

reviews of tribute with their attendant judicial proceedings.¹⁰ After making the point that all these duties are indispensable, and that they must be done on a yearly basis, he slides in 3.6 from the administration of civil law to the criminal courts, considering their size in 3.7 and rounding off the discussion with an explicit statement of a point already made implicitly at 3.2, that the large number of Athenian festivals restricts the number of days available for public business.

This outline of the argument should help to clarify the nature of the military offence at issue in 3.5: it ought not to recur annually as a matter of procedure, and it ought to be a serious matter, but it should not be part of the regular work of the criminal courts.¹¹ Desertion (*ἀσπρτεία*) seems a poor candidate on these grounds, and something to do with the generals much more promising, hence Lipsius' *στρατηγικὰς* (sc. *δίκας*).¹² For the use with *δίκαι* of an adjective ending in *-ικος* defining (in a non-technical manner) the object or area of interest one may compare the regular expressions *φονικὰ δίκαι* (*LSJ* s.v. *φονικός* II), *ἐμπορικὰ δίκαι* (*Dem.* 7.2, 35.46, [Arist.] *Ath. Pol.* 59.5) and *μεταλλικὰ δίκαι* (*Dem.* 37.36, [Arist.] *Ath. Pol.* 59.5).

This suggestion can be supported by two considerations: first, the same procedure, *εἰσαγγελία*, was likely to be used both in cases of dereliction by generals and for the other offences mentioned in the sentence, unusual outrages and acts of impiety such as the mutilation of the herms and the parodying of the Mysteries; secondly, prosecutions of generals, usually by *εἰσαγγελία*, show a sharp rise in the early years of the Peloponnesian War.¹³

Lipsius' neglected suggestion deserves to be adopted. The only drawback is the need to understand the cognate noun *δίκας* (although this did not worry either Lipsius or Kalinka); the emendation might therefore be improved by reading *στρατηγικὰς δίκας* in full,¹⁴ on the assumption that the noun has dropped out by haplography and so caused confusion as to the significance of the adjective.

University of Leeds

ROGER BROCK
MALCOLM HEATH

THE COMMUNISM OF PROPERTY: A NOTE ON ARISTOTLE, *POLITICS* 1263a8–15

Aristotle begins his criticism of the communism of property in Plato's *Republic*¹ with the following (which I have divided into two sections for convenient reference):

(i) *ἐτέρων μὲν οὖν ὄντων τῶν γεωργούντων ἄλλος ἂν εἴη τρόπος καὶ ῥάων, αὐτῶν δ' αὐτοῖς διαπονούτων τὰ περὶ τὰς κτήσεις πλείους ἂν παρέχοι δυσκολίας.* (ii) *καὶ γὰρ ἐν ταῖς*

¹⁰ For the provision for appeal by allied states against their tribute assessments, see R. Meiggs and D. M. Lewis, *A Selection of Greek Historical Inscriptions*² (Oxford, 1988) 69.12–15 with commentary, Antiphon fr. 25–33, 49–56 Thalheim.

¹¹ Technically, *ἀσπρτεία* and related offences were not tried by a regular court, but by a jury of the soldiers involved (D. M. MacDowell, *The Law in Classical Athens* [London, 1978], p. 160), though this might still have been considered representative of the demos as a whole.

¹² E. Kalinka *Die pseudoxenophontische ΑΘΗΝΑΙΩΝ ΠΟΛΙΤΕΙΑ* (Leipzig and Berlin, 1913) ad loc. made some of these points, but responded with the neologism *παραστρατηγίας*; Lipsius' suggestion is both more elegant and closer to the reading of the manuscripts.

¹³ See M. H. Hansen, *Eisangelia* (Odense, 1975), for the procedure and a register of cases (esp. nos. 6–10); on prosecutions of generals, n.b. W. K. Pritchett, *The Greek State at War II* (Berkeley, 1974), pp. 4–33.

¹⁴ For the formula in full cf. *Dem.* 35.46, *Arist. Pol.* 1275 b8–11.

¹ Aristotle criticizes Plato's *Republic* in *Politics* II 1–5, with the bulk of *Politics* II 5 being devoted to the communism of property. Although the critique in *Politics* II 5 is ostensibly aimed at the communism of property of the *Republic*, the *Republic* is most likely just a springboard to

ἀπολαύσει καὶ ἐν τοῖς ἔργοις μὴ γινομένων ἴσων ἀλλ' ἀνίσων ἀναγκαῖον ἐγκλήματα γίνεσθαι πρὸς τοὺς ἀπολαύοντας μὲν ἢ λαμβάνοντας πολλά, ὀλίγα δὲ πονοῦντας τοῖς ἐλάττω μὲν λαμβάνουσι, πλείω δὲ πονοῦσιν.

- (i) Now if the farmers were others [than the citizens],² the manner (in which property would be managed, cf. 1262b37–38) would be different and easier; but if they (i.e. the citizens) do the hard work themselves, the matters connected with possessions will lead to greater discontent. (ii) For in fact, when in the enjoyment [of things]³ and in work they are not equal, but unequal, accusations will necessarily be raised against those enjoying or taking many things while labouring little, by those taking less while labouring more. (*Politics* 1263a8–15)

Of the two sections, (i) is the more problematic, since the Greek is especially ambiguous. I believe, however, that the standard interpretation (which is represented in the above translation) is correct, at least to the following extent: I take (i) to be saying that Plato makes the farmers (and other workers) citizens (i.e. the iron and bronze class), whereas the situation would be easier (i.e. the city would be easier to govern) if the labourers were not citizens but slaves, serfs, or the like. (Part (ii) then describes why this is so, i.e. it describes what grave problem will be likely to arise if the workers are citizens.) This reading seems to be confirmed by what Aristotle writes elsewhere: when describing his own best city, he says that the farmers should be slaves or barbarians, not citizens (1329a25–26, 1330a25–31). Similarly, he says that the fighting class and the farming element should be different, i.e. they should be citizens and non-citizens respectively (1329a40–b2, 1329b36–38). Finally, in his view slaves (unlike citizens) are in no position (or are much less likely) to complain about unfair or unjust treatment.⁴

As for (ii), in a sense the point Aristotle is making is quite straightforward: when property is held in common, some citizens will do more work than others, but will receive only the same as those who do less (which is less than those who work hard deserve), and this will lead to accusations and discontent.⁵

a more general critique of any version of the communism of property. (See *Politics* 1263a3–8, where Aristotle lists different property arrangements.)

² Aristotle says 'farmers' but he probably means 'farmers, and any others who do hard work.'

Newman, in a note on *ἐτέρων*, quite correctly points out: "'others than the citizens," not, I incline to think, "others than the owners," though the two meanings do not lie far apart.' W. Newman, *The Politics of Aristotle* (Oxford, 1887), ii 246. Cf. E. Schütrumpf, *Aristoteles, Politik* (Berlin, 1991), ii 17, 195.

³ *Ἀπόλαυσις* means 'act of enjoying,' 'fruition,' 'result of enjoying,' 'pleasure,' (LSJ s.v. *ἀπόλαυσις*), and here most likely refers to the enjoyment of or benefit from some thing. See Schütrumpf, op. cit., ii. 195.

⁴ Newman (op. cit. ii 246) writes:

If those who till the soil are not citizens but a separate and subordinate class ..., disagreements would be less likely to result from the citizens holding property in common, for, as the citizens would not work themselves, individual citizens would not be in a position to compare their own hard work and small recompense with the easy work and large recompense of others, and thus one main source of disagreement among the citizens would be removed.

Newman is right. Slaves are under the control of others and thus have to do what they are told. Moreover, according to Aristotle, there is no genuine justice or injustice in one's relation to one's slaves. (See *Politics* 1254a8–15, *Nicomachean Ethics* 1134b9–11.)

This arrangement is easier to manage, and Aristotle prefers it. Nevertheless, he does not hold that it is entirely unproblematic. At 1269a34–b12, he points out that slaves, serfs, and helots sometimes revolt, and that generally the supervision of them is troublesome. The solution seems to be to find the middle path between being too lax with them, which leads to arrogance and a belief among them that they merit an equal standing, and being too harsh, which leads them to hate, and revolt against, their masters.

⁵ There is an important question that cannot be answered within the limited scope of this brief note: is Aristotle criticizing the communism of property here simply because he thinks it is

But the question I want to answer is this: whom does Aristotle have in mind? I.e. by whom, exactly, is this discontent felt? Or to put it another way, who will be making these accusations, and against whom? In answering this question, I part company with the standard reading of this passage.

The standard interpretation of *Politics* 1263a8–15 holds that Aristotle is referring to the iron and bronze citizens of the *Republic* on the one hand, and the gold and silver citizens on the other. On this view, Aristotle believes that because the iron and bronze citizens do the hard work—the farming, smithing, etc.—whereas the gold and silver do not, and because the gold and silver men enjoy or have more than the iron and bronze, the iron and bronze citizens will feel resentment towards the gold and silver citizens (whereas if the work proper to the iron and bronze class were done by slaves, there would not be this problem, or there would be less of a problem).⁶ If this interpretation were correct, Aristotle *should* be criticized on the grounds that the gold and silver citizens do *not* have or enjoy more than the other citizens. The gold citizens (the rulers) in a sense rule against their will (*Republic* 517c–520d); and, although the gold and silver citizens receive a ‘wage’ for necessities from the iron and bronze men (416d–e, 463b), in general they own nothing, whereas the iron and bronze citizens do in some sense (however limited, regulated, controlled) have (or have contact with) possessions and property (369e–371e, 373b–d, 416e–417a).⁷

There is, however, a more plausible interpretation of *Politics* 1263a8–15. Aristotle most likely has in mind not *all* of the citizens of the *Republic*, but the iron and bronze citizens alone. Under a communism of property, all *workers* would have the same claim to things (i.e. they would share the property in common), yet some workers would have done more work than others. As a result, these workers would get less than they deserve, whereas others would get more, and this, Aristotle claims, is likely to lead to accusations and discontent among the workers. (See *Politics* 1267a37–41, 1302b10–14, *Nicomachean Ethics* 1131a22–27.) So unless Aristotle had little or no grasp of Plato’s *Republic* (a view I see no reason for accepting),⁸ my interpretation of *Politics* 1263a8–15 is surely the better of the two.⁹

One interesting and important implication of this interpretation (there may be others) is this: we can conclude that, at least with respect to the distribution of property, Aristotle is most emphatically *not* a proto-Marxist (nor Marx an

impractical (i.e. that it leads to greater discontent, which is inimical to the city’s unity), or, beyond this, does he hold that such a system is unjust as well? I argue for the latter interpretation in ‘Aristotle on Property’, *Review of Metaphysics* 46 (June, 1993), 805–7.

⁶ For examples of those who accept this interpretation, see the following: Newman, op. cit. ii 246–7; F. Susemihl and R. Hicks, *The Politics of Aristotle, Books I–V* (London, 1894), p. 233; E. Bornemann, ‘Aristoteles’ Urteil über Platons politische Theorie’, *Philologus* 79 (1923), 141–2; E. Barker, *The Politics of Aristotle* (Oxford, 1958), pp. 55–6; J. Aubonnet, *Aristote, Politique: Livre I et II* (Paris, 1960), p. 138. See also Schütrumpf, op. cit. ii 195.

⁷ A more common objection to this criticism of Plato—levelled against Aristotle by, for example, all those mentioned in the previous note—is that Aristotle assumes there will be a communism of property among the iron and bronze class when, it is claimed, this is obviously not the case. Aristotle, however, says that the *Republic* is unclear on this point (1264a11–17), and he proceeds as if property was common among the lower class. (Perhaps doing so provides a better springboard into his own views.) I have recently argued (‘Aristotle on the Extent of the Communism in Plato’s *Republic*’, *Ancient Philosophy* 13 [1993]) that Aristotle is right in finding Plato unclear.

⁸ Bornemann, op. cit., passim, seems to hold such a view of Aristotle.

⁹ This interpretation is also more consistent with the general aim of Aristotle’s critique of the communism of property (see n. 1), for if it is correct, then the criticism at *Politics* 1263a8–15 would more plausibly apply to any version of the communism of property (which cannot be said for the traditional interpretation).

Aristotelian) as it is sometimes claimed.¹⁰ For it is clear that Aristotle would reject Marx's famous line from the *Critique of the Gotha Programme*: 'From each according to his ability, to each according to his needs!'

Seton Hall University, NJ, USA

ROBERT MAYHEW

CATULLUS 1.5-7

In this note I wish to reopen discussion of the role of Cornelius Nepos in Catullus' dedicatory poem. The Callimachean features of Catullus' assessment of his own work have been well documented.¹ However I believe that, since this is a poem where Catullus evaluates not only his own work, but also that of Nepos, a closer examination of the latter is called for.

Catullus begins by characterizing the *libellus* he is offering to Cornelius Nepos (1-2). It is charming (*lepidum*) and it is new (*novum*),² but it has also been a work of refined composition, as evinced by the metaphor of the pumice-stone (2). Three qualities are thus established: novelty, charm, and refinement. Catullus asks who should receive this gift, and concludes that it is Cornelius, since he thought that Catullus' trifles had some merit.

It is noticeable, however, that the reason for Catullus' choice of recipient is the goodwill shown to his poetry by Nepos. There is no suggestion that the qualities mentioned in the first two lines are also features of the recipient's work. Indeed, Catullus continues by characterizing Nepos' writings in quite a different fashion. In line 5, emphasizing the seriousness of the undertaking, Catullus explains that Nepos' generous opinion of his poetry was manifested at the time when he had embarked on a literary enterprise of his own. The positive Callimachean aspects of lines 5-7, such as the association of Nepos' work (his *Chronica*) with *doctrina* and *labor*, and the implications of literary innovation suggested by *ausus es unus Italorum*³ have been identified by Cairns (153-4).⁴ However, it is worth examining these lines more closely

¹⁰ See, for example, M. Nussbaum, 'Aristotelian Social Democracy', in Douglas, B., Mara, G. and Richardson, H. (eds.), *Liberalism and the Good* (New York, 1990), 203-52; and, 'Nature, Function, and Capability: Aristotle on Political Distribution', in McCarthy, G. (ed.), *Marx and Aristotle: Nineteenth Century German Social Theory and Classical Antiquity* (Lanham, MD, 1992).

¹ For discussions of Callimachean influences on Catullus 1 see J. P. Elder, 'Catullus 1, his Poetic Creed and Nepos', *HSCP* 71 (1966), 143-9 (henceforth referred to as 'Elder'), F. Cairns, 'Catullus 1', *Mnemosyne* 22 (1969), 153-8 (henceforth 'Cairns'), and B. Latta, 'Zu Catullus Carmen 1', *MH* 29 (1972), 201-13 (henceforth 'Latta'). See also G. P. Goold, 'Two Notes on Catullus 1', *LCM* 6.9 (November, 1981), 233-8 (henceforth 'Goold') and B. Arkins, 'Further Thoughts on Catullus 1', *LCM* 8.2 (February, 1983), 18-20 (henceforth 'Arkins').

² For the programmatic aspect of this word, see Elder 147, who compares Cicero's use of the term 'poetae novi', on which see N. B. Crowther, 'ΟΙ ΝΕΩΤΕΡΟΙ, Poetae Novi, and Cantores Euphorionis', *CQ* 20 (1970), 335-8, C. Tuplin, 'Cantores Euphorionis', *PLLS* 1 (1976), 1-23, and R. O. A. M. Lyne, 'The Neoteric Poets', *CQ* 28 (1978), 167-87.

³ Compare the tone of Propertius 3.1.3-4 'primus ego ingredior puro de fonte sacerdos / Italia per Graios orgia ferre choras' and Horace C. 3.30.10ff 'dicar ... / ... / ... / princeps Aeolium carmen ad Italos / deduxisse modos'.

⁴ Cairns 153: 'Catullus' praise of the *Chronica* is couched (albeit informally) in the language of Alexandrian literary criticism and shows clearly that Catullus is lauding the *Chronica* as a work conforming to the canons of that school and possessing all the standard Alexandrian virtues.'