

is not referring to a copy of the Sicilian temple or to a replica of its cult statue, but rather that he is underlining the continuation of ritual practices peculiar to that model and retained only in the sanctuary outside the *pomerium*.

tion and similar papers at [core.ac.uk](http://core.ac.uk)

broug

provided by RB

doi:10.1017/S0009838806000747

## A TEXTUAL NOTE ON XENOPHON OF EPHESUS 3.9.4

In Xenophon's *Ephesian Tale* the male hero Habrocomes is at 3.9 once again in quest of his beloved Anthia. He has allied himself with the brigand Hippothous and eventually arrives with him and his band of robbers somewhere near the shore of Cilicia. After a fruitless excursion Habrocomes returns tired. Meanwhile Hippothous' men have prepared dinner. Habrocomes, however, is too depressed to join them and decides to rest. The following passage about the robbers' *δελίπνων* contains a vexed textual problem. The manuscript reads at 3.9.4: *Προσιούσι δὲ τοῦ τόπου ὁ κύριος τοῖς περὶ τὸν Ἰππόθουον παρούσα καὶ τις πρεσβύτης ἄρχεται διηγῆματος, ἣ ὄνομα Χρυσίον*. The first part of this sentence is manifestly corrupt. All editors made emendations in one way or another. I shall consider here only the three major ones:

1. Hercher wrote in his Teubneriana of *Erotici Scriptores Graeci* (1858–9): *Προϊόντος δὲ τοῦ πότου εὐκαίρως τοῖς περὶ τὸν Ἰππόθουον παρούσα [καὶ] τις πρεσβύτης ἄρχεται διηγῆματος, ἣ ὄνομα Χρυσίον*. It may seem slightly inconsistent to speak of a 'continuation of drinking' even though drinking was not mentioned before. However, taking pleasure in a symposium after dinner is the normal course of events in a Greek banquet, and there is a close parallel for skipping the transition from eating to drinking in the description of Ach. Tat. 2.3.1–3 (*δελίπνων . . . Τοῦ δὲ πότου προϊόντος*).<sup>1</sup>

2. In the Budé-edition of 1926 Dalmeyda proposed: *Προϊούσι δὲ τοῦ πότου [ὁ κύριος] τοῖς περὶ τὸν Ἰππόθουον παρούσα [καὶ] τις πρεσβύτης ἄρχεται διηγῆματος, ἣ ὄνομα Χρυσίον*. For the unparalleled *πρόεμι πότου* compare the genitive in 4.3.5: *προήεσαν τῆς ὁδοῦ*.

3. Papanikolaou rejects in his Teubneriana of 1973 the former suggestions for two reasons:<sup>2</sup> first, he doubts the possibility of a longer symposium in absence of the protagonist Habrocomes; second, he disapproves of the fact that earlier editors neglected the manuscript tradition to such an extent. His own reading is indeed very close to the manuscript: *Πρόσεισι δὲ τοῦ τόπου ὁ κύριος τοῖς περὶ τὸν Ἰππόθουον παρούσα δέ τις πρεσβύτης ἄρχεται διηγῆματος, ἣ ὄνομα Χρυσίον*. That, however, makes no good sense. A host (*κύριος*), with whom the men stay, is neither mentioned before nor does he appear afterwards. His entrance adds nothing to the story and

<sup>1</sup> Cf. P. Schmitt-Pantel, *La cité au banquet: histoire des repas publics dans les cités grecques* (Rome, 1992), 4. The transition is indicated e.g. in Heliod. 5.15.3: *ἐπεὶ δὲ εὐφροσύνης τῆς ἐκ τῶν ἐδεσμάτων εἰς κόρον ἦσαν καὶ τοῖς κρατήρων αἱ τράπεζαι παρεχώρων . . .*

<sup>2</sup> Cf. A. D. Papanikolaou, *Κριτικά παρατηρήσεις εἰς Ξενοφῶντα τὸν Ἐφέσιον*, *EEAth* 20 (1969–70), 360.

would be completely unmotivated. Papanikolaou blames this on the assumed epitomator, which is not very persuasive. There is no parallel in which the epitomator—provided that there was one—would have operated in such a crude manner. The second objection is not valid either: in fact Habrocomes does not disappear for long; he hears what is going on and reacts, albeit with some delay (3.9.7). The narrator did not forget him. Besides, the drunkenness of Hippothous' men at 3.10.4 proves that they did have their wine (ἐκείντο δὲ ὑπὸ μέθης οἱ περὶ τὸν Ἰππόθουον).

Papanikolaou's emendation was praised by G. Nachtergaele without any supporting arguments. T. Hägg, however, subjected it to harsh criticism.<sup>3</sup> On the whole, Hägg's opinion was shared by J. N. O'Sullivan, the editor of a forthcoming new Teubner text, who rejected in 1986 Papanikolaou's solution and defended the earlier conjecture of Dalmeida.<sup>4</sup> But Papanikolaou was probably right about Hercher's and Dalmeida's neglect of the manuscript text. Therefore I should like to make a suggestion which remains close to the manuscript, but avoids the argued difficulties: Πρόσεισι δὲ τοῦ πότου ὁ καιρός τοῖς περὶ τὸν Ἰππόθουον παρούσα καὶ τις πρεσβύτης ἄρχεται διηγῆματος, ἧ ὄνομα Χρυσίων. I think the word κύριος was in any case a tempting reading for a Byzantine scribe. An alternative or supplementary explication for the erroneous replacement of καιρός by κύριος could be the fact that these words were sometimes collocated in puns.<sup>5</sup> The restitution of καιρός is much less radical than eliminating the word completely (Dalmeida) or marginalizing it as an adverb (Hägg). For πότου καιρός compare the first century A.D. fragmentary novel *Metiochus and Parthenope*: . . . τέκνον, πότου καιρός . . . (col. 1.27, ed. Stephens/Winkler), or Garnaud's reading of Ach. Tat. 2.9.1 in his Budé-text (according to *POxy.* 1250, third century A.D.): Ἐπειδὴ δὲ τοῦ πότου καιρός ἦν.<sup>6</sup> As the context of the cited passages shows, the expression πότου καιρός is normally used to indicate the beginning of a symposium with the various entertainment connected to it. This accords well with Xenophon's description: after dining, the robbers are about to start their symposium and listen to Chryson's story for their amusement (a narrative variation of the theme of symposiastic poetry and philosophy). As far as I can see, there is no *verbatim* parallel to πρόσεισι . . . καιρός, but compare Lib. *Or.* 16.37 (οὐπω προσιόντος τοῦ καιροῦ), and Euseb. *Contra Marcellum* 2.4.4 (ἄχρι οὗ ἂν ὁ προσιὼν τῆς κρίσεως

<sup>3</sup> Cf. Nachtergaele in *Scriptorium* 30 (1976), 136; Hägg's considerations in *Gnomon* 49 (1977), 461 are worth citing: 'Ps Versuch, diese korrupte Passage herzustellen, ist denen seiner Vorgänger weit unterlegen. πότου statt τόπου ist evident (vgl. Ach. Tat. II 3,3 τοῦ δὲ πότου προϊόντος ἧδη bzw. V 23,2 für die banale Verwechslung πότου/τόπου), die Einwände Ps. fallen u.a. durch 43,12 ὑπὸ μέθης weg. Das unmögliche ὁ κύριος durch einen Hinweis auf die vermeintliche Epitomierung zu verteidigen, ist ein billiger Ausweg (vermutlich steckt hinter ὁ κύριος [oder OKΣ?] ein Adverb, wie ἧδη bei Ach. Tat.). Die neue Interpunktion ... ist deshalb abzulehnen und καὶ "auch" beizubehalten.'

<sup>4</sup> J. N. O'Sullivan, 'Notes on Xenophon of Ephesus Books III and IV', *RhM* 129 (1986), 83. O'Sullivan's new Teubneriana had not yet appeared when this note was written.

<sup>5</sup> Aristid., *The Opposite Argument*, 380 Jebb: ἀλλ' ἰδόντες οἱ πρόσεισι τὰ πράγματα, ἔως ἔτι καιρός καὶ κύριοι τῆς βουλῆς καθέστατε. *Leucetrians* 4, p. 458 Jebb: ἐν γὰρ τοῖς πολέμοις οὐχ ὁ τρόπος κύριος, ἀλλ' ὅσ' ἂν ἡ τύχη δῶ καὶ ὁ καιρός, ταῦθ' ἕκαστοι μεταλαμβάνουσιν. Perhaps also Dem. *Pro Phormione* 59: . . . ἀλλὰ νῦν ὅτε κύριοι καθέστατε σώσαι· οὐ γὰρ ἔγωγ' ὁρῶ καιρὸν ἐν τίνι ἂν μάλλον βοηθήσειέ τις αὐτῶ.

<sup>6</sup> In addition to that, cf. the twelfth-century novel *Hysmine et Hysminias* by Eustathius Macrembolites: πότου γὰρ ἐκάλεε καιρός (3.5; cf. 5.10f.), and some passages from outside the novel, e.g. Philostr. *V S* 2.585f. Olearius: παραδεδωκότος δὲ αὐτοῦ τοῖς γνωρίμοις τὸ μηδὲ τὸν τοῦ πότου καιρὸν ἀνίεναί. Origen, *Selecta in Psalmos*, MPG 12.1557: ῥήτὸν πρὸς τοὺς παρὰ τὸν καιρὸν τοῦ πότου αὐλοῖς καὶ ψῆδαῖς τερπομένους.

ἀναφανῆ καιρός). One could think of *πρόεισι . . . καιρός*, given that there are some instances of the genitive absolute *καιροῦ προϊόντος*,<sup>7</sup> whereas *καιροῦ προσιόντος* appears only in the example of Libanius quoted above. Still, the idea of progression normally connected with *προέρχομαι / πρόειμι* seems in this case inferior to the idea of addition expressed by *προσέρχομαι / πρόσειμι*. Thus the symposium is marked as a distinctive part of the robbers' banquet, setting the scene for the narration of Chrysiion. There remains the *καί* deleted by the earlier editors and replaced by Papanikolaou. I retain it—like Hägg—as an adverb (*too*). This would imply an asyndetic construction, which is not very surprising in Xenophon (cf. for example 3.11.5).

University of Bern

STEFAN TILG

stefan.tilg@kps.unibe.ch

doi:10.1017/S0009838806000759

<sup>7</sup> A look at *TLG* shows, however, that most of them date from very late or Byzantine authors. The only example before the fourth century A.D. is Origen, *Fragmenta in Evangelium Joannis* 128. There is a single occurrence of *πρόεισι καιρός* (Procl. *In Platonis Alcibiadem* 1, 124: ἀνωθεν γὰρ ὁ καιρός ἀπὸ τῶν θεῶν ἀρχόμενος πρόεισιν ἄχρι τῶν ἐσχάτων), which I find too specialized to be convincing.

## A GREEK MISCELLANIST AS A LIBIDINOUS THESSALIAN WITCH? PAMPHILE IN APULEIUS' *METAMORPHOSES* 2–3\*

Among the significant 'speaking' names in Apuleius' *Metamorphoses* is that of Pamphile, Lucius' hostess who possesses not only an enormous taste for young lovers, but also a considerable knowledge of witchcraft. It is her transformation into a bird in Book 3 of the novel that leads to Lucius' disastrous decision to try out the magic arts himself, with the well-known consequence of his metamorphosis into an ass.

The name Pamphile—the all-lover—certainly wholly accords with the character's behaviour and could therefore be explained as one of the many speaking names within the course of the novel.<sup>1</sup> Lucius is warned explicitly by Byrrhaena, an old family friend, of Pamphile's infamous sexual appetite: *nam simul quemque conspexerit speciosae formae iuuenem, uenustate eius sumitur et ilico in eum et oculum et animum detorquet* (Apul. *Met.* 2.5).

Clearly this explanation for the name Pamphile works perfectly on the level of the narration itself. But one may wonder if Apuleius has chosen the name also for another, that is literary reason. We know that throughout the novel he either mentions

\* I am especially grateful to Katerina Oikonomopoulou (Oxford) with whom I discussed the idea of this paper and who gave me a number of helpful comments and to Stephen Harrison (Oxford) who read a draft version of this paper.

<sup>1</sup> See B. Hijmans, Jr, 'Significant names and their function in Apuleius' *Metamorphoses*', in B. L. Hijmans, Jr and R. Th. van der Paardt (edd.), *Aspects of Apuleius' Golden Ass* (Groningen, 1978), 107–22, esp. 109–10. W. Keulen, 'Significant names in Apuleius: a "good contriver" and his rival in the cheese trade (*Met.* 1, 5)', *Mnemos.* 53 (2000), 310–21.