

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 Minor Works of Xenophon: X. Apologia Socratis

Herbert Richards

The Classical Review / Volume 12 / Issue 04 / May 1898, pp 193 - 195
DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00030547, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00030547

How to cite this article:

Herbert Richards (1898). The Minor Works of Xenophon: X. Apologia Socratis. The Classical Review, 12, pp 193-195 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00030547

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

1001 τιμίῳ γέρα?

1012 κηπεύματα?

1073 Ζεὺς ἀναξ ἀποστεροί—

ἡ γάμον δυσάνορα

δάϊον, ὥσπερ Ἴω

πημονῆς ἐλύσατ' αὖ

χειρὶ παιωνίᾳ, κατὰσχετον

εὐμενεί βίᾳ κτίσας.

'May Zeus preserve us, even as he delivered Io again out of her affliction, after making her possessed by kindly violence.' ὥσπερ

is Auratus' correction of ὅσπερ, αὖ mine of εὖ, and for κατασθένων Weil restored κατὰσχετον:—the word must have been an adjective, and no other is textually probable; but the sense of it must be κάτοχον. Cf. *Eum.* 17 τέχνης δέ νιν Ζεὺς ἐνθεον κτίσας φρένα, where the schol. notes that κτίσαι = ποιῆσαι is a favourite use of Aeschylus (with an adjective, also *Eum.* 717, *Cho.* 1058, *Pers.* 292).

WALTER HEADLAM.

(To be continued.)

THE MINOR WORKS OF XENOPHON.

(Continued from Vol. XI., p. 425.)

X. APOLOGIA SOCRATIS.

WE will try this by the same test of language which we have applied to other disputed works.

The ὥς = ὥστε, which X. alone, or almost alone, of Attic prose writers employs, is found in 16 (ὥς τῶν ἀλλοτριῶν μηδενὸς προσδεῖσθαι). Ἐνθα 'where' occurs in 23. ἰσχυρῶς = πάνυ, σφόδρα will be found in 5 (ἰσχυρῶς ἀγάμενος) and 28 (ἐπιθυμητὴς μὲν ἰσχυρῶς αὐτοῦ): μείον in 24 and 26: σύν in 24 (Διὸς καὶ Ἥρας καὶ τῶν σὺν τούτοις θεῶν); ἐπεὶ of time 3, 4, 14, 33. We have seen before that X. likes a construction such as ἡ ῥᾶστα 'in the easiest way' (7), where other writers usually employ not ἡ but another word: and we have had occasion to notice the poetical λήγω (8), εὐφροσύνη (8), εὐπάθεια (18), κατὰδῆλος (23), μεγαλύνω (32), as words which he rather affects. Δωρεῖσθαι (17) is used chiefly by the poets, hardly ever in oratory (Isocr. 4. 26), never in comedy or in Thucydides, occasionally in X. and Plato. Still more uncommon in Attic prose is οἱ γεννήμενοι (20) which even Plato does not use, but X. *Mem.* 1. 4. 7 does. Ὀμμα is often used by Plato, constantly by Aristotle, occasionally by X. (e.g. *Symp.* 1. 9: *de Re Eq.* 11. 9), otherwise uncommon in prose. Anyone who observes ὄμμα and ὀφθαλμός in Aristophanes and the comic fragments will be able to measure the extent to which each was in familiar use. Κυδρός (29) is known to us chiefly from poets: it occurs however *de Re Eq.* 10. 16. The starting-point of the

Apologia is the μεγαληγορία (1 twice and 2) of Socrates; the very word is distinctly Xn., for X. uses the verb μεγαληγορεῖν three times (*An.* 6. 3. 18: *Cyr.* 4. 4. 2: 7. 1. 17) and the adjective μεγαλήγορος once (*Cyr.* 7. 1. 17), while elsewhere it hardly occurs (Aesch. *Theb.* 565: Eur. *Heracl.* 356).

I will enumerate a few other uncommon words: διασαφηνίζω (1: *Mem.* 3. 1. 11: *R.L.* 4. 3). The simple σαφηνίζω occurs several times in X., otherwise usually in poetry: cf. σαφηνής in poetry and (σαφηνέως) Herodotus: διαρίγγομαι with participle (3: half a dozen times in X., otherwise rare: cf. διαβεβιωκέναι with participle just before): βιοτεύω (6: *Oec.* 15. 3: 20. 15 and often in X.): εὐμένεια (7: εὐμενής rare in prose, often in poets and X.): προξενῶ (7: *An.* 6. 5. 14): φιλοφρονεῖσθαι (7: often in X. and Plato, not common otherwise: X. has φιλόφρων also half a dozen times): ἐπίσκεψις (8: three or four times in X.): ἐτοιμάζομαι middle (8: *Cyr.* 3. 3. 5): ἀμφιλέγω (12: *An.* 1. 5. 11. Ἀμφισβητῶ is the usual word. Cf. the Xn. ἀμφίλογος): συμβούλευμα (13: *de Re Eq.* 9. 12: a very rare synonym for συμβουλή): ὑπερφέρω (15: *Mem.* 3. 5. 13 and twice in *R.L.*): ἐξ ὅτου(περ) since (16 and 27: *An.* 7. 8. 4: *Cyr.* 8. 2. 15: quite rare): ἰσομοιρία (21: *Cyr.* 2. 2. 21, 22): λιπαρητέον (23: λιπαρεῖν *Oec.* 2. 16: *Cyr.* 1. 4. 6: *Hell.* 3. 5. 12): ἐφέπεσθαι, παρέπεσθαι (23 and 27: we have seen before that ἔπομαι is not used freely in prose, though it and its compounds occur often in X. and one or two other writers): προσβατός (23: *An.* 4. 3. 12: 8,

9): προσεθίζω (25: *Hipparch.* 1. 17: *Cyr.* 8. 1. 36): ὁμολογουμένως (27: *Oec.* 1. 11): εὐπραγείν (27: εὐπραγία *Oec.* 9. 12): εὐθυμητέον (27: εὐθυμείσθαι, εὐθυμία several times in X.): δουλπορεπής (30: *Mem.* 2. 8. 4): κακοδοξία (31: κακοδοξείν *Mem.* 1. 7. 2 and 3. 6. 17: κακοδόξος *Ages.* 4. 1: the words are very rare): ἐμαλακίσατο (33. This rare aorist middle instead of ἐμαλακίσθην is only quoted from *Cyr.* 4. 2. 21).

Θανάτου ὑπὸ σοῦ διώκεσθαι (21) is like *Hell.* 7. 3. 6 τουτουσὶ διώκομεν θανάτου, unless περὶ θανάτου is the right reading there: in any case we have ὑπάγειν θανάτου *ib.* 1. 3. 19: 2. 3. 12: 5. 4. 24. In 23 ὅτι δὲ οὕτως ἐγένωσκε καταδηλώτερον ἐγένετο ἐπειδὴ κ.τ.λ. is the irregular imperfect in *oratio obliqua* (for γινώσκει or γινώσκει) which we have seen before to be rather characteristic of X., here facilitated by its coming before the past tense on which it depends. For ἀποκτείνω used of the accuser (26 and 29) cf. *Hell.* 2. 3. 32 (κατηγορῶν ἀπέκτεινεν αὐτούς) and 35. Οἱ ἐμοὶ εὖνοι in 27 reminds us of οἱ ὑμέτεροι δυσμενείς in *Hell.* 5. 2. 33. 'Ἐπιθυμητὴς μὲν ἰσχυρῶς αὐτοῦ (28) 'a great lover of his company,' is like *Mem.* 1. 2. 60 πολλοὺς ἐπιθυμητὰς λαβών (also of Socrates) and *ib.* 1. 2. 5 τοὺς ἑαυτοῦ ἐπιθυμοῦντας. With ἀρρωστέον τὴν ψυχὴν (30) cf. *Oec.* 4. 2 αἱ ψυχαὶ πολλὰ ἀρρωστώτεραι γίνονται. The antithesis of ἐκ τῆς ἀγορᾶς and ἐκ τῆς ψυχῆς in 18 is found also in *Symp.* 4. 41.

There are a few things that should be pointed out as slightly noticeable and not Xn. There seems no precise parallel anywhere for ἐκλήθη εἰς τὴν δίκην (1) nor perhaps for βραχεία in συνεγενόμην βραχεία τῷ Ἀνίου ὑῖῳ (30). I do not know if ἐρρήθη is elsewhere used impersonally (1 οὕτως ἐρρήθη ὑπὸ Σωκράτους), but it is justified by εἴρηται. This impersonal use, though much commoner in perfects and pluperfects, is also found in aorists. We have it again in ἦν νῦν κατακριθῇ μου (7), with which cf. Plato *Polit.* 299 A ὦν δ' ἂν καταψηφισθῇ. Ἀλγύνω (8) is just such a word as we often find in X., known to us otherwise from the poets, and we actually find in him ἄλγος (*Symp.* 8. 37) and ἄλγιδών (*Mem.* 1. 2. 54): οἰκτίζω (4) is another word of the same kind. X. has not elsewhere εἶναι after ὀνομάζω (13 οἰωνοὺς... ὀνομάζουσι τοὺς προσημαίνοντας εἶναι), but Plato and Herodotus have. *Symp.* 6. 2 ὅταν διαλίπωμεν (i.e. λέγοντες) is practically the same as οὐπόποτε διέλιπον ζητῶν (16). Μεγαλύνειν ἑαυτόν (32) is usually expressed by μεγαλύνεσθαι. Schneider says ἀξιομακάριστος (34) is not Xn. It is not, but ἀξίεπαῖνος, ἀξιάκουστος, ἀξίεραστος, ἀξιοθαύμαστος, and

half a dozen similar coinages are. In fact he is fond of making up these words with ἀξιο-. Οἰωνοστήριον (12) is probably not found elsewhere in good Greek, but X. has οἰωνίζομαι, a rare verb, two or three times. No other authority than 25 is cited for ἀνδραπόδισις.

There seems to be nothing in the use of particles which is different from Xn. usage, and the absolute disregard of hiatus is quite in accordance with it.

So far, therefore, as the language goes, there is, I should say, nothing against X.'s authorship, and a great deal in its favour. The language, like the spirit, of the work is quite Xn. Nor can I see anything else that need dispose us to doubt. The repetition of a few sections that occur in the *Memorabilia* seems a very insufficient reason. The two books may have been written at different times, and the sections they have in common are only a small part even of the short *Apologia*. Nor are these sections verbally identical: they vary a little in places, and in a way which perhaps suggests the same author writing at different times rather than a copyist, who would probably have varied either less or very much more. Thus it is the *Apol.* which tells us that τὸ δαιμόνιον stopped Socrates twice, when he was going to meditate on his defence, unless indeed δῖς should be added in the *Mem.* So again the words in 4 ἢ ἐκ τοῦ λόγου οἰκτίσαντες ἢ ἐπιχαρίτως εἰπόντας (ἀπέλυσαν) with their unusual but not unexampled construction (cf. *Mem.* 2, 2, 5 and 2, 7, 8) do not seem the work of a mere imitator. Οἰκτίσαντες is not at all an imitator's word: he would have been much more likely to use ἐλεήσαντες. Indeed, as far as these things go, Geel's contention that the passage in *Mem.* was added later from the *Apol.* seems at least as likely as the contrary hypothesis. In any case it is only about a fifteenth part of *Apol.* that is found also in *Mem.*, and the rest of the matter is quite reason enough for separate treatment. We may bear in mind the parallel case of the parts, much more extensive, which the *Hell.* and the *Ages.* have in common. It is, perhaps, not very good work, but the same may be said of portions of the *Memorabilia*; and in spite of Schneider, who finds ineptitude in every second sentence, it does not seem to fall conspicuously below the level of X. In general tone and spirit it agrees perfectly well with the *Mem.* Geel and Cobet (*N.L.* p. 678) seem therefore justified in regarding it as a sort of concluding chapter to that work, if by this expression (*Memorabilium partem ultimam*

Cobet) they mean not strictly a chapter or integral part, but rather a closely connected pendant.

Since the above was written, I have been glad to find Schanz, for the completion of whose critical edition of Plato all Platonic students hope against hope, giving an opinion in favour of the Xn. authorship: see his *Apologîa* (*Platonis*) of 1893, p. 83.

Schenkl, who holds the *Apologia* to be a rhetorical exercise of the second century B.C., has given in the third part (1876) of his *Xenophontische Studien* a useful summary of a collation of the two MSS. on which the text mainly depends.

1. ἐκλήθη εἰς τὴν δίκην should possibly be <προς> ἐκλήθη εἰς. See above.

ibid. πάντες ἔτυχον τῆς μεγαληγορίας αὐτοῦ· ᾧ καὶ δῆλον ὅτι τῷ ὄντι οὕτως ἐρρήθη ὑπὸ Σωκράτους.

Schneider takes ἔτυχον to mean 'hit,' 'succeeded in representing,' and this is the only meaning it could very well have. But the reasoning would be very bad. 'All writers have succeeded in representing the dignity of his language, and this shows that it really was dignified.' What they really did was somehow to bear witness to it. Some participle or participial phrase has been lost, which went with ἔτυχον ('they all agreed in'), but whether the missing word expressed 'mentioning' or, as others have thought, 'admiring,' or something else, it is beyond our power to say.

5. εἰ καὶ τῷ θεῷ δοκεῖ ἐμὲ βέλτιον εἶναι ἢ δὴ τελευτᾶν.

The sense seems to require ἐμοί. 'Better that I should die' might mean 'better for Athens,' etc., not 'better for me.' The words in 33 point clearly to the change, ἐπεὶ ἔγνω τοῦ ἔτι ζῆν τὸ τεθνάναι αὐτῷ κρείττον εἶναι :

cf. 1. ἐαυτῷ ἡγαίτο αἰρετώτερον εἶναι τοῦ βίου θάνατον. On the other hand we have the accusative in the parallel place *Mem.* 4, 8, 6 εἰ τῷ θεῷ δοκεῖ βέλτιον εἶναι ἐμὲ τελευτᾶν τὸν βίον ἢ δὴ. I am inclined to ἐμοί in both places.

9. ταύτην (τὴν δόξαν) ἀναφαίνων εἰ βαρύνω τοὺς δικαστάς, αἰρήσομαι κ.τ.λ. Read βαρυνῶ.

11. ἐπεὶ θύοντά γέ με...καὶ οἱ ἄλλοι οἱ παρτυγχάνοντες ἐώρων καὶ αὐτὸς Μέλητος, εἰ ἐβούλετο.

Surely εἰ ἐβούλετο implies an ἄν with the verb of the apodosis, 'might have seen me, had he wished.' Κἂν αὐτός seems better than κἂν οἱ ἄλλοι. They did see him and Meletus might have seen him.

14. ἀνέλκει δ' Ἀπόλλων μὴδένα εἶναι ἀνθρώπων ἐμοῦ μῆτε ἑλευθεριώτερον μῆτε δικαιώτερον μῆτε σωφρονέστερον.

The conjecture may be hazarded that we should add μῆτε σοφώτερον. Wisdom certainly ought to be specified, and σωφρονέστερον does not express it. In 16 δουλεύοντα ταῖς τοῦ σώματος ἐπιθυμίαις answers to σωφρονέστερον, ἑλευθεριώτερον and δικαιώτερον are repeated, and we then come to σοφὸν δὲ πῶς οὐκ ἄν τις εἰκότως ἄνδρα φήσειεν εἶναι (where I am not convinced with Hirschig and Schenkl that ἐμέ should be inserted) κ.τ.λ.

20. ἄλλα ναὶ μὰ Δία, ἔφη ὁ Μέλητος, ἐκείνους οἶδα οὓς σὺ πέπεικας σοὶ πείθεσθαι μάλλον ἢ τοῖς γεναμένοις.

Should ἐκείνους be ἐνίους?

22. ἐρρήθη μὲν δῆλον ὅτι κ.τ.λ.

Probably μὲν <οὖν>, or δὴ has been lost before δῆλον: μὲν δὴ occurs 31 and 34.

26. Probably οἶδα <δ'> ὅτι.

29. οὗτός ἐστι καὶ ὁ νικῶν.

Perhaps ἔσται, 'will prove.'

33. πρὸς τᾶλλ' ἀγαθὰ would seem more proper than πρὸς τᾶλλα τὰγαθὰ.

HERBERT RICHARDS.

HERODOTUS ON THE DIMENSIONS OF THE PYRAMIDS.

I venture, though neither archaeologist nor Egyptologist, to ask the attention of those who are such to a few remarks on the topic proposed above, because there seems to be at this time some danger that the gain of their rich discoveries may be turned unnecessarily to an indirect loss, in depreciating, or rather destroying at all points, the credibility of an author upon whom, after all, we depend for much information not to be had from hieroglyphs.

The interpretation of what Herodotus says about the size of the Pyramids is disputable; it is perhaps open to fresh light; but of this at least I am sure, that, if we must accept the interpretation, which appears to content some recent investigators, the testimony of Herodotus is universally worthless. He is convicted of that 'crass negligence' which, in its effect upon the value of a witness, is as damaging as deliberate fraud.

Describing first the larger of the two