

TEXTUAL NOTES ON ACHILLES TATIUS*

ABSTRACT

This paper contributes to the textual criticism of Achilles Tatius' novel Leucippe and Clitophon by proposing a number of alterations to the text of the most recent edition of the complete novel (Les Belles Lettres) (Paris, 1991).

Keywords: Achilles Tatius; editions; textual criticism

Achilles Tatius' novel *Leucippe and Clitophon* was last edited by Jean-Philippe Garnaud (1991). This edition has become the standard point of reference, displacing the—until then—standard edition by Ebbe Vilborg (1955).¹ Garnaud had more textual sources at his disposal (two additional manuscripts and four papyri) than Vilborg; moreover, Vilborg introduced into the text many emendations, a practice which Garnaud's edition avoids. The two editions also differ from each other considerably as a result of the editors' disagreement in their assessment of the value of the main manuscript families: Vilborg gave preference to the β -family, whereas Garnaud to the α -family, which contains what may be the oldest surviving manuscript of the novel (W, twelfth century).² But the case for systematically preferring one family of manuscripts over the other is not strong.³ Furthermore, important divergences between some papyri and the medieval manuscripts of Achilles⁴ suggest that a fixed form was probably lost early in the novel's tradition.

* I am grateful to *CQ*'s anonymous referee and to the Editor for a number of useful comments.

¹ Editions: E. Vilborg, *Achilles Tatius. Leucippe and Clitophon (Studia Graeca et Latina Gothoburgensia 1)* (Göteborg, 1955); J.-Ph. Garnaud, *Achille Tatius d'Alexandrie, le roman de Leucippé et Clitophon (Les Belles Lettres)* (Paris, 1991); S. Gaselee, *Achilles Tatius (Loeb Classical Library)* (London and Cambridge, MA, 1917, revised 1969). T. Whitmarsh, *Achilles Tatius: Leucippe and Clitophon Books I–II* (Cambridge, 2020) includes a new edition of the novel's first two books. See J. O'Sullivan, 'Notes on the text and interpretation of Achilles Tatius 1', *CQ* 28 (1978), 312–29, at 312 for older editions of Achilles Tatius, among which F. Jacobs, *Achillis Tatii Alexandrini De Leucippes et Clitophonis amoribus libri octo* (Leipzig, 1821) stands out for providing a foundation for subsequent editorial work.

² MS M, of the α -family, was dated by Vilborg to the thirteenth century, but an eleventh-century date has also found support: Garnaud (n. 1), xxi n. 53; C. Consonni, 'On the text of Achilles Tatius', in S. Byrne et al. (edd.), *Authors, Authority and Interpreters in the Ancient Novel: Essays in Honour of Gareth L. Schmeling* (Groningen, 2016), 112–30, at 112 n. 2. In Vilborg's notation of manuscript families (not used by Garnaud), α = WMD, β = VGE. R (Vat.gr. 1348), also of the β -family, was regarded by Vilborg (n. 1), xxvi as perhaps the best manuscript of Achilles Tatius, but features only occasionally in Garnaud. Vilborg (n. 1), lxxii expressed caution about F (a manuscript which at times agrees with α , at times with β), but makes significantly more use of it than Garnaud.

³ Consonni (n. 2), 116; Whitmarsh (n. 1), 76.

⁴ These concern the text of the new Π^4 (*P.Rob. inv. 35 + P.Col. inv. 901*, probably third century A.D.), which offers a different text from that of the medieval manuscripts in many places, and the different order of certain chapters of Book 2 (2–3) in Π^1 (*P.Oxy. 1250*, also third century) and the manuscripts; Consonni (n. 2), 115–16.

For all the above reasons, and despite the general quality of Garnaud's edition,⁵ Achilles' text can profit from more textual critical work. Admittedly the richness and the complexity of the manuscript tradition of Achilles' novel make the prospect of a definitive edition seem hardly attainable. In many cases editorial work on Achilles' novel does not consist in correcting errors but in selecting among possible variants,⁶ a process which is further reflected in commentaries,⁷ and is to some extent affected by personal interpretative and aesthetic tastes. However, a reading of Garnaud's text reveals possibilities for editorial improvement at several places, a selection of which is put forward in the present paper. Garnaud's text and critical apparatus are used as the basis of the discussion; the translation of the passages discussed follows Whitmarsh.⁸

1.4.3 λευκή παρειά, τὸ λευκὸν εἰς μέσον ἐφωίνισσέτο καὶ ἐμμεῖτο πορφύραν, οἶαν εἰς τὸν ἐλέφαντα Λυδίη βάπτει γυνή·

οἶαν post εἰς transp. Vilborg || οἶαν MD VGE F : οἶον W || Λυδίη post βάπτει transp. D || Λυδίη MD VE : -δία W F

'Her [*sc.* Leucippe's] cheeks were white, a white that blushed towards the middle, a blush like the purple pigment used by a Lydian woman to dye ivory.' Clitophon alludes to the impression made on him by Leucippe's beauty the first time he set eyes on her. The meaning of this phrase must be similar to that of the Iliadic lines ὡς δ' ὅτε τίς τ' ἐλέφαντα γυνή φοίνικι μίγη | Μηρονίς ἦε Κάειρα ... (4.141–2). Vilborg (n. 7), 22 and recently Whitmarsh (n. 1), 139 rightly see the Ionic form Λυδίη, preserved in the majority of the manuscripts, as suggestive of the Homeric provenance of the simile. The reading of the manuscripts οἶαν εἰς τὸν ἐλέφαντα is preferred by Garnaud (and previously by Gaselee), but is grammatically unsustainable.⁹ One way to improve the text is to revert to Vilborg's emendation εἰς οἶαν τὸν ἐλέφαντα.¹⁰ In this case,

⁵ On the merits and shortcomings of Garnaud's edition, see further G. Anderson's review (*CR* 42 [1992], 439); Consonni (n. 2). Regrettably Garnaud, unlike Vilborg, does not provide a *stemma codicum*; a *stemma* would usefully express the editor's view of the manuscript tradition (including the position in it of the two manuscripts [Ol. and Sin.] that Vilborg did not have), a view which materially affects textual choices.

⁶ Consonni (n. 2), 127, citing C.F. Russo's review of Vilborg's edition (*Gnomon* 30 [1958], 585–90, at 587).

⁷ Vilborg offered support for his editorial decisions in *Achilles Tatius*, Leucippe and Clitophon: *A Commentary* (Göteborg, 1962). The partial commentaries by Whitmarsh (n. 1) and T.F. Carney (Leucippe and Clitophon – *Book III* [Salisbury, 1960]), and the full commentaries of K. Plepelits (*Achilleus Tatios*, Leucippe und Kleitophon [Stuttgart, 1980]) and, to a greater extent, G. Yatromanolakis (*Ἀχιλλέως Ἀλεξανδρέως Τατίου, Λευκίππη καὶ Κλειτοφῶν* [Athens, 1990]) also tackle textual issues; Yatromanolakis further prints a text (without critical apparatus) based on Vilborg's but with several individual editorial choices. Concern for textual matters is also often expressed in the lemmata of J. O'Sullivan, *A Lexicon to Achilles Tatius* (Berlin and New York, 1980).

⁸ Whitmarsh's translation of the novel, which is based on Garnaud's text (but occasionally orients itself towards other readings), can be found in T. Whitmarsh and H. Morales, *Achilles Tatius*, Leucippe and Clitophon (Oxford, 2001). As far as English translations of the novel are concerned, in addition to Gaselee's (n. 1) and Whitmarsh's (this note), there is also J.J. Winkler's translation in B.P. Reardon, *Collected Ancient Greek Novels* (Berkeley / Los Angeles / London, 1989), 175–284, based on Vilborg's edition.

⁹ As shown in detail by Whitmarsh (n. 1), 139, who notes the unsatisfactory sense of the phrase ('one does not dip dye into ivory') and the use of βάπτειν 'dye' with instrumental dative elsewhere in *Achilles Tatius* (2.11.4, 3.7.3). Cf. O'Sullivan (n. 1), 314: 'οἶαν ... βάπτει ... may safely be regarded as nonsense'.

¹⁰ Cf. R.M. Rattenbury's review (*CR* 6 [1956], 229–33, at 232, where for '1.6.4' read '1.4.3').

βάπτει would be taken to mean ‘dip into’ (cf. 3.15.4, in the context of Leucippe’s fake sacrifice: εἶτα λαβὼν ξίφος βάπτει κατὰ τῆς καρδίας καὶ διεγκύσας τὸ ξίφος εἰς τὴν κάτω γαστέρα ῥήγγυσσι). But O’Sullivan’s emendation οἶα τις τὸν ἐλέφαντα¹¹ is a better option. Its main advantage is the ensuing syntactic analogy with the Homeric parallel:¹² τις ... γυνή in both passages; οἶα (Ach. Tat.) and φοίνικι (Hom.) as datives of instrument; the syntactical separation of the three terms in agreement, τις ... γυνή ... Λυδίη, which seems eccentric for prose, invokes the syntax of the Homeric model (τις ... γυνή ... Μηρονίς ἢ ἐ Κάειρα). O’Sullivan supported this emendation with parallels from this novel: τῆς δὲ ἐσθῆτος οὐ πάρεργον εἶχεν ἢ πορφύρα τὴν βαφήν, ἀλλ’ οἷαν μυθολογοῦσι Τύριοι τοῦ ποιμένου εὐρεῖν τὸν κύνα, ἢ καὶ μέχρι τούτου βάπτουσιν Ἀφροδίτης τὸν πέπλον (2.11.4; cf. 3.7.3 ἀλλ’ οὔτε τὸν παρειῶν τὸ ὄχρον τέλεον ἀφοίνικτον ἦν, ἡμέμα δὲ τῷ ἐρεύθει βέβαπται). As O’Sullivan explained, the corruption must have emerged from a misreading of οἶα τις: ‘a scribe having difficulty in reading οἶα τις as written in his exemplar might readily have plumped for οἶαν εἰς with βάπτω under the impression that it gave adequate sense.’ A variation of O’Sullivan’s proposal is Whitmarsh’s οἶα πριστόν ἐλέφαντα;¹³ the phrase πριστός ἐλέφας ‘sawn ivory’ has good parallels (it is used in Homer and Lucian as a comparison for light-coloured skin and teeth), but πριστόν seems palaeographically more difficult here than O’Sullivan’s τις τόν.

1.8.2 οὐκ ἀκούεις τοῦ Διὸς λέγοντος

τοῖς δ’ ἐγὼ ἀντὶ πυρὸς δώσω κακόν, ᾧ κεν ἅπαντες
τέρπωνται κατὰ θυμόν, ἐόν κακὸν ἀμφογαπόντες;

αὕτη γυναικῶν ἡδονή, καὶ ἔοικε τῇ τῶν Σειρήνων φύσει· κάκειναι γὰρ ἡδονῇ φονεύουσιν ᾠδῆς.

γυναικῶν Göttling : κακῶν codd.

‘Do you not know the words of Zeus: “I shall give mankind a bane in exchange for fire, wherewith all | Might rejoice in their hearts, embracing their bane?”¹⁴ Such is the pleasure provided by women, which has similar properties to the Sirens: women too kill with the pleasure of their song.’ This is part of Clinias’ rant against the female sex (Clinias is Clitophon’s cousin and adviser in erotic matters, but unlike Clitophon he prefers boys as lovers to women). Göttling’s emendation—adopted by Vilborg, Garnaud and Whitmarsh—indeed gives an appropriate sense, but it is worth asking whether the reading of the manuscripts can be salvaged. If we read αὕτη κακῶν ἡδονή (meaning ‘this is the pleasure that comes from evil things’),¹⁵ the pronoun would refer to the offering of the female human as a gift by the gods, which is the theme of the Hesiodic quotation; the pleasure derived by men from this gift, says Clinias, is similar in nature (ἔοικε) to that offered by the Sirens,¹⁶ who use the charm of their song to

Vilborg’s other suggestion (following Wifstrand), to delete εἰς and read πορφύραν, οἶαν ... βάπτει, is more invasive and provides a less satisfactory sense. The same is true for Q. Cataudella’s proposal of the frequent formula οἶον εἰ (‘Note critiche al testo di Achille Tazio’, in *Studi in onore di Luigi Castiglioni*, vol. 1 [Florence, 1960], 171–7, at 171–2).

¹¹ O’Sullivan (n. 1), 314–15. This emendation was preferred by Yatromanolakis (n. 7), 576.

¹² Thanks go to *CQ*’s referee for pointing out the details of this analogy.

¹³ Whitmarsh (n. 1), 139, who in his text prints: οἶα ῥεῖς τὸν ἑλέφαντα Λυδίη βάπτει γυνή.

¹⁴ Hes. *Op.* 57–8.

¹⁵ Cf. Vilborg (n. 7), 25. T.W. Lumb’s αὕτη κακόν, ἡδονή (‘Notes on Achilles Tattius’, *CQ* 14 [1920], 147–9, at 147) missed the point.

¹⁶ Whitmarsh (n. 1), 151 suggests that we intuitively understand τῇ with (implicit) ἡδονῇ and φύσει as a dative of respect, even if the proximity of τῇ and φύσει makes it hard to dissociate one from the other.

lure men to their deaths. For κακῶν ἡδονή, cf. Joseph. *AJ* 1.74 ὀρῶν δ' οὐκ ἐνδιδόντας, ἀλλ' ἰσχυρῶς ὑπὸ τῆς ἡδονῆς τῶν κακῶν κεκρατημένους. Instead of assuming an error emerging from dittography (as Vilborg did), we may posit a deliberate rhetorical repetition (κακόν-κακῶν-κακοῦ) at 1.8.1–3, matching the emotionally loaded tone of the speaker's attack against womanhood.

4.4.5 ἂν δέ τι τῶν λαροτέρων ἴδη, τοῦτω περιβάλλει, κύκλω τὴν ἄγρην περισφίγγας, καὶ τὸ πᾶν ἀνεκούφισε καὶ ὤρεξε ἀνω δῶρον δεσπότη.

λαροτέρων Lumb : ἄδροτέρων MD VGE ἀνδροτέρων W

'Anything more dainty that it [*sc.* the proboscis] spies, it encompasses by wrapping itself tightly around this prey, before lifting it up in its entirety and offering it up to its [*sc.* the elephant's] master as a gift.' Clitophon and Leucippe have eloped to Egypt; at the river Nile, they watch the hunt of a hippopotamus and listen to an Egyptian's description of another exotic animal, the elephant. The digression regarding elephants refers to this animal's eating habits, as well as to special food, which the elephant chooses to save for his master. The nature of this special food has puzzled editors. λαροτέρων 'delicious' is an old suggestion (Lumb [n. 15], 148), which was adopted by Gamaud in the place of Vilborg's ἄβροτέρων 'more delicate', an emendation proposed by Jacobs. Cataudella's ἄβρω<το>τέρων ([n. 10], 174), a comparative form of ἄβρωτος 'inedible', is unattested. However, there seems to be no need for emending the reading of the manuscripts ἄδροτέρων (W's ἀνδροτέρων must be a corruption of this reading). The adjective ἄδρός is used elsewhere to describe rich meat and fish (ἰχθύς θ' ἄδρός, Alexis, fr. 175 K.–A.), as well as ripe fruit (καρπὸς ἄδρός, Hdt. 1.17).¹⁷ Hence it is appropriate here as a designation of good-quality food.

4.14.3 τὸ δὲ ὕδωρ ἦδη παρήν, καὶ ὠγκῶντο μὲν αἱ λίμναι πανταχόθεν οἰδοῦσαι, ὁ δὲ ἰσθμὸς ἐπεκλύζετο, πάντα δὲ ἦν ὡσπερ θάλασσα.

ὠγκῶντο Π^{7pc} W : ὠγοντο M ὠγκοῦτο VG ὠκοῦντο E ὠγκῶνται Π^{7ac}

'The water was now on them [*sc.* the enemies]: the lakes swelled, tumescent on every side, while the isthmus was submerged, looking everywhere like a sea.' Clitophon witnesses a clash between the Egyptian army and the gang of the βουκόλοι ('herdsmen-bandits'), which the latter win with the help of a stratagem: their scouts open the dyke that held the waters of the Nile, flooding the enemies' path. The swelling of the lagoons and the flooding of the isthmus described in the present passage is the result of the opening of the dyke. Gamaud's ὠγκῶντο has replaced Vilborg's ὠγκοῦντο. Gamaud's apparatus criticus informs us that he is following editions of the papyrus in printing the pluperfect ὠγκῶντο as a correction from the perfect.¹⁸ Unfortunately, the grammar in Gamaud's text and apparatus criticus is confused. The verb ὠγκόομαι, -οῦμαι 'swell' in the third person plural becomes ὠγκοῦντο in the imperfect, ὠγκῶντο in the pluperfect. Vilborg's ὠγκοῦντο (VRG) may gain

¹⁷ Cf. Steph. in *Hp.* 1.9 ἀδρὰ δὲ τὰ φά· ἄδροτέρα δὲ ἰχθύς καὶ λάχανα καὶ ἄρτος· ἀδροτάτη δὲ ὄρνις καὶ κρέατα καὶ τὰ τοιαῦτα.

¹⁸ Line 14 ὠγκῶντ[αι] ὄ·; M. Gronewald, 'Ein verkannter Papyrus des Achilleus Tatios (*P.Oxy.* 1014 = Achilleus Tatios IV 14, 2–5)', *ZPE* 22 (1976), 14–17. The text in both *P.Oxy.* 1014 (edited by A.S. Hunt) and the edition of Gronewald (who first recognized the papyrus as coming from Achilles' novel) is written unaccented. Vilborg's apparatus criticus also has ὠγκῶντο (W).

some appeal from the following ἐπεκλύζετο (also an imperfect form),¹⁹ but we should rather follow the combined testimony of Π⁷ and W, correct the accent and print ὄγκωντο.

5.3.2 εἰδὼς οὖν ἀμύχανον τὸ τυχεῖν, συντίθησιν ἐπιβουλὴν, ληστῶν ὁμοτέχων <ὄχλον> συγκροτήσας, ἅτε θαλάσσιος ὢν ἄνθρωπος, καὶ συνθέμενος αὐτοῖς ἃ δεῖ ποιεῖν ...

ὄχλον add. Schmidt

‘Realizing that consent would not be forthcoming, he [*sc.* Chaereas] arranged a plot: assembling a band of bandits who shared his trade (he being a man of the sea), he arranged what they had to do.’ The Egyptian fisherman Chaereas desires Leucippe, who does not return his affections; he thus conceives a plan for her abduction, which—according to the transmitted text—includes putting together a band of robbers, ‘who share his art’. The reading of the manuscripts at this point is awkward.²⁰ Both Vilborg and Garnaud adopted Schmidt’s <ὄχλον> to complete the deficient syntax (cf. 8.16.5 ληστῶν ὄχλος). This reconstruction, however, would make Chaereas one of the robbers, which is not what the context suggests (he is presented at 4.18 as a fisherman who fights against the βουκόλοι, that is, ‘herdsmen-bandits’); and it would leave the following phrase (ἅτε θαλάσσιος ὢν) unexplained. Litinas’s ἀλειεῖς τῶν ὁμοτέχων, instead of the usually printed ληστῶν ὁμοτέχων <ὄχλον>, improves the sense of the passage, and is a convincing construction in view of the parallels.²¹ Still, it seems that we ought to keep ‘robbers’ in the passage, especially in view of the similar phrase κελεῦει ληστὰς ἐπ’ αὐτὴν συγκροτῆσαι (2.16.2). To achieve this, we could read ληστὰς τῶν ὁμοτέχων. The sense would be that Chaereas formed a group of robbers out of his fishermen colleagues (ὁμοτέχων would refer to Chaereas’ and his men’s shared skill of fishing); in other words, he picked some men out of his fellow fishermen to take on the role of robbers. Chaereas’ men are indeed later described as robbers (8.5.1; cf. 2.17.3 ληστὰς ἀλειεῖς, the abductors of the hero’s half-sister, Calligone). It is conceivable that ληστὰς τῶν was corrupted into ληστῶν under the influence of the genitive plural immediately following. O’Sullivan ([n. 7], s.v. συγκροτέω) reported Scaliger’s ληστήριον ὁμοτέχων, a similar structure to the one proposed here but palaeographically and grammatically more difficult.

5.15.5 πιστευσόν μοι, Κλειτοφῶν, καίομαι· ὄφελον ἡδυνάμην δεῖξαι τὸ πῦρ· ὄφελον εἶχε τὴν αὐτὴν φύσιν τῷ κοινῷ <τὸ> τοῦ ἔρωτος πῦρ, ἵνα σοι περιχυθεῖσα κατέφλεξα·

εἶχε Göttling : εἶχον codd. || τὸ add. Jacobs || πῦρ Göttling : πυρί codd.

‘Believe me, Clitophon, I am on fire! I wish I could show you this fire of mine. I wish the fire of love shared the nature of normal fire, so that I could have inflamed you by embracing you.’ This is the Ephesian Melite addressing Clitophon, with whom she has fallen madly in love, during their sea journey to Ephesus (a trip to which Clitophon agrees, assuming, falsely, that Leucippe has perished). The reading of the manuscripts ὄφελον εἶχον is preferable to Göttling’s ὄφελον εἶχε, which was printed by Garnaud, as it follows naturally from ὄφελον ἡδυνάμην of the previous sentence (on the rhetorical repetition of ὄφελον with verbs of the same person, cf. 2.24.3 ὄφελον

¹⁹ Thus Gronewald (n. 18), 17.

²⁰ Cataudella (n. 10), 174 offered support for it, but Xen. Ephes. 4.6.5 (καὶ ἐκάστοτε ἀφαιρῶν τῶν ἐπικειμένων τῇ τάφρῳ ξύλων ἄρτους ἐνέβαλε καὶ ὕδωρ παρείχε), which Cataudella cites, is not an exact parallel.

²¹ N. Litinas, ‘Achilles Tattius, *Leucippe and Clitophon* 5.1.3’, *Mnemosyne* 53 (2000), 347–9.

ἔμεινας ἐν Βυζαντίῳ· ὄφελον ἔπαθες πολέμου νόμῳ τὴν ὕβριν).²² However, the full version of the manuscripts, printed by Vilborg (ὄφελον εἶχον τὴν αὐτὴν φύσιν τῷ κοινῷ τοῦ ἔρωτος πυρί, ἵνα σοι περιχυθεῖσα κατέφλεξα ‘I should be of the same nature as the common fire of *erōs*, so as to envelop and burn you’), is unsatisfactory, as this πῦρ is then said to be of a nature that spares lovers locked in embrace (νῦν δὲ πρὸς τοῖς ἄλλοις τοῦτο μόνον τὸ πῦρ ἰδίαν ὕλην ἔχει καὶ ἐν ταῖς περὶ τοὺς ἐραστάς συμπλοκαῖς ἀνακαϊόμενον λάβρον τῶν συμπλεκόμενων φεῖδεται),²³ which is not what Melite wants. Overwhelmed with desire for Clitophon, Melite wishes to literally become all fire, so that she can inflame her lover with the same desire (casting herself, we might think, as Zeus to her lover’s Semele). The emendations adopted by Garnaud, which introduce a comparison between the fire of *erōs* and the κοινὸν πῦρ, that is, fire in its literal sense, improve the sense of the passage, but are quite invasive. There is another way to improve the text while retaining the readings of the manuscripts: O’Sullivan (n. 7), s.v. κοινός proposed to eliminate τοῦ ἔρωτος (presumably as an incorrect scribal gloss) and to read ὄφελον εἶχον τὴν αὐτὴν φύσιν τῷ κοινῷ πυρί, or, alternatively, to replace τοῦ ἔρωτος with οὐκ ἔρωτος. The former option seems preferable in terms of style. But perhaps the sense of the passage is further improved if we posit²⁴ that τοῦ ἔρωτος was displaced from the previous sentence, in which case we might read: ὄφελον ἡδυνάμην δεῖξαι τὸ πῦρ <τοῦ ἔρωτος>. ὄφελον εἶχον τὴν αὐτὴν φύσιν τῷ κοινῷ πυρί, ἵνα σοι περιχυθεῖσα κατέφλεξα ‘I wish I could show you the fire of *erōs*. I should be of the same nature as the common fire, so as to envelop and burn you.’

6.2.6 ἔδοξεν οὖν τῇ Μελίτῃ τὸ νῦν ἀναχωρεῖν, ὅταν δὲ ἐν καλῷ θῆται τὰ πρὸς τὸν ἄνδρα καὶ γένηται τὰ τῆς ὀργῆς ἐν γαλήνῃ, τότε μετιέναι. καὶ ὁ μὲν οὕτως ἐπραξεν.

θῆται Cobet : θῆ codd.

‘Melite thought it best if he [*sc.* Pasion] departed for now, and returned when matters with her husband had been sorted out and his anger had been calmed. That is what he did.’ Melite’s husband, previously thought to be dead, reappears, and Clitophon ends up in prison as an adulterer, but escapes with the help of Melite and the guard Pasion. In the present passage, Melite gives money to Pasion and sends him away, until she calms the anger of her husband. Cobet’s θῆται (passive aorist subjunctive), which is preferred by both Vilborg and Garnaud, may seem to allow for a smoother syntax than the unanimous reading of the manuscripts θῆ (active aorist subjunctive), given the resulting syntactic parallelism with the following sentence (γένηται τὰ τῆς ὀργῆς ἐν γαλήνῃ), but an emendation is not needed.²⁵ θῆ would have Melite as its subject and give her a greater share in the action: she will calm things down with her

²² A verb of the third person is used in a third consecutive utterance, ὄφελόν σε κἄν Θράξ νικήσας ὕβρισεν; but the focus of the meaning remains on the same (the second) person: ὄφελόν σε.

²³ On the ‘usual fire of the god *Erōs*’, i.e. fire as a common attribute of this god, cf. 2.3.3 Ἔρωσ δὲ καὶ Διόνυσος, δύο βίαιοι θεοί, ψυχὴν κατασχόντες ἐκμαίνουσιν εἰς ἀνασχυντίαν, ὁ μὲν καίον αὐτὴν τῷ συνήθει πυρί, ὁ δὲ τὸν οἶνον ὑπέκκαυμα φέρων (of course, καίον and ὑπέκκαυμα are meant metaphorically).

²⁴ As suggested by *CQ*’s referee.

²⁵ As noted by Plepelits (n. 7), 69, who further pointed out that change of subject is not unusual in Achilles Tatius.

husband, then Pasion (subject of ἀναχωρεῖν and μετιέναι) can return. This is exactly what she does at 6.9–11.²⁶

6.17.3 καὶ γὰρ ἂν νῦν ἐρῶ τοῦ καταράτου τούτου μοιχοῦ, μέχρι μὲν αὐτὸν οἶδε μόνον καὶ οὐ κεκοινώνηκεν ἐτέρῳ, ἔχει τὴν ψυχὴν ἐπ' αὐτόν.

ἔχει Garnaud : πάσχει codd.]χει Π³ : βόσκει conl. Gaselee

'If she feels passionate about that accursed adulterer for the time being, that will last only as long as she knows him alone and has slept with no one else.' The speaker of these lines is Sosthenes, the servant of Melite's husband, Thersander, who has imprisoned Leucippe (whom fortune has also brought to Ephesus). Sosthenes speaks to his master, who desires Leucippe, about the maiden's obsessive love for the undeserving Clitophon. ἔχει is Garnaud's emendation of πάσχει, the unanimous reading of the manuscripts. Garnaud was not the first editor to reject the transmitted πάσχει. Vilborg, following Gaselee, printed βόσκει,²⁷ a reading weakened by the testimony of Π³ (]χει).²⁸ On the other hand, Garnaud's ἔχει τὴν ψυχὴν ἐπ' αὐτόν ('elle a l'âme fixée sur lui') is an odd construction. There are two better possibilities to choose from. One is to restore the reading of the manuscripts (with τὴν ψυχὴν functioning as an attribute/accusative of respect), which is reinforced by the following close parallel: ἠδίκηκε μὲν Ἀγαμέμνων ... ἐπ' αὐτῷ δὲ πάσχει τὴν ψυχὴν Ἀχιλλεύς, καὶ πέρως οὐκ ἦν ('Agamemnon did him an injustice ... so Achilles' soul suffered to no end on account of him [sc. Agamemnon] or this [sc. his unjust treatment by Agamemnon]', Procop. *Gaz. Decl.* 7.3.7–9);²⁹ we would then have to replace αὐτόν with αὐτῷ in the prepositional expression,³⁰ but the mixing of cases is a much easier palaeographical mistake than the misreading of a verb. The other possibility³¹ is to insert an adverb such as κακῶς before ἔχει (that is <κακῶς> ἔχει τὴν ψυχὴν ἐπ' αὐτόν 'she is distressed about him'), which is made attractive by parallels such as 1.6.6 (ἀπῆειν ἔχων τὴν ψυχὴν κακῶς), 6.5.5 (ἐγὼ μὲν οὖν οὕτως εἶχον τὴν ψυχὴν κακῶς) and 6.11.2 (ἡ δὲ Μελίτη κακῶς εἶχε τὴν ψυχὴν).

8.1.5 καὶ ὁ μὲν ἐπὶ τῇ πληγῇ μαλ' ἄκων ἀνακραγὼν συνέστευε τὴν χεῖρα καὶ οὕτως ἐπάύσατο.

μαλ' ἄκων Herscher : μαλακὸν codd.

'In consequence, Thersander gave an unmanly shriek at the blow and withdrew his hand, and was thus stopped in his tracks.' Melite's husband, Thersander, while trying to hit Clitophon, inadvertently hurts himself and cries in pain. Garnaud adopted

²⁶ Note the verbal similarity between γένηται τὰ τῆς ὀργῆς ἐν γαλήνῃ and the description of the outcome of her efforts at 6.11.1 ἐγγόνει δὲ ἡμερότερος.

²⁷ Gaselee offered the odd-sounding translation 'she sends her heart out to pasture on him'. Cf. Winkler's more abstract rendition 'her soul is shaped by him alone'.

²⁸ Vilborg (n. 7), 114 admitted in his commentary that the reading βόσκει 'was seriously affected by the papyrus'. The papyrus (*P.Mil.Vogl.* III 124), originally dated to the second century A.D., is now thought to date from the third or early fourth century A.D. (Consonni [n. 2], 115 n. 12).

²⁹ Cf. the translation of P. Maréchaux (*Procopé de Gaza. Discours et fragments* [Paris, 2014]): 'La faute incombait à Agamemnon ... Or, Achille en souffrit dans son âme, et il n'y eut plus de limite.'

³⁰ A point made already by Peerlkamp (recorded in the apparatus criticus of Vilborg's edition). Plepeltis (n. 7), 69 preferred πάσχει ἐπ' αὐτῷ, and so did Yatromanolakis in his commentary ([n. 7], 687), although he printed βόσκει ἐπ' αὐτόν in his text.

³¹ Proposed by CQ's referee.

Herscher's *μαλ' ἄκων* in the place of the reading *μαλακόν* (Vilborg printed *μάλα ἄκων*). The parallel at 6.7.8 (*ὑπεκστήσομαι καὶ μάλα ἄκων*)³² and Vilborg's defence ([n. 7], 124–5) suggest *μαλ' ἄκων ἀνακραγῶν* (translated by Garnaud as 'en criant involontairement')³³ as a possible construction. Schmidt's *μαλ' ἄλγῶν* 'feeling great pain'³⁴ also yields an acceptable sense. However, there is arguably no need to replace the reading *μαλακόν*. Used adverbially to refer to the tone of voice, it conveys a perfectly appropriate meaning ('he gave a weak cry'; cf. Plut. *Ti. Gracch.* 2.5 *ἐνεδίδου τόνον μαλακόν* 'he gave out a soft key-note').³⁵ Whitmarsh's translation ('Thersander gave an unmanly shriek at the blow') is more aligned with the reading of the manuscripts, which was preferred by Plepelits ([n. 7], 70) and seemingly also by O'Sullivan ([n. 7], s.v. *μαλακός, ἦ, ὄν*).

8.11.3 οὐδὲ εἶδον τὸ παράπαν μήτε πολίτην μήτε ξένον ἦκειν εἰς ὀμίλιαν καθ' ὃν λέγεις καιρόν.

'I permitted no man at all, whether citizen or foreigner, to approach me for the purpose of a relationship during the time you mentioned.' This is Melite's affirmation to her husband, who accuses her of having committed marital infidelity during his absence, that she let no one, citizen or foreigner, approach her during that time (technically true, as she only became intimate with Clitophon after her husband's return). Both Vilborg and Garnaud print the transmitted *οὐδὲ εἶδον*, although both syntax (a verb of perception followed by an infinitive) and meaning are odd. Vilborg (n. 7), 136 doubted the manuscript tradition and proposed to read *οὐδὲ εἶων* (= imperfect of *ἐάω* 'allow'), although he did not adopt this reading in his text; there is no relevant note in Garnaud's apparatus criticus. However, it is the sense of *εἶων*, not *εἶδον*, that is reflected in translations: 'je n'ai laissé aucun citoyen ...' (Garnaud); 'I never allowed anybody ...' (Gaselee); 'I permitted no man at all ...' (Whitmarsh); 'I never allowed any man at all ...' (Winkler). An earlier emendation (*οὐδέν' εἶασα* = past tense of *ἐάω*)³⁶ is in the same direction. The text here should probably be emended in favour of *οὐδὲ εἶων*, which gives better sense than *οὐδὲ εἶδον* and is not too distant palaeographically from the reading of the manuscripts. The form *εἶων* is paralleled at 3.13.6 (there a third-person plural); the hiatus after *οὐδέ* is allowed.³⁷

National and Kapodistrian University of Athens

NIKOLETTA KANAVOU
nkanavou@phil.uoa.gr

³² 'I shall keep out of her [*sc.* Leucippe's] way (though with extreme reluctance)' (transl. Whitmarsh); these words are spoken by Thersander.

³³ Cf. 'he could not repress a cry' (transl. Gaselee); '[he] groaned involuntarily' (transl. Winkler).

³⁴ Recorded in the apparatus criticus of Vilborg's edition; he deemed it as 'palaeographically equal' to *μαλ' ἄκων* ([n. 7], 125).

³⁵ Of a servant of Caius (Tiberius' brother), who helped train Caius' voice by using a sounding instrument to produce the right pitch.

³⁶ J. Jackson, 'The Greek novelists: miscellanea', *CQ* 29 (1935), 52–7, at 56. O'Sullivan's suggestion ([n. 7], s.v. *οὐδέ*) of *οὐ* or *οὐδένα* followed by *<περι>εἶδον* is more difficult.

³⁷ See M.D. Reeve, 'Hiatus in the Greek novelists', *CQ* 21 (1971), 514–39, at 522.