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A NOTE ON XENOPHON

HISTORIA GRAECA II. 3. 20

The type of ruse which the Thirty effected here is quite clear, although exactly how it was worked out is not at all certain from Xenophon's narrative as it stands. The intention of the Thirty was to make sure of their power by having under arms only those citizens (3000 in number) whom they felt they could trust.

There are two problems in the text: 1) a. What is the meaning of Xενοφόντος ποιήσας τῶν μὲν τρισχιλίων ἐν τῇ ἁγορᾷ τῶν δ' ἔξω τοῦ κατάλογου ἄλλων ἄλλαχον ἐπειτα κελεύσαντες ἐπὶ τά ὀπλα ἐν δ' ἐκεῖνοι ἀπεληλόθεαν πέμφαντες τοὺς φρουρούς καὶ τῶν πολιτῶν τοὺς ὁμογώμονας αὐτοῖς τὰ ὀπλα πάντων πλῆν τῶν τρισχιλίων παρείλλοντο...

The type of use which the Thirty effected here is quite clear, although exactly how it was worked out is not at all certain from Xenophon's narrative as it stands. The intention of the Thirty was to make sure of their power by having under arms only those citizens (3000 in number) whom they felt they could trust.

There are two problems in the text: 1) a. What is the meaning of κελεύσας ἐπί τά ὀπλα; b. To whom was this order given? 2) Who are the ἐκεῖνοι?

First of all, it is quite clear what the Thirty intended to, and did, accomplish, the removal of weapons from all but the trusted 3000 of the citizen body. As for ἐπί τά ὀπλα the editors explain it variously, e.g. Büchsenschütz, „kurz für κελεύς ἐπί τά ὀπλα,” with the meaning of “go and fetch”. 1) The parallel cited is Anabasis I. 5. 13: εἴδος παραγγέλλει εἰς τά ὀπλα. Here the meaning is clearly “go and fetch”, but there is no parallel at all. For Anab. I. 5. 13 refers to troops at leisure who must hurry to arm in order to defend their camp. Certainly there is no notion here of using arms for any military purpose. Another passage frequently quoted as a parallel is HG II. 3. 54: ἐνέλευσε τοὺς ἐνδεχα

1) Xenophon Griechische Geschichte (Leipzig 1891*) 81. Some editors prefer the phrase “to arms” as a translation; the meaning is about the same.
This, as Cobet\(^2\) already pointed out, is even more far-fetched. In this passage the meaning is obviously a common one of ἐπὶ, namely, “against”, in a hostile sense; hardly “go and fetch”, but rather “lay hands on and arrest.”

Again, why should men called out to a military review (ἐξέτασις)\(^3\) be then sent back to get their equipment?\(^4\)

1) b. Granting for the moment that “go and fetch” is the correct rendering of ἐπὶ τὰ ὀπλα, to whom was this order given? Clearly not to the 3000, for what would be the point of their bringing arms which the Thirty intended that they keep? Was the order given to those ἔξω τοῦ καταλόγου? If, as those who interpret the phrase as “go and fetch” must also assume, the arms are already piled up somewhere, why did the Thirty bother with a move that makes the whole operation more difficult?

This leads directly into problem 2), who are the ἐκείνοι? Most editors feel that this must mean the 3000. Shortly afterwards Xenophon speaks of the arms of all except the 3000 as having been seized by the Spartan garrison\(^5\) acting together with τῶν πολιτῶν οἱ ὀμογνώμονες κύριοι (sc. the Thirty). It is clear that these latter can be none other than the 3000\(^6\). Surely there would be

2) C.G. Cobet, *Novae Lectiones* (Leiden 1858) 311.
3) ἐξέτασις usually in the phrase ἐξέτασις ἐν ὀπλοῖς. Cf. Thucydides IV. 74. 3, VI. 45, VI. 96. 3; *Ath. Pol.* 31. 2. ἐξέτασις σὺν τοῖς ὀπλοῖς γίνεται: Xenophon *Anab.* V. 3. 3. In *Anab.* I. 2. 14, however, ἐξέτασις is used alone and, as the rest of the passage makes clear, it is a review under arms. Hailstone (Hellenics of Xen. Bks. I and II [London 1878] 125) quotes Arnold on Thucydidies II. 5 to the effect that Greek soldiers “at ease” left their arms; Hailstone adds Thuc. IV. 91 and VI. 38. 2, but all three situations are quite different from the event in question here.
4) So too J. Hatzfeld, *Xénophon Helleniques*, Vol. I (Paris 1936) 86: “Il s’agit visiblement d’un stratagème destiné à faire quitter leur équipement aux gens qui ne font pas partie des Trois-Mille, à les éloigner, et à s'emparer des armes abandonnées. x. e. t. o. est ici dépourvu de sens, car on ne peut concevoir qu’on appelle aux armes des gens qui sont déjà armés pour la revue.”
5) If we accept the order of events as given in *Ath. Pol.* 37. 2, then the ἐσοφόλοι cannot be the Spartan garrison. G. Colin, *Xénophon Historien* (Paris 1933) 59, note 1, suggests that the ἐσοφόλοι are the guards of the Thirty, the μαστίγοφόροι ὑπηρέται (Ath. Pol. 35. 1), a kind of special police force ready to carry out the decisions of the Thirty.
6) That this must have been the total number is made clear by the facetious remark of Theramenes (supra, *HG* II. 3. 19) that it seemed odd to him that there be some necessity that only 3000 be καλοὶ κάραβολ. Cf. *HG* II. 4. 2, 9. These last two passages make it clear that there were ἵππεις in addition to the 3000. See G. Colin, op. cit., 42, note 1.
no point in sending them out just to call them back again. If the ἐκεῖνοι are οἱ ἔξω τοῦ καταλόγου, why send them home with the arms they have “gone and fetched”? Nevertheless, the reader feels certain, after having read the whole passage, that the ἐκεῖνοι must be those outside the list?) who “had gone home”. 8) But how is this possible?

In the face of such difficulties of text and interpretation it is best to admit that there are serious difficulties in the text and give up any attempt to interpret what we are given by the codices.

Let us go back to the beginning. The text as it now stands reads: ἐπιτά κελεύσαντες ἐπὶ τὰ ὀπλα. We must admit the possibility that ἐπὶ τὰ ὀπλα is corrupt. The proximity of ἐπιτά to ἐπὶ τὰ strongly suggests that the scribe’s eye may have wandered and he wrote ἐπιτά κελεύσαντες ἐπιτά ὀπλα, effectively removing the word or words 9) that stood before ὀπλα; such errors are common enough as any textual critic can attest. Later, when this phrase was seen to make no sense, the obvious remedy was to emend the second ἐπιτά to ἐπὶ τά. Since with errors of this type anything at all may have dropped out, it is difficult to divine exactly what appeared here originally. It is perhaps a fair assumption that the word or phrase began with ἐπι- or ἀπε- or ὀπλ-, and this likeness caused the scribe to err. At this point if we supply one word, then it must be a word meaning “leave behind”. My suggestion would be to read ἐπιτά κελεύσαντες ὑπολιτέσθαι τὰ ὀπλα.10)

Once this correction is made, the rest is fairly straightforward. Despite the omission of a subject for ὑπολιτέσθαι, the logic

7) For ἐκεῖνοι = “the latter”, see L-S-J s.v., 1; Xen. Mem. I. 3. 13.
8) The variant reading ἀπελθόθησαν (if it is not a ghost reading), if reduced to ἀπελθόθησαν = “were disbanded”, does not help at all.
9) The possibility that a complete phrase has been omitted must not be overlooked. Cf. L. Dindorf’s emendation (quoted by K. Hude, Xenophon-tis Historia Graecα, ed. maior [Leipzig 1930] in the app. crit.): κελεύσαντες ἀπίεναι ἀπολεμένους [νελ καταλογόντας] τὰ ὀπλα. In his own edition (1853), however, Dindorf keeps the MSS reading and refers to Anab. I. 5. 13 and HG II. 3. 34 which, as has been said above, are no parallels at all.
10) I should prefer some form of ἐμλήτω, but this word is not attested in this meaning except in a disputed passage in Anab. I. 8. 18: ὑπολεκτόμενον [ἐπιτά κελεύσαντες codd.] (here passive) ἠδέι τοῦ θεοῦ θείων. Cf. E. C. Marchant, ed., Xenophon-tis Exscriptio Cyri (OCT 1904). I would accept the MS reading here, but this still leaves the evidence very flimsy. The other use of ἐμλήτω in the meaning of “leave behind” quoted by L-S-J (Od. 8. 475): νῦν ὑπολεκτόμενον, ἐπὶ δὲ πλεῖον ἐμλήτω is incorrect. Here the meaning is clearly “left over in addition”.
of the situation narrated will compel us to accept τοὺς ἐξω τοῦ καταλόγουν as the implied subject, and the ἐνέινοι referring back to this subject 11).
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11) Cf. C. G. Cobet’s comment (op. cit. 311) on HG II. 3. 54: κελεύειν... ἐπὶ τὸν Θηραμένην, he says: “...Suaviter multi in talibus λέναι cogitando supplendum esse aient. Quem locum ad id confirmandum omnes afferunt ex vicinia II. 3. 20. miror neminem vidisse prorsus absurdum esse. Vide modo: οἱ δ’ ἐξέπαιν... παρελθόντο. Qui haec sine risu legere potest ἀγέλαστος τις εἶναι μοι δοξεί aut id quod scriptum est non intelligere... Satis habebo si nemo hoc loco abutetur ad demonstrandum λέναι eleganter omitti in κελεύον ἐπὶ ὁπλά. G. E. Underhill, Xenophon Hellenica I, II (Oxford 1915) ad loc. agrees that ἐνέινοι = οἱ ἐξω τοῦ καταλόγου, but maintains that τως τοις σχμιδὸς must be supplied as an object of κελεύοντες which would still leave the passage quite unclear.

TERMS FOR THALASSOCRACY
IN THUCYDIDES

It seems to be generally agreed that, except for such minor peculiarities of vocabulary and style as have been noted by Wilhelm Schmid 1), the language of Thucydides does not show any important changes from passage to passage or book to book. Indeed, Mme. de Romilly flatly asserts: “It stands out clearly from all the studies made of the style and language of Thucydides, that these remain basically the same throughout all his work.” 2) Evidently overlooked is one possibly significant exception. The five words in the table below are of infrequent but important occurrence and are found only in the last four books, in the passages indicated.

1) W. Schmid, Handbuch der Altertumswissenschaft, VII, 1, 5, 1948. p. 189, n. 3. “...die meisten Eigenheiten scheint B. VIII zu enthalten.”