In sum, the considerations adduced by Nails and Monoson in their *SEP* article provide no better cause to doubt either Xenophon's proximity to, or access to reliable information about, the historical Socrates than do the bald assertions often found in earlier secondary literature on the subject. That so many scholars nevertheless continue to deny Xenophon a standing comparable to the one they uncritically embrace for Plato speaks to a pervasive bias in Socratic studies that remains in sore need of correction.

*University of Illinois Urbana-Champaign* KIRK R. SANDERS
ksanders@illinois.edu
doi:10.1017/S0009838825100943

This is an Open Access article, distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives licence (https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/), which permits non-commercial re-use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided that no alterations are made and the original article is properly cited. The written permission of Cambridge University Press or the rights holder(s) must be obtained prior to any commercial use and/or adaptation of the article.

# TWO CONJECTURES IN XENOPHON

**ABSTRACT**

*Conjectures in the* Cynegetica *and the* Cyropaideia *of Xenophon.*

**Keywords:** Xenophon; trap; sauce; emendation; ἐγκαταπήγνυμι; ἐμβάπτω

## I. *CYNEGETICA* 9.12

χρὴ δὲ εἶναι τὰς ποδοστράβας σμίλακος πεπλεγμένας … τὰς δὲ στεφάνας εὐκύκλους ἐχούσας καὶ τοὺς ἥλους ἐναλλὰξ σιδηροῦς τε καὶ ξυλίνους ἐγκαταπεπλεγμένους ἐν τῷ πλοκάνῳ.

The traps should be made out of plaited yew …, with a circular crown and spikes of alternate iron and wood woven into the plaited part (Waterfield).[1]

'disciple' [ὁμιλητής] of Socrates and makes him one of the members of Socrates' entourage in *Symp*.) but also by Aeschines, in whose *Telauges* Hermogenes apparently served to introduce Socrates and the titular character to one another as their mutual friend (see Procl. *In Crat*. 21 [= *SSR* 6.A.83] and the discussions in H. Dittmar, *Aischines von Sphettos: Studien zur Literaturgeschichte der Sokratiker* [Berlin, 1912], 229 and Pentassuglio [n. 12], 208). In addition to having a familiarity with various Platonic dialogues, Xenophon was also clearly conversant with, for example, the work of Antisthenes, who seems to have been regarded as the most important Socratic in the decade following Socrates' death. Kahn (n. 4), 393–401 contains a list of passages in Xen. *Mem*. and *Symp*. that may reflect an awareness of, and even dependence on, some of Plato's writings. On the relationship between Xenophon and Antisthenes, see Prince (n. 12), especially 13–14. Our primary evidence for Antisthenes' preeminence among Socratics during the 390s B.C.E. comes from Isoc. *C. soph*., on which see e.g. C. Eucken, *Isokrates: seine Positionen in der Auseinandersetzung mit den zeitgenössischen Philosophen* (Berlin, 1983), 18–27 and D.J. Murphy, 'Isocrates as a reader of Socratic dialogues', in A. Stavru and C. Moore (edd.), *Socrates and the Socratic Dialogue* (Leiden, 2017), 105–25, at 105–10.

[1] R. Waterfield, *Xenophon: Hiero the Tyrant and Other Treatises* (London, 1997), 150.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838825100906 Published online by Cambridge University Press

The same translation of ἐγκαταπεπλεγμένους ('woven into') is given by Willcock[2] and by Doty,[3] while Marchant has 'plaited into',[4] Brodersen 'eingeflochten' ('woven/plaited into'),[5] and Delebeque (more loosely) 'encastrées dans' ('fitted into').[6] This last translation makes sense (though it does not render the Greek), the others do not.

ἐγκαταπεπλεγμένους must be a mistake for ἐγκαταπεπηγμένους, 'fixed in', like the stakes fixed in the ditch in Hom. *Il.* 9.350 (ἐν δὲ σκόλοπας κατέπηξεν). The corruption of -πεπηγ- to -πεπλεγ- was prompted by the preceding πεπλεγμένας and helped by the following πλοκάνῳ.

## II. *CYROPAIDEIA* 2.2.5

ἀνήλωτο μὲν αὐτῷ ὃ εἰλήφει ὄψον, ὃ δ' ἔτι αὐτῷ λοιπὸν ἦν τοῦ ἐμβάπτεσθαι (*v.l.* ἐμβάψασθαι), τοῦτό πως … ἀνέτρεψεν.

He lost not only the meat he had taken but also what was still left of his sauce; for this last he upset somehow or other.[7]

The diner has lost, in addition to the meat, the remains of the sauce in which he would have dipped the meat.[8] But ὃ … λοιπὸν ἦν τοῦ ἐμβάπτεσθαι cannot mean 'what was left of his sauce'. The active verb ἐμβάπτω takes an accusative of the object dipped in the sauce (Hipponax fr. 26a.3 West, Cratinus fr. 150.4 K.–A., Archestratus fr. 23.6 Olson–Sens)[9] and the middle ἐμβάπτεσθαι, without an expressed object, means 'dip food (in sauce)' (Ar. fr. 158.2 K.–A., Archedicus fr. 2.10[10]). Neither 'what was left of dipping into' (with ἐμβάπτεσθαι taken as middle) nor 'what was left of being dipped into' (with ἐμβάπτεσθαι taken as passive) makes sense. The noun ἐμβάμματος (Muretus), 'that which is dipped into', namely 'sauce', a noun used at *Cyr.* 1.3.4, makes sense. But its corruption to an infinitive is inconceivable.[11]

Delete τοῦ. Then ὃ … λοιπὸν ἦν ἐμβάπτεσθαι means 'what was left for dipping into', that is, 'the remains of the sauce'. The infinitive is now a 'final-consecutive' middle infinitive, and the structure is a familiar one. 'Compounds with ἐν- are regularly used as "final-consecutive" infinitives.'[12] The construction is the same as, for example, Thuc. 2.20.4 χῶρος ἐπιτήδειος … ἐνστρατοπεδεῦσαι 'terrain suitable for camping in', Xen. *Mem.* 3.8.8 (οἰκία) ἡδίστη … ἐνδιαιτᾶσθαι '(a house) most pleasant to live in'. In this

[2] In A.A. Phillips and M.M. Willcock, *Xenophon and Arrian on Hunting* (Warminster, 1999), 69.
[3] R.E. Doty, *Xenophon on Hunting* (Lampeter, 2001), 119.
[4] E.C. Marchant, *Xenophon. VII. Scripta minora* (Cambridge, MA and London, 1925), 425.
[5] K. Brodersen, *Xenophon, Arrianos: Jagd und Jaghunde* (Berlin and Boston, 2018), 77.
[6] E. Delebeque, *Xénophon: L'art de la chasse* (Paris, 1970), 83.
[7] W. Miller, *Xenophon: Cyropaedia* I (Cambridge, MA and London, 1914), 159.
[8] For the custom of dipping food in a sauce or side-dish, see S.D. Olson and A. Sens, *Archestratos of Gela: Greek Culture and Cuisine in the Fourth Century BCE* (Oxford, 2000), 102–3.
[9] For the text (ἔμβαπτ' εὖ [Naeke] rather than ἐμβάπτευ), see Olson and Sens (n. 8), ad loc.
[10] On this passage, see S.D. Olson, *Broken Laughter: Select Fragments of Greek Comedy* (Oxford, 2007), 283.
[11] The conjecture is adopted by L. Dindorf, *Xenophontis Institutio Cyri* (Berlin, 1830), 54 and by M. Bizos, *Xénophon, Cyropédie* I (Paris, 1971), 68.
[12] See my note in *Theophrastus: Characters* (Cambridge, 2004), 248 for further examples; cf. Hom. *Od.* 3.350, Hdt. 2.154.1, 9.106.3, Eur. *Supp.* 535, Thuc. 3.68.3, 4.56.2, Theoc. 5.10, Plut. *Comp. Per. Fab.* 1.2, *Vit. Cat. Min.* 25.2, *Vit. Mar.* 25.3.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838825100906 Published online by Cambridge University Press

construction the (unexpressed) subject of the infinitive is personal, and the (again unexpressed) referent of ἐν- is the noun which has preceded.

*Queens' College, Cambridge* JAMES DIGGLE
jd10000@cam.ac.uk
doi:10.1017/S0009838825100906

This is an Open Access article, distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution licence (https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/), which permits unrestricted re-use, distribution and reproduction, provided the original article is properly cited.

## ONCE MORE (BUT VERY BRIEFLY) ON *THEAETETVS* 147D–148B*

**ABSTRACT**

*Some features of the mathematical passage at Plato,* Theaetetus *147d–148b, are presented; the ability of Theaetetus as a definition-maker is thereby assessed.*

**Keywords:** Plato; Theaetetus; definition; Greek mathematics; *dynamis*; irrational lines

The mathematical passage at *Tht.* 147d–148b is an important piece of evidence for the reconstruction of pre-Euclidean mathematics, in particular the theory of irrational lines. The literature on it is huge.[1] The passage comprises a concise description of 'Theodorus' lesson' on lines that are incommensurable with a reference line, and Theaetetus' attempt at defining some of the involved mathematical objects. I would like to point out some features of this attempt, most of which have gone apparently unnoticed until now, and draw a conclusion on the ability of Theaetetus as a definition-maker. The features are as follows:

- Unless hermeneutic contortions are allowed, the δυνάμεις at 147d3–6 are indisputably plane regions (see the specimina named at 147d4: the repeated preposition περὶ … πέρι is crucial),[2] those defined at 148a7–b1 are indisputably (straight) lines (they are defined as a subset of the γραμμαί at 148a6);[3]

* I presented this work in Barcelona (2012, Institut d'Estudis Catalans), Berlin (2015, joint course with Jonathan Beere) and Lille (2025, Lillibru Seminar). I am grateful to all people there, and in particular to Paolo Fait for a series of suggestions. The remarks of the anonymous referee resulted in an improvement of the text.

[1] Most of the literature focusses on Theodorus' lesson. See the lists in the entries 'Theaetetus' and 'Theodorus' in the *Dictionary of Scientific Biography* (New York, 1970–80) and in the *Dictionnaire des philosophes antiques* (Paris, 1994–2018).

[2] Using unqualified πούς as a unit of measurement for both lines and plane regions is standard practice, but this appears to be the earliest primary evidence.

[3] See B. Vitrac, 'Les formules de la "puissance" (δύναμις, δύνασθαι) dans les mathématiques grecques et dans les dialogues de Platon', in M. Crubellier, A. Jaulin, D. Lefebvre, P.-M. Morel (edd.), *Dunamis. Autour de la puissance chez Aristote* (Louvain-la-Neuve / Paris / Dudley, 2007), 73–148, at 123–32, where the various proposals of modern scholarship are listed and discussed.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838825100906 Published online by Cambridge University Press