

easy to supply; the statement is out of place in this context and in the mouth of this speaker; and it spoils the antithesis of *at vero*.

Difficulties appear when one attempts to establish the precise meaning of the words "recte . . . praecipunt" and their relation to their context. Antonius makes the point that, unlike actual experience in the forum, *controversiae* do not inculcate the necessity for thorough study of the case: they are too simple, involving none of the complications that real cases present. After an example there follows the statement, "recte igitur nihil de causa discenda praecipunt." What is the subject of *praecipunt*? "Eae causae, quae ad pueros deferuntur?" Probably not, since *recte* implies choice; *causae ludicrae* cannot choose, nor can they be congratulated on their inherent nature. Perhaps a plural *eruditi magistri* can be supplied from the genitive singular *eruditi magistri* of 2. 99. If so, the sense would be that *eruditi magistri* are right in teaching nothing about the case (*viz.*, because it is only in real life, not in the *controversiae*, that learning the case thoroughly is necessary). Yet the statement still involves congratulation upon an inherent condition. This is the main, though not the only, problem posed by the suspect matter. A further problem is: why should it be Antonius who offers this commendation and why in this context? Antonius' statements in this work do not ordinarily abound with gratuitous praise of *eruditi magistri*. Yet here, where he has only to state the fact that declamations do not require thorough study of the case, he proceeds to a fatuous expression of approval of this situation. Finally, the words "at vero in foro . . ." would be expected to form a sharp contrast with what immediately precedes. This condition is fulfilled if "recte . . . praecipunt" as well as "haec . . . fere" is expelled from this context so as to effect juxtaposition of "nihil est negotii eius modi causam cognoscere" and "at vero in foro tabulae, testimonia, . . . vita . . . cognoscenda est."

ANDREW R. DYCK
University of Minnesota

ACHILLES TATIUS *LEUCIPPE AND CLITOPHON*

1. 14-15: AN UNNOTICED LACUNA?

Editors and commentators have not so far suggested that something may have fallen out of the text between the fourteenth and fifteenth chapters of Book 1 of *Leucippe and Clitophon*.¹ It is not immediately obvious that anything has. Only by examining one feature of Achilles Tatius' style can we discover that he is unlikely to have composed these chapters in the form in which they have come down to us.

Chapters 12-14 contain an account of the death of Charicles, the lover of Clinias, with whom Clitophon has been discussing Love. Each chapter contains a speech. In 12, a messenger reports Charicles' death; in 13, Charicles' father laments his death; in 14, Clinias reproaches himself for having given Charicles the horse which caused his death. Each of these speeches except the last is immediately followed by a recapitulating phrase: *ταῦτα μὲν οὖν ἀκούων* (13. 1) and *ταῦτα μὲν οὖν*

I should like to thank the journal's referees, whose comments greatly improved this paper.

1. References are to the text of E. Vilborg, *Achilles Tatius: "Leucippe and Clitophon"* (Stockholm, 1955).

οὕτως ἐκώκυεν ὁ πατήρ (14. 1). The beginning of 15, *μετὰ δὲ τὴν ταφὴν*, is thus surprising and abrupt. Not only does no phrase recapitulate Clinias' speech, but we have not been told of the burial. After the messenger's speech, Charicles had been brought in on a bier (13. 2), and there presumably he stayed while his father and lover lamented.

It may be objected that *μετὰ δὲ τὴν ταφὴν* has the abruptness of art, not accident. To narrate a burial scene might compel the author to mention further, and repetitious, lamentations. Achilles Tatius may have managed his omission of the burial scene artfully by a compressed transition; *μετὰ δὲ τὴν ταφὴν* may suggest "after these lamentations and the funeral that followed." To this interpretation there are at least three obstacles. First, the words do not say what they are supposed to suggest; and Achilles Tatius is quite capable of saying "after these lamentations," as he does at 3. 11 *ταῦτα μὲν οὖν ἐθρήνουν*, and 5. 8 *ταῦτα καταθρηνήσας καὶ θάψας τὸ σῶμα*. Second and more persuasive, *μετὰ δὲ τὴν ταφὴν* remains anomalous even when it is understood as a kind of recapitulation of the preceeding lamentations. Recapitulating phrases after speeches in Achilles Tatius almost always contain words for speaking, listening, or some similar activity. Book 3 offers a representative sample: *μετὰ μικρὸν δὲ τῆς εὐχῆς* (5. 5), *ταῦτα μὲν οὖν ἐθρήνουν* (11. 1), *ταῦτα εἰπὼν* (17. 1), *ὥς οὖν ἤκουσα* (23. 1). Finally, one may legitimately wonder whether Achilles Tatius was much concerned with achieving economy in narration and avoiding redundancy. Those who have read him are likely to feel that he would view a decision to omit a funeral scene with lamentations as a lost opportunity rather than a stylish economy. Even if repetition has to be avoided, he is not averse to reminding his readers of what we have missed; consider 2. 34. 7, where, after Menelaus has told of his lover's death and asked if something of the same kind has sent Clinias and Clitophon wandering, the author has his narrator sum up: *στενάξας οὖν ὁ Κλεινίας καταλέγει τὸν Χαρυκλέα καὶ τὸν ἵππον, καὶ γὰρ τάμαυτοῦ*.

An abrupt transition is no reason to hypothesize a lacuna. We may do so, however, when we reflect that Clinias' speech in 14 is the only speech of any length in *Leucippe and Clitophon* which is not immediately followed by a recapitulating phrase, another speech, or the end of a book. Indeed, most short utterances and speeches in dialogue are followed by a recapitulating phrase.

There are fifty-six speeches or series of speeches in *Leucippe and Clitophon*. (By "speech" I mean simply any utterance longer than a subsection of a chapter.) Of these, fifty-two are followed by a recapitulating phrase like *ταῦτα εἰπὼν*, *ταῦτα λέγουσα*, or *ταῦτα ἀκούσας*. Books 2 and 3 end with speeches which naturally are not followed by recapitulating phrases. One short speech in Book 6 (3. 4 ff.) is not followed by any of the usual recapitulating phrases, but the transition to the subsequent action is made clear by *ἐπήνεσεν ὁ Θέρσανδρος καὶ ἐκέλευσε τοῦτο ποιεῖν* (6. 4. 1). The speech in 1. 14 remains anomalous. Recapitulating phrases with *ταῦτα* occur forty times, and other expressions—e.g., *ὥς οὖν ἤκουσα* or *καὶ ἐν τούτῳ*—are less common.

When speeches are grouped, Achilles Tatius often omits the recapitulating phrase after one of the earlier speeches but never fails to end the series with a recapitulating phrase. At 2. 14. 6, for example, Sostratus' interpretation of the oracle is not followed by a recapitulating phrase, but Chaerephon's response is followed by *ταῦτα εἰπὼν* (2. 15. 1). There are twenty-nine such series of speeches,

containing sixty-six separate speeches, in *Leucippe and Clitophon*. Recapitulating phrases are lacking after thirty-one of these speeches in series, but never—the point bears repetition—after the final speech of a series.

Mere cataloging of recapitulating phrases would be supererogatory. The attentive reader can see for himself that the first words of 1. 15 are odd. Nowhere else does the author conclude a series of speeches without a recapitulating phrase. Some words—perhaps quite a few, if we must suppose that Charicles' funeral was narrated—have probably dropped out of the text. A lacuna in Achilles Tatius is not unlikely: the medieval transmission of the text is far from reliable, and the papyri show that not even the order of chapters is in every case certain.²

LEE T. PEARCY, JR.

University of Texas

2. Vilborg, pp. xxxv ff.; F. Conca, "I papiri di Achille Tazio," *RIL* 103 (1969): 649–77; C. F. Russo, "Pap. Ox. 1250 e il romanzo di Achille Tazio," *RAL* 10 (1955): 397–403.