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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 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. 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 ἀφροδίσια) begins. In the MSS. the relevant sentence runs as follows:

"Ἀφροδίσιαν δὲ παρῆνε τῶν καλῶν ἰχυρῶν ἀπέχεσθαι (ἀπέχεσθαι ἰχυρῶς MORYZ). He advised resolutely avoiding sensual passion for the fair."3

The pap. has: ... παρῄνει ἰχυρῶς ... ἀπέχεσθαι. 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 παρῄνει: it directly follows παρῄνει 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 παρῄνει or ἰχυρῶς ἀπέχεσθαι. ἀπέχομαι takes an adverb three times: An. 3, 1, 22: ἡμεῖς δὲ πολλὰ ὀρόντες ἂγαθά

---

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

1 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.


3 See for ἀφροδίσια plus genitive Mem. 2, 6, 22: ... δύνανται ... καὶ τοῖς τῶν ὀραίων ἀφροδίσιοι ἠδόμενοι καρπερείν...
sterroòs autoùn ápeixómeðha .... Cyr. 1, 5, 7: ... pantelødò toùtōn ápeixómeνους and Eq.Mag. 9, 5: ...tôn eφôðra ápeixómeνον μη ἰππεύειν. parainéw is once accompanied by polllà, which can be regarded either as an adverb or as a cognate accusative: HG 2, 1, 5 ... προπιον δὲ ἐν μέρει παρ᾽ ἐκάστην ναῦν παρεθάρρυντε τε καὶ παρήνει πολλὰ, ... The adverb íçyuròc does not offer any help either; it occurs in the Mem. twice more: 3, 13, 4: Κολάκαντος δὲ τίνος íçyuròs ἀκόλουθον, ... and in 4, 7, 5: ...íçyuròc ἀπέτρεπεν.. Elsewhere in Xenophon íçyuròc occurs chiefly with verba curandi timendi, and affectuum, but also with various other verbs among which once épaiνéw (HG 7, 1, 12), ἀπαγγέλλω (Cyr. 4, 5, 12), and ἀπειλέω (Cyr. 6, 3, 27), which are nearer to parainéw than most verbs.

These passages, with, on the one hand, eφôðra / eφôðra / pantelødò ἀπέχομαι and, on the other hand, íçyuròc ἀποτρέπω / ἀπαγγέλλω / ἀπειλέω, do not answer the question as to which of the two verbs íçyuròc 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: ἀφροδισίων δὲ παιρήνει íçyuròc τῶν καλῶν ἀπέχεσθαι.

In view of the distance between ἀφροδισίων 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 íçyuròc, which then was inserted again in a different position by a corretor who thought íçyuròc belonged to ἀπέχεσθαι - is very plausible, also considering the fluctuation of the position of íçyuròc in the MSS., it remains hypothetical, just like the supplement to the pap. text. There may have been written ἀφροδισίων δὲ παρηγνείν íçyuròc τῶν καλῶν ἀπέχεσθαι or πολλὰκις δὲ παρὴγνεὶν íçyuròc ἀφροδισίων ἀπέχεσθαι: 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 text4 would run as follows: ἀφροδισίων δὲ παρηγνείν íçyuròc ἀπέχεσθαι: (ἀπέχεσθαι íçyuròc MORYZ). Although it cannot be deduced from this whether íçyuròc belongs to παρηγνείν or to ἀπέχεσθαι 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 íçyuròc in MORYZ nicht erklären lässt, und weil ausserdem gerade der Begriff ὁ καλὸς 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.

---

4 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 ἰςχυρῶς in MORYZ is not explicable - the following can be said: if the original text had been written without τῶν καλῶν, ἰςχυρῶς either could have been omitted erroneously and then inserted again in different positions, or it could have been placed behind ἀπεχεθαί 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. ἐκτός - πότε (§5-7) and 3. ἀφροδίσια (§8-14). This last subject is announced at the beginning of §8 -Ἀφροδίσιαν δὲ ..., then elucidated through an anecdote (§8-13), and in §14 summarized - οὕτω δὴ καὶ ἀφροδισίαζέειν ... §15 concludes this chapter with a recapitulation of §§5-14: περὶ μὲν δὴ βρῶσεως καὶ πόσεως καὶ ἀφροδισίων οὕτω κατεκεκυσμένος ἦν ... From this we can conclude that ἀφροδισίαν 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 ἀφροδισίων δὲ, which seems more logical? However, this objection applies only to the MSS. text because the exact position of ἀφροδισίων (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 ἀφροδισίων δὲ παρῆνει (τῶν καλῶν) ἰςχυρῶς ἀπεχεθαί must also be examined. The MSS. have: οὐ γὰρ ἐπεὶ ῥάθιδον εἶναι τῶν τοιούτων ἀπτόμενον ομοφρονεῖν, and the pap. οὐ γὰρ οἴ[όν τε ἐφή εἶναι τὸν κα]λῶν ἀπτόμενον ... (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 ἀφροδισίων just as ... τῶν τοιούτων ἀπεχθαί ... 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 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.

---

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

6 Cf. καλῶν in the next sentence, in §11, and 13, where καλῶς 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:

"ἄλλα καὶ Κριτόβουλόν ποτε τὸν Κρίτωνος πυθόμενος ἵνα ἐφίλησε τὸν Ἀλκιβιάδου υἱὸν καλὸν ὄντα, παρόντος τοῦ Κριτόβουλον ἤρετο Ξενοφόντα· Ἐιπέ μοι, ἔφη, ὁ Ξενοφός, οὐ καὶ Κριτόβουλόν ἐνόμιζε εἰναι τῶν εὐφρονικῶν ἀνθρώπων μᾶλλον ή ... 

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] ἐνόμιζε [ἐ]Ι-
[ναι ± 14 τ]ῶν (ε)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, ὁ Ξενοφών neben ἤρετο Ξενοφόντα (oder umgekehrt), 2. εἰπέ μοι eo ipso, und 3. auch παρόντος τοῦ Κριτόβουλον, ein Gedanke, den man aus dem Schlussatz des ganzen Gesprächs am Ende von §13 coi δὲ ὁ Κριτόβουλε ganz selbstverständlich suppltier, und der in dem eigentlichen Gespräch zwischen Xenophon und Sokrates nicht nur nicht entbehrte, sondern vielmehr in auffalliger 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: ἵδων γὰρ τῶν συνόντων ἀμελοῦντα φίλου πενία πιείζουσιν τὸν ἂντιθέτου ἐναντίον τοῦ ἀμελοῦντος αὐτοῦ καὶ ἄλλων παλλῶν ἡμῶν (εἰπέ μοι Y), ἔφη, ὁ Ἀρτάκθενες, ... 
3, 4, 1: ἵδων ... Νίκεφορος ἢρετο· Τίνης, ὁ N. ... 
3, 7, 1: Χαρμιδῆν ... ὄρον ..., Εἰπέ μοι, ἔφη, ὁ Χαρ., ... 
and further 1, 4; 2, 1.3; 1; 4, 2, 8. 3, 2-3. 5. 2.

Seven out of the nine passages show the combination - εἰπέ μοι, ἔφη, ὁ - 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 ἥρετο Ἄντικεένη ... ἔφη, ὃ Ἀντίκεένες, proves that ὃ Ξενοφόν and ἥρετο Ξεν. can very well stand side by side. 2, 5, 1 also shows that Siegmann's third "entbehrlicher Begriff", ἀρόντος τοῦ Κριτόβουλον, 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 - ἕναντίον τοῦ ἀμελούντος αὐτοῦ - could very well have been omitted because the reason for Socrates' conversation has already been given by ἰδὼν γὰρ τινὰ τῶν συνόντων ἀμελούντα φίλου in the same sentence.

Consequently, the text of the MSS. appears to be stylistically correct, contrary to what Siegmann made us believe.7 Also concerning the MSS. text ἐνόμιζε εἶναι τῶν σωφρονικῶν, 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 - οὐ cū ἐνόμιζε εἶναι τὸν Κριτόβουλον τὸν τὸν ὁφρον - 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,8 demonstrate that the object or the adjective/interrogative belonging to the object are always found before εἶναι. Comparable interrogative sentences containing cū and a verb of saying/thinking and εἶναι show the same picture.9 Contrary to Siegmann's supplement, in which the object follows εἶναι, the text of the MSS. - οὐ cū Κριτόβουλον ἐνόμιζε εἶναι τῶν σωφρονικῶν ... - 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' (ἀντι - Ξενοφόντα oder Κριτόβουλον - 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, εἰπὲ μοι, ἔφη, ὃ Ξενοφόν, οὔ cū Κριτόβουλον ἐνόμιζε εἰ-, and in the second, παρόντος τοῦ Κριτόβουλον ἐνόμιζε εἰ-, with 43 and 32 characters respectively, while elsewhere 27 is

7 He writes on p. 75: "Erstens ist der Text der Handschriften (...) stilistisch durchaus nicht ohne Anstoss (...)".
8 Mem. 3, 7, 1: εἰ τι ... ποιύν τίνα τούτον νομίζως ἀν τὸν ἄνδρα εἶναι; 4, 6, 10: Ἀναδείχνε τε, ὃ Ἐνθύδημε, 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).
9 Mem. 4, 6, 14-Φῆς cū ὁμείνα πολίτην εἶναι ὃν cū ἐπαινεῖ ή ὃν ἔγω; 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 même have caused the different pap. text.

Apart from this, Merkelbach supplements the last line with νοι τῶν ἀνθρώπων τῶν ἐκφρο-. 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, 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:

ἐνίησι γάρ τι τὰ φαλάγγια κατὰ τὸ δήμα. "For the scorpions inject something by their bite." To which Socrates replies (§13): Ὅ μῶρε, ἔφη ὁ Σωκράτης, τοῦ δὲ καλοῦς οὐκ οἴει φιλούντας ἐνίέναι τι, ὅτι εὐ ὦχ ὀρᾶτι; οὐκ οἴειθ᾽ ὅτι τοῦτο τὸ θηρίον, ὃ καλοῦς καὶ ἄρτων, τοιοῦτοι δεινότερον ἐστὶ τῶν φαλαγγίων, ὡσι ἐκεῖνα μὲν ἀϕήμενα, τοῦτο δὲ οὐδ᾽ ἀφήμενον, ἐὰν τις αὐτὸ θεάται, ἐνίησι τι καὶ πάνω πρόωθεν τούτον ὡτε 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?"

Now that the context is given, we can look at the sentence Ὅ μῶρε, ἔφη ὁ Σωκράτης, τοῦ δὲ καλοῦς οὐκ οἴει φιλούντας ἐνίέναι τι, ὅτι εὐ ὦχ ὀρᾶτι; The pap. only differs from this in the position of φιλούντας; it immediately follows καλοῦς, provided that Siegmann's supplement, φιλ[ούντας οὐκ οἴει] ἐνίέναι, which in itself fits well and follows the MSS. text closely, is correct.

10 Mem. 1, 2, 20. 24. 25. 64; 2, 3, 1 (with τοιοῦτον instead of the adjective). 6, 17; 4, 8. 2. 10.
11 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 the Bedeutung 'lieben') 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 φιλούντας 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 φιλούντας, and not object. Moreover, Siegmann's translation "... diesen ein Gift einträufeln ..." requires αὐτοῖς or the like in the text, for instance: ... τοὺς δὲ καλοὺς φιλούντας οὕκ ὤει αὐτοῖς ἐνίεναι τι ...

So, if Siegmann's explanation is not acceptable, what explanation is? In my opinion φιλούντας is a gloss (perhaps the thoughts of the scribe were still at §11: ... καὶ τί ἀν οὐ εἴη παθεῖν καλὸν φιλήσας;) which has been incorporated into the text in two different positions. Without φιλούντας the (grammatically correct) sentence runs just as smoothly as with it: ὡς μόρε, ἔφη ὁ Σωκράτης, τοὺς δὲ καλοὺς οὐκ οὔει ἐνίεναι τι, ὅτι εὖ οὖχ ὀράει;

Now we have to examine whether the contents without φιλούντας are correct. When we look back at the survey given on p. 62, the significant point obviously is that ὁ καλὸς deprives man of his common sense without even the lightest touch: ἐνίεις γάρ τι τὰ φαλάγγια κατὰ τὸ δῆμα is opposed to ὁδ' ἀπτόμενον and ἐνίεις τι καὶ πάνω πρόκοψθεν τοῦ καλοῦ. To conclude, only if the relevant sentence does not comprise φιλούντας are its contents logical and faultless.

12 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 ὃτι φύλησε τὸν Ἀλκιβίαδον τινὸς ..., φύλησε can mean at first sight both "kiss" and "love". In §10 ... ἐτώλησε τὸν Ἀλκιβίαδον τινὸς φίλησει ..., it is more probable that φίλησε stands for "kiss" than for "love" in view of ἐτώλησε ("he dared ..."). Consequently, if φίλησε here means "kiss", then this applies also to ἐφίλησε §8, which refers to the same event as ἐτώλησε ... φίλησε. In §11 ... καὶ τί ἀν οὐ εἴη παθεῖν καλὸν φιλήσας; φιλήσας can have both meanings, but in consideration of the context the meaning "kiss" is preferable here too.

13 Also in Cyr. 5, 1, 16, where τὸ πῦρ and ὁι καλοὶ are compared, it appears that one not only catches fire by touching τοὺς καλοὺς, but also by just looking at them: ὥσπερ δ' ἐγὼ χαί ότε πῦρ τῶν ἐκαίνει ἀποτείμα τοὺς καλοὺς εἰσορᾷ. (...) ὅτι τὸ μὲν τοὺς ἀποτείμαν καὶ τοὺς ἀποθέν θεομένους ψάπτουσιν, ὅτε αἰθεθείη τὸι 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 classified the MSS. into two families (ABEH$^1$ and CD FH$^2$ with G in between), which Castiglioni 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$^1$ 2. GV, stemming probably from a copy closely related to the one from which E stems 3. DF and 4. H$^2$QR. A further specification is not possible, nor is it possible, as Ollier 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 all Xenophon papyri known to him, examined also the relation between the MSS. and P.Giss. 175 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 ἄγαται τε καὶ φιλεῖ τὸν ἐρώμενον θάλλουσα μορφῆ τε ἐλευθερία καὶ ἤθει αἰδήμονι τε καὶ γεννασίων ψυχὴ εὐθὺς ἐν τοῖς ἡλικίων ἠγεμονικῆ τε ἀμα καὶ φιλόφρονον οὖσα οὐδὲν ἐπιδεῖται λόγου. That a soul which flourishes in a

14 K. Schenkl, Xenophontische Studien II, Symposium, 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.
18 Pack 1 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 μορφῇ and γενναία/γενναία, two errors which are very small and also easy to account for. In §17

"προς δὲ τούτοις πιστεύοι μήτ’ ὡς παρανθῆσης μήτ’ ὡς καμόν ἁμορφότερος γένηται, μειωθῆναι ἡν 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 παρανθῆσης, παρὰ τι ποιήσης, which has variously been emended until the pap. showed παρανοήσης, which Persson considered a good reading.19

He already admits himself with reference to his source Kornemann20 that the difference between the text of the MSS. and the pap. can easily be explained: "ΠΑΡΑΝΟΗΣΗ 21 ist falsch ΠΑΡΑΠΟΗΣΗ gelesen, und dann ist entweder durch Dittographie des Π oder durch Einschiebung von τι die Lesart der Handschriften entstanden."

Persson then discusses the errors of the pap.: in the quoted sentence (§16) τε is missing after αἰθήμονι, and there is οὖςα instead of ομα after ἡγεμονική τε, which could have arisen from the οὖςα 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 - πιστεύης (πιστεύει G) instead of πιστεύοι 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.22 With reference to Persson's conclusion, Ollier writes not only with regard to P.Giss. 175, but also to P.Lit.Lond. 15223 (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."

19 Unlike Fr.Hornstein, WS 40, 1918, 102-106, who rightly remarked that παρανοής was not correct yet (παρανοής affects the very thing which the ἔρωτις likes, the soul of the ἐρωμένον), and made a conjecture: "Nicht ΠΑΡΑΝΟΗΣΗ stand in der Vorlage der Papyrus, sondern ΠΑΡΑΝΟΗΣΗ, was palaographisch fast dasselbe ist." He refers to the metaphorical use of παρανθῆση 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.
20 Kornemann (n. 18 [1908]), 324.
21 Since the original reading probably is ΠΑΡΑΝΟΗΣΗ (cf. note 18), ΠΑΡΑ ΤΙ ΠΟΗΣΗ need not have been derived from ΠΑΡΑΝΟΗΣΗ (pap.): both errors may have arisen independently from the same (carelessly written) source as well.
22 Ollier, op.cit., 36.
23 Pack' 1565; Ed. princeps by H.J.M.Milne, Aegyptus 4, 1923, 41 ff.
It is remarkable that Roberts\textsuperscript{24} makes a similar statement (without referring to Persson) with respect to a different pap. of the \textit{Smp.} (4, 51 - 5, 3), \textit{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 \textit{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 \textit{P.Heid.} 206, which demonstrate that Siegmann has jumped to conclusions. These passages cannot lead to a statement on the "Priorität des Papyruxtextes". 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 \textit{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.
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\textsuperscript{24} C.H.Roberts, The Antinoopolis Papyri, London 1950, no. 26 (= ed. princeps, see also Pack\textsuperscript{2} 1564).