der eur. El. aber haben die erneut vertretene Ansicht zur Voraussetzung, Eur. habe mit der (auch für S. echten) Partie El. 518 ff. Aischylos kritisieren wollen (vgl. a. O. 43 f.). Diese Annahme indessen ist keinesfalls zwingend, vgl. vor allem Ludwig a. O. 126–128; außerdem jetzt J. Dingel, Das Requisit i. d. gr. Trag., Diss. Tübingen 1967, bes. 128 ff. (weitere Lit. in meiner Stichomythiearbeit 257 A. 146). Zum Elektrenproblem zuletzt A. Lesky, AAHG 21, 1968, 15 f.; Lesky selbst bleibt gegenüber der Möglichkeit einer Lösung skeptisch.

A NOTE ON XENOPHON
HISTORIA GRAECA II. 3. 20

οἱ δ' [*sc. οἱ τριάκοντα*] ἐξέτασιν ποιήσαντες τῶν μὲν τρισχιλίων ἐν τῇ ἀγορᾷ τῶν δ' ἔξω τοῦ καταλόγου ἄλλων ἀλλαχοῦ ἔπειτα κελεύσαντες ἐπὶ τὰ ὅπλα ἐν ᾧ ἐκεῖνοι ἀπεληλύθεσαν πέμψαντες τοὺς φρουροὺς καὶ τῶν πολιτῶν τοὺς ὁμογνώμονας αὐτοῖς τὰ ὅπλα πάντων πλὴν τῶν τρισχιλίων παρείλοντο...

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 κελεύειν ἐπὶ τὰ ὅπλα? 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 ἐπὶ τὰ ὅπλα the editors explain it variously, e. g. Büchsenschütz, „kurz für κελεύειν ἰέναι ἐπὶ τὰ ὅπλα," with the meaning of "go and fetch".[1] The parallel cited is *Anabasis* I. 5. 13: εὐθὺς παραγγέλλει εἰς τὰ ὅπλα. 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: ἐκέλευσε τοὺς ἕνδεκα

---

1) *Xenophons Griechische Geschichte* (Leipzig 1891⁶) 81. Some editors prefer the phrase "to arms" as a translation; the meaning is about the same.

ἐπὶ τὸν Θηραμένην. This, as Cobet[2]) already pointed out, is even more far-fetched. In this passage the meaning is obviously a common one of ἐπί, 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 ὅπλα, 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 ἐκεῖνοι? 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 ὁμογνώμονες αὐτοῖς (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 ὅπλοις. Cf. Thucydides IV. 74. 3, VI. 45, VI. 96. 3; *Ath. Pol.* 31. 2. ἐξέτασις σὺν τοῖς ὅπλοις γίγνεται: 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 Thucydides II. 2. 5 to the effect that Greek soldiers "at ease" left their arms; Hailstone adds Thuc. IV. 91 and VI. 58. 2, but all three situations are quite different from the event in question here.

4) So too J. Hatzfeld, *Xénophon Helléniques,* 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 en éloigner, et à s'emparer des armes abandonnées. κ. ε. τ. ο. 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 φρουροί cannot be the Spartan garrison. G. Colin, *Xénophon Historien* (Paris 1933) 59, note 1, suggests that the φρουροί are the guards of the Thirty, the μαστιγοφόροι 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 κἀγαθοί. Cf. *HG* II. 4. 2, 9. These last two passages make it clear that there were ἱππεῖς 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[7]) 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: ἔπειτα κελεύσαντες ἐπὶ τὰ ὅπλα. We must admit the possibility that ἐπὶ τὰ ὅπλα is corrupt. The proximity of ἔπειτα to ἐπὶ τὰ strongly suggests that the scribe's eye may have wandered and he wrote ἔπειτα κελεύσαντες ἔπειτα ὅπλα, effectively removing the word or words[9]) that stood before ὅπλα; 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 ἔπειτα 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 ἐπ- or ἀπ- or ὑπ-, 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 ἔπειτα κελεύσαντες ὑπολιπέσθαι τὰ ὅπλα.[10])

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

---

7) For ἐκεῖνοι = "the latter", see L-S-J s.v., 1; Xen. Mem. I. 3. 13.

8) The variant reading ἀπεληλύθησαν (if it is not a ghost reading), if reduced to ἀπελύθησαν = "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, Xenophontis Historia Graeca, ed. maior [Leipzig 1930] in the app. crit.): κελεύσαντες ἀπιέναι ἀποθεμένους [vel καταλιπόντας] τὰ ὅπλα. In his own edition (1853), however, Dindorf keeps the MSS reading and refers to Anab. I. 5. 13 and HG II. 3. 54 which, as has been said above, are no parallels at all.

10) I should prefer some form of ἐπιλείπω, but this word is not attested in this meaning except in a disputed passage in Anab. I. 8. 18: ...τὸ ὑπολειπόμενον [ἐπιλειπόμενον codd.] (here passive) ἤρξατο δρόμῳ θεῖν. Cf. E. C. Marchant, ed., Xenophontis Expeditio Cyri (OCT 1904). I would accept the MS reading here, but this still leaves the evidence very flimsy. The other use of ἐπιλείπω in the meaning of "leave behind" quoted by L-S-J (Od. 8. 475): νῶτον ἀποπροταμών, ἐπὶ δὲ πλεῖον ἐλέλειπτο is incorrect. Here the meaning is clearly "left over in addition".

of the situation narrated will compel us to accept τοὺς ἔξω τοῦ καταλόγου as the implied subject, and the ἐκεῖνοι referring back to this subject[11]).

Indiana University   James W. Halporn

---

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 ἰέναι cogitando supplendum esse aiunt. Quem locum ad id confirmandum omnes afferunt ex vicinia II. 3. 20. miror neminem vidisse prorsus absurdum esse. Vide modo: οἱ δ' ἐξέτασιν... παρείλοντο. Qui haec sine risu legere potest ἀγέλαστός τις εἶναί μοι δοκεῖ aut id quod scriptum est non intelligere... Satis habebo si nemo hoc loco abutetur ad demonstrandum ἰέναι eleganter omitti in κελεύω ἐπὶ ὅπλα". G. E. Underhill, *Xenophon Hellenica I, II* (Oxford 1915) *ad loc.* agrees that ἐκεῖνοι = οἱ ἔξω τοῦ καταλόγου, but maintains that τοὺς τρισχιλίους must be supplied as an object of κελεύσαντες 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."

2) J. de Romilly, *Thucydides and Athenian Imperialism*, trans. P. Thody, N.Y., 1963. p. 9. Similarly as to the neoterisms, J. D. Wolcott, "New Words in Thucydides", *TAPA* 29 (1898) 104–157.