

## HIATUS IN THE GREEK NOVELISTS

LIFE offers various amusements, and anyone these days who can choose among them will come late to the study of hiatus in Greek prose. Germany in the 1880s, so it seems, was less fortunate, and few greater excitements were known to young or old than the hunt for hiatus; but now that we no longer strait-waistcoat our classical authors and the austerity of those times is discredited, few collectors of hiatus are to be found, and there are people even in Germany who have never identified a single specimen.

Yet there is nothing to be said for underrating an author's stylistic pretensions, still less for encouraging others to do the same; and the textual critic, whose path is slippery enough at the best of times, can ill afford to dispense with footholds.

There has been no broad study of hiatus in Greek prose since 1841, when Benseler in a long and original book *De hiatu in oratoribus et historicis Graecis* went through the text of 27 authors and attempted to determine their practice.<sup>1</sup> Not for another forty years did scholars train a concerted attack on the authors that Benseler had covered either inadequately or not at all; but once off the mark they applied themselves with such industry that the last sixty years have found little to add and little to revise. Not that these sixty years have been static, or progress unimpeded in the period before: what after all are manuscripts for if not to assure us that Demosthenes wrote ἐκάστῳ ἡμῶν and not ἡμῶν ἐκάστῳ?

The earlier work on hiatus is conveniently digested in Kühner-Blass i, § 49 (1890) and Blass, *Die attische Beredsamkeit*, 2<sup>2</sup>. 139-44 (1892); but the results of the later work are not readily accessible. In Pauly and the little Pauly hiatus is not accorded an entry, and Snell's bibliography in the new *Lexikon der alten Welt* is no more helpful than the article itself; only Shewring in the *Oxford Classical Dictionary* provides a reference of any value—to Skimina's book *État actuel des études sur le rythme de la prose grecque* (1937), which leads if only by accident in the right direction.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> The authors were these (for the last seven he spared only a cursory glance): Isoc., Dem., Gorg., Antisth., Alcidi., Antiph., Andoc., Lys., Isaeus, Demades, Lyc., Din., Aeschin., Herod., Thuc., Xen., Theopomp., Polyb., Plut., Dionys., Diod., Jos., App., Arr., Dio Cass., Herodian, Aelian.

<sup>2</sup> In the circumstances a small bibliography may be of service.

Plutarch: Sintenis, *De hiatu in Plutarchi vitis parallelis* (Zerbst, 1845); Schellens, *De hiatu in Plutarchi moralibus* (Bonn, 1864); Bernardakis, *Plutarchi moralia*, i (Teubner, 1888), lxi-lxx; Ziegler, P.-W., 'Plutarchos' (1951), 932-5.

Polybius: Hultsch, *Philol.* xiv (1859), 288-319; Brief, *Wie beeinflusst die Vermeidung des Hiatus den Stil des Polybius?* (Hradisch, 1907).

'Longinus' and Onesander: H. von Rohden,

*Commentationes in honorem F. Buechelieri et H. Useneri* (Bonn, 1873), 68-94.

Aristotle: Blass, *Rh. Mus.* xxx (1875), 481-505; Kaibel, *Stil und Text der aristotelischen Αθηναίων Πολιτεία* (1893), 9-16.

Diodorus: Kaelker, *Leipz. Stud.* iii (1880), 303-20.

Galen: Marquardt, *Galen scripta minora*, i (Teubner, 1884), xlvii-lv.

Appian: Zerdik, *Quaestiones Appianeae* (Kiel, 1886), 49-82.

Polemo: Schmid, *Atticismus*, i (1887), 58-60; Jüttner, *Breslauer phil. Abh.* viii (1898), 68-75.

Dio, Herodes, Lucian: Schmid, *ibid.* 168, 198, 404.

Philo: H. Jessen, *De elocutione Philonis Alexandrini* (Hamburg 1889); Cumont, *De aeternitate mundi* (1891), xx-xxii; Wendland, *Philos Schrift über die Vorsehung* (1892),

Hiatus in the novelists has not been investigated. Hercher remarked in 1858<sup>1</sup> 'dass Chariton sich in beschränktem Masze des Hiatus enthält', and Jackson in 1935<sup>2</sup> evidently supposed that in Chariton, Achilles Tatius, and Heliodorus, hiatus was generally illegitimate and should be emended away;<sup>3</sup> but recent editors, to judge from their editions, have paid no attention to the question.<sup>4</sup>

Before fresh problems are tackled, a word about theory.

Hiatus is the juxtaposition of vowels in adjacent words. Since in antiquity verse was often written out with no elision, what constitutes juxtaposition in prose is not likely to be the manner in which the author wrote it; that is, ἐπὶ Ἰλιον need not be displaying juxtaposed vowels even if the transmission does not misrepresent the author's orthography.

That at least is the common opinion among modern scholars,<sup>5</sup> and it doubtless holds good for the fourth century; but when scholars in antiquity read fourth-century prose in unelided texts, they did not always come to the same opinion,<sup>6</sup> and it is their theories, or similar inferences drawn from similar observations, that are most likely to have dictated the practice of their contemporaries. Only if a text is rhythmical is this point worth making, because it is only then that ἐπὶ Ἰλιον elided differs in any ascertainable way from ἐπὶ Ἰλιον unelided; but texts in verse are not the only rhythmical texts, and the point does in fact arise fairly often in prose. To take one example, Chariton's clausulae can occasionally be improved by postulating hiatus where elision is possible.<sup>7</sup> Nevertheless, hiatus of this sort may reasonably be left to experts in rhythm until it can be shown that certain forms of it are avoided.

Only one elision is of much interest, the elision of -αι.<sup>8</sup> In Attic comedy and later prose the verbal ending -αι may be elided when the accent suggests that it is short (always, that is, except in the aorist optative). Pronunciation clearly came to correspond.<sup>9</sup> The only mystery that remains is why nominative plurals in -αι and -οι are not treated in the same way.

As for aphaeresis, crasis, and synizesis,<sup>10</sup> it can be assumed that in Attic prose the rules are supplied by Attic comedy and tragedy, in which certain juxtapositions of vowels are also legitimate;<sup>11</sup> but since later writers may have

116-17; Poland, *B.Ph.W.* xiv (1894), 1009-11; M. Arnim, *De Philonis Byzantii dicendi genere* (Greifswald, 1912), 160-4.

Aristides: Schmid, *Atticismus*, ii (1889), 248-53.

Aelian: *ibid.* iii (1893), 291-6.

Josephus: W. Schmidt, *Jahrb. für class. Phil.* Supp. 20 (1894), 345-550 *passim*; M. Auerbach, *Archivum Towarzystwa Naukowego we Lwowie*, dział 1, tom 1, zeszyt 4 (Lwów, 1924), 37-58.

Philostratus: Schmid, *Atticismus*, iv (1896), 469-75.

Plato: Janell, *Jahrb. für class. Phil.* Supp. 26 (1901), 273-324.

Dionysius: Kallenberg, *Rh. Mus.* lxii (1907), 9-32; lxvii (1912), 11-19.

<sup>1</sup> *Jahrb. für class. Phil.* lxxvii (1858), 165.

<sup>2</sup> *C.Q.* xxix (1935), 52-7, 96-112.

<sup>3</sup> When scholars between these dates show awareness of hiatus, acknowledgement is made in the appropriate place.

<sup>4</sup> When Vilborg on p. 131 of his commentary on Achilles Tatius awakes from his sleep and asserts that 'the dative gives . . . an unpleasant hiatus', he is merely echoing Jackson 105.

<sup>5</sup> e.g. Benseler ix-x, Schmid i. 58, Kaibel 10 n. 2.

<sup>6</sup> Dionysius, for instance, diagnoses hiatus in εὐρυχοῦντα ὀρών and δὲ ὅλον at Dem. 2. 22 (*Dem.* 43).

<sup>7</sup> S. Heibges, *De clausulis Charitoneis* (Halle, 1911), 54-6. Cf. also Jüttner (see p. 514 n. 2) 69 n. 1, H. B. Dewing, 'Hiatus in the accentual clausulae of Byzantine Greek prose', *A.J.P.* xxxii (1911), 188-204. οὐδὲ εἷς and οὐδὲ εἷν (*Hel.* 5. 21. 4. 4, Longus 2. 16. 1. 5; 2. 19. 2. 1) are presumably not elided.

<sup>8</sup> Kühner-Blass i, § 53. 5 E.

<sup>9</sup> Blass, *Über die Aussprache des Griechischen*<sup>3</sup> (1888), § 17, Schwyzler, p. 195.

<sup>10</sup> A. Lucius, *De crasi et aphaeresi* (Strasbourg, 1885); Kühner-Blass i, § 54, § 51, § 52.

<sup>11</sup> Kühner-Blass i, § 48. 3.

narrowed these rules, the lists that follow have not been shortened with their assistance (except where crasis is attested by the manuscripts).

Any juxtaposition of vowels that is not obviated by elision, aphaeresis, crasis, or synizesis must count as hiatus, and a particular hiatus can be excused thereafter only on the ground that it is legitimate, not that it is not really hiatus.

Strictly, a form of hiatus may be regarded as entirely legitimate in a text only if the initial vowel follows the final vowel as freely as it occurs initially, or the final vowel precedes the initial vowel as freely as it occurs finally; but as statistics of this sort are meaningless by themselves, and statistics about the author's usage, the reliability of the transmission, and the frequency of certain corruptions are too cumbersome to amass, the textual critic will have to be content, once he has collected and classified all the instances of hiatus, to judge them with a kind of statistical impressionism.

As hiatus after *καί* and the article is freely admitted by all the novelists, no further mention is made of it; the same goes for hiatus between sentences<sup>1</sup> and before *δέ*,<sup>2</sup> where the vowels are obviously kept apart by a pause. One of the main tasks in assessing a writer's tolerance of hiatus is to establish where else pauses occur and how heavy they have to be before hiatus is admitted. In other circumstances hiatus itself can be a useful indication of a pause, but when it is hiatus that is under investigation other methods of locating them ought to have priority—rhythm,<sup>3</sup> word order, the example of modern languages, and relics of ancient punctuation. Fortunately it often becomes clear quite soon whether a writer generally avoids hiatus, and if he does, hiatus can be allowed to play its part in locating pauses.

The categories into which pauses are sorted in this article are as follows:

1. (a) Before *ἀλλά*, e.g. Hel. 2. 21. 7. 1 οὐκ ἐν ἐμαντοῦ ἀλλ' ἐν ἀνδρὸς ἀγαθοῦ  
 (b) Before *ἦ*, e.g. Hel. 2. 14. 3. 1 τί διαφέρουσιν αὐτῷ ἦ πόθεν γενομένην  
 (c) Before *οὐδέ*, e.g. Hel. 10. 16. 7. 6 οὐδ' ὀκλάσω οὐδ' εἰς ἱκεσίαν τρέφομαι  
 (d) Before a second *οὔτε*, e.g. Hel. 1. 3. 4. 3 οὔτε χεῖρας ἀνταράμενοι οὔτε  
 τι τῶν κκυλῶν ἐπενεγκάμενοι  
 (e) Before a second *εἴτε*, e.g. Hel. 1. 18. 3. 3 εἴτε . . . κινούμενοι εἴτε . . .  
 ἐγείροντες
2. Before *μέν/δέ*,<sup>4</sup> e.g. Hel. 1. 2. 3. 6 ὀφθαλμοὺς δ' ἐκείνου οἱ μὲν πόνοι κατέσπων,  
 ἦ δ' ὅψις τῆς κόρης ἐφ' αὐτὴν ἀνείλκεν
- 3.<sup>5</sup> (a) Before a vocative, e.g. Hel. 7. 19. 3. 3 θάρρει, ὦ ξένη  
 (b) After a vocative, e.g. Hel. 10. 34. 4. 4 χαίροντά μοι τοῦτον, ὦ βασιλεῦ,  
 ἀντίπεμψον
4. (a) After an adverbial clause, e.g. Hel. 7. 24. 3. 5 ἐπεὶ δ' ἤχθη, ἐπρώτα . . .  
 (b) After a participial phrase, e.g. Hel. 10. 22. 2. 3 τὸν ὄντα ὅστις ἐστὶν  
 ὁ ξένος ἐρωτωμένη ἀγνοεῖν ἔλεγεν

<sup>1</sup> See however p. 528 n. 1.

<sup>2</sup> Not, of course, before *δέ* itself but before the group of words it belongs to.

<sup>3</sup> Heibges rightly infers Chariton's articulation from the clausulae (27–41), and it is reasonable to transfer his conclusions to writers whose rhythm is not so regular.

On pauses cf. also Hultsch (see p. 514 n. 2), 298–304 and Fraenkel, *Kolon und*

*Satz*, ii with *Nachträge* (*Kleine Beiträge*, i. 93–139).

<sup>4</sup> Cf. Fraenkel (see n. 3), 114.

<sup>5</sup> Neither of these pauses is mandatory: the point about enclitics and rhythm that is made below in connection with *ἐφη* also applies to the vocative (cf. Heibges 40–1, Fraenkel, *Sitzungsberichte der bayerischen Akademie*, 1965 [2], 71–3).

- (c) After a parenthetic or epexegetic clause or phrase,<sup>1</sup> e.g. Ach. Tat. 4. 2. 1. 1 ἐν τούτῳ δὴ Χαρμίδης (τοῦτο γὰρ ἦν ὄνομα τῷ στρατηγῷ) ἐπιβάλλει τῇ Λευκίππῃ τὸν ὀφθαλμόν
5. (a) Before an adverbial clause or noun clause, e.g. Hel. 1. 4. 1. 6 ἐαυτὴν ἀποσφάξειν ἠπειλεῖ εἰ μὴ ἀμφοτέρους ἄγοιεν
- (b) Before a participial phrase, e.g. Hel. 1. 7. 3. 6 Ἑλληνί τινι παραδίδωμι νεανίσκῳ οὐ πρὸ πολλοῦ παρ' αὐτοῖς αἰχμαλώτῳ γεγονότι
- (c) Before an epexegetic phrase or clause, e.g. Hel. 3. 18. 2. 8 δυοῖν θάτερον ἀνάγκη, ἡ . . . ἡ . . . , Ach. Tat. 1. 4. 5. 1 πάντα δέ μ' εἶχεν ὁμοῦ, ἔπαινος, ἔκπληξις . . . , Chariton 5. 1. 3. 4 ἡπειρός ἐστι μεγάλη, ἀφετήριον εἰς τὴν βασιλέως γῆν τὴν πολλήν
- (d) Before a relative clause, e.g. Hel. 3. 16. 4. 2 ἡ ἀληθὺς σοφία, ἥς αὕτη παρωνύμως ἐνοθεύθη
- (e) Before ὥστε (or ὡς = ὥστε) + inf., e.g. Ach. Tat. 3. 5. 3. 2 ἀλλὰ τύχη τινὶ πλησίον γεινόμενον ἡμῶν κάτωθεν παρατρέχει, ὥστε . . . τὸν Κλεινίαν ἰδεῖν αὖθις, Hel. 9. 5. 5. 1 οἱ δ' ἐπεραιοῦντο πεφραγμένοι ὡς, εἴ τι . . . , ἡντρεπίσθαι πρὸς ἄμυναν
6. Before asyndeton, e.g. Ach. Tat. 4. 12. 1. 4 ναυτῶν ὁμοῦ καὶ γεωργῶν καταγωγῇ, ἰχθύων ὁμοῦ καὶ βοῶν

#### 7. Miscellaneous

Some pauses are overdetermined,<sup>2</sup> and there are occasions (e.g. Longus 2. 23. 1. 3) where 5 (c) is hardly distinguishable from 6; but otherwise this classification creates no difficulties.

The complications introduced by direct speech and ἔφη(ν) require separate treatment. Five positions must be considered:

- (a) Before direct speech, e.g. Ach. Tat. 4. 15. 6. 5 θορυβῶν δ' ἅμα λέγω "εἰπόν, τί δέδωκας Λευκίππῃ . . . ;"
- (b) Before . . . " ἔφη, e.g. "θάρσει" ἔφη
- (c) After . . . " ἔφη " . . . , e.g. Hel. 6. 2. 2. 7 "ὁ δὲ" ἔφη "ὁ λόγος"
- (d) After ἔφη, e.g. ἔφη ὁ Κνήμων
- (e) Before ἔφη, e.g. ἡ δὲ Μελίτη ἔφη

A writer who is prepared to prodelide the augment can indulge in (b) and (e) to his heart's content, and it might seem that (a)–(c) are excused by a pause; but in fact prodelision of the augment is rare and often suspect in the novelists, and it is highly doubtful whether there can have been a pause before or after direct speech; such a pause would be incompatible not only with the occurrence of enclitics at the resumption of direct speech<sup>3</sup> but also, in at least one author,<sup>4</sup> with the distribution of clausulae. It must therefore be concluded that a writer who freely allows all or most of these five kinds of hiatus is granting a special licence to direct speech.

<sup>1</sup> Pauses after adverbial clauses parenthetically placed (e.g. Ach. Tat. 2. 31. 2. 4) should perhaps have been included here rather than in (a).

<sup>2</sup> Hiatus overdetermined in other ways (e.g. *κοι ἀλλά*) is ignored unless both classes

to which it may belong are small.

<sup>3</sup> Hel. 4. 6. 1. 3; 5. 20. 7. 5; 10. 9. 5. 8, Ach. Tat. 2. 21. 4. 4; 5. 13. 5. 3, Xen. 3. 3. 3. 3; 3. 5. 7. 1, *Ninus* A V. 12–13.

<sup>4</sup> Chariton (Heibges 38–9).

Heliodorus first, for two reasons: *Aethiopica* is the longest of the novels,<sup>1</sup> and the manuscripts, which are diverse, seldom agree in error.<sup>2</sup>

Heliodorus elides -αι<sup>3</sup> 112 times.<sup>4</sup> He seems to extend the licence to *πάλαι*, which occurs 7 times before a vowel.<sup>5</sup>

He uses hiatus freely in the following circumstances: after *μή* (76), *ἦ* (45), *δὴ* (39, of which 16 are *δὴ οὖν*), *εἰ* (10), *μοι* (13) and *κοι* (2), *τί* (20), *ὅτι* (14) and *τι* (9), and *περί* (45).

He allows hiatus at the following pauses:

1. (a) Before *ἀλλά* (8)  
 (b) Before *ἦ* (4)  
 (c) Before *οὐδέ* (10. 16. 7. 6)  
 (d) Before a second *οὐτε* (1. 3. 4. 3; 6. 15. 3. 1)  
 (e) Before a second *εἴτε* (1. 18. 3. 3)
2. Before *μέν/δέ* (1. 2. 3. 6; 4. 1. 1. 1;<sup>6</sup> 7. 5. 4. 10; 9. 10. 3. 2)
3. (a) Before a vocative (3)  
 (b) After a vocative (*βασιλεῦ* 4, *Καλάσιρι* 1)
4. (a) After an adverbial clause or noun clause (*ὥς* = when 2; *ὥς* = as 1; *εἰ* = whether 1; *ἐπειδὴ* 1; *ἐπεὶ* 1)  
 (b) After a participial phrase (9)  
 (c) After parenth. or exep. (4. 15. 4. 5)
5. (a) Before an adverbial clause or noun clause (*εἰ* = if 4; *εἰ* = whether 1; *ὥς* = that 2; *ὥς* = *ἵνα* 1; *ὥς* = as 1; *ὥστε* 1; *ἐπειδὴ* 1; *ὅτε* 1)  
 (b) Before a participial phrase (10, including 2 with *ὥς*)  
 (c) Before exep. (2. 30. 3. 6; 3. 18. 2. 8; 7. 21. 2. 6)  
 (d) Before a relative clause (5)  
 (e) Before *ὥς* = *ὥστε* (9. 5. 5. 1)
6. Before asyndeton (6)
7. Miscellaneous (1. 16. 4. 5 *καὶ ταῦτ' ἀλλοτρίᾳ* is parenthetically placed; 1. 33. 1. 6 the *ἐπὶ* phrase goes with both participles; 2. 10. 1. 4 and 10. 34. 2. 2 in the heading of a letter between the names of sender and recipient; 7. 14. 8. 1 the verb goes with both nouns; 7. 23. 2. 2 there could be a comma in German)

There are a few doubtful instances among these:

4. (a) 2. 32. 1. 9 pause seems awkward  
 (c) Pause justified only by length of phrase

<sup>1</sup> In Bekker's edition (Teubner, 1855) Heliodorus occupies 309½ pages; in Hercher's *Erotici scriptores Graeci* (Teubner, 1858-9) Achilles Tatius occupies 176½, Chariton 154½, Longus 85½, and Xenophon 71.

<sup>2</sup> H. Gärtner, *Antike und Abendland*, xv (1969), 48, mentions the divergences among the extant witnesses to the text of Chariton and Achilles Tatius and goes on to say 'wir werden gut daran tun, mit ähnlicher Verwilderung auch bei den Aithiopika . . . zu rechnen, wo vorläufig keine entsprechende

Kontrolle möglich ist'. The state of the text gives no ground for such nervousness.

<sup>3</sup> 'From the opening of the *Aethiopica* to their ever-receding close, final *αι* is treated for all purposes as a homophone of *ε*', Jackson 54-5.

<sup>4</sup> *πλὴν εἴ τι με διαλέλῃθεν*, as Dionysius says in a similar context (*Comp.* 23). The same reservation attaches to all the other figures in this article.

<sup>5</sup> Cf. the accentuation of *πρόπαλαι*.

<sup>6</sup> *τῆς δ' ὑστεραίας* Jackson, unnecessarily.

5. (a) 5. 33. 2. 4 text uncertain; 7. 24. 3. 5 pause seems awkward  
 (b) 6. 3. 2. 7 text uncertain

Hiatus is associated with direct speech and ἔφη in the following ways:

- (a) Before direct speech (6, but they can all be classed under 4 (b) above)  
 (b) Before . . . ” ἔφη (60+23 related, e.g. . . . ” ἔλεγεν, . . . ” ἀνεβόησεν)  
 (c) After . . . ” ἔφη “ . . . (10 certain; 37 others may belong elsewhere)  
 (d) After ἔφη (46, of which only 2. 23. 3. 1 ἔφη ἀναβοήσας is not ἔφη+article, and 1 related, 2. 24. 1. 1 ἡρώτα δ)  
 (e) Before ἔφη

Hiatus occurs in 9 variants that are not demonstrably superior but are accepted by Rattenbury:<sup>1</sup>

1. 5. 2. 3 Νείλου ὑπερεκχύσεις mAT (παρεκχύσεις Z)  
 2. 23. 5. 5 οἶνον ὁ Κνήμων C (οἶνον cett.)  
 4. 19. 2. 5 ἥδη ἐπιδιώξετε CBT (ἥδη καὶ ἐπιδιώξετε VMPZA)  
 5. 1. 1. 7 λοιπὸν καὶ ὄρθρου ὑποφαίνοντος VMZP (καὶ ὄρθρου λοιπὸν ὑποφαίνοντος BAT)  
 5. 32. 5. 3 Θεαγένη ἐτόξευσεν CZ (διετόξευσεν VMBA)  
 7. 11. 10. 2 μόνον τῆς ἐκείνου ἔοικεν VM (τῆς ἐκείνου μόνον ἔοικεν BPZAT)  
 8. 7. 6. 4 ἐπιθυμῇ ἡ ψυχὴ BPZAT (ἐπιθυμῇ ψυχὴ VM)  
 8. 13. 2. 4 οὔτοι ἐκόντος MBT (οὔτι VPZA)  
 10. 12. 4. 4 ὑμετέρα εἶναι ZMP (ὑμετέραν εἶναι V, εἶναι ὑμετέρα AT)

In 8 places Rattenbury has introduced hiatus by a questionable emendation:

2. 6. 3. 8 μικροῦ ἔδει<sup>2</sup> Salmasius (μικρὸν codd.)  
 6. 1. 2. 11 ὀλίγου ἔδει Coraes (ὀλίγον codd.)  
 10. 27. 2. 7 ὀλίγου ὑπερφέρουσα Coraes (ὀλίγον codd.)  
 4. 7. 8. 2 ἐγὼ <ἦκω> Rattenbury  
 7. 4. 2. 3 τῇ διανοίᾳ ἀναπεμπάζουσα Rattenbury (τὴν διάνοιαν codd., τὴν ὑπόνοιαν Jackson)  
 7. 5. 2. 3 ἄχρις <οὔ> ὁ Rattenbury  
 9. 3. 1. 2 δεκάδα ὀργυῶν δεκάδι ἀνδρῶν Coraes (δεκάειν codd., δεκάδας ὀργυῶν Colonna)  
 10. 33. 2. 7 κάμοι ὥς θύματι Rattenbury (καί μοι codd.)

<sup>1</sup> Rattenbury's disregard of hiatus is one of the three main shortcomings of his text, which is on the whole, as Jackson 112 hoped it would be, 'a genuine and important service to Greek letters'. The others are his reverence towards the ms. C even at its most irresponsible (e.g. 1. 11. 5. 8 κέψαι, 1. 22. 6. 4 παιδίω, 5. 12. 1. 9 φυγαδεύσαι) and the infantile conjectures of Lumb's that disfigure the apparatus (e.g. 10. 31. 2. 2 cῶ ἐπι) and occasionally the text (5. 12. 3. 3 θείος, 8. 11. 2. 5 χαῖ τ' ἀδόκητα).

While Rattenbury's text is under discussion, attention may as well be drawn to a few unusual lapses of judgement: neither οἶδεν at 7. 19. 6. 5 nor νόον at 10. 9. 6. 11 has the remotest chance of being right, and the same is true of his conjectures at 1. 12. 4. 7;

7. 21. 1. 8; 8. 9. 15. 9, and 9. 7. 1. 4, two of which are nothing short of grotesque. In all these passages except 1. 12. 4. 7 the reading best attested is faultless.

Unnecessary conjectures are also printed at 1. 17. 3. 4 (= 5. 22. 2. 7); 5. 14. 1. 4 (cf. 1. 28. 2. 7; 1. 31. 2. 6); 8. 5. 10. 4; 8. 13. 1. 6; 9. 15. 5. 1, and 10. 9. 4. 4 (cf. Xen. Eph. 1. 12. 4. 2).

The wrong variant is chosen at 1. 8. 1. 4; 3. 7. 5. 8; 4. 14. 1. 2 (read ὅλον κατηφείας); 4. 17. 5. 5; 5. 24. 5. 5; 6. 13. 3. 3; 7. 1. 4. 7; 9. 24. 8. 8 (read πικτὰ ἀν), and 10. 9. 5. 1.

These lists do not purport to be exhaustive.

<sup>2</sup> This hiatus and others in the list are defensible, as it turns out. The corresponding lists for the other authors likewise contain some defensible conjectures.

Hiatus occurs in 4 passages that editors have declared corrupt for other reasons:

2. 3. 4. 6 μή τι κακὸν ἑαυτῷ ἐργάσεται (ἑαυτὸν T, Rattenbury)  
 6. 4. 2. 5 ἐν ἐπισκέψει ἐχομένους (γενομένους Coraes)  
 8. 9. 9. 3 τιμωρία ὑποβαλεῖν (περιβαλεῖν Hirschig)  
 10. 41. 3. 2 ἄμα τῷ Ὑδάσπῃ ἀναδηκάμενοι (ἄμα τῷ Ὑδάσπῃ *del.* Rattenbury)

The remaining instances of hiatus admit of some classification, but none of the classes are very big.

It occurs after a number of monosyllables: ὁ (4), πρό (3), ὦ (3), εὖ (2, εὖ ἔσθι and εὖ οἶδα, legitimate in Attic drama), ᾧ (but Heliodorus did not write this),<sup>1</sup> πη, που, ἦ, ἄ, σή (5. 29. 4. 6; read ἦ σή τ' for ἦ τε σή?)

The short -ι of the dative singular occurs before a vowel 7 times.

There are 7 occurrences of hiatus before a verbal prefix:

- |              |                       |              |                         |
|--------------|-----------------------|--------------|-------------------------|
| 2. 6. 3. 8   | ἔδει ἀποθνήσκειν      | 10. 6. 3. 7  | γυμνοσφισταὶ ὑπεκάθηντο |
| 6. 12. 1. 3  | θατέρῳ ἐπιχλευάσαντες | 10. 14. 2. 7 | ἔχοι ἐκδιδάσκειν        |
| 8. 11. 10. 3 | ἄλλῃ ἐξαρήσεται       | 10. 15. 1. 6 | περιχαρεῖα ἐκπλαγέντων  |
| 9. 1. 5. 8   | χρυσᾷ ἐπιβάλλειν      | 10. 21. 3. 7 | δεῖ ἐπιλέγειν           |

and 5 before the augment:

- |             |                |              |                  |
|-------------|----------------|--------------|------------------|
| 1. 2. 6. 6  | οὕτω ἐγίνωσκον | 9. 17. 2. 4  | Ὑδάσπου ἔπραττον |
| 1. 15. 6. 7 | ταύτῃ ἐκέχρητο | 10. 34. 2. 4 | γνώμῃ ἐνίκησας   |
| 8. 13. 1. 7 | ἐρρωμένη ἔδωκα |              |                  |

These belong together:

- |              |                 |             |                      |
|--------------|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|
| 3. 4. 7. 1   | οὗτοι ἐκείνοι   | 1. 8. 4. 2  | ψυχῇ ἐμῇ             |
| 4. 1. 3. 4   | αὕτῃ ἐκείνῃ     | 5. 2. 10. 1 | „ „                  |
| 5. 8. 3. 4   | „ „             | 7. 6. 5. 7  | αὐτῷ οἱ              |
| 10. 13. 5. 2 | „ „             | 8. 16. 2. 2 | αὐτῷ ἵππον           |
| 1. 3. 4. 4   | ὥς δρόμον εἶχον | 2. 10. 2. 1 | νυνὶ εἶναι (νυνὶ ZT) |
| 2. 22. 1. 7  | γάμου ὥραία     | 7. 23. 1. 7 | τουτοιῖ ἐκθρεψαμένη  |
| 4. 9. 3. 5   | ἔργου ἔχεςθαι   |             |                      |
| 9. 3. 8. 2   | ἔργου εἶχετο    | 5. 22. 7. 6 | ἐδόκει οὖν           |
| 5. 18. 7. 5  | οἴκου ἄρχουσι   | 6. 5. 1. 4  | „ „                  |
| 9. 20. 6. 6  | ἐχθροῦ ἄμυναν   |             |                      |

The residue are all singularities. Since only 20 lack a plausible explanation, suspicion must attach to them, and remedies are suggested where they come ready to hand. The list proceeds in order.

1. 3. 5. 2 δεύτερον ἦδη ἠλίσκοντο (ἦδη δεύτερον ἠλίσκοντο; cf. 2. 5. 1. 4 ἦδη δεύτερον, 1. 8. 2. 7 ἦδη δευτέρα)

<sup>1</sup> It comes in 8. 9. 3 at the end of the following sentence: αὕτῃ δεδοκέναι διωμολόγει τῇ Κυβέλῃ τὸ φάρμακον, εἰληφέναι δὲ παρ' αὐτῆς ἐκείνης ἐφ' ᾧ δοῦναι μὲν τῇ Χαρικλείᾳ, προληφθεῖσαν δὲ εἴτε . . . εἴτε καὶ συγχεθεῖσαν ὑπὸ τῆς Κυβέλης προτέρᾳ δοῦναι τῇ Χαρικλείᾳ νεοῦσης, ἐναλλάξαι τὰς κύλικας καὶ τῇ πρεσβύτιδι προσενεγκεῖν ἐν ᾧ ἦν τὸ φάρμακον. Rare though glosses are in Heliodorus, the relative clause is surely a

gloss designed to furnish προσενεγκεῖν with an object (τὸ φάρμακον is easily enough supplied, as with three of the other infinitives in the sentence, despite the intervention of ἐναλλάξαι τὰς κύλικας). If the common word for cup, ποτήριον, was in the mind of whoever jotted down the words, he will have given no more thought to the gender of the pronoun than editors have done since.

1. 6. 1. 4 *κυρρεῖ ἐπὶ* (*κυρρεῖ περὶ* Jackson *coll.* 2. 27. 2. 6)
2. 18. 4. 3 *ἀναγκαῖον δοκεῖ οὕτω* (*δοκεῖν* CZ, *δοκεῖ del.* Castiglioni, *fort. recte*)
3. 16. 3. 1 *ὥς ἂν τις εἴποι χαμαὶ ἐρχομένη* (in effect a quotation from Homer, with Homer's correction)
5. 17. 4. 2 *ἀληθῆ εἶναι* (*ἀλήθειαν εἶναι* Jackson *coll.* 7. 4. 1. 5; 7. 7. 3. 5)
5. 20. 6. 1 *κόρη αὐτοῖς*
6. 1. 1. 11 *Θεαγένοι ἦξουσι*
7. 12. 1. 5 *φυλαζάμενοι ἂν*
7. 15. 2. 7 *ἔχοι εἰκάζειν*
7. 23. 1. 5 *μανία εἰς*
7. 23. 2. 4 *αὐται ἦσαν* (elided?)
7. 27. 2. 7 *τύχη εἰδέναι* (transpose? best *τὰ τοιαῦτ' εἰδέναι*)
7. 27. 8. 5 *ἄνευ ὕβρεως* (excusable in a preposition?)
8. 11. 10. 3 *παντάρβη ἄλλη* (*ἄλλη om.* T, *καὶ ἄλλη* A)
9. 3. 1. 5 *ἕτεροι εἰς ὄφρυν πρὸς ὕψος* (*πρὸς ὄφρυν εἰς ὕψος*? cf. 4. 17. 1. 4; 9. 4. 3. 3; 10. 6. 1 *εἰς ὕψος*; but 4. 4. 1. 3 *πρὸς ὕψος*)
9. 16. 1. 2 *ἐπῆει ἀντιμέτωπος* (*ἐπῆγεν*? cf. § 2. 1 *ἀντεπῆγε δὲ καὶ ὁ Ὑδάσπηρ*, and 8. 2. 1. 2 *ἐξῆει* VMZA *ἐξῆγε* PT)
9. 21. 1. 2 *πολλῶ αἵματι* (*πολλῶ <τῶ> αἵματι* C.Q. lxii [1968], 287)
10. 12. 3. 3 *“οὐκ ἄξει οὐδεὶς” ἀνεβόησεν* (“οὐκ ἄξει” ἀνεβόησεν “οὐδεὶς” Jackson)
10. 22. 3. 2 *καὶ ταύτη ὑπάνδρω*
10. 23. 4. 1 *ὥφθη ὁ*
10. 33. 1. 7 *ἔχει ἄνδρα* (*ἄνδρα om.* MP, *καὶ ἄνδρα* Z; *ἄνδρ' ἔχει*?)

It may be, of course, that some of the instances included in the previous lists are corrupt as well. One of them (1. 15. 6. 7 *ταύτη ἐκέχρητο*) can be disposed of by an alteration so light as to need no apology (*ταύτη κέχρητο* Jackson), and in another place transposition would markedly improve the order (10. 34. 2. 4 *γνώμη πλέον ἐνίκησας* instead of *πλέον γνώμη ἐνίκησας*). How easily small transpositions occur in prose the papyri have shown again and again, even if variants in the medieval tradition did not prove it.

Now Achilles Tatius.<sup>1</sup> ‘Le romancier n’évitait pas spécialement l’hiatus’ Skimina 192. How then does it come about that on at least 83 pages out of 161 in Vilborg’s edition<sup>2</sup> no hiatus occurs of a kind that Heliodorus would have avoided, and on 35 of those 83 no hiatus at all except after *καί*, the article, or an obvious pause?

Achilles elides -αι 15 times.

He allows hiatus freely in the following circumstances: after *μή* (24), *ἦ* (5), *δή* (7), *μοι* (6) and *κοι* (2), *τί* (11), *τι* (11) and *ὅτι* (10), and *περὶ* (20); before *οὖν* (24: *ἐπεὶ οὖν* 9, *λέγει οὖν* 9, *λέγω οὖν* 4); and at the following pauses:

<sup>1</sup> The other work attributed to an Achilles (E. Maass, *Commentariorum in Aratum reliquiae*, 1898, 27–85) is of so different a nature that nothing is proved by its admission of hiatus. On the style and the author’s date see Rohde, 471.

Mr. James O’Sullivan, who is compiling an index to Achilles Tatius, very kindly read this section of the article and made a number

of helpful comments.

<sup>2</sup> Though Vilborg draws up his text on absurd and incoherent principles (see the last paragraph on p. lxxxv), his reporting of the manuscripts, even if he makes mistakes (Russo, *Gnomon*, xxx [1958], 585–6), is so much easier to apprehend than Jacobs’s that his edition is indispensable.



1. (a) Before ἀλλά (19)  
(b) Before ἦ (6)  
(c) Before οὐδέ (1. 9. 2. 4)
2. Before μέν/δέ (2. 37. 8. 1; 3. 25. 3. 2; 4. 13. 4. 2; 4. 13. 4. 4<sup>1</sup>; 8. 13. 1. 1)
3. (a) Before voc. (5. 23. 7. 2 *v.l.*; 8. 5. 9. 4; 3. 10. 6. 2 *coi*; 5. 20. 5. 1 *μοι*)  
(b) After voc. (4. 17. 1. 2)
4. (a) After adv. clause or noun clause (condit. 5; ἐπειδάν 1; ὥς = when 1; ὅταν 1; ὥςπερ 1; ἐξ οὗ 1)  
(b) After part. (13)  
(c) After parenth. or epex. (4. 2. 1. 1; 6. 17. 1. 4; 8. 6. 5. 5)
5. (a) Before adv. clause or noun clause (condit. 2; ἵνα 6; ὥστε 4; ὥς = ἵνα 3; ὅτι = because 2; ὥς = as 1)  
(b) Before part. (11, inc. 4 with ὥς and 2 with ὥςπερ)<sup>2</sup>  
(c) Before epex. (9)  
(d) Before rel. (10)  
(e) Before ὥστε and ὥς = ὥστε (6)
6. Before asyndeton (12)
7. Miscellaneous (8. 8. 13. 3 ἐν ἀνδρὸς χώρα τῇ οἰκίᾳ τῇ ἐμῇ, οὐκ ἐν μοιχοῦ μόνον, καθεστῆκότα α; but read τὴν οἰκίαν τὴν ἐμὴν β+κατεσχηκότα Wyttenbach)

Some instances can perhaps be added to these:

4. (b) 1. 19. 1. 3
5. (a) 2. 10. 5. 3; 2. 33. 1. 3  
(b) 4. 17. 4. 2; 6. 6. 3. 2  
(c) 5. 6. 3. 5 (or read παρ' αὐτῇ or πρὸς αὐτῇ<sup>2</sup>)

Hiatus is associated with direct speech and ἔφη(ν) in the following ways:

- (a) Before direct speech (8)
- (b) Before . . .” ἔφη (6. 13. 1. 1; 7. 3. 2. 2; 7. 3. 2. 3; *μοι/κοι*” ἔφη 5; 6. 2. 5. 4 πάνν” ἔφη)
- (c) After . . .” ἔφη “. . . (4. 15. 3. 4; 5. 20. 1. 4; 7. 3. 2. 3; 8. 10. 2. 4 *v.l.*)
- (d) After ἔφη (2. 28. 3. 1; 4. 8. 4. 3)
- (e) Before ἔφη (5. 17. 7. 2; and 4 before εἶπεν: 5. 16. 1. 1; 5. 22. 3. 5; 6. 22. 1. 1; 8. 12. 4. 4)

Hiatus occurs in 6 variants that are not demonstrably superior but are accepted by Vilborg:

1. 5. 3. 5 μου ἦν αεVG (ἦν μου ξ, μοι ἦν F)
2. 34. 1. 4 κἀγὼ ἐπὶ τὰς ἄγρας α (ἐπὶ τὰς ἄγρας κἀγὼ β)
7. 3. 6. 6 Μελίτη ἐστὶν β (Μελίτη τίς ἐστιν α)
4. 4. 6. 1 ἐπικάθεται γάρ τις αὐτῷ ἀνὴρ β (ἐπικάθεται γὰρ αὐτῷ τις ἀνὴρ α)
7. 7. 1. 2 πολλὴ ἦν αβ (ἦν πολλή Θ)<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> [αὐτῷ] Jackson, unnecessarily.

<sup>2</sup> The other instance of ὥςπερ after a vowel has been put in 5 (c) because no participle accompanies it.

<sup>3</sup> Vilborg's remarks about Θ on p. xxxi

derive from Dörrie, notwithstanding that B. A. Müller in a valuable review (*Phil. Woch.* lvii [1937], 925-7) had shown him to be guilty of misinterpreting Jacobs's introduction.

8. 10. 4. 3 ἤδη οὕτω φανερώς β (οὕτω *om.* α)

In 13 places Vilborg has introduced hiatus by a questionable emendation :

1. 18. 2. 4 ἦ <ή> Jacobs
2. 19. 6. 3 τὴν Κλειῶ [τε] ἐπεπείκει Jacobs (*si recte, πεπείκει scribendum*)
4. 14. 3. 1 ταύτη οἱ Jacobs (ταύτην *codd.*)
4. 14. 6. 3 πάντη ὑπὲρ Hercher (παντός *codd.*)
5. 18. 4. 5 τῷ ἐτέρῳ ἀνδρὶ Cobet (τῶν ἐτέρων ἀνδρῶν *codd.*; τῶν ἀνδρῶν ἐτέρῳ?)
6. 10. 2. 1 αὐτῇ ἦν Vilborg (αὐτὴν *codd.*)
7. 1. 5. 1 τῷ Θερσάνδρῳ [τὸ] εὑρεθὲν Cobet
7. 6. 5. 2 ἀπολύει <ὁ ἐπὶ> anon.
7. 13. 1. 5 προὔξενει ἀποχρηθεῖαι Cobet (προὔξενει. ἀποχρήται WRG, *recte*<sup>1</sup>)
8. 3. 1. 2 οὗτοι ἐκάκιζον Jacobs (οὕτως *codd.*)
8. 7. 4. 3 ἐπισταμένη οἷῳ Hercher (ἐπισταμένην *codd.*)
8. 8. 13. 3 χώρῃ <ἐν> Jacobs
8. 14. 3. 3 πηγῇ ἔστηκεν Jacobs (πηγῇ δὲ ἔστηκεν β, *aliter* α)

Hiatus occurs in 4 passages that have been declared corrupt for other reasons :

2. 35. 2. 3 ῥᾶον δ' ἂν εἴποι νῦν ἦτοι ὡς κοινωνὸν ἔρωτος εὐρών (ἦ τότε Cobet, ἦτοι *del.* Richards, ἦτοι . . . εὐρών *del.* Castiglioni)
4. 9. 2. 4 μανία εἴη τις ἐπὶ τὸ κακὸν (μανία τις ἐστὶ Jacobs, *fort.* μανία τις εἴη)
8. 8. 12. 2 τὸν μέντοι ἀξιῶ τῆς αὐθαδείας δοῦναι τιμωρίαν, τὸν δὲ . . . (μὲν οὖν Hercher<sup>2</sup>)
8. 10. 3. 1 πέμψει εἰς (μέμψει Götting, *sed locus nondum sanatus*)

Hiatus occurs after a number of monosyllables: ᾄ (4), κύ (2), ἦ, ποῖ, πρό, εὔ (εὔ ἵσθι), 3. 1. 5. 5 ἦ ἡώρητο (γὰρ F, δ Cobet), 5. 9. 1. 5 ᾤ ἐγὼ β (δ' ἐγὼ α), 5. 23. 7. 2 ᾤ ἀνθρώπῳ, 1. 2. 2. 2 ᾤ ἀγαθὲ αF (ὡγαθέ β).

Short vowels occur before another vowel 12 times: -ματι (4), πάνν (3), πολύ, ἄστν, δριμύ, ἐνί, ἄρτι.

There are 11 occurrences of hiatus before a verbal prefix :

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| 1. 15. 6. 3 πηγῇ ἀνέβλυζε                               | 5. 24. 1. 3 Μελίτη ἀναιρεῖται          |
| 2. 17. 1. 2 θεωροὶ ἀπέπλευσαν                           | 7. 7. 1. 1 ὑστεραῖα ἀπηγόμην           |
| 3. 17. 4. 3 σφαγῇ ἀποθνήσκειν                           | (pause? τῆς δ' ὑστεραίας Jackson)      |
| 3. 20. 6. 1 κίστη ἐκτραπέῖσα                            | 8. 4. 1. 1 κἀγὼ ἐξέλεθ' ὅν β (προς- α) |
| 5. 13. 4. 3 ἀεὶ ἐναπομάττεται (ἀεὶ <i>del.</i> Jackson) | 8. 6. 13. 4 θύραι ἀνεψήχθησαν          |
| 5. 23. 5. 2 Μελίτη ἀνέθορεν                             | 8. 16. 5. 2 αὐτῷ ἀφήσειν               |

and 8 before the augment :

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| 1. 1. 9. 5 θαλάσῃ ἐγγράπτο (but read γέγραπτο with Jackson) | 2. 35. 1. 4 μυχῷ ἐκάθευδε              |
| 2. 34. 3. 5 σπουδῇ ἔτρεχεν                                  | 4. 2. 1. 4 Νείλου ἐκάλουν (καλοῦσιν F) |
|   | 5. 9. 1. 5 ἐγὼ ἔτυχον (but see below)  |

<sup>1</sup> ἀποχρήται owes its rescue from the apparatus to Mr. O'Sullivan. The blame for printing ἀποχρηθεῖαι attaches not to Cobet,

who knew only the reading ἀποχρησαι, but to Vilborg.

<sup>2</sup> μὲν τοί<γυν> O'Sullivan.

5. 15. 2. 2 *Κλεωιά* ἐδόκει *λυτο* with Jackson)  
 7. 4. 1. 3 *μου ἐλέλυτο* (but read *λέ-* 7. 5. 2. 3 *Τύχη* ἔπαιξε

and 4 before ἐπί:

2. 14. 2. 3 *χρησμοῦ* ἐστι 6. 16. 5. 3 *αὔτη* ἐστὶ  
 4. 4. 4. 1 *τοιαύτη* ἐστὶν 8. 9. 11. 2 *ἐσπέρα* ἐστί

and 5 before ὁ:

1. 13. 2. 3 *θρήνου* ὁ  
 3. 21. 3. 3 *λέγει* ὁ *χρησμός* (ὁ *χρησμός* del. anon., and it seems to be absent from the new papyrus<sup>1</sup>; the sentence is a mess, but in any case ὁ *χρησμός* is not likely to have been repeated from the previous sentence)  
 4. 10. 2. 3 *στρατηγῷ* ὁ  
 4. 12. 5. 3 *τόπου* ὁ  
 6. 10. 1. 2 *ζητῇ*σιν ὁ

and 2 after ἐγώ (but see above):

1. 16. 1. 1 *ἐγὼ* εὐάγων(ἐγὼ om. M) 8. 17. 2. 1 *καγὼ* ἀκούσας

These are the singularities:

1. 12. 3. 2 *πηδᾶ* ὄρθιος  
 1. 15. 3. 4 *τῷ* *κιττῷ* ὄχημα (ὄχημα *τῷ* *κιττῷ*?)  
 1. 15. 5. 4 *ναρκίσσω* ἢ *κάλυξ* (ἢ *κάλυξ* om. Θ; delete ἢ?)  
 1. 16. 2. 3 *μέντοι* οὐκ  
 2. 9. 1. 2 *ῥυνοχόει* ἡμῖν Π<sup>2</sup>  
 2. 26. 3. 2 *λέγει* ἢ (λέγει <οδν> ἢ?)  
 2. 30. 2. 2 *μου οὕτως* (delete *μου*?)  
 2. 37. 3. 3 *κατέβη* ὠμητῆς (ὠμητῆς *κατέβη*?)  
 2. 37. 4. 3 *τις ἀναβαίνει* εἰς (ἀναβαίνει *τις* εἰς?)  
 2. 37. 4. 3 *ἀνέβη* Ἡρακλῆς (ἀνέβη <καὶ> Ἡρακλῆς Jacobs)  
 3. 2. 9. 5 *ἦδη* ἢ *ναῦς* (ἢ *ναῦς* ἦδη?)  
 3. 3. 1. 2 *εὐτρεπίζει* ἦδη (εὐτρεπίζειν Carney; fort. *ἠὲ* *εὐτρεπίζειν*)  
 3. 13. 3. 4 *ποιεῖ* ἐν *ταὐτῷ* (ἐν *ταὐτῷ* *ποιεῖ*?)  
 3. 15. 5. 2 *ἐπεὶ* ὠπτήθη  
 3. 22. 2. 5 *παρ'* αὐτῷ ἢ *χάρις* (ἢ del. Hercher)  
 3. 24. 1. 1 *ἄμα* δὲ *τῇ* ἔω ἄγω τὸν *Μενέλαον* *τῷ* *στρατηγῷ* (*προσάγω* Jacobs<sup>3</sup>)  
 4. 10. 2. 3 *στρατοπέδου* ἱατρὸν  
 4. 11. 2. 5 *τῇ* δ' ὑστεραία *ἄμα* *τῇ* ἡμέρᾳ (pause? cf. 7. 7. 1. 1 above; *τῆς* δ' ὑστεραίας Jackson)  
 5. 5. 2. 2 *Πρόκνη* ἀηδῶν  
 5. 7. 4. 4 *ἀποτέμνει* αὐτῆς *τὴν* *κεφαλὴν* (τὴν *κεφαλὴν* αὐτῆς? cf. 8. 16. 6. 4 ἀποκόπτει *τὴν* *κεφαλὴν* αὐτοῦ)  
 5. 15. 1. 2 *ἐκάλει* ἡμᾶς (ἡμᾶς *ἐκάλει*? or delete ἡμᾶς?)  
 5. 17. 3. 5 *ἀνεζωσμένη* ἄθλιον

<sup>1</sup> P. Colon. inv. 901, published by Henrichs in *Zeitschrift für Pap. und Epigr.* ii (1968), 211–26.

<sup>2</sup> See Appendix.

<sup>3</sup> This also appears to be the reading of the new papyrus: *ἄμα* δὲ ἔω π[.

5. 19. 2. 2 ἐξ Αἰδου ἦκεις φέρων (φέρων ἦκεις?)  
 6. 10. 1. 2 ταμεινκαμένη αὔθις  
 6. 10. 4. 4 Φήμη ὕδατος (pause?¹)  
 6. 12. 4. 3 Κόδρου εὐγενέστερος  
 6. 13. 3. 1 Λευκίππη οὐκέτι μυθολογοῦντα πρὸς αὐτὸν (πρὸς αὐτὸν οὐκέτι  
 μυθολογοῦντα? or delete οὐκέτι?)  
 6. 17. 3. 4 ἐκείνου εἰς  
 7. 10. 4. 5 ἐξελαύνει ἐπὶ Κυμύρης (<τῇν> ἐπὶ Cobet)  
 7. 16. 1. 4 εἴη αὐτὸς (αὐτὸς εἴη is virtually certain)  
 8. 2. 3. 3 ἀνθρωπίνῳ αἵματι  
 8. 5. 7. 5 ἦρα ἐκ  
 8. 6. 4. 2 ὅσοι εἰς  
 8. 6. 10. 5 ἐνέπνει ἄνωθεν  
 8. 7. 1. 2 ἐτοίμη εἰς²  
 8. 7. 6. 2 ἡντρεπισμέναι ἦσαν  
 8. 9. 9. 4 κοῦ ἀληθῶς (ἀληθῶς is worse than redundant whether after κοῦ or  
 before ὑπανάστηθι)  
 8. 10. 11. 3 ἐωνημένη ἦλθε (ἦλθε *del.* Jacobs)  
 8. 12. 8. 4 ὅταν τις αἰτίαν ἔχη Ἀφροδισίῳ (ὅταν αἰτίαν ἔχη τις Ἀφροδισίῳ?  
 cf. 8. 6. 12. 1 ὅταν οὖν αἰτίαν ἔχη τις οὐκ εἶναι παρθένος)  
 8. 13. 1. 3 Λευκίππη ἱερᾷ (<τῇ> ἱερᾷ Cobet)  
 8. 14. 3. 3 ἐνέβη εἰς  
 8. 17. 4. 4 ἐπειδὴ ἦκεν

Now it would admittedly be rash to import into any text in such number the kind of alterations that have been suggested here, for if the tradition is on the whole sound they can scarcely be necessary and if it is corrupt other remedies quite unsuspected are just as likely to be right; but the tradition of Achilles, for all its richness, seethes with corruption, and passages abound where it is totally uncertain how he expressed himself. A glance at P.Oxy. 1250, which dates from about 300, will disillusion anyone who thinks the medieval tradition rests on secure foundations.

The text of Chariton depends in large part on one manuscript notoriously capricious, Laurentianus 627, F of Achilles Tatius, A of Longus, *cod. unicus* of Xenophon,<sup>3</sup> which diverges considerably from the lost sixth-century fragment Theb. and in a smaller way from three second-century papyri. Blake's edition (Oxford, 1938) is indifferent.<sup>4</sup>

Chariton elides -αι 13 times.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Fraenkel (see p. 516 n. 3), 103-11.

<sup>2</sup> An unpublished papyrus that Mr. P. J. Parsons kindly allows me to quote reads ἐγὼ γὰρ ἐτοίμη τῆς ὑστερίας (i.e. τῆς ὑστερίας: cf. 3. 20. 2. 1 προτεραία βF προτέρα α) εἰς τὸ τῆς κύριγγος σπήλαιον καὶ χωρὶς κλήσεως κατακεκλεισθαι.

<sup>3</sup> Perry has an interesting note on the manuscript in *The Ancient Romanes* (1967), 344-5, due mainly to Professor Aubrey Diller. Its text of Xenophon is evidently not unique after all, because the British

Museum possesses a copy written in the sixteenth century.

<sup>4</sup> The reference in Lesky's *Geschichte der griechischen Literatur*<sup>2</sup> (1963), 926 to a text and translation by F. Zimmermann (1960) actually leads to an essay on the architectural history of Dresden. In a footnote to a paper on Chariton written in 1959 and published in 1961, Zimmermann expressed the hope that his text would appear in the course of 1962, but the world is still waiting for it.

He allows hiatus freely after  $\mu\eta$  (28),  $\eta$  (14),  $\epsilon\iota$  (5),  $\mu\omicron\iota$  (5<sup>1</sup>) and  $\sigma\omicron\iota$  (45),  $\tau\iota$  (10) and  $\tau\iota$  (9), and  $\pi\epsilon\rho\iota$  (13), and at the following pauses (few enough to be catalogued) :

1. (a) Before ἀλλά (2. 4. 2. 3)  
 (b) Before  $\eta$  (6. 1. 1. 2)  
 (c) Before οὐδέ (3. 7. 2. 2 conj.)  
 (d) Before a second  $\epsilon\iota\tau\epsilon$  (7. 4. 10. 4)
2. Before μέν/δέ (1. 13. 7. 1<sup>2</sup>; 2. 5. 1. 1<sup>3</sup>; 5. 8. 10. 1; 8. 8. 1. 2)
3. (a) Before voc. (2. 1. 8. 3  $\sigma\omicron\upsilon$ ,  $\omega$ ;  $\sigma\omicron\iota$  Hercher; 2. 4. 7. 1  $\sigma\omicron\iota$ ,  $\omega$  conj.; 6. 2. 7. 3  $\sigma\omicron\iota$ , ἀνόητε conj.)  
 (b) After voc. (5. 6. 1. 2 βασιλεῦ,  $\eta\eta$  to be classified under 5 (d))
4. (a) After adv. or noun clause (3. 5. 7. 7  $\epsilon\omega\varsigma$ ; 5. 4. 11. 1  $\epsilon\iota$ ; 8. 5. 11. 2  $\omega\varsigma\pi\epsilon\rho$ ; 8. 5. 13. 6  $\epsilon\pi\epsilon\iota$ )  
 (b) After part. (1. 14. 6. 4 conj.; 3. 3. 17. 3 or delete  $\delta$ ; 4. 4. 1. 5; 5. 1. 5. 3 or read Χαιρέον ζώντοcs; 5. 8. 1. 2; 5. 10. 8. 2; 6. 9. 2. 3; 8. 4. 7. 3 or read τὴν Cτάτειραν; 8. 4. 9. 3; 8. 4. 10. 3 or delete  $\eta$ ; 8. 5. 11. 3 *v.l.*)  
 (c) After parenth. or epex. (8. 8. 13. 2<sup>3</sup>)
5. (a) Before adv. or noun clause (5. 4. 3. 6  $\iota\upsilon\alpha$ ; 5. 5. 4. 3  $\epsilon\pi\alpha\nu$ ; 7. 3. 6. 5  $\epsilon\iota$  = whether; 7. 3. 10. 4  $\epsilon\pi\epsilon\iota$ )  
 (b) Before part. (1. 12. 2. 5+ $\omega\varsigma$  but without part.; 2. 1. 1. 6+ $\omega\varsigma$ ; 2. 3. 10. 2 conj.; 6. 9. 7. 3+ $\omega\varsigma$ ; 7. 5. 1. 1; 8. 1. 2. 4+ $\sigma\upsilon\chi$   $\omega\varsigma$ ; 8. 5. 2. 5+ $\omega\varsigma$ )  
 (c) Before epex. (2. 4. 7. 4; 5. 1. 3. 4; 5. 7. 10. 2; 6. 7. 10. 2; 8. 1. 14. 1)  
 (d) Before rel. (1. 12. 7. 2 see below; 2. 6. 3. 6; 4. 5. 1. 1; 6. 7. 7. 3 *aliter* Cobet; 8. 1. 8. 2; 8. 4. 8. 5; 8. 4. 9. 5)
6. Before asyndeton (5. 8. 2. 4; 8. 1. 11. 2)

Hiatus is associated with direct speech and  $\epsilon\phi\eta(\nu)$  in the following ways:

- (a) Before direct speech (3. 5. 5. 3 and 8. 4. 8. 2 after part., i.e. 4 (b), and 6. 7. 8. 2  $\epsilon\phi\eta$  “οὐ”)
- (b) Before . . .”  $\epsilon\phi\eta$  (6. 4. 8. 3  $\epsilon\gamma\omega$ ”  $\epsilon\phi\eta$ ; 7. 6. 11. 1 οὐ”  $\epsilon\phi\eta$ ;  $\phi\eta\varsigma\iota$  Cobet; 8. 3. 13. 2 τοῦτω”  $\epsilon\phi\eta$ , conj.)
- (c) After . . .”  $\epsilon\phi\eta$  “. . . (2. 5. 8. 1 < $\epsilon\phi\eta$ > “αἰτοῦμαι conj.)

Blake introduces hiatus in 15 other places by a questionable emendation, often of his own:

1. 6. 3. 4  $\epsilon\nu$  μέσῳ  $\delta$  δῆμος Blake ( $\epsilon\nu$  μέσῳ τῷ δῆμῳ F)
2. 2. 2. 5 δοκοῦσαι ἰδεῖν Blake ( $\epsilon\delta\omicron\varsigma\alpha\nu$  ἰδοῦσαι F)
2. 5. 3. 5 αὐτοῦ ἐπικαλέσεται Abresch (αὐτόν F)
2. 8. 2. 1 κκόπει οὐν Reiske (αῖν F;  $\delta\eta$ ?)
3. 3. 17. 5  $\epsilon\alpha\nu\tau\omicron\upsilon$   $\omega\varsigma$  Blake ( $\epsilon\alpha\nu\tau\omega$  F)
3. 8. 2. 5 λεχὼν  $\epsilon\tau\iota$  d’Orville (λεχὼς F)
3. 10. 2. 1  $\alpha$   $\eta\delta\epsilon\alpha\nu$  Reiske ( $\delta\epsilon$   $\eta\delta\epsilon\alpha\nu$  F)
4. 1. 6. 4  $\delta\eta$   $\omega\varsigma$  Blake ( $\delta\epsilon$   $\omega\varsigma$  F)

<sup>1</sup> But at 1. 14. 7. 1 read πατὴρ γὰρ αἶν ἐκεῖ μοι or πατὴρ γὰρ αἶν μοι ἐκεῖ.

<sup>2</sup> τῆς  $\delta$ ’ ὑπεραιας Jackson.

<sup>3</sup> τῆς ὑπεραιας Jackson.

4. 2. 5. 6 δραμῶ ἐπεχείρουν Cobet (δραμὸν F)  
 5. 5. 9. 7 τραύματι ἐρωτικῶ Blake (τι θαῦμα ἐρωτικὸν F)  
 6. 6. 5. 5 ὁμιλία ἐρωτική Hilberg (ὁμιλία πρώτη καὶ F)  
 6. 7. 7. 7 πείσῃ ἄκουσα Blake (πεισθῆς ἀκούεις F)  
 7. 3. 1. 1 μόνοι <οί> Blake  
 7. 3. 11. 6 Μιλτιάδου ἡ . . . τριακοσίους d'Orville (Μιθριδάτου τριακοσίους ἡ F)  
 8. 2. 14. 2 προσήκει ἄκοντας Cobet (προσῆκεν F)

and in one place by questionable punctuation :

3. 6. 5. 2 “αὐτῇ ἡ (αὐτῇ;”. “ἡ *edd. cett.*)

In one place Blake prefers a variant not demonstrably superior :

8. 5. 12. 7 τὴν ἐπιστολὴν ἡσυχῇ ἐπιδίδωσιν F (ἡσυχῇ τὴν ἐπιστολὴν ἐπιδίδωσιν Theb.)

Hiatus occurs after a number of monosyllables: *κύ* (4), *πρό* (2), *ὄ* (2), 2. 6. 3. 2 ὦ Ἀφροδίτη, 2. 7. 1. 2 τὸ δὲ δὴ ἀληθές (delete δὴ?), 3. 6. 3. 4 *κη* ἑορτῇ, 7. 2. 4. 7 ζῶ εἰς, 8. 4. 5. 1 εἶ ὁ (*aliter* Hercher); and short vowels: *πολύ* (3), *πάνυ* (2), *μεταξύ* (2), dative singular (11).

Hiatus occurs 8 times before a verbal prefix :

- |             |                    |             |                            |
|-------------|--------------------|-------------|----------------------------|
| 1. 1. 12. 5 | νέοι ἀπήεσαν       | 7. 3. 11. 7 | Χαιρέου ἀνευφημῆουσιν      |
| 2. 3. 4. 4  | ἵππῳ ἐπέβη         |             | (ἀνευφημῆουσιν <i>del.</i> |
| 3. 7. 7. 7  | πρεσβεῖαι ἀφίκοντο |             | d'Orville)                 |
| 4. 2. 2. 6  | αὐτοὶ ἀποδώσομεν   | 7. 5. 5. 6  | Καλλιρρόῃ ἀπαντήσασα       |
| 5. 8. 1. 2  | Καλλιρρόῃ ἀνέκραγε | 8. 3. 12. 5 | ἐθελονταὶ ἐνέβησαν         |

and 5 times before the augment :

- |             |                   |             |                  |
|-------------|-------------------|-------------|------------------|
| 1. 4. 11. 2 | Καλλιρρόῃ ἐκάθητο | 6. 1. 2. 4  | ληστὰι ἐπώλησαν  |
|             | (καθῆστο Hercher) | 7. 6. 4. 2  | χαμαὶ ἐκαθέζοντο |
| 3. 4. 8. 1  | μέσῳ ἔστη         | 8. 3. 10. 4 | ἐγὼ ἐβουλόμην    |

Hiatus occurs 4 times before *οὖν* and twice after *ἐπειδή*.

The remaining instances are these :

1. 1. 6. 4 τῷ ἐτέρῳ ὀφθῇ (Cobet; *cod. evan.*)  
 1. 3. 2. 2 κώμου †ῆσαν καὶ† (κώμου ἡσυχῇ Blake, with hiatus)  
 1. 12. 7. 1 αὐτοῦ ἡ (read ἡ γυνὴ γὰρ αὐτοῦ τέθηκεν ἥς ἥρα?)  
 1. 13. 10. 2 ἡ δὲ γὰρ πωλουμένη ἡπίστατο (read ἦδει γὰρ πωλουμένη? but there is further corruption hereabouts)  
 1. 13. 10. 3 πάλαι εὐγενείας (ταλαιπωρίας Cobet)  
 1. 14. 5. 4 τῇ δ' ὑστεραία ἐπὶ (τῆς δ' ὑστεραίας Jackson; pause? cf. 5. 3. 11. 2 below, Ach. Tat. 4. 11. 2. 5 etc.)  
 2. 2. 5. 2 λέγει ἡ (εἶπεν ἡ Heibges 76–7)  
 2. 8. 3. 1 κατεστρατηγημένη ὑπὸ (<δ'> ὑπὸ Hercher)  
 2. 8. 7. 6 αὐτῇ ἔκτρων  
 2. 9. 6. 2 αὐτῇ εἰκὼν  
 2. 9. 6. 2 αὐτῷ ὅμοια (ὅμοια *del.* Abresch, *recte*)  
 2. 10. 8. 5 θατέρου ἔχεσθαι (θάτερον ἐλέσθαι Schmidt)

2. 11. 1. 6 ἑτέρου ἀνδρὸς  
 3. 1. 4. 2 τοσαύτη ἦν (τοσαύτη < . . > ἦν Jackson)  
 3. 2. 17. 3 ἀπελείφθη ἐν  
 3. 3. 17. 3 αὐτῷ ὁ  
 3. 4. 8. 3 ἑμαυτοῦ ἀδελφόν  
 3. 5. 3. 4 ὁμοῦ εὐχαί  
 3. 5. 7. 4 ὥφθη ἐν  
 3. 8. 5. 4 μόνη ἠθέλησε  
 3. 9. 5. 3 οὐρανοῦ ἀντεραστήν  
 4. 6. 4. 4 διαφθείρει αὐτοῦ  
 4. 6. 7. 7 ἐπιστολῇ ὄνομα (τοῦνομα d'Orville, recte)  
 4. 7. 8. 6 ἐδόκει ἐγγυς  
 5. 3. 11. 2 ἡμέρᾳ ἀκροάσομαι (pause? cf. on 1. 14. 5. 4 above)  
 5. 4. 4. 3 ὅλη ἡ Βαβυλῶν (delete ἡ? cf. 6. 1. 5. 4 ὅλην Βαβυλῶνα)  
 5. 6. 6. 4 βούλει εἶναι  
 5. 9. 2. 2 αὕτη ἐστὶ  
 6. 3. 2. 3 παρ' ἐμοὶ ἐμοῦ (παρ' ἐμὲ Hilberg)  
 6. 5. 6. 2 ἐπλήγη ὥσπερ<sup>1</sup>  
 6. 8. 4. 3 μεγάλη Ἀσίαν  
 7. 2. 1. 1 προσποιούμενοι ἐθέλειν (θέλειν Hercher)  
 7. 3. 2. 2 ἐναντίῳ ἀνέμῳ (ἐναντίῳ < τῷ > ἀνέμῳ Jackson)  
 7. 4. 13. 2 κατειλήφει ὁ  
 7. 5. 7. 2 ἀρκεῖ Αἴγυπτος, (Αἴγυπτος ἀρκεῖ would produce a favoured clausula)  
 7. 5. 13. 2 κυμβολῇ ἡγωνίσατο  
 8. 1. 5. 1 δίκαιοι ἐν τούτῳ  
 8. 2. 12. 5 ὅπου οὐ (read ὅπου μὴ?)  
 8. 4. 5. 1 (= 8. 5. 13. 6) Διονυσίῳ εὐεργέτῃ  
 8. 8. 13. 2 ἀγαθῷ ἀνδρὶ

'Er vermeidet noch sorgfältig den Hiatus', Schmid, P.-W. 'Chariton' 2169.<sup>2</sup> Yes; but the manuscript does not.

The least objectionable text of Longus is Seiler's (1843), but as the readings of the manuscripts are buried away in the notes at the back recourse must be had to Kairis (Athens 1932) or Dalmeyda (Budé 1934)—conditional and provisional recourse, however, because according to Professor Douglas Young<sup>3</sup> Dalmeyda's apparatus needs correcting in over 300 places.

Longus elides -αι 10 times.

<sup>1</sup> This instance apart, Chariton uses ὥσπερ after a consonant both in the middle (19) and at the beginning (7) of a sentence, after καί (7), and after ὅτι (1). καθάπερ follows a long vowel (2), a consonant (6. 9. 4. 5, 7. 1. 2. 3), and a short vowel both in the middle (3) and at the beginning (3) of a sentence. This instance is therefore highly suspect (read ὥσπερ ὑπὸ ξίφους ἐπλήγη τοῦ λόγου?), and so is ὅτι ὥσπερ at 7. 3. 2. 2, the more so because ὅτι καθάπερ does occur (4. 4. 1. 3).

Heliodorus' only obvious rule in the use of

ὥσπερ (107) and καθάπερ (38) is not to put ὥσπερ after a long vowel. Achilles has ὥσπερ after a long vowel in 3 places out of 42 and uses καθάπερ only 3 times. For Longus' practice see p. 530 n. 1. Iamblichus has πάντων ὥσπερ (p. 7. 14), διαπλεύονται καθάπερ (p. 7. 18), and φοικικωτέρους ὥσπερ (fr. 96). Ninus has πρώτων ὥσπερ, ἄγω καθάπερ, καὶ καθάπερ, and ]για καθάπερ. Metiochus has φύσεως καθάπερ.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Hercher cited on p. 515 above.

<sup>3</sup> Proc. Camb. Phil. Soc. cxciv (1968), 65.

He uses hiatus freely after  $\mu\eta$  (4),  $\eta$  (7),  $\delta\eta$  (2),  $\epsilon\iota$  (3),  $\mu\omicron\iota$  (2),  $\delta\tau\iota$  (10),  $\tau\iota$  (7),  $\tau\acute{\iota}$  (4) and  $\delta\iota\acute{o}\tau\iota$  (1), and  $\pi\epsilon\rho\acute{\iota}$  (7).

He allows hiatus at the following pauses :

1. (a) Before  $\alpha\lambda\lambda\acute{\alpha}$  (3)  
 (b) Before  $\eta$  (2. 22. 4. 3)  
 (c) Before  $\omicron\upsilon\delta\acute{\epsilon}$  (2. 34. 2. 1)  
 (d) Before  $\omicron\upsilon\tau\epsilon$  (1. 27. 2. 4)
2. Before  $\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu/\delta\acute{\epsilon}$  (1. 22. 2. 3, 2. 2. 1. 2, 3. 21. 4. 3)
4. (a) After an adv. clause ( $\epsilon\pi\epsilon\iota$  3. 22. 3. 2,  $\acute{\omega}\varsigma$  = when 4. 34. 3. 2.)  
 (b) After part. (6)
5. (a) Before an adv. clause ( $\acute{\omega}\varsigma\tau\epsilon$  6,  $\delta\tau\iota$  = because 4. 32. 3. 4)  
 (b) Before part. (2. 39. 2. 5)  
 (c) Before epex. (2. 1. 4. 2, 3. 21. 4. 3)  
 (d) Before rel. (9)
6. Before asyndeton (2. 23. 1. 3, 2. 32. 3. 3)

Hiatus is associated only once with direct speech or  $\epsilon\phi\eta$  :

- (a) Before direct speech 4. 35. 2. 5  $\epsilon\phi\eta$  “ $\eta\nu$ ”

Only 3 of these instances are at all suspect, 2 in 4 (b) and the one last mentioned. In both 2. 14. 3. 2  $\omicron\iota$   $\delta'$   $\omicron\upsilon\kappa$   $\acute{o}\lambda\acute{\iota}\gamma\omega\nu$   $\chi\rho\eta\mu\acute{\alpha}\tau\omega\nu$   $\omicron\iota$   $M\eta\theta\upsilon\mu\eta\nu\alpha\iota\omicron\iota$   $\sigma\tau\epsilon\rho\acute{o}\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\iota$   $\epsilon\zeta\eta\tau\omicron\upsilon\nu$  . . . (*varie mutaverunt edd.*) and 4. 19. 1. 1  $\omicron\iota$   $\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu$   $\tau\alpha\upsilon\tau\alpha$   $\sigma\upsilon\nu\theta\acute{\epsilon}\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\iota$   $\alpha\pi\eta\lambda\theta\omicron\nu$   $\epsilon\zeta\omega$   $\pi\acute{\alpha}\lambda\upsilon$  there ought to be no pause heavy enough for hiatus after the participial phrase, sandwiched as it is between subject and verb (in the latter passage read  $\pi\alpha\rho\eta\lambda\theta\omicron\nu$ ?), and  $\epsilon\phi\eta$  “ $\eta\nu$ ” at 4. 35. 2. 5 might be expected to have had some parallel in a novel whose characters are continually saying things.

Hiatus occurs in 7 variants that are not demonstrably superior but are accepted by Dalmeyda :

2. 23. 4. 3  $\tau\acute{o}\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon$   $\epsilon\delta\epsilon\eta\theta\eta\mu\epsilon\nu$  A ( $\tau\omicron\upsilon\tau\omicron\nu$  B)
2. 35. 2. 3  $\acute{\epsilon}\nu$   $\kappa\alpha\theta\acute{\epsilon}\delta\rho\alpha$   $\acute{o}\rho\theta\iota\omicron\nu$  B ( $\acute{\epsilon}\varsigma$   $\kappa\alpha\theta\acute{\epsilon}\delta\rho\alpha\nu$  A)
3. 9. 1. 4  $\tau\omicron\iota\omicron\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon$   $\gamma\eta\rho\omicron\tau\rho\acute{o}\phi\omicron\upsilon$   $\epsilon\upsilon\tau\upsilon\chi\acute{\eta}\kappa\alpha\nu\tau\alpha\varsigma$  B ( $\tau\omicron\iota\omicron\upsilon\tau\omicron\nu$   $\gamma\eta\rho\omicron\tau\rho\acute{o}\phi\omicron\nu$  A according to Cobet, *Variae Lectiones*, 180)
4. 8. 2. 2  $\kappa\alpha\iota$   $\mu\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\iota\tau\tau\alpha\iota$   $\alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\iota\varsigma$  A ( $\alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\iota\varsigma$   $\kappa\alpha\iota$   $\mu\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\iota\tau\tau\alpha\iota$  B)
4. 24. 4. 1  $\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\acute{\omega}$   $\acute{\upsilon}\mu\acute{\iota}\nu$  A ( $\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\acute{\omega}$  om. B)
4. 25. 2. 2  $\theta\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\epsilon\iota$   $\epsilon\acute{\iota}\nu\alpha\iota$  A ( $\eta\nu$  B)
4. 33. 4. 3  $\acute{\epsilon}\kappa\acute{\iota}\tau\tau\alpha$   $\eta$  A ( $\acute{\epsilon}\kappa\iota\nu\epsilon\acute{\iota}\tau\omicron$   $\eta$  B)

Dalmeyda has introduced hiatus in 10 places by a questionable emendation and in one place by an oversight :

1. 8. 1. 2  $\alpha\acute{\iota}\pi\acute{o}\lambda\omicron\iota$  < $\omicron\iota$ > Hercher
1. 13. 2. 7  $\tau\rho\upsilon\phi\epsilon\rho\omega\tau\epsilon\rho\alpha$   $\epsilon\acute{\iota}\eta$  Cobet ( $\tau\rho\upsilon\phi\epsilon\rho\acute{\omega}\tau\epsilon\rho\omicron\nu$  A,  $\tau\rho\upsilon\phi\epsilon\rho\acute{\omega}\tau\epsilon\rho\omicron\varsigma$  Geel)
2. 11. 1. 1  $\kappa\alpha\theta\epsilon\zeta\acute{o}\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\iota$  (A) < $\acute{\epsilon}\pi\iota$ > Jungermann
2. 28. 3. 1  $\kappa\acute{\alpha}\kappa\epsilon\acute{\iota}\nu\eta$  [ $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$ ]  $\acute{\alpha}\rho\tau\iota$  Hercher
2. 30. 3. 6  $\alpha\upsilon\tau\eta$   $\acute{o}\delta\acute{o}\nu$  ( $\alpha\upsilon\tau\eta$   $\tau\eta\nu$   $\acute{o}\delta\acute{o}\nu$  *codd. secundum edd. cett.*)
2. 38. 1. 3  $\eta\delta\eta$   $\acute{\epsilon}\pi\iota\gamma\iota\nu\omicron\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\eta\varsigma$  Hercher ( $\gamma\epsilon\gamma\epsilon\nu\eta\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\eta\varsigma$  *codd.*)
3. 21. 4. 1  $\tau\acute{\omega}$   $\pi\epsilon\delta\acute{\iota}\omega$   $\alpha\upsilon\lambda\acute{\omega}\nu$  Wyttenbach ( $\tau\acute{o}$   $\pi\epsilon\delta\acute{\iota}\omicron\nu$  *codd.*)



3. 34. 2. 4 δαπανήσῃ <ἐπι>κείμενον Courier  
 4. 2. 6. 5 μετοπώρου ὀπώρα Hinlopen (μετοπώρου τρυφή *codd.*)  
 4. 35. 5. 2 οἱ θεοὶ ὥσπερ Hirschig<sup>1</sup> (ὥσπερ οἱ θεοὶ *codd.*)  
 4. 39. 2. 7 Στρατιώτου ὀνομάσαντες Cobet (Στρατιώτην *codd.*)

Hiatus occurs in one passage that editors have declared corrupt for other reasons:

2. 18. 1. 6 ἀνακτησάμενη αὐτὸν (ἀνακτησόμενον Courier, ἀνακτησάμενον Seiler)

Short vowels occur before another vowel 34 times (which amounts to a mannerism): πάνυ (7), ἄρτι (3), μέλι (2), θῆλυ, dative singular (21).

Hiatus occurs after a number of monosyllables:

1. 7. 2. 2 φῖ (ἐν φῖ ἡ πηγὴ *del.* Naber)  
 1. 11. 22. 8 γῆ (γῆ <μὲν>? but μὲν/ἀλλά in Longus only at 2. 8. 5. 4)  
 1. 20. 3. 4 γῆ ἦν (γῆ *del.* Dalmeyda)  
 3. 10. 3. 6, 3. 14. 2. 3 ὄ  
 3. 16. 1. 2 ῆ

The remaining instances are not all singularities, but their number is so small that it did not seem worth creating separate classes:

- |                                       |                                    |
|---------------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| 1. 4. 2. 4 τὸ πᾶν σχῆμα χορεία ἦν     | 2. 34. 1. 1 αὐτῇ ἡ                 |
| ὀρχουμένων (χορεία <i>del.</i>        | 3. 6. 1. 1 δρόμῳ οὖν               |
| Tournier, ὀρχουμένων ἐν               | 3. 9. 1. 1 κενὴ ἄρτων καὶ κρεῶν    |
| χορεία Brunck)                        | (κρεῶν καὶ ἄρτων? cf.              |
| 1. 27. 1. 3 διδάσκει αὐτῇν            | 3. 11. 2. 3)                       |
| 2. 3. 2. 2 ἐκείνῳ ἐσύρισα             | 3. 10. 4. 1 πολλή ἐστι             |
| 2. 13. 4. 5 αἱ θραυτέραι αὐτῶν        | 3. 15. 2. 1 αὐτῇ ἡ Λυκαίνιον ὀρώσα |
| 2. 23. 1. 2 αὐτῷ αἱ B, ὀρᾷ ἡμι-       | A, αὐτῇ ὀρώσα B                    |
| γύννοιας A                            | 3. 20. 2. 5 ἀετοῦ δυνύχων          |
| 2. 23. 2. 2 λέγει ἐπιρρωννύουσα       | 3. 30. 5. 1 πλείω ἔλεγεν           |
| 2. 24. 1. 2 κοινῇ ὕφ' B (κινῶν μεστός | 4. 1. 1. 2 τρυγητοῦ ὄ              |
| A)                                    | 4. 1. 2. 1 ἥδη οὖν                 |
| 2. 24. 4. 5 ἐκείνη ἔδοξε              | 4. 2. 2. 5 καρποῦ αὐταῖς           |
| 2. 31. 1. 5 τροφῇ ἦν                  | 4. 5. 2. 2 αὐτῷ ἔργον              |
| 2. 33. 2. 2 πέμπει οὖν                | 4. 23. 2. 2 πάλαι εἰδῶς (elided?)  |

Some of these instances are so intractable that Longus himself may have been under constraint; but since he allows his distaste for hiatus to drive him into artificiality,<sup>2</sup> suspicion is justified.

<sup>1</sup> This conjecture is beyond question illicit, for Longus is as sensitive as anyone to the difference between ὥσπερ and καθάπερ. ὥσπερ he uses after a consonant (25), καί (8), δέ (4), and ἀλλά (2), καθάπερ after other short vowels (9) and all long vowels (10). The exceptions are 1. 32. 4. 5 ἐπέλειπε καθάπερ (ἐπέλειπεν ὥσπερ would have been perverse when καθάπερ has just preceded in a balancing phrase), 3. 12. 4. 1 κύουγος καθάπερ (to avoid an excess of

sigmas?), 4. 25. 2. 6 νύκτα ὥσπερ (too many short syllables in νύκτα καθάπερ ἱκέτης?).

W. Norlind, 'När levde Longos?', *Eranos*, xxiv (1926), 189-91, appears to have been too sweeping and in part misguided on this point (p. 190); indeed, his remarks about hiatus in Longus are altogether too superficial.

<sup>2</sup> e.g. 1. 15. 1. 2 ὁ βουκόλος ὁ τὸν Δάφνιν ἐκ τοῦ κυροῦ καὶ τὸν τράγον ἀνιμνιάμενος, 1. 21. 2. 1 οἱ κύνες οἱ τῶν προβάτων ἐπὶ

It used to be a popular notion that Longus, 'al pari di Eliano, non cerca di evitare l'iato, da cui si guardano accuratamente gli scrittori sino al II secolo' (Garin, *S.I.F.C.* xvii (1909), 455), and that he must therefore be a contemporary of Aelian and Philostratus. Once the misapprehension about hiatus is dispelled, scholars who would like to place him in the second century need have no qualms.

Xenophon<sup>1</sup> poses an unusual problem. He owes his survival to Laurentianus 627, but more correctly he barely survives in his own person at all, because

φυλακῇ (Hercher; ἐπὶ φυλακὴν A) καὶ τῶν αἰγῶν ἐπόμενοι, 2. 26. 3. 5 αἶ τε γὰρ ἄγκυραι κατὰ βυθοῦ πειρωμένων ἀναφέρειν ἔμενον (κατὰ βυθοῦ *post* ἀναφέρειν Hercher) αἶ τε κῶπαι καθιέντων εἰς εἰρεσίαν ἐθραύοντο, 3. 28. 2. 2 ὁ γὰρ δελφίς οὐκ ἀγαθὸν ὁδωδῶς αὐτῷ προσέπιπτεν ἔρριμμένος καὶ μυδῶν, 3. 31. 1. 3 ὁ Πᾶν ὑμᾶς ἀντὶ τῶνδε καὶ αἱ Νύμφαι φιλήσειαν (?), 4. 32. 1. 3 εὐμορφότερα τοσοῦτον ἐφάνη, 4. 40. 3. 4 τότε Χλόη πρῶτον ἔμαθεν ὅτι... (cf. 1. 17. 3. 1, 1. 32. 1. 3, 2. 8. 1. 3, 3. 22. 2. 2 τότε πρῶτον).

It is worth mentioning here that καίτοι stands before a consonant (3), καίτοιγε before a vowel (4). Incidentally, καίτοιγε should not be printed as two words because Longus does not use γε, a point noticed as long ago as 1834 by Struve, *De exitu versuum in Nonni Panopolitani carminibus*, n. 9 (not quite accurate).

<sup>1</sup> He is called Ἐφέσιος by Suidas, just as the Xenophon who wrote *Κυπριακά* is called *Κύπριος* (Suidas' third novelist of the name, who wrote *Βαβυλωνιακά*, presumably did come from Antioch).

Among the Xenophons listed at Diog. 2. 59 the fifth is someone *μυθῶδης τερατείαν πεπραγματευμένος*. Menagius in his commentary (London, 1664) asserted that this Xenophon was the *θαυμασιόποιος* whose apprentice Cratisthenes of Phlius was able to conjure up fire and perform other bewildering tricks (Athenaeus 19 e; neither gentleman is registered in P.-W.). Wickert in P.-W. 'Xenophon' 2089 (1967) suggests no identification but assumes that he was a 'mythologischer Schriftsteller', an assumption evidently shared by Jacoby, who gave him a place in the first volume of *F.G.H.* (no. 24). Menagius' view has little to commend it, Wickert's nothing; for *πεπραγματευμένος* denotes authorship, and *μυθῶδης* is no epithet to use of a mythological compilation.

One of the works that Photius read with his friends was τὰ ὑπὲρ Θούλην ἀπικτα by Antonius Diogenes. Here are a few phrases from his summary of it (*Bibliotheca*, no. 166):

109 a 11 μύθων ἐγγὺς καὶ ἀπίστων  
b 16 τὸ κατὰ τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς αὐτοῦ  
μυθῶδες θέαμα  
34 ἐντεῦθεν ἐπιμυθεύεται ὅπως...  
110 a 14 ὕλην ἀφθονον παρέσχε μυθοποιίας  
111 a 5 ἑτέρα τινα τερατεύεται  
30 ὁ γοῦν Διογένης ὁ καὶ Ἀντώνιος  
ταῦτα πάντα Δεινίαν εἰσαγαγὼν  
πρὸς Κύμβαν τερατευσάμενον...  
36 περὶ τῶν πλείστων αὐτῷ μυθολογη-  
θέντων  
112 a 4 μνημονεύει δ' οὗτος (sc. Antonius  
Diogenes) ἀρχαιοτέρου τινὸς Ἀντι-  
φάνους ὃν φησι περὶ τοιαυτὰ τινα  
τερατολογήματα κατεσχολακέναι.  
ἔστι δε ἐν αὐτοῖς καὶ μάλιστα,  
ὡς ἐν τηλικούτοις πλάσμασι τε καὶ  
μυθεύμασι, δύο τινὰ...

No one has ever called Antonius Diogenes a mythological writer or taken him for a conjuror: he is usually ranked with the novelists.

It may be inferred, then, that the Xenophon in question was a novelist of some sort; but unless all fiction was alike to Diogenes (or to Demetrius of Magnesia, if Diogenes derives the notice from him), it is improbable that the *μυθῶδης τερατεία* was the extant *Ephesiaca*, because *Ephesiaca* bears a much closer resemblance to the novels of Heliodorus, Achilles Tatius, and Iamblichus, than to Antonius Diogenes' fabrications, and nowhere in his summaries of those novels (*Bibliotheca*, nos. 73, 87, 94) does Photius employ similar language. If in spite of this Diogenes' novelist is one of the three in Suidas, he could be any of them.

After this note was written it turned out that Rohde had anticipated it: 'man könnte... unter der *μυθῶδης τερατεία* eine, wie es dem Demetrius scheinen mochte, schamlos erlogene (und doch als wahr erzählte) abenteuerliche Geschichte verstehen, einen Roman, nach unserer Ausdrucksweise' (p. 346 n. 1). Nevertheless, confirmation from Photius seemed welcome, and when Pauly gives currency to error the truth can bear reiteration.



cήν· πλέον γὰρ οὐδὲν ἔμα\_\θον· ταύτην \\_εδοξε τῷ \\_Αρει θύ\\_σαι· καὶ δὴ πάντ' \\_ἦν  
 παρεσκευασμένα καὶ ἐπέστησαν οἱ διώκοντες· κἀγὼ μὲν \\_ἐξέφυγον, ἡ δ' οὐκ οἶδ'  
 ὅτι ἐγένετο· ἦν δὲ καλὴ πάνυ, \\_Αβροκόμη, καὶ ἐσταλμένη λιπῶς· κόμη ξανθή,  
 χαρίεντες ὀφθαλμοί·” \\_ἔτι λέγοντος αὐτοῦ ἀνεβόνηκε \\_Αβροκόμη· “τὴν \\_ἐμὴν  
 \\_Ανθειαν εὔρα\\_κας, \\_Ιππόθοε· ποῦ δ' ἄρα καὶ πέφευγε; τίς δ' αὐτήν \\_ἔχει γῆ;”

Many more such passages can be cited from the rest of the work, e.g.:

1. 4. 2 ὦ πάντ' ἀνανδρός ἐγὼ καὶ πονηρός· οὐ καρτερῶς νῦν; οὐ μὲν ὧ γεννητικός;  
οὐκ ἔσομαι κρείττων<sup>3</sup> ἔρως;
2. 7. 5 cὺ δ' ἐν τῷ δεσμωτηρίῳ μέινας οἰκτρῶς ἀποθνήσκεις, οὐκ ἔχων οὐδ' ὅστις  
σου τὸ σῶμα κοσμήσει. ἀλλ' ὁμνῦν σοι τὸν ἀμφοτέρων δαίμονα ὡς ἐγὼ μὲν ὧ σῇ  
καὶ ζῶσα κἂν ἀποθανεῖν δεήσῃ
3. 6. 4-5 κκηψαμένη δὲ τῇ ἀγωνίᾳ ὑπὸ δίψῃ<sup>4</sup> κατελιῆθαι ἐκέλευεν αὐτῇ τινα  
τῶν οἰκετῶν ὕδωρ ἐνεγκεῖν ὡς δὴ πιομένη. καὶ δὴ κομισθέντος ἐκπώματος  
λαβοῦσα οὐδενὸς ἔνδον αὐτῇ παρόντος ἐμβάλλει τὸ φάρμακον καὶ δακρύσασα  
“ὦ φιλάτου” φησὶν “Ἀβροκόμου ψυχῇ, ἰδοὺ σοι τὰς ὑποσχέσεις ἀποδίδωμι καὶ  
ὁδὸν ἔρχομαι τὴν παρὰ σέ, δυστυχῇ μὲν ἀλλ' ἀναγκαίαν.<sup>5</sup> καὶ δέχου μ' ἄσμενος  
καὶ μοι παρέχε τὴν ἐκεῖ μετὰ σοῦ διαίταν εὐδαίμονα”. εἰποῦς' ἔπιε τὸ φάρμακον,  
καὶ εὐθὺς ὕπνος τ' αὐτὴν κατέειχε καὶ ἔπιπτεν εἰς γῆν
4. 6. 7 ἦς γάρ ποτ' ἐν ὁμοίᾳ τύχῃ καὶ σύ, καί ε' ἐν Τύρῳ κατέλιπον ἐν δεσμωτηρίῳ  
ἀλλ' εἰ μὲν ζῆς ἐτι, δεινὸν οὐδέν· ἴσως γάρ ποτ' ἀλλήλους ἐξομεν· εἰ δ' ἤδη τέθνηκας,  
μάτην ἐγὼ φιλοτιμοῦμαι ζῆν, μάτην δ' οὗτος, ὅστις ποτ' ἐστίν, ἐλεεῖ με τὴν  
δυστυχῇ
5. 8. 7-9 . . . “οἷμοι τῶν κακῶν.” λέγουσα “ἐγὼ μὲν καὶ πόνους ὑπομένω πάντας  
καὶ ποικίλων πειρῶμαι δυστυχῆς συμφορῶν καὶ τέχνας σωφροσύνης ὑπὲρ γυναῖκα  
εὐρίσκω. Ἀβροκόμῃ [σοι]<sup>6</sup> δ' ἴσως ἄλλη πού δέδοκται καλή· ταῦτα γάρ μοι  
σημαίνει τὰ ὀνειράτα. τί οὖν ἐτι ζῶ; τί δ' ἐμαυτὴν λυπῶ; κάλλιον οὖν ἀπολέσθαι

<sup>1</sup> In Attic the prosody is *Ἀβροκόμης*, but Heibges has made it probable that in Chariton the lighter combinations of mute and liquid are ambivalent (57-9). This is the justification for arbitrary procedure below, e.g. οἰκτρῶς ὑποθησκευεῖς but ἦδη τεθνηκας.

<sup>2</sup> The heroine is either *Ἀνθία* or *Ἀνθεῖα* (1. 12. 2. 7); the former produces hiatus in

a number of places, the latter inferior clausulae. Klaffenbach prefers *Ανθεια* (Zimmermann, p. 265 n. 3).

<sup>3</sup> κρείττων Hemsterhuys: καλλίων F.

<sup>4</sup> κηψαμένη δὲ ἀφωνία [ὑπὸ δίψους] . . .  
Jackson, p. 96.

<sup>5</sup> This should be the order at 1. 10. 10. 7 as well, instead of *ὁδὸν μὲν δυστυχῇ ἀλλ' ἀναγκαίαν*.

<sup>6</sup> ... εὕρισκω Ἀβροκόμῃ· σοὶ δ' ἔως...  
F, edd. omnes; fort. etiam ἔως delendum.

καὶ ἀπαλλαγῆναι τοῦ πονηροῦ τούτου βίου, ἀπαλλαγῆναι δὲ τῆς ἀπρεποῦς ταύτης  
καὶ ἐπισφαλοῦς δουλείας. Ἀβροκόμης μὲν γὰρ εἰ καὶ τοὺς ὄρκους παραβέβηκε,  
μηδὲν οἱ θεοὶ τιμωρήσαντο τοῦτον· ἵσως ἀνάγκη τι εἶργασται· ἐμοὶ δ' ἀποθανεῖν  
καλῶς ἔχει σωφρονούσης.” ταῦτ' ἔλεγε θρηνοῦσα καὶ μηχανῇν ἐζήτει τελευτῆς

See also for instance 1. 2. 7 *πολλάκις* . . . *ἐμακάριζον*, 1. 3. 1–2 *ὥς οὖν* . . . *ἀκούσῃ*, 1. 16. 3–5 *δεῖ δέ σε* . . . *ἀπορριψόν*, 3. 5. 5–6 *προσπίπτει* . . . *ὑπὲρ χνούμενος*, 4. 2. 4–5, 4. 5. 5, 5. 1. 2–4 *ὑπεδέξατο* . . . *πολλήν*, 5. 1. 8–9 *Λακεδαιμόνιοι* . . . *κύνειμι*, 5. 7. 4–6, 5. 14. 3.

Since the absence of hiatus is as marked in these passages as in 3. 1–3, the conclusion is inescapable that Xenophon not only avoided hiatus but also favoured certain rhythms. To the editor this information is almost useless, because any single instance of hiatus can always be blamed on the epitomator, to say nothing of the manuscript; but to the critic intent on rescuing Xenophon from the clutches of the epitomator it ought to be of some interest.

Of Iamblichus' *Babyloniaca* only excerpts survive, last collected by Habrich (Teubner 1960). The sources are a handful of manuscripts,<sup>1</sup> which preserve 3 or 4 substantial passages and 6 short *γνώμαι*, and Suidas, who can be made to yield anything up to 116 citations (13 attributed explicitly, 4 betrayed by proper names, the rest placed by conjecture).

It is fair to take the substantial fragments first.

fr. 1 (46 lines): p. 5. 3 *-αι* elided; 7 before *ἀλλὰ*

p. 7. 2 before *epex.*; 3 *πεζοὶ ἀργυράσπιδες*<sup>2</sup>; 22 before *epex.*

p. 9. 4 before *ἵνα*; 6 *παρέχει ὑγρὰν* V, *edd.* (*παρέχειν* L)

fr. 35 (68 lines): p. 27. 11 before *rel.*; 18 before *part.*; 19, 20 before *ἀλλὰ*;  
19 before *οὐ μόνον ὅτι*; 19 *ὅτι ἀφόρητον*

p. 29. 12 before *ὥστε* clause; 21 before *ὥς* = that (or after *voc.*)

<sup>1</sup> Habrich has taken over Hinck's collations (*Polemonis declamationes* [Teubner, 1873], viii–ix, 45–57) as though no further work had been done on the manuscripts; but a much fuller account of them, albeit hard to follow, was given by M. Naechster, *De Pollucis et Phrynichi controversiis* (Leipzig, 1908), 47–57. Properly appraised, so Naechster argued, they offer no support at all for the ascription of fr. 101 Habrich to Iamblichus. Naechster also discussed at length (57–9), but too confidently, Iamblichus' debt to Xenophon (not the novelist) in fr. 1 Habrich.

<sup>2</sup> A structural fault lies bare on the surface at this point, and no one but Rohde appears to have been disconcerted by it. The piece falls into the following sections: (p. 5. 3 *τὸ ἄρμα ἐφ' ᾧ φέρεται ὁ βασιλεὺς* (the king's chariot and apparel are described) . . . , p. 7. 1 *ἡγούνται δ' ἵππεῖς κρηπτοῦχοι τε καὶ κατράπαι* . . . , p. 7. 2 *οἱ μὲν πεζοὶ ἀργυράσπιδες* (and more about their armour) . . . , p. 7. 10 *οἱ*

*δ' ἐφ' ἵππων ἐλαύνουσι Νισαίων* (and the horses are described). The absurdity of *ἡγούνται δ' ἵππεῖς* . . . , *οἱ μὲν πεζοὶ* . . . , *οἱ δ' ἐφ' ἵππων* . . . was not lost on Rohde, who proposed *οἱ μέντοι πεζοὶ*. There are two objections to this: (1) why are the *ἵππεῖς* so summarily dismissed? (2) who are the people riding on Nisaeen horses? A better solution would be to delete *ἵππεῖς*, or at least obelize it. The one objection to this is that on a literal interpretation only those of the *κρηπτοῦχοι* κ.τ.λ. who are on foot would have their armour described. This anomaly cannot be ironed out, however, unless *οἱ δὲ* were to mean 'others' of the *πεζοὶ*; and what would they be doing on horseback? Read therefore, until someone has a brighter idea, *ἡγούνται δὲ [ἵππεῖς] κρηπτοῦχοι τε καὶ κατράπαι καὶ ἱππάρχαι καὶ χιλιάρχαι οἷς τι μέτεστι τοῦ ἔργου, οἱ μὲν πεζοὶ, ἀργυράσπιδες <καὶ χρυσάσπιδες>, ἔτι δὲ ἀργυροθώρακες καὶ χρυσοθώρακες . . . , οἱ δ' ἐφ' ἵππων ἐλαύνουσι Νισαίων . . .*

- fr. 61 (47 lines complete, snatches of 37 others): p. 47. 16 after voc.; 17 γεωργοῦ ἀλλοτρι[ (punctuation uncertain)  
 p. 49. 12 εἶθι εὐθὺς; 14 ἐν νῶ ἔχουσα Boissevain from εν[.]ως ἔχουσα  
 p. 51. 6 Κοραίχῳ ἢ Ὑωνίς; 16 before direct speech; 17 before ἐπείπερ;  
 24 ἐξηπατήθη ἢ ἐψυχαγωγήθη  
 p. 53. 2, 4, 5, 7 after ὅτι; 3 φόνου εἵργεν Habrich (φόνον ἰδεῖν P); 8 before οὐδὲ; 12 -αι elided  
 fr. 101 (17 lines)—

Of the other 6 fragments in the manuscripts, only fr. 60 contains hiatus: *πρόχειροι ὑποπτεῦσαι*.

In the 17 certain fragments from Suidas there are the following instances:

- |                        |  |
|------------------------|--|
| fr. 3 μοιχοῦ ὁ         | fr. 84 before epex.  |
| fr. 70 after ὥς = when | fr. 98 νῦν μὲν ἐγέλα ἱταμόν ( <i>v.l.</i> ἐγέλα<br>νῦν μὲν ἱταμόν) |
| fr. 78 after part.     |  |

Of the 99 conjectural fragments no more than 23, and perhaps fewer, contain hiatus of a kind that the other novelists would have avoided: 6, 7, 15, 17, 20, 31, 33, 36, 43, 44, 47, 51, 57, 76, 83, 95, 102, 105, 109, 114, 115, 120, 124.

Two different conclusions can be drawn from these facts. One is Kroll's (P.-W. 'Iamblichos' 645): 'die eigentliche Erzählung mied weder den Hiatus noch baute sie metrische Satzschlüsse . . . Dagegen zeigen die Reden' alle Künste der zweiten Sophistik . . . Hier ist der Hiatus gemieden, die Sätze schliessen metrisch . . .'<sup>2</sup> The other is that Iamblichus may be misrepresented by false ascriptions.

Combing the fragments for hiatus is a depressing pastime: many of them are too small for the outcome to be significant, in many the punctuation is not clear where hiatus occurs, and over the whole enterprise hangs a cloud of uncertainty, for not only may some of the fragments registered in Pack under 'Romance' be masquerading as fragments of novels, but fragments of novels may be lurking unidentified elsewhere.

The fragments that seemed to deserve treatment here are Pack<sup>2</sup> nos. 95, 244, 2259, 2268, 2468,<sup>3</sup> 2474, 2476, 2616-31, 2636-9. No notice has been taken of gratuitous supplements, least of all those in the latest collection of fragments, F. Zimmermann's *Griechische Roman-Papyri* (Heidelberg, 1936).<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Heibges's dissertation does not confirm a similar qualification added by Wilamowitz in the 3rd edition of *Die griechische Literatur des Altertums* (1912) to his remarks about Chariton's rhythm: 'so finden wir die Rhythmen . . . besonders stark bei Chariton wenn er direkte Reden einführt' 226, '... in den Reden noch ganz mit den hellenistischen Rhythmen verziert' 258.

Achilles Tatius, however, would repay study in this respect: see for instance 3. 10. 2-6, 6. 21. 2-3, 7. 7. 2-6.

<sup>2</sup> On this see Heibges, 92-3.

<sup>3</sup> Dr. Stephanie West has very kindly pointed out that this piece may well come from a novel. Incidentally, it is quite strongly rhythmical.

<sup>4</sup> The enormous labour that Zimmermann expended on annotation may appear to confer on his supplements more than the usual authority. In fact it was almost all wasted, partly because too little survives of the texts, partly because his command of Greek and his feeling for congruity are equally unsure. The following passages will illustrate all three of these criticisms: no. 1 A I 8 ἀ[γαθὴν γε εἶχεν] ἐλπίδα, no. 9. 28 ἀσφαλὲς γὰρ δ' οἶ[ν] οἶ[ν] . . . , no. 11. 12 [γυναικὶ δ' ἐφωράθη ἀναστ]ᾶς αὐτῇ, no. 13. 20-5 εἶτα δὲ το[ῦ]ς ἀλλοις φ[ί]λοις ἐκαλ[έ]σαντο δὴ εἰς[ ] τὴν ἐμῇ[ν οἰκίαν ἀσφάλλον]τε[ς] ὥς-π[ερ] πάροινον οἱ ἐν ᾧ[τ]ει [κ]αὶ ὁδ[ὸ]ν ὁδοι-ποροῦν]τε[ς] ἀφ[ι]κο[ν]το, 29-44 ἐξάνιστα[ται] . . . (Zimmermann's Muse is nodding) . . . ἐκ

\* indicates that on present evidence hiatus is avoided, † that on present evidence it is freely admitted.

95 (Antonius Diogenes?) line 8 διδασκάλου ἐπεφερόμεθα; 17 σπουδῇ ὅα (pause?); 20 ρι ἐξιναι

\*244 (Chione) fr. I. 2 βασιλεία εἰς *edd.* (why not βασιλεια εἰς?); II. 13 before direct speech; 15 τι εὐρίσκω; III. 8 before ἦ

\*2259 (Webelis) line 17 περὶ αὐτόν

2268 *recto* line 5 ὅπου ἐχρ[; 10 μὴ οὐθ[; 18 παρ[ε]χῶρει ἀπαντ[  
*verso* line 6 ἄνευ ἐμοῦ; 6 before ἀλλὰ; 9 ἐμοί ἐστιν

\*2468 (82 lines, 25–53 almost complete) line 16 κκεῖν ἐνῆν; 17 ]αι ἐργ[

2474 col. II. 21 αὐτῇ ἦ; 23 before rel.; 25 after part.; 31 κελεύει αὐτὴν; 40 ἐπεὶ ἐγεν[

†2476 (Nectanebus) all kinds of hiatus, e.g. III. 6–8 ἐκτὸς τοῦ ἑαυτοῦ ἱεροῦ εἰμι, καὶ τὰ ἐν τῷ ἀδύτῳ ἡμτέλεστά ἐστιν

\*2616 (Ninus)<sup>1</sup> A I. 28 ]η ὑπέμειναν; II. 23 πρὸ ἐναυτοῦ; III. 26 δὴ ἦ; 27 σπενεάτω ἦ; 34 περὶ ἡμῶν; IV. 8 ἂ ἔδωκας; 11 μὴ εἰς; 28 -αι elided; V. 28 τι οὐ[; B III. 35 ἦ ἄρξομαι

\*2617 (Ninus) line 21 πάν]υ ἀρκοῦσα

†2618 (Tefnut) all kinds of hiatus

2619 (Sesonchosis) *recto* line 8 ]νομου ἡλικίας; 9 πατρὶ εἶπεν

†2620 (Glaucetes)<sup>2</sup> II. 29 ὁδοῦ ἐκ[; 30 δὴ ὑπὸ; 31 πλατανίστῳ ἐκείνῃ; 32 ἄμφω ἀνηρημένοι; 38 ἡφάνισθη ἐπινεύσαντος; 41 πού αὐθις ἴδοι ἐκείνον; 54 ἦ ἦν; 55 ὑπερῷ [ου ἄ]γουςα κάτω εἰς

\*2621 (Herpyllis) line 16 τι ε[; 39 ]ενῇ εἰς ἄπειρον (εἰς ἄπειρον *del.* Lavagnini)

\*2622 (Metiochus) line 33 μὴ ομο[

2623 (Metiochus?) —

τοῦ] συμποσίον [τῷ τ' οἶνῳ διαβρα]χεῖς ὥς[περ ἐκβακχεύων ἄδει] ὑμέ[ναιον πάνν δὴ δ]εινόν, “ῥάν[υμαι δ' ἄρα τε φρέ]να” [κάγῳ. οὕτως δ' εἰ]στόρε[ε [τ]ὸ [φρόνημα τῶν] σφόδρα γε[αῶν καὶ τὴν τοῦ] δεσπότου [ὀργὴν ὡδῇ τῇ αἰ]δρία καὶ Ἄτ[ταλος, οἶον αὐτ]οῦ ἐαλωκώς, [τοῦ κώππειν ἄ]νεῖχεν (ἐπεί[γνω γὰρ τὰ συν]ετῆ) καὶ τὰ μὲν [πρῶτα αὐτοῦς κ]ελεύει μέ[νειν καὶ τρέπ]ε[σθαι εἰς τὸ [εὐμελές ἐκείνο] συμποσίον.

If Zimmermann had confined these fantasies to the apparatus, they would have been less of a nuisance. As it is, not only the text but the index too is full of them.

Zimmermann prided himself on being the first to offer ‘eine Rezension im eigentlichen Sinn’ (*Phil. Woch.* liv [1931], 193) of Lavagnini’s *Eroticorum fragmenta papyracea* (Teubner, 1922). What ‘eine Rezension im eigentlichen Sinn’ would have made of his own compilation is one of the more tantalizing secrets that history was never permitted

to disclose. B. A. Müller’s review in *Phil. Woch.* lviii [1938], 561–8 was charitable to the point of sycophancy: ‘in mustergültiger Weise herausgegeben’, 563; ‘die Textgestaltung dieses Bandes, in deren Dienst eine ausgezeichnete sprachliche Schulung von einer heute nicht häufigen Abgeschlossenheit steht, ist nach jeder Richtung sehr vorzüglich’, 565; ‘überall fühlt man hier in Kenntnis, Erkenntnis und Behandlung des Sprachlichen ein hohes Mass sprachlicher Meisterschaft’, 566.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Vitelli, ‘L’iato nel romanzo di Nino’, *S.I.F.C.* ii (1894), 297–8; Schmid iv. 471 (deficient).

<sup>2</sup> As the same name occurs in the new fragments of Lollianus’ *Phoenicea* (A. Henrichs, *Die Phoinikika des Lollianos*, Cologne, 1970), and their style is equally unpretentious, 2620 doubtless belongs to the same work.

†2624 line 4 γυνή ὑπεράνω αὐτοῦ ἀνέκειτο

2625 line 16 μετενόει ἐφ' οἷς (pause?); 35 αὐτοῦ οὐκ (pause?)

2626 line 9 ]νι οἴκῳ ἀποκεκλειμέν[; 19 ]σαμένου ἐπὶ

2627 I. 7 τι ἄλλο; 13 ]ται ἐπ[...ικου ἀνέστεφεν; II. 38 ]ατι ἔχοντι

\*2628 line 3 δὴ ἐπὶ; 10, 34 before ἀλλὰ; 17 before rel.; 23 στρεφομένη ἐι.[ (pause?); 30 before direct speech; 33 before direct speech

2629 line 2 ]αυτω ου[; 6 ]ονιωσχ[ ?; 10 προτρέποντι ἐώκει

2630 —

2631 —<sup>1</sup>

\*2636 —

2637 col. II. 39 ]ου ἐαλωκῶς

2638 —<sup>2</sup>

2639 line 6 τόπῳ εἰρήνῃ; 6 before ἔστε clause

The upshot of these tedious enumerations? In general (though uncertainties remain in the details), that all the novelists avoided most kinds of hiatus. No more need be said about the implications for editorial method, but one or two thoughts about literary pretensions come to mind.

When Reitzenstein identified the Egyptian story of Tefnut in a Greek version (*Sitzungsberichte der Heidelberger Akademie der Wissenschaften* 1923, Abh. 2<sup>3</sup>), it struck him that Xenophon's *Κύρου Παιδεία* might have had some kind of oriental model (p. 30); certainly he was in no doubt about the affinity between Oriental 'Märchen- bzw. Unterhaltungsliteratur' and the Greek novel (p. 31). Similarly, an eminent Egyptologist commends Lavagnini for his sagacity in appending to *Eroticorum fragmenta papyracea* the fragment known as Nectanebus' dream (Barns, *Mitteilungen aus der Papyrussammlung der österreichischen Nationalbibliothek*, v [1956], 34). Now attractive as it may be to suppose that the earliest fiction in Greek prose was inspired among Egyptian Greeks by a thousand years or more of native tradition, no one ought to mention Nectanebus' dream in the same breath as the story of Ninus before he has asked himself which is greater, the difference in content between the Greek novel and other branches of Greek literature, let us say historiography, or the difference in literary pretensions between the Greek novel and Egyptian fiction rendered into Greek. Of course they are incommensurable; but which is more important? Whatever the answer, hiatus is a serviceable measure of literary pretensions, and it immediately sets Tefnut and Nectanebus apart from Ninus and Parthenope.

To some scholars the search for origins and the tracing of development are uncongenial: the novel was invented, 'on a Tuesday afternoon in July' (Perry, *The Ancient Romances*, 175). Without adverting to Egyptian fiction, they

<sup>1</sup> Zimmermann must be commended for taking the trouble to state in his introduction to each piece whether or not hiatus is avoided in it; but unfortunately he does not seem to know what hiatus is. At any rate, 'Hiat nicht vermieden' does not apply to this piece

on the evidence available.

<sup>2</sup> 'Hiat offenbar nicht vermieden Zimmermann; but see n. 1 above.

<sup>3</sup> See now S. R. West, 'The Greek version of the legend of Tefnut', *J.E.A.* lv (1969), 161-83.



emphasize 'the originally humble and demotic character of this kind of writing, in significant contrast to that of the great body of formal literature which moves on a separate and higher intellectual level, and in terms of which the ideal romance in its origin cannot be explained at all' (Perry 33). This view has an air of profundity about it, but unless it is borne out by a lack of literary ambition on the part of the novelists themselves, it is really no more than a projection of the writer's own evaluation. Authors who avoided hiatus and took trouble over rhythm would have been surprised to hear that their works were addressed to the 'juvenile' and the 'poor in spirit'; and if they had been informed that the function both of their stylistic polish (about which Perry is silent) and of their historiographical framework (about which Perry says a great deal) was merely to bestow respectability on fiction, they might well have retorted that but for historiography and other stylish prose it would never have entered their heads to write in the first place.

Exeter College, Oxford

M. D. REEVE

#### APPENDIX ON ACH. TAT. 2. 9. 1

Such odd views have been taken of this passage that it may be as well to set out the truth so far as it is ascertainable.

The digression that is appended in the manuscripts at chapter 2. 1 to the second *δείπνον* is appended by *II* at chapter 9. 1 to the third (the first having occurred in chapter 5 of book 1). Since *II* covers only 7. 7-9. 3, the effects can be seen only at 9. 1, as follows:

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{ἐπειδὴ δὲ τοῦ δείπνου καιρὸς ἦν } \textit{codd.} \\ \text{ἐσπέρας δὲ γενομένης} \quad \textit{II} \end{array} \right\} \text{πάλιν ὁμοίως συνεπίνομεν. } \left\{ \begin{array}{l} - \\ \text{digression 2. 1} \end{array} \right.$$

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} - \\ \text{ἦν γὰρ . . . 3. 2 γεωργῇ} + \text{ἐπειδὴ δὲ τοῦ πότου καιρὸς ἦν } \textit{codd.} \end{array} \right\} \text{ῥηνοχόει}$$

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{δὲ ὁ Κάτυρος ἡμῖν } \textit{codd.} \\ \text{ἡμῖν ὁ Κάτυρος} \quad \textit{II} \end{array} \right\}.$$

With these differences some scholars associate three other facts:

- (a) The last sentence of book 1, which mentions a *δείπνον*, interrupts the transition to book 2;
- (b) One branch of the manuscripts omits the first clause of chapter 2;
- (c) One branch of the manuscripts omits *ὁμοίως* at the beginning of chapter 9.

None of these facts, however, need be pertinent, and only (a) is at all likely to be.

Opinions about the discrepancy have conflicted. Some scholars hold that the order in the manuscripts is impossible (so Calderini, Garin<sup>1</sup>), others that the order in *II* is impossible (so Russo, *Rend. Acc. Linc.* ser. 8. x [1955], 397-403, with the support of Rattenbury, *C.R.* lxx [1956], 230), others that neither is impossible (so Dörrie, Colonna, Vilborg; Dörrie prefers the order in the manuscripts, Colonna and Vilborg the order in *II*).

Two of the explanations offered for the discrepancy can be rejected. Grenfell & Hunt made the suggestion, and it is repeated from time to time, that a leaf may at some stage have become misplaced; but it would be a singular

<sup>1</sup> References where none are given can be found on pp. x-xiii of Vilborg's edition.

coincidence if a self-contained passage had become misplaced (cf. Dörrie 86). Russo 402-3 thinks *II* comes from an abridgement; but of abridgement there is no trace, and furthermore this is precisely the sort of passage that would not have survived abridgement.

Vilborg's treatment of the problem, far from being final, is careless in the extreme. Not only does he fail to record in his apparatus at the beginning of chapter 9 that *II* omits *πάλιν ὁμοίως συνεπίνομεν* before *ῥηνοχόει*, but his discussion on pp. xxxix-xlii is imprecise and perverse, imprecise because like Grenfell & Hunt and Gaselee he talks as though *II* presented the whole of chapter 2 in a different place, perverse because in consequence he entertains solutions that are more involved and improbable than they need have been. His impreciseness is to blame for the assertion that 'the *δείπνα* which the archetype mentions (ch. 2-3 and ch. 9) are reduced to one in the papyrus (described in chapters 2, 3, 9)' (p. xli; repeated by Rattenbury 230).

Now to business. If the digression is removed from the manuscripts, its absence cannot be detected.<sup>1</sup> On the contrary, it cries out to be removed, because it severs *αὐτήν* in the first sentence of 3. 3 from what it refers to, namely the girl, who was last mentioned at the beginning of chapter 2. This point seems not to have been made, unless it is what people have in mind when they speak of abruptness in the transition from 3. 2 to 3. 3.<sup>2</sup>

Since no operation so simple can be performed on *II* without pleonastic results (. . . *πάλιν ὁμοίως συνεπίνομεν. ἐπειδὴ δὲ τοῦ πότου καιρὸς ἦν* . . .), the text of *II* merits serious consideration. Yet according to Russo (401-2 and *Gnomon*, xxx [1958], 588-9) it is open to several objections:

- (a) What takes place elsewhere in Achilles *ἐσπέρας γενομένης* is sleep;
- (b) The tenses (*συνεπίνομεν*, 3. 1. *παρασκευάσας* . . . *ἔτυχε, παρέθηκε*) are a jumble;
- (c) As Achilles nowhere else distinguishes between a *δείπνον* and a *κυμπόσιον*, there is no such thing as *τοῦ πότου καιρὸς*;
- (d) *ἐσπέρας γενομένης* is inconsistent with 9. 3 *τὸ λοιπὸν τῆς ἡμέρας* and 10. 3 *ἐπιτηρήσας οὖν ὅτε τὸ πολὺ τῆς ἀγῆς ἐμαραίνετο*.

As Russo admits, (b) is not serious; nor is (c), because at a feast in honour of Dionysus the drinking may well be given pride of place. On the other hand it is difficult to be happy about (a) and (d), and another worry is the hiatus in *ῥηνοχόει ἡμῖν*.

Mr. O'Sullivan makes the further point that in either context the *γὰρ* at the beginning of the digression is illogical: it was not dinner time *because* there was a festival of Dionysus.

It may therefore be said that editing, whether of Achilles' own or of someone else's, is the cause of the discrepancy, and that the digression originally belonged neither to the manuscripts, where the context has not been brought into harmony with it, nor to *II*, where the context has been brought into harmony with it in a clumsy way. The better context for it, though Achilles need not have agreed, is the *δείπνον* at which Clitophon makes most progress, the third (so Colonna against Dörrie).

<sup>1</sup> The content of the lacuna suspected by Jacobs before 3. 3 is supplied by 1. 5. 3 *κλέπτων ἅμα τὴν θεάν*, as Russo 400 points out; and the connection between Dionysus

in the digression and Dionysus in 3. 3 (Dörrie 88, Russo 401) is dispensable.

<sup>2</sup> Jacobs, to whom they appeal, put Leucippe's name in his supplement.