

To compare beauty seen for only a fleeting moment with ἀρπαζομένη ἀστραπή is very much in the author's manner: elsewhere he refers to κάλλος itself as ἀρπαζόμενον (2.36.1 τὸ δὲ ἀρπαζόμενον καὶ ὄν ἐστιν αἶψα, with special reference to the short-lived beauty of young boys) and as ἀστράπτων (1.19.1;⁴ 2.1.2; 5.1.1). He uses ἀρπάξομαι of what is snatched away and can no longer be seen or enjoyed (also 2.35.5 τὸ δὲ ἔτι πινόμενον ἀρπάζεται; 3.2.2 ὁ ἥλιος τέλειον ἀρπάζεται). Here the word is well used in a direct comparison between beauty fleetingly glimpsed and a lightning flash. And, of course, ἀστραπήν suggests that the beauty of Leucippe is ἀστράπτων like all the best beauty in Achilles Tatius.⁵

University of Newcastle Upon Tyne

JAMES N. O'SULLIVAN

⁴ Note also *ibid.* ὅν δὲ ἡ τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν ἐμάρμαιρεν αὐτῇ.

⁵ Cf. 1.4.2. (sc. ἡ Λευκίππη) καταστράπτει μου τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς τῷ προσώπῳ.

ON HELIODORUS AETHIOPICA 7.12.6

7.12.6.4–8 εἰμὶ γάρ τοι τῇ δεσποίνῃ τὰ πάντα καὶ μόνον οὐκ ἀναπνεῖ με καὶ ὄρᾱ, καὶ νοὺς ἐκείνη καὶ ὦτα καὶ πάντα τυγχάνω, τοὺς καλοὺς αὐτῇ κάγαθοὺς γνωρίζουσα αἶψα καὶ τὸ πιστὸν αὐτῇ διὰ πάντων ἀπορρήτων φυλάττουσα.

Mr. Reeve has shown beyond question that the vulgate is corrupt: 'μόνον οὐκ' marks exaggerations. ὄρᾱ (με) is not an exaggeration (or sense in the context), and there is therefore something wrong with the text.¹

It must be noted at the outset that not only is the vulgate corrupt, but part of the tradition contains further corruption right beside ὄρᾱ,² and the way in which the manuscripts are related³ is important with regard to the nature of the problem and its solution: V and M, whose agreement gives the reading of γ, one of the two lost hyparchetypes, offer . . . καὶ ὄρᾱ ἀλλὰ καὶ . . ., and since the omission of ἀλλὰ from β (perhaps deliberate) is far more likely than its insertion in γ, the archetype (α), now lost, very probably read (in some script or other): εἰμὶ γάρ τοι τῇ δεσποίνῃ τὰ πάντα καὶ μόνον οὐκ ἀναπνεῖ με καὶ ὄρᾱ ἀλλὰ καὶ νοὺς ἐκείνη καὶ ὦτα καὶ πάντα τυγχάνω . . .

In this there are three pointers to corruption: (1) the unsuitability of ὄρᾱ with μόνον οὐκ; (2) the strange ἀλλὰ; (3) why νοὺς and ὦτα but not eyes? Eyes should surely be mentioned if ears are:⁴ cf. Hld. 8.17.4.4 Περσῶν γὰρ βασιλείοις

¹ C.Q. N.S. 18 (1968), 286.

Mr. Reeve's very tentative μόνον οὐκ ἀναπνεῖ (δὲ) ἐμὲ καὶ ὄρᾱ . . . will probably seem more attractive to others than it did to him, but 'she all but . . . sees through me (my eyes)' is not suitable before the unqualified νοὺς ἐκείνη καὶ ὦτα καὶ πάντα τυγχάνω. (μόνον οὐκ seems certainly not to affect these words.) Besides, ἀναπνεῖ (δὲ) ἐμὲ καὶ ὄρᾱ is an odd word-order.

² The apparatus (Budé) presents the evidence in a way that leads one from the truth. It should have ὄρᾱ καὶ BPZAT: ὄρᾱ ἀλλὰ καὶ VM.

³ On this I follow Rattenbury and Lumb,

the Budé editors. Even if their account of the tradition should be proved to have faults in it, it is anyhow hard to see how ἀλλὰ got into VM unless it was in the archetype.

⁴ That we should have a word for eyes in a catalogue like this is supported also by X. Cyr. 8.2.10–12; Arist. Pol. 3.11.9, 1287^b 29 f. ἐπεὶ καὶ νῦν ὀφθαλμοὺς πολλοὺς οἱ μόναρχοι ποιῶσιν αὐτῶν καὶ ὦτα καὶ χεῖρας καὶ πόδας; Plu. Arat. 25.7, 1039A; Luc. Ind. 23. The following passages, in which eyes and ears, vision and hearing, are referred to literally, also favour my view: Ach. Tat. 1.6.3.1 ὀφθαλμοὶ καὶ ὦτα πολλῆς

αὐλαῖς ὀφθαλμοὶ καὶ ἀκοαὶ τὸ εὐνούχων γένος, quoted by Mr. Reeve. The scribe who wrote ὀρᾶ was probably aware of the need for a reference to vision and dealing with an exemplar that was not clearly legible here. But we need not a verb, but a noun parallel to νοῦς . . . ὦτα . . . πάντα.

All three difficulties in the passage centre on the words ὀρᾶ ἀλλὰ⁵ which must be changed. Change them to ὀμματα⁶ and all the difficulties disappear at once. Read εἰμὶ γάρ τοι τῇ δεσποίνῃ τὰ πάντα καὶ μόνον οὐκ ἀναπνεῖ με· καὶ ὀμματα καὶ νοῦς ἐκείνῃ καὶ ὦτα καὶ πάντα τυγχάνω . . . 'for, mark you, to my mistress I am all things, all but the breath of life: (both) eyes and mind I am to her and ears and everything . . .' In the rhetorical balance thus established around ἐκείνῃ, ὦτα answers ὀμματα and the vague πάντα at once responds to νοῦς, which lacks a suitable parallel faculty, and resumes τὰ πάντα.

University of Newcastle Upon Tyne

JAMES N. O'SULLIVAN

γεμίζόμενα περιεργίας; Hld. 1.8.1.5 οὐδεμιᾶς οὔτε ἀκοῆς οὔτε ὀψως ἐφ' ἑαυτήν ἀντισπώσης.

⁵ It is very noteworthy how seldom scribal error produced a *vox nihili*. See G. Thomson, 'Marxism and Textual Criti-

cism', *Wissenschaftliche Zeitschrift der Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin*, vol. 12 (1963), 43–52 (45), or any extensive apparatus criticus.

⁶ ὀμμα in Hld. e.g. 2.8.5.10; 2.16.6.3; 2.24.6.4.