in the youth of the general?

¹⁴See F. Wehrli, *Die Schule des Aristoteles*² 2 (Basel and Stuttgart 1967) 65; J. Burnet, *Thales to Plato* (London 1953) 153; I. Düring, *Herodicus the Crateteian* (Stockholm 1941) 153–155; W. K. C. Guthrie, *A History of Greek Philosophy* 3 (Cambridge 1969) 390 and n. 1. J. W. Fitton, in *CQ* N.S. 20 (1970) 56–66, wishes to establish as fact what Aristoxenus had to say about Socrates' marriages but fails to convince; I intend to give my reasons for this judgment elsewhere.

¹⁵Frs. 52, 54–59 Wehrli².

favour repudiation. What cannot be doubted is the character of Aristoxenus himself. His own testimony is more than sufficient to convict him as a sensation-seeker and muck-raker whose guide is a malicious and infirm judgment.

It is this hostile and unsatisfactory witness who informs us that Socrates was Archelaus' pupil, that he became his master's *paidika*, and, it seems, that their association began when Socrates was "about seventeen."¹⁶ We are not surprised to notice that none of this receives any support from Plato, who never mentions any association between Socrates and Archelaus and puts even Socrates' acquaintance with Anaxagoras, the teacher of Archelaus, at two removes, through hearing his book read by some one else. The homosexual implication causes no astonishment either, given Aristoxenus' other essays in denigration. What must seem surprising is that Aristoxenus had access to reliable information on such a relationship more than a century earlier that was withheld from Plato, Xenophon, and the other Socratics or was unreported by them. It is even more surprising that we hear nothing of this association in what we know or can reasonably conjecture about the numerous charges that were brought against Socrates, in the controversy that followed his trial, by the sophist Polycrates in his lost *Accusation of Socrates*. For the silence of Polycrates at least cannot be put down to a prejudice in Socrates' favour.

Furthermore, it is unlikely that Aristoxenus relied on Ion himself. Diogenes is our source for both, and the scandal that he attributes to the Peripatetic in chapter 19 of his *Life of Socrates* would have been just as appropriate to his purposes in chapter 23, where it is missing from his quotation from Ion, had he found it in the *Ἐπιδημία*. We see also, from the notice of Socrates in the *Suda*, that the tradition consistently ascribed the report of the relationship to Aristoxenus and, from Porphyry's fuller account, that, though he does not name his source, the story is used to illustrate the accusation, which we know to have been made by Aristoxenus, that Socrates led a disorderly life. On the evidence available to us we must conclude that, though the story is not incompatible with Ion's reminiscence, there is no external evidence that would justify deriving it from his book, and the internal evidence points to the methods and ambience of Aristoxenus alone.

According to Cyril of Alexandria (*Adv. Iul.* 6.208), Porphyry in his *Φιλόσοφος Ἱστορία* discussed his sources in the matter of the callings of Socrates' father and mother, as stone-cutter and midwife respectively.¹⁷

¹⁶Porphyry (260 F 11 *FGrHist*); *Suda*, s.v. *Σωκράτης*: 60A3 *VS*. Only Porphyry reports *περὶ τὰ ἑπτακαίδεκα ἔτη* (which F. Jacoby in *CQ* 41 [1947] 10–11 however gives as "about eighteen years"). Though he does not name Aristoxenus, Porphyry's agreement with the *Suda*, which does, makes it probable that he is following him.

¹⁷*εἰ δὲ ὁ μὲν* ('*Ἀριστοξένος*) *διὰ δυσμένειαν μὴ ἀξιόπιστος*, *Τίμαιος δὲ διὰ ἡλικίαν*,

Porphyry appears to say that on this point Aristoxenus might be thought to be unreliable because of his prejudice and Timaeus because of the lateness of his date; in that case corroboration was to be sought from the testimony of Aristodemus, a pupil of Plato, who was older than Aristoxenus (and so, presumably, not open to either of the objections brought against Aristoxenus and Timaeus). Porphyry evidently acknowledges here the incredibility that was held to attach to reports on Socrates made by Aristoxenus, whom he cited as a witness in his history (fr. 51–55 Wehrli²).

Porphyry tells us also (fr. 54a Wehrli²) that Aristoxenus gave as his source for Socrates' combination of persuasiveness with irascibility one Spintharus, who had met Socrates. Spintharus is a shadowy figure, known to late antiquity as a musician from Tarentum, like Aristoxenus himself, sometimes called Aristoxenus' father, sometimes his teacher.¹⁸ We cannot test directly the reliability of his evidence, but we should note that he is not said to be Aristoxenus' source in regard to Socrates' relation to Archelaus; that chronology makes it very improbable that a Tarentine who was the father or teacher of Aristoxenus (born not earlier than ca. 375) could have been a witness of an association that is alleged to have taken place presumably in Athens or in Athenian jurisdiction before 450; and that Spintharus was well-placed to share the prejudice of Aristoxenus himself in

νέωτερος γὰρ ὁ Τίμαιος ('Αριστόξενος codd.), Μενεδήμῳ τῷ Πυρραίῳ χρηστέον, Πλάτωνος μὲν γεγονότι μαθητῇ, πρεσβυτέρῳ δὲ γεγονότι 'Αριστοξένου, λέγοντι ἐν τῷ Φιλοκράτους, ὅτι οὐκ ἐπαύετο Σωκράτης οὔτε ὑπὲρ τοῦ πατρὸς ὡς λιθουργοῦ λαλῶν, οὔτε ὑπὲρ τῆς μητρὸς ὡς μαίας.

Changes such as those made in the text of Cyril by F. Wehrli in his text of Aristoxenus (*Sch. des Arist.*² 2.24) seem necessary, if a tolerable sense is to be found. Wehrli's comment is as follows: "In fr. 51 will Kyrill den Angaben von A. und Timaios erst Glauben schenken, nachdem sie durch Menedem bestätigt sind. Jenem traut er wegen seiner Gehässigkeit nicht, diesem aus chronologischen Gründen (A. muss tatsächlich etwas älter gewesen sein als Timaios ...); Menedem sei persönlich zuverlässig und komme zudem Sokrates noch näher." F. Jacoby (260 F 8; 2B. 1209 *FGrHist*) gets the same meaning by slightly different means: he reads simply ὁ μὲν, while annotating (sc. ὁ 'Αριστόξενος), accepts Röper's ἀναξιόπιστος, and excises ὁ 'Αριστόξενος.

¹⁸Spintharus is a source both for Socrates and for Archytas (frs. 54a and 30 Wehrli²). An elusive figure, he is sometimes said to have been Aristoxenus' father (*Suda*, s.v.; fr. 1 Wehrli²: υἱὸς Μνησίου, τοῦ καὶ Σπινθάρου μουσικοῦ; cf. Diog. Laert. 2.20 and Sextus Empiricus, *Math.* 6.1. C. Müller in *FHG* 2. 269 conjectures that there has been a conflation of two different traditions concerning the father. He is followed by F. Wehrli in *Sch. des Arist.*² 2.47 and in *RE Suppl.* Bd. 11 (1968) 336, who argues that Spintharus was in fact only his teacher. It seems however possible that "Spintharus," "the Spark," is a by-name or nickname of Mnesias; so perhaps in the case of Dionysius "the Renegade," ἡ Σπίνθαρος, ὡς ἐνιοι in Diog. Laert. 5.92. In any case, our Spintharus is said to have been a citizen of Tarentum (Plut. *De gen.* 23.592 f.), like Aristoxenus, and is mentioned in a list of musicians provided by Aelian (*NA* 2.11: fr. 69d Wehrli²), where his name occurs between those of Damon and Aristoxenus (cf. the *Suda*).

favour of Archytas and the Pythagoreans of Tarentum and against Socrates and Plato of Athens.

Thus far we have the known malice and uncertain sources of Aristoxenus and the apparent silence of Ion, Plato, the Socratics, and Polycrates. What remains to be examined is the assertion that Socrates became the pupil of Archelaus at the age of "about seventeen." Does this circumstantial detail, by pointing to an early and knowledgeable source, lend credibility to the story? Or is it to be seen as a late product of calculation and probability?

The best indication of Aristoxenus' reasoning, it seems, is offered by the immediate contexts in Diogenes, Porphyry, and the *Suda's* article on Socrates, in which we find his views reported. In each case there is mention of the doxographic tradition that Socrates was Archelaus' pupil. Porphyry adds that Socrates remained with Archelaus "for many years."¹⁹ Diogenes and Porphyry state that Archelaus was the pupil of Anaxagoras. In his life of Archelaus Diogenes (2.16) gives a carefully articulated account of the succession. Anaxagoras, he says, "was first to bring the philosophy of nature from Ionia to Athens and was called the physicist, for the reason that in him natural philosophy came to its end, upon the introduction of ethics by Socrates. It would seem that Archelaus also dealt with ethics, for he has discussions of laws, goodness, and justice. Socrates took this subject over from him and was held to be its inventor, because he brought it to its highest pitch." It is particularly interesting that Diogenes, in his *Life of Socrates* (2.19), gives a chronological turn to the doxographic construction by synchronising the beginning of Socrates' association with Archelaus with the condemnation of Anaxagoras. "According to some he was a pupil of Anaxagoras, and also of Damon, as is stated by Alexander in his *Successions of the Philosophers*, but when Anaxagoras was condemned, he became a pupil of Archelaus the physicist."

The tradition that there was a succession in the philosophy of the fifth century from Anaxagoras to Archelaus to Socrates is well attested in our sources, being found in Strabo, Clement of Alexandria, Sextus Empiricus, Galen, Eusebius, and the *Suda's* notice on Archelaus,²⁰ in addition to the

¹⁹This information, which is given by Porphyry alone, seems to be no more than an attempt to give an indefinite substance to the relationship between Archelaus and Socrates. The doxographical tradition assumed (cf., e.g., Diog. Laert. 2.16) that Ionian physics ended when Socrates' moral philosophy began. It does not appear that any date was given to this critical change, but the assumption required a considerable period of time during which Socrates was Archelaus' pupil. It is possible, if not very likely, that the chronological implication of the succession was reinforced by a comparison of the date soon before 450 required by Aristoxenus' story with the 440 implied by Ion's reference to the Samian expedition.

²⁰The texts are conveniently collected by Diels-Kranz in 59A7 and 60A1-3, 5, and 7 *VS.* Add Schol. Pl. *Euthphr.* 11a (p. 419 Greene).

texts already mentioned. It evidently had its origin, or was first reported, in Theophrastus' great work, *The Opinions of the Physicists*.²¹ Its authority seems still to be widely accepted.²² Nevertheless, it should not be received at face-value as a statement of biographical facts, in view of the doubts that arise concerning other successions that are offered by the doxographical tradition.²³ These include the relations between Anaximander, Xenophanes, and Parmenides, to take one notorious example.

The earliest evidence upon which the succession from Anaxagoras to Socrates could be built is the famous passage of the *Phaedo* (96a ff.) which gives Socrates' intellectual autobiography. We read there that Socrates' hopes of finding a teleological explanation of things were raised when he heard of the prominence given to Mind in the philosophy of Anaxagoras but were dashed soon afterwards when he discovered upon closer study that Anaxagoras made no thorough use of his principle but was content to explain things in the unsatisfactory way followed by other thinkers. This account was taken as establishing two relevant points: Socrates never met Anaxagoras but derived from his acquaintance with the Ionian philosophy which he represented a profound dissatisfaction that led him to look for a non-material cause. If these were to be incorporated in a succession of teacher-pupil relationships, it was necessary that Socrates have a teacher who was the pupil of Anaxagoras and capable of instructing him in the philosophy of Ionia. It would be better still, if this intermediary could serve as a transition between natural and moral philosophy. We find Archelaus cast in just such a role in Diogenes' Life of Archelaus (2.16; see above, 305). This coincidence of biographical facts with doxographical relationships must give qualms to wary and critical readers.

The chronology of Anaxagoras, as given by our MSS of Diogenes Laertius (2.7), presents a disorderly appearance, which is commonly removed by the acceptance of two emendations within a few lines, in order to reconcile with other information the testimonies attributed to the *Chronica* of Apollodorus and *The Archon List* of Demetrius of Phaleron.²⁴ If we leave these two uncertainties out of account, the remainder is easily harmonised. Anaxagoras was born in the 70th Olympiad (500–497, from

²¹See Simplicius in *Phys.* 27.23: 60A5 VS and *Dox. Graec.* 479.17 and p. 139.

²²Cf., e.g., J. Burnet, *Thales to Plato* (London 1953) 124–125; A. E. Taylor, *Socrates* (Anchor ed.; New York 1953) 66–67; and F. Jacoby in *CQ* 41 (1947) 11. Contrast the reasoned scepticism of E. Zeller, *Die Philosophie der Griechen* 2.1⁶ (Leipzig 1922) 49, n. 1 and the statement of Xenophon's Socrates (*Symp.* 1.5), ἡμᾶς δ' ὁρᾶς αὐτουργούς τινας τῆς φιλοσοφίας ὄντας.

²³The influence of the successions constructed by the doxographers on the biographies of philosophers is discussed in an unpublished paper by Professor J. B. McDiarmid of the University of Washington, to which I am indebted. See also *HSCP* 61 (1953) 132 and 149, n. 143.

²⁴Apollod. 244 F 31 *FGrHist*; Dem. Phal. fr. 150 Wehrli².

Apollodorus); was twenty years old at the time of the invasion of Xerxes, when he began to study philosophy at Athens (from Demetrius),²⁵ where he remained for thirty years; and lived for seventy-two years altogether (i.e., until 428–425). Scaliger's emendation (Ol. 88 for 78) brings Apollodorus' date for Anaxagoras' death into agreement, and Meursius neatly substitutes the archonship of Calliades (480/479) for that of Callias (456/455) in the citation from Demetrius.

On this chronology it is stated that Anaxagoras arrived in Athens in 480/479 and it is implied by the round number thirty that he left about 451/450 (by inclusive reckoning). A. E. Taylor argued strongly that this is a true statement of the facts,²⁶ but his view is now generally rejected.²⁷ Nevertheless, it is the case that anyone in antiquity who was interested in the dates of Anaxagoras' presence in Athens could readily draw from this chronology the inference that Anaxagoras departed shortly before the middle of the century.

The doxographic succession, Anaxagoras-Archelaus-Socrates, implied no more for chronology than that Socrates was never a pupil of Anaxagoras, following in this the authority of Plato.²⁸ But the possibility was now present that chronology could be fitted closely to the succession, so that Socrates' association with Archelaus would be held to begin just when the latter succeeded Anaxagoras as head of the Ionian school in Athens. However approximate the result of such a combination must be, we see in Diogenes' Life of Socrates (2.19; see above, 305) that this kind of step was in fact taken.

If Socrates began his association with Archelaus not long before 450, it was possible to determine his age at that time. According to Plato

²⁵Diogenes' report of Demetrius (ἤρξατο δὲ φιλοσοφεῖν 'Αθήνησιν ἐπὶ Καλλίου/Καλλιάρχου) is capable of being taken to mean, "he began the study of philosophy when Callias/Calliades was archon at Athens." This use of 'Αθήνησιν with the archon's name is known elsewhere, notably in another fragment of Demetrius (fr. 149 Wehrli²; cf. E. Derenne, *Les procès d'impiété intentés aux philosophes à Athènes* (Bibl. de la Fac. de Philos. et lettres de l'Université de Liège fasc. 45 [Liège 1930]) 31; F. Jacoby's commentary on 244 F 31). However it is usual to tuck the word inside the genitive absolute or to fasten it neatly behind. If Diogenes intended this meaning, he chose a dangerously ambiguous word order. In general his carelessness is compatible with this assumption, but he shows immediately afterwards that he is interested in the length of Anaxagoras' sojourn in Athens, and it might be thought that he would be readier to find a date for his arrival there than one for his initiation in philosophy alone. In any case, whatever Demetrius' or Diogenes' intentions, the sentence is undoubtedly cast in such a form, and in such a context, as to encourage the interpretation and inference given here.

²⁶"On the Date of the Trial of Anaxagoras," *CQ* 11 (1917) 81–87.

²⁷Cf., e.g., J. A. Davison, "Protagoras, Democritus, and Anaxagoras," *CQ* N.S. 3 (1953) 33–45.

²⁸Diog. Laert. 2.19, 45, Aristid. *Or.* 45 (p. 25 Dindorf), and *Suda*, s.v. Σωκράτης (829 Adler), are exceptions. Contrast the texts in note 20 above.

Socrates was about 70 at the time of his trial (in 400/399).²⁹ The date of his birth therefore goes back to about 469/468 (by inclusive reckoning). The age of twenty was an acceptable, perhaps a conventional, time at which to begin the study of philosophy: at least Anaxagoras was said to have begun at that age, as has been seen, and Plato was reported to have been twenty when he met Socrates (Diog. Laert. 3.6). On the very approximate calculation which has been postulated here Socrates was even younger when he met Archelaus, sufficiently younger, it must have seemed, to make plausible an imputation of paederasty. At the age of eighteen a boy became a youth (*ἐφηβος*), his beard began to grow strongly, and his bloom was seen to fade. Seventeen was then the latest age at which the beginning of the relationship could be made very probable, as we see also from an epigram by Strato in the Anthology.³⁰ Anyone who conceived of the matter in this way, shared both Aristoxenus' malice towards Plato and Socrates and his taste for scandal of all kinds, was tolerant of approximations, and knew the opinion, reported by Theophrastus (60A5 *VS*), that Socrates "had converse" (*συγγεγονέναι*) with Archelaus, might conclude that Socrates was "about seventeen" when he came under the influence of Archelaus and so could have been his *paidika*.³¹ This conclusion would certainly be more acceptable to him than Ion's unprejudicial statement that Socrates was "young." Ion's mention of Samos had no relevance to the doxographical-chronological calculation and was indeed incompatible with it, if Ion

²⁹*Cri.* 52e; "more than 70" according to T's text of *Apol.* 17d. Cf. the comments of F. Jacoby in *FGrHist* 2C. 730.

³⁰*Anth. Pal.* 12.4. At Pl. *Symp.* 181d Pausanias, for his own purposes, denies the usual view, earlier expressed by Phaedrus (178c, 180a), that the *παιδικά* is of an age to be *ἀγένητος*: see Bury's notes on 180a and 181d.

³¹It is interesting to notice that in the *Parmenides*, which has a dramatic date near the middle of the century, Parmenides is 65, Zeno appears as his *paidika*, and Socrates is said to be *σφόδρα νέος* (127 b-c). This relationship has at least a partial symmetry with the succession, Anaxagoras-Archelaus-Socrates. Each is constructed to illustrate the relation between Socrates and a principal tendency of the philosophy of his youth, and both assume approximately the same date for the critical point of articulation. So Socrates heard the book of Anaxagoras, *νέος ὢν* (*Phd.* 96a). But it may be that the difference between *νέος* of the *Phaedo* and *σφόδρα νέος* of the *Parmenides* is significant. In the latter dialogue Plato appears to be under a chronological constraint that compels him to extend Parmenides' life down to the middle of the century and to introduce Socrates to philosophy at as early an age as possible. In that case Plato may have thought of the crucial date for Socrates' encounter with Ionian philosophy as somewhat later than the dramatic date assumed for the confrontation with Eleaticism, presumably therefore in the forties. This is consistent with the date given by Ion according to the interpretation offered here and with his use of an unqualified *νέος*. This conclusion then offers support to the view that Aristoxenus' account, which requires an earlier date, is not derived from Ion's but is incompatible with it. It is not incredible that he has assimilated what Ion had to report to the date and the paederastic relationship involved in the Eleatic succession.

referred to the Samian campaign of 440. It must therefore be noticed that our reports concerning Aristoxenus make no mention of Samos and that it is in that degree more likely that Aristoxenus drew on a source other than Ion.³²

If the conclusion of the argument just presented in this paper is right, several interesting consequences follow. First, the teacher-pupil relationship between Archelaus and Socrates that is regularly accepted in the ancient tradition is a doxographic construction of the school of Aristotle in the fourth century and is without corroboration in fifth-century sources or in any good historical evidence. Secondly, Aristoxenus' account of a homosexual relationship when Socrates was about seventeen is subject to a similar judgment. Thirdly, there is reason to suspect that a chronology which fixed Anaxagoras' sojourn in Athens between 480 and 450 may have been influenced by the doxographic convention that Socrates' association with Archelaus had to intervene between the period in which Anaxagoras was introducing the Ionian philosophy into Athens and that in which Socrates evolved his own moral philosophy. Finally, to judge by our incomplete report of Ion's reminiscence, it seems likely that Socrates (and Archelaus) served in the Samian campaign of 440, though he may not have taken part in a pitched battle.³³

UNIVERSITY COLLEGE, TORONTO

³²The opposite assumption is theoretically possible, that the date of Anaxagoras' departure from Athens was fixed by the help of Aristoxenus' report about the seventeen-year-old Socrates, but it seems improbable. First, Diogenes' report on the chronology makes no mention of the date of departure, which is left to the reader's inference instead of being made a datum. Secondly, it would be surprising if Aristoxenus had access to a source for the early life of Socrates that was unknown to our relatively abundant Socratic literature. Thirdly, Plato's silence about the teacher-pupil relationship in *Phd.* 96a ff. and his obscure mention of "some one" who read Anaxagoras' book aloud make it highly improbable that it was known to him, whereas it is precisely the kind of construction that was being made systematically in the school of Aristotle. That Socrates is represented in the *Phaedo* (96b3, 97b8, and 109b3, with Burnet's notes) as acquainted with certain ideas of Archelaus is no more than we should expect of him, or of other thoughtful Athenians, and proves nothing for the teacher-pupil hypothesis. Finally, Aristoxenus' bad reputation must seriously discredit eccentric testimony that he alone provides.

³³That Socrates took part in no battle of the Samian campaign is the conclusion also of A. Busse, *Sokrates* (Berlin 1914) 79, 84.