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](#)

Xenophontea

Herbert Richards

The Classical Review / Volume 20 / Issue 07 / October 2006, pp 346 - 348

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00994861, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00994861

How to cite this article:

Herbert Richards (2006). Xenophontea. The Classical Review, 20, pp 346-348 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00994861

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

456 ἄμαχον = 822 ἔμολον; 460 οὔτε . . οὔτε = 826 οὐτ' ἔ . . οὐτ' ἔ; 543-5 = 562-4 ephymnia with slight changes; 900 πορευθεῖς = 911 ε-πλαθεῖς. *Fragments* (Nauck) 781, 17 Ἀφροδίταν = 26 Ἀφροδίται; 19 θεῶν = 27 θεάν.

Sophocles occupies, as always, a middle position: Euripides, in spite of an occasional ebb (*Heracidae Ion Iphigenia Taurica Bacchae*), plainly advances, if not towards greater frequency, at least towards greater complexity of rhyme.

These are the facts from tragedy, and I imagine that it needs no words of mine to make clear that 'rhyme,' as defined at the outset of this paper, was used by the Greek tragedians, consciously and deliberately, as a more subtle mode of antistrophic response: that very ebb of which I have just spoken makes it, to my mind, quite impossible to interpret the phenomenon as altogether a play of the subconscious. The elements of this 'rhyme' are various and subtly interwoven: mere assonance, weak and full rhyme, kinship and contrast of sense play across each other, occasionally reaching such a pinnacle of close union as we are quite unaccustomed to seek in our own poetry.¹

¹ It is a common requirement in modern French poetry. See, of course, Banville's *petit traité* and

My pet instance comes from the *Helena* where, in an enigmatical chorus, rhymed with exceptional subtlety and pervaded by a curious chime of ὦ Ἑλένα, the name Ἑλένα 1120 answers to νεφέλαν 1135: the whole fable of the play writ in brief. I suspect that more is concealed here, which will come to light when someone solves for us the riddle of this fascinating but most baffling play.²

cf. the following passage (L. Muhlfield, 'Chronique de la littérature,' *revue blanche*, 15 avril, 1893 = tom. iv p. 289) ' . . il faudrait essayer de surprendre respectueusement la "manière" de Heredia. J'en veux indiquer un seul trait: c'est le caractère supérieurement simple, précis et prépondérant des mots à la rime,

Seul, parfois, un bouvier menant ses buffles boire,
De sa conque où soupire un antique refrain
Emplissant le ciel calme et l'horizon marin,
Sur l'azur infini dresse sa forme noire.

Ces quatre mots boire, refrain, marin, noire résument chacun le vers qu'ils terminent.' The critic did not go far to pick his example, and I will not trouble about a better.

² Note the date of this paper.—Aristophanes has his trace of rhyme when he strikes a higher lyric note: *Clouds* 276-8 ἀέναοι Νεφέλαι, ἀρθώμεν . . εὐά(γητον) = 298-300 παρθένοι: ὀμβροφόροι, ἔλθωμεν . . εὐα(νδρον γὰρ) and 287 μαρμαρέαις ἐν αὐγαῖς = 309 παντοδαπαῖς ἐν ἔραις.

C. J. BRENNAN.

(To be continued.)

XENOPHONTEA.

ANABASIS.

1. 2. 21. The third ὅτι should be omitted or changed. Perhaps ὅτε, parallel to ἐπεὶ.

1. 5. 9 συναγείρεσθαι should be συναγερεῖσθαι to match μαχεῖσθαι.

ibid. καὶ συνιδεῖν δ' ἦν τῷ προσέχοντι τὸν νοῦν τῇ βασιλεύῳ ἀρχῇ πλήθει μὲν . . ἰσχυρὰ οὖσα, τοῖς δὲ μήκει . . ἀσθενής.

Mr. Marchant says 'τῇ . . ἀρχῇ C₁ DV: τοῦ . . ἀρχῇ A: ἡ . . ἀρχῇ C₂ cet.', himself reading the dative. With the dative after προσέχοντι one might be content; but are the nominatives ἰσχυρὰ οὖσα and ἀσθενής right? As far as I know, such phrases as ἦν ιδεῖν, which are common enough, always take an accusative. If we have a nominative, ιδεῖν must be used in an absolute way, *was to see*, for which I do not know any exact

parallel. Such a use as Ar. *N.* 1172 νῦν μὲν γ' ιδεῖν εἰ πρῶτον ἐξαρηντικός is different, (1) because it refers to actual sight, (2) because there is no participle like οὖσα here. Aristophanes could never have said ιδεῖν εἰ ἐξαρηντικός ὢν. This suggests that ἰσχυρὰν οὖσαν and ἀσθενῇ are what Xenophon wrote, possibly τὴν . . ἀρχήν. The confusion of the MSS. points perhaps to something different from the reading of any of them.

1. 9 5 αἰδημονέστατος . . τῶν ἡλικιωτῶν ἐδόκει εἶναι τοῖς τε πρεσβυτέροις καὶ τῶν ἑαυτοῦν ὑποδεεστέρων μᾶλλον πείθεσθαι.

To match αἰδημονέστατος we need μάλιστα. μᾶλλον could in any case hardly stand, and the mistake is common enough.

1. 10. 4. Read ὡς ἤδη πάντας νικῶντες and omit the ὡς πάντας νικῶντες preceding. They can never have been meant to stand together. Cf. on 3. 4. 45.

2. 4. 5 ἐγὼ ἐνθυμούμαι μὲν καὶ ταῦτα πάντα.

There seems little force in καί. Perhaps καὶ <αὐτός>.

2. 5. 25 ἐγὼ μὲν γε, ἔφη ὁ Τισσαφέρνης, . . ἐν τῷ ἐμφανεῖ λέξω τοὺς πρὸς ἐμὲ λέγοντας ὡς κ.τ.λ. ἐγὼ δέ, ἔφη ὁ Κλέαρχος, ἄξω πάντας καὶ σοὶ αὖ δηλώσω κ.τ.λ.

For λέξω read δείξω, which is better suited to ἐν τῷ ἐμφανεῖ and matches the δηλώσω following. Parts of λέγω and δείκνυμι are apt to get confused (Δ Δ).

3. 1. 7 ταῦτ', ἔφη, χρὴ ποιεῖν ὅσα ὁ θεὸς ἐκέλευσεν.

Perhaps πάντα for ταῦτα.

3. 4. 45. Omit διακελεομένων τοῖς ἑαυτῶν. Cf. on 1. 10. 4 above.

4. 3. 29 <λέγων> ὅτι οὗτος?

5. 6. 22. Read οὐδέν for οὐδέ before ὑμῖν.

6. 5. 25 παρήγγελο δὲ τὰ μὲν δόρατα ἐπὶ τὸν δεξιὸν ὤμων (τῶν δ. ὤμων Cobet) ἔχειν, ὥς σημαίνει τῇ σάλπιγγι.

ὥς *until* with present is so unusual that it may well be wrong. See *C.R.* xvi. 11. It would have to mean 'until the trumpeter was giving' or 'began to give the signal,' which seems pointless. σημήναι (σημήνιαι) would be natural, or ὥς ἂν σημήνη.

7. 3. 21 οὗτοι δ' (οἱ τρίποδες) ἦσαν κρεῶν μεστοὶ νενεμημένων.

Surely νενημένων, as in 5. 4. 27 θησαυρὸν . . ἄρτων νενημένων.

7. 7. 36 σοὶ δὲ νῦν ἡ κατ' ἐναντιὸν πρόσδοδος πλείων ἔσται ἢ ἐμπροσθεν τὰ παρόντα πάντα ἀέκκητο.

The antithesis of πρόσδοδος suggests ὑπάρχοντα rather than παρόντα.

RESPUBLICA LACEDAEMONIORUM.

2. 12 εἰσὶ δὲ καὶ οἱ παντάπασι τοῦ διαλέγεσθαι τοὺς ἑραστοὺς ἐργουσιν ἀπὸ τῶν παίδων.

It is hardly possible that ἐργουσι should take both τοῦ δ. and ἀπὸ τ.π. In *Cyrop.* 5. 1. 25 (σοῦ ἀπελείφθη τοῦ μὴ σοὶ ἀκολουθεῖν) τό is now read for τοῦ. But that passage and some others quoted here by Haase suggest strongly, what had occurred to me otherwise, that we should insert a negative. If we read τοῦ <μὴ> διαλέγεσθαι, we can then take it as an instance of τοῦ or τοῦ μὴ in a final sense, *that they might have no intercourse with them at all*, though the words

come in a rather strange order. It is not a little curious that there are several other passages in this short treatise in which τό or τοῦ and an infinitive gives us trouble. See 4. 6: 5. 7: 8. 3: each of which has its own peculiarities, not easy to deal with in any one way.

4. §§ 3, 4 seem quite inadequate after the marked introduction of the subject by ὡς οὖν κ.τ.λ., ἐξηγήσομαι, and, even if we ignore that, leave the whole thing quite imperfectly stated. What are the men chosen to do? Something must have been lost.

5. 8. It is clear that the words ὡς μήποτε αὐτοὶ ἐλάττους τῶν σιτίων γίνεσθαι must be altered in some such way as Hug suggests, so as to convey the meaning that the exercises (πόνοι) of the men, not the men themselves (which is meaningless), were to be μὴ ἐλάττους τῶν σιτίων. The φιλοπονῇ preceding proves this, and I had conjectured the same thing before seeing Hug's emendation. I should suggest ὡς μήποτε αὐτοῖς <πόνοις> ἐλάττους κ.τ.λ. ἐπιμελείσθαι ὡς (ὥστε) with infinitive would seem admissible, even if it does not actually occur.

7. 4 τοῦ γε εἰς τοὺς συσκήνους ἕνεκα ἔχειν δαπανᾶν.

As the construction is ἕνεκα τοῦ ἔχειν δαπανᾶν, the order is very remarkable, and I do not feel sure that it can be right.

ιβ. 5 καὶ γὰρ χώρας μεγάλης καὶ ἀμάξης ἀγωγῆς δέου' ἂν.

From the parallel passage in Plutarch ἀποθήκης τε μεγάλης καὶ ζεύγους ἀγοντος Dindorf would read ἀγούσης for ἀγωγῆς. Perhaps it should be ἀξούσης here and ἀξοντος in Plutarch, for the future is much more idiomatic.

9. 5 γυναικὸς δὲ κενὴν ἔστιαν οὐ περιουσιόεν.

οὐ, which gives quite the wrong meaning, is wanting in one MS. of some value and is omitted by Dindorf. Perhaps we should read αὖ, a word which occurs many times in this book, and is used in 13. 10 and 15. 5 just as it would be here, to introduce a new, not a contrasted, point.

11. 2 ἀπάντων τὰ μὲν ἀμάξῃ προστέτακται παρέχειν, τὰ δὲ ὑποζυγίῳ.

Editors now read ἀπαντα, but the datives remain without proper construction. I thought first of μὲν <ἐν>, which would still leave ὑποζυγίῳ rather doubtful. Now I incline to change ἀπάντων or ἀπαντα to ἄγοντα.

ib. 10. Jebb's emendation of ἀποθούσιν to ἀποθεν (better ἀποθεν ?) οὖσιν and omission of ἧ should certainly be received. When he writes ἀποθεν οὖσιν ἀντιπάλους etc. (Dakyns' *Xenophon*, ii. 317 n. 3), I take ἀντιπάλους to be a slip of the pen for ἐναντίους.

12. 7 παραλειμμένα . . ὅσα δὲ ἐπιμελείας. Surely δέεται is as necessary as it is well

attested, though neither Dindorf nor Pierleoni adopts it. The genitive ἐπιμελείας cannot well depend upon ὅσα.

15. 6 μᾶλλον should perhaps be μάλιστα, a change that has to be made in other passages. In μᾶλλον the reference is not definite enough.

HERBERT RICHARDS.

MORE PROHIBITIONS IN GREEK.

I WISH to thank Dr. Headlam for his courteous reply to my paper in vol. xix. p. 30, and to apologise for my delay, which is owing to an affection of the eyes.

I am still only half-convinced: that is, I feel that Dr. Headlam has a strong case only so far as the aorist, e.g. μὴ ποιήσης, is concerned. I am told that my instances must be regarded, at most, as exceptions to the rule. But these exceptions mount to considerable proportions when we neglect the vast majority of cases where it is impossible to decide whether, e.g. μὴ ποίει must of necessity mean 'cease doing.' One may fairly ask why, if the distinction was so universally observed, Greek found it necessary at all to say παύσαι λέγουσα (*Eur. Hipp.* 706) and the like.

I append a few more instances of μὴ + pres. imperat. which certainly do not mean 'cease what you are doing.' My references are to Bekker's text.

Dem. 1005. 11 :

ἀν δὲ φῇ δεινὰ πάσχειν καὶ κλάη καὶ ὀδύρηται καὶ κατηγορῇ μου, ἃ μὲν ἂν λέγῃ, μὴ πιστεύετε.

1017. 15 :

ἐὰν μὲν ἐπιχειρῇ ταῦτα λέγειν, μὴ ἐπιτρέπετε ἀναισχυντεῖν. Add 1021. 29, 1024. 7, 1026. 22,—all, μὴ ἐπιτρέπετε and all, as the context shows, referring to the future.

523. 17 :

μὴ δὴ τοῦτο λέγειν αὐτὸν ἔατε. The ἐρῶν in 522. 24 proves that ἔατε does not mean 'cease allowing.'

527. 10 :

μὴ τοῖνυν ἔατε ταῦτ' αὐτὸν λέγειν, μὴδ', ἂν βιάζηται, πείθεσθ' ὥς δίκαιόν τι λέγοντι.

The future reference of ἔατε and πείθεσθε is shown by the sentence following and by μέλλειν 525. 25.

Aristoph. *Birds* 1532-1534 :

ἤξουσιν πρέσβεις δεῦρο περὶ διαλλαγῶν
παρὰ τοῦ Διὸς
ὕμεις δὲ μὴ σπένδεσθε.

Frogs 618-622 :

Aeacus says : καὶ πῶς βασανίσω ; to which Xanthias replies :

δήσας, κρεμάσας . . . πλὴν πράσω
μὴ τύπτε τοῦτον μὴδὲ γητείω νέψ.

Plato *Rep.* 338 A is interesting :

μὴ οὖν ἄλλως ποίει, ἀλλ' ἐμοὶ τε χαρίζου ἀποκρινόμενος καὶ μὴ φθονήσης καὶ Γλαύκωνα τόνδε διδάξαι καὶ τοὺς ἄλλους.

It seems to me that μὴ ποίει is here used merely because μὴ ἄλλως ποίει is phraseological, i.e. an idiom of *polite* remonstrance (see *C.R.* xix. p. 27).

Is μὴ ἄλλως ποιήσης found ?

I have kept Dem. 582. 15. to the last, as it might be made to prove anything. The text there runs :

μὴ κατὰ τοὺς νόμους δικάσητε· μὴ βοηθήσητε τῷ πεπονθότι δεινῷ· μὴ εὐορκείτε.

H. DARNLEY NAYLOR.

Ormond College, Melbourne University.