

NOTES ON XENOPHON OF EPHESUS BOOKS III AND IV¹

I shall defend the text of the *codex unicus*, F (Laurentianus conv. soppr. 627), at 3.3.5; 4.1; 5.7; 5.11; 6.2; 6.4; 10.2; 4.2.4; 5.6; emend it myself at 3.2.4; 2.12; 3.6; 3.7; 4.1; 4.4; 5.4; 5.8 (re-punct.); 9.1; 11.4 *bis*; 4.1.1; 2.6; 6.1–2; cf. 3.6.5; and support earlier conjectures at 3.9.7; 10.1; 4.2.5; 4.2; 6.5; cf. 3.9.4.

3.2.4. τέλος δὲ ἐδυνήθημεν καιροῦ λαβόμενοι γενέσθαι μετ' ἀλλήλων μόνοι καὶ τὸ τῆς ἡλικίας ἄλλοις ἀνύποπτον ἦν.

ἄλλοις Hemst. ἀλλήλοισ F del. Her., Da. παράλληλον Lo.

To express the intended sense fully ἀνύποπτον has no need of Hemsterhuys's ἄλλοις, whereas τὸ τῆς ἡλικίας alone makes no sense. Besides, we should be slow to suspect ἀλλήλοισ (F) where the meaning clearly must be 'our closeness to each other in age'. I suggest τὸ τῆς ἡλικίας ἀλλήλοισ (παραπλήσιον) ... *vel sim*.

3.2.12. κἀγὼ μὲν τῷ Ὑπεράνθει συνενηχόμεν ὑπῶν αὐτῷ καὶ κουφοτέραν τὴν νῆϊν ἐποιούμην

αὐτὸν Her.

Since ὑπέρχομαι (-ειμι) not only takes the accusative as its normal case, but also seems nowhere else to have the sense 'support', ὑπὼν αὐτῷ must be considered a strong possibility. Cf. Phld. *D.* 3.11 μὴ στερεμνίου τινὸς ἡμῖν ὑπόντος.

3.3.5. ποῦ δὲ ἄρα καὶ πέφευγε;

ποι Her.

ποῦ is certainly right and Hercher's ποι should not continue to cast doubt on it. By X.'s time it could mean 'whither' as well as 'where'. With this passage see esp. Ach. Tat. 8.2.1 'ποῦ (ποι Jacobs, followed by Vilborg) φύγωμεν ἔτι τοὺς βιαίους;'; also Ach. Tat. 1.17.4; 2.31.6; and LSJ s. v. *που ad fin*.

1) Ed. A. D. Papanikolaou (Teubner 1973). For my notes on Books I and II see RhM 125 (1982) 54 ff.; 127 (1984) 266 ff.; on Book V JHS 100 (1980) 201 ff.

3.3.6. (text of F) ναί, πρὸς αὐτοῦ σοι ψυχὴν Ὑπεράνθους, μὴ με ἐκὼν ἀδικήσης, ...

αὐτοῦ: αὐτῆς Her./σε Peerlk./ψυχῆς edd.

Papanikolaou reads πρὸς αὐτοῦ σε ψυχῆς Ὑπεράνθους. The original may very well have run like this: πρὸς αὐτοῦ σοι (τῆς) ψυχῆς (ποθεινοτέρου) Ὑπεράνθους, ... Cf. 1.11.3 Ἄνθια ..., τῆς ψυχῆς μοι ποθεινοτέρω, together with Hippothous' own words in the speech to which Abrocomes is now replying: 3.3.2 ὦ πάντων μοι Ὑπεράνθη φίλτατε. It should also be observed that *Hyperranthes* is dead and that X. elsewhere uses ψυχὴ only with reference to the living.

3.3.7. τῇ δὲ Ἄνθια αἱ τριάκοντα παρεληλύθεσαν ἡμέραι καὶ παρεσκευάζετο τῷ Περγίλῳ τὰ περὶ τὸν γάμον, καὶ ἱερεῖα κατήγετο ἐκ τῶν χωρίων, πολλὴ δὲ ἦ τῶν ἄλλων ἀφθονία:

καὶ ἱερεῖα Abr.: ἱερεῖα καὶ F

There is not the least likelihood that Abresch's transposition of καὶ is right. The asyndeton in F between ἱερεῖα and what precedes is to be expected and preserved: ἱερεῖα ... ἀφθονία is an elaboration of the foregoing clause and such elaborations are regularly asyndetic. With this passage cf. esp. Ach. Tat. 1.8.3 ... τῆς τοῦ γάμου παρασκευῆς βόμβος αὐλῶν, δικλίδων κτύπος, πυρῶν δαδουχία; also e.g. (with elaborative finite clauses) Ach. Tat. 1.3.3–4; X. Eph. 1.8.2; 2.13.2. Examples could be multiplied.

What then is to be done with καὶ? It is possible that something has fallen out before or after it, but that seems unlikely in this series of short simple clauses, and the best thing could be just to delete it. However it seems to me by no means unlikely that the right reading is ... ἱερεῖα πολλὰ κατήγετο ... Two independent considerations conspire to favour πολλὰ. In the novelists πολλὰ is the *vox propria* of ἱερεῖα (X. 1.8.1; 3.7.4; Ach. Tat. 2.15.3), and, besides, since what follows here is πολλὴ δὲ ἦ ... ἀφθονία, it should also be noted that X. likes to accumulate forms of πολὺς in such descriptions: for our present purposes cf. esp. 3.7.4 πολλὰ μὲν ἐπισφάξας ἱερεῖα, πολλὴν δὲ ἐσθῆτα καὶ κόσμον ἄλλον ἐπικαύσας; also e.g. 1.10.4 πολλὴ μὲν ἐσθῆς καὶ ποικίλη, πολὺς δὲ ἄργυρος καὶ χρυσός, ἢ τε τῶν οὐτιῶν ὑπερβάλλουσα ἀφθονία (where ὑπερβ. is only a variation on πολλή); 1.10.6; 3.8.3; 5.9.1. In the foregoing instances the pattern is πολὺς μὲν ..., πολὺς δέ ..., but that that could be varied is shown by e.g. 3.5.10; 7.4; 4.3.2 ἦν δὲ πάντα

εὐτρεπῆ· (I replace the editors' comma with a high point) κάμηλοί τε πολλάι καὶ ὄνοι καὶ ἵπποι σκευαγωγοί· ἦν δὲ πολὺ μὲν πλῆθος χρυσοῦ, πολὺ δὲ ἀργύρου, πολλή δὲ ἐσθῆς. Without πολλά 3.3.7, where there is indubitably some corruption, lacks X.'s usual exuberance in such descriptions.

3.4.1. ἐν δὲ τῷ χρόνῳ <καθ'> ὃν ἡ Ἀνθία ληφθεῖσα ἐκ τοῦ ληστηρίου * * ἦλθεν εἰς τὴν Ταρσὸν πρεσβύτης Ἐφέσιος ἰατροῦς τὴν τέχνην, Εὐδοξὸς τοῦνομα·

καθ' add. Hemst. / ὃν] ὄθ' Hir. // lac. indicavit Pap.; post ληστηρίου Bürger add. διῆγεν παρὰ τῷ Περιλάῳ / post εἰς τὴν Jack. add. Περιλάου οἰκίαν, ἦκεν εἰς τὴν

To read <καθ'> (which has no basis in X.'s usage) without any idea of what should follow it is an astonishing editorial step. ὄθ' is the mystifying proposal not of Hirschig but of Cobet.

Despite the cleverly contrived homoeoteleuton of Jackson's εἰς τὴν <... εἰς τὴν> (he would, by the way, read ὃν), it seems reasonably certain that the indubitably missing words came just after ληστηρίου. As the text stands, ἦλθεν εἰς τὴν Ταρσὸν ... as the introduction of Eudoxus corresponds well in the markedly repetitive style of X. with the words used to introduce newcomers in other parts of the romance (of book 3 in fact): 3.2.5 καὶ ἔρχεται τις ἀπὸ Βυζαντίου (πλησίον δὲ τὸ Βυζάντιον τῇ Περίνθῳ) ἀνὴρ ... ὃς ... Ἀριστομάχος ἐκαλεῖτο; esp. 11.1–2 οἱ δὲ λησται τὴν Ἀνθίαν εἰς Ἀλεξάνδρειαν παρέδωκαν ἐμπόροις ... ἔρχεται δὴ τις εἰς Ἀλεξάνδρειαν ἐκ τῆς Ἰνδικῆς ..., Ψάμμυς τὸ ὄνομα. Besides, in the relative clause we should expect a reference not to Anthia's arrival in Tarsus (ὃν ... ἦλθεν εἰς τὴν T. ...), but more clearly to the period of time she spent there. So we need something like Bürger's ὃν ... <διῆγεν παρὰ τῷ Περιλάῳ>, though not, I think, exactly that. In expressing sojourns X. sometimes uses παρὰ and the dative of person with εἰμί (e.g. 2.10.1; 11.1) but not with διάγω, which has either ἐν and the dative of place (5.2.1; 9.1; 11.1; 15.4) or an adverb in ἐν- (ἐνθα 2.10.1; ἐνταῦθα 5.1.8; 2.6). We might then try to improve on Bürger with ὃν ... ληστηρίου <διῆγεν ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ τοῦ Περιλάου>, ἦλθεν ..., which would also have the incidental merit of explaining the error (homoeoteleuton). For the word-order cf. 3.2.10 εἰσεμι νύκτωρ εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν τοῦ Ἀριστομάχου. The basis is, of course, not terribly secure, but it is what we have to work from, if we want to form a clearer idea of the original text.

3.4.1. ἦκε δὲ ναυαγίῳ περιπεσὼν εἰς Αἴγυπτον πλέων
ναυαγία Cob., Her.

ναυάγιον (used mostly in the plural) originally meant 'a piece of wreckage', but in later Greek it also occurs with the sense of ναυαγία, the misfortune of 'shipwreck': LSJ cite (s. v. ναυάγιον II) only Strabo 4.1.7 ναυαγίῳ περιπεσεῖν. Since the change from ναυαγίῳ to ναυαγία is so easy, it should be noticed that the abstract use of ναυάγιον derives support from the fact that ληστήριον, which cannot so plausibly be changed to ληστεία, is also found with an abstract meaning ('piracy', 'brigandage') in later Greek. For this use LSJ (s. v. ληστήριον II *robbery*) cite only Lucian *Cont.* 11, where the word is plural; for the singular see X. Eph. 4.1.4 κοινωνοὺς τοῦ ληστηρίου; 5.12.5 οἱ τῆς ἀποδημίας κοινωνήσαντες καὶ τοῦ ληστηρίου.

3.4.4. ... καὶ εἰσῆει παρ' ἕκαστα πρὸς τὴν Ἀνθίαν, πάντων ἀπολαύων τῶν ἐπιτηδείων, αἰεὶ δεόμενος αὐτῆς εἰς Ἔφεσον παραπεμφθῆναι.

The asyndeton between the participles is very odd. The antithetical relationship between them would be brought out by αἰεὶ (<δὲ>) δεόμενος ..., the reason for the error being obvious.

3.5.4. ὃ φιλάτη μου πασῶν Ἀβροκόμου ψυχῆ

The survival of μου in this much-scrutinised text is surprising. It is clearly a mistake for μοι. Cf. 3.3.2. ὃ πάντων μοι Ὑπεράνθη φίλατε; 7.2 ὃ φιλάτη μοι κόρη; 5.9.13 τοῦ πάντων αὐτῷ φιλάτου; also 1.11.3 τῆς ψυχῆς μοι ποθεινότερα; 5.13.4 ὃ πάντων ἡμῖν τιμωτάτη. The error is in any case common (see CQ 28 [1978] 325 n. 55) and here there was the particular provocation of Ἀβροκόμου.

3.5.7. λαθεῖν ἀποδράσασαν ἐντεῦθεν

ἀποδράσαν Cob., Her.

It is quite clear from the material in W. Veitch, *Greek verbs, irregular and defective* (Oxford 1887; repr. 1967) s. v. διδράσκω that 1st aorist forms of -διδράσκω are completely acceptable, and there is no point in keeping ἀποδράσαν in the apparatus.

3.5.8. ἀναζητήσας τοὺς γονεῖς Μεγαμήδη τε καὶ Εὐύππην ἄγγελλε αὐτοῖς τὴν ἐμὴν τελευτήν καὶ πάντα τὰ κατὰ τὴν ἀποδημίαν, (καὶ) ὅτι Ἄβροκόμης ἀπόλωλε λέγε.

καὶ add. Hemst.

It seems to me that πάντα is better taken as object of λέγε than of ἄγγελλε: . . . τελευτήν καὶ πάντα . . . λέγε. And with this arrangement Hemsterhuys's καὶ is not strictly necessary: what for Anthia is the most important event of the ἀποδημία is picked out and put, with a note of melancholy, in apposition to πάντα.

3.5.11. λαβοῦσα δὲ ἡ Ἄνθια καὶ πολλὴν γνοῦσα χάριν αὐτὸν ἀποπέμπει.

αὐτὸν Hemst.: αὐτῷ F

αὐτὸν hardly deserves to be in the text at any rate. From αὐτῷ an object for ἀποπέμπει can easily be understood. Cf. 2.13.6 ἡ δὲ συνήθης αὐτῷ (αὐτὸν Loc.) τῆς κόρης ὄψις εἰς ἔρωτα ἤγαγε.

3.6.2. καὶ ὑμέναιος ἦδετο ἐπὶ γάμοις εὐδαίμοσι.

ἦδετο Hemst.: ἦγετο F

ἦγετο is right. Cf. Ach. Tat. 5.16.5 ἐμοὶ μὲν ὑμέναιον ἄγειν (ἄδειν Hemst., still in Vilborg's 1955 text) δοκεῖ τὰ τῶν ἀνέμων αὐλήματα (and do αὐλήματα in any case *sing*?). For this use of ἄγω in general, and the tendency to change the verb to ἄδω, see E. K. Borthwick in *CR* n. s. XXI (1971) 318–20.

3.6.4. σκηψαμένη δὲ τῇ ἀγωνία ὑπὸ δίψους κατειλήφθαι ἐκέλευσεν αὐτῇ τινι τῶν οἰκετῶν ὕδωρ ἐνεγκεῖν, ὡς δὴ πιομένη

[τῇ] ἀφωνία [ὑπὸ δίψους] Jack.

The deletion of τῇ and the proposal of ἀφωνία for ἀγωνία are without a doubt both wrong, but Jackson ought not to be saddled with the deletion of ὑπὸ δίψους as well: in quoting the passage (CQ XXIX [1935] 96) he omits ὑπὸ δίψους, but he says nothing about it and the omission is certainly either a mere scribal error or due to a feeling on Jackson's part that the phrase had no importance for his purpose.

The text of F is faultless: the bride purports to be seized by thirst because of *the trepidation* involved in waiting for her groom. For the sense of ἀγωνία see the *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae* s. v. (on both ἀγωνία and ἀφωνία LSJ is much inferior).

With the use of ὑπό cf. 5.7.9 ἄλλοτε ἄλλως ὑπὸ τῆς συμφορᾶς (i. e. τῆς νόσου) κατέχομαι; with the causal dative cf. e. g. 3.2.14 ἀπορία βίου καὶ ἀθυμία τῆς συμφορᾶς ἐπέδωκα ἑμαυτὸν λησθηρίῳ; 5.8.1; 9.1; 10.5.

3.6.5. ὃ φιλάτου' φησὶν Ἐβροκόμου ψυχῆ, ...'

φιλάτου is to be regarded with great suspicion. The adjective would more naturally agree with the vocative; and cf. 3.5.4 ὃ φιλάτη μοι (*scripsi*: μου F) πασῶν Ἐβροκόμου ψυχῆ.

3.9.1. ἔξεβίβασαν τὴν Ἀνθίαν καὶ διέγνωσαν ἐκ τοῦ πλοῦ παραδοῦναι τισὶν ἐμπόροις

πλοῦ (ἀναλαβόντες) Her. πλοίου Peerlk.

In his text Hercher read πλοῦ (ἀνενεγκοῦσαν), but in his 'Adnotatio critica' (p. LVI) he says 'rectius inseruissem ἀναλαβόντες (Anthiam), v. *Charit.* I, 13 ἵνα καὶ ἐκ τῆς θαλάσσης αὐτοὺς ἀλάβητε.'

As the text stands it seems quite impossible to construe ἐκ τοῦ πλοῦ and quite clear that something has been lost. Given the constant recurrence of situation and expression in X., both strong support for the suggestion itself of a lacuna and a fair idea of how it should be filled can be derived from 5.5.8: ... ἀποδίδοται αὐτὴν (i. e. Anthia) πορνοβοσκῶ. ὁ δὲ ἰδὼν κάλλος οἶον οὐπω πρότερον ἐτεθέατο, μέγα κέρδος ἔξιν τὴν παῖδα ἐνόμιζε, καὶ ἡμέραις μὲν τισὶν αὐτὴν ἀνελάμβανεν ἐκ τοῦ πλοῦ κεκτηκυῖαν καὶ ἐκ τῶν ὑπὸ τῆς Ῥηναίας βασάνων. The pirates' purpose (3.9.1) is exactly the same as that of the brothelkeeper (5.5.8), to derive as much financial profit as possible from Anthia's good-looks, and the better she looks the greater the profit (cf. also 3.11.1). In each case she has just had a trying voyage preceded by harrowing experiences. The brothelkeeper lets her recover so that she will look her best again and be worth more to him, and that, given the coincidences of circumstance and expression, is without a doubt what the pirates in 3.9.1 did too. Despite *Charit.* 1.13, Hercher's ἀναλαβόντες is not likely to be right on its own in X.; we also need at least κεκτηκυῖαν (5.5.8; cf. also 5.1.11 ἐκ τῆς ἀλμείας κεκτηκῶς). ἐκ τοῦ πλοῦ (κεκτηκυῖαν ἀναλαβόντες) seems at least a firm step in the right direction.

3.9.4. ... ἔκειτο οὐδὲν προσιέμενος. πρόσσεισι δὲ τοῦ τόπου ὁ κύριος τοῖς περὶ τὸν Ἰπλόθοον παροῦσα δὲ τις πρεσβύτις ἄρχεται διηγήματος, ἧ ὄνομα Χρυσίον.

προσσεισι Pap.: προσιοῦσι F.: προῖοῦσι Hemst., Da.: προῖόντος Peerlk., Her. / τόπου] πότου Soc., Her., Da. / ὁ κύριος del. Soc., Da.: εὐκαίρως Ja., Her. / post Ἰπλ. add. Pap. semicolon / δὲ Pap.: καὶ F del. Ja., Her., Da.

I cannot tell how Paranikolaou imagined that the statement 'the man in charge of the place approaches...' (*vel sim.*) could possibly fit in here!

Hippothis and his brigands have set about their supper and the result of their indulgence we see later that night when Abrocomes creeps out of their camp unnoticed: ἔκειντο δὲ ὑπὸ μέθης οἱ περὶ τὸν Ἰπλόθοον (3.10.4). Clearly they have not just been eating! Equally clearly τόπου in 3.9.4 is a mistake for πότου (cf. Ach. Tat. 5.23.2 πότον β: τόπον α, wrongly); and since πότος and προιέναι are regularly associated with each other (Ach. Tat. 2.3.3 τοῦ πότου προῖόντος; 8.4.2 προῖόντος δὲ τοῦ πότου), it is also clear that the impossible προσιοῦσι (F) is a corruption of προῖ-, provoked no doubt by the preceding προσι-έμενος. As for the form of προιέναι to be read and its grammatical relation to πότου, if X. can write προήεσαν τῆς ὁδοῦ (4.3.5; 5.2.6 μέχρις ἂν προέλθωσιν ... τῆς ὁδοῦ), why should we object to προῖοῦσι (dat. pl. of προῖών, agreeing with τοῖς περὶ τὸν Ἰ.) τοῦ πότου? Paranikolaou's punctuation is false and there is nothing wrong with παροῦσα καὶ τις πρεσβύτις. ὁ κύριος is, of course, impossible. So we get προῖοῦσι δὲ τοῦ πότου †ὁ κύριος† τοῖς περὶ τὸν Ἰπλόθοον παροῦσα καὶ τις πρεσβύτις ἄρχεται διηγήματος, ...: 'As Hippothous and his men progressed with their drinking an old woman who was there too began to tell them a story.' The only part of speech that will fit well where ὁ κύριος stands is an adverb (something like ἀκορέστως perhaps). ὁ κύριος may have resulted from the misreading of an abbreviation by a scribe acquainted with Christian texts, but there seems to be no other indication that abbreviations were used in the transmission of X.

With the syntactic sequence compare 4.5.1 τῆς δὲ Ἀνθίας οὔσης ἐν τῷ ἄνθρω ἐρᾷ τῶν φρουρούντων αὐτὴν ληστῶν εἰς, Ἀγχιάλος τοῦνομα, where τῆς Ἀ. is governed by ἐρᾷ. καὶ ('also') is often associated with πάρεμι (*adsum*): X. 1.10.6; 5.13.1; also e.g. Ach. Tat. 3.20.6; 8.7.6; cf. 2.7.1 ἐπιπαρῆν δὲ αὐτῇ καὶ ἡ Κλειώ.

3.9.7. ... παρεῖτο δὲ ὑπὸ ἀθυμίας: ὄψε δὲ καὶ <μόλις> ἀναθορῶν ἐκ τῆς τοῦ Ἰπλοθίου φωνῆς

δὲ ⟨ἀνενεγκῶν⟩ Hemst. / μόλις add. Peerlk. ** Her.

Peerlkamp supported his ⟨μόλις⟩ with 2.4.5: ἡ δὲ Ἀνθία ὑπὸ συμφορᾶς ἔκειτο ἀγανής, . . . ὁψὲ δὲ καὶ μόλις αὐτὴν ἐγείρασα . . . But μόλις is not at all a suitable adverb in sense to use with ἀναθορῶν (and neither indeed is ὁψὲ particularly apt), and I feel that Hemsterhuys's ὁψὲ δὲ ⟨ἀνενεγκῶν⟩ καὶ ἀναθορῶν . . ., which I would in any case myself have suggested, is extremely likely to be right. Here are the other places where X. uses ὁψὲ: 1.9.1–2 ἔκειντο δὲ ὑφ' ἡδονῆς παρειμένοι, . . . ὁψὲ δὲ ὁ Ἀβροκόμης ἀνενεγκῶν περιέλαβε . . .; 2.3.8 ὁψὲ δὲ ἀνενεγκῶν.

In Hercher's text, by the way, the lacuna is marked not after καὶ (as Papanikolaou's apparatus suggests) but before it.

3.10.1. ἀκούσας ὁ Ἀβροκόμης περιέρρηξε τὸν χιτῶνα καὶ μεγάλως ἀνωδύρετο . . .

περιέρρηξάτο B, Cob., Her.

The middle form should be read: cf. 2.5.6; 3.7.2 (also of mourning). Elsewhere X. uses the active only where the clothing torn is not that of the subject of the verb (2.6.2; 5.5.2). The error was caused by a simple psycho-phonetic stumble.

3.10.2. τίς ἄρα ληστής οὕτως ἐρωτικός, ἵνα καὶ νεκρᾶς ἐπιθυμία σου, ἵνα καὶ τὸ σῶμα ἀφέληται; ἀπεστερήθην σοῦ ὁ δυστυχής, [καὶ] τῆς μόνης ἐμοὶ παραμυθίας. ἀποθανεῖν μὲν οὖν ἔγνωσται πάντως; ἀλλὰ τὰ πρῶτα καρτερήσω, μέχρι που τὸ σῶμα εὕρω τὸ σὸν καὶ περιβαλὼν ἐμαυτὸν ἐκείνω συγκαταθάψω.

σοῦ del. Wif. νῦν Cast. / καὶ del. Hemst. / ἀπεστερήθην ὁ δυστυχής καὶ (τοῦ σώματός σου), τῆς μόνης Bürger, Da.

The critics have not understood this passage. Abrocomes has just heard both that Anthia is dead and that her corpse has been carried off by brigands. He resolves to die; but not until he has found the corpse, so that he can be buried with it. He will kill himself after he has recovered the corpse, and so it is perfectly clear that his reason for wanting to die is not the absence of the corpse but the death of Anthia. This being so, it is quite clear from the οὖν of ἀποθανεῖν μὲν οὖν ἔγνωσται πάντως that the preceding sentence must contain a reference to the girl's death and not just to the loss of the corpse. All suggestions aimed at producing a sentence that refers only to the loss of the corpse are therefore wrong;

and the words ἀπεστερήθην σοῦ, which express the necessary thought, are to be kept.

The next question is whether παραμυθίας as well as σοῦ refers to the living Anthia herself, not to the corpse, and so whether Hemsterhuys (followed by Hercher) was right in deleting καὶ and creating apposition. The answer is most emphatically 'No!'. The idea that when one's beloved is dead, possession of the corpse is a consolation is a recurrent motif in the romance: in 5.1.12 Abrocomes repeats his wish to find Anthia κἄν νεκρᾶν and gives as his reason Αἰγιαλεῖ μὲν γὰρ τοῦ βίου μεγάλη παραμυθία τὸ σῶμα τὸ Θελεξινόης (cf. 5.1.11 αὕτη (i. e. her mummified body) με παραμυθεῖται βλεπομένη); cf. the use of παρηγορία in Ach. Tat. 7.5.3 ἐν μὲν γὰρ τοῖς ψευδέσι θανάτοις ἐκείνοις παρηγορίαν εἶχον ὀλίγην, τὸ μὲν πρῶτον ὄλον σου τὸ σῶμα, τὸ δὲ δεύτερον, κἄν τὴν κεφαλὴν δοκῶν μὴ ἔχειν εἰς τὴν ταφὴν (cf. παρηγορέω Ach. Tat. 1.13.3); cf. also the desire to find the grave of the beloved (X. 3.8.7). It is certain then that in 3.10.2, where the main theme of the context is the disappearance of the corpse, παραμυθίας in ἀπεστερήθην ... τῆς μόνης ἔμοι παραμυθίας refers to the corpse. The text of F has no fault in it here: the lamenting hero stresses both σοῦ and καὶ saying, 'I have been deprived of *you and* of my only source of consolation' (clearly the corpse, given the context and what may properly be called the conventions of the genre).

Hercher's deletion of μὲν (see his edition) was worse than unwarranted. For μὲν ... ἀλλὰ ... see e.g. X. 5.9.8; Ach. Tat. 1.11.3; 3.22.1; 4.9.7; 5.20.3; 6.20.3; 7.4.5; 8.13.2 (usually in direct quoted speech). Here the μὲν and ἀλλὰ clauses are very closely related and are in sense interlaced with the preceding sentence: οὖν belongs to both of them, the μὲν clause following from ἀπεστερήθην σοῦ, the ἀλλὰ clause from ἀπεστερήθην ... τῆς μόνης ἔμοι παραμυθίας: 'I have lost *you (and so on the one hand [μὲν] I am resolved to die) and* your corpse (*and so despite my resolve [ἀλλὰ] I must postpone my death until I find the corpse).*'

3.11.3–4. οὗτος ὁ Ψάμμης ὄρᾳ τὴν Ἀνθίαν παρὰ τοῖς ἐμπόροις καὶ ἰδὼν ἀλίσκεται καὶ ἀργύριον δίδωσι τοῖς ἐμπόροις πολὺ καὶ λαμβάνει θεράπειναν αὐτήν. ὠνησάμενος δὲ ἄνθρωπος βάρβαρος κατευθὺς ἐπιχειρεῖ βιάζεσθαι καὶ χρῆσθαι πρὸς συνουσίαν

κατευθὺς Radermacher: καὶ εὐθὺς F (καὶ del. Her., Da.)

Radermacher's importation of the form κατευθὺς into X. is utterly makeshift. The likelihood is that we have here another of

F's lacunae: ἄνθρωπος βάρβαρος καὶ * * εὐθύς ..., the requisite supplement being something like <αὐτῆς ἐαλωκώς> (cf. e. g. 2.13.6) or <πονηρῶς ἐπ' αὐτῇ διακείμενος> (1.15.4; 2.4.2) or <ἐρῶν τῆς κόρης σφοδρὸν ἔρωτα> (e. g. 1.15.4), καὶ meaning 'and at that', 'and moreover' (cf. e. g. Ach. Tat. 1.7.4; 3.17.2; 8.3.1). The feeling that some such supplement as I have suggested is necessary is strengthened by 2.2.4 ἄνθρωποι βάρβαροι μήπω πρότερον τοσαύτην ἰδόντες εὐμορφίαν ...

3.11.4. σκήπτεται ... ὅτι αὐτὴν ὁ πατὴρ γεννωμένην ἀναθείη τῇ Ἰσιδι μέχρις ὥρας γάμων, καὶ ἔλεγεν ἔτι τὸν χρόνον ἐνιαυτοῦ τεθεῖσθαι

ἐνιαυτοῦ τεθεῖσθαι Lumb: ἐνιαυτῷ τίθεσθαι F

Lumb's ἐνιαυτοῦ τεθεῖσθαι (read also by Dalmeyda) strikes me as absolute nonsense; and the reading of F (taking into account that τίθεσθαι might, after ἀναθείη, be taken as equivalent to ἀνατίθεσθαι) makes no sense either. It seems best to regard τίθεσθαι as an error influenced by ἀναθείη and to read ἔτι τὸν χρόνον ἐνιαυτῷ λείπεσθαι (cf. LSJ s. v. λείπω B II 3, esp. Archim. *Con. Sph.* 21; also Ach. Tat. 8.6.4, being wary of the corruption there), 'that the period involved was still short by a year', i. e. 'that the period of consecration still had a year to run' (and so Psammiss could not touch her for a year), perfect sense in the context. Hercher (*Adnot. crit.* to his edition, p. LVII) says, 'Fort. ἔτι χρόνον ἐνιαυτοῦ λείπεσθαι' (i. e. 'that a period of a year was still left'), but that involves three changes and the awkwardly pleonastic χρόνον ἐνιαυτοῦ.

4.1.1. ἐνέπρησαν δὲ καὶ κόμας καὶ ἄνδρας ἀπέσφαξαν πολλοὺς καὶ οὕτως ἀπελθόντες εἰς Λαοδίκειαν τῆς Συρίας ἔρχονται κἀνταῦθα ...

ἐπελθόντες Da.

Hippothus and his brigands move from Tarsus to Syria burning and killing as they go, and the sense of καὶ οὕτως ... must be 'and *having progressed* (*vel sim.*) in this way they came to Laodicea ...' The prefix of ἀπ-ελθόντες ('depart') has no place here and was probably caused by assimilation to ἀπέσφαξαν. Dalmeyda's ἐπελθόντες ('attacking' *vel sim.*?) is not very attractive. παρελθόντες ('passing on their way', 'going along': see LSJ s. v. πάρεμι (*ibo*) I 1 and III; s. v. παρέρχομαι I 1 and III) is the strongest possibility. X. uses παρέρχομαι in descriptions of journeys in 4.1.3

ἸΑλεξάνδρειαν μὲν παρεῖλον, ἦλθον δὲ ἐπὶ Μέμφιν; 3.3 ἸΑλεξάνδρειαν παρελθοῦσα ἐγένετο ἐν Μέμφει; 5.10.3 Κρήτην παρελθὼν, ἐν Κύπρῳ γενόμενος; esp. 4.1.4 where Hippothous and his crew are again engaged in their pillaging, καὶ ἄλλας παρελθόντες κώμας οὐκ ὀλίγας, ὧν τὰς πολλὰς ἀφανεῖς (ἐποίησαν), εἰς Κοπτὸν ἔρχονται τῆς Αἰθιοπίας πλησίον. ἐνταῦθα ... The verb is used absolutely in the sense 'pass by' at 1.2.8; cf. (*caute*) 1.12.1.

4.2.4. εἰ μὲν τι ἸΑβροκόμης ἀδικεῖ, καὶ ἀπολοίμην οἰκτρῶς καὶ ...

ἀδικῶ Abr., Her.

Cf. 2.5.1 Μαντῶ ἐρᾷ σου, ... δέομαι ..., where ἐρῶ Cob., Her.

4.2.5. μήτε τὸ Νεῖλου ῥεῦμα μανθείη ποτὲ ἀδίκως ἀπολομένου σώματος

ἀπολομένου σώματι Cast., Da. ἀπολομένῳ σώματι Peerlk.

Castiglioni's conjecture is clearly right, the error being due to assimilation of σώματι to the (substantival) participle. Presumably those who keep σώματος think only of the grammar and regard ἀπολ. σώματος as a genitive absolute loosely related to μανθείη. But both the transmitted reading and Peerlkamp's conjecture are ruled out by the fact that the corpse (which is clearly what σώμα means here) must not be subject of the participle since it is the ἄνθρωπος and not his corpse that perishes unjustly (i. e. without having committed any crime); note later in the same sentence ἄνθρωπον οὐδὲν ἀδικήσαντα ἀπολλύμενον.

4.2.6. ἐφέρετο οὔτε τοῦ ὕδατος αὐτὸν ἀδικούντος οὔτε τῶν δεσμῶν ἐμποδιζόντων οὔτε τῶν θηρίων παραβλαπτόντων, ἀλλὰ παραπέμποντος τοῦ ῥεῦματος

Why παρα-βλαπτόντων? The prefix seems to me to be inappropriate ('damage incidentally' LSJ) and to be a false anticipation of παρα-πέμποντος (note also παρα-φυλάσσοντες two lines later), the original word having been simply βλαπτόντων.

4.4.2. ἐπιβάς σκάφους ἀνήγετο τὴν ἐπὶ Ἰταλίᾳ, (ὡς) ἐκεῖ πεισομένός τι [μαθεῖν] περὶ ἸΑνθίας, ὃ δὲ ἀρχῶν τῆς Αἰγύπτου μαθὼν τὰ κατὰ τὸν ἸΑραξον, ...

ὡς add. Hir.; cf. 5.11.1 / πεισομένους] πειρασόμενος Jack. / μαθεῖν del. Hir.

Hercher cited 5.11.1 (διέγνω τὴν Ἀθηναίαν ἀγαγεῖν ἀπὸ Ἰταλίας εἰς Ἐφεσον, ὡς ἀποδώσων τε τοῖς γονεῦσι καὶ περὶ Ἀβροκόμου ἐκεῖ τι πεισόμενος) in support of Hirschig's ὡς; a better parallel is 5.10.2 (ἐπιβάς ἐπλεῖ τὴν ἐπὶ Σικελίας πάλιν, ὡς ἐκείθεν ἐπὶ Κρήτην τε καὶ Κύπρον καὶ Ῥόδον ἀφιζόμενος . . .) since the important consideration in deciding whether to read <ὡς> is not the precise nature of the participle but that of the governing verb. However 5.11.1 (cf. 5.10.2 *ad fin.*) does have significance here: it means that πεισόμενός is proof against Jackson's πειρασόμενός. μαθεῖν is probably an intrusive false variant for the following μαθῶν.

4.5.6. There can be no valid objection to the μὲν deleted by Hercher (followed by Da. and Pap.). What set out to be a μὲν / δέ structure was disrupted by the unusual extension of the μὲν clause, and by the time we come to where the δέ might have been, the μὲν / δέ structure has been half-forgotten and, because the reasons for not adopting the μὲν courses of action have already been given in parentheses, the place of δέ is usurped by οὖν (in ἐγνώ οὖν . . . at the end of the paragraph).

4.6.1–2. ὀρῶσι τὸν Ἀγχίαλον ἀνηρημένον καὶ τὴν Ἀθηναίαν παρὰ τῷ σώματι καὶ εἰκάζουσι τὸ γενόμενον καὶ ἀνακρίναντες αὐτὴν μανθάνουσι πάντα. ἔδοξεν οὖν αὐτοῖς ἐν ὀργῇ τὸ γενόμενον ἔχειν καὶ τὸν τεθηκῶτα ἐκδικῆσαι φίλον

ἔχειν καὶ] ἔχουσι Da.

Papanikolaou prints a patently corrupt text (ἐν ὀργῇ τὸ γ. ἔχειν makes no sense) and fails to record the only reasonable attempt ever made to correct it, Castiglioni's ἐν ὀργῇ [τὸ] γενομένους <τοῦ πραχθέντος μεγάλης τιμωρίας> ἔχειν καὶ κτέ. (his alternative to <ῦ> γενομένου <τιμωρίας> ἔχειν is, as will become clear, inferior).

There is to my mind no doubt that ἐν ὀργῇ γενομένους is right: cf. 2.5.5 ἐν ὀργῇ ἀκατασχέτῳ γίνεται; 11.2 ἐν ὀργῇ γενομένη. τὸ γενόμενον is either a false repetition of the τὸ γενόμενον a line before or the result of a feeble attempt (inspired by the earlier τὸ γενόμενον) to patch up the text after it had become lacunose.

The text as supplemented by Castiglioni is not likely to be right. The brigands must be subject of ἔχειν, as of ἐκδικῆσαι (and so e.g. <ῦπ> ἔχειν [X. 4.2.4; Ach. Tat. 8.8.13] is not possible) and ἔχειν τιμωρίας seems to occur only with the crime as subject (Men. *Pk.* 253); for the verbs used with τιμωρία see LSJ s. v.; add (εἰσ)πράττω, -ομαι from X. 1.4.5; 2.1.2; 5.7, a constancy of usage

which, of course, also tells against the supplemented text. A better text would be ... <τὴν δίκην> ἔχειν ... ('to have their satisfaction'): see LSJ s. v. δίκη IV 3; note also a few sentences later (4.6.3) ἵνα ... μεγάλην δίκην ὑπόσχη τῶν τετολμημένων, and in 2.11.2 the sequence ἡ δὲ ἐν ὀργῇ γενομένη ... πράξομαι δίκας. On the admissibility of δίκην ... ἐκδικῆσαι (which may even be thought attractive in itself) see John Jackson, CQ XXIX (1935) 96.

4.6.5. ἐπενόει δὲ ὅπως ἐπὶ πλείον αὐτῆ ζήσεται, ὅπως τε ...

ἐπενόει Her.

ἐπινοέω occurs only here in X., whereas ἐννοέω is a favourite word of his and has just the sense required here: with ὅπως in 2.5.5; 3.3.7; 5.9.4. ἐπενόει (read also by Dalmeyda) is a mistake for ἐπενόει arising from the following cluster of π's (prob. esp. from ἐπ-ι). In the Teubner text of X. himself a similar error of modern origin is found in 2.11.11: τόπω ἐπεινώ.

The text of Xenophon presented by the *codex unicus* seems to be strikingly characterised by errors of omission and assimilation².

Hamburg

James N. O'Sullivan

2) During preparation of this article I was supported by a Fellowship of the Alexander von Humboldt-Stiftung, support which I acknowledge most gratefully.