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 provisionary 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: ὡς γὰρ δὴ τὸν Ἀθηναίων δῆμον πρότερον ἀπωσμένον τότε πάντως πρὸς τὴν ἑωυτοῦ μοῖραν προσεθήκατο, τὰς φυλὰς μετωνόμασε καὶ ἐποίησε πλεῦνας 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

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 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 LUCRETIUS

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

played in the composition of *De rerum natura* and in the mind of Lucretius, so that we may see what impression of Memmius Lucretius wished to give to the world.

Biographical information regarding Memmius is easily obtainable (the letters of Cicero are the major source), and I shall not reproduce what we know of him here.[1] However, what little information we do have is interesting because without exception it is unfavorable to Memmius.

Memmius' writings seem to have been fairly widely known, and again, as with the biographical information, the comments on his literary creations are unfavorable.[2] Two fragments of his works remain: a portion of an oration,[3] and a line of poetry,[4] but as neither remains because of its literary merits, it is pointless to comment upon them.

What can be learned, however, from the scanty remnants of the judgments of his contemporaries is that Memmius represented the extreme in corruption and licentiousness in what was already an extremely corrupt and licentious society, full of men vainly and foolishly "ad summum succedere honorem certantes." Hence Lucretius may have used Memmius, although tacitly and indirectly, as an example of the worst in a bad society.

Aside from this role which Memmius may have played in Lucretius' poem—a reminder of the excesses and extremes of the society—it may also be asked why Lucretius made use of the name of Memmius at certain places in the poem. The name occurs twelve times in *De rerum natura*. The first instance, "quos ego de rerum natura pangere conor / Memmiadae nostro, quem tu, dea, tempore in omni / omnibus ornatum voluisti excellere rebus" (1. 25–27),[5] and the second, "nam neque nos agere hoc patriai tempore iniquo / possumus aequo animo nec Memmi clara propago / talibus in rebus communi desse saluti" (1. 41–43), occur in the formal prologue to the poem. Hence Lucretius may have used the name at this early point purely for stylistic reasons: the necessity of mentioning one's patron near the beginning of a work.

But after these two instances, the name Memmius is used ten times, always in the vocative. In each instance I quote the entire line, with no attempt to provide a syntactically complete sentence or phrase: "hoc tibi de plano possum promittere, *Memmi* (1. 411); "illud in his rebus longe fuge credere, *Memmi*" (1. 1052); "corporibus, paucis licet hinc cognoscere, *Memmi*" (2. 143); "quae tibi posterius, *Memmi*, faciemus aperta" (2. 182); "sint genere. in primis animalibus inclute *Memmi*" (2. 1080);[6] "dicendum est, deus ille fuit, deus, inclute *Memmi*" (5. 8); "quorum naturam triplicem, tria corpora, *Memmi*" (5. 93); "cetera de genere hoc adfingere et addere, *Memmi*" (5. 164); "omnia sunt hominum tutelae tradita, *Memmi*" (5. 867); "sit facilest ipsi per te cognoscere, *Memmi*" (5. 1282). When the lines are arranged in this manner the eye can see what the mind otherwise may fail to comprehend: save for one instance, every use of *Memmi* is at the end of the line. What immediately comes to mind is the formulaic use of the epithet and other phrases in the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*. It would seem that Lucretius used the word *Memmi* whenever he was temporarily at a loss about how to finish a line, and that he had no special thought of appropriateness to the context. The framework in which the name of Memmius appears varies incredibly, and any attempt to find a rationale would be difficult indeed, since, with the exception of the first two instances—the formal inclusion of Memmius in the Prologue (1. 26, 42)—the mention of Memmius could be removed without harming the sense in the least. Those six instances where some word in the second person occurs in conjunction with *Memmi* would remain just as meaningful were *Memmi* removed and the second person under-

1. The best modern biography is Münzer's in *RE*, XV, 1 Hbd. (1931), 610–16 ("Memmius," 8). The major ancient source is Cicero, three of whose letters (*Fam.* 13. 1, 2, 3) were written to Memmius. Memmius was mentioned several times elsewhere by Cicero: *Att.* 1. 18; 4. 15, 16, 17; 5. 11; *Q. fr.* 3. 3. 3; *Brut.* 247. Other ancient sources include Suet. *Iul.* 23, 49, 73; *Gram.* 14; Catull. 10 and 28; and Plut. *Luc.* 37.

2. Plin. *Ep.* 5. 3; Gell. 19. 9. 7; Ov. *Tr.* 2. 433; Cic. *Brut.* 247.

3. Suet. *Ter.* 3.

4. Nonius 194 (Morel *FPL* 91).

5. All citations from *De rerum natura* are from the edition of C. Bailey (Oxford, 1922).

6. I use the conjecture of Gronovius here, which, although probably unacceptable, is interesting because it fits the pattern.

stood as an exhortation to the reader. In the remaining four instances, where the second person does not occur, the word *Memmi* is entirely irrelevant to the context.[7]

Possibly Lucretius held *Memmi* in reserve until he had a thought that he could not at once complete metrically, and then inserted the word and moved on. A random glance at the recent computer-prepared concordance to *De rerum natura* will show that many words in the poem occur only at certain places in the hexameter, possibly indicating a formulaic tendency in the over-all composition of *De rerum natura*.[8] *Memmi* was a word that Lucretius needed to use on occasion by virtue of his dedication of the poem to Memmius, but a word that, aside from the first two instances, did not need to be used thereafter at any specific point in the poem. This would seem a reasonable interpretation of Lucretius' design, because of the great variance of the context into which the name of Memmius was introduced and the difficulty of finding any contextual rationale for insertion at any specific point. I doubt very much the frequent assertion that Lucretius wished to draw Memmius' or anyone's attention to specific parts of the poem; more than likely Lucretius thought that the entire poem was important and that any part was as worth while as the next.

In summation, our knowledge concerning the possible relationship between Lucretius and Memmius is interesting through our lack of information rather than through actual historical evidence. If Memmius were a noted patron of the arts, worthy of the dedication of an epic poem, why is there no mention of this anywhere, including the one place—the letters of Cicero to Memmius—where one would expect it? When Cicero attempted to convince Memmius that he should not demolish the alleged house of Epicurus (Cic. *Fam.* 13. 1), what better means could Cicero have used than to appeal to Memmius' noted services to the arts and literature?

In fact, it may be best to follow the view of Ettore Bignone, who held that Memmius was an equal, rather than a patron, of Lucretius.[9] Certainly this fits the evidence or lack of evidence, available to us. Lucretius saw Memmius as a flagrant example of the corrupt and wanton society in Rome that he was striving to eliminate. Since Memmius was so seen by those of his contemporaries who cared to comment on the matter, there is no reason to believe that Lucretius would have considered him any differently.[10]

DUANE W. ROLLER

HARVARD UNIVERSITY

7. See the ed. of *De rerum natura* by W. A. Merrill (New York, 1907), p. 25; also J. P. Elder, in *CP*, LXIII (1968), 58–60.

8. L. Roberts, *A Concordance of Lucretius*. Supplement to *ΑΓΩΝ*: 1968. (Berkeley, 1968), *passim*.

9. E. Bignone, *Storia della letteratura latina*², Florence, [n.d.], II, 159.

10. I wish to thank Professor J. P. Elder for his assistance and advice in the preparation of this Note.

TRIMALCHIO'S MENU AND WINE LIST

In three fairly recent articles it has been contended that Trimalchio was not a rich man by Petronian standards, that Opimian wine was not the choice of connoisseurs in A.D. 66, and that the recitation of the *actuarius* (*Sat.* 52) claiming vast lands for Trimalchio was a rehearsed speech prompted by Trimalchio himself.[1] But it is in the food set before the guests that Trimalchio tries especially to impress upon his *convivae* that he is indeed a wealthy man and a lavish spender. The number of separate foods in the *Cena* strikes the reader at first glance as truly impressive; by my count there appear to be sixty-two items.

How does Petronius intend us to take this vast display of foods? One of the clues to Petronius' intent is that seen by B. Baldwin in his article on Opimian wine: "his (Trimalchio's) Opimian wine would be at least 170 years old. If genuine, such a vintage would not

1. G. Bagnani, "And Passing Rich," *Phoenix*, Supp. I (1952), 218–23; K. F. C. Rose, "Trimalchio's Accountant," *CP*, LXII (1967), 258–59; B. Baldwin, "Opimian Wine," *AJP*, LXXXVIII (1967), 173–75. J. P. Sullivan, *The "Satyricon" of Petronius* (London, 1968), notes that Cicero's tomb was three times bigger than Trimalchio's and that "his house is old-fashioned and has been converted and enlarged, rather than newly built on a Texas scale" (p. 150).