

O'Sullivan, J.N. 2005. *Xenophon Ephesius, De Anthia et Habrocome Ephesiacorum libri V*, ed. J.N.O. (Bibliotheca Teubneriana). Monachi/Lipsiae, Saur. xxxiv, 128 p. Pr. €98.00 (hb).

Xenophon of Ephesus' *Ephesiaca*, an ancient Greek novel dated by most scholars in the first half of the second century AD, is a tantalizingly peculiar text for more than one reason. Having come down to us from antiquity in no more than a single codex (the so-called Florentinus Laurentianus Conv. Soppr. 627, written in the thirteenth century and preserved in the Biblioteca Laurenziana in Florence since 1425), its mere survival has certainly been one of the most precarious in the history of ancient Greek textual tradition. Apart from the novel itself, the only source providing information about its author is a short passage in the *Suda*, calling him *historikos* and identifying him as the author of a love story in ten books about Habrocomes and Anthia.¹ Since the name of Xenophon might well have been a pseudonym alluding to the famous historiographer Xenophon of Athens (whose *Cyropaedia* includes the love story of Panthea and Habradatas),² we do not know the author's real name for certain. Moreover, it has been argued that the text as we have it today is not the original, but an epitome of a longer version that is now lost—a suggestion first made by E. Rohde in his monumental study on the Greek novel, but more fully explored by K. Bürger.³ Among other things, the *Suda*'s mention of *ten* books, which is twice the number of books preserved in the codex Florentinus, and various instances of logical inconsistency throughout the narrative have triggered this view.

As a matter of fact, the editor of this edition of the *Ephesiaca* is one of the few scholars who have thoroughly argued against the epitome theory, and the only one who has dedicated a book-length study to the problem.⁴ According to J.N. O'Sullivan (henceforth O.), the *Ephesiaca* provides us with a link between Greek novelistic *literature* on the one hand, and formulaic oral story-telling, which he identifies as its origin, on the other. Notably, he dates Xenophon back to 50 AD, and maintains that both Chariton and Aristaenetos have been influenced by him. Since these aspects have been fully developed in O.'s 1995 study, he mentions them only cursorily in the (Latin) *praefatio* to this edition (pp. xii-xiii), which is

¹ Cf. Adler, A. (ed.) 1928-38. *Suidae lexicon* (Leipzig; repr. Stuttgart 1967-71), III 495.

² Cf. O'Sullivan, J.N. 1995. *Xenophon of Ephesus: His Compositional Technique and the Birth of the Novel* (New York), 1.

³ Rohde, E. 1876. *Der Griechische Roman und seine Vorläufer* (Leipzig), 401 (³1914, 429); Bürger, K. 1892. *Zu Xenophon von Ephesus*, *Hermes* 27, 36-67.

⁴ O'Sullivan 1995, 10-1.

primarily concerned with the textual tradition of the *Ephesiaca* from the 15th century onwards. After briefly discussing the reception of the unpublished codex by, among others, Angelo Poliziano and Salvinus (pp. vi-viii), O. gives an overview of the editions that have been published before his, from the *editio princeps* by Cocchi (1726) leading up to Novaković' edition (1987). Subsequently, a significant part of the *praefatio* is dedicated to situating the new edition in the field and pointing out that it has something substantial to offer given the inaccuracy with which some of the earlier editions have been composed (pp. ix-xii). O.'s claim is, unfortunately, only too correct. Symptomatically, merely two of the thirteen previous editors claim to have provided themselves with direct access to the codex Florentinus (Dalmeyda [1926] and Papanikolaou [1973]), but O. wisely adds that "sub oculis habuisse aliud esse, aliud diligenter legisse" (cf. p. ix). Given the unreliability of even these two editions,⁵⁾ I could not agree more with O.'s view on the desirability of this new edition.

The edition itself is preceded by a *conspectus librorum* (pp. xviii-xxix), the explanation of the different *sigla* (p. xxx), the abbreviations of proper names (pp. xxx-xxxii) and terminology (pp. xxxiii-xxxiv) adopted in the apparatus, and, finally, the passage from the *Suda* containing the only testimony on Xenophon of Ephesus (p. xxxiv). It is followed by two indices (*index nominum*, pp. 83-6, and *index verborum*, pp. 86-128).

Generally speaking, the high expectations set by the *praefatio* are met in the edition, which is, in my view, a far more accurate and better-documented edition of the *Ephesiaca* than the previous ones. A striking pattern underlying this edition is shaped by O.'s persistent effort to re-assess the reading of the *codex unicus* where it has been discarded by earlier editors. In many instances, O. argues (correctly, I think) that F's reading has been unnecessarily rejected, and, in following the codex more closely, he succeeds in presenting a reading that is logically more plausible than earlier readings. The rejection of Peerlkamp's and Dalmeyda's reading of *καλόν* between *ἄγαλμα* and *κατεφαίνετο* (book 1 line 29), for example, is a case in point. Not only is *καταφαίνομαι* well-attested without predicate indeed, but O.'s reading also provides the sentence with a more natural symmetry, unnecessarily thwarted by the addition of a predicate in earlier readings. Line 76 of the first book provides us with another example. O. re-inserts, unlike Dalmeyda and Papanikolaou, the *μέν* that has been omitted as early as Salvinus' apograph of the codex (anno 1700), thus providing the sentence with a logically plausible and balanced dynamic. Likewise, the codex' reading of the aorist infinitive (*μαντεύσασθαι*) in line 166 of the same book seems to me perfectly acceptable from a grammatical point of view, although editors have been unanimous in reading a present infinitive

⁵⁾ Cf. also M.D. Reeve's review of Papanikolaou's edition in *JHS* 96 (1976), 192-3.

here. Generally, O.'s decision to follow the codex rather than previous editions is well corroborated by references to attestations of similar passages. A good example is the motivation of his (and the codex') reading of καὶ ζῶσαν καὶ τεθνεῶσαν (book 2 line 234), where editors from Hirschig (1856) onwards have favoured ἢ ζῶσαν ἢ τεθνεῶσαν, which seems logically more plausible at first sight. Although the list of examples could easily be extended (e.g., ἤγετο, book 3 line 191; πάντα καινά, book 3 line 233; etc.), these few instances should suffice to illustrate my point.

Although the apparatus in O.'s edition surpasses that of earlier editions in accuracy and completeness, the reader might find the provided information somewhat sparse in a (limited) number of cases where O. follows a reading of the codex that has been contested by earlier editors. The apparatus does not tell us, for example, that the codex' reading of ἐώρων (book 1 line 141), which O. accepts, has been contested by Hercher (1858) and Dalmeyda (1926). More examples could be adduced (book 2 line 250; book 3 line 358; etc.), but they hardly detract from O.'s achievement of providing an apparatus that is more comprehensive and pays more attention to detail than any previous edition. As an example, let me refer to lines 6 and 7 of the first book, where O. points out that the words ὠραιότητι σώματος ὑπερβαλλούση were deleted (unnecessarily) by Tresling (1792),⁶ and not by Hirschig (1856), as both Dalmeyda and Papanikolaou would have it.

The list of O.'s own conjectures is too long to be dealt with in any detail here. Although there is always room for disagreement regarding specific readings (O.'s suggestion to change the perfectly sensible Ἐφέσω [book 2 line 70; ἐφέσω in the codex] into Τύρω, for example, might in the end be inevitably speculative), the majority of O.'s conjectures are convincing. Also here, a limited number of examples should suffice. O.'s reading of ἰκέτην ἔχε κα<ι> σῶσον (book 1 line 113) is, in my view, indeed more compelling than any of the alternatives suggested by earlier editors and listed in the apparatus. Similarly, the adaptation of the codex' reading of αὐτῆ (book 2 line 284) into ταύτη undermines the necessity of omitting τῆ ὕλη, as has been suggested by others. Furthermore, O.'s preference for [εἰς] ἐπιζήτησιν over εἰς ἐπιζήτησιν (book 2 lines 295-6) is certainly defensible, and τὴν παρ' αὐτοῦ (book 2 line 302) is in the given context (i.e., the representation of the shepherd's words addressed to Habrocomes) indeed more likely than the previously suggested qualifications of the preceding τὴν εὐσέβειαν. Finally, O.'s addition of ὅμοιον following ἀλλήλοις in book 3 line 31 makes for a much more appealing reading than Papanikolaou's, which resorts to reading the codex' ἀλλήλοις as ἄλλοις (following Hemsterhuys), and than Dalmeyda's, which omits this word altogether (following Hercher).

⁶ Tresling, A.H. 1792. *Adversariorum criticorum specimen* (Groningen).

To conclude: this edition is the most accurate, precise and detailed edition available of Xenophon's *Ephesiaca*. Of course, no written work is ever free from shortcomings, but this will rightly be the standard edition to turn to for every scholar working on Xenophon for many years to come.

Universiteit Gent, Faculteit Letteren en Wijsbegeerte
Blandijnberg 2, 9000 Gent, Belgium
koen.detemmerman@ugent.be

Koen de Temmerman

Earlier editions of Xenophon of Ephesus mentioned in this review:

- Cocchi, A. 1726. *Xenophontis Ephesii Ephesiacorum libri V. De amoribus Anthiae et Abrocomae* (London)
- Dalmeyda, G. 1926 (³1962). *Xénophon d'Éphèse. Les Éphésiaques ou le roman d'Habrocomes et d'Anthia* (Paris)
- Hercher, R. 1858. Ξενοφώντος Ἐφεσίου τῶν κατὰ Ἄνθειαν καὶ Ἀβροκόμην Ἐφεσιακῶν βιβλία ε', in: Ἐρωτικῶν λόγων συγγραφεῖς/*Erotici scriptores Graeci* (Leipzig), t. prior, pp. xlix-lx & 327-99
- Hirschig, W.A. 1856. *Xenophontis Ephesii de amoribus Anthiae et Abrocomae libri V*, in: *Erotici scriptores* (Paris), pp. i-ii, xiv-xvii & 183-222
- Novaković, D. 1987. *Ksenofont Efeški: Efeške priče. Nepoznat Autor: Pripovijest o Apoloniju, Kralju Tirskome* (Zagreb)
- Papanikolaou, A.D. 1973. *Xenophontis Ephesii Ephesiacorum libri V de amoribus Anthiae et Abrocomae* (Leipzig)
- Peerlkamp, P. 1818. *Xenophontis Ephesii de Anthia et Habrocome Ephesiacorum libri V* (Haarlem)