

toral world through which he will move in the rest of Book Eight.¹⁵ But it is in his employment of the image of the blazing twigs that Virgil's *calliditas* is perhaps most in evidence.¹⁶ For if he was not to use this simile to describe Dido's passion, then Book Eight could indeed supply the most obvious alternative: for it contains the only truly erotic scene in the whole epic, to wit, the seduction of Vulcan by Venus. But in the actual employment of the motif Virgil seems deliberately to tease the reader who is familiar with the Alexandrian model. For Vulcan's passion as it blazes up is in fact compared, not to blazing twigs, but to lightning in the heavens.¹⁷ And Apollonius' simile of the industrious woman who kindles an early-morning fire is now transformed from

an image of blazing passion to a time-fixing device¹⁸ relating to the coldly sober aftermath: "haud secus Ignipotens nec tempore segnior illo / mollibus e stratis opera ad fabrilia surgit." Once again, moreover, the Virgilian simile explores possibilities that were lacking in the original. For (as in the last example) it forms a bridge, this time from the palace of Vulcan to the Cyclops' forge, where the god, like the Roman matron, will give instructions to subordinates, as they too work by a fire.¹⁹ And the picture of the chaste Roman matron industriously striving to preserve the home and family she cherishes makes an effective contribution to the ethos of the book as a whole.²⁰

E. L. HARRISON

UNIVERSITY OF LEEDS

15. Cf. Putnam, *op. cit.*, pp. 108-9; V. Pöschl, *Die Dichtkunst Virgils* (Innsbruck, 1950), pp. 239-40.

16. *Aen.* 8. 407 ff.

17. *Ibid.* 8. 388 ff.

18. Cf. H. Fränkel, *Noten zu den "Argonautika" des Apollonios* (Munich, 1968), p. 141 on "Stundenbilder" and their relation to similes. This particular example does actually become a simile as well in the course of its development, *cum* (408) leading on to *haud secus* as well as to *nec tempore segnior illo* (414).

19. Cf. Putnam, *op. cit.*, pp. 139-40, where he points out also that the children the housewife seeks to support are matched by the *Aeneadae* Venus wishes to protect.

20. Cf. Pöschl, *op. cit.*, p. 277. Hügi, *op. cit.*, p. 47, rightly subordinates the Homeric model used by Apollonius (*Il.* 12. 433 ff.) since it lacks the essential ingredients of the early rising and the fire lighting. It is however worth noting that Virgil's "castum ut servare cubile / coniugis et possit parvos educere natos" (412-13) has no parallel in Apollonius, but recalls the Homeric *ἵνα παῖσιν δαίκεα μισθὸν ἄρῃται* (*Il.* 12. 435).

THE *DIAPSEPHISMOS* OF *ATH. POL.* 13. 5

Mentioned in *Ath. Pol.* 13. 5 is a *diapsephismos* that took place "after the expulsion of the tyrants." Aristotle alluded to the measure to justify an immediately preceding remark to the effect that bankrupts and aliens had insinuated themselves into the citizen body by way of Pisistratus' faction. The implication was, for Aristotle, that this *diapsephismos* gave explicit recognition to and provided a remedy for that sorry state of affairs. His opinion that Pisistratus adulterated the citizenry is presum-

ably an inference from the fact of the *diapsephismos*.¹ Whether the inference is right or wrong, the alleged *diapsephismos* is not intrinsically suspicious. Yet the datum has been rejected by some modern scholars.²

Felix Jacoby insisted,³ like most others,⁴ in taking the *diapsephismos* in strict conjunction with the remark in *Politics* 1275B. Here it is said that Cleisthenes enlarged the demos, after the overthrow of the tyranny, by enrolling foreigners and slaves in the tribes: πολλοὺς γὰρ

1. J. Day and M. H. Chambers, *Aristotle's History of the Athenian Democracy* (Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1962), p. 118; cf. H. T. Wade-Gery, *Essays* (Oxford, 1958), p. 148, who supposed that Aristotle's "substantial evidence" for what he alleged of Pisistratus "is the fact of a *διαψευσιμός* and that for this he had documentary authority." It is not clear to me that there could have been any documentary evidence on this point which would have reached Aristotle. Instead I would prefer to suppose that one memory of the oligarchic regime which managed to endure was that of a wholesale disenfranchisement. Recorded in the fifth century, it was then interpreted by Aristotle (or his predecessors) in the fashion indicated in 13. 5. It follows that the *diapsephismos*, if it is historical, must have been sufficiently severe to have made an

impression not only on contemporaries but on those who followed them.

2. Above all by F. Jacoby, *FGrHist* III b Suppl. I 158 ff., followed by Day and Chambers, *op. cit.*, p. 118. Aristotle's testimony is accepted by D. M. Lewis, *Hist.*, XII (1963), 38, D. Kienast, *Hist. Zeit.*, CC (1965), 281, n. 2, and, in a discussion devoted to the entire problem, by K.-W. Welwei, *Gymnasium*, LXXIV (1967), 423 ff.

3. *Op. cit.*, p. 159.

4. E.g., Hignett, *A History of the Athenian Constitution* (Oxford, 1952), p. 133; Wade-Gery, *op. cit.*, pp. 148 ff.; Day and Chambers, *op. cit.*, p. 118; F. R. Wüst, *Hist.*, XIV (1964), 370 ff.; Welwei, *loc. cit.*

ἐφυλέτευσε ξένους καὶ δούλους μετοίκους.⁵ Jacoby supposed that "the contradictory pieces of information in *Politics* and in the *Ἀθηναίων πολιτεία* . . . are not tradition or historical facts of the closing sixth century, not stroke and counterstroke in the contest of the parties, they are political invention and counter invention of the closing fifth century and of the fourth."⁶ As he well knew ("stroke and counterstroke"), there is nothing necessarily contradictory about these traditions: the first can refer, and indeed ought *prima facie* to refer, to an action taken by the nobility on its return in power to Athens in 510, the second to an extension in the citizen body by Clisthenes in 508/7. Nor is there any reason for moderns to connect these measures, though invariably it has been done. Aristotle alluded to the *diapsephismos* to prove that unworthy people, the poor and the impure, had joined the body of citizens in Pisistratus' time; Clisthenes, in an independent context, was charged with having introduced people of a different type,⁷ slaves and foreigners, into the tribes. Nowhere in Aristotle is there an implication that the later action was a reaction to the earlier or that Clisthenes' extension of the franchise to slaves and aliens was a reflex of some prior purge of *them*⁸ from the citizen rolls. The *diapsephismos* mentioned in 13. 5 prompts no "counterstroke" in *Ath. Pol.* 21. In 21, to be sure, there is an allusion to Clisthenes having swelled the citizen rolls: πρῶτον μὲν οὖν συνένειμε πάντας εἰς δέκα φυλὰς ἀντὶ τῶν τεττάρων, ἀναμείξαι βουλόμενος, ὅπως μετάσχωσι πλείους τῆς πολιτείας. But although this statement presupposes precisely what Aristotle mentioned in the *Politics*, the *diapsephismos* to which he had made earlier allusion is here ignored and hardly can be meant to be interpolated by the reader.

A *diapsephismos* by reactionaries, if it

occurred, and a Clisthenic extension of the franchise to foreigners and slaves are not ideas that entail each other, though they can be made to do so. The remark in the *Politics* is an unqualified charge implying a radical departure on Clisthenes' part irrelevant to prior Athenian policy. If Aristotle supposed that Clisthenes merely canceled an earlier *diapsephismos*, the charge made against him should reflect it and have been less sweeping. It would in fact have been formulated in a different manner. Indeed, in that case, the tradition probably would have fixed on Pisistratus as the culprit with Clisthenes' role being secondary. Wade-Gery's suggestion⁹ that the statement in the *Politics* is "a hasty and careless inference from the same διαψηφισμός" indicates the implicit illogic of this modern and unnecessary preconception. Surely the only inference from the *diapsephismos* which could have suggested itself to Aristotle is what we see him to have inferred in *Ath. Pol.* 13. 5. The *diapsephismos* suggests prior irregularities; it does not imply future ones.

Jacoby may have been prone to suspect the historicity of this *diapsephismos* because the allegation against Clisthenes which he tied to it was palpably a propagandistic charge of later times (whether justified or not). It seemed to him to be an example of the kind of fabrication practiced in the fourth century which he above all others has illuminated. In this instance, however, his own explanation is hardly cogent. He believed that Androtion invented the oligarchic *diapsephismos* in order to exculpate Clisthenes from the charge of debasing the citizenship. But then our tradition would have been formulated quite differently. There would be at least a hint of the purpose of this invention. But as it stands, the *diapsephismos* implies not the desire to excul-

5. The passage has recently been discussed by J. H. Oliver, *Hist.*, IX (1960), 503 ff., D. Kagan, *Hist.*, XII (1963), 41 ff., Wüst, *loc. cit.*

6. *Loc. cit.*, p. 159.

7. Men of uncertain Attic ancestry and paupers are not the same as foreigners and slaves in conception or formulation. (It does not matter that a foreigner or slave who passed himself off as an Athenian would be "impure.") The distinction is important since it suggests that Aristotle's mind was working along different presuppositions from our own. In

explaining the *diapsephismos* as he has done he imagined Pisistratus as having tolerated in his own interests a comparatively mild and undramatic admixture. He let people pass themselves off as citizens. But Clisthenes is supposed to have made slaves and foreigners citizens in one legislative stroke.

8. See the preceding note. The two groups should on this view have been identical.

9. *Essays* (Oxford, 1958), p. 148.

pate Clisthenes but an attempt to incriminate Pisistratus. In short, Androtion would have had to speak of something more than a *diapsephismos* if he were defending Clisthenes. A vote on the title of Athenians to citizenship is something any citizenry, properly qualified, would consider an intrinsically laudable operation and implies only criticism of prior irregularity. Aristotle's use of the term *diapsephismos* in 13. 5, whatever action it covers, adds nothing further to that meaning. We may infer, with Day and Chambers, that the Athenians "vindictively expelled any whom they suspected of being supporters of the recent tyrants."¹⁰ But do we have the right to *infer* an *implication* (and this is what it amounts to) without ancient help and build a theory on it? It is not implied that Clisthenes' action was a "counter-stroke." We cannot legitimately reject Aristotle's inference about Pisistratus' policy from the *diapsephismos*, substitute our own (exculpatory of Clisthenes) and then explain by it the reason behind the appearance of this very word in that author. If Androtion (or anyone else) had invented the *diapsephismos* as a defense for Clisthenes he would have qualified or amplified it in some way so as to imply or demand that inference. Some echo of his purpose would reverberate in *Ath. Pol.*

The only serious objection to the *diapsephismos* raised by Jacoby is that "Herodotus knows neither a *διαψηφισμός* nor its counterpart . . ."¹¹ It is not enough, in my opinion, to say with Welwei that since Herodotus was corrected by Aristotle in another instance centering on this time,¹² and since Herodotus' sketch is not exhaustive, Aristotle should be followed *tout court*. Aristotle's unaided testimony could be right and the burden of proof quite properly is on those who dispute it. All the same, one would like a little corroboration from Herodotus to be on the safe

side. I suggest, however, that if we free ourselves from the preconception alluded to above—that the *diapsephismos* was the negative incitement to the Clisthenic extension of citizenship to slaves and foreigners—it is possible to find that both Herodotus and Aristotle agree that a significant revision in the citizen rolls took place before the reforms of Clisthenes.

Let us, in the first place, bear in mind that Aristotle is telling us of an archaic instance of a practice current in his own time. *Diapsephismos* is the word he would use to describe a reduction made in the body of citizens if he wished to use language consistent with current constitutional practice.¹³ The fact that the term could in his time only attach to the question of Athenian heritage does not necessarily suggest that a *diapsephismos* was always directed against the impure. Even Aristotle, who seems to have thought in such terms, implies a somewhat broader target in 13. 5, where he speaks of *οἱ τε ἀφηρημένοι τὰ χρέα διὰ τὴν ἀπορίαν* as well as of *οἱ τῷ γένει μὴ καθαροί*. A *diapsephismos* could, presumably, be hinged on any consideration; the only requirement is of a revision of the citizen rolls. The question is therefore whether there is any further suggestion in Aristotle and Herodotus that such a revision took place in 510 or shortly thereafter.

That Aristotle thought so seems very likely. That is shown by the interesting phrase in *Ath. Pol.* 20. 1 where Clisthenes drew the demos to his cause, *ἀποδιδούς τῷ πλήθει τὴν πολιτείαν*. The usual translations—*teilhaben am Staat*, *universo populo tribuens rempublicam*—tend to make the burden of this remark metaphysical; they make it refer to the "tenour" of Clisthenes' entire legislation.¹⁴ Why? Because the meaning "giving back citizenship to those who had lost it" "is surely impossible *per se*: to identify the *πλήθος* here

10. *Op. cit.*, p. 118.

11. *Op. cit.*, p. 159.

12. *Loc. cit.* (n. 2 above), p. 425, on *Ath. Pol.* 20. 2-4; Wade-Gery, pp. 424 f., Jacoby, *Atthis* (Oxford, 1949), p. 337, n. 40. I do not see why *schol.* Aristoph. *Lysist.* 273 either suggests that Herodotus was wrong or why Aristotle must have used the bronze stele to correct Herodotus. Aristotle may have assumed that the Athenians, as well as the Spartans, were allowed to leave the acropolis because of the later

reappearance in Herodotus of Isagoras. But Isagoras may be an exception, not a "contradiction."

13. Harpocr. s.v. *διαψήφισις*: *διαψήφισις δέ ἐστιν, ὅταν ἅκα στάσεως δημοτικῆς γενομένης ἀνέρχονται ἅπαντες οἱ ἐκ τῶν δήμων καὶ σκοποῦσι τίς τε ἐστὶ πολίτης καὶ τίς ξένος, τοῦτον διώκουσιν ὡς ἐξ αὐτοῦ γενομένης τῆς στάσεως*. In this case it would not have been the demesmen but the nobles who held the review.

14. Wade-Gery, *op. cit.*, p. 147.

with the *ξένοι* and *δοῦλοι* of the *Politics* (and the above rendering demands that identification) is quite certainly impossible."¹⁵ But if we forget about the "foreigners" and "slaves" of the *Politics* it is not impossible; it is conceivable and even plausible. Let us consider the possibility that "the people" simply ceased to exist as a political force. For the reactionary nobility unquestionably governed.¹⁶ We may call their rule a provisional government or them merely a cabal. But we are not to suppose because it was a transitory phenomenon that the participants realized it or that they simply marked time or did nothing about the *demos* because Clisthenes would soon undo them. They could not know it was not worth the bother. So the nobles, we may infer, installed an oligarchy. They probably dismissed the Solonic *boule* (if there was one) and replaced it with the "Three Hundred."¹⁷ Was the *demos* permitted to retain the hard-won gains accrued to it because of Solon and Pisistratus?

Aristotle's *diapsephismos* can therefore refer to a radical revision of the citizen lists or of those entitled to participate in government immediately after the fall of the tyranny. For Herodotus, too, implies that such a change occurred. In this context, I submit, the troublesome sentence in 5. 69. 2 becomes intelligible and important: *ὥς γὰρ δὴ τὸν*

15. *Ibid.*, p. 149.

16. I shall argue elsewhere that we are unjustified in dating the "struggle" that took place between Clisthenes and Isagoras to the time prior to 508/7 since Herodotus (5. 66. 2) inferred the struggle from Clisthenes' defeat of Isagoras in that year. But however we imagine the course of events from 510 to 508/7, and Clisthenes' role in them, the fact that the émigrés ruled by the grace of Cleomenes in reactionary fashion should not be doubted. It is naïve to suppose that the barons or Cleomenes would have tolerated counterrevolution or counterrevolutionaries with the city in their power or, in other words, that the insurgency of 508/7 had a prehistory.

17. The *boule* of Herodotus 5. 72. 2 defended itself when even Clisthenes, as his withdrawal indicates (5. 72. 1), had lost hope. That *boule* (I infer) must have been his own creation; a Solonic council *ex hypothesi* theretofore tolerated by the

Ἀθηναίων δῆμον πρότερον ἀπωσμένον τότε πάντως πρὸς τὴν ἐσωτοῦ μοῖραν προσεθήκατο, τὰς φυλὰς μετωνόμασε καὶ ἐποίησε πλεῖνας ἐξ ἐλασσόνων. The usual interpretation of *ἀπωσμένον*¹⁸ seems to be that during the struggle between Isagoras and Clisthenes the people merely sat on their hands, ignored by the combatants. That involves assuming that Herodotus wished to convey by this word a negative fact instead of a positive one. Though *ἀπωθέω* can carry that meaning, the other meaning is at least a shade more likely. The people had been "pushed out": the new government of the oligarchs had deprived the *demos* of its erstwhile stake in government. Small wonder that Clisthenes unleashed an irresistible force when he took them into partnership.

To conclude, the evidence against the *diapsephismos* is insubstantial. General probability and supporting remarks in both Aristotle and Herodotus indicate it is a fact. If so it tells us a good deal about the kind of regime installed by Cleomenes in 510 and incidentally explains the ferocity of popular support for Clisthenes even in the teeth of Cleomenes on his return to Athens in aid of Isagoras.¹⁹

CHARLES W. FORNARA

BROWN UNIVERSITY

barons and consequently amenable to their wishes would have acted more moderately and not have risked extinction. The fire-eaters, those most hostile to the oligarchy, will already have been purged. What preceded the Clisthenic *boule*, therefore, may well have been—if it were not a packed council of Four Hundred—precisely the "Three Hundred" Cleomenes wished to (re-)install.

18. See Kienast, *Hist. Zeit.*, CC (1965), 271, n. 1.

19. That the people were willing to resist both Sparta and the barons when deserted by Clisthenes (see n. 17) is one of the most remarkable incidents of this remarkable period. Clisthenes' departure, which I hope no one will understand as an act of self-abnegation (in order to save the democracy—as if there was a chance of Cleomenes sparing it) permits us to see how desperate were the hopes of the Athenians. My hypothesis, I believe, makes this phenomenon intelligible.

GAIUS MEMMIUS: PATRON OF LUCRETIVS

Gaius Memmius (*ca.* 104–*ca.* 49 B.C.) has achieved immortality of a sort by the generally unfavorable impression he made on his contemporaries. In fact, whether his efforts were

in politics, social life, or literature, they drew adverse criticism from his most esteemed contemporaries. In this note I should like to suggest the function that Memmius may have