The Classical Review

<http://journals.cambridge.org/CAR>

Additional services for *The Classical Review*:

Email alerts: [Click here](#)

Subscriptions: [Click here](#)

Commercial reprints: [Click here](#)

Terms of use : [Click here](#)

The Minok Works of Xenophon

H. Richards

The Classical Review / Volume 11 / Issue 03 / April 1897, pp 133 - 136
DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00026469, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00026469

How to cite this article:

H. Richards (1897). The Minok Works of Xenophon. The Classical Review, 11, pp 133-136
doi:10.1017/S0009840X00026469

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

The Classical Review

APRIL 1897.

THE MINOR WORKS OF XENOPHON.

(Continued from p. 21.)

VI., VII. THE CONSTITUTIONS.

IN dealing with the two *Constitutions* that have come down to us under the name of Xenophon, I shall not enter upon a general discussion of all the grounds for asserting or impugning the genuineness of either of them. So far as these grounds consist in the matter of the two works, they have been very fully discussed, and I at any rate am not capable of adducing any fresh argument. I wish however to submit the language in which they are written to a somewhat closer scrutiny than it has as yet received, and to see what conclusions, if any, can be drawn from it as to the questions of probable date and authorship. It will be best to begin with the *Respublica Lacedaemoniorum* and to go on subsequently to the *Respublica Atheniensium*. After discussing in both cases the language and any inferences that may be drawn from it, I shall offer a few suggestions on particular passages.

F. Haase's edition of the *R.L.* (1833) contains some remarks on the diction and a discriminating verbal index. Cobet in the *Novae Lectiones* (1858) pointed out two or three things as regards the language, especially a few more or less technical Spartan terms. He had on further study changed his mind as to the authorship (Preface, p. xxiv.) and had satisfied himself that the *R.L.* was a genuine work of X. He

relies however mainly on some things in the contents of the book, and his observations on the language, weighty as anything of Cobet's on such a subject must be, are very slight. In *Xenophontis Opuscula Politica Equestria et Venatica* (Oxford, 1866) L. Dindorf points out certain words and constructions which in his opinion tell against X.'s authorship. E. Naumann (*De Xenophontis libro qui Λακεδαιμονίων Πολιτεία inscribitur*: Berlin, 1876) and H. Bazin (*La République des Lacédémoniens de Xénophon*: Paris, 1885) examine the language with some care and come to a conclusion opposite to Dindorf's.

Useful as is the work which these writers have done, it is not unfair to say that they have left untouched a large, perhaps the larger, part of the material available. More particularly they have taken little notice of various points of grammatical usage, which are of great importance in an inquiry like this, such as certain uses of conjunctions and other small but frequent words. To a considerable proportion of the facts now to be stated attention has not, to the best of my belief, hitherto been called. No doubt there are more which could be added. My list has no pretensions to be complete, and I shall be quite satisfied if the statements in it are correct as far as they go. With our present insufficient supply of trustworthy indexes and lexicons to particular authors it is not easy to make sure of one's

facts. Sturz's *Lexicon Xenophonticum* (1801–1804), though old, has been very useful: from Sauppe's *Lexilogus Xenophonticus* (1869) I have not got as much assistance as I hoped. When Joost has followed up his study of the *Anabasis* (*Was ergibt sich aus dem Sprachgebrauch Xenophon's in der Anabasis für die Behandlung der griechischen Syntax in der Schule?* Berlin, 1892) by similar studies of the other larger works, our resources for dealing with a question like the present will be considerably increased.

In the first place let us notice that the use of final conjunctions in the *R.L.* is quite in accordance with the practice of X. (see Goodwin's *M. and T.* espec. Appendix iii. and iv.). Final *ὥς*, which is almost peculiar to him among Attic prose-writers, occurs three times (2, 6: 13, 1: 15, 5): *ὥς* seven times, and *ἵνα* four. Weber has shown that in most of the works of X. *ὥς* and *ὅπως* together are used more freely than *ἵνα*, the conjunction common in Aristophanes, Plato, and the orators. The unattic use of *ὥς* and *ὥς ἂν* with 'object clauses' after *ἐπιμελείσθαι* etc. occurs 3, 3: 6, 1: 14, 4. X. has a third frequent but unattic use of *ὥς*, the use = *ὥστε*, which we find in Herodotus and Hippocrates with the infinitive and sometimes with the indicative. (In Herodotus Cobet has altered infinitive to indicative quite needlessly). This use is found in the *R.L.* 5, 3 and 8: 11, 6 etc., and Madvig has no reason whatever for altering the *ὥς* in 5, 8 to *ὥστε*. Very characteristic of X. is the Herodotean and unattic use of *ἔστω* for *ἔως* in both senses, 'while' and 'until.' Goodwin (§ 617) says 'in Attic prose (especially in X.),' but is it ever used in Attic prose except by X.? It occurs here 11, 8 and 9. The temporal use of *ἐπεὶ*, which is, I imagine, quite uncommon in the orators, who use *ἐπειδή* instead, though frequent enough in Herodotus, Thucydides, and Xenophon, will be found in 1, 1 and 5 and 2, 1. *Ἐνθα* 'where,' used when a writer of pure Attic prose would put *οὗ*, *οἴου*, *ἵνα*, *οὗ*—Demosthenes, for instance, does not use *ἐνθα* once, nor does Lysias—occurs 3, 4: 5, 7 etc. This use is constant in X. The adverbial *ἥ* of manner (9, 3: 10, 1 etc.) is much commoner in X. than in the orators. The phrase in 1, 3 *σίτω ἥ ἀνυστόν μετρωτάτω* is thus doubly Xn., for *ἀνυστόν* is not a word of ordinary Attic, but occurs *Anab.* 1, 8, 11 in the similar phrase *σιγῇ ὥς ἀνυστόν . . προσῆσαν*. It has been pretty well known since 1874, when Tycho Mommsen published his figures, that X. differs from all Attic prose-writers in preferring *σύν* to *μετά*.

Thus, according to Mommsen, in Thucydides *σύν* occurs only 37 times, and *μετά* with a genitive 400, but in X. *μετά* with a genitive occurs 275 times, and *σύν* 556. In the *R.L.* *σύν* will be found in 8, 5: 13, 1 and 2: *μετά* I think only in 11, 7. The preposition *ἀμφί* = *περί* is well known to be characteristic of X., and so is the phrase *τὰ ἀμφί τι*: we have here in 7, 2 *τὰ ἀμφί χρηματισμόν*. X. several times uses *παρά* in the sense of 'close to,' 'alongside of,' etc. with verbs of rest, e.g. *de Re Eq.* 8, 12 *ἔως μὲν ἂν παρὰ τοῖς φίλοις τις ᾗ*: *Cyr.* 1, 4, 18 *εἶπεν αὐτῷ μένειν παρ' ἐαυτόν*: we have here in 12, 2 *φυλακάς γε μὴν ἐποίησε μεθημερινὰς τὰς μὲν παρὰ τὰ ὅπλα εἶσω βλεπούσας*. *Πρόσθεν*, which X. uses very often instead of the more usual Attic *ἐμπροσθεν*, occurs in 13, 6. (Cobet, *N.L.* p. 688, when he altered *πρόσθεν* in *Mem.* 1, 4, 6 to *ἐμπροσθεν*, had perhaps not noticed X.'s practice. *Πρόσθεν* is the older word, as appears from *ἐμπροσθεν* not occurring in Homer, and from there being no phrase *ἐμπροσθεν* . . *πρίν* κ.τ.λ. We may doubt whether *τοῦ ἐμπροσθεν* is right in Eur. *Hipp.* 1228, since it seems to be the only place in tragedy where *ἐμπροσθεν* is found). Throughout the treatise the Xn. *γε μὴν* is of very frequent occurrence: *καί*—*δέ*, which is also very common in X. and by no means equally so in all prose-writers, occurs a dozen times, and the double *τε*, rare in Attic prose but used sometimes by X., may be found in 1, 9. In other respects too the statistics given by Roquette (*De Xenophontis Vita*, p. 39), who takes no notice of *καί*—*δέ*, seem to show that the use of particles is thoroughly Xn.

Very many other words may be found in the *R.L.* which belong to the peculiar vocabulary of X. In 12, 5 *μάσσω* has been restored for *ἐλάσσω*, just as in *Cyr.* 2, 4, 27 *μάσσω* was corrected to *ἐλάσσω* by L. Dindorf following Suidas s.v. *μάσσω*. X. also uses the unattic *μήκιστος*. *Μείων* (= *ἥττων* or *ἐλάττων*) and *μειονεκτεῖν*, *μειονεξία* are thoroughly Xn.; these words occur 9, 1: 11, 9. *Κρατύνω* (2, 3), *ἀρήγω* (4, 5), *πεπαμένος* (6, 4), *κατάρχω* (8, 2), *σίνομαι* (12, 5), are verbs which occur seldom or never in ordinary Attic, but they may be found in X., *ἀρήγω* constantly. Such too are *ἐρευνῶ* (7, 6), a Platonic word hardly used in common language, and *ἐπικουρῶ* (2, 6 etc.) which seems to occur only once in an orator. *Ἐπομαι* (8, 2 etc.) is avoided by the orators, very frequent in X. and not rare in Plato. *Κλωπεύω* (2, 7) is used in *Anab.* 6, 1, 1. *Ῥαδιουργῶ* and *Ῥαδιουργία* (2, 2 and 14, 4) are regular Xn. words, but occur nowhere in the orators nor in Plato, once in a fragment

of the New Comedy, and once in a pseudo-Aristotelian work. Βλακεύω (2, 9) is hardly found in other Attic writers, but X. is fond of it and kindred words. The same may be said of μεγαλύνομαι (8, 2). The uses of ἀποδεικνύειν = 'ordain' (10, 7), of διαπράττειν (2, 10) and κατεργάζεσθαι (9, 1), all with accusative and infinitive, may be paralleled from other Xn. writings, but hardly elsewhere. Πληγὰς ἐμβάλλειν (6, 2) seems not to be found out of X.

X.'s favourite and peculiar use of ἰσχυρῶς = πάνν, σφόδρα etc., occurs in 2, 2 and 3, 4. Μεγάλως, which is used occasionally by X. and Plato but not by the orators, occurs in 10, 4. Πάμπαν, unknown to Thucydides, to the orators, and except for one Aristophanic hexameter (*Peace* 121) to the comic poets, occurs in 1, 3 and elsewhere in X., as it does now and then in Plato. Ὡσαύτως (6, 3) may be described in almost the same terms (three or four times in Demosthenes). Πυκνά = πολλάκις may be found in 12, 5 and elsewhere in X. Τῷ παντί (8, 5), with comparatives and similar expressions is thoroughly Xn. The use of ὅσα in 5, 7 τῇ ὄρφνῃ ὅσα ἡμέρα χρηστέον is found in *Hell.* 6, 1, 15: *Cyr.* 1, 5, 12. Εὐφροσύνη is a substantive known to us chiefly from Homer and other poets, but X. is addicted to the use of it, and we have it here in 7, 6. Τέκνα for παῖδες occurs in 1, 8 and τεκνοποιεῖσθαι, τεκνοποιία, εὔτεκνος in the same chapter: Thucydides, the orators and even Plato avoid using τέκνον: Aristophanes has it only in burlesque or in touches of real poetry; but X. uses it very often.

Finally I believe that the following words of various kinds, though not confined in use to the works of X., will be recognised as belonging more or less to his vocabulary by those who have given attention to it: διαβρύπτω (2, 1), μεγαλείως (4, 6), ἡλιξ (5, 5), ἀφοδος (5, 7), ἡδυπάθεια (7, 3), ὁμογνώμων (8, 1), κακοδαμονία (9, 3), καλοκάγαθία (10, 1), ἀνυπόστατος (10, 7), σχολαί(δ)ατα (11, 3), γοργός (11, 3), παρεγγήσις (11, 4: X. does not use this word elsewhere, but he has παρεγγῶν constantly and παρεγγή *Anab.* 6, 5, 13: παραγγέλλω, παραγγελία are the ordinary Attic); ἐθελούσιος (13, 7), ὑπερφέρειν (15, 3 and 8).

If now, looking to the other side of the argument, we ask whether there is anything in the language which tells strongly against X.'s authorship, the question may in spite of Dindorf be answered confidently in the negative. In 1, 5 σφῶν αὐτῶν = ἀλλήλων, and as far as Sturz's lexicon shows, there is no other certain instance of this use in

X. Two words seem to be of late date, μειρακιόσθαι (3, 1) and ἐμφυσῶσαι (3, 4), but the quotation in Stobaeus gives us ἐμφύσαι for the second, and εἰς τὸ μειρακιόσθαι is probably a later addition to ἐκ παίδων ἐκβαίνωσι. In 8, 4 ἱκανοί (= κύριοι) εἰσι ζημιούν may be a mistake: so perhaps is the odd phrase εἰς τὰ ἔσχατα μάλα σοφός in 1, 2. Παύειν ἀπό τινος (3, 1) is at least unusual (cf. ἐκ and ἀπό with ἀπαλλάττειν, ἀπαλλάττεσθαι) and so are the phrases οἱ ἐκ δημοσίου (3, 3) and ἐπὶ πόλεως (11, 2), the use of περᾶν of time in 4, 7 τοῖς τὴν ἡβητικὴν ἡλικίαν πεπερακόσιν, and the use of καὶ μὴν after τε, if right, in 5, 7. Κατεστάθη (15, 1) is not a common form, but it occurs (ἐστάθη) in *Hell.* 3, 1, 9: 5, 2, 43 as well as in the orators (Veitch, who does not cite this passage). With τῶν δεομένων γίνεσθαι (13, 7) compare *Cyr.* 2, 3, 3 τῶν πράττεσθαι δεομένων. All these points are very trifling.

There are a fair number of words that occur perhaps nowhere else in X., but this is in no way surprising. Each of his works taken separately presents words of which the same may be said, and not one of the words in the *R. L.* except μειρακιόσθαι and ἐμφυσῶσαι need give rise to any suspicion. A few of them (συσκήναι, ἀστυφέλικτος, ἐπὶ φρουρᾶς, etc.) are, as Cobet pointed out, technical Spartan terms, quite natural in this treatise. Some again belong to the class most characteristic of X., that are otherwise known to us only or mainly from their use in the poets, though no doubt it was not from the poets that they were taken by X. the traveller, the Athenian who lived with Ionians and Dorians of various communities. Such are ἔκγονα (1, 4): γεραίός (1, 7: γεραῖτεροι is frequent in X.): ἀναθρώσκω (2, 3, found in Herodotus): ῥαδινός (2, 6): ὄρφνη (5, 7: ὄρφνις used of colour *Cyr.* 8, 3, 3): ἐπὶ κλησις (9, 4: Herodotus and Thucydides): τέρμα (10, 1: used literally *Cyr.* 8, 3, 25): ἐκτελεῖν (10, 7): ἀραιός (11, 6): κνεφαῖος (13, 3: κνέφας in *Anab.* 4, 5, 9 and elsewhere): λῆις = λεία (13, 11): ἐπιμυογος (14, 7. cf. Aesch. *Ag.* 611, where it is active in meaning). Τορός (2, 11) is another word, partly of the same kind. Cobet had no need to alter τὸν τορώτατον ('the smartest') τῶν εἰρένων to τὸν πρεσβύτατον, as is shown by Plat. *Theaet.* 175 E τὸς τε καὶ δξέως διακονεῖν and Ar. *Ran.* 1102 κάπεριδεσθαι τορώς. Διάκορος (1, 5) used by Herodotus and in the form διακορῆς by Plato, is just such a word as we should expect to find in X. Εὐχερής, εὐχέρεια are not used by him elsewhere, but εὐχερέστερον is not at all strange in 2, 5 and Aristotle *H. A.* 8, 6, 2

offers an exact parallel for the sense in which it is used. So *ῥυπαίνεται* (11, 3) is paralleled by *ῥυπαίνονται* *Ar. Eth.* 1, 8, 1099b 2, and the adjectival *παράλογος* (5, 3) occurs several times in Aristotle (*παράλογως* the adverb in Demosthenes). X, and Aristotle often have words in common. *Ἀποκαθιστάναι* 'restore' (6, 3) seems to occur elsewhere only in late authors, but this may be accidental and is the case with many Thucydidean words. The very curious use of *νομίζω* (1, 7: 2, 4: 12, 3) hereafter to be noticed, should be mentioned here.

There is one more argument from the language which should not be left out of account, and which tells, if not for, at any rate not against Xn. authorship. This is the argument from hiatus. It is well known that in this matter the rules by which many writers and speakers of the fourth century bound themselves with various degrees of strictness were not recognised by X. any more than by Thucydides, though Benseler (*De Hiatu* p. 197) makes a partial exception with regard to the first two chapters of the *Memorabilia*. The writer of the *R. L.* also disregards them altogether. This is far from constituting an argument in X.'s favour: but perhaps we may say that, if the *R. L.* had been of later date, there is a greater likelihood that some care would have been taken to avoid hiatus. One theory of the authorship at any rate seems to be discredited by this observation,

(To be continued.)

namely the theory of Lehmann, who attributes the work to a pupil of Isocrates. No pupil of Isocrates is likely to have been so careless of hiatus as this writer shows himself, nor indeed so indiscriminate in his vocabulary, a matter about which Isocrates was very particular.

Although then Dindorf ventured to say that the whole style was *eiusmodi ut, quo magis quis assuetus sit Xenophonti, eo minus eum sit in hoc libro agnitus*, the considerations here adduced will probably be allowed to be very much in favour of the traditional view that the *R. L.* is the genuine work of X. and that it is so throughout. There is not in the language any sign of patchwork and the intrusion of a later hand. The words on which I have laid stress occur in all parts of the treatise: there is no chapter in which some of them may not be found. Even the fourteenth, on which especial doubt has been thrown and which seems to be at least out of its proper place, presents an instance of final *ὥς* and of two more or less noticeable Xn. words (*πρόσθεν* twice and *ῥαδιουργία*). It would be quite consistent with these facts to hold that the treatise is incomplete, a mere fragment or fragments of what X. wrote or perhaps meant to write, but they go very much against the view that we have in it the work of anyone but X. himself.

H. RICHARDS.

GREEK METRICAL INSCRIPTIONS FROM PHRYGIA.

(Continued from page 32.)

VI.

Found at Doghan Arslan, near Spore of the Prephenisais.

εἰςβαι[?]ων οἶμους πολυ[π]ειρ[?]τοιο[?] [εἰς.
κέλευθον
ἤλυθες ἀμφὶ κ[?]όρης [σ]ώματος ἰδρο-
σύνας,
τέρπει δ' ἀψίδεσσι πολυτροχά[λ]οις ἐνὶ
κέντρ[οι]ς
5 ἀντγος αἰθερίης τείρεσι λανπομένας,
ἡελίω τ' ἀνὰ μέσσα πολυ[φ]εγγεῖ τε σελήνῃ,
ἐξ ὧν δὴ πάντων ἐστι βίος μερόπων.
ἐν τούτο[ι]ς φύεται τρέφεται γήρᾳ τε τελείται
ζῶης κ(αι) θανάτου κλήρος ἐν οἷς
πέλεται.
10 τῆσδε μαθημοσύνης Ἐπιτύγχανον ἴδριν ἐόντα,

πνοιῆς δ' ἀ[π]λάνκτους εἰδότα μαντο-
σύνας,
θέσφατά τ' ἀνθρώποισιν ἀληθέα φημίζοντα
ὄντων μέλλοντων ἐσσομένων πρότερο[ν].
ἄσπεσι δ' ἐν πολλοῖσιν ἰθαγενέων λάχε
τείμας,
15 λείψας κ(αι) κοῖρους οὐδὲν ἀφανροτέ-
ρους.
σφῇ δ' ἀρετῇ κ(αι) μέτρα δαεῖς κ(αι) πείρατα
κόσμον
εἰς ὄρ(φ)νην ἰκόμην πᾶσιν ὀφειλομένην.

This is the imperfect epitaph of an astrologer, by name Epitynchanos (v. 10), whose sons carried on the profession after his death (v. 15). [This Epitynchanos, citizen of many cities (v. 14), is probably the same person who acted as High-priest at Akmonia,