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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)

---

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).

*Authors, Authority, and Interpreters in the Ancient Novel, 112–130*
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, whereas Garnaud does not seem to share the same confidence in the (pretended) virtues of F.

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. Unfortunately, from such an idiosyncratic selection (and the scanty information provided in his prefatory ‘Notice’), the positions relative to the whole *stemma codicum* of both manuscripts cannot but remain uncertain. In any case, their contribution to the text of Achilles is hardly to be praised.

---

3 Vilborg 1955, lxvii and lxxi n. 1 (special readings); lxx (‘F represents a third branch of our medieval Achilles Tatius 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 si, ma contaminati tra di loro’).

4 Possibly a wiser attitude. I have counted: 1,1,2 (σῶστρα F: σῶστρα τε cett.); 1,7,1 (τὸν ἴππον F: καὶ τὸν ἴππον); 2,1,2 (κῆμας [whence Jacobs κυμάς] F: κύλωκας); 2,37,1 (ἔοικεν εἶναι F: ἔοικε μᾶλλον εἶναι [according to Vilborg this is the reading of the α-family alone, whereas β reads ἔοικέναι]). 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 κύλωκας (2,1,2), which does not make any sense here, with a misreading of uncial letters; κῆμας 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, lxvii. 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:

\[
1,12,4 = p. 14,24 \text{ Vilborg (F): ταλαντευόμενος (Russo, who had the manuscript collated on his behalf by A. La Penna),}^{10} \text{ ταλαντούμενος (Garnaud Vilborg, same reading as WG)}
\]

\[
8,19,3 = p. 161,28 \text{ V. (W): Τύρῳ (Russo), τῇ Τύρῳ (Garnaud Vilborg)}
\]

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]; θυσανων cett.); 6,1,1 (παράσχων Sin. [Jacobs, Vilborg]; παράσχεις; see below n. 24); 7,12,1 (αιτοῦ Sin. [likewise R = Vat. gr. 1348, whence Vilborg]; αἰτοῦ); 8,2,3 (μεμίλησε Sin. [Hercher, Vilborg]; μεμίλησε μὲν); 8,9,4 (κἂν τοῖς γυναικί κεκατέρων κἂν ... εἰσὶν WGV). We may consider these as mere orthographic variants or easy conjectures. Conca 1995, 133 singles out the reading of the Sinaiticus ιοντα (5,9,3: ιοντα 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. ιοντα; add 8,5,3 (ιοντα G: ιοντα cett.) and 8,14,1 (ιοντα G [κινδυνούς according to Vilborg]: ιοντα).

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 ταλαντεύομενος, and it could be of some interest to know the actual reading of F here.
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1,1,7 = p. 2,19 V. (M): διαδοµένοι (Vilborg), διδοµένοι (Garnaud)
1,5,4 = p. 7,2 V. (W): κρούσµάτος (Vilborg), κρούσµάτων (Garnaud)
1,14,1 = p. 16,10 V. (M): χηρῆτο (sic Vilborg), ἐχρῆτο (Garnaud)
8,17,5 = p. 160,8 V. (W): ἐνολον (sic Vilborg), ἐνολον in all manuscripts according to Garnaud

3 The sources (II): The papyri

The number of the papyri of Achilles Tatus has noticeably increased since E. Vilborg published his edition in 1955. 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 others 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. 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. 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 Π3 = P. Oxy. 3836 (3,21–23,23), Π2 = P. Oxy. 1014 (4,14,2–5), and a few fragments (P. Oxy. 3837 [8,6,14–18,7,6], formerly Π5) from the same papyrus manuscript as Π4. A dating to the III or even IV century would better suit Π4 = 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 minoribus 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 τούτος ἐπερχόµενοι (3,24,4) is in my view preferable to ἄφεται δὲ ὅσον οὐδέπω ἐπερχόµενοι διεσχίσασθαι πρὸς τούτος in Π4, with hiatus (see below, n. 23). The vulgate text ἦµα δὲ τῇ ἐκ ἅγιον (prosp.: Jacobs) τὸν Μενέλαον τῷ στρατηγῷ (3,24,1) was suffering from an illicit hiatus until Π4 has offered the key for its emendation: ἦµα δὲ ἐκ τῷ στρατηγῷ τὸν Μένελαον ἵµα (suppl. Willis). Likewise, the hiatus affecting ἐτοίµη in the text of Π4 ἐτοίµη τῆς υστερῆς (scil. υστεράτως: 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

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 squilibri.’ 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, xlvi–xlxi). 19 Likewise, the text of VGE μαθής δὲ σοι 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

\[\begin{align*}
\text{ἀγριόμαι} (7,14,4: \text{ἤγριώσαι} \text{ WM} \text{ ἐξηγρίωσαι} \text{ VG}) \\
\text{ἀναπλέω} (2,17,3: \text{ἀνέπλευσεν} \text{ WM} \text{ ἀπέπλευσεν} \text{ VGE} \text{ F}) \\
\text{διαπίπτω} (3,21,2: \text{διαπίπτοι \text{ WM} F} \text{ peculiarly}: \text{ O’Sullivan 1980, 90, s.v.} \text{ διεκπίπτοι} \text{ VE[-teiv G]}) \\
\text{ἐκφονέω} (8,14,2: \text{ἐξεφονόσεν} \text{ WM} \text{ ἐξεβόησεν} \text{ VG}) \\
\text{ἐναφείμ] (1,19,2: \text{ἐναφὺκε} \text{ WD} \text{ [aR according to Vilborg]} \text{ def. O’Sullivan 1980, 137, s.v.} \text{ ἐπαφήκε} \text{ cett. [VGE F]}) \\
\text{ἐννέω} (7,3,3: \text{ἐνένευσον} \text{ WM} \text{ ἐπένευσον} \text{ VGE}) \\
\text{ἐπεισέρχομαι} (7,13,1: \text{ἐπεισέρχεται} \text{ WM} \text{ [prob. wrongly]: O’Sullivan 1980, 121, s.v.} \text{ ἐπισέρχεται} \text{ VG}) \\
\text{ἐπεισερχομαι} (3,10,5: \text{παρακαθεύδει} \text{ WM E παρακαθεύδει} \text{ VG F} \text{ see Vilborg’s apparatus \text{ ad loc.}}) \\
\text{ἐπεισερχομαι} (4,15,1: \text{προσπολυμένη} \text{ WM} \text{ πυρπολούμενη} \text{ VE[-η G]}) \\
\text{ἐπεισερχομαι} (7,10,1: \text{ἐπεισέρχεται} \text{ WM} \text{ ἐπεισέρχεται} \text{ VGE}) \\
\text{ὑποπίνω} (8,16,1: \text{ὑποπίνουσαν} \text{ WM} \text{ [perhaps rightly]: O’Sullivan 1980, 419, s.v.} \text{ ὑποπινόων} \text{ VG ὑποπινόων coni. Vilborg})
\end{align*}\]

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), ἐξαγριόομαι (7,14,4), παρακαθεύδω (3,10,5), and συναγορεύω (7,10,1):

\[\begin{align*}
\text{ἁλιεύω} (2,14,10: \text{ἁλιεύσαι} \text{ WM ἁλιεύεται} \text{ VGE F}) \\
\text{ἀπομιμέομαι} (8,10,9: \text{μιμεῖται} \text{ WM} \text{ ἀπομιμέωται} \text{ VG})
\end{align*}\]

\[\begin{align*}
20 \text{ 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 διεκπίπτω (3,22,2: διεκπίπτει \text{ Π} Γ), absent from Garnaud’s apparatus \text{ ad loc.} (‘Π’ longe abest a textu recepto’) but defended by Laplace 1993, 48–49.}

21 \text{ Perhaps ἐνενέυσον was introduced by assimilation to the preceding ἐνεώρων (ἐνεώρων δὲ ἡμῖν πυκνά καὶ ἄλλη ἔννοια) but in such cases one should admit the possibility that the writer was pursuing a particular effect, like τὸν µοιχὸν ἐξελέγχας (\text{ WM} ἐκλεγάς \text{ VGE}) σὺ τὸν δεσπόταν ἐξέλισκας καὶ τῆς ὀικίας ἔξωπετελάς (6,8,1).}
5 New conjectures

New conjectures by the editor himself are few.

2,19,6: ὁ Σάτυρος...τὴν ἄνοιξιν πειράται καί, ὡς εἴδε δυνατήν, τὴν Κλειώ γε ἐπεπείκε, καί τῆς κόρης συνειδύας, μηδὲν ἀντιπράζει τῇ [κόρῃ] τέχνῃ

A similar emendation (γε for τε) has been proposed by Jacobs in 6,19,4: φύσει γε (τε codd.) ὑπ’ ἀσπονδός.

2,35,4: ποίᾳ δριµύτερον - ἐφην - ὦ τι παρακύψαν μόνον οὐχέται, καί οὐκ ἀπολαύσαι δίδωσι τῷ φιλοῦντι
ποίᾳ (sic) Garnaud: ποί WM VE πὴ G πῶς F Vilborg

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

3,25,5: ἐνθεὶς δὲ καὶ ἐναράμοσας τὸν δρόμον τῇ σοφῇ κλέει τὸ χάσμα γνῶν χώματι, ἐπὶ τὸν Νείλον οὗτος ὑπταται τὸ ἔργον φέρον

22 Possibly a misreading of uncials; in 3,8,3 WM exhibit the corrupted ἄγαγὼν for ὁ δὲ ἀλγὼν (WM VGE).
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 ἡ Μελίτη is a slight modification of the reading of WM.

The expression πάσχει τὴν ψυχήν 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).

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
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).  

6 Miscellaneous

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

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

ἔνιοι δὲ...προσραγέντες ὑπὸ τοῦ κύματος τῇ πέτρᾳ διελύθησαν...ἐπεὶ οὖν τὸ πλοῖον διελύθη...

διελύθησαν WM Garnaud [deest D]: διυφθείροντο 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 ἀποθάνει (Π2 WMD VGE ἀποθάνει F); 7,9,8 ἀποθάνη (WM VGE ἀποθάνου Sinaiticus).
26 ‘Jealous’ Tyche: Char. 4,1,12 (Τύχη βάσκανε...ἐφθόνησεν). 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. πονηρά; see also Jacobs 1821, 466, ad loc.
where διελύθησαν, which is rather oddly used in reference to persons (‘Quelques-uns…se briserent sous la force du flot contre le roc et mouri- rent’), 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: ἐχρᾶτο μου τῷ δόρῳ τρυφῶν
ἐχρᾶτο W Garnaud: ἐχρῆτο M [χρῆτο sec. Vilborg, qui in textum recipit ἐχρῆτο ex Salmiasi conjectura] χρῆσθαι D χρῆσθαι VGE [deest F] (X. Cyn. 1,2 ἐχάρη τῷ δόρῳ καὶ ἐχρῆτο)

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 Π is on ἐχρῆτο (3,20,7).30

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


29 See especially D.H. Ant. Rom. 4,26,5 (II, p. 49, 4 Jacoby): ἡ στήλη…γραµµάτων ἔχονα χαρακτήρας…ὡς τὸ παλαιὸν ἡ Ἑλλάς ἐχρῆτο (ἐχρᾶτο codd.: see Jacoby 1874, 34); Josephus AJ 19,105 (IV, p. 228, 21 Niese): λοιδορίαις τε ἐχρᾶτο κατὰ τοῦ Γαίου (to be emended to ἐχρῆτο 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,Ι μνήµη γὰρ αὐτῆς (Leucippe) τοῦ πολλάκις παρὰ δόξαν σεισόθαι…τὴν ἐλπίδα προιξέναι ἀποχρῆσαι (corr. Cobet) τῇ Τύχῃ, the manuscripts read, respectively, ἀποχρῆσαι (WG, def. Reeve 1971, 523 n. 1, with different interpunction: τὴν ἐλπίδα προιξέναι. Ἀποχρῆσαι [Leucippe] τῇ Τύχῃ), ἀπόχρησται (M) and ἀποχρῆσαι (V).

led in Achilles’ text, but Vilborg was perhaps overzealous in rejecting it for a (brilliant) emendation by J. Jackson.\textsuperscript{32} κεφαλὴ περιφερής, οὖς µικρὸν. A certain fluctuation between σµικρός and µικρός is neither unusual nor a problem in itself,\textsuperscript{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)\textsuperscript{34} will confirm this assumption. In Longus µικρός is unanimously attested eight times, once σµικρός.\textsuperscript{35} In three passages the Laurentianus and the Vatican manuscript diverge from one another;\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{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)\textsuperscript{38}

\begin{itemize}
\item 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.
\item 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).
\item Reeve 1986\textsuperscript{2} 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).
\item Μικρός: 1,16,2; 2,12,1; 33,2; 3,7,3; 9,2; 23,5; 25,2; 30,3. Σµικρός: 1,7,2.
\item 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 Dalmeysa) σµικροῦ, both silently. See also Asser 1873, 32 (unreliable); Valley 1926, 18 (fairly complete).
\item Vieillefond 1987, Ivi–Iviii; Reeve 1986\textsuperscript{2}, xiii: ‘rarius peccat V [the Vatican ms.] quam F [the Laurentianus ms.], sed saepius quam cui continuo pareatur.’
4,4,7: ἔθαύμαζον (WM VGE edd.), ἐπεθήκεν (D)39
5,17,3: σχοίνοσι (codd. Garnaud), χοίνιζε (marginal reading from the manuscript Lond. Old Royal 16 D XVIII [= A in Vilborg’s notation])40
6,12,4: ἐτεθήπα (Mενάνδρου G) εὐγενεστέρος εἶτε Κροίου πλουσιώτερος. The variant Μενάνδρου cannot be explained here but because of the presence in the same context of the similarly sounding Θερσάνδρῳ at the end of the preceding paragraph, and of Θέρσαινδρῳ a few lines later (6,12,5).

1,14,3: ἔγω δὲ σοι τὸν φονέα, τὸν ἀνδροφόνον ἐστὶ καὶ Κόρον φιλτάτη μου τῶν ψυχῶν (µου in the codex unicus Laurentianus [= Achilles’ F]) πασῶν Ἀβροκόμου, 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 πολῶ G F (ἐπὶ πολέως F 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 (Caet. 16: ἐπεθήκεν, explained by the scholiast ad loc. [p. 49, 12 Rabe] with ἔθαυμαζον; 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. σχοίνος). The termination is characteristically Ionic; σχοίνοσι 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 ἔγχεει (2,23,2, ἔγχεει 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.
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.\(^{43}\)

While commenting on 2,3,2, Dörrie remarked that one is faced to the choice between the ‘Attic’ feminine τὴν ὀµφακα (V F) and the more vulgar masculine form τὸν ὀµφακα (WM GE Π\(^{1}\) Garnaud Vilborg).\(^{44}\)

In the manuscripts of Achilles we read ὀδῆ four times (2,15,2 \([\text{bis}]\); 4,5,2 \([\text{bis}]\)), only once the ‘Attic’ ὀσῆ (2,38,3, probably by assimilation to the preceding ὤσφραῖς); elsewhere (4,4,8) both ὀσῆν (WMD Garnaud) and ὀδῆν (VGE Vilborg) are well attested.\(^{45}\)

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 Π\(^{4}\), 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


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

\(^{45}\) Phryn. Praep. Soph. 97,21 <ἀσμή>· διὰ τοῦ σ μόνον, καὶ οὐ διὰ τοῦ δ. 'Ἰάνων δὲ διὰ τοῦ δ; Pollux 2,75–76 (I, p. 106, 14–16 Bethe) points out that ὀδημή, though commonly regarded as to be κολεόν τὸ ὄνομα, is lacking adequate evidence in Attic prose; ὀδημή 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 ὀσημή (1,8,2; Hernandez Lara 1994, 165).

\(^{46}\) Moeris s.v. (o 27 Hansen): ὀστείου Ἀττικῶς, ὀστείου Ἑλληνικῶς. Remote from the praxis: Thackeray 1909, 44: ‘The rule as regards ὀστείου ὀστείων 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 ὅν ὀστείον ἐκ τῶν ὀστείων μου). According to Giangrande 1953, 61 ὀστείου in Eunapius VS 7,6,9 (480) is a Herodotean reminiscence.

\(^{47}\) ‘Several times Π\(^{4}\) has an Attic form…or construction…where the vulgar substitutes a late or trivialized equivalent’ (Willis 1990, 78): for example, Π\(^{4}\) (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.’ 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.

2,37,6: γυναικὶ μὲν ὄνυ ὑγρὸν μὲν τὸ σῶμα ἐν ταῖς σωματοκεῖς, μαλθακὰ δὲ τὰ χείλη πρὸς τὰ φυλήματα, καὶ διὰ τούτο μὲν ἔχει [scil. ἡ γυνὴ] τὸ σῶμα κτλ.

2,38,2: γυναιξὶ μὲν γὰρ πάντα ἐπίπλαστα, καὶ τὰ ῥήματα καὶ τὰ σχήματα· κἂν εἶναι δόξη καλῆ [scil. ἡ γυνὴ] κτλ.

Possibly the requested subject for ἔχει (2,37,6) might be supplied ad sensum by the preceding plural γυναιξὶ (WM VGE F): Hercher’s γυναικί, then, is unneeded. 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 1926: 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: πλῆθος τῶν παννυχιζόντων προσέρρεον
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 parallels\(^ {52}\) and by another occurrence in Achilles (8,3,1), which is very close to the passage quoted above: ὄχλος συνερρήσῃ (συνερρήκεν Μ) τῶν ἐν τῷ ιερῷ παρόντων. And, if further evidence was needed, we could add the text of Π\(^ {4}\) (3,24,1 = col. IV, 20–21): πολὺ συνερρύη (συνερρύκεν M) τῶν ἐν τῷ ιερῷ παρόντων.

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):

\[\begin{align*}
&\text{ἔδοξεν οὖν αὐτῷ διασκοπήσαντι σὺν τοῖς παρέδροις αὐτοῦ} \\
&[a.] \text{θάνατόν μὲν ἐμοὶ καταγνῶνα κατὰ τὸν νόμον, δὲ ἐκέλευσε τὸν} \\
&\text{αὐτοῦ κατειπόντα φόνον τεθνάναι,} \\
&[b.] \text{περὶ δὲ Μελίτης κρίσιν γενέσθαι δευτέραν ἐν ταῖς βασάνωις τῶν} \\
&\text{θεραπαινίδων,} \\
&[c.] \text{Θέρσανδρον δὲ ἐπομόσαι περὶ τοῦ Σωσθένους ἐν γράμμασιν, ἦ μὴ} \\
&\text{οὐκ εἰδέναι τί γέγονε,} \\
&[d.] \text{κἀ δὲ, ὡς ἦδη κατάδικον, βασανισθῆναι περὶ τοῦ Μελίτὴν τῷ} \\
&\text{φόνῳ συνεγνωκέναι.}
\end{align*}\]

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 ὁπλῖται προσέρρουσιν; 7: καὶ ἰππεῖς (πλείους add VGE Vilborg) προσέρρουσιν. See also Josephus AJ 14,93: πολλοὶ δ’ ἀριστοβούλοι...προσέρρουσιν; [Lucianus] Amores 8: ἐὰν ἡ τριάς προσερρήσησαν; Mayer-G’schrey 1889, 1899, 25.

\(^{52}\) Hld. 4,19,1: πολίτων εἰς πλῆθος συρρεόντων; 7,3,1: τοῦ πλῆθους...συρρεόντως (Neimke 1889, 53 [nr. 69]); X.Eph. 5,13,1: συνέρρεε δὲ ἐὰν τὸ πλῆθος; D.S. 20,82,5: συνέρρεε πανταχόθεν πλῆθος; 34/35,6,1: συνέρρεεν εἰς Ρώμην οἱ σύλλοι; D.H. Ant. Rom. 9,25,1: ὄχλον συνερρήσατος Plut. Crass. 28,3: συνερρηκότος ὄχλον; Ael. VH 12,58: συνέρρεε...τὰ πλῆθη. Ὄχλος and πλῆθος 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 ἐπεδάκρυεν, εἰ ποτε [τὸ] κατὰ Λευκίππην ἐγεγόνει <τὸ> δράμα

According to Vilborg, Garnaud (in their critical apparatuses) and O’Sullivan (1980, 99, s.v. δράμα), the transposition of τὸ 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 ἐπεδάκρυεν, ὅπότε [τὸ] κατὰ Λευκίππην ἐγεγόνει<ν> [δράμα]; 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 δράμα (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 δράμα].

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 δράμα); Hirschig 1856, 116, 22–24 (ὅπότε [τὸ] κατὰ Λ. ἐγεγόνει [δράμα]); Hercher 1858, 193, 4–5. – ‘The MSS put the article before κατά. This would be possible only if ἐγεγόνει 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.
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