

LSJ s.v. στόμα III. 2 cite this passage and translate “at the very verge of life”, a rendering whose only merit is that, in context, it equals in meaninglessness the Greek original. στόματι is clearly corrupt and Hutchinson’s τέρματι should be received into the text. Marchant’s *apparatus* incorrectly reports πρὸς τὸ τέρμα as the reading in Plutarch: the Plutarch manuscripts have πρὸς τῷ τέρματι. In fact, in the passage in question (*Mor.* 784 E-F), Plutarch explicitly states that he is quoting Xenophon *verbatim* (αὐτοῖς ὀνόμασιν). Since ancient authors often quoted from memory due to the inconvenience involved in checking references in a *volumen*, Plutarch is thus an especially valuable witness here. τέρμα in the sense of ‘end of life’ occurs in a variety of combinations, as may be seen from a glance at *LSJ s.v. τέρμα* II. 2 (to the examples adduced there add Aelian *V.H.* 2. 35 Γοργίας ὁ Λεωντῖνος ἐπὶ τέρματι ὄν τοῦ βίου...). For those who desire further proof, I would compare in *Xenophon himself Lac.* 10. 1: Καλῶς δέ μοι δοκεῖ ὁ Λυκοῦργος νομοθετῆσαι καὶ ἧ μέχρι γήρωσ ἀσκοῖτ’ ἂν ἀρετή. ἐπὶ γὰρ τῷ τέρματι τοῦ βίου κτλ. In such expressions ἐπί seems to be commoner than πρὸς, but this should not cause us pause. Euripides, for example, has γήρωσ ἐσχάτοις πρὸς τέρμασιν (*Andr.* 1081) and the parallel in Plutarch confirms the πρὸς in our passage. In fact, the corruption +στοματι+ is itself proof that Xenophon wrote πρὸς here: the scribe was deceived into writing στόματι precisely because he had still in his ear the sigma and the tau of πρὸς τῷ – quite literally a case of stuttering. Finally, I would caution in advance against any attempt at defending πρὸς τῷ στόματι τοῦ βίου by a comparison with the old Homeric phrase ἐπὶ γήρωσ οὐδῶ: *patrociniūm doctius quam verius*.

Symp. I. 6–7:

- 1 καὶ ὁ Καλλίας, Καὶ πρόσθεν μὲν γε, ἔφη, ἀπεκροτυτόμην ὑμᾶς ἔχων πολλὰ καὶ σοφὰ λέγειν, νῦν δέ, ἐὰν παρ’ ἐμοὶ ᾗτε, ἐπιδείξω ὑμῖν ἑμαυτὸν πάνυ πολλῆς σπουδῆς ἄξιον ὄντα. οἱ οὖν ἀμφὶ τὸν Σωκράτην πρῶτον μὲν, ὡσπερ εἰκὸς ἦν, ἐπαινοῦντες
- 5 τὴν κλήσιν οὐχ ὑπισχνούντο συνδειπνήσειν· ὡς δὲ πάνυ ἀχρόμενος φανερός ἦν, εἰ μὴ ἔψουντο, συνηκολούθησαν. ἔπειτα δὲ αὐτῷ οἱ μὲν γυμνασάμενοι καὶ χρυσάμενοι, οἱ δὲ καὶ λουσάμενοι παρήλθον.

⁸ παρήλθον *tuetur Naber coll. Alexis (sic) ap. Athen.* iv. 170 B: προσῆλθον *Richards*

Callias is inviting Socrates and some of his friends to come to a *symposion* at his house. The words ἐὰν παρ’ ἐμοὶ ᾗτε (“if you

are/will be at my house”) are, in context, clearly clumsy. What is wanted is a verb of *motion*; compare line 6 below ... εἰ μὴ ἐφροντο, σινηκολούθησαν. Xenophon wrote ... ἐὰν παρ’ ἐμὲ ἦτε ... Similarly, in the *Symposium* of Plato (174A), Socrates, when asked where he was going so elegantly attired, replies Ἐπὶ δεῖπνον εἰς Ἀγάθωνος ... ταῦτα δὴ ἐκαλλωπισάμην, ἵνα καλὸς παρὰ καλὸν ἴω. The corruption probably arose through an uncial false division: ... *EMEITTE* ... Note that παρὰ *c. acc.* can mean “to the house of”, just as παρὰ *c. dat.* can mean “at the house of”. παρῆλθον in line 8, therefore, is sound; it is used here *absolutely* (“they came to the house”). Naber quite correctly compared Alexis, *fr.* 174. 2–3 (Kock): δεῖπνον αἰτήσεις με σὺ ἤδη παρελθὼν. Richards, who conjectured προσῆλθον, was presumably bothered by αὐτῶ. This pronoun, however, need not be governed by παρῆλθον; it is a *dativus commodi* (i. e. “to please him”, as the context shows).

Symp. 1. 14–15:

ὡς δὲ οὐδὲ τότε ἐγέλασαν ἐπ’ αὐτῶ, ἐν τῶ μεταξὺ πανσάμενος τοῦ δεῖπνον συγκαλυψάμενος κατέκειτο. καὶ ὁ Καλλίας, Τί τοῦτ’, ἔφη, ὦ Φίλιππε; ἀλλ’ ἢ δόδνη σε εἰληφε;

I do not understand the use of ἀλλ’ ἢ here; nor can I translate, in context, ἀλλ’ ἢ, which the Budé editor Allier prints (on what authority he does not indicate). Correct to ἀλλ’ ἦ. See Denniston, *The Greek Particles*² pp. 27–8; this master of such niceties, I was pleased to find, had no doubts: “In X. *Symp.* 1. 15 ... read certainly ἀλλ’ ἦ”.

Symp. 4. 36–7:

- 1 ... τύραννοι δ’ εἰσὶ τινες οἱ ὄλους μὲν οἴκους ἀναιροῦσιν, ἀθρόους δ’ ἀποκτείνουσι, πολλάκις δὲ καὶ ὄλας πόλεις χρημάτων ἕνεκα ἐξανδραποδίζονται. τούτους μὲν οἷον ἔγωγε καὶ πάνν οἰκτίρω τῆς ἄγαν χαλεπῆς νόσου. ὁμοία γάρ μοι δοκοῦσι πάσχειν ὥσπερ
- 5 εἴ τις πολλὰ ἔχει καὶ πολλὰ ἐσθίων μηδέποτε ἐμπίμπλατο.
- 5 ἔχει Nitsche: ἔχων *codd.*: πίνων Schneider

Nitsche’s makeshift πολλὰ ἔχει is damned by its imbalance and superfluity; editors would have done better to obelize. Schneider’s πίνων is more reasonable, but is open to the objec-

tion that a Greek would have used the word-order *πολλά ἐσθίων και πολλά πίνων*; compare 4. 37 below: ...*μοι και ἐσθίοντι ... και πίνοντι κτλ.* (Homer's *ὁ πῖνε και ἤσθε* does not, of course, gain-say this.) Moreover the corruption of *πίνων* to *ἔχων* is paleographically inexplicable. The passage is to be amended by *excision*: ...*ὥσπερ εἶ τις [πολλά ἔχων], και πολλά ἐσθίων, μηδέποτε ἐπιπλαιο.* This fits the context perfectly and a similar comparison occurs in chapter 8. 15 below: *και μὴν ἐν μὲν τῇ τῆς μορφῆς χρήσει ἐνεστί τις και κόρος, ὥστε ἄπερ και πρὸς τὰ στία διὰ πλησμονῆν, ταῦτα ἀνάγκη και πρὸς τὰ παιδικὰ πάσχειν.* It remains to explain the interpolation. Here is the sentence which *immediately follows* the passage given above (that is, 4. 36–7):

- 1 ἐγὼ δὲ οὕτω μὲν πολλά ἔχω ὡς μόλις αὐτὰ και [ἐγὼ ἄν] αὐτὸς εὕρισκω.
 1 ἔχω: ἔχων ABGH¹H²H^a 2 ἐγὼ *del.* Cobet ἄν *om.* B

In this sentence for *πολλά ἔχω* there was a variant reading *πολλά ἔχων*. I suggest that at some stage in the manuscript tradition this variant *πολλά ἔχων* was erroneously “restored” from the margin to the text before *και πολλά ἐσθίων*, possibly due to a misunderstanding of the intensive usage of *και* here. (Some may prefer to regard *και* as a stopgap added after the interpolation of *πολλά ἔχων* and delete it too. The choice is difficult; compare, however, *Cyr.* 4. 1. 17 ...*αἱ σύες ... φεύγουσι, κἄν πολλαὶ ὡσι (και πολλαὶ οὔσαι D) ...*) If Cobet’s deletion of *ἐγὼ* is correct, this interpolation may have had a similar origin (i.e. *ἐγὼ* would be a corruption of a marginal variant *ἔχω*). There is a good illustration of this type of error in Aristotle, *EN* 1094^b. 14–18 (Bywater):

- 1 τὰ δὲ καλὰ και τὰ δίκαια, περὶ ὧν ἡ πολιτικὴ σκοπεῖται, πολλὴν ἔχει διαφορὰν και πλάνην, ὥστε δοκεῖν νόμῳ μόνον εἶναι, φύσει δὲ μή. τοιαύτην δὲ τινα πλάνην ἔχει και τάγαθὰ διὰ τὸ πολλοῖς συμβαίνειν βλάβας ἀπ’ αὐτῶν.
 1 πολλὴν *Asp.* (v. *etiam infra ad lin. 3*): τοσαύτην K^bL^bΓ 3 τινα πλάνην ἔχει: τινα πολλὴν ἔχει διαφορὰν και πλάνην ὥστε δοκεῖν ἔχειν *pr.* K^b

The late Werner Jaeger, in a private communication, wrote to me the following: “The words in K^b *πολλὴν ἔχει διαφορὰν και πλάνην ὥστε* are clearly a *varia lectio* for 1 *τοσαύτην ἔχει διαφορὰν και πλάνην ὥστε* which was written in the margin of an older copy as alternative reading, but got into the text in 3 after *τοιαύτην τινὰ. Var. lectiones* in the *E.N.* ought to be investigated.”

HG 1. 3. 19:

...καὶ Ἀναξίλαος (ὃς ἐπαγόμενος θανάτου ὕστερον ἐν Λακεδαιμόνι διὰ τὴν προδοσίαν ἀπέφυγεν...) ἐπαγόμενος Π: ὑπαγόμενος *codd.*

Marchant is certainly wrong in preferring the reading of the papyrus fragment *ἐπαγόμενος*, which is a mere slip. The manuscripts have preserved the correct idiom *ὑπαγόμενος θανάτου*. Compare below 2. 3. 12: *ἔπειτα πρῶτον μὲν οὐδὲ πάντες ἤδεσαν ἐν τῇ δημοκρατίᾳ ἀπὸ συκοφαντίας ζῶντας ... συλλαμβάνοντες ὑπήγον θανάτου* and 5. 4. 24: *οἱ δ' ἔφοροι ἀνεκάλεσάν τε τὸν Σφοδρίαν καὶ ὑπήγον* (Pierson: *ἀπήγον codd.*) *θανάτου*. See *LSJ s.v. ὑπάγω A. II* for more examples. *Π* dates from the third century A.D., the oldest manuscripts of the *Hellenica* are of the fourteenth century: one more example of a later witness preserving the truth against an older one.

HG 2. 3. 30-31:

- 1 οὗτος γὰρ ἐξ ἀρχῆς μὲν τιμώμενος ὑπὸ τοῦ δήμου κατὰ τὸν πατέρα Ἄγνωνα, προπετέστατος ἐγένετο τὴν δημοκρατίαν μεταστῆσαι εἰς τοὺς τετρακοσίους, καὶ ἐπρώτευν ἐν ἐκείνοις. ἐπεὶ δ' ἤσθετο ἀντίπαλόν τι τῇ ὀλιγαρχίᾳ συνιστάμενον, πρῶτος
- 5 αὖ ἡγεμὼν τῷ δήμῳ ἐπ' ἐκείνους ἐγένετο. ὅθεν δήπου καὶ κόθορρος ἐπικαλεῖται. [καὶ γὰρ ὁ κόθορρος ἀρμόττειν μὲν τοῖς ποσὶν ἀμφοτέροις δοκεῖ, ἀποβλέπει δὲ ἀπ' ἀμφοτέρων.]
6-7 καὶ γὰρ – ἀμφοτέρων *del. Moris*

The speaker is Critias, the time about January, 403 B.C., and the object of this vituperation Theramenes. The words *καὶ γὰρ – ἀμφοτέρων* are regarded by many as a gloss; this is a difficult passage and deserves re-examination. Two questions must be posed: 1) Are the words really spurious? and 2) What is the meaning of *ἀποβλέπει δὲ ἀπ' ἀμφοτέρων*?

A. One readily understands why *ὅθεν δήπου καὶ κόθορρος ἐπικαλεῖται* could have been the cause of an explanatory gloss intruding itself into the text, and a bare statement such as *ὁ κόθορρος εἰς ἀμφοτέροισι τοὺς πόδας ἀρμόζει* would indeed be suspect (I am quoting from an actual scholium to Aristophanes, *Ranae* v. 47). The bracketed words, however, seem to reveal more careful writing: *καὶ γὰρ*, the balanced *μὲν – δὲ* clauses, and the unnecessary *δοκεῖ* (“used occasionally, as here, of things which are quite certain” Manatt). Most important of all, nobody has explained adequately the meaning of *ἀποβλέπει δὲ ἀπ' ἀμφο-*

τέρων. It is perilous business to expunge as an “explanatory gloss” words which may well be untranslatable. Furthermore, the μὲν clause *alone* adequately explains the meaning of κόθορονος here (compare the scholium cited above). Glosses 1) are written to clarify and 2) tend to be as brief as possible. This supposed gloss violates both principles. There is, moreover, some positive evidence in support of genuineness:

1) The deleted words are thought to have crept in from Theramenes’ speech below (2. 3. 47): ἀποκαλεῖ δὲ κόθορόν με, ὡς ἀμφοτέροις πειρώμενον ἀρμόττειν. On the contrary, this sentence seems to support the words in question. This (common) usage of ὡς *c. part.* implies the reason not of the speaker, but of another (see Kühner-Gerth II. 2. 91–92); the natural interpretation of the sentence, therefore, is that Theramenes is here *echoing* what Critias has already said (note the use of ἀποκαλεῖ = “he calls me *in derision*”). Furthermore, ἀρμόττειν is a common enough word, but in this meaning it is normally applied to *things*, not *persons*. Its appearance here is most readily understood if Theramenes is paraphrasing Critias’ earlier remarks. Finally, those who consider καὶ γὰρ ... ἀμφοτέρων as an interpolation regard it as coming, as Manatt observes, “in part from” this passage. The origin of the real crux, ἀποβλέπει δὲ ἀπ’ ἀμφοτέρων, they cannot explain in this way.

2) The scholiast to Ar. *Ran.* 47 knew the words: ὁ δὲ Ξενοφῶν ἐν Ἑλληνικοῖς ἀμφοτέροις τοῖς ποσὶν ἀρμόζειν αὐτόν φησιν. This is not decisive, of course, since the scholiast (or rather the older source whence he derives) may have used an already interpolated text. Nevertheless, the evidence of the scholiast must be taken into account, and the burden of proof...

3) In the disputed passage the correct Attic (and Xenophon-tian) form ἀρμόττειν is preserved. A later interpolator would have been much more likely to have written the koinē form ἀρμόζειν (compare the scholium to Aristophanes). We need not look beyond the manuscripts of Xenophon himself for examples of ἀρμόττω trivialized to ἀρμόζω; see *Cyr.* 1. 3. 17; 1. 4. 18; 2. 1. 16; *Eq.* 12. 1.

B. Various interpretations of the words ἀποβλέπει δὲ ἀπ’ ἀμφοτέρων have been advanced:

1) *LSJ* s.v. ἀποβλέπω II. state “ἀ. ἀπ’ ἀμφοτέρων *face* both ways, dub. in X. *HG* 2. 3. 31.” This is how the Loeb translator

Brownson understands the passage (“for as the buskin seems to fit both feet, so he faces both ways”). ἀποβλέπω can mean “face” in this sense, but when so used it normally has πρὸς, ἐπί, or εἰς expressed with it (ἀποβλέπω is literally “I look *away from* (other things to direct my attention to), I gaze at”). For examples, see Eur. *Andr.* 246, Josephus *A.J.* 11. 5. 5, Dio Cassius 76. 11. The correct translation would therefore be “he looks *away from* both (towards a third party)”, which is nonsense in context. Furthermore, if Theramenes is the subject of ἀποβλέπει δέ, one would have expected the sentence to begin καὶ γὰρ ὁ μὲν κόθορνος...

2) Various conjectures for ἀποβλέπω have been proposed: ἀπολέπει Postgate, ἀπολείπει Laves, ἀποβέβληται Ellis. None deserves consideration.

3) The subject of ἀποβλέπει is probably ὁ κόθορνος (because of the μέν – δέ). ἀποβλέπει may have a quasi-technical meaning here, which has not been understood yet. This is not likely.

My conclusions are that the words καὶ γὰρ – ἀμφοτέρων may well be genuine and that ἀποβλέπει δὲ ἀπ’ ἀμφοτέρων is probably corrupt and should be obelized. The passage still awaits its Oedipus and I print here the inconclusive results of my investigation with the hope that they may help another to a definitive solution of the problem.

HG 3. 5. 23–24:

...διὰ οὖν πάντα ταῦτα ἔδοξεν αὐτοῖς τοὺς νεκροὺς ὑποσπόνδους ἀναιρεῖσθαι. οἱ μὲντοι Θηβαῖοι εἶπαν ὅτι οὐκ ἂν ὑποδοῖεν τοὺς νεκρούς...

ὑποδοῖεν B: ἀποδοῖεν cet.

Elsewhere ὑποδίδωμι is found only with an intransitive meaning (“give way”); compare the intransitive usage of ἐπιδίδωμι (“advance”, “increase”). It never recurs in Xenophon. That ἀποδοῖεν is the correct variant here is clear from the parallel passage below, 6. 4. 15: ἐπεὶ δὲ πᾶσιν ἐδόκει ὑποσπόνδους τοὺς νεκροὺς ἀναιρεῖσθαι, οὕτω δὴ ἔπεμψαν κήρυκα περὶ σπονδῶν. οἱ μὲντοι Θηβαῖοι ... τοὺς νεκροὺς ὑποσπόνδους ἀπέδοσαν.

HG 5. 4. 54:

ὁ μὲντοι Ἀγησίλαος, ἐπεὶ ὥρα ἦν, ἀπελθὼν ἐστρατοπεδεύσατο ἐνθάπερ τοὺς πολεμίους εἶδε παρατεταγμένους. τῇ δ’ ὑστεραία ἀπήγαγε τὴν ἐπὶ Θεσπιάς. θρασέως δὲ παρακολουθούτων

τῶν πελταστῶν, οἳ ἦσαν μισθοφόροι τοῖς Θηβαίοις, καὶ τὸν Χαβρίαν ἀνακαλοῦντων, ὅτι οὐκ ἠκολούθει, ὑποστραφέντες οἱ τῶν Ὀλυνθίων ἱππεῖς, ἤδη γὰρ κατὰ τοὺς ὄρκους συνεστρατεύοντο, ἐδίωξάν τε αὐτούς πρὸς ὄρθιον, καθάπερ ἠκολούθουν, καὶ ἀπέκτειναν αὐτῶν μάλα πολλούς.

I have previously discussed this passage in *HSCP* 67 (1963) pp. 271–2, to which I refer the reader. Briefly, Jaeger correctly called attention to the fact that καθάπερ ἠκολούθουν has no meaning in this context and that furthermore Xenophon normally (though not exclusively, be it noted) uses ὅσπερ; he therefore conjectured καθ' ἅπερ (= “where”) ἠκολούθουν. In my earlier discussion I pointed out that the *simple* relative pronoun is used with κατὰ in this local usage (καθ' ὃ, καθ' ἃ) and therefore conjectured καθ' ἃ παρηκολούθουν. In further support of my conjecture I wrote: “...the compound παρακολουθεῖν (= “to follow at one’s heels”) is more appropriate in this context; it is the verb used a few lines above of these same peltasts.” It is a not infrequent practice in Greek (and Latin) to have a compound verb followed by the *simplex* with the same meaning; (a most useful recent discussion of this phenomenon is Professor Watkins’ “*An Indo-European Construction in Greek and Latin*”, *HSCP* 71 (1966) pp. 115–119). This might seem an argument against my παρακολούθουν. The fact is we *do* have this construction here: παρακολουθούτων is answered by ...ὅτι οὐκ ἠκολούθει..., so that no exception may be taken to παρακολουθούτων on these grounds. Finally, in support of his conjecture, Jaeger noted the *local* relative clause ἐνθαπερ τοὺς πολεμίους εἶδε παρατεταγμένους, which occurs in the first sentence of our passage. The parallel is apt, but it should be noted that ἐνθαπερ here does *not* confirm Jaeger’s καθ' ἅπερ. The Greeks simply did not use καθ' ὅπερ and καθ' ἅπερ in a local sense.

HG 5. 4. 51:

οἱ δ' αὖ Θηβαῖοι δέισαντες περὶ τῆς πόλεως, ὅτι ἐρήμη ἦν, ἀπολιπόντες ἐνθα παρατεταγμένοι ἦσαν δρόμῳ ἔθειον εἰς τὴν πόλιν...

Read here ...ἐνθα(περ) παρατεταγμένοι... and compare 5. 4. 54 ...ἐνθαπερ τοὺς πολεμίους εἶδε παρατεταγμένους... (cited in full above). περ dropped out before παρ. *LSJ*, s.v. ἐνθα II. 1, recognize the local meaning “where”, *ubi*, in a *literal* sense only in poetry and “*in later prose*” (my italics). The earliest prose

author whom they cite is Philo Judaeus. This is perhaps a too rigid restriction, but it does seem true that *ἐνθα* = *ubi* is uncommon in the earlier prose writers. In Xenophon, it occurs at *Cyr.* 5. 4. 21 and *An.* 4. 3. 7 (elsewhere?); it should be noted that *An.* 4. 1. 2 and 6. 2. 1, where *ἐνθα* does occur, are both interpolated passages (?). I find it in one other passage in Xenophon, *Cyr.* 2. 3. 22: *ἐπειδὴν δέ, ἔφη, καταστῶμεν ἐπὶ τὸν δρόμον ἐνθα περιπατοῦμεν...* Is it coincidence that here the word following *ἐνθα* begins with *περ*? Read *ἐνθα(περ)*. Finally, let me repeat that my observations about the usage of *ἐνθα* in Xenophon seem to apply only when 1) *ἐνθα* means *ubi*, 2) in the *literal* sense of the word, and 3) does not seem to hold good when *ἐνθα* stands for either *unde* or *quo*. Needless to say, I have not read through the *corpus xenophonticum* specifically to determine his usage of *ἐνθα* and *ἐνθαπερ*; my observations are quite empiric and may be refuted when a complete and scientific *index verborum* to Xenophon is produced. Such an *index* is a *sine qua non* for a definitive study of the origin of koinē Greek. Xenophon was nurtured on as pure Attic Greek as Plato, but lived among non-Attic Greeks for a significant part of his life. It is no accident that so many items of vocabulary and syntax are found in him alone of the “Attic” authors. To the Romans Xenophon may have been a model of the simple Attic style, but there is truth in Helladius’ remark: ...Ξενοφῶν ... οὐδὲν θαυμαστόν, ἀνὴρ ἐν στρατείαις σχολάζων καὶ ξένων συνουσίαις εἰ τινα παρακόπτει τῆς πατρίου φωνῆς. διὸ νομοθέτην αὐτὸν οὐκ ἂν τις Ἀττικισμοῦ παραλάβοι (preserved by Photius, *Bibliotheca, codex* 179 = Migne, *PG* 104, column 317 A).

HG 5. 4. 58:

ὑποφαίνοντος δὲ πάλιν τοῦ ἥρος ὁ μὲν Ἀγησίλαος κλινοπετιῆς ἦν. ὅτε γὰρ ἀπῆγε τὸ στράτευμα ἐκ τῶν Θηβῶν, ἐν τοῖς Μεγάροις ἀναβαίνοντος αὐτοῦ ἐκ τοῦ Ἀφροδισίου εἰς τὸ ἀρχεῖον ἐγγίνται ὅποια δὴ φλέψ, καὶ ἐρρῦη τὸ ἐκ τοῦ σώματος αἷμα εἰς τὸ ὑγῆς σκέλος. γενομένης δὲ τῆς κνήμης ὑπερόγκου καὶ ὀδυνῶν ἀφορήτων, Στρακόσιός τις ἰατρὸς σχάζει τὴν παρὰ τῷ σφυρῶ φλέβα αὐτοῦ.

It would be rash to attempt a diagnosis of Agesilaus’ actual ailment from the above description; possibly he suffered from phlebitis, which causes the leg to become swollen and take on a purplish, “bloody” complexion. In any event, it is clear what *Xenophon* conceived to have happened: some blood vessel or

other burst (*ὅποια δὴ φλέψ* at this time may refer to an artery as well as to a vein) and Agesilaus hemorrhaged. The blood from this internal bleeding accumulated in Agesilaus' sound leg (he was lame in one leg), which became swollen and quite painful. *ἔρρῴη τὸ ἐκ τοῦ σώματος αἷμα εἰς τὸ ὑγιές σκέλος* is certainly an exceptional expression: "the blood from the body flowed into the sound leg" – as if the leg were an entity distinct from the body. (The Budé editor Hatzfield circumvents the difficulty by paraphrasing simply "*il y eut une hémorragie interne dans sa bonne jambe.*") I at first suspected *σώματος* of being corrupt, but now believe it to be used loosely here for "trunk", just as "body" is sometimes used in English (compare, for example, the boxing expression "a blow to the body" and the like). The transmitted text stands, I believe, in need of a minor correction which will help define the meaning of *σώματος* here. Read ... *ῥήγγνται ὅποια δὴ φλέψ, καὶ (κατ)ερρῴη τὸ ἐκ τοῦ σώματος αἷμα εἰς τὸ ὑγιές σκέλος. κατερρῴη*, "flowed down", localizes the source and makes the sense clearer. This refinement will seem a piece of *λεπτολογία* to some, but a Greek, *ni fallor*, would have felt the distinction. Compare *Iliad* 4. 149 *ὡς εἶδεν μέλαν αἷμα καταρρέον ἐξ ἄτειλης*; 13. 539 *κατὰ δ' αἷμα νεοτάτου ἔρρει χειρός*; *Hdt.* 4. 187 *οἱ γὰρ δὴ τῶν Λιβύων νομάδες ... τῶν παιδίων τῶν σφετέρων, ἐπεὰν τετραέ- τεα γένηται, οἰσύπη προβάτων καίουσι τὰς ἐν τῆσι κορυφῆσι φλέβας, μετεξέτεροι δὲ αὐτῶν τὰς ἐν τοῖσι κροτάφοισι, τοῦδε εἵνεκα ὡς μὴ σφεας ἐς τὸν πάντα χρόνον καταρρέον φλέγμα ἐκ τῆς κεφαλῆς δηλῆται*. Accidental omission of *κατα* (*κατ*) after *καὶ* is of course commonplace.

HG 7. 5. 6:

ἔξῃλθε μὲν δὴ ὁ Ἐπαμεινώνδας διὰ ταχέων. ἐπεὶ δὲ ἐγένετο ἐν Νεμέα, ἐνταῦθα διέτριβεν...

Read *ἐνταῦθα* (*δὴ*) *διέτριβεν*. Compare below 7. 5. 12: *ἐπεὶ γὰρ ἦγετο Ἀρχίδαμος ... ἐνταῦθα δὴ οἱ πῦρ πνέοντες ... ἐγκλίνουσι*. The error is due to haplography (recall that *δη* and *δι* came to be identical in sound). *ἐνταῦθα δὴ* is a common collocation in Xenophon; see, for example, 7. 5. 16 and *Symp.* 2. 6. An additional example is *An.* 4. 3. 7: *ἐνταῦθα δὴ πολλὴ ἀθυμία ἦν τοῖς Ἑλλησιν*, an expression which leads us to a similar corruption in *HG* 6. 2. 8:

ἐπολιόρκει μὲν δὴ οὔτω τὴν πόλιν. ἐπεὶ δὲ οἱ Κερκυραῖοι ἐκ μὲν τῆς γῆς οὐδὲν ἐλάμβανον διὰ τὸ κρατεῖσθαι κατὰ γῆν, κατὰ

θάλατταν δὲ οὐδὲν εἰσήγετο αὐτοῖς διὰ τὸ ναυκρατεῖσθαι, ἐν πολλῇ ἀπορία ἦσαν.

Read ... ἐν πολλῇ (δὴ) ἀπορία ἦσαν. Compare *An.* 3. 1. 2: ἐπεὶ δὲ οἱ στρατηγοὶ συνειλημμένοι ἦσαν καὶ τῶν λοχαγῶν καὶ τῶν στρατιωτῶν οἱ συνεπόμενοι ἀπωλώλεσαν, ἐν πολλῇ δὴ ἀπορία ἦσαν οἱ Ἕλληνες... See also below *HG* 6. 2. 24: ...οἱ δ' ἔξω ἐν πάσῃ δὴ ἀθυμίᾳ ἦσαν. The error arose from an uncial haplography (*ΔΗΔΗ*). In the *Anabasis* the opening sentences of Books II–V and VII have been deleted by Dindorf and others as later summations. 2. 1. 1 begins ὡς μὲν οὖν, the other books in question all begin ὅσα μὲν δὴ. It is not my intention to go into the question of the spuriousness of these opening sentences here, but I would like to call attention to the striking structural similarity of *HG* 6. 2. 8 and *An.* 3. 1. 1–2. The agreement is exact: ...μὲν δὴ ... ἐπεὶ δὲ ... ἐν πολλῇ δὴ ἀπορία ἦσαν*).

Boston College

Robert Renehan

Postscriptum 1970

1) Since submitting this paper to *Rb. Mus.*, I find that I have been anticipated in my treatment of *Symp.* 4. 36–7 by R. Lange, who proposed the deletion [*πολλὰ ἔχων καὶ*]. See my *Greek Textual Criticism* (Cambridge, Mass. 1969), 38–9.

2) On re-reading my discussion of *HG* 2. 3. 30–1 several years after writing it, I remain convinced that Morus was wrong to delete the words καὶ γὰρ ὁ κόθορνος – ἀμφοτέρων. However, I am now more inclined to regard ἀποβλέπει δὲ ἀπ' ἀμφοτέρων [*ε. ὁ κόθορνος*] as sound, whatever the precise meaning of ἀποβλέπει here.

*) I would like to thank my wife for her patient and instructive comments.