

NOTES ON XENOPHON OF EPHEBUS 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 (Budé 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)επλήσθη, ...
(ἐν)επλ. Cobet

There is no need for the prepositional prefix (read also by Hir., Her., Da.): in X. we find both ὀργῆς ἐνεπλήσθη (2.4.3) and ὀργῆς πλησθεῖς (3.2.10), in Ach. Tat. both δακρύων ἐμπεπλησμένους (5.15.1) and ἐπλήσθη δακρύων (6.7.1).

2.4.3. ἀκούσας ὁ Ἀβροκόμης εὐθύς μὲν ὀργῆς ἐνεπλήσθη.
ἀναβλέψας δὲ ἀτενὲς εἰς τὸν Λεύκωνα ... ἔφη
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 ἀπο- with Hercher: cf. 3.3.3 ἀποβλέψας εἰς τὸν Ἄ. ... ἔφη ...; 5.9.7 ἀποβλέψασα δὲ εἰς τὸν Ἴ. ... φησὶν Even if Abrocomes did look up, it is likely that ἀπο- is still the right reading; cf. 4.2.4 ὁ δὲ ἀποβλέψας (ἀνα – Her.) εἰς τὸν ἥλιον καὶ τὸ ρεῦμα ἰδὼν τοῦ Νείλου ... φησι

2.4.4. ἀπειλείτω νῦν, εἰ θέλει, Μαντῶ ξίφη καὶ βρόχους καὶ
πῦρ καὶ πάντα ὅσα δύναται σῶμα ἐνεγκεῖν οἰκέτου.
ἐνεγκεῖν F: βασανίζειν B²) ἀναγκάσαι Burger, Da.

1) For my notes on Book I see *RbM* 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 *οὐκ οἶσω πορονοβοσκὸν δεσπότην*, which is no parallel at all.

δύναται expresses not an ability of the body but the notion of ‘all possible tortures’ and *ἐνεγκεῖν* means ‘suffer’, ‘have inflicted on it’. It is worth comparing Ach. Tat. 8.5.5 *πᾶσαν αἰκίαν ἤνεγκεν εἰς τὸ σῶμα πλὴν μιᾶς*.

2.4.5. *ἀλλὰ δέομαί σου, τῆς ψυχῆς [καὶ] τῆς ἐμῆς δέσποτα, μὴ προδοῶς ἑαυτὸν μηδὲ εἰς ὀργὴν ἐμβάλλης βαρβαρικὴν, συγκατάθου δὲ τῇ τῆς δεσποίνης ἐπιθυμίᾳ· κἀγὼ ὑμῖν ἀπειμι ἐκποδῶν, ἑμαυτὴν ἀποκτείνασα.*
καὶ del. Hemst.

The *καὶ* deleted by Hemsterhuys (followed also by Hir., Her., Da.) may be kept. Abrocomes has just proclaimed his readiness to endure anything rather than break his undertaking of fidelity 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. *ἡ δὲ Μαντῶ χρονιζούσης τῆς Ῥόδης οὐκέτι καρτεροῦσα γράφει γραμματίον πρὸς τὸν Ἀβροκόμην· ἦν δὲ τὰ ἐγγεγραμμένα τοιάδε·*
Ἐβροκόμη τῷ καλῷ δέσποινα ἢ σὴ χαίρειν.
Μαντῷ ἐρᾶ σου, μηκέτι φέρειν δυναμένη· ἀπρεπὲς μὲν ἴσως παρθένω, ἀναγκαῖον δὲ φιλοῦση· δέομαι, μὴ με παρίδης μηδὲ ὑβρίσης τὴν τὰ σὰ ἡρημένην. 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? *Μαντῷ ἐρᾶ κτλ.* has been badly mispunctuated. Read *Μαντῷ ἐρᾶ σου. μηκέτι φέρειν δυναμένη, ἀπρεπὲς μὲν ἴσως παρθένω, ἀναγκαῖον δὲ φιλοῦση δέομαι. μὴ με παρίδης ... ἡρημένην. 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 ... ἤρημένην*; 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 πονήρως καὶ οὐκέτι φέρειν δυναμένη ἐπεγείρει ...*; cf. 2.12.1 *ταύτην ... ὁ καλὸς Μοῖρις ἐρᾷ· μηκέτι δὲ φέρειν δυναμένη* (referring, of course, not to Moeris) *μετεπεμψάμην ...*; 4.5.4 *ἡ ... ὄψις ἐξέκαεν αὐτὸν εἰς τὸν ἔρωτα· οὐκέτι δὲ φέρειν δυνάμενος ἐπεγείρει ...*; cf. also e.g. 1.4.4 *ὁ θεὸς σφοδρότερος αὐτῷ ἐνέκειτο ... οὐκέτι δὴ καρτερῶν, δίψας ἑαυτὸν ... εἶπεν ...*; 2.3.3 *καὶ μᾶλλον ἀνεκαίετο καὶ διέκειτο πονήρως· καὶ οὐκέτι καρτεροῦσα ἔγνω ...*. The pattern is evidently characteristic, the participle in each case going with the following verb. In 2.5.1 *οὐκέτι καρτεροῦσα* in the narrative expresses the psychological state in which Manto took the step of making her written request (*γράφει*); so in the letter the corresponding *μηκέτι φέρειν δυναμένη* bears the same relation to *δέομαι*. 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 *Μαντῶ ἐρᾷ σου*. For *δέομαι* with a substantival adjective as internal accusative cf. Th. 1.32 *ξύμφορα*; Pl. *Prt.* 335e *δυνατά*; D. 38.2 *δίκαία καὶ μέτρια*. 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 *θερινόν τε καὶ λιγυρόν ὑπηγεῖ* (sc. *ὁ τόπος*) ...; cf. Plu. *Mor.* 64e *σαθρόν ... ὑπηγεῖ καὶ ἀγεννές* (sc. *ἡ κολακεία*).

2.5.2. *ἐὰν δὲ ἀντείπης, ἐννόει μὲν οἷα πείση τῆς ὑβρισιμένης ἑαυτὴν ἐκδικούσης, οἷα δὲ οἱ μετὰ σοῦ κοινωνοὶ τῆς σῆς ὑπερηφανίας σύμβουλοι γενόμενοι,*
κοινωνοὶ ut gloss. secl. Cob., Da. / *καὶ* *σύμβουλοι* Peerlk., Her.

Since *οἱ μετὰ σοῦ* is good Greek for 'your companions' (LSJ s.v. *μετά* II) and the expression *οἱ μετὰ σοῦ κοινωνοί* (as against *κοινωνός* with dat. of pers.: 5.15.4 *κοινωνοὶ πάντων τοῖς συντρόφοις ἦσαν*) seems to be unparalleled, I would read Peerlkamp's *καὶ*, linking *κοινωνοί* and *σύμβουλοι* (both nouns) as complements of *γενόμενοι*. Deletion of *κοινωνοί* is an unnecessarily drastic measure; and why *κοινωνοί*, 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 Ἀβροκόμην ὧ τολμηρὰ καὶ μαρὰ εἰπὼν κεφαλή, ἐτόλμησας ...;*

I strongly suspect that *τολμηρά* is a mistake for *πονηρά*, a mistake provoked by the following *ἐτόλμησας*³⁾, with which it gives a very awkward effect. *τολμηρός* occurs only here in X.; *πονηρός* is common (12 times; – *ως* 8 more), and cf. especially 2.4.3 ‘ὁ πονηρὸς ἔφη καὶ Φοινίκων τῶν ἐνταῦθα βαρβαρώτερε, ἐτόλμησας ...;’ 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 περιορῆσαι τὴν ἐσθῆτα αὐτοῦ
 τοῖς οἰκέταις καὶ φέρειν πῦρ καὶ μάστιγας καὶ παίνειν τὸ
 μειράκιον. ἦν δὲ τὸ θέαμα ἐλεεινόν· αἱ τε γὰρ βάσανοι τὸ 10
 σῶμα πᾶν ἠφάνιζον βασάνων ἄηθες ὄν οἰκετικῶν, τὸ τε
 αἷμα κατέρρει [πᾶν] καὶ τὸ κάλλος ἐμαραίνεται. προσῆγεν
 αὐτῷ καὶ δεσμὰ φοβερὰ καὶ πῦρ καὶ μάλιστα ἐχρήτο ταῖς
 βασάνοις κατ’ αὐτοῦ, τῷ νυμφίῳ τῆς θυγατρὸς ἐνδεικνύ-
 μενος ὅτι σῶφρονα παρθένον ἄξεται. 15

10 post γὰρ in F spatium quattuor litterarum est;
 altera manus inser. βάσανοι idemque adscriptum in
 margine; πληγαὶ Cob. οὐλαὶ 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 (*παίνειν*, 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 *πληγαὶ* is difficult. I prefer Cobet’s *πληγαί*.

3) Assimilation is common in our text of X., some of the most striking instances being: 1.7.2 *βουλευομένοις* ... *βουλευομένον* (*βουλομένον* Cob.); 1.15.1 *ἔδοκει* ... *ἔδόκει* (*ἔδεδοῖκε* Hemst.); 1.15.5–6 *πόνῳ* ... *πόνους* (*λόγους* Hemst.); 2.3.1 *ἀβροκόμον* ... *ἀβροκόμον* (*Ἀνθίας* Her.); 2.7.4 *ἀγομαὶ* ... *ἀγομαι* (see my note on this passage below).

2.7.3. *ὡς δὲ ἤδη παρεσκευάζοντο εἰς Συρίαν ἀπιέναι, προέπεμφεν ὁ Ἄψυρτος τὴν θυγατέρα μετὰ δώρων πολλῶν, ἐσθῆτάς τε [τάς] Βαβυλωνίους καὶ χρυσὸν ἄφθονον καὶ ἄργυρον ἐδίδου.*

τε is clearly prospective and the elaborative finite clause *ἐσθῆτάς 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 ἄγομαι δῶρον δοθεῖσα τῇ Μαντοῖ καὶ εἰς χεῖρας τῆς ζηλοτυπούσης ἔρχομαι.*

ἔρχομαι Wif.: *ἄγομαι* F *δίδομαι* vel *ἐκδίδομαι* Hemst.

δίδομαι (3.2.8; LSJ s.v. *χεῖρ* II6d) could be right and so, I suppose, could Wifstrand's *ἔρχομαι* (LSJ s.v. *χεῖρ* 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*: *παραδίδομι*, 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 *παραδιδόναι τινὰ εἰς χεῖράς τινος* see e.g. N.T. *Act. Ap.* 21.11; 28.17; *Ev. Luc.* 9.44; 24.7. The error came about through false repetition of the first *ἄγομαι*, 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 ἢ ζῶσαν ἢ τεθνεῶσαν εὔρομι.*

ἢ ... ἢ ... Hir.: *καὶ ... καὶ ...* F

ἢ ζῶσαν ἢ τεθνεῶσαν (read also by Her., Da.) would mean 'either alive or dead' (as if there were another possibility) and not 'whether alive or dead' (*εἴτε ... εἴτε ...*), the meaning presumably 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 σὴ καὶ ζῶσα κὰν ἀποθανεῖν δεήσῃ.*

2.11.1–2. ἡ δὲ Ἀνθία ἦν μὲν τινα χρόνον παρὰ τῷ αἰπόλῳ, συνεχὲς δὲ ὁ Μοῖρις ὁ ἀνὴρ τῆς Μαντοῦς εἰς τὸ χωρίον ἐρχόμενος ἐρᾷ τῆς Ἀνθίας σφοδρὸν ἔρωτα. καὶ τὰ μὲν πρῶτα ἐπειράτο λανθάνειν, τελευταῖον δὲ λέγει τῷ αἰπόλῳ τὸν ἔρωτα καὶ πολλὰ ὑπισχνεῖτο συγκύψαντι. ὁ δὲ τῷ μὲν Μοίριδι συντίθεται, δεδοικῶς δὲ τὴν Μαντῶ ἔρχεται πρὸς αὐτὴν καὶ λέγει τὸν ἔρωτα τὸν Μοίριδος.

συγκύψαντι Ja.: συγκρούψαντι F

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

Moeris Anthiam amat, quam Lamponis caprarii coniugem esse existimat, initio clam illum rem habens; tum vero, quum se nihil videret proficere, Lamponi amorem fatetur, magnam mercedem pollicitus *συγκρούψαντι*. Inepta lectio. Moeris enim caprarii opem ad Anthiae amorem consequendum redimere studebat. Et ille τῷ Μοίριδι συντίθεται. Hinc apparet legendum esse *συγκύψαντι*, *si secum in illam rem incumberet*⁴).

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' *συγκρούψαντι* 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* (*συγκρούψαντι*, sc. τὸν ἔρωτα) from everyone else, especially, of course, from Manto. Lampon pretends to agree to this (*συντίθεται* = *προσποιεῖται συντίθεσθαι*) and refers me-

4) *Achillis Tatii Alexandrini de Leucippes et Clitophonis amoribus libri octo*. Textum ... recensuit ... F. Jacobs (Leipzig 1821) 451.

rely to a verbal undertaking), but then goes and *reveals* (λέγει) Moeris' love to Manto in contravention of the agreement (note τῷ μὲν Μοίριδι συντίθεται [sc. συγκρύπτειν τὸν ἔρωτα] ..., δεδοικώς 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. συγκύψαντι 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 δέομαί σου, Λάμπων αἰπόλε, ὃς μέχρι νῦν
εὐσέβησας, ἂν ἀποκτείνης, κἄν ὀλίγον θάψον με τῇ
παρακειμένη γῆ καὶ ...

ὃς Hemst. (read also by Her.): ὡς F

What is wrong with ὡς? It can be taken either as causal ('since'; cf. 3.5.2) dependent on δέομαι or as comparative ('just as') dependent on θάψον.

2.11.7. οἶδας ὅτι ἡ δέσποινα Μαντῶ ἐκέλευσέ μοι λαβεῖν καὶ
φονεῦσαι σε· ἐγὼ δὲ καὶ θεοὺς δεδιὼς καὶ τὸ κάλλος
οἰκτείρας βούλομαι σε μᾶλλον πωλῆσαι πόρρω που τῆς
γῆς ταύτης, μὴ μαθοῦσα ἡ Μαντῶ ὅτι οὐ τέθηκας, 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 ὕλη δασεῖα. τὴν οὖν νύκτα
ἐκείνην πλανώμενοι ἐν αὐτῇ τῇ ὕλῃ ὑπὸ τῶν περὶ τὸν
Ἰππόθοον τὸν ληστήν συνελήφθησαν.

τῇ ὕλῃ F: del. Cob., Her., Da. ut dittographiam

Surely *ἐν ταύτῃ τῇ ὕλῃ!*? What point would the emphasis in *αὐτῇ* have? And there seems to me to be no likelihood that *τῇ ὕλῃ* is intrusive.

2.12.2. *λαθὼν οὖν τὸν Ἄψυρτον καὶ πάντα τοὺς κατὰ τὸν οἶκον εἰς ἐπιζήτησιν τῆς Ἀνθίας ἔρχεται. ἔλθων οὖν ἐν τῷ ἀγρῷ ἔνθα μετὰ τοῦ αἰπόλου ἢ Ἀνθία διέτριβεν, ἄγει δὴ παρὰ τὸν αἰγιαλὸν τὸν Λάμπωνα τὸν αἰπόλον, ᾧ πρὸς γάμον ἐδεδώκει τὴν Ἀνθίαν ἢ Μαντώ, ἐδεῖτο δὲ τοῦ Λάμπωνος εἰπεῖν αὐτῷ εἴ τι οἶδε περὶ κόρης ἐκ Τύρου.* 15 20

17 * *ἄγει δὴ Her. ὑπάγει δὴ Da. ἄγεται Cast.// 17.18
 παρεκάλει δὴ τὸν αἰπόλον τὸν Λ. (εἰπεῖν αὐτῷ) Hemst.//
 18 τὸν αἰγιαλὸν τὸν Λάμπωνα del. Da., τὸν αἰγ. del. Cast.

(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*⁵) but *ἐπί* (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. *ἐπί* 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 *μεγάλῃ 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*] *ἐπί ζήτησιν* and cf. esp. 3.9.5 *ἔξελθὼν 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) *ἐλθὼν οὖν ἐν τῷ ἀγρῷ ... , ἄγει 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 *ἀντρον τὸ ἀποδεδειγμένον αὐτοῖς εἰς ἀπόθειν τῶν χορημάτων*.

- (a) the absence of all detail of Abrocomes' journey, unusual even in X. (cf. 3.10.4, the doublet of this passage);
- (b) ἐν τῷ ἀγρῶ where one would expect εἰς τὸν ἀγρόν after ἐλθῶν (though ἐν is not impossible: LSJ s.v. ἐν A17; X. elsewhere uses a prep. with acc. in such expressions with ἔρχομαι);
- (c) the apparently intransitive use of ἄγει, unique in the *Ephesiaca*;
- (d) the apparently apodotic δὴ, also unique in X.

The exact original is very probably irrecoverable, but since the ἀγρός was just outside Antioch (2.9) and X. frequently uses γίνομαι with ἐν to express arrival in a place (2.9.4 γενομένην δὲ ἐν τῷ χωρίῳ ἔνθα ὁ Λάμπων ἔνευε τὰς αἰγας, ...; 4.3.3 ἐγένετο ἐν Μέμφει; 5.4.5; 5.10.3; 5.10.5; 5.11.4) and uses ἄγω with a reflexive pronoun with παρὰ and acc. of person to mean 'take oneself to ...' (5.10.5; 5.13.5 αὐτοῦς Locella, rightly: αὐτοῦς F), we may not be too far from the right track with something like this: ἐλθῶν οὖν (εἰς τὴν Ἀντιόχειαν⁶) (**) ἐγένετο ἐν τῷ ἀγρῶ ἔνθα ἄγει δὴ (ἑαυτὸν) παρὰ ...

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

2.12.3. ὁ δὲ αἰπόλος καὶ τὸ ὄνομα εἶπεν ὅτι [καί] Ἀνθία καὶ τὸν γάμον καὶ τὴν εὐσέβειαν τὴν περὶ αὐτὴν καὶ τὸν Μοίριδος ἔρωτα καὶ τὸ πρόσταγμα τὸ κατ' αὐτῆς καὶ τὴν εἰς Κιλικίαν ὁδόν·

αὐτὴν Hemst.: αὐτοῦ F αὐτὸν Wif.

περὶ αὐτοῦ (F) makes no sense here. Hemsterhuys' περὶ αὐτὴν superfluously expresses what can readily be understood and fails to express a necessary restriction of τὴν εὐσέβειαν; Wifstrand's περὶ αὐτὸν would mean 'towards (in regard to) himself' (LSJ s.v. περὶ C5, e.g. Pl. *Smp.* 193a εὐσεβεῖν περὶ θεοῦς), not at

6) Cf. 3.1.3 εἰς Μάζακον ἔρχονται; 3.2.10; 3.4.1 ἦλθεν εἰς τὴν Ταρσόσιν; 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 *εὐσέβησας*) *alone*, *τὴν εὐσέβειαν τὴν παρ' αὐτοῦ* (or *παρ' ἑαυτοῦ*). 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' ἀλλήλων δάκρυσιν*.

2.13.6. *ἡ δὲ συνήθης αὐτὸν τῆς κόρης ὄψις εἰς ἔρωτα ἤγαγε, ...*
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 *αὐτόν* is easily understood as object of *ἤγαγε*. Cf. 3.5.11 *πολλὴν γουῖσα χάριν αὐτῷ* (*αὐτόν* Hemst.) *ἀποπέμπει*.

2.14.3. *ἴωμεν οὖν Κιλικίαν μὲν ἀφέντες ἐπὶ Καππαδοκίαν καὶ τὸν ἐκεῖ Πόντον· λέγονται γὰρ οἰκεῖν ἄνδρες εὐδαίμονες.*
τὸν 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 *... εὐδαίμονες (ἐνταῦθα)*: cf. 3.2.1 *εἰμὶ τὸ γένος πόλεως Περίνθου (...)* *τῶν τὰ πρῶτα ἐκεῖ δυναμένων· ἀκούεις δὲ καὶ τὴν Πέρινθον ὡς ἐνδοξος καὶ τοῦς ἄνδρας ὡς εὐδαίμονες ἐνταῦθα*.

Göttingen

James N. O'Sullivan