The Classical Quarterly 68.1 79–90 © The Classical Association (2018)
doi:10.1017/S0009838818000125

VIRTUE AND SELF-INTEREST IN XENOPHON'S *MEMORABILIA* 3.9.4–5

Are people at bottom motivated entirely by self-interest? Or do they act only sometimes out of self-interest, and sometimes for other reasons—say, to help out a friend for her own sake, with no expectation of being benefitted in return? Scholars have often thought they could discern in the works of classical Greek thinkers a commitment to *psychological egoism*, the thesis that one is motivated to act only by considerations of the expected benefits and harms that will accrue *to oneself*.[1] For instance, a host of influential interpreters have taken Plato to be wedded to psychological egoism throughout his corpus. Often, the commitment is thought to run so deep that Plato rarely, if ever, manages to articulate it explicitly, let alone to examine it critically and defend it.[2] That kind of approach obviously invites challenges, and lately there has been a small but growing resistance to the egoistic interpretation of Plato.[3] The challenges are especially welcome given the general lack of support for psychological egoism in the present intellectual climate: egoistic readings have increasingly seemed to imply a crippling weakness in the Platonic system.

Even the modest amount of recent dissent concerning Plato contrasts sharply with the state of scholarship on that other Socratic: Xenophon. Xenophon's Socrates is widely thought to commit himself to psychological egoism, and in no uncertain terms. In fact, we know of *no one* who dissents from that judgement, not even among those responsible for the current revival of interest in Xenophon's Socratic writings.[4]

[1] Notice that psychological egoism is a descriptive thesis about what motivations people actually have and are capable of having, not a prescriptive thesis about what *should* move people. (Egoistic prescriptive theses often go by the name *ethical egoism* or *rational egoism*.) Of course, such descriptive theses supply constraints for any prescriptive theses one might want to develop: if people are incapable of being motivated by any considerations other than those of self-interest, there is no sense developing an ethical theory demanding that they sometimes be motivated by other considerations.

[2] So G. Vlastos, *Socrates: Ironist and Moral Philosopher* (Ithaca, NY, 1991), 203 n. 14: '[For Socrates] desire for happiness is strictly self-referential: it is the agent's desire for his own happiness and that of no one else. This is so deep-seated an assumption that it is simply taken for granted: no argument is ever given for it in the Platonic corpus.'

[3] See D. Morrison, 'Happiness, rationality, and egoism in Plato's Socrates', in J. Yu and J.E. Gracia (edd.), *Rationality and Happiness: From the Ancients to the Early Medievals* (Rochester, NY, 2003), 17–34; R. Weiss, *The Socratic Paradox and Its Enemies* (Chicago, 2006); S. Ahbel-Rappe, 'Cross-examining happiness: reason and community in Plato's Socratic dialogues', in A. Nightingale and D. Sedley (edd.), *Ancient Models of Mind: Studies in Human and Divine Rationality* (Cambridge, 2010), 27–40; and S. Ahbel-Rappe, 'Is Socratic ethics egoistic?', *CPh* 107 (2012), 319–40.

[4] That is true even of some who have drawn the opposite conclusion when it comes to Plato's Socrates: Morrison (n. 3) argues that Plato's Socrates is not committed to psychological egoism, but he concludes that Xenophon's Socrates clearly is. This is all the more striking because elsewhere Morrison reports having drawn the latter conclusion reluctantly, thinking psychological egoism an

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838818000125 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Strikingly, the judgement is founded on a single piece of 'direct' evidence, a sole passage in which Xenophon's Socrates has been taken to espouse egoism. Our goal is to show that the passage can be read in a way implying no such commitment. We shall argue that the position Socrates takes depends on a background thesis, one that Socrates acknowledges indirectly but clearly and that is alone enough to explain why he says what he does. The proponent of an egoistic reading must acknowledge the same background thesis and goes wrong in supposing that there is any clear statement of egoism in the text. Egoism is thus both superfluous and unwarranted as an interpretative device. Since it is likewise unsupported by anything else in the corpus of Xenophon's writings, the egoistic reading can and should be jettisoned.

The passage in question is Xen. *Mem*. 3.9.4. Since its translation and interpretation are controversial, we quote it in Greek and then discuss.[5]

σοφίαν δὲ καὶ σωφροσύνην οὐ διώριζεν, ἀλλὰ τὸ[6] τὰ μὲν καλά τε καὶ ἀγαθὰ γιγνώσκοντα χρῆσθαι αὐτοῖς καὶ τὸ τὰ αἰσχρὰ εἰδότα εὐλαβεῖσθαι σοφόν τε καὶ σώφρονα ἔκρινε. προσερωτώμενος δὲ εἰ τοὺς ἐπισταμένους μὲν ἃ δεῖ πράττειν, ποιοῦντας δὲ τἀναντία σοφούς τε καὶ ἀκρατεῖς[7] εἶναι νομίζοι, 'οὐδέν γε μᾶλλον', ἔφη, 'ἢ ἀσόφους τε καὶ ἀκρατεῖς· πάντας γὰρ οἶμαι προαιρουμένους ἐκ τῶν ἐνδεχομένων ἃ οἴονται συμφορώτατα αὐτοῖς εἶναι, ταῦτα πράττειν· νομίζω οὖν τοὺς μὴ ὀρθῶς πράττοντας οὔτε σοφοὺς οὔτε σώφρονας εἶναι.'

The passage begins with the narrator's contention that Socrates 'did not differentiate wisdom and moderation' and instead 'distinguished a wise and moderate person in virtue of his doing what is estimable upon recognizing it and avoiding what is shameful

unfortunate but undeniable feature of Xenophon's Socratic works: see D. Morrison, 'Remarques sur la psychologie morale de Xénophon', in M. Narcy and A. Tordesillas (edd.), *Xénophon et Socrate: Actes du Colloque d'Aix-en-Provence (6–9 novembre 2003)* (Paris, 2008), 11–28, at 14. For other important ascriptions of psychological egoism to Xenophon, see A. Delatte, *Le troisième livre des* Souvenirs socratiques *de Xénophon*, *Étude critique* (Paris, 1933), 116–17; L.-A. Dorion, '*Akrasia* et *enkrateia* dans les *Mémorables* de Xénophon', *Dialogue* 42 (2003), 645–72, at 651; N. Denyer, *Plato: Protagoras* (Cambridge, 2008), 129 and 185; M. Bandini and L.-A. Dorion, *Xénophon: Mémorables*, Tome 2, 1re partie [Livres II–III] (Paris, 2011), 347 n. 5; and D.M. Johnson, 'From generals to gluttony: *Memorabilia* Book 3', in A. Stavru and C. Moore (edd.), *Socrates and the Socratic Dialogue* (Leiden, 2018), 481–99, at 493.

[5] Except where indicated, all quotations and references are to the *Memorabilia* and follow the recent Budé editions: see M. Bandini and L.-A. Dorion, *Xénophon: Mémorables*, Tome 1 [Introduction générale, livre I] (Paris, 2010[3]; 2000[1]); Bandini and Dorion (n. 4); and M. Bandini and L.-A. Dorion, *Xénophon: Mémorables*, Tome 2, 2e partie [Livre IV] (Paris, 2011).

[6] The text of the first sentence is a well-known crux. The MSS are divided between reading τὸ … τὸ and τὸν … τὸν, while Heindorf (whose reading is accepted by the Budé) proposes τῷ … τῷ. Despite the hesitant defence of τὸν … τὸν in Delatte (n. 4), 113–15, we continue to think that it makes the combinations of participle and infinitive too difficult to explain. Both of the other readings are awkward; but if one adopts τὸ … τὸ and interprets the infinitival clauses introduced by the articles as accusatives of respect, Heindorf's emendation seems unnecessary. In any event, the general sense of the passage is not in dispute, and the proposed variants do not measurably affect the interpretation we go on to offer.

[7] In the OCT (*Xenophontis Opera Omnia*, vol. 2 [Oxford, 1921[2]; 1901[1]]), E.C. Marchant adopts ἀκρατεῖς, though he apparently changes his mind and prints ἐγκρατεῖς in his Loeb edition (E.C. Marchant, O.J. Todd and J. Henderson, *Xenophon: Memorabilia, Oeconomicus, Symposium, Apology* [Cambridge, MA, 2013] [E.C. Marchant and O.J. Todd (edd.), 1923[1]]). Oddly, Marchant still translates his OCT text in the Loeb edition (a translation retained in the recent revision). Despite the popularity of ἐγκρατεῖς among earlier editors (on which, see Delatte [n. 4], 115 n. 3), it has the thinnest of manuscript support, appearing only in S (Ambr. E 11 inf.), where it is also corrected.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838818000125 Published online by Cambridge University Press

when he knows it.'[8] An imagined interlocutor then pursues the issue by asking whether Socrates would consider σοφούς τε καὶ ἀκρατεῖς those people who know how they should act but do the opposite. This is effectively to offer a counterexample to the position that wisdom and moderation are not to be differentiated: here is a case in which they come apart. Socrates responds by rejecting the suggestion that the people in question are wise, and he offers by way of explanation the lines that are typically taken as a clear expression of egoism.

Three preliminary terminological comments will help forestall some possible misunderstandings as to what we think is at stake in this exchange.

(1) The adjective ἀκρατής does not here mean 'weak-willed', and the present passage is not referring to the range of phenomena that interpreters have become accustomed to discuss, following Aristotelian usage, as cases of *akrasia*.[9] Xenophon consistently uses the adjective to mean 'self-indulgent' or 'dissolute' or 'licentious', exactly as Aristotle uses the term ἀκόλαστος.[10] Someone is ἀκρατής just in case he is wont to engage in excessive pleasure-seeking with no concern for what is right.[11]

(2) The term σωφροσύνη designates a particular moral virtue, the one paradigmatically associated with a proper attitude toward bodily pleasure. The issue of how σωφροσύνη is related to what is designated by the term ἐγκράτεια is a complex one given the range of relevant texts. Our view is that there is no hard and fast distinction. Xenophon tends to prefer σωφροσύνη when he is stressing the

[8] Rather than follow the common practice of identifying the narrator of the *Mem*. with its author, we hold that the narrator is a fictional character—in effect, the ideal Socratic. Nothing in our argument turns on that point, but we shall subsequently avoid presupposing that Xenophon is the narrator.

[9] See Dorion (n. 4), 658–9 and *passim*; and cf. Bandini and Dorion (n. 5 [Tome 2, 2e partie]), 170–1 n. 2. The point was made earlier by Vlastos (n. 2), 100–1, but his argument depended on the misjudgement that interpreting ἀκρασία to mean 'incontinence' would create a conflict between 3.9.5, where the possibility of knowledge-based incontinence is effectively denied, and 4.5.6, where it would be affirmed openly. The problem actually lies in Vlastos's translation of 4.5.6, where he took Socrates to be declaring that ἀκρασία 'often so stuns men that, though perceiving both the good and the bad, it makes them do the worse instead of the better' (πολλάκις αἰσθανομένους τῶν ἀγαθῶν τε καὶ τῶν κακῶν ἐκπλήξασα [οὐ δοκεῖ] ποιεῖν τὸ χεῖρον ἀντὶ τοῦ βελτίονος αἱρεῖσθαι;). What Socrates says is better understood as an assertion that ἀκρασία 'often so stuns their perception of good and evil that they choose the worse instead of the better' (Marchant). (Hence the immediately preceding remark in the same sentence: ἢ οὐ δοκεῖ [*sc*. ἡ ἀκρασία] σοι προσέχειν τε τοῖς ὠφελοῦσι καὶ καταμανθάνειν αὐτὰ κωλύειν, ἀφέλκουσα ἐπὶ τὰ ἡδέα … ;) Read that way, the passage no longer conflicts with 3.9.5 regardless of the interpretation of ἀκρασία upon which one relies. None the less, we think that the context of 4.5.6–7 best supports taking ἀκρασία to designate self-indulgence rather than weakness of will. For discussion of the relevant issues, see Bandini and Dorion (n. 5 [Tome 2, 2e partie]), 172 n. 6 and 173–6 nn. 8–9.

[10] Aristotle distinguishes the ἀκρατής from the ἀκόλαστος at *Eth. Nic.* 7.8 (and concisely at 7.9.1152a4–6): both pursue bodily pleasure, but only the latter thinks this to be what he ought to pursue. Like Aristotle's ἀκόλαστος, Xenophon's ἀκρατής does not feel conflicted in pursuing pleasure. Xenophon himself infrequently uses ἀκόλαστος and cognates. In the several occurrences outside the Socratic works it means 'unpunished'. The sole case in the Socratic works is *Mem*. 2.1.1, where the phrase ἀκολαστοτέρως ἔχοντα ('rather undisciplined') offers a polite way of describing the indulgent tendencies of Socrates' friend Aristippus.

[11] Delatte's (n. 4) interpretation of the passage is based on exactly the misunderstanding we are cautioning against. Note especially his citation of Aristotelian passages (*Eth. Nic.* 7.3.1145b25 and *[Mag. Mor.]* 2.6.1200b25) as evidence in favour of retaining the first occurrence of ἀκρατεῖς (115–6 n. 3)—a correct decision (see n. 7 above), though one made on faulty grounds. Despite the accurate accounts of the meaning of ἀκρατεῖς given by Dorion, the mistake persists in Denyer's commentary on the *Protagoras* (n. 4), 122 (on 329c7–d1). For a similar misinterpretation, see F. Bevilacqua, *Memorabili di Senofonte* (Turin, 2010), 143–4.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838818000125 Published online by Cambridge University Press

intellectual component of the relevant virtue. (Besides 3.9.4, see 1.2.17 and 4.5.6–7.) Crucially, however, both σωφροσύνη and ἐγκράτεια operate on a continuum, designating anything from a partial ability for self-discipline to a relatively complete form of self-mastery.[12] Thus σωφροσύνη is used as a virtue-term in 3.9.4, and in 1.2.17–18 it designates what Socrates was concerned to teach others; but in the latter passage we are also told that both Critias and Alcibiades σωφρονοῦντε when they were in Socrates' company.[13] As for ἐγκράτεια, it can refer to the discipline practised by someone training to be virtuous.[14] Yet, it is also at points used of a relatively advanced form of self-mastery. At 4.8.11, the narrator speaks of Socrates as φρόνιμος, but he *also* refers to him in the same context—one in which he is enumerating Socrates' virtues—as ἐγκρατής. Elsewhere (notably 1.2.1 and 1.5.6) he likewise stresses Socrates' ἐγκράτεια, and at 1.5.1 he calls ἐγκράτεια a καλόν τε κἀγαθὸν ἀνδρὶ κτῆμα.[15]

(3) At the beginning of 3.9.4, we are told that Socrates 'did not differentiate' σωφροσύνη from wisdom. We take Socrates to be staking out an intellectualist thesis about virtue by identifying σωφροσύνη with a kind of wisdom. Thus in the opening sentence of 3.9.5 'justice and every other form of virtue' are said to *be* wisdom. (Socrates is not there identifying the virtues with one another by way of identifying them all with wisdom any more than he would be identifying the crafts with one another if he said 'Ship-building is knowledge, and so is every other craft'.[16] Rather, he is saying that each virtue, σωφροσύνη included, is a form

[12] For an even stronger statement of the interchangeability of the two terms, see the introduction by Bandini and Dorion (n. 5 [Tome 1]), 87–9 n. 91, and cf. Dorion (n. 4), 652–3.

[13] The treatment of those figures in *Mem*. 1.2 merits a thorough discussion, especially in view of the comments at 1.2.19–23 regarding the possibility that one may lose whatever virtue one has acquired. Yet, we take it as relatively clear that neither Critias nor Alcibiades is represented as having achieved anything close to complete possession of the virtue. Hence 1.2.39: Κριτίας δὲ καὶ Ἀλκιβιάδης οὐκ ἀρέσκοντος αὐτοῖς Σωκράτους ὠμιλησάτην ὃν χρόνον ὠμιλείτην αὐτῷ, ἀλλ' εὐθὺς ἐξ ἀρχῆς ὡρμηκότε προεστάναι τῆς πόλεως. (Compare 1.2.14–16.)

[14] See, for example, 2.1.1. Compare also 1.2.24 (τῶν μὴ καλῶν ἐπιθυμιῶν κρατεῖν), which should be read with 1.2.18 (σωφρονοῦντε).

[15] At 1.5.4–5 Socrates speaks in a way that has been taken to suggest clearly that ἐγκράτεια is a precondition for virtue but not itself a virtue: ἆρά γε οὐ χρὴ πάντα ἄνδρα, ἡγησάμενον τὴν ἐγκράτειαν ἀρετῆς εἶναι κρηπῖδα, ταύτην πρῶτον ἐν τῇ ψυχῇ κατασκευάσασθαι; τίς γὰρ ἂν ἄνευ ταύτης ἢ μάθοι τι ἀγαθὸν ἢ μελετήσειεν ἀξιολόγως; (See e.g. G. Seel, 'If you know what is best, you do it: Socratic intellectualism in Xenophon and Plato', in L. Judson and V. Karasmanis [edd.], *Remembering Socrates: Philosophical Essays* [Oxford, 2006], 20–49, at 34; and D. Morrison, 'Xenophon's Socrates on sophia and the virtues', in L. Rossetti and A. Stavru [edd.], *Socratica 2008: Studies in Socratic Literature* [Bari, 2010], 227–40, at 234–5.) However, the foundations of a building are just as much part of the building as the walls and the roof, and Socrates' remark that one should pursue ἐγκράτεια 'first' may simply underscore the idea, implicit in the metaphor of a foundation, that without ἐγκράτεια no other virtue is possible. What's more, the idea that no valuable learning is possible without it does not imply that it is not a type of learning. Compare the case of someone who says: 'You'll never learn anything (else) unless you learn your letters.' (Other relevant passages, notably 4.5.1–2 and 4.5.7–9, can also be read along much the same lines.)

[16] For some references to proponents of the view that Socrates here identifies the virtues with one another, see Bandini and Dorion (n. 4), 351 n. 12. Socrates' contention that all the virtues are forms of wisdom is silent on the question of the unity of the virtues in so far as it does not indicate whether the possession of one relevant form of knowledge entails the possession of any other. Dorion makes a similar point, but he goes further and maintains that 4.6 (esp. 4.6.7) implies that the relevant forms of knowledge are not mutually entailing. (See Bandini and Dorion [n. 4], 351–4 n. 12 and [n. 5 (Tome 2, 2e partie)], 192–4 n. 6.) We do not think that 4.6 speaks clearly to the issue. Dorion's interpretation of that chapter is central to the position he takes concerning 3.9.4–5 in his (n. 4).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838818000125 Published online by Cambridge University Press

of wisdom.[17]) Accordingly, Socrates' attempts to make a person σωφρονέστερος typically involve a heavy dose of dialectical argument as well as instruction by example.[18]

With those points in view, let us now look carefully at the way in which Socrates defends his position in response to the interlocutor's objection that someone might be wise while lacking σωφροσύνη and instead being ἀκρατής. Socrates begins his response thus: οὐδέν γε μᾶλλον, ἔφη, ἢ ἀσόφους τε καὶ ἀκρατεῖς. That short remark has occasioned a good deal of scholarly wrangling, and addressing the controversy will be crucial for understanding the force of the position that Socrates goes on to take. In an extensive review of earlier interpretations, Delatte argued that parallel uses of οὐδέν γε μᾶλλον (ἤ) at *Mem*. 3.12.1 and *Oec*. 12.18 require one to interpret the construction as meaning 'no more F than G', in the sense 'neither F nor G'.[19] The difficulty of such an interpretation is that Socrates would then seem to be saying that the people at issue are *neither wise and self-indulgent nor ignorant and self-indulgent.* Yet, in the final clause of 3.9.4, Socrates asserts that such people are neither wise nor moderate; and it is clear from the further discussion in 3.9.5 that he in fact considers them ignorant. In order to resolve the tension thus created, Delatte proposed emending the text of the clause governed by the οὐδὲν μᾶλλον-construction, reading ἐγκρατεῖς in place of ἀκρατεῖς: it would be just as absurd to suppose that someone can be wise and self-indulgent as it would be to suppose that he can be unwise *and self-controlled*.[20]

Delatte's proposal has met with little acceptance,[21] but compelling alternatives are difficult to find in the literature. Some translators and interpreters render οὐδὲν μᾶλλον ἤ as 'no more than' (or something similar) and thereby seem to adopt without comment a version of the reading that Delatte rightly deems unworkable.[22] Other

[17] Morrison (n. 15), 228–9 agrees that justice and every other virtue are identified as kinds of wisdom at 3.9.5, but he thinks that σωφροσύνη in 3.9.4 is moral virtue as a whole and is being identified with moral wisdom as a whole. The other virtues are thus parts of σωφροσύνη/wisdom. Dorion, by contrast, thinks that σωφροσύνη is a particular virtue, coordinate with justice and the others. (See Bandini and Dorion [n. 4], 344 n. 13.) Yet, he argues that οὐ διώριζεν must mean 'does not separate' rather than 'does not differentiate', and he explains the phrase as asserting that σωφροσύνη and wisdom are mutually entailing.

[18] See 4.3, *passim*; 4.5.1; 4.5.11–4.6.1; and cf. 4.6.15, 4.8.11.

[19] See Delatte (n. 4), 118 with n. 1. Delatte argues against another reading of the construction, whereby it means 'equally F and G'. For that interpretation, see A. Döring, *Die Lehre des Sokrates als sociales Reformsystem. Neuer Versuch zür Lösung des Problems der sokratischen Philosophie* (Munich, 1895), 182. (For illustration of the two competing readings of the οὐ μᾶλλον-construction among the pre-Socratics, see P. DeLacy, 'οὐ μᾶλλον and the antecedents of ancient scepticism', *Phronesis* 3 [1958], 59–71, at 60.) Delatte is correct to reject Döring's reading, since it would have the implication that the person under discussion is equally wise and unwise. While one could possibly make sense of such a thought—say, by supposing that the person is wise in the sense of knowing what should be done but unwise in the sense of none the less preferring what he takes to be in his interests—Socrates will go on at the end of 3.9.4 and in 3.9.5 to deny wisdom of any sort to a person who divorces his interests from his sense of what should be done. We discuss his reasons in what follows. For recent treatment of later philosophical uses of the οὐ μᾶλλον-construction, see (in addition to DeLacy) R. Bett, *Pyrrho, his Antecedents, and his Legacy* (Oxford, 2000), 30–3.

[20] See Delatte (n. 4), 116–17. Note that this emendation concerns a different use of ἀκρατεῖς from the one discussed in n. 7.

[21] It is in fact dismissed as 'francamente assurdo' in Bevilacqua (n. 11), 253.

[22] See, for instance, the translation by H. Tredennick and R. Waterfield, *Xenophon: Conversations of Socrates* (New York, 1990), where Socrates responds as follows to the question whether he would think the people under discussion 'wise and weak' (note the mistranslation of ἀκρατεῖς): 'No more than I think them unwise and weak … . So I think that those who act wrongly are neither wise nor prudent.'

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838818000125 Published online by Cambridge University Press

translations are hardly more viable.[23] We consider the correct approach to be the one adopted by Marchant in his Loeb translation: 'No; not so much that, as both unwise and vicious.' Against it, Seel has recently revived Delatte's contention that the meaning of οὐδὲν μᾶλλον must accord with the other instances of the same construction in Xenophon.[24] However, the supposed parallels are crucially different in a way that has gone unappreciated. Both of them involve a comparison of different things. That is, they take the form either 'x is F no more than y is F' (*Mem*. 3.12.1) or 'x can do F no more than y can do G' (*Oec*. 12.18). Yet, in the present case, Socrates is comparing competing descriptions *of the same thing*: 'I would think x is F οὐδὲν μᾶλλον ἢ I would think x is G.' In a comparison of that sort, μᾶλλον ἤ can take on the meaning 'rather than' or 'in preference to', and we submit that it does so here.[25] In other words, Socrates is saying, 'I do not think the description "x is F" holds any attraction as compared with "x is G".' Or, filling in the relevant content: 'I wouldn't find [your characterization] preferable to saying "*unwise* and self-indulgent".'

Socrates' response initially has the air of a paradox: how can a person who knows what it is right to do be considered *unwise*? The answer is, of course, that Socrates resists not only the interlocutor's judgement about the situation but also his underlying description of it.[26] There cannot be a person such as the interlocutor describes: someone who is ἀκρατής cannot at the same time be wise.

Socrates proceeds to explain his position thus: πάντας γὰρ οἶμαι προαιρουμένους ἐκ τῶν ἐνδεχομένων ἃ οἴονται συμφορώτατα αὑτοῖς εἶναι, ταῦτα πράττειν· νομίζω οὖν τοὺς μὴ ὀρθῶς πράττοντας οὔτε σοφοὺς οὔτε σώφρονας εἶναι. Marchant offers the following translation: 'For I think that all men have a choice between various courses, and choose and follow the one which they think conduces most to their advantage. Therefore, I think that those who follow the wrong course are neither wise nor prudent.' Here we dissent, at least as regards the first sentence. All the other translations we have consulted follow much the same practice,[27] and this remark is what interpreters have taken as an announcement of psychological egoism. We propose to read the remark differently, so that the participle προαιρουμένους is not coordinate with the main verb

[23] Dorion's translation in the Budé edition (n. 4) treats the remark as if the adjectives ἀσόφρους and ἀκρατεῖς were being compared with one another: 'Ils ne sont pas moins dépourvus de savoir que de maîtrise de soi.' We cannot see how the grammar warrants such an approach. Bevilacqua (n. 11) translates: 'Non li ritengo niente di più che ignoranti e incapaci di dominarsi.' Yet, it is difficult to explain how rendering οὐδὲν μᾶλλον ἤ as 'nothing more than' connects the thought adequately with the preceding question, represented by εἰ … νομίζοι. (A translation similar to Bevilacqua's is offered by C. Natali, 'Socrates' dialectic in Xenophon's *Memorabilia*', in L. Judson and V. Karasmanis [edd.], *Remembering Socrates: Philosophical Essays* [Oxford, 2006], 3–19, at 8: 'I think that they are nothing more than both unwise and lacking in self-control.')

[24] Seel (n. 15), 38.

[25] For such a meaning, see, for instance, Thuc. 2.87.2 (cited in LSJ): καὶ οὐχὶ ἐς ναυμαχίαν μᾶλλον ἢ ἐπὶ στρατείαν ἐπλέομεν ('we made the voyage not to fight a sea battle but for a land-engagement').

[26] Seel (n. 15), 38 ignores this point and thus condemns a reading like Marchant's as awkward.

[27] Bandini and Dorion (n. 4): 'je crois en effect que tous les hommes choisissent, parmi les actions possibles, celles d'ont ils s'imaginent qu'elles leur apportent le plus d'avantages, et que ce sont celles-là qu'ils font …' . Tredennick and Waterfield (n. 22): 'I presume that everyone acts by choosing from the courses open to him the one which he supposes to be most expedient.' Bevilacqua (n. 11): 'Credo infatti che tutti gli uomini, quando scelgono tra le varie possibilità, fanno ciò che ritengono più utile per loro.' (Cf. also p. 139 of her edition.) G. Boys-Stones and C. Rowe, *The Circle of Socrates: Readings in the First-Generation Socratics* (Indianapolis, 2013), 86–7 (adapting a translation by K. Sanders): 'I think that everyone chooses what he takes to be the most expedient among his available options and acts accordingly.'

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838818000125 Published online by Cambridge University Press

πράττειν, as the other translations have it. Instead, the participle describes the circumstances under which the action of that verb occurs. We translate the whole: 'You see, I think that all people, when selecting from the range of possibilities those they think most beneficial for themselves, will do just those things. So I consider those who don't act rightly to be neither wise nor moderate.' Read thus, Socrates' point is the restricted one that *in those cases in which a person is committed to pursuing her advantage*, she will always act according to her best judgement of what it is. Nothing is said to deny that on other occasions she might follow different principles.

Why does Socrates restrict his remark that way? And why does he make the seemingly tautologous assertion that in cases in which a person is committed to pursuing her advantage, she will always act according to her best judgement of what it is? Here it is crucial to keep in mind the context—namely, Socrates' concern with correcting his interlocutor's suggestion about the self-indulgent person. Someone whose primary inclination is to engage in self-indulgent behaviour just is someone who is motivated to pass over actions she takes to be somehow right in favour of those that prove immediately satisfying. She considers her behaviour to promote her own advantage, and she makes this conception of her advantage the primary consideration in her deliberations. But Socrates thinks that the self-indulgent person is *wrong* about her welfare, and that is why he is concerned to look at her as one instance of the broader type. The interlocutor has proposed that she is wise but self-indulgent: wise because she recognizes both what it is right to do and what is in her interest; self-indulgent because she chooses the latter in preference to the former. However, Socrates insists that she is instead *un*wise and self-indulgent. With his seemingly tautologous remark, he is emphasizing that her mistake is not a failure to act on the results of her deliberation: no person committed to pursuing her self-interest would do that. Instead, her mistake is a misguided conception of her interest. Despite her inability to see as much, what it is right to do and what is in her interest in fact coincide.

In support of that line of interpretation, note Socrates' reference toward the end of his response to τοὺς μὴ ὀρθῶς πράττοντας. Coming after the comment about self-interested deliberators, it clearly refers to those who fail to assess their interests correctly; but it *also* picks up on the interlocutor's description of those who do not do what they should (ἃ δεῖ πράττειν), where what is in view is some general conception of the rightness of action. The self-indulgent person makes a factual mistake in prying interest apart from right conduct, and then compounds the mistake by choosing, between the two options she has set for herself, the one that is neither what is right to do nor what is really in her interest. Had she been wise, she would have recognized that there is at bottom no trade-off between interest and obligation, and thus no division between wisdom and moderation.

On that interpretation, Socrates advocates a radical thesis: doing what is right is good not simply for others but for the agent herself. Plato's Socrates is well known for holding such a view.[28] Xenophon's holds a version of it no less strongly. Consider 1.5.3, where Socrates states the thesis with regard specifically to the ἀκρατής:

καὶ γὰρ οὐχ ὥσπερ οἱ πλεονέκται τῶν ἄλλων ἀφαιρούμενοι χρήματα ἑαυτοὺς δοκοῦσι πλουτίζειν, οὕτως ὁ ἀκρατὴς τοῖς μὲν ἄλλοις βλαβερός, ἑαυτῷ δ' ὠφέλιμος, ἀλλὰ κακοῦργος μὲν τῶν ἄλλων, ἑαυτοῦ δὲ πολὺ κακουργότερος, εἴ γε κακουργότατόν ἐστι μὴ μόνον τὸν οἶκον τὸν ἑαυτοῦ φθείρειν, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὸ σῶμα καὶ τὴν ψυχήν.

[28] Perhaps the fullest expression and most vigorous defence of it occurs at Pl. *Grg.* 466a–481b. It is arguably also the main thesis of the *Republic*.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838818000125 Published online by Cambridge University Press

The greedy seem to enrich themselves by robbing everyone else of what they have, but the self-indulgent person is not thus harmful to others while being beneficial to himself. No, he does evil to everyone else and does himself even greater evil, if in fact the greatest of evils is not just to ruin one's household but also one's body and soul.

Bracket for the moment the issue of the greedy person's profiting at the expense of others. Socrates is clear that the self-indulgent person harms himself. In fact, that is a running theme in his conversations. One might think of the exchanges between Socrates and Antiphon (1.6), where Socrates rebuts Antiphon's characterization of him as a 'teacher of misery' (1.6.3). He does so precisely by defending the beneficial effects of a life of restraint and by rejecting as slavish and unhealthy Antiphon's own preference for a life of 'delicacy and extravagance' (τρυφὴν καὶ πολυτέλειαν, 1.6.10). Or one might think of Socrates' lengthy conversation with his self-indulgent friend Aristippus, whom Socrates patiently encourages to cultivate self-control (2.1). In the process, Socrates undercuts Aristippus' idea that devoting oneself to one's own desires and refraining from the trouble of political engagement is the path to a life of freedom. Instead, the more laborious path is a more promising route to a free and gratifying life—a lesson that Socrates famously drives home by recounting at length Prodicus' tale of the Choice of Heracles. And the list of passages could go on.

In 1.5, Socrates points out more succinctly but no less emphatically how poorly the self-indulgent person fares. A person of that sort is not one to succeed at serious projects, such as leading an army, or educating children, or managing an estate. He is physically and psychologically unhealthy besides, and he is unsuited to close friendship. Whatever happiness he expects to gain by his behaviour is thus illusory.

Socrates' comparative remark about the greedy is somewhat more difficult to interpret. Perhaps he means to emphasize that the greedy only seem to enrich themselves by robbing others. Or perhaps he allows that they really do enrich themselves. Either way, Socrates would surely deny that their unjust grasping benefits rather than harms them. It may take some effort to see precisely why. By contrast to the hangovers and failures of the self-indulgent, the actions of the greedy may not produce outward signs of their self-inflicted harm. Yet, once one realizes that wealth is no determinant of happiness, one can see how misdirected their efforts in fact are.[29]

In contrast to the greedy and the self-indulgent, the person who knows what is right will understand that she cannot promote her interests by vicious means, and so she will have no deliberative motivation to follow anything but the virtuous course. To be sure, Socrates does not express the point with full generality in 1.5.3 or, for that matter, in 3.9.4. In both passages he makes his point by focussing only on the paradigm case of the person who lacks ἐγκράτεια. But that he holds the thesis in broad form—as regards all the virtues—is evident from 3.9.5, which fills out the line of thinking begun in 3.9.4. There, Socrates' views are reported as follows:

ἔφη δὲ καὶ τὴν δικαιοσύνην καὶ τὴν ἄλλην πᾶσαν ἀρετὴν σοφίαν εἶναι. τά τε γὰρ δίκαια καὶ πάντα ὅσα ἀρετῇ πράττεται καλά τε καὶ ἀγαθὰ εἶναι· καὶ οὔτ' ἂν τοὺς ταῦτα εἰδότας ἄλλο ἀντὶ τούτων οὐδὲν προελέσθαι οὔτε τοὺς μὴ ἐπισταμένους δύνασθαι πράττειν, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐὰν ἐγχειρῶσιν, ἁμαρτάνειν· οὕτω [καὶ] τὰ καλά τε καὶ ἀγαθὰ τοὺς μὲν σοφοὺς πράττειν, τοὺς δὲ μὴ σοφοὺς οὐ δύνασθαι, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐὰν ἐγχειρῶσιν, ἁμαρτάνειν. ἐπεὶ οὖν τά τε δίκαια

[29] See here *Mem*. 4.1.5, 4.2.38–9; *Oec*. 1.9–15.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838818000125 Published online by Cambridge University Press

καὶ τἆλλα πάντα καλά τε καὶ ἀγαθὰ ἀρετῇ[30] πράττεται, δῆλον εἶναι ὅτι καὶ <ἡ> δικαιοσύνη καὶ ἡ ἄλλη πᾶσα ἀρετὴ σοφία ἐστί.

He said that justice and the whole rest of virtue is wisdom. After all, he said, just actions and all actions done from virtue are estimable. Those knowing what's estimable[31] would never select anything else in preference to it, and those ignorant of it are incapable of doing it. Even if they try, they fail. So the *wise* do what's estimable, while the *unwise* cannot and fail even if they try. And since just actions and all other forms of estimable activity are cases of virtuous action, it is clear that justice and every other form of virtue is wisdom.

Here, Socrates asserts a general link between virtue and wisdom. The link is undergirded by the idea that virtuous actions are 'estimable', καλά τε καὶ ἀγαθά. What is thereby meant is that acting virtuously involves conducting oneself admirably, and so achieving the best and most proper life for a person (in so far as it is a matter of one's own conduct). That idea is reinforced in the final sentence of the passage, where Socrates emphasizes that there are no things that are καλά τε καὶ ἀγαθά outside the sphere of virtuous conduct. To know the former is to know what is virtuous. Combined with the earlier remark that virtuous actions are καλά τε καὶ ἀγαθά, this amounts to the contention that what is virtuous and what is estimable completely coincide.

Socrates declares that the person who knows what is estimable (and hence virtuous) will never choose anything over it—ἀντὶ τούτων οὐδὲν προελέσθαι. Having obliquely made the connection in 3.9.4 between self-interest and what one ought to do, Socrates is now emphasizing that there are no goals in acting which could distract the knower from the pursuit of what is estimable.

His further remark about the failure of the ignorant person is interestingly ambiguous. Does such a person fail owing to a general lack of knowledge, doing what he wrongly conceives to be estimable? Or is his failure due to an inability to stick to the right course once he resolves on it? Although both factors could well be at issue, we think that Socrates has in mind primarily the first. Thus, when he says that the ignorant are incapable of doing what is estimable, he does not mean that they can never stumble upon it. Yet, their understanding of it will be deficient, and even if they should act according to their conception of it (rather than pursuing a false idea of self-interest that they dissociate from it) they will typically fail to achieve what is *truly* estimable. This idea of an intellectual mistake on the part of those ignorant of the virtuous course

[30] Rejecting the preference of Bandini and Dorion (n. 4) as well as Bevilacqua (n. 11) for Reiske's emendation of ἀρετῇ to σοφίᾳ. Dorion argues in the former work (350 n. 11) that the received text is at odds with the suggestion of the preceding lines that everything just and estimable is due to *wisdom*. Yet, the fact that things just and estimable are accomplished by means of virtue (ἀρετῇ πράττεται) is precisely what allows Socrates to go on to infer in the final clause of the sentence that virtue is identical to wisdom. (Dorion doubts that the latter conclusion really follows, but this is because he wrongly views the conclusion as being intended to follow directly from the first clause of the sentence, rather than from the first clause together with what has been said immediately before: 'Or comment pourrait-on conclure, à partir de l'énoncé que le juste et toutes les choses belles et bonnes se font grâce à la vertu [ἀρετῇ πράττεται], que la justice et les autres vertus consistent en *sophia*?') What's more, there is no tension between what is said here and the earlier contention that τά τε γὰρ δίκαια καὶ πάντα ὅσα ἀρετῇ πράττεται καλά τε καὶ ἀγαθὰ εἶναι. Socrates regards ὅσα ἀρετῇ πράττεται and καλά τε καὶ ἀγαθά as extensionally equivalent expressions, and that is why he can be casual about the order in which they occur.

[31] Taking the referent of ταῦτα to be καλά τε καὶ ἀγαθά. Others interpret differently. For instance, Delatte (n. 4), 121 and Dorion (Bandini and Dorion [n. 4]), 349 n. 9 take it to be τά τε δίκαια καὶ πάντα ὅσα ἀρετῇ πράττεται. J. Greenwood (*Xenophontis Memorabilia Socratis* [London, 1823], 140) takes it to be the whole proposition τά τε γὰρ δίκαια καὶ πάντα ὅσα ἀρετῇ πράττεται καλά τε καὶ ἀγαθὰ εἶναι.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838818000125 Published online by Cambridge University Press

neatly echoes Socrates' emphasis elsewhere—in 4.5.6–8—on the way in which ἀκρασία can distort one's perception of what is good and thereby prevent one from achieving it.[32]

On the account of 3.9.4–5 we are here offering, there is no commitment to the idea that people are motivated solely by self-interest. To be sure, 3.9.4 discusses situations in which people deliberate with an eye to their interests. Yet, the remark there is conditional: Socrates is not suggesting that people *always* have such a goal in mind. His conditional remark is instead meant to help bring into view the reason that self-indulgent people count as unwise: they mistake their own interests. 3.9.5 then rounds out the point by stressing that everyone who knows what is estimable will do it, presumably because they see the convergence of it with their interests. Understood that way, 3.9.5 forms a tight connection with the position taken in 3.9.4.

Contrast our account with the available interpretations, which would have Socrates accept not only that acting in one's interests involves doing what is estimable, but also that one always does what one takes to be in one's interests. The latter by itself is insufficient to explain Socrates' thought in the passage, since without the former there remains the possibility that those who behave self-indulgently *are* genuinely promoting their interests. By contrast, and crucially for our purposes, the idea that acting in one's interests involves doing what is estimable can do all the necessary work without any appeal to psychological egoism: anyone who *knows* that acting self-indulgently harms her interests will have no deliberative motive so to act. After all, what would such a motive amount to? Acting self-indulgently just is attempting to promote one's own interests with no regard for what is right—presumably, with no regard for others' interests, or perhaps for doing one's duty in some disinterested sense. Once one recognizes that it is impossible to further one's interests in such a fashion, one has no temptation to act self-indulgently. It does not in fact matter whether one's motives are ultimately self-directed, other-directed, duty-directed, or some combination of those options. What is crucial is that no self-interested motives will *compete* with other motives and thereby lead one to reject what is right. Psychological egoism need not factor in the explanation here: since none of the varieties of motivation will lead someone who fully knows what is right toward self-indulgence, the mere fact that the knower is self-controlled rather than indulgent is not revelatory of the kind of motivation that prompts her behaviour. Our interpretation therefore goes the more economical route of relying solely on the idea of a coincidence between what is right and what is in one's interests, dispensing with psychological egoism as an interpretative device.[33] To be sure, the position Socrates stakes out here is *consistent* with psychological egoism. Yet, it in no way presupposes the truth of egoism.

In support of the interpretation we are taking, let us here emphasize what we noted at the outset, namely that there is *no* other direct support for psychological egoism anywhere in the corpus of Xenophon's writings. We thus submit not only that egoism has no place in 3.9.4–5, but also that it has no role to play in the views of Xenophon's Socrates at all. Now that scholarship has cast doubt on the supposition that it was a deep-running assumption of classical thought, any naïve faith in it would be unwarranted. And dispensing with egoism relieves one of the burden of

[32] On the translation of 4.5.6, compare n. 9 above.

[33] For a similar assessment in Plato, concerning the thesis that the one who knows what is right will never unjustly harm another, see R. Jones and R. Sharma, 'The wandering hero of the *Hippias Minor*: Socrates on virtue and craft', *CPh* 112 (2017), 113–37, at 130–3.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838818000125 Published online by Cambridge University Press

struggling to explain a number of passages in Xenophon's corpus that are at odds with egoism on their most straightforward reading. Consider just two of them.

In 3.2, Socrates converses with someone chosen to be general about the qualities of a good leader. He begins by considering why Homer calls Agamemnon 'shepherd of the people'. As Socrates explains, a shepherd cares for the safety and the needs of the sheep, and on that basis is able to fulfil the goals for which they are reared. Since those goals ultimately concern the benefit of the humans who care for them, one might think that Socrates would follow out the analogy by declaring that the reason a general keeps his soldiers safe and provides for their needs is that they will thus contribute to his own well-being. Yet, that is not the point. Instead, the analogy concerns only the way in which care helps the care-giver to fulfil a goal; and Socrates declares that the leader's ultimate goal is to help the soldiers realize their desires for their own happiness (ἵνα κρατοῦντες τῶν πολεμίων εὐδαιμονέστεροι ὦσιν, 3.2.1). Socrates pursues the thought by asking about Homer's description of Agamemnon as 'a good king and a strong warrior' (βασιλεύς τ' ἀγαθὸς κρατερός τ' αἰχμητής, 3.2.2):

ἆρά γε ὅτι αἰχμητής τε [καὶ] κρατερὸς ἂν εἴη, οὐκ εἰ μόνος αὐτὸς εὖ ἀγωνίζοιτο πρὸς τοὺς πολεμίους, ἀλλ' εἰ καὶ παντὶ τῷ στρατοπέδῳ τούτου αἴτιος εἴη, καὶ βασιλεὺς ἀγαθός, οὐκ εἰ μόνον τοῦ ἑαυτοῦ βίου καλῶς προεστήκοι, ἀλλ' εἰ καί, ὧν βασιλεύοι, τούτοις εὐδαιμονίας αἴτιος εἴη;

Is it that he would be a strong warrior not if he alone should fight well against the enemy but if he should likewise be responsible for this in the whole army? And he would be a good king not if he should manage well just his own life, but if in addition he should be responsible for happiness in those whom he rules?

Here, Socrates explicitly denies that the king's actions are properly evaluated from a purely self-regarding point of view. He goes on to explain why he thinks a king should work for the common happiness: those who chose him did so for the sake of their well-being, and the ruler is thus obligated to serve them. At the end of the chapter, Socrates' point can therefore be summed up as follows (3.2.4): καὶ οὕτως ἐπισκοπῶν τίς εἴη ἀγαθοῦ ἡγεμόνος ἀρετὴ τὰ μὲν ἄλλα περιῄρει, κατέλιπε δὲ τὸ εὐδαίμονας ποιεῖν ὧν ἂν ἡγῆται. ('In thus reflecting on the virtue of a good leader he stripped away everything else and left in place only this: making happy those whom one leads.')

One might just manage to give the conversation an egoistic spin. For instance, one might maintain that, while Socrates' ideal leader focusses strictly on the good of his subjects in his capacity as leader, the reasons why he takes on a leadership role in the first place are a further issue and could well be self-interested. One might further insist that the rank-and-file soldiers exhibit purely egoistic motives: as Socrates notes explicitly in 3.2.3,[34] people choose their leaders with their own interests in view, since they wage war for the sake of their own happiness.[35]

Although such a reading may be possible, it is difficult to see why one would be drawn to it absent any clear evidence that Socrates is an egoist. Were he considering the leader *solely* in his capacity as leader, one could fairly expect him to be explicit about the point.[36] Instead, his remarks about the virtues of a leader seem designed

[34] καὶ γὰρ βασιλεὺς αἱρεῖται οὐχ ἵνα ἑαυτοῦ καλῶς ἐπιμελῆται, ἀλλ' ἵνα καὶ οἱ ἑλόμενοι δι' αὐτὸν εὖ πράττωσι· καὶ στρατεύονται δὲ πάντες ἵνα ὁ βίος αὐτοῖς ὡς βέλτιστος ᾖ, καὶ στρατηγοὺς αἱροῦνται τούτου ἕνεκα, ἵνα πρὸς τοῦτο αὐτοῖς ἡγεμόνες ὦσι.

[35] Morrison (n. 4), 14–15 advances an egoistic reading along both of the lines just mentioned.

[36] Contrast how laboriously Plato works the point at *Resp.* 340c–347d.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838818000125 Published online by Cambridge University Press

precisely to be giving advice—characteristically tactful in its indirectness—to someone who already occupies that role, encouraging him to focus on his men rather than himself.[37] Similarly, the mere fact that Socrates casts the soldier as choosing to go on campaign for reasons that are at least in part self-interested does not mean that he allows no room for other-directed acts during this or that engagement. Nor need it rule out Socrates' also holding that the soldier is partly motivated to go to war by a direct concern for others.

Finally, and much more briefly, consider 2.2, which discusses the care parents take for their children. In chastising Lamprocles for disrespecting his mother, Socrates underscores the trials and the risks that a mother faces during pregnancy and delivery. He goes on to stress the way in which a mother bears the rigours of child-rearing without *any* sense of the rewards to herself: 'she nurtures [her baby] for a long time, enduring toil day and night without knowing whether she will reap any return' (καὶ τρέφει πολὺν χρόνον καὶ ἡμέρας καὶ νυκτὸς ὑπομένουσα πονεῖν, οὐκ εἰδυῖα εἴ τινα τούτων χάριν ἀπολήψεται, 2.2.5). Again, a defender of egoism might insist on giving an egoistic spin to the care a mother takes for her offspring, emphasizing the satisfaction she receives from nurturing the baby, or her desire to perpetuate something of herself. Whatever one may think of such manoeuvres, it is striking that they appear *nowhere* in Socrates' discussion of parenting. There is in fact not a whisper of support for egoism, and there are plenty of remarks that would be difficult to square with it.

In want of any evidence that would demand an egoistic reading of those passages and others that pose like difficulties, egoism should once and for all be set aside in discussions of Xenophon's Socrates. Once one does so, what will stand out from 3.9.4–5 are the two commitments that overtly guide Socrates' thought: intellectualism about virtue and the idea that doing what is right is good for an agent herself. Seeing that those commitments operate independently of egoism is valuable in so far as it underscores how much more work remains to be done on the reasons why Xenophon's Socrates subscribes unwaveringly to them. Such work is especially pressing because the two theses at issue are likewise some of the most deeply held commitments of Plato's Socrates. Probing the nature of Xenophon's adherence to them will put us in a much better position to appreciate his philosophical relationship to Plato and, thereby, to think further about whether the 'Socratic question' is a hopeless one, as Dorion has recently argued,[38] or whether instead there is some hope for uncovering a broadly consistent set of intellectual commitments from the seemingly disparate works of the two authors.[39]

Harvard University RUSSELL E. JONES
rjones@fas.harvard.edu

Clark University RAVI SHARMA
rsharma@clarku.edu

[37] Of course, since Socrates thinks that doing what is right is at the same time in one's own interest, he has no need to portray good leaders as sacrificing themselves for the sake of their men. In focussing on others they also achieve what is good for themselves, a theme that is in fact sounded explicitly in Socrates' conversation with Aristippus (2.1.17–19).

[38] See Bandini and Dorion (n. 5 [Tome 1]), xcix–cxviii.

[39] For written comments or helpful conversations about the issues discussed in this paper, we are grateful to audiences at Western University and the Tahoe Workshop in Ancient Philosophy, as well as to Adam Beresford, Don Morrison, Bryan Reece, Marco Romani Mistretta and an anonymous referee for this journal.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838818000125 Published online by Cambridge University Press