

On the Text of Achilles Tatius

CLAUDIO CONSONNI
University of Milan

1 Introduction

In 1991 J.-Ph. Garnaud published a new critical edition of Achilles Tatius' novel *Leucippe and Clitophon*, some thirty years after E. Vilborg's previous one.¹ Garnaud's text is furnished with a brief introduction, a readable critical apparatus, and a facing French translation with footnotes. However, the editor's critical assumptions and textual choices still deserve some reflections.

2 The sources (I): The manuscript tradition

For sake of convenience, the most significant manuscripts containing the text of Achilles Tatius' novel are listed below:

α -family (in Vilborg's notation):

W Vat. gr. 1349 (XII century)

M Marc. gr. 409 (XIII century, *in.*?)²

D Vat. gr. 914 (XIV century), books I–IV

β -family:

V Vat. gr. 114 (XIII century, *ex.*)

G Marc. gr. 607 (XV century)

E Ambr. gr. 394 (XV–XVI century)

¹ Garnaud 1991 (I have not seen the revised and corrected edition of 1994). All information concerning the manuscripts and their relationships are set forth concisely and quickly (Touwaide 1993, 3*) almost reticently (Donnet 1993, 295). Previous edition by Vilborg 1955 (commentary 1962).

² Colonna 1994, 179–181 did not give up his former hypothesis of a more ancient date for this manuscript (second half of the XI century).

In addition to these, one must consider **F** (Laur. c.s. 627, XIII century), a *codex mixtus* which, in the case of variants, is found agreeing (frequently in error) 149 times with **WMD**, and 160 with **VGE**. It provides us with more than two hundred special readings: Vilborg paved the way in his text for 14 of them,³ whereas Garnaud does not seem to share the same confidence in the (pretended) virtues of **F**.⁴

Garnaud also had at his disposal two manuscript sources unknown to the former editors of Achilles – they are the Sinaiticus gr. 1197 (XVI century; containing books V to VIII) and the *excerpta* from the Olomucensis M 79 (XV century) – whose ‘leçons significatives’ only are said to have been recorded in the apparatus.⁵ Unfortunately, from such an idiosyncratic selection⁶ (and the scanty information provided in his prefatory ‘Notice’), the positions relative to the whole *stemma codicum* of both manuscripts cannot but remain uncertain.⁷ In any case, their contribution to the text of Achilles is hardly to be praised.⁸

³ Vilborg 1955, lxvii and lxxi n. 1 (special readings); lxx (‘**F** represents a third branch of our medieval Achilles Tattius tradition [...] **F** is...probably to be regarded as an early Byzantine διόρθωσις of the text’). ‘Kritisiert wird...hauptsächlich, daß Vilborg, der selbst mit der früheren Überschätzung der Florentiner Handschrift **F** brach...immer noch zu hoch bewerte’ (Plepelits 1980, 64). A number of cases involving variants of **F** are listed and partly discussed by Alberti 1979, 47–50; according to him, the textual tradition of Achilles is tripartite, but with some degree of contamination (‘tre rami sì, ma contaminati tra di loro’).

⁴ Possibly a wiser attitude. I have counted: 1,1,2 (σῶστρα **F**: σῶστρά τε *cett.*); 1,7,1 (τὸν ἵππον **F**: καὶ τὸν ἵππον); 2,1,2 (κάμπας [whence Jacobs καμπάς] **F**: κάλυκας); 2,37,1 (ἔοικε εἶναι **F**: ἔοικε μάλλον εἶναι [according to Vilborg this is the reading of the α-family alone, whereas β reads εἰκέναι]). In three cases out of four **F** does not have a different text, but only a shorter one. Vilborg (1962, 37, *ad loc.*) tentatively explains κάλυκας (2,1,2), which does not make any sense here, with a misreading of uncial letters; κάμπας in **F**, then, could be either a genuine reading of a less corrupted source, or come from an intralinear (marginal) annotation or even by conjecture.

⁵ Garnaud 1991, xxiii.

⁶ As a matter of fact, in the apparatus we find many special readings (about 80 for the Sinaiticus), mostly irrelevant, and a few cases where the Olomucensis (see below, n. 7) or the Sinaiticus (I have counted 10 occurrences) in turn agree with one or more other manuscripts.

⁷ For the *stemma codicum* one must resort to Vilborg 1955, lxxii. From a different source (Hagedorn-Koenen 1970, 55–56) we learn that the Sinaiticus belongs to the β-family; readings from the Olomucensis are rarely mentioned in the apparatus, but it seems to be somewhat akin to **V** (and **R** = Vat. gr. 1348, see Guida 1981, 8–9).

⁸ Where the readings of the Sinaiticus (Sin.) diverge from those of **WMD VGE F**, Garnaud chooses to follow this manuscript five times, but – significantly – his text is by no

We have a number of discrepancies between Garnaud's apparatus and that of Vilborg's edition (a few examples are mentioned in this paper, *passim*), and in such cases we are left to guess who is telling the truth, if anyone. Generally, our judgment rests on the *a priori* assumption that each new edition should improve our knowledge of the manuscript evidence; otherwise, it is obvious that only the results of a fresh examination of the manuscripts (older editions of Achilles Tatius are better left out) could definitely settle the matter, something I do not propose to offer in this paper. But we can usefully spend a little time performing a sort of 'triangular' check against the samples from **WM V F** (book 1) and **W** (books 3, partially, and 8) provided by C. F. Russo in his review of Vilborg's edition.⁹ Not surprisingly, in many places Garnaud agrees with Russo against Vilborg (e.g. 1,3,2 = p. 5,1 Vilborg; 1,3,4 = 5,14 etc.). Somehow surprisingly, in a few places Garnaud agrees with Vilborg against Russo, for example:

- 1,12,4 = p. 14,24 Vilborg (**F**): *ταλαντευμενος* (Russo, who had the manuscript collated on his behalf by A. La Penna),¹⁰ *ταλαντούμενος* (Garnaud Vilborg, same reading as **WG**)
 8,19,3 = p. 161,28 V. (**W**): *Τύρω* (Russo), *τῆ Τύρω* (Garnaud Vilborg)

Even more surprisingly, a number of readings in Vilborg's apparatus are seemingly confirmed by Russo, though only in an indirect way, through his silence on possible errors made by Vilborg:

means different from that printed by Vilborg: 5,24,1 (*θυσάνων* Sin. [Commelinus, Vilborg]: *θυσάνων cett.*); 6,1,1 (*παράσχης* Sin. [Jacobs, Vilborg]: *παράσχοις*; see below n. 24); 7,12,1 (*αὐτοῦ* Sin. [likewise **R** = Vat. gr. 1348, whence Vilborg]: *αὐτοῦ*); 8,2,3 (*μεμείανται* Sin. [Hercher, Vilborg]: *μεμείανται μὲν*); 8,9,4 (*κἄν τοῖς γυμνασίοις ἐωρῶμεν* Sin. [according to Vilborg **W** alone reads *ἄν*]: *κἄν...ἐωρῶμεν M VG ἄν...ἐωρῶμεν W*). We may consider these as mere orthographic variants or easy conjectures. Conca 1995, 133 singles out the reading of the Sinaiticus *ἑαυτὸν* (5,9,3: *ἑμαυτὸν cett.*), stressing its potential value as evidence of an idiom familiar to us from the Late Greek (for statistics on singular and plural usages see Fabricius 1962, 54–58). Similar variants found in Achilles' manuscripts are listed by O'Sullivan 1980, 131, *s.v.* *ἑμαυτοῦ*; add 8,5,3 (*ἑαυτοῦ G*: *ἑμαυτοῦ cett.*) and 8,14,1 (*ἑαυτὸν G* [*αὐτὸν* according to Vilborg]: *ἑμαυτὸν*).

⁹ Russo 1958, who wrote it in order to demonstrate – perhaps not too generously – that Vilborg's apparatus is marred by a number of imprecisions.

¹⁰ It is more than an irrelevant detail, since **VGE** have *ταλαντευόμενος*, and it could be of some interest to know the actual reading of **F** here.

- 1,1,7 = p. 2,19 V. (M): διαδούμενοι (Vilborg), διδούμενοι (Garnaud)
 1,5,4 = p. 7,2 V. (W): κρουσμάτων (Vilborg),¹¹ κρουσμάτων (Garnaud)
 1,14,1 = p. 16,10 V. (M): χηρήτο (*sic* Vilborg), ἐχρήτο (Garnaud)
 8,17,5 = p. 160,8 V. (W): εὔολον (*sic* Vilborg), εὔβουλον in all manuscripts according to Garnaud

3 The sources (II): The papyri

The number of the papyri of Achilles Tatius has noticeably increased since E. Vilborg published his edition in 1955.¹² In particular, Garnaud could take advantage from the text of Π⁴ as newly reconstructed by W. H. Willis (1990), who was able to join together the fragments from P. Col. inv. 901 (formerly known as Π⁴ itself) with those from P. Rob. inv. 35. This papyrus, which is longer than the others¹³ and diverges in so many places from the manuscripts, seems thus to support the theory that the textual tradition of the Greek novels has been somewhat fluid over the earlier centuries, at least (as in our case) as far as wording and word order are concerned.¹⁴ On the other hand its antiquity (early III century, being very close to Achilles' time) almost invites us to think of it as an authoritative source on matters of textual criticism for our novel.¹⁵ As it turns out, the new Π⁴ more vigorously than

¹¹ 'Alle pagine 7 e 8 [references are to Vilborg's pages] tutto bene' (Russo 1958, 585).

¹² All listed in Garnaud's 'Notice' (xxiii–xxv) and Willis 1990, 75–76. Besides Π⁴ (see below in the text), the 'new' papyri are Π⁵ = P. Oxy. 3836 (3,21–23,23), Π⁷ = P. Oxy. 1014 (4,14,2–5), and a few fragments (P. Oxy. 3837 [8,6,14–18,7,6], formerly Π⁶) from the same papyrus manuscript as Π¹. A dating to the III or even IV century would better suit Π³ = P. Med. 124 (Cavallo 1996, 37 n. 61).

¹³ It covers 3,17,2–3,25,6, but only (approximately) a half of the original text is preserved.

¹⁴ E.g. West 1973, 17; Reardon 2004, xiii: 'patet tales fabulas...a posterioribus minoris aestimatas esse quam quas opus esset accurate exscribere.' The variously explained (Conca 1969, 649 n. 1) transposition of the section 2,2–2,3,1–2 in Π¹ (P. Oxy. 1250) is itself revealing of some perturbation in the ancient tradition.

¹⁵ See Laplace 1993, 43 n. 5. The text of the manuscripts ἀφίξονται δὲ ὅσον οὐδέπω πρὸς τούτοις ἕτεροι δισχίλιοι (3,24,4) is in my view preferable to ἀφίξονται δὲ ὅσον οὐδέπω ἕτεροι δισχίλιοι πρὸς τούτοις in Π⁴, with hiatus (see below, n. 23). The vulgate text ἅμα δὲ τῇ ἔῳ ἄγω (προσάγω Jacobs) τὸν Μενέλαον τῷ στρατηγῷ (3,24,1) was suffering from an illicit hiatus until Π⁴ has offered the key for its emendation: ἅμα δὲ ἔῳ τῷ στρατηγῷ τ[ὸν] Μενέλαον ἄγω (*suppl.* Willis). Likewise, the hiatus affecting ἐτοίμη εἰς (8,7,1, *codd.*) is avoided in the text of Π¹ ἐτοίμη τῆς υστε[ρ]ασ (*scil.* ὑστεραίας; Reeve 1971, 525 n. 2) εἰς, which, unfortunately, is not satisfactory with respect to the plot as we know it: Leucippe says that she is 'ready' (ἐτοίμη) to undergo the ordeal in the cave of the pan-

before raises the question whether the medieval manuscript tradition should be regarded as sound enough (or, in more pragmatic terms, to what extent we might confidently rely on it). An answer, even a tentative one, requires a thorough study; this, however, would go out of the scope of the present article, and so I shall content myself with a very general consideration, namely that the fragmentary nature of the papyrus' source should be properly acknowledged as having a limit in itself, thus warning one not to misjudge the amount of valuable evidence such an ancient tradition can afford.¹⁶

4 Making a critical edition

It is generally assumed that the textual tradition of Achilles Tatius calls for an eclectic approach.¹⁷ What is most conspicuous in Garnaud's edition, however, is that whenever the text of one branch of the tradition cannot be proved transparently superior to that of the other, the preference is constantly – but silently – granted to the α -family.¹⁸ As a result, this particular conduct sometimes leads to an objectionable text: for example, it is hardly a good idea to follow **WM**, which omit *κατὰ κέρας ἑκάτερον* (3,13,7), if we consider that the same expression is found later in the text (8,6,5, by the consensus of all manuscripts).¹⁹

pipe 'on the following day' (τῆς ὑστεραίης), but 'the ordeal in fact takes place three days later (8,7,6; 8,15,1)' (Parsons 1989, 68).

¹⁶ In Castiglioni's words (1931, 575): 'teoreticamente, io sono sfavorevole alle preferenze per la tradizione frammentaria nei confronti della completa... perché s'ingenerano nei testi veri squilibrii.' For examples of good and improper use of the papyrus' evidence see below § 6, my notes on 1,14,1 and 6,5,2, respectively.

¹⁷ Dörrie 1935, 70: 'utriusque stirpis testimonia adhibenda sunt ad textum constituendum.' R. M. Rattenbury 1937, 365 expressed some doubts about the correctness of Dörrie's collations in the case of Heliodorus; a number of years later, in his review of Vilborg's edition, Dörrie himself felt bound to admit some inadequacies in his 1930's dissertation, due to partial unavailability of first-hand data (Dörrie 1959, 428 n. 1).

¹⁸ Vilborg, instead, came to the opposite conclusion of a slight (average) superiority of the β -family after a comparison between the two on a random sample from Achilles' text (Vilborg 1955, xlvii–xlix).

¹⁹ Likewise, the text of **VGE** *μισθὸς δὲ σοὶ μὲν χρυσοὶ πεντήκοντα τῆς διακονίας κτλ.* (4,6,2) is in my view preferable to the more contracted (perhaps too much contracted) *χρυσοὶ μὲν πεντήκοντα τῆς διακονίας κτλ.* (**WM**).

As a consequence of this assumption, Garnaud's text comes out to be rather different from that of Vilborg, and even the vocabulary of our novel has undergone noticeable changes. We may appreciate this with a glance at the verbal forms; some are new to Achilles (most of them are compounds):²⁰

- ἀγριόμαι (7,14,4: ἡγρίωσαι **WM** ἐξηγρίωσαι **VG**)
 ἀναπλέω (2,17,3: ἀνέπλευσεν **WM** ἀπέπλευσεν **VGE F**)
 διαπίπτω (3,21,2: διαπίπτει Π⁴ **WM F** ['perhaps rightly': O'Sullivan 1980, 90, s.v.] διεκπίπτει **VE[-τείν G]**)
 ἐκφωνέω (8,14,2: ἐξεφώνησεν **WM** ἐξεβόησεν **VG**)
 ἐναφήμι (1,19,2: ἐναφήκε **WD** [**aR** according to Vilborg][*def.* O'Sullivan 1980, 137, s.v.] ἐπαφήκε *cett.* [**VGE F**])
 ἐννέω (7,3,3: ἐνένευον **WM** ἐπένευον **VGE**)²¹
 ἐπισέρχομαι (7,13,1: ἐπισέρχεται **WM** ['prob. wrongly': O'Sullivan 1980, 121, s.v. εἰσέρχομαι] εἰσέρχεται **VG**)
 παρακαθέζομαι (3,10,5: παρακαθέζεται **WM E** παρακαθεύδει **VG F** [see Vilborg's apparatus *ad loc.*])
 προπολέομαι (4,15,1: προπολουμένην **WM** πυρπολουμένην **VE[-νη G]**)
 συνηγορέω (7,10,1: συνηγοροῦντες **WM** συναγορεύοντες **VGE**)
 ὑποπίνω (8,16,1: ὑποπίνουσαν **WM** ['perhaps rightly': O'Sullivan 1980, 419, s.v. ὑποτείνω] ὑποτείνουσαν **VG** ὑπομένουσαν *coni.* Vilborg)

Below are listed the verbs that have been lost to the new text of Achilles, in addition to the above mentioned διεκπίπτω (3,21,2), ἐκβοάω (8,14,2), ἐξαγριόμαι (7,14,4), παρακαθεύδω (3,10,5), and συναγορεύω (7,10,1):

- ἀλιεύω (2,14,10: ἀγρεύεται **WMD** ἀλιεύεται **VGE F**)
 ἀπομιμέομαι (8,10,9: μιμείται **WM** ἀπομιμείται **VG**)

²⁰ The following list is meant to be representative, and does not purport to be complete; I have checked for references *LRG* and O'Sullivan 1980. We should reckon among the 'new' verbs also διεκπαίω (3,22,2: διεκπαίσει Π⁴), absent from Garnaud's apparatus *ad loc.* ('Π⁴ longe abest a textu recepto') but defended by Laplace 1993, 48–49.

²¹ Perhaps ἐνένευον was introduced by assimilation to the preceding ἐνεώρων (ἐνεώρων δὲ ἡμῖν πυκνὰ καὶ ἀλλήλοις ἐνένευον), but in such cases one should admit the possibility that the writer was pursuing a particular effect, like τὸν μοιχὸν ἐξέκλεψας (**WM** ἔκλεψας **VGE**): σὺ τῶν δεσμῶν ἐξέλυσας καὶ τῆς οἰκίας ἐξαπέστειλας (6,8,1).

διάγω (6,4,2: ἀγαγών **WM** διάγων **VE**)²²
 διεξιμι (8,5,4: διηγούμην **WM** διεξίειν **VG**)
 εἰσθρόσκω (8,6,7: ἐκθορὼν **WM** [‘wrongly’: O’Sullivan 1980, 121, s.v. εἰσθρόσκω] εἰσθορὼν **VG**)
 καταξάινω (5,17,6: ἔξανε **WM** κατέξανε **VG**)
 προσπτύσσομαι (5,8,2: περιπτυξάμενος **WM** προσπτυξάμενος **VG**)
 συναθροίζω (3,24,1: συνερρυηκέναι Π⁴ συνηθροῖσθαι *codd.*)
 συναρπάζω (6,4,2: ἀρπάζει **WM** συναρπάζει **VE**)

5 New conjectures

New conjectures by the editor himself are few.

2,19,6: ὁ Σάτυρος...τὴν ἄνοιξιν πειρᾶται καί, ὡς εἶρε δυνατὴν, τὴν Κλειώ γε ἐπεπείκει, καὶ τῆς κόρης συνειδυίας, μηδὲν ἀντιπράξει τῇ [κόρη] τέχνῃ
 γε Garnaud: τε *codd.* ante τὴν Κλειώ τε lacunam statuit O’Sullivan 1980, 401 s.v. τε [κόρη] del. Jacobs

A similar emendation (γε for τε) has been proposed by Jacobs in 6,19,4: φύσει γε (τε *codd.*) ὦν ἄσπονδος.

2,35,4: ποῖα δριμύτερον - ἔφην - ὅ τι παρακῦψαν μόνον οἴχεται, καὶ οὐκ ἀπολαῦσαι δίδωσι τῷ φιλοῦντι
 ποῖα (sic) Garnaud: ποῖ **WM VE** πῆ **G** πῶς **F** Vilborg

Garnaud writes here an adverbial ποῖα; elsewhere in Achilles ποῖος is always accompanied by a noun.

3,25,5: ἐνθεὶς δὲ καὶ ἐναρμόσας τὸν ὄρνιν τῇ σορῷ κλείει τὸ χάσμα γηίνῳ χῶματι, ἐπὶ τὸν Νεῖλον οὕτως ἵπταται τὸ ἔργον φέρων
 κλείει Garnaud: καὶ εἰς *codd.* κ[Π⁴ καὶ κλείσας Hercher κλείσας Castiglioni γηίνῳ: γαίνῳ **W** (Russo 1958, 585)

²² Possibly a misreading of uncials; in 3,8,3 **WM** exhibit the corrupted ἀγαγών for ὁ δὲ ἀλγῶν (**W**^{m^g} **VGE**).

5,23,2: ἔμελλε <τις> τῇ Λευκίππῃ παρέξειν ὄχημα

<τις> add. Garnaud τῇ Λευκίππῃ **VGE** τῇ Μελίττῃ **WM** ἢ Μελίττῃ Vilborg

It is a quite startling coincidence that, contrary to their respective habits, Garnaud's suggestion is built upon the text of **VGE**, whereas Vilborg's ἢ Μελίττῃ is a slight modification of the reading of **WM**.

6,17,3: καὶ γὰρ ἂν νῦν ἐρᾷ τοῦ καταράτου τούτου μοιχοῦ, μέχρι μὲν αὐτὸν οἶδε μόνον καὶ οὐ κεκοινώνηκεν ἑτέρῳ, ἔχει τὴν ψυχὴν ἐπ' αὐτὸν ἔχει Garnaud: πάσχει *codd.*]χει Π³ βόσκει Gaselee Vilborg ('fancifully': O'Sullivan 1980, 342, *s.v.* πάσχω)

The expression πάσχει τὴν ψυχὴν is vigorous, though syntactically harsh; anyway, ἔχει is preferable to βόσκει in Vilborg's edition (the hiatus seems tolerable: see Reeve 1971, 522 [4(a)] and below, n. 23).

8,8,13: ὥστε, ὁποτέρως ἂν ἀποθάνῃ οὗτος, ὡς μοιχὸς ἢ ὡς φονεὺς, δίκην δεδοκῶς οὐ δέδοκεν

ἀποθάνῃ οὗτος Garnaud: ἀποθάνοι οὗτος **WM** αὐτὸς ἀποθάνοι **VG** οὗτος ἀποθάνῃ Co-bet, Vilborg

Hiatus in the Greek novelists is a matter that has been largely overlooked until the fundamental study by M. D. Reeve (1971) made scholars aware of it. But, as it stands, when we come to the treatment of problematic hiatuses, we easily see that substantial agreement is lacking; moreover, scholarly attitudes in this respect sometimes are neither perspicuous nor even consistent.²³ This leads us back to our starting point. In my view, it would be wiser not to allow here a hiatus (Garnaud, after **WM**), which is avoided in the β-family

²³ Reeve's views are shared by O'Sullivan 1980 ('l'auteur [O'Sullivan] a une tendance peut-être excessive à pourchasser l'hiatus, bien que celui-ci ne puisse être éliminé entièrement, à ce qu'il semble.' Vian 1981, 349) and Reardon 2004, xiii–xiv (not even Char. 4,6,4 διαφθείρει αὐτοῦ escapes his treatment, *pace* Slings 1997, 109). A brief mention for two recent contributions on textual criticism of Greek novels: Renehan 2001, 234–235, having pointed out that 'the avoidance of hiatus is by no means absolute' emends <ἄμφο> ἐπὶ in Longus 1,7,1; the suggestion made by Dawe 2001, 295 ἐξ αἰθρίας πολλῆ (πολλῆς *codd.*) αἰφνίδιον ἀγλὺς περιχεῖται (Ach. Tat. 3,1,1) seems unnecessary.

(Cobet Vilborg).²⁴ Moreover, under these circumstances the explanation offered by Garnaud for the insertion of τις (a marginal reading from the Parisinus 2913 [= **P** in Vilborg's notation]) in 7,6,5 is striking: to get rid of an unpleasant hiatus affecting Vilborg's text (Garnaud 1991, 192 n. 1; perhaps he is merely echoing a suggestion by O'Sullivan).²⁵

6 Miscellaneous

In this section I shall comment on a number of passages of some interest.

1,13,6: ἄλλο σοι, τέκνον, προσεδόκων πῦρ ἀνάψαι· ἀλλὰ τοῦτο μὲν ἔσβησεν ἢ πονηρὰ Τύχη μετὰ σοῦ, ἀνάπτει δὲ σοι δᾶδας κακῶν. ὦ πονηρᾶς ταύτης δαδουχίας

πονηρὰ Τύχη **WMD** Garnaud: φθονηρὰ Τύχη **VGE** Vilborg

The right epithet for Tyche is φθονηρὰ ('jealous'), not πονηρὰ ('evil'), see 5,7,9 μοι τῶν ἐν τῷ προσώπῳ φιλημάτων ἐφθόνησεν ἢ Τύχη and 3,23,3 ἐφθόνησέ μοι δαίμων τις τῆς καθαρᾶς ἡδονῆς (where δαίμων τις is substantially equivalent to ἢ Τύχη).²⁶ The corrupted πονηρὰ (**WMD**) has arisen from the reduplication of πονηρᾶς in the following line.²⁷ This is confirmed by the circumstance that the same α-family shows a similar error (3,4,6):

ἔνιοι δέ...προσραγέντες ὑπὸ τοῦ κύματος τῇ πέτρῳ διελύθησαν...ἐπεὶ οὖν τὸ πλοῖον διελύθη...

διελύθησαν **WM** Garnaud [deest **D**]: διεφθείροντο **VGE F** Vilborg

²⁴ Iotacistic variants in the case of verbal terminations are pretty frequent: see especially 2,34,5 ἀποθάνοι (**WM VE F** ἀποθάνει **G**); 3,25,4 ἀποθάνη (Π⁴ **WMD VGE** ἀποθάνει **F**); 7,9,8 ἀποθάνη (**WM VGE** ἀποθάνει Sinaiticus).

²⁵ Laplace 1993, 51 n. 37 rejects the text of Π⁴ as reconstructed by Willis (3,23,3) ἀπὸ Τύρου ἀποδεδημηκότα 'en raison de l'hiatus qu'elle [Willis' restoration] créerait.' In Plutarch's genuine writings 'auslautende Langvokale und Diphthonge vor vokalischem Anlaut sind unbedingt verpönt' (Ziegler 1951, 933).

²⁶ 'Jealous' Tyche: Char. 4,1,12 (Τύχη βάσκανε...ἐφθόνησας). Tyche in the Greek novels: Alperowitz 1992, 75–87; in Polybius: Walbank 1956, 16–26. In 8,4,4 the manuscript tradition is split between τῆς Τύχης (**WM** Garnaud) and τοῦ δαίμονος (**VG** Vilborg).

²⁷ O'Sullivan 1980, 362, s.v. πονηρὰ; see also Jacobs 1821, 466, *ad loc.*

where διελύθησαν, which is rather oddly used in reference to persons ('Quelques-uns...se brisèrent sous la force du flot contre le roc et mou-
rurent'), has been influenced, in the way of an anticipation, by the following διελύθη, more properly said of the πλοῖον (διαλύω meaning 'break up a ship': *LSJ*, s.v. 2).

1,14,1: ἐχρᾶτό μου τῷ δόρω τρυφῶν

ἐχρᾶτο **W** Garnaud: ἐχρήτο **M** [χρηήτο sec. Vilborg, qui in textum recipit ἐχρήτο ex Salmasii coniectura] χρήσθω **D** χρήσθαι **VGE** [deest **F**] (X. *Cyn.* 1,2 ἐχάρη τῷ δόρω καὶ ἐχρήτο)

The form ἐχρᾶτο (which can be regarded either as 'Ionic' or as belonging to the *Koine*)²⁸ is poorly attested in the late Hellenistic and early imperial literature;²⁹ moreover, it seems to be not quite in place in Achilles' language, since it rests upon a feeble manuscript evidence and elsewhere the consensus of all manuscripts and Π⁴ is on ἐχρήτο (3,20,7).³⁰

When coming to the description of the hippopotamus in book 4, we read (4,2,3): κεφαλή περιφερής, οὐ σμικρά. The form σμικρός – 'Attic' rather than 'Ionic' here, if such a distinction is worthy to be drawn³¹ – is unparal-

²⁸ Ionism: Phryn. *Praep. Soph.* fr. 366 De Borries: χρήται· οἱ Ἀττικοί, οἱ δὲ Ἴωνες χρᾶται καὶ ἐχρᾶτο. In inscriptions from Ionia χρήσθαι besides χρᾶσθαι (Scherer 1934, 72); Herodotus (1,187; 2,159 *alibi*): 'der bei der Benutzung der Hdt.ausgaben gewonnene Eindruck einer morphologischen Einheitlichkeit dieses Verbums nur illusorisch ist' (Rosén 1962, 122). – *Koine*: 'γράμμα...frequently contracts to α in the papyri of Roman and Byzantine periods' (Gignac 1981, 368); Crönert 1903, 223 n. 2. In Attic 'the spelling χρᾶσθαι is a very rare variant attested only in the Hellenistic period' (Threatte 1996, 522). In *New Testament* 'ζῆν e χρήσθαι hanno come in greco classico η in luogo di α' (Blass-Debrunner-Rehkopf 1982, 91).

²⁹ See especially D.H. *Ant. Rom.* 4,26,5 (II, p. 49, 4 Jacoby): ἡ στήλη...γραμμῶν ἔχουσα χαρακτῆρας...οἷς τὸ παλαιὸν ἢ Ἑλλάς ἐχρήτο (ἐχρᾶτο *codd.*: see Jacoby 1874, 34); Josephus *AJ* 19,105 (IV, p. 228, 21 Niese): λοιδορίας τε ἐχρᾶτο κατὰ τοῦ Γαίου (to be emended to ἐχρήτο according to Schmidt 1894, 472–473). In the fragmentary pieces of the cynic writer Teles the spelling χρᾶσθαι is unanimously attested only pp. 37, 7 and 38, 9 Hense.

³⁰ In 7,13,1 μνήμη γὰρ αὐτῇ (Leucippe) τοῦ πολλάκις παρὰ δόξαν σεσῶσθαι...τὴν ἐλπίδα προὔξεναι ἀποχρηθῆσαι (*corr.* Cobet) τῇ Τύχῃ, the manuscripts read, respectively, ἀποχρήται (**WG**, *def.* Reeve 1971, 523 n. 1, with different interpunction: τὴν ἐλπίδα προὔξεναι. Ἀποχρήται [Leucippe] τῇ Τύχῃ), ἀπόχρητε (**M**) and ἀποχρήσαι (**V**).

³¹ 'Attic': Schmid 1887–1896, I, 580, not belonging to the *Koine*: Moeris s.v. (σ 38 Hansen): σμικρὸν Ἀττικῶς, μικρὸν κοινόν. Mayer-G'schrey 1898, 4 n. 1 (absent from Parthenius); Blass-Debrunner-Rehkopf 1982, 91; Hernandez Lara 1994, 177. – Ionism:

leled in Achilles' text, but Vilborg was perhaps overzealous in rejecting it for a (brilliant) emendation by J. Jackson:³² κεφαλή περιφερής, οὐδς μικρόν. A certain fluctuation between σμικρός and μικρός is neither unusual nor a problem in itself,³³ and a comparison with Longus (whose text is, among the novelists, the most suitable for our purpose because of the recent editions by M. D. Reeve and J.-R. Vieillefond)³⁴ will confirm this assumption. In Longus μικρός is unanimously attested eight times, once σμικρός.³⁵ In three passages the Laurentianus and the Vatican manuscript diverge from one another;³⁶ from a methodological perspective it is interesting to observe that, in these cases, the editors too behave differently, according to their respective critical guidelines: thus, Vieillefond chooses to follow the Laurentianus (σμικρός 2,1,2; 8,4; μικρός 2,38,1), Reeve instead writes everywhere μικρός, with no regard for any particular manuscript authority.³⁷

Just for sake of curiosity, now I shall briefly review a few unexpected special readings that stand out in Garnaud's apparatus:

3,12,1: καθάρσιον τοῦ στρατοῦ (**WM VE F** *edd.*), καθάρσιον τοῦ λαοῦ
(**G**)³⁸

Rüst 1952, 19–20 ('beide Formen echt ionisch sind'). Everywhere μικρός in the Lucianic treatise *De dea Syria*, written in Ionic (13 = III, p. 5, 28 Macleod; 6,1; 6,7; 16 = p. 7, 25 [after word-ending -ς]; 7,27; 20 = p. 10,19; 29 = p. 16,16 [conj.]) and in the Ionic intermezzo *Vit. auct.* 14 (II, p. 35, 12 M.; 'une tirade qui est un bon paradigme scolaire réunissant toutes les particularités dialectales:' Bompaigne 1958, 633).

³² Jackson 1935, 53 n. 1. Vilborg 1962, 80: 'σμικρόν would be a highly improbable form in A.T.' The presence of σμικρός here seemed unproblematic to Sexauer 1899, 3 (listing this occurrence under the heading: 'Jonismen'), among others.

³³ See Schmid (above, n. 31); Dürr 1899, 9; Ghedini 1926, 21, Deferrari 1916, 5. In Lucian's *Apologia* 13 μικρά and σμικρότητι occur in the same sentence (III, p. 373, 19–22 Macleod).

³⁴ Reeve 1986² and Vieillefond 1987. Longus' text rests on two fundamental manuscripts: Laur. c.s. 627 (= **F** of Achilles Tatius) and Vat. gr. 1348 (= **R**, in Vilborg's notation).

³⁵ Μικρός: 1,16,2; 2,12,1; 33,2; 3,7,3; 9,2; 23,5; 25,2; 30,3. Σμικρός: 1,7,2.

³⁶ Σμικρός in the Laurentianus alone: 2,1,2 (after word-ending -ς); 8,4; in the Vaticanus alone: 2,38,1. I have not taken into account the occurrence 1,19,3, where Reeve (Hirschig) reads μικροῦ, Vieillefond (Hercher Dalmeyda) σμικροῦ, both silently. See also Asser 1873, 32 (unreliable); Valley 1926, 18 (fairly complete).

³⁷ Vieillefond 1987, lvii–lviii; Reeve 1986², xiii: 'rarius peccat **V** [the Vatican ms.] quam **F** [the Laurentianus ms.], sed saepius quam cui continuo pareatur.'

³⁸ [Lucianus] *Asin.* 22 (II, p. 288, 21 Macleod): καθαρισμὸν τοῦ στρατοῦ; also Gr. Naz. *Or.* 15,3 (*PG* 35, 913c): τῶν μετὰ Χριστὸν Στέφανος...παντὸς τοῦ λαοῦ καθάρσιον.

4,4,7: ἐθαύμαζον (**WM VGE** *edd.*), ἐτεθήπειν (**D**)³⁹

5,17,3: σχοίνισι (*codd.* Garnaud), χοίνιξι (marginal reading from the manuscript Lond. Old Royal 16 D XVIII [= **A** in Vilborg's notation])⁴⁰

6,12,4: εἶτε ἐστὶ καὶ Κόδρου (Μενάνδρου **G**) εὐγενέστερος εἶτε Κροίσου πλουσιώτερος. The variant Μενάνδρου cannot be explained here but because of the presence in the same context of the similarly sounding Θερσάνδρω at the end of the preceding paragraph, and of Θέρσανδρον a few lines later (6,12,5).

1,14,3: ἐγὼ δέ σοι τὸν φονέα, τὸν ἀνδροφόνον ἐωνησάμην
σοι **WMD** Garnaud: σου **VGE** Vilborg

The dative pronoun σοι is defended by O'Sullivan,⁴¹ but the genitive is in my view recommended by the internal parallel ἐγὼ τὴν ἀνδροφόνον σου κατεφίλησα (7,5,4) in a similar context, namely a para-tragic lamentation. O'Sullivan proposed an analogous emendation to X. Eph. 3,5,4 ὧ φίλτάτη μοι (μου in the *codex unicus* Laurentianus [= Achilles' **F**]) πασῶν Ἄβροκόμου ψυχῆ, but there with the support of other examples in Xenophon's novel.⁴²

2,7,4: ἐξ ἐπιπολῆς ψαύουσά μου τῶν χειλέων

ἐξ ἐπιπολῆς **WMD** Garnaud: ἐπιπολῆς **VE** Vilborg ἐπὶ πολὺ **G F** (ἐπὶ πολέως **F**^{pc} sec. Vilborg)

³⁹ Not mentioned in Vilborg's apparatus and unparalleled in Achilles. Τέθηπα is well attested in Philo, Parthenius (2,1); Plutarch (*Amatorius* 19,764f; *alibi*), Lucian (*Cat.* 16: ἐτεθήπειν, explained by the scholiast *ad loc.* [p. 49, 12 Rabe] with ἐθαύμαζον; *alibi*), Aelian (see Schmid 1887–1896, III, 222).

⁴⁰ Vilborg prints χοίνιξι, following the editorial 'vulgate' ('the form in -σι is hardly right': O'Sullivan 1980, 397, *s.v.* σχοῖνος). The termination is characteristically Ionic; σχοίνισι is an Herodotean word (2,68,8), then in Arrian, *Ind.* 3,4. – As far as pretended Ionisms are concerned, it is perhaps not unworthy to note that in **G** alone we find the uncontracted ἐγγέει (2,23,2, ἐγγεῖ *cett.*) – 'Ionic' (Lindemann 1889, 36: 'concedendum est... solutas formas [εε/εει] longe prevalere') and also not unfamiliar to the *Koine* (Blass-Debrunner-Rehkopf 1982, 143) –, but elsewhere the same manuscript alone reads περιρρεῖ (2,11,5, περιρρέει *cett.*), so as to demonstrate the intrinsically unreliable, volatile nature of such spellings.

⁴¹ O'Sullivan 1978, 325.

⁴² O'Sullivan 1986, 80.

[a.] Garnaud opts here for the prepositional form ἐξ ἐπιπολῆς (**WMD**), which is ‘un-Attic’ according to the ancient rhetors; as a comparison, Heliodorus has the ‘Attic’ ἐπιπολῆς (like the β-family in Achilles), even if it cannot be overlooked that his style is throughout comparatively higher.⁴³ [b.] While commenting on 2,3,2, Dörrie remarked that one is faced to the choice between the ‘Attic’ feminine τὴν ὄμφακα (**V F**) and the more vulgar masculine form τὸν ὄμφακα (**WM GE Π¹** Garnaud Vilborg).⁴⁴ [c.] In the manuscripts of Achilles we read ὀδμή four times (2,15,2 [*bis*]; 4,5,2 [*bis*]), only once the ‘Attic’ ὀσμὴ (2,38,3, probably by assimilation to the preceding *hapax* ὀσφραῖς); elsewhere (4,4,8) both ὀσμὴν (**WMD** Garnaud) and ὀδμήν (**VGE** Vilborg) are well attested.⁴⁵ [d.] In 4,19,3, the tradition is split between ὀστέον (**WMD** Garnaud) and the ‘Attic’ ὀστοῦν (**VGE** Vilborg); except that, in this case at least (but, possibly, not only), the distinction drawn by the atticising rhetors does not seem to be fully true to the literary praxis.⁴⁶

Atticism is a complex matter to deal with, and those above are only a few scattered examples somehow related to it (one serious shortcoming, among others, is that we did not take into account Π⁴, which is very interesting to this respect).⁴⁷ From the editor’s point of view, it is difficult to take a clear-cut decision between ‘Attic’ and ‘un-Attic’ variants here, because it

⁴³ Pollux 4, 189 (I, p. 257, 13 Bethe): ἐπιπολῆς τετρῶσθαι, *alibi*. Phryn. *Praep. Soph.* 66,18 De Borries: Ἀττικῶς μὲν ἄνευ τῆς ἐξ προθέσεως, οἱ δὲ ἐξεπιπολῆς λέγοντες ἐπλανήθησαν ἀπὸ τοῦ ἐξαιφνης καὶ ἐξεπίτηδες; *Ecloga* 98 Fischer (οἱ ἀρχαῖοι); see Luc. *Soloecista* 5 (I, p. 169, 1–2 Macleod). Diodorus Siculus writes ἐξ ἐπιπολῆς (Palm 1955, 107).

⁴⁴ Dörrie 1935, 83; Phryn. *Ecloga* 33 Fischer (ἡ ὄμφαξ...θηλυκῶς δέον, οὐκ ἀρσενικῶς) and *Praep. Soph.* 96,24. Τὸν ὄμφακα is defended by Conca 1969, 663 as *difficilior*, with reference to *LSJ*.

⁴⁵ Phryn. *Praep. Soph.* 97,21 <ὀσμὴ>· διὰ τοῦ σ μόνον, καὶ οὐ διὰ τοῦ δ. Ἰώνων δὲ διὰ τοῦ δ; Pollux 2,75–76 (I, p. 106, 14–16 Bethe) points out that ὀδμή, though commonly regarded as to be καλὸν τὸ ὄνομα, is lacking adequate evidence in Attic prose; ὀδμή is defended, instead, by the *Antiatticista* (see Schmid 1887–1896, I, 207). According to Schmid, Aelian and Philostratus are consistent in using the ‘Attic’ form (II, 143; IV, 209); among the novelists, Chariton has ὀσμὴ (1,8,2; Hernandez Lara 1994, 165).

⁴⁶ Moeris s.v. (ο 27 Hansen): ὀστοῦν Ἀττικῶς, ὀστέον Ἑλληνικῶς. Remote from the praxis: Thackeray 1909, 44: ‘The rule as regards ὀστέον ὀστοῦν in LXX is that the contracted forms are used in the nom. and acc., the uncontracted in the gen. and dat.’ (e.g. *Ge.* 2,23 τοῦτο νῦν ὀστοῦν ἐκ τῶν ὀστέων μου). According to Giangrande 1953, 61 ὀστέον in Eunapius *VS* 7,6,9 (480) is a Herodotean reminiscence.

⁴⁷ ‘Several times Π⁴ has an Attic form...or construction...where the vulgate substitutes a late or trivialized equivalent’ (Willis 1990, 78): for example, Π⁴ (Garnaud) has the ‘Attic’ form κολεόν (3,21,4) instead of κουλεόν (*codd.*), one out of the few ‘reine Jonismen’ listed by Sexauer 1899, 4.

involves a comprehensive, full-detailed picture of Achilles' 'Atticism' or 'classicism.'⁴⁸ But, on the other hand, it can be positively stated that the editor's attitude towards the manuscript tradition is far from being irrelevant to a more precise appreciation of the Atticistic colour in our novel.⁴⁹

2,37,6: γυναικὶ μὲν οὖν ὕγρον μὲν τὸ σῶμα ἐν ταῖς συμπλοκαῖς, μαλθακὰ δὲ τὰ χεῖλη πρὸς τὰ φιλήματα. καὶ διὰ τοῦτο μὲν ἔχει [*scil.* ἡ γυνή] τὸ σῶμα κτλ.

γυναικὶ corr. Hercher, Vilborg, Garnaud: γυναιξὶ **WM VGE F** [deest **D**]

and only a few lines later (2,38,2):

γυναιξὶ μὲν γὰρ πάντα ἐπίπλαστα, καὶ τὰ ῥήματα καὶ τὰ σχήματα· κἂν εἶναι δόξη καλὴ [*scil.* ἡ γυνή] κτλ.

γυναιξὶ **WM** Garnaud: γυναικὶ **VGE F** Vilborg (Hercher) [deest **D**]

Possibly the requested subject for ἔχει (2,37,6) might be supplied *ad sensum* by the preceding plural γυναιξί (**WM VGE F**): Hercher's γυναικί, then, is unneeded.⁵⁰ Otherwise, for sake of consistency, one is expected to choose the singular γυναικί also at 2,38,2 (**VGE F**; 'necessary in view of the following δόξη:': Vilborg 1962, 65).

⁴⁸ The only extensive study about style and language is Sexauer 1899 (outdated, following in Schmid's steps), whose conclusion runs: 'Er [Achilles] bemüht sich, attisch zu schreiben... Daneben erscheint eine lange Reihe später Ausdrücke... sowie Spätes und Ungewöhnliches auf dem Gebiet der Grammatik...' (pp. 76–77); so we have a description of the generic type 'NN. is an Atticist, but occasionally he uses constructions from the contemporary language,' criticized with reason by Hult 1990, 17 (with valuable remarks on method). From the comparative approach of Zanetto 1990 we learn that, despite of some traces of 'coerenza stilistica,' a novelistic style (a consistent set of stylistic tendencies common to the Greek novel as a literary genre) cannot be defined; on the contrary, we have to do with (more or less) sophisticated works, with a marked individual character.

⁴⁹ Again, we observe that Heliodorus, Longus, and Chariton all write the 'Attic' κρύφα (see *LRG* III, 72, *s.v.*), Achilles (8,17,9) alone, instead, the 'un-Attic' quasi-synonym λεληθότως (Melcher 1905, 17; Hernandez Lara 1994, 58; 133); the latter, however, is admitted by the 'moderate' classicist Pollux (6, 209 [II, p. 52, 17 Bethe]).

⁵⁰ Wackernagel 1926², 93: 'wenn nicht so sehr von einer Mehrzahl, als vielmehr von der Gattung als solcher, also von einer abstrakten Mehrheit die Rede ist, kann der Singular oder Plural stehen.'

6,5,2: πλήθος τῶν παννουχιζόντων προσέρρεεν
 προσέρρεεν **WM** Garnaud: συνέρρεεν **VGE** Vilborg

The verb προσρέω (**WM**) is used twice elsewhere in reference to persons,⁵¹ but here συρρέω (**VGE**) is supported by many external parallels⁵² and by another occurrence in Achilles (8,3,1), which is very close to the passage quoted above: ὄχλος συνερρήη (συνερρήηκεν **M**) τῶν ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ παρόντων. And, if further evidence was needed, we could add the text of Π⁴ (3,24,1 = col. IV, 20–21): πολὺν συνερρηκέναι μύσ[ος] (*suppl.* Willis: ‘a great abomination has streamed together’ [μύσος = μυσσαροὺς ἄνδρας]). Here the medieval tradition reads instead πολὺν συνηθοῖσθαι ληστήριον, and, questionably enough, in Garnaud’s text both sources are mixed by overlapping them into the spurious πολὺν συνερρηκέναι ληστήριον.

The deliberations of the president of the judges (ὁ πρόεδρος τῶν δικαστῶν) at the court of Ephesus are summed up in a long, articulated sentence (7,12,1):

ἔδοξεν οὖν αὐτῷ διασκοπήσαντι σὺν τοῖς παρέδροις αὐτοῦ
 [a.] θάνατον μὲν ἐμοῦ καταγῶναι κατὰ τὸν νόμον, ὃς ἐκέλευσε τὸν
 αὐτοῦ κατειπόντα φόνον τεθνάναι,
 [b.] περὶ δὲ Μελίτης κρίσιν γενέσθαι δευτέραν ἐν ταῖς βασάνοις τῶν
 θεραπαινίδων,
 [c.] Θέρσανδρον δὲ ἐπομόσαι περὶ τοῦ Σωσθένους ἐν γράμμασιν, ἥ μὴν
 οὐκ εἰδέναι τί γέγονε,
 [d.] κάμῃ δέ, ὡς ἤδη κατάδικον, βασανισθῆναι περὶ τοῦ Μελίτην τῷ
 φόνῳ συνεγνωκέναι.

In this case, too, Garnaud does not refrain from accepting at face value the text of **WM**, which omit δέ (double underlined) after Θέρσανδρον in the

⁵¹ Ach. Tat. 3,13,5: οἱ ὀπλίται προσέρρεον; 7: καὶ ἵππεῖς (πλείους *add.* **VGE** Vilborg) προσέρρεον. See also Josephus *AJ* 14,93: πολλοὶ δ’ Ἀριστοβούλῳ...προσέρρεον; [Lucianus] *Amores* 8: δὺ’ ἢ τρεῖς προσερρήησαν; Mayer-G’schrey 1889, 25.

⁵² Hld. 4,19,1: πολιτῶν εἰς πλήθος συρρεόντων; 7,3,1: τοῦ πλήθους...συρρύντος (Neimke 1889, 53 [nr. 69]); X.Eph. 5,13,1: συνέρρει δὲ ἅπαν τὸ πλήθος; D.S. 20,82,5: συνέρρει πανταχόθεν πλήθος; 34/35,6,1: συνέρρεον εἰς Ῥώμην οἱ ὄχλοι; D.H. *Ant. Rom.* 9,25,1: ὄχλου συνερρηκότης; Plut. *Crass.* 28,3: συνερρηκὸς ὄχλον; Ael. *VH* 12,58: συνέρρει...τὰ πλήθη. Ὀχλος and πλήθος are to be regarded as synonyms: Giangrande 1991, 59 n. 26.

colon [c.], but the particle (VG Vilborg) – in response to those in the other *cola* (simple underlined) – is needed for a correct balancing of the sentence as a whole.

8,5,9: ὁ δὲ Σώστρατος καὶ ἐπεδάκρυν, εἴ ποτε [τὸ] κατὰ Λευκίππην ἐγγέγονει <τὸ> δρᾶμα

According to Vilborg, Garnaud (in their critical apparatuses) and O'Sullivan (1980, 99, s.v. δρᾶμα), the transposition of τό was fathered by Jacobs. I have found it first in Gaselee's text, whereas I have failed to detect any trace of it in the editions of Salmasius, Jacobs, Hirschig, and Hercher.⁵³ The latter, reworking a suggestion by Hirschig, proposed to read: ὁ δὲ Σώστρατος καὶ ἐπεδάκρυν, ὁπότε [τὸ] κατὰ Λευκίππην ἐγγέγονει<v> [δρᾶμα]; such an obtrusive emendation is neither recommendable in itself nor needed here, but it is probably not as farfetched as it seems, insofar as an interpolated δρᾶμα (added by a second hand in the manuscript A = Ambr. F 128) can be found in Josephus *AJ* 20,79 (IV, p. 289, 11 Niese): οὐ μὴν ὁ Ἰζάτης κατεπλάγη [τὸ δρᾶμα].

7 Conclusion

We may subscribe to the view that, in the case of Achilles Tatius, 'si tratta più di scegliere che di emendare.'⁵⁴ In the present paper, I have briefly discussed on general topics and individual passages in Achilles' novel from the standpoint of textual criticism, in order to gain, as far as possible, a deeper insight into the *ratio* of the editorial choices that affect it in a positive or negative way. I am well aware of the fact that my discussion is far from being fully exhaustive and, moreover, I have raised many questions while offering few solutions; but there are two main conclusions that can be drawn

⁵³ Gaselee 1969², 400-[401]-402 (silently); Jacobs 1821 (not even in his *Animadversiones, ad loc.* [p. 936]); Salmasius 1640, 473 (with the 'Byzantine' paroxytone δρᾶμα); Hirschig 1856, 116, 22–24 (ὁπότε [τὸ] κατὰ Λ. ἐγγέγονει [δρᾶμα]); Hercher 1858, 193, 4–5. – 'The MSS put the article before κατὰ. This would be possible only if ἐγγέγονει could mean "was discussed" *vel sim.* [so Jackson's (1935, 105) ἐνενόει], which I doubt seriously' (Vilborg 1962, 127); for the opposite view, 'I see no good reason for bracketing and changing the person against the consensus of the MSS., which are with Jacobs' (Walden 1894, 9 n. 1).

⁵⁴ Russo 1958, 587.

from it with some confidence. First, we have seen that the editor's critical assumptions about the manuscript tradition (and the papyri) have a significant bearing on the definition of the expressive style of the author at its surface level. Secondly, that by paying greater attention to linguistic and rhetorical-literary features internal to the text itself, one is granted a useful criterion which, when applied to problematic cases, might potentially lead to valuable accomplishments in the textual criticism of Achilles' novel.

Bibliography

- Alberti, G. B. 1979. *Problemi di critica testuale*, Firenze: La Nuova Italia.
- Alperowitz, M. 1992. *Das Wirken und Walten der Götter im griechischen Roman*, Heidelberg: C. Winter.
- Asser, G. 1873. 'De Longi Sophistae usu grammatico. Particula I', Diss. Vratislaviae.
- Blass F., Debrunner A., Rehkopf F. 1982. *Grammatica del greco del Nuovo Testamento*, Brescia (Italian transl.): Paideia.
- Bompaire, J. 1958. *Lucien écrivain. Imitation et création*, Paris: De Boccard.
- Castiglioni, L. 1931. 'Review of C. Hude, *Xenophontis Historia Graeca* [Leipzig 1929–1930]', *Gnomon* 7, 572–577.
- Cavallo, G. 1996. 'Veicoli materiali della letteratura di consumo. Maniere di scrivere e maniere di leggere', in: O. Pecere and A. Stramaglia A. (eds.), *La letteratura di consumo nel mondo greco-latino*, Cassino: Università degli Studi di Cassino, 11–46.
- Colonna, A. 1994. 'Nota su un codice antico di Achille Tazio (Marciano Gr. 409)', in: C. Curti and C. Crimi (eds.), *Scritti classici e cristiani offerti a F. Corsaro*, Catania: Università degli Studi di Catania, I, 179–181.
- Conca, F. 1969. 'I papiri di Achille Tazio', *RIL* 103, 649–677.
- 1995. 'Note al testo di Achille Tazio', *Acme* 48, 133–138.
- Crönert, G. 1903. *Memoria Graeca Herculanensis*, Leipzig: Teubner.
- Dawe, R. D. 2001. 'Some Erotic Suggestions', *Philologus* 145, 291–311.
- Deferrari, R. J. 1916. *Lucian's Atticism*, [repr. Amsterdam 1969]: [Hakkert].
- Donnet, D. 1993. 'Review of Garnaud 1991', *AC* 62, 295–296.
- Dörrie, H. 1935. 'De Longi Achillis Tatii Heliodori memoria', Diss. Gottingae.
- 1959. 'Review of Vilborg 1955', *Gymnasium* 66, 428.
- Dürr, K. 1899. *Sprachliche Untersuchungen zu den Dialexeis des Maximus von Tyrus*, *Philologus* Supplbd. VII/1.
- Fabrics, C. 1962. *Zu den Jugendschriften des Johannes Chrysostomos. Untersuchungen zum Klassizismus des vierten Jahrhunderts*, Lund: CWK Gleerup.
- Garnaud, J.-Ph. 1991. *Achille Tatius. Le roman de Leucippé et Clitophon*, Paris: Les Belles Lettres.
- Gaselee, S. 1969². *Achilles Tatius*, The Loeb Classical Library, London – Cambridge (1917).
- Ghedini, G. 1926. *La lingua greca di Marco Aurelio Antonino*, Milano: Vita e Pensiero.
- Giangrande, G. 1953. *Caratteri stilistici delle Vitae sophistarum di Eunapio*, *Boll. Class.* n.s. 2, 59–70.
- Giangrande, G. 1991. *Plutarco. Narrazioni d'amore*, Naples: D'Auria.

- Gignac, F. T. 1981. *A Grammar of the Greek Papyri of the Roman and Byzantine Periods*, II, Milan: Cisalpino-Goliardica.
- Guida, A. 1981. 'Nuovi testimoni di Longo e Achille Tazio', *Prometheus* 7, 1–10.
- Hagedorn, D., Koenen L. 1970. 'Eine Handschrift des Achilleus Tatiος', *MH* 27, 49–57.
- Hercher, R. 1858. *Erotici scriptores Graeci*, I, Leipzig: Teubner.
- Hernandez Lara, C. 1994. *Estudios sobre el aticismo de Cariton de Afrodiasias*, Amsterdam: Hakkert.
- Hirschig, G. A. 1856. *Erotici scriptores*, Paris: Didot.
- Hult, K. 1990. *Syntactic Variation in the Greek of the 5th Century AD*, Göteborg: Acta Universitatis Gothoburgensis.
- Jackson, J. 1935. 'The Greek Novelists. Miscellanea', *CQ* 29, 52–57; 96–112.
- Jacobs, F. 1821. *Achillis Tatii Alexandrini de Leucippes et Clitophontis amoribus libri VIII*, Leipzig: in bibliopolio Dykiano.
- Jacoby, K. 1874. *Über die Sprache des Dionysius von Halikarnass in der Römischen Archäologie*, Aarau: H. R. Sauerländer.
- Laplace, M. 1993. 'À propos du P. Robinson-Coloniensis d'Achille Tatiος, Leucippé et Clitophon', *ZPE* 98, 43–56.
- Lindemann, H. 1889. 'De dialecto Ionica recentiore', Diss. Kiliae.
- LRG = Conca F. [Beta S. from vol. III]-De Carli E.-Zanetto G., *Lessico dei romanzieri greci*, I, Milano: Cisalpino-Goliardica, 1983; II–IV, Hildesheim: Olms-Weidman, 1989–1997.
- Mayer-G'schrey, R. 1898. 'Parthenius Nicaeensis quale in fabularum amatorum breviario dicendi genus secutus sit', Diss. Heidelberg.
- Melcher, P. 1905. 'De sermone Epicteteo, quibus rebus ab Attica regula discedat. Pars I', Diss. Halis Saxonum.
- Neimke, Ph. 1889. 'Quaestiones Heliodoreae', Diss. Halis Saxonum.
- O'Sullivan, J. N. 1978. 'Notes on the Text and Interpretation of Achilles Tatiος I', *CQ* 28, 312–329.
- 1980. *A Lexicon to Achilles Tatiος*, Berlin – New York: De Gruyter.
- 1986. 'Notes on Xenophon of Ephesus Books III and IV', *RhM* 129, 77–89.
- Palm, J. 1955. *Über Sprache und Stil des Diodoros von Sizilien*, Lund: CWK Gleerup.
- Parsons, P. J. 1989. *P. Oxy. 3837*, in: *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri*, LVI, 66–69.
- Plepelits, K. 1980. *Achilleus Tatiος. Leukippe und Kleitophon. Eingeleitet, übersetzt und erläutert von K. P.*, Stuttgart: A. Hiersemann.
- Rattenbury, R. M. 1937. 'Review of Dörrie 1935', *Gnomon* 13, 358–365.
- Reardon, B. P. 2004. *Chariton Aphrodisiensis. De Callirhoe narrationes amatoriae*, Munich – Leipzig: Saur.
- Reeve, M. D. 1971. 'Hiatus in the Greek Novelists', *CQ* N.S. 21, 514–539.
- 1986². *Longus. Daphnis et Chloe*, Leipzig: Teubner.
- Renehan, R. 2001. 'Some Notes on Longus, *Daphnis and Chloe*', *RhM* 144, 233–238.
- Rosén, H. B. 1962. *Eine Laut- und Formenlehre der herodotischen Sprachform*, Heidelberg: C. Winter.
- Russo, C. F. 1958. 'Review of Vilborg 1955', *Gnomon* 30, 585–590.
- Rüst, A. 1952. 'Monographie der Sprache des hippokratischen Traktates ΠΕΠΙ ΑΕΡΩΝ ΥΔΑΤΩΝ ΤΟΠΩΝ', Diss. Freiburg.
- Salmasius, C. 1640. *Ἐρωτικῶν Ἀχιλλέως Τατίου sive de Clitophontis et Leucippes amoribus...*, Lugduni Batavorum: apud F. Hegerum.
- Scherer, A. 1934. 'Zur Laut- und Formenlehre der milesischen Inschriften', Diss. Munich.

- Schmid, W. 1887–1896. *Der Atticismus in seinen Hauptvertretern von Dionysius von Halikarnass bis auf den zweiten Philostratus*, I–IV, Stuttgart: Kohlhammer.
- Schmidt, G. 1894. *De Flavii Iosephi elocutione observationes criticae*, *Fleckeisens Jahrbücher für class. Philologie* Supplbd. XX, 343–550.
- Sexauer, H. 1899. ‘Der Sprachgebrauch des Romanschriftstellers Achilles Tattius’, Diss. Heidelberg, Karlsruhe.
- Slings, S. R. 1997. ‘Review of G.P. Goold, *Chariton. Callirhoe*’, [Cambridge – London 1995], *Mnemosyne* s. IV 50, 107–111.
- Thackeray, H. 1909. *A Grammar of the Old Testament in Greek according to the Septuagint*, I, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Threatte, L. 1996. *The Grammar of Attic Inscriptions, II, Morphology*, Berlin – New York: De Gruyter.
- Touwaide, A. 1993. ‘Review of Garnaud 1991’, *Scriptorium* 47, 2*–3*.
- Valley, G. 1926. ‘Über den Sprachgebrauch des Longus’, Diss. Uppsala.
- Vian, F. 1981. ‘Review of O’Sullivan 1980’, *RPh* 55, 348–350.
- Vieillefond, J.-R. 1987. *Longus. Pastorales*, Paris: Les Belles Lettres.
- Vilborg, E. 1955. *Achilles Tattius. Leucippe and Clitophon*, Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell.
— 1962. *Achilles Tattius. Leucippe and Clitophon. A Commentary*, Stockholm – Göteborg: Acta Universitatis Gothoburgensis.
- Wackernagel, J. 1926². *Vorlesungen über Syntax*, I, Basel: Birkhäuser.
- Walbank, F.W. 1956. *A Historical Commentary on Polybius*, I, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Walden, J. W. H. 1894. ‘Stage-Terms in Heliodorus’s *Aethiopica*’, *HSCP* 5, 1–43.
- West, M. L. 1973. *Textual Criticism and Editorial Technique*, Stuttgart: Teubner.
- Willis, W. H. 1990. ‘The Robinson-Cologne Papyrus of Achilles Tattius’, *GRBS* 31, 73–102.
- Zanetto, G. 1990. ‘La lingua dei romanzieri greci’, *GIF* 42, 233–242.
- Ziegler, K. 1951. ‘Plutarchos von Chaironeia’, *RE* XXI.1, 635–962.