THE LINGUISTIC PHILOSOPHIES OF PRODICUS IN XENOPHON'S 'CHOICE OF HERACLES'?

The only version we have of Prodicus' famous account of the 'Choice of Heracles' is the one that Xenophon puts into the mouth of his Socrates (*Mem.* 2.1.21–34). David Sansone has recently argued that this contains words that are uncharacteristic of Xenophon, and that these represent the lost words of Prodicus: 'it is in the area of vocabulary that we find the strongest reason for regarding this passage as a very close approximation to Prodicus' actual wording' (p. 134).[1] The consensus of opinion is against him, as he notes (n. 4), but if he is right, Xenophon's Choice offers better evidence for Prodicus' linguistic philosophies than we thought. I do not find the argument compelling because it rests on a lack of awareness of common features of Xenophon's language. My procedure in this article is to exemplify those features and show how they relate to the Choice. L. Gautier, *La langue de Xénophon* (Geneva, 1911) describes many of them, but he did not deal with the Choice in sufficient detail, and at some points his description can be improved or refined.

There is circumstantial evidence that Xenophon's version conveys Prodicus' sentiments. He makes Socrates preface his account of the Choice with the comment that Prodicus uses it to pursue the question of virtue 'in this sort of way as far as I recall (2.1.21: ὧδέ πως λέγων ὅσα ἐγὼ μέμνημαι)'. This neither denies nor confirms exact quotation, but his concluding remark is that Prodicus adorned his sentiments (γνώμας) with 'even grander words (ἔτι μεγαλειοτέροις ῥήμασιν)' than in the version he has just given (2.1.34), and this distinction suggests that in the area of linguistic expression he has departed from Prodicus, for though a ῥῆμα may mean a thought, as at *Hellenica* 2.3.56, here it is opposed to sentiments and means the verbal expression of that thought.[2] This could involve words, phrases or even figures of speech. When Socrates refers to Gorgias' ῥήματα at *Symposium* 2.26, the focus of the attention is the peculiar word ἐπιψακάζειν, but this is contained within a phrase and Gautier argues (p. 106) that he means rhetorical figures. In the Choice then, allowing that Socrates is referring to expression in general, if he is using his customary irony, he is saying that his language is far grander than Prodicus'. Otherwise he has sought elevated expression in his version, but not on a par with Prodicus. In either case, he is saying that the language is different from Prodicus.

Sansone builds the linguistic case against the consensus brick by brick. My argument will chip away at his edifice, and will rely, like his, on a cumulative effect, but I believe there will be enough chips to undermine the edifice and return to the status quo of belief that the Choice does not preserve the language of Prodicus, and therefore cannot be used as evidence of his philosophic interests in language.

The linguistic evidence for Xenophon's borrowing falls into two categories: unusual words on the one hand, many of them occurring *hapax*, and the profusion of synonyms, known to be an interest of Prodicus, on the other.[3] Yet Gautier demonstrated that both are features of Xenophon's language and that his fondness for

[1] 'Heracles at the Y', *JHS* 124 (2004), 125–42.
[2] *Cyn.* 13.3 takes the sophists to task for paying more attention to ῥήματα than good thoughts, if that is an authentic work of Xenophon.

synonyms among other things actually drives him to produce unique words (Gautier, 118–26). There is then no paradox in Gautier's conclusion that the language of the Choice is no different from Xenophon's regular language on the one hand, and that on the other it contains rare and un-Attic expressions (105–8) – because his regular style is precisely to employ rare words.[4] H. Richards ('The minor works of Xenophon', *CR* [1897] 135), also found unusual words and *hapax legomena* an integral aspect of his language; their appearance in *RL* gives no cause for surprise and Richards rejects them as evidence against authenticity.

The statistics for *hapax legomena* in the Choice do look impressive (Sansone, 132). There are fifteen occurrences in 976 words, which is higher than in passages of equivalent length from Xenophon's *Memorabilia*, *Hellenica*, *Anabasis* and *Cyropaedia*. These comparisons are highly objective, as Sansone explains. Yet *hapax* expressions occur in them all (even the lowest count is five), and there are even more in other passages, such as *Memorabilia* 3.10, which has around eighteen occurrences in under 900 words;[5] this passage also contains other words that occur elsewhere only once.[6] It happens that some of these reflect the technical content (Socrates is discussing the arts and crafts in this passage) and the objection could be made that this is not an appropriate comparison, but the Choice also contains technical content, for instance in the description of the physical appearance of Vice and Virtue, where many rare words occur. This makes it an appropriate comparison, perhaps a better one than the more objective comparisons above, because it compares like with like.

Sansone does not explain the process of Xenophon's borrowing from Prodicus, but to make the case against borrowing convincing and to explore Xenophon's language, it is worthwhile to try to explain as far as is possible the process that might have led Xenophon to choose his words on his own initiative. Gautier notes how difficult it is to explain every rare word (128): 'Bien habile qui pourrait chaque fois expliquer le choix du terme rare'; one instance is ἁρμοστήρ, a *hapax* variation on the usual ἁρμοστής at *Hell.* 4.8.39 (43–7). Yet some large categories can be drawn up. To do this, I move briefly outside the controversial area of the Choice into more neutral territory, and deal with his rare words first.

Category 1. Xenophon uses rare words because unusual content requires them. One instance is συμπαίστορας 'playmates' in *Cyr.* 1.3.14, which occurs nowhere else in Xenophon and in other authors in our period only in Aristophanes, who at *Frogs* 411 uses the feminine form συμπαίστριας. Xenophon puts this *hapax* into the mouth of a grandfather as one of the good things his grandson will enjoy if he stays with him. We conclude that this is the only time he ever needed to refer to playmates, a concept of childhood, which he does not much address elsewhere. The word has been lurking in his vocabulary, but has never been needed until now. There is a play on παῖδας . . . συμπαίστορας, but the context is otherwise plain, calling for no special stylistic effects.[7]

---

[3] I deal with the first on my pp. 426–32 and the second on my pp. 432–5.

[4] *Pace* Sansone, n. 33.

[5] γραφική, εἰκασία, πιθανώτατον, ποθεινότατον, ἐρασμιώτατον, δρομέας, ψυχαγωγεῖ, ζωτικόν, ζωτικωτέρους, συμπιεζόμενα, διελκόμενα, ἀπειλητικά, σκέπης, θωρακοποιόν, ἄρρυθμον (2), ἀνάρμοστοι, κλειδῶν, ἐπωμίδων, πρόσθημα.

[6] φωτεινός *Mem.* 4.3.4; ἐνεργάζεσθαι, *Mem.* 2.1.20; σωφρονικός *Mem.* 1.3.9; ἀπειρόκαλον cf. ἀπειροκαλία *Cyr.* 1.2.3; κατασπώμενα, *An.* 1.9.6; στήθους, *Cyn.* 4.1, 5.30.

[7] Kühner-Gerth 149 says that -τωρ words are poetic and often accompany proper names, but not these examples.

Category 2. One special category of unusual content is technical content. This is exemplified by the use of the *hapax* συμπράκτορας at *Cyr.* 3.2.29 to describe native emissaries who facilitate access to the Indian king. The same word is used of the official who assists access to Delphi in Herodotus, who uses it *hapax* himself (6.125.2).[8] Another kind of technical content is physiognomy and the description of physical characteristics. *Cyr.* 8.4.21 uses the *hapax* 'hook-nosedness' γρυπότης, in contrast with 'snub-nosedness' σιμότητα, which occurs elsewhere only in *Cynegeticus* 10.13. The specialized nature of these words is confirmed by their occurrence in similar contexts in Aristotle's corpus, and later in Galen and Plutarch, but not elsewhere.[9] Like descriptions of playmates, the description of physiognomy is relatively rare in Xenophon's other works, and on this occasion he is seeking words to convey a shape of a potential husband's nose that will balance the shape of a potential wife's nose, in a humorous wedding match.

Category 3. The desire for stylistic balance produces other categories of *hapax*, such as οὐ φορήματι, ἀλλὰ προσθήματι at *Mem.* 3.10.13. Xenophon also regularly uses alpha-privatives *hapax* to produce a balanced and succinct antithesis with a positive term.[10] One instance is the choice of ἄμουσον at *Oec.* 12.18 to produce ἄμουσον . . . μουσικοὺς ποιεῖν. The word occurs in the poets, such as Euripides, *Ion* 526, and Aristophanes, *Wasps* 1074, but the context of *Oeconomicus* gives no reason for Xenophon to be seeking a poetic effect.[11] Another is the *hapax* ἀγράμματος, to contrast with γραμματικός (*Mem.* 4.2.20), and yet another is the *hapax* ἄγαμοι of *Symposium* 9.7, who are contrasted with the married men in that scene: οἱ μὲν ἄγαμοι . . . οἱ δὲ γεγαμηκότες. The word is found in Homer, *Il.* 3.40 and then frequently in poetry and prose, and is imported on this single occasion by Xenophon to capture in two succinct words the contrast between the married and unmarried.

Category 4. The need for synonyms also provokes *hapax* expressions when Xenophon seeks variation, and he often stretches out to the boundaries of his vocabulary for them (Gautier, 118–26). A straightforward example of such variation is *An.* 2.1.20–3, which shows a range of terms for speaking, including the better manuscript reading of the *hapax* ἀπεκρίθη. Another includes the use of the rarer word for proximity at *Poroi* 4.46: τῶν ἀργυρείων ἡ ἐγγύτατα πόλις . . . ἡ μετὰ ταῦτα πλησιαίτατα Θῆβαι, where the variation is not done for its own sake, but stresses the idea of proximity; their placement may also be designed to produce sound patterns.[12] Not all such variations are explicable. Gautier quotes *Cyr.* 1.2.1: ὥστε πάντα μὲν πόνον ἀνατλῆναι, πάντα δὲ κίνδυνον ὑπομεῖναι τοῦ ἐπαινεῖσθαι ἕνεκα. This is a clichéd form of expression, as can be seen from *Hier.* 7.1. ὑποδύεσθαι was available as the required synonym for ὑπομεῖναι, but on this occasion Xenophon prefers the *hapax*.

---

[8] Soph. *OT* 116 uses it of one who accompanied Laius to Delphi, and in Antiphon's *Tetralogies* 2.4.6 the technical sense may be of an accomplice in crime.

[9] His Socrates is aware of the existence of a large corpus of medical writings, in which they must have occurred (*Mem.* 4.2.10).

[10] He also uses them for scientific content, for instance: ἀστάθμητος *Mem.* 4.7.5, and from *Oec.*: ἄτριπτα 18.5, ἄχυρα 18.7 (*bis*) ἄσακτος 19.11. Cf. also ἀόρατος *Mem.* 4.3.13 (balances ὁρᾶται, then used to recap); ἀμορφότερος *Symp.* 8.17 (the non-comparative form appears in *Cyn.* 3.2–3).

[11] Plato used this antithesis more than once (e.g. *Phd.* 105E).

[12] Xenophon combines ἐγγύς and πλήσιον to emphasize the idea of proximity elsewhere too (e.g. *Cyr.* 6.1.17–18).

Category 5. Gautier demonstrates that Xenophon's love of assonance will also drive him to the use of unusual words (114–16), such as when *Mem.* 1.2.29 uses the *hapax* πειρῶντα to balance ἐρῶντα, or when the *hapax* χείρ is used for a 'company' at *Oec.* 21.8 to produce a rather frigid pun: that a commander marches with a 'strong arm' when many arms are ready to serve him. The explanation of *hapax* occurrences of course often involves a combination of motives. One example is of the list of the various qualities of Agesilaus (*hapax legomena* are italicized): ἐχθροῖς μὲν δυσεξαπάτητος, φίλοις δὲ εὐπαραπειστότατος . . . ἐκεῖνον οἱ μὲν συγγενεῖς φιλοκηδεμόνα ἐκάλουν, οἱ δὲ χρώμενοι ἀπροφάσιστον, οἱ δ' ὑπουργήσαντές τι μνήμονα, οἱ δ' ἀδικούμενοι ἐπίκουρον, οἵ γε μὴν συγκινδυνεύοντες μετὰ θεοὺς σωτῆρα (*Ages.* 11.11–12). The unusual words capture Agesilaus' unusual qualities but in addition make the comparisons succinct and memorable.

These categories of *hapax* occurrence make a framework within which the rare words of the Choice can be explained as a result of Xenophon's normal practices.

ὑπόβαθρα, a 'bed-base' is an example of specialized vocabulary that describes specialized content (2.1.30). Virtue offers this item as evidence of the unusual luxury ('even' a bed-base) that represents the vice of indulgence, and it is the unusual content that dictates the unusual word. A very close parallel is found in Xenophon's use of the *hapax* ἐφεστρίδες in *Symp.* 4.38 for another quite luxurious item.

Four of the rare words describe the appearance of flesh, which is semi-technical content (πολυσαρκία, καθαρότης, ἁπαλότης, αὐχμηρός). They are found in medical writers and in other physical descriptions of flesh, such as αὐχμηρός ('withered') in Euripides, *Helen* 1540 and Plutarch, *Lycurgus* 16.6. Xenophon does not use them elsewhere because he seldom discusses the physical appearance of flesh elsewhere, but γρυπότης discussed above (*Cyr.* 8.4.21) indicates that he uses *hapax legomena* when that kind of content surfaces. In those of his works that do discuss the semi-technical appearance of flesh we find words very like πολυσαρκία, for example on horse-flesh: εὔσαρκοι and οὐ μέντοι φλεψί γε οὐδὲ σαρξὶ παχέα (*Eq.* 1.13; 1.5). *RL* 5.8 says of human flesh: εὔχροί τε καὶ εὔσαρκοι καὶ εὔρωστοι. Flesh is described as ἁπαλός at *An.* 5.4.32. The body is described as καθαρός at *Oec.* 10.8. The use of αὐχμηρός in the Choice (*Mem.* 2.1.31) also produces a succinct adjectival contrast to λιπαροί in a sentence characteristic of Xenophon that thrives on balance and involves alpha-privatives as well as other contrasting terms: ἀπόνως μὲν λιπαροὶ διὰ νεότητος τρεφόμενοι, ἐπιπόνως δὲ αὐχμηροὶ διὰ γήρως περῶντες.[13]

Sansone held that the three abstract nouns ending in -της: καθαρότης, ἁπαλότης, νεότης were also 'of a particular type uncommon in Xenophon', suggesting again the influence of Prodicus (133). Yet these forms are not so uncommon in Xenophon, and he often uses them in clusters as he does in the Choice. *Mem.* 2.2.7 has two: χαλεπότητα, ἀγριότητα, *Oec.* 19.11 another two: ὑγρότητα, ξηρότητα. There are another two in a short compass in *Ag.*, 11.11–14: φαυλότητι, νεότητος, and four in his *De re equestri* 9.9–10.7, three of them clustering in 10.6–7: χαλαρότητι, τραχύτητι, λειότητι, λειότητος. In the Choice, ἁπαλότης is to be explained in the terms above, as semi-technical description of flesh, and καθαρότης as well. The third, which is νεότης, is very common in Xenophon. Another case of technical content that requires this kind of abstract noun is χαλαρότης, which figures only in *De re equestri* 9.9, 10.13, 10.16. There is no influence from Prodicus in these other cases of such

---

[13] The use of περᾶν as a metaphor for old age is also somewhat unusual, elsewhere being used of movement through space, such as water: *Oec.* 20.28; *An.* 4.3.21.

hapax legomena, and probably none in the Choice either. Xenophon's clusters are often designed to emphasize one idea (the wildness of a mother in *Mem.* 2.2.7) or to contrast two opposites (watery as opposed to dry in *Oec.* 19.11).

Among the other *hapax legomena* in the Choice are three alpha-privative adjectives. These are dictated by the desire for one succinct word, as in the case of ἄμουσος in *Oec.* 12.18 (above). They also either repeat and therefore emphasize an important idea, or stand in balanced opposition to it. In 2.1.23 the *hapax* ἄγευστος is paired with the more regular ἄπειρος, balancing lack of good things against want of bad things and emphasizing the lack: τῶν μὲν τερπνῶν οὐδενὸς ἄγευστος . . . τῶν δὲ χαλεπῶν ἄπειρος. In 2.1.31 ἀθέατος is balanced by the more regular ἀνήκοος to emphasize two other different areas of deprivation: τοῦ δὲ πάντων ἡδίστου ἀκούσματος, ἐπαίνου ἑαυτῆς, ἀνήκοος εἶ καὶ τοῦ πάντων ἡδίστου θεάματος ἀθέατος (*Mem.* 2.1.31). In 2.1.33 ἀμόχθοις echoes the earlier more regular ἀπράγμων. The adverb ἀπόνως is used twice elsewhere: *Cyr.* 7.5.74 and *Mem.* 3.1.13, and at 2.1.31 it balances ἐπιπόνως. There is no indication that Prodicus was interested in alpha-privatives.

If one had to find a pedigree for these words, it is the tragic poets, and this might reflect Socrates' awareness that the piece needed a high style; but words that come from the poets are also used for mundane content. As Gautier said, Xenophon's poetic words are often from dialects he heard in his life outside Athens, or perhaps from his wide reading.

Another word alleged to be unusual is αὐτοκράτορες, which describes young men when they reach the age of independence. It is more commonly used of political power as Sansone says (131). However, there is a parallel thought in the expression of this liberation at *RL* 3.1, where young men of that same age become αὐτονόμους. This is another word that Xenophon 'normally' uses in political contexts (e.g. in *Hell.* 5.4.1). Even though the words are different, the metaphor is the same, in which the age of liberation is expressed in political terms. Not only is this metaphoric usage not un-Xenophontic, but it is actually characteristic of him. We might say that metaphor produces *hapax* usage in both these instances because the metaphor is unusual. A desire for assonance might produce the preference at *RL* 3.1: ἄρχουσι δὲ οὐδένες ἔτι αὐτῶν, ἀλλ' αὐτονόμους ἀφιᾶσιν, but there is also the possibility that the two words have fine distinctions of meaning. 'Autonomous' means freedom to do as one pleases, since the point being made in *RL* is that the young are left utterly at liberty to do as they please, whereas 'autocratic' implies power to make a decision *on one's own*, which is the focus of the choice and the usual significance of the adjective when Xenophon uses it of officials (e.g. *Hell.* 1.4.20); the decision to be made by the young man is spelled out after the word is used in the Choice as if this is the focus: εἴτε . . . εἴτε.

Xenophon has Virtue use the poetic θίασος (2.1.31) instead of a more normal word for a 'company', but this is in order to capture her sarcasm about those who keep the company of Vice. *Oec.* 21.8 uses the *hapax* χείρ for a company when the context is right. Here the context is right for θίασος. Virtue has earlier described Vice as one the gods have 'cast out' of their company, and to refer to her 'company' in sacred language is suitably ironic cutting. Did the whole idea with the rare word come from Prodicus? Xenophon elsewhere describes the company of virtue in religious terms. *Oec.* 21.12 speaks of those truly 'initiated' into moderation (τοῖς ἀληθινῶς σωφροσύνηι τετελεσμένοις). The company of Vice is the antithesis of these.

θαμά is an interesting case (2.1.22). Xenophon uses θαμινά (*An.* 4.1.16; *Oec.* 3.4; *Mem.* 3.11.16) and *Cynegeticus* 3.7 pairs this with σκοπεῖν, which the Choice

compounds.[14] The definition of *hapax* usage is at issue here, when one form is so similar to the other. Sansone dismisses the emendation that produces it at *Cyr*. 8.8.12 even though it creates a nice alliteration and is accepted by editors.

Sansone also mentions πλησιαίτερον (2.1.23) where ἐγγύτερον is expected because it is 'regularly' used in Xenophon (131). Yet, as discussed above, Xenophon uses the superlative form in *Poroi* 4.46: ἡ μετὰ ταῦτα πλησιαίτατα Θῆβαι and again in *An.* 1.10.5 and 7.3.29, the first in the midst of 'p' alliteration: Πρόξενον καλέσας (πλησιαίτατος γὰρ ἦν). It produces some 'p' alliteration in the Choice too, and this may account for it, but the main provable point is that the word is not outside Xenophon's normal vocabulary, and there are cases, for instance in *An.* 7.3.29, where he uses it for equally inexplicable reasons as in the Choice. He might have thought that there was an unpleasant jingling in ἐγένοντο ἐγγύτερον.

Sansone finds cause for suspicion also in the two feminine forms in the list of the helpful roles that Virtue plays: παραστάτις and συλλήπτρια, not only because they occur *hapax*, but because they are feminine. These are supposed to come from Prodicus' concern for the 'correctness of words' (ὀρθότης ὀνομάτων), which meant he favoured female-gender words where they existed, as is suggested by the parody in *Clouds*: p. 133, which concerns the gender of a fowl. It could be said that Aristophanes himself is an addict of such correct forms, producing as he does feminine –τρια forms such as ἀλείπτρια, βάπτρια, βασανίστρια, κλέπτρια, συλλήπτρια, συγχορεύτρια, συνθεάτρια and συμπαίστρια. Xenophon had little need for such forms most of the time, since the description of helpful female characters is a relative rarity in his works. He uses their masculine forms elsewhere though. παραστάτης is too common to catalogue.[15] συλλήπτωρ, also a *hapax*, occurs at *Mem.* 2.2.12, in the conversation immediately following the Choice, where the thought is similar to that of the Choice. Perhaps he was inspired by the memory of what he had written, but he seems to have a personal fondness for unusual words for those who 'assist', as is shown by the other *hapax* ἀλεξητῆρες at *Oec.* 4.3.[16] Of course, he uses συλλαμβάνειν in its verbal form to indicate assistance (e.g. *Mem.* 2.3.18, 2.6.37). The reason why these feminine forms are unique to the Choice is not only that he does not often describe the useful qualities of females elsewhere, but because in the extensive list he is making of words for the helpfulness of Virtue he must reach the outer limits of his vocabulary. He calls her 'a beloved *co-worker* for craftsmen, a trusted *guardian* of the household for their owners, a kindly *protector* for servants, a good *helpmate* for the toilsome activities of peacetime, a firm *ally* in the works of war, an excellent *partner* in friendship': συνεργός, φύλαξ, παραστάτις, συλλήπτρια, σύμμαχος, κοινωνός. The other words do not of course possess feminine forms. He has himself narrowed down the range of words he has to choose from by preferring those compounded with elements that underline the close company that Virtue will keep with those who choose her: συν, παρα and κοιν-. This is presumably why he did not reuse ἀλεξητῆρ at *Oec.* 4.3.[17]

Returning to παραστάτις, it can be said in addition to the arguments above that Xenophon is scrupulous in using feminine –ις forms for nationalities and distinguishes male from female Persians in this form (*Cyr.* 8.5.21: Πέρσαις καὶ Περσίσιν).

---

[14] He also uses θαμίζειν: *Hell.* 5.4.29; *Cyr.* 7.3.2.
[15] The feminine –ις forms are in tragedy, including παραστάτις.
[16] *De re equestri* 5.6 uses a related word in a technical sense of horses' equipment.
[17] For another example of fondness for a series of συν- compounds: *Mem.* 2.4.6: συνεπισχύει, συμβοηθεῖ, συμπράττων, συμπείθων.

Other instances of feminine –*ις* forms are Dardan*ις* in *Hell.* 3.1.10 and Kil*issa* in *An.*
1.2.12–20, the commoner αὐλητρίς and ὀρχηστρίς (*Hell.* 2.2.23, possibly *Mem.*
2.6.36, *Symp.* 2.1) and παλλακίς alongside παλλακή (*Cyr.* 5.2.28). He also distin-
guishes female goddesses in the usual way (θεὰν without the article but τὴν θεὸν with
the article *Symp.* 8.15, 35).

The other type of linguistic evidence for Prodicean influence is synonyms. Sansone
says that Plato and Aristotle demonstrate that Prodicus distinguished synonyms for
pleasure, for desiring, for doing, and that the Choice uses synonyms in apparently
'gratuitous profusion' in a way that suggests that a particular point is being made
about them (134). This point is that Xenophon preserves Prodicus' interest in the
'correctness of words' in the meanings of synonyms. He notes how Vice 'examines,
pays attention to, observes and stares at' herself (2.1.22), the various words for the
pleasures she offers Heracles (2.1.24), the variety of her words for 'naming', including
the *hapax* ὑποκορίζεσθαι.[18] Virtue also has her share of synonyms, for instance for
the 'service' that she asks Heracles to give to various others (2.1.28: θεραπευτέον,
εὐεργητέον, ὠφελητέον, θεραπευτέον, ἐπιμελητέον, ἐθιστέον). It is admitted that
Xenophon's Choice lacks any overt explanation of correct usage, which might count
against Prodicus, but the argument here is that Xenophon drew on a popular form of
Prodicus' lecture that provokes the audience to wonder about the synonyms, rather
than giving overt explanations of them (134f., 138f.). Xenophon's version also exhibits
a non-Prodicean inconsistency in the use of synonyms, but on that score the argument
is that Vice uses them inconsistently to demonstrate her inconsistent character,
whereas Virtue uses them correctly to show her correctness (136).

I want first to categorize Xenophon's own very frequent use of synonyms for the
purpose of the present discussion. The definition of a synonym is problematic, but
one test is whether they are interchangeable in sense. This is true of one category of
his usage, which is in sentences that emphasize reciprocal activity. An example with
synonyms for 'perceiving' and 'loving' is *Mem.* 2.7.9: σὺ μὲν ἐκείνας φιλήσεις ὁρῶν
ὠφελίμους σεαυτῶι οὔσας, ἐκεῖναι δὲ σὲ ἀγαπήσουσιν αἰσθόμεναι χαίροντα
αὐταῖς. A second category, in which a fair amount of interchange is also possible, is
when he emphasizes the one idea through a repeated list, such as at *Symposium* 8.39,
which has synonyms for 'inquiring' and 'knowing': σκεπτέον μέν σοι ποῖα
ἐπιστάμενος Θεμιστοκλῆς ἱκανὸς ἐγένετο τὴν Ἑλλάδα ἐλευθεροῦν, σκεπτέον δὲ
ποῖά ποτε εἰδὼς Περικλῆς κράτιστος ἐδόκει τῆι πατρίδι σύμβουλος εἶναι,
ἀθρητέον δὲ καὶ πῶς ποτε Σόλων φιλοσοφήσας νόμους κρατίστους τῆι πόλει
κατέθηκεν, ἐρευνητέον δὲ καὶ ποῖα Λακεδαιμόνιοι ἀσκοῦντες κράτιστοι δοκοῦσιν
ἡγεμόνες εἶναι.[19] In none of these examples does Xenophon discriminate the 'correct'
usage of synonyms in a philosophical manner. Rather he uses them to convey a
reciprocal thought, or emphasize an idea in a manner that makes them
interchangeable in sense, though not perhaps in terms of sound patterns. Elsewhere he
does use synonyms that are not interchangeable, but in these cases too, his distinction
is literary rather than philosophical. Gautier (124) notes the four words for the maids
at *Cyr.* 5.1.4–6 as an example of straightforward variation, where Xenophon resorts
to the *hapax* δμωή, but these terms are not interchangeable because their choice is
driven by their local context: that when δούλαις is used for them, the usual issue of
freedom versus slavery is in the air, since the dress of the maids is no different from
that of their free mistress, the redoubtable Panthea, who prefers not to kit herself out

---

[18] Plato uses this in *Resp.* 400E, 474E, 560E for 'bad-naming'.
[19] Cf. *Hiero* 8.9–10 and *RL* 9.5 for other lists of emphatic verbal adjectives.

with anything grander, and that when they are referred to as αἱ ἀμφ' αὐτήν, they literally do surround her. There is then a case for saying that when the poetic δμῳαί is used in a passage of high emotion, with the mistress and maids in shouting distress, it is not just for variation, but to raise the tone.[20] This leaves θεράπαινα, which is Xenophon's normal word for maids when they come with mistresses: *Hell.* 5.4.6. It is clear that Xenophon feels a philosophical distinction between the slave and the free woman, but the other distinctions are literary, to make a special point about the maids in the context.

When we turn to the Choice, we see Xenophon's literary usage at work. Socrates describes Vice looking at herself in the middle voice κατασκοπεῖσθαι, (this is another *hapax*) but looking outwardly at others in the active ἐπισκοπεῖν, then he uses the standard word for another 'gazing' at her (θεᾶται) and another for her 'glancing' from herself to her shadow (ἀποβλέπειν). This variation of terms for looking brings attention to the importance she puts on her looks, in contrast to Virtue. Some of the words are interchangeable (ἐπισκοπεῖν could equally well be used of her own reflexive gaze: *Mem.* 4.2. 24, 30), but other words are appropriate to the action being described, such as θεᾶται (*Mem.* 3.11.1–2, also of a desirable woman). Passing to Virtue's use of synonyms, when Virtue describes Vice as cast out by the gods, she also achieves emphasis through two balanced synonyms, each of four syllables: ἐκ θεῶν μὲν ἀπέρριψαι, ὑπὸ δὲ ἀνθρώπων ἀγαθῶν ἀτιμάζηι (2.1.31). She might also be choosing words appropriate respectively to the actions of gods and men, but the toss might be argued, since casting out something is an act of dishonour for men too in *Mem.* 1.2.53. However, when Virtue lists the ways Heracles must serve others, she is using the exact cast of expression observed in Xenophon's example of listing at *Symp.* 8.39 above. There is the same list of synonymous verbal adjectives accompanied by other synonymous expressions for 'desiring' and 'being loved and honoured': εἴτε τοὺς θεοὺς ἵλεως εἶναί σοι βούλει, θεραπευτέον τοὺς θεούς, εἴτε ὑπὸ φίλων ἐθέλεις ἀγαπᾶσθαι, τοὺς φίλους εὐεργητέον, εἴτε ὑπό τινος πόλεως ἐπιθυμεῖς τιμᾶσθαι, τὴν πόλιν ὠφελητέον, εἴτε ὑπὸ τῆς Ἑλλάδος πάσης ἀξιοῖς ἐπ' ἀρετῆι θαυμάζεσθαι, τὴν Ἑλλάδα πειρατέον εὖ ποιεῖν . . . The words for giving service may seem appropriate to their objects, but are interchangeable in sense in Xenophon's vocabulary.[21] In the treatment given the one who serves them, the kindliness of the gods is appropriately distinguished from the love of men, but the two words for honour are interchangeable.[22] Those looking for discrimination of meaning in this passage would become confused, but their literary emphasis on the need for service in order to achieve honour is clear.

These examples already indicate that Virtue's synonyms do not reflect Prodicus' usage. If his correct usage involved synonyms for 'desiring' as they say, then here is Virtue using them without discrimination, for there seems no reason at all why she would want to discriminate about the strength or nature of the wish that Heracles might have for honour. This makes her no different from Vice, who uses words for pleasure indiscriminately in order to convey emphatically to Heracles what a

---

[20] *LSJ* says it does not occur at all in prose.

[21] For example, *Mem.* 2.6.25 uses εὐεργετεῖν of the πόλιν and ὠφελεῖν of φίλους. *Mem.* 2.4.6 uses both these words of friends, along with εὖ ποιεῖν. *Mem.* 2.2.11–13 uses θεραπεύειν of assistance to friends, and the Choice itself uses this word of cultivating the land, as well as the gods: 2.1.28.

[22] *Mem.* 3.6.3, 16–18 equates being honoured with being admired (θαυμάζεσθαι) where the theme is again that if you seek honour, you must serve.

pleasurable choice he has in her (2.1.24). Of course, the whole cast of Virtue's thought about the need to serve in order to achieve honour is Xenophontic, as shown in *Mem.* 1.2.55, 3.6.3, 16–18.

Virtue and Vice cannot be distinguished from each other even in the vocabulary of pleasure, which is Sansone's test case. Vice uses words cognate with ἥδεσθαι for general pleasures, and alongside these: κεχαρισμένον of food and drink, τερφθείης of sights and sounds, ἡσθείης of smell and touch, εὐφρανθείης of sex (2.1.24). This may appear inconsistent, but Virtue shows a similar pattern. She uses ἥδεσθαι for the 'good' pleasures associated with food, drink, sleep, sound and sight, and χαίρειν for the pleasure of praise, which is apparently correct Prodicean usage, but she defies Prodicus' correct usage if we include the other synonym for pleasure, ἀγάλλεσθαι, against which her χαίρειν is balanced: οἱ μὲν νέοι τοῖς τῶν πρεσβυτέρων ἐπαίνοις χαίρουσιν, οἱ δὲ γεραίτεροι ταῖς τῶν νέων τιμαῖς ἀγάλλονται (2.1.33). The entire cast of the sentence and the emphatic synonymous reciprocity it conveys can be found in the non-discriminating *Mem.* 2.7.9: σὺ μὲν ἐκείνας φιλήσεις ὁρῶν ὠφελίμους σεαυτῶι οὔσας, ἐκεῖναι δὲ σὲ ἀγαπήσουσιν αἰσθόμεναι χαίροντα αὐτοῖς. Here too, as in that example, Virtue uses two different words to describe the same object without distinction of meaning. *Mem.* 2.6.35 confirms the lack of distinction between χαίρειν and ἀγαλλέσθαι: οὐδένι οὕτω χαίρεις ὡς φίλοις ἀγαθοῖς καὶ ἐπί τε τοῖς καλοῖς ἔργοις τῶν φίλων ἀγάλληι οὐχ ἧττον ἢ ἐπὶ τοῖς σαυτοῦ καὶ ἐπὶ τοῖς ἀγαθοῖς τῶν φίλων χαίρεις οὐδὲν ἧττον ἢ ἐπὶ τοῖς σαυτοῦ ... Virtue also seems inconsistent, but effective in her emphasis, in describing virtue's pleasure as 'honours' on the one hand and 'praise' on the other, and the old men as both πρεσβύτεροι and γεραίτεροι. These could distinguish the perspectives of the men, in that it is more appropriate for the young to receive praise from their elders than honour, but this would press the distinction in a way that the parallel from *Mem.* 2.7.9 suggests we should not do. Xenophon treats both honour and praise as the object of mature desire at *Hiero* 7.3 and if there is any difference of perspective between the words for the old men, the distinction is Xenophontic.[23]

This desire for emphasis also explains the one difference between the usage of Vice and Virtue that is apparent, which is the point at which their synonymous expressions cluster. Vice uses them for corrupt sensual pleasures, Virtue for the spiritual delights of the young and old men in praise. The role the synonyms play is then to highlight the different kinds of pleasure that Virtue and Vice offer Heracles.

The confirmation that Xenophon uses synonyms for pleasure without distinction where he wants to emphasize the notion of pleasure, and perhaps for sheer variation too, is *Hiero* 1.4–38. The wise Simonides uses both ἥδεσθαι and εὐφραίνειν and their cognates (against ἄχθεσθαι and λυπεῖσθαι) of the general pleasures that affect both body and soul; ἥδεσθαι of sounds, εὐφραίνειν of food and drink. The ruler Hiero uses εὐφραίνειν of sound, ἥδεσθαι of food and drink, and εὐφροσύνη of the pleasure of expectation of food. Simonides then uses ἥδεσθαι of food and drink himself, and Hiero uses χάρα, perhaps to balance the earlier disyllabic synonym πόθου (25). The pleasures of sex involve ἥδεσθαι compounds, but also ἀγαπητόν and εὐφραίνειν, but ἥδεσθαι and its cognates predominate, climaxing in the quadruple *isocolon* of 1.35.

---

[23] *Cyr.* 1.2 uses both words. πρεσβύτεροι dominates at 1.2.8, where the perspective is of the younger men; cf. 1.2.12–13, where γεραίτεροι is used of the class of older men, without perspective. On the other hand the preference may be one in which he uses one synonym in one section and the other later. See for this kind of sequencing of synonyms: V. Gray, 'Continuous history and Xenophon *Hellenica* 1–2.3.10', *AJP* 112 (1991) 201–28.

The synonyms are not designed to represent incorrect usage, but to emphasize the topic under discussion.

It is impossible to prove the thesis that Xenophon's Choice contains words from Prodicus on the grounds that the language is uncharacteristic of Xenophon. It is easy to establish the equal possibility that Xenophon chose them from his own enormous vocabulary for his own deliberate reasons, since his Choice grandly demonstrates the general features of his language. This applies to his use of rare words, his synonyms and even his feminine forms. The argument that he borrowed them from Prodicus would have to be that they are more *likely* to be a product of borrowing than of his own invention, and I do not see how that case might be argued, particularly against Socrates' indication that his language is not Prodicean. There is no evidence that Prodicus' vocabulary contained rare words, but plenty of evidence that Xenophon's did. The two areas that are said to point most to Prodicus' linguistic theories are the feminine forms and the synonyms. Yet the patterns of synonym use in the Choice are so variable that even an expert audience would be pressed to detect a reference to such theories, let alone the general audience that is proposed. The case that Virtue is consistent in her usage does not stand examination. This leaves the mere clustering of synonyms, but if this indicated Prodicus' presence, he would be the inspiration for vast tracts of Xenophon's writing. Nor are the feminine forms so surprising that they would alert such an audience to that phenomenon. Those reading *Memorabilia* would recognize the language as having a literary effect characteristic of Xenophon.

This investigation also shows that Xenophon's characteristic sentiments appear in the Choice, within his characteristic casts of expression. For instance, in listing the services Heracles must offer to win renown (2.1.28), Virtue produces a characteristic sentence structure that also expresses the idea he attributes to Socrates elsewhere, that one must offer useful service in order to receive honour (*Mem.* 2.1.28; cf. 1.2.55, 3.6.3, 16–18 etc.). There is no reason to think Xenophon does not preserve the gist of the piece that Prodicus wrote, in which Vice and Virtue address Heracles, but coincidences like these make the detail of the sentiments questionable. It is a cause of unease therefore that the account of how the tyrannical ruler is deprived of pleasure in sight and sound, which Xenophon puts in the mouth of Simonides (*Hiero* 1.11–14), expands Virtue's account of how Vice is deprived of such pleasures: τοῦ δὲ πάντων ἡδίστου ἀκούσματος, ἐπαίνου ἑαυτῆς, ἀνήκοος εἶ, καὶ τοῦ πάντων ἡδίστου θεάματος ἀθέατος, against *Hiero* 1.14: τοῦ μὲν ἡδίστου ἀκροάματος, ἐπαίνου, οὔποτε σπανίζετε . . . τοῦ δ' αὖ χαλεπωτάτου ἀκροάματος, λοιδορίας, ἀνήκοοί ἐστε. The thought that Vice eats and drinks, sleeps and has sex before she feels a natural desire for them, and therefore has to stimulate desire artificially to make them enjoyable (2.1.30), whereas Virtue's friends satisfy that desire only when it comes to them naturally (2.1.33), finds expression not only at *Mem.* 1.3.6 (on drink); *Mem.* 3.11.12–14 (on food and drink and sex), but also at *RL* 5.4. It is also this that makes Hiero complain that he feels no desire because he has so much food and drink available, and that he needs stimulation to make eating possible (*Hiero* 1.17–23, and on sex: 29–30). Socrates distinguishes the corrupt Aphrodite from the pure Aphrodite, complete with their different names, just as Xenophon's Choice distinguishes Virtue and Vice (*Symposium* 8.9–10). In the matter of respect for the gods, moreover, whereas we need to explain away Prodicus' alleged atheism (Sansone, 141), no discount is needed of Xenophon's piety, which is amply attested in his other works.

The University of Auckland, New Zealand   V. GRAY
v.gray@auckland.ac.nz