

## NOTES ON XENOPHON OF EPHEBUS BOOK I

I shall work from the Teubner text and *apparatus* of A.D. Papanikolaou (1973).

1.1.1 τούτω τῷ Λυκομήδει ἐκ γυναικὸς ἐπιχωρίας Θεμιστοῦς γίνεται παῖς Ἀβροκόμης, μέγα δέ τι χροῖμα [ὠραιότητι σώματος ὑπερβαλλούση] κάλλους οὔτε ἐν Ἰωνίᾳ οὔτε ἐν ἄλλῃ γῆ πρότερον γενομένου.

ἐπιχωρίον Her / δέ F: del. Her. δὴ Hemst. // ὠραιότητι σώματος ὑπερβαλλούση del. Hir. // γενομένου Zag., Rich.

(1) Hercher was surely right in bringing ἐπιχωρίας into line with Xenophon's universal practice elsewhere.

(2) μέγα ... κάλλους will not construe and must be emended. Hirschig's drastic excision is not an acceptable solution. Apart from the matter of where the words suggested for deletion are supposed to have come from into a passage that hardly needed glossing, their deletion does not give an entirely satisfactory text anyway: neither μέγα δέ τι χροῖμα κάλλους... γενομένου nor μέγα δέ τι χροῖμα κάλλους... γενομένου (Zagoiannes) has the *generic* sense needed: it was beauty of a *particular order* that had not been seen before. I suggest μέγα δέ<sup>1)</sup> τι χροῖμα ὠραιότητι σώματος ὑπερβαλλούση, <τοσοῦτον> κάλλους οὔτε ἐν Ἰωνίᾳ οὔτε ἐν ἄλλῃ γῆ πρότερον γενομένου. In this ὠραιότητι will be dative of respect or of cause.

The phrase χροῖμά τι κάλλους ἀπιστον occurs in Ach. Tat. 6.3.4, but that does not mean that as close an expression to this as possible must be made to occur here no matter how drastic the surgery needed to produce it. χροῖμα can be used without a defining genitive in the sense of 'marvel', and with reference to beauty: Ach. Tat. 1.15.1 μέγα τι χροῖμα πρὸς ὀφθαλμῶν ἡδονήν.

For the thought, with its suitable generic element, cf. Xen. Eph. 2.2.4. πάντες ἐτεθανμάκεσαν τὸ κάλλος, καὶ ἄνθρωποι βάρβαροι μῆπω πρότερον τοσαύτην ἰδόντες εὐμορφίαν θεοῦς ἐνόμιζον εἶναι τοὺς βλεπομένους; 5.5.8 ἰδὼν κάλλος οἶον οὐπω πρότερον ἐτεθέατο.

1.1.3 ἦν δὲ περισπούδαστος ἄπασιν Ἐφεσίοις, ἀλλὰ καὶ τοῖς τῆν

---

1) The δέ can be defended. See J.D. Denniston, *The Greek Particles* (Oxford 1954<sup>2</sup>) 163.

ἄλλην Ἀσίαν οἰκοῦσι, καὶ μεγάλας εἶχον ἐν αὐτῷ τὰς ἐλπίδας ὅτι πολίτης ἔσοιτο διαφέρων.

ἀλλά] ἅμα Lumb

Lumb's ἅμα should be deleted from the *apparatus*. ἀλλὰ καὶ...οἰκοῦσι is a parenthesis, correcting the impression that interest in Abrocomes was confined to the Ephesians. εἶχον has as its subject only the Ephesians, the people specially interested in the hero as a πολίτης.

1.1.6 εἰ δέ ποιν ἱερὸν ἢ ἄγαλμα Ἔρωτος εἶδε, κατεγέλα, ἀπέφαινε τε ἑαυτὸν Ἔρωτος παντὸς καλλίονα καὶ κάλλει σώματος καὶ δυνάμει. καὶ κάλλει σώματος καὶ δυνάμει del. Her.

καλλίονα κάλλει is completely inept and καλλίονα δυνάμει is nonsense. Hercher saw this and resorted to his favourite remedy, wholesale deletion. Abrocomes was *superior* to Eros both in physical beauty (judged against representations of the god) and in power: he could resist him, or so he thought (1.1.5). It seems very likely that an original κρείττονα became καλλίονα by assimilation to κάλλει.

In 1.4.2 καλλίων may very well be a corruption of κρείττων (conj. Hemsterhuys) influenced by the καλλίων two lines above it.

1.2.7 καὶ ἦσαν ποικίλαι παρὰ τῶν θεωμένων φωναί, τῶν μὲν ὑπ' ἐκπλήξεως τὴν θεὸν εἶναι λεγόντων, τῶν δὲ ἄλλην τινα ὑπὸ τῆς θεοῦ πεποιημένην.

πεποιημένην Giangr. coll. 1, 8, 2: περιποιημένην F περιπεποιημένην Hemst. παραπεποιημένην Abr., Rich. περιτιομένην Chariton. περιτῶς τετιμημένην Kontos κεκοσμημένην Zag.

Giangrande's πεποιημένην, based on ἦν δὲ αὐτοῖς ὁ θάλαμος πεποιημένος of 1.8.2 which is supposed to mean 'and the bridal chamber was ready (or adorned) for them', is less than probable. It is not good critical practice to emend one passage on the model of another that is, to say the least, intensely suspect.

Nothing else in the list of conjectures is very appealing either. My own contribution is πεπεμμένην. One may compare, for what it is worth, 3.2.6 ὡς ὑπὸ τινος ἀπεσταλμένος κατ' ἔμου θεοῦ (where the idea of a mission of hostility makes ἀποστέλλω more suitable than πέμπω).

1.4.5 ὁ δὲ Ἔρωσ ἔτι ὠργίζετο καὶ μεγάλην τῆς ὑπεροφίας ἐνενοεῖτο τιμωρίαν εἰσπράξασθαι τὸν Ἀβροκόμην. διέκειτο δὲ....

ἐνενοίει Her., Da. / εἰσπράξασθαι Mitsch.: τὸ πράξασθαι F πράξασθαι Cast. coll. 2, 11, 2.

Castiglioni's simple deletion of the τὸ before πράξασθαι should be accepted. τὸ is by no means likely to be an error for εἰσ-; its intrusion may be related to the suspect -το of ἐνενοεῖτο<sup>2)</sup>.

1.5.6 ἐν ὁμοίῳ δὲ φόβῳ καὶ ὁ Μεγαμήδης καὶ ἡ Εὐδίππη [καὶ] περὶ τῆς Ἀνθίας καθεισθήκεισαν, ὁρῶντες αὐτῆς τὸ μὲν κάλλος μαραινόμενον, τὴν δὲ αἰτίαν οὐ φαινομένην τῆς συμφορᾶς.

καὶ ante περὶ del. B<sup>3)</sup>, Ja.

We have just been told in 1.5.5 that Lycomedes and Themisto, Abrocomes' parents, were worried about their son's condition. Now we are told that Anthia's parents *too* were similarly worried about her *also*. The first καὶ marks the addition of Megamedes and Euippe to those who are worried; the third one emphasizes that the heroine's condition *too* was causing parental concern. We may feel that the third καὶ is a bit redundant, but there is no justification for deleting it. It may also be felt to be slightly illogical: Anthia's parents were afraid *only* for their daughter. But such a use of καὶ is not at all uncommon. There is another example of it in this chapter: 1.5.8 πολλὰ δὲ καὶ ὑπέρο Ἀβροκόμου οἱ περὶ τὸν Λυκομήδην ἔθνον....

1.8.1-3 καὶ εἰσαγαγόντες κατέκλιον ..... ἐπὶ τῆς κλίνης Βαβυλωνία ἐπεποικίλο σκηνή· παίζοντες Ἔρωτες, οἱ μὲν..... ὑπ' αὐτῇ τῇ σκηνῇ κατέκλιαν τὴν Ἀνθίαν, ἀγαγόντες πρὸς τὸν Ἀβροκόμην

εἰσαγαγόντες Ja.: εἰσάγοντες F / κατέκλιαν Ja., Her. .... // ὑπ' Peerlk.: ἐπ' F

The author may have wished, rather oddly, to emphasize that the bride was escorted right to the σκηνή *itself*, but after εἰσαγαγόντες κατέκλιον and the description of the decorated σκηνή I would expect to find... ταύτη τῇ σκηνῇ... in the resumption of the narrative (with asyndeton!). ἐν ταύτῃ τῇ σκηνῇ for ἐπ' αὐτῇ τῇ σκηνῇ (F)? The nature of the σκηνή, which was not just a canopy but had full decorated sides, would justify ἐν. The preposition would be used as in e. g. ἐν τῷ ἄνθρωπῳ (4.4.1; 4.5.1); cf. especially 3.7.4 τὴν Ἀνθίαν... ἤγεν εἰς τοὺς πλησίον τῆς πόλεως τάφους. κἀνταῦθα κατέθετο ἐν τινι οἰκήματι.

2) The middle occurs only here with the inf., and an original ἐνενοίει may well have been assimilated to ὠργίζετο and διέκειτο. For the active with inf. see 2. 9. 2; 3. 1. 2; 5. 4. 2.

3) B is a manuscript and 'del. B' involves an assumption.

1.9.4 “ναί” φησὶν “Ἀβροκόμη, δοκῶ σοι καλή, καὶ μετὰ τὴν σὴν εὐμορφίαν ἀρέσκω σοι; ἀνάνδρε καὶ δειλέ, πόσον ἐβράδυνας ἐρῶν χρόνον, πόσον ἡμέλησας;...”

Read “... , δοκῶ σοι καλή; καὶ (‘even’) μετὰ... χρόνον; πόσον...”. For ναί associated with a question cf. Ach. Tat. 2.5.2.

1.11.5...μέγα ἀνωλόλυξε καὶ “τί τοῦτο” ἔφησεν “Ἀβροκόμη, πεπίστευκας ὅτι...;...”

τοῦτο Her.: ταῦτα F.

In Hercher’s text τί means ‘why’, τοῦτο is object of πεπίστευκας and anticipates the ὅτι clause. But we must not make Anthia express her indignant surprise in the halting syntax of the ‘Old Oligarch’. Read... “τί ταῦτα”, ἔφησεν, “Ἀβροκόμη; πεπίστευκας ὅτι...;...”. For τί ταῦτα; see LSJ s. v. τίς (i. e. τις B) I<sub>2</sub>; cf. especially Ach. Tat. 3.18.5 “ποῖ γῆς εἰμι καὶ τί ποτε (τί ποτε aF: τί β) ταῦτα ὄρω;”.

1.12.1 συνήεσαν δὲ πάντες οἱ Ῥόδιοι, τὸ κάλλος τῶν παίδων καταπεπληγότες, καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν ὅστις τῶν ἰδόντων παρήλθε σιωπῶν ἄλλ’ οἱ μὲν ἔλεγον ἐπιδημίαν αἰσίων θεῶν, οἱ δὲ προσεκύουν καὶ προσηγύχοντο.

σιωπῶν Salv.: λυπῶν F σιγῶν vel ὀλιγορῶν Schmidt / ἄλλ’ οἱ Ja.: ἄλλοι F / αἰσίων Schmidt: ἐκ τῶν F del. Her. // προσηγύχοντο Hemst.; cf. 1, 1, 3, 2, 7: προσεποιούντο F.

In ἐπιδημίαν ἐκ τῶν θεῶν (F) ἐκ has no place in the syntax and τῶν is unsuitably generic. Schmidt’s αἰσίων is only a stop-gap: the word is not found elsewhere in Xenophon and it has no great appropriateness here. λέγω does occur in the author with the sense ‘speak of’, ‘mention’, but it is a relatively rare use of the word (only 1.2.8; 3.3.4) and, though in textual criticism statistics by themselves are no sure guide, one must be reluctant to emend a text so as to produce a comparative rarity where there is nothing special to be said for it. Palaeography notwithstanding, one has to consider the claims of εἶναι here. Compare, for thought and expression, 2.2.4: the lovers arrive in Tyre καὶ πάντες ἐτεθανυμάκεσαν τὸ κάλλος, καὶ ἄνθρωποι βάρβαροι μῆπω πρότερον τοσαύτην ἰδόντες εὐμορφίαν θεοῦς ἐνόμιζον εἶναι τοὺς βλεπομένους.

1.13.6 “τὰ μὲν χρήματα” ἔφασαν “ὦ δέσποτα, καὶ ἡμᾶς οἰκέτας ἔχε, φεῖσαι δὲ τῆς ψυχῆς...”

As I read this, it struck me that the word-order is awkward and should be τὰ μὲν χρήματα... ἔχε καὶ ἡμᾶς οἰκέτας, a thought

strikingly corroborated by 4.3.5 τὰ χρήματα λαμβάνει καὶ τὴν Ἀνθίαν αἰχμάλωτον.

1.14.1 Ἀκούσας ὁ Κόρυμβος εὐθὺς μὲν ἐκέλευσε φείσασθαι φονεύον-  
τας, ....

φείσασθαι] παύσασθαι Hir.

‘...to spare in (while *vel sim.*) slaying’ is all φείσασθαι φονεύοντας can mean. <τοὺς> φονεύοντας would still leave φείσασθαι uncomfortably without an object. Five lines above Anthia and Abrocomes had pleaded with Corymbus, “φείσαι δὲ τῆς ψυχῆς καὶ μηκέτι φόνευσε...” (1.13.6), and, with sparing in his mind, a scribe here wrote φείσασθαι for παύσασθαι (conj. Hir.). For this kind of error cf. e. g. 1.7.2 βουλευομένοις...βουλευομένου (F); 1.15.1 ἐδόκει...ἐδόκει; 1.15.5-6 πόνω...πόνους; 2.3.1 ἄβροκόμου... ἄβροκόμου; 2.7.4 ἄγομαι...ἄγομαι.

1.14.4 ῥίψας ἑαυτὸν εἰς τὴν θάλασσαν ἐνήχετο ὡς καταληγόμενος τὴν τριήρη, “ποῖ με καταλείπεις, τέκνον” λέγων “τὸν γέροντα, τὸν παιδαγωγόν; ποῖ δὲ ἀπερχόμενος, Ἀβροκόμη;...”

ποῖ με καταλείπεις] τίμη (vel τῶ) με καταλείπεις Her. coll. Char. 3, 5, 4.

The old man was being left behind as he spoke and the future καταλείπεις has no place here. καταλειπ- became καταλειψ- under the influence of καταληψ- of the previous line. And I cannot see how the first ποῖ can be made to give sense. It is a false anticipation of the following ποῖ and has supplanted some other word. “τί με καταλείπεις, ...;” is exactly what is required.

Chariton’s τίμη (τί Cobet) με καταλείπεις, ...; (3.5.4) is itself an anomaly unacceptable as a basis for emendation here. The original there had perhaps τί νῦν με καταλείπεις, ...; ... ἐπίμεινον δὲ κἂν ὀλίγας ἡμέρας, ... Cf. Ach. Tat. 4.1.7 “Νῦν”, εἶπεν, “οὐκ ἔξεστί σοι... ἦν δὲ ὀλίγον ἀναμείνης χρόνον, ...”

The University of Newcastle upon Tyne  
James N. O'Sullivan