

NOTES ON MENANDER'S *COLAX* AND *SICYONIUS*<sup>1</sup>*Colax* (CGFP 163)

53 τί λυσιτελεῖν ἡμῖν ἀπλοφαίνεις τὰδικεῖν;'

The text to the left of the bar is given only in P. Oxy. III 409. According to Grenfell and Hunt in the *editio princeps*, it has at the start of the line τιλυσιτελεημιν. But λυσιτελες appears no less likely as a reading than λυσιτελει: there is hardly any ink in place for the final letter.<sup>2</sup> If it is accepted, there will be no reason to adopt the first editors' emendation λυσιτελει(ν): λυσιτελές is just as suitable.

95–9

ὅσοι τύραννοι πάποθ', ὅστις ἡγεμὼν  
μέγας, κατράπ[ης], φρούραρχ[ο]ς, οἰκιστὴς τόπ[ο]υ,  
τρατηγός, οὐ [ . . . ] ἀλλὰ τοὺς τελέως λέγω  
ἀπολωλότας, [νῦν τ]οῦτ' ἀνήρηκεν μόνον,  
οἱ κόλακες, οὐτ[ . ] δ' εἰςὶν αὐτοῖς ἄθλιοι.

Grenfell and Hunt's supplement in 98 (P. Oxy. III 409.62) is unlikely. νῦν does not seem an effective addition to what precedes: indeed, the first editors, who punctuate after it, do not include it in their translation. On the other hand, Sandbach's suggestion (93 n.) that it goes with what follows, giving the sense 'destruction is *nowadays* so caused, whatever happened in the past', is far-fetched. We do not expect a restriction of this kind after ὅσοι τύραννοι πάποθ' (95). In any case, τ]οῦτ' ἀνήρηκεν<sup>3</sup> μόνον may be felt to be too similar to τ]οῦτ' ἀπολώλεκεν μόνον five lines before. Menander will have written [τὸ τοι]οῦτ'. Now it may be argued that this vague expression is less likely than τ]οῦτ' to be followed by οἱ κόλακες in apposition, but the next line is in any case highly objectionable, and may well be an explanatory interpolation: see Sandbach's note (on his line 94).

*Sicyonius*

7–10

ἐχρῶντ' ἀγορᾶι, καθῆτό τ' ἐπὶ τῆς ἀγκ[άλης  
ἔ]χων ὁ θεράπων τὴν τροφίμην. πωλ[ουμένοις

<sup>1</sup> These notes represent work undertaken when I was a Research Associate in the University of Oxford (2013–14). The post was funded by the British Academy.

In the notes on *Colax*, lemmata are taken from *CGFP* (C. Austin (ed.), *Comicorum Graecorum fragmenta in papyris reperta* (1973)), and in the notes on *Sicyonius*, from the edition by R. Kassel (1965). I also refer to the edition of Menander by F. H. Sandbach (OCT, <sup>2</sup>1990) and his notes (in A. W. Gomme and F. H. Sandbach, *Menander: A Commentary* (1973)), to the Loeb Menander (ed. W. G. Arnott, 1979–2000), to the *editio princeps* of *Sicyonius* (ed. A. Blanchard and A. Bataille, *RechPap* 3 (1964) 103–76 with plates VI–XIII), and to the recent edition of the play by A. Blanchard (Budé vol. iv, 2009). Other abbreviations:

Arnott, Final Notes	W. G. Arnott, Final Notes on Menander's Sikyonioid (vv. 343–423 with frs. 1, 2 and 7), <i>ZPE</i> 118 (1997) 95–103.
Arnott, Further Notes	W. G. Arnott, Further Notes on Menander's Sikyonioid (vv. 110–322), <i>ZPE</i> 117 (1997) 21–34.
Barigazzi	A. Barigazzi, Sul «Sicionio» di Menandro, <i>SIFC</i> 37 (1965) 7–84.
Coles	R. A. Coles, Notes on Menander's Sikyonioid, <i>Emerita</i> 34 (1966) 131–7.
Handley	E. W. Handley, Notes on the <i>Sikyonioid</i> of Menander, <i>BICS</i> 12 (1965) 38–62.
Jouguet	P. Jouguet, Papyrus de Ghorân, <i>BCH</i> 30 (1906) 103–49.
Lloyd-Jones	H. Lloyd-Jones, Notes on the Sikyonioid of Menander, <i>Emerita</i> 34 (1966) 139–49 = <i>Greek Comedy, Hellenistic Literature, Greek Religion, and Miscellanea</i> (1990) 77–86.
Schroeder	O. Schroeder (ed.), <i>Novae comoediae fragmenta in papyris reperta exceptis Menandreis</i> (1915).

<sup>2</sup> See P. Oxy. III pl. III, or the first of the fold-out plates at the end of M. J. Pernerstorfer, *Menanders Kolax* (2009).

<sup>3</sup> The papyrus has ἀνήρηκεν, not -κων, as reported in the first edition and in *CGFP*: see the plates mentioned in n. 2. For the possibility that ἀνεῖρηκεν is to be restored, see below on *Sic.* 82.

π]ροσῆλθεν ἡγεμών τις ἡρώτα “πόσ[ου  
ταῦτ’ ἐστιν;” ἤκουσεν· συνεχώρησ’ ἐπ[ρίατο.

At the end of 8, πωλ[ουμένοις (Handley 40) is in the right case, but the general will have gone up to the pirates to ask the price: πωλ[οῦσι δέ.

15–17

τούτω[ι τ]υχόν[ι]  
ἐ]κ τοῦ παραχρῆμ[ι]  
τ]ῶι παιδίωι τὴν πατ[ρ]

Handley’s tentative proposal (40) for 15, τούτω[ι τ]υχόν[ι], seems too long. One might perhaps consider τούτω[ν] ἐχόν[των]: e.g., in the circumstances, the pair will not be saved immediately (16), but there is hope that the girl will eventually be restored to her fatherland (with Handley’s πατ[ρίδα] in 17).

75 Following the removal of some offset papyrus,<sup>4</sup> Coles (134; *Emerita* 35 (1967) 163) reads ] . ὑπερβ . ῶ. Lloyd-Jones (144 = 81) writes that ‘Coles’s reading is consistent with several possibilities: but the one which strikes me as likelier than most is ἀνυπερβάτωι’. But since there is no evidence that the iota adscript was written, ὑπερβᾶλω seems more probable.

77

]ουπερ ἐγενόμην

Coles (134) comments ‘Before π, I think ι. Before that, ο or ε possible (not α)’, and according to Lloyd-Jones (144 = 81), this reading, ‘in conjunction with the sense, suggests that εἴπερ is the likeliest word to have been written’. But ἐπ]εἴπερ seems no less likely.

82 The transmitted ἀνειρηκαὶς is interpreted correctly by F. Blass (ap. Jouguet 114): ‘ἀνείρηκαὶς = ἀνήρηκαὶς’.<sup>5</sup> For the spelling, perhaps Menander’s own, cf. L. Threatte, *The Grammar of Attic Inscriptions* ii (1996) 486. *Dysc.* 595 ἀνηρειαία, quoted by Kassel, may be a corruption of ἀνειρηκειαία with εἰ and η having switched positions, even if it is the perfect of ἀναίρειω; so too in *Colax*, *CGFP* 163.98, ἀνηρηκεν (cf. n. 3) may represent ἀνείρηκεν rather than ἀνήρηκεν. Cf. also *Asp.* 225 (ἀφηρητα Β).

100–101

ἐμοὶ δὲ καὶ τούτωι τί πρῶγμ’ ἐστ[ιν]  
μὴ τοῦτον ἡμῖν τὸν τρόπον λαλε[ῖ]

101 looks like an angry retort to the rhetorical question in the previous line. Perhaps the speaker is addressing himself, e.g. “ἐμοὶ δὲ καὶ τούτωι τί πρῶγμ’ ἐστ[ιν];” λέγεις;<sup>6</sup> ἢ μὴ τοῦτον ἡμῖν τὸν τρόπον λάλει [, ‘Do you say “What have he and I to do with each other?”? Don’t speak to us like that!’ There seems to be something similar (with a combination of first- and second-person forms and ‘Do not say!’ addressed by the speaker to himself) in *Mis.* 387 ff. Sandbach = 790 ff. Arnott as interpreted by Handley (ap. M. Balme (tr.), *Menander: The Plays and Fragments* (2001) 176–7), *Κιμίχη* ξηλήλυ[θη]εν ἢ “τ]ί” φησ “πέπονθ’;” ἄπ[α]ν[θ] ὑπὲρ ταύτης λαλ[εῖ]ς. ἢ μέ[λ]ει γέ μοι ταύτης δι’ ἐμαυτόν; μὴ λέγε κτλ., ‘If Simiche comes out, you say “How is she?”’ etc.

<sup>4</sup> See now the photograph published on the website of the Institut de Papyrologie de la Sorbonne (<http://www.papyrologie.paris-sorbonne.fr/photos/2030072.jpg>).

<sup>5</sup> He does not suggest that it is to be emended. Cf. his comment on Philod. *Mort.* 37.13 in *GGA* (1886) 540: ‘ἀ(ν)ειρημένων (att. Orthogr. für ἀνηρ.)’.

<sup>6</sup> λέγων was proposed by Schroeder (24) in this place (and λάλει [κύ γε at the end of the next line). Sandbach’s ἐστ’; [οὐδὲ ἐν would give a straightforward answer to the rhetorical question, but this seems unidiomatic: cf. Kassel’s note. Blanchard records a proposal of Austin’s, ἐστ[ιν]; φράσων, but it seems no more likely that the speaker demanded a response to his rhetorical question.

102–3

τολμητέον γάρ ἐστιν. ἀλλ' εἰ[ . . . ]ρ[  
 τούτων ἀληθὲς ὁ θεράπων τι [

Jouguet (114) supplies τι γ[ὺν λέγει at the end of 103, and Schroeder (24) εἴ[πε]ρ [μόνον at the end of 102. The result makes sense, but the position of τι seems surprising. Perhaps it was e.g. εἴ [φη]ζί[ί] τι | τούτων ἀληθὲς ὁ θεράπων, τί γ[ίνεται]; Sigma does not seem excluded as an interpretation of the upright at the end of 102, though no trace remains of its base.

118

]τῶν cῶν ὄνασθαι μηθέν' ἄλλον ἀλλὰ cé

At the start, Austin (ap. Kassel) and Webster (ap. Handley 43) suggest βούλομαι, and Kassel as an alternative βούλεται. This would give a somewhat confusing sentence: βούλομαι (-εται) τῶν cῶν ὄνασθαι looks complete in itself, and it seems awkward to add an accusative subject after it. Perhaps the truth is φημί (or φησὶ) δεῖν. Cf. e.g. *Epitr.* 752–3 φησὶ δεῖν εἰς Πειρηναίᾳ | αὐτὸν βαδίσει.

126–8

(Πυ.) ]τέθνηκε πέρυκιν. (Cτρ.) οἴμοι. (Θη.) γραῦς φόδρ' ἦν  
 ] . ἐκείνη γέγονεν. (Πυ.) ἀλλ' ἐμ' πράγμασιν,  
 Cτρατοφάνη, κ[αι]νοῖς ἔχει cὺ φόδρα τ' ἀνελπίζοις τίςιν.

On 126, Kassel comments 'an τέθνηκε; (Πυ.) πέρυκιν (sc. ἀπέθανεν)?', and this is surely preferable: see Sandbach's note. Before it, ἡ μήτηρ] (Handley 44) is likely, and at the start of the line, perhaps an impatient εἶπον, 'Tell me!': cf. *Dysc.* 410, fr. 447.

In what follows, it seems difficult to take ἐκείνη γέγονεν to refer to the same person as γραῦς φόδρ' ἦν at the end of the preceding line: if 'she' is understood (from what precedes) as the subject of ἦν, why is ἐκείνη used here to indicate the subject? Austin's supplement (ap. Kassel) φιλότιμη δ' ὄμω] is doubtful for this reason, and the sense is odd: why 'nevertheless'? Perhaps Pyrrhias says (in response to Stratophanes' cry οἴμοι) e.g. γραῦς φόδρ' ἦν, | ἡ τύχη δέ πο]ς ἐκείνη γέγονεν, 'She was a very old woman, and that turn of fate has somehow come about', before turning to the matter of real concern. Cf. for the expression Pl. *Crit.* 46b ἐπειδὴ μοι ἦδε ἡ τύχη γέγονεν.

139–40

τοῦτο προὔνοεῖτό σου  
 καὶ τελευτῶς' ἀπεδίδου ce τοῖς ἐαυτῶν εὐλόγως.

'εαυτῶν (sive ceαυτῶν) vix sanum', as Kassel notes. The singular is easily restored ((c)εαυτοῦ M. Papatthomopoulos, *RPh* 39 (1965) 222 = *Varia philologica et papyrologica* i (1990) 22) but the γ' inserted by several scholars after it in order to avoid hiatus is unconvincing. Perhaps it was τοῦτο προὔνοεῖτό σου | καὶ τελευτῶς', ἀπεδίδου ce τοῖς (c)εαυτοῦ <δ'> εὐλόγως. For καὶ τελευτῶς', 'even on her deathbed', cf. e.g. *Mis.* 365 Sandbach = 766 Arnott καὶ λανθάνειν βουλόμενον.

145–7

(Cτρ.) βαδίζετε.  
 δεῦρο Θήρων (Θη.) οὐ λέγεις μοι–; (Cτρ.) πρόαγε, μηθέν πο λάλει.  
 (Θη.) ἀλλ' ὄμωc κἀγῶ– (Cτρ.) βάδιζε. καὶ cὺ δεῦρο, Πυρρία:

In 147, where Kassel emends to βάδιζε, it may be possible to keep the transmitted βαδίζω: (Θη.) ἀλλ' ὄμωc κἀγῶ– βαδίζω. (Cτρ.) καὶ cὺ δεῦρο, Πυρρία. Then Theron, beginning to say 'I too am interested' (Sandbach) or the like, thinks better of it and indicates that he is coming. Another bare imperative, βάδιζε, addressed to Theron *after* the impatient πρόαγε, μηθέν πο λάλει, is possible, but further disobedience at this point would seem to call for a less measured response. Sandbach adopts Kassel's emendation but has no

full stop after βάδιζε: βάδιζε καὶ εὐ δεῦρο, Πυρρία. But no imperative is needed or expected with δεῦρο, cf. 146 δεῦρο Θήρων. Handley, keeping the transmitted text, understands Stratophanes to be saying ‘I’m going and you’re coming too’ (*BICS* 26 (1979) 82–3 = *Actes du VII<sup>e</sup> Congrès de la FIEC* ii (1984) 550–51; *BICS* 31 (1984) 31 n. 9), but we expect an imperative from him, not a piece of present-tense narrative.<sup>7</sup>

175 ἄπασαν ἡμῖν εἰ[

εἰ[πέ is suggested by several scholars. After it, Barigazzi (21) proposes τὴν ῥῆσιν. :: καλῶς, and Austin (ap. Blanchard) τὴν πρῶξιν– (Ελ.) καλῶς, but *Epir.* 293–4, (Cu.) εἶρηκεν; (Cu.) οὐκ ἤκουσας; εἶρηκεν. (Cu.) καλῶς. | οὐκοῦν ἐγὼ μετὰ ταῦτα, is scarcely a convincing parallel for the use of καλῶς in the present passage, where ‘Excellent!’ or the like does not make sense. A likelier supplement is ἄπασαν ἡμῖν εἰ[πέ τὴν πρῶξιν σαφῶς. Cf. e.g. *Dysc.* 217 ἐκείνῳ πᾶν τὸ πρῶγμ’ εἰπὼν σαφῶς, *Epir.* 332 ἐξ οὗ μαθόντες πάντα τὰ καθ’ αὐτοὺς σαφῶς.<sup>8</sup>

187–8

τοῦ τῆς θεοῦ δήμου γάρ εἰμ’, ἐπόνυμος  
ἔβλεπται ἔλευσίνιος

The passage is discussed by Arnott (Further Notes 29), who observes that Chantraine’s parenthetical βλέπει (proposed in the *editio princeps* (125)) does not seem to be paralleled, and rightly insists that ἔλευσίνιος must be the man’s name, not Βλέπει. But Arnott’s own tentative proposal βλέπ’ εἷς (μ’) is not convincing: why should he say this here? I suggest τοῦ τῆς θεοῦ δήμου γάρ εἰμ’ ἐπόνυμος | βλέπει ε’ ἔλευσίνιος, ‘It is Eleusinius who is looking at you’. Cf. *Epir.* 932 τίς ε’ ἀὖ βλέπω γῶ; and for the use of a third-person form close to a first-person form referring to the same character, e.g. *Mis.* 262–3 Sandbach = 663–4 Arnott εἰ μὴ γὰρ οὗτος δοκιμάσει με, κυρίως | δῶκει τε ταύτην, οἴχεται Θρακωνίδης, *Dysc.* 692–4 θάρρει. (Κν.) τεθάρρηκ’. οὐκέτι | ὑμῖν ἐνοχλήσει τὸν ἐπίλοιπον γὰρ χρόνον | Κνήμων; *Sam.* 647 ff.; J. Blundell, *Menander and the Monologue* (1980) 66 with n. 5.

220–23

]υτος ἐμπαθῶς τε τῶν  
λα]μβάνεται βρυχώμενος  
]έλαβε τοὺς ἐκτηκότας  
]ε τί βούλει; λέγε, λέγε.”

Austin (ap. Handley 51 and ap. Kassel) supplies at 221–3 e.g. τριχῶν ἑαυτοῦ λα]μβάνεται βρυχώμενος. | καὶ θαῦμ’ ὀρῶντας] έλαβε τοὺς ἐκτηκότας: | πάντες δ’ ἐβόησαν “εὐ δ]ε τί βούλει; λέγε, λέγε”. This gives good sense, though it is of course quite uncertain. But in 221, ἑαυτοῦ seems superfluous, and one might consider supplying instead ὁ μέλεος. Cf. *Epir.* 890–91 οἷαν λαβὼν | γυνοαῖχ’ ὁ μέλεος ἠτύχηκα. Then in 222, the additional participle ὀρῶντας does not seem to make any useful contribution. Another possibility would be βρυχώμενος | ἐλεεινά: θαῦμα δ’] έλαβε: cf. e.g. *Soph. OT* 1265 δεινὰ βρυχηθείς.<sup>9</sup>

308 ἔφη προελθὼν ἐχθρὸς εἰς ομ[

Kassel mentions Schroeder’s proposal (26) εἰς ὀμ[ιλίαν, but this seems a doubtful expression (‘to intercourse’). Coles (136) thought of εἰς ὀμ[ήγυριν, which could give suitable sense, but Lloyd-Jones (148 = 85)

<sup>7</sup> Arnott (Further Notes 25) finds in καὶ βᾶδιζω an example of the use of καὶ to contrast ‘the objective reality of an idea with its subjective reality or with the unreality of something else’ (J. D. Denniston, *The Greek Particles* (1954) 321), but this is unsuitable when the word so emphasized is ἐγώ.

<sup>8</sup> Arnott (Further Notes 28) rightly observes that Handley’s τὴν κατάστασιν (46) does not give the right sense, but his own τὴν γε συμφορᾶν, with its strange γε, is no improvement.

<sup>9</sup> Some have preferred to suppose that the subject of έλαβε (222) is οἶκτος (K. Kumaniecki, *Athenaeum* 53 (1965) 158; cf. R. Kassel, *Erano*s 63 (1965) 11 = *Kleine Schriften* (1991) 281) or έλεος (B. Marzullo, *QIFG* 2 (1967) 71), rather than θαῦμα. But the preserved part of 223 does not suggest pity.

objects that 'the occurrences of this word hitherto known indicate that it smacks too much of high poetry to be used by Menander, at any rate in this kind of context'. I suggest εἰκόμ[ενος τὸ σύν (or some other suitable object): cf. *Epirr.* 462–3 ἤξ]ω διαδραμών – εἰς πόλιν γὰρ ἔρχομαι | νυ]γί – περὶ τούτων εἰκόμενος τί δε[ῖ] ποεῖν.

312 ἔμοι τί σὺ σπουδαίω

Sandbach's paraphrase, 'what project has Theron of adequate importance?', points to a supplement such as σπουδαίω[ν οὕτω πρᾶγμα ἔχεις (σπουδαίω[ν Blass ap. Jouguet 113; ἔχεις Sudhaus ap. Schroeder 26), with οὕτω suitably taken up in the next line by ὅτ' ἄξιον ταύτης φ[ανῆναι τῆς ὁδοῦ (φ[ανῆναι Lloyd-Jones 148 = 86; τῆς ὁδοῦ Blass).

314–19

ἦν κεκόμικας με δεο[  
 ἀεὶ τι μικρὸν ἔτι προε[  
 ἄξιον, ἀκριβῶς ἴσθι, γιν[  
 τίς εἰμι; μὰ τὸν Ἑφαιστ[ον  
 σπουδαίον ἂν δέξῃ μ[  
 λαλοῦντα γὰρ σὺ θηρι[

Sandbach (312 n.) reasonably suspects that the paragraphi under 316 and 317 are misplaced. Apart from his arguments, ἀκριβῶς ἴσθι fits an attempt to reassure the sceptical Cichesias, and γὰρ (319) is hard to account for if Cichesias' speech has just begun with a conditional clause at the start of the preceding line. Sandbach suggests that the paragraphi below 316 and 317 should be below 315 and 316. But it seems to me that a paragraphus is probably wanted below 318, whereas that below 316 is not confirmed by anything in the preserved text. Perhaps then the first paragraphus belongs one line higher up and the second one line lower down. Then some such reconstruction as the following could be considered for 315–19 (incorporating earlier proposals):

ἀεὶ τι μικρὸν ἔτι προέ[ρχεσθαι; λέγε.  
 (Θη.) ἄξιον, ἀκριβῶς ἴσθι, γιν[ώσκειν τόδε·  
 τίς εἰμι, μὰ τὸν Ἑφαιστ[ον οὐκ ἠπίστασο,  
 σπουδαίον ἂν δέξῃ μ[ε μηδὲν ὑποβαλεῖν.  
 (Κι.) λαλοῦντα γὰρ σὺ, θηρί[ον, βλέπω πάλαι.

In 315, λέγε is suggested as an alternative to Sandbach's πᾶν (assigned to Theron): ἀκριβῶς ἴσθι by itself seems to lend sufficient emphasis to ἄξιον. In 319, following Blass's θηρί[ον (ap. Jouguet 113; cf. Arnott, *Further Notes* 33), βλέπω πάλαι or the like may be supported by *Soph. OT* 626 οὐ γὰρ φρονοῦντά σ' εὖ βλέπω. Cichesias finds it difficult to believe that a chatterer such as this will have anything worth while to propose.

343–50

(Κι.) οὐκ εἰς τὸν ὄλεθρον – χαλεπὸς ἦσθ' – ἀποφθερεῖ  
 ἀπ' ἐμοῦ; Κιχησίαν σὺ τοιοῦθ' ὑπέλαβες  
 ἔργον ποιῆσειν ἢ λαβεῖν ἂμ παρά τινος  
 ἀργύριον; ἀδίκου πράγματος. (Θη.) Κιχησίαν –;  
 (Κι.) Σκαμβωνίδην γενόμενον. (Θη.) εὖ γ'. (Κι.) ἄρ' ὑπέλαβες;  
 (Θη.) τούτου με πρᾶξαι μισθὸν αὐτοῦ, μηκέτι  
 ὦν ἔλεγον ἄρτι. (Κι.) τοῦ τίνος; (Θη.) Κιχησίασ  
 Σκαμβωνίδης γε – πολὺ σὺ βέλτιον λέγεις·

The assignment of the parts is uncertain. In 343, it may be better to give χαλεπὸς ἦσθα to Theron, as recommended by Sandbach (cf. Arnott, Final Notes 95). For 346–50, I suggest the following arrangement:

ἀργύριον – (Θη.) ἀδίκου πράγματος. (Κι.) Κιχησίαν  
 Κκαμβωνίδην γε τὸ γένος; (Θη.) εὖ γ'. “ἄρ' ὑπέλαβες;”  
 τούτου με πρᾶξαι μισθὸν αὐτοῦ, μηκέτι  
 ὦν ἔλεγον ἄρτι. (Κι.) τοῦ τίνος; (Θη.) “Κιχησίας  
 Κκαμβωνίδης γε” – πολὺν δὲ βέλτιον λέγεις

Theron is impressed by the quality of what he takes to be the old man's impersonation of an angry Cichesias. In congratulating him, he freely repeats parts of his question, imitating his impassioned delivery, but his own impression falls far short of the old man's (350 πολὺν δὲ βέλτιον λέγεις). So 347 ἄρ' ὑπέλαβες; (cf. 344) and 349–50 Κιχησίας | Κκαμβωνίδης γε (cf. 346–7) are both spoken by Theron and to be placed between quotation marks. The old man's performance merits the payment that he has promised (348–9). Cichesias is puzzled (349)<sup>10</sup> but Theron fails to notice this and continues, recalling another memorable part of the speech (349–50).

There is a paragraphus under 346, and Arnott (Final Notes 95) plausibly takes ἀδίκου πράγματος to be spoken ironically by Theron. The assignment of what follows to Cichesias is recommended by the echo at 349–50, as Arnott points out. That echo will be more precise if J. Martin's γε τὸ γένος (ap. J.-M. Jacques, *REA* 69 (1967) 306) is adopted at 347 as an emendation of the transmitted γενομενος, where γενόμενον was suggested in the first edition (146), but either conjecture is possible. The suggestion that ἄρ' ὑπέλαβες; (347) is a quotation spoken admiringly by Theron in Cichesias' voice seems new. Admittedly it does not quite match 344, but it is still instantly recognizable, especially if Theron imitates Cichesias' delivery. Kassel assigns the words to Cichesias himself, but it seems less likely that he would himself repeat in this way the question that he has just asked, ‘Did you suppose?’ Sandbach, assigning the question to Theron, translates ‘have you got it, then?’, but it is not clear that the verb could be understood in this sense, especially when it has just been used in the sense ‘suppose (falsely)’ at 344.

383–5

(Cτρ.) ἡγοῦ ζ[ὺ τῶιδε] κατὰ πόδας  
 ἐγὼ δι[ώ]κω, μικρὰ τοῖ[ς γ' ἔνδο]ν φράσσα.  
 (Δρ.) ]όμεν ημερᾶ. Κ[ι]χησία.

In 383, the reading given by the first edition (148), μ[, appears correct, but we do not expect either ‘merely’ (μ[όνον κύ] Lloyd-Jones 149 = 86) or ‘alone’ (μ[όνος κύ] Arnott, Final Notes 97). A more likely supplement is ἡγοῦμ[ένον σε]. Then in the next line τοῖ[ς γ' ἔνδο]ν by itself looks long enough for the gap, as Sandbach says (384–5 n.).

At the start of 385, Barigazzi's προάγ]όμεν (62) is likely. As for the trace after ημε, Coles (137) notes that ‘the remains seem curiously hollow-backed for ρ (the ρ of φρασον in the line below is barely parallel). The traces might suit χ, but this is very difficult’. Iota is excluded,<sup>11</sup> but lambda may be possible. It does not usually come so far to the left at the top, but the hand is very irregular, and there are examples that seem comparable in this respect, such as the first in 213. Then we could have ἦ μέλλεις, [Κ]ιχησία;<sup>12</sup> ‘Are you going to (come), Cichesias?’ Kassel has α after his ρ: the trace is the end of a stroke descending from left to right, and would suit λ as well. The traces after that are not useful, but μέλλεις seems to be of the right length: Coles (137) notes that after με there is ‘space for three to four letters before [Κ]ιχησία’.

<sup>10</sup> For the reading here, see Coles 136.

<sup>11</sup> Arnott (Final Notes 97) finds it acceptable, describing the traces as ‘the top of a hasta well above the line, and its foot well below it bending slightly to the left’. But the high trace is clearly the beginning of an oblique descending from left to right; the iotas compared by Arnott are not similar.

<sup>12</sup> Not Κ[ι]χησία: see Coles 137.

387–90

εἰς γειτόνων ἅπαντα δεῦρ[  
 τοὺς κανδύτανας, τοὺς ἄορτ[  
 ἅπαντα, τοὺς ρίσκους ἅπαντ[  
 καὶ μη . . . ευρησκονταc ἐνθα[δ]

In 389, ἅπαντ[αc, printed in the first edition (150), is very likely. After it, perhaps e.g. πατέρα γὰρ ἢ καὶ μητέρ[η] εὐρίσκονταc ἐνθα[δ]ὶ πρέπει (plural for singular?): the relocation that Stratophanes is proposing befits a man who finds his parents. Kassel says of the traces after μη ‘possis τερ’, and this looks plausible, although Sandbach says only that the traces do ‘not suggest, nor quite exclude, μητερ’.

391–6

αὐτήν τ' ἀπιέναι δεῦρο πρὸc[  
 κέλευε τὴν ἐμήν, μεθ' ὑμῶ[ν  
 τοὺς βαρβάρους παῖδαc καταλ[  
 ἐνταῦθα καὶ Θήρωνα τοὺc τ' ὀ[νηλάταc  
 καὶ τοὺc ὄνουc. ταῦτα λέγ'· ἐγὼ[  
 ἐντεῦξομ' αὐτὸc τᾶλλα τῶι τ . [

[τὴν μητέρα (A. Oguse, *CE* 40 (1965) 125; Webster ap. Handley 58) is very likely at the end of 391. As for what follows, Sandbach on 386 ff. argues convincingly for Handley's view that ‘the barbarians, Theron, and the donkey-drivers are to stay in his [i.e. Stratophanes'] house’. It would be helpful to have that spelt out in the text: e.g.

αὐτήν τ' ἀπιέναι δεῦρο πρὸc [τὴν μητέρα  
 κέλευε τὴν ἐμήν μεθ' ὑμῶ[ν, παρὰ δ' ἐμοὶ  
 τοὺc βαρβάρους παῖδαc καταλ[ύονταc μένειν  
 ἐνταῦθα καὶ Θήρωνα κτλ.

Cf. e.g. Pl. *Grg.* 447b παρ' ἐμοὶ γὰρ Γοργίαc καταλύει (LSJ s.v. καταλύω II.2).

As for 395–6, Coles (137) says of the final trace of 396 ‘I doubt α[ (Handley p. 58); η[ might suit the traces more satisfactorily’. So instead of Handley's ἐγὼ [δ' ἐτοιμάων ἢ ἐντεῦξομ' αὐτὸc τᾶλλα τῶι τὰ[ύτηc πατρί, in which τὰ[ύτηc is in any case surprising when the girl has not been mentioned recently, one could have ἐγὼ [δὲ τῶι πατρί ἢ ἐντεῦξομ' αὐτὸc τᾶλλα τῶι τῆ[c παρθένου, with adverbial τᾶλλα.

401–2

οἶον γὰρ οὗτοc ἔτι λέγειc οναντ[  
 πρῶγμ' ἐcτ' ἐπαινεῖν χάριν εν . [

In 401, Sandbach's punctuation (following H. Lloyd-Jones, *GRBS* 7 (1966) 150 = *Greek Comedy, Hellenistic Literature, Greek Religion, and Miscellanea* (1990) 70), οἶον γὰρ – οὗτοc, ἔτι λέγειc; οναντ[, is very plausible, and ὄν ἄντ[ικρυc (proposed by Austin ap. Kassel) is attractive at the end. As for 402, Coles (137) says of the final traces ‘read ενο[ (so Austin)? I suspect too tight an arc for ε[’.<sup>13</sup> I suggest supplying χάριν ἐν ὀ[φθαλμοῖc τ' ἔχειν. For the postponed τε, cf. Sandbach on *Peric.* 128, and for the phrase, Eur. fr. 736.5–6 ἢ δ' ἐν ὀφθαλμοῖc χάριc ἢ ἀπόλωλ', ὅταν τιc ἐκ δόμων ἀνήρ θάνηι.

409 αὐτῆc θ' ἐταίραc ἢ κακ[

Perhaps αὐτῆcθ' ἐταίραc ἢ κακ[ῆ] συμβουλία, ‘This bad advice is a courtesan's’ (referring to, and rejecting, what has been said in the preceding lines?).

<sup>13</sup> J.-L. Fournet ap. Blanchard reads ‘εν[ι] uel εν[η]’, and the plate in the *editio princeps* (pl. XI) may seem to show an upright in the final position, but the arc is clear in the photograph published on the website of the Institut de Papyrologie de la Sorbonne (<http://www.papyrologie.paris-sorbonne.fr/photos/2072272.jpg>).

418–20

πῶς δ' ἂν διακόψαις δῶιδά[  
 πρὶν ὁμολογήσαι καὶ στεφαν[  
 δράζω. κατάνευσον.

Concerning the text at the start of 420, Coles (137) writes as follows: ‘I find ρ very hard to read: perhaps the “tail” is in fact an offset. δωζω seems a more satisfactory reading (the c is hard to make out, but not impossible).’<sup>14</sup> Handley (59) had proposed for the end of 419 and the start of 420 e.g. (A.) πείθητί μοι. | (B.) δράζω. (A.) κατάνευσον, with δράζω indicating the speaker’s assent to the preceding request. If δωζω is to be read in this place, a different reconstruction will be required, e.g. (incorporating Handley’s attractive suggestions for 418 and the first half of 419) πῶς δ' ἂν διακόψαις– :: δῶιδά [μοί τις ἐκδότη– | :: πρὶν ὁμολογήσαι– :: καὶ στεφάν[ους. :: δώζειν ἃ δεῖ; The interpretation of the lines remains quite uncertain. If, as Arnott suggests (Final Notes 100–101), Stratophanes had promised Malthace a ‘dowry’ and this is mentioned in 414–15, then the question in 418–19 may be addressed by her to him; in that case, δώζω (420) would be his response.

W. B. Henry, Department of Greek and Latin, University College London  
 w\_b\_henry@yahoo.co.uk

<sup>14</sup> Arnott (Final Notes 101) finds δραζω no less likely, but the new photograph (<http://www.papyrologie.paris-sorbonne.fr/photos/2092272.jpg>) confirms Coles’s reading; Sandbach considers it ‘certain’.