

that Aeschylus has given the Furies in the play.<sup>18</sup> The *Σεμναί* were traditionally offered sacrifices by those who had been acquitted of charges of murder.<sup>19</sup> In the traditional symbolism and even in the scheduling of the historical murder trials, the goddesses assumed a status of fundamental importance. A scholiast to Aeschines (1.188) tells us that

οἱ Ἀρεοπαγῖται τρεῖς πού τοῦ μηνὸς ἡμέρας τὰς φονικὰς δίκας ἐδίκαζον, ἐκάστη τῶν θεῶν μίαν ἡμέραν ἀπονέμοντες.

The Areopagites apparently tried cases of murder on three days of the month, allotting one day to each of the goddesses.

Not only, according to the scholiast's account, was each trial day allocated to one of the Furies; but also the total number of trial days seems to have been based upon the traditional number of their band: three.<sup>20</sup> Insofar as it was one of only two festivals to interrupt the proceedings of these murder trials, the Panathenaia would have been welcomed as a rare and pleasant diversion that filled these unusually sorrowful days of the month with joyful and optimistic celebration.

Thus, the final scene of the *Eumenides* reflects a pattern of custom and festival that would have been familiar to Athenians: at the end of Aeschylus' trilogy, as at the end of the month of Hecatombion in historical Athens, the trial of murder attended by angry spirits of vengeance gives way to a joyful celebration of civic unity.<sup>21</sup>

Yale University

BENJAMIN H. WEAVER

<sup>18</sup> A. H. Sommerstein, *Aeschylus: Eumenides* (Cambridge, 1989), p. 11, points out that Aeschylus is probably innovating here in linking Furies with *Σεμναί*.

<sup>19</sup> ἐνταῦθα θύουσι μὲν ὅσοις ἐν Ἀρείῳ πάγῳ τὴν αἰτίαν ἐξεγένετο ἀπολύσασθαι, θύουσι δὲ καὶ ἄλλως ξένοι τε ὁμοίως καὶ ἄστοί (Paus. 1.28.6). See Sommerstein, pp. 10–11.

<sup>20</sup> Three as the traditional number of the Furies: Schol. in Aeschin. 1.188 ταῖς Σέμναις] τρεῖς ἦσαν, ὧν τὰς μὲν δύο τὰς ἐκατέρωθεν Σκόπας ὁ Πάριος πεποίηκεν ἐκ τῆς λυκνίτου λίθου, τὴν δὲ μέσσην Κάλυμνος; Pol. Fr. 41 (K. Muller, *FHG* iii. 108); see Preller–Robert i. 837.

<sup>21</sup> I would like to thank Heinrich von Staden, A. Thomas Cole, John Dugan, and Brian Fuchs for their helpful suggestions and criticisms.

## HISTORY AS LUNCH: ARISTOPHANES, *KNIGHTS* 810–19

- Πα. οὐκουν δεινὸν ταυτί σε λέγειν δῆτ' ἔστ' ἐμὲ καὶ διαβάλλειν 810  
 πρὸς Ἀθηναίους καὶ τὸν δῆμον, πεποιηκότα πλείονα χρηστά,  
 νῆ τὴν Δήμητρα, Θεμιστοκλέους πολλῶ περὶ τὴν πόλιν ἤδη;  
 Αλ. ὦ πόλις Ἄργους, κλύεθ' οἷα λέγει. σὺ Θεμιστοκλεῖ ἀντιφερίζεις;  
 ὃς ἐποίησεν τὴν πόλιν ἡμῶν μεστὴν εὐρῶν ἐπιχειλῆ, 815  
 καὶ πρὸς τούτοις ἀριστώσῃ τὸν Πειραιᾶ προσέμαξεν,  
 ἀφελὼν τ' οὐδὲν τῶν ἀρχαίων ἰχθύς καινοὺς παρέθηκεν.  
 σὺ δ' Ἀθηναίους ἐζήτησας μικροπολίτας ἀποφῆναι  
 διατειχίζων καὶ χρησιμῶδαν, ὃ Θεμιστοκλεῖ ἀντιφερίζων.  
 κἀκείνος μὲν φεύγει τὴν γῆν, σὺ δ' Ἀχιλλείων ἀπομάττει.

In this passage the Sausage-Seller is commenting disparagingly on the boast of Paphlagon/Cleon that he has done far more good for Athens ('the city') than Themistocles ever did. In lines 814–16 the Sausage-Seller seems to allude to certain laudable actions on the part of Themistocles, which greatly benefitted the city, and in 817–18, by contrast, he sets against these an allegedly deleterious recent proposal/activity of Paphlagon/Cleon.

The allusions, however, are not made in a simple, straightforward fashion. As happens so often in *Knights*, they are set in the context of a metaphor, the terminology

of which applies literally to the consumption of victuals. Perhaps because of this complication commentators have found some difficulty in providing a full and satisfactory explanation of both the metaphor itself, and the historical actions which are, or may be, alluded to through it.

Some elements are clear enough. The specific reference in line 815 to Themistocles' well-attested (cf. Thucydides 1.93.3–7) fortification of the port of Piraeus is explicit (this achievement is also referred to later in the scene, at lines 884–6). Equally plain is the terminology of food and eating in lines 815–16, 'he kneaded the Piraeus into a cake for her (the city) to eat at her lunch'; 'he served her up new kinds of fish'.

But elsewhere there are difficulties and apparent obscurity. Do lines 814 and 816 also allude to specific historical actions of Themistocles? If so, which ones? How does line 814 fit, if it does fit, with the food metaphor in 815–16? None of the earlier twentieth-century commentators<sup>1</sup> are very illuminating on these points. In the most recent edition of the *Knights*, that of A. H. Sommerstein,<sup>2</sup> line 814 is translated as 'he found our city part full of water, and filled her up to the brim' (though in his commentary on the line, p. 187, Sommerstein admits that the words 'of water' are not in the Greek). By way of explanation he suggests that the historical reference is to the public spirited activities of Themistocles in the office of ὑδάτων ἐπιστάτης, overseer of the city's water supply, an account of which is given by Plutarch in his *Life of Themistocles*, 31.1. However, no other ancient source, apart from Plutarch, assigns such a position to Themistocles. There was an office at Athens in the later fourth century, whose official title was actually τῶν κρηνῶν ἐπιμελητής, 'curator of the wells' (*Ath. Pol.* 43.1). But its existence is not attested at all before the mid fourth century B.C.<sup>3</sup> It seems very unlikely that this office existed as early as the 480s or 470s. Sommerstein's interpretation of 814 is thus rather unconvincing.

Can we provide a better explanation of this line and the passage as a whole? Let us look first at the metaphorical elements in the passage. The relative pronoun ὅς at the beginning of line 814 introduces three parallel third person finite verbs within a single sense unit spanning lines 814–16. Hence the natural interpretation would be to take line 814 as part of the same consumption metaphor as lines 815–16. There is surely an intended connexion. Thus, just as 815–16 refer to *eating*, 814 must refer to the complementary activity of *drinking*. However, the liquid envisaged to be in the filled-up receptacle here is not water but wine. Commentators on the passage do not seem to have realised that what we have in the metaphor in lines 814–16 is an implicit assumption of the common tripartite division of a full Greek meal, the three elements being bread, (usually, though not always, referred to as σίτος or ἄρτος), wine (οἶνος), and ὄψον, which in the later fifth century usually meant cooked fish or a fish-paste relish.<sup>4</sup>

In our passage the consumption metaphor involves three items. One, indicated by the reference to fish in 816, is clearly ὄψον; the second occurs in προσέμαξεν (815), 'he kneaded (Piraeus) into a barley cake'.<sup>5</sup> Barley-bread (μᾶζα) was an alternative

<sup>1</sup> R. A. Neil (London, 1901), p. 118; B. B. Rogers (London, <sup>2</sup>1930), pp. 114–15; J. van Leeuwen (1900), pp. 148–9.

<sup>2</sup> (Warminster, 1981), p. 87.

<sup>3</sup> See P. J. Rhodes, *A Commentary on the Aristotelian Athenaion Politeia* (Oxford, 1981), pp. 516–17, who refers to two inscriptions from the third quarter of the fourth century, *IG* ii<sup>2</sup> 215 and 338, which are the first to attest the office.

<sup>4</sup> See e.g. Homer, *Odyssey* 3.479–80; Thucydides 1.138.5; Plato, *Gorgias* 518B–C. I have discussed this traditional tripartite division in *CQ* 44.2 (1994), 536–9.

<sup>5</sup> The prepositional part of the compound verb προσέμαξεν here means 'in addition', and does no more than reinforce πρὸς τοῦτοις; the participle ἀριστώσῃ is a dative of interest, not

type of *σίτος* to *ἄρος*, wheat-bread (cf. *Knights* 1104–5). Thus it seems clear that what is assumed to be the liquid in line 814, where the city seems to be momentarily (and slightly illogically) viewed as itself a drinking vessel, is the traditional third element, wine: ‘he found our city (only) part full (of wine), and he filled her right up to the top’.

What then about the historical references/allusions in our passage? The fact that 815 has a clear historical reference, and that 814–16 form a single sense unit (with each line contributing to a fully worked-out metaphor), does suggest that 814 and 816 also allude to specific historical activities on Themistocles’ part, and are not merely generalized commendations. However, *pace* Sommerstein, it is much more likely that, as the scholiast *ad loc.* suggests, line 814 alludes to the other famous exploit of Themistocles, described at some length by Thucydides (1.89.2–93.2), which occurred immediately before the completion of the fortification of the Piraeus, i.e. his role in successfully organizing the rebuilding of the severely damaged city walls in winter 479/8, an enterprise which involved a deceptive embassy to Sparta. Whenever they are mentioned, these two achievements are invariably coupled together by our sources.<sup>6</sup> So we, and the audience, might justifiably expect a coupled reference here too.

Furthermore, Thucydides 1.89.3 informs us that, when the Athenians returned to their city after its occupation by the Persians, ‘small parts’ of the perimeter wall were still standing, i.e. it had not been totally destroyed. That detail perhaps helps to explain the sense and reference of the rare word *ἐπιχειλή* in line 814. In the context this must mean, ‘part full’, i.e. *not μεστήν*.<sup>7</sup> Equally, it implies that the receptacle was not completely empty either.

Finally, what about the ‘new kinds of fish’ in 816? There is no reference to overseas trade<sup>8</sup> or to maritime activities here. The fish are part of the metaphor only, not the historical point. But the expression is not a purely general compliment. I would suggest that there is a specific historical action alluded to here, viz. the increase in the city’s perimeter area in 479/8. Thucydides 1.93.2 tells us that with the rebuilt Themistoclean wall ‘the city boundaries were extended on all sides’. This was an important development, which the audience was surely well aware of. That the enclosed city’s increased geographical size is the underlying historical point in 816 is strongly indicated by what immediately follows. In direct (*σὺ δ’*) contrast to this action of Themistocles, Paphlagon/Cleon is alleged to have tried to make the Athenians *μικροπολίτας*, ‘citizens of small town’, or ‘little citizens’, by ‘building cross walls and chanting oracles’. We do not know what exactly this phrase refers to, but it is a very plausible hypothesis<sup>9</sup> that Cleon had recently proposed (apparently unsuccessfully) the building of secondary defensive walls at certain spots within the existing perimeter walls, to provide extra protection against the possibility of a direct assault by the Peloponnesians at the time of one of their summer invasions of Attica during

an indirect object. So, rightly, Neil, p. 118; cf. Sommerstein, p. 87, ‘and more than that...for her as a second helping’. Plutarch, *Themistocles* 19.4, was mistaken in taking the verb in the sense ‘join onto’ here. Neither Aristophanes nor the Sausage-Seller is under the erroneous impression that Themistocles built the Long Walls.

<sup>6</sup> E.g. Thucydides 1.89.2–93.8; Diodorus 11.39–43; Nepos, *Themistocles* 6; Plutarch, *Themistocles* 9.1–4.

<sup>7</sup> So Neil, p. 118, and Rogers, p. 114, following the explanation of the ancient lexicographers, ‘full only to the lip’; cf. LSJ, s.v. *ἐπιχειλής* II. Whatever the precise sense of *ἐπιχειλής*, there is clearly a contrast in the line between *μεστήν* and *ἐπιχειλή*.

<sup>8</sup> As suggested by Neil, p. 118.

<sup>9</sup> Accepted e.g. by Neil, p. 119, but mentioned only as a possibility by Sommerstein, p. 188.

431–25 B.C., and that he had claimed that support for the proposal could be found in an oracle.<sup>10</sup> 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

<sup>10</sup> 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 δουλεῦεν, 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. Bowersock<sup>1</sup> 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.

<sup>1</sup> 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).