NOTES ON MENANDER’S COLAX AND SICYONIUS 1

Colax (CGFP 163)

53 τί λυϲιτελεῖν ἡμῖν ἀπλοφαίνεις τάδικεῖν;

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 τιλυϲιτελεῖμιν. But λυϲιτελέξ appears no less likely as a reading than λυϲιτελέι: there is hardly any ink in place for the final letter. 2 If it is accepted, there will be no reason to adopt the first editors’ emendation λυϲιτελεί⟨ν⟩: λυϲιτελέξ is just as suitable.

95–9

οὗτοι τύραννοι πόσποθ’, ὠσις ἥγεμόν
μέγας, ἐστράτηγ[ας], φρούραρχ[ος], οἰκιστ[ῆς] τόπ[ο[υ],
στρατηγ[ός], οὐ [ . . . ] ἀλλὰ τοὺς τελέως ἕγω
ἀπολολόταϲ, [νῦν τῇ]τύρντ’ ἀνήρηκεν μόνον,
οἱ κόλακεϲ, οὐτ[·] δὲ εἰϲίν αὐτοῦ ὅθλιοι.

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 ἀπολωλόταϲ (95). In any case, τῇτ’ ἀνήρηκεν 3 μόνον may be felt to be too similar to τῇτ’ ἀπολόλεκεν μόνον five lines before. Menander will have written τό τοίρντ’. Now it may be argued that this vague expression is less likely than τῇτ’ 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

ἐξρώντ’ ἄγοραὶ, καθητ’ τ’ ἐπὶ τῆς ἄγκ[άλης]
ἐξ’ χων ὁ θεράπων τὴν τροφίμην. πολιομένοις

1 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.


Other abbreviations:


Barigazzi A. Barigazzi, Sul «Sicionio» di Menandro, SIFC 37 (1965) 7–84.


Jouguet P. Jouguet, Papyrius de Ghorân, BCH 30 (1906) 103–49.


Schroeder O. Schroeder (ed.), Novae comicæ diae fragmenta in papyris reperta exceptis Menandreis (1915).

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

3 The papyrus has ἀνήρηκεν, not -κεν, as reported in the first edition and in CGFP: see the plates mentioned in n. 2. For the possibility that ἀνείρηκεν is to be restored, see below on Sic. 82.
At the end of 8, πολίμενος (Handley 40) is in the right case, but the general will have gone up to the pirates to ask the price: πολιμένι δέ.

15–17

ταύτις τῇ γυγῶν
ἐκ τοῦ παραχρήμη
τῷοι θεῖοι οὕς πατη
Handley’s tentative proposal (40) for 15, ταύτις τῇ γυγῶν, seems too long. One might perhaps consider ταύτις γυγῶν εἰς τοῦ παραχρήμη, rather than ταύτις τῇ γυγῶν, 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 πατη in 17).

75 Following the removal of some offset papyrus,4 Coles (134; Emerita 35 (1967) 163) reads ]...υπερβο. 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 ἀνυπερβῆτοι’. But since there is no evidence that the iota adscript was written, υπερβακλο seems more probable.

77 ἥν ἐγένομην
Coles (134) comments ‘Before π, I think τ. Before that, o or e possible (not α)’, and according to Lloyd-Jones (144 = 81), this reading, ‘in conjunction with the sense, suggests that ἥν περ is the likeliest word to have been written’. But ἥν περ seems no less likely.

82 The transmitted ἀνειρηκαϲ is interpreted correctly by F. Blass (ap. Jouguet 114): ‘ἀνειρηκαϲ = ἀνειρηκαϲ’.5 For the spelling, perhaps Menander’s own, cf. L. Thriate, The Grammar of Attic Inscriptions ii (1996) 486. Dysc. 595 ἀνειρηκαϲ, quoted by Kassel, may be a corruption of ἀνειρηκαϲ with ει and η having switched positions, even if it is the perfect of ἀναιρέω; so too in Colax, CGFP 163.98, ἀνειρηκαϲ (cf. n. 3) may represent ἀνειρηκαϲ rather than ἀνήρηκαϲ. Cf. also Asp. 225 (αφηρητα Β).

100–101

ἐμοὶ δὲ καὶ τοῦτοι τί πρέψη ἐκτὶν
μή τοῦτον ἡμῖν τῶν τρόπων λαλεῖν
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 τοῦτοι τί πρέψη ἐκτὶν;” λέγεις;6 | μή τοῦτον ἡμῖν τῶν τρόπων λαλεῖν [, ‘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), Cμμίζη ξελάληλθυ[θ]εν | “τι” φης “κέπονθ;” οὐδέ[θ] υπὲρ ταύτης λαλ[εί]. | μέ[λ]ε[ι] χρίστῃ ἠμ[ε]ρικάτου; μή λέγει κτλ., ‘If Simiche comes out, you say “How is she?” ’ etc.

4 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).

5 He does not suggest that it is to be emended. Cf. his comment on Philod. Mort. 37.13 in GGA (1886) 540: ‘ὑπερβο (att. Orthogr. für ἀνυπερβο).’

6 λέγει was proposed by Schroeder (24) in this place (and λαλεῖν ἐν γε at the end of the next line). Sandbach’s ἐκτι; | 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, ἐκτι; φάσον, but it seems no more likely that the speaker demanded a response to his rhetorical question.
102–3

θολυμητόν γὰρ ἐκτιν. ἄλλ' εἰ[ ... ]π[ ... ]

τοῦτον ἀληθὲς ὁ θεράπων τί[ ].

Jouguet (114) supplies τί γ[υ]ν· λέγει at the end of 103, and Schroeder (24) εἰ[πε]ρ[ ... ]μόνον at the end of 102. The result makes sense, but the position of τί seems surprising. Perhaps it was e.g. εἰ [φη]ξ; τί τί τοῦτον ἀληθὲς ὁ θεράπων, τί γ[υ]νεται; 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 κὼν ὄνακθαὶ μηθὲν' ἄλλον ἄλλα εἰ

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 (-έται) τῶν κὼν ὄνακθαὶ looks complete in itself, and it seems awkward to add an accusative subject after it. Perhaps the truth is φημὶ (or φησί) δείν. Cf. e.g. Epitr. 752–3 φης δεΐν εἰς Περισσᾶ ἑ αὐτὸν βαδίσαι.

126–8

(Πυ.) τέθνηκεν πέρυςιν. (Στρ.) οἴμοι. (Θη.) γραῦϲ εφόδρ' ἢν

τελευτῶϲ, ἕκεινα γέγονεν. (Πυ.) ἄλλ' εἰ πράγμαϲιν,

Στροτοφάνη, ἱκανοῖς έκείνοι σὺ εφόδρα τ' ἀντιλίπτοις τειν.

On 126, Kassel comments ‘an τέθνηκε; (Πυ.) πέρυςιν (sc. ἀπέθανεν)’?, and this is surely preferable: see Sandbach’s note. Before it, ἢ μῆτηρ (Handley 44) is likely, and at the start of the line, perhaps an impatient εἴπον, ‘Tell me!’: cf. Dyss. 410, fr. 447.

In what follows, it seems difficult to take ἕκεινα γέγονεν to refer to the same person as γραῦϲ εφόδρ’ ἢν at the end of the preceding line: if ‘she’ is understood (from what precedes) as the subject of ἢν, why is ἕκεινα used here to indicate the subject? Austin’s supplement (ap. Kassel) φιλτάτη δ’ ὀμός is doubtful for this reason, and the sense is odd: why ‘nevertheless’? Perhaps Pyrrhias says (in response to Stratophanes’ cry οἴμοι) e.g. γραῦϲ εφόδρ’ ἢν, ἢ τῆς δὲ ποιεὶ κατανεῖ 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 ἑπειδῆ μοι ὣδε ἢ τῆς γέγονεν.

139–40

tοῦτο προῦνοεῖτό σου
cοι τελευτῶϲ ἄπεδίδου σε τοῖς ἐκατὼν εὐλόγωϲ.

ὡς εὐνοτον (sive euvnoton) vix sanum’, as Kassel notes. The singular is easily restored ((ε)(ε)υνοτὸς M. Papatimopoulos, 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 προῦνοεῖτό σου καὶ τελευτῶϲ, ἄπεδίδου σε τοῖς (ε)(ε)υνοτ插座 (δ’) εὐλόγωϲ. For καὶ τελευτῶϲ, ‘even on her deathbed’, cf. e.g. Mis. 365 Sandbach = 766 Arnott καὶ λοιπήν μιαν βουλομένων.

145–7

(Στρ.) βοδίζετε.

dέιρῳ Θήρων (Θη.) οὐ λέγεις μοι;)· (Στρ.) πρόαγε, μηθὲν πω λάλει.

(Θη.) ἄλλ’ ὀμοὶ κόρᾳ—(Στρ.) βοδίζε. καὶ σὺ δεῦρο, Πυρρία.

In 147, where Kassel emends to βοδίζε, it may be possible to keep the transmitted βοδίζω; (Θη.) ἄλλ’ ὀμοὶ κόρᾳ—βοδίζω. (Στρ.) καὶ σὺ 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, βοδίζε, addressed to Theron after the impatient πρόαγε, μηθὲν πω 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 σὺ δεῦρο, Πυρρίω. But no imperative is needed or expected with δεῦρο, cf. 146 δεῦρo 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 Congrès de la FIEC ii (1984) 550–51; BICS 31 (1984) n. 9), but we expect an imperative from him, not a piece of present-tense narrative.7

175 ἀπασαν ἡμῖν εἰ[

εἰπέ is suggested by several scholars. After it, Barigazzi (21) proposes τὴν ῥήσιν: καλὸς, and Austin (ap. Blanchard) τὴν πρᾶξιν—(Ελ.) καλός, but Epitr. 293–4, (Συ.) εἰρήκεν; (Συ.) οὐκ ἰκουσας; εἰρήκεν. (Συ.) καλός. ὁ οὐκόν ἐγὼ μετὰ ταύτα, is scarcely a convincing parallel for the use of καλὸς in the present passage, where ‘Excellent!’ or the like does not make sense. A likelier supplement is ἀπασαν ἡμῖν εἰπέ τὴν πρᾶξιν σαφῶς. Cf. e.g. Dysc. 217 ἐκείνω πάν τὸ πρᾶγμ’ εἰπὼν σαφῶς, Epitr. 332 εἰ οὐ μαθόντες πάντα τά καθ’ εὐτύχοις σαφῶς.8

187–8
tοῦ τῆς θεοῦ δήμου γάρ εἰμ’, ἐπώνυμος
βλέπης ἕλευσίνιος

The passage is discussed by Arnott (Further Notes 29), who observes that Chantaine’s parenthetical βλέπης (proposed in the editio princeps (125)) does not seem to be paralleled, and rightly insists that ἔλευσίνιος must be the man’s name, not Βλέπης. But Arnott’s own tentative proposal βλέπ’ εἰς (μ’) is not convincing: why should he say this here? I suggest τοῦ τῆς θεοῦ δήμου γάρ εἰμ’ ἐπώνυμος: βλέπεις ἔλευσίνιος. It is Eleusinians who is looking at you’. Cf. Epitr. 932 τῇς εὑρέσιμους, 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 γάρ οὖν δοκιμάζει με, κυρίως ὁ δέκει ταύτῃ, ὑψέται Ἐρακονίδης. Dysc. 692–4 θάρει. (Κυ.) τεθάρησκε: οὐκέτι εἰς ἐμὴν ἐνοχήλητι τὸν ἐπιλογὸν γὰρ χρόνον | Κνήμων; Sam. 647 ff.; J. Blundell, Menander and the Monologue (1980) 66 with n. 5.

220–23

 kukος ἐμπαθὸς τε τῶν
λαβάμαντας βρυχόμενος
ἔλαβε τοὺς ἐκπικότας
ἔλαβε τοὺς εὐθείαν ἔλαβε τοὺς ἐκπικότας.

Austin (ap. Handley 51 and ap. Kassel) supplies at 221–3 e.g. τριχῶν ἐνυποτο λαβάμαντας βρυχόμενον: λαβὼν θαύμα, ὁ θαύμα, ὁ θαύμα . This gives good sense, though it is of course quite uncertain. But in 221, ἐνυποτο seems superficial, and one might consider supplying instead ὁ μέλεος. Cf. Epitr. 890–91 οἷς λαβὼν γιόναι γιόναι γιόναι γιόναι γιόναι. Then in 222, the additional participle ὀρώντας does not seem to make any useful contribution. Another possibility would be βρυχόμενος ἔλευσίνιος δ’ ἔλαβε: cf. e.g. Soph. OT 1265 δεινὰ βρυχήθηκείς.9

308 ὑπη προελθὼν ἐφ’ θεὸς εἰς οἷς[

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

7 Arnott (Further Notes 25) finds in καὶγὰρ βοᾶδίζω 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 ἐγὼ.

8 Arnott (Further Notes 28) rightly observes that Handley’s τὴν καπάκταις (46) does not give the right sense, but his own τὴν γε συμφοριῶν, with its strange γέ, is no improvement.

9 Some have preferred to suppose that the subject of ἔλαβε (222) is θεῶς (K. Kumaniecki, Athenaeum 53 (1965) 158; cf. R. Kassel, Eratos 63 (1965) 11 = Kleine Schriften (1991) 281 or ἐλεος (B. Marzullo, QIFG 2 (1967) 71), rather than θεῶς. 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 εἰϲόμενοϲ τὸϲ σῶϲ (or some other suitable object); cf. Epitr. 462–3 ἡξὶϲ διαδραμῶν – εἰϲ πῶλιν γὰρ ἔρχομαι! νυὐγ! – περὶ τοῦτον εἰϲόμενοϲ τί δε[τ] ποείϲ.

312 ἡμι τι εὖ σπουδαῖο[
Sandbach’s paraphrase, ‘what project has Theron of adequate importance?’, points to a supplement such as σπουδαῖοϲ ν οὕτω πρᾶγμα ἐξειϲ (σπουδαῖοϲ Blass ap. Jouguet 113; ἐξειϲ Sudhaus ap. Schroeder 26), with οὕτω suitably taken up in the next line by ὦϲτ’ ἀξίων ταύτηϲ φιλανήϲει τῆϲ ὀδοῦ (φιλανήϲει Lloyd-Jones 148 = 86; τῆϲ ὀδοῦ Blass).

314–19 ἧϲ κεκόμεϲ με δεο[ἀεί τι μικρὸν ἔτι πρεϲ; ἀξίωϲ, ἀκριβῶϲ ίϲθί, γιν[
τίϲ εἰϲμ; μᾶ τὸν Ἰηραἱϲτοϲ σπουδαῖοϲ ἀν δέϲηϲ μ[
λαλοῦντα γὰρ ἐϲ ἦϲ Θηρῆ[
Sandbach (312 n.) reasonably suspects that the paragraphi under 316 and 317 are misplaced. Apart from his arguments, ἀκριβῶϲ ίϲθι fits an attempt to reassure the sceptical Cichesias, and γάρ (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):

ἀεί τι μικρὸν ἔτι προεϲθεϲθαι; λέγε.
(Θηϲ.) ἀξίωϲ, ἀκριβῶϲ ίϲθι, γιν[
τίϲ εἰϲμ; μᾶ τὸν Ἰηραἱϲτοϲ σπουδαῖοϲ ἀν δέϲηϲ μ[
λαλοῦντα γὰρ ἐϲ ἦϲ Θηρῆ[

In 315, λέγε is suggested as an alternative to Sandbach’s πάνυ (assigned to Theron): ἀκριβῶϲ ίϲθι by itself seems to lend sufficient emphasis to ἀξίωϲ. In 319, following Blass’s ἦϲρίϲοϲ (ap. Jouguet 113; cf. Arnott, Further Notes 33), βλέπω πάλαϲ or the like may be supported by Soph. OT 626 οὐ γὰρ φρονοῦϲταϲ ε’ εὖ βλέπω. Cichesias finds it difficult to believe that a chatterer such as this will have anything worth while to propose.

343–50 (Κιϲ.) οὐϲ εἰϲ τὸν ὀλεθροϲ – χαλεπῶϲ ἐϲθ’ – ὀποφθερεῖ ἀϲ’ ἐϲμ; Κιγκηϲίαϲ κὼ τοιϲοθ’ ὑπέλαϲεϲ ἔργων ποίϲεϲ ἡ λαβεῖϲ ἄμι παρά τῖϲοϲ ἄργυϲοϲ; ἀδίκωϲ πράϲτμαϲ. (Θηϲ.) Κιγκηϲίαϲ –;
(Κιϲ.) Σκαμβωνίϲϲ ἑϲμ; νεµόϲεϲ. (Θηϲ.) εὗ γ’. (Κιϲ.) ἀϲ’ ὑπέλαϲεϲ; (Θηϲ.) τοῦτοϲ με πράϲϲα μιϲθὸϲ ὀϲτοϲ, μιϲτεϲ ἄν ἑϲλεϲον ἄρτι. (Κιϲ.) τοῦ τίϲοϲ; (Θηϲ.) Κιγκηϲίαϲ Σκαμβωνίϲϲ γε – πολὺ εὗ βέλτιϲο λέγεϲ;
The assignment of the parts is uncertain. In 343, it may be better to give \(\text{χαλεπός \ ήθος} \) to Theron, as recommended by Sandbach (cf. Arnott, Final Notes 95). For 346–50, I suggest the following arrangement:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{ἀργύριον} & \quad (\Theta \eta) \quad \text{αδίκου πράγματος}. \quad (\mathrm{K}) \quad \text{Κιχησίας} \\
\text{Σκαμβωνίδης} & \quad \text{γε} \quad \text{τό γένος}; \quad (\Theta \eta) \quad \text{ε\'} \quad \text{‘ἀρ’ ύπέλαβες!’} \\
\text{τούτου με πράξαι μιθόν αυτού, μηκέτι} & \\
\text{ἄν ἔλεγον ὁρτί}. \quad (\mathrm{K}) \quad \text{τού τίνος}; \quad (\Theta \eta) \quad \text{‘Κιχησίας} \\
\text{Σκαμβωνίδης γε} & \quad – \text{πολύ} \quad \text{κυ βέλτιον λέγεις}
\end{align*}
\]

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 \text{πολύ} \quad \text{κυ βέλτιον λέγεις}). So 347 \text{ἀρ’ ύπέλαβες}; (cf. 344) and 349–50 \text{Κιχησίας} \text{Ι Σκαμβωνίδης} \text{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)\textsuperscript{10} 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 \text{αδίκου 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 \text{γε} \quad \text{τό γένος} (ap. J.-M. Jacques, \textit{REA} 69 (1967) 306) is adopted at 347 as an emendation of the transmitted \text{γενομενος}, where \text{γενομενον} was suggested in the first edition (146), but either conjecture is possible. The suggestion that \text{ἀρ’ ύπέλαβες} (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

\[
\text{(Στρ.)} \quad \text{ἡγοῦ} \quad \text{τῷ τῶιδε} \quad \kappaατὰ κόδας} \\
\text{ἐγὼ διλόκω, μικρὰ τοῖ[c] \text{γ’ \ ἐνδο} \gamma \ \text{φράϲας}.} \\
\text{(Δρ.)} \quad \text{Ἰφιμεν} \quad \text{ημερο.} \quad \text{Κιχηϲίας.}
\]

In 383, the reading given by the first edition (148), \(\mu[\), appears correct, but we do not expect either ‘merely’ (\(\mu[ον \text{c}]) \text{Lloyd-Jones} 149 = 86) or ‘alone’ (\(\mu[ον \text{c}]) \text{Arnott, Final Notes 97}). A more likely supplement is \(\text{ἡγοϲ[ενόν} \) ce]. Then in the next line τοἳ[c \text{ἐνδο} \gamma] by itself looks long enough for the gap, as Sandbach says (384–5 n.).

At the start of 385, Barigazzi’s \(\text{προάγ} \text{ιφιμεν} (62) \) is likely. As for the trace after \(\eta \text{με}, \) Coles (137) notes that ‘the remains seem curiously hollow-backed for ρ (the ρ of φράϲον in the line below is barely parallel). The traces might suit χ, but this is very difficult’. Iota is excluded,\textsuperscript{11} 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 \(\text{ἡ \μέλλεις,} \ \text{Κιχηϲίας}; \) ‘Are you going to (come), Cichesias?’ Kassel has ζ 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 \(\mu[έλλεις seems to be of the right length: Coles (137) notes that after \(\mu \text{με}, \) there is ‘space for three to four letters before \(\text{Κιχηϲίας}.\)’

\textsuperscript{10} For the reading here, see Coles 136.

\textsuperscript{11} 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.

\textsuperscript{12} Not \(\text{Κιχηϲίας:} \) see Coles 137.
387–90

ień ἑτερόν τὸν ἄπαντα δεύτερον ἀπὸ τοὺς κανάλινας, τοὺς ἀπό τὸν ἁπάντα, τοὺς ῥίκους ἄπαντα καὶ μητέρα, εὑρίσκοντας ἔνθαδ’

In 389, ἄπαντα[}], printed in the first edition (150), is very likely. After it, perhaps e.g. πατέρα γάρ ἐν τῇ μητέρα ἐυρίσκοντας ἔνθαδ’ (plural for singular?): the relocation that Stratophanes is proposing befits a man who finds his parents. Kassel says of the traces after μή ‘possis τερ’, and this looks plausible, although Sandbach says only that the traces do ‘not suggest, nor quite exclude, μητέρα’.

391–6

αὐτὴν τῇ ἐπίνειν δεύτερον πρὸς[...

[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.

αὐτὴν τῇ ἐπίνειν δεύτερον πρὸς τῇ μητέρᾳ κέλευε τὴν ἐμὴν μεθ’ ὑμῶν, παρὰ δ’ ἐμοὶ τοὺς βαρβάρους παύσας καταλύσας μένειν ἕπειρον καὶ Ἐνθαδ’. Αὐτὸς τάλλα τοῦ τῆς παρθένου, with adverbial τάλλα.

Cf. e.g. Pl. Grg. 447b παρ’ ἐμοὶ γάρ Γοργίας 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’ ἐπιμάκων ἐν ἐπιμάκων αὐτὸς τάλλα τῶι τοῦτος πατρῇ, in which τοῦτος is in any case surprising when the girl has not been mentioned recently, one could have ἐγὼ δ’ τοῦ πατρῆι ἐν ἐπιμάκων αὐτὸς τάλλα τῶι τῆ[...] παρθένου, with adverbial τάλλα.

401–2

ὁ ἄνθρωπος ἐπὶ λέγειν ὑπάρχειν ἑπάρχειν[...

In 401, Sandbach’s punctuation (following H. Lloyd-Jones, GRBS 7 (1966) 150 = Greek Comedy, Hellenistic Literature, Greek Religion, and Miscellanea (1990) 70), ὁ ἄνθρωπος, ἐπὶ λέγειν ὑπάρχειν[...] is very plausible, and ὁν ἐπιμάκων (proposed by Austin ap. Kassel) is attractive at the end. As for 402, Coles (137) says of the final traces ‘read ev[... (so Austin)? I suggest too tight an arc for ε[...[13] I suggest supplying χάριν ἐν ὑπάρχειν ὑπάρχειν τῇ ἐπιμάκων. For the postponed τε, cf. Sandbach on Peric. 128, and for the phrase, Eur. fr. 736.5–6 ἐν ὑπάρχειν ὑπάρχειν, ὁταν τις ἐκ δομῶν ἀνήρ θάνης.

409 αὐτής θ’ ἐπιστρέφει ἡ κακ[...
418–20
\[ \pi \omicron \epsilon \delta' \ \alpha \nu \ \delta \iota \kappa \omicron \omicron \psi \alpha \xi \ \delta \iota \delta \xi \nu \] 
\[ \pi \omicron \nu \ \omicron \mu \omega \lambda \omicron \gamma \eta \zeta \alpha \iota \ kai \ \delta \iota \phi \alpha \nu \] 
\[ \delta \rho \alpha \varsigma \omicron \ \kappa \alpha \tau \alpha \nu \epsilon \nu \omicron \nu \omicron \.] 

Concerning the text at the start of 420, Coles (137) writes as follows: ‘I find \( \rho \) very hard to read: perhaps the “tail” is in fact an offset. \( \delta \omicron \omicron \omicron \) seems a more satisfactory reading (the \( \varsigma \) is hard to make out, but not impossible).’\(^{14}\) Handley (59) had proposed for the end of 419 and the start of 420 e.g. (\( \Lambda \)) \( \pi \epsilon \iota \varsigma \theta \eta \tau \mu \omicron \ \omicron \) | (\( \Beta \)) \( \delta \rho \alpha \varsigma \omicron \ \kappa \alpha \tau \alpha \nu \epsilon \nu \omicron \nu \omicron \), with \( \delta \rho \alpha \varsigma \omicron \) indicating the speaker’s assent to the preceding request. If \( \delta \omicron \omicron \omicron \) 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) \( \pi \omicron \epsilon \delta' \ \alpha \nu \ \delta \iota \kappa \omicron \omicron \psi \alpha \xi \ \delta \iota \delta \xi \nu \) – :: \( \delta \iota \delta \nu \ [\mu \omicron \ \iota \varsigma \ \epsilon \kappa \delta \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \] – :: \( \pi \omicron \nu \ \omicron \mu \omega \lambda \omicron \gamma \eta \zeta \alpha \iota \ kai \ \delta \iota \phi \alpha \nu \) – :: \( \kappa \alpha \tau \alpha \nu \epsilon \nu \omicron \nu \omicron \] – :: \( \delta \omicron \omicron \omicron \ \alpha \ \delta \epsilon \iota \); 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, \( \delta \omicron \omicron \omicron \ (420) \) would be his response.

W. B. Henry, Department of Greek and Latin, University College London
w_b_henry@yahoo.co.uk

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