

NOTES ON THE TEXT AND INTERPRETATION OF ACHILLES TATIUS I

The romance of Leucippe and Clitophon had already been edited by I. and N. Bonnavitus (*ed. prin.* Heidelberg, 1601), Salmasius (1640), Boden (1776), and Mitscherlich (1792), but it was the work of Friedrich Jacobs, published in 1821, that provided the foundation for serious criticism of the text based on knowledge of a substantial number of representative manuscripts. Hirschig (Didot, 1856), Hercher (Teubner, 1858), and Gaselee (Loeb, 1917) based their editions on that of Jacobs, each introducing whatever changes were prompted or approved by his own critical faculties.

In 1955 E. Vilborg published an edition for which he had examined afresh all known evidence for the text.¹ This work offers a convenient presentation of the evidence and, for the time being, any study of the text must begin from it. However, while Vilborg has performed a useful service, his edition shows a lack of the critical qualities that make a good editor, and this impression is strengthened by his commentary (1962). In his review of Vilborg's edition C. F. Russo, if the material he presents is accurate, convicts Vilborg of some slips in reporting the readings of W V M and F, but less than a third of the readings given by Russo bear on actual statements in Vilborg's apparatus, and what he offers is mostly trivial and deserves the attention of an editor at two points only.² The paradoxical effect of Russo's review is to confirm the opinion that short of new finds there is little, if anything, more to be learned about the text from manuscripts and that its improvement beyond what is allowed by the variants already reported now depends on emendation by conjecture.

E. H. Warmington (1968) has drawn on Vilborg for the revision of Gaselee's Loeb text and translation, and the result contains a great number of errors: Warmington corrects very few of the many mistakes made by Gaselee and the critical notes that he adds are often inaccurate and misleading.³

Apart from those responsible for the editions many others have tried their hand at emending Achilles Tatius: in 1955 Vilborg recorded the efforts of fifty-seven scholars. Some critics have merely touched in passing on one or two problems, or what they took to be problems, but several have directed a sustained effort towards emending the author. Among these last have been some men of high reputation, most notably Jacobs, renowned for his work on the *Greek*

¹ Since 1955 further manuscript material has come to light: a Sinaitic codex of the β tradition containing books 5–8 (see *Mus. Helv.* 37 (1970), 49–57) and three more papyrus fragments, none of them affecting book 1.

² *Gnomon* 30 (1958), 585. At 8.14.5.15 W apparently has $\eta\kappa\omicron\nu\alpha\gamma\omicron\nu\tau\epsilon\varsigma$ which merits some consideration since it avoids the element of redundancy in $\epsilon\iota\lambda\kappa\omicron\nu\alpha\gamma\omicron\nu\tau\epsilon\varsigma$, however suitable $\epsilon\iota\lambda\kappa\omicron\nu\alpha\gamma\omicron\nu\tau\epsilon\varsigma$ may otherwise seem; 8.17.3.19 $\delta\iota\alpha\mu\alpha\rho\tau\eta\theta\epsilon\iota\eta$ (W *sec.* Russo) is of course right against the augmented optative $\delta\eta\mu\alpha$ - (W *sec.* Vilborg),

and we hardly needed a manuscript to tell us that.

³ On book 1, e.g. p.14 n.1 'The MSS. all have $\Sigma\epsilon\lambda\eta\eta\nu\eta\nu$: . . . the β MSS. $\epsilon\upsilon\rho\omega\pi\eta\nu$. . .'; p.30 n.1, in which read $\eta\ \kappa\alpha\lambda\lambda\acute{\iota}\omega\nu$; p.40 n.1 Salmasius did not merely add $\delta\lambda\omicron\varsigma$; p.46 n.1 mirrors the strangeness of Vilborg's apparatus; p.48 n.1 Hercher believed that the manuscripts had $\kappa\alpha\rho'$ $\alpha\upsilon\tau\eta\nu$; p.50 n.1. Why 'W and M' rather than 'a'? (cf p.54 n.1); p.54 n.1 is badly arranged and gives the wrong impression that $\alpha\mu\alpha$ is not in the *a* text and that Jacobs wanted to delete it.

Anthology, C. G. Cobet, and John Jackson, who is widely regarded as perhaps the best critic of Greek texts in this century.

In the following notes⁴ I use Vilborg's *sigla* and usually begin from his text. When my discussion starts from a text other than Vilborg's or when I favour a return to a reading in one or more of the earlier editions I make that clear. By 'the editors' I mean Jacobs and his successors.⁵ In four-number references to the text the first number refers to the book, the second to the chapter, the third to the chapter-section, and the fourth to the line on Vilborg's page. In a series of references to the same book the number of the book is included only in the first reference of the series.

1.1.4 ἔγραψεν ὁ τεχνίτης ὑπὸ τὰ πέταλα καὶ τὴν σκιάν, καὶ ὁ ἥλιος ἡρέμα τοῦ
λεμιῶνος κάτω σποράδην διέρρει, ὅσον τὸ συνηρεφές τῆς τῶν φύλλων
κόμης ἀνέφξεν ὁ γραφεύς.

The text is manifestly corrupt: as it stands τοῦ λεμιῶνος is not syntactically linked to anything in the context. Vilborg⁶ imagines that it is governed by διέρρει. If the *δια-* of διέρρει had an expressed object it would be the foliage, not the meadow. The sense clearly must be that the sunlight shone through the breaks in the foliage *down onto* the meadow, κατὰ τοῦ λεμιῶνος. I suggest that the text of the manuscripts was produced by a transposition and by the corruption of *κατα* to *κατω*, and that we should read . . . κατὰ τοῦ λεμιῶνος [κάτω] . . . For κατὰ w. gen. meaning *down upon* see 1.5.3.23 ἐρείσας κ. τῆς στρωμνῆς τὸν ἀγκῶνα. Cf. *down upon*, *down over* 1.1.7.20 κόμαι κ. τῶν ὤμων λελυμένοι; 3.15.3.27 κ. τῆς κεφαλῆς σπονδὴν περιχέαντες. Cf. of striking someone *on* a part of the body: (a) κατὰ κόρρης 2.24.1.17; 5.23.5.20; 6.20.1.7; 7.3.5.7; (b) κ. τῶν προσώπων 4.9.2.27; 15.6.24; 8.1.3.12; (c) κ. τοῦ μηροῦ 5.7.2.20; cf. (d) κ. τοῦ χειλὸς 2.7.4.8.

With the corruption of *κατα* to *κατω* cf. (*caute*) 2.8.2.6 κατω Π¹; κατὰ τῶν στέρνων α : διὰ τῶν στέρνων β; also 3.20.7.9 where we should read μεταστρέψας κάτω (*scripsi*: κατὰ codd.) τὸ τοῦ σιδήρου μέρος. Transpositions are, of course, common in the manuscripts;⁷ at 2.2.1 all the *codices* have τότε γὰρ τὸν Διώνυσον, giving nonsense in the context, and Π¹ furnishes the right word-order τὸτ[ε] τον γαρ Δ. (*coni.* Jacobs).

1.2.3 πάντως δὲ ὁ τοιοῦτος τόπος ἡδὺς καὶ μύθων ἄξιος ἐρωτικῶν.

ὁ τοιοῦτος τόπος codd. (τόπος *om.* M): τοιοῦτος secl. Scaliger: ὅτι οὗτος ὁ τόπος Lumb

The faultlessness of the text saves one the effort of wrestling with Lumb's conjecture: cf. 2.21.1.26 ὁ δὲ τοιοῦτος . . . φοβοῦμαι; 8.6.5.21 αἴτιον δὲ τῆς τοιαύτης τάξεως ἢ τῆς ἁρμονίας διανομή.

+ I am very grateful to Prof. W.G. Arnott, Mr. M.D. Reeve, and Mr. E.W. Whittle for reading the notes in manuscript and letting me have their comments. I have not always taken their advice, perhaps unwisely, and the faults that remain are mine alone.

⁵ In referring to the texts of the editors I use the editors' names abbreviated as follows: Ja(cobs), Hi(rschig),

He(rcher), Ga(selee), Vilb(örg).

⁶ *Achilles Tatius Leucippe and Clitophon A Commentary (Studia Graeca et Latina Gothoburgensia XV)* (Göteborg, 1962), p.20.

⁷ e.g. at 1.1.2.8; 1.2.9; 1.6.17–18; 1.7.19; 1.11.14–15; 1.11.15–16; cf. 1.12.21; 2.1.3; 2.2.5; 3.2.1; 4.1.25; 5.2.20; 5.3.25; 5.5.5; 6.1.19.

1.3.6 Ἦκουσι πρὸς σέ θυγάτηρ ἐμὴ Λευκίππη καὶ Πάνθηα γυνή· πόλεμος γὰρ περιελαύνει Βυζαντίους Θρακικούς. σῶζε δέ μοι τὰ φίλτατα τοῦ γένους μέχρι τῆς τοῦ πολέμου τύχης.

δέ α E G F : δή V R ξ (so He, Ga)

δέ does not even make sense here, and δή is obviously suitable, whether we take it as purely emphatic or as having a connective force. For emphatic δή with an imperative see also 3.19.3.13 λέγε δη . . . ; 5.11.4.11 ἀκουσάτω δὴ καὶ ὁ K . . .

1.4.3 (codd.) λευκὴ παρειά, τὸ λευκὸν εἰς μέσον ἐφωνίσσεται καὶ ἐμμεῖτο πορφύραν, οἷαν εἰς τὸν ἐλέφαντα Λυδία βάπτει γυνή.

οἷαν (οἷον W) εἰς codd.: εἰς del. Wifstrand: εἰς οἷαν Vilborg / Λυδία WF: Λυδίη M D V ε ξ: Λυβύη G

The intended sense must be ‘. . . purple like that with which a Lydian woman dyes ivory.’ οἷαν . . . βάπτει contains an unparalleled construction with βάπτω, ‘to dye’,⁸ and may safely be regarded as nonsense. Merely to delete εἰς with Wifstrand is to produce slightly different nonsense, and Vilborg’s εἰς οἷαν is makeshift and takes the passage too far in sense and syntax from its Homeric model; and the author’s word for ‘dip’ is βαπτίζω.⁹ Cataudella’s οἷον εἰ¹⁰ is not acceptable either: with the present indicative βάπτει we would need ‘as when’, not ‘as if’ which gives nonsense.

The attempt to solve the difficulty should be based on (1) the passage of Homer that Ach. Tat. is adapting: *Il.* 4.141 f. ὥς δ’ ὅτε τις τ’ ἐλέφαντα γυνὴ φοῖνικι μίηνη / Μηονίς ἡὲ Κάειρα, παρήϊον ἔμμεναι ἵππων,¹¹ and on (2) Ach. Tat.’s use of βάπτω elsewhere with reference to dyeing: 2.11.4.3 (πορφύραν) ἧ καὶ μέχρι τούτου βάπτουσιν Ἀφροδίτης τὸν πέπλον; 11.5.19 βάπτει τὸ αἷμα τὴν γένυν; 3.7.3.17 οὔτε τῶν παρειῶν τὸ ὠχρὸν τέλεον ἀφοίνικτον ἦν, ἥρμα δὲ τῷ ἐρευνθεῖ (*scripsi*: ἐρευνθεῖ codd.) βέβαπται, οὔτε . . . In these places when the word denoting the dye or colour is not the subject of βάπτω (as it is in 2.11.5.19), it is expressed as a dative of the instrument, just like φοῖνικι in the passage of Homer. It seems extremely improbable that at 1.4.3 Ach. Tat. departed from his own mode of expression with βάπτω in adapting a passage of Homer in which that same construction is found. So we get οἷα . . . τὸν ἐλέφαντα Λυδία βάπτει γυνή. And what about εἰς? I believe that Ach. Tat. echoed his original closely¹² and wrote οἷα τις . . . A scribe having difficulty

⁸ The sense ‘to dip’ is not, of course, appropriate.

⁹ For εἰς οἷαν see *Comm.*, p.22. βαπτίζω: 2.14.9.23 κοντὸν εἰς τὸ ὕδωρ β.; cf. 4.18.6.8.

¹⁰ Not used by Ach. Tat.

¹¹ Both here and in Ach. Tat. the likeness is between πορφύρα, φοῖνιξ, and blood: in Ach. Tat. the blood in the cheeks of Leucippe, in Homer the blood on the thighs of Menelaus, is compared to the dye used for a cheek-piece. πορφύρα is clearly the colour of blood in Ach. Tat. 2.11.5–7.

¹² Note φοῖνικι (*Il.*)—ἐφωνίσσεται (Ach. Tat.). For Ach. Tat. βάπτω was more suitable than the Homeric μιάνω, a word with strong connotations of defilement

that he would not want to suggest in this context. Heliodorus, probably echoing the same passage of Homer, has (10.15) ἐγύνωσεν αὐτίκα ἡ Χαρίκλεια τὴν λαιὰν καὶ ἦν τις ὥσπερ ἔβενος περιδρομος ἐλέφαντα τὸν βραχίονα μιάνων, where the connotations of μιάνω are not out of place. Plutarch, with reference to *Il.* 4.141, writes (*De E Apud Delphos* 393 C): τὸ δ’ ἐν εἰλικρωῆς καὶ καθαρὸν· ἐτέρου γὰρ μεῖξει πρὸς ἕτερον ὁ μiasμός, ὥς που καὶ Ὅμηρος ἐλέφαντα τινὰ φωνισσόμενον βαφῇ μιαινεσθαι φησί. In LSJ s.v. μιάνω category 1 should be abandoned: in *Il.* 4.141 μίηνη does not properly mean ‘dye’. Homer uses it in the simile to suggest in anticipation the staining, befouling of Menelaus’ legs by his blood which the

in reading οἷα τις¹³ as written in his exemplar might readily have plumped for οἷαν εἰς with βάπτω under the impression that it gave adequate sense.

The basis of the odd word-order, . . . τις . . . Λυδία . . . γυνή, is in Homer's . . . τις . . . γυνή . . . Μηρονίς ἡὲ Κᾶειρα.

1.6.6 καὶ τινὰς ἐμπεριπατήσας διαύλους καὶ ἐποχετευσάμενος ἐκ τῆς θέας ἔρωτα σαφῶς ἀπῆεν ἔχων τὴν ψυχὴν κακῶς.

For σαφῶς I suggest οὕτως, which is probably an unattractive conjecture at first sight. These stages lead me to it: (1) there can be no doubt that σαφῶς is corrupt: in sense ('clearly', 'plainly') it cannot be taken with ἀπῆεν and both its sense and its position are against taking it with anything else;¹⁴ (2) nothing resembling σαφῶς gives acceptable sense: experiments with σοφῶς, †σα† φῶς, †σαφ† ὡς, and the like are fruitless; (3) we must, then, either (a) delete σαφῶς or (b) read something fairly unlike it; (4) I would not delete it, because its mere intrusion could not be plausibly accounted for; (5) it is necessary, then, to find some word, preferably not quite unlike σαφῶς, that there is good reason to believe Ach. Tat. might well have written here; (6) there is much to be said in favour of οὕτως: if we were merely to delete σαφῶς the passage would have no sense deficiency whatever and so no need for a word that would add anything to the sense; on the other hand Ach. Tat. occasionally uses a retrospective, resumptive οὕτως with reference to circumstances in which, or because of which, something happens: note esp. 3.25.5.8 ἐνθὺς δὲ καὶ ἐναρμόσας τὸν ὄρνιν τῇ σόρῳ καὶ κλείσας (καὶ κλείσας He : καὶ εἰς codd.: κλείσας Castiglioni) τὸ χάσμα γῆνιφ χώματι, ἐπὶ τὸν Νεῖλον οὕτως ἵπταται τὸ ἔργον φέρων, where οὕτως refers to the actions in aorist participles, as it would in 1.6.6; see also 1.13.4.26; 5.26.7.13–14 bis; 7.12.3.27; 16.2.16; 8.1.5.1 ἐπὶ τῇ πληγῇ . . . ἀνακραγῶν συνέστειλε τὴν χεῖρα καὶ οὕτως ἐπαύσατο; 14.3.6. A οὕτως of this kind would, it seems to me, be very much in place here.

1.7.2–3 . . . ἔλεγεν· 'Ἐσθὲ καὶ σὺ μοι ποτὲ δοῦλος.' ταχὺ πρὸς τοῦτον ἀπιὼν καὶ ἀσπασάμενος . . . ἔφην . . .

καὶ σὺ μοι ποτὲ δοῦλος. ταχὺ aF: καὶ σὺ ποτὲ μοι δοῦλος. ταχὺ G: ποτὲ καὶ σὺ μοι δοῦλος ταχὺ. Vεξ (et edd. praeter Vilb.) // δὲ post ταχὺ add. F.

The punctuation of Vεξ (in effect β) should be followed. The decisive point is that ταχὺ . . . ἀπιὼν would be illogical after the last sentence of chapter 6, καὶ ταῦτά μοι τριῶν ἡμερῶν ἐπυρσεύετο: an expression of haste or urgency would be entirely strange without some specific mention of a point, rather a period, of time. I suppose one might be prevented from seeing this by the intervening introduction of Clinias.

There are other considerations too in favour of Vεξ: the new sentence should properly begin with πρὸς τοῦτον rather than with anything else;¹⁵ and for the

simile is intended to illuminate (cf. μάνθην αἵματι μηροί, v.146). The instance from Heliodorus does not belong in 1 either: ebony does not *dye* anything.

¹³ Cf. 1.5.3.21 τί (ἐἰ G); cf. 1.5.6.9 ἐρωτικός (τρωτικός Apostol. Arsen.).

¹⁴ Apart from considerations of word-order, it cannot go with ἔχων . . . κακῶς in sense (see Vilb. *Comm.*, p.24): there is no reason why Ach. Tat. should say

whether Clitophon was showing any outward signs of his emotional state, since there was no one to observe them; we would hardly be told that his feelings were clear to himself; and I do not believe σαφῶς could mean 'as will be obvious (to the reader)', 'of course'. Those who do not like οὕτως must at any rate accept †σαφῶς†.

¹⁵ Retrospective οὗτος of the kind we have here, with asyndeton, is always at (or,

use of *ταχύ* in a prediction cf. 1.9.5.23 ἐγὼ δέ σοι καὶ τὸ ἔργον ἔσσεσθαι *ταχύ* *μαντεύομαι*;¹⁶ 5.16.6.2 δεξιὸν μοι καὶ τοῦτο τῶν οἰωνισμάτων· ἔσθ μοι *ταχύ* καὶ πατήρ.

1.8.1 'Γάμον,' εἶπεν, 'ἤδη σοι δίδωσω ὁ πατήρ; τί γάρ ἡδίκησας, ὥα καὶ πεδηθῆς; . . .'

καὶ *om.* F // πεδηθῆς F: δεθῆς *cett.*

The text¹⁷ is hybrid and the apparatus (Vilb) is misleading and should have καὶ δεθῆς: πεδηθῆς F.

καὶ δεθῆς (αβ) is the right reading: Clinias says to his boyfriend, who is threatened with matrimony, 'What crime have you committed, that you should *actually* be imprisoned (put in bonds)?' The *δεσμός* (*δεσμά*) of marriage must be due to some *ἀδίκημα*. Ach. Tat. quite frequently uses *δέω* (act., or absol. in pass. as here) with reference to imprisonment: 7.1.3.10; 2.4.18 τὰ οἰκεία κατέλεγεν, ἐφ' οὗς ἦν δεδεμένος; 9.14.2; 8.8.9.4; 8.10.6 τοὺς δεθέντας ἐλευθεροῖς; 9.8.10–12 bis 'ποῖον δικαστήριον ἐκέλευσε δεθῆναι τὸν ἄνθρωπον; ἔστω γάρ πάντα ἀδικήσας, ὅσα ἂν εἴπης, ἀλλὰ καὶ κριθῆτω πρῶτον . . . ὁ νόμος αὐτόν . . . δησάτω.'; 9.11.22; 10.4.2. He does not use *πεδάω*¹⁸ in this way. The emphatic καὶ is, of course, entirely appropriate here.

1.8.8 καὶ ταῦτα μὲν ἐπὶ τῶν εὐμόρφων τις ἂν εἴποι γυναικῶν, ἔνθα καὶ μέτριον τὸ ἀτύχημα. τὸ γὰρ κάλλος ἔχει τινὰ παρηγορίαν τῶν κακῶν, καὶ τοῦτό ἐστω ἐν ἀτυχήμασιν εὐτυχεῖν·

τινὰ Headlam: τὴν αF: *om.* β (et He)

Misfortunes can imply their consolation, the sickness the cure, and so Jacobs chose to read τὴν παρηγορίαν quoting in support of it Theophyl(actus) Sim(ocatta) *Epist.* xxv ἔχεις λόγον τὸ φάρμακον; id., *Epist.* lxxv καὶ τοῦ πάθους ἔχεις τὸ φάρμακον. However, in such expressions the article indicates that the comfort is complete and Clinias plainly believes that a man cannot be fully consoled if he suffers the misfortune of marriage: if the woman is beautiful, the misfortune is *μέτριον*, but to be married at all is still misfortune.

Hirschig followed Jacobs in reading τὴν παρηγορίαν. In 1910 Headlam proposed τινὰ for τὴν, apparently without acquainting himself with the absence of τὴν from part of the tradition, and this conjecture has been accepted by Gaselee, Vilborg, and Warmington.¹⁹

Now if the manuscripts had τινὰ παρηγορίαν, no one would quarrel with it, and, as it is, it may be right and deserves a place in the apparatus, but the text of β is equally good and should be preferred to a conjecture. It seems better to regard τὴν as inserted by a scribe subject, at a less conscious level, to the error

in the case of 1.3.5.17 and 2.1.3.11, as near as possible to) the beginning of its sentence: in the first two books see 1.2.1.2; 4.1.2.3; 5.3.7; 8.2.19; 19.1.4; 2.1.3.11; 5.1.1; 6.1.13; 6.3.20; 10.2.9; 14.6.4; 15.1.4; 19.2.23; 19.6.11; 22.7.16; 27.3.1; 28.3.15; 31.1.18. Specially relevant to 1.7.2–3 are these places, in which the demonstrative refers to a person just introduced (or, as in 1.3.5.17, revived for his role in the plot): 1.3.5.17 ἦν ἀδελφός, ὡς ἔφην, τοῦ πατρὸς Σώστρατος. παρὰ τούτου τις ἔρχεται . . .; 2.4.2.14; 13.1.19; 20.1.13. Cf. the use of

ἐνταῦθα ('thither') at the beginning of its sentence and referring to a place just introduced: 1.1.2.6; 4.12.8.18.

¹⁶ *μαντεύομαι* β: *μαντεύσομαι* αF. The fut. is wrong and probably due to wrongly taking *ταχύ* and *μαντεύ(ο)μαι* together.

¹⁷ Read by all the editors except Hercher who reads F.

¹⁸ 1.6.3.3; 6.19.4.21.

¹⁹ Gaselee's note on τινὰ is 'Headlam's correction for MSS. τὴν.' Warmington reproduces this inaccuracy.

of thought that led Jacobs and others to retain it, than to assume that it comes through some cause from an original *τινα* which for some *other* reason has left no trace in β.

- 1.8.10 καὶ ὁ Χαρικλῆς, 'Ταῦτα μέν,' ἔφη, 'καὶ θεοὶς καὶ ἐμοὶ μελήσει· καὶ γὰρ εἰς τὴν προθεσμίαν τῶν γάμων χρόνος ἐστὶν ἡμερῶν, πολλὰ δ' ἂν γένοιτο καὶ ἐν νυκτὶ μιᾷ· καὶ κατὰ σχολὴν ζητήσομεν.

<ὀλίγων> post ἡμερῶν Naber // καὶ κατὰ σχολὴν ζητήσομεν del. He // ζητήσομεν Mξ: ζητήσωμεν WD: τηρήσομεν VeF: τηρήσωμεν G

The incompleteness of καὶ κατὰ σχολὴν ζητήσομεν has been tolerated long enough. ζητήσομεν must have an object and there is nothing in the context that can be understood with it. We must insert at least <μηχανήν> and it is, I suppose, most likely to have been omitted from just after σχολήν. Both <μηχανήν> and the use of ζητέω here are supported by 2.12.1: there, with reference to the marriage arranged between himself and his half-sister Calligone, Clitophon says ἐξήτουν μηχανήν δι' ἧς δυναίμην ἀναβαλέσθαι τὸν γάμον.²⁰ In both passages the purpose of the seeker(s) is the same, the avoidance of a marriage.

- 1.9.1 πάντοτε Λευκίππην φαντάζομαι.

πάντοτε F: πάντα a V ε G: ταῦτα ξ

Read πάντα: cf. 5.13.3.15 πάντα δὲ ἔβλεπέ με;²¹ 7.16.4.24 καὶ ἅπαντα ἔβλεπον εἰς τὸ ἐκεῖνης πρόσωπον; 8.9.2.12 πάντα ὑποκύπτων καὶ ὑποκατακλινόμενος αἰεί.

- 1.9.2 οὐ γέγονεν ἄλλω τῷ τοιοῦτον ἀτύχημα· τὸ γὰρ κακὸν μοι καὶ συνοικεῖ.

ἄλλω τῷ F: ἄλλο cett.

There is no good reason for rejecting ἄλλο in favour of the reading in F, which has all the appearance of a deliberate scribal alteration. All ἀτυχήματα, at least of this kind, happen to people, and ἄλλω τῷ does not add anything to the sense. And if Ach. Tat. had written ἄλλω τῷ here, we would surely have ἐμοὶ in the following clause, since there would then be a contrast of persons.

- 1.9.4—5 ὀφθαλμοὶ γὰρ ἀλλήλοις ἀντανακλώμενοι ἀπομάττουσιν ὥς ἐν κατόπτρῳ τῶν σωμάτων τὰ εἶδωλα· ἡ δὲ τοῦ κάλλους ἀπορροή, δι' αὐτῶν εἰς τὴν ψυχὴν καταρρέουσα, ἔχει τινὰ μίξιν ἐν ἀποστάσει· καὶ ὀλίγον ἐστὶ τῆς τῶν σωμάτων μίξεως· καὶ γὰρ ἐστὶ σωμάτων συμπλοκή.

ὀλίγον aVEF: ὀλίγων G: ὀλίγιστόν R: παρ' ὀλίγον Knox: γλυκίων Götting: ἡ καλλίων Schmidt (deleto καὶ) // ἐστὶ: ἄπεσι Guyet // καὶ γὰρ aGF: κενὴ Veξ

The oft emended καὶ ὀλίγον ἐστὶ does not need emendation at all. There is nothing wrong with it in sense or syntax. Substantival ὀλίγον with a partitive genitive occurs also at 4.14.2.24 ἀνέωξαν ὀλίγον τοῦ χρώματος; 5.26.2.25 οβέσον μοι ὀλίγον τοῦ πυρός; 7.4.1.29 ὀλίγον δέ τί μοι τῆς ψυχῆς ὑπελέλειπτο.

²⁰ δυναίμην ἀναβαλέσθαι β: ἀναβάλλεσθαι δυναίμην α // <ἂν> post ἧς add. Cobet. The question of Ach. Tat.'s use of ἂν with the potential optative is a vexed one. At 8.6.15.17 a recently discovered papyrus has . . . βουλομένην ἂν ἀπιτε . . . where the codices omit ἂν. Here (2.12.1) the right

reading is perhaps δυναίμην <ἂν> ἀναβαλέσθαι.

²¹ ἔβλεπεν ἐμέ M. The emphatic pronoun seems necessary: there is a contrast between Clitophon, who received Melite's attention, and the food, which she neglected.

The sense too is perfect: when an εἶδωλον emanates from each body and enters the other through the eyes this actually involves 'a little of the mingling of the bodies'. Götting (γλυκίων) and Schmidt (καλλίων) made their suggestions under the influence of οὐκ οἶδας οἶόν ἐστιν ἐρωνένη καὶ βλεπομένη· μείζονα τῶν ἔργων ἔχει τὴν ἡδονήν (1.9.4). But it is a mistake to think that there is some contradiction between μείζονα τῶν ἔργων ἔχει τὴν ἡδονήν and ὀλίγον ἐστὶ τῆς τῶν σωμάτων μίξεως: the second statement says nothing about the relative degrees of pleasure to be had from the two kinds of μίξις and refers merely to a similarity of process between them. Besides, καινὴ γάρ ἐστι σωμάτων συμπλοκή, which goes perfectly well after . . . ὀλίγον . . . , may be thought an odd reason to give for the *superiority* of μίξις ἐν ἀποστάσει over the intercourse of bodies in general; with a comparative we would need something like τῆς κοινῆς τῶν σωμάτων μίξεως.

- 1.9.5 μέγιστον γάρ ἐστιν ἐφόδιον εἰς πειθῶ συνεχῆς πρὸς ἐρωμένην ὁμιλία.
ὀφθαλμός γάρ φιλίας πρόξενος καὶ τὸ σύνηθες τῆς κοινωνίας εἰς
χάριν ἀνυσιμώτερον.

ἀνυσιμώτερον Wyttenbach: αἰδεσιμώτερον codd. Apostol. Arsen. Maxim.

αἰδεσιμώτερον is generally, and rightly, considered unsuitable in sense²² and the editors (except Jacobs, who retains αἰδεσιμώτερον unenthusiastically) have adopted Wyttenbach's ἀνυσιμώτερον,²³ which may be right. However, Ach. Tat. does not use ἀνύσιμος elsewhere,²⁴ and there is a more ordinary word, forms of which he does use, which gives the sense needed here, and which is by no means prohibitively unlike the manuscript reading: χρησιμώτερον. Cf. esp. 3.21.3.24 πᾶντως δὲ καὶ ὁ χρησμός ἡμῖν εἰς τὸ λαθεῖν χρήσιμος.²⁵

If the comparative is thought to be too restrained (esp. after μέγιστον . . . ἐφόδιον . . .), then χρησιμώτατον.

- 1.10.3 πρὸς δὲ τὴν τῆς Ἀφροδίτης χάριν καὶ γνώμης ἔχωσι, ἃ πάσχουσιν
ἀκούειν οὐ θέλουσι· τὴν γὰρ αἰσχύνην κείσθαι νομίζουσιν ἐν τοῖς ῥήμασι.

γνώμης: γνώμην Jacobs (<τὴν> γνώμην He): γνώμης <τι> Ga: ὁρμὴν Schmidt

Vilborg differs from previous editors in accepting the text of the manuscripts, citing²⁶ in support of it Hld. 7.21.3 εἰ μὲν οὖν ἔχεις γνώμης (γνώμην H. Richards) καὶ τελείως δρᾶσαι τὸ ἔργον οὐκ ἔχω λέγειν. But this solitary parallel is weakened by the fact that an original γνώμην might so easily have become γνώμης by phonetic assimilation to ἔχεις, and Richards's γνώμην is very probably right.²⁷ Besides, of course, apart from the matter of the genitive with ἔχω the wider syntax in Hld. is different from that in Ach. Tat.

The necessary meaning, as Vilborg says, is clear ('even if they have an inclination towards the pleasure of love'); the question concerns syntax and how exactly the author would have expressed that meaning.

²² See LSJ s. αἰδέσιμος and Vilb. *Comm.*, p.27.

²³ Tyrwhitt's ἐναισιμώτερον (see R. Dawes, *Miscellanea Critica ex recensione Thomae Kidd* (London, 1827²), p.612) has not enjoyed much attention, happily enough: it is an improbable poeticism of no suitable sense, arrived at, in Tyrwhitt's argument, by high-rise palaeographics.

²⁴ ἀνύω: 3.1.4.14; 5.5.4.12 ἥνυσεν (Villoison: ὠνησεν codd.).

²⁵ χρήσιμος also at 4.6.3.26; 8.9.3.15; 10.5.7 (after Aeschines 1.61), always of persons.

²⁶ *Comm.*, p.28.

²⁷ The alternative is εἰ μὲν οὖν <οὕτως> ἔχεις γνώμης, <ὥς> καὶ . . .

If we accept the transmitted text, γνώμης will be partitive genitive with ἔχωσω, a very doubtful construction, and γνώμης ἔχειν πρὸς τι, a mode of expression unparalleled not only in Ach. Tat. but, apparently, in the whole of Greek literature, will mean 'to have a favourable disposition towards something.' Thucydides 3.25.2 πρὸς τοὺς Ἀθηναίους ἥσσαν εἶχον τὴν γνώμην seems to support Jacobs's γνώμην. However, the article is necessary in Thucydides,²⁸ where εἶχον means 'directed' (*vel sim.*) and πρὸς τοὺς Ἀθηναίους is dependent on the verb, and if we adopted γνώμην we would have to introduce a second change and read <τὴν> γνώμην with Hercher. In the form of expression that I propose it is regular for the genitive, in this case γνώμης, to be without the article: I suggest that γνώμης is quasi-locative genitive, ἔχωσω is intransitive, and an adverb of manner has been lost.

Ach. Tat. frequently²⁹ uses ἔχω intransitively with an adverb to express condition or disposition; that in, or in respect of, which the subject is said to be in some condition, or somehow disposed is, when expressed, in the genitive without the article or in the accusative;³⁰ the person (thing) towards whom (which) the subject is disposed in a particular way is in the accusative governed by πρὸς. These are the occurrences of ἔχω and an adverb (1) with genitive only: 2.37.5.10 καὶ μετρίως ἔχω πείρας; 3.6.1.24 οὕτω γὰρ ἡλικίας εἶχε; 21.3.26 . . . τὸ ξίφος ὡς ἔχει μηχανῆς; 4.11.2.24 ἕκαστος, ὡς εἶχε τάχους . . . ; 6.6.1.20 ὡς εἶχεν ὁρμῆς; 7.8.4 ὡς ἔχει λύπης; 8.6.15.16 ὅπως (ὁπως Π⁶: πῶς codd.) ἂν αὐτοῖς σχοίτε (α: σχήτε β) τύχης; esp. 2.21.3.30 . . . ἀποθανεῖν ἤθελεν. οὕτω δὲ γνώμης ἔχων ἐλέφαντι περιτυγχάνει . . . ; (2) with πρὸς and accusative only: 1.19.1.4 . . . πῶς ἔχει πρὸς τὴν ἀκρόασιν τὴν ἐρωτικὴν; 2.4.2.13 ἔχει πρὸς με ὡς ἐραστήν; 4.2.14 πρὸς ἡμᾶς οὕτως ἔχειν, ὡς . . . ; 5.22.2.5 πρὸς τε τὴν μαγεύουσαν οὕτως ἔχειν, ὡς . . . ; 6.15.3.23 τὸ γὰρ ἐμὸν οὕτως ἔχει πρὸς αὐτήν, ὡς ἀθάνατον εἶναι; 20.3.15 . . . πῶς πρὸς τὰς αἰκίας ἔχω; 7.9.10.15 πολὺ μᾶλλον πρὸς τὴν Μ. εἶχεν ἀλλοτριώτερον; (3) with both gen. and πρὸς with acc.: 1.7.1.21 οὕτω δὲ εἶχε φιλοτιμίας πρὸς αὐτό (sc. τὸ μειράκιον), ὥστε . . . ; 5.22.2.1 Τὰ μὲν ἐμὰ ὅπως ἔσχεν πρὸς σε φιλανθρωπίας. This evidence all but compels us to the view that an adverb has been lost from 1.10.3. The original text was perhaps . . . καὶ γνώμης <προθύμως>³¹ ἔχωσω . . .

²⁸ The same form of expression (always with μάλλον) occurs in Thuc. 5.13.2; 5.14.1; 5.44.

²⁹ Intrans. ἔχω with adv. (without gen. and πρὸς with acc.): (27 times) 2.1.2.7 (οὕτως); 8.1.1 οὐκ οἶδ' ὅπως εἶχεν (εἶχεν Π¹: om. codd.); 10.3.17 (ὡς); 16.1.25 (μαλακῶς); 19.2.25 (οὕτως); 23.5.10 (ὡς); 24.1.17 (ὡς); 3.16.1.23 (ἀναιρῶς); 23.2.18 (καλῶς); 4.2.2.16 (οὕτως); 11.3.27 (οὕτως); 14.1.21 (οὕτω); 16.1.1 ἀκούσατε δὲ ὡς ἔχω περὶ τοῦ φαρμάκου; 17.4.4 (πῶς); 5.6.1.7 (οὐχ ὕγιως); 10.7.17 (ὡς); 20.4.15 (ἀπόρως); 21.3.6 (ὡς); 23.5.18 (ὡς); 6.2.5.17 (καλῶς); 9.6.18 (οὕτως); 13.4.6 (οὕτως); 15.1.18 . . . πῶς ἔχει τὰ κατὰ τὴν κόρην εἰς πειθῶ πρὸς αὐτόν; 15.2.21 (οὕτως

ἀπλῶς); 7.9.10.12 (οὕτως); 8.7.6.18 (μάλα εὐτρεπῶς (εὐτρεπῶς codd.: corr. Jacobs)); 12.1.6 (οὕτως).

³⁰ Always τὴν ψυχὴν: 1.6.6.17; 6.5.5.19; 11.2.25.

³¹ This adv. does not occur elsewhere in Ach. Tat., but προθυμέομαι is found at 3.22.4.7. For προθύμως ἔχειν πρὸς τι see Pl. *Smp.* 176 C.

Since προθύμως refers primarily to mental disposition, it might seem unsuitable for use with γνώμης, but there is a contrast here between thoughts and the expression of them, between γνώμη and τὰ ῥήματα, and this would justify, indeed necessitate, the writing of γνώμης as well as προθύμως.

1.10.4 παρθένος δὲ τοὺς μὲν ἔξωθεν ἀκροβολισμοὺς τῶν ἐραστῶν εἰς πεῖραν φέρει καὶ ἄφνω συντίθεται τοῖς νεύμασι.

εἰς πεῖραν has hitherto been taken with ἀκροβολισμοὺς: 'virgines vero amantium praeludia tentandi gratia adhibita ferunt' (Cruceius); 'the long-range skirmishes that a lover uses to feel his way' (Gaselee-Warmington). But the word-order surely puts the phrase with φέρει: this also gives better sense and rhythm, suitably modifying the otherwise very flat φέρει: 'bears the long-range flirtings of lovers, to see what they are like.'

1.10.4 καὶ ὑποσχέσθαι θέλῃ τὴν χάριν, αἰσχύνεται. τότε γὰρ πάσχει νομίζει τὸ ἔργον, ὅτε μᾶλλον τὴν πεῖραν ἐκ τῆς τῶν λόγων ἡδονῆς ἀκούει.

ὅτε . . . ἀκούει αF: ὅταν . . . ἀκούη β // μᾶλλον secl. He

(1) Elsewhere in Ach. Tat. there are seven instances of τότε anticipating³² or resuming³³ a ὅταν clause, but τότε and ὅτε are never related in this way. In textual criticism statistical arguments on their own are dangerous, but they have great strength when other considerations tend to the same conclusion. Here the context demands a hypothetical generalizing clause, β offers ὅταν . . . ἀκούη, and that is what we should read.

(2) Hercher bracketed μᾶλλον and A. Wifstrand³⁴ thought that it was illogically placed and belonged in sense with τότε. There is nothing wrong with it, nothing illogical about its position, and it has nothing to do with τότε. μᾶλλον should be taken closely with τὴν πεῖραν and the Greek means 'when because of the pleasure that her lover's words give her she hears rather the attempt', i.e. 'the actual physical attempt on her suggested in the words rather than just the verbal proposition.' Ellipsis of this kind with μᾶλλον occurs also at 2.37.1.17 Καὶ μὴν οὐράνιον ἔοικε μᾶλλον εἶναι (ἔοικε μᾶλλον εἶναι α: εοικέναι β: εοικεν εἶναι F, and Vilb) τὸ τῶν γυναικῶν κάλλος, i.e. *rather* than that of boys; 6.6.4.4 ἐπὶ τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς μᾶλλον ρεέτω τοὺς ἑμούς, i.e. *rather* than εἰς γῆν; 7.9.8.5 ἄρ' οὐν οὐ πολὺ μᾶλλον ἂν καὶ ἐλεγχόμενος ἡρνήσατο τὸν φόνον, i.e. *rather* than accuse himself.

1.10.4—5 παρθένος δὲ τοὺς μὲν ἔξωθεν ἀκροβολισμοὺς τῶν ἐραστῶν εἰς πεῖραν φέρει . . . ἐὰν δὲ αἰτήσης τὸ ἔργον προσελθῶν, ἐκπλήξεις αὐτῆς τὰ ὥτα τῇ φωνῇ, καὶ ἐρυθριᾷ . . . τότε γὰρ πάσχει νομίζει τὸ ἔργον, ὅτε μᾶλλον τὴν πεῖραν ἐκ τῆς τῶν λόγων ἡδονῆς ἀκούει. ἐὰν δὲ τὴν πεῖραν προσάγων τὴν ἄλλην καὶ εὐάγων αὐτὴν κατασκευάσας ἡδέως ἥδη προσέρχῃ, σιώπα . . .

(1) It strikes me that we very probably have here an example of a fairly common type of error, the substitution of a word that the scribe has very lately written for the word that he should now be copying. In this passage πεῖραν occurs three times in six lines and the second and third occurrences are within a line of each other, and, if they are both right, must have different, in fact unsuitably clashing, meanings.³⁵ There is no question of verbal play: the

³² τότε . . . ὅταν . . . 7.12.5.19.

³³ ὅταν . . . τότε . . . 1.6.3.25; 16.2.9; 18.5.1; 6.2.6.19; 7.7.8.6; 8.10.2.18.

³⁴ Εἰκότα. *Emendationen und Interpretationen zu griechischen Prosaikern der Kaiserzeit. V, Zu den Romanschriftstellern* (Lund, 1945), p.21. Vilborg (*Comm.*, p.28)

approves Wifstrand's view.

³⁵ The second πεῖραν refers to an actual physical 'attempt' to have intercourse with the girl; the third πεῖραν would signify 'an approach', 'an attempt' to win her over of quite the opposite kind.

third *πειῶν* in the transmitted text is merely awkward, and in a way that is very uncharacteristic of the writer.

2.4.3, where Clitophon is getting further advice, this time from Satyrus, on how to woo Leucippe, at once strengthens the sense that there is an error here and provides the word that in all probability Ach. Tat. wrote where the third *πειῶν* stands: *δεῖ δέ σε καὶ τὴν κόρην μὴ μέχρι τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν πειῶν, ἀλλὰ καὶ ῥῆμα δριμύτερον εἰπεῖν. τότε δὲ πρόσαγε τὴν δευτέραν μηχανήν· θίγε χειρὸς . . .*

(2) *ἡδέως* makes only very feeble sense, and Berger's *ἀδεῶς*³⁶ goes perfectly with *ἡδη*, denoting a feature of the approach that would naturally result from the girl's already being *εὐάγωγος* and already having indicated as much to her lover *τοῖς νεύμασι*. *ἀδεῶς* became *ἡδέως* under the influence of *ἡδη* and because *ἡδέως* is itself a good Greek word, and one that would occur to a scribe as not out of place in this context. For the thought, with *ἀδεῶς*, cf. 2.10.3, where Clitophon actually makes an approach to Leucippe having already had some earnest of success: *πρόσεμμι θρασύτερος γενόμενος πρὸς αὐτὴν ἐκ τῆς πρώτης προσβολῆς, ὥσπερ στρατιώτης ἡδη νενικηκώς καὶ τοῦ πολέμου καταπεφρονηκώς.*

1.10.6–7 *κἂν μὲν προσῇ τις συνθήκη τῆς πράξεως, πολλάκις δὲ καὶ ἐκούσαι πρὸς τὸ ἔργον ἐρχόμεναι θέλουσι βιάζεσθαι δοκεῖν, ἵνα τῇ δόξῃ τῆς ἀνάγκης ἀποτρέπωνται τῆς αἰσχύνῃς τὸ ἐκούσιον. μὴ τοῖνυν ὀκνήσῃς, ἐὰν ἀνθισταμένην αὐτὴν ἴδῃς, ἀλλ' ἐπιτῆρει πῶς ἀνθίσταται· σοφίας γὰρ κἀνταῦθα δεῖ. κἂν μὲν προσκαρτερῇ, ἐπίσχεσ τὴν βίαν· οὐπὼ γὰρ πεῖθεται· ἐὰν δὲ κτλ.*

μὲν aF: *μὴ* β // *τις συνθήκη* β: *ταῖς συνθήκαις* aF // *post πράξεως lac. ind.* Jacobs // *καὶ: μὴ* R: *om.* W // *ἐκούσαι: δοκοῦσαι* R // *δοκεῖν: δοκεῖ* F // *αὐτὴν om.* β

The first index of possible corruption is the unusual³⁷ apodotic *δέ*. But there is another: if *κἂν μὲν . . . πράξεως* is right and there is already an actual *συνθήκη* τῆς πράξεως, why does the lover need to observe the nature of the woman's resistance to discover whether she is willing? And how is the conclusion *οὐπὼ πεῖθεται* possible? Besides, how can a woman who makes a sexual agreement with her lover hope then, perhaps immediately, to put up an effective pretence that she is being raped by him? And even if this is somehow possible, what is the point in carrying the pretence to such lengths that nothing substantial takes place between them because of it? The text cannot be left as it is.

There are two ways of attempting to solve the problem:

(a) Mark a lacuna after *πράξεως* with Jacobs. But I cannot see any suitable contrast or balance between *κἂν μὲν . . . πράξεως*, * * and *πολλάκις δὲ . . .* no matter how the lacuna is filled.³⁸

(b) Read the long-neglected *μή* of β,³⁹ and then *πολλάκις δὴ*⁴⁰ . . . ; *δὴ*

³⁶ Read by Hirschig.

³⁷ Only here in apodosis to a conditional clause. Cf. 8.10.12.8; 17.3.20. (Neither of these instances of *δέ*, the only ones in Ach. Tat. at all relevant, is very secure in itself.)

³⁸ Jacobs, p.454, says only, 'Ceterum in hoc periodo oratio non constat. Post *πράξεως* apodosin excidisse apparet', and

he does not suggest any supplement. To join *κἂν μή . . . πράξεως* with what precedes, as Salmasius and Boden did, is obviously inept.

³⁹ Note in this same clause *τις συνθήκη* β: *ταῖς συνθήκαις* aF, wrongly.

⁴⁰ See J. D. Denniston, *The Greek Particles* (Oxford, 1954²), pp.206 and 224 f. Emphatic *δὴ* is fairly common in

would mark an important, and to the neophyte Clitophon perhaps surprising, element in the discourse of Clinias. It is worth remembering that this advice is given to, and intended to be helpful to, one who in fact does *not* yet have a *συνθήκη τῆς πράξεως* with the object of his affections.

1.10.7 ἐὰν δὲ μαλθακώτερον ἤδη θέλῃ, χορήγησον τὴν ὑπόκρισιν, μὴ ἀπολέσης σου τὸ δράμα

μαλθακώτερον . . . θέλῃ codd. (μαλθακωτέρα D): μαλθακωτέραν . . .

θέλῃς Sa: μαλθακωτέραν . . . βλέπῃς Richards // ἀπολέσης βF: ἀπολέσαι a.

(1) ἐὰν δὲ μαλθακώτερον ἤδη θέλῃ⁴¹ is indubitably strange. I should be surprised to find other instances of (ἐ)θέλω with a comparative adverb of this kind. I would read ἐὰν δὲ μαλθακώτερον ἤδη διατέθῃ. Compare 6.7.8 ὅταν δὲ ἡμερώτερον διατέθῃ, τότε αὐτῇ διαλεχθῆσομαι together with its context.

It seems likely that the corruption came about in two easy stages: first the *δια* of *διατέθῃ* fell out, phonetically nudged by the preceding -δη, and then *τέθῃ*, naturally in this context, suggested *θέλῃ* to a copyist. It is, of course, possible that one scribe, in a careless moment, was responsible for both steps in the corruption. It may be too that metathesis, -τέθῃ to -θέτῃ, played a part.

(2) *χορήγησον τὴν ὑπόκρισιν, μὴ ἀπολέσης σου τὸ δράμα*. What do these words mean? The interpreters say: 'act still with proper caution, lest after all you should lose your labour' (Rowland Smith); 'you must be prepared to act a part, or else you will lose all the trouble of your plot' (Gaselee-Warmington, with this elaboration in a footnote: 'You must stage-manage (*χορηγεῖν*) your own acting, or else you will not get your play accepted, and so will have wasted all the trouble you took in composing it'⁴²); 'stage your part so that (the trouble you took in composing) your plot will not be lost' (Vilborg, *Comm.*, p.29).

The Greek says nothing about prior composition.⁴³ By this point the lover will be in the thick of his acting and the play will, so to speak, already have been on stage for some time; and if he does not act as the play requires, he is in danger not of 'losing it' (whatever that might mean) but of 'ruining'⁴⁴ it.

There is still the question of what *χορήγησον* means. *χορηγεῖν* has two basic meanings: (A) 'lead a chorus' (LSJ s.v. I *ad init.*); (B) 'provide the cost of a chorus' (II 1). Two secondary senses derive from these: (a) 'take the lead in' (I *ad fin.*); (b) 'be provider' *vel sim.* (II 2), 'provide', 'furnish' (II 3). In the present passage *χορήγησον* is used metaphorically: there is no chorus in question, only the lover and his girl, but the author wants to use as many words as possible with theatrical associations. Now, of the secondary senses that

Ach. Tat. (e.g. 1.6.1.17; 2.21.3.2; 3.3.2.18; 4.1.6; 19.3.13; 20.6.3). *πολλάκις δὴ*, however, does not occur elsewhere and *δὴ* is not found in *apodosi*. The corruption of *δὴ* to *δέ*, and vice versa is, of course, very frequent: see e.g. Ach. Tat. 1.3.4.10; 3.6.21; 4.1.26; 2.4.1.8; 4.3.16; 11.2.2; 11.3.7; 20.3.21; 35.2.11; 3.1.3.8; 4.3.14.

⁴¹ Vilborg (*Comm.* p.29) says that the *θέλῃς* of previous editors has no manuscript authority. Anyway ἐὰν δὲ . . . θέλῃς would be entirely unsuitable as an antithesis to *κἂν μὲν προσκαρτερῇ*. Note that Richards's improbable *μαλθακωτέραν* . . . βλέπῃς is based on a text with *θέλῃς*.

⁴² In this interpretation I do not understand how the play is already being acted before it has even been accepted. (There is no question of a preliminary audition: in his advice Clinias is talking about the real performance.)

⁴³ σου (*μου* G: *om.* R) is a little strange. It hardly refers irrelevantly to literary authorship. The lover is the protagonist and is probably thought of as improvising to meet the circumstances as he goes along.

⁴⁴ For *ἀπόλλυμι* with the sense 'ruin' in Ach. Tat. see 1.8.9.18; 2.24.1.18 *ἀπώλεσάς μου* . . . τὰς ἐλπιδάς.

χορηγεῖν can have, as set out above, those in (b) are clearly inappropriate here, while (a) gives good sense. If the girl persistently resists her lover, Clinias' advice to him is ἐπίσχες τὴν βίαν; if she shows compliance, he should press on, no longer tentative, and dictate the course of events, not merely 'act with proper caution'⁴⁵ or anything like that. After all, if the use of force, already advised by Clinias, has not only not alienated the girl, but actually caused her to make her willingness apparent to the lover, why should the text be interpreted in such a way that Clinias advises him now to be particularly cautious or to hold back in any way?

There remains the difficulty that in the only occurrence of χορηγεῖν meaning 'take the lead in' recorded in the lexicons (see LSJ s.v.I) it takes a genitive: Pl. *Tht.* 179 d οἱ γὰρ τοῦ Ἡρακλείτου ἐταῖροι χορηγοῦσι τοῦτου τοῦ λόγου μάλα ἐρρωμένως. However, one instance is not enough to establish the genitive as the invariable case with χορηγέω in this sense, and the present passage furnishes as much evidence for the accusative (at least in later Greek). It is worth while to compare the variation between acc. and gen. *rei* with the better-documented analogous ἡγεομαι (cf. LSJ s.v. I 4 and II 2 *ad fin.*) and ἐξάρχω (LSJ s.v. 1 and 2).

Translate: 'take the lead in the acting, or you'll ruin your play.'

- 1.12.1–2 ἅμα δὲ αὐτῷ λέγοντι συνεξεφώνησεν ὁ οἰκέτης· 'Τέθνηκε Χαρκλῆς· τὸν μὲν δὴ Κλεινίαν πρὸς τὴν ἀγγελίαν ἀφήκεν ἢ φωνὴ καὶ ἔμενεν ἀκίνητος, ὥσπερ τυφῶνι βεβλημένος τῷ λόγῳ. ὁ δὲ οἰκέτης διηγεῖται· 'Ἐπὶ τὸν ἵππον τὸν σὸν ἐκάθισεν, ὧ Κλεινία, ὅς τὰ πρῶτα μὲν ἤλανευσεν ἡρέμα, δύο δὲ περιελθὼν ἢ τρεῖς δρόμους τὴν ἵππασίαν ἐπέσχε καὶ τὸν ἵππον ἰδρῶντα κατέψα καθήμενος, τοῦ ρυτῆρος ἀμελήσας . . .'

μὲν post Ἐπὶ add. M // ὧ Κλεινία, <ὁ νεανίας>· ὅς . . . Jackson // πρῶτα μὲν αF: μὲν πρῶτα β // ἤλανευσεν MDVEG: ἔλανευσεν WRF // ἢ τρεῖς δρόμους περιελθὼν transp. F // καὶ post ἢ add. G

Jackson was right in finding the relative here 'repugnant to all human modes of speech',⁴⁶ but his <ὁ νεανίας>, like many another palaeographically 'neat' conjecture, is quite improbable: Charicles is never referred to as anything but Χαρκλῆς or μειράκιον. μειράκιον could not, of course, be antecedent to ὅς and we must not make the servant awkwardly repeat the boy's name. The relative, then, must refer to the horse, the only available antecedent, and it must be object, not subject, of ἤλανευσεν.⁴⁷ Read ὄν.

- 1.13.1 διωλύγιον ἐκώκυσε καὶ ἐκδραμεῖν ἐπὶ τὸ σῶμα μὲν ἠπειγέτο· ἐπηκολούθουν δὲ ἀγῶ, παρηγορῶν ὡς ἡδυνάμην.

⁴⁵ This would need something like . . . καὶ τότε . . . in view of σοφίας γὰρ κἀνταῦθα δεῖ a couple of lines above. Note Smith's 'still'.

⁴⁶ CQ 29 (1935), 54. Wilborg does not record the conjecture.

⁴⁷ Apart from the fact that ἤλανευσεν should most naturally have the same subject as ἐπέσχε and κατέψα, viz. the boy, horses, and ships occur as the objects, never the subjects, of active forms of ἐλαύνω

and its compounds except at Hdt. 7.183.2 τῶν δὲ δέκα νεῶν τῶν βαρβάρων τρεῖς ἐπήλασαν (a: ἐπάλησαν D: δοκῶ ἐστάλησαν R: ἐπεστάλησαν SV) περὶ τὸ ἔρμα, where, however, ἐπήλασαν should be regarded as corrupt unless νῆας (νέας) rather than νῆες (νέες) can be understood with τρεῖς, a possibility even if not a very appealing one. (Read ἐστάλησαν: see CQ N.S.27 (1977), 92 ff.).

ἐκδραμεῖν α: ἐκδραμῶν β || μὲν οτι. ε⁴⁸

μὲν by its position cries out, and has hitherto cried out in vain, for ἐκδραμῶν.

1.13.4 καὶ μοι τέθνηκας θάνατον διπλοῦν, ψυχῇ καὶ σώματι

ψυχῆς καὶ σώματος He

How is the dative to be taken? Hercher's proposal should be adopted. Cf. 7.5.3.10 νῦν δὲ τέθνηκας θάνατον διπλοῦν, ψυχῆς καὶ σώματος, where the genitive is subjective genitive dependent on θάνατον. These passages demonstrate that in expressions of this kind the explanatory words qualify the noun denoting that which is 'double': 1.15.6.19 ὡς δοκεῖν τὸ ἄλσος εἶναι διπλοῦν, τὸ μὲν τῆς ἀληθείας, τὸ δὲ τῆς σκιᾶς; 2.23.3.1 τρέμων τρόμον διπλοῦν, χαρᾶς ἅμα καὶ φόβου; 5.7.8.13 τέθνηκας ἀληθῶς θάνατον διπλοῦν, γῇ καὶ θαλάττῃ διαιρούμενον. There is no way in which the dative ψυχῇ καὶ σώματι could depend on θάνατον at 1.13.4.

1.13.6 ἄλλο σοι, τέκνον, προσεδόκων πῦρ ἀνάψαι· ἀλλὰ τοῦτο μὲν ἔσβεσεν ἡ φθονερά τύχη μετὰ σοῦ. ἀνάπτει δέ σοι δᾶδας κακῶν.

ἀνάψαι: ἀνάψευ Cobet // ἀνάπτει α: ἀνθάπτει β

The verb of a clause dependent on προσδοκάω, 'expect', and referring to a relatively future time is either future infinitive alone or aor. inf. with ἄν.⁴⁹ Cobet's ἀνάψευ is possible,⁵⁰ but it seems very likely here that Ach. Tat. would have used the aor. inf. with ἄν to emphasize that the action of the dependent clause was never to take place.⁵¹ I propose ἄν ἄψαι.⁵² It is in favour of ἄψαι, that it goes better than a compound with the following ἀνθάπτει (β). There can be little or no doubt that the highly appropriate ἀνθάπτει ('lights up in its stead') is right: it is far too easy a coinage to reject on the grounds of its uniqueness.⁵³

⁴⁸ Russo (*Gnomon* 30 (1958), 585) says that V too omits μὲν. It should be noted that the manuscripts that omit μὲν are among those that have ἐκδραμῶν anyway.

⁴⁹ On προσδοκάω with aor. inf. without ἄν see E. Fraenkel's commentary on A. Ag. 675–6.

⁵⁰ Fut. inf. 2.24.2.22; 7.14.2.2; 14.5.14; acc. and fut. inf. 3.2.7.4; 5.26.11.27. Elsewhere only acc. and pres. inf.: 3.20.6.5.

⁵¹ Cf. the use of ἵνα with a past tense indicative in the next paragraph, 1.14.1.

⁵² (a) For ἄπτω meaning 'light', 'kindle' see 2.11.1.28 ἄψαντος τὰς δᾶδας; 4.7.4.15 ἄψω πῦρ ἐπὶ τοὺς πολεμίους.

(b) Confusion (see, with app. crit., e.g. A. Ag. 340 (see E. Fraenkel ad loc.); 1094; Pers. 650; Pr. 963; Supp. 606; S. O. T. 1387), and the possibility of confusion (e.g. A. Ag. 280; S. Aj. 1144; El. 373; O. C. 927; Pb. 443; E. Med. 370 οὐδ' ἄν ἡψάμην χερσῶν; Pl. R. ii.375 b; Smp. 174 b; cf. R. i.330 c . . . οἱ ἄν . . .; Smp. 176 c . . . ὁπότερ' ἄν . . .; Hp. Ma. 299 a . . . ἄν ἴσως

. . .); D. 18.224; 18.258; 19.312; Th. 1.11; Ach. Tat. 2.20.1.13; 4.13.4.9; 6.1.3.13; 8.9.8.10) of ἄν and ἀν- are, of course, common. Usually a simple verb and its compound in ἀν- have substantially different meanings, one of which would be evidently unsuitable in a particular passage, and this goes to determine the word division, e.g. in ἀνεχεῖν (-ομι, -ον etc.), ἀναλίσκειν, ἀναίρειν, ἀνείπειν, ἀνελθεῖν, and the like; sometimes the requirements of syntax are the main determining factor, e.g. in cases involving ἀναγγελλεῖν (A. A. 280), ἀναπτειν, ἀναπτεσθαι (E. Med. 370; Ach. Tat. 8.8.1.23 (with app. crit), where Vilborg's ἄψαμι is presumably an error for ἄψαίμην), ἀνερῶταν (Pl. Lg. iv.712 e . . . ἄν ἐρωτηθεῖς (ἀνερῶτηθεῖς Madvig) . . .), ἀνιστορεῖν (A. Pr. 963).

(c) <ἀν> ἀνάψαι would not have been repugnant to the Greek ear (cf. D. 9.48 . . . ἄν ἀναχωρεῖν . . .), but ἄν ἄψαι, which is interpretation rather than change, is simpler. And there is also the point about ἄψαι . . . ἀνθάπτει . . .

⁵³ Ach. Tat. may also have coined

1.14.3 ἐγὼ δέ σου τὸν φονέα, τὸν ἀνδροφόνον ἐωνησάμην.

σου β: σοι α (et edd. praeter Vilb)

The sentence needs σοι for its point. Clinias did not merely buy the horse, not a matter for regret in itself, but having bought it he gave it to Charicles (σοι) and this led to the boy's death. The dative is nicely balanced between intended advantage⁵⁴ and actual disadvantage. σου and σοι often occur as variants,⁵⁵ too often to allow an editor just to follow 'the best family' of manuscripts with confidence in a particular case. Here the scribe of β may have been influenced by σου τὸν φονέα of 1.14.2 just above.

1.15.2 (codd.) ἔθαλλον οἱ κλάδοι, συνέπιπτον ἀλλήλοις ἄλλος ἐπ' ἄλλον· αἱ γείτονες τῶν πετάλων περιπλοκαί, τῶν φύλλων περιβολαί, τῶν καρπῶν συμπλοκαί. τοσαύτη τις ἦν ὁμιλία τῶν φυτῶν.

αἱ γείτονες: γείτονες αἱ Guyet, Vilb: ἐγίνοντο He

Two observations may be made immediately: there is no reason why γείτονες should be feminine, since the partitive genitives that depend on it are not feminine; and there is every reason why it should not be shorn of the article and taken as complement with Guyet. That change produces an extremely banal truism; and, besides, τοσαύτη τις ἦν ὁμιλία τῶν φυτῶν clearly requires that περιπλοκαί, περιβολαί, and συμπλοκαί should be climactic complements in the preceding sentence.

The upshot of these thoughts is οἱ γείτονες. οἱ became αἱ⁵⁶ by assimilation to the feminine endings in the sentence. This simple change brings perfect sense on its own: ἦσαν or ἐγίνοντο can readily be understood. An alternative, which I do not, however, favour, is to attach γείτονες to the preceding clause, a move prompted by the asyndeton in ἔθαλλον . . . , συνέπιπτον ἀλλήλοις . . . , and read . . . , συνέπιπτον ἀλλήλοις ἄλλος ἐπ' ἄλλον οἱ γείτονες [sc. τῶν κλάδων] <καὶ ἐγίνοντο> τῶν πετάλων περιπλοκαί, κτλ.⁵⁷

1.15.4 τῶν δὲ φύλλων ἄνωθεν αἰωρουμένων ὑφ' ἡλίῳ πρὸς ἄνεμον συμμιγεῖ ὥχρᾶν ἐμάρμαιρεν ἡ γῆ τὴν σκιάν.

συμμιγεῖ Ve: συμμιγῆ αG

The editors have taken ὑφ' ἡλίῳ πρὸς ἄνεμον συμμιγεῖ together as meaning 'in sunlight mingled with wind' *vel sim.* . With this interpretation the hiatus⁵⁸

ἀνταισχύνομαι (8.4.1.11), ἀντιβομβέω (3.2.2.13; cf. Eust. 1885.19), and ἀντικαταδύομαι (6.18.5.26). On p.173 of his edition Vilborg marks ἀντιπεριβάλλω (5.8.3.1) too as a ἅπαξ εἰρημένον, but see LSJ s.v. .

⁵⁴ The fact that Clinias did not buy the horse actually as a present for Charicles (1.7.1) is neither here nor there: it became a love-present so soon after its purchase that Clinias, especially in his distress, might well speak of himself as having bought it for, as well as to the ruin of, Charicles.

⁵⁵ 1.13.5.28 (σοι WD); 14.3.18 (σοι W); 2.21.5.11 (σου W); 6.9.2.28 (σοι α); cf. 5.11.3.3 (σου: σοι Cobet, rightly: it was Clinias' homeland too!). Cf. μου/μοι

1.3.6.21 (μου G); 5.3.25 (μοι F); 5.5.7 (μοι F); 8.11.26 (μου F); 2.22.2.19 (μοι F); 4.17.1.21 (μοι β: μου α); 5.21.5.15 (μου β: μοι α); 6.10.2.2 (μου β: μοι α); 7.4.1.1 (μοι β: μου α); cf. 6.22.1.4 (μου: μοι Hase, rightly).

⁵⁶ Cf. 1.15.8.25 (αἱ β: οἱ α).

⁵⁷ On returning to Jacobs I find that he says this ad loc.: 'Mihi in mentem venit: συνέπιπτον ἀλλήλοις ἄλλος ἐπ' ἄλλον οἱ γείτονες· τῶν πετάλων περιπλοκαί—in novissimis subaudiendum ἦσαν.' But in this the ellipsis of ἦσαν (substantive rather than copulative) is entirely unnatural.

⁵⁸ The editors, however, should not be thought of as having adverted to this. See Reeve, *CQ* N.S. 21 (1971), 515.

in . . . *συμμιγεῖ ὥχρᾶν* . . . is legitimized by a pause after the participial phrase.⁵⁹ There are, however, difficulties in this: 'sunlight mingled with wind' is a curious expression, and *συμμιγής* seems not to occur elsewhere with a dependent *πρός* and acc.⁶⁰ And, more important, there are strong considerations pointing in a different direction: Ach. Tat. knew and occasionally echoed Plato's *Phaedrus*⁶¹ and the only other recorded place in Greek literature where *συμμιγής* and *σκιά* are found in one sentence is *Phdr.* 239 c and there they go together syntactically;⁶² in the passage under discussion aG offer *συμμιγῇ*, the form that would agree with *σκιάν*; and if *συμμιγεῖ(-γῇ)* is detached from the preceding words, they give faultless sense on their own, 'the leaves waving above in the sunlight in response to the wind'; *πρός ἄνεμον* in particular has a meaning⁶³ very suitable in this context, and the same will be true of *συμμιγῇ* with *σκιάν*.⁶⁴ I am not inclined to regard all this as chance, and, therefore, propose . . . *συμμιγῇ <καί>*⁶⁵ *ὥχρᾶν ἐμάρμαιρεν* . . .

1.15.5 τὰ δὲ ἄνθη ποικίλην ἔχοντα τὴν χροιάν ἐν μέρει συνεξέφαινε τὸ κάλλος, καὶ ἦν τοῦτο τῆς γῆς πορφύρα, <ἴον> καὶ νάρκισσος καὶ ῥόδον.

συνεξέφαινε Jackson // ἦν τοῦτο: ἐν ταύτῳ Lumb // <ἴον> Jacobs: <ἴα> Lumb: <. ἴον ἢ πορφύρα> Jackson

(1) 'As the flowers conspired not to display but to create the beauty *συνεξέφαινε* is intrinsically better than *συνεξέφαινε*. In addition it gives the note for his *πορφύρα*'.⁶⁶ We must not let the rhetorical flair of Jackson's first sentence blind us to its falsehood: and *ἐν μέρει* suits a joint display better than a conspiracy of weaving. However, in the context *συνεξέφαινε* is perhaps interesting enough to keep its place in the apparatus.

(2) 'And the flowers . . . displayed their beauty together, and this was . . . <the violet> and the narcissus and the rose'⁶⁷ is not something that should

⁵⁹ Reeve's category 4(b); see op. cit. 516 and 522.

⁶⁰ Elsewhere alone or with dat., though *συμμεῖγνυμι(-ύω)* is found with *πρός* and acc. in Pl. *Ti.* 57 d (cf. X. *H.G.* 1.3.7; id. *Cyr.* 7.4.11; Arist. *Mete.* 354^a1).

⁶¹ Compare e.g. Ach. Tat. 1.2.3 with *Phdr.* 229 f.; 1.4.4 (and 1.9.4–5; 5.13.4) with 251 b; 1.6.6.6 with 251 e; 1.9.4.20 (and 5.13.4.20) with 251 b; 1.9.6.3–4 with 240 c; 1.9.6.5–6 with 255 d; 1.15.4.6–7 with 230 b.

⁶² *Phdr.* 239 c οὐδ' ἐν ἡλίῳ καθαρῷ τεθραμμένον ἀλλ' ὑπὸ συμμιγεῖ σκιᾷ, ' . . . in mingled (chequered) shade' as is clear from the contrast with ἐν ἡλίῳ καθαρῷ. 'in a dense shade' LSJ, wrongly. Anyone who needs an example of *συμμιγής* really meaning 'dense' will find one in Plu. *Caes.* 717 f εἰς συμμιγεῖς δρυμοὺς κατωκνημένοι (of the Nervii).

⁶³ For *πρός* and acc. expressing response to, correspondence with, cf. 1.12.4.22 ὁ δὲ ἵππος τῇ τῶν ποδῶν κυρτούμενος ἀμύλλῃ ἄνω τε καὶ κάτω πεδῶν πρὸς τὴν ἐκατέρων σπουδὴν δίκην νέως χειμαζομένης τοῖς νύτοις

ἐκυμαίνεται; cf. 3.2.5.23 bis ἡ δὲ ναῦς ἀεὶ πρὸς μὲν τὸ κυρτούμενον τῆς θαλάσσης ἡγείρετο, πρὸς δὲ τὸ παράδρομον ἥδη καὶ χθαμαλὸν τοῦ κύματος κατεδύετο. Cf. Xen. *Eph.* 1.2.6 κόμη . . . πρὸς τὴν τῶν ἀνέμων φορὰν κινουμένη.

⁶⁴ The mottled appearance of the shadow cast by the latticed reed support and the vines is not adequately expressed by *ὥχρᾶν* alone.

⁶⁵ Merely to omit *ὥχρᾶν* (as a gloss on *συμμιγῇ*) would create hiatus. Besides, it does add something to the description. It is not impossible that the context in *Phdr.* 239 c suggested *ὥχρᾶν* to Ach. Tat. here: the shadow, like the boy, is beautiful but (and because) pale. The omission of *καὶ* is a frequent error: see, with app. crit., e.g. 1.1.6.16 (*καὶ*¹ om. V); 5.6.10 (om. WFξ, prob.); 7.1.23 (om. F); 8.8.12 (om. β); 9.4.18 (om. α); 9.5.23 (om. M); 11.2.26 (om. MD); 11.3.2 (*καὶ*² om. α); 14.2.15 (*καὶ*¹ om. R); 17.3.24 (*καὶ* W: om. cett.).

⁶⁶ CQ 29 (1935), 101.

⁶⁷ Jackson's insertion does not substantially change this, merely adding a link to the chain.

lightly be ascribed to any usually sensible writer, especially when it is the result of an attempt to emend a passage rightly acknowledged to be corrupt. If the retrospective pronoun has as its virtual complement a catalogue of flowers, then it refers to τὰ ἄνθη, not to τὸ κάλλος, and should be ταῦτα, not τοῦτο.

As Jackson says,⁶⁸ 'That the violet . . . was mentioned along with the narcissus and the rose is certain from the context'. There are two possibilities: (1) τῆς γῆς πορφύρα refers to the beauty of all the flowers and means 'an ornament of the ground', a rare metaphorical use of πορφύρα seemingly paralleled only by Secundus, *Sententiae* 6 σελήνη οὐρανοῦ πορφύρα. If this is so, then τοῦτο is right, but some words, the last of which was very probably ἴον, have been lost from after πορφύρα. Any proposal for filling the lacuna should be such that with it the list of flowers is not complement, or virtual complement, to τοῦτο or to anything else denoting the beauty of the flowers rather than the flowers themselves;⁶⁹ (2) τῆς γῆς πορφύρα is a circumlocution for, or a title of, the violet, 'purple ornament (garment) of the earth'. If this is the case τοῦτο must become ταῦτα, and, while it is possible that no further change is needed, the original text is likely to have been καὶ <ἴον> ἦν ταῦτα, τῆς γῆς πορφύρα, καὶ . . . , or, better, καὶ ἴον ταῦτα, τῆς γῆς πορφύρα, καὶ

The first approach, apparently followed by all critics hitherto, is open to these objections: it is superfluous to tell us so specially that the beauty of the flowers adorned the ground; and πορφύρα, even as a pure metaphor, is not the most suitable of words to find referring to flowers that include half-white roses and white narcissi.⁷⁰

The second interpretation I find far preferable: τῆς γῆς πορφύρα is an entirely apt expression for the violet; and compare the phrases used of the rose at 2.1.2: . . . τὸ ῥόδον ἂν τῶν ἀνθέων ἐβασίλευε· γῆς ἐστι κόσμος, φυτῶν ἀγλαΐσμα, ὀφθαλμὸς ἀνθέων, λειμῶνος ἐρύθημα . . .

1.15.8 ὁ κύκνος . . . ὁ ψιττακὸς . . . ὁ ταῶς τοῖς ἄνθει περιούρων τὸ πτερόν.
ἀντέλαμπε δὲ ἡ τῶν ἀνθέων θέα τῇ τῶν ὀρνίθων χροῖᾳ, καὶ ἦν ἄνθη
πτερῶν.

περιούρων β: ἐπισύρων α // τη *suprascr.* ε *post* ἀντέλαμπε *add.* V // ἀνθέων β:
ἀνθῶν α // χροῖᾳ α: χροῖᾳ β

The sense of καὶ ἦν ἄνθη πτερῶν has so far eluded interpreters. 'The usual interpretation is: "and the plumage itself consisted of flowers"' (Vilb. *Comm.*, p.33); 'whose plumage itself seemed to consist of very flowers' (Gaselee-Warmington).

Apart from the fact that a translation based on the idea that πτερῶν is some kind of desperately strange genitive of material should be 'and there were flowers consisting of feathers', there is no need whatever to take ἄνθη as the plural of ἄνθος and raise a syntactic oddity. ἄνθη is feminine singular and the clause means 'and there was a full bloom of feathers' giving in context the appropriate antithesis ' . . . the flowers vied in brilliance with the colourful plumage, and the feathers were (like) flowers in bloom'. For the metaphor cf. 1.16.3 (just below) οὗτος [sc. ὁ ταῶς] τὸ κάλλος ἐπιδείκνυται λειμῶνα πτερῶν. ὁ δὲ τοῦ ταῶ λειμῶν εὐανθέστερος. ἄνθη, ἡ, occurs also at 1.15.4.7 ὁ καρπὸς ὠραίαν εἶχε τὴν ἄνθην.

⁶⁸ CQ 29 (1935), 101.

⁶⁹ Something with at least the sense of

<τὰ ἄνθη δὲ ἴον>.

⁷⁰ See the next sentence in the text.

- 1.16.2 (a) 'Τοῦτο μέντοι οὐκ ἄνευ τέχνης ὁ ὄρνις,' ἔφην, 'ποιεῖ· ἀλλ' ἔστι γὰρ ἐρωτικός. ὅταν ἐπαγαγέσθαι θέλῃ τὴν ἐρωμένην, τότε οὕτως καλλωπίζεται.

ποιεῖν G // γὰρ post ὅταν add. β: γοῦν Hi: οὖν Vilb

If a particle were needed after ὅταν, the elaborative γὰρ in β would be faultless and we can straightway forget about γοῦν (Hi, and so Gaselee-Warmington—'at least') and Vilborg's οὖν with the notions behind it.⁷¹ In fact, the absence of a particle in one of the two branches of the tradition seems highly significant in a passage where so many critics have felt some need to supply one: they very probably had as forerunner a scribe who introduced γὰρ into the β tradition. And this feeling that a particle is necessary springs from failure to understand properly the text presented in α (and, if I am right, in the archetype) with the correct wording but the wrong punctuation.

Reflect on the completeness of τοῦτο οὐκ ἄνευ τέχνης ποιεῖ, ἀλλ' ὅταν ἐπαγαγέσθαι θέλῃ τὴν ἐρωμένην, τότε οὕτως καλλωπίζεται and read 'Τοῦτο . . . ποιεῖ, ἀλλ' (ἔστι γὰρ ἐρωτικός)⁷² ὅταν ἐπαγαγέσθαι . . . ἀλλ' ὅταν . . . θέλῃ counterbalances οὐκ ἄνευ τέχνης ('crafty intent') perfectly, whereas with ἀλλ' ἔστι γὰρ ἐρωτικός the antithesis is weak. This, the absence of particle in α, and dislike of a close ἀλλά . . . γὰρ . . . combination in Ach. Tat.⁷³ have brought me to what is in fact merely a repunctuation of the α text.

- 1.18.4—5 ἀλλ' οὐκ εὐθέως πρὸς τὸν νυμφίον ἐξέρχεται (οἶδε γάρ, ὅτι θάνατον ἐν τοῖς ὁδοῦσι φέρει), ἀλλ' ἄνεισω εἰς τὴν πέτραν καὶ περιμένει τὸν νυμφίον καθάραι τὸ στόμα. ἐστᾶσιν οὖν ἀμφότεροι πρὸς ἀλλήλους βλέποντες, ὁ μὲν ἡπειρώτης ἐραστής, ἡ δὲ ἐρωμένη νησιώτις. ὅταν οὖν ὁ ἐραστής ἐξεμέσῃ τῆς νύμφης τὸν φόβον, ἡ δὲ ἐρρωμένον ἰδῇ τὸν θάνατον χαμαί, τότε καταβαίνει τῆς πέτρας καὶ εἰς τὴν ἡπειρον ἐξέρχεται καὶ τὸν ἐραστὴν περιπτύσσει καὶ . . .

ἐξέρχεται α: ἔρχεται β // τὴν del. He // ἐραστής ἡπειρώτης transp. WG

(1) The situation is this: the murena comes in from the sea to mate with the viper on the shore; she does not, however, come ashore straightway on sighting

⁷¹ 'Our text shows no other instances of δταν beginning a clause without an attached particle; the normal phrase is ὅταν οὖν which may have dropped out here by haplography. γὰρ in β is probably secondary, perhaps due to γὰρ just before' (Comm., p.34). 'clause' should be 'sentence': when the δταν clause follows the main clause δταν is, of course, not followed by a particle. By 'ὅταν οὖν which' he means 'ὅταν οὖν, and οὖν' and the loss of οὖν would not be caused by 'haplography'. And why should this 'normality' of ὅταν οὖν oust ὅταν γὰρ (cf. 1.6.3.24; 4.12.4.24; 8.8.3.26—1 μὲν γὰρ)?

⁷² For a parenthetic γὰρ clause preparing for what follows it see 5.3.4.24 μεταστραφεῖς οὖν (ἔτυχον γὰρ παρεστῶς ἐργατηρίῳ ξωγράφου) γραφὴν ὁρῶ κειμένην . . . In the following places a parenthesis with

γὰρ interrupts the structure of the clause to which it refers and at least the main substance of what is referred to follows the parenthesis: 2.14.2.16 Σώστρατος (τοῦ πολέμου γὰρ, ὡς ἔφην, στρατηγὸς ἦν οὗτος), ' . . . εἶπεν, ' . . . ': 17.3.17 ὁ δὲ (ἦν γὰρ . . .) . . . 26.1.14 καὶ ὁ K. (ἐν ὑπερφῶ γὰρ τὸν θάλαμον εἶχε) . . . κατατρέχει; 7.2.3.13; 13.2.10 . . . καὶ (ἦν γὰρ τῶν ἀγρῶν . . .) ἐκτρέχει τε ἐπ' αὐτὸ . . . ; 8.7.6.14.

⁷³ ἀλλά (. . .) γὰρ . . . in Ach. Tat. elsewhere only at 8.17.3.22 μὴ με νομίσης ληστήν εἶναι τινα καὶ κακοῦργον· ἀλλὰ γὰρ εἰμι τῶν εὐγεγονότων . . . 'for, on the contrary, . . . ' (see J. D. Denniston, *The Greek Particles* (Oxford, 1954²), p.107). With my interpretation here cf. Denniston, pp.98—9.

him but gets onto *an offshore rock* safe from her poisonous land lover, and waits there until he has vomited out his poison and only then comes ashore to mate with him. The *τὴν* of *εἰς τὴν πέτραν* must be deleted (so Hercher) or replaced by *τινα*: the rock is indefinite at this first mention of it. Those who retain the article are perhaps all subject to Vilborg's apparent illusion that *τὴν πέτραν* refers to some part of the shore (a part not readily accessible to the viper, presumably): 'The article here is equally possible as 1.23 *εἰς τὸν αἰγιαλόν*.'⁷⁴ (See also the comment on *νησιῶτις* quoted below.) That *πέτραν* is an offshore rock is plain from *καταβαίνει τῆς πέτρας καὶ εἰς τὴν ἡπειρον ἐξέρχεται*, and from *νησιῶτις* to anyone who properly understands that word.

(2) *ἐστᾶσω οὖν ἀμόφτεροι πρὸς ἀλλήλους βλέποντες, ὁ μὲν ἡπειρώτης ἐραστής, ἡ δὲ ἐρωμένη νησιῶτις*.

'So the two of them stay where they are looking at each other, the one a lover confined to the mainland, the other his islanded beloved.' ὁ and ἡ are pronominal and ἡπ. ἐρ. [sc. ὦν] and ἐρ. νησ. [sc. οὔσα] are complementary. I think the difficulties of the relationship at this stage for the viper are brought out better by this syntactic arrangement than by the alternative suggested in the word-order of WG in which *ἐραστής* (and so *ἐρωμένη*) might be subject with the article. The order in the majority of the manuscripts is designed not merely to get a chiasmus of a kind but to make the author's syntactic intention clearer.⁷⁵

Apart from the question of syntax *νησιῶτις* has caused some difficulty to interpreters: '... the lover of the land and the beloved of *the sea*' (Gaselee-Warmington, with my italics); 'One would expect another adjective than *νησιῶτις* to denote 'coming from the sea'' (Vilb. *Comm.*, p.36). One would indeed!

1.19.2 *ἡ μὲν οὖν μετὰ μικρὸν ἀπιούσα ὥχετο (τῆς γὰρ κιθάρας αὐτὴν ὁ καιρὸς ἐκάλει), ἔμοι δὲ ἐδόκει παρεῖναι· ἀπελθούσα γὰρ τὴν μορφήν ἐπαφῆκέ μου τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς*.

ἐπαφῆκέ VEGF: *ἐναφῆκέ* aR

(1) Leucippe had been present and seemed to Clitophon to be present *still*. *ἔτι* is perhaps not entirely necessary, but to omit it would be unlike the emphatic style of Achilles. To avoid illicit hiatus⁷⁶ *ἔτι*, if it is inserted,⁷⁷ must come just before *ἐδόκει*.⁷⁸

(2) Did Leucippe 'discharge' her image 'at' (*ἐπαφῆκέ*) Clitophon's eyes *after she had left* the garden (tense of *ἀπελθούσα*!) or did she 'leave' it behind 'in' (*ἐναφῆκέ*) them? Read with aR!

University of Newcastle upon Tyne

J. N. O'SULLIVAN

⁷⁴ *Comm.*, p.36. The sea, already mentioned, of course implies the shore.

⁷⁵ To take ὁ ἡπειρώτης (subst.) as subject with *ἐραστής* as complement would, of course, in the resulting sense be more or less to put the cart before the horse. Perhaps at least the scribe to whom the order in G is owed (see Vilborg's edition, p.lxiv) saw this and, failing to see the possibility of taking ὁ as a pronoun, changed the word-order.

⁷⁶ *ἔτι* before a vowel: 2.21.4.6; 34.5.22; 5.17.6.3. Cf. 2.22.7.14 οὐκέτι εἶχε; 8.15.3.4 μηκέτι αἰδομένη.

⁷⁷ Scribal omission of *ἔτι*: 2.21.4.6 (om. G); 5.26.12.30 (om. a); 7.5.2.6 (om. β); 8.5.5.14 (om. G).

⁷⁸ Emphatic *ἔτι* in a forward position separated from the word it modifies: 2.21.4.6 'Τί οὖν *ἔτι* ἀποθνήσκειν,' ἔφη, 'με δεῖ . . .'; 5.18.6.9 ἐγὼ δὲ *ἔτι* σοι ταῦτα γράφω παρθένος.