NOTES ON XENOPHON OF EPHESES BOOK II

In these notes¹) I start from the Teubner text of A. D. Papa­nikolaou (1973), with an eye also to the editions of Hirschig (Di­dot 1856), Hercher (Teubner 1858), and Dalmeyda (Bude 1926, repr. 1962). I shall defend here and there (2.3.8; 4.4; 4.5; 10.3; 11.1; 11.5; 11.7; 13.6) rejected readings of the codex unicus, F (Laurentianus conv. soppr. 627), propose a few conjectures of my own (2.6.1; 7.4; 11.11; 12.2; 12.3; 14.3; repunctuation 5.1; 7.3), and occasionally support suggestions made by others (2.4.3; 5.2; 6.3) and not always taken into the text.

2.3.8. ἀκούσας ὁ Λεύκων δακρύων (ἐν) ἐπιλήσθη, ...
(ἐν) ἐπλ. Cobet

There is no need for the prepositional prefix (read also by Hir., Her., Da.): in X. we find both ὄργης ἐνετέλησθη (2.4.3) and ὄργης πλησθεὶς (3.2.10), in Ach. Tat. both δακρύων ἐμπετελησ­μένος (5.15.1) and ἐπιλήσθη δακρύων (6.7.1).

2.4.3. ἀκούσας ὁ Ἀβρόκόμης εὐθὺς μὲν ὄργης ἐνετέλησθη.
ἀναβλέψας δὲ ἄτενες εἰς τὸν Λεύκωνα ... ἐφη ... ἀποβλέψας Her.

It is, I suppose, possible that we should think of Abrocomes as seated, or lying, with Anthia (2.4.1) and so looking up at Leu­con, but I would be inclined to read ἀπό- with Hercher: cf. 3.3.3 ἀποβλέψας εἰς τὸν Ἄ ... ἐφη ... ; 5.9.7 ἀποβλέψασα δὲ εἰς τὸν Ἰ ... φησίν ... Even if Abrocomes did look up, it is likely that ἀπό- is still the right reading; cf. 4.2.4 ὁ δὲ ἀποβλέψας (ἀνα – Her.) εἰς τὸν ἠλιον καὶ τὸ δεύμα ἰδὼν τοῦ Νείλου ... φησι ... .

2.4.4. ἀπευλείτω νῦν, εἰ θέλει, Μαντώ ξίφη καὶ βρόχους καὶ πῦρ καὶ πάντα δῶν δύναται σώμα ἐνεγκείν οἰκέτου.
ἐνεγκείν F: βασανίζειν B²) αναγκάσαι Burger, Da.

¹) For my notes on Book I see RhM N.F. 125 (1982) 54 ff.
²) On B (basically a manuscript copy of the editio princeps) see Papanikolaou’s edition p. IX and M. D. Reeve in JHS 96 (1976) 193 n. 4.
Papanikolaou defends ἐνεγκεῖν with 5.5.6 οὐχ ὦσο χρησο-
βοσκόν δεσπότην, which is no parallel at all.

dύναται expresses not an ability of the body but the notion
of ‘all possible tortures’ and ἐνεγκεῖν means ‘suffer’, ‘have inflic-
ted on it’. It is worth comparing Ach. Tat. 8.5.5 πάσαν αἰχίαν
ηνεγκεν εἰς το σῶμα πλήν μιᾶς.

2.4.5. ἀλλὰ δέομαι σου, τῆς ἴνης τῆς ἐμῆς δέσποτα, μή
προδός ἑαυτὸν μηδὲ εἰς ὅργην ἐμβάλῃς βαρβαρίαν, συγ-
κατάθομι δὲ τῇ τῆς δεσποινῆς ἑπιθυμίας κάγῳ ὑμῖν ἀπειμο
ἐκποδών, ἐμαυτὴν ἀποκτείνασα.
καὶ del. Hemst.

The καὶ deleted by Hemsterhuys (followed also by Hir.,
Her., Da.) may be kept. Abrocomes has just proclaimed his readi-
ness to endure anything rather than break his undertaking of fidel-
ity to Anthia by compliance with Manto’s desire for him; Anthia
is pointing out that Abrocomes is master of her life too and that
there is therefore an alternative to his being imperilled: rather than
see him sacrifice himself (ἑαυτὸν) she will give up the other life
that is at his disposal, so freeing him from his attachment by love
and oaths to her and making the way clear for him to comply with
Manto and save his own life.

2.5.1. ἢ δὲ Μάντω χρονιζοῦσα τῆς 'Ρόδης οὐκέτι καρτεροῦσα
γράφει γραμμάτιον πρὸς τὸν Ἀβροκόμην̣ ἦν δὲ τὰ ἐγγε-
γραμμένα τοιάδε·
"Ἀβροκόμη τῷ καλῷ δέσποτα ἡ σῇ χαίρειν.
Μάντω ἐρᾶ σου, μηκετί φέρειν δυναμένη· ἀπρεπὲς μὲν ὅσος
παρθένῳ, ἀναγκαῖον δὲ φιλοῦσα· δέομαι, μὴ με παρίδης
μηδὲ υβρίσῃς τὴν τὰ σὰ ἱημεῖνην. ἐὰν γὰρ πεισθῆς, ......"

What is the relationship between ἐρᾶ and δυναμένη? What is
to be understood as the object of φέρειν? What can ἀναγκαῖον
plausibly be taken to refer to? Μάντω ἐρᾶ κτλ. has been badly
mispunctuated. Read Μάντω ἐρᾶ σου. μηκετί φέρειν δυναμένη,
ἀπρεπὲς μὲν ὅσος παρθένῳ, ἀναγκαῖον δὲ φιλοῦσα δέομαι. μὴ
με παρίδης .... ἱημεῖνην. ἐὰν γὰρ πεισθῆς, ...... ‘Manto loves
you. No longer able to endure (sc. my unspoken love), I make a
request unseemly perhaps for a maiden, but necessary for one in
love. Do not etc. ....’ It might be thought that δέομαι should be
followed by a comma or a high-point, but the request is not, of
course, expressed in μή με παρίδης ... ήρημένη; indeed it is not forthrightly expressed at all, though what it is is nonetheless clear. With the punctuation I have proposed compare 1.4.6 διέκειτο δὲ καὶ ἡ Ἀνθία πονηρός καὶ οὐκέτι φέρειν δυναμενή ἑπεκεῖται ...; cf. 2.12.1 ταύτην ... ὁ καλὸς Μοῦρος ἔρα μηκέτι δὲ φέρειν δυναμενή (referring, of course, not to Moeris) μετεπεμψάμην ...; 4.5.4 ἢ ... ὡς ἐξέκασεν αὐτὸν εἰς τὸν ἔρωτα οὐκέτι δὲ φέρειν δυνάμενος ἑπεκεῖται ...; cf. also e.g. 1.4.4 ὁ θεὸς σφοδρότερος αὐτῷ ἐνέκειτο ... οὐκέτι δὴ καρτερόφαν, ὡς ἐκατὸν ... εἶπεν ...; 2.3.3 καὶ μάλλον ἀνεκαίετο καὶ διέκειτο πονηρός καὶ οὐκέτι καρτερούσα ἔγνω ... The pattern is evidently characteristic, the participle in each case going with the following verb. In 2.5.1 οὐκέτι καρτερούσα in the narrative expresses the psychological state in which Manto took the step of making her written request ἑπεκεῖται. It may be that the text originally had καὶ μηκέτι ... or μηκέτι δὲ ..., but in this letter the asyndeton is natural enough after the blurted third-person profession Μαντώ ἐρα σου. For δέομαι with a substantival adjective as internal accusative cf. Th. 1.32 ξύμφορα; Pl. Prt. 335e δυνατά; D. 38.2 δίκαια καὶ μέτρα. In all these places the adjective is plural, but the singular can be seen as analogous to its use in e.g. Pl. Phdr. 230c θερίνον τε καὶ λιγυρὸν ὑπηχεῖ (sc. ὁ τόπος) ...; cf. Plu. Mor. 64e σαθρόν ... ὑπηχεῖ καὶ ἀγεννές (sc. ἡ κολαχεία).

2.5.2. έκν ενδέ αντείπης, ἐννόει μὲν αὐτή πείσῃ τῆς ὑβρισμένης ἑαυτὴν ἐκδικοῦσης, οὐδὲ οἱ μετὰ σου κοινονοὶ τῆς σῆς ὑπερηφανίας σύμβουλοι γενόμενοι,

Since οἴ μετὰ σου is good Greek for ‘your companions’ (LSJ s.v. μετὰ II) and the expression οἱ μετὰ σου κοινονοὶ (as against κοινονοῦς with dat. of pers.: 5.15.4 κοινονοὶ πάντων τοῖς συντρόφοις ἕσαν) seems to be unparalleled, I would read Peerlkamp’s (καὶ), linking κοινονοὶ and σύμβουλοι (both nouns) as complements of γενόμενοι. Deletion of κοινονοί is an unnecessarily drastic measure; and why κοινονοί, which occurs four more times in X. (always with gen. rei: 2.14.2; 4.1.4; 5.10.4; 5.15.4) rather than σύμβουλοι (only here in X.)?

2.6.1. μεταπεμψάμενος δὲ τὸν Ἄβροκόμην ὥς τολμηρὰ καὶ μιαρὰ εἶπον 'κεφαλή, ἑτόλμηςας ...'
I strongly suspect that τολμηρά is a mistake for πονηρά, a mistake provoked by the following ετόλμησαι, with which it gives a very awkward effect. τολμηρός is common (12 times; – ως 8 more), and cf. especially 2.4.3 ‘ω πονηρός ἔφη καὶ Φοινίκων τῶν ἐνταῦθα βαρβαρότερε, ετόλμησας …’ When X. uses πονηρός of a person, he usually couples it with another adjective (1.4.2; 3.2.7; 3.5.2; 5.5.3; exceptions at 4.2.5; 4.2.8).

2.6.2-5. … ἐκέλευε περιφρήζας τὴν ἑσθήτα αὐτοῦ τοῖς οἰκεταῖς καὶ φέρειν πῦρ καὶ μάστιγας καὶ παίειν τὸ μειράκιον. ἢν δὲ τὸ θέαμα ἠλεεινόν· αἴ τε γὰρ βάσανοι τὸ 10 ἄριττα πάν ἠπάντιζον βασάνων ἀθέτες ὁν οἰκετικῶν, τὸ τε αἵμα κατέφερε [πάν] καὶ τὸ κάλλος ἐμαιραίνετο. προσήγειν αὐτῷ καὶ δεσμὰ φοβερὰ καὶ πῦρ καὶ μάλιστα ἔχροτο ταῖς βασάνοις καὶ αὐτοῦ, τῷ νυμφῷ τῆς θυγατρὸς ἐνδεικνύμενος ὅτι σῶφρονα παρθένον ἄξεται.

10 post γὰρ in F spatium quattuor litterarum est; altera manus inser. βάσανοι idemque adscriptum in margine; πληγαῖ Cob. οὐλαί Cast.; lac. sign. Her.

βάσανοι (read also by Da.) is clearly a conjecture, and, it seems to me, not a very good one. Two instruments of torture are mentioned, πῦρ καὶ μάστιγας (9) and orders are given to use the lashes (παίειν, 9); the effects of a form of torture are described (10–12), effects of just the kind that would be produced by lashes; and then (12–13) we are told that Apsyrtus used on Abrocomes καὶ δεσμὰ φοβερὰ (which we can leave out of account) καὶ πῦρ, where the first καὶ means ‘also’, i.e. as well as what was mentioned where βάσανοι now stands. Fire, itself an instrument of torture and one of the only two mentioned, as well as what? To me it seems clear that we must fill the lacuna in F not with a general word for tortures (βάσανοι), but a word for whips or blows therefrom. The decision between μάστιγες and πληγαῖ is difficult. I prefer Cobet’s πληγαῖ.

3) Assimilation is common in our text of X., some of the most striking instances being: 1.7.2 βούλευομένους … βούλευομένου (βουλομένου Cob.); 1.15.1 ἐδόκει … ἐδόκει (ἐδεδούκει Hemst.); 1.15.5–6 πόνῳ … πόνου (λόγους Hemst.); 2.3.1 ἀβροκόμου … ἀβροκόμου (’Ἀνθίας Ηερ.); 2.7.4 ἄγομαι … ἄγομαι (see my note on this passage below).
2.7.3. ὡς δὲ ἦδη παρεσκευάζοντο εἰς Συρίαν ἀπίεναι, προ-
ἔπεμφεν ὁ Ἀργυρός τὴν θυγατέρα μετὰ δώρων πολλῶν,
ἐσθητὰς τε [τάς] Βαβυλωνίων καὶ χρυσῶν ἀφθονον καὶ
ἀργυρον ἐδίδου.

te is clearly prospective and the elaborative finite clause
ἐσθητὰς τε ... ἐδίδου should be separated from the preceding
sentence by a high-point, not an inadequate comma (also in Hir.,
Her., Da.).

2.7.4. εἰς Συρίαν ἁγωμai δώρων δοθείσα τῇ Μαντώι καὶ εἰς
χείρας τῆς ἡλιοτυπούσης ἐρχομai:

ἐρχομαι Ἡἱ.: ἁγωμai Ἔ δίδομαι vel ἐκδίδομαι Hemst.

δίδομαι (3.2.8; LSJ s.v. χείρ II6d) could be right and so, I
suppose, could Wifstrand's ἐρχομαι (LSJ s.v. χείρ II6d; but note
that the person whose 'hands' are involved seems always to be
expressed in the dat., not the gen., and the meaning usually is
'come to blows with' vel sim.), but the strongest possibility is
παραδίδομαι: παραδίδωμι, the ordinary Greek word for 'give
over', 'hand over', is common in X. (1.14.5; 2.2.5; 2.9.3; 2.13.6;
3.9.1; 3.11.1; 5.5.4; 5.10.12; always, except at 5.10.12, with a
personal object). For παραδίδομαι τινὰ εἰς χειρας τινος see e.g.
about through false repetition of the first ἁγωμai, not through
mere misreading, and in trying to reverse a corruption of this kind
there is no reason to look for a word that resembles the usurper
specially closely.

2.10.3. ἐκείνην ἣ ζῶσαν ἣ τεθνεώσαν εὗροιμι.

ἡ ... ἢ ... Hir.: καὶ ... καὶ ... F

ἡ ζῶσαν ἡ τεθνεῶσαν (read also by Her., Da.) would mean
'either alive or dead' (as if there were another possibility) and not
'whether alive or dead' (ἐῖτε ... ἐῖτε ...), the meaning presum-
ably sought. I see nothing wrong with καὶ ... καὶ ... (F): the
participles are conditional and the sense is 'both if she is alive and
if she is dead', i.e. 'in either case'. The view that the author so
expressed himself derives some support from 2.7.5 ἐγὼ μενῶ σῇ
καὶ ζῶσα κὰν ἀποθανεῖν δεῖσῃ.
2.11.1–2. ἦ δὲ Ἀνθία Ἰὴν μὲν τινα χρόνον παρὰ τῷ αἰτῆλώ, συνεχές δὲ ὁ Μοίρις ὁ ἀνήγς τῆς Μαντοῦς εἰς τὸ χωρίον ἑρχόμενος ἔρχεττ ἢ τῆς Ἀνθίας σφοδρόν ἐρωτα. καὶ τὰ μὲν πρῶτα ἑπειράτο λανθάνειν, τελευταῖον δὲ λέγει τῷ αἰτῆλῳ τὸν ἐρωτα καὶ πολλὰ ύπισχνεῖτο συγκύψαντι. ὁ δὲ τῷ μὲν Μοίριδι συντίθεται, δεδοικός δὲ τὴν Μαντὴν ἐρχεται πρὸς αὐτῆν καὶ λέγει τὸν ἐρωτα τὸν Μοίριδος.

συγκύψαντι Ἰα.: συγκύψαντι F

Hercher (1858), Dalmeyda (1926), and Papanikolaou (1973) have expelled συγκύψαντι in favour of συγκύψαντι for which Jacobs argued thus:


Manto had consigned Anthia to cohabiting with the goatherd Lampon (there is no mention of actual marriage). Moeris, the husband of Manto, fell in love with Anthia and finding that he could not succeed with the girl unknown to the goatherd, had to tell him of his love, hoping by bribery to make him in some sense an ally.

Jacobs’ belief that Moeris must have sought from Lampon some extensive cooperation in winning Anthia’s favours is quite without foundation. Far from being ‘inept’ συγκύψαντι is eminently suitable in its context, whereas συγκύψαντι has no special appropriateness: at first Moeris tries to get to Anthia unknown to the goatherd (λανθάνειν), but when he finds that any effective attempt to win the girl without the goatherd’s knowledge is impossible, rather than be caught in the act by one whose silence had not been bought, he tells (λέγει) Lampon of his love and promises him a large reward provided he joins with himself in keeping the affair concealed (συγκύψαντι, sc. τὸν ἐρωτα) from everyone else, especially, of course, from Manto. Lampon pretends to agree to this (συντίθεται = προσποιεῖται συντίθεσθαι and refers me-

4) Achillis Tattii Alexandrini de Leucippes et Clitophontis amoribus libri octo. Textum ... recensuit ... F. Jacobs (Leipzig 1821) 451.
rily to a verbal undertaking), but then goes and reveals (λέγει) Moeris’ love to Manto in contravention of the agreement (note τῷ μὲν Μοῖριδι συντίθεται [sc. συγκρύπτειν τὸν ἔρωτα] ..., δεδομένῳ δὲ ... λέγει τὸν ἔρωτα ...). Moeris would have preferred to conceal his love from everyone (except, of course, Anthia); circumstances forced him to reveal it to one person; along with that revelation went the necessity of trying to ensure that that one person cooperated in concealing it from everyone else (συγκρύπτειν). There is no basis in the text for thinking that Moeris wanted anything more from the goatherd than his silent connivance. συγκρύπταντι has all the allure of a difficilior lectio, but we must put back the word that is not only tolerated by the sense-pattern of the passage but perfectly suited to it.

2.11.5. ἀλλὰ δέομαι σου, Λάμπτων αἰσθέλε, δέ μέχρι νῦν εὑσθηρας, ἂν ἀποκτείνησι, κἂν ὀλίγον θάψω με τῇ παρακείμενη γῇ καὶ ...

δέ Hemst. (read also by Her.): ὄς F

What is wrong with ὄς? It can be taken either as causal (‘since’; cf. 3.5.2) dependent on δέομαι or as comparative (‘just as’) dependent on θάψω.

2.11.7. οἴδας ὅτι ἡ δέσποινα Μαντῶ ἔκελενσε μοι λαβεῖν καὶ φονεύσαι σε· ἔγω δὲ καὶ θεοῦς δεδιώς καὶ τὸ κάλλος οἰκτείρας βούλομαι σε μᾶλλον πωλήσαι πόρρω ποτή γῆς ταύτης, μὴ μαθοῦσα ἡ Μαντῶ ὅτι οὐ τέθνηκας, ἐμὲ [μᾶλλον] κακῶς διαθήσει.

μᾶλλον2 del. Peerl. ut dittographiam

The proximity of the two occurrences of μᾶλλον might arouse suspicion, but it should in my judgement be allayed before affecting the text (contra Her., Da.). The two μᾶλλον’s (each used with one pole of the comparison in ellipsis) refer to different things and I see no cogent objection to keeping both of them: ‘to sell you ... rather [than to kill you], ... make me suffer rather [than you]’. That there is a comparison/contrast in the last clause is in any case suggested by the emphatic ἐμὲ.

2.11.11. ἦν δὲ ἐν τῷ τόπῳ ἐκείνῳ ὤλη δασεία. τὴν οὖν νύκτα ἐκείνην πλανώμενοι ἐν αὐτῇ τῇ ὄλη ὑπὸ τῶν περί τὸν Ἰππόθοον τὸν ληστὴν συνελήφησαν.

τῇ ὄλη F: del. Cob., Her., Da. ut dittographiam
Surely ἐν ταύτῃ τῇ ὠλη! What point would the emphasis in αὕτη have? And there seems to me to be no likelihood that τῇ ὠλη is intrusive.

2.12.2. λαθὼν οὖν τὸν Ἀψυρτον καὶ πάντας τοὺς κατὰ τὸν ὀλίκον εἰς ἐπιζήτησιν τῆς Ἀνθίας ἔρχεται. ἔλθων οὖν ἐν τῷ ἄγρῳ ἔθα μετὰ τοῦ ἀιπόλον ή Ἀνθία διέτοιβεν, ἂγει δὴ παρά τὸν αἰγιαλόν τὸν Λάμπτωνα τὸν αἰπόλον, ὦ πρὸς γάμον ἐδεδώκει τὴν Ἀνθίαν ἢ Μαντώ, ἐδείτο δὲ τὸν Λάμπτωνος ἐντείνει αὐτῷ ἐν τῷ οίδε περὶ κόρης ἐκ Τύρου. 20


(1) Abrocomes goes off in search of his lost beloved, Anthia: εἰς ἐπιζήτησιν τῆς Ἀνθίας ἔρχεται, as F has it. The preposition that is the vox propria for expressing purpose before a noun of action with a verb of going vel sim. is not εἰς (X. 1.5.1; 2.3.1; 3.9.5; Ach. Tat. 1.8.11; 5.4.1; cf. 2.10.3; LSJ s.v. ἐπὶ CIII1) and the word for ‘searching for’, ‘seeking’, a common activity in the romances, usually with the heroine as the object of the search, is ζήτησις (X. 2.14.4 τὴν μὲν Ἀνθίας ζήτησιν [the same search as in 2.12.2] οὐ λέγει; 3.9.5; 3.9.8 μεγάλη ζήτησις [sc. τῆς Ἀνθίας]; Ach. Tat. 6.8.4; 6.10.2; 7.1.5) not ἐπιζήτησις, and the prefix has no function here. Read [εἰς] ἐπὶ ζήτησιν and cf. esp. 3.9.5 ἐξελθὼν δὲ ἐπὶ ληστῶν ζήτησιν. After the words had been wrongly divided, or as they were being wrongly divided, someone supplied εἰς to govern ἐπιζήτησιν without adverting to the correct alternative. This is no more unlikely than that the scholars who produced LSJ should believe that the sense ‘craving’ is appropriate here (s.v. ἐπιζήτησις ad. init.). X. does in fact use expressions of the form εἰς ἐπιθυμίαν ... ἔρχεται (5.9.11; 4.5.6 εἰς φόβον ... ἔρχεται) and in itself, without considering the context, εἰς ἐπιζήτησιν τῆς Ἀνθίας ἔρχεται might mean, indeed would mean, ‘he comes to crave for Anthia’, and this is perhaps the sense that whoever inserted εἰς wanted to produce.

(2) ἔλθων οὖν ἐν τῷ ἄγρῳ ..., ἂγει δὴ παρὰ ... There are four causes of suspicion here:

5) On εἰς governing that object of action (but not motion) see LSJ s.v. V2; it is so used in X. 4.3.6 ἀντρὸν τὸ ἀποδεδειγμένον αὐτοῖς εἰς ἀπόθεσιν τῶν χρημάτων.
the absence of all detail of Abrocomes' journey, unusual even in X. (cf. 3.10.4, the doublet of this passage);

(b) ἐν τῷ ἀγῷ where one would expect εἰς τὸν ἀγῷν after ἐλθὼν (though ἐν is not impossible: LSJ s.v. ἐν A17; X. elsewhere uses a prep. with acc. in such expressions with ἔχομαι);

(c) the apparently intransitive use of ἂγει, unique in the Ephesiaca;

(d) the apparently apodotic δὴ, also unique in X.

The exact original is very probably irrecoverable, but since the ἀγῷς was just outside Ἁγία (2.9) and X. frequently uses γίνομαι with ἐν to express arrival in a place (2.9.4 γενομένη δὲ ἐν τῷ χωρίῳ ἐνθα ὁ Λάμπων ἔνεμε τὰς αἰγας, ...; 4.3.3 ἐγένετο ἐν Μέμφει; 5.4.5; 5.10.3; 5.10.5; 5.11.4) and uses ἀγῳ with a reflexive pronoun with παρά and acc. of person to mean 'take oneself to ...' (5.10.5; 5.13.5 αὐτοὺς Locella, rightly: αὐτοὺς F), we may not be too far from the right track with something like this: ἐλθὼν οὖν (εἰς τὴν Ἀντιόχειαν) (***) ἐγένετο ἐν τῷ ἀγῷ ἐνθα ... ἂγει δὴ (ἐαυτὸν) παρὰ ....

(3) παρά τὸν αἰγαλὸν τὸν Λάμπωνα τὸν αἰτόλον ... The shore has no business whatsoever here. It is certain that ΑΙΒΑΛΟΝ is a mistake for ΑΙΠΟΛΟΝ (perhaps connected with αἰγαλοῦ half a Teubner page above) and that τὸν αἰτόλον started life as a correction of τὸν αἰγαλὸν; there is no reason to suspect τὸν Λάμπωνα. We should therefore read παρὰ τὸν αἰτόλον τὸν Λάμπωνα [τὸν αἰτόλον].

2.12.3. ὁ δὲ αἰτόλος καὶ τὸ ὅνομα εἶτεν ήτι [καὶ] Ἄνθια καὶ τὸν γάμον καὶ τὴν εὐσέβειαν τὴν περί αὐτῆς καὶ τὸν Μοιρίδος ἔρωτα καὶ τὸ πρόσταγμα τὸ κατ' αὐτῆς καὶ τὴν εἰς Κιλικίαν ὀδὸν·

αὐτὴν Hemst.: αὐτοῦ F αὐτόν Wf.

περί αὐτοῦ (F) makes no sense here. Hemsterhuys' περί αὐτῆς superfluously expresses what can readily be understood and fails to express a necessary restriction of τῆς εὐσέβειας; Wifstrand's περί αὐτῶν would mean 'towards (in regard to) himself' (LSJ s.v. περί C5, e.g. Pl. Smp. 193a εὐσεβεῖν περί θεοῦ), not at

6) Cf. 3.1.3 εἰς Μακαχον ἔρχονται; 3.2.10; 3.4.1 ἠλθὲν εἰς τὴν Ταρσὸν; 3.11.2; 4.1.1; 4.1.4; 5.2.6; 5.3.3; 5.4.3; 5.11.4.
all the required sense. The goatherd told of the respect shown to Anthia by himself (2.9.4; esp. 2.11.5 where he is the subject of ευσέβησας) alone, τὴν ευσέβειαν τὴν παρ’ αὐτοῦ (or παρ’ ῶντ’ 
τοῦ). See LSJ s.v. παρά AII2; I have found no exact parallel in X. with an abstract/verbal noun, but cf. e.g. 1.9.5 τοῖς παρ’ ᾶλληλων δάχρουσι.

2.13.6. ἡ δὲ συνήθης αὐτὸν τῆς κόρης ὅψις εἰς ἐρωτα ἡγαγε, …

αὐτὸν Locella: αὐτῷ F

There can be no firm justification for changing αὐτῷ (F) to αὐτὸν (read also by Hir., Her., Da.). αὐτῷ belongs, as the word-order suggests, with συνήθης (as dat. of relation) and from it αὐτὸν is easily understood as object of ἡγαγε. Cf. 3.5.11 πολλὴν γνοὺσα χάριν αὐτῷ (αὐτὸν Hemst.) ἀποπέμπει.

2.14.3. ὦμεν οὖν Κιλικίαν μὲν ἀφέντες ἐπὶ Καππαδοκίαν καὶ τὸν ἐκεῖ Πόντον’ λέγονται γὰρ οἶκεῖν ἄνδρες εὐδαιμονες.

tὸν Πόντον’ ἐκεῖ Hir., Da. / οἰκεῖν (αὐτοῦ) Zag.

Hirschig’s ἐκεῖ λέγονται γὰρ … (read also by Da.) leaves γὰρ in an utterly impossible position! But οἰκεῖν cannot be left without a local adverb. ἐκεῖ γὰρ λέγονται … is a possibility (cf. Hercher p. LV), but I should prefer … εὐδαιμονες ἐνταῦθα: cf. 3.2.1 εἰμὶ τὸ γένος πόλεως Περίνθου (…) τῶν τὰ πρῶτα ἐκεῖ δυναμένων ἄκουες δὲ καὶ τὴν Πέρινθον ὡς ἐνδοξος καὶ τοὺς ἄνδρας ὡς εὐδαιμονες ἐνταῦθα.

Göttingen
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