

**THE CYNEGETICUS;
DISSERTATION**

Published @ 2017 Trieste Publishing Pty Ltd

ISBN 9780649193059

The Cynegeticus; Dissertation by Henry Nevill Sanders

Except for use in any review, the reproduction or utilisation of this work in whole or in part in any form by any electronic, mechanical or other means, now known or hereafter invented, including xerography, photocopying and recording, or in any information storage or retrieval system, is forbidden without the permission of the publisher, Trieste Publishing Pty Ltd, PO Box 1576 Collingwood, Victoria 3066 Australia.

All rights reserved.

Edited by Trieste Publishing Pty Ltd.
Cover @ 2017

This book is sold subject to the condition that it shall not, by way of trade or otherwise, be lent, re-sold, hired out, or otherwise circulated without the publisher's prior consent in any form or binding or cover other than that in which it is published and without a similar condition including this condition being imposed on the subsequent purchaser.

www.triestepublishing.com

HENRY NEVILL SANDERS

**THE CYNEGETICUS;
DISSERTATION**

THE CYNEGETICUS

DISSERTATION

SUBMITTED TO THE BOARD OF UNIVERSITY STUDIES OF THE
JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY IN CONFORMITY WITH
THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY.

BY

HENRY NEVILL SANDERS, M. A.



BALTIMORE
1903

Φαμί δὲ βασιλῶν Χείρωνος αἰσεν.

Pindar, Pyth. IV 103.

Viellard ! tels m'ont parlé ces pasteurs des humains
Nourris de ton esprit, élevés par tes mains . . .

Leconte de Lisle, Khirón.

Alle suche dysport as voydith ydlnesse
Yt syttyth enery gentilman to knowe;
For myrthe annexed is to gentilnesse.
Qwerfore among alle oper, as y trowe,
To know the craft of hontyng and to blowe,
As thys booke shall witnessse, is one the beste;
For it is holsum, plesant, and honest.—
And for to sette yonge hunterys in the way,
To venery y caste me fyrst to go,
Of wheche .IIII. bestis be, that is to say
The hare, the herte, þe wulfhe, the wyilde boore also;
Of venery for sothe þer be no moe.
And so it shewith here in portretwre,
Where enery best is set in hys figure.

Twicl.

(Eng. version from Cottonian MS. B, XII Vesp.)



THE CYNEGETICUS.

In the earlier years of modern scholarship the critical treatment of the *Cynegeticus* was confined to attack upon its genuineness as a work of Xenophon and resulted in athetesis in whole or in part. More recently the work has been subjected to investigation both from the point of view of philosophic content and from that of stylistic detail. The two latter phases of criticism, thoroughly worked out as they have been by modern scientific method, have been altogether inconclusive as to the authorship and the date of the treatise. Towards the solution of these difficulties, I propose to apply a fourth line of investigation, if possibly I may weave the results arrived at by my predecessors to a logical conclusion, by trying to determine more nearly the date of publication from literary allusion and the locality from topographical consideration. In pursuance of this object I originally prepared a somewhat lengthy dissertation dealing with the ethos of the *Cynegeticus* in the form of a detailed commentary, at the same time devoting much space to the articles of scholars relating to the subject, and finally briefly indicating my own conclusions. This dissertation was accepted by the Board of University Studies of the Johns Hopkins University in February of 1903, and should have been published forthwith, but considerations arose which suggested the advisability of putting much of the matter in the form of a text book,¹ and in consequence I have ventured to reconstruct the dissertation so as to deal exclusively with the problem of authorship.

The plan of the *Cynegeticus* divides naturally into three parts:—a proem I 1-17 lauding venery at the time when Greek

¹This point must be emphasised, as the Board of Studies of the Johns Hopkins University would hardly have accepted the dissertation in its present form as adequate, nor would the writer have had the hardihood to offer the same. On the other hand, in the edition proposed there may be much to offend scholars who are not sportsmen, even as the *Cynegeticus* has proved offensive being tentative in Greek Literature—on the border land between a treatise and an epideictic effusion, holding a place as precarious as the social prestige of a fancier.

Jagd enthalten ist, in ähnlicher Weise seinen jugendlichen Zuhörern, um ihren Eifer zu wecken, mündlich entwickelt und dabei auch seine tiefe Abneigung gegen die damaligen Sophisten, die Lehrer einer falschen Bildung, ungeniert ausgesprochen hat, und dass dies etwa von einem seiner Söhne der Jagdanleitung hinzugefügt worden ist; für diese selbst aber was die schriftliche Aufzeichnung geboten. The date of composition he sets at 384-383. The main part of the work contains no naive tone, no *fervor juvenilis*, and introduction and conclusion and certain other passages are to be set down to an interpolator.

Norden¹ treats of the proemium of the *Cynegeticus* in that division of the *Kunstprosa* which he entitles "Von Hadrian bis zum Ende des Kaiserzeit," a position that has not failed to draw comment from the critics. His whole treatment depends upon Radermacher's article then recently published, to the conclusions of which he subscribes except for the date of the proem. This he assigns to the *Zweite Sophistik*. He quotes *Cyn. I 3* and adds: this affected modesty is however precisely one of the most prominent and offensive properties of the style of the *Zweite Sophistik*. "Dass in solchem Stil ausschliesslich Vertreter der sog. *Zweiten Sophistik* geschrieben haben, kann ich mit grösster Bestimmtheit versichern." This is decided enough, yet the *Zweite Sophistik* is a phase of style not a period, and one may read the entire book without being able to decide what limits in time Norden sets to the *Zweite Sophistik*. Philostratus² writes: *περὶ δὲ Αλαχίου τοῦ Ἀτρομήτου, ὃν φάμεν τῆς δευτέρας σοφιστικῆς ἀρξαι...* Yet Norden writes: Radermacher urteilt (p. 36) vor dem III Jh. v. Chr. dürfte das Proömium schwerlich entstanden sein; er denkt also wohl an die ältere asianische Schule und zieht daher Hegesias zum Vergleich heran. Es lässt sich aber aus dem Stil beweisen, dass das Proömium ein Product der *Zweiten Sophistik* ist. As a matter of fact if one reads Norden's description of this ältere asianische Schule he will think Radermacher has good grounds for his conviction. But Norden's criticism of Radermacher is apparently not merely a correction of the term "asianisch." He would relegate the proemium to the time when the chase excited an interest such as we find in Arrian and Pollux. Surely however if that is the case it is remarkable that Arrian accepts the Proem as Xenophon's. He would hardly have done

¹ E. Norden, *Antike Kunstprosa*, Leipzig 1898.

² *Vit. Soph. I*, 18, 507.

so had the author been within a generation or so of his time, for he must have made some mark as the precursor of the New Style¹.

On the other hand what Norden has to say of the early Asiatics is more to the point here. "In their moods of soft, empty pathos they broke up periods into short mincing sentences; every sentence had a strongly rhythmical cadence, clauses with ditrochee $\bar{\nu}\nu\bar{\nu}$ being an especial favourite and $\bar{\nu}\nu\bar{\nu}\bar{\nu}$, a form much affected later." He adds that Asianism linked itself to old Sophistic *Kunstprosa*; further, "in their moments of bombast they displayed a bacchantic, dithyrambic prose with the watchword of Caprice as Law Supreme."

In a series of articles that dwelt with the minor works of Xenophon, H. Richards² has endeavoured to establish the authenticity or spuriousness of sundry of the writings of Xenophon from an exhaustive analysis of the diction. In the case of the *Cynegeticus* he says: "The facts of language that tell against a Xn. authorship are negative rather than positive." He takes *Cyn.* I-XI to be genuine work of Xenophon. In XII and XIII various things point to Xenophon as the author and there is nothing that points the other way. "The preface is dithyrambic in tone and poetic in expression (cp. *Cl. Rev.* 1899, p. 347, col. 2), but there is nothing in the vocabulary that is inconsistent with Xenophontine authorship." In *Cl. Rev.* 1899 p. 383 he makes some critical notes on the *Cynegeticus* which may prove useful to anyone editing the text but which do not concern us at present.³

The foregoing writers are representative of the school of partial athetesis. Their methods have naturally points of contact with the other lines of investigation we are now about to consider, but for practical purposes the distinction is warranted by their several conclusions. So far the manner of our author has been considered; the contents of the work and the style of composition, granting that after Gorgias matters of style in Greek Literature are thoroughly artificial, intentional and therefore capable of statistical analysis, afford opportunity for a more material,

¹ Compare Norden, p. 407 f. *Gratius' Carmen Veneticum* shows an acquaintance with the *Cynegeticus*, yet it would be straining a point to see an allusion to our poem in the opening address to Diana.

² *Classical Review* 1898, pp. 385, 388. 1899, pp. 198, 342.

³ A similar remark applies to the article of van Herwerden, *Mnemosyne* N. S. XXIII, 1895.

more scientifically tangible, investigation. The application of comparative philosophy to the matter of the *Cynegeticus* is found in the writings of Kaibel, Dümmler and Joël¹.

G. Kaibel² begins by insisting on the versatility of Xenophon, the diversity of the subjects on which he writes, and his adaptiveness to their sphere, his close connection with contemporary literature and his susceptibility to external suggestion. While admitting that the substance and the form of the treatise (in entirety) are surprising, conforming but little to the picture one has of Xenophon's manner of thought and expression, he denies the probability of a careless interpolator on the grounds of the harmony between the material and the linguistic mould in which it is cast. That it is the product of a youthful Xenophon is improbable from the words *παραινέ τοῖς νέοις*, and also the poor facilities for experience in hunting afforded by Attica possessed by enemies³.

The *Cynegeticus* is primarily an encomium on the chase; not a technical treatise like the *περὶ ἰστικῆς*, but rather analogous to the *ὀλιγορμικός*, which is interpreted as an encomium on agriculture. It is also a defence of the chase against the attacks of its opponents, and it is out of "this defence, the conclusion and perhaps the most noteworthy part of the book, that there is evolved an independent attack to which the chase but serves as an accommodating bridge." The objection to the devotees of the chase is really that the hardy hunters are a menace to *ἡδονή*. The contrast set up between *ἡδονή* and *πόνος* would alone suffice to reveal Aristippus as the opponent engaged. To Xenophon the *θέλειν πορεύειν* is the way to virtue, the proof of which, neither very clear nor very deep, goes hand in hand with the Prodicus chapter directed against Aristippus in *Memorabilia* II 1.

Turning to the introduction Kaibel finds that the colourless sketching of the heroes no less than the lack of variety of invention, hints at want of practice on the author's part, but the tone and impress of the whole section does not to his mind fall far short of Isocrates' manner, e. g. in *Panath.* 72. The position of Cheiron with his twenty-one pupils is an advance on that

¹ It is a matter for regret that Gomperz or some Philosopher conversant with the Hippocratean Corpus has not treated the *Cyn.* comparatively.

² *Hermes* XXV 1890, p. 581 f.

³ A point more than once insisted on by Mahaffy, himself no mean sportsman.

accorded him by Homer, where he is *δικαιότατος Κενταύρων*, or on his presentation as the huntsman, as plastic art of the VIth century represented him. The aim of Cheironian education is Virtue, the medium of education Toil and Work. Here, too, Xenophon is limited by an influence from without. Antisthenes' Herakles¹ shows a surprising similarity to the introduction to the *Cynegeticus*; in it Antisthenes wished to demonstrate the theme *τὸ κατ' ἀρετὴν ζῆν* is the *τέλος*, making use also of the theme *ὅτι ἡ πόσις ἀγαθόν*. The theme was worked out in his Great Herakles. By not borrowing mechanically for his catalogue of heroic pupils Xenophon protests against Antisthenes' interpretation of the Homeric *δικαιότατος Κενταύρων*. Xenophon has no place for Herakles the Hero of Cynic Doctrine; he would not have put him among the pupils of Cheiron even if the legend had already admitted him in that circle. Kaibel touches on the possibility of Antisthenes' having introduced a *φρόνησις* in person; this would lend poignancy to the ironical thrust in Plato *Phaedr.* 250 d, and Xenophon's intent in maintaining that 'Αρετή² become human would be like the Loved One before whose eyes the Lover is bashful about doing or saying anything ugly, would be to fight Aristippus with Antisthenes' weapons, at the same time not sparing criticism of his fellow scholar.

This being so, Kaibel continues, the work was not written by Xenophon in his early days, nor in the VIth century at all. The attack on the sophists in chap. XIII is directed against the sophists of the Gorgianic school and, combined with them, certain philosophers, the false in contrast to the true philosophers. Isocrates *περὶ ἀντιδόσεως* is similar. The *μάταια* censured by Xenophon (*Cyn.* XIII 2) may well be identical with the *μάταια λόγοι* of Isocrates XV. 269. To obtain a wordy commentary on the few sentences of Xenophon one has but to write out the half of the *Antidosis* oration.

After the attack on the Hedonists and sophists, Xenophon compares hunters and *τοὺς ἐπὶ πλεονεξίας εἰκὴ λόγους*, the politicians who turn their public activity to their own advantage. The fact that a strained transition from the sophists to these people who are ruined by their influence is considered sufficient, points to Isocrates XV 274 being already in the author's mind. Isocrates in a similar train of thought comes quite naturally to the same sentiments. Kaibel then compares the method of treatment

¹Dümmler, *Akademika*, p. 192.

²*Cyn.* XII 19, 20.