

Reprinted for private circulation from
CLASSICAL PHILOLOGY, Vol. XXX, No. 4, October, 1935

PRINTED IN THE U.S.A.

MOSES I. FINKELSTEIN

Ἐμπορος, Ναύκληρος, and Κάπηλος: A PROLEGOMENA
TO THE STUDY OF ATHENIAN TRADE¹

BY MOSES I. FINKELSTEIN

IT IS unfortunate for the study of Greek economic history that so many scholars have been unable to break away from modern channels of thought and, specifically, from modern terminology. Expressions such as "firms," "joint stock companies," "bank drafts," "capitalists," and the like constantly appear in their discussions of Greek business activity. The confusion of thought which must inevitably arise from such terminology interferes with any attempt to obtain a correct view of the conditions existing in antiquity. Such terms, closely bound up with definite modern connotations, cannot fail to bring a great variety of elements into the picture which never existed in ancient Greece. Yet the difficulty is easily surmounted. One may retain the Greek terms either in the original or in transliteration, accompanied by the necessary explanations, or one may employ modern terminology after it has been properly defined in its application to antiquity.² The common failure to use the Greek terms in the sense in which the Greeks employed them is nowhere more apparent than in the treatment of the words which distinguished the various types of Greek traders.³

¹ The author wishes to thank Professor W. L. Westermann of Columbia University for many helpful suggestions.

² W. L. Westermann has hit upon a variation of the first method, or, perhaps more correctly, a combination of the two types, in his use of the expression "trapezite banking" in his article, "Warehousing and Trapezite Banking in Antiquity," in *Journal of Economic and Business History*, III (1930), 30-51. The second method becomes necessary with terms like "capital," and it is in just that case that perhaps the worst confusion has arisen. Max Weber pointed out in his article, "Agrarverhältnisse im Altertum," in the *Handwörterbuch der Sozialwissenschaften*, I (3d ed., 1909), 52-158, that much of the controversy about the extent of capitalism in antiquity can be attributed to the failure of the various participants to define their uses of the term "capital." See also Friedrich Dertel's remarks in his notes to the third edition of Robert von Pöhlmann, *Geschichte der sozialen Frage und des Sozialismus in der antiken Welt* (München, 1925), II, 515-16.

³ Not only has the inability to steer clear of modern concepts caused considerable confusion in terminology, but it has also produced many valueless conclusions, as, e.g., the oft-repeated remark that wages in Greece were low. The implication in this state-

In the main the Greeks used three words to designate men engaged in commercial activity: ἔμπορος, ναύκληρος, and κάπηλος.⁴ Much has been written in modern times in an attempt to classify these three types of merchants. Yet no one, to my knowledge, has taken the logically prior step of determining whether ancient usage was sufficiently constant to warrant the definition of these terms into exact and consistent meanings. In other words, all the scholars who have dealt with this question have started from the premise that Greek traders were classifiable according to some standard (usually a modern one) and, further, that the ancients themselves followed this classification. Having established their categories, they have then proceeded under the assumption that the status of every trader mentioned by Demosthenes, for example, may be accurately determined from the word used in referring to him. Further, upon these systems has been built many a theory about Greek trade, about its "capitalistic" or "non-capitalistic" nature, or about producer-consumer relations.⁵

Although each of these three words, ἔμπορος, ναύκληρος, and κάπηλος, probably had a specific denotation, customary ancient usage disregarded the distinctions so frequently that we may not safely make any deductions from the terminology per se.⁶ In the light of the

ment is, of course, that they were low as compared with modern standards. When we ask what standards, confusion arises. That three obols, e.g., is a smaller sum of money by weight and metallic content than twenty dollars is unquestionable—and meaningless. Yet meaningless as it may be, it is the only basis for the comparison, since three obols in fifth-century Greece was a living wage, though minimum, and hence quite comparable to twenty dollars today. The figures which I have used here are, of course, arbitrary.

⁴ These terms are to be discussed in their commercial sense only, and not in such uses as ἔμπορος for "voyager" (e.g., Aesch. *Choeph.* 661-62), etc. Other words for traders than these three are also found, but their use is comparatively so rare that I shall mention them only incidentally. No attempt will be made to discuss specific terms such as ἀγορεύων, ἀνδροπόδακτος, and the like.

⁵ See, e.g., Johannes Hübner, *Staat und Handel im alten Griechenland* (Tübingen, 1928), pp. 1-8.

⁶ Numerous examples of the uncertainty of Greek economic terminology in general might be cited, e.g., the use of χρῆματα to mean money or goods or both (see Fritz Pringsheim, *Der Kauf mit fremdem Geld* ["Romanistische Beiträge zur Rechtsgeschichte" (Leipzig, 1916), No. 1, pp. 5-6]), or the innumerable meanings of οὐρα. We may compare modern words like "dealer," "trader," "shopkeeper," etc., and the varying connotations of esca. Paul Huxford, "Monetae," in *Daremberg-Sag.*, III, 1731-32, points out that even modern legislation is "hardly able to mark the line which separates

??
1

emphasis placed upon these terms in so important a work as that of Johannes Haschroek,⁷ the subject is worthy of a detailed examination.

The present discussion will be limited to the fifth and fourth centuries B.C. Even that period is perhaps too long, for the connotations of words such as these frequently change within a few years. Unfortunately, there is not enough material available to allow a closer delimitation of the period to be discussed.⁸ It has seemed advisable to eliminate all authors whose writings fall entirely after the death of Alexander, but to include all the works of those authors who overlap Alexander's reign. The only later works which have been used are the lexica and scholia; and their importance for this question has been greatly overrated. As is to be expected, they are as badly confused in their definitions and classifications as are most modern students who have dealt with this subject.⁹

Only a mere handful of the numerous passages in which these three terms appear are in themselves of definitive value. Plato, after differentiating between sale of one's own products (*αὐτοπωλική*) and sale of the products of others (*μεταβλητική*), goes on to distinguish in the latter group between *καπηλική*, trade which is carried on within the city, and *ἐμπορικὴ*, the exchange of commodities from city to city.¹⁰ Aristotle calls *ἐμπορία* the principal means of obtaining profit through exchange (*μεταβλητικὴ*) and subdivides it into *ναυκληρία*, *φορτηγία*, and *παράστρασις*.¹¹ Elsewhere he states that "marketing" (*ἀγοραῖος*)

the merchant from the non-merchant." See C. E. Paoli, *Studi di diritto antico* (Firenze, 1930), pp. 99-101, for a discussion of this same problem in connection with the *δικαὶ ἐμπορικαί*. Cf. Oertel's review of H. Knorring, *Emporice* (Amsterdam, 1926), in *Gnomon*, VI (1930), 37-38.

⁷ Cited in n. 5.

⁸ The great majority of sources date from the fourth century, and the conclusions reached may be taken as primarily applicable to that century. Nearly all the sources are Athenian.

⁹ Failure to pay proper attention to the chronology has produced some amusing results. A particularly glaring example is to be found in K. F. Hermann, *Lehrbuch der griechischen Privatwirtschaftslehre* (3d ed. by Hugo Blümner; Freiburg i. B., 1882), p. 428, n. 3, where the statement is made that *ἐμποροὶ* always used boats belonging to others. The authorities cited are Homer *Od.* xxiv. 300 and Hesych., s.v. *ἐμπορος*.

¹⁰ *Soph.* 223C-D. Cf. *Repub.* 371D, where Plato defines *ἀνήγας* as a trader who buys and sells in the *ἀγορὰ*, and *ἐμπορος* as one who trades from city to city.

¹¹ *Pol.* 1238b. This passage has proved a stumbling-block for every commentator. The meaning of *παράστρασις* is particularly obscure, and an almost unbelievable variety of suggestions has been put forth. It seems to me to be a fruitless task to attempt to

buying and selling, wholesaling + retailing

consists of buying (ὄνη), selling (πρῶσις), ἔμπορία, and καπηλεία.¹² That is all that the Greeks have left us by way of definition, and the confusion is immediately apparent. Aristotle in one passage takes ἔμπορία to be the generic term for "trade," including ναυκλήρια among its subdivisions, and then, in the same work, proceeds to use the term merely as a form of ἀγοραῖος, apparently distinct not only from καπηλεία, but also from buying and selling.¹³ Plato, on the surface more consistent, differentiates the two terms on the basis of the scene of operations: καπηλεία is local, ἔμπορία interlocal commerce; and, according to his view, both concepts would seem to exclude trade in commodities of one's own production.

Two or three other passages, while not definitions, may be included among the definitive sources. The commercial laws, cited by Demosthenes,¹⁴ make certain provisions for ναυκλήροι and ἔμποροι in connection with their activity, namely, ἔμπορία. This would seem to lead to three inferences: (1) that ναυκλήροι and ἔμποροι are to be distinguished from each other, although none of these laws now extant does so in any way, (2) that Plato is correct in defining ἔμπορος as a "foreign trader,"¹⁵ and (3) that ἔμπορία is the generic term for "commerce." But Isocrates uses ἔμπορία to denote trade in general, and in the same passage uses καπηλεία in the identical sense.¹⁶ A similar

unravel the mystery, and since my whole discussion hinges on mass evidence and not on the interpretation of any one passage, I make no attempt at it. Suggestions about καπηλεία have been offered, among others, by H. Bächenschütz, *Besitz und Erwerb im griechischen Alterthum* (Halle, 1909), p. 456; Hermann-Blümner, *op. cit.*, p. 428; Victor Brans, "Les sociétés commerciales à Athènes," *Rev. de l'Indust. publique en Belgique*, XXV (1882), 114-17; Henri Faneulle, *L'industrie dans la Grèce ancienne* ("Bibliothèque de la Faculté de Philosophie et Lettres de l'Université de Liège," fasc. 7-8 [1900-1901]), I, 301-2 (contra Lujo Brentano, *Das Wirtschaftleben der antiken Welt* [Jena, 1929], p. 43, n. 1); L. Beauchet, *Histoire du droit privé de la république athénienne* (Paris, 1887), IV, 380-81; Huvelin, "Mercuria" and "Navicularia," in *Daremb.-Sag.*, III², 1756, and IV¹, 20, respectively; Gustave Glotz, *Le travail dans la Grèce ancienne* (Paris, 1920), p. 351; Knorrings, *op. cit.*, p. 115; Etienne Cicoulli, *Commerce e civiltà nel mondo antico* (Milano, 1929), p. 68, n. 1. Note also the various attempts at interpretation made by translators. A particularly good example of "wish-fulfillment translation" is B. Saint-Hilaire's "commerce par eau, commerce par terre, et vente en boutique" (2d ed.; Paris, 1848), pp. 38-39.

¹² Pol. 1291a. 5-7; 1291b. Kc-23

¹³ Cf. Plato's καὶ πωλοῦντες καὶ καπηλείοντες in *Protog.* 313D. Aristot. *Eth. Bud.* 1215a adds to the confusion still further.

¹⁴ Dem. xxxiii. 1 and variously in oration lviii. Cf. also l. 6.

¹⁵ This follows from the nature of the commercial laws.

¹⁶ II. 1.

confusion (or carelessness) is found in Plato's *Republic*, where Plato employs the term *καπηλεία* in referring to both *κάπηλοι* and *ἐμποροί*.¹⁷

The few passages cited above are enough to indicate the chaos which will be found when all the relevant ancient sources are brought together. The great majority of modern writers merely state in passing (with minor variations) that the *ναύκληρος* was the shipowner, that the *ἐμπορος* was the international wholesaler, always a sea-trader, and generally not using his own ship, and that the *κάπηλος* was the retailer and middleman in the market place.¹⁸

A few men have, however, delved deeper into the problem and their conclusions must be summarized at greater length. To examine all the various views in detail is obviously impossible. The fullest discussion is that of Hasebrock.¹⁹ He considers all three as middlemen between producer and consumer, and defines them as follows:

¹⁷ 525C-D.

¹⁸ Thus August Böckh, *Die Staatshaushaltung der Athener* (3d ed. by Max Fränkel; Berlin, 1886), I, 61-62, 77, 124, 636, n. c; Hermann-Blinner, *op. cit.*, pp. 419-20, 426-28; Beuchet, *op. cit.*, IV, 86-88; T. Thalheim, "Ἐμπορία" in Pauly-Wissowa, Vol. V, col. 2626; A. Hug and Erich Zielarth, "Καπηλεία" and "Κάπηλος," *ibid.*, Vol. X, cols. 1888-89; Henri Francois, "Industrie und Handel," *ibid.*, Vol. IX, col. 1403; Louis Girard, *L'approvisionnement d'Athènes en blé au V^e et au IV^e siècle* ("Université de Paris, Bibliothèque de la Faculté des Lettres," XXV [1909]), pp. 327, 341; Glotz, *op. cit.*, pp. 343-44; Ciccoli, *op. cit.*, pp. 68-69; and others.

The most detailed expression of the traditional view will be found in Paul Havelin's four articles, "Mercator," "Mercatarius," "Navicularius," and "Negotiator," in *Darumb.-Zug.*, III, 1731-36 and 1743-69; IV, 20-21 and 41-45, respectively. He takes as his starting-point the hypothesis that a merchant "neither buys nor sells for himself," i. e., he must be a middleman, and, further, that the Greek writers recognized this distinction ("Mercatura," p. 1732). His classification is, in brief: (1) *μεταβληταί* (true commerce), subdivided into *ἐμπορία* ("grand commerce") and *καπηλεία* (trade properly); (2) the *ἐμπορος* essentially a sea-trader; (3) *κάπηλος*, originally meaning the land-trader, and, since land trade was never important in Greece, used to designate the small merchant and shopkeeper; (4) *ναύκληρος*, with three meanings: (a) the owner of a ship who rents it to an *επιπλοῦς* (entrepreneur), (b) the entrepreneur of a ship, who may or may not own it, and (c) a ship-captain; and (5) *ἐμπορος* and *ναύκληρος*, generally used together. Another detailed discussion will be found in Büchsenhütts, *op. cit.*, pp. 443-58; this frequently cited work is entirely antiquarian in its approach, and the use of the source materials violates all rules of historical research.

Similar definitions are given in all the dictionaries from Stephanus to the new Liddell and Scott.

¹⁹ In the work cited in n. 5, and in an earlier article, "Die Betriebsformen des griechischen Handels im IV. Jahrh.," in *Herms*, LVIII (1929), 393-425. This view has been accepted *in toto* by August Kraemer in his review in *Philologische Wochenschrift*, Vol. XLIX (1929), cols. 378-80, 403-13. My citations to Hasebrock's work are all to his book and not to the article in *Herms*.

Kapelos is the trader who normally does not leave his domicile in order to carry out his trading activity, . . . in other words, the local dealer who sells in the home market. . . . Opposed . . . are naukleros and emporos. They are the traders of the interlocal and international commerce from place to place, especially using the sea. . . . Naukleros is the trader who owns his own ship and carries out his trading activity on this ship, usually in person; emporos (originally simply passenger) is the trader without his own ship. . . . Since the trader without his own ship is the characteristic phenomenon of Greek commercial life, so "emporos" exceeds this special meaning and has the general sense of "Verhändler," as opposed to the kapelos . . . just as the corresponding "emporion" is opposed to "kapelia."

Had he stopped there, Hasebroek would merely have repeated the traditional viewpoint. He was, however, far too familiar with the source materials to accept this simple, three-ply differentiation as a complete and final one. His other remarks may be outlined as follows: (1) a further differentiation respecting the κάπηλος must be made "according to the method of purchasing the goods which he sells: if the goods come directly from the producer, he is a kapelos in the narrower, true sense; if they come from another trader . . . then he is a 're-sale-kapelos' (παλιγκάπηλος);"²⁰ (2) if he is selling his own products, he is to be further distinguished as an ἀγοπωλῆς;²¹ (3) the κάπηλος is not a shopkeeper as such—for this concept the Greeks more often used μεταβολεῖς,²² though the κάπηλος was also frequently a shopkeeper or peddler; (4) the essential distinction between ἔμποροι and κάπηλοι, then, is that of local as opposed to foreign trade, and not that of retailer versus trader *en gros*;²³ (5) the κάπηλος frequently sold to another trader and it is possible that "he generally did not come into contact with the consumers, but re-sold to the local retailers"; (6) "naukleroi and emporoi, however, are also not wholesalers per se," though they obviously preferred to dispose of their goods in bulk.²⁴

²⁰ He cites Schol. Aristoph. *Plut.* 1156; Dem. xxv. 45, lvi. 7; Pollux vii. 12; and Phot., s.v. παλιγκάπηλος.

²¹ He cites Plato *Soph.* 223C, 231D; *Politeia* 280C.

²² His authorities are Schol. Aristoph. *Plut.* 1156; Dem. xxv. 46; and Pollux i. 50.

²³ So also H. Holckstein, *Het economisch leven in Griekenlands bloeitijd* (Haarlem, 1923), pp. 164-70; and F. Oertel in his review of Kuurtinga in *Gnomon*, VI (1930), 38.

²⁴ Early in his discussion Hasebroek says that "the meaning of concept of this nature is at all times more or less varying." Despite this observation, and despite the exceptions which he constantly notes, he proceeds to make a sharp differentiation between the several terms.

H. Knorringa also devotes considerable space to this problem,²⁶ but the unfortunate method which he employed in the organization of his materials²⁶ makes it difficult to determine his position exactly. His views may be summarized somewhat as follows: (1) that, when using either *ἐμπορος* or *κάπηλος*, "people especially thought of dealers in victuals, meat and drink,"²⁷ the *ἐμπορος* primarily handling grain, the *κάπηλος* trading chiefly in wine; (2) that the *ἐμπορος* usually traded by sea, but that this was not essential,²⁸ (3) that, contrary to Hasebroek's view, "it appears that also a trader with a ship of his own was usually called *ἐμπορος*, and that, if such a trader was called *ναύκληρος*, he was more looked upon as the owner of a ship than as a trader,"²⁹ and (4) that Hasebroek overemphasized the trading activities of the *ναύκληρος*, as against his primary occupation of shipowner.³⁰

Of all the views put forth, the most nearly tenable, in my judgment, is that of Paoli,³¹ who, after pointing out the usual distinctions, goes on to show that the standard modern translations (e.g., *ναύκληρος* = *Reeder, armateur, armatore*) are a monstrous combination of ancient and modern concepts.³² Rather than perpetuate such confusion, Paoli advocates the retention of the original Greek. Furthermore, he makes no attempt to evolve a scheme which will encompass all the various definitions and usages of antiquity, but merely cites these definitions and usages and their sources.

²⁶ In the work cited in n. 6, esp. pp. 46-47, 51-52, 96-98, and 114-18.

²⁷ His arrangement is by ancient authors. See Oertel's very pertinent criticism in his review in *Gnomon*, VI (1930), 37-39.

²⁸ He cites numerous passages in Plato and Aristophanes.

²⁹ His authority is Aristoph. *Ach.* 974.

³⁰ His authorities are Diels, 636; Aristoph. *Birds* 511; Thuc. i. 137. 2; Xen. *Oec.* viii. 12, *Anab.* vii. 5. 14, *Hell.* iii. 1. 1; and Plato *Epist.* 329E.

³¹ Ulrich Zehbarth, *Beiträge zur Geschichte des Handels und Seehandels im alten Griechenland* (Hamburg, 1927), pp. 45-48, agrees. He points especially to IG, I², 127 and 128, and *Iyeng.* c. *Lower*, 18.

³² Especially in his article, "Grandi e piccoli commercianti nelle liriche di Orazio," *Riv. di fil. e di instr. class.*, II (new ser., 1924), 45-63. See also his *Studi di diritto antico* (Firenze, 1930), pp. 23-24. In his brief article, "Armatore (nel diritto greco)," *Enciclop. ital.*, IV, 409, he seems to revert to the more current view of the matter; and more recently in his article, "L'autonomia del diritto commerciale nella Grecia classica," *Stu. del dir. com. e del dir. gov. d. obbligazioni*, XXXIII (1935), 36-54.

³³ The English term "shipowner" does not necessarily imply the same large scale of operations as do the German, French, and Italian words given, and may, therefore, be used as a translation of *ναύκληρος*.

Before attempting a critical examination of these theories, we should note that the ancient sources are so chaotic that it is almost impossible to present them in any systematic arrangement. It seems best to me to treat the passages in four main groups, subdivided according to the type of information they provide for our problem. For the moment, the scholia and lexica will not be considered at all.³³

The first group is concerned with the general term for "trade." On the one hand, we have those passages which indicate that the term is ἔμπορία.³⁴ On the other hand, there are a few cases where καπηλεία is clearly used as the generic word.³⁵ We may note especially the contradictions which are found within the works of the same author as follows: Plato in the *Republic* (260C-D and 525C) as against several other passages cited in note 34; page 1345a of the pseudo-Aristotelian *Oeconomica* as against pages 1345b and 1346a; the interchangeable use of the two terms by Isocrates in the letter to Nicoteles (§ 1); Aristotle in *Politics* 1256a-1258a as against 1258b.

The second group includes those passages which relate to the mari-

³³ Although I have attempted to examine every use of the words ναυκληρος, ἔμπορος, and κάρηλος in the literature and inscriptions of the fifth and fourth centuries, I do not cite passages such as IG, II², 1563-78, which throw no light (however dubious) on our problem.

³⁴ In Dem. xxiii. 1, 23 and lviii. 10, 53, laws are quoted which relate to the ναυκληρος and ἔμποροι, and in each case ἔμπορος is singled out as the generic term. In lvi. 10 he refers to a law about ναυκληροί and ἐπιδηροί, apparently used for ἔμποροι (most unusual, but cf. lvi. 24). Cf. Herod. iii. 130; Thuc. vi. 81. 5; and Aristot. *Pol.* 1258f. Plato, in several passages in which he is enumerating various occupations, uses ἔμπορία and ἐμπορεύω for trade (*Sympl.* 205A, *L'Acad.* 50E, *Polityca* 14E-15A, *Politicus* 267E); likewise Aristoph. *Peace* 296-98; Dem. xxiii. 140; and Aristot. *Oec.* 1345b-1346a. Isoc. ii. 1 and vii. 25 may also be mentioned here, for the interchangeable use of ἔμπορία and καπηλεία clearly indicates that he is referring to trade generally and not to one specific form. Of dubious value, but perhaps to be included in this group are Simonides, frag. 137 (Bergk); Aristoph. *Birds* 718; and Xen. *Moen.* iii. 4. 2 and *Hiero* ix. 9.

The only place where I find καπηλεία used in what seems to be the generic sense is in Xen. *Moen.* i. 6. 8, where Xenophon appears to be enumerating occupations: γεωργίας ἢ ναυκληρίας ἢ ἄλλ'. The exact meaning of ναυκληρία here is, however, not at all certain. Xenophon may have meant shipowning and not commerce.

³⁵ Above all, Isoc. ii. 1, already discussed in n. 34. Aristot. *Oec.* 1345a lists καπηλεία in a catalogue of occupations alongside of γεωργική (cf. *Pol.* 1320a), whereas Dem. xxiii. 140 and Xen. *Moen.* iii. 7. 6 use ἔμπορία in the same connection. Plato (*Itypob.* 525C) cautions against the acquisition of knowledge ὡς ἔμπορος ἢ καπηλός and then later, in the same sense, says merely μὴ τοῦ καπηλείου. Equally important is his use of κάρηλος in *Politicus* 260C-D; there it is undoubtedly the generic term and is to be contrasted with *Sophl.* 228C-D, where Plato makes a similar comment using the term ἔμπορος. The use of καπηλεία and καπηλική in Aristot. *Pol.* 1256a-1258a also seems clearly generic. See finally Herod. i. 94, ii. 35, 141, and iii. 89.

time aspect of trade. It is usually stated that the *ἐμποροὶ* engaged in interlocal trade by sea,³⁶ but there are a few cases where *ἐμπορία* is used to refer definitely either to land commerce or to purely sedentary trading.³⁷ Of particular importance here are those passages which mention the traders who follow the armies both to provide supplies for the soldiers and to buy up their booty. This type of dealer can hardly be classed with the merchants carrying on large-scale operations, but rather approaches the ordinary peddler, though not entirely. At any rate, although the sea is not an important factor in his activities,³⁸ yet *ἐμπορος* appears to be the regular term for this type of dealer³⁹ (although *κάπηλος* was also used).⁴⁰ Once again it is noteworthy that Plato, who provides us with the most definite statement that *ἐμπορία* was maritime commerce, nevertheless implies clearly in one passage that it need not be so limited; and Xenophon in one case uses *ἐμποροὶ* and in another *κάπηλοι* for traders who accompanied armies.

³⁶ Of prime importance in this group are the actual definitions by Plato (*Soph.* 223D and *Repub.* 371D) of *ἐμποροὶ* as going ἐξ ἑλλης εἰς ἑλλης πῶδες to buy and sell. Cf. *Soph.* 224A-C and *Levia* 949E; and *Lycourg.* *op. cit.* 14-15. Then we have mention of actual trips taken by *ἐμποροὶ* in *Lysias* xxxii. 25; *Isoc.* xvii. 4; *Dem.* xxxiv. *μενεῖν*, xlix. 31; *Lycourg.* *op. cit.* 55-57; and *Ditt.*, *Syll.* 3, No. 304. See further *Simonides* in *Anth. Gr.* vii. 354a; *Aeschylus* *op. cit.* *Rhet.*, III, 651, n. 10 (=Bergk, *frag.* 2); *Aristoph.* *Plut.* 1179-80; *Xen. Ger.* xx. 27-28, *Vect.* iii. 2-4; *Plato Critias* 117E; *Isoc.* i. 19, viii. 21, xvii. 37; *Lysias* xxii. 17; *Dem.* viii. 25; *Aristot.* *Ath. Pol.* 51, 4, *Pol.* 1327a; *Ephorus* *op. cit.* *Schol. Hes. Opera* 633 (=Jacoby, *Fr. Gr. Hcl.*, 70 F 100); *Plato* *op. cit.* *Plut. Theomist.* xxiii. 5 (=Kock, *frag.* 183); and *Ditt.*, *op. cit.* 3, No. 280—all of which refer to *ἐμποροὶ* generally in connection with the sea. Finally, note the commercial laws in *Dem.* xxxiii. 1 and l. 6, and the fact that originally the judges in the *δικὰς ἐμπορικῶν* were called *ναυτοδίκαι*.

³⁷ In *Repub.* 371A, Plato says ἐπεὶ μὲν γε κατὰ θάλατταν ἡ ἐμπορία γίγνηται, and the inference follows logically that *ἐμπορία* need not be carried on by sea; likewise *Xen. Vect.* i. 7, κατὰ γῆν δὲ πολλὰ δέχεσθαι ἐμπορία. *Thuc.* iii. 74. 2 tells of a fire in the Agora which destroyed the goods of many *ἐμποροὶ* (this could hardly refer to storage); cf. the use of *ἐμπορία* in *Aesacus* *Act.* x. 14. In *Xen. Hipparch.* iv. 7, the *ἐμποροὶ* mentioned are obviously engaged in interlocal trade, but by no means necessarily by sea. Cf. *Soph. Oed. Col.* 25, 303, 301, where *ἐμπορος* means traveler, and it is clear that the reference is to land travel. See also the passages cited in n. 13, where *ἐμπορος* and *κάπηλος* are used interchangeably.

³⁸ Although in *Thuc.* vi. 31. 5 and *Xen. Hell.* i. 6. 37, *ἐμποροὶ* accompanied soldiers on foreign expeditions to Sicily and Arginusae, respectively, and of course by boat. Cf. also *Thuc.* ii. 67. 4, vii. 24. 2.

³⁹ *Thuc.* ii. 67. 4, vi. 31. 5, vii. 24. 2; and *Xen. Ages.* i. 21, *Cyr.* vi. 2. 38-39, *Hell.* i. 6. 37.

⁴⁰ *Xen. Cyr.* iv. 5. 42, contrasted with *Cyr.* vi. 2. 38-39.

have
overlapped

Next is the group of passages regarding the distinction between *ναύκληροι* and *ἔμποροι*. The first subclass comprises those texts which indicate that the *ναύκληρος* was primarily a shipowner (the view of Knorringa and Ziebarth already quoted) transporting the wares of *ἔμποροι*.⁴¹ The second subdivision, by no means incompatible with the first, contains cases where *ναύκληροι* carried on trade for themselves.⁴² In none of these cases is it stated or even implied that they transported their own merchandise exclusively. Finally, there are the rare cases where *ἔμποροι* undoubtedly owned their own vessels.⁴³ It is worth noting that the majority of passages in group 3 are from Demosthenes' private orations and can unhesitatingly be accepted as indicative of ordinary usage, at least during the second half of the fourth century.

The fourth group concerns the *κάπηλοι*. In numerous cases they are shopkeepers,⁴⁴ or at least purely local dealers.⁴⁵ But in a few passages we find *κάπηλος* and *ἔμπορος* used quite interchangeably.⁴⁶ Once

⁴¹ Most important here are the cases of *ναύκληροι* who are actually named and who without question transport the wares of *ἔμποροι*, such as Hagestratos in Dem. xxxii. 3, 4, 5, Pylleios in Dem. xxxv. 10, 20, Dionysodoros and Parmeniskos in Dem. lvi *passim*, Lampis in Dem. xxxiv *passim*; also the anonymous *ναύκληρος* in Dem. xlii. 29, 40. Aeneas Tact. x. 12 apparently implies the same thing. Xenophon (*Mena.* ii. 6. 38 and iii. 9. 11) uses *ναύκληρος* to mean "shipowner" without reference to trade one way or another, but merely as distinguished from the pilot or captain; cf. Xen. *Veal.* iii. 14, *Anab.* vii. 2. 12; and Plato *Epist.* 349E.

⁴² Lysias vi. 49; Aristot. *Pol.* 1258b; Dem. xxxii. 1, lvi. 3. 34; and Lycurg. *op. cit.* 18. But Arist. *Rhet. ad Aliz.* 1424a, implies a distinction between *ναύκληρος* and *ἀγοραῖος*. Note the interchangeable use of *ναύκληρος* and *ἔμπορος* in Soph. *Philo.* 128, 547-49, where the character introduced as a spy passing for an *ἔμπορος* is referred to as being rigged out like a *ναύκληρος*. In Xen. *Oec.* viii. 12, it is impossible to decide whether the cargo does or does not belong to the *ναύκληρος*.

⁴³ Dem. viii. 26 and *Isoc.* xvii. 57.

⁴⁴ I cite uses of *κάπηλος*, *καπηλῆος*, etc., indiscriminately: Aristoph. *Plut.* 435, 1120-21, *Ecol.* 154, *Theos.* 347, 737, *Lys.* 400; Antiphanes *op. Athen.* i. 411B (= Kock, frag. 24); Eubulus *op. Athen.* xi. 473E (= Kock, frag. 80); Niostratus *op. Athen.* xv. 700B (= Kock, frag. 22); Lysias i. 24, frag. Teubner i. 3-5; *Isoc.* vii. 49, xv. 287; Theopompus *op. Athen.* xii. 525F (= Jacoby, *op. cit.*, 115 F 62); Plato *Laos* 918A; Diogenes Cyn. *op. Aristot. Rhet.* 1411a; Aeneas Tact. xxx. 1; and Dittb., *op. cit.*, No. 169 (from Iasos).

⁴⁵ Archippos *op. Athen.* vii. 227A (= Kock, frag. 26); Plato *Soph.* 223D, *Repub.* 371D, *Laos* 840C-D, and *Gorg.* 518B; and Theoph. *Char.* 6.

⁴⁶ Plato *Laos* 918B and *Isoc.* ii. 1 are clear proof. In two other passages—Plato *Soph.* 213D and *Protag.* 314A—the interchangeability of the two terms seems likely but is not entirely certain. Sophocles' use of *κάπηλος* to mean a Phoenician trader (*op. Schol. Pind. Pyth.* ii. 125 = Nauck, frag. 823) probably belongs here too. Of uncertain value are Plato's terms *φωχεμπορεύς* and *μαθηματοπωλετής* in *Soph.* 224B, D.

On the other hand, Plato *Laos* 910D; Lysias xii. 17-21; and Xen. *Veal.* iv. 6 clearly

more it must be pointed out that Plato here too disregards his own carefully drawn distinctions. It becomes clear that the inconsistencies are not merely variant usages by different authors, but are also to be found within the works of the same author, at times even in the same passage.⁴⁷

Now let us see what the various scholists and lexicographers did with this material. As indicated before, not much should be expected from them, and the very fact that the lexiua and scholia devote so much attention to these terms is in itself an indication that in their time fifth- and fourth-century usage of these words required explanation. A striking example of the confusion that existed is provided by Hesychius' terse definition (among others) of *ἐμπορος* as equivalent to *μέτοικος*, which has absolutely no basis in fact. Never, to my knowledge, do we find such synonymous use in the period we are considering.⁴⁸

The most important text of this type is the scholion to Aristophanes, *Plutus* 1155, where traders (*πωλοῦντες*) are subdivided into five kinds: the *αὐτοπώλης* who sells goods of his own production, the *κάπηλος* who buys from the *αὐτοπώλης* and sells his wares in the same locality (*χώρα*) where purchased, the *ἐμπορος* who sells abroad, the

imply that there is a distinction between the two, with which cf. Aristot. *Pol.* 1291a. Note the differentiation of *ἐμπορος* from *μετάβολος* implied in a fourth-century inscription from Chios (Collitz-Bechtel, IV, 875, n. 52, ll. 15-16); Thuc. vi. 31. 5, on the other hand, seems to imply synonymy of these two words.

* Two passages cannot be allocated to any of these groups but add to the mass of evidence, as follows: Plato *Lawe* 613D-E, *καπηλείας καὶ κεραιήριας καὶ ἄλλων νοσήσιον* . . . ; Aristoph. *Εἰσὶς* 981-96, *τὰς τ' ἐμπορίας τὰς κεφαλὰς πρὸς τὸν μάντιο καταρούσιν, ἑστ' ἀπολέσται τῶν κεραιήρων οὐδέτι.*

Most of the passages referring to the *ἕκαστα ἐμπορικά* are omitted in this discussion, for that would necessitate a thorough analysis of these courts, which cannot be made here. The absence of that small group of passages will in no way affect our results. One example will suffice to show that the situation with regard to the various other commercial terms which I do not take up is as confused as are the three which I do discuss: contrast Dem. xxxiii. 4 with lvii. 1 for different uses of *ἐργάσιμα*.

* Aeschin. i. 40, *ὅσα μὲν οὖν τῶν ἐμπορῶν ἢ τῶν ἄλλων ἕκαστα ἢ τῶν πολιτῶν τῶν ἡμετέρων*, seems to have such implications, but it is unique in the literature of this period and is undoubtedly to be explained by the use of *ἄλλος* to mean not "other" but "in addition," as in Plato *Gorg.* 473D, *πολιτῶν καὶ τῶν ἄλλων ἕκαστα* (cf. Aeschin. i. 163).

See also Suid., s.v. *κλαρόται*, where the equally ridiculous parallel is drawn between *μέτοικοι καὶ κλαροί, κλαρόται, κτλ.* Note the absence of *ἐμπορος* in Pollux iii. 51-60 (*περὶ πωλοῦν, ἕκαστα καὶ τῶν περὶ αὐτοῖς*), where every conceivable synonym for foreigner and metis is given. Hesychius' definition has, strangely enough, been given considerable weight by many scholars.

παλιγκάπηλος who buys from the ἔμπορος and resells, and the μεταβολαίς, the retailer who sells in very small quantities (κατὰ τὴν κοτύλην). This passage has been used as one of the main props for most of the classifications built up by modern scholars. But can it correctly be accepted as a trustworthy scheme of definitions applying to the usage of the fifth and fourth centuries B.C.? It should certainly be subjected to the same scrutiny as any of the modern definitions, and then, if accepted, it can be used only as confirmatory evidence in support of the fifth- and fourth-century sources.

When we examine these late sources using the same methods established above for the contemporary sources, the doubtful worth of such material quickly becomes apparent. It is curious that the scholiasts and lexicographers neglected the word ναύκληρος almost completely,⁴⁹ possibly because they considered its older use so similar to their own as to require no further explanation. Time and time again they define κάπηλος and ἔμπορος as ὁ πραγματευτής (a term not at all current in our period)⁵⁰ and then go on to qualify this equation with some more specific meaning.⁵¹ Can it be that they also recognized the indiscriminating uses of these terms to be found in earlier times? At any rate, we find both ἔμπορος and κάπηλος defined as the generic commercial term. Several passages connect the ἔμπορος with the sea,⁵² and a few say that the ἔμποροι used boats belonging to others.⁵³ We find many definitions of κάπηλος as the sedentary trader.⁵⁴ Thus far

⁴⁹ This is particularly noticeable in Pollux i. 80 (ἔμπορον καὶ ναυκλῆρον ἀνδραγα). iii. 124-25 (περὶ τοῦ πωλεῖν καὶ ἀνείσθαι), and in his discussion of ships, i. 82-125.

⁵⁰ The only place in fifth- and fourth-century literature where I find it used in some such sense is in Dem. xlv. 4. Phileas also mentions a παλαιῆμπορος, which I find nowhere in our sources.

⁵¹ Ἐμπορος: Hesych. and Suid., s.v.; *Etym. M.* 333. 20; Bachmann, *Anecd. Gr.*, i. 219. 1; Schol. Aristoph. *Frag.* 521 (and Ravenstein Schol.), 904, 1179.

Κάπηλος: Hesych. and Suid., s.v.; Bachmann, *Anecd. Gr.*, i. 267. 24 defines κάπηλος as μεταβολαίς, πραγματευτής without further qualification. Cf. Suid., s.v. ἀνδροποδὸς-κάπηλος, where he says περὶ τὸ ναυκλήσειν τὸ ἐκδράσασθαι ἢ ἐστὶν περιήκειν (similarly in *Harpor.*). Note the absence of ἔμπορος in Pollux vii. 8-9, 12 (περὶ τῶν ἐκ τοῦ ποικράκειν δουμάτων).

⁵² Suid. and Hesych. s.v.; Schol. Aristoph. *Frag.* 521 (and Ravenstein Schol.), 904, 1179.

⁵³ Hesych., Suid., and Zoacas s.v.; *Etym. M.* 336. 20; Bachmann, *Anecd. Gr.*, i. 219. 1.

⁵⁴ Suid., s.v. πανδοκίτρια, ταβερναία; Phot., s.v. ταβερναία; Schol. Aristoph. *Frag.* 426, 1155; Bachmann, *Anecd. Gr.*, i. 379. 26.

everything works beautifully according to system, but then we come to several passages where *ἐμπορος* and *κάπηλος* are used interchangeably. Thus, one of Suidas' definitions of *ἀνδραποδοκάπηλος* is *σωματέμπορος*;⁵⁰ and for *καπηλείας* he gives *ἐμπορείας*, as does Photius. Even more noticeable is the synonymy of *κάπηλος* with *μεταβολεύς*⁵¹—so much so, in fact, that the scholiast to Aristophanes (*Plutus* 1155) says that in his time *κάπηλος* is regularly used to express both concepts. It is scarcely worth while discussing or even noting their definitions and uses of *παλιγκάπηλος*, *ἀποπάλης*, and similar terms, and their statements about middlemen, etc.⁵² Only a perusal of the lexica themselves, and particularly of Suidas, can adequately indicate how much confusion actually exists in them. For exact definitions they are as useless as Roget's *Thesaurus*.

We are now in a position to criticize the views of Hasebroek and Knorrings. There are three general objections which affect the entire approach of these two scholars and which apply equally well to almost everyone else who has worked with this material. The first is the undue weight they place upon "evidence" from the scholia and lexica; some of their points are based entirely on such sources. The second is that none of their classifications has any place for large-scale trading operations by land. It is quite true that the sea played an overwhelmingly preponderant rôle in Greek economic life, and that land routes were avoided because of expense, the uncertainties of this form of travel, and the peculiar nature of the terrain with its innumerable mountains. Nevertheless, a certain amount of trade was carried on without recourse to waterways, and such traders, few as they might be, would find no place in the usual system of classification. A third

⁵⁰ Likewise in Harpoc. The scholiast to Aristoph. *Eu.* 1030 says *ἀνδραποδοστήν: σωματέμπορον . . .*, to which cf. Schol. Aristoph. *Plut.* 521.

⁵¹ Zonaras and Phot., s.v. *κάπηλος*; *Elym. M.* 490. 4; Bachmann, *Anecd. Gr.*, 1. 267. 24; Bekker, *Anecd. Gr.*, 1. 102. 16; Schol. Aristoph. *Peace* 447 (and Ravenius Schol.); Pollux iv. 48-51. But Pollux vii. 193 says *κάπηλος δὲ οὐ μόνον οἱ μεταβολεῖς ἀλλὰ καὶ . . .* Note in connection with the preceding discussion of *κάπηλος*=*ἐμπορος* the two definitions of *ἀνδραποδοκάπηλος*: *μεταβολεῖς ἀνδραπόδων* in Bachmann, *Anecd. Gr.*, 1. 86. 13 and in Hesych. s.v. Finally, note *μετάβολοι τετραγματοί* in Hesych. s.v. and in Bachmann, *Anecd. Gr.*, 1. 299. 3; and *παλιγκάπηλος: μεταβολεῖς* in Hesych. and Zonaras s.v., and *Elym. M.* 648. 60 (all three also equate *κάπηλος* with *μεταβολεῖς*).

⁵² I have not attempted to cite all the uses of these various terms to be found in the lexica and scholia but merely enough examples to indicate the situation.

objection to these systems is that none of them provides a place for such terms as ἀγοραῖος. I realize that to do so would be impossible, but rather than make such omissions I prefer not to classify at all.

Considering Haselbrock first, the following specific objections to his schema are presented:⁵⁸

1. There is not sufficient evidence to show that ἔμποροι, ναύκληροι, and κάπηλοι were all middlemen. In fact, whereas the first two from the nature of their commercial operations may be regarded as usually middlemen, the prevailing evidence would indicate that the κάπηλοι were primarily shopkeepers. Further, κάπηλος was the usual term for "shopkeeper,"⁵⁹ not μεταβολεὺς (as Haselbrock states), which occurs but rarely. We may safely say that the κάπηλοι were usually not middlemen, and we have at least one instance where the ἔμποροι were also shopkeepers in the Agora.⁶⁰ Similarly, Haselbrock's distinction between the κάπηλος who buys from the producer and the παλιγκάπηλος who buys from another trader breaks down because of the extreme rarity of the latter term.⁶¹ Nor does this rarity of παλιγκάπηλος indicate that the κάπηλοι bought their goods almost exclusively from producers. For if that were the case, what term would designate those middlemen to whom the large-scale operators disposed of their wares? Haselbrock himself carries this point to a *reductio ad absurdum* when he says of the κάπηλος that it is possible "that he generally did not come into contact with the consumers, but re-sold to the local retailers." This explanation would establish for antiquity a chain of dealers between producer and consumer which would be even more complicated and extensive than the middleman group of today.

2. Ἐμπορος may not be defined as "the trader without his own ship." Even though this was frequently the case, some ἔμποροι un-

⁵⁸ In the light of the preceding discussion, it does not seem necessary to examine the sources used by Haselbrock and Knorrings at this point. They have all been discussed elsewhere. My criticisms are based both on their specific citations and on the material which they failed to use.

⁵⁹ See n. 44.

⁶⁰ See n. 37.

⁶¹ Note the use of παλιγκάπηλος in connection with large-scale trading in Dem. lvi. 7. I could find but three uses of this word in all the literature of the fifth and fourth centuries; the other two are Aristoph. *Plut.* 1156 and Dem. xxv. 30. None of these passages gives any clue as to the specific denotation of παλιγκάπηλος; for that modern scholars have gone to the *lexica* and *scholia*. Knorrings (p. 118) thinks it was used "to express intense contempt," a purely fanciful interpretation which the evidence will not support.

questionably did own trading vessels, and, further, some carried on their operations by land.

3. The trading activity of the *ναύκληρος* was not his predominant one. On the other hand, I cannot subscribe to the thesis of Knorringa and Ziebarth that he was primarily a shipowner, but prefer to consider the two aspects as approximately equal in importance.⁶²

4. It is not definitely established that all three types are always to be distinguished from the producer. As usual, we have evidence on both sides of the question.

The following objections are to be made to Knorringa's views: (1) Granted that when the ancient authors employed the terms *ἐμπορος* and *κάπηλος* they "especially thought of dealers in victuals, meat and drink," this fact is not to be attributed to the terms themselves, but rather to the fact that food products, and particularly grain and wine, were the principal objects of ancient trade.⁶³ All the evidence clearly indicates that this commercial terminology took in every aspect of trade. (2) There is no ground for stating that "a trader with a ship of his own was usually called *ἐμπορος*." Although a few did own their ships, many (probably the majority) did not, and the *ναύκληροι* whose ships they employed as a rule transported their own commodities at the same time. (3) The *ναύκληρος* was not primarily a shipowner.

It seems to be clear that very few generalizations can be established from the available evidence as to the use of these commercial terms, and that in general we must limit ourselves to the statement that in some cases a given word was used in one way and in other cases differently. The following is a summary of my main conclusions, stated under eight main points:

1. The Greeks of the fifth and fourth centuries B.C. used *ἐμπορεύομαι* and its derivatives when they wished to express the concept "trade" in its widest sense. Occasionally, but less often, the term *καπηλεύειν* was also employed.

⁶² So also Huelin, cited in n. 18, who, however, adds a third aspect, ship-captain, which is palpably wrong.

⁶³ The same error quite frequently appears in the lexica and scholia. In them *κάπηλος* is often defined as "properly" a wine-seller. e.g. Suid., s.v. *κάπηλος*, *πανδοκέτρια*; Hesych., s.v. *καπηλείας*; Schol. Aristoph. *Plu.* 426, 435 (and Ravenna Schol. 435, 1063). They even suggest a false etymology to connect *κάπηλος* with wine. In this connection see also the letter of Aristippos in Hercher, *Epistolographai Graeci*, Socraticorum 11.

2. The use of *ναύκληρος* is apparently the only consistent one of all. It seems to have been limited to the man who owned a trading vessel, who frequently (perhaps usually) engaged in commerce himself and who rarely, if ever, transported only his own merchandise. There is enough evidence to show that the few passages which might be interpreted to mean that the *ναύκληρος* was only the captain or pilot and not the owner of a ship cannot be accepted in that sense.⁶⁴ It must be emphasized that *ναύκληρος* is the only one of these words to which we may assign a definite and exclusive meaning, namely, shipowner. But even here there are variations within that meaning.

3. The *ἔμπορος* was usually a maritime trader, but not necessarily so. Conversely, the *κάπηλος* was usually a local trader. Whereas there seems to be no actual case of a *κάπηλος* making a trading voyage, the occasional synonymous use of *κάπηλος* for *ἔμπορος* seems to indicate that this was not impossible.

4. Ἐμποροὶ usually transported their wares on boats belonging to others. A few are known, however, who owned their own ships. Since there was the technical term *ναύκληροι* for "shipowners," who often carried on commercial operations as well, we have further proof that it is impossible even to attempt a classification. Ἐμπορος and *ναύκληρος* obviously are used interchangeably in many cases,⁶⁵ yet there are many other cases where one term seems to include the other, and still other cases in which they are mutually exclusive.

5. The *κάπηλος* was commonly a retailer, perhaps usually so.

6. There is unfortunately little evidence as to how *ναύκληροι* and *ἔμποροι* disposed of their wares. From the fact that they were often interlocal, maritime traders, it seems logical to infer that they were usually wholesalers. It must be kept in mind, however, that the season for sea voyages was limited and that they would therefore have sufficient time during the winter in which to dispose of their

⁶⁴ Thus note that Plato constantly uses the pilot of a ship for purposes of illustration, yet not once does he use the term *ναύκληρος* in this connection, but always *κυβερνήτης*. Cf. Plato *Leuco* 707A and *Xen. Mem.* II. 9. 11. The only exceptions are *Soph. Antip.* 994 (where *ναυκληρεῖν* is used metaphorically for "to guide or direct a city") and a similar metaphor in *Aesch. Suppl.* 176-77.

⁶⁵ It is interesting to notice that in referring to Solon's trip to Egypt, Aristotle (*Ath. Pol.* II. 1) uses *ἔμπορία* and Plutarch (*Solon* 25) uses *ναυκληρία*.

goods at retail if they so desired. There is some evidence to show that this was occasionally done.⁵⁶

7. It seems likely that these three types were themselves, as a rule, not producers. Again we have a few definite statements to this effect,⁵⁷ but such evidence is canceled by the fact that neither the term *αὐτοπώλης* nor any other which clearly means "one who sells goods of his own production" appears except in rare instances.⁵⁸ On this point, perhaps, we are again forced to evade the issue. Some *ἐμπόροι*, etc., were probably producers and others were not, and the various terms were used indiscriminately to cover both cases.

8. Hasebroek is correct in stating that the basic distinction between *ἐμπόροι* and *κάπηλοι* is not that of retailer versus wholesaler but rather that of locale. How carefully the distinction was retained is another matter.

A subsequent study will deal with the same problems as they appear in the documents of Ptolemaic and Roman Egypt. It is very possible that the papyri, with their wealth of private and official documents, will produce more positive results than can be derived from the exclusively literary and epigraphical sources of the fifth and fourth centuries.

NEW YORK CITY

⁵⁶ Thus Thuc. iii. 74. 2; Aristoph. *AcA.* 974; and Aristot. *Occ.* 1347b. This also seems to be indicated by the use of *ἐμπορος* in a Carian inscription of the fourth century B.C. (Collitz-Buchler, IV, 875, n. 52).

⁵⁷ E.g., Heraclid. § 60 (frag. 611 Ross) and Plato *Gorg.* 517D.

⁵⁸ Another such expression is *δημοσγογῆς τοῦ αὐτοῦ τούτου* in Plato *Gorg.* 517D. Note that Aristoph. *Peace* 1208-9 introduces the *λοπατοῖς* with the words *καὶ γὰρ οὐνοὶ ἐπὶ τῶν κάπηλων* (cf. *ibid.* 446-47).