NOTES ON XENOPHON OF EPHESUS BOOK I

I shall work from the Teubner text and *apparatus* of A. D. Papanikolaou (1973).

1.1.1 τούτῳ τῷ Λυκομήδει ἐκ γυναικὸς ἐπιχωρίας Θεμιστοῦς γίνεται παῖς Ἁβροκόμης, μέγα δέ τι χρῆμα [ὡραιότητι σώματος ὑπερβαλλούσῃ] κάλλους οὔτε ἐν Ἰωνίᾳ οὔτε ἐν ἄλλῃ γῇ πρότερον γενομένου.

ἐπι χωρίου Her / δέ F: del. Her. δή Hemst.// ὡραιότητι σώματος ὑπερβαλλούσῃ del. Hir. // γενόμενον Zag., Rich.

(1) Hercher was surely right in bringing ἐπιχωρίας into line with Xenophon's universal practice elsewhere.
(2) μέγα ... κάλλους will not construe and must be emended. Hirschig's drastic excision is not an acceptable solution. Apart from the matter of where the words suggested for deletion are supposed to have come from into a passage that hardly needed glossing, their deletion does not give an entirely satisfactory text anyway: neither μέγα δέ τι χρῆμα κάλλους...γενομένου nor μέγα δέ τι χρῆμα κάλλους...γενόμενον (Zagoiannes) has the *generic* sense needed: it was beauty *of a particular order* that had not been seen before. I suggest μέγα δέ¹) τι χρῆμα ὡραιότητι σώματος ὑπερβαλλούσῃ, ⟨τοσούτου⟩ κάλλους οὔτε ἐν Ἰωνίᾳ οὔτε ἐν ἄλλῃ γῇ πρότερον γενομένου. In this ὡραιότητι will be dative of respect or of cause.

The phrase χρῆμά τι κάλλους ἄπιστον occurs in Ach. Tat. 6.3.4, but that does not mean that as close an expression to this as possible must be made to occur here no matter how drastic the surgery needed to produce it. χρῆμα can be used without a defining genitive in the sense of 'marvel', and with reference to beauty: Ach. Tat. 1.15.1 μέγα τι χρῆμα πρὸς ὀφθαλμῶν ἡδονήν.

For the thought, with its suitable generic element, cf. Xen. Eph. 2.2.4. πάντες ἐτεθαυμάκεσαν τὸ κάλλος, καὶ ἄνθρωποι βάρβαροι μήπω πρότερον τοσαύτην ἰδόντες εὐμορφίαν θεοὺς ἐνόμιζον εἶναι τοὺς βλεπομένους; 5.5.8 ἰδὼν κάλλος οἷον οὔπω πρότερον ἐτεθέατο.

1.1.3 ἦν δὲ περισπούδαστος ἅπασιν Ἐφεσίοις, ἀλλὰ καὶ τοῖς τὴν

---

1) The δέ can be defended. See J. D. Denniston, *The Greek Particles* (Oxford 1954²) 163.

ἄλλην Ἀσίαν οἰκοῦσι, καὶ μεγάλας εἶχον ἐν αὐτῷ τὰς ἐλπίδας ὅτι πολίτης ἔσοιτο διαφέρων.

ἀλλὰ] ἅμα Lumb

Lumb's ἅμα should be deleted from the *apparatus*. ἀλλὰ καὶ...οἰκοῦσι is a parenthesis, correcting the impression that interest in Abrocomes was confined to the Ephesians. εἶχον has as its subject only the Ephesians, the people specially interested in the hero as a πολίτης.

1.1.6 εἰ δέ που ἱερὸν ἢ ἄγαλμα Ἔρωτος εἶδε, κατεγέλα, ἀπέφαινέ τε ἑαυτὸν Ἔρωτος παντὸς καλλίονα καὶ κάλλει σώματος καὶ δυνάμει.

καὶ κάλλει σώματος καὶ δυνάμει del. Her.

καλλίονα κάλλει is completely inept and καλλίονα δυνάμει is nonsense. Hercher saw this and resorted to his favourite remedy, wholesale deletion. Abrocomes was *superior* to Eros both in physical beauty (judged against representations of the god) and in power: he could resist him, or so he thought (1.1.5). It seems very likely that an original κρείττονα became καλλίονα by assimilation to κάλλει.

In 1.4.2 καλλίων may very well be a corruption of κρείττων (conj. Hemsterhuys) influenced by the καλλίων two lines above it.

1.2.7 καὶ ἦσαν ποικίλαι παρὰ τῶν θεωμένων φωναί, τῶν μὲν ὑπ' ἐκπλήξεως τὴν θεὸν εἶναι λεγόντων, τῶν δὲ ἄλλην τινὰ ὑπὸ τῆς θεοῦ πεποιημένην.

πεποιημένην Giangr. coll. 1, 8, 2: περιποιημένην F περιπεποιημένην Hemst. παραπεποιημένην Abr., Rich. περιτιομένην Chariton. περιττῶς τετιμημένην Kontos κεκοσμημένην Zag.

Giangrande's πεποιημένην, based on ἦν δὲ αὐτοῖς ὁ θάλαμος πεποιημένος of 1.8.2 which is supposed to mean 'and the bridal chamber was ready (or adorned) for them', is less than probable. It is not good critical practice to emend one passage on the model of another that is, to say the least, intensely suspect.

Nothing else in the list of conjectures is very appealing either. My own contribution is πεπεμμένην. One may compare, for what it is worth, 3.2.6 ὡς ὑπό τινος ἀπεσταλμένος κατ' ἐμοῦ θεοῦ (where the idea of a mission of hostility makes ἀποστέλλω more suitable than πέμπω).

1.4.5 ὁ δὲ Ἔρως ἔτι ὠργίζετο καὶ μεγάλην τῆς ὑπεροψίας ἐνενοεῖτο τιμωρίαν εἰσπράξασθαι τὸν Ἀβροκόμην. διέκειτο δὲ....

ἐνενόει Her., Da. / εἰσπράξασθαι Mitsch.: τὸ πράξασθαι F πράξασθαι Cast. coll. 2, 11, 2.

Castiglioni's simple deletion of the τὸ before πράξασθαι should be accepted. τὸ is by no means likely to be an error for εἰσ-; its intrusion may be related to the suspect -το of ἐνενοεῖτο[2]).

1.5.6 ἐν ὁμοίῳ δὲ φόβῳ καὶ ὁ Μεγαμήδης καὶ ἡ Εὐίππη [καὶ] περὶ τῆς Ἀνθίας καθειστήκεισαν, ὁρῶντες αὐτῆς τὸ μὲν κάλλος μαραινόμενον, τὴν δὲ αἰτίαν οὐ φαινομένην τῆς συμφορᾶς.

καὶ ante περὶ del. B[3]), Ja.

We have just been told in 1.5.5 that Lycomedes and Themisto, Abrocomes' parents, were worried about their son's condition. Now we are told that Anthia's parents *too* were similarly worried about her *also*. The first καὶ marks the addition of Megamedes and Euippe to those who are worried; the third one emphasizes that the heroine's condition *too* was causing parental concern. We may feel that the third καὶ is a bit redundant, but there is no justification for deleting it. It may also be felt to be slightly illogical: Anthia's parents were afraid only for their daughter. But such a use of καὶ is not at all uncommon. There is another example of it in this chapter: 1.5.8 πολλὰ δὲ καὶ ὑπὲρ Ἀβροκόμου οἱ περὶ τὸν Λυκομήδην ἔθυον....

1.8.1–3 καὶ εἰσαγαγόντες κατέκλινον ...... ἐπὶ τῆς κλίνης Βαβυλωνία ἐπεποίκιλτο σκηνή· παίζοντες Ἔρωτες, οἱ μὲν .... ὑπ' αὐτῇ τῇ σκηνῇ κατέκλιναν τὴν Ἀνθίαν, ἀγαγόντες πρὸς τὸν Ἀβροκόμην

εἰσαγαγόντες Ja.: εἰσάγοντες F / κατέκλιναν Ja., Her. ..... // ὑπ' Peerlk.: ἐπ' F

The author may have wished, rather oddly, to emphasize that the bride was escorted right to the σκηνή *itself*, but after εἰσαγαγόντες κατέκλινον and the description of the decorated σκηνή I would expect to find...ταύτῃ τῇ σκηνῇ... in the resumption of the narrative (with asyndeton!). ἐν ταύτῃ τῇ σκηνῇ for ἐπ' αὐτῇ τῇ σκηνῇ (F)? The nature of the σκηνή, which was not just a canopy but had full decorated sides, would justify ἐν. The preposition would be used as in e. g. ἐν τῷ ἄντρῳ (4.4.1; 4.5.1); cf. especially 3.7.4 τὴν Ἀνθίαν...ἦγεν εἰς τοὺς πλησίον τῆς πόλεως τάφους. κἀνταῦθα κατέθετο ἔν τινι οἰκήματι.

---

2) The middle occurs only here with the inf., and an original ἐνενόει may well have been assimilated to ὠργίζετο and διέκειτο. For the active with inf. see 2. 9. 2; 3. 1. 2; 5. 4. 2.

3) B is a manuscript and 'del. B' involves an assumption.

1.9.4 "ναὶ" φησὶν "Ἀβροκόμη, δοκῶ σοι καλή, καὶ μετὰ τὴν σὴν
εὐμορφίαν ἀρέσκω σοι; ἄνανδρε καὶ δειλέ, πόσον ἐβράδυνας ἐρῶν
χρόνον, πόσον ἠμέλησας;..."

Read "..., δοκῶ σοι καλή; καὶ ('even') μετὰ...χρόνον;
πόσον...". For ναί associated with a question cf. Ach. Tat. 2.5.2.

1.11.5 ...μέγα ἀνωλόλυξε καὶ "τί τοῦτο" ἔφησεν "Ἀβροκόμη,
πεπίστευκας ὅτι...;..."

τοῦτο Her.: ταῦτα F.

In Hercher's text τί means 'why', τοῦτο is object of πεπίστευ-
κας and anticipates the ὅτι clause. But we must not make Anthia
express her indignant surprise in the halting syntax of the 'Old
Oligarch'. Read... "τί ταῦτα", ἔφησεν, "Ἀβροκόμη; πεπίστευκας
ὅτι...;...". For τί ταῦτα; see LSJ s. v. τίς (i. e. τις B) I₂; cf.
especially Ach. Tat. 3.18.5 "ποῖ γῆς εἰμι καὶ τί ποτε (τί ποτε aF:
τί β) ταῦτα ὁρῶ;".

1.12.1 συνῄεσαν δὲ πάντες οἱ Ῥόδιοι, τὸ κάλλος τῶν παίδων κατα-
πεπληγότες, καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν ὅστις τῶν ἰδόντων παρῆλθε σιωπῶν· ἀλλ'
οἱ μὲν ἔλεγον ἐπιδημίαν αἰσίων θεῶν, οἱ δὲ προσεκύνουν καὶ προσηύ-
χοντο.

σιωπῶν Salv.: λυπῶν F σιγῶν vel ὀλιγωρῶν Schmidt / ἀλλ' οἱ Ja.: ἄλλοι F /
αἰσίων Schmidt: ἐκ τῶν F del. Her. // προσηύχοντο Hemst.; cf. 1, 1, 3. 2, 7:
προσεποιοῦντο F.

In ἐπιδημίαν ἐκ τῶν θεῶν (F) ἐκ has no place in the syntax and
τῶν is unsuitably generic. Schmidt's αἰσίων is only a stop-gap:
the word is not found elsewhere in Xenophon and it has no
great appropriateness here. λέγω does occur in the author with
the sense 'speak of', 'mention', but it is a relatively rare use of
the word (only 1.2.8; 3.3.4) and, though in textual criticism
statistics by themselves are no sure guide, one must be reluctant
to emend a text so as to produce a comparative rarity where
there is nothing special to be said for it. Palaeography notwith-
standing, one has to consider the claims of εἶναι here. Compare,
for thought and expression, 2.2.4: the lovers arrive in Tyre καὶ
πάντες ἐτεθαυμάκεσαν τὸ κάλλος, καὶ ἄνθρωποι βάρβαροι μήπω
πρότερον τοσαύτην ἰδόντες εὐμορφίαν θεοὺς ἐνόμιζον εἶναι τοὺς
βλεπομένους.

1.13.6 "τὰ μὲν χρήματα" ἔφασαν "ὦ δέσποτα, καὶ ἡμᾶς οἰκέτας ἔχε,
φεῖσαι δὲ τῆς ψυχῆς..."

As I read this, it struck me that the word-order is awkward
and should be τὰ μὲν χρήματα...ἔχε καὶ ἡμᾶς οἰκέτας, a thought

strikingly corroborated by 4.3.5 τὰ χρήματα λαμβάνει καὶ τὴν Ἀνθίαν αἰχμάλωτον.

1.14.1 Ἀκούσας ὁ Κόρυμβος εὐθὺς μὲν ἐκέλευσε φείσασθαι φονεύοντας, ...

φείσασθαι] παύσασθαι Hir.

'...to spare in (while *vel sim.*) slaying' is all φείσασθαι φονεύοντας can mean. ⟨τοὺς⟩ φονεύοντας would still leave φείσασθαι uncomfortably without an object. Five lines above Anthia and Abrocomes had pleaded with Corymbus, "φεῖσαι δὲ τῆς ψυχῆς καὶ μηκέτι φόνευε..." (1.13.6), and, with sparing in his mind, a scribe here wrote φείσασθαι for παύσασθαι (conj. Hir.). For this kind of error cf. e. g. 1.7.2 βουλευομένοις...βουλευομένου (F); 1.15.1 ἐδόκει...ἐδόκει; 1.15.5–6 πόνῳ...πόνους; 2.3.1 ἀβροκόμου... ἀβροκόμου; 2.7.4 ἄγομαι...ἄγομαι.

1.14.4 ῥίψας ἑαυτὸν εἰς τὴν θάλασσαν ἐνήχετο ὡς καταληψόμενος τὴν τριήρη, "ποῖ με καταλείψεις, τέκνον" λέγων "τὸν γέροντα, τὸν παιδαγωγόν; ποῖ δὲ ἀπερχόμενος, Ἀβροκόμη;..."

ποῖ με καταλείψεις] τίνι (vel τῷ) με καταλείπεις Her. coll. Char. 3, 5, 4.

The old man was being left behind as he spoke and the future καταλείψεις has no place here. καταλειπ- became καταλειψ- under the influence of καταληψ- of the previous line. And I cannot see how the first ποῖ can be made to give sense. It is a false anticipation of the following ποῖ and has supplanted some other word. "τί με καταλείπεις,...;" is exactly what is required.

Chariton's τίνι (τί Cobet) με καταλείπεις,...; (3.5.4) is itself an anomaly unacceptable as a basis for emendation here. The original there had perhaps τί νῦν με καταλείπεις,...; .... ἐπίμεινον δὲ κἂν ὀλίγας ἡμέρας,.... Cf. Ach. Tat. 4.1.7 "Νῦν", εἶπεν, "οὐκ ἔξεστί σοι...· ἢν δὲ ὀλίγον ἀναμείνῃς χρόνον,..."

The University of Newcastle upon Tyne
James N.O'Sullivan