

MONIQUE E. VAN ROSSUM-STEENBEEK

RASH CONCLUSIONS ON FOUR XENOPHON PAPYRI

aus: Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik 97 (1993) 57–66

© Dr. Rudolf Habelt GmbH, Bonn



## RASH CONCLUSIONS ON FOUR XENOPHON PAPYRI\*

During my research into some Xenophon papyri, it appeared that various scholars have represented the differences between papyri and medieval manuscripts<sup>1</sup> as more spectacular than they in fact are. On the one hand, *P.Heid.* 206 containing part of the *Memorabilia* was considered better than the MSS. It does indeed differ substantially, but the question whether it really is better will be answered in the first part of this paper.

On the other hand, three *Symposium*-papyri, *P.Giss.* 175, *P.Lit.Lond.* 152 (both of the same roll), and *P.Ant.* I 26, also gave rise to conclusions which must be examined critically, as I will do briefly in the second part of this article.

### 1. *P.Heid.* 206

Though much can be said about this pap.<sup>2</sup> assigned to ca. 280 B.C., with *Mem.* 1, 3, 7-13, I will confine myself to a detailed discussion of three interesting passages which led Ernst Siegmann, its first editor, to remarkable conclusions.

#### 1a. *Mem.* 1, 3, 8

The first passage stems from *Mem.* 1, 3, 8, where a new subject (Socrates' attitude towards ἀφροδίτια) begins. In the MSS. the relevant sentence runs as follows:

" Ἀφροδιτίων δὲ παρήνει τῶν καλῶν ἰχυρῶς ἀπέχεσθαι (ἀπέχεσθαι ἰχυρῶς MORYZ). He advised resolutely avoiding sensual passion for the fair."<sup>3</sup>

The pap. has: ... πα]ρηνει ἰχυ[ρως ... απεχε]θαι. Only these words can be supplemented with a considerable degree of certainty.

Although the MSS. differ as regards the order of ἰχυρῶς and ἀπέχεσθαι, it is certain that ἰχυρῶς belongs to ἀπέχεσθαι. In the pap. text, on the other hand, ἰχυρῶς appears to belong to παρήνει: it directly follows παρήνει and it is separated from ἀπέχεσθαι by one or two words. This difference evokes the question whether one of the two readings is to be preferred. To find the answer some data must be put on paper.

There is no precise parallel for either ἰχυρῶς παρήνει or ἰχυρῶς ἀπέχεσθαι. ἀπέχομαι takes an adverb three times: *An.* 3, 1, 22: ἡμεῖς δὲ πολλὰ ὀρῶντες ἀγαθὰ

\* I thank Prof. Dr. M. A. Harder for her constructive criticism and suggestions, and Mrs. S. van Gelder for correcting my English.

<sup>1</sup> Manuscripts are abbreviated as MSS., papyrus as pap. (though *P.Ant.* I 26 stems from a parchment roll, it is also called pap.), names of classical authors and their works as usual in H.G.Liddell/R.Scott/H.S.Jones, *A Greek-English Lexicon* and titles of periodicals as usual in *L'Année Philologique*.

<sup>2</sup> Pack<sup>2</sup> 1557; Ed. princeps by E.Siegmann in *Literarische griechische Texte der Heidelberger Papyrussammlung*, Heidelberg 1956, 68-83 (no. 206). See also R.Merkelbach, *Ein Ptolemaeischer Xenophon-Papyrus in Studien zur Textgeschichte und Textkritik (...)*, Köln/Opladen 1959, 157-162.

<sup>3</sup> See for ἀφροδίτια plus genitive *Mem.* 2, 6, 22: ... δύνανται ... καὶ τοῖς τῶν ὀραίων ἀφροδιτίοις ἠδόμενοι καρτερεῖν...

στερρῶς αὐτῶν ἀπειχόμεθα .... *Cyr.* 1, 5, 7: ... παντελῶς τούτων ἀπεχομένους and *Eq.Mag.* 9, 5: ...τῶν σφόδρα ἀπεχομένων μὴ ἰπεύειν. παραινέω is once accompanied by πολλά, which can be regarded either as an adverb or as a cognate accusative: *HG* 2, 1, 5 ... προσίων δὲ ἐν μέρει παρ' ἐκάστην ναῦν παρεθάρρυνέ τε καὶ παρήνει πολλά, ... The adverb ἰχυρῶς does not offer any help either; it occurs in the *Mem.* twice more: 3, 13, 4: Κολάσαντος δέ τινος ἰχυρῶς ἀκόλουθον, ... and in 4, 7, 5: ...ἰχυρῶς ἀπέτρεπεν.. Elsewhere in Xenophon ἰχυρῶς occurs chiefly with *verba curandi timendi*, and *affectuum*, but also with various other verbs among which once ἐπαινέω (*HG* 7, 1, 12), ἀπαγγέλλω (*Cyr.* 4, 5, 12), and ἀπειλέω (*Cyr.* 6, 3, 27), which are nearer to παραινέω than most verbs.

These passages, with, on the one hand, στερρῶς / σφόδρα / παντελῶς ἀπέχομαι and, on the other hand, ἰχυρῶς ἀποτρέπω / ἀπαγγέλλω / ἀπειλέω, do not answer the question as to which of the two verbs ἰχυρῶς belongs. Because Siegmann was not satisfied with this result, he supplemented the pap. text and subsequently drew conclusions on the basis of this hypothetical text; his supplement is: ἀφροδιείων δὲ πα]ρήνει ἰχυ[ρῶς τῶν καλῶν ἀπέχε]θαι.

In view of the distance between ἀφροδιείων and τῶν καλῶν, which is larger in the pap. text as supplemented by Siegmann, and therefore less usual than in the text of the MSS., he writes that one must conclude that the pap. text has priority. Though his further argumentation - the MSS. text would be caused by the erroneous omission of ἰχυρῶς, which then was inserted again in a different position by a corrector who thought ἰχυρῶς belonged to ἀπέχεθαι - is very plausible, also considering the fluctuation of the position of ἰχυρῶς in the MSS., it remains hypothetical, just like the supplement to the pap. text. There may have been written ἀφροδιεία δὲ παρήνει ἰχυρῶς τῶν καλῶν ἀπέχεθαι or πολλάκις δὲ παρήνει ἰχυρῶς ἀφροδιείων ἀπέχεθαι: two (of - in view of the space and irregular hand - many) possibilities, mentioned by Siegmann himself.

Finally, τῶν καλῶν could be a gloss. In that case, the text<sup>4</sup> would run as follows: Ἀφροδιείων δὲ παρήνει ἰχυρῶς ἀπέχεθαι· (ἀπέχεθαι ἰχυρῶς MORYZ). Although it cannot be deduced from this whether ἰχυρῶς belongs to παρήνει or to ἀπέχεθαι or to both, the theory of τῶν καλῶν being a gloss is quite interesting.

Siegmann considers the theory as unlikely "weil sich dann die Stellung von ἰχυρῶς in MORYZ nicht erklären lässt, und weil ausserdem gerade der Begriff ὁ καλός im Mittelpunkt der folgenden Erörterung steht." Merkelbach, on the contrary, thinks τῶν καλῶν is a gloss which crept into the text in different positions, but he does not take the objections of his predecessor into consideration.

<sup>4</sup> In view of the uncertain pap. text we cannot ascertain whether τῶν καλῶν was present in the pap. or not. Cf. the second of the other possible supplements just mentioned.

Against Siegmann's first objection - the place of ἰχυρῶς in MORYZ is not explicable - the following can be said: if the original text had been written without τῶν καλῶν, ἰχυρῶς either could have been omitted erroneously and then inserted again in different positions, or it could have been placed behind ἀπέχεσθαι by a scribe who was aiming at an unambiguous text.

Siegmann's second argument ("und weil ... steht") can also be refuted; the third chapter of book one deals with Socrates' attitude towards three different subjects: 1. θεοί (§1-4) 2. cίτος - πότος (§5-7) and 3. ἀφροδίτια (§8-14). This last subject is announced at the beginning of §8 - Ἀφροδιτίων δὲ ...-, then elucidated through an anecdote (§8-13), and in §14 summarized - οὕτω δὴ καὶ ἀφροδιτιάξειν ... §15 concludes this chapter with a recapitulation of §§5-14: περὶ μὲν δὴ βρώσεως καὶ πόσεως καὶ ἀφροδιτίων οὕτω κατεσκευασμένος ἦν ... From this we can conclude that ἀφροδιτίων is the essential word in our sentence and not τῶν καλῶν, which therefore could be a gloss.

A different objection to the gloss theory may be the position of τῶν καλῶν. Why are these words not put immediately after ἀφροδιτίων δὲ, which seems more logical? However, this objection applies only to the MSS. text because the exact position of ἀφροδιτίων (if present) in the pap. is not known.

However, in view of the question whether τῶν καλῶν might be a gloss or not, the text following ἀφροδιτίων δὲ παρήνει (τῶν καλῶν) ἰχυρῶς ἀπέχεσθαι must also be examined. The MSS. have: οὐ γὰρ ἔφη ράιδιον εἶναι τῶν τοιούτων ἀπτόμενον κωφρονεῖν, and the pap. οὐ γὰρ οἶ[όν τε ἔφη εἶναι τὸν κα]λῶν ἀπτό[μενον ... (supplemented by Siegmann).

The pap. text is comprehensible without τῶν καλῶν in the first sentence because of the other καλῶν. The MSS. text is, however, ambiguous because of τοιούτων, which in my opinion refers, with or without a preceding τῶν καλῶν, to ἀφροδιτίων<sup>5</sup> just as ... τῶν τοιούτων ἄπτεσθαι ... in 1, 3, 7 relates to the touching of food and drink (cf. the discussion of Siegmann's second argument on p. 3). From this it follows that τῶν καλῶν can also be left out in the MSS. text without obscuring its meaning. Besides, the ambiguous τοιούτων is to be preferred as lectio difficilior to the pap. text καλῶν because this might have been an explanatory gloss<sup>6</sup> which later crept into the text instead of τοιούτων.

The arguments in support of the gloss theory are in my opinion quite convincing, but it cannot be proved with certainty. Only one thing is irrefutable: with so many uncertain factors (of which the pap. text is the most important), one may not "auf die Priorität des Papyrustextes schliessen" as Siegmann does.

<sup>5</sup> In view of this interpretation one might object that ἀπτόμενον is never used in combination with the abstract ἀφροδιτίων. But against this it can be said that ἀπτόμενον refers only indirectly, via the ambiguous τῶν τοιούτων, to ἀφροδιτίων, and the words τῶν τοιούτων ἀπτόμενον re-echo τῶν τοιούτων ἄπτεσθαι in §7.

<sup>6</sup> Cf. καλὸν in the next sentence, in §11, and 13, where καλοῦς is also found.

**1b. Mem. 1, 3, 8-9**

The second passage contains the transition of *Mem.* 1, 3, 8 to 9, just where a new anecdote about Socrates is introduced. The MSS. text is as follows:

"ἀλλὰ καὶ Κριτόβουλόν ποτε τὸν Κρίτωνος πυθόμενος ὅτι ἐφίλησε τὸν Ἀλκιβιάδου υἱὸν καλὸν ὄντα, παρόντος τοῦ Κριτοβούλου ἤρετο Ξενοφῶντα· Εἰπέ μοι, ἔφη, ὦ Ξενοφῶν, οὐ μὲν Κριτόβουλον ἐνόμιζες εἶναι τῶν σωφρονικῶν ἀνθρώπων μᾶλλον ἢ ...

So, when he had heard that Critobulus, son of Crito, had kissed the fair son of Alcibiades, he asked Xenophon the following question in the presence of Critobulus: "Tell me, Xenophon, didn't you believe that Critobulus was a self-controlled person rather than ..." "The first part up to ὄντα inclusive is also in the pap., after this only the following has been preserved:

[ ±17 ἐ]νόμιζες [ε]ἶ-  
[ναὶ ± 14 τ]ῶν <σ>ωφρο-

Apart from these supplements nothing is certain.

Siegmann is right in saying that there is no space in the pap. for the MSS. text. However, his further arguments (p. 76) in support of the far shorter pap. text must be looked at very critically:

"(...) dann zeigt sich, dass dieselben Begriffe, die sich im Papyrus nicht unterbringen lassen, auch im Text der Handschriften entbehrlich sind: 1. ἔφη, ὦ Ξενοφῶν neben ἤρετο Ξενοφῶντα (oder umgekehrt), 2. εἰπέ μοι eo ipso, und 3. auch παρόντος τοῦ Κριτοβούλου, ein Gedanke, den man aus dem Schlusssatz des ganzen Gesprächs am Ende von §13 κοὶ δὲ ὦ Κριτόβουλε ganz selbstverständlich suppliert, und der in dem eigentlichen Gespräch zwischen Xenophon und Sokrates nicht nur nicht entbehrte wurde, sondern vielmehr in auffälliger Weise überhaupt nicht eigentlich in das Gespräch hineinwirkt."

Nine *Mem.* passages, in which Socrates enters into a conversation, prove that the text of the MSS. is stylistically correct, and that the three elements mentioned are not out of place:

2., 5, 1: ἰδὼν γάρ τινα τῶν συνόντων ἀμελοῦντα φίλου πενίαι πιεζομένου, ἤρετο Ἀντιθένη ἐναντίον τοῦ ἀμελοῦντος αὐτοῦ καὶ ἄλλων πολλῶν· Ἄρ' (εἰπέ μοι Y), ἔφη, ὦ Ἀντίθενε, ...

3, 4, 1: Ἰδὼν ... Νικομαχίδην ... ἤρετο· Τίνες, ὦ Ν. ...

3, 7, 1: Χαρμίδην ... ὀρῶν ..., Εἰπέ μοι, ἔφη, ὦ Χαρ., ...

and further 1, 4; 2; 2, 1.3; 1; 4, 2, 8. 3, 2-3. 5, 2.

Seven out of the nine passages show the combination - εἰπέ μοι, ἔφη, ὦ - which points to the fact that Siegmann's second "superfluous" element "εἰπέ μοι eo ipso" occurs more often than not. As for Siegmann's first element, we can conclude the following: before Socrates addresses his conversation partner in the vocative (8 times the vocative of a name, once with παῖ, 2, 2, 1), the name of that person has already been mentioned in all parallels. Moreover,

2, 5, 1 with ἤρετο Ἀντιθένη ... ἔφη, ὃ Ἀντίθενεε, proves that ὃ Ξενοφῶν and ἤρετο Ξεν. can very well stand side by side. 2, 5, 1 also shows that Siegmann's third "entbehrlicher Begriff", ἀρόντος τοῦ Κριτοβούλου, cannot be dismissed only because it is dispensable. Xenophon often gives such information: here, for example, Socrates is speaking to Antisthenes in the presence of many, including a pupil who neglects his friend. This pupil plays no part any more in the following conversation, and the information about his presence - ἐναντίον τοῦ ἀμελοῦντος αὐτοῦ - could very well have been omitted because the reason for Socrates' conversation has already been given by ἰδὼν γὰρ τινα τῶν συνόντων ἀμελοῦντα φίλου in the same sentence.

Consequently, the text of the MSS. appears to be stylistically correct, contrary to what Siegmann made us believe.<sup>7</sup> Also concerning the MSS. text ἐνόμιζεε εἶναι τῶν σοφρονικῶν, he states that the pap. text, which according to him must have had τὸν Κριτόβουλον between εἶναι and τῶν, is to be preferred because it is "stilistisch ohne jeden Anstoss". This statement is quite subjective: in view of his own supplement of the pap. text, there can hardly have stood anything other than τὸν Κριτόβουλον. But if we examine the grammatical structure of the reconstructed sentence - οὐδὲ ἐνόμιζεε εἶ[ναι τὸν Κριτόβουλον τ]ῶν <σ>οφρο-... - it appears to deviate from the normal structure on one point: all the other interrogative sentences within the *Mem.* which contain a form of νομίζω in the second person and εἶναι,<sup>8</sup> demonstrate that the object or the adjective/interrogative belonging to the object are always found before εἶναι. Comparable interrogative sentences containing κύ and a verb of saying/thinking and εἶναι show the same picture.<sup>9</sup> Contrary to Siegmann's supplement, in which the object follows εἶναι, the text of the MSS. - οὐδὲ Κριτόβουλον ἐνόμιζεε εἶναι τῶν σοφρονικῶν ... - is correct.

Merkelbach, who did not agree with Siegmann, is rightly more guarded in his opinion on the MSS. text:

"Dieser Text ist untadelig, und es scheint mir unmöglich, den Pap. so zu ergänzen, dass ein vernünftiger Sinn dabei herauskommt. (...) Wahrscheinlich liegt eine mechanische Verderbnis vor, ein 'Sprung vom Gleichen zum Gleichen' (ὄντα - Ξενοφῶντα oder Κριτοβούλου - Κριτόβουλον)."

However, such a "Sprung" alone cannot account for the text as transmitted to us. In both cases the error results in a line with too many characters: in the first case, εἰπέ μοι, ἔφη, ὃ Ξενοφῶν, οὐδὲ Κριτόβουλον ἐνόμιζεε εἶ-, and in the second, παρόντος τοῦ Κριτοβούλου ἐνόμιζεε εἶ-, with 43 and 32 characters respectively, while elsewhere 27 is

<sup>7</sup> He writes on p. 75: "Erstens ist der Text der Handschriften (...) stilistisch durchaus nicht ohne Anstoss (...)":

<sup>8</sup> *Mem.* 3, 7, 1: εἴ τις ..., ποιόν τινα τοῦτον νομίζοις ἂν τὸν ἄνδρα εἶναι; 4, 6, 10: Ἀνδρείαν δέ, ὃ Εὐθύδημε, ἄρα τῶν καλῶν νομίζεις εἶναι; and further 2, 2, 9; 3, 5, 2. 12, 3; 4, 2, 37. 4, 9, 5, 2. 3(2x). 5. 6, 2.10(1x).

<sup>9</sup> *Mem.* 4, 6, 14: Φῆς δὲ ἀμείνω πολίτην εἶναι ὃν δὲ ἐπαινεῖς ἢ ὃν ἐγώ; and further 2, 2, 10; 3, 8, 5.6.

the maximum number. Therefore, only together with more changes in the text could *the saut du même au meme* have caused the different pap. text.

Apart from this, Merkelbach supplements the last line with -ναι των ἀνθρώπων των <ς>ωφορο-. Though I cannot provide an alternative which is not subject to criticism, his supplement is not very probable because everywhere in the *Mem.* where (τῶν) ἀνθρώπων plus adjective occurs,<sup>10</sup> the word order is (τῶν) plus adjective plus ἀνθρώπων.

In conclusion, I would like to say two things. Firstly, we can ascertain that the MSS. probably have the right text, unlike the pap., which is incomplete due to mechanical loss and a subsequent change of the text. Secondly, it is obvious that Siegmann was guided too much by his desire to consider the pap. text better than it actually is: on subjective grounds he disapproves of the MSS. text (p. 75-76), and he uses the pap. text supplemented by himself (!) as an established fact for his further argumentation (p. 76-77), which finally leads him to a conclusion (p. 77) as incorrect as his way of working: "Damit ist so gut wie sicher erwiesen, dass der Papyrus in Z. 23/4 den ursprünglichen Wortlaut erhalten hat."

### 1c. Mem. 1, 3, 13

The third passage consists of the beginning of *Mem.* 1, 3, 13. For the sake of clarity I will first give a survey of the context. Because Xenophon (§12) is amazed at the strength of a kiss, Socrates asks him if he does not know that the scorpions can do considerable harm, even though they are very small and touch their victims only with their mouth. Of course, Xenophon knows this:

ἐνίημι γάρ τι τὰ φαλάγγια κατὰ τὸ δῆγμα. "For the scorpions inject something by their bite." To which Socrates replies (§13): ὦ μῶρε, ἔφη ὁ Σωκράτης, τοὺς δὲ καλοὺς οὐκ οἶει φιλοῦντας ἐνιέναι τι, ὅτι μὴ οὐχ ὄραϊς; οὐκ οἶσθ' ὅτι τοῦτο τὸ θηρίον, ὃ καλοῦσι καλὸν καὶ ὠραῖον, τοσοῦτοι δεινότερόν ἐστι τῶν φαλαγγίων, ὅσῳ ἐκεῖνα μὲν ἀσάμενα, τοῦτο δὲ οὐδ' ἀπτόμενον, ἐάν τις αὐτὸ θεᾶται, ἐνιήμι τι καὶ πάνυ πρόσωθεν τοιοῦτον ὥστε μαίνεσθαι ποιεῖν; "And do you think, you foolish fellow, that the fair inject nothing when they kiss, just because you don't see it? Don't you know that this creature called 'fair and young' is more dangerous than the scorpion, seeing that it need not even come in contact, like the insect, but at any distance can inject a maddening poison into anyone who only looks at it?"<sup>11</sup>

Now that the context is given, we can look at the sentence ὦ μῶρε, ἔφη ὁ Σωκράτης, τοὺς δὲ καλοὺς οὐκ οἶει φιλοῦντας ἐνιέναι τι, ὅτι μὴ οὐχ ὄραϊς; The pap. only differs from this in the position of φιλοῦντας; it immediately follows καλοῦς, provided that Siegmann's supplement, φιλ[οῦντας οὐκ οἶει] ἐνιέναι, which in itself fits well and follows the MSS. text closely, is correct.

<sup>10</sup> Mem. 1, 2, 20. 24. 25. 64; 2, 3, 1 (with τοιοῦτων instead of the adjective). 6, 17; 4, 8, 2. 10.

<sup>11</sup> This last translation is by E.C.Marchant, Xenophon. Memorabilia and Oeconomicus, London 1965.



At first sight, both readings seem to provide a correct text so that there is no preference for one or the other. In contrast to Merkelbach, leaving it at "Wieder eine belanglose Variante der Wortstellung", Siegmann was not content with such a statement and tried to explain the origin of this variant. Since φιλεῖν (in der Bedeutung 'lieben'<sup>12</sup>) in §8, 10, and 11 is used of "Liebenden" - "Wie überhaupt erst durch den Vergleich in §12 die Aktivität innerhalb des geschilderten Verhältnisses vom Liebenden zum Geliebten hinüberwechselt." - he thinks the pap. text could easily have been misinterpreted as follows: "dass aber diejenigen, die schöne Knaben lieben, [diesen] ein Gift einträufeln, glaubst du nicht?" Thereupon, he argues that only the pap. text leads to this misinterpretation, and for that reason it must preserve the original word order, which must have been simplified in the MSS. (by separating φιλοῦντας from τοὺς δὲ καλοὺς) in order to get an unambiguous text.

In my opinion, this explanation and especially the potential misinterpretation ("dass aber ... nicht?") is far-fetched. Precisely the comparison in §12, where "die Aktivität (...) vom Liebenden zum Geliebten hinüberwechselt", makes it clear that τοὺς δὲ καλοὺς is subject, specified by φιλοῦντας, and not object. Moreover, Siegmann's translation "... diesen ein Gift einträufeln ..." requires αὐτοῖς or the like in the text, for instance: ... τοὺς δὲ καλοὺς φιλοῦντας οὐκ οἶει αὐτοῖς ἐνιέναι τι ...

So, if Siegmann's explanation is not acceptable, what explanation is? In my opinion φιλοῦντας is a gloss (perhaps the thoughts of the scribe were still at §11: ... καὶ τί ἂν οἶει παθεῖν καλὸν φιλήσας;) which has been incorporated into the text in two different positions. Without φιλοῦντας the (grammatically correct) sentence runs just as smoothly as with it: ὦ μῶρε, ἔφη ὁ Ἐωκράτης, τοὺς δὲ καλοὺς οὐκ οἶει ἐνιέναι τι, ὅτι οὐχ ὀρθῶς;

Now we have to examine whether the contents without φιλοῦντας are correct. When we look back at the survey given on p. 62, the significant point obviously is that ὁ καλός deprives man of his common sense without even the lightest touch: ἐνίησι γὰρ τι τὰ φαλάγγια κατὰ τὸ δῆγμα is opposed to οὐδ' ἄπτόμενον and ἐνίησί τι καὶ πάνυ πρόωθεν of the καλός.<sup>13</sup> To conclude, only if the relevant sentence does not comprise φιλοῦντας are its contents logical and faultless.

<sup>12</sup> Just as in his footnote 6, Siegmann remarks here that in §8, 10, and 11 φιλεῖν means "lieben", but that is debatable; in §8 πυθόμενος ὅτι ἐφίλησε τὸν Ἀλκιβιάδου υἱὸν ..., ἐφίλησε can mean at first sight both "kiss" and "love". In §10 ... ἐτόλμησε τὸν Ἀλκιβιάδου υἱὸν φιλεῖν ..., it is more probable that φιλεῖν stands for "kiss" than for "love" in view of ἐτόλμησε ("he dared ..."). Consequently, if φιλεῖν here means "kiss", then this applies also to ἐφίλησε §8, which refers to the same event as ἐτόλμησε ... φιλεῖν. In §11 ... καὶ τί ἂν οἶει παθεῖν καλὸν φιλήσας; φιλήσας can have both meanings, but in consideration of the context the meaning "kiss" is preferable here too.

<sup>13</sup> Also in Cyr. 5, 1, 16, where τὸ πῦρ and οἱ καλοὶ are compared, it appears that one not only catches fire by touching τοὺς καλοὺς, but also by just looking at them: ὅμως δ' ἔγωγε οὐτε πυρρὸς ἐκὼν εἶναι ἄπτομαι οὐτε τοὺς καλοὺς εἰσορῶ. (...) ὡς τὸ μὲν πῦρ τοὺς ἀπτομένους καίει, οἱ δὲ καλοὶ καὶ τοὺς ἄπρωθεν θεωμένους ὑφάπτουσιν, ὥστε αἰθεσθαι τῷ ἔρωτι.

Consequently, though it cannot be proved for certain, it seems as if the original reading has been corrupted both in the MSS. and the pap., so that we are not dealing with "wieder eine belanglose Variante der Wortstellung" as Merkelbach said, nor is it "wahrscheinlicher, dass der Papyrustext die ursprüngliche Wortstellung bewahrt hat" as Siegmann concluded.

## 2. The Symposium papyri

Siegmann was not the only scholar dealing with a Xenophon papyrus who worked quite subjectively. When we look at the *Symposium* papyri, it appears that three other scholars have drawn three strikingly similar conclusions with respect to the relationship between several *Smp.* papyri and the MSS. In order to demonstrate that their inferences are not based on convincing evidence, I will examine only the differences between one pap. and the MSS. There is no need for a comparable examination of all the variant readings to see that the other two conclusions are unfounded as well.

Before dealing with the conclusions, I will first give some information on the manuscript tradition of the *Smp.* Schenkl<sup>14</sup> classified the MSS. into two families (ABEH<sup>1</sup>H<sup>a</sup> and CDFH<sup>2</sup> with G in between), which Castiglioni<sup>15</sup> has rightly criticised. The latter also included in his classification the MSS. QRV, which were not collated or estimated at their true value before. He distinguishes four groups: 1. E and its derivations ABEH<sup>1</sup>H<sup>a</sup> 2. GV, stemming probably from a copy closely related to the one from which E stems 3. DF and 4. H<sup>2</sup>QR. A further specification is not possible, nor is it possible, as Ollier<sup>16</sup> writes, "de se prononcer avec une complète assurance sur la valeur de chacun de ces manuscrits (...)". It also has to be observed that we do not have any indication of the age of the archetype from which all these MSS. stem.

After this brief survey of the manuscript tradition, we can turn to the *Smp.* papyri. Axel Persson, who has discussed in his book<sup>17</sup> all Xenophon papyri known to him, examined also the relation between the MSS. and *P.Giss.* 175<sup>18</sup> containing *Smp.* 8, 15-18, a passage in which Socrates shows Callias that love of the personality is better than physical love.

First, Persson mentions (p. 50) the places where only the pap. has a good reading:

"(§16) ὡς μὲν γὰρ ἄγαταί τε καὶ φιλεῖ τὸν ἐρώμενον θάλλουσα μορφῆι τε ἐλευθερίαι καὶ ἦθει αἰδήμονί τε καὶ γενναίωι ψυχῇ εὐθὺς ἐν τοῖς ἡλιξιν ἡγεμονικῇ τε ἄμα καὶ φιλόφρων οὐσα οὐδὲν ἐπιδείται λόγου· That a soul which flourishes in a

<sup>14</sup> K.Schenkl, *Xenophontische Studien II*, Symposion, in *Sitzungsber. der phil.-hist. Klasse der Akad. der Wissensch.* 83, Wien 1876, 141ff. For more information on the MSS. see this work and those mentioned in notes 15, 16, and 17.

<sup>15</sup> L. Castiglioni, *Studi Senofontei II*, *Rendic. della Accad. dei Lincei, classe di scienze morali, etc.* V, 21, 1912, 507-524.

<sup>16</sup> F.Ollier, *Xenophon. Banquet - Apologie de Socrate*, Paris 1961, 35.

<sup>17</sup> A.W.Persson, *Zur Textgeschichte Xenophons in LUA N.F. AFD.* 1. Bd. 10, Nr. 2, Lund 1915.

<sup>18</sup> Pack<sup>2</sup> 1565; Ed. princeps by E.Kornemann in *Philologus* 67, 1908, 321-325, is with some small changes *Griechische Papyri im Museum des Oberhessischen Geschichtsvereins zu Giessen*, Bd. I. 1, Leipzig 1910.

frank form and with a modest and noble character, and which already among its comrades is at the same time authoritative and friendly, that such a soul admires and loves its beloved needs no argument."

In this sentence the MSS. had μορφῆ and γενναῖα/γενναία, two errors which are very small and also easy to account for. In §17

"πρὸς δὲ τούτοις πιττεύοι μήτ' ἂν παρανθήκηι μήτ' ἂν καμῶν ἀμορφότερος γένηται, μειωθῆναι ἂν τὴν φιλίαν; And, besides, when he can believe that the friendship will not lessen even if his youth withers away or if he becomes unsightly through a disease." the MSS. had instead of παρανθήκηι, παρά τι ποιήκηι, which has variously been emended until the pap. showed παρανοήκηι, which Persson considered a good reading.<sup>19</sup> He already admits himself with reference to his source Kornemann<sup>20</sup> that the difference between the text of the MSS. and the pap. can easily be explained: "ΠΑΡΑΝΟΗΧΗ<sup>21</sup> ist falsch ΠΑΡΑΠΟΗΧΗ gelesen, und dann ist entweder durch Dittographie des Π oder durch Einschlebung von τι die Lesart der Handschriften entstanden."

Persson then discusses the errors of the pap.: in the quoted sentence (§16) τε is missing after αἰδήμονί, and there is οὔσα instead of ἄμα after ἡγεμονική τε, which could have arisen from the οὔσα a few words further.

On the basis of these five small differences, and - what is fully incomprehensible - on the basis of a common error (iotacism) of pap. and most MSS. in the quoted sentence from §17 - πιττεύηι (πιττεύει G) instead of πιττεύοι AF - Persson draws a rather surprising conclusion:

"Deutlich scheint es mir, dass der Archetypus der Handschriften und der Papyrus verschiedene Gruppen vertreten - oder wahrscheinlicher, dass der Archetypus der Hss. in die Zeit nach dem Papyrus fällt."

Although this conclusion does not tally with the scanty variants nor with the fact that we cannot date the archetype, it is followed by Ollier.<sup>22</sup> With reference to Persson's conclusion, Ollier writes not only with regard to *P.Giss.* 175, but also to *P.Lit.Lond.* 152<sup>23</sup> (*Smp.* 8, 6-9), which was not known to Persson: "Les deux fragments sont des débris du même rouleau. (...) Il représentait un état de la tradition antérieur à l'archétype de nos manuscrits."

<sup>19</sup> Unlike Fr.Hornstein, WS 40, 1918, 102-106, who rightly remarked that παρανοήκηι too was not correct yet (παρανοήκηι affects the very thing which the ἐραστής likes, the soul of the ἐρώμενος), and made a conjecture: "Nicht ΠΑΡΑΝΟΗΧΗ stand in der Vorlage der Papyrus, sondern ΠΑΡΑΝΘΗΧΗ, was palaeographisch fast dasselbe ist." He refers to the metaphorical use of παρανθήκηι in Pollux, 2, 21, where a list of words relating to old age is given. See also Hornstein, Lexicalisches zu παρανθεῖν, WS 77, 1964, 178-180.

<sup>20</sup> Kornemann (n. 18 [1908]), 324.

<sup>21</sup> Since the original reading probably is ΠΑΡΑΝΘΗΧΗ (cf. note 18), ΠΑΡΑ ΤΙ ΠΟΙΗΧΗ need not have been derived from ΠΑΡΑΝΟΗΧΗ (pap.): both errors may have arisen independently from the same (carelessly written) source as well.

<sup>22</sup> Ollier, op.cit., 36.

<sup>23</sup> Pack<sup>2</sup> 1565; Ed. princeps by H.J.M.Milne, Aegyptus 4, 1923, 41 ff.

It is remarkable that Roberts<sup>24</sup> makes a similar statement (without referring to Persson) with respect to a different pap. of the *Smp.* (4, 51 - 5, 3), *P.Ant.* I, 26: "The text (= of the pap.) (...) antedates the formation of the families into which they (= MSS.) divide." This conclusion is, however, as unfounded as those of Persson and Ollier: even if the *Smp* papyri evince remarkable divergences from the MSS. text, we cannot conclude that they are older than the archetype, since the latter cannot be dated.

### **Conclusion**

I hope it is now obvious why I have chosen to begin this paper with the title "Rash Conclusions on Four Xenophon Papyri". This title does not seem too extravagant to me, looking back, on the one hand, to the three passages of *P.Heid.* 206, which demonstrate that Siegmann has jumped to conclusions. These passages cannot lead to a statement on the "Priorität des Papyrustextes". The only thing we can infer is that this pap. diverges rather substantially from the MSS., whereas this is usually not the case in the Xenophon papyri.

On the other hand, the strikingly identical conclusions which three scholars drew with regard to the *Symposium* papyri also appeared to be quite rash. We can say at the most that these papyri might represent a tradition different from that of the MSS., which, however, does not necessarily mean older.

Groningen

Monique E. van Rossum-Steenbeek

---

<sup>24</sup> C.H.Roberts, *The Antinoopolis Papyri*, London 1950, no. 26 (= ed. princeps, see also Pack<sup>2</sup> 1564).