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2. 1 ταῦτα δὲ καὶ ἐπιδεικνὺς ὡς ἐν θαύματι ἀργύριον ἐλάμβανεν.

'Ως ἐν θαύματι is difficult to understand. (a) Todd translates, "as a spectacle"; Finckh (apud Herbst) takes it as, "als etwas Ausserordentliches," which Herbst tries to explain by supplying ὄντα: "quasi in miraculo posita essent." However, Herbst is forced to add, "Quanquam scio ἐν θαυματί ἐσθαι plerumque esse mirari, obstupescere." This is true. 'Εν θαύματι (sing.) is generally used only in connection with verbs like γίναται, γίγνεσθαι, (ἐν)ἐξεσθαι, meaning, "to wonder, to be astonished," vel sim. (cf. Dutton 194, LSJ s.v. θαύμα II): Hdt. 1. 68. 1 ἐν θάυματι ἦν ὁρῶν τὸ ποιεόμενον, 3. 3. 3 τὰς γυναῖκας ἐν θαΰματι γενέσθαι, 7. 128. 2 ἐν θαύματι μεγάλῳ ἐνέσχητο, 7. 218. 2 ἐν θαύματι ἐγένοντο, 8. 135. 3 ἐν θαύματι ἔχεσθαι, 9. 11. 3 ἐν θαύματι γενόμενοι, 9. 37. 3 ἐν θαύματι μεγάλῳ ἐνέχεσθαι τῆς τόλμης, Th. 8. 14. 2 ἐν θαύματι ἦσαν καὶ ἐκπλήξει. A similar usage occurs in Plut. Pomp. 14. 5, ὅρῶν δὲ τοὺς ἀκούσαντας ἀπὸ τοῦ προσώπου καὶ τοῦ σχῆματος ἐν θαύματι πολυμένους (they were astonished because they had heard Pompey say something bold and outrageous). From these passages we can conclude that ἐν θαύματι (sing.) is an idiomatic expression which does not fit our context.

(b) Woldinga 235 f. paraphrases our passage, "als in een kermiskraam," and LSJ (s.v. θαύμα I.2) interpret θαύμα in our passage as "mountebank-gambols." Certainly this is much closer to the true meaning of the expression than the parallels listed under (a). Θαύματα in the plural is a terminus technicus denoting anything that serves to amuse and entertain the audience at a fair (Hsch. s.v. θαύματα, Θ 147 Latte: ἀ οί θαυματοποιοὶ.

1 I am very much indebted to Professor William M. Calder III, who encouraged me to write this paper (a πάρεργον of my forthcoming commentary on Xenophon's Symposium), read carefully two drafts of it and gave helpful suggestions.
It can be said of menageries (Isoc. 15. 213 θεωροῦντες ἐν τοῖς θαύμασιν τοὺς μὲν λέοντας . . . ) and of mechanical devices (Arist. Mech. 848a11) as well as of jugglers’ booths (Ath. 10. 452f ἐν τοῖς θαύμασιν ὑπεκρίνετο μίμους), of performances on stage (Thphr. Char. 27. 7 ἐν τοῖς θαύμασι τρία ἡ τέτταρα πληρώματα ὑπομένειν) and of the whole event of a fair (Thphr. Char. 6. 4 ἐν θαύμασι). I suggest changing one letter and reading in our passage the plural θαύμασιν in precisely this technical sense: ταύτα δὲ καὶ ἐπίδεικνύσις ὡς ἐν θαύμασι(ν) ἀργύριον ἐλάμβανεν, meaning, “he showed them (scil. at symposia for which he is hired; cf. 2, 2, 4. 55) as in performances at a fair and earned money from that.” (For ὡς introducing a prepositional phrase as a comparison, see Kühner–Gerth I 472 Anmerk. 1.) The emendation ἐν θαύμασι is supported by two passages in Plato which connect the terminus technicus θαύμασι with the verb δεικνύων or its compound ἐπίδεικνύων?: Pl. R. 7. 514b τοῖς θαυματοποιοῖς πρὸ τῶν ἀνθρώπων πρόκειται τὸ παραφράγματα, υπὲρ δὴν τὰ θαύμασι δεικνύωσιν (θαύμασι being a kind of puppet-show or toy theater), and Pl. Lg. 2. 658b–c θαύμασι ἐπίδεικνύσις, “presenting a puppet-show” (cf. England ad loc.), contrasted with ἐπίδεικνύναι ραψωδίαν, κιθαρωδίαν, τραγῳδίαν, κωμῳδίαν. Based on these two parallels one might even interpret our passage as an allusion to the performance of a puppet-show. Although this might not necessarily be cogent, it is interesting that the Syracusan impresario in 4. 55 makes a similar statement, comparing his acrobats to νευρόσπαστα, “puppets.” The origin of the corruption θαύμασι(ν) > θαύμασι is easy to explain, especially since the manuscript from which the error originated possibly lacked ν ephelkustikon added to θαύμασι (see, in general, Kühner–Blass I 295).

6, 9 Καὶ νῦν σὺ γε λοιδοροῦμεν ἐοικας, εἰ δὲ πάντες αὐτοὶ βελτίων φης ἐστι

So all manuscripts. The sense of this would be an absurd phrase like, “if you say that in all things you are better than he is” (αὐτοὶ being a gen. compar. dependent on βελτίων). Since the passage is clearly corrupt, many attempts have been made to heal it. These attempts can be divided into three groups, according to their understanding of πάντες:

(a) Πάντες is accusative neuter plural, the accusative being the subject of an acc. cum inf.-construction that depends on φης. Therefore the correct reading is either πάντες αὐτοῖ βελτίωνα (Leuncl. 1569, 1594 and 1595) or πάντες αὐτοῖ βελτίω (see Zeune, Bornemann, Lange, Schenkl), which should be interpreted as “si omnia, quae in eo sunt, meliiora esse dicis, quam revera sunt” (Sauppe ad loc.), or even πάντες αὐτοῖ βελτιστα (Weiske). In

2 Cf. the definition from Hesychios quoted above.
all these interpretations the genitive must be considered as dependent on πάντες, and not as a genitivus comparationis with the comparative βελτίω.

(b) Πάντες αὐτοῦ βελτίω is the correct reading, but πάντες is accusative masculine singular, and the passage therefore should be rendered, “si unumque hic meliorem iudices, quam Syracusanum” (Bornemann). This, however, is improbable in the context, and Bornemann himself expresses doubts regarding this solution.

(c) Πάντες is an acc. limitationis; αὐτοῦ must be changed to αὐτόν (this form is noted by Leuncl. 1594 in margin), so that the correct reading is πάντες αὐτόν βελτίω (βελτίωνα is given by Leuncl.), “if you say that he is better in all things,” scil. better than the καλοῖ and βέλτιστοι, with whom Philippos is going to compare the Syracusan (for this would be so incredible that Philippos’ comparison would be slander rather than praise). I think that this emendation is better than most modern critics have assumed and that Cirignano is probably right in preferring it for his Symposium text. The explanation of πάντες as an acc. limitationis is strengthened by a close parallel in the Cyropaedia: 5. 5. 34 οὔ γὰρ τοι ἔγνω Μήδιδ ήρθον διὰ τὸ κρέιττων αὐτῶν πάντων εἶναι, ἀλλὰ μᾶλλον διὰ τὸ αὐτοῦ τούτους ἁξιοῦν ἡμᾶς αὐτῶν (αὐτῶν, ἐαυτῶν νν. II.) πάντος βελτίωνος εἶναι. Such a parallel is particularly welcome in an author like Xenophon, who largely tends to express the same concepts in the same words.

8. 1 Ἄρος... εἰκός ἡμᾶς... μή [ἀν] ἀμνησιοῦσαι;

This passage has caused much confusion. Scholars have assumed that the meaning of the sentence as given by Marchant would be, “Is it right for us not to forget Eros?” that is, “We ought to forget him,” whereas the context demands precisely the opposite: “We must not forget him”; “I hope we shall remember him.” For this reason various alterations of the text have been proposed: (a) a change of Ἄρος to Ἄλλα in order to make the sentence a statement, not a question (Richards 1902: 294); (b) an addition, Ἄρος <οὐ> εἰκός (Richards 1896: 294, withdrawn in Richards 1907: 22); (c) the elimination of μή (Hartman 244 f.).

Since Ἄρος provides a neutral introduction for a question, per se suggesting neither a positive nor a negative answer (see Kühner-Gerth II

3 Cf. also Marchant’s proposal, πάντα τα αὐτοῦ βελτίω.
4 Bornemann also proposes εἰ μή πάντες αὐτοῦ βελτίω φης εἶναι, " nisi quemque convivarium eo meliorem esse dicatis," which is as improbable as Marchant’s second proposal, πάντων αὐτοῦ βελτίω.
5 The modern apparatus critics do not present accurately the readings of Leunclaviius.
6 If it really is an emendation and not rather a varia lectio.
7 Cf. for the acc. limitationis with βελτίων Symp. 4. 6 ὥσπερ βελτίων, Cyr. 2. 1. 13 ὥσπερ αὐτοῖς βελτίωνες γένονται.
8 Cf., however, Richards 1902: 294: “It may be thought that the obvious remedy is to strike out μή, but the position of ἂν or any such particle, if right, then becomes very questionable, and in any case I think the remedy is to be found elsewhere.”
527), and since Richards 1907: 22 is therefore right in pointing out that one should not alter the beginning of our phrase, we are still faced with this question: “Is it (neutral) right for us not to forget Eros?” I think there are two ways to avoid this dilemma: (a) We could assume that ἀρό ν κτλ. must be interpreted silently as demanding an answer, “Yes, it is right; for we should ‘not forget him,’ i.e. we should remember him.” This interpretation makes the construction of the question seem strange and at the same time demands a rather pointless litotes, μη ἁμημονήσατι, “not to forget” = “to remember.” Furthermore, it does not explain the intrusion of ἄν, which is in all our manuscripts, but is cancelled by Steph. 1561 adn, Steph. 1581 marg. (b) Possibly Stephanus was wrong in eliminating ἄν here. I suggest reading μη ἀναμνησθῆναι or, even more plausibly, μη ἁμημονήσατι. “An is the result of erroneous word division and ἁμημθῆναι or ἁμημονέωσαί has been subsequently “corrected” into ἁμημονήσατι. Both readings would convey the meaning, “Is it right (neutral) for us not to remember/to mention Eros?” and this question would easily suggest the answer, “No, of course it is not right; we must remember him.”

9. 6 καὶ γὰρ ἦκουσον τοῦ Διονύσου μὲν ἑπερωτῶντος αὐτὴν εἰ φιλεῖ αὐτὸν, τής δὲ οὕτως ἑπομνυούσης ἀνόμωσαν ἄλλα καὶ τοὺς παρόντας ἀπαντᾷ συνομόσα (ἐπομόσα DF) ἄν ἡ μὴ τὸν παῖδα καὶ τὴν παῖδα ὑπ’ ἄλληλον φιλεῖσθαι.

(a) In general modern editors have accepted the reading in the majority of our manuscripts, συνομόσαι. Presumably they explain ἐπομόσαι10 as a corruption, created under the influence of the preceding ἑπομνυούσης. But this argument has a weak point: There is a certain difference between the present ἑπομνυούσης and the aorist συνομόσα, which renders this kind of corruption more improbable than it may seem at first sight. I propose reading συνεπομόσα, a rare verb for whose active LSJ give only two references, one in Aristophanes, Lys. 237 Συνεπόμυνθ’ ὑμεῖς ταύτα πᾶσαι; (the answer of the πᾶσαι is νῦν Δίας), the other in Xenophon, An. 7. 6. 19 (with an infinitive construction following, exactly as in our passage). If my

9 For ἁμημονήσατι, “remember,” cf. Souda s.v. Ἑσδρας (II 422. 8 f. Adler) τῶν μὴ ἐμφανηκότων βιβλίων τὰς γραφὰς ἁμημονεύουσας, Steph. Schol. in Hp. Prog. 1. 10, line 121 Duffy ἁμημονεύει τῶν οἰκείων ἐργῶν η μυχή (cf. ibid. line 128), Anon. in Rh. 116. 30 οὐκ ἔχουσιν ἁμημονεύουσα πολλά, Gal. De diebus decr. IX 867. 15 f. Kühn εἰ δὲ καὶ τῆς ἐμής πείρας ἑφεξῆς ἁμημονεύοντός με, Excerpta Polyaeini 1. 1, line 31 (ed. Woelfflin/ Melber) ἢν χρειάζεται καλούσης ἁμημονεύουσαν ταύτα πάντα ἕκκλησι οὔς πολυμνῆμων, Origenes, Cels. 5. 46 ἁμημονεύοντα ἐκ καρδίας. The fact that all these references are later than Xenophon is not necessarily a cogent argument against my proposal, since Xenophon’s language in many aspects is very “modern” (and often anticipates the koine). Furthermore, he might well have used an unusual word in a particularly important passage (8. 1 is the transition from the “normal” part of the Symposium to Sokrates’ great speech on Eros).

10 Ἐπομόσαι is also the reading of all editiones veteres (s. XVI) as well as of Bach, Zeune and Lange. Steph. 1561 and 1581 and Leuncl. 1569, 1594 and 1595 note συνομόσα in margine.
assumption is correct, there is a corruption which must have originated in
the following way: A *sciōlus* was struck by the word *συνεπομόσαι*,
unfamiliar to him because of its rarity. He cancelled this word, adding a
marginal note like, "*aut συνομόσαι aut ἔπομόσαι* legendum," and
destroying what Xenophon had conceived as an elegant climax. As a result,
the majority of the manuscripts, depending on our *sciōlus*, chose his first
solution, while a minority favored the second one.¹¹ Xenophon’s text
means: Not only would "Dionysos" swear, but all guests would be ready to
swear the same oath together with him (*συνεπομύνατι* has precisely this
meaning in Ar. loc. cit.), because the girl’s ("Ariadne’s") performance was
so natural that it convinced them all.

(b) "Ωστε is an addition made by Steph. 1581"¹² that has been accepted
by all modern editors except for Cirignano, who excludes it from his
*Symposium* text. I think ὡστε, or ὡς in the sense of ὡστε (see below), is
indispensable. If it were deleted, the girl would swear μή μόνον τὸν
Διόνυσον, ἀλλὰ καὶ τοὺς παρόντας ἀπαντας συνεπομόσαι ἃν ἢ μὴν τὸν
παῖδα καὶ τὴν παίδα ὑπ’ ἀλλήλων φιλεῖσθαι. In my opinion it is obvious
that this would be absurd. The girl ("Ariadne") swears (a) "Yes, I do love
you" (the narration, of course, does not make this as explicit as I put it
here), and she does this so convincingly that not only would "Dionysos"
swear, "Oh yes, we are in love," but all guests, if they were asked to do this,
would swear together with him (b) "Oh yes, they both really love each
other."¹³ The narrator presents (b) as a consequence of (a); therefore he
needs to say ὡστε. Μή μόνον ... ὑπ’ ἀλλήλων φιλεῖσθαι is clearly a
statement of the narrator, not the content of ἐπομυσαίς. By making this
statement the narrator shows how fascinated the audience is by the lively
and skilful performance they are watching. Furthermore, accepting
Cirignano’s solution one would be forced to take ὡτως as preparing the
following utterance in the infinitive, which in our passage seems odd.¹⁴

Some forty years before Stephanus had made his supplement, Castalio
had added ὡς, which is independently advanced by Castiglioni 82.
Unfortunately, modern editors in our century ignore it, although it was
noted in 1830 by Herbst. Castalio’s variant would at least be worth
mentioning in the apparatus criticus of a new edition of the *Symposium*. I

¹¹ NB: All manuscripts of the *Symposium* which are known to us have the same archetypus.
¹² It is not in Steph. 1561. In its preface Stephanus says that his readings are partly based
on variants in manuscripts he checked. Unfortunately, he does not specify which manuscripts
he used to prepare his second edition.
¹³ Xenophon’s narration proceeds somewhat rapidly at this point, and the reader has to
supply some things that are not made explicit. However, the sentence in the form given by
Marchant’s OCT is perfectly comprehensible and becomes, I think, even more comprehensible
if *συνεπομόσαι* is accepted, so that one should not (with Schenkl, Ollier, Thalheim) assume a
lacuna after Διόνυσον. See Castiglioni 82 f., who argues convincingly against Thalheim’s
Διόνυσον η<sup>ς</sup>περισθήναι.
¹⁴ Passages in direct speech like *An*. 4. 6. 10 ἐγὼ δ’ οὖτω γιγνώσκω· εἰ μὲν ἀνάγκη κτλ.
have a different character.
think it is better than ὀστε—its omission from the text is easier to explain, not only because of its brevity, but because it could have been omitted under the influence of οὔτως, οὔτως ἐπομνυόσης ὦς creating the confusion. Xenophon uses both constructions (cf. for οὔτως . . . ὦς Symp. 4. 21, 4. 37, 4. 39, 8. 35 and Castiglioni 82). ὀξ + inf. instead of ὀστε + inf. is particularly "Xenophontean"; see Kühner–Gerth II 501 Anmerk. and Stahl 492, Nr. 1.
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