

Athens, Intellectuals, and Demetrius of Phalerum's *Socrates**

LARA O'SULLIVAN

The University of Western Australia

SUMMARY: The literary tradition documents a fraught relationship between Athens and philosophers—a relationship dominated by, but scarcely confined to, the Athenians' condemnation of Socrates. The historicity of much of this tradition has been questioned, and suspicion has fallen on Demetrius of Phalerum's *Apology of Socrates* as a pivotal work within the supposed fabrication of this tradition. This article seeks to reassess the contribution of Demetrius's *Socrates* to the anti-Athenian intellectual tradition, and to suggest that the work's enduring significance resides rather in its contribution to Peripatetic historical investigation.

THE FIGURE OF SOCRATES WAS A SITE FOR DISPUTATION, AN EMBLEM OF ALL that was felt to be good and bad about intellectuals, and this both within his own lifetime and beyond: one has only to think of the representations by Aristophanes, Xenophon, and Polycrates among his contemporaries. These diverse representations of Socrates may reveal as much about their authors as they do about their subject, and this has certainly been thought to be the case in the *Socrates* that Demetrius of Phalerum composed around a century after Socrates' death. The tenor of Demetrius's *Socrates* has elicited in the modern literature some markedly diverging assessments, many encouraged by differing assumptions about Demetrius's own circumstances in writing. A Peripatetic philosopher and orator, a some-time governor of Athens, Demetrius may indeed have had many conflicting reasons, both political and philosophical, for engaging with Socrates. Demetrius's work is, for Long, part of a Peripatetic

* I wish to acknowledge the helpful comments of TAPA's two anonymous reviewers, whose observations have greatly improved this paper. All remaining errors are, of course, my own. References to Demetrius's works throughout use the text, translation, and fragment numbers of the collection by Fortenbaugh and Schütrumpf 2000, unless otherwise stated.

movement that sought “to undermine the ethical integrity of Socrates’ life” (1988: 155);¹ for Fitton (1970) by contrast, Demetrius’s bias is in favour of his subject rather than against.

That Demetrius’s *Socrates* has been so differently understood is not entirely surprising. The work survives only in fragments, preserved by later writers of whom none apparently had first-hand knowledge of the text.² There is, moreover, an uneasy tension between those surviving passages that relate to Socrates himself (the tenor of which, at least on first reading, appears potentially critical of their subject) and those other passages apparently detailing Athens’s poor treatment of other philosophers. But the nature of Demetrius’s *Socrates* would be of rather esoteric interest had not Dover (1976), in his renowned article on anti-intellectualism in Athens, claimed for it a pivotal place in our understanding of Athens’s relations with philosophers. For Dover, the anti-intellectualism documented for the fifth-century (witness the attacks on Anaxagoras and Protagoras, for example) is the unhistorical product of a later age. Some of them extrapolated from comedy or perhaps from misremembered casual remarks, these “stories” of philosophical persecution needed influential media through which they could be assimilated into the historical tradition. Demetrius’s *Socrates* offered such a vehicle to Dover, who concluded that “the glimpse we get of [Demetrius’s] *Apology of Socrates* is enough to justify the hypothesis that it was a work in which the theme of long-standing antagonism between the Athenian *demos* and the philosophers

¹ For the *Socrates* as decidedly anti-Socratic see Sansone 1989: 177. Further bibliography on antipathy to Socrates is gathered by Calabi Limentani 1964: xxi n28. The very existence of an entrenched anti-Socratic line in Peripatetic scholarship is, however, conjectural: it relies heavily on the assumption that Peripatetic writers in general echoed the anti-Socratic views of Aristoxenus, and he was scarcely a ‘typical’ Peripatetic. According to the *Suda* s.v. Ἀριστόξενοϛ, he expected to succeed Aristotle as head of the Lyceum, and when that position actually fell to Theophrastus, he turned against his former associates; fragments of his *Life of Plato* (Aristoxenus F64–65 Wehrli 1967 with commentary, and with the response of Philochorus *FGrHist.* 328 F223) give some indication of how his antagonism was manifest. When other Peripatetics included in their Socratic writings material common to Aristoxenus (on which, see below 401–3) it is not clear that they used that material with a similarly hostile intent.

² The fragments are known chiefly through Plutarch’s *Aristides* and Diogenes Laertius. The former relied on Panaetius for his knowledge of the Phalerean material, or at least for that concerning Socrates’ alliance with Myrto, as Calabi Limentani 1964: xxi observes. Diogenes’ citations of Demetrius of Phalerum are coupled with references to Demetrius of Magnesia’s treatise *Namesakes* and to Apollodorus’s *Chronicles*; the material from Demetrius of Phalerum is so closely interconnected with the later material from Demetrius of Magnesia and from Apollodorus that it is clear that it is in fact being mediated through those accounts.

was developed further than the available evidence warranted, and through which a highly coloured picture of this antagonism was transmitted to later ages" (1976: 38–39). Dover suggests, for example, that Demetrius of Phalerum may have been instrumental in shaping the story that the Athenians burned Protagoras's books (D. L. 9.52), or possibly in the fabrication of the "decree of Deiopeithes" (reported by Plutarch *Pericles* 32.1), a measure providing for the impeachment of teachers of physics. Arguing thus, Dover accords the work a significance that extends beyond the tradition on Socrates to the broader question of anti-intellectualism in antiquity.

The political climate of the late fourth century encourages Dover's view. Demetrius had, at that time, witnessed at first hand a spate of anti-intellectual activity in Athens: a number of philosophers, including his close associates Aristotle and Theophrastus, were the targets of politically-motivated accusations of impiety, and Demetrius himself was moved to intervene in an attempted attack on Theodorus the Atheist.³ Furthermore, Demetrius's own expulsion from the city in 307 B.C.E. was closely followed by an attempt, through the short-lived "law of Sophocles", to place the philosophical schools under the regulation of the state.⁴ For this kind of "persecution" of intellectuals, the death of Socrates could furnish a striking precedent or parallel, and it is not unreasonable to suppose that Demetrius might have struck back at his political adversaries. He is known, after all, to have written a *Denunciation of the Athenians*, and indeed to have engaged in a propaganda war of sorts with Demochares, the man who was probably the driving force behind the law of Sophocles.⁵ Dover would have the *Socrates* serve the cause of Demetrius's

³ The accusations against Aristotle (chiefly for honouring his friend Hermias with divine honours) are given by D. L. 5.5 and Ath. 696b; an action against Theophrastus is recorded by D. L. 5.37 and alluded to by Aelian *V.H.* 8.12; for Theodorus, see D. L. 2.101 and Philo *Quod omnis probus liber sit* 127ff.

⁴ For the law of Sophocles, see D. L. 5.38, Pollux 9.42, and Alexis F99 Kassel and Austin. In the legal tussle that surrounded the passage of the law, Demetrius's political detractors employed the figure of Socrates in their anti-intellectual rhetoric: thus Demochares *ap. Ath.* 215c.

⁵ A propaganda war between Demetrius and Demochares is clearly attested by Polybius (12.13.7ff = Dem. F89), and Gottschalk 2000: 374–76 sees potentially in Demetrius's *Socrates* a response to the calumnies against Socrates contained in Demochares' defence of Sophocles' law (see note above). To the extent that Demochares' vitriol will have made the character of Socrates topical, and raised specific allegations to which Demetrius may have responded, some relationship between the *Socrates* and Demochares' speech is plausible indeed; that Demochares' speech was the primary impetus for Demetrius's work, however, and that the *Socrates* contained "criticism of the Athenians," as Gottschalk 2000: 376n3 maintains, goes beyond the evidence of the fragments.

polemic, with the fate of Socrates becoming paradigmatic of that Athenian hostility against philosophers which Demetrius himself had suffered.

Dover's thesis has won followers,⁶ and the potential importance that he has imputed to the Phalerean *Socrates* makes a renewed examination of that work timely. Such a re-examination is the purpose of this paper, in which it will be suggested that Dover's hypothesis is problematic on a number of levels. To begin, the three key fragments of the *Socrates* which signalled for Dover the anti-Athenianism of the whole —fragments which concern the philosophers Heraclitus, Democritus, and Anaxagoras—are not unambiguously anti-Athenian, even when read in isolation. That their purpose was to reflect ill on Athens is rendered yet more suspect when the tenor of these three key passages is compared with the other fragments of the *Socrates*, fragments that deal with the figure of Socrates himself. Indeed a consideration of the genre and apparent interests of the Socratic material indicates that Demetrius's concerns in the *Socrates* were rather different from the creation of a "new story" of Athenian anti-intellectualism.

A brief survey of the three fragments that form the foundation of Dover's hypothesis may furnish a starting point. All are preserved by Diogenes Laertius and all explicitly attributed to Demetrius of Phalerum. The texts are as follows:

D. L. 9.15 = Dem. F106: Δημήτριος δέ φησιν ἐν τοῖς Ὀμωνύμοις καὶ Ἀθηναίων αὐτὸν ὑπερφρονῆσαι, δόξαν ἔχοντα παμπλείστην, καταφρονούμενόν τε ὑπὸ τῶν Ἐφεσίων μᾶλλον τὰ οἰκεῖα. μέμνηται αὐτοῦ καὶ ὁ Φαληρεὺς Δημήτριος ἐν τῇ Σωκράτους ἀπολογίᾳ.

Demetrius [of Magnesia] in his *Namesakes* says that he [Heraclitus] looked down even on the Athenians, although he was very highly esteemed [by them], and that although he was slighted by the Ephesians [he preferred] what was his own all the more. Demetrius of Phalerum too mentions him in his *Apology of Socrates*.

D. L. 9.37 = Dem. F108: Δημήτριος δὲ ὁ Φαληρεὺς ἐν τῇ Σωκράτους ἀπολογίᾳ μὴδὲ ἐλθεῖν φησιν αὐτὸν εἰς Ἀθήνας.

Demetrius of Phalerum in his *Apology of Socrates* says that he [Democritus] did not even come to Athens.

⁶Notably Wallace 1996: 229–30: "it is certainly true that in his *Defence of Socrates*... Demetrios said scandalous things about Athens' treatment of intellectuals. ... It is perfectly credible that he bore a grudge against the Athenians ... for their treatment of him." In a similar vein, Tritle 1988: 29–31 suspects a Phalerean origin for Plutarch's narrative, at *Phoc.* 38.2, of the death of Phocion, with its explicit evocation of the death of Socrates.

D. L. 9.57 = Dem. F107: Διογένης Ἀπολλοθέμιδος Ἀπολλωνιάτης, ἀνὴρ φυσικὸς καὶ ἄγαν ἐλλόγιμος. ἤκουσε δέ, φησὶν Ἀντισθένης, Ἀναξιμένους. ἦν δὲ τοῖς χρόνοις κατ' Ἀναξαγόραν. τοῦτόν φησιν ὁ Φαληρεὺς Δημήτριος ἐν τῇ Σωκράτους ἀπολογίᾳ διὰ μέγαν φθόνον μικροῦ κινδυνεῦσαι Ἀθήνησιν.

Diogenes of Apollonia, son of Apollothemis, [was] a highly respected natural philosopher. According to Antisthenes, he attended the lectures of Anaximenes. He lived at the same time as Anaxagoras. In his *Apology of Socrates*, Demetrius of Phalerum says that because of [incurring] great envy he came close to losing his life in Athens.

The supposed anti-Athenian tendency of these fragments is hard to discern. In the case of the fragment concerning Heraclitus, Diogenes Laertius attests merely that Demetrius of Phalerum made mention of him (μένεται αὐτοῦ D. L. 9.15); Athens is brought into the picture only if we follow Mouraviev (1985) and, by changing αὐτοῦ to ταύτου, claim a Phalerean interest in the preceding material (material that Diogenes in fact attributes to Demetrius of Magnesia). Such emendation to ταύτου is unnecessary. While Laertius's placement of his reference to Demetrius of Phalerum is odd, coming as it does in the midst of his *Life of Heraclitus*—it makes Laertius, while detailing Heraclitus's life, pause to mention merely that Demetrius of Phalerum mentioned Heraclitus, and give no indication of what Demetrius actually said about him—it is an explicable oddity, given that Diogenes was not using Demetrius of Phalerum's work at first hand. Rather, Diogenes had just come across a mention of Demetrius of Phalerum in Demetrius of Magnesia's *Namesakes*, and Diogenes thus records this snippet of information (that Demetrius of Phalerum also mentions Heraclitus) along with his citation of Demetrius of Magnesia's anecdote about the philosopher (also at 9.15).

It needs to be noted further that, even if we allow the emendation of 9.15, we are still no closer to finding a strain of anti-Athenianism. Heraclitus's refusal to visit Athens and his preference for Ephesus serve simply to illustrate the disdain of the philosopher for popular recognition. In this context, the shunning of the Athenians hardly reflects ill on them. On the contrary, it is the fame of Athens as the seat of philosophers that is the key: Heraclitus's rejection of the Athenians' hospitality is all the more pointed because they are sympathetically disposed towards intellectuals, and Heraclitus's emphatic rejection of them merely illuminates that contempt for mankind that is his most prominent attribute in the Hellenistic tradition.⁷

This is hardly promising material on which to build an interpretation of the *Socrates* as a vehicle for anti-Athenianism, nor indeed is Demetrius's

⁷ Kirk 1954: 4–5 outlines the tradition on Heraclitus's misanthropy.

assertion that Democritus did not come to Athens. The latter can be viewed as fundamentally antithetical to Athens only if it is supposed that it is a deliberate untruth, a falsification betrayed by its conflict with the well-known Democritean dictum "I came to Athens and no-one knew me" (ἦλθον ἐς Ἀθήνας καὶ οὐτις με ἔγνωκεν D. L. 9.36) This famous phrase is, however, the only evidence that Democritus *did* go to Athens, and it is attested relatively late (first, in fact, by Demetrius of Magnesia, an author later than Demetrius of Phalerum); its authenticity cannot be proved, and it may indeed have arisen as a variant explanation for the silence about Democritus in Plato's works, a silence that had prompted comment from ancient scholars.⁸ At most, the Phalerean can be said to be contradicting another tradition by denying that Democritus came to Athens (and he might not even have been doing that, if the Democritean dictum was invented after Demetrius of Phalerum's own day); he is not here demonstrably contradicting an established truth.⁹ Given that there is nothing intrinsically anti-Athenian in the material on Heraclitus and Democritus, it is unsurprising that this material has been employed to illustrate other themes: Diogenes Laertius, who cites Demetrius on both Heraclitus and Democritus, employs Demetrius's material as evidence of the attitude of philosophers to glory.¹⁰

⁸ Ostwald 1986: 271, while accepting the dictum as genuine, notes the lack of corroborative evidence for Democritus's visit to Athens. Thrasyllus's attempt to identify as Democritus the anonymous interlocutor of the pseudo-Platonic dialogue *Rivals* (D. L. 9.37) attests to the speculation among scholars about the connections (or lack thereof) between Socrates and Democritus; claims that Democritus never came to Athens, or that he went unrecognised in that city, would both offer explanations for Plato's silence.

⁹ The belief that Democritus did not come to Athens may have been shared by Demetrius's contemporary, Aristoxenus, who alleged that Plato wished to burn as many of Democritus's books as he could gather, apparently to suppress Democritus's views (D. L. 9.40 = Aristoxenus F131 Wehrli 1967). This allegation itself is no doubt unhistorical, based perhaps on the assumed antipathy that formed yet another explanation for Plato's failure to mention Democritus; it does seem to reflect a belief that Democritus's views were known in Athens through the circulation of books, rather than through dissemination by a circle of pupils.

¹⁰ Diogenes Laertius appends to Demetrius's denial of a visit by Democritus to Athens an explanation based on the worth of fame: τοῦτο δὲ καὶ μείζον, εἶγε τοσαύτης πόλεως ὑπερεφρόνησεν, οὐκ ἐκ τόπου δόξαν λαβεῖν βουλόμενος, ἀλλὰ τόπῳ δόξαν περιθεῖναι προελόμενος (D. L. 9.37). This explanation is introduced by Diogenes in a manner suggesting that Demetrius of Phalerum's claim is to be compared with an earlier statement. The intended contrast can only be with the claims made by Demetrius of Magnesia, cited only lines above, to the effect that Democritus went to Athens but, despising glory, did not make himself known (the Magnesian goes on to cite Democritus's famous assertion that he went to Athens and was not recognised there). Diogenes Laertius therefore quotes the

The fragment of the *Apology* at D. L. 9.57 comes closest to meriting, at least on first reading, an anti-Athenian categorisation. In it, a philosopher is stated to have come "within an ace of danger" in Athens, and the danger further attributed to "great envy." It is indeed tempting to draw an obvious parallel between this passage and descriptions of Demetrius's own experience in Athens, for Aelian *V. H.* 3.17 (= Dem. F40) states that Demetrius was driven into exile by the customary envy of the Athenians. But does this fragment demonstrate that the *Apology* developed a theme of Athenian anti-intellectual sentiment more than warranted by the actual history of philosophical/Athenian relations? Some have ventured an affirmative here, but it is an affirmative based largely on the identification of the subject of the piece as *Diogenes of Apollonia*, rather than Anaxagoras. It is the former who is the subject of the *Life* in which Laertius preserves this fragment, and Laertius's use of οὐτός for the subject of a biography is paralleled throughout his writing. Observing that Demetrius's is the sole account of any trouble encountered by the Apollonian in Athens, Wehrli (1967) thus contends that the appearance of such an obscure episode in the *Socrates* might indeed confirm its anti-Athenian theme.¹¹

There is good reason, however, to believe that the notice applies instead to Anaxagoras, for whom some experience of difficulty in Athens is rather better attested beyond Demetrius of Phalerum's testimony.¹² Grammatically, οὐτός could refer just as easily to him, for it is Anaxagoras who is named in the line preceding the citation of the *Apology*.¹³ Demetrius of Phalerum is, moreover, known to have had a sustained interest in Anaxagoras, mentioning him in two other treatises. In his chronographic work *List of Archons*, Demetrius claimed that Anaxagoras took up philosophy at Athens in the time of Callias, archon 456/55 B.C.E. (so D. L. 2.7 = Dem. F94), and in his work

two Demetrios (of Phalerum and of Magnesia) for conflicting statements about Democritus' presence in Athens, both statements being intended to cast some light on Democritus' approach to popular acclaim. Cicero notably employs these very same *exempla* (Heraclitus and Democritus) in his discussion of the nature of fame and its desirability for the philosopher at *Tusc. Disp.* 5.36.104.

¹¹ Thus Derenne 1976: 42n1, and similarly Wehrli 1967 (commentary on his Demetrius F91) believe that Diogenes of Apollonia was meant. Diogenes' views certainly elicited mockery and criticism at Athens: witness the parodies by Aristophanes and by Philemon, with Guthrie 1968: 362–63. These comic allusions are, however, the only evidence that Diogenes came to Athens at all, let alone suffered there.

¹² Mansfeld 1980: 82–83 similarly applies the passage to Anaxagoras.

¹³ There is the additional possibility that Diogenes Laertius himself intended the notice to apply to Diogenes of Apollonia, but that in doing so he has bungled Demetrius' original material (material with which he was not, after all, familiar at first hand: see n2 above).

On Old Age,¹⁴ Demetrius recorded that Anaxagoras had buried his sons with his own hands (D. L. 9.20 & 2.13 = Dem. FF84 & 85. This latter tradition on the demise of Anaxagoras's sons could well have been linked to the tradition on Anaxagoras's own misfortunes in Athens, and such a link is indeed made by Diogenes Laertius when citing the information). If the notice at D. L. 9.57 applies to Anaxagoras and not to Diogenes of Apollonia, it ceases to be a notice of an all but forgotten interlude in Athenian affairs. Whatever we may think of the historicity of the confused and confusing literary tradition around Anaxagoras's "troubles" in Athens, we can scarcely credit its genesis to Demetrius, given that it was known already by Ephorus and may be alluded to by Plato.¹⁵ Far from developing a theme of pronounced Athenian anti-intellectualism, the great envy that in Dem. F107 so endangered Anaxagoras might not even have been aimed at the philosopher in the first instance; certainly the other accounts of Anaxagoras's trouble make Pericles the true target of the attack.¹⁶

If there is little within the material of the key three Socratic fragments themselves to sustain Dover's reconstruction, that reconstruction becomes still more problematic once we widen our view to consider the nature of Demetrius's *Socrates* as a whole. Dover may have been encouraged in his hypothesis by an assumption that Demetrius's work was an *Apology of Socrates* composed within the tradition of the other, more lastingly famous *apologiai* of Plato, Xenophon and even, one might add, of Libanius. In these latter works, and indeed in the corresponding anti-Socratic material of Polycrates' *Accusation of Socrates*, the Athenians' trial and condemnation of Socrates offered a dramatic focal point of, and impetus for, the ongoing debate about the nature of that philosopher: Socrates' defenders and critics alike could borrow from the forensic model by presenting their claims in speeches, and their claims and counterclaims were, to some extent, informed by issues surrounding the trial.¹⁷

¹⁴ On the work *On Old Age* see further Fornara 1996.

¹⁵ Diod. Sic. 12.39.2 = Ephorus *FGrHist.* 70 F196; Plato *Apol.* 26d.

¹⁶ As the ultimate object of the envy, Themistocles is another possibility, for he is named by Stesimbrotus (*ap. Plut. Them.* 2) as a pupil of Anaxagoras, and the tradition known to Satyrus (*ap. D. L.* 2.12) that Anaxagoras was condemned *in absentia* for Medism, is readily reconciled with any assumed connection between these two. (For Demetrius on Anaxagoras and Themistocles, see Woodbury 1981: 302ff.) According to Demetrius's likely chronology of Anaxagoras's life, however, (on which, see the appendix below) Pericles is the more plausible candidate.

¹⁷ On Polycrates' *Accusation*, see Chroust 1957: 44. As early as the start of the third century, this "speech" was believed by some to be one of the genuine prosecution addresses delivered in 399 B.C.E. (so D. L. 2.38, citing Hermippus). The view, once well established in classical scholarship, that much of the *apologia* of Xenophon and Libanius is a response

We would surely expect Demetrius's *Socrates* to engage in this dialogue, and to have a similar focus on the drama of 399 B.C.E. if its underlying theme is to be the Athenians' ongoing antagonism towards philosophers. Any such emphasis is, however, singularly lacking from the extant fragments. There is nothing at all that could conceivably have been part of a defence speech,¹⁸ and some of Demetrius's claims are demonstrably at odds with the apologetic tradition exemplified (for all their differences) by Xenophon and Plato. Indeed, to the extent that the *Socrates* was apologetic at all, and merited the title of *Apology* thrice bestowed on it by Diogenes Laertius (9.15, 37, 57),¹⁹ it seems to have been primarily a response to, and refutation of, a biography of Socrates compiled by Demetrius's former colleague in the Peripatos, Aristoxenus.²⁰ A relationship between the works of Demetrius and of Aristoxenus seems likely: both featured a denial of Socrates' poverty, and both credited to Socrates two wives—not only the Xanthippe known from Plato, but also one Myrto, a descendant of Aristides the Just.²¹ We are dealing here with something more than

to Polycrates' pamphlet, has been challenged by Livingstone 2001: 32–36; he argues that Polycrates' *Accusation* was not a serious work but a παίγδιον. While Livingstone's caution against using Xenophon and Libanius to "reconstruct" Polycrates' lost *Accusation* is worth noting, it does need to be remembered that Polycrates' jesting and cleverness were not universally recognised as such in antiquity: Favorinus, who disproved the authenticity of the work, did so not on grounds of its lack of serious attack, but because of chronological impossibilities contained within it (see D. L. 2.39). Xenophon, Libanius, and other apologists might have chosen to answer damaging allegations raised against Socrates by Polycrates, even if they recognised that this was not a speech delivered at his actual trial.

¹⁸ There is indeed, as Wehrli 1967 observed in his discussion of the *Socrates* fragments (at FF91–98 in his collection), much that *could not* have been included in the course of a fictitious defence speech set in 399 B.C.E. (although one must concede that such could have been included in some kind of framing preface or conclusion). This includes material pertaining to Demetrius's own day, preserved in Plut. *Arist.* 1.2 and 27.4 = Dem. FF102 & 104.

¹⁹ Jacoby 1926 is, to my knowledge, not widely supported in drawing a distinction between the *Socrates* (so called by Plutarch, and by Diogenes when listing the Phalerean oeuvre at 5.81) and the *Apology* (thus Jacoby's commentary on *FGrHist.* 228 FF40–45). The notorious unreliability of ancient titles is sufficient to account for these different listings of the work.

²⁰ This has already been suggested, without much discussion, by Wehrli 1967, in his commentary on his Demetrius FF91–98, and by Momigliano 1971: 77. The possibility that Demetrius's work responds also to a speech by Demochares is acknowledged above n5, although on current evidence the connection with Aristoxenus's *Socrates* is more compelling; no extant *Socrates* fragments correspond to specific material from Demochares' speech.

²¹ See Plut. *Arist.* 1.9 = Dem. F102, Plut. *Arist.* 27.3–4 = Dem. F104 & Athen. 555d–556b = Dem. F105; Cyrill. *Contra Julianum* 6.185 & Theodoret. *Graec. affect. curatio* 12.61, D.

a sharing of material between two scions of the Peripatos, for Aristoxenus's *Socrates* was patently antipathetic to its titular subject, so much so that Porphyry deemed Aristoxenus's charges more malevolent than those of Socrates' actual legal prosecutors.²² Demetrius's purpose does not seem to have been similarly denigratory: on the contrary, Plutarch understood Demetrius's refutation of Socrates' poverty (at Plut. *Arist.* 1.1–9 = Dem. F102) as an attempt to save that philosopher from ignominy, and Demetrius's analogous refutation in the very same passage of the alleged poverty of Aristides the Just, a figure of whom Demetrius evidently approves, further cautions against a simple assimilation with Aristoxenus's *Socrates*.²³ In particular, Demetrius's claim that Socrates had an estate, and also "seventy minas, which were put out at interest by Crito" (μνᾶς ἑβδομήκοντα τοκίζομένας ὑπὸ Κρίτωνος Plut. *Arist.* 1.9) looks very much like a refutation of Aristoxenus's allegations of usury against Socrates;²⁴ Demetrius's version makes Socrates the original owner of the money, but Crito the practitioner of the usury.²⁵ We may suspect that a similar difference of intent marked the treatment by Demetrius and by Aristoxenus of the issue of Socrates' wives. Aristoxenus evidently employed these unions as a proof of Socrates' lustful temperament. Demetrius's particular

L. 2.20 = Aristoxenus F54a–b, Wehrli 1967. Demetrius and Aristoxenus are here distinguished from the Socratic tradition of Plato, Xenophon and Libanius, in whose *apologiai* Socrates' poverty was an established motif: thus Plato *Apol.* 38b; Xen. *Oec.* 2.3. Indeed in the work of Libanius there is a particularly striking contrast to Demetrius's assertion of Socrates' wealth: with Dem. F102 compare Libanius *Apol.* 17ff.

²² Thus Porphyry *ap. Cyrill. Contra Julianum* 6.185 and Theodoret. *Graec. affect. curatio* 12.61.

²³ On Demetrius's approval of Aristides, see Plut. *Dem.* 14.1 = Dem. F156. By denying the poverty of Aristides, Demetrius was again at odds with one strand of Socratic *apologiai*, for the tradition ascribing poverty to Aristides seems to have had its genesis in the *Callias* of Aeschines of Sphettus, himself a well known Socratic philosopher: see Wilamowitz 1893: 160n65 and subsequently Dittmar 1976: 206–7.

An anecdotal tradition concerning Demetrius's clashes with the Cynic Crates (D. L. 6.90; Ath. 422c; Plut. *Mor.* 69c) suggests further that the ostentatious poverty cultivated by the Cynics in supposed emulation of Socrates was not well regarded by Demetrius, nor indeed by Peripatetic scholars in general. On Peripatetic luxury, see also D. L. 6.90.

²⁴ The emendation by Sansone 1989: 179 of the text to ἀπὸ Κρίτωνος (thus Socrates had "the sum of seventy minas, placed at his disposal by Crito, which he let out at interest"), is unnecessary, motivated as it is by a desire to bring Demetrius *into line* with Aristoxenus.

²⁵ Thus Demetrius perhaps viewed Crito's financial offer to Socrates (Plato *Apol.* 38b and *Crit.* 45b) as a proffered repayment of money originally bestowed on Crito by Socrates.

view of these liaisons cannot, unfortunately, be teased out from our sources, for Plutarch (*Arist.* 27.3–5 = Dem. F104) and Athenaeus (555d–556b = Dem. F105) both group Demetrius's account with those of other Peripatetic writers and in doing so distort the individual versions;²⁶ what is clear, however, is that Socrates' marital history did not occasion opprobrium from all the writers of the Peripatos.²⁷

If Aristoxenus's treatise, and not the Athenians' trial and condemnation of Socrates, were the central target of redress or apology in Demetrius's work, the remaining fragmentary material hints that the thrust of his *Socrates* was rather what we might today classify as more properly historical than forensic; this is perhaps not surprising, given that Aristoxenus's work was a biography, a *bios*, of its subject.²⁸ Those fragments that deal with Socrates himself are concerned with the fixing of the circumstances of that philosopher's life, such as his wealth, his wives, and the dates of his birth and death. Thus, for example, the following (D. L. 2.44 = Dem. F109):

Ἐγεννήθη δέ, καθά φησιν Ἀπολλόδωρος ἐν τοῖς Χρονικοῖς, ἐπὶ Ἀφειώωνος τῷ τετάρτῳ ἔτει τῆς ἑβδομηκοστῆς ἑβδόμης Ὀλυμπιάδος, Θαργηλιῶνος ἑκτῇ, ὅτε καθαίρουσιν Ἀθηναῖοι τὴν πόλιν καὶ τὴν Ἄρτεμιν Δήλιοι γενέσθαι φασίν. ἐτελεύτησε δὲ τῷ πρώτῳ ἔτει τῆς ἐνενηκοστῆς πέμπτῃς Ὀλυμπιάδος, γεγονὼς ἑτῶν ἑβδομήκοντα. ταῦτα φησι καὶ Δημήτριος ὁ Φαληρεὺς. ἔνιοι γὰρ ἐξήκοντα ἑτῶν τελευτῆσαι αὐτόν φασιν.

²⁶ A summary of Peripatetic accounts of Socrates' marriages is preserved also at D. L. 2.26, a summary that unfortunately omits reference to Demetrius. Both Plutarch and Athenaeus imply that Demetrius deemed Socrates a bigamist; neither, however, is strictly accurate in the reporting of the views of individual Peripatetic writers, as is revealed by comparison with the more careful synopsis at D. L. 2.26 (with Woodbury 1973: 7–10 for preferring Diogenes to Plutarch and Athenaeus). Fitton 1970 has shown that the Peripatetics may have believed Socrates to have been properly married to Myrto alone.

²⁷ Hieronymus of Rhodes's version of the unions (*ap. Ath.* 556a–b & D. L. 2.26), for example, cast Socrates' action as legally valid, if not morally conventional. The hostility of the Peripatetic line is further suspect because the Peripatetics attributed Socrates' liaison with Myrto to her dowerless state; this justification is curiously similar to one fabricated to defend Aristotle's own liaison with Pythias, a liaison which prompted attacks against Aristotle. For the calumny on Pythias, see Euseb. *Praep. Evang.* 15.2; for the response — a forged letter — see Aristotle F663 Rose 1966, with the comments of Mulvany 1926: 156. Gottschalk 1972: 341 suggests that Aristotle's apologist must have found a model in the Aristotelian passage on Socrates' marriage to Myrto. Aristotle's Socrates tradition cannot have been demonstrably hostile if it provided suitable material for the forgery of an apologist!

²⁸ Jerome (in his preface to *De vir. ill.*) explicitly names Aristoxenus among the predecessors of Suetonius in the writing of biographical accounts.

He [Socrates] was born, as Apollodorus says in his *Chronicles*, at the time of [the archonship of] Aphepsion in the fourth year of the seventy-seventh Olympiad on the sixth of Thargelion, the day the Athenians purge the city and the Delians say that Artemis was born. He died in the first year of the ninety-fifth Olympiad at the age of seventy. The same is said by Demetrius of Phalerum as well, but there are people who say that [Socrates] died at sixty.

A similar concern for the establishment of dates and events is betrayed in those fragments of the *Socrates* that deal with the archonship of Aristides the Just (Plut. *Arist.* 1.2 & 5.9–10 = Dem. FF102 & 103²⁹).

If the fragments that treat the figures of Socrates and Aristides give an accurate impression of the tendencies of the work as a whole—and it is worth noting that these fragments, although few, are much more extensive, and give much more of a sense of the thread of Demetrius's argument than do the fragments on Heraclitus, Democritus, and Anaxagoras—then they may provide a lens through which we may reappraise Demetrius's discussion of other philosophers and interpret that discussion within the framework of a historical treatment of Socrates. Far from being indicative of a sustained attack on Athens's treatment of philosophers, Demetrius's allusions in his *Socrates* to these other philosophers may well have been driven by the need to locate Socrates' life within the continuum of philosophical activity in Athens, in temporal and social terms, and moreover in terms of the influences on his ideas. The synchronisation of birth dates, acmes and dates of deaths for leading philosophical and literary figures, the question of philosophers' possible acquaintance with each other and the establishment of teacher/pupil relations among them—these are well demonstrated as central concerns of the later ancient biographical tradition and of related chronographic works, such as Apollodorus's *Chronicles* and the *Lives* of Diogenes Laertius.³⁰ More significantly, these are concerns demonstrable in Demetrius's other writings. Thus in one fragment of unknown provenance (*Vita Aeschinis* 3.6–7 = Dem. F140), Demetrius claims that Aeschines the orator was a pupil of Socrates and later of Plato. Another fragment of similarly unknown origin (Plut. *Dem.* 28.3 = Dem. F164) records that Archias, famous as the henchman who drove Demosthenes to his death, belonged to the school of Anaximenes.³¹

²⁹ Demetrius located Aristides' archonship after the battle of Plataea, a tradition corrected by Plutarch. Demetrius's position has, however, found its defenders: see Piccirilli 1983.

³⁰ For an example of this type of scholarship, one could look to Diogenes Laertius's extensive discussion of the relative ages of, and the connections between, Democritus, Anaxagoras, and Socrates at 9.41–42.

³¹ It should be noted, however, that Fortenbaugh and Schütrumpf 2000 have rejected this latter fragment from Demetrius's *fragmenta*.

Demetrius's *List of Archons* contained similar material, for Demetrius there noted the date at which the "Seven Sages" became so called (D. L. 1.22 = Dem. F93), and further made claims concerning the timing of Anaxagoras's Athenian sojourn (D. L. 2.7 = Dem. F94, with appendix below).

This *List of Archons* itself is of particular interest, for two fragments often assigned to the *Socrates* could equally well belong to it. The first fragment (F109 = D. L. 2.44, quoted above) contains Demetrius's calculation of Socrates' birth-year and age at death. Its subject matter certainly encourages its inclusion in the *Socrates*, but this fragment has been preserved through the medium of Apollodorus's *Chronicles*; Apollodorus nowhere, however, explicitly cites the *Socrates*, yet his acquaintance with Demetrius's *List of Archons* is demonstrable (see D. L. 2.7 = Dem. F94), and it is thus quite possible that the *List of Archons* was Apollodorus's source of the information again here. The other fragment in question details the date of the archonship of Aristides (thus Dem. F103 = Plut. *Arist.* 5.9–10); its material is patently suited to the *List*, but it is usually assigned instead to the *Socrates* because Plutarch cites the latter work at *Arist.* 1.2.³² The nature of these two fragments suggests that there was possibly a significant overlap between the *Socrates* and the *List of Archons*: the *List of Archons* seems to have shared with the *Socrates* an interest in philosophers, while—more importantly in this context—the *Socrates* seems to have reflected some of the chronographic interests of Demetrius's *List of Archons*.

Once again, viewed in the context of these other fragments of Demetrius's writings, the contentious fragments about Democritus, Heraclitus, and Anaxagoras in the *Socrates* may betray a concern not for Athens's antagonism towards intellectuals, but rather a concern for the establishment of dates, and of social and philosophical relationships. The role of these philosophers in the *Socrates* may have been simply to establish the starting point of philosophy in Athens, and to mark the transfer of that discipline from the shores of Ionia to the city that was to become its greatest abode: hence Demetrius's interest in noting which philosophers had come to Athens—and which, like Heraclitus, had not. There may, however, have been a more specific reason for their inclusion. The contemporaneity of Democritus and Socrates, for example, is known to have given rise to questions about whether the two had known each other personally, and Demetrius's belief that Democritus had not visited Athens

³² This is not to argue that the discussion of Aristides' archonship had no place in the *Socrates*. The Peripatetics were keen to establish the relationship between Aristides the Just and Myrto, whom they believed to have married Socrates (see above, 402–3); Demetrius's chronological fixing of Aristides' life may have been motivated, at least in part, by this question. The inclusion of such material in the *Socrates* points rather to a continuity of material between the *Socrates* and the *List of Archons*.

(Dem. F108 = D. L. 9.37) will have had a direct impact on that question; it is notably in the broad context of just this question that Diogenes Laertius cites Demetrius.³³ Questions about the relationship between philosophers may also be the crux of the fragment concerning Anaxagoras (Dem. F107). Demetrius's statement that Anaxagoras came "within an ace of danger" at Athens may have belonged to a temporal discussion, for Anaxagoras's departure from Athens was prompted by that putative danger; such establishment of Anaxagoras's *floruit* will have allowed Demetrius to trace his philosophical associations. Notably, the linking in Dem. F107 of οὗτος back to Anaxagoras (a link which, as suggested above, Diogenes Laertius has misleadingly incorporated into his own discussion of Diogenes of Apollonia at 9.57) hints that the preceding line in Diogenes Laertius' text, with its clear determination of the temporal relationship between Diogenes and Anaxagoras—Diogenes of Apollonia "lived at the same time as Anaxagoras" (ἦν δὲ τοῖς χρόνοις κατ' Ἀναξαγόραν)—is also of Phalerean origin.³⁴ The figure of Anaxagoras may, furthermore, have occupied a vital place in Demetrius's treatment of Socrates' life, for the tradition known to Diogenes Laertius (2.45) that made Socrates a pupil of Anaxagoras may derive from Demetrius of Phalerum; at 2.45 Diogenes Laertius has, after all, just cited Demetrius and his intermediary, Apollodorus, for detail on the timing of the death of Socrates.

All this argues for a reassessment of the place of Demetrius's work within the literary traditions of antiquity. As a pivotal text in the creation of a story of Athenian hostility towards philosophers, a story poised to counterbalance the strident anti-intellectualism (voiced albeit perhaps by a minority) in Demetrius's own day, the *Socrates* is on shaky ground: the remaining fragments simply do not admit the conclusion that Demetrius fabricated or elaborated a history of Athenian antagonism. The onus is on those who, with Dover, wish to challenge the tradition of Athens' anti-intellectual behavior, to find another influential medium for its construction and transmission.

In Demetrius's mapping of the historical circumstances of Socrates' life, we can discern instead a writer moulded by the historicizing interests of the Peripatos and informed by an Aristotelian approach to research. His concentration on the dates, events, and social connections of his subject echoes interests manifest in Aristotle's own works (the discussion of Solon's background in Aristotle's *Ath. Pol.* 5.3 affords comparison here³⁵); this debt to the Peripatos

³³ In Demetrius's claim, Freeman 1953: 291 sees further a defence of Socrates against the implication that he had either acted with disdain towards Democritus, or failed to recognise his talent.

³⁴ For chronological detail, see the appendix below.

³⁵ I thank one of the anonymous reviewers of this article for this comparison.

extends to Demetrius's specific choice of particular subject matter, for at least one issue touched upon in the *Socrates*, namely Socrates' marital liaisons, had been widely investigated by that school.³⁶ Again a clear product of Peripatetic schooling is Demetrius's empirical methodology, which is to be seen most clearly in his amassing of evidentiary proof for Aristides' affluence (Plut. *Arist.* 1.1ff = Dem. F102, in which Demetrius lists a Phalerean estate, tenure of the eponymous archonship, an ostracism and choregic tripods).

On this basis, the *Socrates* claims a place in the tradition of Peripatetic historical endeavor; it may even claim a place in the forefront of Peripatetic biographical writings alongside Aristoxenus's *Socrates*.³⁷ With his historical/biographical research, Demetrius assuredly forged a path for the exploration of historical data against which the claims and assertions of other Socratic traditions, such as those of Xenophon and Plato could be measured. In some of its manifestations, the information-gathering of the Peripatos has served later scholarship ill. One thinks here of the tendency among some of its students to search out biographical detail, where none was intended and when no other sources were available, in the fictions composed by poets, dramatists and philosophers.³⁸ It is probably to just this tendency that Heraclitus owes the demise credited to him in the biographical tradition, with the philosopher who had stated that corpses are worth less than dung being made to end his own life buried under a pile of ordure! But such distortions are of a rather different, and perhaps less insidious, nature than that which Dover would have us impute to Demetrius. From those distortions, he must be exonerated on the existing evidence.

APPENDIX

The reconstruction of the temporal relationships between philosophers envisaged by Demetrius is complicated by the problems that beset the following fragment from his *List of Archons* on the life of Anaxagoras (D. L. 2.7 = Dem. F94):

³⁶ Apparently it was Aristotle who first linked Socrates with Myrto: so Ath. 556a, and implicitly at D.L. 2.26, although Plutarch *Arist.* 27.3 expresses scepticism about the Aristotelian provenance of the work (the treatise *On Being Well-born*) in which the liaison with Myrto was treated. Aristotle's claim was apparently taken up by a number of Peripatetic writers (including Callisthenes, Satyrus, Aristoxenus, and Demetrius himself) keen to establish Myrto's exact relationship to the famous Aristides.

³⁷ Momigliano 1971: 67–68, 77 was reluctant to view Demetrius's *Socrates* as a biography as such, although the possibility is entertained, and a biography of Demosthenes by Demetrius seems to be attested by Dion. Hal. *De Demos.* 53.

³⁸ Such a tradition of fabricating biographical details for the lives of poets is thoroughly treated by Lefkowitz 1981.

Λέγεται δὲ κατὰ τὴν Ξέρξου διάβασιν εἴκοσιν ἐτῶν εἶναι, βεβιωκέναι δὲ ἑβδομήκοντα δύο. φησὶ δ' Ἀπολλόδωρος ἐν τοῖς Χρονικοῖς γεγενῆσθαι αὐτὸν τῇ ἑβδομηκοστῇ Ὀλυμπιάδι, τεθνηκέναι δὲ τῷ πρώτῳ ἔτει τῆς ἑβδομηκοστῆς ὀγδόης. ἤρξατο δὲ φιλοσοφεῖν Ἀθήνησιν ἐπὶ Καλλίου, ἐτῶν εἴκοσιν ὧν, ὥς φησι Δημήτριος ὁ Φαληρεὺς ἐν τῇ τῶν Ἀρχόντων ἀναγραφῇ, ἔνθα καὶ φασιν αὐτὸν ἐτῶν διατρίψαι τριάκοντα.

It is stated that he [Anaxagoras] was twenty years old at the time of Xerxes' crossing and that he lived to the age of seventy-two. Apollodorus in his *Chronicles* says that he was born in the seventieth Olympiad and died in the first year of the †seventy–eighth†. He took up philosophy at Athens at the time of Callias, when twenty years old, as Demetrius of Phalerum says in his *List of Archons*, and they also say that he stayed there for thirty years.

The dates of Anaxagoras's life are desperately confused, and this obviously corrupt passage does little to clarify the issues. The first year of the seventy-eighth Olympiad (468/67 B.C.E.) can scarcely have witnessed the death of a man born around 500 B.C.E. and noted for his longevity. The information here attributed to Demetrius of Phalerum—information mediated through Apollodorus, as Mansfeld (1979) has shown—also requires correction, for Callias was archon 456/55 B.C.E., and Apollodorus can scarcely have accepted both that Anaxagoras was a mere twenty in his archonship and that he was twenty at the age of Xerxes' crossing. One solution is to change Callias to Calliades (archon 480/79 B.C.E.),³⁹ but Mansfeld argues forcefully, on literary and historical grounds, that the reading Callias is correct, and that it is the following clause that should be emended. Mansfeld's proposed emendation ἐτῶν εἴκοσιν <ἐκεῖ διατρίβ>ων ὥς φησι Δημήτριος ὁ Φαληρεὺς would set the *duration* of Anaxagoras's stay at around twenty years (thus roughly 456/55 to 436/35 B.C.E.).⁴⁰

If Mansfeld's 1979 proposed emendation correctly reflects Demetrius's beliefs, Demetrius may have located Anaxagoras's Athenian period rather later than Plato apparently did, for Plato's Socrates seems to have been acquainted with Anaxagoras only through his books (*Phaedo* 97b–99c, cf *Apol.* 26d). These dates would certainly have allowed Demetrius to make Socrates a pupil of Anaxagoras, for Demetrius believed Socrates to have been born in

³⁹ So Taylor 1917: 81; Jacoby 1926 on *FGrHist.* 228 F2; Woodbury 1981: 306–7.

⁴⁰ This tentative emendation does involve the grammatical infelicity of making διατρίβειν govern a genitive case. Diogenes Laertius is certainly familiar with the classical construction with accusative (thus at 5.78); he does, however, couple a genitive with this verb within the very passage in question (2.7), as Mansfeld 1979: 30n59 already notes, and the genitive is so used in post-classical Greek: see Blass, Debrunner, and Funk 1961: 99–100. (§186 (2)).

469/68 B.C.E. (D. L. 2.45 = Dem. F109); they would, moreover, have allowed Demetrius to have argued, as suggested above, for the synchronisation of the lives of Diogenes and Anaxagoras, since the scanty evidence locates Diogenes' stay in Athens *ca.* 440–430 B.C.E.⁴¹

WORKS CITED

- Blass, F. & Debrunner, A. 1961. *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*. Trans. R. W. Funk. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Calabi Limentani, I. 1964. *Plutarchi Vita Aristidis*. Florence: La Nuova Italia editrice.
- Chroust, A.-H. 1957. *Socrates, Man and Myth; The Two Socratic Apologies of Xenophon*. London: Routledge.
- Derenne, E. 1976. *Les procès d'impiété intentés aux philosophes à Athènes au Vme et au IVme siècles avant J.C.* New York: Arno. Original publication Liège, 1930.
- Diels, H. & Kranz, W. 1954. *Die Fragmente der Vorsokratiker*. Berlin: Weidmann.
- Dittmar, H. 1976. *Aischines von Sphetos Studien zur Literaturgeschichte der Sokratiker; untersuchungen und Fragmente*. New York: Arno. Original publication Berlin, 1912.
- Dover, K. J. 1976. "The Freedom of the Intellectual in Greek Society." *Talanta* 7: 24–54.
- Fitton, J. W. 1970. "That was no lady, that was" *CQ* 20: 56–66.
- Fornara, C. W. 1966. "Sources of Plutarch's *An seni sit gerenda res publica*." *Philologus* 110: 119–27.
- Fortenbaugh, W. W. & Schütrumpf, E. 2000. *Demetrius of Phalerum: Text, Translation, and Discussion*. Rutgers Studies in Classical Humanities, 9. New Brunswick/London: Transaction Publishers.
- Freeman, K. 1953. *The Pre-Socratic Philosophers: A Companion to Diels Fragmente der Vorsokratiker*. 3rd ed. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Gottschalk, H. B. 1972. "Notes on the Wills of the Peripatetic Scholarchs." *Hermes* 100: 314–42.
- . 2000. "A Politician among Philosophers." In Fortenbaugh, W. W. & Schütrumpf, E. ed. *Demetrius of Phalerum. Text, Translation and Discussion*. Rutgers Studies in Classical Humanities, 9. New Brunswick/London: Transaction Publishers. 367–80.
- Guthrie, W. K. C. 1968. *A History of Greek Philosophy* 2. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kirk, G. S. 1954. *Heraclitus of Ephesus: The Cosmic Fragments*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- . Raven, J. E. & Schofield, M. 1983. *The Pre-Socratic Philosophers: A Critical History with a Selection of Texts*. 2nd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Jacoby, F. 1926. *Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker* 3b. Leiden: Brill.
- Kassel, R. & Austin, C. 1991. *Poetae Comici Graeci*. 2 Berlin/New York: W. de Gruyter.

⁴¹ Thus Kirk, Raven, and Schofield 1983: 434, noting the parody of Diogenes' teaching by Aristophanes. The continuities of thought from Anaxagoras to Diogenes in the concept of *voûç* certainly seems to have encouraged the assumption of a link between the two by Demetrius's close friend and colleague, Theophrastus (see Theoph. *Phys. Op.* F2 = Diels/Kranz 64 A5).

- Lefkowitz, M.R. 1981. *The Lives of the Greek Poets*. London: Duckworth.
- Livingstone, N. 2001. *A Commentary on Isocrates' Busiris*. Leiden/Boston: Brill.
- Long, A. A. 1988. "Socrates in Hellenistic Philosophy." *CQ* 38: 150–71.
- Mansfeld, J. 1979. "The Chronology of Anaxagoras' Athenian Period and the Date of his Trial, Part I." *Mnemosyne* 32: 39–69.
- . 1980. "The Chronology of Anaxagoras' Athenian Period and the Date of his Trial, Part II." *Mnemosyne* 33: 17–95.
- Momigliano, A. 1971. *The Development of Greek Biography; Four Lectures*. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press.
- Mouraviev, S. N. 1985. "Marginalia Heraclitea." *REG* 98: 129–32.
- Mulvany, C. M. 1926. "Notes on the Legend of Aristotle." *CQ* 20: 155–67.
- Ostwald, M. 1986. *From Popular Sovereignty to the Sovereignty of Law: Law, Society, and Politics in Fifth-Century Athens*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Piccirilli, L. 1983. "Demetrio Falereo e l'arcontato di Aristide." *ASNP* 13: 659–72.
- Rose, V. 1966. *Aristotelis qui ferebantur librorum fragmenta*. Stuttgart: Teubner. Original publication 1886.
- Sansone, D. 1989. *Plutarch: Lives—Aristeides and Cato*. Warminster: Aris & Phillips.
- Taylor, A. E. 1917. "On the Date of the Trial of Anaxagoras." *CQ* 11: 81–87.
- Tritle, L. A. 1988. *Phocion the Good*. London/New York: Croom Helm.
- Wallace, R. W. 1996. "Book Burning in Ancient Athens." In Wallace, R. W. & Harris, E. M. ed. *Transitions to Empire: Essays in Greco-Roman History, 360–146 B.C. in Honor of E. Badian*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press. 226–40.
- Wehrli, F. 1967. *Die Schule des Aristoteles 2 Aristoxenos*. Basel: Schwabe.
- . 1968. *Die Schule des Aristoteles 4 Demetrios von Phaleron*. Basel: Schwabe.
- Von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, U. 1893. *Aristoteles und Athen* 1. Berlin: Weidemann.
- Woodbury, L. 1973. "Socrates and the Daughter of Aristides." *Phoenix* 27: 7–25.
- . 1981. "Anaxagoras and Athens." *Phoenix* 35: 295–315.