

431–25 B.C., and that he had claimed that support for the proposal could be found in an oracle.¹⁰ This could have been misrepresented by his enemies as an attempt to ‘break up’ the city.

Thus the expression ‘serving up new kinds of fish without taking away any of the old’, when translated into historical terms, very probably means ‘increasing the overall area enclosed by the city walls in the new circuit, but not excluding from it any of the quarters previously contained within the old circuit’.

The Sausage-Seller’s point in these seven lines is that Themistocles literally made the city bigger in three specific particulars; with higher rebuilt walls, an associated fortified harbour, and a larger enclosed area. By contrast Cleon has tried to make it smaller. This point is made through the medium of a consumption metaphor, which itself assumes the traditional tripartite division of the victuals. In these terms, Themistocles provided the city with a full three-item lunch. By contrast Paphlagon/Cleon cheats the citizens of the gastronomic goodies that are rightfully theirs. He consumes them himself, and stunts their growth. This charge is implied by contrast here, but is made explicitly at e.g. 824–7, 1217–24.

University of Exeter

JOHN MARR

¹⁰ For Cleon’s apparent propensity for citing oracles to support his political proposals cf. *Knights* 109–17, 797–800, 966–1097, 1229–48.

A NOTE ON PSEUDO-XENOPHON, *THE CONSTITUTION OF THE ATHENIANS* 1.11*

ὅπου γὰρ ναυτικὴ δύναμις ἐστίν, ἀπὸ χρημάτων ἀνάγκη τοῖς ἀνδραπόδοις δουλεύειν, ἵνα ἡ λαμβάνων μὲν πρᾶττη† τὰς ἀποφοράς, καὶ ἐλευθέρους ἀφιέναι.

Amongst the numerous difficult passages of the anonymous *Constitution of the Athenians* the present one, as a whole, has particularly tenaciously resisted attempts at interpretation or elucidation in spite of progress made as to a number of details. One major obstacle to a real understanding of this sentence (but by no means the only one) is the corrupt phrase in the final clause. All the main *codices* read λαμβάνων μὲν πρᾶττη, which obviously does not make any sense and thus gives rise to many conjectures. Bowersock¹ as opposed to his various predecessors adopted an agnostic view and does not add another conjecture to the existing bulk.

In this note I will try to explain the single parts of the sentence and tie their meaning down in such a way that a probable and reasonable understanding of the text of the *whole* period can be established, that is to say inclusive of the corrupt passage. I will not suggest another conjecture. It would be more useful to show how the overall meaning can sensibly be and partly already has been confirmed, so that an understanding of what must have been the general content of the *locus corruptus* suggests itself, an understanding compatible with quite a few of the proposed conjectures and not requiring one in particular.

After having dealt with the ban on corporal punishment in 1.10 the anonymous author moves on to the *τροφή* of the slaves, confining his argument to the slaves and not alluding to the metics as before. Perhaps the best discussion of our sentence is that

* My thanks to the anonymous referee for many helpful comments.

¹ Text: G. W. Bowersock, *HSCPh* 71 (1966), 33–55 or the same in the Loeb Xenophon edition vol. VII: *Scripta Minora* (London, 1968). Cf. also G. Serra, *La costituzione degli Ateniesi dello Pseudo-Senofonte* (Rome, 1979).

of Rupprecht,² whose argument is, however, flawed by the fact that he regards the part from *ἵνα* onwards as an interpolation.

First, it is essential to consider the proper place of *ἀπὸ χρημάτων*. There are two possibilities: one can either punctuate after *ἐστίν* or before *ἀνάγκη*. The *codices* suggest the latter (accepted by many of the older editors like Kirchhoff, Müller-Strübing, Rühl, though already corrected by Camerarius), obtaining the sense *ναυτικὴ δύναμις τρέφεται ἀπὸ χρημάτων*.³ This is rejected by e.g. Kalinka, Marchant, Gelzer, Rupprecht, Frisch and Bowersock⁴ because the Athenian naval power does *not* differ from others in so far as *it alone* is dependent on *χρήματα*; the same holds true for any naval power. Thus one has to fall back on the former possibility: 'for where there is a naval power'.

Now the logical subject of *δουλεύειν* must be ascertained. The slaves or the (Athenian) masters? As opposed to those translations which take the slaves to be the subject,⁵ a much better sense can be gained if one chooses the other option, considering the historical background. The author tries to explain why the (Athenian) masters concede so many liberties to their slaves. The reason is not, as the final clause will show, philanthropy, but the fact that they want to make money out of their slaves' work. For it was a common practice at Athens⁶ that house-slaves not needed in the household worked on various paid jobs outside the house and had to give their masters a contribution of the money they earned. Thus the (Athenian) masters were to some extent economically dependent on their slaves, which meant as a consequence a certain freedom of action on the slaves' side. *τοῖς ἀνδραπόδοις* can then be understood as an indirect object to *δουλεύειν*:⁷ assuming a rhetorical hyperbole, one could therefore say that the (Athenian) masters are slaves to their slaves, that is to say they cannot prohibit them from (correspondingly hyperbolic) *τρυφᾶν* and *μεγαλοπρεπῶς διαιτᾶσθαι* (*Ath.* 1.11.) because they are actually too large a factor in their masters' income. A reference to the slaves as subject is also unlikely because of the use of the word *δουλεύειν*, a word which signifies only a passive state of dependence and hardly ever an active performance; this latter, however, would have to be the meaning here, if the word referred to the slaves.

The sense of *ἀπὸ χρημάτων*⁸ can now also fully be understood: it can be agreed that as a result of money many things are accomplished in Athens, and the more money there is the more things are done.⁹ A further confirmation concerning *δουλεύειν* is provided by the last part of the sentence: undoubtedly the logical subject

² E. Rupprecht, *Die Schrift vom Staate der Athener* (*Klio* Beiheft 44; Leipzig, 1939), pp. 60–8.

³ N.b. Thucydides 1.81.4: *εἰ μὴ γὰρ ἡ ναυσὶ κρατήσομεν ἢ τὰς προσόδους ἀφαιρήσομεν ἀφ' ὧν τὸ ναυτικὸν τρέφουσιν,...*

⁴ E. Kalinka, *Die Pseudoxenophontische ΑΘΗΝΑΙΩΝ ΠΟΛΙΤΕΙΑ* (Leipzig/Berlin, 1913); E. C. Marchant (ed.), *Xenophontis opera omnia* V (Oxford, 1919); K. I. Gelzer, *Die Schrift vom Staate der Athener* (*Hermes-ES* Heft 3; Berlin, 1937), p. 111; E. Rupprecht (n. 2), pp. 60–1; H. Frisch, *The Constitution of the Athenians, a Philological-Historical Analysis of Pseudo-Xenophon's Treatise De Re Republica Atheniensium* (Copenhagen, 1942); G. W. Bowersock (1966).

⁵ E.g. E. Kalinka (n. 4), p. 69, or H. Frisch (n. 4), p. 17.

⁶ The evidence is collected by E. Kalinka (n. 4), pp. 129–32. Cf. more recently de Ste. Croix, *CSAGW*, p. 563 n. 9.

⁷ Cf. the parallel in Plato, *Republic* 569a: ..., τότε αὐτὸς (sc. the δῆμος) δουλεύων τοῖς αὐτοῦ δοῦλοις... (i.e. the son, who, although an adult, is still supported by his father).

⁸ Cf. LSJ s.v. *ἀπό* III 6.

⁹ Cf. *Ath.* 3.3, ἐγὼ δὲ τοῦτοις ὁμολογήσαιμ' ἂν ἀπὸ χρημάτων πολλὰ διαπράττεσθαι Ἀθήνησι, καὶ ἔτι ἂν πλείω διαπράττεσθαι, εἰ πλείους ἔτι ἐδίδosan ἀργύριον....

of the infinitive is formed by the (Athenian) masters, so that there is no change of subject. Unlike most commentators I wonder whether it would really cause problems if one understood the last three words as referring to an actual setting free of the slaves. Such a literal understanding seems at least possible, since, as the (Athenian) masters on economic grounds have to be slaves of their own slaves, so, on the same economic grounds (*ἀπὸ χρημάτων* must be taken as referring to both *kola*), they are shown to be 'forced' to approve of potential redemptions of their slaves, which are put into effect by the slaves' own money. It must be conceded, however, that, as noted in the case of *δουλεύειν*, so also generally the language of slavery and freedom could well be used hyperbolically as in 1.8–9, 18 and perhaps 3.11 (cf. also 1.10–12, where freedom actually becomes licence).

The parts of the period dealt with so far can be summarized as follows (taking account of the historical background): where many slaves are available, some of them, given the existence of a naval power whose organization is labour-intensive, have to work on various jobs for different purposes and thus earn their own money, and their masters become economically dependent on their salary and can be said to be slaves to their slaves to such an extent that if the slaves so desire and are able to pay for their freedom they even have to set them free.

Within this framework, it should not be too difficult to guess the content of the corrupt clause; two additional hints can be gained from the text: (i) *ἵνα* indicates a purpose, and (ii) *τὰς ἀποφοράς* points at a context including money. Thus it seems fairly manifest that the corrupt passage gives the end which the (Athenian) masters (assuming their being the logical subject because of the fact that they form the logical subject both in the preceding and the following colon) aim at by being slaves to their own slaves. This end was already hinted at by *ἀπὸ χρημάτων ἀνάγκη*, of course, and is now resumed and confirmed along the same lines, as *τὰς ἀποφοράς* shows. Thus the content of the purpose clause must be something like: '... in order that the (Athenian) masters get money from their slaves' work'. Both corrupt words in the passage (*λαμβάνων* and *πράττει*) suit this context very well: the first might be taken to refer to the masters and the second to their slaves.

As regards the *ἵνα*-clause, mention need therefore not be made of the many conjectures that have been suggested, since we can define the meaning without discussing the possible restoration of the actual text. For the final clause reveals at any rate the purpose of the (Athenian) masters' being slaves: they are, quite plainly, after their slaves' money, which the latter earn by their work. It might be worth noting that with the masters' being the subject of the sentence's three parts in question a restoration of *λαμβάνωμεν* would entail a step from generalization—certainly a strong tendency of our author—to (Athenian) reality. To this extent it *does* matter how we restore the text.

So a translation of the whole sentence can be attempted (adopting Marchant's conjecture): 'For where there is a naval power, it is necessary as a result of money that they [formally the masters in general, but clearly pointing at the Athenians] are slaves to the slaves, in order that we [the Athenian masters] get of that which he [the slave] carries on the due payment [for this is the whole purpose of our being slaves of the slaves], and <sc. it is necessary as a result of money> to set them free.'

In my opinion this interpretation not only suits the overall political tendency (polemizing in favour of oligarchy) of the *Constitution of the Athenians* very well, but also very reasonably fits the treatise's style, marked by very harsh transitions as well as leaps of thought, which can be shown, however, to make sense in most cases.