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 Hellenics of Xenophon

Herbert Richards

The Classical Review / Volume 15 / Issue 04 / May 1901, pp 197 - 203

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00030067, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00030067

How to cite this article:

Herbert Richards (1901). The Hellenics of Xenophon. The Classical Review, 15, pp 197-203
doi:10.1017/S0009840X00030067

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

least acknowledge that B is as good as D. Now the reading $\delta\varsigma$ ἐξέπεμφας has, far above the other, marks of genuineness when we consider the remoteness of the vocative Σώγενης. It is moreover virtually supported by one Scholion to v. 76. $\delta\omicron\tau\iota\varsigma$, δ Σωγῆνης, τῶν τοῦ πεντάθλου ἀγωνισμάτων ἐξέπεμψεν ἑαυτοῦ τὸ γυῖον ἀνεν ἰδρώτος: for few will maintain the 3rd person to be anything more than a variation on the 2nd due to that remoteness of which I just now spoke. The application of $\delta\varsigma$ to Sogenes is to my mind correct: and is, after all, the main point. Pindar then says: I vow, Sogenes, that I am not exaggerating the praises of one who achieved victory in the $\pi\acute{\alpha}\lambda\eta$ before noontide: v. Pausanias vi. 24, § 1.

J. A. NAIRN.

The word *ἔλακεν* is much more likely to have fallen out than *ταῦρος*. J. ADAM.

—end: but it may be a question whether the latter part of the Second Book should be put in *B* or *A*. It is also held that the first division of the *Hellenics*, whatever its precise extent, must come very early, if not absolutely first, in the list of X.'s writings. Dittenberger and Roquette couple it with the *Cynegeticus*, though the latter at any rate thinks that to be some eight or ten years the earlier of the two. In a previous

volume of this Review I have analysed the language of the *Cynegeticus*, and it has occurred to me now that there may be some use in doing the same thing, more fully than it has been done yet, for the first two books of the *Hellenics*. Such an examination may help us on the one hand to conclusions as to comparative dates, and on the other may throw light on the many peculiarities of X.'s language. It is interesting to see to what extent these peculiarities appear in his earliest writings, if only we can be sure which his earliest writings are.

Dividing the two books at 2. 3. 10, and taking the two divisions separately—I shall call them *a* and *b*—I will first briefly indicate anything in the Greek that from this point of view seems noticeable. Perhaps I may venture to refer to my former articles as dealing more fully with several of the matters of idiom which I just mention here.

(a) 1. 1. 1—2. 3. 10.

1. X.'s characteristic use of *σύν* instead of *μετά* appears about ten times (1. 1. 11 and 32 : 3. 13 and 15 &c. : 2. 1. 7, 10 : 2. 21). *Ἄρα* used as a preposition, with the dative of a person, rare and Xenophontean, is found 1. 1. 26. 1. 2. 18 gives us in *πρὸς ἑπτακοσίους* amounting to 700, about 700, a very unusual use of *πρὸς* (usually *εἰς*), for which L. and S. refer only to Polybius; and in 1. 4. 15 *παρ' ἐκάστην ἡμέραν* is equally unusual for *καθ' ἐκάστην ἡμέραν*. The characteristic uses of *ὥς* = *ὥστε* and *ὥς* final are represented by at least one instance apiece, 1. 6. 20 *ὥς μὴ...καταδήλους εἶναι* and *ιδ.* 28 *ἀνήγετο...ὥς...προσπέσοι*. According to Weber final *ὥς* occurs five times as against three instances of *ὥτα*. Temporal *ἐπειδή*, for which the orators use *ἐπειδὴ*, is quite frequent (1. 2. 5 &c.). *Ἐπὶ* (1. 1. 29 : 2. 1. 27?) is not common in prose. *Μέχρι* used as a conjunction, decidedly rare in Attic, is found half a dozen times in Book 1 (1. 3, 6, and 27 : 2. 16 : 3. 6, 11), but nowhere else (I think) in *Hell.* though it appears in various parts of *Anab.* : *μέχρι οὗ*, which seems even less Attic, occurs 1. 5. 1 and 14. In 2. 1. 2 *μή* seems not purely final (Weber's *paratactic* use) but dependent on *σφαλερόν*. The single connecting *τε* and the double *τε-τε* are used a few times (according to Roquette *τε* 6 and *τε-τε* 7 times). X.'s rather favourite *ἦ* occurs 1. 7. 28. *ὥσεί* with numbers (1. 2. 9) is unusual; so is *ἐφ' ᾧ* for *ἐφ' ᾧτε* (2. 2. 20) and *ὅσα* for *ὅσάκις* (1. 1. 28). The very frequent use of *ἐντεῦθεν* in narrative (1. 1. 6, 8, &c. : cf. Ar.

Ach. 528, 530, 535, 539) strikes us, and the tmesis in *πρὸς δ' ἔτι* (1. 7. 27). Cf. *ὥς δ' αὖτως* 2. 2. 9. In 1. 2. 8 *σφίσιν*, if right, = simply *αὐτοῖς* and has no reflexive meaning. This is a use regarded as purely poetical (Kühner-Blass 1. 593. 5) but seems to recur 7. 5. and 6. 5. 35. We notice *σφᾶς αὐτοῦς* (not *ἐαυτοῦς*) 1. 3. 21 : 7. 8, and the same words meaning *ἡμᾶς αὐτοῦς* 1. 7. 19.

2. Unusual forms of words. *Δυνασθείς* (1. 4. 16) is a form of the aorist used by X. alone of Attic prose-writers. Very similar is the 'surprising' Ionic *φάμενος* (1. 6. 3) which he does not seem to use elsewhere. *Αὔξω* (1. 4. 13) is a form (Ionic? semi-poetical) often used by him for *αὐξάνω*. *Ἀπελογήθη* (1. 4. 13), if = *ἀπελογήσατο*, has to be illustrated from the old Attic of Antiphon, and from a grammarian's statement that Alexis once used it. It occurs here in a hopeless sentence, but the rarity of the form is in favour of its being really Xenophontean. *Ἐδωκαν* (1. 2. 10) barely deserves mention (*ἔδοσαν* Cobet).

3. Rare words. In Book 1 we notice 1. 27 *προηγόρῳ* (cf. 2. 2. 22) : 1. 30 *κοινότης* : 1. 32 *καταιτιαθείς* ; 1. 33 *προνομή* *foraging*, a very Xn. word not in Herodotus or Thucydides : 3. 7 *στενοπορία* (doubtful, cf. 3. 5. 20) : 3. 19 *εἰσέσθαι* from *εἰσιέναι* (Cobet *εἰσφρέσθαι*) : 4. 3 *κάρανος* : 4. 12 *ἔδος* *statue* (Isocr. 15. 2) and *οἰωνίζομαι* : 6. 4 *διαθροῶ* and *παραπίπτω* : 6. 5 and 12 *αἰτιάζομαι* : 6. 12 *ἐφοδιάζομαι* : 6. 13 *ἔμφρους* : 7. 20 *ἀποδικῶ* : 7. 30 *συμμορία*. We must add, if the text is right, the very odd use of *ἀνοίγω* 1. 1. 2 : 5. 13 : 6. 21.¹

4. Words either distinctly poetical or belonging to the vocabulary of such writers as Thucydides, Xenophon, Plato, not to that of the orators. Such are 1. 5 *ῥών* : 1. 30 (*συν*)*αλίζω* : 1. 37 &c. *λήγω* : 4. 15 *ἀμνηχανία* : 4. 17 *παροιχόμενος* : 4. 20 *λεχθείς* and 7. 16 *ἔλεξεν* instead of *ῥηθείς* and *εἶπεν* or *ἔλεγεν* : 5. 4 *μείων* : 6. 27 and 2. 1. 21 *ἀντίον* : 6. 28 *ἐξαπινάιως* (so *de Re. Eq.* 9. 5 : *ἐξαπίνης* several times in *Anab.*) : 7. 33 *γεραίρω* : Book II. 1. 24 and 27 *ἐπομαι* : 2. 3 *κοιμῶμαι* : 2. 9 *ὥσαύτως*. Of these *λήγω*, *λεχθείς* and

¹ It has been suggested that in the three passages we should read *ὥς ἤνυτον* &c. for *ὥς ἤνοιγον* &c., and this gives us just the right sense, *as best they could*, &c. In Ar. *Rhet.* 3. 9. 1409 b 4, the best MS. has by a blunder *ἀνοίγειν* for *ἀνύτειν*, and in Plut. *Mor.* 130 D *ἀνοιστόν* is a blunder for *ἀνυστόν* (*ὥς ἀνυστόν ἐστι*). We have *Anab.* 1. 8. 11 *ὥς ἀνυστόν* and *R. L.* 1. 3 ἦ *ἀνυστόν*; and, if *ὥς ἤνυτον* does not occur elsewhere in X., neither does *ὥς ἤνοιγον*. But it would be strange for the same mistake to occur in three successive places.

ἔλεξεν, μείων, ἀντίον, κοιμῶμαι may be called distinctly Xenophontean. If ἐθέλοντος in 1. 4. 14 means *wishing* and not *being ready*, it should be added to the list.

5. Words in unusual sense: unusual phrases. 1. 1. 13 διώκω simply *follow*: *ibid.* and 2. 1 ἄλλος *next* (τῇ ἄλλῃ ἡμέρᾳ as in *Cyr.* 2. 3. 24 and τῷ ἄλλῳ ἔτει: L. and S. omit the use); 4. 13 τὸ τῆς πόλεως δυνατόν *means*, with 6. 7 κατὰ γε τὸ ἑαυτοῦ δυνατόν and 14 εἰς τὸ ἐκείνου δυνατόν *power*: 4. 16 καὶνὰ (= νέωτερα) πράγματα: 5. 16 and 7. 1 οἱ ἐν οἴκῳ *those at home*: 5. 17 πονηρῶς φέρεσθαι *be ill spoken of* and 2. 1. 6 εὖ φέρεσθαι (3. 4. 25 κακῶς φέρεσθαι in the commoner sense): 6. 20 ἀνέχω *continue* (so *Thuc.*): 6. 29 ναύαρχος not *Spartan* (cf. 5. 1. 5): 7. 12 παράνομα συγγεγραφέναι (Cobet γεγραφέναι): 7. 14 καλεῖν *prosecute*: 7. 34 ἔκριναν τὴν Εὐρυππολήμην and ἔκριναν τὴν τῆς βουλῆς *voted for, carried a resolution*: Book II. 1. 1 ὦρα = τὰ ὥρατα: 1. 14 and 3. 8 παραδεικνύει φόρους in the sense of *paying over, accounting for*: 2. 20 καθιέναι *φυγάδας restore exiles* (usually *κατάγειν*).

6. There remain a few points of grammar or expression that deserve notice. 1. 1. 2 μετ' ὀλίγον τούτων *a little after this*. Cobet omitted τούτων. This might be right, though in dealing with such a writer as X. very risky, if the construction were only known from late Greek, e.g. Paus. 4. 29. 1 μετὰ δ' οὐ πολὺν χρόνον τοῦ ἔργου and *ib.* 8. 5. 5: [Lucian] 73. 31 μετ' οὐ πολὺ τῆς συκοφαντίας: Diod. 13. 84. 5 apparently. But Herodotus, with whom X. has many little things in common, writes 6. 40. 2 τρίτῳ ἔτει τούτων and *ib.* 46. 1 δευτέρῳ ἔτει τούτων. In 1. 1. 23 γράμματα πεμφθέντα ἔάλωσαν the plural verb is distinctly a Xn. habit. Δέκα μυριάδες στρατιάς (1. 1. 37), the genitive depending on μυριάδες, is an unusual turn of phrase; it recurs 5. 21 and *Anab.* 1. 4. 5: In 1. 4. 16 τοῖς δ' αὐτοῦ ἔχθροῖς we notice the unusual position of αὐτοῦ. A few more instances of this may be gathered from X., e.g. 7. 1. 20 οἱ ἄλλοι αὐτῶν σύμμαχοι. In 1. 4. 17 τῶν τε φοβερῶν ὄντων τῇ πόλει γενέσθαι the government of γενέσθαι by φ. ὁ. is remarkable. Κατηγορεῖν κατὰ τινος (1. 7. 9) is not quoted from any other place. The imperfect indicative in 2. 1. 14 ἀναμνήσας ὥς εἶχε φιλίας (not ἔχει or ἔχοι) is a construction found with special frequency in Xenophon.

(b) 2. 3. 10—end of book 2.

1. σύν ten or twelve times (3. 25, 48, 49, 54 etc.) and 3. 46 the very Xn. preposition

ἀμφί. Final ὥς 3. 14 and 33. Final ὅπως 3. 21, 28, 41 and 4. 3. Temporal ἐπεὶ 3. 38, 42 etc. Ἄρε, almost unknown in the orators, fairly common in Thucydides Xenophon Plato, occurs 3. 15. The characteristic ἐνθα *where* 3. 31 and the unusual ἐκείνη *there* 3. 34. In 4. 39 a demonstrative use of ἐνθα (δὴ), which is of frequent occurrence in *Anab.* and *Cyrop.*, as it is in Herodotus, but otherwise quite rare in Attic prose or poetry (*Phaedrus* 247 v: *Rep.* 618 v): usually temporal, occasionally local. (Plato, Xenophon, Aristotle have ἐνθα μὲν...ἐνθα δέ...demonstratively a few times: cf. *Thuc.* 6. 45). Πρόσθεν, not ἔμπροσθεν, 3. 48 twice. Πῇ 4. 31 and ὅπῃ 4. 38 where most Attic prose would have had ὅπου and ὅπως. The γε μὴν of which X. is so fond appears first in *Hell.* in 3. 33 and 42 and ἄλλὰ μὴν *ib.* 40: καὶ...δέ, also a favourite phrase, 4. 15 and answering τε in 4. 6: τε-τε 3. 12: anaphora with μὲν and δέ, very common in X., 3. 21, 25, 28, 29 etc.: τῷ παντί with a comparative 3. 22. The indirect reflexive σφίσι etc. rare in orators, 3. 13: 4. 8 twice and 35: σφᾶς αὐτοῖς, not ἑαυτοῖς, 4. 37. Ἐκ τούτου *after this* (4. 2, 10) is I think unusual elsewhere but frequent in parts at any rate of Xenophon.

2. Unusual forms of words: the aorist δυνασθῆ 3. 33 and the uncontracted genitive plural κερδέων 4. 21, 40, both Xn.: also ἔλᾶν for ἐλαύνειν, like ἀπέλα *Cyr.* 8. 3. 32, and perhaps συνέθηκαν 3. 20.

3. Words more or less rare. In Ch. 3 such are—14 συνεθέλω: 15 ὁμογνώμων, several times in X.: *ibid.* and twice in 31 ἀντικόπτω: *ibid.* and 51 θανατῶ: 25, 32, 41 περισφύζω: 33 ἐντρέπομαι *regard*, perhaps rather poetical: 38 βουλεία: 41 εὐδηλος quite Xn.: 44 γνωστός: 50 ἀναφεύγω: 56 ἀγαστός, probably in no prose but X.'s.

Ch. 4. 8 ἐξειδιῶμαι: 10 ἀρεστός, half a dozen times in X.: 13 ἀποσημαίνομαι: 20 κατασιωπῶ: 24 ἐκκαθεύδω and ἐφοδεύω: 32 συνέπομαι, rare or non-existent in oratorical prose: 34 ἐπιχωρῶ: 38 ἔκκλητοι.

We may add the phrases 3. 36 ὅτε ταῦτα ἦν *when these things were taking place*, and 50 τοῦτο οὐ βιωτὸν ἡγήσάμενοι: 4. 37 οἱ ἀπὸ τοῦ κοινοῦ.

4. Words of a slightly poetical nature: ἔλεξεν (3. 24, 35: 4. 9, 12, 20, 39): δυσμενής (3. 39, 42) and εὐμενής (3. 43, 50: 4. 31): προσφιλῶς (3. 44): λιτανεύω (4. 26). The first four of these are all Xn. words. Εὐνή (4. 6) may probably be added.

5. The following words appear in more or less unusual senses: 4. 1 ἄγω *evict* twice: 4. 25 πιστά *pledges* several times in X.,

though not in him only: and three compounds of *ἵεναι*, viz. 4. 11 *ἀνιέναι* *admit, allow to pass* (?) as in 7. 2. 12: 4. 32 *ἐνιέναι* *shoot*: 4. 39 *διέναι* *disband*.

6. In point of syntax we may notice 3. 30 *προπετής* with infinitive: 3. 55, 56 the imperfects indicative in *oratio obliqua*: 4. 2 *μάλ' εὐημερίας οὐσης*, in which it is not clear whether *μάλα* goes with *εὐημερίας, οὐσης*, or both (cf. 5. 4. 14 *μάλα χειμῶνος ὄντος*: 6. 2. 39 *μάλα στρατηγὸν νομιζόμενον*): 4. 7 *τροπαῖον στήσασθαι*, which X. prefers to *τ. στήσαι*: 4. 42 the Xn. substantival use of *καλά* in *τοῖς ἄλλοις καλοῖς*.

So far as the above observations go, it appears that there is no marked difference between the two parts. Probably the only points of distinction worth noticing—and they will seem extremely small—are that in *δ* there appear for the first time the very Xn. *ἐνθα* *where*, *ἀμφί*, and *μὴν* (*γε μὴν, ἀλλὰ μὴν*). On the other hand the conjunction *μέχρι* and *ὥς* = *ὥστε* occur in *α* and not in *δ*. The proportion of Xn. peculiarities cannot be called greater in the later composition, if 2. 3. 10—end is later, than in the earlier. There is however one significant difference which my statements above do not bring out, but which Roquette (De Vita X. pp. 40–46, 54–55) very rightly dwells on, and of which the appearance of *μὴν* is one and an important example. As compared with most of X.'s work, *α* like *Cynegeticus* is conspicuously deficient in *particles*, whereas in *δ* they certainly begin to appear, and they continue to appear (I am speaking now from a general impression) more and more frequently in the remaining books. The difference which they make does seem to me sufficient, when one has formed a habit of noticing such things, to establish a presumption of later date, though it is strange that in other respects no greater difference of diction manifests itself. But even in Books iii. and iv. the number of Xn. peculiarities seems to increase but slowly, and except in *particles* I should say there was very little distinction to be drawn, though no doubt there is some. I have however shrunk from the labour, which alone would enable anyone to speak with confidence, of examining those books and also the three last with equal minuteness.

There remains the second point. What light, if any, on the origin and history of X.'s departures from ordinary Attic idiom do we gain from the study of a composition generally and reasonably agreed to be early? We find him already using such words and

forms, notable in various ways, as (1) *σύν, ὥς, μέχρι*: (2) *ἐλέξεν, ἀντίος, μείων*: (3) *φάμενος, δυνασθεῖς*. Touching only the fringe of a somewhat extensive enquiry, we may therefore say that in an early work he is already using a diction which distinguishes him from all other Attic prose-writers without exception, and that these peculiarities can hardly have been acquired by him on Attic soil. I do not think it is really arguing in a circle to say that they point to his having already had much intercourse with non-Attic Greeks and that his notorious intercourse with such Greeks goes with other things to show that these peculiarities are not simply 'old Attic.' We should therefore be led, even on grounds of language alone, to conclude that *α* was at any rate not written before the expedition of Cyrus and probably not for some little time after his return from it.

I append some critical notes on passages of all seven books.

1. 2. 8 *οἱ δ' ἐκ τῆς πόλεως ἐβοήθησαν σφίσιν*.

Perhaps a participle has fallen out before *σφίσιν*, e.g. *προσπεσούμενοι* or *ἐπιχειρήσοντες*. X. uses the pronoun now and then, e.g. 1. 7. 5, with no reflexive sense.

1. 4. 6 *ὥς μηδὲν μέμψησθε*. Such a sudden transition into *oratio recta* is certainly found occasionally, but it would hardly be made here for the sake of two or three words and the various readings point to something wrong. Read rather *μέμψασθαι*, comparing 1. 6. 20.

ib. 16 *τοιούτος δοκεῖν εἶναι οἷοσπερ πρότερον*. The ordinary correction *τοιούτοις οἷοισπερ* fails to give any satisfactory sense. The meaning required seems to me something like *τοιούτοις δοκεῖν εἶναι οἷοιπερ ἦσαν πρότερον*, or (less ambiguously) *πρότερον μὲν δοκεῖν εἶναι οἷοιπερ καὶ ἦσαν*.

ib. 17 The aorist *κινδυνεύσαι* should, I think, be the future *κινδυνεύσοι* or *κινδυνεύσει*. Cf. 4. 4. 2 *γρόντες...ὥς...κινδυνεύσει πάλιν ἡ πόλις λακωνίσαι*: *Cyr.* 1. 5. 3 *λέγων ὥς...κινδυνεύσοιεν...καταστρέψασθαι*. The aorist would refer to the past. *Γενέσθαι* seems to depend on *φοβερῶν ὄντων*, as it might on *ἐπιδόξων ὄντων*, but the construction is unusual.

1. 6. 32 *εἶπεν ὅτι ἡ Σπάρτη οὐδὲν μὴ κάκιον οἰκεῖται αὐτοῦ ἀποθανόντος*.

Οἰκεῖται, for which one inferior MS. and the Aldine text have *οἰκνεῖται*, often adopted by editors, is impossible. Mr. Marchant mentions the modern conjectures *οἰκῆται, οἰκήσει, οἰκῇ, οἰκτεῖται*, of which the last

scarcely deserved mention. Οικεῖται 'will be founded, settled' is quite unsuitable in sense. Further the future with οὐ μή in a negative statement, though established for verse and even comic verse, must, I think, be regarded as questionable in prose. The regular prose use is the aorist subjunctive, the present subjunctive occurring very seldom, though it does occur (Goodwin *M.T.* 295), in any verb that has an aorist available. The use of some part of οἰκῶ in the passage before us may seem supported by such expressions as those of Aeschines 1. 180 οὐ πολλὸν χρόνον τὴν Σπάρτην ἀπόρθητον οἰκήσουσιν: 2. 182 οὐδεὶς ἡμῶν διὰ τὰς ἑμὰς ἡδονὰς κάκιον οἰκεῖ, but that part would naturally be the aorist active or passive, οἰκήσῃ (neuter) or οἰκηθῇ. The MS. readings οἰκεῖται and οἰκεῖται (though the latter may probably be no more than a guess) might be better accounted for, if we supposed X. to have written διακείται, *will be no worse off*. This perfect, practically a present, would be admissible in default of an aorist. The version of Callicratidas' words in Plut. *Mor.* 222 F οὐ παρ' ἑνα τὰ Σπάρτας ἀποθανόντος γάρ μου οὐδὲν ἡ πατρίς ἐλαττωθήσεται proves nothing either way. For the supposed confusion of *δια* and *οἰ* cf. the suggestion on 4. 1. 24.

ib. 35 ταῖς δὲ ἄλλαις κ.τ.λ. As the words stand, we could only take it that Theramenes and Thrasybulus were to rescue the survivors and collect the dead with 37 ships and also to conduct the rest against Eteonicus. But this is evidently not the meaning: cf. 7. 31. Some words have dropped out to the effect that 'they should themselves sail' against Eteonicus.

1. 7. 17. Much difficulty has been found in *ἔπεισαν* κ.τ.λ., nor is this, I think, surprising. It is surely clear on an examination of the passage that there is here a considerable hiatus. Euryptolemus rises to do three things: τὰ μὲν κατηγορήσων...τὰ δ' ὑπεραπολογησόμενος, τὰ δὲ συμβουλευσών. We have the *κατηγορῶ* μὲν at the beginning of 17, the *συμβουλεύω* δέ in the middle of 19, but the defence has disappeared, or rather is confused in 17-18 with the accusation, for no intelligible ground of blame is stated at all. What seems to have happened is that after *κατηγορῶ* μὲν οὖν αὐτῶν ὅτι a passage of indeterminate length has been lost, in which the speaker first censured Pericles and Diomedes and then went on to his second point, what he had to say in their favour. The *ἔπεισαν* κ.τ.λ. belongs to this second head, as the context shows: he lays stress on the kindly feeling which made them

persuade their colleagues to do something else than what was proposed. The infinitive governed by *ἔπεισαν* is lost. What we really have therefore in these two §§ is the defence, or some of it, not the accusation, which is never given at all.

ib. 24 καὶ οὐκ ἀδικοῦντες ἀπολοῦνται. 'Ἀδικοῦντες has given much trouble. I take it to be an instance of what we find apparently recurring in several other passages of the *Hellenics*: see on 2. 3. 48. A word that is in the copyist's mind as having already occurred or being about to occur is inadvertently substituted for the word that he ought to write. We all make this mistake ourselves in writing and in copying. 'Ἀδικοῦντες has occurred two lines previously and stands here by this mental trick for some other word or words. To the genuine word we have no particular clue.

ib. 29. Perhaps <ὑπὲρ> ἐαυτῶν ὄντας.

ib. 32. ὦν <ἦν> εἰς, as in 31?

2. 3. 14. Should not οὗς ἐβούλοντο be ὅσους ἐβούλοντο? In 4. 10. the MSS. vary between οἷς and ὅσοις. Cf. *τοσούτους* in 3. 42.

ib. 47. It is natural to conjecture that πάντως should be πάντων, as in the next line.

ib. 48. οἱ δὲ ἀπορίαν δραχμῆς ἀν' ἀποδόμενοι τὴν πόλιν δραχμῆς μετέχοιεν. This seems a clear case of the error spoken of above on 1. 7. 24. The second *δραχμῆς* is ludicrously inappropriate, some word expressive of *power*, *affairs*, etc., being clearly wanted. A like error, it seems to me, is to be found in the second *ἰππεῦσι* of 2. 4. 8, the second *ἐποίησε* of 6. 3. 10, the second *πορίζοντας* of 7. 2. 17, and possibly the second *λόγοι* of 4. 8. 15. Scholars do not always sufficiently appreciate (1) that errors are apt to arise from this cause: (2) that, when they do, the lost word may bear little or no resemblance to the word that has taken its place. Of course the error is easier if the two words are, for instance, of the same number of syllables, but there is no necessity in the matter, and therefore conjectural restoration has, as a rule, nothing to go by beyond the general sense required.

2. 4. 14. ἔχοντες γὰρ ὅπλα μὲν ἐναντίοι αὐτοῖς καθέσταμεν. οἱ δὲ θεοὶ κ.τ.λ. Unless something (e.g. ὀλίγοι) has been lost before μὲν, that word is out of its place. Put it after ἐναντίοι, comparing the notes below on 4. 1. 6. and 4. 3. 13.

ib. 38. αὐτοῖς should perhaps be αὐτοῦς, and *ib.* 40. πλουσιώτεροι would naturally be a superlative.

3. 2. 1. τῇ ἐαυτοῦ οἰκήσει Φρυγία. Οἰκήσει

perhaps a gloss. Cf. 4. 26. τὴν Φαρναβάζου Φρυγίαν and 4. 1. 1. The reference is to the distinction of the two Phrygias, Greater and Less.

ib. 28. περιεβλήθη?

3. 3. 2. εἰ δὲ υἱὸς κ.τ.λ. Do not these words belong to Agesilaus as a rejoinder? If so, Cobet's ἐμὲ ὦν ἂν would still be necessary, unless we read ἐμὲ δὴ δεῖ. In Doric ἂν is unsuitable.

ib. 8. Is τὴν right with γυναῖκα? Perhaps τινά. For λυμαίνεσθαι ἑώκει Cobet conjectured λ. ἐδόκει, and ἑώκει does seem odd. Perhaps λυμανεῖσθαι ἑώκει, which would be more ordinary.

ib. 10. πρῶτον...πρίν κ.τ.λ. The phrase is unusual and πρῶτον is liable to be confused with πρότερον. Should we read πρότερον here?

3. 4. 23. ἐπομένον. The future seems needed.

ib. 27. For εἶναι read εἶη. So perhaps in 5. 4. 35. we should read ἀντίποι.

4. 1. 6. ποῖον τινὸς γένους ἐστὶν ὁ Σ.; ὁ δ' εἶπεν ὅτι Περσῶν οὐδενὸς ἐνδεέστερος. Probably ἐνδεεστέρου.

ib. τοῦτον μὲν φασὶ τὴν θυγατέρα αὐτῷ καλλίονα εἶναι.

There is nothing to explain the μὲν after τοῦτον. Perhaps τοῦτον μέντοι, but I incline rather to φασὶ μὲν.

ib. 24. πολλὰ μὲν ἐκπώματα καὶ ἄλλα δὴ οἷα Φαρναβάζου κτήματα.

Οἷα does not seem very natural. Is it an error for ἰδία? The σκευή and ὑποζύγια belong to the army. Cf. the suggestion on 1. 6. 32. above.

ib. 36. καίτοι ἐλεύθερον εἶναι ἐγὼ μὲν οἶμαι ἀντάξιον εἶναι τῶν πάντων χρημάτων, οὐδὲ μέντοι τοιούτῳ σε κελεύομεν, πένητα μὲν, ἐλεύθερον δ' εἶναι. Logic requires the reverse order, ἐλεύθερον μὲν, πένητα δέ.

ib. 37. No doubt ἀποκρίνομαι is wrong, but ἀποκρινώμαι is at least as likely as ἀποκρίνωμαι.

4. 3. 13. ἔλεγεν ὡς ἀγγέλλοιτο ὁ μὲν Π. τετελευτηκώς, νικῶν δὲ τῇ ναυμαχίᾳ. A false antithesis. One could understand νικῶν, or ἀγγέλλοιτο μὲν..., νικῶν δέ. Cf. the note on μὲν above in 4. 1. 6.

4. 6. 6. ὁρῶντες δὲ τοὺς τυραννεύοντας. A predicate seems missing, e.g. ξένους: the tyrants were not even Corinthians.

4. 8. 5. φίλως ἐδέχοντο· φιλίως, as in *Cyr.* 6. 3. 13. ? or φιλικῶς, as in 7. 2. 23. ?

ib. 38. τοῖς πολεμίοις should, I think, be τοὺς πολεμίους. It is the enemy that are moving.

5. 1. 31. ὅσοι μὴ δέχονται. The future δέξονται is required. In 4. 2. 5. the present

tenses πέμποι, συστρατεύοιτο, παρέχοιτο may be right, but it is not unlikely that X. wrote futures. There is only the difference of a letter in each case, and no mistake is commoner.

5. 2. 4. τάφρον ὄρυττε., τοῖς μὲν ἡμίσει τῶν στρατιωτῶν προκαθημένους σὺν τοῖς ὅπλοις τῶν ταφρενόντων, τοῖς δ' ἡμίσειν ἐργαζομένους. When an instrumental dative of person is attached to a verb, as τοῖς ἡ. to ὄρυττε here, no participle can very well be joined to the dative. If we want a participle, the phrase then goes into the genitive absolute and X. would have written here τῶν ἡμίσεων προκαθημένων..., τῶν δ' ἡ. ἐργαζομένων. It seems to me clear that he really wrote here the nominatives προκαθημένους and ἐργαζόμενος. The general is said to do with, or by means of, his men what in reality they do. This is indeed the sense in which he τάφρον ὄρυττε and in which generals are constantly said τειχίζειν etc., in Greek as in all languages. For an exactly parallel use of a verb with an instrumental personal dative cf. *Cyr.* 1. 6. 11. ἔχων ἐργάτας οἷς ἂν ἐργάζοιτο. Herod. 2. 14. 4. has a very similar turn of phrase, though the dative in this case expresses animals, not men: ἐπεὰν καταπατήσῃ τῇσι ἐπὶ τὸ σπέρμα. In this book of the *Hellenics* 1. 19. τότε μὲν ἀναπαύων καὶ παραγγέλλων ἀποκοιμᾶσθαι, τότε δὲ κόπαις προσκοιζόμενος I am not sure that we should not read προσκείμενος, but it is hardly necessary to change.

ib. 39. ἔχειν should be ἔξεν. The thing is distinctly in the future.

5. 4. 30. οἷς ἐχρημάτισατο, Perhaps <ἐν> οἷς, ἐν having dropped out after εἰν.

6. 1. 15. ὅταν σπέυδῃ, ἄριστον καὶ δεῖπνον ποιησάμενος ἅμα πονεῖσθαι. I should conjecture ποιήσασθαι ἅμα πονούμενος or πονούμενος ἅμα ποιήσασθαι, meaning that he worked even at meals. The middle πονεῖσθαι does not seem to occur elsewhere in X., but in him it need not be questioned.

ib. 17. συντίθεσθαι.. τὰ ἑαυτοῦ is hardly Greek for τίθεσθαι or διατίθεσθαι. So in 4. 8. 20. συνθεμένους cannot mean *having got together* and has been altered.

6. 2. 32. ἤρετο ὅπως μήτε.. εἶναι μήτε.. ἀφίκεσθαι. Can X. have turned out such an anacoluthon all within half a dozen words? Is it not more likely that something is lost, e.g. ὅπως <δέοι> μήτε? The middle ἤρετο is stranger than πορεύεσθαι in 6. 1. 15. above, but apparently right. Cf. the middle voice of *συνορᾶν* in 6. 5. 23.

6. 4. 23. We should get fair sense, if we might read something like καὶ Α. ἂν περιγενέσθαι, εἰ ἀναγκάζονται τοῦ ζῆν ἀπονηθέντες

διαμάχεσθαι. Cf. Isocr. 6. 75. ἀπονενοημένως δὲ πρὸς τὸ ζῆν διακείμενον.

ib. 24. βούλεσθε <πάντας> or <τοὺς ἀνθρώπους>?

6. 5. 23. συνιδόμενον?

ib. 42. ἐλπίζειν δὲ χρὴ ὡς ἄνδρας ἀγαθοὺς .. γενήσεσθαι. Another almost inconceivable anacoluthon like that in 2. 32. Perhaps ὡς should be καί.

7. 1. 2. δοκεῖ ταῦτα οὐκ ἀνθρωπίνῃ μᾶλλον ἢ θείᾳ φύσει τε καὶ τύχῃ διωρίσθαι. A strange use of φύσει. Should we read θέσει? τιθέναι is used of the ordinances of heaven.

ib. 38. τὴν ὑμνουμένην ἂν χρυσὴν πλάτανον οὐχ ἱκανὴν ἔφη εἶναι τέττιγι σκιὰν παρέχειν. Ἄν gives a wrong sense. He did not say it would not be capable: he said it was not capable. Expressions like λεγόμενος, ὑμνού-

μενος etc., referring to some well-known name, phrase, story, very frequently have a δὴ added to them. Δὴ is very liable to be confused with ἄν. We may therefore read here τὴν ὑμνουμένην δὴ. Cf. 6. 3. 20. ὡς νῦν Θηβαίοις τὸ λεγόμενον δὴ δεκατεθῆναι ἐλπὶς εἶη: *Anab.* 1. 8. 10. τὰ δὲ δρεπανηφόρα καλούμενα: *Ar. Av.* 652. ἔστιν λεγόμενον δὴ τι: *Plat. Symp.* 221 B.: *Gorg.* 514 E.: *Soph.* 241 D.: *Phil.* 46 c.; *Menand. fragm. incert.* 221 (Meineke).

7. 4. 11. μένειν ὡς ἐν τῇ ἑαυτῶν πόλει ἔχοντας does not seem Greek. Some word has been omitted that went with ἔχοντας. It may have been such as ἡσυχίαν or ἡσυχως, or something quite different.

HERBERT RICHARDS.

ADVERSARIA BIBLICA.

1. SS. Mark, 11 § 3, Matt. 21 § 3, Luke 19 § 31, 34, ὁ κύριος αὐτοῦ (αὐτῶν) χρεῖαν ἔχει. Some years ago I noted that to me the natural translation would be 'Its (their) owner needs (it or them).' Since then I have asked a number of scholars, and all have told me that, though the question had never occurred to them, their answer would be the same as mine, with perhaps an alternative translation, 'Their owner has a job on.' I remark (1) our duty is first to translate naturally, then to comment, e.g. that the words seem an untruth, or that the owner may have been a disciple then with our Lord, or that it is assertion that Our Lord is the owner of the world ('all the beasts of the forest are mine, etc. '); (2) it is significant that the order is kept the same in all the synoptists. (3) *τις, τινες τῶν ἐκεῖ ἐστηκότων* are used in SS. Mark and Matt. for the objectors to the taking of the animals: St. Luke complicates the matter by saying *οἱ κύριοι αὐτοῦ*.¹ (4) St. Mark never uses ὁ Κύριος as a variant for Jesus: *a fortiori* in what is in the Triple Tradition, the words cannot be so used. St. Luke, who does so use them as a variant, may have mistaken the sentence, and his use of *οἱ κύριοι* may be due to this. More probably it is carelessness of possible misunderstanding: cf. 16 § 8. (5) Oddly enough we

can parallel our requirement that in order to get the ordinary translation, αὐτοῦ must be after χρεῖαν. St. Paul writes, 1 Cor. 12 § 21 (*bis*), *χρεῖαν σου (ὑμῶν) οὐκ ἔχω* (cf. St. Mark 14 § 63).

2. It has been attempted to show that the fragment of [St. Peter's] gospel is in its origin heretical from the fact that in it the mis-translation Ὁ Θεός μου, ὁ Θεός μου, εἰς τί με ἐγκατέλιπες; is not committed, but the correct ἡ δύναμις given, and from the fact that ἀνελήφθῃ is used of Our Lord's Death. But we have in St. Luke evidence that this attempt goes too far, and that we should rather suppose that this gospel was placed outside the Canon because it gave a handle to Gnostic dissidence from the Apostolic simple tradition by its indiscreet or naive lack of precision in dogmatic language—when weighed by the disputants in the refining discussions of the 2nd century. In 5 § 17 St. Luke writes δύναμις Κυρίου ἦν εἰς τὸ ἰᾶσθαι αὐτόν, which, however we interpret Κυρίου, has not the theological exactness of definition that we find later; and 9 § 51 we have ἐγένετο δὲ ἐν τῷ συμπληροῦσθαι τὰς ἡμέρας τῆς ἀναλήψεως αὐτοῦ. The use in St. John of ὑψωθῆναι ἐκ τῆς γῆς suggests the possibility that this union in one view of the Passion and Triumph may come from the Lord Himself.

3. St. Paul in *Rom.* 13 § 8 writes ὁ ἀγαπῶν τὸν ἑτερον νόμον πεπλήρωκε. Are not these words to be translated 'He that loves has fulfilled the second commandment (second

¹ St. Mark's continuation *καὶ εὐθὺς αὐτὸν ἀποστέλλει πάλιν* ὥδε probably will support our interpretation: St. Matt. has lost *πάλιν* and so makes the bystander the subject.