

Editors' note. Recent inspection of the papyrus suggests that β is not altogether secure and that the space between it and the μ may not be large enough for the restoration, but that the letter after the β(?) could well be ρ.

ON ACHILLES TATIUS 6.6.3

Ach. Tat.¹ 6.6.3 ὡς οὖν ἤκουσεν ἡ Λευκίππη ἀνοιγομένων τῶν θυρῶν, ἦν δὲ ἔνδον λύχνος, ἀνανεύσασα μικρὸν αὐτῆς τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς κατέβαλεν. ἰδὼν δὲ ὁ Θέρσανδρος τὸ κάλλος ἐκ παραδρομῆς ὡς ἀρπαζομένης ἀστραπῆς (μάλιστα γὰρ ἐν τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς κάθηται τὸ κάλλος) ἀφῆκε τὴν ψυχὴν ἐπ' αὐτὴν κτλ.

(1) There are three things to be noticed with regard to ἤκουσεν ἡ Λευκίππη ἀνοιγομένων τῶν θυρῶν: (a) the hiatus; (b) the fact that in every other place where Achilles Tatius uses ἀκούω with the genitive of the source of the sound and an appended participle the participle always belongs to a verb of speaking used literally (λέγοντος 1.8.2.16; 2.36.3.8; εἰπόντος 3.21.6.13; λαλούσης 3.18.1.12 (sc. ταύτης); διαλεγομένων 2.26.1.15; ποτινωμένης 6.15.4.28; ὑποκρυνομένου 7.11.1.6) or metaphorically (2.14.8.15 ἀκούσαι . . . τοῦ ὕδατος λαλοῦντος); (c) 2.23.6.11–12 τὸν φόρον ἀκούσας ἀνοιγομένων τῶν θυρῶν.

The combination of these three phenomena means, I believe, that we should read ἤκουσεν ἡ Λευκίππη (τὸν φόρον) ἀνοιγομένων τῶν θυρῶν.

(2) What is the syntax of ἰδὼν τὸ κάλλος ἐκ παραδρομῆς ὡς ἀρπαζομένης ἀστραπῆς? How is the genitive ἀρπαζομένης² ἀστραπῆς to be taken?

(a) It should not be seen as a subjective genitive dependent on παραδρομῆς. παραδρομή is hardly a suitable word to use of the movement of a bright flash, and the ideas in παραδρομῆς and ἀρπαζομένης do not combine well. Besides, in the first part of the comparison the agent in the figurative παραδρομῆς is naturally the one who sees, i.e. Thersander, and not what is seen, and even the hint of a comparison between Thersander and ἀρπαζομένη ἀστραπή would be ludicrous.

(b) Nor is it a possessive genitive dependent on τὸ κάλλος understood. The primary point of the comparison is speed, not beauty. While beauty may be thought of as brilliant and dazzling, as it is in Achilles Tatius (see below), it is entirely unlikely that ἀστραπή itself would be regarded as being a special paradigm of beauty, and there is in fact no trace of such an idea in the author.

(c) To take it as a genitive absolute would not yield complete, acceptable sense; and there is the more objective point that such a genitive absolute after comparative ὡς³ would be unparalleled in Achilles Tatius.

Achilles Tatius is a straightforward writer and here he wrote ἰδὼν . . . τὸ κάλλος ἐκ παραδρομῆς ὡς ἀρπαζομένην ἀστραπήν. The genitive was introduced by assimilation to παραδρομῆς, perhaps with further provocation from ὡς.

¹ Ed. E. Vilborg (Stockholm, 1955). In four-number references to the text the fourth number refers to the line on Vilborg's page.

² ἀρπαζομένης clearly must be regarded

as passive like the instances of ἀρπάζομαι cited later.

³ The same holds good for ὥσπερ, as one might expect, and this tells against Carney's unnecessary ἀποιδούντος at 3.11.1.

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

University of Newcastle Upon Tyne

JAMES N. O'SULLIVAN

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

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

ON HELIODORUS AETHIOPICA 7.12.6

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

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

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

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

¹ C.Q. N.S. 18 (1968), 286.

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

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

³ On this I follow Rattenbury and Lumb,

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

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