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PREFACE

A new critical edition of the letters of Alciphron has long been a desideratum.1 The current standard edition by Schepers, which appeared in the Bibliotheca Teubneriana in 1905, has been criticized for adopting far too many conjectures into the text,2 and for its unreliable apparatus.3 The aim of the present work is to address this need, at least partially, by establishing a new text of the *Letters of the Courtesans*, based on a complete collation of all extant manuscripts which have been examined on microfilm and, with the exception of two manuscripts, *in situ*.

The guiding principle for the constitution of the text has been to try to preserve the text of the manuscripts wherever possible and, where corruption seems to have occurred, to use conjectural emendation sparingly. In general corruptions limited to a few characters or a single word have been emended whereas longer corrupt passages have been left intact and marked with daggers. The critical apparatus has been divided into a main apparatus below the text and two appendices in order to keep the main apparatus from swelling excessively with unimportant details and unnecessary conjectures.4 The translation makes no literary claim and should be regarded as a complement to the commentary. Notes have been added to the translation to provide basic information on the names and places mentioned in the text. The commentary deals primarily with matters of textual criticism and should perhaps more properly be called textual notes. In the commentary passages are discussed where an emendation has been adopted or where the present edition differs from the editions by Schepers or Benner-Fobes. The lack of indices is hopefully justified by the fact that this is an unpublished dissertation.

---

1 Cf. Benner-Fobes (1949) 31–2 n. b, ‘Great as Schepers’s services to Alciphron have been a new critical edition is much to be desired’, and Schmitz (2004) 87, ‘There is no satisfactory modern edition of, let alone scholarly commentary on Alciphron’s writings.’

2 Cf. Wilamowitz (1909) 466, ‘Die Ausgabe des Alkiphron von Scheppers [sic] hat das große Verdienst, die Recensio fest zu begründen, was nicht leicht war; aber im Texte hat sie leider nur zu viel von den billigen Correcturen beibehalten, mit denen man den Rhetor beglückt hat, gleich als ob man wüßte, wie correctes Attisch er hätte schreiben können und wollen.’

3 See Benner-Fobes (1949) 31 n. a. For a selection of errors found in Schepers’ apparatus, see n. 170.

4 This approach has been suggested by Kraggerud (2005). For the editorial principles of the present edition, see p. 59.
INTRODUCTION

I ALCIPHRON

Nothing can be said about the life of Alciphron and even his date is uncertain. There are no internal criteria in the letters which could shed light on this issue.\(^5\) It has been suggested, on tenuous grounds, that he was a Syrian, like Lucian.\(^6\) He is called ῥήτωρ in the manuscripts and by Ioannes Tzetzes (c. 1110–1180/85) in his scholia to The Histories, or Chiliades.\(^7\) Eustathios of Thessalonike (c. 1115–1195) calls him Ἀττικιστής in his commentary on the Iliad.\(^8\) Additional Byzantine testimonia to Alciphron are found in a grammatical treatise, possibly by Gregorios Pardos (c. 1070–1156),\(^9\) a speech by Gregorios Antiochus (12th cent.),\(^10\) and in the Etymologicum Genuinum.\(^11\)

\(^5\) Baldwin (1982) suggested the first decade of the third century AD as a terminus ante quem, on the basis of the reference in 4.19.7 to the singing statue of Memnon which fell silent after repairs during the reign of Septimius Severus (146–211 AD), but this is rightly rejected by Anderson (1997) 2190 n. 8.

\(^6\) The references to Adonis and the Adonis festival (4.10.1, 4.14.3, 4.14.8, 4.17.2), a Syrian merchant (4.11.4), pistachio nuts and dates (3.39.1), the fishing up of a dead camel (1.20.3) and chalybonian wine (3.37.1) are put forth as evidence of his Syrian origin by Keller (1862) 404 n. 109.

\(^7\) Scholia et Glossemata in Chiliades 8.888 Ἀριστοτέλης καὶ ἕτεροι πιτύαις γράφουσιν, αὐτὸς δὲ ποιτίαις (cf. 4.13.10 πυτίας) γράφω κατὰ τὸν Ἀλκίφρων ῥήτωρα. cf. Benner-Fobes (1949) 6 n. b, who incorrectly refer to πίτυς (2.9.1, 2.18.3).

\(^8\) Eust. Il. 762.65–7 ἐκ δὲ τοῦ τοιούτου σεμνοῦ θαλαμηπόλου λέξιν ἐρανισάμενος ὁ Ἀττικιστὴς Ἀλκίφρων ἔφη, ὡς ὁ δεῖνα οἷός τε ἦν ἐν ὀφθαλμοῖς ἁπάντων τὴν ψάλτριαν ἐνεργεῖν (cf. 3.19.9). Further references to Alciphron are found in Eust. Il. 229.3–4 ἐκ δὲ τῶν Ὕμηρικῶν πετάλων καὶ ποτήρια ἐκπέταλα τὰ πλατέα, ὡς ἔνδοτα νυξόν ὁ Καλὸς Ἀλκίφρων τὸν Πατελλοχάρωνα (cf. 3.18) συνέθετο, 1295.39–41 τὸ μέντοι παρὰ Ἀλκίφρονι ἀποσκλῆναι κινδυνεύω λιμῷ (cf. 3.1.1) καὶ άλλως τινα ἀφελεῖς ἐννοίας καὶ εἰς τὴν αὐτῶν φράσιν. Attributed to the treatise περὶ συντάξεως λόγου by Kominis (1960) 127–9, cf. Alexiou (1999) 108.


\(^10\) Oratio in Sebastocratorem Constantium Angelum 396–7 Bachmann-Dölger πῶς δὲ ἡμῖν κόλπον θύρα ἢ βαλαντίου ή κίστης πλουτοφύλακος ἀνοιγήσεται, οἷς μὴ πρὸς γνώμης τὰ τοιαῦτα θυροκοπεῖν, ἀλλὰ μηδὲ ἄλλως τὰ φιλοσοφικὰ ἐπίπτειν καὶ θυροτρίβων καὶ κατὰ τοὺς Ἀλκίφρωνος λοπαδεκθάμβους καὶ Τρεκεδείπνους (cf. 3.1) παρασιτεῖν;

\(^11\) α 1263 Lasserre-Libadaras Ασελγαίνει (ν)· σημαίνει μὲν κυρίως τὸ πάρα φύσιν ταῖς γυναιξὶ μέγνυσθοι ... ἐλεγαίνειν οὖν ἐστὶ τὸ ἀσελγαίνειν, καὶ κατὰ πρόσοδον τῆς
Scholars have tried to date Alciphron by looking for similarities in Lucian (c. 115/25–180/90 AD), Aelian’s *Letters of farmers* (c. 165/70–230/5 AD) and Longus’ *Daphnis and Chloe* (late 2nd or early 3rd cent. AD). This has not, however, yielded any reliable results, since it is almost impossible to tell who imitated whom, and also because of the uncertain dating of these three authors. Alciphron’s Atticizing language, on the other hand, and the historical setting in the letters, placing the action in classical Athens of the 4th century BC, would indicate that he belonged to the period known as the Second Sophistic when these traits were common.

It is commonly stated that there are no references to Alciphron until he appears in a fictitious correspondence with Lucian in the collection of letters attributed to Aristaenetus (5th or 6th cent. AD). But it has been argued, with some merit, that Alciphron the epistolographer might be identical with Alciphron the philosopher mentioned in the *Meditations* of Marcus Aurelius (121–180 AD), who should probably be identified with Alciphron the Magnesian philosopher mentioned in the *Suda*, Alciphron the Maecandrian quoted in Athenaeus 1.31d (about Pramnian wine), and the Alciphron mentioned as the author of the

α ἐπιτάσσεως καὶ πλεονασμῷ τοῦ σ ἁσελγάινειν. οὕτως Ἀλκίφρων (?). The verb is not attested in Alciphron, but cf. 3.33.1 τὴν τῆς γαμετῆς ἁσέλγειαν.

12 For summaries of this tricky question, see Schepers (1901) i–vi, Benner-Fobes (1949) 6–18, Hunter (1983b) 6–15 and Anderson (1997) 2194–9. For further studies, see Reich (1894), Bonner (1909), Carugno (1955) and (1956), Pinto (1973), Vienne (1979) and Santini (1995); passages collected by Meiser (1904) and (1905).

13 Alciphron for instance uses the dual form and the optative, cf. Schmitz (2004) 92 n. 20. He is not, however, a rigid Atticist and his language even shows traces of Latinisms, cf. Schmid (1894) 1548. For the language, see also Sakorraphos (1893) and Schepers (1901) xix–xxi; for the style, see Conca (1974).


15 Aristaen. 1.5 Ἀλκίφρων Λουκιανός and 1.22 Λουκιανός Αλκίφρων. A collection of 50 fictitious letters in two books is attributed to Aristaenetus who was strongly influenced by Alciphron, cf. Arnott (1982). For a discussion of the problematic dating of Aristaenetus, see Drago (2007) 16–36.


17 M. Aur. Med. 10.31 καὶ Ἀλκίφρωνα (sc. ἑδών) Τρωπαίοφόρον φαντάζοντος.

18 Suda α 1288 Ἀλκίφρων· Μάγνης, τῆς παρὰ Μαιάνδρῳ Μαγνησίας, φιλόσοφος. See Kroll (1918) and Goulet (1989).

19 Ath. 1.31d Ἀλκίφρων δ’ ὁ Μαιάνδριος περὶ τὴν Ἑφεσίαν φησὶν ἐνδὲ ἄρειαν κώμην τὴν πρότερον μὲν καλομενὴν Λητοῦς, νῦν δὲ Λατώρειαν ἀπὸ Λατωρείας ἀμαζώνους ἐν Ἡ γίνεσθαι τὸν πράμιον οἶνον.
II THE EPISTOLARY GENRE

treatise On Ancient Luxury (περὶ παλαιᾶς τρυφῆς) in a marginal note to Athenaeus 12.518b (describing the customs of the Sybarites). This is, of course, highly speculative but it is an interesting hypothesis which would support the dating suggested above, and it is not entirely inconceivable that an author interested in courtesans and parasites would have written a treatise like On Ancient Luxury.

The exact date of Alciphron must, however, remain uncertain and it is unlikely that this question will ever be solved, unless some new evidence emerges. This has, in any case, little bearing on the interpretation and appreciation of the letters of Alciphron.

II THE EPISTOLARY GENRE

The letter as a medium for written communication is found in all scriptural cultures and to the Greeks this practice probably came from the Orient. We find the first literary reference to letter writing already in Homer’s Iliad 6.167–70, whereas the earliest historical reference is the correspondence between Amasis of Egypt and Polycrates, dating from the early 520s BC, mentioned in Herodotus 3.40–3.

Letters were originally written on wax-coated wooden tablets, which could be folded and sealed. But also other materials, like metal, potsherds or animal skin, were used. The earliest physical letters to survive, dating from c. 500 BC, are written on thin sheets of lead. Later on papyrus became the predominant writing material. Many of these

20 The marginal note is in manuscript A (Marcianus graecus 447): τοῦτου (Kai- bel: τοῦτο Α) καὶ Ἀλκίφρων μέμνηται ἐν τῷ περὶ παλαιᾶς τρυφῆς καὶ τῶν ἄλλων σχεδὸν ἁπάντων. This Alciphron is identified with the Magnesian philosopher mentioned in Suda by Kaibel (1890) 144, and with the Alciphron in Marcus Aurelius by Dittenberger (1903) 10–1, who does not, however, believe that Alciphron the epistolographer and Alciphron the philosopher are the same person. See also Zecchini (1989) 178 with n. 150 and Gorman and Gorman (2007) 47 n. 37.
21 Cf. Anderson (1997) 218g.
22 For a brief introduction to Greek letters, see Trapp (2012). For more extensive surveys, see Sykutris (1931), Schneider (1951), Luck (1961) and Trapp (2003) 1–34.
letters have survived on Egyptian papyri, dating from the 3rd cent. BC and onwards, which give us valuable information about the social and economic life of Hellenistic and Greco-Roman Egypt.

Letters were also used in official and diplomatic correspondence between cities, officials, kings and emperors, especially by the Hellenistic kings and Roman emperors. Most official letters to survive are found on inscriptions but there are also numerous examples on papyri.

Gradually letter writing evolved into a diverse literary genre and there also appeared theoretical writings about the composition of letters. The earliest to survive is an excursus on the plain style found in the rhetorical treatise *On style* 223–35 (Περὶ ἑρμηνείας) falsely attributed to Demetrius of Phalerum, which has been variously dated to the period between the 3rd cent. BC and the 1st cent. AD. Letter writing is also mentioned as a part of characterization (ἥθος τοῖς) in a treatise on rhetorical school exercises by Theon of Alexandria (*Progymnasmata* vol. 2, p. 115.22 Spengel). Further examples include a short work on how to write letters, which is included in the corpus of Philostratus’ letters, and a letter by Gregory of Nazianzus (*Ep.* 51). We also have two handbooks on letter writing, one falsely attributed to Demetrius of Phalerum (*Τύποι ἐπιστολικοί*) and the other attributed in the manuscripts alternatively to Libanius and Proclus (*Ἐπιστολιμαῖοι χαρακτῆρες*). According to these theorists the characteristics of the letter are simplicity of language and style, brevity and ethos. The letter should be an image of the writer’s soul.

Although the distinction between private and literary letters is not always clear, scholars usually regard anthologies of private letters by famous individuals as literary. These were in most cases edited and published by others after the death of the author. The earliest examples are the letters of Plato, edited by Aristophanes of Byzantium (265/257–190/180 BC), and the letters of Aristotle, edited by Artemon (c. 100 BC). Other examples are the letters of Emperor Julian (331/2–363 AD) and Libanius (314–393 AD), the latter consisting of more than 1500 letters. The first Greek author to publish an anthology of letters himself was Gregory of Nazianzus (329/30–289/90 AD).

The letter could also be used for apologetic or propagandistic purposes, e.g. the letters of Isocrates, Plato and Demosthenes. Most of these, however, are spurious. Yet another use of the letter form are philosophical or didactic letters, the most famous examples being the three

---

26 For a discussion, with text and translation, see Malherbe (1988).
27 To be distinguished from the pseudonymous letters of Aristotle which have survived.
letters of Epicurus to his disciples (preserved in Diog. Laer. 10.35–116), and the letters of St Paul in the New Testament. Consolatory letters also belong to this category, e.g. Plutarch’s letter to his wife on the death of their daughter (Moralia 608a–12b). The letter form could also be used for treatises on technical and scholarly matters, e.g. the letters of Dionysius of Halicarnassus to Ammaeus and Cn. Pompeius, and for dedications attached to other works, e.g. Parthenius, Love Stories and Arrian, Discourses of Epictetus.

The verse epistle, which was a popular genre with the Romans (e.g. Ovid’s Heroides), was not very common in Greek literature, although a few examples are found in the Greek Anthology, e.g. 5.9 (Rufinus), 11.44 (Philodemus).

Finally there are the fictitious letters which can be divided into three groups: embedded letters in fictional and historical narratives, pseudonymous letters and imaginary letters.

Letters were occasionally used to illuminate the narrative in fictional and historical works during the classical period, e.g. Euripides, Iphigenia in Tauris 727–87, Herodotus 3.40–3, Thucydides 1.128–32 and Xenophon, Cyropaedia 4.5.26–34. During the Hellenistic period the letter does not seem to have been a favoured literary form but since the evidence is so sparse no clear conclusion can be drawn. During the Second Sophistic, however, the letter became very popular, especially in the Greek Novel, e.g. Chariton, Chaereas and Callirhoe and Achilles Tatius, Leucippe and Clitophon. But we also find embedded letters in Lucian’s True History 2.29–36 and Saturnalia 3–4 (The Letters of Kronos). In this group we should also include the Alexander Romance, a fictional biography of Alexander the Great found in numerous versions, where letters are mixed with third person narrative.

Pseudonymous letters are written by an anonymous author in the name of a famous historical or mythological character. Most of these are products of the Second Sophistic and include letters purportedly written by famous philosophers like Aristotle, Democritus, Heraclitus, Hippocrates, Plato, the Pythagoreans, Socrates, the Socratics and Zeno; wise men like Anacharsis, Apollonius of Tyana, Crates, Diogenes, Solon and Thales; authors like Euripides, Lucian and Xenophon; orators like Aeschines, Demosthenes and Isocrates; politicians or tyrants like Artaxerxes, Brutus, Dion, Periander and Phalaris. To this group belong also

two collections of letters which can be characterised as epistolary novels or novellas: the letters of Chion and those of Themistocles. The pseudonymous letters probably developed out of the rhetorical school exercises of declamation (μελέτη) and characterization (ἠθοποιία).

The third group of fictitious letters are the imaginary letters. From the Second Sophistic we have collections of imaginary letters by Philostratus, Aelian and Alciphron. From a later period there are collections by Aristaenetus (5th or 6th cent. AD) and Theophylactus Simocatta (7th cent. AD). The literary pedigree of these letters, as with the pseudonymous letters, can be traced back to the rhetorical exercises.

The 73 love letters attributed to Philostratus (c. 170–240 AD) differ from the letters of Aelian and Alciphron. They are all anonymous and for 53 of the letters there is no named recipient (23 are addressed ‘To a boy’ and 30 ‘To a woman’). The general theme in these 53 letters, as well as in another two (addressed ‘To a certain friend’), is erotic persuasion, with the writer vacillating between praise and blame of the recipient. On the other hand, the subject matter for the remaining 18 letters varies greatly and they also have named recipients, e.g. Epictetus, Chariton and Philostratus. There are letters of advice, recommendation, business, and a long letter to the empress Julia Domna with advice on literary matters.

The 20 letters attributed to the Roman author Claudius Aelianus (165/70–230/5 AD) are purportedly written by Attic farmers in the 4th century BC. The letters give the reader a glimpse of the simple country life of farmers as imagined by a member of the Greek elite. The themes and characters suggest influence from comedy. The letters have senders and recipients with speaking names or names borrowed from comedy, e.g. the group of four letters between Callipides and the misanthrope Cnemon (13–16), which may have been inspired by Menander’s Dyscolus or Lucian’s Timon. We also have two sets of letter pairs (7–8, 11–12), the former being a correspondence between a farmer and a courtesan named Opora (the name meaning ‘Ripe for plucking’). He is sending her figs, grapes, wine and roses, but she wants only cash.


It has been suggested that 7–8 are based on Alexis’ Opora, but they are also simi-
III THE LETTERS OF ALCIPHRON

There are in total 123 letters attributed to Alciphron. They are arranged in four books according to the fictional types of the letter writers: 22 letters of fishermen, 39 letters of farmers, 42 letters of parasites and 20 letters of courtesans.

Most of the letters in the collection could be described as short character sketches in letter form depicting the world of classical Athens, although filtered through Greek Comedy. They are clearly influenced by the rhetorical exercises of declamation (μελέτη) and characterization (ηθοποιία), and the plot or theme of the letters can often be summarized in the question: What would A write to B in situation X? But we also find other themes, especially in the letters of the courtesans, e.g. a funeral elegy on the death of Bacchis (4.11), an ecphrasis of a country picnic which turns into an orgy (4.13) and a description of a beauty contest (4.14). The letters are written in an Atticizing language and include many references to Attic customs and topography, e.g. the Academy (4.7, 4.18), Ceramicus (4.18), Adonis festival (4.10, 4.14) and the Dionysia (4.14). These were typical traits of a sophist wanting to show off his Attic vocabulary and knowledge of classical Athens.

The letters of the fishermen, farmers and parasites differ from the letters of the courtesans in certain significant aspects. Most of the figures in the former group are purely fictional characters with speaking names, which reveal their profession or character. We meet fishermen with names like Φιλόσκαφος ‘Loveboat’ (1.1), Εὐκόλυμβος ‘Divewell’ (1.8) and Ναυσίβιος ‘Boatlife’ (1.15); farmers like Φιλόμοσχος ‘Love-calf’ (2.3), Τρυγόδωρος ‘Vintner’ (2.12) and Εὐστάφυλος ‘Vinelander’ (2.19); and parasites like Τρεχέδειπνος ‘Dinnerchaser’ (3.1), Κοτυλοβρόχθισος ‘Cup-Guzzler’ (3.5) and Ωρολόγιος ‘Clock-Watcher’.
The characters in the letters of the courtesans, on the other hand, are persons well known from classical literature, e.g. Phryne (4.1, 4.3–4.5), Bacchis (4.2–4.5, 4.11, 4.14), Glyceria (4.2, 4.14, 4.18–4.19), Lamia (4.16–4.17), Praxiteles (4.1), Hyperides (4.3–4.5), Demetrius Poliorcetes (4.16) and Menander (4.2, 4.18–4.19).

The letters of the fishermen, farmers and parasites also differ from the letters of the courtesans in another aspect, namely in their dissatisfaction with their way of life. Most of the time they are complaining about the hardships of life and the difficulties of getting a livelihood from the sea or the soil, or a rich patron’s table, and they often wish for a better life. This theme is less prominent in the letters of the courtesans, but it does occur (e.g. 4.9 and 4.15). The courtesans on the other hand are worried about losing their lovers and source of income (e.g. 4.2, 4.7, 4.10, 4.16 and 4.17).

The letters of the fishermen, farmers and parasites seem to form a coherent corpus where some of the letters are connected, e.g. a fisherman wants to become a farmer (1.3), a fisherman wants to become a parasite (1.9), a parasite wants to become a farm hand (2.32), a parasite who has turned to highway robbery having failed as a farmer (3.34). There are, however, no similar connections with the letters of the courtesans. These are, on the other hand, more interconnected and tightly organized, in some cases with a visible narrative thread, e.g. the trial of Phryne (4.3–4.5), the absent/dead Bacchis (4.11, 4.13–4.14), the relationship between Menander and Glyceria (4.2, 4.18–4.19).

The main inspiration for Alciphron was no doubt Attic Comedy, especially New Comedy and Menander, which is duly acknowledged by making Menander himself appear as a correspondent in the final letters of the collection (4.18–4.19), but we also find echoes of other authors, e.g. Xenophon, Theocritus and Lucian.

Translation by Benner-Fobes (1949). For a study on the names in Alciphron, see Sondag (1905) and Casevitz (2002). The artificial and sometimes absurd names was perhaps Alciphron’s way of making the reader aware that the letters were fictional, cf. Schmitz (2004) 99 and König (2007) 277–80.


Passages collected, and sometimes modified to fit comic trimeters, in CAF 3.674–9, Kock (1886) and (1888). See also Volkmann (1886) and Benner-Fobes (1949) 8–14. According to Reich (1894) Alciphron used comedy only with Lucian as intermediary, but this is rejected by Benner-Fobes (1949) 6–16 and Nesselrath (1985) 20 n. 15.

The Cynegeticus seems to have been the inspiration for 2.1, cf. Vieillefond (1929).


On the relationship between Lucian and Alciphron, see n. 12.
IV THE MANUSCRIPT TRADITION

No single manuscript preserves all of the 123 letters of Alciphron. The corpus must be reconstructed from three manuscript families and two independent manuscripts.\(^49\) The letters are arranged into four books according to the fictional types of the letter writers: 22 letters of fishermen, 39 letters of farmers, 42 letters of parasites and 20 letters of courtiers.\(^50\) The first family consists of three manuscripts with a selection of letters from books 3, 2 and 1.\(^51\) The second family consists of two manuscripts containing all of the letters from book 1 and a selection from books 2 and 3.\(^52\) The third family consists of four primary manuscripts, which contain a fragmentary selection of letters from books 1, 3 and 2, and all of the letters from book 4.\(^53\) In addition to these there are secondary manuscripts which derive from the primary manuscripts.\(^54\)

---

49 The exemplars of the three families are called x, x’ and x” by Schepers (1905) vii–xxii. The independent manuscripts are Vindobonensis phil. gr. 342 (11th cent.) containing 2.1–2.4, 2.6–2.15, 2.17–2.27, 2.16, 2.28–2.39 (but not 2.5 as reported by Hunger (1961) 436) and Parisinus suppl. gr. 352 (13th cent.) containing 1.1–1.22, 3.1–3.4, 3.5 (des. ἐξ οὗ).

50 The letters in book 1 and 3 are arranged according to Parisinus gr. 1696, except for 3.40 which is missing and supplied from VFpd. The letters in book 2 are arranged after Vindobonensis phil. gr. 342, except for 2.5 which is missing and supplied from x, x’ and x”. The letters in book 4 are arranged according to VFp. Prior to Schepers the ordering followed that of the Aldine edition and Bergler.

51 Harleianus 5566 (14th cent.) and Marcianus gr. VIII.2 (14th–15th cent.), both containing 3.1–3.7, 3.9–3.18, 3.20–3.27, 3.33, 3.28–3.32, 3.34–3.35, 3.37–3.39, 3.42, 3.19; 2.2–2.15, 2.17–2.27, 2.16, 2.28–2.30; 1.1–1.13, 1.15–1.22; and Neapolitanus gr. IIIA.14 (14th–15th cent.) consisting of two codicological units, the first containing 3.1, 3.17, 3.2–3.4, 3.6–3.7, 3.9–3.13, 3.16, 3.18–3.19 and the second containing 1.1–1.12, written by a different hand.

52 Parisinus gr. 1696 (14th cent.) containing 1.1–1.22; 2.2–2.15, 2.17–2.27, 2.16, 2.28, 2.30; 3.1–3.39, 3.41–3.42; and Vaticanus gr. 140 (14th cent.) which has the same selection of letters up to 3.19 where the manuscript ends abruptly. The folia that are missing at the end of this manuscript probably contained 3.20–3.39, 3.42, cf. Schepers (1905) xvi–xvii.

53 Vaticanus gr. 1461 (V), Laurentianus gr. 59.5 (F), Parisinus gr. 3021 (P) and Parisinus gr. 3050 (D) containing 1.1–1.11, 1.13–1.22, 3.36–3.41, 2.2–2.8, 4.1–4.19, fragm. 5. In Parisinus gr. 3050 the order is different. The fragmentary letters 1.11, 1.13, 3.36, 3.41, 2.2, 2.8, 4.1, 4.12–4.13, fragm. 5 are copied at the end of the manuscript, by the same hand as the rest of the manuscript.

54 Parisinus suppl. gr. 205, Palatinus gr. 132 (Heidelberg) and Newberry 103 (Chicago) which lack 1.11, 1.13, 3.36, 3.41, 2.2, 2.8, 4.1, 4.12–4.13, fragm. 5; Parisinus suppl. gr. 212 and Vindobonensis. phil. gr. 318 which lack the same letters and in addition also 4.16–4.19; Laurentianus gr. 55.2 which has 4.18, 4.2–4.7; and Parisinus gr. 3054 and Parisinus gr. 2832 which have 4.18–4.19, 4.2.
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1. Description of the manuscripts

The following list of all manuscripts containing letters from book 4 is arranged in an alphabetical order according to the present location of the manuscripts.\textsuperscript{55} The manuscript sigla employed by Schepers are cumbersome and have been changed in order to keep the apparatus compact:\textsuperscript{56} Vat. 2 = V, Flor. = F, Π = P, Δ = D, Paris. suppl. 205 = K, Pal. 132 = C, Paris. suppl. 212 = M, Vind. = W, Φ = L, Paris. 2832 = S.\textsuperscript{57} For manuscripts unknown to Schepers the following sigla have been introduced: N, Z, Bran\textsuperscript{1}, Bran\textsuperscript{2}, Ottob, Vall\textsuperscript{1}, Vall\textsuperscript{2}.\textsuperscript{58}

Chicago, The Newberry Library

Newberry 103 (Ry. 9), paper, 15th cent., 180 ff., 22 × 14 cm.\textsuperscript{59} Written by Thomas Bitzimanos (Θωμᾶς Βιτζιμάνος RGK 1.141, 2.187, 3.236), probably in Crete.\textsuperscript{60}

Contents: Georgius Gemistus Pletho, \textit{De generatione deorum} (ff. 1\textsuperscript{r}–11\textsuperscript{v}); Philo, \textit{Quod omnis probus liber sit} (ff. 11\textsuperscript{r}–34\textsuperscript{v}); Alciphron, \textit{Epistulae} 1.1–1.10, 1.14–1.22 (ff. 37\textsuperscript{r}–44\textsuperscript{v}); Crates, \textit{Epistula} 9 (f. 44\textsuperscript{v}); Alciphron, \textit{Epistulae} 3.37–3.40, 2.3–2.7, 4.2–4.11, 4.14–4.19 (ff. 44\textsuperscript{v}–63\textsuperscript{v}); Melissa, \textit{Epistula} (f. 63\textsuperscript{v}r); Myia, \textit{Epistula} (ff. 63\textsuperscript{v}–64\textsuperscript{v}); Theano, \textit{Epistulae} (ff. 64\textsuperscript{r}–68\textsuperscript{r}); Hippocrates, \textit{Epistulae} (ff. 69\textsuperscript{r}–86\textsuperscript{r}); Heraclitus, \textit{Epistulae} (ff. 87\textsuperscript{r}–94\textsuperscript{v}); Diogenes, \textit{Epistulae} (ff. 95\textsuperscript{r}–105\textsuperscript{r}); Crates, \textit{Epistulae} (ff. 105\textsuperscript{r}–108\textsuperscript{r}); Aeschines, \textit{Epistulae} (ff. 108\textsuperscript{r}–110\textsuperscript{r}); Aelianus, \textit{Varia Historia} (excerpts, ff. 113\textsuperscript{r}–167\textsuperscript{r}); Georgius Gemistus Pletho, \textit{Contra Scholarii pro Aristoteles obiectiones} (des. ἀνήρ αὖ ἐν τοῖς σοφωτάτοις τῶν) (ff. 167\textsuperscript{r}–168\textsuperscript{v}).\textsuperscript{61}


\textsuperscript{55} All manuscripts have been examined on microfilm and, with the exception of C and N, \textit{in situ}.
\textsuperscript{56} The general rule has been to use capital letters of the Latin alphabet with a mnemonic value, as recommended by West (1973) 74.
\textsuperscript{57} C is reused from Seiler (1853), K and M from Schepers (1901); L, S and Z are based on the names of the scribes: Janos Laskaris (L), Ioannes Skoutariotes (S), Zanobio Acciaiuoli (Z).
\textsuperscript{58} The use of longer sigla seemed permissible for the 17th century manuscripts since they are seldom mentioned in the apparatus.
\textsuperscript{59} This manuscript seems to have been unknown to previous editors.
\textsuperscript{60} Bitzimanos worked in the scriptorium of Michael Apostoles in Crete, cf. Sicherl (1997) 195.
\textsuperscript{61} Ff. 34\textsuperscript{r}–36\textsuperscript{r}, 68\textsuperscript{r}, 110\textsuperscript{v}–112\textsuperscript{r}, 169\textsuperscript{r}–180\textsuperscript{r} are blank.
Laurentianus gr. 55.2, paper and parchment, 15th cent., 321 ff., 37 × 25.5 cm.62 The manuscript is composed of two codicological units: I. (ff. 1–101) paper, 27 lines, 37 × 25.5 cm, written by Antonios Eparchos (Ἀντώνιος Ἐπαρχός RGK 1.23, 2.32, 3.36). II. (ff.102–321) parchment, 34 lines, 37 × 25.5 cm, written by Zanobio Acciaiuoli.63


Bibliography: Bandini (1768) 217; Castiglioni (1907) 360–5; Castiglioni (1911) 41–8; Foerster-Richtsteig (1927) 116; Dilts (1975) 37; Ständer (1980) 34; Eleuteri-Canart (1991) 60–2, pl. xviii.

Laurentianus gr. 59.5, parchment, 15th cent., 110 ff., 32.5 × 23 cm (Schepers = Flor.). The manuscript consists of a single codicological unit written by an unidentified scribe.


Bibliography: Bandini (1768) 491–493; Wagner (1798) 2.xv–xvi; Hercher (1873) lxvi–vii; Schepers (1901) xxxvii; Druerup (1904) 9, 24; Schepers (1905) xvii; Castiglioni (1907) 343–59; Weichert (1910) Iv; Castiglioni (1911) 2–9, 20–26; Foerster-Richtsteig (1927) 18, 193; Tudeer (1931) 22–23, 77–84; Benner-Fobes (1949) 20, 30 n. a; Reuters (1957) 19, 42; Torraca (1959) xxxv, xlii; Roncali (1969) 382 nr

---

62 This manuscript seems to have been unknown to previous editors.
64 F. 209 blank.

Heidelberg, Universitätsbibliothek


Bibliography: Stevenson (1885) 63–64; Schafstaedt (1892) 11; Schepers (1901) xxxvii–xxxviii; Drerup (1904) 11, 16, 25; Drerup

65 Subscription on f. 52v: ζαχαρίδης βίους έγραψε τοὺς δό λώστε. Zacharides worked in the scriptorium of Michael Apostoles in Crete.

66 The identification of the scribes is uncertain, cf. Moraux (1976) 370–1. The unit containing Alciphron is attributed to Aristoboulos Apostoles (1468/9–1535) who is most likely the scribe of the unit containing Alciphron in K. The handwriting in the two manuscripts is similar but not identical. On Aristoboulos Apostoles, see Geanakoplos (1962) 167–200. He worked in his father’s, Michael Apostoles, workshop in Crete. The manuscript has watermarks typical for Crete, cf. Sicherl (1997) 195 and Wittek (1953) 290–7.

67 Ff. 53r–56v, 88v, 146r–149r, 161v–, 258v are blank.
IV THE MANUSCRIPT TRADITION


Leiden, Universiteitsbibliotheek

Leid Bibliothecae Publicae gr. 67L, paper, 17th cent., 60 ff., 24 x 18 cm. This manuscript was copied by Theodor Rycke (1640–90) from various sources,68 and was used by Bergler for his edition.69

Contents: Notes in Latin with references to catalogues containing Alciphron (f. 1r);70 Eustathius, Commentarii ad Homeri Iliadem 380.41–4 (f. 2v); Alciphron, Epistulae 1.11–1.13, 2.2, 2.8–2.15, 2.17–2.27, 2.15, 2.28, 2.30, 3.1–3.19 (ff. 4r–20v); Crates, Epistula 9 (ff. 20r–21r), Alciphron, Epistulae fragm. 5, 4.12–4.13, 3.20–3.36, 3.37, 3.42, 3.19, 1.1–1.10, 1.14–1.22, 3.37–3.40, 2.3–2.7, 4.2–4.11, 4.14–4.19 (ff. 21v–57r).71


Naples, Biblioteca Nazionale

Bran1 Brancaccianus gr. I F 3, paper, 150 ff. The manuscript is a miscellany composed of several codicological units with Latin texts and one unit with Greek texts (ff. 21–44), 17th cent.,72 16.5 x 23 cm, written by the same unidentified scribe as Bran2, Ottob, Vall1 and Vall2.

Contents: Latin text (ff. 1r–20v); Alciphron, Epistulae 1.11–1.13, 2.2, 2.8–2.15, 2.17–2.27, 2.16, 2.28, 2.30, 3.1–3.19 (ff. 21v–38v); Crates,

68 Fragm. 5, 4.12–4.13 were copied from V, or a copy of V, see pp. 42–3; 4.2–4.11, 4.14–4.19 from the Aldine edition, or possibly the ed. 1606, see pp. 49–50. The other sources were Urbinas gr. 110 and Vaticanus gr. 140, cf. Schepers (1905) xvi, who incorrectly assumed that C was the source for 4.2–4.11, 4.14–4.19.
69 See the description of this edition on pp. 54–5.
71 Ff. 1r, 2–3r, 34r–35r, 58v–60v blank.
72 Dated to the 15th cent. by Napolitano-Nardelli-Tartaglia (1977) 29, but this is unlikely, see the description of Vall1 and Vall2 on pp. 30–1. This manuscript seems to have been unknown to previous editors.
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**Bran** Brancaccianus gr. IV A 3, paper, 420 ff. The manuscript is a miscellany composed of several codicological units with Latin texts and one unit with Greek texts (ff. 281–285), 17th cent., 16 × 22 cm, written by the same unidentified scribe as Bran1, Ottob, Vall1 and Vall2.


**Paris, Bibliothèque nationale**


73 The next quire with letter 3.30 is found in Bran1, f. 286v.
74 Dated to the 15th cent. by Napolitano-Nardelli-Tartaglia (1977) 29, but this is unlikely, see the description of Vall1 and Vall2 on pp. 30–1. This manuscript seems to have been unknown to previous editors.
75 Older foliation: 78r–82v; marginal note on f. 285v (82v): ‘e Cod. 146[1?] a pag. 2[64?]’; a similar note is found in Vall1, see n. 96.
76 The dating is by Omont (1888) 47.
77 Skoutarion is also the scribe of V. He was active in Florence in the second half of the 15th century, cf. Sicherl (1997) 230–3. This unit has a watermark dated to 1491, according to Sicherl (1997) 260.
78 A description is found in Omont (1904).

Bibliography: Omont (1888) 47; Schepers (1901) xxvii; Drerup (1904) 4–5, 20–21; Omont (1904); Schepers (1905) X; Torraca (1959) xxxvii, xliii–xliv; Wartelle (1963) 114.

**P**

Parisinus gr. 3021, paper, 15th cent., 181 ff., 20.5 × 13 cm (Schepers = Π). The manuscript consists of a single codicological unit written by an unidentified scribe, probably in Crete.79

Contents: Libanius, Epistulae (ff. 1′–38′); Synesius, Epistulae (ff. 41′–52′); Basilius, De legendis gentilium libris (ff. 55′–72′); Chion, Epistulae (ff. 73′–93′); Euripides, Epistulae (ff. 94′–101′); Diogenes, Epistulae (ff. 101′–115′); Crates, Epistulae (ff. 115′–119′); Heraclitus, Epistula (ff. 119′–120′); Aeschines, Epistulae (ff. 125′–135′); Alciphron, Epistulae 1.1–1.10, 1.11 (des. ἐνορχεῖσθαι τὰς), 1.13 (inc. περισυχένουν), 1.14–1.22 (ff. 141′–148′); Crates, Epistulae 9–10 (des. μεθύσκεσθαι)80 (ff. 148′–149′); Alciphron, Epistulae 3.36 (inc. βουλῇ κοινοῦμενος), 3.37–3.41; 2.2 (inc. ἐώκειν δὲ), 2.3–2.7, 2.8 (des. ὀπεχθομένη); 4.1–4.19, fragm. 5 (ff. 149′–171′), Melissa, Epistula (f. 172v–); Myia, Epistula (ff. 172′–173′); Theano, Epistulae (ff. 173′–176′); Musonius, Epistula (ff. 177′–179′); Mithridates, Epistula (f. 180v–); Brutus, Epistulae (f. 181v–).

Bibliography: Omont (1888) 93–94; Schafstaedt (1892) 9; Schepers (1901) xxv–xxvii; Drerup (1904) 5; Fritz (1905) 366; Schepers (1905) viii–ix; Sabatucci (1906) 375; Foerster-Richtsteig (1927) 126; Düring (1951) 28; Torraca (1959) xxxvii, xlv; Garzya (1973) 23; Gößwein (1975) 35; Attridge (1976) 43; Garzya (1979) xxii; Städele (1980) 48; Müseler (1994) 12, 55–8.

**D**

Parisinus gr. 3050, parchment, 15th cent., 166 ff., 21.5 × 12 cm (Schepers = Δ). Written by Demetrios Moschos (Δημήτριος Μόσχος, RGK 1.97, 2.131, 3.165), probably in Crete before 1470.82

80 After Crates 10 there is an empty space of 17 lines before Alciphron 3.36 which starts on f. 149′ line 21.
81 Ff. 39′–40′, 53′–54′, 72′, 121′–124′, 136′–140′, 153′, 171′ are blank.
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Bibliography: Wagner (1798) 2.xiv; Omont (1888) 100; Schafstaedt (1892) 9; Schepers (1901) xxvi; Diels (1905) 38; Schepers (1905) ix–x; Sabatucci (1906) 375; Tudeer (1931) 47–48, 84–95, 111 n. 1, 125; Benner-Fobes (1949) 20–1; Düring (1951) 29; Reuters (1957) 22; Turraca (1959) xxxvii, xliv; Wartelle (1963) 114; Gößwein (1975) 35; Penella (1979) 15; Städele (1980) 49; Sakalis (1989) 95, 221–8; Sicherl (1991) 101–4; Müseler (1994) 13, 61–4; Sicherl (1997) 191–203; Muratore (2006) 111–3, 150 n. 648.

Parisinus gr. 3054, paper, 15th cent., 190 ff., 10,5 × 6,5 cm (Schepers = Φ). Written by Janos Laskaris (Ἰάνος Λάσκαρις, *RGK* 2.197, 3.245).84


Bibliography: Omont (1888) 101; Schepers (1901) xxvii; Drerup (1904) 6, 20–21; Drerup (1906) xxxi, lxiv; Schepers (1905) x; Sabatuc-

---

83 Ff. 72r, 157v–160v are blank.
85 Ff. 111v, 188v–189v are blank.
Parisinus suppl. gr. 205, paper, 15–16th cent., 93 ff., 26,5–28,5 × 20–20,5 cm (Schepers = Paris. suppl. 205). The manuscript is composed of three codicological units: I. (ff. 3–30, 74–89, 93) 28,5 × 20,5 cm, written by Aristoboulos Apostoles (Ἀριστόβουλος Ἀποστόλης, RGK 1.27, 2.38, 3.46). \[86\] II. (ff. 31–63, 90–92) 26,5 × 20 cm, written by Michael Apostoles (Μιχαήλ Ἀποστόλης RGK 1.278, 2.379, 3.454). \[87\] III. (ff. 64–71), written by an unidentified scribe on the same paper as unit I. \[88\]


Bibliography: Foerster (1885) 908–11; Omont (1888) 231; Schafstaedt (1892) 9; Schepers (1901) xxvii; Drerup (1904) 6; Schepers (1905) xx–xxi; Sabatucci (1906) 376; Foerster-Richtsteig (1911) 342–3; Düring (1951) 29; Reuters (1957) 22; Diller (1963) 50–4; Penel-

---

86 Subscription on f. 93′: ἀριστόβουλος ἀπόστολος ἐξέγραψε. This unit once belonged to the collection of Pierre Pantin (1556–1611), nr. 5 (older pagination: 213–268, 269–299), cf. Diller (1963) 50–54 and Sicherl (1997) 226–8; ff. 1–2 are blank (different paper).


88 Pantin nr. 5 (older pagination: 301–16); ff. 72–73 are blank (different paper).

89 Omont (1888) 231 erroneously reports *Demothensis epistola*.

90 Ff. 62′–63′, 72′–73′. 89′ are blank; f. 92 has been inverted after rebinding so that the verso is on the recto side.
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**M** Parisinus suppl. gr. 212, paper, 15th cent., 239 ff., 21.5 × 14.5 cm (Schepers = Paris. suppl. 212). This manuscript contains both Greek and Latin texts; it consists of several codicological units written by different hands.

Contents: Various religious texts (ff. 1r–21v); Aristoteles, Historia Animalium (fragmentary, ff. 22r–147r);91 Euripides, Hecuba (fragmentary, ff. 148r–159v); Euripides, Orestes (fragmentary, ff. 159r–161v);92 Alciphron, Epistulae 1.1–1.10, 1.14–1.22 (ff. 162r–171v); Crates, Epistula 9 (f. 171v); Alciphron, Epistulae 3.37–3.40, 2.3–2.7, 4.2–4.11, 4.14–4.15 (ff. 171v–185r); Latin texts by Marsilio Ficino and Johannes Reuchlin (ff. 186r–231v); Excerpts from Aphthonius, Diogenes, Epistulae, Plato, Phaedrus, Thucydides, Athanasius Alexandrinus (ff. 232r–237r).


**Rome, Biblioteca Vallicelliana**

**Vall** Vallicellianus gr. 137 (Allatius XV), paper, 17th cent., 146 + 34 ff.93 The manuscript consists of two volumes, the first containing four codicological units and the second volume two units. The selection from Alciphron in the first volume (ff. 3r–6v) is written by Leo Allatius,94 and the selection in the second volume (ff. 1r–10v) by the same scribe as Bran1, Bran2, Ottob and Vall2; on ff. 4–5 there is a watermark similar to one found in paper used in Rome 1662 (Piccard-Online, nr 153742).

Contents: Vol. 1: Cyrilrus Contaris, Epistula (ff. 1r–2v); Alciphron, Epistulae 1.11–1.13 (f. 3v); List of titles and incipit of 2.2–2.15 and

---

93 This manuscript seems to have been unknown to previous editors.
list with incipit of 2.17–2.18 (f. 3v); Alciphron, *Epistulae* 3.1–3.5 (ff. 4r–4v); List with incipit of 2.19–2.20, 2.22–2.27, 2.16, 2.28, 2.30, 3.6–18, 4.12, 4.19, fragm. 5 (f. 6v); Nicetas Magister, *Epistulae* (ff. 7r–13r); Cyriacus, *Epistula* (f. 14r); Anonymous ethopoeiae (ff. 15r–18r); Procopius Gazaenus, *Epistulae* (ff. 21r–42v); Maximus Planudes, *Epistulae* (ff. 43r–142r); Socrates, *Epistula* (f. 144r); Menippus, *Epistula* (144v).\textsuperscript{95}

Vol. 2: Alciphron, *Epistulae* 1.11–1.13, 2.2, 2.8–2.15, 2.17–2.27, 2.16, 2.28, 2.30, 3.1–3.19, \textbf{4.12} (ff. 1r–10v);\textsuperscript{96} Crates, *Epistula* 9 (f. 10v);\textsuperscript{97} Nicetas Magister, *Epistulae* (ff. 13r–34r).\textsuperscript{98}

Bibliography: Martini (1902) 203.

**Vallicellianus gr. 141** (Allatius XXII), paper, 17th cent., 195 ff.\textsuperscript{99} The manuscript contains both Greek and Latin texts; it consists of several codicological units. The unit containing Alciphron (ff. 114r–115v) is written by the same scribe as Bran\textsuperscript{1}, Bran\textsuperscript{2}, Ottob and Vall\textsuperscript{1}; on ff. 117, 121–122 there are watermarks similar to one found in paper used in Rome 1662 (Piccard-Online, nr 153742) as in Vall\textsuperscript{1}.

Contents: *Nomocanon* (excerpts, ff. 4r–54v); Homer, *Iliad* 18.460–616 (ff. 59r–63v); *Nomocanon* (excerpts, ff. 66v–67v); Eustathius, *Commentarii ad Homeri Iliadem* (excerpts on book 18, ff. 71r–108v); *Admirabilia orbis* (ff. 112r–v); Alciphron, *Epistulae* \textbf{4.13}, fragm. \textbf{5} (ff. 114r–115v); Theological fragment (ff. 119r–120v); Latin text (ff. 124r–125v); *Dionysii Periegetae Vita* (fragment, ff. 126r–v); Latin texts (ff. 130r–195v).\textsuperscript{100}

Bibliography: Martini (1902) 204.

**Vatican City, Biblioteca Vaticana**

**Ottob** Ottobonianus gr. 465, paper, 17th cent., 17 ff., 22,5 × 33,0 cm.\textsuperscript{101} The manuscript is written by the same scribe as Bran\textsuperscript{1}, Bran\textsuperscript{2}, Vall\textsuperscript{1} and Vall\textsuperscript{2}.


\textsuperscript{95} Ff. 5r–6r, 13r, 14r, 18r–20v, 145r–146r are blank.

\textsuperscript{96} Marginal note on f. 10v: ‘cod. 1461. p. 264’; a similar note is found in Bran\textsuperscript{2}, see n. 75.

\textsuperscript{97} Marginal note on f. 10v: ‘cod. 132. p. 190’; see the description of C on pp. 24–5.

\textsuperscript{98} Ff. 11r–12r are blank.

\textsuperscript{99} This manuscript seems to have been unknown to previous editors.

\textsuperscript{100} Ff. 55r–58r, 64r–65r, 67r–70v, 108r–111r, 113r–117r, 121r–122r, 126r–127v are blank; ff. 118 and 128 are flyleaves.

\textsuperscript{101} This manuscript seems to have been unknown to previous editors.
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(ff. 9v–16v).  

Bibliography: Feron-Battaglini (1893) 258.

V Vaticanus gr. 1461, parchment, c. 1450–60, 297 ff., 21 × 14 cm (Schepers = Vat. 2). Written by Iohannes Skoutariotes (Ἰωάννης Σκουταριώτης, RGK 1.183, 2.242, 3.302) in Rome, perhaps in 1454.

Contents: Phalaris, Epistolae (ff. 1r–60v); Pythagoras, Epistula ad Hieronymem (ff. 60v–61r); Anacharsis, Epistolae (ff. 61v–64r); Euripides, Epistolae (ff. 65v–70v); Diogenes, Epistolae (ff. 70v–81r); Crates, Epistolae (ff. 81v–84v); Theano, Epistolae (ff. 84v–88r); Melissa, Epistula (f. 89r–v); Myia, Epistula (ff. 89v–90v); Hippocrates, Epistula (ff. 90v–99v); Plato, Epistolae (ff. 100r–151r); Chion, Epistolae (ff. 151r–166r); Isocrates, Epistolae (ff. 167v–189v); Socraticorum Epistolae (ff. 189v–202r, 206v–209v, 210r–211r); Speusippus, Epistolae (ff. 202r–206v, 209v–210v); Socrates, Epistolae (ff. 211v–217v); Lysis, Epistula (ff. 217v–219r); Mithridates, Epistula (ff. 227v–228r); Brutus, Epistolae (ff. 228r–241v); Alciphron, Epistolae 1.1–1.10, 1.11 (des. ἐνορχεῖσθαι τάς), 1.13 (inc. περισυχθέναι), 1.14–1.22 (ff. 242r–251v); Crates, Epistula 9, 10 (des. μεθύσκεσθαι) (f. 251v); Alciphron 3.36 (inc. βουλῆς κοινούμενος), 3.37–3.41, 2.2 (inc. ἐφέκεν δὲ), 2.3–2.7, 2.8 (des. ὀπεχθομένη), 4.1–4.19, fragm. 5 (ff. 252r–279v); Apollonius Tyaneus, Epistolae (ff. 281r–297v); Philostratus, Vita Apollonii (excerpts, ff. 287r–v, 297r–v); Apollonius Tyaneus, Epistolae (ff. 287–297v).


102 2.23 was omitted from the main text but added by the same hand on a slip of paper glued to f. 3v.
104 After Crates 10 there is a space of 12 lines on f. 251v and 14 lines on f. 252v before Alciphron 3.36 starts on line 15.
105 F. 280r–v are blank.
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W Vindobonensis phil. gr. 318, paper, ca 1510, 223 ff., 18.5 × 11.5 cm (Schepers = Vind.). Written by Demetrios Moschos (Δημήτριος Μόσχος, RGK 1.97, 2.131, 3.165), probably in Venice around 1510. The manuscript belonged to cardinal Domenico Grimani who in 1522 donated his library to the monastery S. Antonio di Castello in Venice. The manuscript was bought by the Wiener Hofbibliothek in 1672.

Contents: Phalaris, Epistulae (ff. 1r–44r); Mithridates, Epistula (f. 45r); Brutus, Epistulae (ff. 46r–55r); Alciphron, Epistulae 1.1–1.10, 1.14–1.22 (ff. 56r–62r); Crates, Epistula 9 (f. 62r); Alciphron, Epistulae 3.37–40, 2.3–7, 4.2–10, 14, 15, 11 (ff. 62v–71r); Metrical table (f. 72r); Vita Pindari (f. 73r); Pindarus, Olympia (ff. 74r–107r); Pindarus, Pythonia (ff. 107r–128r); Musaeus, Hero et Leander (ff. 129r–135r); Callimachus, Hymni (ff. 136r–158r).


2. The primary manuscripts

The manuscripts used in this edition for constituting the text are VFPD, which contain all the letters from book 4 and a selection of letters from books 1–3. The archetype (ω) was probably damaged since letters 1.11, 1.13, 2.2, 2.8, 3.36 are incomplete in VFPD which they are not in the manuscripts of the other families. ω has two descendants, α and β.

106 According to Hunger (1961) 408.
109 Ff. 44r, 55/1 (not numbered), 71r, 71/1–10, 72r, 128r, 128/1–2, 135/1–6, 159r–194 are blank, cf. Hunger (1961) 408.
110 1.1–1.10, 1.11 (des. ἐνορχεῖσθαι τάς), 1.13 (inc. περισουχένσιν), 1.14–1.22; 3.36 (inc. βουλῆ κοινούμενος), 3.37–3.41; 2.2 (inc. ἐκόησιν ἔδε), 2.3–2.7, 2.8 (des. ἀπεχθομένη). In D the incomplete letters 1.11, 1.13; 3.36, 3.41; 2.2, 2.8 are added in the end of the manuscript, see the description of D on p. 27–8.
111 In this edition the term archetype is used for the ancestor of VFPD, although it is probably a hyparchetype when constructing the stemma for the whole tradition of Alciphron’s letters, cf. Schepers (1905) xx–xxi.
β, which are the ancestors of VF and PD. α and β are siblings since they each have their respective omissions which are reproduced in VF and PD. The following omissions are found in VF:

4.3.1 οὐχ ἦττον om. VF
4.3.1 οὐ τυγχάνομεν om. VF
4.7.1 δὲ om. VF
4.10.3 οὐ om. VF
4.16.5 ὁ om. VF
4.19.1 τὰς om. VF

The following omissions are found in PD:

4.3.1 σοι om. PD
4.13.10 ταῦτα om. PD
4.13.11 καὶ om. PD
4.14.1 ἐπὶ θυσίαν om. PD
4.14.2 Μοσχάριον, Ὀασ, Ἀνθράκιον, Πετάλη, Ὀρυαλλίς om. PD
4.16.1 τῆς om. PD
4.16.7 τὴν σὴν om. PD
4.17.5 εἰς om. PD
4.18.3 ἀλλ’ αἰσθανόμενοι, Γλυκέρα, δὴ συναποθνήσκομεν om. PD
4.18.11 τὰ στενά om. PD
4.18.14 καὶ om. PD
fragm. 5 Λαῖς om. PD
fragm. 5 μὲν om. PD (also V)

The omission in 4.18.3 probably resulted from a *homoeoarchon* where a scribe when copying the phrase *συναποθάνοιμεν ἀλλ’ αἰσθανόμενοι, Γλυκέρα, δὴ συναποθνήσκομεν* has jumped from *συναποθάνοιμεν* to *συναποθνήσκομεν* and omitted ἀλλ’ αἰσθανόμενοι, Γλυκέρα, δὴ συναποθνήσκομεν.

VF and PD also have numerous variant readings but there is no great difference in the quality between these two branches. They both need to be taken into account when constituting the text. Sometimes the variant readings found in VF give an inferior text:

4.1.1 κατακλινώμεν] κατακλίνωμεν VF
4.2.4 ύποψίας] ύπεροψίας VF
4.3.1 Φρύνη] φρύνης VF
4.5.3 μεμίσησαι] μεμίμησαι VF
4.6.5 ἀνιάσονται] ἰάσονται VF
4.7.4 λῆρος] λήροι VF
4.11.4 χλανίσκιον] χλανίδιον VF
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At other times the variant readings in PD are inferior:

4.1.1 ἡδη] ἴδη PD
4.7.6 στασιάζει] στρασιάζει PD
4.11.8 προτόσεις] πόσεις PD
4.13.4 περί] παρά PD
4.13.10 σκώληκας] κώληκας PD
4.13.14 τότου] τότοι PD
4.16.3 αὐτὸν] αὐτοῖς PD
4.16.9 τοὺ δείπνου] αὐτοῦ δείπνου PD
4.17.2 [ζην] τήν PD
4.17.5 οὖν] νῦν PD
4.17.10 ώς] ὡς PD
4.18.13 σποδός] σπονδός PD
4.18.14 ἀρπάζας] ἀρπάξας PD
4.18.15 οὖ τῶν μεγάλων] οὗτοι μεγάλων PD
4.19.13 μή με τι] μήτε τι PD
fragm. 5 λαλεῖν μή] μὴ λαλεῖν PD

V and F

The exemplar of V and F (α) seems to have been damaged or illegible in some places as is evident from the gaps left by the scribes in the manuscripts:

4.13.4 μικρὸν PD: μ[2 litt.] VF
4.13.4 ήν PD: [3 litt.] VF

F has more of these gaps which would suggest that it was copied at a later stage than V when the exemplar had become even more illegible:112

4.1.1 πώποτε PD: πάνποτε V: πάν[6 litt.] F
4.12.3 ἀρεθμοὶ PD: ἀρεθμοὶ V: ἄρ[2 litt.]θμοι F
4.13.3 ἄνυσθεῖσα PD: ἐνυσθεῖσα V: [2 litt.]νυσθεῖσαι F
4.13.6 ἄλλα VPD: ἄ[2 litt.] F

112 The date of F is uncertain but V was perhaps written in 1454, see p. 32.
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4.16.7 ἀφεῖσα VPD: ἀφ[2 litt.]σα F
4.17.10 διακομωδεῖ σε Τιμοκράτης ὁ Μητροδώρου VPD: διακω[25 litt.] F

These examples also rule out any possibility of F being the exemplar of V. It is likewise unlikely that F was copied from V:

4.14.6 καὶ περιάλλων] καὶ om. V
4.19.7 καὶ τῶν αὐτόθι] καὶ om. V

The omissions in V are perhaps not conclusive but if we add the following readings from V the picture should be clear:

4.2.3 χρηστοτέρῳ] τρηστοτέρῳ V
4.2.3 κέχρησαι] κέχρηται V
4.7.1 ἐπήρας] ἐπήρες V
4.8.1 φοιτάν] φοιτῶν V
4.8.2 ἐνεφορησάμην] ἐν εὐφορησάμην V
4.11.9 ἀποδυράμενος] ἀποδυνάμενος V
4.14.3 στέφανοι] στεφάνου V
4.14.4 ζῶον] ζῶον V
4.14.4 βόμβυξ] κόμυξ V
4.19.5 ἀναψύχω] ἐν ἀψύχῳ V
4.19.10 πέτραν] μητέραν V
4.19.14 σοῖ] σοφοὶ V
4.19.18 βασιλικωτέρα] βασικωτέρα V

Some of these readings are simple scribal errors, which could easily have been corrected, but others would have been nearly impossible to correct. So it is highly probable that F is not a copy of V.

F generally offers a sounder text than V but F has introduced some readings which deteriorate the text. The errors are, however, slight and mostly orthographical:

4.2.4 οἰτιάσῃ με] οἰτιάσημαι F
4.4.3 τῶ ἀποτεύγματι] τῶν ἀποτεύγματι F
4.5.1 τῶ τοιούτῳ] τῶν τοιούτων F
4.5.2 στέρξει] στέρξειν F
4.6.1 εὐξίππην] εὐρίππην F
4.6.4 παιδέρωτα] παιδ᾽ ἔρωτα F
4.7.8 λήρου] κλήρους F
4.8.3 ύφ᾽ ἡμῶν] ἐφημῶν F
4.14.1 τῶν] τήν F
4.14.2 τῆς εὐφημίας] τεύφημίας F
4.16.7 πασοῦ] πάσ F
A peculiar trait of V and F is that they sometimes omit diacritical signs between a preposition and a noun or a pronoun. This characteristic, which probably derives from α, is even more frequent in V.

**P and D**

The relation between P and D is not completely clear but they are probably siblings. The only thing that can be said with certainty is that P is not a copy of D based on the following omissions:

- 4.12.3 συγκαρ om. D
- 4.14.8 σόν om. D
- 4.16.1 τοσούτος om. D
- 4.16.8 πάση om. D
- 4.18.11 τὴν καλὴν ἀκρόπολιν, τὰς σεμνὰς θεάς, τὰ μυστήρια om. D

Furthermore the order of the letters in D differs from the order found in P. The fragmentary letters 1.11, 1.13, 3.36, 3.41, 2.2, 2.8, 4.1, 4.12–4.13 and fragm. 5 have been added at the end of the manuscript, separately from the rest of the letters.

It is probable that D is not a copy of P even if this cannot be ruled out completely since the omissions in P are not substantial enough:

- 4.16.4 ἐπαφροδίτως D: ἐπαφρ[3 litt. τως P: ἐπαφρίτως Vf
- 4.16.9 αὐταὶ Vf: αὐτ[3 litt.] P: αὐτοὶ D

The scribe of D could easily have supplied the missing letters. The following example could also be used as an argument that D is not a copy of P:

- 4.16.1 πέφρικα καὶ δέδοικα D: καὶ δέδοικα om. VFP

But most editors take καὶ δέδοικα as a marginal gloss to πέφρικα so the example is not a good argument. The readings introduced in P are not very helpful either in establishing the relationship between P and

---

113 e.g. 4.1.1 μετ’ ἀλλήλων] μεταλλήλων VF, 4.2.5 ὑπὸ Χρέμητος] ὑποχρέμητος VF, 4.3.3 ἀντ’ ἐκείνης] ἀντεκείνης VF, 4.5.3 παρὰ πάσαις] παραπάσαις VF, 4.6.2 πρὸς ἐκείνην] προσεκείνην VF, 4.6.3 μετ’ ἐκείνης] μετεκείνης VF, 4.7.2 ἐξ οὗ] ἔξῳ VF.
114 e.g. 4.5.1 ἀλλ’ Εὐθίας] ἀλλευθίας V, 4.6.2 ἀντὶ τούτων] ἀντιτούτων V, 4.6.2 διὰ Στράτωνα] διαστράτωνα V, 4.6.3 κατὶ τὴν] κατιτὴν V, 4.7.1 μετὰ χεῖρας] μεταχεῖρας V, 4.7.5 διὰ τοῦτο] διαστούτο V.
115 See the description of D on pp. 27–8.
116 For a discussion of this passages, see commentary on 4.16.1.
D since they consist mostly of orthographical errors which would have been easy to correct:

4.2.4  [ζηλοτυπίαις] [ζηλωτυπίαις P
4.4.2  [ζηλοτυπίαις] [ζηλωτυπίαις P
4.6.5  μέλιη] μέλλει P
4.7.8  δμιμασί] δμιμασίν P
4.7.8  ἐπιδιειδόμεθα] ἐπιδιειδόμεθα P
4.11.7  αὐτῆς] αὐτοῖς P
4.12.1  ἐλεῶ] ἐλαιῶ P
4.12.3  ἐστιν] ἐστι P
4.13.15  ἡ δ` ἵων] ἰδίων P
4.14.5  θραυαλλίς] θριαλλίς P
4.17.9  πρεσβευτάς] πρευσβευτάς P
4.19.10  πειραιεύς] πειρεεύς P
fragm. 5 λαλοῦσι] λαλούσιν P

The readings introduced by D on the other hand confirm that D cannot be the source of P:

4.2.4  ἀποδήμησιν] ἀποδήμην D
4.3.1  μόνης] μόνος D
4.4.4  μαστάρια] μαστήρια D
4.4.4  ἐπέδειξας] ἀπέδειξας D
4.5.3  προτιμώσας] προτιμώσας D
4.6.2  ἡ δὲ καλῶς] ἀλλὰ καλῶς D
4.6.3  παρῇμεν] παρ᾽ ἡμῖν D
4.6.5  σκώμασιν οὐδὲ] σκώμασιν οὐδὲν D
4.7.3  τῇ Μεγάρας] τῆς Μεγάρας D
4.8.2  τό] τότε D
4.8.3  ἄνπερ ὡς] ἄν ωσπερ D
4.9.2  περιβάλλομένη] προβαλλομένη D
4.9.4  ἡμῖν] ἡμῖν D
4.13.5  ἐνήσαμεν] ἐστήσαμεν D
4.17.8  ὡστερον] ἔτερον D
4.19.17  δηλωσόν μοι] δηλωσοῦ μοι D
fragm. 5 ἰσχυεγχύλους] ἰσχυεσχέλους D
fragm. 5 θηριοτραφηθείσα] θηριοτραφηθείσα D

Looking at the readings introduced in P and D we can see that P presents a sounder text than D.

Schepers suggested that D might be a copy of P but found it more likely that both manuscripts derive from a common source which had
IV THE MANUSCRIPT TRADITION  

corrections and additions to the text.\textsuperscript{117} P has numerous corrections and variant readings above the text or in the margin written by the same hand as the main text. These variant readings are nearly always found also in D.\textsuperscript{118} In most cases they offer a better reading:

\begin{verbatim}
4.3.1 οὐ τυγχάνομεν PmgD: om. VFP
4.4.4 ποιήσης PmgD: πωλήσης VFP
4.5.2 φρύνην PmgD: μυρρίνην VFP
4.16.5 προσέπεμψαν Vfp: προσέβλεψαν PmgD
4.17.9 σεαυτήν FPmgD: ἕαυτήν VP
4.18.7 ἔγνωκα V: ἔγνων κἂν PmgD
4.19.12 περιβέβληται V: περιβέβληνται VFP: παραβέβληνται PmgD
4.19.19 ἐμὴ PmgD: ἐμοὶ VFP
\end{verbatim}

These readings might be used as an argument that D is not a copy of P but they are not sufficient proof. The scribe of D might very well have thought that the corrections in P were the correct readings and incorporated them into his copy.

Based on the evidence presented here it is probable that D is not a copy of P but rather that P and D are siblings. This cannot, however, be stated with certainty until a collation of the letters from books 1–3 in P and D has been made.\textsuperscript{119}

3. The secondary manuscripts

Descendants of V and F (L and S)

For 4.2, 4.18–4.19 we have two additional witnesses in L and S. They are

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{117} Cf. Schepers (1905) ix n. 2. Schepers’ arguments should, however, be used with caution since many of the examples put forth by him are reported incorrectly, e.g. 4.10.4 πειρασθέν P: πειραθέν D, should be πειρασθέν PD; 4.16.2 τούδε P: τούτου D, should be τούτου PD; 4.17.2 γεγονὼς D: om. P, should be γεγονὼς om. PD; 4.17.2 μουσικῶς P: φυσικῶς D, should be φυσικῶς PD. See also n. 170.
\item \textsuperscript{118} One exception is 4.13.11 πρέζις VFPD: τῆς Pmg (Schepers wrongly reports that D has τῆς).
\item \textsuperscript{119} There are similar problems in determining the relationship between P and D for other authors found in these manuscripts. P seems to be contaminated in the case of Chion, Euripides and Diogenes, cf. Sicherl (1997) 207–8. In the case of the letters of Melissa, Myia and Theano, D is a copy of a lost manuscript which is a sibling of P, cf. Städele (1980) 130, 136.
\end{itemize}
clearly related to V and F because they share the following readings:\textsuperscript{120}

4.2.1 εἰωθότα [εἰωθότας] VFLS
4.2.4 ὑποψίας [ὑπερψίας] VFLS
4.19.6 γένοιτο [γένοιτο] VFLS

When the readings of V and F diverge, L and S sometimes agree with F:

4.2.2 λογίζομαι FLS: λογιζόμενον V
4.2.3 κέχρησαι FLS: κέχρηται V
4.19.7 μεγάλου καὶ FLS: καὶ om. V
4.19.13 ἀττικός FLS: ὀττ[5 litt.] V
4.19.14 σοὶ FL: σὺ S: σοφοὶ V
4.19.16 στύρακα] στύρραν V: στύραν FLS
4.19.18 ἵερων μνήμονι FLS: ἱερομνήμονι V

In some passages, however, L and S agree with V:

4.2.4 σοιτάσῃ μὲ VLS: σοιτάσματι F
4.18.3 ἥλος V: ἥλος LS: [4 litt.] F
4.18.15 μέλλω F: μέλλων VLS
4.19.6 πρωτέως VLS: πρῶτεως F
4.19.19 ἐπιτρέποντας] ἐπιτρέποντος VLS: ἐπιτρέποντες F
4.19.20 κρεῖσσον] κρείσσων VLS: κρείσσω F

L and S have introduced new readings which would suggest that one is the copy of the other, or that they are siblings deriving from a lost copy of either V or F:

4.2.3 βακχίδος] βακχίδης LS
4.18.1 ἐπαίρω] ἐπαίρων LS
4.18.3 ἡμῶν] ἡμῖν LS
4.18.7 κόπτω] κόπτων LS
4.18.11 κώμαις] κώμαις LS
4.18.11 ἄργυρον καὶ πλοῦτον] ἄργυρον, καὶ πλοῦτον δὲ LS
4.19.2 τὴν ἐπιστολήν] τῆς ἐπιστολῆς LS
4.19.8 ἔλεω] θέλων LS
4.19.10 πέτραν F: μητέραν V: τροίαν LS
4.19.11 ἡ πατρίς] οἱ πατρίς LS
4.19.13 ἀφηρημένην] ἀφηρημένον LS
4.19.17 σαφῶς] σαφές LS

\textsuperscript{120} Schepers erroneously thought that S was a copy of L and that L derived directly from the archetype. He was probably misled by poor collations. See Schepers (1905) x and xx–xxi.
4.19.17 ἰδεῖν] ἰδεῖναι LS
4.19.20 παρά ἐρωτω[ν] περὶ ἐρῶν τῶ LS
4.19.20 πάντως] πάντα LS

The relationship between L and S is not absolutely clear but they are probably siblings. The following omission in L should rule out the possibility of it being the exemplar of S:

4.18.11 ὅλην τὴν ἰωνίαν] ὅλην τὴν ἐωνίαν S: τὴν ἰωνίαν L.

The readings introduced in L consist mostly of orthographical errors and are not of any help in establishing the relationship between L and S:

4.2.2 κἀμοι] καὶ μοι L
4.18.1 λέγω καὶ γράφω] λέγων καὶ γράφων L
4.18.8 ἐνθυμοῦμαι] ἐνθυμοῦμαι L
4.19.5 διασκευάζω] διακευάζω L
4.19.14 Μένανδρ[ε] μένανδρος L

The errors introduced in S are perhaps of more value for ruling out the possibility of it being the exemplar of L:

4.2.2 παρεγγυήσω] παρ᾽ ἐγγυήσω S
4.18.1 ἐναντίον] ἐναντίων S
4.18.3 συγκαταβαίη] καταβαίη S
4.18.5 μενάνδρο] μενάνδρου S
4.18.13 ἐμαυτῷ συναποίσω] σὺν αὐτῷ συναποίσω S
4.19.2 γεγάνωσαι] γεγόνασαι S
4.19.2 ταῦτα] τα S
4.19.3 τὸ λεγόμενον] τὰ λεγόμενα S
4.19.8 δόξης] δόξας S
4.19.8 θέλω] θέλουν S
4.19.14 σοὶ] σὺ S
4.19.20 ἀφήσεις] ἀφίσεις L: ἀφής S

Based on these readings the conclusion is that L and S are siblings and that they derive from a lost manuscript which was copied from either V or F with the other used as a corrective.\footnote{Sicherl thinks that L and S derive from a lost manuscript (Grimani-Codex 208) which is a descendant of V, cf. Sicherl (1997) 252–3.} In any case L and S are of no use in the constitution of the text and the readings found in them are not worthy of any consideration.

\footnote{Sicherl thinks that L and S derive from a lost manuscript (Grimani-Codex 208) which is a descendant of V, cf. Sicherl (1997) 252–3.}
INTRODUCTION

Descendants of V (Leid, Bran¹, Bran², Vall¹, Vall², Ottob)

There are a few late manuscripts (Bran¹, Bran², Vall¹, Vall², Ottob), all written by the same scribe and probably dating from the 17th century,¹²² which contain a selection of letters from books 1–3 not printed in the Aldine edition,¹²³ and 4.12 (Bran², Vall¹, Ottob), 4.13 (Vall², Ottob) and fragm. 5 (Bran¹, Vall², Ottob). These manuscripts are related with Leid and they all belong to the same family as V,¹²⁴ since they reproduce readings found in V:

4.12.2 ψιμύθιον | ψυμύθιον V Leid Bran² Vall¹ Ottob (ψιμύθιον Leid Bran² in marg.)
4.12.3 ἀφρυθμοὶ | ἄφεθμοι V Leid Bran² Vall¹ Ottob
4.13.3 ἁνυσθεῦσα | ἁνυσθεῖσα V Leid Vall² Ottob
4.13.6 δὲν | ἀλλ᾽ V Leid Vall² Ottob ([2 litt.] F: σοῦν PD)
4.13.8 ὁράίζον | ὁράζον V Leid Ottob: ὁράζον Vall²
4.13.9 ἱδροῦσης | ἱδροῦσηs V Leid Ottob
4.13.11 τῶν συνεξήθεν | τῶν συνεξεῖ V Leid Vall² Ottob
4.13.12 πυγήν | πηγήν V Leid Vall² Ottob
4.13.17 λέγουσι | λέγουσαι V Leid Vall² Ottob

But they also introduce new readings not found in V which would indicate that they derive from a lost descendant of V (ζ):

4.13.2 ἐκπιεῖν | ἐκποιεῖν Leid Vall² Ottob
4.13.3 τοῦτον | τοῦτο Leid Vall² Ottob
4.13.3 κιωνία | κιωνία Leid Vall² Ottob
4.13.14 σκευηρεφῆ | σκευηρεφῆ Leid Vall² Ottob
4.13.14 κραιπάλῃ | κρεπάλῃ Leid Vall² Ottob
fragm. 5 ἰσχνας ἐγχύλους | ἰσχνας ἐγχύλους Leid Bran¹ Vall² Ottob
(ἰσχν᾽ ἐγχύλους V)

The internal relationship between these manuscripts cannot be determined from collations of 4.12–4.13 and fragm. 5 alone, but the following omission and variant readings would suggest that Leid is not the source for Vall² or Ottob:

4.13.1 οὐτὸ δ᾽ ἔστι Leid: οὐτοδεστὶ V Vall² Ottob

¹²² Bran¹ and Bran² are parts of the same manuscript; Vall¹ and Vall² are parts of another manuscript. See the description of the manuscripts on pp. 25–6, 30–1.
¹²³ 1.11–1.13, 2.2, 2.8–2.15, 2.17–2.27, 2.16, 2.28, 2.30, 3.1–3.39, 3.42.
¹²⁴ For fragm. 5, 4.12–4.13. The rest of the letters from book 4 in Leid are copied from the Aldine edition, or possibly the ed. 1606, see pp. 49–50.
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4.13.4 ἦν Leid (also PD): [3 litt.] VF: [4–5 litt.] Vall² Ottob

4.13.7 ἀγροῦ om. Leid

4.13.12 λέγω] γέλω Leid

4.13.14 ἦ δὲ] ἥδυ Leid

Similarly Ottob is not likely the source for Leid or Vall² as the following examples show:

4.13.5 ἐπ᾽ αὐτῷ Ottob (also FPD): ἐπαυτῶν V: ἐπ᾽ αὐτῶν Leid Vall²

4.13.11 Κρουσμάτιον om. Ottob

4.13.14 κάλυκας] κίλυκας Ottob

These manuscripts are of no importance for the constitution of the text but they are interesting as a form of manuscript edition supplementing the Aldine edition, found in at least three copies made by the same scribe.

Descendants of D (KCNMWZ Ald)

The manuscripts KCNMWZ and the Aldine edition belong to the same family as D. The fragmentary letters 4.1, 4.12–4.13 and fragm. 5, which were added in the end of D, are omitted in KCNMWZ Ald. In MW also 4.16–4.19 have been omitted, whereas Z only has a selection consisting of 4.18, 4.2–4.7. The following omissions in D are also found in KCNMWZ Ald and should therefore be sufficient proof that they are descendants of D:

4.6.3 τὴν ἀγερωχίαν om. DKCNMWZ Ald

4.14.8 σῶν om. DMKCNW Ald

4.16.1 τοσοῦτος om. DKCN Ald²⁵

4.16.8 πάση om. DKCN Ald

4.18.11 τὴν καλῆν ἀκρόπολιν, τὰς σεμνὰς θεὰς, τὰ μυστήρια om. DKCNZ Ald

The following readings in DKCNMWZ Ald give additional support to this relationship:

4.3.1 μόνης] μόνος DKCNMWZ Ald

4.4.4 ἐπεδείξας] ἀπεδειξας DKCNMWZ Ald

4.6.2 ἦ δὲ καλῶς] ἀλλὰ καλῶς DKCNMWZ Ald

4.6.3 παρῆμεν] παρὰ ἦμῖν DKCNMWZ Ald

²⁵ 4.16–4.19 are missing in MW.
INTRODUCTION

4.8.3 ἄνπερ ὡς] ἄν ὡπερ DKCNMW Ald
4.9.2 περιβαλλομένη] προβαλλομένη DKCNMW Ald
4.17.8 ἔστερον] ἐτερον DKCN Ald
4.19.4 ἡ] δῆλος ἢν DKCN Ald
4.19.8 οὖτοις ὃ βασιλεύς] ὃ βασιλεύς οὗτοις DKCN Ald
4.19.17 δηλωσόν μοι] δηλώσαι μοι DKCN Ald

KCNMW Ald are most likely not direct descendants of D but probably derive from a lost descendant of D (δ) since they share the following omission not found in D:126

4.5.1–2 θηρίῳ προσέφθαρσαι. πλὴν ἰσως τῶ om. KCNMW Ald

It is unlikely that K, C or N was the exemplar for the others because of the omissions and readings found in these manuscripts.127 MW can also be ruled out as they omit letters 4.16–4.19 and show no signs that folia have been lost.128

K, C and N

These manuscripts were probably written at the same scriptorium in Crete, which makes their internal relationship difficult to establish.129
But the following omission would suggest that they, together with the Aldine edition, derive from a common lost source (δ):

4.16.6 τὰ δὲ ἄδηειν, τὰ δὲ αὐλεῖν, τὰ δὲ ὀρχεῖσθαι om. KCN Ald

KCN also share a few variant readings which supports this relationship:

4.14.6 ἐγένοντο] ἐγένετο KCN
4.16.1 παρρησίας] παρουσίας KCN
4.16.2 μικρὸν] μικρόν KCN
4.18.15 βλέποντι] βλέπειν τί KCN
4.18.16 καιρὸν] καιρόν KCN

The exact relationship between KCN is unclear. Sometimes KC agree

126 Z does not omit this phrase so it is probably a direct copy of D, see p. 52.
127 See below, pp. 44–7.
128 In M the scribe has inserted τέλοι ἐπιστολαί ἀλκιφρονος (sic) after 4.15.
129 Aristoboulos Apostoles was probably the scribe of K, and perhaps also of C; N was written by Thomas Bitzimanos. They all worked in the scriptorium of Michael Apostoles in Crete, see the description of the manuscripts on pp. 22, 24–5 and 29–30.
against N, sometimes KN agree against C, and at other times CN agree against K. But the following omissions and readings introduced by each manuscript make it likely that they are siblings. The following omissions are found in Kc but not in N:

4.4.1 τοῦ om. KC
4.16.6 οὐδὲ om. KC
4.17.7 μὴ πρὸσιθῇ μὴ om. KC

K is most likely not the source of CN since it has numerous readings not found in CN, and also some itacistic errors.

Likewise the following omissions should rule out the possibility of C being the exemplar of KN:

4.4.2 μὲν om. c
4.6.1 ποιεῖν om. c
4.6.4 τὸν om. c
4.8.1 ἡμᾶς om. c
4.9.2 μοι om. c
4.9.4 ἐστίν om. c
4.14.7 ἡδίων om. c
4.16.1 σε om. C
4.16.3 ἔχω om. C
4.16.6 εἶναι om. C
4.19.2 σὺν om. C

Furthermore the following transpositions in C make it an unlikely source for KN:

4.9.2 τῶν ἀνοῆτων ἑραστῶν χάριτες] χάριτες τῶν ἀνοῆτων ἑραστῶν C
4.18.16 ἀεὶ στέφεσθαι] στέφεσθαι ἀεὶ C

130 e.g. 4.8.1 ἀποδύρεσθαι] ἀποδύρασθαι Kc, 4.9.5 πέμπει] πέμπειν Kc, 4.14.3 σου] σοι Kc, 4.14.3 πότος] τόπος Kc, 4.17.8 τῶν θεῶν] τῶν θεῶν Kc, 4.19.6 ὑπερθάλασσαι] ὑπερθάλασσαί Kc.
131 e.g. 4.16.2 συγκρίνει] συγκρίνεις Kn, 4.19.5 ἐσθῆτας] ἐστῆτας Kn, 4.19.10 ἐν Νάξῳ] ἀνάξω Kn.
132 e.g. 4.14.3 καταλειφθέντα] καταληφθέντα CN, 4.19.15 ἦκουσαν] ἦκουσαν CN.
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To this can be added numerous readings introduced in C which are not found in KN,\textsuperscript{135} and many itacistic errors.\textsuperscript{136} A few readings, however, are worth mentioning as they seem to be attempts to correct the text:

\begin{itemize}
  \item 4.10.1 ᾧπας] αὐτῶς ᾧπας C
  \item 4.16.5 Ἐρως] ὦ ἔρως C
  \item 4.17.2 κυρίας] κυρίας καὶ C
  \item 4.18.16 χώματος] χώματός μοι C
  \item 4.19.12 ὦς βίαιος] ὦ βίαιος C
  \item 4.19.13 νουθετῶν] νουθετῶν με C
  \item 4.19.14 εἶτε] ἦ C
  \item 4.19.14 ἡμῶν] ἡμῖν C
\end{itemize}

One interesting point is that C shares a few readings with the Aldine edition:\textsuperscript{137}

\begin{itemize}
  \item 4.3.2 Εὐθίας] εὐθείας C Ald
  \item 4.14.1 ἐπήγγειλεν] ἀπήγγειλεν C Ald
  \item 4.16.7 ἐτέρους] ἐταιροὺς C Ald
  \item 4.17 tit. Λεόντιον] λεόντιος C Ald
  \item 4.17.2 ὁφέτω] ἐφέτω C Ald
  \item 4.17.2 φυσικῶς] μουσικῶς C Ald
  \item 4.17.5 προσλαμβάνει] προσλαμβάνει C Ald
  \item 4.19.12 ἦς] οἷς C Ald
\end{itemize}

Some of the examples are probably coincidental but the reading μουσικῶς in 4.17.2 is difficult to explain. It is possible that C was used as a corrective to the Aldine edition.\textsuperscript{138}

N can also be ruled out as a possible source for KC as the following omissions show:\textsuperscript{139}

\begin{itemize}
  \item 4.16.6 οἶ ψυχαί] οἰ om. N
\end{itemize}


\textsuperscript{137} C and Ald also have the same rubric before 4.16: ἄρχη τοῦ δευτέρου τμῆματος.

\textsuperscript{138} The exact dating of the codicological unit in C containing Alciphron (see the description of C on pp. 24–5) is uncertain but it was probably written sometime between 1490 and 1500, cf. Sicherl (1997) 195–6.

\textsuperscript{139} N also has the following additions against KC: 4.18.11 ὅλην ἐν] ὅλην τὴν ἐν N, 4.19.20 ἰσχύει] ἐν ἰσχύει N.
N has introduced many new readings which deteriorate the text. The scribe, Thomas Bitzimanos, seems also to have been prone to orthographical and itacistic errors.

The Aldine edition and its apograph (Leid)

The Aldine should be included as a textual witness together with the secondary manuscripts since it seems to derive from the same lost copy of D (δ) as KCN, as is evident from the following omission: τὰ δὲ ἀδειν, τὰ δὲ αὐλεῖν, τὰ δὲ ὀρχεῖσθαι om. KCN Ald

The Aldine contains numerous corrections possibly deriving from V, which was probably used as a corrective for the Aldine edition for the letters of Alciphron, Pythagoras, Chion, Anacharsis and Euripides. But most of the corrections in the Aldine which correspond with V could also be the result of independent conjecture by the editor Marcus Musurus. Examples of corrections corresponding with V:

140 e.g. 4.3.3 παρεσκεύασας] παρεσκοτάσας N, 4.7.5 τὰς ἀτόμους τοὺς ἀτόμους N, 4.16.7 ἐταίρας] ἐτέρους N, 4.16.7 φίλας] φίλους N, 4.17.10 ποσάκιος] ποσάκιος N.
141 e.g. 4.2.5 λοιδορεῖσθαι] λοιδωρεῖσθαι N, 4.7.4 μειράκιων] μειράκιον N, 4.16.1 θεάσωμαι] θεάσομαι N, 4.17.2 διεστραμμένους] διεστραμένους N, 4.19.21 ἔρω- σο] ἔρω- σο N.
144 V was available to the editor Marcus Musurus, cf. Sicherl (1997) 201-2 and Sicherl (1998) 90, 92-3. But it is inexplicable why Musurus in that case did not include 4.1, 4.12-4.13 and fragm. 5 from V.
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4.7.7 πότερος άμεινον VF Ald: πότερον άμεινον PD
4.16.3 διαθήσει VF Ald: διαθήσειν PDKC
4.16.9 τοῦ δείπνου VF Ald: αὐτοῦ δείπνου PDKC

The Aldine edition offers valuable conjectures which in many places improve the text. The following conjectures have been adopted in the present edition:

4.2.2 σὲ Ald (also W): om. rell.
4.2.5 κἂν μοι Ald (also P⁎W): κάμοι rell.
4.7.3 Ἐρπυλλίδι Ald: ἐρπυλλίδι rell.
4.8.3 ὃ Ald: ὅν rell.
4.9.2 Μυρρινοῦντι Ald (also W): μυρρινοῦντι rell.
4.10.1 Ἐρπυλλίδος Ald: ἐρπυλλίδος VFPD
4.10.2 γὰρ ἐξῆς Ald (also W): γὰρ Λύσιδος ἐξῆς rell.
4.10.5 Ἐρπυλλὶς Ald (also P): ἐρπυλὶς VFD
4.14.7 ἔρξι Ald (also W): ἑρᾶν rell.
4.18.3 ζῆλος Ald: ἢλος VPD: [4 litt.] F
4.18.17 ἀκαιροτέραν Ald: ἀκεραιοτέραν VFP⁎D: ἀκαραιοτέραν P⁎
4.19.1 ως Ald (also PCN): ὃς VF: [1 litt.] S D
4.19.2 θεασάμεναι δὲ Ald: θεασάμενοι rell.
4.19.2 ὅν om. Ald
4.19.9 εὖ οἶδα Ald: εὖ δ᾽ οἶδα rell.
4.19.15 οὐ δεῖ Ald: οὐδὲ rell.
4.19.16 φῦλα Ald (corr. φύλλα Bergler): φῦλα VFP: φῦλα D
4.19.17 τὸ ἁγρίδιον Ald: τὸν ἁγρίδιον rell.
4.19.19 ἔχῃς Ald: ἔχεις D: ἔχοις VFP
4.19.20 υμῶν Ald: ἡμῶν rell.
4.19.20 μὲ γέγραφας Ald (also P⁎): μεταγέγραφας rell.

The Aldine also shares a few readings with W against all the other manuscripts which improve the text:

4.2.2 σὲ W Ald: om. rell.
4.2.5 κἂν μοι W Ald (also P⁎): κάμοι rell.
4.9.2 Μυρρινοῦντι W Ald: μυρρινοῦντι rell.
4.10.2 γὰρ ἐξῆς W Ald: γὰρ Λύσιδος ἐξῆς rell.

And some that do not improve the text:

4.2.2 φέρειν] φέρει W Ald
4.2.4 ἀποδήμησιν] ἀποδημίαν W Ald (for ἀποδήμην)
There are also quite a few conjectures in the Aldine which do not improve the text.\textsuperscript{145}

The Aldine was possibly the source for Leid for letters 4.2–4.11, 4.14–4.19 since the conjectures in the Aldine are repeated in Leid.\textsuperscript{146} But the source might even have been the Geneva edition of 1606, which is a reprint of the Aldine, since some of the readings introduced in this edition also occur in Leid:

4.7.3 μισογύναιον Ald: μεσογύναιον 1606 Leid
4.9.3 δακρύεις Ald: δακρύσεις 1606 Leid
4.9.5 σεαυτὸν Ald: σε αὐτὸν 1606 Leid
4.16.2 ἐπέσταλκε Ald: ἐπέσταλκες 1606 Leid (also C)


\textsuperscript{146} Schepers (1905) xvi, incorrectly assumed that these letters were copied from C. Leid was one of the manuscripts used by Bergler for his edition, see pp. 54–5.
This cannot, however, be stated with any certainty since the examples are so few.

M and W

M and W omit letters 4.16–4.19. Furthermore, the order of the letters is slightly different in W: 4.2–4.10, 4.14–4.15, 4.11. This transposition might be deliberate in order to make the letters chronologically more coherent by placing 4.11 (lamenting the death of Bacchis) after 4.14 (which is addressed to Bacchis). In M the scribe has inserted τέλος ἐπιστολαὶ ἀλκιφρονος (sic) after 4.15. This would suggest that MW are copies of a lost manuscript (e) which omitted 4.16–4.19 and also seems to have been damaged as the following examples show:

4.11.9 καταλέλειπται] έλειπται M (sic): λέλειπται W  
4.14.4 ἄνεσάλευσεν] ἐσάλευσεν W: αν ἐσάλευσεν M

MW also share a few omissions:

4.7.5 ἀδελφαῖς καὶ] καὶ om. MW  
4.8.3 παραψυχὴ καὶ] καὶ om. MW  
4.8.4 τῆς ύπεροψίας] τῆς om. MW

M is clearly the inferior manuscript in the group. It contains numerous orthographical errors. But M is most likely not a copy of W since it preserves the original ordering of the letters. Furthermore the following omissions in W should make it clear that M and W are siblings:

4.2.5 τῆς om. W  
4.7.3 οὐ̃τὸν om. W  
4.14.5 γε om. W

W has a special position among the secondary manuscripts. The scribe,
Demetrios Moschos, has introduced many corrections into the text, some of which have been adopted in the present edition:

4.2.5 φειδύλου W (also Z): φιδύλου VFPD
4.6.1 προσέμην W: προσήμην rell.
4.9.2 ἀργυρείος W: ἀργυρίος rell.

However, most of the corrections by Demetrios Moschos do not improve the text. W also shares a few readings with Ald against all the other manuscripts which improve the text:

4.2.2 σὲ W Ald: om. rell.
4.2.5 κἄν μοι W Ald (also ppc): κἀμοὶ rell.
4.9.2 Μυρρινοῦντι W Ald:
4.10.2 γὰρ Λύσιδος ἑξῆς W Ald:

And some that do not improve the text:

4.2.2 φέρειν] φέρει W Ald
4.2.4 ἀποδήμησιν] ἀποδημίαν W Ald (for ἀποδήμην)
4.10.5 ἀποσκήψειν] ἀποσκήπτειν W Ald

Moschos also has a peculiar way of altering the word order in some passages. It is unclear whether these are intentional or accidental.

149 W also shares a few readings with Ald against all the other manuscripts which improve the text:
150 4.5.2 στέρξει δηλονότι Μυρρίνην ὑπεριδών] ὑπεριδών δηλονότι στέρξει μυρρίνην
Although W was most likely copied after the publication of the Aldine edition this does not necessarily mean that Moschos had a copy at hand when he copied W.\textsuperscript{151} He might well have come up with the conjectures independently. One would also think that Moschos would have copied 4.16–4.19 from the Aldine edition had he had access to it.

\textbf{Z}

Z only contains letters 4.18, 4.2–4.7. This manuscript preserves 4.5.1–2 \textit{θηρίῳ προσέφθαρσα, πλὴν ἃς τῷ which is omitted in KCNMW Ald so it cannot derive from the same exemplar as these. Z is most likely a direct copy of D as the following examples show.

\begin{itemize}
  \item 4.3.1 \textit{τυγχάνομεν} PM\textsuperscript{sg}KCMW Ald: \textit{τυγγχάνομεν} DZ
  \item 4.6.1 ν\textit{σύ}τη FPDZ: \textit{ἐν} τῇ KM: \textit{ἐν} τῇ C
  \item 4.6.1 \textit{ποτὲ ἐντυγχάνειν} ποτὲ μὲν ἐντυγχάνειν DZ: ποτὲ μὲν τυγχάνειν KC: ποτὲ σφυντυγχάνειν W
\end{itemize}

The scribe of Z, Zanobio Acciaiuoli,\textsuperscript{152} made numerous changes to the text, one of which has been adopted in the present edition:

\begin{itemize}
  \item 4.18.13 \textit{ἡ} μέγα Z: \textit{ἡ} μέγα rell.
\end{itemize}

Most of the conjectures do not improve the text but they still deserve to be mentioned since they give us a glimpse of Acciaiuoli’s attempts at textual criticism.\textsuperscript{153}

\begin{itemize}
  \item W, 4.6.2 \textit{οὐδὲν ἀρήμην} [\textit{ἀρήμην} oūdēν W, 4.6.4 \textit{χρῶμα σανδαράχης}] σανδαράχης χρῶμα W, 4.7.5 δοκοῦμεν σοι] σοι δοκοῦμεν W, 4.8.1 πρός τινας τῶν διαλεγομένων οἱ\textit{εἰ} οἱ πρός τινας τῶν διαλεγομένων W, 4.8.2 τοῖς ἰάλλοις παρέχειν] παρέχειν παρὰ τοῖς ἰάλλοις W, 4.9.1 οἰκίαν ἑταίρας \textit{τρέφεσθαι} W:
  \item D, 4.9.2 τῶν ἰανοήτων ἐραστῶν \textit{χάριτες} τῶν ἰανοήτων ἐραστῶν W.
\end{itemize}

\textsuperscript{151} W was probably written around 1510, see the description of W on p. 33.

\textsuperscript{152} On Zanobio Acciaiuoli, see Trapp (1998) 159–81.

\textsuperscript{153} On Zanobio Acciaiuoli, see Trapp (1998) 159–81.
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4. The stemma codicum

This is a tentative stemma of the manuscript tradition. The dashed lines indicate manuscripts possibly used as correctives.
The Aldine edition of the Greek epistolographers which appeared in 1499 in Venice contains 44 letters of Alciphron arranged in two books: 1.1–1.10, 1.14–1.22, 3.37–3.40, 2.3–2.7, 4.2–4.11, 4.14–4.15 in book 1 and 4.16–4.19 in book 2. This edition, which seems to be based on a lost descendant of D, is valuable for its numerous conjectures, some of which have been adopted into the text of the present edition. Despite his attempts to correct the text, the editor Marcus Musurus apologizes for the corrupt text in his postscript on f. [Δ ii]: Ἐν μέντοι τοῖς Ἀλκίφρονος ἔστιν οὐ τὰ τῆς ἐννοίας δημιουργηθέν, μηδὲν ἤμων παρά τὰ ἐν ἀντιγράφοις ἀνηκέστως οὕσι δειδομένοις ρηματικῶς καινοτομεῖν τολμησάντων.

In 1606 an edition appeared in Geneva which reprinted the Greek text of the Aldine together with a Latin translation. The translation is falsely attributed to Jacques Cujas (1522–90) in the title and the dedicatory introduction. This edition was perhaps one of the sources used for for Leid.

The proper editio princeps of Alciphron did not appear until 1715 in Leipzig. The editor Stephan Bergler added 72 letters to the 44 letters published in the Aldine edition, making a total of 116 letters. He arranged the new letters in a third book: 1.11–1.13, 3.1–3.5, 2.1–2.2, 2.8–2.28, 2.30–2.39, 3.6–3.36 (3.1–3.72 Bergler). Most of the letters seem to derive from Leid, but 2.1, 2.31–2.39 come from Vindobone-

---

154 In volume 2, ff. [ρ vi]−ττ ii. The second book has the heading ἄρχη τοῦ δευτέρου τμήματος which is also found in C. For the present edition the copy of Uppsala University Library (Ink. 32.103) has been used, cf. Collijn (1907) nr 528.
156 See p. 48.
158 The letters of Alciphron are on pp. 359–80.
159 Cf. Fabricius-Harles (1790) 676 and Benner-Fobes (1949) 32.
160 See pp. 49–50.
161 Bergler also added numbers to the letters in book 1 (1–39) and 2 (1–4). This numbering was used in subsequent editions and is included in brackets in the present edition.
162 Bergler omitted the fragmentary letters 3.42, 4.12–4.13 and fragm. 5 which are found in Leid, perhaps because they were incomplete, cf. Schepers (1905) xv. Bergler had received this manuscript from Jacob Perizonius (1651–1715), cf. Bergler (1715) [viii], ‘Deinde Vir Cl. Jacobus Perizonius thesaurum maximum Epistolaram Alciphrons mihi transmisit, Mense Martio anni modo elapsi. Perscrutavit illae ad Virum Clarissimum ex Bibliotheca Theodori Rycii. Ex Vaticana autem sunt descriptae, vel ab ipso Rycio, qui Roma fuerat, vel potius a Graeco aliquo, cujus opera ibi usus fuerat. Adscriptum etiam est alicubi indi-
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The edition also includes a new Latin translation and a commentary. The text and translation was reprinted in 1791 without the commentary.

In the edition of 1798 Johann August Wagner added five new letters: 2.29 (Epistula Inedita B Wagner), 3.41 (Fragm. 2), 4.1 (Fragm. 3), 4.12 (Fragm. 4), Fragm. 5 (Fragm. 5). He also included short fragments of 4.13 (Fragm. 6-20), bringing up the total to 121 letters, not including the fragments of 4.13. Wagner relied on collations made by others of W, F, Vindobonesis phil. gr. 342 and Barberinianus gr. 181.

Finally in 1853 the first complete edition of the 123 letters was produced by Ernst Eduard Seiler, who added 3.42 (3.74 Seiler) and 4.13 (Fragm. 6). He used F, P, D, C, W, L and S for the letters of the courtesans. Seiler’s collations of F were not incorporated into the text since the book had already gone to the printer when he returned from Italy. Instead he printed them in the preface. The edition deserves merit for its critical apparatus and extensive commentary which incorporates the notes of Bergler and Wagner. Seiler also included a revised Latin translation based on Bergler and an extensive index. The edition was reprinted in 1856.

The edition by August Meineke from 1853 is not based on any fresh collations but uses the text of Seiler. Meineke, however, incorporates the readings of the Italian manuscripts from Seiler’s preface. The edition does not have any translation but is valuable for its notes and conjectures.

Rudolf Hercher’s edition of the Greek epistolographers from 1873 is based on previous editions and the text is heavily influenced by the conjectures of Cobet who often went too far in correcting the language of Alciphron in order to accommodate the strict rules of Atticism. Hercher also included a revised version of Seiler’s translation.

In 1901 appeared the first edition arranged into four books, in the form of a doctoral dissertation at the University of Groningen by

---

163 Bergler apparently did not use this manuscript for the other letters from book 2 since he omitted 2.29, cf. Schepers (1905) iv.
164 Epistula Inedita A is Crates 9 which is interpolated between 1.22 and 3.36 in the manuscripts.
165 The fragments of 4.13 are excerpts collected from different printed editions.
166 For the other books Seiler also used Parisinus gr. 1696, Parisinus gr. 2720, Vaticanus gr. 140, Palatinus gr. 155, Marcianus gr. 512 and Marcianus gr. VIII.2.
167 An arrangement into four books had been proposed already by Wagner (1798) 2.xiii and Schanz (1882).
Menno Antonius Schepers. The edition is based on an extensive study of the whole manuscript tradition and is valuable for the copious notes in the critical apparatus. The order of the letters differs slightly from the 1905 edition: 4.1, 4.12–4.13, fragm. 5 come after 4.19.\footnote{168}

In 1905 Schepers published a revised version of his doctoral dissertation in the Bibliotheca Teubneriana. The text is unfortunately marred by numerous unnecessary conjectures\footnote{169} and an unreliable apparatus.\footnote{170}

\footnotetext[168]{See the table of manuscripts and editions on p. 58.}

\footnotetext[169]{Cf. Wilamowitz (1909) 466 and Benner-Fobes (1949) 31 n. b.}

\footnotetext[170]{e.g. 4.2.2 υπό τα ἐπὶ VF (sigla changed in accordance with the present edition) = (should be corrected to) ὑπὸ VF; 4.3.1 οὐχ ἦττον om. VF, not reported; 4.6.1 αὐτή] αὐτή FP = FPD; 4.7.4 λήρος D: λήρον P: λήροι VF = λήρος D: λήροι VFP; 4.7.8 κατάβαλλε] κατάβαλε W = κατάβαλε] κατάβαλλε Ald; 4.9.1 οἰκίαν post τρέφασθαι hab. PD = D; 4.10.3 οὐ om. VF, not reported; 4.10.4 πειραθέν D: πειρασθέν VFP = πειρασθέν] πειραθέν KW; 4.10.5 ἀποσκήπτειν Ald: ἀποσκῆψεσθαι οἷον (in the text is probably a typographical error) = ἀποσκήψειν W Ald; 4.11.8 μέλουσα PD: μέλουσα Bergler: μέλουσα VFP; 4.12.2 αξία] αξία PD = D; 4.12.3 δοκεῖ VF = δοκεῖ VFP (dokéin is probably a typographical error by Meineke); 4.13.3 αἰφνιδίως V: αἰφνιδίως VFPD (αιφνιδιός is probably a typographical error by Seiler); 4.13.4 ἀκήρατον] ἀκήρατον VFPD; 4.13.6 δὲ om. VF}
V THE EDITIONS

The Loeb edition from 1949 by Allen Rogers Benner and Francis H. Fobes is not based on any independent examination of the manuscripts but is nevertheless a slight improvement over Schepers since it incorporates the collations of V and F made by Castiglioni, correcting many of the inaccuracies in the apparatus of Schepers.\textsuperscript{171} Benner-Fobes have adopted a more conservative stance towards the text and rely less on conjectures than did Schepers.\textsuperscript{172} The edition also includes a useful introduction and translation.

The selective editions by Fiore (1957), Avezzu-Longo (1985, 1992), Costa (2001), Trapp (2003) and Conca-Zanetto (2005) are based on Schepers and Benner-Fobes. They are, however, valuable for their translations and notes.


\textsuperscript{171} Castiglioni (1907) 342–69 and (1911) 1–75.

\textsuperscript{172} Cf. Benner-Fobes (1949) 5 n. e.
### INTRODUCTION

#### VI TABLE OF MANUSCRIPTS AND EDITIONS

This table gives an overview of the contents of the manuscripts and editions, and the relative order of the letters from book 4.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Manuscripts</th>
<th>Editions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vat. gr. 1501</td>
<td>[V F P D K C N M W Z L S]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laur. gr. 595</td>
<td>1 1 1 1 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Par. gr. 3961</td>
<td>2 2 2 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 2 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Par. gr. 3950</td>
<td>3 3 3 3 3 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 3 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Par. suppl. gr. 305</td>
<td>4 4 4 4 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 4 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paris. gr. 152</td>
<td>5 5 5 5 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 5 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newberry 105</td>
<td>6 6 6 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 6 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Par. suppl. gr. 212</td>
<td>7 7 7 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 7 7 7 7 7 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vind. Philol. gr. 318</td>
<td>8 8 8 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 8 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laur. gr. 55.2</td>
<td>9 9 9 9 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paris. gr. 3054</td>
<td>10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pal. gr. 132</td>
<td>11 11 11 11 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newberry 105</td>
<td>12 12 12 12 18 2 1 1 1 1 18 18 18 18 18 12 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newberry 105</td>
<td>13 13 13 13 19 3 1 2 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Par. suppl. gr. 305</td>
<td>15 15 15 15 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 15 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Par. suppl. gr. 305</td>
<td>16 16 16 16 15 15 15 15 15 15 15 15 15 15 16 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paris. gr. 152</td>
<td>17 17 17 17 17 17 17 17 17 17 17 17 17 17 17 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paris. gr. 152</td>
<td>18 18 18 18 15 15 15 15 15 15 15 15 15 15 18 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paris. gr. 152</td>
<td>19 19 19 19 16 16 16 16 16 16 16 16 16 16 19 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paris. gr. 285</td>
<td>fr. 5 20 20 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paris. gr. 152</td>
<td>20 20 20 20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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VII EDITORIAL PRINCIPLES

For the most part a negative apparatus is used, but in some cases a positive apparatus is used for the sake of clarity. The critical apparatus generally reports all variant readings found in the primary manuscripts (VFPD) with the following exceptions:

1. Variations or omissions of breathings, accents, punctuation and iota subscript are not reported with the exception of morphological or semantic variants (ἵδρυσας/ἱδρύσας, κατακλινώμεν/κατακλίνωμεν).

2. Misspellings such as itacism (ι/ει/η/οι, ε/αι), variations in vocal length (ο/ω) and the doubling of consonants are not reported with the exception of morphological or semantic variants (μέλει/μέλει) and personal names (Ἑρπυλίς/Ἑρπυλίς).

3. The punctuation has been normalized.

4. Variants from the secondary manuscripts which can be regarded as scribal conjectures are only reported when they have been adopted into the text or merit serious consideration; the rest are reported in the Appendix critica (pp. 207–11).

5. Conjectures are only reported when they have been adopted into the text or merit serious consideration; all other conjectures are reported in the Appendix coniecturarum (pp. 212–45).
SIGLA

V     cod. Vaticanus gr. 1461 (c. 1450–60)
F     cod. Laurentianus gr. 59.5 (s. XV)
P     cod. Parisinus gr. 3021 (s. XV)
D     cod. Parisinus gr. 3050 (s. XV)
K     cod. Parisinus suppl. gr. 205 (s. XV–XVI)
C     cod. Palatinus gr. 132 (s. XV)
N     cod. Newberry 103 (s. XV)
M     cod. Parisinus suppl. gr. 212 (s. XV)
W     cod. Vindobonensis phil. gr. 318 (c. 1510)
Z     cod. Laurentianus gr. 55.2 (s. XV)
L     cod. Parisinus gr. 3054 (s. XV)
S     cod. Parisinus gr. 2832 (s. XV)
Leid  cod. Leidensis Bibl. Publ. gr. 67L (s. XVII)
Bran1 cod. Brancaccianus gr. I F 3 (s. XVII)
Bran2 cod. Brancaccianus gr. IV A 3 (s. XVII)
Vall1 cod. Vallicellianus 137 (s. XVII)
Vall2 cod. Vallicellianus 141 (s. XVII)
Ottob cod. Ottobonianus gr. 465 (s. XVII)

Ald   ed. Aldina, Venetiis 1499

{ } litterae deletae
( ) litterae additae
[5 litt.] (in apparatu) fenestra ca. 5 litterarum in codice
( ) (in apparatu) litterae suppressae
*** lacuna textus
† loci corrupti
ac ante correctionem
add. addidit, -erunt
ap. apud
cod. codex
codd. codices
conf. confirmat, -ant
coni. coniecit
def. defendit
des. desinit
err. typ. error typographicus
exp. expunxit
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>hab.</td>
<td>habet, -ent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inc.</td>
<td>incipit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ind.</td>
<td>indicavit, -erunt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in marg.</td>
<td>in margine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>man. rec.</td>
<td>manu recentiore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mg</td>
<td>in margine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>interp.</td>
<td>interpunctionem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lac.</td>
<td>lacunam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lin.</td>
<td>linea, linearum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>om.</td>
<td>omisit, -erunt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pag.</td>
<td>paginarum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pc</td>
<td>post correctionem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rell.</td>
<td>reliqui</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>secl.</td>
<td>seclusit, -erunt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sl</td>
<td>supra lineam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>suppl.</td>
<td>supplevit, -erunt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>susp.</td>
<td>suspicatus est</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>transp.</td>
<td>transposuit, -erunt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>var. lect.</td>
<td>varia lectio</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Μὴ δείσῃς· ἐξείργασαι γὰρ πά γκαλόν τι χρῆμα· οἷον ἢδη τίς σοι τῶν πώποτε· οὐδείς· τῶν κατὰ χειρῶν πο

ηθέντων τὴν σεαυτοῦ ἑταίραν ἔδρασας ἐν τεμένει· μέση 5 γὰρ ἠστηκα ἐπὶ τῆς Ἀφροδίτης καὶ τοῦ Ἐρωτὸς ἄμα
tοῦ σοῦ. μὴ φθονήσῃς δὲ μοι τῆς τιμῆς· οἱ γὰρ ἡμᾶς
tεθασάμενοι ἐπαινοῦσι Πραξιτέλη, καὶ ὅτι τῆς σῆς τέχνης
gέγονα οὐκ ἀδοξοῦσί με Θεσπιεῖς μέσην κεῖσθαι θεῶν. ἐν
tῇ δωρεᾷ λείπει, ἐλθεῖν σε πρὸς ἡμᾶς, ἵνα ἐν τῷ 10
tεμένει μετὰ ἀλλήλων κατακλίνωμεν· οὐ μιανοῦμεν γὰρ
tοὺς θεοὺς οὓς αὐτοὶ πεποιήκαμεν. ἔρρωσο.

1 (ἈΛΚΙΦΡΟΝΟΣ ΡΗΤΟΡΟΣ ΕΠΙΣΤΟΛΑΙ ΕΤΑΙΡΙΚΑΙ) Rycke: ΑΛΚΙΦΡΟΝΟΣ ΕΠΙΣΤΟΛΑΙ ΑΛΙΕΥΤΙΚΑΙ ΚΑΙ ΕΤΑΙΡΙΚΑI Ald (ante
litt.] F κατὰ χειρῶν] διὰ χειρῶν Seiler: μετὰ χειρῶν
Granholm χείρων D 5 ἠστηκα F 6–7 (ἄμα) τοῦ σοῦ. (ἄλλα) μὴ
φθονήσῃς Granholm 8 ἐπαινοῦσι] με Θεσπιεῖς post ἐπαινοῦσι add. et exp. P 11 κατακλίνωμεν VF
4.1 [fragm. 3]

Have no fear! For who else in mankind has ever accomplished a wonderful thing such as this? Nobody! From the toils of your hands you have set up a statue of your companion in a sacred precinct; for I stand in the middle, in front of Aphrodite and Eros, both yours. Don’t begrudge me the honour. For those who see me praise Praxiteles, and because I originate from your art the people of Thespiae don’t think me unworthy of being placed between gods. One thing is still missing from your gift: that you come to me so that we may lie down with each other in the sacred precinct. We shall not defile the gods which we ourselves have created. Farewell.

1 The most famous courtesan of the 4th cent. BC who according to the biographical tradition was the mistress of Hyperides and Praxiteles; see also 4.3, 4.4 and 4.5. 
2 An Athenian sculptor, active c. 370–320 BC, most known for his marble statue of Aphrodite in Cnidus for which Phryne allegedly posed as model. 
3 A famous group of statues which stood in the sanctuary of Eros in Thespiae, cf. Paus. 9.27.5, Ath. 13.591b. 
4 A city in Boeotia from which Phryne originated.
Ὃ Μένανδρος ἡμῶν ἐπὶ τὴν τῶν Ἰσθμίων θέαν εἰς τὴν Κόρινθον ἐλθεῖν βεβούληται· ἐμοὶ μὲν οὐ κατὰ νοῦν· οἶδας γὰρ οἷον ἔστιν ἑραστοῦ τοιούτου καὶ βραχύν ύστερησαι χρόνον· ἀποτρέπειν δ’ οὐκ ἔνην μὴ πολλάκις εἰωθότα. οὐδ’ ὅτις αὐτὸν παρεγγυήσω μέλλοντα ἐπιδημήσειν ἐξο, οὐδ’ ὅτις μὴ, βουλόμενον αὐτὸν σπουδασθῆναι ὑπὸ σοῦ, κάμοι τινα φέρειν φιλοτιμίαν τούτο λογίζομαι· οἶδα γὰρ τὴν οὕσαν ἡμῖν ἑταιρείαν· δέδοικα δέ, ὦ φιλτάτη, οὐ σὲ τοσοῦτον — χρηστοτέρῳ γὰρ ἤθει κέχρησαι τοῦ βίου — ὅσον αὐτὸν ἐκείνον. ἑρωτικὸς γάρ ἔστι δαιμονίως, καὶ Βακχίδος οὐδὲν ἂν τῶν σκυθρωποτάτων τις ἀπόσχοιτο. τὸ μὲν δοκεῖν αὐτὸν οὐκ ἔλαττο ν τοῦ σοὶ ἐντυχεῖν ἢ τῶν Ἰσθμίων ἕνεκεν τὴν ἀποδήμησιν πεποιῆσθαι, οὐ πάνυ πείθομαι. ἴσως αἰτιάσῃ με τῆς ὑποψίας. συγγίνωσκε δὲ ταῖς ἑταιρικαῖς, ὦ φιλτάτη, ζηλοτυπίαις. ἐγὼ δ’ οὐ παρὰ μικρὸν ἢγοίμην Μενάνδρου δι αμαρτεῖν ἑραστοῦ.

5 ἄλλως τε κἂν μοι κνισμός τις ἢ πρὸς αὐτὸν ἢ διαφορὰ γένηται, δεήσει με ἐπὶ τῆς σκηνῆς ὑπὸ Χρέμητος τίνος ἢ Φειδύλου πικρῶς λοιδορεῖσθαι. ἐὰν δ’ ἐπανέλθῃ μοι οἶος ὄχετο, πολλὴν εἴσομαι σοι χάριν. ἔρρωσο.
Our Menander\textsuperscript{3} has decided to go to the Isthmian games in Corinth.\textsuperscript{4} I don’t like it; for you know how it is to lack such a lover even for a short while. But I couldn’t talk him out of it since he’s not in the habit of often going abroad. I don’t know how to entrust him to you when he intends to come for a visit, nor how not to when he himself hopes to be courted by you, and I reckon this will give me honour as well. For I’m aware of the companionship that exists between us; I don’t fear you, my dearest, as much as I fear him, for you have a more honest character than lifestyle. But he’s divinely passionate, and not even the gloomiest philosopher could keep his hands off Bacchis. The rumour that he has made the trip no less in order to meet you than for the Isthmian games, I don’t find very credible. Perhaps you’ll accuse me of being suspicious; please forgive the jealousy of a courtesan, my dearest. But I would not think it a small matter to be deprived of Menander as my lover. Especially if there is a quarrel between us or a disagreement arises, I will have to endure being bitterly ridiculed on the stage by some Chremes or Pheidylus.\textsuperscript{5} But if he comes back to me the same as he went away, I’ll be very grateful to you. Farewell.

\textsuperscript{1} A character in comedy and a famous courtesan of the 4th cent. BC who was the mistress of Harpalus, the treasurer of Alexander the Great; see also \textsuperscript{4.18} and \textsuperscript{4.19}. \textsuperscript{2} A character in comedy, often depicted as an honest and faithful courtesan, e.g. in Ter. \textit{Hec.}; see also \textsuperscript{4.3}, \textsuperscript{4.4}, \textsuperscript{4.5}, \textsuperscript{4.11} and \textsuperscript{4.14}. \textsuperscript{3} An Athenian dramatist (c. 342–291 BC); the best known representative of Attic New Comedy; see also \textsuperscript{4.18} and \textsuperscript{4.19}. \textsuperscript{4} Athletic games celebrated every other year in the sanctuary of Poseidon on the Isthmus of Corinth; part of the Panhellenic games together with the Olympic and Pythic games. \textsuperscript{5} Stock characters in comedy.
Βακχίς Ὑπερίδη

Πάσαι σοι ἴσον εἰς τὸν ἔταιρον καὶ ἔκαστη γε ἡμῶν οὐχ ἦττον ἢ Φρύνη. ὁ μὲν γὰρ ἀγὼν μόνης Φρύνης, δὲν ὁ παμπόνηρος Εὐθίας ἔπανεῖλε, ὁ δὲ κίνδυνος ἀπασών· εἰ γὰρ αἰτοῦσαι παρὰ τῶν ἔραστῶν ἄργυριον ὥστε τοῖς διδοῦσιν ἀἱ τυγχάνουσιν ἃ σεβεῖας κριθήσομεν, πεπαῦσθαι κρεῖττον ἡμῖν τῷ βίῳ τούτου καὶ μηκέτι ἔχειν πράγματα μήδε τοῖς υἱοθετεῖ ναρέχειν. 1 νῦν δ' οὐκέτι τὸ ἑταιρεῖν αἴτιασόμεθα ὅτι ζηλώσομεν ὕπερ τῆς Φρύνης, ἀλλ' ὅτι ἔραστις ἔραστις ἀργυρίου πολλὰ τοῖνυν ἄγαθά γενοῦτο σοι τῆς φιλανθρωπίας καὶ γὰρ ἑταίραν χρηστὴν σεαυτῷ περιέσώσομεν. καὶ ἥμας ἀμεῖψομεν σε ἀντὶ εὐφροσύνης τοῦ ὑπερίδης, ἀλλ' ἐπιεικὴς ἐραστὴς εὑρέθη, ἀλλ' ὅτι ἔραστις ἔραστις ἀργυρίον πολλὰ τοῖνυν ἄγαθα γενοῦτο σοι τῆς φιλανθρωπίας καὶ γὰρ ἑταίραν χρηστὴν σεαυτῷ περιέσώσομεν. καὶ ἥμας ἀμεῖψομεν σε ἀντὶ εὐφροσύνης τοῦ ὑπερίδης.
4.3 [1.30]
Bacchis¹ to Hyperides²

We courtesans are all grateful to you, and each of us no less than Phryne.³ Because the trial, which that thoroughly depraved Euthias⁴ brought forward, concerned only Phryne, but the danger concerned us all; for if we don’t get any money from our lovers when we ask for it, or if we who get money are going to be condemned for impiety by the ones who give it, then we might as well put an end to this lifestyle and no longer have trouble or cause trouble for our companions. Now, however, we shall no longer blame ourselves for being courtesans because Euthias has been found to be a bad lover, but we shall strive for it because Hyperides has been found to be fair. Many may good things come to you for your kindness! For you have both saved an honest courtesan for yourself and put us in a mood to thank you on her behalf. If only you would write down the speech you held in Phryne’s defence, then indeed we courtesans would set up a golden statue anywhere you want in Greece.

¹ A character in comedy, often depicted as an honest and faithful courtesan, e.g. in Ter. Hec.; see also 4.2, 4.4, 4.5, 4.11 and 4.14. ² An Athenian orator and politician (390/89–322 BC) known for his flamboyant lifestyle and numerous love affairs with courtesans, among others Phryne (see 4.1) and Myrrhine (see 4.5). He defended Phryne when she was charged with impiety, cf. Ath. 13.590d–e, [Plut.] X orat. 8.49d–e. The speech is not extant but was well known in antiquity. ³ The most famous courtesan of the 4th cent. BC who according to the biographical tradition was the mistress of Hyperides and Praxiteles, among others. ⁴ A former lover of Phryne who brought charges against her for impiety, cf. Ath. 13.590d–e. See also 4.4 and 4.5.
Βακχὶς Φρύνη

Οὐ τοσούτον σοι τοῦ κινδύνου συνηχέσθην, φιλτάτη, ὡςον ὅτι πονηροῦ μὲν ἄπηλλάγης ἔραστον, χρηστὸν δὲ εὕρες Ὑπερίδην, συνήσθην. τὴν γὰρ δίκην σοι καὶ πρὸς εὐτυχίαν γεγονέναι νομίζω· διαβόητον γὰρ σε οὐκ ἐν 5 ταῖς Ἀθήναις μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐν τῇ Ἑλλάδι ἀπάστη ὁ ἀγών ἔκεινος πεποίηκεν. Εὐθίας μὲν γὰρ ἰκανὴν τιμωρίαν δῶσει τῆς στῆς ὀμιλίας στεροῦμενος· ὑπὸ γὰρ ὀργῆς μοι δοκεῖ κινηθεῖς διὰ τὴν ἐμφύτου ἀμαθίαν ὑπερᾶραι τὸ μέτρον τῆς ἐρωτικῆς ζηλοτυπίας. καὶ νῦν ἔκεινον ἔρωντα 10 μᾶλλον εὖ ἱσθι ἡ Ὑπερίδην. ὁ μὲν γὰρ διὰ τὴν τῆς συνηγορίας χάριν δὴλος ἐστὶ σπουδάζεσθαι βουλόμενος καὶ ἔρωμεν ἕαυτὸν ποιῶν, ὁ δὲ τῷ ἀποτεύγματι τῆς δίκης παρώξυνται. προσδέχου δὴ πάλιν δι᾽ αὐτοῦ δεήσεις καὶ λιτανείας καὶ πολὺ χρυσίον. μὴ δὴ καταδιαιτήσῃς ἡμῶν, 15 ὦ φιλτάτη, τῶν ἑταιρῶν, μηδὲ Ὑπερίδην κακῶς δόξαι βεβουλεῦσῃς ποιήσῃς τὰς Εὐθίου ἱκεσίας προσιεμένη, μηδὲ τοῖς λέγουσι σοι ὅτι, εἰ μὴ τὸν χιτωνίσκον περιρρηξαμένη τὰ μαστάρια τοῖς δικασταῖς ἐπεδείξας, οὐδὲν ἂν ὁ ῥήτωρ ὠφέλει, πείθων. καὶ γὰρ αὐτὸ 20 τοῦτο ἐνα ἐν καιρῷ γένηται σοι ἡ ἐκείνου παρέσχε συνηγορία.
I wasn’t as troubled by your danger, my dearest, as I was glad that you got rid of a bad lover and found a good one in Hyperides. I think that the trial also brought you good luck, for this trial has made you famous not only in Athens, but all over Greece. Euthias is going to pay a sufficient penalty by being deprived of your company; it seems to me that he overstepped the bounds of erotic jealousy because he was stirred by anger due to his innate stupidity. And you can be sure that he now desires you more than Hyperides. For the latter obviously wishes to be courted in return for his advocacy of you and is playing the part of the favoured lover, while the former is enraged by his failure in the trial. So expect once again entreaties, appeals and a lot of gold through him. Don’t condemn us courtesans, my dearest, and don’t, by accepting the pleas of Euthias, make Hyperides seem like he’d made a bad judgement, and don’t believe those who say that the rhetor would not have accomplished anything if you had not torn open your chiton and exhibited your breasts to the judges. For it was his defence that made it possible for this very thing to happen at the right moment.

---

1 A character in comedy, often depicted as an honest and faithful courtesan, e.g. in Ter. Hec.; the sender of 4.3, 4.5; recipient of 4.14 and subject of 4.11. 2 The most famous courtesan of the 4th cent. BC who according to the biographical tradition was the mistress of Hyperides and Praxiteles, among others; see also 4.1, 4.3 and 4.5. 3 An Athenian orator and politician (390/89–322 BC) known for his flamboyant lifestyle and numerous love affairs with courtesans, among others Phryne (see 4.1) and Myrrhine (see 4.5). He defended Phryne when she was charged with impiety, cf. Ath. 13.590d–e, [Plut.] X orat. 849d–e. The speech is not extant but was well known in antiquity. 4 A former lover of Phryne who brought charges against her for impiety, cf. Ath. 13.590d–e. See also 4.3 and 4.5.
Μὴ δὴ κρείττονος εἴη σοι τυχεῖν ἐραστοῦ, δέσποινα Ἀφροδίτη, ἀλλ᾽ Εὐθίας σοι δὲν νῦν περιέπεις συγκαταβιώθη. τάλαινα γυνὴ τῆς ἀνοίας, ἥτις τῷ τοιούτῳ θηρίῳ προσέφθαρσαι—πλὴν ἴσως τῷ κάλλει πεπίστευκας—Φρύνην γὰρ στέρξει δηλονότι Μυρρίνην ὑπεριδών. ἀλλ᾽ ἔοικας κνίσαι τὸν Ὑπερίδην βεβουλῆθαι ὡς ἔλαττόν σοι νῦν προσέχοντα. κάκεινος ἐταίραν ἐξεί ἀξίαν ἑαυτοῦ καὶ σὺ ἐραστὴν σοὶ πρέποντα. αἱτήσον τι παρ᾽ αὐτοῦ, καὶ ὅψει σεαυτὴν ἢ τὰ νεώρια ἐμπεπρηκυῖαν ἢ τοὺς νόμους καταλύουσαν. ἱσθι γοῦν ὅτι παρὰ πάσαις ἡμῖν τὴν φιλανθρωποτέραν Ἀφροδίτην προτιμώσας μεμίσησαι.
By Lady Aphrodite, may you not find a better lover, but may Euthias, whom you’re now looking after, spend his life with you! You poor, ignorant woman, who have corrupted yourself with such a creature—but perhaps you have trust in your beauty—for obviously he will desire Phryne and look down on Myrrhine. But it seems you want to annoy Hyperides for paying less attention to you now. However, he has a mistress worthy of himself and you have a lover who suits you. Ask him for something, and you’ll see that you’ve set fire to the docks or are dissolving the laws. Be sure, though, that you’re hated by all of us who honour a more humane Aphrodite.
4.6 [1.33]
Θαῖς Θεττάλῃ

Οὐκ ἄν ποτ' ὤθην ἐκ τοσαύτης συνηθείας ἐσεθαί μοι τινα πρὸς Εὐξίππην διαφοράν. καὶ τὰ μὲν ἄλλα ἐν οἷς αὐτῇ χρησίμη γέγονα ὑπὸ τὸν ἀπὸ τῆς Σάμου κατά−πλοιν, οὐκ ὀνειδίζω· ἀλλὰ Παμφίλου—γινώσκεις τοὐτό καὶ σὺ—ὁσον ἡμῖν διδόντος ἀργύριον, ὅτι ταύτη ποτὲ 2 μὲν ἑντυγχάνειν ἔδοκεί, τὸ μειράκιον οὐ προσιέμην. ἤ δὲ καλός ἡμᾶς ἀντὶ τούτων ἠμείστω τῇ κάκιστα ἀπο−λουμένῃ Μεγάρα χαρίζεσθαι θέλουσα. πρὸς ἑκείνην δ' ἦν τις παλαιά μοι διὰ Στράτωνα ύπόνοια· ἀλλὰ Παμφίλου—γινώσκεις τοῦτο καὶ σύ—ὅσον ἡμῖν διδόντος ἀργύριον, ὅτι ταύτῃ ποτὲ 10 μὲν οὐδὲν ὀμην ποιεῖν παράλογον κακῶς λέγουσάν με. 3 Ἀλῶα δ' ἦν, κατί τὴν παννυχίδα πάοσι, ὡστερ ἦν εἰκός, παρῆμεν. ἐθαύμαζον δὲ τῆς Εὐξίππης τὴν ἀγερω−χίαν· τὸ μὲν γάρ πρῶτον κιχλίζουσα μετ' ἑκείνης καὶ μωκωμένη τὴν δυσμένειαν ἐνεδείκνυτο, εἴτα φανέρως 15 ποιήματα ἦδεν εἰς τὸν οὐκέθ' ἠμῖν προσέχοντα ἑραστὴν. 4 κατί τούτοις μὲν ἦττον ἠλγουν· ἀπαναίσχυντήσασα δὲ εἰς τὸ φῦκός με καὶ τὸν παιδέρωτα ἐςκωπτεν. ἔδοκει δὲ μοι πάνυ κακῶς πράττειν ὡς μηδὲ κάτοπτρον κεκτῆ−σθαι· εἰ γάρ εἶδέν ἑαυτὴν χρῶμα σανδαράχης ἔχουσαν, 20 οὐκ ἄν ἡμῖς εἰς ἀμορφίαν ἐβλασφήμηκει. ἐμοὶ μὲν οὖν βραχὺ μέλει περὶ τούτων· ἀρέσκειν γάρ τοῖς ἑρασταῖς, οὐχὶ Μεγάρα καὶ Εὐξίππη βοῦλομαι ταῖς πιθήκοισι. δεδήλωκα δὲ σοὶ ἵνα μή με τι μέμπσῃ. ἀμυνοῦμαι γὰρ αὐτὰς οὖκ ἐν σκώμμασι οὐδὲ βλασφημίαις, ἀλλ' ἐν οἷς 25 μάλιστα ἀνιάσονται. προσκυνῶ δὲ τὴν Νέμεσιν.

I would never have thought that after such an intimate friendship there would be a quarrel between me and Euxippe.\(^3\) I don’t reproach her with the other matters in which I was of service to her at the time of her voyage from Samos. But when Pamphilus\(^4\) was offering me all that money—and you know this too—I didn’t admit the lad because he was thought to occasionally be meeting with her! She repaid me nicely for this, wishing to please that goddamned Megara.\(^5\) I did have a long-standing suspicion of her on account of Straton,\(^6\) but I didn’t think she would do anything out of the ordinary slandering me. It was the Haloa,\(^7\) and we were all present at the night-festival as was to be expected. I was amazed at Euxippe’s arrogance. First she was showing her hostility by giggling and making jokes with Megara, then she openly sang some verses with the subject of the lover who was no longer paying attention to me. I didn’t mind that so much. But then she put away all shame and made fun of me for my rouge and make-up! She seemed to be so badly off that she didn’t even own a mirror. For if she had seen that she herself had a red complexion, she wouldn’t have slandered me for being ugly. However, I don’t care one bit about that, for it is my lovers I want to please, not Megara and Euxippe—those apes! I’ve told you this so that you won’t blame me for anything. For I will avenge myself on them, not with jokes and mockeries, but with the things that will hurt them the most. I bow before Nemesis.

\(^1\) An Athenian courtesan and a character in comedy and Lucian; the mistress of Alexander the Great and Ptolemy I.  
\(^2\) A character in Menander; the mistress of Diphilus in 4.10; see also 4.14.  
\(^3\) A courtesan also mentioned in 4.14.  
\(^4\) A character in comedy and Lucian; described in 1.15 as an extravagant youth.  
\(^5\) A courtesan; see also 4.7, 4.11, 4.13 and 4.14.  
\(^6\) A character in Menander.  
\(^7\) A festival of Demeter and Persephone celebrated by women only, often associated with courtesans. See also 4.18.
Ἐξ οὗ φιλοσοφεῖν ἔπενον σας, σεμνός τις ἐγένοι καὶ ταύτας ὑπέρ τοὺς κροτάφους ἐπῆρας. εἶτα σχήμα ἔχον καὶ βιβλίδιον μετὰ χεὶρας εἰς τὴν Ἀκαδημίαν σοβεῖς, τὴν δὲ ἥμετέραν οἰκίαν όσον ὡς οὐδὲ ἰδὼν πρότερον παρέχη. 5

ἐμάνης Εὐθύδημε· οὐκ οἶδας οἷός ἐστιν ὁ σοφιστὴς οὗτος ὁ ἐσκυθρωπακώς καὶ τοὺς θαυμαστοὺς τούτους διεξιὼν πρὸς ὑμᾶς λόγους; ἄλλῳ ἔμοι μὲν πράγματα πόσον ἔστων oiei χρόνος ἐς οὐ παρέχει βουλόμενος ἐντυχεῖν, προσ-

φθείρεται δὲ Ἕρπυλλίδι τῇ Μεγάρας ᾠβρα; τότε μὲν οὖν αὐτὸν oι οὐ προσίέμην· σὲ γὰρ περιβάλουσα κοιμᾶσθαι μᾶλλον ἐβουλοῦτο τῷ παρά πάντως προσποιήσεσθαι χρυσίον· ἐπεὶ δὲ σὲ ἀποτρέψει εἰσὶν τῆς μεθ᾽ ἡμῶν συνηθείας, ὑποδέξομαι αὐτὸν καὶ, εἰ βούλει, τὸν διδάσκαλον τοῦτον ἐπιδείξω σοι νυκτὸς ἀρκούμενον ταῖς συνήθεσις ἡδοναῖς. λῆρος ταῦτα εἰσὶ καὶ τῦφος καὶ ἐργολάβεια μειρακίων, ὡς ἀνόητε. oiei δὲ διαφέρειν ἑταίρας σοφιστήν; τοσοῦτον ἴσως ὅσον ὅτι διά τῶν αὐτῶν ἐκάτεροι πείθειν, ἐπεὶ ἐν γε ἀμφότεροι τῶν πρόκειται να λαβεῖν. πόσῳ δὲ ἄμεινος άκτιν καὶ ἐνεσθαι· δέστεραι oι λέγομεν πρὸς οὐκ εἰσὶν, ἀλλὰ πιστεύομεν ὁμώνυμοι τοῖς ἑράσταις ὅτι φιλούμεν ἡμᾶς· οὐδὲ ἄξιομεν ἀδελφαῖς καὶ ἡμᾶς μήγενοι τοῖς ἀνδραῖς, ἀλλὰ οὐδὲ γυναικεῖς ἀλλοτρίας. εἰ μή ὅτι τάς νεφέλας ὀπόθεν εἶν
Ever since you got into your head to study philosophy you’ve become a solemn kind of guy with your eyebrows raised to the top of your head. Then you stroll to the Academy with a pompous appearance and with a booklet in your hands, and walk by my house like you’d never seen it before. You have lost your mind, Euthydemus! Don’t you know what sort of person this sophist is who takes on a severe look as he delivers these wonderful discourses to you? How long do you think he has been pestering me for a rendezvous while he’s corrupting himself with Herpyllis, the maid of Megara? Then I didn’t accept him, for I wanted to sleep embracing you rather than the gold from all sophists together. But since he seems to be turning you away from our intercourse, I’ll welcome him and show you, if you like, that this misogynist teacher isn’t satisfied with the normal nightly pleasures. This is just nonsense and humbug and profit-making off boys, you fool! Do you think a sophist is any different from a courtesan? Maybe in so far as they don’t persuade by the same means, but they certainly both have one and the same goal: gain. How much better and pious we are, though! We don’t say there are no gods, but we do believe our lovers when they swear they love us. Nor do we think that it’s right for men to have sex with their sisters and mothers, or even with other men’s wives. But perhaps we seem inferior to the sophists because we don’t know where the clouds come from or what the

1 An Athenian courtesan and a character in comedy and Lucian; the mistress of Alexander the Great and Ptolemy I.  
2 The character was perhaps inspired by the sophist of Pl. Euthyd. and Xen. Mem.  
3 A public gymnasium outside the city walls of Athens where Plato founded his school in the early 4th cent. BC.  
4 A courtesan; the mistress of Aristotle and according to some sources the mother of Nicomachus, cf. Diog. Laert. 5.13, Timaeus FGrH 566 F 157 and Ath. 13.589c.  
5 A courtesan; see also 4.6, 4.11, 4.13 and 4.14.
καὶ τὰς ἀτόμους ὁποῖαν ἀγνοοῦμεν, διὰ τοῦτο ἦττος
6 δοκούμεν σοι τῶν σοφιστῶν. καὶ αὐτὴ παρὰ τούτοις ἔσχολακα καὶ πολλοῖς διείλεγμαι. οὐδὲ εἰς ἑταῖρα ὁμιλῶν τυραννίδας ὀνειροπολεῖ καὶ στασιάζει τὰ κοινά, ἀλλὰ στάσας τὸν ἐωθινὸν καὶ μεθυσθείς εἰς ὥραν τρίτην ἤ 5 τετάρτην ἠρεμεῖ. παιδεύομεν δὲ οὐ χείρον ἡμεῖς τοὺς νέους. ἐπεὶ σύγκρινον, εἱ βούλει, Ἀσπασίαν τὴν ἑταίραν καὶ Σωκράτην τὸν σοφιστήν, καὶ πότερος ἄμεινον αὐτῶν ἔπαιδευσεν ἄνδρας λόγισαι: τῆς μὲν γὰρ γὰρ ὃς καθηγητής
7 τεταρτήν καὶ πολλοῖς διείλεγμαι. οὐδὲ εἷς ἑταῖρᾳ ὁμιλῶν τυραννίδας ὀνειροπολεῖ καὶ στασιάζει τὰ κοινά, ἀλλὰ σπάσας τὸν ἑωθινὸν καὶ μεθυσθείς εἰς ὥραν τρίτην ἤ 5 τετάρτην ἠρεμεῖ. παιδεύομεν δὲ οὐ χείρον ἡμεῖς τοὺς νέους. ἐπεὶ σύγκρινον, εἱ βούλει, Ἀσπασίαν τὴν ἑταίραν καὶ Σωκράτην τὸν σοφιστήν, καὶ πότερος ἄμεινον αὐτῶν ἔπαιδευσεν ἄνδρας λόγισαι: τῆς μὲν γὰρ γὰρ γὰρ
8 Περικλέα, τοῦ δὲ Κριτίαν. κατάβαλε τὴν μωρίαν ταύτην καὶ ἀθρόιαν, ὁ ἐμὸς ἔρως Εὐθύδημε—οὐ πρέπει σκυθρω-ποῖς εἶναι τοιούτοις ὄμμασι—καὶ πρὸς τὴν ἐρωμένην ἦκε τὴν ἐαυτοῦ ὄμοιο ἐπανελθὼν ἀπὸ Λυκείου πολλάκις τὸν ἱδρῶτα ἀπατώνημος. ἦν μικρὰ κραπαλῆσαντες ἐπι- δειξόμεθα ἄλληλοις τὸ καλὸν τέλος τῆς ἡδονῆς. καὶ σοὶ 15 νῦν μάλιστα φανοῦμαι σοφὴ. οὐ μακρὸν δίδωσιν ὁ δαίμων χρόνον τοῦ ζῆν: μὴ λάθῃς τούτον εἰς ἀινίγματα καὶ λήρους ἀναλώσας. ἔρρωσο.
atoms are like. I, too, have spent some time with these sophists and discussed with many of them. No one who spends time with a courtesan dreams of tyrannies and revolting against the state; on the contrary, having drained his morning beaker he rests in his drunken stupor until the third or fourth hour. We are no worse at educating the youth! For compare, if you like, Aspasia¹ the courtesan and Socrates the sophist,² and judge which one of them educated men better. You will see that Pericles³ was her pupil and Critias⁴ his. Give up this foolishness and unpleasantness, Euthydemus, my love—it doesn’t become such eyes to be sullen—and come to your lover as you often did having returned from the Lyceum⁵ and wiping off the sweat, so that we may get a little drunk and show each other the sweet goal of pleasure! And to you I will now appear most wise. The deity doesn’t give us a long time to live; make sure you don’t waste it on riddles and nonsense! Farewell.

¹ A highly educated woman from Miletus who took part in the intellectual life in Athens and was married to Pericles; in comedy usually depicted unfavourably as a courtesan, but in the later tradition held in higher regard.    ² Perhaps a reference to the Socrates in Ar. Nub., where he is represented as an atheist and corrupter of the youth who indulges in scientific speculations.    ³ An Athenian politician (495/90–429 bc); married to Aspasia; see also 4.7.7.    ⁴ A descendant of an old Attic noble family (c. 460–403 bc); belonged to the circle of Socrates and later a member of the oligarchic council of 400 and one of the thirty tyrants in 404.    ⁵ A public gymnasium outside the city walls of Athens where Aristotle founded his school in the late 4th cent. bc.
Εἰ μὲν ήδονήν σοὶ τίνα φέρειν ἤ φιλοτιμίαν πρὸς τίνας τῶν διαλεγομένων οἴει τὸ πολλάκις ἡμᾶς ἐπὶ τὰς θύρας φοιτᾶν καὶ τοῖς πεμπομένοις πρὸς τοὺς εὐτυχεστέρους ἡμῶν θεραπαινιδίοις ἀποδύρεσθαι, οὐκ ἀλόγως ἡμῖν 5 ἐντρυφᾶς. ἴσθι μέντοι, καίτοι ποιῶν οἶδα πράγμα ἀσύμφορον ἐμαυτῷ, οὕτω με διακείμενον ὡς ὅλιγοι τῶν

2 ἐντυγχανόντων σοὶ νῦν ἄμεληθέντες ἢ διαστεθείν, καίτοι γε ὃμην τὸν ἄκρατον ἔσεσθαι μοι παρηγόρημα, ὅπερ Ἐὐφρονίῳ τρίτην ἐσπέραν πολύν τῶν τίνας ἐνεφορησάμην, ὡς 10 δὲ τὰς παρὰ τὴν νύκτα φροντίδας διωσόμενος. τὸ δὲ ἀφα ἠναντίως ἔσχεν· ἀνερρίπισε γάρ μου τὴν ἐπιθυμίαν ὡστε κλαίωντα με καὶ βρυχόμενον ἀποδύρεθαί μὲν παρὰ τοῖς ἐπιεικεστέροις, γέλωτα δὲ τοῖς ἀλλοις παρέχειν.

3 μικρὰ δὲ ἐπέστι μοι παραψυχὴ καὶ μαραίνόμενον ἦδη 15 παραμύθιον ὅ μοι ὑπὸ τὴν λυπρὰν τῷ συμποσίῳ μέμψιν προσέρριψας ἀπ᾽ αὐτῶν περισπάσασα τῶν πλοκάμων, ὡς δὴ πᾶσι τοῖς ὑπὸ ἡμῶν, ψηλείτειν ἀεικατεῖν. εἰ δὴ σοὶ ταύτα ἠδονήν φέρει, ἀπόλαυσα τῆς ἠμετέρας μερίμνης, κἂν ἢ σοὶ φίλον διηγοῦν τοῖς νῦν μὲν μακαριωτέροις ἡμῶν, οὐκ εἰς μακράν δὲ, ἀντίπαρ εἰς ἐμοῖς ἠχῶσιν, ἀνίασμον.

4 εὗχου μέντοι μηδέν σοὶ νεμεσῆσαι ταύτης τῆς ύπεροψίας τὴν Ἀφροδίτην. ἐτερος ἡ πολυορούμενος ἐγραφέ καὶ ἀπειλῶν, ἀλλ᾽ ἐγὼ δεόμενος καὶ ἀντιβολῶν· ἔρω ἡμᾶς, ὥς Πεταλή, κακῶς. ὃ ποιῆσαι δὲ, μὴ κάκιον 25 ἐχὼν μιμήσωμαι τίνα τῶν περὶ τὰς ἔρωτικὰς μέμψεις ἀτυχεστέρων.
4.8 [1.35]
Simalion¹ to Petale²

If you think it brings you any pleasure or distinction from some of your lovers to have me often coming to your door and cry my heart out to the servants sent to the lovers more lucky than I, then you’re mocking me not without reason. But know this: although I know I’m doing myself a disservice, I’m behaving like few of your present lovers would behave if they were being neglected. I really thought I would find comfort in the unmixed wine that I was pouring down in great quantities two nights ago at the house of Euphronius,³ in order to drive away the thoughts that trouble me by night. But it turned out the opposite. For it rekindled my yearning so that my weeping and wailing aroused pity in the decent but laughter in the rest. I have a small consolation and comfort that is already withering, that which you ripped from your very curls and threw at me during the quarrel which distressed the guests, as if you were annoyed with everything I have sent you. If this really brings you joy, then enjoy my distress, and if it should please you, then do tell those who at the moment are happier than me but who will shortly experience pain, that is to say if they are like me. Pray, however, that Aphrodite will not be angry with you for this scorn. Another man would have written reviling and threatening, but I write begging and praying. For I’m in love, Petale, badly. And I fear that if it gets any worse I shall imitate someone more unfortunate in erotic complaints.

¹ Only attested here and in 4.9. ² A courtesan; see also 4.9, 4.13 and 4.14. ³ Perhaps Euphronius of Athens who is mentioned by Plin. *HN* 14.120 as an authority on wine-making.
Ἐβουλόμην μὲν ὑπὸ δακρύων οἰκίαν ἑταίρας τρέφεσθαι· λαμπρῶς γὰρ ἂν ἔπραττον ἀφθόνων τοῦτων ἀπολαύουσα παρὰ σοῦ. οὐν δὲ δεὶ χρυσὸν ἡμῖν, ἱματίων, κόσμου, θεραπαινίδων· ἢ τοῦ βίου διοίκησις ἄπασσα ἐντεῦθεν. οὐκ ἔστιν ἐν Μυρρινοῦντι πατρῷον κτημάτιον, οὐδ᾽ ἐν τοῖς ἀργυρείοις μέταλλον, ἀλλὰ μισθωμάτια καὶ οἱ δυστυχεῖς αὐτοὶ καὶ κατεστεναγμέναι τῶν ἀνοῆτων ἔραστῶν χάριτες. σοὶ δὲ ἐνιαυτὸν ἐνυγχάνουσα ἀδημονῶ, καὶ αὐχμηρὸν μὲν ἔχω τὴν κεφαλὴν μηδὲ ἰδοὺς τοῦ χρόνου τοῦτο μύρον, τὰ δὲ ἀρχαία καὶ τρύχινα περιβαλλομένη ταραντινίδια αἰσχύνομαι τὰς φίλας· οὕτως ἀγαθόν τί μοι γένοιτο. εἶτα οἴει μέ σοι παρακαθημένην πόθεν ζήσειν· ἀλλὰ δακρύεις· πεπαύσῃ μετὰ μικρόν. ἐγὼ δὲ, ἂν μή τις ὁ διδοὺς ᾖ, πεινήσω τὸ καλόν. θαυμάζω δὲ σοῦ καὶ τὰ δάκρυα ὥς ἐστιν ἀπίθανα. δέσποινα Ἀφροδίτη· φιλεῖν, ἄνθρωπε, φὴς καὶ βούλει σοι τὴν ἐρωμένη διαλέγεσθαι· ζῆν γὰρ χωρὶς ἐκείνης μή δύνασθαι. τί οὖν; οὐ πο τήρια ἐστὶν ἐπὶ τῆς οἰκίας ὑμῖν, μὴ χρυσία τῆς μητρός, μὴ δάνεια τοῦ πατρὸς κομιούμενος; μακαρίᾳ Φιλῶτις· [τοῖς εὐμενεστέροις ὦμμασί τῆς Χάρι τες· οἷον ἐραστὴν ἔχει Μενεκλείδην, ὃς καθ᾽ ἡμέραν δίδωσί τι. ἄμεινον γὰρ κλαῖν. ἐγὼ δὲ τὰς φίλας· οὐκ ἔραστην ἔχω· στεφάνια μοι καὶ ρόδα ὡσπερ ἄωρῳ τάφῳ πέμπει καὶ κλαίει δι᾽ ὅλης φησὶ τῆς νυκτὸς. ἐὰν φέρῃς τι, ἧκε μὴ κλαίων, εἰ δὲ μὴ, σεαυτὸν οὐχ ἡμᾶς ἀνιάσεις.
4.9 [1.36]
Petale¹ to Simalion²

I wish a courtesan’s house could be maintained by tears; I would indeed have been very well off enjoying an abundance of these from you. But now we have need of gold, garments, jewellery and servants; all livelihood comes from that. I don’t have a small paternal estate in Myrrhinus,³ nor a stake in the silver mines,⁴ but only my small fees and these unfortunate and lamentable gifts from my stupid lovers. I’m sorely troubled having been sleeping with you for a year now, and my head is filthy not having even seen an unguent within that time, and wearing the old and ragged shawl I feel shame before my friends; may I therefore have some luck! By what should I then make a living, if I’m idly sitting by your side? You are crying, but you will soon stop. I, however, if I don’t have a generous lover I will surely starve. I’m also surprised how unconvincing your tears are.

O Lady Aphrodite! You say that you’re in love, my good man, and wish that your mistress would sleep with you because you can’t live without her. So what! Are there no wine-cups in your house? Is there no one who is going to bring back money from your mother or loans from your father? Happy Philotis!⁵ The Graces looked on her with more favourable eyes. What a lover she has in Menecleides,⁶ who gives her something each day! That’s sure better than weeping. But I, miserable creature, have a dirge-singer, not a lover. He sends garlands and roses to me as if I were in an early grave and says he cries all through the night. If you bring me something, come without weeping; otherwise you’re going to torture not me but yourself.

¹ A courtesan; see also 4.8, 4.13 and 4.14. ² Only attested here and in 4.8. ³ A deme in eastern Attica. ⁴ Perhaps Laurium, the mining district in southern Attica. The mines which were state property were leased to private citizens. ⁵ The name of a courtesan in Ter. Hec. and title of a comedy by Antiphanes. ⁶ The lover of Bacchis who laments her death in 4.11.
Murrínη Νικίππη

Οὐ προσέχει μοι τὸν νοῦν ὁ Δίφιλος, ἀλλὰ ἀπάσ έπὶ τὴν ἀκάθαρτον Θεττάλην νένευκε· καὶ μέχρι μὲν τῶν Ἀδωνίων καὶ ἐπίκωμος ποτὲ πρὸς ἡμᾶς καὶ κοιμησόμενος ἐφοίτα, ἢδη μέντοι ὡς ἃν τις ἀκκιζόμενος καὶ ἐρώμενον 5 ἐαυτὸν ποιῶν καὶ τὰ γε πλείστα ὑπὸ τοῦ Ἑλίκους, ὑπὸ ὁτὲ μεθυσθείη, ὀδηγούμενος· ἐκεῖνος γὰρ τῆς Ἐρπυλλίδος 2 ἐρῶν τὴν παρ’ ἡμῖν ἠγάπα σχολήν· νῦν μέντοι δῆλος ἔστι μὴδ’ ὅλως ἡμῖν ἐντευξόμενος· τέτταρας γὰρ (Λύσιδος) ἐξῆς ἡμῖν πρὸς τὸν Λύσιδον κήπῳ μετὰ Θεττάλης καὶ τοῦ κάκιστα ἀπολουμένου Στρογγυλίωνος, ὡς ταύτην αὐτῷ προὔμηνσε ὑπὸ τὴν ἐρωμένην ἐμοὶ τι προσκρούσας, κραιπαλᾷ. γραμματίδια μὲν οὖν καὶ θεραπαινίων διαδρομαὶ καὶ ὅσα τοιαῦτα μάτην διήνυσται, καὶ οὐδὲν ἐξ αὐτῶν ὑπερεντρυφᾶν. δοκεῖ δὲ μοι μᾶλλον ὑπὸ τῶν τετυφῶσθαι καὶ ὑπερεντρυφᾶν ἡμῖν. λοιπὸν οὖν ἀποκλείειν, κἂν ἔλθῃ πρὸς ἡμᾶς κοιμηθήσεται, ἥτις καὶ ἐντευξάσθαι· εἶσθε γὰρ ὡς κατὰ τῆς ἐρωμένης ἄμελεισθαι καταβάλλεσθαι. εἶναι δὲ μηδ’ ὅλως ἐντευξόμενος, καὶ ἐπὶ πρὸς ἡμᾶς κοιμησόμενος, οὐ γὰρ ἐντευξάστι ἀμελεῖσθαι καὶ μισθωμάτων στερησόμεθα, ἀλλ’ εἰ 3 τοῦτων ἐντευξάσθαι καὶ ὑπερεντρυφᾶν ἡμῖν. λοιπὸν οὖν ἀποκλείειν, κἂν ἐντευξάσθαι· εἶσθε γὰρ ἡ βαρύτης τῷ ἀμελεῖσθαι καὶ ταβάλλεσθαι. εἶναι δὲ μηδ’ ὅλως ἐντευξόμενος, καὶ ἐπὶ πρὸς ἡμᾶς κοιμηθήσεται, ἥτις καὶ ἐντευξάσθαι· εἶσθε γὰρ ἡ βαρύτης τῷ ἀμελεῖσθαι καὶ ταβάλλεσθαι. εἶναι δὲ μηδ’ ὅλως ἐντευξόμενος, καὶ ἐπὶ πρὸς ἡμᾶς κοιμηθήσεται, ἥτις καὶ ἐντευξάσθαι· εἶσθε γὰρ ἡ βαρύτης τῷ ἀμελεῖσθαι καὶ ταβάλλεσθαι. εἶναι δὲ μηδ’ ὅλως ἐντευξόμενος, καὶ ἐπὶ πρὸς ἡμᾶς κοιμηθήσεται, ἥτις καὶ ἐντευξάσθαι· εἶσθε γὰρ ἡ βαρύτης τῷ ἀμελεῖσθαι καὶ ταβάλλεσθαι. εἶναι δὲ μηδ’ ὅλως ἐντευξόμενος, καὶ ἐπὶ πρὸς ἡμᾶς κοιμηθήσεται, ἥτις καὶ ἐντευξάσθαι· εἰς τῷ ἀμελεῖσθαι καὶ ταβάλεσθαι. εἶναι δὲ μηδ’ ὅλως ἐντευξόμενος, καὶ ἐπὶ πρὸς ἡμᾶς κοιμηθήσεται, ἥτις καὶ ἐντευξάσθαι· εἰς τῷ ἀμελεῖσθαι καὶ ταβάλεσθαι. εἶναι δὲ μηδ’ ὅλως ἐντευξόμενος, καὶ ἐπὶ πρὸς ἡμᾶς κοιμηθήσεται, ἥτις καὶ ἐντευξάσθαι· εἰς τῷ ἀμελεῖσθαι καὶ ταβάλεσθαι. εἰς τῷ ἀμελεῖσθαι καὶ ταβάλεσθαι. εἰς τῷ ἀμελεῖσθαι καὶ ταβάλεσθαι. εἰς τῷ ἀμελεῖσθαι καὶ ταβάλεσθαι. εἰς τῷ ἀμελεῖσθαι καὶ ταβάλεσθαι. εἰς τῷ ἀμελεῖσθαι καὶ ταβάλεσθαι.
Myrrhine\textsuperscript{1} to Nicippus\textsuperscript{2}

Diphilus\textsuperscript{3} pays me no attention, but is completely bent on that filthy Thettale.\textsuperscript{4} Up to the time of the Adonis festival\textsuperscript{5} he would sometimes come to fool around and get laid, although he was already then indifferent and playing the favoured lover, and most often, whenever he was drunk, he was accompanied by Helix;\textsuperscript{6} desiring Herpyllis,\textsuperscript{7} the latter loved spending time at our house. Now, however, it’s clear that he won’t have anything to do with me at all, since for four days in a row he’s been reveling in the garden of Lysis\textsuperscript{8} with Thettale and that goddamned Strongylion,\textsuperscript{9} who procured this mistress for him because he for some reason was angry with me. Letters and servants running back and forth and all such things have accomplished nothing, and no help has come of them. They seem to have made him even more crazy and arrogant towards me. The only thing that remains is to lock him out and to reject him if he at some point, in case he should wish to annoy the other one, should come to me to get laid; for arrogance is usually broken down by being slighted. But if I should accomplish nothing even in this way, then I’ll need a more efficient drug, like the ones used on the seriously ill. For not only is it bad to be deprived of my fees, but also to be a laughing-stock for Thettale. There is a love potion, you say, often tried by you in your youth. That’s the sort of remedy I need, which would sweep away not only his delusion, but

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
  \item[2] The name is not attested in comedy.
  \item[3] Possibly a reference to Diphilus of Sinope, the poet of Attic New Comedy.
  \item[4] A character in Menander; see also 4.6 and 4.14.
  \item[5] A religious festival held in June/July celebrating the death and rebirth of Adonis, see also 4.14.8.
  \item[6] The name is not attested in comedy.
  \item[7] In 4.7 she is the maid of Megara.
  \item[8] Perhaps inspired by the disciple of Socrates in Pl. Lys, where the topic is friendship and love.
  \item[9] Probably a slave according to Hunter (1983a) 86 n. 2. Also the name of a bronze sculptor from the early 4th cent. bc, see Paus. 1.40.3, 9.30.1.
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
κραιπάλην ἐκκορήσειεν. ἐπικηρυκευσόμεθα δή αὐτῷ καὶ
dακρύσομεν πιθανῶς, καί τὴν Νέμεσιν δεῖν αὐτὸν ὄραν εἰ
οὕτως ἔμε περιόψεται ἐρῶσαν αὐτοῦ, καί τοιαύτα ἄλλα
ἔρούμεν καὶ πλασόμεθα. ἥζει γὰρ ὡς ἐλεών δήπου με
καιομένην ἐπ᾽ αὐτῷ· μεμνῆσθαι γὰρ τοῦ παρελθόντος 5
χρόνου καὶ τῆς συνηθείας ἐχειν καλῶς ἔρει, φυσῶν ἐς
τὸν ὁ λάσταυρος. συλλήψεται δὲ ἡμῖν καὶ ὁ Ἑλίξ· ἐπ᾽
ἐκεῖνον γὰρ ἡ Ἑρπυλὶς ἀποδύσεται. ὁ λάσταυρος
γὰρ αὐτὸν ἢ ἐμοὶ ζῆν ἢ τεθνάναι Θεττάλη. 10

5 αὐτῶν VF 7 Ἑλίξ D 8 ἑρπυλὶς P Ald: ἑρπυλὶς VFD 10 μέλει VF
also his drunken behaviour. I will send him a message and weep convincingly, and say that he should watch out for Nemesis if he neglects me, who desires him, in this way, and I will make up other such things to tell him. Then he’ll surely come to take pity on me for burning with desire for him; for he will say that it’s good to remember the past and our relationship, puffing himself up, that creep. And Helix too will assist me, since Herpyllis will strip for him. However, love potions tend to be uncertain and will suddenly result in death. I don’t care one bit; either he will live for me or die for Thetttale.
Οἴχεται Βακχίς ἢ καλῆ, Ἐυθύκλεις φίλτατη. οἴχεται, 
pολλά τέ μοι καταλιποῦσα δάκρυα καὶ ἔρωτος ὡς ὅ 
ηδίστου τότε οὕτω πονηροῦ νῦν μνήμην· οὐ γὰρ ἐκλή-
σομαί ποτε Βακχίδοις, οὐχ οὕτως ἔσται χρόνος. ὡς 
συμπάθειαν ἐνεδείξατο· ἀπολογίαν ἐκείνην καλῶν ὡς 
τις ἀμαρτάνοι τού τῶν ἔταιρῶν βίου. καὶ εἰ συνελθοῦσα 
ἀπασαι πανταχόθεν εἰκόνα τινὰ αὐτῆς ἐν Ἀφροδίτης ἢ
Χαρίτων θεῖεν. δεξιὸν ὡς πρός τοῦ τῶν ἑταιρῶν 
πονηρῶν, ὡς τὸ πάντων ὡς ζωγράφισκον καὶ τοῦ 
διδόντος, ὡς τὸν ἄγνωστον ὡς τὸν κακοῦ τοῖς ἐν 
τῇ κοινῇ βλασφημίᾳ· τῷ ἄδικον· ὡς ἀκοῦτα αὐτῆς ἡ
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4.11 [1.38]  
Menecleides¹ to Euthycles²

My beautiful Bacchis³ is gone, dearest Euthycles, she’s gone, leaving me with many tears and a memory of a love that is as painful now as it was sweet then; for I will never forget Bacchis, that time will not come! How much affection she showed! You wouldn’t be wrong in calling her an apology of the courtesan’s way of life. And if they all came together and placed a statue of her in the sanctuary of Aphrodite or the Graces, they would, in my opinion, do something righteous. For the common talk, that they are mean, disloyal, only interested in profit, always belonging to whoever is paying, and the cause of every bad thing that happens to their lovers, this she, by her own case, has shown to be an unjust accusation; in this way she opposed the common slander with her own character.

You know the Mede who swooped in from Syria and strutted about with all that retinue and equipage, promising eunuchs, maidservants and foreign jewellery; and yet, to his chagrin, she didn’t admit him, but was happy to sleep under this cheap and common cloak of mine, and content with the scanty gifts I had sent her, she scorned those luxurious and golden gifts of his. What else? How she told the Egyptian merchant who was offering a lot of money to shove off!

I’m sure there would be nothing better than her. What a noble character that some deity led into an unfortunate course of life. And then she’s gone having left me behind and from now on on Bacchis will lie alone. How unfair, dear

¹ The lover of Philotis in 4.9; perhaps a reference to the rhetor Menecleidas (4th cent. BC) mentioned in Plut. Pel. 25.  
² Perhaps the poet of late Old Comedy; Ath. 3.124b quotes a passages from a play entitled The Profligates or The Letter.  
³ A character in comedy, often depicted as an honest and faithful courtesan, e.g. in Ter. Hec.; see also 4.2, 4.3, 4.5 and 4.14.
6 γὰρ αὐτῇ συγκατακεῖσθαί με καὶ νῦν ὡς τότε. ἀλλ᾽ ἐγὼ μὲν περίειμι καὶ τροφῆς ψαύω καὶ διαλέξομαι τοῖς ἐταίροις, ἢ δὲ σύκετι με φαϊδροῖς τοῖς ὄμμασιν ὄμηται μειδιώσα, οὐδὲ ἔλεως καὶ εὐμενῆς διανυκτερεύσει τοῖς ἡδίστοις ἐκείνοις κολάσμαιν. ἀρτίως μὲν οἶνον ἐφθέγγετο, 5 οἰνὸν ἐβλεπεν, ὡσαὶ τοῖς ὁμιλίαις αὐτῆς Σειρῆνος ἔνιδρυντο, ὡς δὲ ἤδυ τι καὶ ἀκήρατον ἅπε τῶν φιληµάτων νέκταρ ἔσταζεν: ἐπ᾽ ἄκροις μοι δοκεῖ τοῖς χείλεσιν αὐτῆς ἐκάθισεν ή Πειθώ. ἀπαντα ἐκείνη γε τὸν κεστὸν ὑπεζώσατο, ὅλαις ταῖς χάρισι τὴν Ἀφροδίτην δεξιώσα- 10 μένη.

8 ἔρρει τὰ παρὰ τὰς προπόσεις μινυρίσματα, καὶ ή τοῖς ἐλεφαντίνοις δακτύλοις κρουομένη λύρα ἔρρει. κεῖται δὲ ἡ πάσαις μέλουσα Xάρισι κωφῇ λίθος καὶ σποδιά. καὶ Μεγάρα μὲν ή ἢππόπορνος ζῆν, οὕτω Θεαγένην συλήσαςα ἀνήλιος, ὡς ἐκ πάνω λαμπρᾶς οὐσίας τὸν ἄθλιον χλαµύδιον ἀρτάσαντα καὶ πέλτην οἰχεσθαί στρατευσό- 15 μενον: Βακχὶς δὲ ἡ τὸν ἐραστῆν φιλοῦσα ἀπέθανε. ῥάων γέγονα πρὸς σὲ ἀποδυράμενοι, Εὐθύκλεις φίλτατε· ἡδύ γάρ μοί τι δοκεῖ περὶ ἑκείνης καὶ λαλεῖν καὶ γράφειν· 20 οὐδὲν γὰρ ἦ τὸ μεμνηθαὶ καταλέιπηκαι. ἔρρωσο.
Fates. For I ought to lie next to her now as before. But I survive and I touch food and I’m going to talk with my friends; yet she will never again look at me with her bright eyes and smile, nor will she graciously and favourably spend the night in those most pleasurable punishments. How she spoke just recently, how she gazed, what Sirens frequented her conversations, what sweet and pure nectar dripped from her kisses. It seems to me that Peitho sat on the edge of her lips. She girded herself with all her charm and with all her graces honoured Aphrodite.

Gone are the ditties she sang during our toasts and the lyre she played with her ivory fingers is gone. A silent stone and ashes she lies who was dear to all the Graces. And Megara,¹ that mega-whore, lives who robbed Theagenes² so unsparingly that he, having lost his great fortune, seized his shabby military cloak and shield, and went off to war. But Bacchis who loved her lover is dead. I feel better now having cried out to you, my dearest Euthycles. I think it’s sweet both to talk and to write about her; for nothing remains but memory. Farewell.

¹ A courtesan; see also 4.6, 4.7, 4.13 and 4.14. ² In Lucian Catapl. 6 we are told that a philosopher called Theagenes killed himself over a courtesan from Megara.
Εἶδόν σου τὴν νύμφην μυστηρίοις καλὸν περιβεβλημένην θέριστρον· ἐλεῶ σε, νῆ τὴν Ἀφροδίτην, ταλαίπωρε, οἴα πάσχεις μετ’ ἐκείνης καθεύδων τῆς χελώνης. οἶον τὸ χρώμα γυναικὸς, αὐτοσανδαράκη· ἡλίκους δὲ καθεῖτο 5 τοὺς πλοκάμους ἢ νύμφη, οὐδὲν ἕοικότας ταῖς ἐπὶ τῆς κορυφῆς θριξίν. ἡλίκων δὲ κατεπέπλαστο ψιμύθιον· καὶ τὰς ἑταίρας λοιδοροῦσιν ὅτι καλλωπιζόμεθα. ἀλλὰ μεγάλην ἅλυσιν· ἀξία γέ ἐστιν διατελεῖν πλὴν οὐχὶ χρυσῇ, φάσματος ἔχουσα πρόσωπον. ἡλίκοι 10 δὲ οἱ πόδες, ως πλατεῖς, ως ἄρρυθμοι. αἰαῖ, γυμνὴν περιλαβεῖν ἐκείνην οἷόν ἐστιν· ἐμοὶ μὲν καὶ βαρύ τι δοκεῖ προσπνέειν· μετὰ φρύνου καθεύδειν ἄν εἰλόμην, Νέμεσι δέσποινα. ἐμβλέψαι τί μὴ δωρίδι βούλομαι ἢ μετὰ τῆς ἁλύσεως καὶ τῶν περισκελίδων συγκαρ 15
I saw your young wife at the Mysteries, draped in a beautiful summer dress. I pity you, by Aphrodite, miserable man—how you must suffer sleeping with that tortoise! What a complexion for a woman, quite vermilion! What long curls your young wife let loose, bearing no resemblance to the hair on her head! How much white lead she had plastered on! And they slander us courtesans for making ourselves up. She was indeed wearing a great chain; she certainly deserves to spend her life in a chain, but not a golden one, having the face of a ghost. What large feet she has, so broad and disproportionate! Woe, how it is to embrace her naked! I also have the impression that she has bad breath. I would prefer to sleep with a toad, lady Nemesis. I would rather look in the face than with her chain and anklets **
4.13 [fragm. 6]

*** ἐραστοῦ χωρίον Νύμφαις θυσίαν λέγουσα ὀφείλειν. εἰκοσι ἀπέχει τῆς πόλεως στάδια; αὐτὸ δὲ ἐστὶ λειμὼν τις ή κῆπος; ὀλίγη δὲ παρὰ τὴν ἔπαυλιν ἀνεῖται σπόρι-μος, τὰ δὲ λοιπὰ κυπαρίττια καὶ μυρρίναι, ἐρωτικοῦ, 5 φίλη, κτημάτιον οὖν, οὐ γεωργοῦ.

2 εὐθὺς μὲν ἢ άφοδος ἡμῶν εἰχέ τινα παιδιάν· τὰ μὲν γὰρ ἀλλήλας ἐσκώπτομεν ἢ τοὺς ἐραστάς, τὰ δ᾽ ὑπὸ τῶν ὑπαντώντων ἐρρινώμεθα. Νικίας δ᾽ ὁ λάσταυρος οὐκ οἶδα πώς ἐπανιών "ποῦ" φησιν ἡμῖν "ἀθρόαι; τὸν τίνος ἀπείπειν ἄγρον; μακάριον ἑκεῖνο τὸ χωρίον ὃποι βαδίζετε· ὅσας ἔξει συκᾶς." τοῦτον μὲν οὖν Πετάλη ἀπεσόβησε κωμῳδήσασα ἀκολάστως. ἀπέπτυσε γὰρ ἡμᾶς καὶ ἀκαθάρτους εἰπὼν ἀπεφθάρη. ἡμεῖς δὲ πυρακάνθους ῥιοῦσαι καὶ κλωνία καὶ ἀνεμώνας συλλέγο-σαι παρῆμεν αἰφνιδίως· ἔλαθε δ᾽ ἡμᾶς ἡ ὁδὸς διὰ τὴν παιδιάν ὡς οὖν ὠθήσαμεν ταχέως ἀνυσθεῖσα.

4.13 [fragm. 6]

*** lover’s place, saying she owed a sacrifice to the Nymphs. It’s located twenty stades from the town.¹ It’s actually a meadow or garden; but close to the farm there is a plot of tillage, the rest consists of cypresses and myrtle. It’s really a property for a lover, my dear, not a farmer.

Right away our departure offered some amusement; for one moment we were making fun of each other or our lovers, and the next we were being teased by the people we met. The lecher Nicias,² returning from I don’t know where, said to us, ‘Where are you going all together? Whose field are you going off to drain? Happy is the estate where you’re going! How many figs it will have!’³ Petale⁴ shoed him away and made fun of him in a shameless manner. He cursed us and called us dirty, and then he dashed off. We were picking fire-thorn berries and gathering twigs and windflowers, and then suddenly we were there. We didn’t even realise, because of the amusement, that our journey had come to an end quicker than we had expected.

At once we busied ourselves with the sacrifice. A short distance from the farm there was a rock, its top shaded by laurels and plane trees. On either side of it were bushes of myrtle, and ivy ran around it somehow from the top, clinging closely to the stone; from it clear water dripped. Under the projecting edges of the rock some statues of Nymphs were set up and a Pan peeped out as though he was spying on the Naiads. Across from it we piled up an improvised

¹ The stadion was a Greek unit of length corresponding to c. 162–210 meters; the Attic stadion was 186 meters. ² A common name in Greek Comedy; probably not a reference to a specific person. ³ Probably a euphemism for the female sexual organ, cf. Henderson (1991) 118. ⁴ A courtesan; the recipient of 4.8 and sender of 4.9; also mentioned in 4.14.
ὑπερέκυπτεν· ἀντικρὺ βωμὸν αὐτοσχεδίως ἐνήσαμεν, εἶτα
σχῖσα καὶ πόπαν τῷ πυριδίῳ καὶ προσευξάμεναι
πολλὰ μὲν ταῖς Νύμφαις, πλεῖο δὲ ἢ οὐκ ἐλάττω τῇ
Αφροδίτῃ, ἱκετεύομεν διδόναι τινὰ ἡμῖν ἐρωτικὴν ἄγραν.

τὸ λοιπὸν εὐτρεπεῖς ἐπὶ τὴν εὐωχίαν ἤμεν. “Ἰωμεν”
ἐφη ἡ Μέλισσα “οἶκαδε καὶ κατακλινῶμεν”.

οἴκαδε καὶ κατακλινῶμεν.

μὴ μὲν οὖν πρὸς γε τῶν Νυμφῶν καὶ τοῦ Πανός” εἶπον ἐγὼ “τοῦ
tου· ὀρᾶς γὰρ ὡς ἐστὶν ἐρωτικός· ἥδεως ἢ ἡμᾶς 10
ἐνταῦθα κραπαλώσας ἱδοί· ἀλλ’ ὑπὸ ταῖς μυρρίναις ἢν
ἱδοὺ τὸ χωρίον ὡς ἐνδροσόν ἐστὶν ἐν κύκλῳ καὶ τρυφε-

ροίς ἀνθείς ποικίλον. ἐπὶ ταῦτης βουλομήν ἢν τῆς πόας
κατακλιθῆναι ἢ ἐπὶ τῶν ταπητίων ἐκείνως καὶ τῶν μαλ-
θακῶν ὑποστρωμάτων ἱδία. ἀλλά ἐχέτω τι πλέον τῶν

ἐν ἀστεί τἀνταῦθα συμπόσια, ἐνθα ἀγροῦ ὑπαίθριοι χά-

ritez”. “ναὶ ναί, λέγεις καλῶς” ἐφασαν· εὔβους οὖν κατα-
kλώμεναι, αἱ μὲν σμίλακος, αἱ δὲ μυρρίνης κλάδους καὶ
τὰ χλανίσκια ἐπιστορέσασθαι αὐτοσχεδίως συνερρίψαμεν.

ἡν δὲ καὶ τούδαφος λωτῷ καὶ τριφύλλω μαλθακὸν· ἐν 20
μέσῳ κύκλῳ καὶ τῖνες ύάκινθοι καὶ ἄνθεια διαποίκια

τὴν ὄψιν ὁράζον· ἔφης “ἐφασαν· οὖν κατα-
κλώμεναι, τὰ τέ ἔλιθος ταῦτα ὡσπερ αἱ πυγαί, καὶ
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altar; then after we had placed splinters and cakes on it, we began by sacrificing a white hen; and after we had poured a libation of mead and milk over the altar and offered frankincense over the little flame and offered many prayers to the Nymphs, and at least as many to Aphrodite, we begged that they give us a quarry of lovers.

From then on we were fit for the feast. ‘Let’s go home’, Melissa\(^1\) said, ‘and recline at the table.’ ‘Let’s not, by the Nymphs and Pan here,’ said I. ‘For you see how horny he is. He would gladly see us carousing here! See there under the myrtles how dewy the place is all around and dappled with dainty flowers. I would like to recline on this grass rather than on those rugs and soft sheets in private. Let drinking parties here amid the beauty of the countryside and open air surpass those in town!’ ‘Yes, yes, you speak well!’ they said. So some of us immediately broke off branches of yew, others branches of myrtle, and we spread our cloaks and threw them together in an improvised manner. The ground was soft from clover and trefoil. In the middle circle some hyacinths and a variety of flowers made the sight beautiful. Nightingales, perched amid leaves of spring, sang in a pleasant and twittering way; the drops of water that gently dripped like sweat from the rock made a pleasant sound befitting our springtime drinking party. There was wine, not domestic but Italian, the kind of jars you said you’d bought at Eleusis, very sweet and plentiful. There were eggs, which quivered like buttocks, slices of tender goat and homebred hens. Then there were

---

\(^1\) Cf. Lucian \textit{Dial. meret.} 4, a dialogue between Melitta and Bacchis.
χιμαιρίδος ἀπαλῆς τεμάχη καὶ ἄλεκτορίδες οἰκουροὶ· εἶτα γαλάκτια ποικίλα, τά μὲν μελιτηκτα, τά δ᾽ ἀπὸ ταγήνου—πυτίας μοι δοκῶ καλούσιν αὐτά καὶ σκόληκας· εἶτα πεμμάτια ὅσα τε ἄγρος ἤμιν ἐαρινῆς ὅπωρας ἐπεδαψιλεύετο.

μετὰ δὲ τούτῳ συνεχῶς περιεσόβουν αἱ κύλικες· καὶ τὸ πιεῖν μέτρον ἢν τρεῖς φιλοτησίας, οὐ τὸ ποσὸν. ἐπιεικῶς δὲ πως τὰ μὴ προσηναγκασμένα τῶν συμποσίων τῶ συνεχεῖ τὸ πλεῖον ἀναλαμβάνει· ὑπεψεκάζομεν μικροῖς τισι κυμβίοις ἄλλ᾽ ἐπαλλήλοις. καὶ 10 παρῆν Κρουμάτιον ἡ Μεγάρας καταυλοῦσα, ἡ δὲ Σιμμίχη πρὸς τὰ μέλη καὶ πρὸς τὴν ἁρμονίαν ᾖδεν.

ἐχαίρον αἱ ἐπὶ τῆς πίδακος Νύμφαι. ἣνίκα δὲ ἀναστάσα καταρχῆσατο καὶ τὴν ὀσφύν ἄνεκίνησεν ἡ Πλαγγών, ὅλιγον ὁ Πὰν ἐδέησεν ἀπὸ τῆς πέτρας ἐπὶ τὴν πυγὴν 15 αὐτῆς ἐξάλλεσθαί. αὐτίκα δὲ Ἦμας ἐνδοὺ ἐδόνον ἡ μουσική καὶ ὑποβεβρεγμέναι εἶχομεν τὸν νοῦν—οἶδας ὅ

τι λέγω. τὰς τῶν ἐραστῶν χεῖρας ἐμαλάττομεν τοὺς δακτύλους ἐκ τῶν ἁρμῶν ἠρέμα πως χαλῶσαι, καὶ πρὸς Διονύσῳ ἐπαίζομεν· καὶ τις ἐφίλησεν ὑπτιάσασα καὶ 20 μασταρίων ἠρέμαν χαλῶσαι, καὶ οἶδας ἄτεχνως τοῖς βουβῶσι τὸ κατόπιν τῆς ὀσφύος προσαπέθλυβε. διανίστατο δὲ ἦδη ἡμῶν μὲν τῶν γυναικῶν τὰ πάθη, τῶν ἀνδρῶν δὲ ἐκεῖνα. ὑπεκδυόμεναι δ᾽ οὖν μικρὸν ἄποθεν συνηρεφῇ τινα λόχμην εὕρομεν, 25 ἄρκοντα τῇ τότε κραιπάλῃ θάλαμον. ἐνταῦθα

a variety of milk-cakes, some honey-cakes, others from the frying pan (I think they call them junkets and twists). Then there were sweetmeats as much as the country lavished upon us from its spring fruits.

Thereafter the cups went around continuously; there was a limit to drink three friendship toasts, but no limit on how often. In a way drinking parties with no restraints tend to get more because of the continuity; we sipped the wine from small cups, but one after the other. Croumation, Megara’s maid,1 was there and she played the flute, and Simmiche2 sang to the melody and the music. The Nymphs at the spring were delighted; and when Plangon3 got up and danced, moving her hips, Pan almost jumped off the rock straight onto her buttocks. The music immediately excited us women deep down and being somewhat drunk we were in the mood for some...you know what I’m talking about. We caressed our lovers’ hands and gently untied their flexed fingers, and fooled around in the presence of Dionysus. Someone lay on her back and kissed her lover and let him feel her breasts, and as if simply turning away she actually pressed her lower abdomen against his groin. The passion was already rising for us women, and that other thing was rising for the men. So we women slipped away and found a shady thicket not far away, a bridal chamber sufficient for our present drunkenness. There we

---

1 A flute girl in 1.15.4. Megara is a courtesan; she is the sender of 4.14 and mentioned in 4.6, 4.7 and 4.11.  
2 An old maidservant in Men. Dys.; a courtesan mentioned in Lucian Catapl. 22 and Dial. meret. 4.  
3 A famous courtesan from Miletus mentioned in Ath. 13.594b–d; occurs frequently in comedy.
διανεπαυόμεθα τοῦ πότου καὶ τοὺς χιτωνίσκους ἀπιθάνως εἰσπειάομεν· κάπειτα ἢ μὲν κλωνία μυρρίνης συνέδει ὦστερ στέφανον ἐαυτῇ πλέκουσα καὶ, “εἰ πρέπει μοι, φιλή, σκέψαι,” ἢ δ’ ἵων ἔχουσα κάλυκας ἐπανήγει, “ὡς χρηστόν ἀποτείνει,” λέγουσα, ἢ δὲ μήλα ἀώρα “ἰδοὺ 5 ταυτί” ἐκ τοῦ κόλπου προφέρουσα ἐπεδείκνυτο, ἢ δὲ ἐμινύριζεν, ἢ δὲ φύλλα ἀπὸ τῶν κλωνίων ἀφαιροῦσα διέτρωγεν ὦστερ ἀκκιζομένη· καὶ τὸ δὴ γελοίοτατον, πᾶσαι γὰρ ἐπὶ ταυτὸ ἀνιστάμεναι ἀλλήλας λαυθάνειν ἐβουλόμεθα· θατέρα δὲ οἱ ἄνθρωποι ὑπὸ τὴν λόχμην 10 περίχροντο.

16 οὕτως μικρὰ παρεμπορευσαμέναι τῆς ἀφροδίτης πάλιν συνειστήκησι πότος· καὶ οὐκέθ’ ἡμῖν ἐδόκουμ προσβλέπειν ὡς πρότερον αἱ Νύμφαι, ἀλλ’ ὁ Πάν καὶ ὁ Πρίατος ἦδιον. ἐμφαγεῖν δὴ πάλιν ὅρνιθια ταυτί τὰ τοῖς δικτύοις ἀλλισκόμενα καὶ πέρδικες καὶ ἐκ τρυγὸς ἀφαιροῦσα βότρυες καὶ λαγῳδίων νῶτα, εἶτα κόγχοι καὶ κήρυκες ἢσαν ἐς ἀστεοὶ οἱ κομισθέντες, καὶ ἐπιχώριοι κοχλίαι καὶ μύκητες οἱ ἀπὸ τῶν κομάρων, καὶ σισάρων εὐκάρδιοι 11 ρίζαι οὗτε δεδευμέναι καὶ μέλιτες· ἐτὶ μέντοι δὴ μάλιστα 20 ἠδέως ἐφάγομεν, ἀλλὰ καὶ σέλινα· ἡλίκαι δοκεῖς ταύτην ἀφροδίτην λέγουσι ταύτας φιλεῖν.
took a rest from the drinking and without enthusiasm jumped into our chitons. And then one girl tied together twigs of myrtle as if twining a garland for herself and said, 'Look, my love, if this suits me'; another girl returning with buds of violet said, 'What a lovely fragrance'; another taking some unripe apples from her fold, showed them and said, 'Look at these!' Another was humming, and yet another was picking leaves from a twig and gnawing them as if playing hard to get. And what was most ridiculous—although we had all got up for the same reason, we didn’t wish to be seen by each other. The men came around on the other side behind the thicket.

After this little love commerce, we were thirsty again. The Nymphs didn’t seem to look at us like before, whereas Pan and Priapus seemed to look at us with greater pleasure. Again we had those small birds, caught with nets, and partridges, and very sweet grapes conserved in must, and chines of hare. Furthermore there were mussels and periwinkles that were brought in from town, and native snails, and mushrooms from the strawberry trees, and roots of parsnip, good for the stomach, steeped in vinegar and honey. Moreover there was lettuce and celery that we ate with greatest delight; and how big do you think the lettuce was? The garden was near by; we each said to our maids, ‘Pull this one!’ ‘No, by Zeus, this one!’ ‘No, not that one, this one!’ Some were leafy and long, others twisted like curly hair, others yet were short and their leaves had a yellowish tinge. They say Aphrodite loves them.
ἐαρίσασαι δ᾽ οὖν καὶ ἀναξανθεῖσαι τοὺς στομάχους ἐκραπαλώμεν μάλα νεανικῶς μέχρι μηδὲ λανθάνειν ἄλλη-λας θέλειν, μηδὲ αἰδουμένως τῆς ἀφροδίτης παρακλέ-πτειν· οὕτως ἡμᾶς ἐξεβάκχευσαν αἱ προπόσεις. μισῶ τὸν ἐκ τῶν γειτόνων ἀλεκτρυνα· κοκκύσας ἀφεῖλετο τὴν παροινίαν.

ἐδει ἀπολαῦσαι σε τῆς γοῦν ἀκοῆς τοῦ συμποσίου—τρυφερόν γὰρ ἢν καὶ πρέπον ἐρωτικῆ φιλία—εἰ καὶ μὴ τῆς παροινίας ἐδυνήθης ἐβουλόμην οὕν ἀκριβῶς ἐκαστα ἐπιστεῖλαι καὶ προὐτράπην· σὺ δὲ εἰ μὲν ὄντως ἔσχηκας μαλακῶς, ὡς ἄμεινον ἕξεις σκόπει· 
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So after we had enjoyed the spring and stimulated our appetites afresh, we engaged in a very youthful revelry to the point that neither did we care that we were seen by each other, nor did we bother to make love in secret; the wine filled us with such a bacchic frenzy. I hate the neighbour’s cock! His crowing put an end to our revelry.

You should at least have the pleasure of hearing about our drinking party—for it was sumptuous and suitable for erotic friendship—even if you couldn’t partake in our revelry. So I wanted to write you a detailed written account of everything, and I was urged to do so. If you really were feeling unwell, try and find a way to get better; but if you’re staying at home because you’re expecting your lover to come, then you’re staying at home not without reason. Farewell.
 Μεγάρα Βακχίδι

Σοὶ μόνῃ ἐραστής γέγονεν, ὅν φιλεῖς οὕτως ὡστε μηδὲ ἄκαρῃ πως αὐτοῦ διαζευχῆται δύνασθαι. τῆς ἁρδίας, δέσποινᾳ Ἀφροδίτη. κληθείσα ὑπὸ Γλυκέρας ἐπὶ θυσίαν εἰς τοσούτον χρόνων—ἀπὸ τῶν Διονυσίων γάρ ἦμιν 5 ἐπήγγειλεν—οὐχ ἥκεις, εἰ μὴ δι᾽ ἐκείνην οὐδὲ τὰς φίλας

2 ὕδειν γυναῖкоς ἀνασχομένη. σώφρων γέγονος σὺ καὶ φιλεῖς τὸν ἐραστήν, μακαρία τῆς εὐφημίας· ἠμεῖς δὲ πόρναι καὶ ἀκόλαστοι. ὑπῆρξε καὶ Ἰόλειοι συκίνη βακτηρία· ήργίζομαι γάρ, νὴ τὴν μεγάλην θεόν. πάσαι παρῆμεν, 10

Θεττάλη, Μοσχάριον, Θαῖς, Ἀνθράκιον, Πετάλη, Ἐρυαλλίσ, Μυρρίνη, Χρυσίον, Εὐξίππη· ὅπου καὶ Φιλομένη, καίτοι γεγαμημένα προσφάτῳ καὶ ἐξωτικομένη, τὸν καλὸν ἀποκοιμίσασα τὸν ἄνδρα ὅμως μὲν ὁμοίως δὲ παρῆν.

3 σὺ δ’ ἠμῖν μόνῃ τὸν Ἀδωνίν περιέψυχες, μή που κατα− 15

λειφθέντα αὐτὸν ὑπὸ σοῦ τῆς Ἀφροδίτης ἡ Περσεφόνη παραλάβη.

οἶον ἠμῶν ἐγένετο τὸ συμπόσιον—τί γάρ οὐχ ἄψωμαι σου τῆς καρδίας;—ὁσῶν χαρίτων πλῆρες. ὃδαι σκώμματα πότος εἰς ἀλεκτρούνων ὠδάς μύρα στέφανοι 20

τραγήματα. ὑπόσκιος τις δάφναις ἢν ἡ κατάκλισις έν


104
Only you have a lover whom you love so much that you can’t be separated from him even for a moment. By Lady Aphrodite, that’s disgusting! Even though you were invited by Glycera to her sacrificial feast such a long time ago (for she sent us the invitations at the time of the Dionysia) you didn’t come—perhaps because of her you can’t stand even to see your girlfriends. You’ve become virtuous and are in love with your lover, congratulations on that reputation! We, on the other hand, are shameless whores. Philo too had a fig-wood staff; so I’m really angry, by the great goddess! We were all present: Thettale, Moscharium, Thais, Anthracium, Petale, Thryallis, Myrrhine, Chrysium and Euxippe. Why even Philoumene, despite recently married and jealously watched, was present, having put her lovely husband to sleep, although she arrived late. Only you stayed to fondle your Adonis, afraid perhaps that if he was left alone by you, his Aphrodite, Persephone would snatch him away.

What a drinking party we had—why shouldn’t I make you regretful?—full of great delights! Songs, jokes, drinking till cockcrow, perfumes, garlands and sweetmeats. Our place of reclining was shaded by some laurels. Only one thing was missing: you, but nothing else. We have often

1 A courtesan, mentioned in 4.6, 4.7, 4.11 and 4.13. 2 A character in comedy, often depicted as an honest and faithful courtesan, e.g. in Ter. Hec.; the sender of 4.2–4.5 and subject of 4.11. 3 A character in comedy and a famous courtesan of the 4th cent. BC who was the mistress of Harpalus, the treasurer of Alexander the Great. See also the correspondence between Menander and Glycera in 4.18–4.19. 4 The most important festivals of Dionysus were the Rural Dionysia, in December, and the Great Dionysia, in March, celebrated with processions and performances of tragedy, comedy and dithyramb. See also 1.9.3, 2.37.1 and 3.35.2. 5 A proverbial expression of unknown origin, probably a reference to fig-wood being weak and unreliable. 6 Names of courtesans from comedy; some occur elsewhere in Alciphron. 7 The sender of 4.15.
μόνον ἦμῖν ἔλιπε, σύ, τὰ δ᾽ ἄλλα οὐ. πολλάκις ἐκρατισμένες, οὔτω δὲ ἢ δεός ὅλιγάκις. τὸ γοῦν πλείστην ἦμῖν παρασκευάσαν τέρψιν, δεινὴ τις φιλονεικία κατέσχε Θρυαλλίδα καὶ Μυρρίνην ὑπὲρ τῆς πυγῆς ποτέρα κρείττου καὶ ἀπαλωτέραν ἐπιδείξει. 

καὶ πρώτη Μυρρίνη τὸ ζώνιον λύσασα—βόμβυξ δ᾽ ἦν τὸ χιτώνιον—δι᾽ αὐτοῦ τρέμουσα, ὁ γὰρ τις μελίπηκτον γάλα τὴν ὀσφὺν ἀνεσάλευσεν, ὑποβλέπουσα εἰς τούτοσον πρὸς τὰ κινήματα τῆς πυγῆς ἡμῖν ἐνεργοῦσα τι ἐρωτικὸν ὑπεστέναξεν, ὥστε ἐμέ, νη τῆς Ἀφροδίτης, καταπλαγῆναι.

οὐ μὴν ἀπεῖπέ γε ἡ Θρυαλλίς, ἀλλὰ τῇ ἀκολασίᾳ παραφρευδόκιμησεν αὐτήν· "οù γὰρ διὰ παραπετασμάτων ἐγώ" φησίν "ἀγωνίσομαι, οὐδὲ ἀκκιζομένη, ἀλλ᾽ οἷον ἐν γυμνικῷ· καὶ γὰρ οὐ φιλεῖ προφάσεις ἀγώνων." ἀπεδύσατο τὸ χιτώνιον καὶ μικρὸν ὑποσιμώσασα τὴν ὀσφὺν "Ἰδοὺ, σκόπει τὸ χρῶμα" φησίν "ὡς ἀκριβῶς, Μυρρίνη, ὡς ἀκριβῶς, ὡς καθαρὸν, τὰ παραπόρφυρα τῶν ἰσχίων ταυτί, τὴν ἐπὶ τοὺς μηροὺς ἐγκλισέ, τὸ μῆτε υπέροχον τοῦτον μήτε ἀσαρκοῦν, τοὺς γελασίνους ἐπ᾽ ἀκρων ἀλλ᾽ ὑπ᾽ ἑαυτῆς νή τῆς Δίας,—ἀμείαν ὑποκλωσίας—"ἀδήμου ἡ Μυρρίνης". καὶ τοσοῦτον παλμὸν ἐξειράσατο τῆς πυγῆς καὶ ἀπασάν αὐτὴν ὑπὲρ τὴν ὀσφὺν τῇδε καὶ τῇδε ὅσπερ ρέουσαν περιεδίνησαν, ὥστε ἀνακροτῆσαι πάσας καὶ νίκην ἀποφήνασθαι τῆς Θρυαλλίδος. ἐγένοντο δὲ καὶ περιάλλων συγκρίσεις καὶ περὶ μασταρίων ἀγῶνες· τῆς μὲν γὰρ Φιλουμένης γαστρὶ ἀντεξετασθῆναι οὐδ᾽ ἡτισεν ὡς ἡτασακρής. καταπαννυχίσασα δ᾽ οὖν καὶ τοὺς
caroused but rarely with this much pleasure. But what gave us the most delight was that a fierce quarrel arose between Thryallis and Myrrhine concerning which of them had the most beautiful and smooth buttocks.¹

And Myrrhine, having first loosened her girdle—her dress was made of silk—swayed her hips which quivered like junkets through the dress, while she was looking back at the movements of her buttocks. Then she sighed gently like she was making love so that, by Aphrodite, I was astounded.

Thryallis, however, didn’t give up, but outdid Myrrhine in shamelessness. ‘I shall not compete behind curtains’, she said, ‘nor play coy, but as in a gymnastic contest; for a contest doesn’t like excuses.’ She took off her dress, tightened her buttocks and said, ‘there, look carefully at the skin, Myrrhine, how pure, how spotless; look here at the purple lining of the hips, the slope towards the thighs, which are neither too fat nor too lean, and the dimples at the sides; but, by Zeus, they don’t quiver’—and at the same time she smiled—‘like Myrrhine’s’. And then she made her buttocks quiver so much, and she whirled the whole thing around, to and fro, over her loins, like it was flowing, so that we all applauded and declared that the victory belonged to Thryallis.

There were also comparisons of hips and breast competitions. However, nobody dared to compare her belly with Philoumene’s, since she had not born any children and was plump. So having spent the entire night there

¹ Thryallis (‘Wick’), mentioned only here and in Ath. 13.583e. Myrrhine was the mistress of Hyperides, cf. [Plut.] X orat. 832d, Ath. 13.590c–d; the recipient of 4.5 and sender of 4.10.
ἐραστὰς κακῶς εἰποῦσαι καὶ ἄλλων ἐπιτυχεῖν εὐξάμεναι—ἀεὶ γὰρ ἣδιων ἡ πρόσφατος ἀφροδίτη—ὡχόμεθα ἐξοινοι, καὶ πολλὰ κατὰ τὴν ὁδὸν κραιπαλήσασαι ἐπεκωμάσαμεν Δεξιμάχῳ κατὰ τὸν χρυσοῦν στενωτόν, ώσ ἐπὶ τὴν ἄγνον κάτιμεν, πλησίον τῆς Μενέφρονος 5 οἰκίας. ἐρᾷ γὰρ σύνοι Θαῖς κακῶς καὶ, ἥ Δία, εἰκότως· ἕναγχος γὰρ πλούσιον κεκληρονόμηκε πατέρα τὸ μειράκιον.

νῦν μὲν οὖν συγγνώμην ἔχομεν σοι τῆς υπεροψίας, τοῖς Ἀδωνίοις δὲ ἐν Κολλυτῷ ἑστιώμεθα παρὰ τῷ Θετ- 10 τάλης ἐραστῇ· τὸν γὰρ τῆς Ἀφροδίτης ἐρώμενον ἡ Θετ- τάλη στέλλει. ὅπως δ᾽ ἥξει ς φέρουσα κήτιον καὶ κοράλ- λιον καὶ τὸν σὸν Ἀδωνίν ὃν νῦν περιψυχεῖς· μετά γὰρ τῶν ἐραστῶν κραιπαλήσομεν. ἔρρωσο.
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speaking ill of our lovers and praying for new ones (for fresh love making is always sweeter) we departed drunk, and carousing a lot on the way we stopped for a revelry at Deximachus’s house at the Golden Alley, where you go down to the agnus tree, near Menephron’s house. Thais is madly in love with him and, by Zeus, with reason; for the lad has recently inherited his rich father.

Now this time we forgive you for scorning us, but we’re celebrating the Adonis festival in Collytus at Thettale’s lover’s place; for Thettale is dressing up the darling of Aphrodite. See to it that you come bringing a little garden, a doll and your Adonis whom you’re now fondling, for we are going to carouse with our lovers. Farewell.

1 Deximachus and Menephron are not attested in Greek literature but for the latter cf. Ovid Met. 7.386ff. 2 The Adonia was celebrated at midsummer when women would gather on roof-tops bringing pots of quickly withering plants which symbolized the death of Adonis. Collytus was a deme in the southern part of Athens.
4.15 [1.40]
Φιλουμένη Κρίτωνι

Τι πολλά γράφων ἀνιᾷς σεαυτόν; πεντήκοντά σοι χρυσῶν δεῖ καὶ γραμμάτων οὐ δεῖ. εἰ μὲν οὖν φιλεῖς, δός· εἰ δὲ φιλαργυρεῖς, μὴ ἐνόχλει. ἔρρωσο.
4.15 [1.40]
Philoumene\textsuperscript{1} to Crito\textsuperscript{2}

Why do you torture yourself with much writing? What you need is fifty pieces of gold and not letters. So if you love me, hand them over; but if you love money, stop bothering me. Farewell.

\textsuperscript{1} A courtesan mentioned in 4.14. \textsuperscript{2} In 3.28 a certain Crito is mentioned, who had sent away his son to study philosophy with undesired results.
4.16 [2.1]
Λάμια Δημητρίῳ

Σὺ ταύτης τῆς παρρησίας αίτιος, τοσούτος ὃν βασιλεὺς εἶτα ἐπιτρέψας καὶ ἐταίρα γράφειν σοι καὶ οὔχ ἡγησάμενος δεινὸν ἐντυγχάνειν τοῖς ἐμοῖς γράμμασιν ὥλη μοι ἐντυγχάνων. ἐγὼ, δέσποτα Δημήτριε, ὅταν μὲν ἔξω σε 5 θεάσωμαι καὶ ἀκοῦσω μετὰ τῶν δορυφόρων καὶ τῶν στρατοπέδων καὶ τῶν πρέσβεων καὶ τῶν διαδημάτων, νὴ τὴν Ἀφροδίτην, πέφρικα καὶ δέδοικα καὶ ταράττομαι, καὶ ἀποστρέφομαι ως τὸν ἦλιον, μῆ ἐπικαῶ τὰ ὅμοια καὶ τότε μοι ὄντως ὁ πολιορκητὴς εἶναι δοκεῖς, Δάματερ. 10

2 οἴον δὲ καὶ βλέπεις τότε, ὡς πικρὸν καὶ πολεμικόν· καὶ ἀπιστῷ ἔμαυτῇ καὶ λέγω “Λάμια, σὺ μετὰ τοῦτο καθεύδεις καὶ λέγω “Λάμια, σὺ μετὰ τοῦτο καθεύδεις; σὺ διὰ νυκτὸς ὅλης αὐτὸν καταυλεῖς; σοὶ νῦν οὕτως ἐπέσταλκε: σοὶ Γνάθαιναν τὴν ἑταίρα συγκρίνει,” καὶ ἠλογημένη σιωπῶ καὶ εὐχομένη σε θεάσομαι παρ᾽ ἑαυτῇ καὶ, ὅταν ἔλθῃς, προσκυνοῦσα. καὶ, ὅταν περιπλακῇς μέγα φιλῆς, πάλιν πρὸς ἐμαυτὴν τὰ ἐναντία λέγω “οὕτως ἐστίν ὁ πολιορκητής; οὕτως ἐστίν ὁ ἐν τοῖς στρατοπέδοις; τοῦτον φοβεῖται Μακεδονία, τοῦτον ἢ Ἑλλάς, τοῦτον ἢ Θρᾴκη; νὴ τὴν Ἀφροδίτην, σήμερον 20 αὐτὸν τοῖς αὐλοῖς ἐκπολιορκήσω καὶ ὄψομαι τί μὲ διαθῆσαι, μᾶλλον εἰς τρίτην.” παρ᾽ ἐμοὶ γὰρ δειπνήσεις, δέομαι, τὰ Ἀφροδίσια. ποιῶ ταῦτα κατ᾽ ἐτοι καὶ ἀγῶνα ἐχὼ εἰ τὰ πρότερα τοῖς ύστεροις νικῶ. ὑποδέξομαι δὴ σε ἐπαφροδίτως καὶ ὡς ἔνι μάλιστα πιθανῶς, ἃν μοι 25 περιουσιάσαι γένηται ύπὸ σοῦ, μηδὲν ἀνάξιον τῶν σῶν

You are the cause of this outspokenness, you who, though you are a mighty king, permit even a courtesan to write to you and don’t think it wrong to have my letters when you’ve had me. I, however, lord Demetrius, when I see you and hear you in public with your bodyguard and your soldiers and your ambassadors and your diadems, then, by Aphrodite, I tremble and I fear and I’m troubled, and I turn away as from the sun, so that I won’t burn my eyes; and then you really seem to be the besieger, by Demeter. How you look then, so fierce and warlike! I distrust myself and say, ‘Lamia, are you sleeping with this man? Are you charming him with your flute all night long? Has this man sent you a message now? Does he compare Gnathaena the courtesan with you?’ In confusion I keep silent and pray to see you at my place, and when you come I greet you. But when you embrace me and kiss me intensely, then again I say to myself just the opposite: ‘Is this the besieger? Is this the military commander? Is this the fear of Macedonia, of Greece, of Thrace? By Aphrodite, today I will force him to surrender with my flute and I will see how he’s going to treat me, or rather the day after tomorrow.’ For you will dine with me (I hope) during Aphrodite’s feast. I do this every year and I hold a contest to see if I can beat my earlier celebrations. I shall welcome you in a manner befitting Aphrodite and as seductively as possible, if you give me the necessary means; after all, I’ve done nothing unworthy of your favour ever since that sacred night, even

1 An Athenian courtesan who was the mistress of Demetrius Poliorcetes, cf. Plut. Demetr. 27 and Ath. 13,577c; also the recipient of 4.17. 2 Demetrius Poliorcetes (337/6–283 BC) was a member of the Antigonid dynasty and king of Macedon 294–288 BC. 3 An Athenian courtesan; the mistress of the comic poet Diphilus (see 4.10.1), cf. Ath. 13,579d–581a, 585a–b.
ἀγαθῶν ἐξ ἐκείνης τῆς ιερᾶς νυκτὸς ἔτι πεποιηκυίᾳ, καί−
5 τοι σοῦ γε ἐπιτρέπουντος ὅπως ἃν βούλωμαι χρήσθαι
τῷ ἐμῷ σώματι· ἀλλὰ κέχρημαι καλῶς καὶ ἀμίκτως πρὸς
ὁποὶ ποιῆσο τὸ ἐταιρικόν, οὐδὲ ψεύσομαι,
δέποτα, ὡς ἂλλαι ποιοῦσιν. ἐμοὶ γὰρ ἐξ ἐκείνου, μὰ
τὴν "Ἀρτεμιν, οὐδὲ προσέπεμψαν ἐτὶ πολλοί οὐδὲ ἐπει−
ρασαν, αἰδούμενοι σοῦ τὰς πολιορκίας.
δὲς ἐστιν Ἑρώς, ὦ βασιλεὺς, καὶ ἐλθεῖν καὶ ἀναπτῇ−
nαι. ἐλπίδας πτεροῦται, καὶ ἀπελπίδας ταχὺ πτεροῦ−
6 ἐν εἰώθεν ἀπογνωσθεῖς. διὸ καὶ μέγα τῶν ἐταιρουσῶν
10 ἐστι σόφισμα, δεῖ τὸ παρὸν τῆς ἀπολαύσεως ὑπερτιθε−
μένας ταῖς ἐλπίδας διακρατεῖν τοὺς ἔραστάς. πρὸς ὑμᾶς δὲ
συν ὑπερτίθεσθαι ἔξεστι, ὡστε φόβον εἶναι κόρου. λοι−
πὼν ἡμᾶς δεῖ τὰ μὲν πονεῖν, τὰ δὲ μαλακίζεσθαι, τὰ δὲ
ἀθεῖν, τὰ δὲ αὐλεῖν, τὰ δὲ ὀρχεῖσθαι, τὰ δὲ δειπνοποιεῖν,
15 τὰ δὲ κοσμεῖσθαι τὸν οἶκον, τὰς δὲ ὑπερωσοῦν ἄλλως
tαχὺ μαραίνομενας μεσολαβοῦσας χρήσεις, ἐνα μάλλον
ἐξάπτωται τοῖς διαστήμασιν αὐαλούστερα αὐτῶν αἱ
ψυχαὶ, φοβουμένων μὴ ἄλλο πάλιν γένηται τῆς ἐν τῷ
παρόντι τύχης κόλυμα.
7 20 ταῦτα δὲ πρὸς μὲν ἐτέρους τάχα ἀν ἐδυνάμην, βασι−
λεὺς, φυλάττεσθαι καὶ τεχνιτεύειν· πρὸς δὲ σε, ὡς ὑμᾶς
ἐξεῖσε ἐπὶ ἐμοί ὡς ἐπιδεικνύναι με καὶ ἀγάλλεσθαι
πρὸς τὰς ἀλλὰς ἑταίρας ὅτι πασῶν ἐγὼ πρωτεύω, μὰ
ς ψηλὰς Μούσας, οὐκ ἂν ὑπομείναιμι πλάττεσθαι· οὕς
25 ὡς ἀφεῖσα πάντα καὶ τὴν ψυχήν ἐμαυτῆς εἰς τὴν σὴν ἀρέσκειαν ὑπερτίθη
νήσαι. εὖ οἶδα γὰρ ὅτι ὑμῶν ἔν τῇ Θηριππίδιου
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though you let me use my body as I see fit. On the contrary, I’ve used it honourably and have not had intercourse with other men. I will not behave like a courtesan, nor will I lie, my lord, like others do. In fact, ever since that time, by Artemis, many no longer send me messages or make an attempt on me, because they fear that you will lay them under siege.

Eros is swift, my king, swift to come and swift to fly away. When he’s hopeful he has wings but when he despairs and has lost all hope he usually sheds his wings right away. That’s why courtesans have a great trick; by constantly postponing the moment of pleasure they have control over their lovers by giving them hope. But with you it’s not possible to postpone, so I fear you will get bored. As a result it is necessary that we, by interrupting intimacies that would otherwise quickly wither, sometimes be busy, at other times be unwell, sing, play the flute, dance, make dinners, decorate the house, so that their souls will get more inflammable from the interruptions and kindle more easily, out of fear that there will be yet another obstacle to their present good fortune.

I might have been able to take these precautions and play these tricks on others, my king; but, by the friendly Muses, I couldn’t bear using these fabrications on you who are so fond of me that you show me openly and boast to the other courtesans that I surpass them all; I’m not that stony-hearted. So even if I gave up everything, even my life, to please you, I’d count the cost as low. For I know very well that the preparation will be talked about not only in the house of Therippides,¹ where I’m going to prepare for you

¹ ‘Wildehorseson’, cf Benner-Fobes (1949) 159. A nouveau riche with this name is mentioned in 3.5.
οἰκία, ἐν ᾗ μέλλω σοι τὸ τῶν Ἀφροδισίων εὐτρεπίζειν δείπνον, ἔσται διαβόητος ἡ παρασκευή, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐν ὅλῃ τῇ Ἀθηναίων πόλει, νὴ τὴν Ἀρτεμιν, καὶ ἐν τῇ Ἑλλάδι πάσῃ. καὶ μάλιστα οἱ μισητοὶ Λακεδαιμόνιοι, ἵνα δοκῶσιν ἂνδρες εἶναι οἱ ἐν Ἐφέσῳ ἀλώπεκες, οὐ παύσονται τοῖς Ταύγετοις ὄρεσι καὶ ταῖς ἐρημίαις ἑαυτῶν διαβάλοντες ἡμῶν τὰ δείπνα καὶ καταλυκουργίζοντες τῆς σῆς ἀνθρωποπαθείας. ἀλλ᾽ αὐτοὶ μὲν χαιρόντων, δέσποτα, σὺ δὲ ἐμοὶ μέμνησο φυλάξαι τὴν ἡμέραν τοῦ δείπνου καὶ τὴν ὥραν ἣν ἂν ἔλη ἀρίστη γὰρ ἥν βούλει. ἔρρωσο.
the banquet of the Aphrodisia festival,¹ but also in the whole city of Athens, by Artemis, and in all of Greece. And most of all, those hateful Spartans on their desolate mountains of Taygetus² will not cease to criticize my banquets or to invoke the laws of Lycurgus³ against your generosity, so that they pass as men who were foxes at Ephesus.⁴ But let them have their way, my lord; you just remember to reserve the day of the banquet and the hour you chose—whichever you decide will be the best. Farewell.

¹ A religious festival celebrated especially by courtesans in honour of Aphrodite Pandemos. ² Mountain range in southern Peloponnesus. ³ The legendary founder of Sparta who was considered one of the greatest lawgivers in antiquity. ⁴ A reference to the Spartan fleet commander Lysander who lived in luxury in Ephesus during the Peloponnesian war. A proverbial saying ‘when they leave Greece, the lions become foxes at Ephesus’ is attributed to Lamia by Ael. VH 13.9, cf. Tsirimbas (1936) 45–6.
Οὐδὲν δυσαρεστότερον, ὡς ἔοικεν, ἐστὶν ἃρτι πάλιν μειρακευμένου πρεσβύτου. οὐά με Ἑπίκουρος οὗτος διοικεῖ πάντα λοιδορῶν, πάντα ὑποπτεύων, ἐπιστολὰς ἀδιαλυτοὺς μοι γράφων, ἐκδίώκων ἕκ τού κήπου. μὰ τὴν 5 Ἀφροδίτην, εἰ Ἄδωνις ἦν, ἢ ὄντως ἐγγὺς ὀγδόηκοντα ἔτη, οὐκ Ἄνι αὐτοῦ ἰσχύοντος καὶ ἐπιστολὰς ἀδιαλυτοὺς καὶ καταπεπιλημένου εἰ μᾶλα πόκοις ἀντὶ πίλων. μέχρι τίνος ὑπομενεῖ τις τὸν φιλόσοφον τούτον; ἐχέτω τὰς περὶ φύσεως αὐτοῦ κυρίας δόξας καὶ τοὺς 10 διεστραμμένους κανόνας: ἐμὲ δὲ ἀφέτω ζῆν, ἡ δὲ Αφροδίτη ἐγνώσατο καὶ ἠθετήσετο. διότι ἐγὼ ἀναστᾶσα ἐπὶ τὸν πολιορκητὴν ἄγριαν ἀνέμειτος ἀναγράφων, καὶ ἀνόικεν τοὐτὸν, οὐχ ἀντὶ τοῦ Λάμια Δημήτριον μὴ γάρ ἐστι σωφρονήσατι διὰ τὸν αὐτοῦ τοῦτον καὶ σωκρατίζει καὶ στομυλεύεσθαι θέλει καὶ 15 εἱρωνεύεσθαι, καὶ Ἀλκιβιάδην τινὰ τὸν Πυθοκλέα νομίζει καὶ Ἑσθιόππην ἐμὲ οἴεται ποιήσειν. καὶ χερτάς ἀναστᾶσα ὅποιποτε γῆν πρὸ γῆς φεύξομαι μᾶλλον ἢ τὰς ἐπιστολὰς αὐτοῦ τὰς ἀδιαπαύστους ἀνέξομαι.

4 δὲ πάντων δεινότατον ἡ ἀπό τοὺς ἀφορητότατον 20 τετόλμηκεν, ὑπὲρ οὗ καὶ γνώμην βουλομένη λαβεῖν τί

Leontium\textsuperscript{1} to Lamia\textsuperscript{2}

Nothing is harder to please, it seems, than an old man who is just starting to behave like a boy again. How this Epicurus is controlling me, criticizing everything, suspecting everything, writing me incomprehensible letters\textsuperscript{3} and chasing me out of his garden.\textsuperscript{4} By Aphrodite, even if he had been an Adonis, though nearly eighty years old, I wouldn’t put up with him, this lice-ridden and sickly man who is all wrapped up in fleece instead of felt. How long must one endure this philosopher? Let him have his \textit{Principal Doctrines on Nature} and his distorted \textit{Canons},\textsuperscript{5} and permit me to live according to nature, my own mistress, without anger and violence. I really have such a besieger, not at all like you, Lamia, have in Demetrius.\textsuperscript{6} It’s not possible to lead a virtuous life on account of this man. He wants to be a Socrates with his chatter and irony, and he believes Pythocles is an Alcibiades and thinks he can make me his Xanthippe.\textsuperscript{7} I will end up leaving for whatever place and flee from land to land rather than to endure his incessant letters.

But now he has ventured into the most terrible and intolerable act of all, which is why I’m writing to you, hop-

\textsuperscript{1} An Athenian courtesan who was a student and mistress of Epicurus, cf. Ath. 13.588b; later the mistress of Metrodorus (see 4.17.10), cf. Diog. Laer. 10.5–6, 23. \textsuperscript{2} An Athenian courtesan who was the mistress of Demetrius Poliorcetes, cf. Plut. Demet. 27 and Ath. 13.577c; also the sender of 4.16. \textsuperscript{3} Perhaps ‘indestructible (i.e. well-sealed) letters’ as a pun on Epicurus’ theory of atoms, cf. Epicurus \textit{Ep. Hdt.} 54. \textsuperscript{4} The school of Epicurus (342/1–271/0 BC) was located in a garden outside the walls of Athens near the Dipylon Gate. \textsuperscript{5} Works by Epicurus; the first title is actually two separate works, the \textit{Principal Doctrines} and \textit{On Nature}, cf. Diog. Laert. 10.27, 30. \textsuperscript{6} Demetrius Poliorcetes (337/6–283 BC) was a member of the Antigonid dynasty and king of Macedon 294–288 BC. \textsuperscript{7} For the attraction between Socrates and Alcibiades, cf. Pl. \textit{Symp.} 219b–d. Pythocles (c. 300 BC) was a student of Epicurus and according to some sources Epicurus was in love with him, cf. Diog. Laert. 10.5. Epicurus dedicated a letter to him which is preserved in Diog. Laert. 10.84–116. Xanthippe was the wife of Socrates.
μοι ποιητέον ἐπέσταλκα σοι· Τίμαρχον τὸν καλὸν οἶσθα τὸν Κηφισιάθεν. οὔκ ἄρνούμαι πρὸς τὸν νεανίσκον οἰκεῖως ἐξειν—ἐκ πολλοῦ πρὸς σὲ μοι τάληθη, Λάμια—καὶ τὴν πρῶτην ἀφροδίτην ἐμαθον παρ’ αὐτού σχεδὸν οὔτος γάρ με διεπαιρεθένεαν ἐκ γειτόνων οίκ- 5 οὖσαν. ἦς ἐκείνου τοῦ χρόνον πάντα μοι τάγαθα πέμπων οὐ διαλέλοιπεν, ἐσθῆτα, χρυσία, θεραπαίνας θεράποντας Ἰνδός Ἰνδᾶς. τάλλα σιωτώ. ἀλλὰ τὰ μικρύστατα προλαμβάνει τᾶς ὀρας, ἕνα μηδεῖς φθάσῃ με γευσάμενος. τοιούτων οὖν ἐραστὴν “ἀπόκλεισον” φησὶ “καὶ μὴ προσ- 10 ἵτω σοί”, ποιοὶς δοκεῖς αὐτόν ἀποκαλῶν ὀνόμασιν; οὔτε ὃς Ἀττικὸς οὔτε ὃς φιλόσοφος *** ἢ Καππαδοκίας πρ- 6 ώτος εἰς τὴν Ἑλλάδα ἤκων. ἐγὼ μὲν εἰ καὶ ὄλη γένοιτο ἢ Ἀθηναίων πόλις Ἐπικούρων, μὰ τὴν Ἄρτεμιν, ὃς ἄργοστατήσω πάντα αὐτοὺς πρὸς τὸν Τιμάρχου βραχ- 15 ίναι, μᾶλλον δὲ οὐδὲ πρὸς τὸν δάκτυλον.

τὶ σὺ λέγεις Λάμια; οὔκ ἄληθη ταῦτα; οὐ δικαῖα φημι: καὶ μὴ δὴ, δέομαι σου πρὸς τής Ἀφροδίτης, μὴ σοι ταῦτα ὑπελθέτων “ἀλλὰ φιλόσοφος, ἀλλὰ ἐπιφανής, ἀλλὰ πολλοῖς φίλοις κεχρημένος.” λαβέτω καὶ ἄχω, διδα- 20 σκέτω δ’ ἄλλους: ἐμὲ δὲ οὔδεν θάλπει τὶ δόξα, ἀλλ’ ὃ θέλω· (θέλω) δὲ Τίμαρχον, Δάματερ. ἀλλὰ καὶ δι’ ἐμὲ πάντα ἠνάγκαστα τὸ νεανίσκος καταλιπών, τὸ Λύκειον καὶ τὴν ἑαυτοῦ νεότητα καὶ τοὺς συνεφήβους καὶ τὴν ἑταιρείαν, μετ’ αὐτοῦ ζῆν καὶ κολακεύειν αὐτὸν καὶ 25 καθυμεῖν τὰς ὑπηνέμους αὐτοὶ δόξας. ὁ Ἀτρεὺς οὗτος, ἔξελθε φησίν ἐκ τῆς ἑμῆς μοναγρίας καὶ μὴ πρόσιθι Λεοντίῳ. ἄλλ’ ός οὐ δικαιοτέρον ἐκείνου ἐρούντος “σὺ μὲν

ing you’ll tell me what to do. You know that handsome fellow Timarchus from Cephisia.¹ I don’t deny that I’m quite familiar with the young man (I have for a long time been truthful to you, Lamia) and I almost got my first lesson in love from him; he took my virginity when I was living next door. Since that time he has never ceased sending me all sorts of nice things like clothes, gold, Indian maids and Indian servants. I won’t mention the rest. But he anticipates the seasons in the smallest delicacies, so that nobody may taste them before I do. So that’s the kind of lover about whom Epicurus says, ‘Shut him out and don’t let him come near you.’ What kind of names do you think he’s calling him? Not as an Athenian or a philosopher *** or of Cappadocia coming to Greece for the first time.² Even if the whole city of Athens were full of Epicures, by Artemis, I wouldn’t weigh them all against Timarchus’s arm, or even against his finger!

What do you say, Lamia? Isn’t this true? Am I not right? And don’t, I beg of you by Aphrodite, don’t let this answer enter your mind: ‘But he’s a philosopher, he’s distinguished, he has many friends.’ He may even take what I have, and teach others. It is not doctrine that warms me, but the object of my desire, and I desire Timarchus, by Demeter! What’s more, on account of me the young man has been forced to abandon everything, the Lyceum, his youth, his comrades and friends, in order to live with Epicurus and flatter him and chant his windy doctrines. This Atreus says, ‘Get out of my realm and don’t approach Leontium!’ Like it wouldn’t be more fair if Timarchus said ‘No, don’t you approach mine!’ And the man who is young

¹ Possibly an Epicurean; Metrodorus (see 4.17.10) addresses a Timarchus in Plut. Adv. Col. 1117B. Cephisia was a deme in north central Attica.
8 οὖν μὴ πρόσιθι τῇ ἐμῇ." καί ὁ μὲν νεανίσκος ὃν ἄνέχε- 
tai τὸν ὑστερον ἀντεραστὴν γέροντα, ὁ δὲ τὸν δικαιό-
terον οὐχ ὑπομένει.

τί ποιήσω, πρὸς τῶν θεῶν ἱκετεύω σε Λάμια. νὴ τὰ 
μυστήρια, νὴ τὴν τούτων τῶν κακῶν ἀπαλλαγὴν, ώς 5 
ἐνθυμηθεῖσα τοῦ Τιμάρχου τὸν χωρισμὸν ἄρτι ἀπέψυ-
γμαι καὶ Ίδρωκα τὰ ἄκρα καὶ ἡ καρδία μου ἀνέστρα-
pται. δέομαι σου, δέξαι με πρὸς σεαυτὴν ἡμέρας ὀλίγας, 
καὶ ποιήσω τὸν τούτου αἰσθάνεσθαι πηλίκων ἀπήλαυν 
ἀγάθων ἔχων ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ με. καὶ σοὶ μὴ ποιήσω τὸν 
kόρον, 10 
εὐ οἶδα· προς σεαυτὴν ἡμέρας μὴ διαπέμπω τοῦ 
τρόδωρον καὶ "Εμαρχον καὶ Πολύαινον. ποσάκις οἶει με, 
Λάμια, πρὸς αὐτοῦ ἔδοξα παραγενομένην εἰπεῖν "τί ποιεῖς 
ἐν Τιμάρχου τὸ ν χωρισμὸν ἄριτ ἀπέψυγμαι καὶ ἵδρωκα τὰ ἄκρα 
καὶ μὴ ποιήσω τὸν Τίμαρχον. ἔρρωσο.
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puts up with his elderly rival, the latecomer, but the other can’t stand him who has a more rightful claim.

By the gods, I implore you, Lamia, what should I do? By the mysteries, by the release from these misfortunes, when I think about my separation from Timarchus I immediately turn cold, my hands and feet begin to sweat and my heart turns upside down. I beg you, take me into your house for a few days, and I’ll make him aware of what good things he was enjoying with me in the house. He’s not going to stand the boredom any more; that I know for sure. He will immediately send out Metrodorus, Hermarchus and Polyaenus as ambassadors.¹ How often, Lamia, do you think I’ve told him in private: ‘What are you doing, Epicurus? Don’t you know how Timocrates, the brother of Metrodorous,² is making fun of you because of this, in the assembly, in the theatre, in front of the other sophists?’ But what can I do with this man? He’s shameless in his desire, and I’m going to be just like him, shameless, and not let go of my Timarchus. Farewell.

¹ Students of Epicurus; Hermarchus was the successor of Epicurus, cf. Diog. Laert. 10.15. ² Metrodurus (331/330–278/7 BC) was an Epicurean philosopher; his brother Timocrates (c. 300 BC) was a pupil and later a critic of Epicurus.
Μένανδρος Γλυκέρᾳ

Ἐγὼ μὰ τὰς Ἐλευσινίας θεὰς, μὰ τὰ μυστήρια αὐτῶν, ἃ σοι καὶ ἕκαστιν ἔκεινών ὡμοσα πολλάκις, Γλυκέρᾳ, μόνος μόνη, ὡς οὐδὲν ἔπαρω τὰ ἐμὰ, οὐδὲ βουλόμενός σοι χαρίζεσθαι ταύτα καὶ λέγω καὶ γράφω· τί γὰρ ἐμοὶ χωρὶς σοῦ γένοιτ᾽ ἂν ἥδιον; τί δ᾽ ἐπαρθῆναι μεῖζον δυναίμην τῆς σῆς φιλίας, εἰ καὶ τὸ ἔσχατον ἡμῶν γῆρας διὰ τοὺς σοὺς τρόπους καὶ τὰ ἂντικροῦσας αὐτῶν νεότης ἀεὶ φανεῖται μοι· καὶ συννεάσασαι ἄλληλοις καὶ συγγνώμασαις, καὶ, νὴ τοὺς θεοὺς, δυναίμην τῆς σῆς φιλίας, εἰ καὶ τὸ ἔσχατον ἡμῶν γῆρας διὰ τοὺς σοὺς τρόπους καὶ τὰ ἂντικροῦσας αὐτῶν νεότης ἀεὶ φανεῖται σοι· τί γὰρ ἂντικροῦσας αὐτῶν νεότης ἀεὶ φανεῖται συννεάσαις μοι· καὶ συναποθάνομεν ἀλλήλοις καὶ συγγνώμασαις, καὶ, νὴ τοὺς θεοὺς, συναποθάνομεν, ἀλλ᾽ αἰσθανόμενοι, Γλυκέρᾳ, ὃτι συναποθνήσκομεν, ἵνα μηδετέρῳ ἐν Αἴδου συγκαταβαίη τις ζῆλος, εἰ τὶνων ἄλλων ὁ σωθεὶς πειράσεται ἀγαθῶν. μὴ δὴ γένοιτο μοι πειραθῆναι σοῦ μηκέτ' οὕς: τί γὰρ ἂντικροῦσας αὐτῶν νεότης ἀεὶ φανεῖται συναποθάνομεν; ἕπειξέ δὲ τὰς συνήθεις ἀσθενείας, ἃς οἱ μὴ φιλοῦντές με τρυφὰς καὶ σαλακωνίας καλεῖν εἰώθασιν — ἐπιστεῖλαί σοι ἐν ἄστει μενούσῃ διὰ τὰ Ἁλ ῦα τῆς θεοῦ, τὰ δὲ γράμματα τῶν Πειραιαίων ἐπιστεῖλαί μοι τοῦ βασιλέως Αἰγύπτου Πτολεμαίου τοῦ βασιλέως, τά δὲ γράμματα ταῦτα τὰ τῆς γῆς ἀγαθὰ καὶ ἐμὲ καὶ Φιλήμονα· καὶ γὰρ ἐκείνῳ γράμματα κεκομίσθαι φασί· καὶ αὐτὸς δὲ οἱ Φιλήμων ἐπέστειλεν διὰ τοῦτο ἀλλ᾽ εἰ ἂν τὸ τῆς γῆς ἀγαθόν·
By the Eleusinian goddesses, by their mysteries,—on which I have often sworn to you even in their presence, Glycera, when we were alone—I swear that I don’t glorify myself or say and write this wishing to please you; for what pleasure would there be for me without you? What could excite me more than your love, if our autumn of life will forever seem to me as youth thanks to your manner and character? Let us be young together, grow old together and, by the gods, die together, provided we realize that we’re dying together, Glycera, so that neither of us may become jealous in Hades if the survivor is going to enjoy further good things. But may I never enjoy them when you are no more; for what good would then be left?

What is now urging me to write to you who are in the city celebrating the Haloa of the goddess, as I am lying sick in Piraeus (you know about my usual weakness, which my enemies tend to call luxuriousness and snobbery) is the following. I have received a letter from Ptolemy, the king of Egypt, in which he begs me in every way and—promising in a royal fashion ‘all the goods of the earth’, as the saying goes—urges both me and Philemon. For they say that he too has received a letter, and Philemon himself has written to me, revealing that his own invitation was simpler in style.
6 νάνδρῳ γεγραμμένα ἦττον λαμπρά. ἀλλ’ ὀψεῖται καὶ
βουλεύσεται τά ἰδία οὕτω.

ἐγὼ δὲ οὐ περιμενῶ βουλάς, ἀλλὰ σὺ μοι, Γλυκέρα,
καὶ γνώμη καὶ Ἀρεσπαγγίτις βουλὴ καὶ Ἡλιαία, ἀπαντα,
νὴ τὴν Ἀθηνᾶν, δεὶ γέγονας καὶ νῦν ἔσῃ. τάς μὲν οὖν 5
ἐπιστολὰς τοῦ βασιλέως σοι διεπεμψάμην, ἵνα μὴ κόπτω
σε δις καὶ τοῖς ἐμοῖς καὶ τοῖς ἐκείνου γράμμασιν ἐντυγ-
χάνουσαν· ᾧ δὲ ἐπιστέλλειν αὐτῷ ἤγενοκα, βουλομαὶ σε
εἰδέναι.

8 πλεῖν μὲν καὶ εἰς Αἴγυπτον ἀπιέναι μακρὰν οὕτω καὶ
ἀπωκισμένην βασιλείαν οὔωσιν, μὰ τοὺς δώδεκα θεοὺς,
οὔδὲ ἐνθυμοῦμαι. ἀλλ’ οὔδὲ εἰ ἐν Αἰγίνῃ ταύτῃ γε τῇ
πλησίον ἔκειτο Αἴγυπτος, οὔδ’ οὕτως ἐν νῷ ἀν ἔσχον
ἀμφότεροι τῆς ἐμην βασιλείαν τῆς σῆς φιλίας μόνος ἐν
tοσούτῳ ὄχλῳ Αἰγυπτίων χωρὶς Γλυκέρας ἐρημιάν 10

9 πολυάνθρωπον ὄραν. ἥδιον γὰρ καὶ ἀκινδυνότερον τὰς
σὰς θεραπεύω μάλλον ἁγκάλας ἢ τὰς ἁπάντων τῶν
σατραπῶν καὶ βασιλέων· ἐπικίνδυνον μὲν τὸ ἀνε-
λεύθερον, εὐκαταφρόνητον δὲ τὸ κολακεῦον, ἀπιστόν δὲ
τὸ εὐτυχοῦμενον. ἐγὼ δὲ καὶ τὰς Θηρικλείους καὶ τὰ 20
καρχήσια καὶ τὰς χρυσίδας καὶ πάντα τὰ ἐν ταῖς αὐλαῖς
ἐπίφθονα παρὰ τούτων Ἀθηνῶν, καὶ τὸν Διόνυσον καὶ
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and less ornamental since it wasn’t written to Menander. But he will have to look after himself and make his own decisions.

I’m not going to wait for advice, since you, Glycera, have always been and now will be my judgment, my Areopagus council¹ and my Heliastic court,² my everything, by Athena. I have forwarded the king’s letter to you so that I won’t bother you twice, meeting with both my letter and his. But I want you to know what I’ve decided to write to him.

Setting sail and departing for Egypt, such a vast and distant kingdom, I’m not even considering, by the twelve gods! Even if Egypt was in Aegina³ here nearby, even then I wouldn’t think of leaving my kingdom of your love, alone in a large crowd of Egyptians without Glycera, looking upon a crowded desert. With greater pleasure and less danger I pay court to your embraces rather than those of all the satraps and kings. Servility is dangerous, flattery is contemptible and success is treacherous. As for the Thericlean cups,⁴ beakers, golden plates and all the good things born among these which are looked upon with jealousy at the courts, I would not take them in exchange for the yearly Pitcher feast,⁵ for the Lenaea festival in the theatres,⁶ for the singing at the sheaf-gathering yesterday,⁷ for the exercises in the Lyceum⁸ and for the sacred Academy,⁹ by Dionysus and his Bacchic ivy leaves, with

¹ Consisted of ex-archons who met on the Ares Hill, north-west of the Acropolis.  
² The public assembly in Athens which was composed of jurors selected from Athenian citizens.  
³ An island in the Saronic Gulf about 16 nautical miles from Pireus.  
⁴ Thericles (late 5th or early 4th cent. BC) was a famous Corinthian potter whose work was often praised in antiquity.  
⁵ The second day of the Anthesteria, a spring festival celebrating Dionysus.  
⁶ A festival held in January/February celebrating Dionysus with processions and competitions in tragedy and comedy.  
⁷ The meaning of ἀμαλογία is uncertain; perhaps it should be translated ‘idle talk’.  
⁸ A public gymnasium outside the city walls of Athens where Aristotle founded his school in the late 4th cent. BC.  
⁹ A public gymnasium outside the city walls of Athens where Plato founded his school in the early 4th cent. BC.
τοὺς βακχικοὺς αὐτοῦ κισσούς, οἷς στεφανωθῆναι μᾶλλον ἢ τοῖς Πτολεμαίου βούλομαι διαδήμασιν, ὅρωσις καὶ καθημένης ἐν τῷ θεάτρῳ Γλυκέρας. ποῦ γὰρ ἐν Αἴγυ-πτῳ δῷσιν ἐκκλησίαν καὶ ψήφον ἀναδιδομένην; ποῦ δὲ δημοκρατικὸν ὅχλον οὕτως ἑλευθεριάζοντα; ποῦ δὲ 5 θεσμοθέτας ἐν τοῖς ίεραις κόμαις κεκισσωμένους; ποίον περισχοίνισμα; ποίαν αἵρεσιν; ποῖος Χύτρους, Κεραμεικόν, ἄγοραν, δικαστήρια, τὴν καλὴν ἀκρόπολιν, τὰς σεμνὰς θεὰς, τὰ μυστήρια, τὴν γειτνιῶσαν Σαλαμῖνα, τὰ στενὰ, τὴν Ψυτταλίαν, τὸν Μαραθῶνα, ὅλην ἐν τοῖς 10 Ἀθῆναις τὴν Ἑλλάδα, ὅλην τὴν Ἰωνίαν, τὰς Κυκλάδας 11 πάσας; ἀφεὶς τὰῦτα καὶ Γλυκέραν μετ᾽ αὐτῶν εἰς Αἴγυ-πτον διέλθω χρυσὸν λαβεῖν καὶ ἄργυρον καὶ πλοῦτον; ὦ μετὰ τίνος χρήσομαι; μετὰ Γλυκέρας τοσοῦτον διατε-θαλασσευμένης; οὐ πενία δὲ μοι ἔσται χωρὶς αὐτῆς 13 ταῦτα; ἐὰν δὲ ἀκούσω τοὺς σεμνοὺς ἔρωτας εἰς ἄλλον αὐτὴν μετατεθεικέναι, οὐ σπόδος μοι πάντες οἱ θησαυροί γενήσονται; καὶ ἀποθνήσκων τὰς μὲν λύπας ἐμαυτῷ συναποίσω, τὰ δὲ χρήματα τοῖς ἰσχύουσιν ἀδικεῖν ἐν 15 μέσῳ κείσεται.

ἠ μέγα τὸ συμβιοῦν Πτολεμαίῳ καὶ σατράπαις καὶ τοιούτοις ψόφοις, ὅν οὐτε τὸ φιλικὸν βέβαιον οὐτε τὸ διεχθρεῦον ἀκίνδυνον. ἐὰν δὲ διοργισθῇ τί μοι Γλυκέρα, ἅπαξ αὐτὴν ἁρπάσας κατεφί λησα· ἂν ἔτι ὀργίζηται, μᾶλλον αὐτὴν ἐβιασάμην· κἂν βαρυθύμως ἔχῃ, δεδάκρυκα· καὶ πρὸς ταῦτ᾽ οὐκέθ᾽ ὑπομείνασα τὰς ἐμὰς λύπας δεῖται λοιπόν οὐτε στρατιώτας ἔχουσα ὁποῖος ἀδικεῖν ὑπομείνασα, τὸς ἰσχύουσαν ἀδικεῖν ἐν 20 μέσῳ κείσεται.

ἢ μέγα καὶ συμβιοῦν Πτολεμαίῳ καὶ σατράπαις καὶ τοιούτοις ψόφοις, ὅν οὐτε τὸ φιλικὸν βέβαιον οὐτε τὸ διεχθρεῦον ἀκίνδυνον. ἐὰν δὲ διοργισθῇ τί μοι Γλυκέρα, ἅπαξ αὐτὴν ἁρπάσας κατεφί λησα· ἂν ἔτι ὀργίζηται, μᾶλλον αὐτὴν ἐβιασάμην· κἂν βαρυθύμως ἔχῃ, δεδάκρυκα· καὶ πρὸς ταῦτ᾽ οὐκέθ᾽ ὑπομείνασα τὰς ἐμὰς λύπας δεῖται λοιπόν οὐτε στρατιώτας ἔχουσα ὁποῖος ἀδικεῖν ὑπομείνασα, τὸς ἰσχύουσαν ἀδικεῖν ἐν 20 μέσῳ κείσεται.

ἤ μέγα καὶ θαυμαστὸν ἰδεῖν τὸν καλὸν Νεῖλον· οὐ
which I would rather be crowned than with the diadems of Ptolemy, as Glycera is watching and sitting in the theatre. Where in Egypt will I see an assembly or a question being put up for vote? Where will I find a democratic crowd with so much freedom? Where will I find junior archons wreathed with ivy in their sacred hair? What roped enclosure will I find?1 What election? What pot-feast,2 Ceramicus,3 market place, jury courts, lovely Acropolis, honoured Goddesses,4 Mysteries, neighbouring Salamis, the Narrows,5 Psyttalia,6 Marathon,7 all Greece in Athens, all Ionia, all the Cycladic Islands? Shall I abandon these and Glycera with them, and go to Egypt to get gold, silver and riches? With whom shall I enjoy this? With Glycera who is so far separated from me by the sea? Will not these things seem like poverty without her? Moreover, if I hear that she has transferred her noble love to another man, will not all my treasures become dust? And when I die, I will carry my sorrows with me and my property is going to lie in the open for those who have the power to do wrong.

Surely it’s a great thing to live with Ptolemy and satraps and big shots like that, whose friendship isn’t constant and whose enmity isn’t without risk. But if Glycera is angry with me for something, I just grab her and give her a kiss; if she continues to be angry, I force her even more, and if she’s sulky, I am all tears. And therefore, when she no longer endures my tears she finally begs me, since she has neither soldiers, spearmen nor guards, for I am everything to her.

Surely it’s a great and wondrous thing to see the beauti-

---

1 Roped enclosures were used during religious festivals and political events; it is not clear which one is referred to here.  2 The third day of the Anthesteria.  3 The potters’ quarters in Athens and the site of an important cemetery.  4 Euphemism for the Erinyes/Furies who had a sanctuary near the Acropolis.  5 Passage between Salamis and Attica.  6 A rocky island between Salamis and Pireus.  7 A deme on the east coast of Attica.
μέγα δὲ καὶ τὸν Εὐφράτην ἰδεῖν; οὐ μέγα δὲ καὶ τὸν Ἰστρον; οὐ τῶν μεγάλων καὶ ὁ Θερμώδως, ὁ Τίγρις, ὁ Ἀλυς, ὁ Ρήνος; εἰ μέλλω πάντας τοὺς ποταμοὺς ὁρᾶν, καταβαπτισθήσεται μοι τὸ ζῆν μὴ βλέποντι μοι Γλυκέραν. ὁ δὲ Νεῖλος οὕτως, καίπερ ὅν καλὸς, ἀλλ᾽ ἀποτεθηρίωται, καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν οὐδὲ προσελθεῖν αὐτοῦ ταῖς δίναις ἐλλοχωμένου τοσοῦτοις κακοῖς.

ἐμοὶ γένοιτο, βασιλεῦ Πτολεμαίε, τὸν Ἀττικόν ἰδεῖ στεφθαι κισσόν. ἐμοὶ γένοιτο χῶματος καὶ τάφου πατρῶν τυχεῖν καὶ τὸν ἐπὶ ἐσχάρας ύμνήσαι κατ᾽ ἐτος 10 Διόνυσον, τὸς μυστηριώτιδας ἄγειν τελετάς, δραματουργεῖν τι καίνοι ταῖς ἐπιστοι καὶ ταῖς ποταμοῖς, γελῶντα καὶ χαίροντα καὶ ἀγωνιῶντα καὶ νικῶντα. Φιλήμων δὲ εὐτυχεῖτο καὶ τὰμα ἁγαθὰ γενόμενος ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ. οὐκ ἔχει Φιλήμων Γλυκέραν τινά, οὐδὲ ἄξιος ἦν ἴσως τοιοῦτου ἀγαθοῦ. 15

σὺ δὲ ἐκ τῶν Ἁλῴων, δέομαι, Γλυκέριον, εὐθὺς πετομένη πρὸς ἡμᾶς ἐπὶ τῆς θάλασσας φέρου. μακροτέραν ἑορτὴν οὐδὲποτε οὐδὲ ἀκαιροτέραν. Δήμητρ, ἵλεως γενοῦ. 20
ful Nile; but isn’t it also great to see the Euphrates?¹ And
isn’t it also great to see the Ister?² Aren’t Thermodon,³ the
Tigris,⁴ the Halys,⁵ the Rhine⁶ among the mighty rivers? If I
intend to see all the rivers, my life will be completely sub-
merged and I won’t see Glycera. This river Nile, though
beautiful, is full of savage beasts, and it’s not even possible
to go into its eddy since it has so many dangers lying in amb-
bush.

May I always be crowned with attic ivy, king Ptolemy.
May I have a mound and grave in my own country, and
every year sing in honour of Dionysos at the hearth, per-
form the rites of the Mysteries and put up a new play at the
annual stage-performances, laughing, rejoicing, contend-
ing, fearing defeat, and winning. Philemon may even have
the good fortune to obtain my goods when he’s in Egypt.
Philemon doesn’t have a Glycera and perhaps he wasn’t
worthy of such a treasure.

But you, my little Glycera, please come to me flying on
your saddled mule as soon as the harvest festival is over. I
have never seen a longer or more ill-timed festival. Demeter, please forgive me!

¹ The more westerly of the two rivers which enclose Mesopotamia. ² The
Danube. ³ Probably the Terme river in Asia Minor. ⁴ The more easterly of the
two rivers which enclose Mesopotamia. ⁵ The longest river in Asia minor.
Γλυκέρα Μενάνδρῳ

Ὡς διεπέμψω μοι τοῦ βασιλέως τὰς ἐπιστολὰς, εὐθὺς ἀνέγνων. μὰ τὴν Καλλιγένειαν ἐν ἡ νῦν εἰμι, κατέχαιρον, Μένανδρε, ἐκπαλῆς ύπὸ ἠδονῆς γινομένη καὶ τὰς παρούσας οὐκ ἐλάνθανον. ἤν δὲ ἢ τε μῆτηρ μου καὶ ἢ 5 ἐτέρα ἄδελφη Ἐὐφρόνιον καὶ τῶν φίλων ἦν οἶσθα· καὶ παρὰ σοὶ ἐδείπνησε πολλάκις καὶ ἐπῆνες αὐτῆς τῶν ἐπιχώριον ἀττικισμόν, ἀλλ᾽ ὡς φοβούμενος αὐτὴν ἐπαινεῖν—ὅτε καὶ μειδίασασα θερμότερον σε κατεφίλησα—οὐ μέμνησαι, Μένανδρε; 10

2 θεασάμεναι δε με παρὰ τὸ εἰωθὸς καὶ τῷ προσώπῳ καὶ τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς χαίρουσαν “ὦ Γλυκέριον” ἱραμεν “τί σοι τηλικοῦτον γέγονεν ἀγαθόν, ὅτι καὶ ψυχή καὶ σώματι καὶ πάσιν ἄλλοιστέρα νῦν ἡμίν πέφηνας καὶ τὸ σῶμα γεγάνωσας καὶ διαλάμπεις, ἐπιχώριτὸν τι καὶ νὰθεται;” καγὼ “Μένανδρον” ἔφθα ὑ τὸ ἐμὸν ἄν ὁ Ἀιγύπτου βασιλεὺς Πτολεμαῖος ἐπὶ τῷ ἡμίσι τῆς βασιλείας τρόπον τινὰ μεταπέμπεται” μεῖζον τῇ φωνῇ φθεγξαμένη καὶ σφοδροτέρα, ὅπως πᾶσιν ἀκοῦσωσιν αἱ παροῦσαι. καὶ ταῦτα ἔλεγον ἐγὼ διατινάσσουσα καὶ σοβοῦσα ταῖς χερσὶν ἐμαυτῆς τὴν ἐπιστολὴν σὺν τῇ βασιλικῇ σφραγίδι. 20

3 χαίρεις οὖν ἀπολειπομένη;” ἔφρασαν. τὸ δὲ οὐκ ἦν, Μένανδρε. ἀλλὰ τοῦτο μὲν οὐδὲν τρόπῳ μά τὸς θεάς, οὐδ᾽ εἰ ὑπαλλήλης καὶ τὸ λεγόμενον φθέγξατο, πεισθείν ἄν ὅτι βουλήσεται μὲ ποτε ἢ δυνήσεται Μένανδρος ἀπολιττῶν ἐν Ἀθήναις Γλυκέραν τὴν ἐαυτοῦ μόνος ἐν Ἀιγύπτῳ βασιλεύειν μετὰ πάντων τῶν ἀγαθῶν.

4.19 [2.4]

4.19 [2.4]
Glycera¹ to Menander²

As soon as you sent over the King’s letter, I read it. By Calligenea,³ in whose hands I now am, I rejoiced, Menander, and was beside myself with pleasure and it did not go unnoticed by those present. My mother was there and one of my two sisters, Euphronium, and one of my girlfriends whom you know; she often dined at your house and you praised her local Attic wit, but as if fearing to praise her—the time when I smiled at you and gave you a hotter kiss than usual—don’t you remember, Menander?

When they saw the unusual happiness in my face and my eyes they asked me, ‘Dear Glycera, what great good fortune has come to you, charming and desirable, that you now seem like a different person in soul, body and every aspect and your body is radiant and shining?’ ‘Ptolemy,⁴ the King of Egypt’, I replied, ‘has invited my Menander, promising, in a way, half his kingdom’, raising my voice and speaking with more emphasis so that all present would hear. And as I said this I was shaking and brandishing in my hands the letter with the royal seal. ‘You rejoice in being deserted?’ they asked. But this wasn’t the case, Menander. I would in no way whatsoever, by the gods, be convinced of this, not even if the proverbial ox would speak to me,⁵ that Menander would ever want to or be able to leave his Glycera in Athens and alone rule in Egypt in the midst of all its wealth.

¹ A character in comedy and a famous courtesan of the 4th cent. BC who was the mistress of Harpalus, the treasurer of Alexander the Great; the sender of 4.2 and recipient of 4.18. ² An Athenian dramatist (c. 342–291 BC); the best known representative of Attic New Comedy; the sender of 4.18 and mentioned in 4.2. ³ The goddess of the beautiful birth and the name of the third day of the Thesmophoria festival, cf. 2.37.2. ⁴ Probably Ptolemy I Soter (367/6–282 BC), who invited Menander to Alexandria according to Plin. HN 7.30.111. ⁵ For the speaking ox as a prodigy, cf. Livy 35.21.4 and App. B Civ. 4.1.4; see also Tsirimbas (1936) 46–7.
ἀλλὰ καὶ τοῦτό γε δῆλος ἐκ τῶν ἐμπιστολῶν ὑν ἀνέγνων ὢν ὁ βασιλεὺς, τάμα πεπυμένος, ὡς ἐοικε, περὶ σοῦ, καὶ ἀτρέμα δι’ ὑπονοιῶν Αἰγυπτίοις θέλων ἄττικισμοις σε διατωθάζειν. χαίρω διὰ τοῦτο, ὃτι πεπλεύκασι καὶ εἰς Αἰγυπτον πρὸς αὐτὸν οἱ ἥμετεροι ἔρωτες καὶ πεῖθεται πάντως ἐξ ὧν ἰκουσεν ἄδυνατα σπουδάζειν ἐπιθυμοι Ἄθηνας πρὸς αὐτὸν διαβήναι. τί γὰρ Ἂθηνα ἔφην, τοῦτ᾽ ἦν Μένανδρε, ὦτι οὐκ ἀρα Γλυκέρα μόνον ἀλλὰ καὶ βασιλεῖς ὑπερθάλασσοι ἐρῶσί σου, καὶ διαπόντιοι φῆμαι τὰς σὰς ἀρετὰς κατηγγέλκασι. καὶ Αἰγυπτός καὶ Νεῖλος καὶ Πρωτέως ἀκρωτήρια καὶ οἱ Φάριαι σκοπιαὶ πάντα μετέωρα νῦν, βουλόμεναι νῦν, εἰ μὴ ἐν ἄστει παρὰ Γλυκέρᾳ γένοιτο καὶ τὴν ἐμὴν εὐδαιμονίαν ἴδοιεν, τὸν πάντῃ διὰ τὸ κλέος αὐτοῦ Μένανδρον καὶ νύκτωρ καὶ μεθ᾽ ἡμέραν ἑμοὶ περικείμενον.

ὁ μὴν ἀλλ᾽ ἐγεὶ ἄρα πόθος αἱρεῖ σὲ καὶ τῶν ἑκεῖ ἀγαθῶν καὶ εἰ μηδενὸς ἀλλου τῆς γε Αἰγύπτου, χρήμα-
However, judging from the letter I read, the King obviously had heard about this, my relationship with you, it seems, and he wanted to tease you slightly by insinuation with his Egyptian Attic wit. I’m delighted about this, that our love has sailed over to him in Egypt; and by what he has heard he’s certainly convinced that he’s striving for the impossible when he wants Athens to come over to him. For what would Athens be without Menander? And what would Menander be without Glycera? I, who set the masks in order for him and put on the clothes, and who stand behind the scenes squeezing my fingers and trembling until the theatre breaks into applause. Then, by Artemis, I recover my breath and embrace you, the blessed head of these plays, and take you in my arms.

But what gave me pleasure then, as I told my friends, was this, Menander, that not only Glycera but also kings across the sea love you, and that your fame overseas proclaims your excellence. Both Egypt, the Nile, the promontories of Proteus\(^1\) and the lighthouse of Pharos\(^2\) are now all in suspense, wishing to see Menander and hear the misers, the lovers, the superstitious, the faithless, the fathers, the sons, the servants and every character that appears on the stage. These they will hear, but they will not see Menander, unless they should come to Glycera in town and see my happiness; the Menander who is known everywhere because of his fame and lies in my arms night and day.

Nevertheless, if a desire for the good things over there possesses you, or, if for nothing else, just for Egypt, a great

---

2. One of the seven wonders of the world; built by Sostratus between 299 and 279 BC.
τοῖς μεγάλοις, καὶ τῶν αὐτῶι πυραμίδων καὶ τῶν ἡχούντων ἄγαλματων καὶ τοῦ περιβόητου λαβυρῖνθου καὶ τῶν ἀλλών ὅσα ὑπὸ χρόνου ἢ τέχνης παρ’ αὐτοῖς τίμια, δέομαι σου Μένανδρε, μὴ ποιήσῃ με πρόφασιν·
8 μηδὲ με Άθηναιοι διὰ ταῦτα μισησάτωσαν ἢδη τοὺς μεδίμνους ἄριστοντες, οὕς αὐτοῖς ὁ βασιλεὺς πέμψει διὰ σέ. ἀλλ’ ἀπτιθεὶς πάσι θεοῖς, ἄγαθῇ τύχῃ, δεξιοῖς πνεύμασι, Διὶ οὐρίῳ· ἐγὼ γάρ σε οὐκ ἀπολείψω. μὴ τοῦτο δόξῃς με λέγειν, οὐδ’ αὐτῇ δύναμαι κἀκεῖ θέλω. ἀλλὰ παρεῖσα τὴν μητέρα καὶ τὰς ἀδελφὰς ναυτὶς ἔσομαι συμπλέουσά σοι· καὶ σφόδρα τῶν εὐθαλάσσων γεγένημαι, εὐ [8] οἴδα. καὶ ἐκκλωμένης κώπης ναυτίας ἐγὼ θεραπεύσω, 
9 βάλω σου τὸ ἀσθενοῦν τῶν πελαγισμῶν· ἄξω δὲ σε ἀτέρ μίτων Ἀριάδνη εἰς Ἀἴγυπτον, οὐ Διόνυσον ἀλλὰ Διονύσου θεράπον καὶ προφήτην. 
10 Διονύσου θεράποντα καὶ προφήτητην. οὐδὲ ἐν Νάξῳ καὶ ἐρημίαις ναυτικαῖς ἀπολειφθέντης τὰς σὰς ἀπιστίας κλαίουσα καὶ ποτνιωμένη. χαίρετον οἱ Θησεῖς ἐκεῖνοι καὶ τὰ ἄστυ καὶ ὁ Πειραιεὺς καὶ ἡ Ἀἴγυπτος. οὐδὲν χωρίον ἡμῶν τοὺς ἔρωτας οὐχὶ δέξεται πλῆρες· κἂν πέτραν οἰκῶμεν, εὖ οἶδα ἀφροδίσιον αὐτὴν. πέπεισμα ἢ μήτε χρημάτων σε μήτε περιουσίας μήτε πλούτου τὸ καθάπαξ ἐπιθυμεῖν, ἐν ἐμοὶ καὶ τοῖς δράμασι τὴν εὐδαιμονίαν κατατιθέμενον· ἀλλ’ οἱ συγγενεῖς, ἀλλ’ οἱ πατέρες, ἀλλ’ οἱ φίλοι, σχεδὸν οἰσθα, πάντῃ πάντες πολλῶν δέονται, πλουτεῖν ἠλύουσι καὶ

wonder, and the pyramids there and the singing statues\textsuperscript{1} and the renowned labyrinth\textsuperscript{2} and the other things which by them are prized for their antiquity or art, I beg you, Menander, don’t make me your excuse. Don’t let the Athenians hate me on account of this when they are already measuring up the bushels of corn which the King is going to send them on your account. Go, with the protection of all the gods, with good fortune, favourable winds and a propitious sky! For I’m not going to leave you. Don’t think that I say that, I myself can’t do it even if I wanted to. But I shall abandon my mother and my sisters and become a sailor-woman who sails with you; I’m an excellent sailor, I’m sure. Even if the oar should brake I will tend to your nausea, I will comfort you in your seasickness; as Ariadne \textit{sans} thread I will guide you to Egypt, not as Dionysus but as a servant and interpreter of Dionysus.\textsuperscript{3} Nor will I be left behind lamenting and bewailing your treachery in Naxos\textsuperscript{4} and in a naval wilderness. Away with people like Theseus\textsuperscript{5} and the treacherous crimes of the elders! For us every place is safe, both the town, the Piraeus and Egypt. There is no place that will not receive our complete love; even if we should dwell on a rock, I’m sure our affection would make it a temple of Aphrodite. I’m convinced that you don’t desire money or abundance or wealth at all, but you stake your happiness on me and on your plays. However, relatives, country and friends, you probably know, everyone

\textsuperscript{1} Two seated statues of King Amenhotep III (1392–1355 BC) in Thebes, one of which issued sounds at sunrise having been damaged in an earthquake (possibly 27 BC). It fell silent again after repairs during the reign of Septimius Severus (146–211 AD) which has been used as a possible dating criteria for Alciphron, cf. Baldwin (1982).
\textsuperscript{2} An extensive temple precinct of Amenemhet III (c. 1850 BC) in Hawara near the Fayum oasis described in Hdt. 2.148.
\textsuperscript{3} The daughter of Minos and Pasiphae in Crete who falls in love with the Athenian hero Theseus and helps him kill the Minotaur and escape the labyrinth with the help of a thread.
\textsuperscript{4} After escaping from Crete with Theseus she is abandoned by him on Naxos where she later becomes Dionysus’ wife.
\textsuperscript{5} Mythical king and national hero of Athens, belonging to the generation before the Trojan War.
χρηματίζεσθαι. οὐ μὲν οὐδέποτε περὶ οὐδενὸς αἰτίασθη με
οὔτε μικροῦ οὔτε μεγάλου, τοῦτο εῦ οἶδα, πάλαι μὲν ἕττημένος μου πάθει καὶ ἔρωτι, νῦν δὲ ἦδη καὶ κρίσιν
προστεθεικῶς αὐτοῖς, ἃς μάλλον περιέχομαι, Μένανδρε, δοκεῖν μετὰ τῆς ἐμπαθοῦς φιλίας τὸ ὀλιγοχρόνιον· ἔστιν
γὰρ ὃς βίας ή ἐμπαθῆς φιλία οὐτῶ καὶ εὐδιάλυτος·
οὗτοι δὲ περιβέβληται καὶ ἄφραγέστερον ἐν
tοῦτοις ἠδὴ τὸ ἔργον οὔτε ἀμιγὲς ἢδοναῖς τε καὶ δία τὸ
πλήθος οὔτε περιδεεῖς· λύσει δὲ τὴν γνώμην ὃς μὲ πολ-
lάκις περὶ τούτων αὐτῶν νουθετῶν διδάσκεις.

ἀλλ' εἰ καὶ σὺ μή μὲ τή μέμψῃ μηδὲ αἰτίασθη, δέδοικα
τοὺς Ἀττικούς σφῆκας, οἵτινες ἀρξοῦνται πάντῃ μὲ περι-

βομβεῖν ἐξιοῦσαν ὡς αὐτὸν ἀφῃρημένη τῆς Ἀθηναίων
πόλεως τὸν πλούτον. ὡστε δέωμα σου Μένανδρε, ἐπί-
σχες, μηδὲ πώ τῷ βασιλεί μηδὲν ἀντεπιστείλης. έτι βού-

λευσαί περίμεινον ἔως κοινή γενόμεθα καὶ μετὰ τῶν
φίλων καὶ Θεοφράστου καὶ Ἐπικούρου. τάχα γὰρ

ἀλλοιότερα καὶ σοι φανεῖται ταῦτα. μάλλον δὲ
cαι θυσώμεθα καὶ εἰδῶμεν τί λέγει τά ιερά, εἴτε λόγον εἰς
Ἀγγυπτόν ἡμᾶς ἀπείναι εἴτε μένειν. καὶ χρηστηριασθῶμεν
eis Ἀδελφῶν πέμψαντες· πάρτιος ἡμῶν ἔτι θεοῦ, ἀπολο-

γίαν ἐξομεν καὶ πορευόμενοι καὶ καθαρσίν τοῖς θεοῖς. μάλλον δὲ ἐγὼ τοῦτο ποιήσω· καὶ γάρ ἔχω
tινὰ νεωστὶ γυναῖκα ἀπὸ Φρυγίας ἥκουσαν εὖ μᾶλα
tοὺς ἔμπειρον, γαστρομαντεύεσθαι δεικτῷ καὶ τῇ τῶν
σπαρτῶν διατάσει νύκτωρ καὶ τῇ τῶν θεῶν δείξει· καὶ

οὐ δεῖ λεγοῦσῃ πιστεύειν, ἀλλ' ἰδεῖν, ὡς φασι. διαπέ-

ψομεν πρὸς αὐτῆν. καὶ γάρ, ὡς ἔφη, καὶ κάθαρσιν τινα

3 πάθει Bergler: πᾶσι VFPD 7 περιβέβληται V: περιβέβληται VslFP:
παραβέβληται PslD: παραβέβληται Meineke <τι> Βουλής|βουλαὶ Ald:
βουλῆ Meineke: βουλὴ Granholm 9 πλήθος|πάθος Meineke
</l>}: λύσεις Ald 11 μή μέ F: μήτε VPD 12 Ἀττικοὺς|αττ[5 litt.] V 13 ἀφηρημένης PD 18 σοι] σοφοὶ V 19θυσόμεθαVF
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everywhere require many things, they want to be rich and
make money. You will never blame me for anything neither
small nor big. I’m sure, you who long ago yielded to me
out of passion and love, and who have now to these added
judgement, on which I place more reliance, Menander,
fearing the brevity of passionate love; for the passionate
love is as violent as it’s easy to dissolve; but for those who
are adorned with reasoning, for them the relationship is
actually stronger, neither chaste as regards both pleasures
and abundance, nor very timid. It will solve the problem†
as you yourself often instruct and advise me in these matters.

But even if you don’t reproach or accuse me of any-
thing, I still fear the Attic wasps who begin to swarm all
around me when I go out, as if I had taken away the very
wealth from the city of the Athenians. So I beg you, Men-
ander, wait a while, and don’t yet write any answer to the
King. Think it over some more! Wait until we’re together
and with our friends, both Theophrastus and Epicurus.†

For perhaps they and you will view this matter differently.
Let us rather make sacrifices and see what the offerings tell
us, whether it’s better for us to go to Egypt or to stay here.
And let us send someone to Delphi to consult the oracle;
he is our hereditary god.‡ We’ll have the gods as an excuse
in either case, whether we go or stay. Better still, I will do
the following. I have a women who has recently come from
Phrygia and who’s very experienced in these matters, she’s
skilled in gastromancy by observing the tension of the
strings at night and by calling up the gods. And we don’t
have to believe just her words, but see for ourselves, as they
say. I shall send for her. As a matter of fact, so she says, the

1 Menander (c. 342–291 BC) supposedly did his military service together with
Epicurus (342/1–271/0 BC) (cf. Strabo 14.1.18), and was the pupil of the peri-
patetic philosopher Theophrastus (371/0–287/6 BC) according to Diog. Laert.
5.36–7.  2 Apollo Patroos was worshipped as the mythical ancestor of the
Athenians.  3 An area in central Anatolia.  4 Demonic divination through
ventriloquism.
δεὶ προτελέσαι τὴν γυναίκα καὶ παρασκευάσαι τινὰ ζῷα ἰερεύσαι καὶ λιβανωτὸν ἄρρενα καὶ στύραν καὶ πέμματα σελήνης καὶ τὰ ἄγρια φύλλα τῶν ἄγνων. οἶμαι δὲ καὶ σὲ φθήσεσαι Πειραιόθεν ἐλθεῖν· ἦ δήλωσόν μοι σαφῶς μέχρι τίνος οὐ δύνασαι Γλυκέραν ἰδεῖν, ἵν᾽ ἐγὼ μὲν καταδράμω πρὸς σέ, τὴν δὲ Φρυγίαν ταύτην ἑτοιμάσωμαι ἤδη.

καὶ ἃ μελετᾶν πειράζεις ἀπὸ σαυτοῦ με, τὸν Πειραιᾶ καὶ τὸ ἀγρίδιον καὶ τὴν Μουνυχίαν καὶ κατ᾽ ὁλίγον ὅπως ἐκπέσωσι τῆς ψυχῆς, οὐ δύναμαι πάντα ποιεῖν, μὰ τοὺς θεοὺς· σὺ δὲ οὐ δύνασαι διαπεπλεγμένος ὅλως ἤδη μοι. κἂν οἱ βασιλεῖς ἐπιστείλωσι πάντες, ἐγὼ πάνως εἰμὶ παρὰ σοὶ βασιλικωτέρα καὶ εὐσεβέι σοι κέχρημαι ἐραστῇ καὶ ὅρκων ἱερῶν μνήμονι.

ὥστε πειρῶ μᾶλλον, ἐμὴ φιλότης, θάσσον εἰς ἀστυ παραγενέσθαι, ὅπως εἰ γε μεταβουλεύσαι τῆς πρὸς βασιλείας ἀφίξεως, ἔχῃς εὐτρεπό τὰ δράματα ἐξ αὐτῶν, ἀπὸ τοὺς θεοὺς· σὺ δὲ οὐ δύνασαι διαπεπλεγμένος ὅλως ἤδη μοι. κἂν οἱ βασιλεῖς ἐπιστείλωσι πάντες, ἐγὼ πάνως εἰμὶ τὰς ἡμέρας ἀφίξεως, ἔχῃς εὐτρεπό τὰ δράματα ἐξ αὐτῶν, ἀπὸ τοὺς θεοὺς· σὺ δὲ οὐ δύνασαι διαπεπλεγμένος ὅλως ἤδη μοι. κἂν οἱ βασιλεῖς ἐπιστείλωσι πάντες, ἐγὼ πάνως εἰμὶ τὰς ἡμέρας ἀφίξεως, ἔχῃς εὐτρεπό τὰ δράματα ἐξ αὐτῶν, ἀπὸ τοὺς θεοὺς· σὺ δὲ οὐ δύνασαι διαπεπλεγμένος ὅλως ἤδη μοι. κἂν οἱ βασιλεῖς ἐπιστείλωσι πάντες, ἐγὼ πάνως εἰμὶ τὰς ἡμέρας ἀφίξεως, ἔχῃς εὐτρεπό τὰ δράματα ἐξ αὐτῶν, ἀπὸ τοὺς θεοὺς· σὺ δὲ οὐ δύνασαι διαπεπλεγμένος ὅλως ἤδη μοι. κἂν οἱ βασιλεῖς ἐπιστείλωσι πάντες, ἐγὼ πάνως εἰμὶ τὰς ἡμέρας ἀφίξεως, ἔχῃς εὐτρεπό τὰ δράματα ἐξ αὐτῶν, ἀπὸ τοὺς θεοὺς· σὺ δὲ οὐ δύνασαι διαπεπλεγμένος ὅλως ἤδη μοι.
woman has to perform a purifying ceremony first and prepare some animals to be sacrificed and some strong frankincense and a long stalk of styrax\(^1\) and moon-shaped wheat cakes and leaves from a wild chaste-tree.\(^2\) I think even you will arrive from Piraeus first; or else tell me just for how long you can’t see Glycera, so that I may run down to meet you and have this Phrygian woman ready at once. \(^\dagger\) And what you are trying by yourself, to accustom me so that the Piraeus, your small estate and Munychia\(^3\) will gradually fall out of my mind, I can’t do, \(^\dagger\) by the gods! Neither can you who are already completely interwoven with me! Even if all the kings would send you letters I’m still more regal to you than all of them and in you I have found a dutiful lover who’s also mindful of sacred oaths. So try rather, my love, to come as soon as possible into town, so that if you should change your mind about going to the King you should have your plays prepared and especially those of your plays from which Ptolemy and his Dionysus (who isn’t democratic, you know) can benefit the most, be it *Thais* or *The Hated Man* or *The Braggart* or *The Arbitrators* or *The Girl who Gets Slapped* or *The Man from Sicyon*\(^4\) or whatever it might be. What now? Am I a bold and daring woman to judge Menander’s plays when I’m only an amateur? But I have a love for you that is wise and makes

\(^1\) The resin extracted from the *Styrax officinalis* was used as incense in cults. \(^2\) The leaves from the *Vitex agnus-castus* was used as an antaphrodisiac. \(^3\) A steep hill to the north-east of Piraeus. \(^4\) Titles of plays by Menander which are preserved only in fragments from papyri and quotations by other authors.
γυναῖκα ταχέως παρ’ ἔρωτων μανθάνειν· ἀλλ’ οἰκονομούσιν (οἱ) ἔρωτες στειδοῦντες αἰδούμεθα, (μὰ) τὴν Ἄρτεμιν, ἀνάξιοι ύμῶν εἶναι μὴ θάττουν μανθάνουσαι. πάντως δέομαι, Μένανδρε, κάκεινο παρασκευάσσαθαι τὸ δράμα ἐν ὧδε μὲ γέγραφας, ἵνα κἀκεῖνο μὴ παραγένωμαι σὺν σοί, δι’ ἄλλου πλέον πρὸς Πτολεμαίον, καὶ μᾶλλον αἰσθητοί ὁ βασιλεὺς ὅσον ἰσχύει καὶ παρὰ σοί, γεγραμμένους φέρειν ἑαυτοῦ τοὺς ἔρωτας ἀφεῖς ἐν ἄστει τοὺς ἀληθινοὺς. ἀλλ’ οὐδὲ τούτους ἀφήσεις, εὖ ἵσθι: κυβερνάν ἢ πρῶρατεύειν, ἔως δὲ σφωνοθα📍πραγμῃ ἀπὸ ἡμᾶς Πειραιότεθν, μυθήσομαι, ἵνα σε τάς ἐμαὶς χερσὶν ἀκόμη ναυστόλησω πλέον ὑμῶν εἰς φαῖνοιτο. φανείη δὲ, ὡς θεοὶ γενεῖς, δ’ κοινὴ λυσιτελές ἦ, καὶ μαντεύσαιτο ἡ Φρυγία τὰ συμφέροντα κρεῖσσον τῆς θεοφορουμένης σου κόρης. ἔρρωσο.

me capable of understanding these matters. For you taught me, an attractive woman, to learn quickly from lovers; but lovers dispense it in haste; we feel ashamed, by Artemis, to be unworthy of you not having been quicker to learn. I just beg you, Menander, to produce that play too in which you have cast me, so that even if I should not go with you, I may sail to Ptolemy in another form, and the King may be more aware of how much influence he has over you that you bring your written loves having left your true ones in town.

But you’re not going to leave them behind, be sure of that. Until you come here to me from Piraeus, I will be learning how to be a helmsman or captain, so that I may steer you with my own hands untouched by the waves as I’m sailing, if this should appear to be the better choice. May that happen, all you gods, which will profit us both, and may the Phrygian woman make a more appropriate prophesy than your Woman Possessed by a God.¹ Farewell.

¹ A play by Menander preserved only in a few short quotations and fragments of papyri.
οὐκ ἐπύθεσθε τὰ νεώτερα νῦν πράγματα; οὐκ ἦκούσατε 
καὶ ἐταίρας ὑμῖν ἐπιτετείχισται 
χρήμα, Λαΐς ὑπὸ Ἁπελλου τοῦ ζωγράφου θηριοτροφη−
θείσα. ἀθλιαί, κλείσατε τα ἐργαστήρια αὐτῶν, μᾶλλον δὲ 
καὶ ἑαυτὰς ἀποκλείσατε· μία νῦν ἔστιν ἡ τὴν Ἑλλάδα 
ολὴν διασοβοῦσα γυνὴ, μία· Λαΐς ἐν τοῖς κουρείοις, Λαΐς 
ἐν τοῖς θεάτροις, ἐν ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις, ἐν τοῖς δικαστηρίοις, 
ἐν τῇ βουλῇ, πανταχῆ. πάντες αὐτὴν λαλοῦσι, νὴ τὴν 
Ἀφροδίτην, καὶ οἱ κωφοὶ διανεύουσιν ἄλληλοι τὸ ἐκεῖνης 
κάλλος· οὕτω γλῶσσα γίνεται καὶ τοῖς λαλεῖν μὴ δυνα−
μένοι Λαΐς. εἰκότως· ἐνδεδυμένη μὲν γὰρ εὐπροσωπο−
tάτη ἔστιν, ἐκδύσα δὲ ὅλη πρόσωπον φαίνεται, οὕτε 
κατάξηρος οὔτε κατάσαρκος, ἂλλ' οἶα λέγομεν ἥμεις τὰς 
ἰσχνεσχέλους· τρίχας ἐνουλισμέναι φύσει, ξανθίζουσι δὲ 
ἀφαρμάκευτα καὶ τῶν ἀκρωμίδων ὑπερκεχυμέναι μαλα−
kὼς. ὁθαλμοῖ δὲ, νὴ τὴν Ἄρτεμιν, ὅλης σελήνης εὐκυ−
kλότεροι; καὶ τὸ μέλαν αἰ κόραι μελάνταται καὶ τὸ 
κύκλῳ λευκὸν ***
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Fragm. 5
The courtesans in Corinth to the courtesans in town

Are you not aware of the latest developments? Have you not heard the new name among the courtesans? What a great stronghold has not been built against us—Lais, kept as a wild beast by the painter Apelles.¹ Close your workshops, wretched women, or rather shut yourself up in them. There’s only one woman now that excites all of Greece, only one. Lais in the barber shops, Lais in the theatres, in the assemblies, in the courts, in the council chamber, everywhere. Everybody talks about her, by Aphrodite, and the deaf and dumb are nodding about her beauty to each other; so does Lais give speech to those who can’t even talk. That's reasonable. For with her clothes on she’s the fairest of face, and with her clothes off her body seems as fair as her face, neither too wrinkled nor too fleshy but the kind we call thin and juicy. Her hair is naturally curly, blond but not coloured and falls softly over her shoulders. Her eyes, by Aphrodite, are rounder than the full moon, and her pupils are the blackest of black and the encircling white ***

¹ Two famous courtesans go by the name Lais: ‘the elder’ Lais from Corinth (died in 392 BC) and ‘the younger’ Lais, from Hykkara in Sicily, who was the daughter of Timandra, the companion of Alcibiades, and was brought as a slave to Corinth in 415 BC after the Sicilian expedition during the Peloponnesian War. According to Ath. 13.588c–d she was made a courtesan by the painter Apelles (born around 380/375 BC and most active around 332–329 BC) after he had seen her in Corinth when she was still a girl. This anachronistic story has led some scholars to believe there was a third Lais who lived in the late 4th cent. BC, cf. Geyer (1924). Apelles’ most famous painting was the Aphrodite Rising from the Sea for which Phryne stood model according to Ath. 13.590f–591a.
COMMENTARY: 4.1

TITLE

(ΑΛΚΙΦΡΟΝΟΣ ΡΗΤΟΡΟΣ ΕΠΙΣΤΟΛΑΙ ΕΤΑΙΡΙΚΑΙ): the title is missing in all manuscripts and has probably been lost during the transmission. The conjecture was first printed without any reference in Schepers (1901) 110. It is attributed to Rycke in Schepers (1905) 109. The conjecture probably derives from Leid (f. 36r) ΑΛΚΙΦΡΟΝΟΣ ἐπιστολαὶ ἄλιευτικαὶ καὶ ἑταιρικαὶ (before letter 1.1) which in turn is a copy of the Aldine edition where the title reads ΑΛΚΙΦΡΟΝΟΣ ΕΠΙΣΤΟΛΑΙ ΑΛΙΕΥΤΙΚΑΙ ΚΑΙ ΕΤΑΙΡΙΚΑΙ (also before letter 1.1). The adjective ἑταιρικαὶ (cf. 4.2.4 ταῖς ἑταιρικαῖς ... ζηλοτυπίαις, 4.16.5 οὐ ποιήσω τὸ ἑταιρικὸν) is analogous to the titles found in some manuscripts for books 1 and 2 (Ἀλκίφρονος ῥήτορος ἐπιστολαὶ ἄλιευτικαὶ and Ἀλκίφρονος ῥήτορος ἑπιστολαὶ ἄγροικαὶ); but on the other hand the majority of the manuscripts of book 3 has the title Ἀλκίφρονος ῥήτορος ἑπιστολαὶ παρασίτων (παρασιτικαὶ cod. Γ) so it is certainly possible that the title for book 4 could have read Ἀλκίφρονος ῥήτορος ἑπιστολαὶ ἑταιρῶν.

4.1

PHRYNE TO PRAXITELES

(Φρύνη Πραξιτέλει): there is no title in the manuscripts but the conjecture by Jacobs is most likely correct. There are numerous anecdotes about the relationship between the sculptor Praxiteles (active c. 370–320 BC) and Phryne, cf. Raubitschek (1941) 893–907, Pollitt (1990) 84–9. Phryne supposedly posed as a model for Praxiteles on several occasions, among others for his famous Aphrodite of Knidos. This letter alludes to the famous statues of Eros, Aphrodite and Phryne by Praxiteles which stood in the sanctuary of Eros in Thespiae, cf. Paus. 9.27.5 ἐνταῦθα καὶ αὐτοῦ Πραξιτέλους Άφροδίτη καὶ Φρύνης ἐστὶν εἰκὼν, λίθου καὶ ἡ Φρύνη καὶ ἡ θεός.

There are further indications of the lacunose state of the manuscripts: 3.42 is missing in VFPD, and 3.41 (Παλλάχανος Μονογνάθῳ) consists of only seven words and ends abruptly, ἔξωλεις ἀπόλοιντο οἱ Κλεισθένεις καὶ οἱ Δράκον(τες). Apart from this letter only 2.1 lacks a title; 2.1 is preserved in one single manuscript and the title was probably lost at some stage in the transmission.
1. Μὴ δείσῃς: all editors, beginning with Wagner, have indicated a lacuna before μὴ δείσῃς. It is possible that the beginning has been lost considering that the title is missing, as well as the end of the preceding letter (3.41), see previous note. But the absolute use of δείδω is quite common (cf. LSJ 1) and perfectly understandable in this context. The prohibitive subjunctive μὴ δείσῃς is picked up by μὴ φθονήσῃς δὲ a few lines below. Praxiteles fears that he is going to risk prosecution for impiety or even religious pollution for setting up a statue of Phryne in a sacred precinct; hence Phryne’s comforting words οὐκ ἀδοξοῦσι με Θεσπιεῖς μέσην κεῖσθαι θεῶν and οὐ μιανοῦμεν γὰρ τοὺς θεοὺς.

ἐξείργασαι γάρ πάγκαλόν τι χρήμα, οἶον ἦδη τὶς σοι τῶν πώποτε; οὔδείς τῶν κατὰ χειρῶν ποιηθέντων τὴν σεαυτοῦ ἐταίραν ἵδρυσας ἐν τεμένει: this passage is problematic and possibly corrupt, but the tentative reading provided here gives the sense of what Phryne wants to say: Praxiteles has produced a work of art beyond comparison with his statue of Phryne.

Seiler’s οἶον δὴ τι οὔδείς εἶδε πώποτε πάντων τῶν διὰ χειρῶν ποιηθέντων (‘qua quidem omnium operum manu factorum nemo unquam vidit’) is too adventurous: the seclusion of σοι, the transposition of οὔδείς and διὰ for κατὰ. Although it has been adopted by Benner-Fobes who translate ‘such as nobody, in fact, has ever seen before among all things fashioned by men’s hands’, it is nevertheless an unsatisfactory emendation.

The same applies to Post’s οἶον ἦδη γ’ ἀντισοῖτ᾿ ἄν ποτε οὔδείς τῶν καταχειροτονηθέντων, ‘such that hereafter none of the condemned could ever equal it’ (Post (1946) 32). His palaeographical arguments are certainly quite reasonable: ἀντισοῖτ᾿ from τὸς σοι and καταχειροτονηθέντων from κατὰ χειρῶν ποιηθέντων; but Post has confused the statue of Phryne in Thespiae with the statue of Phryne which stood in Delphi between the kings Archidamus and Philip. This completely undermines his argument that the passage is an allusion to the nine archons of Athens who took an oath to dedicate a statue of gold in Delphi if they transgressed any of Solon’s laws, cf. Ath. pol. 7.1.

οἶον ἦδη τὶς σοι τῶν πώποτε: the verb in the relative clause should be supplied from the main clause: οἶον ἦδη τὶς (sc. ἔξειργασαι) σοι τῶν πώποτε. Here ἦδη is used as a marker of intensification (BDAG 4) as in 4.16.7 οὕτως ἦδη αὐχεῖς ἐπ᾿ ἐμοὶ, 4.19.12 ἄρραγέστερον ἐν τούτοις ἦδη τὸ ἔργον. The personal pronoun σοι should probably be interpreted as an ethical dative (K-G 1.423, Smyth §1486). For τῶν πώποτε ‘who ever yet existed’, cf. LSJ πώποτε II.4. For the delayed position of the interrogative pronoun, cf. 4.9.3 ἔτα οἶει μέ σοι παρα-
καθημένην πόθεν ζήσειν;  
τῶν κατὰ χειρῶν πονηθέντων τήν σεαυτοῦ ἑταίραν ἱδρύσας:
the sense is clear but the syntax is problematic. τῶν πονηθέντων should probably be taken as a genitive of material (K-G 1.333, Schwzyer 2.124, Smyth §1323). For τὰ πονηθέντα 'toils', cf. Plut. Them. 17.4.

τὸν καρπὸν ἀπέχειν τῶν ὑπὲρ τῆς Ἑλλάδος αὐτῶν πονηθέντων.
The aorist participle ἱδρύσας (F) is adopted by all editors but the aorist indicative 2nd sing. ἱδρύσας (VPD) is required and also has more support in the manuscripts; the aorist participle is probably an attempt by the scribe of F to emend the text by connecting it to ἐξείργασαι γὰρ πάγκαλόν τι χρῆμα. For ἱδρύω used in the sense 'set up a statue of' (LSJ II), cf. Ars. Pax 1091 Ἑιρήνην ἔιλοντο καὶ ἱδρύσανθ 'ἱερείῳ.

But the main problem lies with κατὰ χειρῶν. The phrase κατὰ χειρῶν (or more commonly κατὰ χειρὸς) ὕδωρ 'water down over the hands' (LSJ χείρ II.6.h.) is common in comedy but the sense must be something else here. The meaning should be 'with your hands' but this use is not attested in Alciphron, or elsewhere for that matter. In Alciphron κατά + gen. is used in the general sense of 'down upon, over' (LSJ A.II.1) 3.2.3, 3.30.3, 3.30.5; 'down into, among' (LSJ A.II.2) 2.35.3; in a hostile sense 'against' (LSJ A.II.5) 3.7.5, 3.22.1, 3.26.4; or in wows 'by' (LSJ A.II.5) in 1.13.4.

Unless κατὰ χειρῶν can mean 'down from your hands' an emendation is needed; perhaps μετὰ χειρῶν or Seiler’s διὰ χειρῶν (adopted by Benner-Fobes).

μέση … ἐστηκα ἐπί: μέσος usually takes a simple genitive (LSJ I.1.c) as it does a few lines below, μέσην κείσθαι θεῶν, cf. Ath. Epit. 2.2.118 (regarding a statue of Phryne) ἐστηκε δ’ ἢ εἰκών αὐτή μέση Ἀρχιδάμου καὶ Φιλίππου, Paus. 6.16.7 μέσος δὲ ἐστηκεν αὐτῶν Λύσιππος.

On account of this Bast deleted ἐπί. The construction with μέσος and ἐπί is unparalleled but there is no need to delete ἐπί which can mean 'before, in the presence of' (LSJ I.2.e, K-G 1.497, Schwzyer 2.470), cf. 3.1.18.3 ἐπὶ τοῦ βωμοῦ τῆς Ὀρθίας τυπτόμενος, Dem. 25.36 τί γὰρ οὐκ ἐξελήλεγκται τούτων ἐπὶ πάντων πολλάκις, Pl. Ap. 17c εἴσωδα λέγειν καὶ ἐν ἄγορα ἐπί τῶν τραπεζῶν, Dion. Hal. Ant. Rom. 5.29 πίστεις δοὺς ἐπὶ θεῶν.

Meineke (1843) 265 suggested ἀπὸ instead of ἐπί, quoting Soph. OC 1595–7 ἀρ’ οὗ μέσος (Brunck: ἐφ’ οὗ μέσου codd.) στὰς τοῦ τε Θορικίου τέτρον | κοίλης τ’ ἀχέρδου κάτο (codd.: κατὶ var. lect., Canter) λαῖνου τάφου, | καθέζετ’. In his edition Meineke prints ἀπὸ but he raises some doubts in the commentary (p. 164): ‘libri ἐπὶ, quod fortasse recte habet: media in nemore posita sum Veneris Amorisque signo vici-
na’. Seiler follows Meineke in printing ἀπὸ in the text whereas Benner-Fobes keep ἐπὶ. Cobet, quoting the text of Meineke and Seiler, without mentioning ἐπὶ, suggests that ἀπὸ should be removed. The note, ‘[ἐπὶ] del. Cobet’, in Schepers’ apparatus is therefore a bit misleading, since Cobet in fact deleted ἀπὸ.

τῆς Ἀφροδίτης καὶ τοῦ Ἐρωτοσ ἁμα τοῦ σου: the position of ἁμα is odd and the meaning unclear. Hercher’s τῆς σῆς Ἀφροδίτης καὶ τοῦ Ἐρωτοσ τοῦ σου (adopted by Schepers, although he keeps ἁμα) is unsatisfactory on palaeographical grounds; it does not explain how ἁμα has appeared in the text. If we keep ἁμα it should be interpreted adverbially as in 1.15.3 φερομένων δὲ ἁμα ‘as we sailed about together’, cf. LSJ A.II, ‘together, at once, both’.

A tentative suggestion is to read μέση γὰρ ἐπὶ τῆς Ἀφροδίτης καὶ τοῦ Ἐρωτοσ τοῦ σου. ἀλλὰ μὴ φθοniąσης γέ μοι τῆς τιμῆς. The corruption of ἀλλὰ into ἁμα is a common error in majuscule manuscripts as is γέ into δέ; the displacement of ἁμα, however, would be more difficult to explain. For the use of ἀλλὰ with the imperative or subjunctive, cf. 2.6.2 ἀλλὰ χαῖρε καὶ ἀπτίθη, LSJ II.2; for ἀλλὰ ... γέ, see Denniston 12–5.

ἐπαινοῦσι ... ἀδοξοῦσί με Θεσπιείς: the scribe of P has almost succumbed to a saut du même au même in this passage; he first wrote ἐπαινοῦσι με Θεσπιείς (having skipped Πραξιτέλη, καὶ ὅτι τῆς σῆς τέχνης γέγονα οὐκ ἀδοξοῦσί), but then corrected his text by expunging με Θεσπιείς.

κατακλινῶμεν: the aorist passive subjunctive is naturally more suitable here than the present/aorist active subjunctive κατακλίνωμεν (VF), cf. 4.13.6 ἰωμὲν ... οἴκαδε καὶ κατακλινῶμεν.

4.2

GLYCERA TO BACCHIS

1. Ὅ Μένανδρος ἡμῶν: Bergler objected to the possessive genitive ἡμῶν and suggested ἡμῖν (adopted by Wagner, Hercher and Schepers) as referring to βεβούληται. But the change is not necessary since the possessive genitive of the personal pronoun is the equivalent of the possessive pronoun (K-G 1.559, Schwyzter 2.205–6, Smyth §1196). The plural can either be interpreted as referring to both Glycera and Bacchis or as a plural of modesty (Smyth §1008, Gildersleeve 54).

βεβούληται: the scribal conjecture βεβούλευται (Z) deserves to
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be mentioned; βούλευω would suit the context as well as βούλομαι. A similar scribal conjecture is found in 4.5.2 βεβουλήθαι (VFPD: βεβουλεύθαι W).

οἶδας: there is no need to change into οἶδα (Cobet, adopted by Hercher, Schepers and Trapp). Schepers misses the point when he in his apparatus notes: ‘Secunda persona hic non placet’; Glycer is hoping for sympathy from Bacchis by pleading to their shared experiences.

It should be noted that the two other examples of οἶδας in Alciphron have also been emended: 4.7.2 οὐκ οἶδας (codd.: εἰδὼς Cobet: οὐσθα Hercher) οἴδας ἐστιν ὁ σοφιστής οὗτος, 4.13.12 οἶδας (codd.: οἴσθ Cobet) ὁ τι λέγω. The classical form οἴδα is found 14 times in Alciphron (7 times in Book 4). The form οἶδας became standard in Koine but it is also found in classical authors, e.g. Hom. Od. 1.337, h.Merc. 456, 467, Thgn. 491, 957, Hippon. fr. 177 West, Hippoc. Acut. 18, Eur. Alc. 780, Hdt. 3.72, 4.157, Xen. Mem. 4.6.6. In comedy the metrically equivalent οἴδας was more common although οἶδας is found in Phoenicid. fr. 3.2 K-A, Philem. fr. 45.3 K-A and Strato Com. fr. 1 K-A, cf. Arnott on Alexis fr. 15.11 K-A.

ἐραστοῦ τοιούτου ... ύστερῆσαι: ‘to lack such a lover’; for the construction ύστερέω + gen., cf. LSJ IV.1, DELG ύστερος ‘manquer quelque chose, être privé de’, BDAG ύστερό 3a. The reading is defended by Meiser (1905) 208, who cites Lucian Par. 12 του ήδεος ύστερουντα. The conjectures ἐστερῆσαι (should be attributed to Dobree (1782–1825) and not Meineke, adopted by Schepers and Trapp) and στέρεσαι (Cobet) do have some arguments in their favour (cf. 4.4.2 τῆς σῆς ὁμιλίας στερούμενος, 4.10.3 τῶν παρ᾽ αὐτοῦ μισθωμάτων στερησόμεθα) but there is no need to change the text.

εἰωθότα corresponds with the object (sc. αὐτόν) of ἀποτρέπειν and makes perfect sense; but Meineke’s εἰωθότος (adopted by Benner-Fobes and Trapp) might be correct since εἰωθότος (VF) would have been a more likely corruption of εἰωθότος than of εἰωθότα (PD). The corruption would then have occurred in two stages: εἰωθότος > εἰωθότας > εἰωθότα.

2. μέλλοντα ἐπιθημήσειν: Schepers conjectured ἐπιθημεύειν arguing that Alciphron elsewhere uses a present infinitive with μέλλω (1.14.1 μέλλουσιν ἀπαγγέλλειν, 1.14.3 μέλλειν ... παραδίδοναι, 3.4.1 μέλλοντα ... ἠναι, 3.11.3 λειαν μελλοῦσι, 3.23.4 μέλλοντα ψαύειν, 3.23.5 μέλλει ... εἰδέναι καὶ ... ἀληθίζεσθαι, 4.16.8 μέλλω ... εὐτρεπίζειν, 4.18.15 μέλλω ... ὀρῶν). But the change is not motivated on these grounds alone since both present and future infinitive are used with μέλλω; sometimes there
is a distinction between the tenses but not always, cf. K-G 1.177–9, Schw-zyer 2.293–4, B-D §356, Smyth §1959a.

μή, βουλόμενον: defended by Meiser (1905) 208, who also notes that αὐτόν stands in contrast to κάμιοι. Schepers adopted Boissevain’s emendation μή, βουλομαι μὲν (although μή, βουλομαι μὲν οὖν had been suggested already by Wagner). But the resulting period βουλομαι μὲν ... καὶ ... λογίζομαι ... δέδοικα δέ would break the symmetry of the sentence: οὔτε ὅπως αὐτόν παρεγγυήσω μέλλοντα ἐπιδημήσειν ἔχω, οὔτε ὅπως μή (sc. παρεγγυήσω), βουλόμενον αὐτόν σπουδασθῆναι ὑπὸ σοῦ. A similar phrase is found in 4.4.3 ὁ μὲν ... δήλος ἐστι σπουδάζει-σθαι βουλόμενος.

οἶδα: Cobet’s οἶδε (adopted by Hercher and Schepers) is not necessary; οἶδα makes better sense. Glycera is confident that Bacchis is not going to do anything that will risk their friendship. She trusts Bacchis more than she does Menander.

ἐταιρείαν: all editors print ἐταιρείαν (PD) but ἐταιρείαν is to be preferred, cf. 4.17.7 where all manuscripts have ἐταιρείαν.

3. δέδοικα ... οὔ (σέ) τοσοῦτον ... ὅσον αὐτόν ἐκεῖνον: σέ is a necessary addition by W and Ald; we need an object to δέδοικα in the main clause corresponding to αὐτὸν ἐκεῖνον in the relative clause.

4. τὸ μὲν γὰρ δοκεῖν αὐτόν οὐκ ἔλαττον τοῦ σοί ἐντυχεὶν ἢ τῶν Ἰσθμίων ἐνεκεν τὴν ἀποδήμησιν πεποιήσθαι, οὐ πάνυ πείθομαι: a ‘slightly catty’ remark according to Trapp (2003) 226, who translates ‘as for the impression getting around that he planned the trip as much to meet you as because of the Isthmian games, I’m not altogether sure I believe it’. Glycera does not suspect Menander of lying about his reason for going to Corinth, namely the Isthmian games, or the honesty of Bacchis (χρηστότερῳ ἤθει κέχρησαι τοῦ βίου). But since he also wishes to be courted by Bacchis during his visit (βουλόμενον ... σπουδασθῆναι ὑπὸ σοῦ) and since he is an amorous man (ἐρωτικὸς ... δαιμονίως) Glycera fears that he will not be able to keep his hands off the irresistible Bacchis (Βακχίδος οὐδ᾿ ἂν τῶν σκυθρωποτάτων τις ἀπόσχοιτο). The suspicions are directed more towards Menander than Bacchis but the letter also contains an implied critique of Bacchis as was pointed out by Monégier du Sorbier (1987) 427–8.

ἀποδήμησιν: the word is only attested here and in an inscription from Nicopolis (CIG 1.2 nr 1813b3). Words formed on -δήμησις are very rare; there are no examples before Alciphron and only a few examples from Byzantine authors. The conjecture ἀποδήμησιν (W and Ald,
adopted by Bergler, Wagner, Hercher and Trapp), a correction of the corrupted ἄποδημην (D), is tempting since ἄποδημία is a common word, cf. Pl. Cri. 52b ἄλλην ἄποδημιάν ἔποιήσω, Plut. Cat. Min. 12.3 τὸστὸν τὸν τρόπον ἔποιεῖτο τὴν ἄποδημίαν, Lucian Icar. 1 ἐν αὐτοίς τοῖς ἀστροῖς ἔποιούμην τὴν ἄποδημίαν. The corruption from ἄποδημιαν to ἄποδήμησιν could be explained as a scribal error influenced by ἐπιδημήσειν a few lines above.

Ὕποψίας: the variant ὑπερψίας (VF) ‘contempt, disdain’ does not fit the context and is probably a scribal error resulting from a confusion of the abbreviations used for the prepositions ὑπο-/ὑπερ-. For ὑπερψίας, cf. 4.8.4, 4.14.8.

(ἂν) ἡγοίμην: Seiler’s emendation, adopted by Schepers (1905) and Trapp, gives most sense; the potential optative is what we would expect, as above in 4.2.3 Βασκίδος οὔδ’ ἂν τῶν σκυθρωτάτων τις ἄποδχοιτο. The loss of ἂν might be explained as a haplography after μικρόν. The potential mood is continued in the following sentences, ἄλλως τε κάν... γένηται, δεήσει με... λοιδορεῖσθαι καὶ Ἆν δ’ ἐπανέλθη μοι οίος ὥξετο, πολλῆν εἰσομαί σοι χάριν. The imperfect ἡγούμην (VFPD) can hardly be defended, although it has been adopted by Meineke and Benn-Fobes; the imperfect would suggest unreality or potentiality in the past, in which case we would also need an ἂν. The conjecture ἡγούμαι (Aldine, adopted by Bergler, Wagner, Seiler, Hercher and Schepers (1901)) is attractive but the potential optative is preferable.

5. ἄλλως τε κάν μοι κνισμός τις ἂν πρὸς αὐτόν ἢ διαφορὰ γένηται: the correction κάν μοι (Pχις (possibly by a different hand) W Ald) is necessary for κάμοι (VFΨθ). The lack of the conjunction εἰ ἔποιεῖτο to confusing attempts to correct the text in Vf: κάμοι κνισμός τις ἂν εἰ Vf πρὸς αὐτόν ἢ (Vf) διαφορά γένηται. Note also how the conditional clause κάν μοι... ἂν... ἢ... γένηται, δεήσει is echoed in next sentence ἂν δ’ ἐπανέλθη μοι... εἰσομαί.

We should not delete ἂν (Ald, followed by Bergler, Wagner, Hercher and Schepers) or ἢ... ἢ διαφορά (Hirschig); the heaping up of synonyms, like ἂν/γένηται and κνισμός/διαφορά, is common in Alciphron, e.g. 1.21.1 ὑπερμαζάς ἢ μέμηνας, 3.35.3 κλώζειν ἢ συρίτειν, 3.40.2 ἢς τας (τοὺς VF) θόλους ἢ τας καμίνους (ἡ τας καμίνους secl. Cobet) τῶν βαλανείων, 4.13.1 λειμών τις ἢ κῆπος, 4.19.21 κυβερνάν ἢ πρωρατεύειν. This stylistic device known as περιβολή was used already by classical authors (for examples, see Schacht (1890) 15–23) and imitated by later authors, especially Dio of Prusa and Aelian, cf. Schmid (1896) 523–4.

κνισμός: ‘itching, irritation, quarrel’, a rare word, attested before
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Alciphron only in Soph. fr. 537.1 Radt τάδ’ ἔστι κνισμός καὶ φιλημάτων ψόφος and Ar. Plat. 974 οὐκ οὖσιν ἐρεῖς ἀνύσασα τὸν κνισμὸν τίνα. But the verb κνίζω is quite common (2.31.1 ἔρας κυθαρώδου γυναικὸς κάμε κνίζεις, 4.5.2 ἔσικας κνίζα τὸν Ὕπερείδην βεβουλήσθαι, 4.10.3 εἰ δὴ κνίζα ποτὲ ἐκεῖνην βουλήσθη). For διαφορά used in a similar phrase, cf. 4.6.1 οὐκ ἀν ποτ’ ὠθήσῃ ἐκ τοσαύτης συνηθείας ἐσεθαί μοι τίνα πρὸς Εὐξίππην διαφοράν.

Φειδύλου is a correction by the scribes of W and Z; the manuscripts have Φιδύλου which the Aldine has changed to Διφίλου, perhaps influenced by 4.10.1 Δίφιλος (Bergler: Διίφιλος VFPD), the poet of New Comedy.

4.3

BACCHIS TO HYPERIDES

῾Υπερέίδη: the manuscripts have Ὕπερείδης throughout, which Hercher unnecessarily changed to Ὕπερειδὴς (adopted by the subsequent editors). Ὕπερειδῆς is the prevailing form in Attic inscriptions but both forms occur in contemporary authors, e.g. Lucian, Athenaeus.

1. τοῖς διδοῦσιν αἳ τυγχάνουσαι ἀσεβείας κριθησόμεθα: the reading of the manuscripts is defended by Meineke, who takes τοῖς διδοῦσιν as a dative of the agent to κριθησόμεθα (K-G 1.422). Schepers deleted αἳ before τυγχάνουσαι but this is not necessary since the pronoun ἡμεῖς should be understood from the context as in Pl. Leg. 680c οὐ σφόδρα χρώμεθα οἱ Κρῆτες τοῖς ξενικοῖς ποιήσαι, cf. K-G 1.602, Smyth §1149. Meineke’s interpretation was criticized by Hermann (1857) 69, who found the syntax too strained and defended ἐντυγχάνουσαι (Aldine, adopted by Bergler, Wagner, Seiler, Hercher and Benner-Fobes). This is also a plausible reading but gives a slightly different sense by making τοῖς διδοῦσιν the object of ἐντυγχάνουσαι ‘if we meet with those who give money’.

μηκέτι ... μηδὲ: the manuscripts have μήτε which Seiler rightly corrected to μηδὲ, cf. 1.11.1 οὐκέτ’ εἰμὶ ἐν ἔμαυτῇ, ὁ μήτερ, οὐδὲ ἀνέχομαι γῆμασθαι, 3.34.4 οὐκέθ’ ὁμοίως δεκτὸς οὐδὲ χαρίες ἐδόκουν, 4.11.6 ἡ δὲ οὐκέτι με φαίδρος τοῖς δύμασιν ὑμεται μειδίως, οὐδὲ ἱερῶς καὶ εὐμενῆς διανυκτερεύσει τοῖς ἡδίστοις ἐκείνοις κολάσμασιν and also 4.4.4 μὴ δὴ καταδιασθήσῃς ἤμων ... μηδὲ Ὅπερειδῆν κακῶς δὸξα βεβουλεύσθαι ποιήσῃς, 4.19.13 μὴ μέ (F: μήτε VPD) τι μέμψῃ μηδὲ
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αἰτιάσῃ. In Alciphron μήτε and οὔτε are always repeated (e.g. 4.14.5 τὸ μήτε ὑπέρογκον αὐτῶν μήτε ἀσαρκον, 4.17.5 οὔτε ὡς Ἄττικος οὔτε ὡς φιλόσοφος, 4.18.13 οὔτε τὸ φιλικὸν βέβαιον οὔτε τὸ διευθέτευν ἀκίνδυνον); hence Meineke’s more unlikely conjectures μηκέτι ⟨μήτε⟩... μήτε and μηκέτι ⟨μήτε αὐτὰς⟩... μήτε.

2. πολλά ... ἀγαθὰ: for Hercher’s κἀγαθὰ (adopted by Schepers) cf. 3.28.4 πολλά καὶ ἀγαθὰ δοίης, Ἀφροδίτη πᾶνδημε, τῇ φιλτάτῃ γυναικί. But note also 4.9.2 οὔτως ἀγαθόν τί μοι γένοιτο, 4.19.2 τί σοι τηλικοῦτον γέγονεν ἀγαθόν. The change is not necessary since πολλά ἀγαθά and πολλά κἀγαθὰ are equally idiomatic, cf. AGPS 69.32.3.

4.4

BACCHIS TO PHRYNE

1. πονηροῦ μὲν ἀπηλλάγης ἔραστοι, χρηστόν δὲ εὑρές Ὕπερίδην: there is no need to delete Ὕπερίδην (Meineke, followed by Hercher and Schepers) as a marginal gloss, or alternatively add Εὐθίου after ἔραστο (Meineke, adopted by Benner-Fobes); we should read χρηστόν δὲ (sc. ἔραστήν) εὑρές Ὕπερίδην, as in 4.3.2 πονηρὸς Εὐθίας ἔραστής εὑρέθη, 4.9.4 οὖν ἔραστήν ἔχει Μενεκλείδην.

2. μὲν γάρ: the particle μὲν is usually followed by a corresponding δέ, e.g. 4.3.1 ὁ μὲν γὰρ ἀγὼν μόνης Φρύνης ... ὁ δὲ κίνδυνος ἀπασῶν. But here μὲν is picked up by καὶ νῦν. The repetition of γάρ is not unusual in Alciphron; here the particle is repeated four times in the paragraph, τὴν γὰρ δίκην ... νομίζω· διαβόητον γάρ ... πεποίηκεν. Εὐθίας μὲν γάρ ... στερούμενος: ὑπὸ γάρ ὀργῆς ... ζηλοτυπίας.

Meineke (1853) 102, changed γάρ to οὖν with the laconic argument ‘scripsi quod sententia postulat’. Although the γάρ of the manuscripts might have been influenced by the γάρ of the previous two sentences, it is difficult to see how Meineke’s correction would improve the text.

3. προσδέχου ... δι’ αὐτοῦ: προσδέχομαι in this passage means ‘expect’ (cf. Schepers 1901 113, LSJ III) and not ‘accept’ which seems to be the reason for Naber’s ⟨μὴ⟩ προσδέχου. The manuscripts have δι’ αὐτοῦ which can mean ‘through him’ or perhaps ‘on account of him’; διά + gen. is sometimes used in a causal sense, cf. BDAG A.5 citing Ach. Tat. 3.4.5 ὁ γάρ ὀφθαλμὸς πελάγους γεμισθεὶς ἀόριστον ἐκτείνει τὸν
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φόβον, ὡς καὶ διὰ τούτων (‘for this reason’, trans. BDAG) δύνατον δυστυχεῖν πλέονα. Perhaps we have a similar use in 1.9.3 πάντως γάρ πρὸς τῇ καταβολῇ τάργυρίου ἐσται παρ’ αὐτῶν τις διὰ σοῦ (‘thanks to you’, trans. Benner-Fobes) παραμυθία Διονυσίων ἢ Ἀπατουρίων τελουμένων.

The reading δι’ αὐτοῦ does make sense but we would expect something like ‘from him’ and Meineke’s ἀπ’ αὐτοῦ (adopted by Schepers) is an attractive suggestion. The confusion between ἀπ’ and δι’ is common (ἈΠ > ΔΙ) and may have been induced by the preceding δὴ. For the use of ἀπ’ cf. 2.23.1 τὸν ἀπὸ (Γ: ὑπὸ rell.) τῶν ὁμοιόμοιων προσφιλήσαι γέλωτα, 4.18.5, ἐδεξάμην ἀπὸ (VFPD: παρὰ Cobet) Πτολεμαίου τοῦ βασιλέως Αἰγύπτου γράμματα.

Bergler’s παρ’ αὐτοῦ (adopted by Hercher) gives the same sense and is used in 4.5.3 αἰτησόν τι παρ’ αὐτοῦ, 4.7.3 τὸ παρὰ πάντων σοφιστῶν χρυσίων. But a corruption from παρ’ to δι’ is less likely. Meiser deleted δι’ (adopted by Benner-Fobes); he seems to think that δι’ has crept in by dittography of the syllables λιν in πάλιν (ΠΑΛΙΝ > ΠΑΛΙΝΔΙ) but this is not a very likely corruption since there is an intervening ν.

4. εἰ ... ἐπέδειξας, οὐδὲν (ἂν) ... ὦφέλει: Seiler’s addition of ἄν is necessary; for unreal conditional sentences, see K-G 2.469–71; Schwyzer 2.686. In Koine and later Greek ἄν is often omitted in unreal conditional sentences (B-D §360) but Alciphron always uses ἄν, cf. 2.13.1 εἰ γεωργεῖν ἐβούλου ... ἔφερες ἄν ... κιττόν, 4.6.4 εἰ γάρ εἶδεν (Bergler: οἴδεν VFPD) ἐστὶν χρώμα σανδαράχης ἔχουσαν, οὐκ ἄν ἡμᾶς εἰς ἀμορφίαν ἐβλασφήμει, 4.17.2 εἰ Ἀδώνις ἦν ... οὐκ ἄν αὐτοῦ ἦν σχόμεν, 4.18.8 εἰ ἐν Ἀγάμησος, οὐδ’ οὗτος ἐν νῷ ἄν ἐσχόν. The omission of ἄν could be explained as a haplography after οὐδὲν, as in 3.11.1 οὐδὲν (ἂν) (Meineke) δεινὸν ἐτί γένοιτο.

ἀπέδειξας ‘display, bring forward’ (D) is virtually synonymous with ἐπέδειξας ‘exhibit, show’ (VFP) but ἀποδείκνυμι is not used by Alciphron whereas ἐπιδείκνυμι is, in several passages, e.g. 4.14.4 δεινὴ τῆς φιλονεικία κατέσχε Θρυαλλίδα καὶ Μυρρίνην ύπερ τῆς πυγῆς ποτέρα κρείττω καὶ ἀπαλωτέραν ἐπιδείξει. Bergler conjectured ἐπιδείξας for ἀπέδειξας.
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4-5

BAcCHIS TO MYRRHINE

1. Μὴ δὴ κρείττονος εἴη σοι τυχεῖν ἔραστοῖ, δέσποινα Ἀφροδίτη: for the optative in wishes (K-G 1.226–8, Schwyzer 2.320–4), cf. 3.12.1 κακὸς κακῶς ἀπόλοιτο καὶ ἄφωνος εἴη Λικύμνιος, 3.28.4 πολλὰ καὶ ἄγαθα δοίης, Ἀφροδίτη πάνδημε, 3.32.1 θεοὶ μάκαρες, ἱλήκοτε καὶ εὐμενεῖς εἴητε, and for the infinitive used as subject with the impersonal ἐστί (Schwyzer 2.366–7), cf. 2.38.2 κακὸς κακῶς ἀπόλοιτο καὶ ἄφωνος εἴη Λικύμνιος, 3.35.3 ἔτει δ’ οὐκ ἦν ἑτέρως πράττειν, 4.17.3 μὴ γὰρ ἔστι σωφρονῆσαι, 4.17.10 ἀλλὰ τί ἔστιν αὐτῷ ποιῆσαι, 4.18.16 οὐκ ἔστιν οὐδὲ προσελθεῖν.

Valckenaeer’s δοίη σοι τυχεῖν ἔραστοι δέσποινα Ἀφροδίτη makes Aphrodite the subject but δέσποινα Ἀφροδίτη should be interpreted as an invocation as in 4.9.3 δέσποινα Ἀφροδίτη, φιλεῖν, φής, 4.12.3 μετὰ φρύνου καθεύδειν ἂν εἱλόμην, Νέμεσι δέσποινα, 4.14.1 τῆς ἀηδίας, δέσποινα Ἀφροδίτη. The phrase δέσποινα Ἀφροδίτη is attested only in Ach. Tat. 8.5.8, Chariton 3.2.12, 5.10.1 and Herm. in Phdr. 189.16.

Εὐθίας σοι ὧν νῦν περιέπεις συγκαταβιών: the choice of words is unusual; περιέπω ‘treat’ is mostly used with an adverb but here it seems to be used in the same way as the poetic ἀμφιέπω (LSJ ii.1) ‘look after, tend’. For the rare συγκαταβιόω ‘spend one’s life with’, cf. Plut. Amat. 754a, Plut. Animine an corp. 500f, Xen. Ephes. 1.11.3, 5.8.4.

2. Φρύνην γὰρ στέρξει δηλονότι Μυρρίνην ὑπεριδών: this is the text found in PmsD; VFP have Μυρρίνην γὰρ στέρξει δηλονότι Μυρρίνην ὑπεριδῶν which must be corrupt. Seiler inverted the names reading Μυρρίνην γὰρ στέρξει δηλονότι Φρύνην ὑπεριδῶν and interpreted this passage as ironic ‘nimirum Myrrinam amabit, Phryne neglecta’. A similar interpretation is also suggested by the scribe of W who has changed the text to Φρύνην γὰρ ὑπεριδῶν δηλονότι στέρξει Μυρρίνην. But in the previous letter we learn that Euthias is still very much in love with Phryne (4.4.2 νῦν ἐκεῖνον ἐρῶντα μᾶλλον εὖ ἴσθι ἢ Ὑπερίδην) and Bacchis warns Phryne not to accept his gifts (4.4.4 μηδὲ Ὑπερίδην κακῶς δόξαι βεβουλεύσθαι ποιήσῃς τὰς Εὐθίου ἱκεσίας προσιεμένη). So the sense must be that Euthias will continue to desire Phryne but grow tired of Myrrhinhe.

The use of the verb στέργω ‘love, be fond of, be content’ is a bit peculiar; it is seldom used of sexual love as for example in 2.30.1 οὐδὲις
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tὸ μέτρῳ (Reiske: τῷ μέτρῳ τὸ codd.) πίνειν ἐστεργε. Seiler’s δῆλον ὅτι (adopted by the subsequent editors) is not necessary; the adverbial δηλονότι ‘clearly’, ‘obviously’ is used in the same sense as the elliptical phrase δῆλον ὅτι ‘it is clear that’ (LSJ δῆλος II.4), cf. K-G 2.368, Schw-yzer 2.590.

3. μεμίσησαι: the variant μεμίμησαι (VF) ‘you are imitated’ for μεμίσησαι ‘you are hated’ is probably a scribal error.

4.6
THAIS TO THETTALÊ

ΘΕΤΤΑΛΗ: The manuscripts have the accent on the last syllable (θετταλὴ VF; θετταλὴ PD) as in the adjective Θετταλή ‘thessalian’ but the correct accentuation is ΘΕΤΤΑΛΗ (W Ald), cf. Herodianus De prosodia catholica 3.1.321 Θεττάλη δράμα Μενάνδρου βαρύνεται παρὰ Αττικοῖς εἰς ἰδιότητα τεθέν.

1. Εὐξίππην: a courtesan with this name is mentioned in 4.14.2 (emended to Ζευξίππη by Hercher) but the name is otherwise very rare, cf. Plut. Am. narr. 779c, Herodianus De prosodia catholica 3.1.112, 3.1.377, St. Byz. 1.168 Billerbeck. Perhaps we should read Ζευξίππην (Reiske, adopted by Schepers 1901), cf. 3.14.1 οὐκ ἀνέχομαι ὅτι ἢ Ζευξίππην τὴν ἢ ἡπίπορνον ἀπηνῶς τῷ μειρακίῳ χρωμένη.

μὲν ἐντυγχάνειν: this is in fact the reading of the primary manuscripts (Schepers incorrectly states that F and P omit μὲν). All editors print ἐντυγχάνειν which is a conjecture in the Aldine for μὲν τυγχάνειν, the reading found in the secondary manuscripts; this has been emended to συντυγχάνειν by the scribe of W.

προσίεμην: the manuscripts have προσήμην (imperfect indic. middle 1.sg. of πρόσειμι ‘be added to, belong to’), but this reading does not seem correct; the use of the middle form ἤμην for ἢ/ἡ is common in later Greek, including Alciphron (2.10.1 οἶδα τῇ ἢμην (codd.: ἢν Cobet), 3.18.3 ἤμην (codd.: ἢν Hercher) οἶα τῖς Σπαρτιάτης ἄνηρ), but προσήμην would require a dative, cf. 3.14.3 τὰ προσόντα τούτῳ, 1.15.3 δόσοι μὴ περιουσία ... πρόσεστι. The conjecture προσίεμην (imperfect indic. middle 1.sg of προσήμι ‘let come near, admit’) by the scribe of W (and by Bergler) is no doubt correct. This reading was also anticipated by the unknown translator in ed. 1606, ‘non admitte-
bar’. For similar use of προσίημι, cf. 3.22.3 τὸν διαβολόκ μὴ προσιέμενον, 4.4.4 τὰς Εὐθίου ἱκεσίας προσιεμένη, 4.7.3 αὐτὸν οὐ προσιέμην, 4.11.4 αὐτὸν οὐ προσίετο.

2. ἡ δὲ: the variant ἄλλα (D) is probably a scribal error induced by ἄλλα Παμφίλου a few lines above and ἄλλα ταύτην a few lines below.

κάκιστα ἀπολουμένη: a common phrase in comedy where it is used as a strong imprecation ‘utterly damned, goddamned’ (LSJ ἀπόλλυμι B.I.1). It also occurs in 3.3.1 κάκιστ’ ἀπολουμένων (κάκιστα Ven., not reported by Schepers) and 4.10.2 κάκιστα ἀπολουμένου (VFPD: κάκιστα Ald.). The phrase is always written with elision in comedy but it also occurs without elision, e.g. Lucian Hist. conscr. 14, Ael. Ἐπ. 9. Meineke’s κάκιστ’, which is misspelled κακίστ’ in Schepers (1905), therefore hardly seems merited.

ἄλλα ταύτην μὲν: the μὲν clause is contrasted with what precedes as in 4.7.2, cf. Denniston 378. There is no need for Hirchig’s ἄλλα ταύτην μὲν (οὖν) (adopted by Schepers).

3. Ἀλῶα: the Haloa was a festival of Demeter and Persephone celebrated by women only and was often associated with courtesans, cf. 2.37.1, 4.18.4, 4.18.17, Dem. 59.116, Lucian Dial. meret. 1.1, 7.4. See further Dillon (2002) 120–4. The etymology is uncertain but it possibly derives from ἀλῶς ‘threshing floor’. Cobet (1854) 118 argued for the spelling Ἀλῶα (adopted by the subsequent editors) in analogy with adjectives like Νείλῳος and Κώος, cf. ΚΒ 2.292.

παρῆμεν: the reading in VFP (anticipated by Reiske) for παρ’ ἡμῖν (D) is no doubt correct, cf. 4.6.3, 4.13.3, 4.13.11, 4.14.2, 4.14.3.

ποιήματα: Naber’s ποιημάτια (adopted by Schepers) is hardly necessary; Naber also conjectured θεραπαινίδιων for θεραπαινίδων in 4.10.2 which Schepers for some reason rejected. Alciphron is very fond of diminutives, e.g. 4.3.1 ἄργυριον, 4.4.4 χρυσίον ... μαστάρια, 4.7.1 βιβλίδιον, 4.9.2 κτηματίων ... μισθωμάτια ... ταραντινίδια, 4.9.5 στεφάνια, 4.10.2 γραμματίδια, 4.11.4 χλανίσκιον, 4.11.8 χλαμύδιον, 4.13.3 κλωνία, 4.14.4 ζώνιον, 4.14.5 χιτώνιον, 4.14.8 κηπίον, 4.19.17 ἄγρυρον. But he frequently also uses normal forms, e.g. 1.17.2 κτῆμα, 3.21.2 μισθοῦς, 4.13.1 κήπος, 4.13.2 ἄγρον, 4.13.15 στέφανον, 4.18.5 γράμματα, 4.18.12 χρυσόν ... ἄργυρον. For further references on diminutives, see Arnott on Alexis fr. 2.7 K-A.

4. εἶδεν: the manuscripts have οἶδεν but Bergler’s εἶδεν is preferable. It is doubtful whether the perfect οἶδεν could be used in the protasis of an
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unreal conditional sentence; an imperfect or aorist is needed, cf. note on 4.4.4. The confusion between ει and οι is common due to the fact that they were pronounced in the same way.

5. μή μέ τι: Meineke’s slight change gives better sense than the manuscripts’ μή μέ ἄτι (μηκέτι W) as in 4.19.13 ἀλλ’ εἰ καὶ σῦ μή μέ (F: μήτε rell.) τι μέμψῃ μηδὲ αἰτιάσῃ, δέδοικα τοὺς Ἀττικοὺς σφήκας. Thais asks for understanding for what she is about to do, i.e. steal Pamphilus from Euxippe.

4.7

THAIS TO EUHYDEMUS

1. Ἀκαδημίαιν: this is the orthography often found in later texts, e.g. Lucian Dial. meret. 10.2., Max. Tyr. 11.6, 15.8. Meineke’s Ἀκαδήμειαιν (likewise in 2.11.1 and 4.18.10) which represents the orthography of the classical period is not necessary, cf. Meisterhans-Schwyzer (1900) 41, 50 and Threatte (1980) 128.

2. ἐμάνης, Εὐθύδημε ὁὐκ οίδας οἶός: Meineke’s ἐμάνης Εὐθύδημε, (ἡ) ὁὐκ οίδας (adopted by Schepers) is rightly rejected by Radermacher (1924) 29, who points out that asyndeton is characteristic for the letter style. For οίδας, see note on 4.2.2.

ὑμᾶς: the variant ἑμᾶς (PD) is probably a scribal error, although Thais does state further down that she has spent time with sophists herself, 4.7.6 καὶ αὐτὴ παρὰ τούτωι ἐσχόλακα καὶ πολλοῖς διείλεγαι. The confusion between ὑμᾶς and ἑμᾶς is common in the manuscripts since they were pronounced in the same way.

Ἑρπυλίδι: a courtesan named Herpyllis was the mistress of Aristotle (Diog. Laert. 5.13) and according to some sources the mother of Nicomachus (Timaeus FGrH 566 F 157, Ath. 13.589c). The manuscripts have Ἑρπυλίδι which the Aldine has corrected as in 4.10.1 Ἑρπυλίδος (Ald: Ἑρπυλίδος rell.) and 4.10.5 Ἑρπυλίς (P Ald: Ἑρπυλίς rell.).

ἄβρᾳ: not ‘slave’ but ‘maid’ (LSJ), ‘la femme de confiance de la maîtresse de maison’ (DELG ἄβρος), see Francis (1975) 43–66. The orthography of ἄβρᾳ (ἄβρα F Ald) is uncertain; it is most often printed aspirated by editors of literary texts but in lexicographical works it is printed unaspirated, which Francis advocates, e.g. Poll. Onom. 4.151, Ael. Dion. 6 Erbse.
3. σὲ γὰρ περιβάλλουσα κοιμᾶσθαι μᾶλλον ἐβουλόμην ἢ τὸ παρὰ πάντων σοφιστῶν χρυσίον: περιβάλλουσα governs both σὲ and τὸ χρυσίον, cf. Radermacher (1924) 29, who notes a similar passage in Hor. Sat. 1.1.70–1 congestis undique saccis | indormis. Seiler’s conjecture, χρυσίον (adopted by Schepers) and Meiser’s χρυσίον (λαβείν) spoils the image.

τῆς μεθ’ ἡμῶν συνηθείας: the reading μεθ’ ἡμῶν (VF and conjectured in the Aldine) is most likely correct; for the construction of συνηθεία ‘intimacy’, ‘sexual intercourse’ (LSJ συνηθεία 1.1.b) and μετά, cf. [Plut.] Par. min. 310e συνήθειαν ἔχειν μεθ’ ἑτέρας. The variant καθ’ ἡμῶν (PD) is a scribal error, which the scribe of W has tried to correct to καθ’ ἡμᾶς.

4. λῆρος ταῦτα εἰσι: the singular λῆρος ‘nonsense’ (D) is preferable to the plural λῆροι (VFP) in analogy with the singular τῦφος and ἔργολαβεια, cf. 3.19.10 ὡς τῶν σοφιστῶν λῆρος. The plural form λῆρους found in the final sentence of this letter is used as a more general reference. Meineke’s λῆρος ταῦτα ἐστι (adopted by Hercher and Schepers) deserves consideration; the neuter plural subject (especially a pronoun) normally has a verb in the singular (K-G 1.64–6, Schwyzer 2.607–8).

This use is less consistent in later Greek (B-D §133) but Alciphron always uses ταῦτα with a singular verb, e.g. 1.15.5 πλὴν ἐμὲ γε ταῦτα οὐκ ἔτερπεν, 3.10.3 ταῦτα ... ἐξ ὁφθαλμῶν ἐγεγόνει καὶ ἤν ἐν ἀσφαλεί, 3.26.4 ἐι ταῦτα εἰς φανερόν ὅθεν, 4.8.3 ἐ δὴ σοι ταῦτα ἡδονὴν φέρει, 4.18.4 ἐ δὲ τὸν ἤτερον με ... ταῦτ’ ἔστιν, 4.18.13 ὡς τενία δὲ μοι ἔσται χωρίς αὐτῆς ταῦτα, 4.19.14 τάχα γὰρ ἀλλοιότερα κάκεινοι καὶ σοι φανεῖται ταῦτα.

ἔργολαβεια: this spelling is not attested before Alciphron; the common spelling is ἔργολαβία.

τοσοῦτον ... ὅσον οὐ ... ἐκάτεροι πείθειν: the reading of the manuscripts is defended by D’Arnaud (1730) 229, who argues for an ellipse of the verb βούλονται: οὐ ... ἐκάτεροι πείθειν (sc. βούλονται). He compares this passage with Opp. Cyn. 257–8 ἀμφὶ δὲ πάσαι | γριφέας ἐλλίσσοντο βυθοὺς ἀκάτοισι περῆσαι. All editors, except Bergler and Benner-Fobes, have adopted the scribal conjecture πείθουσιν (W).

7. πότερος ἁμεινον αὐτῶν ἐπαίδευσεν ἄνδρας: we should read πότερος ἁμεινον (VF Ald) as an echo of the previous sentence, παιδεύομεν δὲ οὐ χέριν ἡμεῖς τοὺς νέους. This reading is defended by Henry (1905) 76–7. The point that Thais is trying to make is that she can be a better teacher to Euthydemos than Critias can. The scribal conjecture
πότερος ἀμείνους (W, adopted by Seiler and all subsequent editors) for πότερον ἀμεινον (PD) is certainly possible but would give a slightly different sense.

8. κατάβαλε: the aorist form is without doubt correct, cf. 3.20.2 πέπαυσο, κατάβαλε τὴν ἁλαζονείαν, τρισάθλε. See also Georgacas (1953) 243. The Aldine’s κατάβαλλε was none the less adopted by Schepers (1905) and Benner-Fobes, most likely because Schepers incorrectly attributed κατάβαλε to W and κατάβαλλε to the other manuscripts.

Ἡκε οἰος ἑπανελθὼν ἀπὸ Λυκείου πολλάκις τὸν ἱδρῶτα ἀποψώμενος: the relative clause does not have a finite verb which has prompted numerous unnecessary conjectures: ⟨εἴωθας⟩ ἑπανελθὼν (Reiske), ἑπανήλθε (Meiser), πολλάκις ἐφοίτας καὶ μοι παρεκάθησο (Meineke), πολλάκις ἐφοίτας οὐ (ῆκες) (Polak). But we can read the sentence with an ellipse of the verb ἢκες: οἰος (sc. ἢκες) ἑπανελθὼν. Ellipses occur elsewhere in Alciphron, e.g. 4.7.4 τοσοῦτον ... ὁσον οὐ ... ἐκάτεροι πείθειν (sc. βούλονται), 4.13.2 ποῦ ... ἀθρόαι (sc. ἢκεσ), 4.11.3 τὸ γάρ θρυλούμενον υπὸ πάντων, ὡς πονηραί (sc. εἰσι), ὡς ἀπίστοι, ὡς πρὸς τὸ λυσιτελές βλέπουσα μόνον, ὡς ἀεὶ τοῦ διδόντος, ὡς τίνος γὰρ οὐκ ἀπίστοι κακοὶ τοῖς ἑπανελθὼν.

λήρους: the variant κλήρους (V) ‘lot, inheritance’ is probably a scribal error; for λήρους ‘nonsense’, see note on 4.8.4.

4.8

SIMALION TO PETALE

2. παρηγόρημα: Bergler’s παρηγόρημα ‘consolation’ for the manuscripts’ κατηγόρημα ‘accusation, charge’ is most likely correct and has been adopted by all editors. The consolation theme is continued in the next paragraph with παραψυχή and παραμύθιον.

βρυχόμενον: from βρυχάομαι ‘roar, wail’; the variant βρυχόμενον (VF) from βρύκω or βρύχω ‘bite’, ‘devour’, can hardly be anything but a scribal error.

3. μικρὰ δ’ ἐπεστί μοι παραψυχή καὶ ... παραμύθιον δ: the correction of δν to δ (Aldine, adopted by Bergler, Wagner, Seiler, Meineke and Hercher) presents the easiest solution for this passage; δν might be an error of assimilation prompted by the ending of παραμύθιον. Schepers’ παραμύθιον (ὁ στέφανος) δν (adopted by Benner-Fobes) and
Keil’s παραμύθιον (τὸ ῥόδον) δ are not needed since it is quite clear that Simalion refers to a flower or garland as was pointed out by Herel (1768) 6–7; Cobet (1854) 119, suggested reading ἐτὶ ἔστι (adopted by Schepers) with the argument ‘solatium alicui ἐπείναι non potest’, but cf. Soph. Aj. 1215 τίς μοι, τίς ἔτι οὖν τέρψις ἐπέσται.

ὑπὸ τὴν λυπρὰν τῶν συμποσίῳ μέμψιν: ‘in the course of the reproach which distressed the guests’. Most editors have adopted Bergler’s (ἐν) τῷ συμποσίῳ but there is no need for a preposition; the dative is dependent of λυπρὰν (cf. LSJ λυπρός II.1). See also the note on ἐρωτικὰς μέμψεις in the next paragraph.

4. φοβοῦμαι ... μὴ ... μιμήσωμαι τινα τῶν περί τὰς ἐρωτικὰς μέμψεις ἀτυχεστέρων: the subjunctive μιμήσωμαι (PDpc: μιγήσωμαι Dpc) after a verb of fearing is needed, as in 4.16.6 φοβουμένων μὴ ἀλλ’ πάλιν γένηται τῆς ἐν τῶ παρόντι τύχης κόλυμα. The indicative μιμήσμοι (VF) is a scribal error; the confusion between ω and ο is very common. There is no need to change μέμψεις to τέρψεις (Nauck), πράξεις (Schepers) or θρύψεις (Polak). The meaning of ἐρωτικὴ μέμψις is unclear but the phrase is found in Democrit fr. 271 D-K ἐρωτικὴν μέμψιν ἢ ἀγαπωμένη λύει ‘the beloved frees one from the reproach of love’ (translation by Taylor (1999) 45), Lucian Am. 15 ἀσημίναι δ’ αὐτῶ φιλοσοφοί καὶ κλεπτομένης λαλιᾶς ἐρωτικαὶ διεπεραινόντο μέμψεις ‘whispering indistinctly and carrying on a lover’s complaints in secret conversation’ (translation by Macleod (1967) 173).

The sense is a not entirely clear but Simalion is probably threatening to commit suicide if things get any worse; note a similar passage in 1.11.4 ἢ τούτῳ μιγήσωμαι ἢ τὴν Λεσβίαν μιμησαμένη Σαπφώ οὐκ ἀπὸ τῆς Λευκάδος πέτρας, ἀλλ’ ἀπὸ τῶν Πειραικῶν προβόλων ἐμαυτὴν εἰς τὸ κλυδώνιον ὠσω.

4.9

PETALE TO SIMALION

2. ἐν τοῖς ἀργυρεῖοις ... μέταλλον: ‘stake in the silver mines’, this construction only occurs here (cf. LSJ μέταλλον I.3). The adjective ἀργυρεῖος is normally used in conjunction with μέταλλα or ἐργα, e.g. Thuc. 2.55.1 τὰ ἀργυρεῖα μέταλλα ἐστίν Ἀθηναίοις. But a similar phrase is found in Aeschin. In Tim. 101 ἐργαστήρια δύο ἐν τοῖς ἀργυρεῖοις. The manuscripts have ἀργυρίοις (corrected to ἀργυρεῖοις by
the scribe of W) which is probably an itacistic error, although it could also be interpreted as a dative of ἄργυριον 'money'.

τοῦ χρόνου τούτου: ‘within that time’, which refers to ἐνιαυτὸν. The temporal genitive is used to denote the time within which an event takes place (K-G 1.385–7, Schwyzser 2.112–3). We should not follow Bergler, Wagner, Hercher and Schepers in adopting τὸν χρόνον τοῦτον (MW Ald: τοῦτον KCN).

3. τις ὁ διδοὺς: Hirschig deleted τις (followed by Schepers) by arguing that τις is never joined with the article, but cf. Lib. Decl. 13.1.6 ἀντισχεῖν δυνησόμεθα, εἰ μή τις ὁ κωλύσων φανέται.

φιλεῖν: the infinitive φιλεῖν (Reiske and Valckenaer, adopted by Hercher and Schepers) is preferable to φιλεῖς (VFPD); φής governs both φιλεῖν and ζῆν ... μὴ δύνασθαι in the next sentence, cf. 4.9.5 κλάειν δι’ ὅλης φῆσι τῆς νυκτός.

4. οὐ ποτήριά ἐστιν ἐπὶ τῆς οἰκίας ὑμῖν, μὴ χρυσία τῆς μητρός, μὴ δάνεια τοῦ πατρός κομιούμενος: most editors find this passage corrupt or lacunose but the text is probably sound; we should supply the verb and read μὴ (sc. τις ἐστίν) χρυσία τῆς μητρός, μὴ δάνεια τοῦ πατρός κομιούμενος ‘is there no one (i.e. a cunning slave) who will recover your mother’s gold or father’s loans?’ For κομίζω used of recovering money or debts, cf. LSJ II.8, Lys. 32.14, Andoc. 1.38, Dem. 4.7.

Stealing from ones parents for the sake of satisfying a courtesan is a common theme in comedy, cf. Harsh (1955) who mentions Plaut. Pseud. 120–2 [Pseudolus] si neminem alium potero, tuom tangam patrem. | [Calidorus] di te mihi semper servent! verum, si potest, | [pietatis causa ... vel etiam matrem quoque, 290 [Calidorus] egon patri surrupere possim quiequam, tam cauto seni?, Lucian Dial. meretr. 12.1 καὶ καλῶς, ὅτι μήτε ἄργυριον πώποτε ἠτέσάσε μήτε ἠτέσα, ἠτέσα, ἠτέσα, μήτε παραλογισάμενον τὸν πατέρα ἢ ὑψόλευμον πάθος ἢ ἄναγκαις εἰς δικοῖν καὶ Dial. meretr. 7.4 μόνον οὕτος οὐ τέχνην εὑρήκει ἐπὶ τὸν πατέρα, οὐκ οἰκήτην καθήκεν ἐξαπατήσῃ, οὐκ ἀπὸ τῆς μητρὸς ἠτέσας ἀπειλήσας ἀποπλευσθῶς στρατευόμενος, εἰ μὴ λάβοι, ἀλλὰ κἀκεῖστος ἠτέσα ἐπιτρίβων μήτε αὐτός διδοὺς μήτε παρὰ τῶν διδούσων ἐώς λαμβάνειν;

Wagner’s τί οὖν οὐ ... ὑμῖν μὴ ... κομιουμένοις is an interesting suggestion by taking κομιουμένοις as a conjunct participle governed by ὑμῖν, ‘nonne habes domi pocula, aurea monilia matris, syngraphos patris, quae tu, (servique, qui filius herelibus hanc talem operam tam prompte solent praestare) adferatis?’ (Wagner (1798) 1.213). This
conjecture deserves serious consideration according to Costa (2001) 1.146 (who wrongfully attributed the conjecture to Hercher); Costa suggested the following translation: ‘Can’t you bring goblets even if you can’t get hold of ...?’

Φιλῶτις: Seiler’s correction of φιλότης (adopted by all subsequent editors) is simple and elegant; Φιλῶτις is the title of a comedy by Antiphanes (fr. 221 K-A) and the name of a courtesan in Terence’s Hecyra.

{τοῖς} εὔμενεστέροις ὄμμασιν εἶδον ἐκείνην αἱ Χάριτες: D’Arnaud is right in deleting τοῖς, which is probably a dittography prompted by the ending of Φιλῶτις (Seiler: φιλότης VFPD), cf. 3.8.2, ἀλλ’ ἴσως εὔμενεστέροις ὄμμασιν ἐκείνον εἶδον αἱ Χάριτες, Aristaen. 1.11, εὐμενεστέροις ὄμμασιν ἐκείνην αἱ Χάριτες εἶδον, Aristaen. 1.19, Μελισσάριον ... εὐμενέσιν ὀφθαλμοῖς ... εἶδεν ἡ Τύχη.

5. κλαίων: Seiler prints κλάων (adopted by all subsequent editors) probably on account of κλαίων in the two previous sentences. But note 4.8.2 κλαίοντα, 4.19.10 κλαίουσα.

4.10
MYRRHINE TO NICIPPE

1. Δίφιλος: Bergler’s Δίφιλος (adopted by Seiler and all subsequent editors) is no doubt the correct reading for διίφιλος (VFPD). If the δ was written with a long tail it may well have been misread as δι which would have resulted in the adjective διίφιλος ‘dear to Zeus’. The proper name, however, is spelled Δίφιλος, cf. Pl. Cra. 399a–b.

2. τέτταρας: PD have the Ionic spelling τέσσαρας; the manuscripts are inconsistent regarding the variation between the Attic -ττ- and the Ionic -σσ- (e.g. 1.17.2 τεττάρων, 1.13.1 τέσσαρας, 2.36.2 τεσσάρων) but on the whole the Attic spelling seems to predominate in Alciphron, e.g. ἦττων 5x, ἥσσων nil; θάλαττα 20x, θάλασσα 2x; κρείττων 5x, κρείσσων 1x; πράττω 10x, πράσσω nil. Note also the alliteration in τέτταρας ... Θεττάλης.

{Λύσιδος} ... Λύσιδος: an error of anticipation which has been corrected in W and Ald.

3. κοιμηθησόμενος: Cobet and Meineke (followed by Hercher and Schepers) changed the passive κοιμηθησόμενος of the manuscripts to
the middle κοιμησόμενος in agreement with 4.10.1 ἐπίκωμος ποτε πρὸς ἠμᾶς καὶ κοιμησόμενος ἐφοίτα (as an alternative Meineke suggested changing κοιμησόμενος in 4.10.1 to κοιμηθησόμενος). The assumed corruption could be explained as an ‘unconscious reminiscence or anticipation of nearby syllables in the sequence’ (Diggle (2004) 444): ἐλθη... κοιμηθησόμενος ... βουληθείη.

Although the change from middle to passive is a bit strange there is reason to keep the passive κοιμηθησόμενος. There might be some subtle nuances between the middle and the passive voice in this context; Diphilus took a more active role in the past (ἐπίκωμος ποτε πρὸς ἠμᾶς καὶ κοιμησόμενος ἐφοίτα) whereas he now expects to be pampered by Myrrhine (κἂν ἐλθη ποτὲ πρὸς ἠμᾶς κοιμησόμενος). Both the middle and the passive voice are used in erotic contexts, cf. e.g. (middle) Lucian Dial. D. 10.5 (Ganymedes to Zeus) ἐγώ δὲ κοιμήσωμαι σοῦ καταφιλούντος; (passive) Lucian Dial. meret. 14.2 (a courtesan complaining to her stingy lover) ἄλλ' ἐκοιμήθης νῦκτος δύσο. Unfortunately the other examples in Alciphron shed no light on this question since they can be interpreted as either middle or passive, cf. 2.36.2 ἥκουσα ... Ἐπιμενίδην τινὰ Κρῆτα κεκοιμῆσθαι, 4.7.3 σὲ γὰρ περιβάλλουσα κοιμᾶσθαι μᾶλλον ἐβουλώμην, 4.11.4 ύπο τούμον ἡγάπα κοιμωμένη χλανίσκιον.

εἰ δὴ ... βουληθείη ... ἐὰν δὲ ... ἀνύσυμεν: the editions present a confusing array of variants for this passage. The root of the problem seems to be Meineke’s unclear note (Meineke (1853) 105) on 4.10.3 ‘Legebatur ἐὰν pro ei.’ Meineke, who prints εἰ δὴ ... βουληθείη... εἰ δὲ ... ἀνύσυμεν, is referring to the second εἰ but this has been misinterpreted by some editors as referring to the first εἰ. Hercher prints ἐὰν δὲ ... βουληθῇ ... εἰ δὲ ... ἀνύσυμεν, but expresses confusion in his note on the passage (p. xvi) ἐὰν δὲ et βουληθῇ nescio unde irrepserint. Restitue εἰ δὲ et βουληθείη.’ The source for the subjunctive βουληθῇ for the optative βουληθείη is unknown and is probably a typographical error. Hercher does, however, correctly attribute the second εἰ as a conjecture by Meineke. But Schepers has clearly misunderstood Meineke’s note since he prints εἰ δὴ βουληθείη ... εἰ δὲ ... ἀνύσυμεν (in his apparatus he attributes the first εἰ as a conjecture by Meineke for the manuscripts’ ἐὰν). Finally Benner-Fobes have restored what they thought to be the reading of the manuscripts to ἐὰν δὴ ... βουληθείη ... εἰ δὲ ... ἀνύσυμεν, a complete reversal of the correct reading.

οὐ τοῦτο μόνον ... ἀλλὰ: usually written οὐ μόνον ... ἀλλὰ καὶ (cf. LSJ μόνος B.Π.2, K-G 2.257, Denniston 3) but occasionally καὶ is omitted, especially if ἀλλὰ is followed by a conjunction or relative clause (cf.
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K-G 2.257). Frequently found in Alciphron with καί (1.15.3, 1.17.3, 2.19.1, 2.27.1 3.14.1, 3.19.7, 3.29.2, 3.40.1, 4.4.1, 4.16.8, 4.19.6); the only passage without καί is 3.3.2 οὐ πρὸς κόρον μόνον ἀλλ᾽ εἰς τρυφήν. The omission of οὐ (VF) is probably a scribal error caused by a haplography of οὐ τοῦτο.

4. πειρασθέν: this is the reading of the primary manuscripts (aorist passive participle of πειράζω). However, all editors except Bergler and Benner-Fobes print πειραθέν (aorist passive participle of πειράω) a scribal conjecture found only in K and W (Seiler and Schepers wrongly report that D has πειρασθέν). According to LSJ πειράζω was used by early authors only in present and imperfect, and πειράω in the other tenses. Alciphron does not, however, seem to follow this practice so πειρασθέν should not be changed: πειράω is used in 2.7.1 ἐπειρῶ (imperfect), 2.7.1 πειρῶν (present), 3.2.3 πειραθείσα (aorist), 4.18.3 πειραθήναι (aorist), 4.19.17 πειράζεις, 4.19.19 πειρῶ (present); πειράω or πειράζω is used in 3.18.3 πειράσεται (future), 4.16.5 ἐπείρασαν (aorist).

ὅ ... ἐκκορήσειεν: there is no need to change the aorist optative to ἐκκορήσει (Meineke, adopted by Hercher and Schepers) or ὅ τι ἐκκορήσει (Cobet). The optative without ἄν can be used in relative clauses when expressing a wish, cf. AGPS 54.13.2, K-G 2.429, 2.435, Schwzyer 2.322, Xen. An. 3.2.3 οἴμαι γὰρ ἂν ἡμᾶς τοιαύτα παθεῖν οἷα τοὺς ἐξήρασις ἢ τὸν πολὺς τοσαῦτα θεοί ποιῆσαι, Dem. 18.290 τί οὖν, ὦ κατάρατ᾽, ἐμοὶ περὶ τούτων λοιδορεῖ, καὶ λέγεις ἂ σοὶ καὶ τοῖς σοῖς οἱ θεοὶ τρέψειν εἰς κεφαλήν. The verb ἐκκορέω is used also in 3.26.1 ἀλλ᾽ ἐκκορηθείης ὅτι ἄκαιρος εἶ καὶ λάλος. But it is quite rare and found only in comedy before Alciphron, cf. Ar. Pax 59 μὴ ἐκκόρει τὴν Ἑλλάδα, Ar. Thesm. 760 ταλαντάτη Μίκα, τίς ἑκκόρησέ σε, Men. Georg. 53 ἀλλ᾽ ἐκκορηθείης σὺ γ᾽.

5. ἀμφιβάλλειν εἰῶθε τὰ φίλτρα καὶ ἀποσκῆψειν: ‘love potions tend to be uncertain and will suddenly result in death’ (LSJ ἀμφιβάλλω IV.2 and ἀποσκῆπτειν II.1), cf. Dion. Hal. Ant. Rom. 7.15 ἡ ἡμετέρον δημοκρατίαν εἰς μέγα τι κακὸν ἀποσκῆψειν οἱ Θεοί. Note the similar passage in 3.34.5 εἰῶθα ταῦτα γὰρ αἱ τοσαῦτα μεταβολαὶ οὐκ εἰς τὸ ζῆν ἀλλ᾽ εἰς ἀπώλειαν καταστρέφειν. The change in tense from the present ἀμφιβάλλειν to the future ἀποσκῆψειν is a bit odd but the changes suggested are unnecessary: ἀποσκῆπτει (W Ald, adopted by Bergler, Wagner, Seiler and Hercher), ἀποσκῆπτει (Schepers 1905), καὶ (δὴ καὶ) ἀποσκῆπτειν (Meineke), κἂν ἀποσκῆψειν (Meineke),
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καὶ ἀποσκήπτειν (ἔνιστε) (Cobet, adopted by Schepers (1901)), καὶ ἀποσκήπτειν (ἐσθ’ ὅτε) (Cobet). For the dangers of using love potions, see Faraone (1999) 110–19.

4.11

MENECLEIDES TO EUTHYCLLES

1. ἔρωτος ὅσον ἡδίστοι τότε οὕτω πονηροῦ νῦν μνήμην: the reading of the manuscripts, ἔρωτος ὅσον ἡδίστοι τὸ τέλος οὐ πονηροῦ νῦν μνήμην, does not make any sense; a plausible emendation would be to read τότε οὗτω for τὸ τέλος οὐ. A tentative explanation of the corruption could be that an abbreviation of -τω in οὗτω was displaced over τότε and subsequently misinterpreted as τὸ τέλος by a scribe. For abbreviations of -τω, cf. Allen (1889) 25, Plate viii. For οὗτω ... ὅσος, cf. 3.25.2 καὶ οὖχ οὕτω με ἔδακνεν ἢ ὑβρίς ὅσον τὸ διάφορον τοῦ ὑβρίζοντος. A similar expression of nostalgia is used later in this letter (4.11.5 ἔδει γὰρ αὐτῇ συγκατακείσθαι με καὶ νῦν ὡς τότε). Jacobs’ τότε τοσοῦτον πικροῦ (adopted by Meineke and all subsequent editors) is difficult to explain on palaeographical grounds, although πικροῦ would be more suited with ἡδίστοι than πονηροῦ. Abresch’s τότε τόσον πονηροῦ is equally unlikely palaeographically and furthermore τόσος is not attested in Alciphron.

οὗτος ἔσται χρόνος: a common phrase, although most often written with the article, ὁ χρόνος, which was suggested by Seiler and adopted by Hercher and Schepers. The reading οὗτως in VFP (not reported by Schepers), in W (possibly a conjecture) and Bergler (probably a typographical error since he translates ‘non veniet illud tempus’) would be a possible reading but less likely than οὗτος in this context.

4. καὶ ὅμως ἄκοντα αὐτὸν ὑποσκόπτω: numerous conjectures have been suggested for ἄκοντα, ranging from interesting to puzzling (see appendix), but the text is probably sound: ἄκοντα normally means ‘involuntary, unwilling’ (as in 3.5.2 δύο δὲ ὅτε καὶ ἔρρωμένῳ τόχιστα αὐτήν καὶ ἄκουσαν ἀπάξει δυνησόμεθα, 2.35.3 καὶ ἔχω τὸν ἕξ ὑβρεως ἀνδρα, οὐχ ἔκοισα μὲν ὅμως δὲ ἔχω) but should here be translated ‘to his chagrin’, cf. Wagner (1798) 2.256 ‘et tamen, quidquid ille indignaretur, non admisit’ and Keil (1853) 47 ‘wider seinen Willen, zu seinem Verdruss nahm sie ihm nicht auf’. For προσίημι in this context, cf. 4.4.4 τὰς Εὐθίου ἱκεσίας προσιεμένη, 4.6.1 τὸ μειράκιον οὐ προσίεμη (W: 170
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προσήμην VFPD), 4.7.3 τότε μὲν οὖν αὐτὸν οὐ προσιέμην.

χλανίσκιον: a diminutive of χλανίς 'mantle', see also 4.13.8 τὰ χλα-
νίσκια (VFPD: χλανίσκια Bast: χλανίδια Meineke) ἐπιστορέσασαι;
the variant χλανίδιον (VF, adopted by Meineke and Hercher) is virtually
synonymous but mostly used of a woman’s mantle.

5. τί δαί: a colloquial expression which is very common in comedy. All
editors before Schepers read τί δέ (D) which is more commonly used
in a transition from a person or a thing to another as in 4.19.19, cf.
K-G 2.134. But δαί can also be used in a transitional sense according
to Denniston 263; it is probably the correct reading here, being rather
a lectio difficilior and not a scribal error from a common confusion be-
tween αῖ and ε.

ὡς χρηστὸν ἥδος οὐκ εἰς εὐδαίμονα βίου προαίρεσιν δαίμων τις

ὑπήνεγκεν: ‘what a noble character that some deity led into an unfor-
tunate course of life’, a somewhat difficult sentence which has puzzled
the scholars; Bergler keeps the text of the manuscripts but translates
‘felicitae vitae conditionem’ which would suggest the reading εὐδαίμο-
νος βίου προαίρεσιν (Seiler, adopted by Schepers (1091)). The phrase
εὐδαίμων βίος ‘a happy life’ is indeed common in philosophical texts
(LSJ εὐδαίμων 3) but here we should rather read βίου προαίρεσιν
‘course of life’ (sometimes written without βίου, cf. LSJ 1.2). For exam-
pies, see e.g. Dem. Ἐρ. 3.18 ἐν δὲ προαιρέσει χρηστῆ καὶ βίω σώφρονι
καὶ δημοτικῷ προελέσασαι ζῆν, Dem. 23.141 δὲ δ’ ὑμιὼν ἐκεῖνος τούτῳ
τῇ προαιρέσει τοῦ βίου, Dem. 48.56 μελαγχολάν δοκέων ἀπαίνει τοῖς
οἰκείοις καὶ τοῖς γνωρίμοις τῇ προαιρέσει τοῦ βίου, Dem. 61.2 τὰ δ’
αὐτῷ συμβουλέει περὶ παιδείας τε καὶ προαιρέσεως τοῦ βίου, Aristot.
Metaph. 1004b24 διαφέρει τῆς μὲν τῷ τρόπῳ τῆς δυνάμεως, τῆς δὲ τοῦ
βίου τῇ προαιρέσει.

ὑπήνεγκεν has unnecessarily been changed to ἀπήνεγκεν (Meineke)
and ὑπήγαγεν (Hirschig), cf. LSJ ὑποφέρω V.2, App. B Civ. 2.1.2 ἐς πε-
νίαν ὑπενηνεγμένου, 5.1.6 ὁ δὲ πόλεμος αὐτὰ ἐς τοσοῦτον ὑπενηνόχει.

Schepers (1905) deleted the whole sentence but it is most likely not
a later addition since the passage appears to be alluded to by Aristaen.
1.12 ἐταίρας μὲν γὰρ Ἡ πυθίας εἰληχε βίον, ἀπλότητα δὲ σύμφωνον ἔχει
καὶ ἀμεμπτον ἡθος, ἀπαίνει τῆς τάξεως τοῦ βίου βελτίω, καὶ αὐτὸν με

6. ἡδίστοις ... κολάσμασιν: ‘pleasant punishments’, the masochistic
tone is slightly odd in this context but the reading in PD (adopted by
Bergler, Wagner, Seiler and Benner-Fobes) is probably correct; the vari-
ant κολαύμασιν (VF), a vox nihili, is most likely a scribal error and not remnants of a different reading. The word κόλασμα 'punishment' is very rare and not attested in erotic contexts but Benner-Fobes point to an interesting parallel in Hsch. κ 3308 κολάζειν -περαίνειν (for the sexual meaning of περαίνω, see LSJ II). Bergler defended κολάσμασιν with the rather embarrassing reference to Ar. Nub. 1070 γυνή δὲ συναμώρουμεν χαίρει 'a women likes being treated rough'. The numerous conjectures are pale in comparison: ἀπολαύσμασιν 'enjoyment' (Meineke), κολακεύμασιν 'flattery' (Hercher), παλαίσμασιν 'wrestling-match' (Hermann), ἀκολαστάσμασιν 'act of licentiousness' (Bergk), ἀγκαλίσμασιν 'embraces' (Meiser).

7. ἀπαντα ἑκείνη γε τὸν κεστὸν ύπεξώσατο: ‘she girded herself with all her charm’. Meineke suggested ὑπέζωστο (adopted by Schepers and Benner-Fobes) but it is very likely that the reading of the manuscripts, ὑπεξώσατο, is correct since this passage is paraphrased by Aristaen. τῆς Ἀρισταίου τῶν Χαρίτων πάντως (cod.: πασῶν pauw) ἡ Λαῒς τὸν κεστὸν ὑπεξώσατο (cod.: υπεζωσαται Sambucus: υπεξωσαται Hercher: υπεξωσατο Abresch, Bast). Aristaenetus’ ὑπεξώσατο is shown to be the correct reading on account of prose rhythm by Nissen (1940) 3.

Friederich’s ιμάντα for ἀπαντα was prompted by the passage in Hom. Il. 14.214 κεστὸν ιμάντα. But since Aristaenetus’ paraphrase has πάντως it is likely that Alciphron wrote ἀπαντα. Meiser’s ἀπαντα ἑκήλει, ἣ γε τὸν κεστὸν ὑπεξώσατο κόλποις, (σὺν) ταῖς Χάρισι τὴν Ἀφροδίτην δεξιωσαμένη is not convincing; the change of subject from Peitho to Bacchis would be awkward. According to Meiser (1905) 219, Alciphron is alluding to Eup. 102.5–6 K-A πειθώ τις ἐπεκάθιζεν ἐπὶ τοῖς χείλεσιν. οὕτως ἑκήλει καὶ μόνος τῶν ῥητόρων.

ὀλαις ταῖς χάρισι τὴν Ἀφροδίτην δεξιωσαμένη: most editors print χάρισι but the context requires that the phrase be translated ‘with all her graces she greeted Aphrodite’; δεξίονοις ‘greet, honour’ is often used with the instrumental dative, e.g. h. Ven. 15–6 (the gods welcoming Aphrodite) οἱ δ’ ἦσσαντο ιδέντες | χερσὶ τ’ ἐδεξίωσαν, Soph. El. 975–6 τίς γάρ ποτ’ ἀστῶν ἢ ξένων ἡμᾶς ιδὼν | τοιοῦτος’ ἐπαίνοις οὐχὶ δεξίωσεται. This interpretation is also supported by the fact that a different adjective is used in the phrase below, πάσαις μέλουσα Χάρισι, which without a doubt refers to the personified Graces; this might of course be for the sake of variation but a more likely explanation is that the change from ὀλαις to πάσαις marks a shift in the meaning of χάρις, from graces to Graces. The use of ὀλαις with persons would also be strange, although not unattested. ὀλαις ταῖς χάρισι is defend-
ed by Friedrich (1870) 543, but he argues that χάριτες are attributes of Aphrodite; but in that case we would need a preposition. The uncommon usage of ὅλος has prompted some unnecessary conjectures: αὐταῖς (Reiske), ὁμοῦ (Meineke); but cf. LSJ ὅλος I.5, 3.18.2 ἐπεὶ γὰρ εἰς ἐμαυτὸν ὅλας τὰς ἐκθέσεις συνελεξάμην, ἀπορία δὲ ἣν αὐτοῖς παντελῆς ἁγιουρίου, ἐπὶ ἐμὲ πάντες ὄφρησαν, Men. Ph. 295–6 εἰς ὅλος δὲ μοι σὺ, Δαῖ, τῶν ὅλων κατάσκοπος πραγμάτων γενοῦ, Nonnus Dion. 47.481–2 ἄχνυμενος δὲ ἵνα χαίδης Διόνυσος ὅλας ὀίστησε γυναῖκας, Anth. Pal. 5.217.5 (Paulus Silentius) χρυσὸς ὅλους ὑπῆρξας, ὅλας κληίδας ἐλέγχει.

8. μέλουσα: the manuscripts have μέλλουσα, a simple confusion of double consonants, which Bergler corrected, although he was anticipated by the anonymous translator of ed. 1606 ‘iacet omnibus adamata gratisque muta, lapis et civis’.

4.12

LEAENA TO PHILODEMUS

1. οἷον τὸ χρῶμα γυναικός, αὐτοσανδαράκη: ‘what a complexion for a woman, quite vermilion’, the reading of the manuscripts gives the required sense; there is no need for Meineke’s (τῆς) γυναικός (adopted by all subsequent editors). A white complexion was considered attractive on women and it was also a sign of wealth and respectability since it proved that they did not have to work outside in the sun; it was common practice to whiten the skin with powder of white lead, cf. 4.12.2 ὅσον δὲ κατεπέπλαστο ψιμύθιον. αὐτοσανδαράκη is attested only here; for σανδαράκη ‘realgar, arsenic sulphide’, cf. 4.6.4 εἰ γὰρ εἶδεν ἐστιν χρῶμα σανδαράχης ἔχοσαν, οὐκ ἂν ἡμᾶς εἰς ἀμορφίαν ἐβλασφήμει. Alciphron frequently uses the prefix αὐτο-, cf. 2.37.3 αὐταδέλφων, 3.4.2 αὐτόνεκρον, 3.7.2 αὐτοσκωμάτων, 3.7.3 αὐτοχαρίτων, 3.19.1 Ἀὐτόκλητος, 3.34.2 αὐτοσκαπανεύς, 3.42.2 Ἀὐτόχθονος. For further examples see Richards (1923) 23–4 and Verdenius (1968) 137, 148–9. ταῖς ἐπὶ τῆς κορυφῆς θριξίν: D’Orville’s τῆς κορυφῆς is a simple correction of ταῖς κορυφαῖς (VFPD) which probably is a corruption by assimilation to the adjacent ταῖς ... θριξίν.

3. αἰαῖ: the manuscripts have αἲ αἴ but Seiler’s accentuation is supported by Hdn. Gr. 2.933; this accentuation is customary in modern editions
although the manuscripts usually accent each αί individually, cf. Barrett on Eur. Hipp. 208–9. The interjection is common in tragic lamentation but rare in prose, but cf. 3.31.2 σιά τής ἀγερωχίας (Seiler: αί σιά codd.), Lucian Dial. meret. 10.3 σιάι τάλαν, ούδὲ το χαίαρειν προσέγραψε.

**dοκεὶ προσπνέειν:** verbs ending in -εω are usually contracted in later Greek following the practice of classical Greek but there are exceptions to this rule, especially in monosyllabic words, cf. B-D §89. Both uncontracted and contracted forms are found in Alciphron so the reading of the manuscripts should be preserved, cf. 1.4.2 ἀναπνεῖν, 2.7.2 ἀναπνέεις (ἀναστένεις Bergler: βαρὺ ἀναπνεῖς Seiler), 4.13.15 ἀποπνεῖ. The present ἀναπνεῖ of the manuscripts is preferable to cobet’s imperfect ἐδόκει (adopted by Hercher, Schepers and Benner-Fobes), cf. 4.4.2 ὑπὸ γὰρ ὀργῆς μοι δοκεὶ κινηθεὶς διὰ τὴν ἐμφυτὸν ἀμαθίαν ὑπερᾶραι τὸ μέτρον τῆς ἐρωτικῆς ζηλοτυπίας, 4.10.2 δοκεὶ δὲ μοι μᾶλλον ὑπὸ τοῦτων τετυφώσθαι καὶ ὑπερεντρυφᾶν ἡμῖν, 4.11.7 ἐπ’ ἄκροις μοι δοκεὶ τοῖς χείλεσιν αὐτῆς ἐκάθισεν ἡ Πειθώ, 4.11.9 ἥδυ γάρ μοι τι δοκεὶ περὶ ἐκείνης καὶ λαλεῖν καὶ γράφειν.

**ἐμβλέψαι 'τι μή δωρίδι' βουλομαι ἢ μετὰ τής ἀλύσεως καὶ τῶν περισκελίδων 'συγκαρ ***:** this passage is corrupt beyond repair; Wagner’s only comment on the passage is fitting (2.221): ‘Haec vero Oedipum exspectant’. The end of this letter and the beginning of the next is missing, probably due to physical damage in the archetype (περισκελίδων συγκαρ VF: π[2 litt.]σκ[5 litt.]λίδων συγκαρ P: om. D). Wagner, who first edited this letter, wrongly reported that F has συγκαρ which was then adopted by all subsequent editors and formed the basis for the unconvincing conjectures.

Seiler suggests Νέμεσι δέσποινα, ἐμβλέψαι σε τῇ Δωρίδι εὐχομαι, ἢ μετὰ τῆς ἀλύσεως καὶ τῶν περισκελίδων συγκεραυνοῦσθαι αὐτὴν 'lady Nemesis, I pray that you will look at the Dorian girl, or strike her down together with her chain and anklets' by comparing with 4.10.4 ἐπικηρυκευομέθα δή αὐτῶ καὶ δακρύσωμεν πιθανῶς, καὶ τὴν Νέμεσιν δεῖν αὐτῶν ὀράν εἰ σύνος ἐμὲ περιόψεται ἐρῶσαν αὐτοῦ. But the change of βούλομαι to εὐχομαι is difficult to defend and the meaning of the sentence is rather strange.

Polak’s Νέμεσι δέσποινα, ἐμβλέψαι τινὶ δωρίδι βουλομαι, ἢ μετὰ τῆς ἀλύσεως καὶ τῶν περισκελίδων συγκεράσθαι ἑκείνῃ ‘lady Nemesis, I would rather look at a doris than to be closely attached to that one with her chain and anklets’ is unsatisfactory; Polak, according to Schepers (1901) 154, seems to interpret δώρις as the plant doris or echis mentioned in Plin. HN 22.24 and 25.58. But this makes no sense at all.

Warmington’s Χιμαιρίδι ‘the Chimaera’ (adopted by Benner-Fobes
but rejected by Georgacas (1953) 243) gives sense but it is difficult to see how Χιμαιρίδι would have been corrupted into τι μὴ δωρίδι. Furthermore, χιμαιρίς is a diminutive of χίμαιρα 'she-goat', cf. the unattested conjecture in 4.13.10 χιμαιρίδος (Herings: χειμερίδος VFPD, a vox nihili). But perhaps χιμαιρίς was used in analogy with χίμαιρα which can mean both 'she-goat' and 'Chimaera'. For Alciphron’s fondness of diminutive forms, see note on 4.6.3.

4.13

1. *** ἐραστοῦ χωρίον Νύμφαις θυσίαν λέγουσα ὕφείλειν: the beginning of the letter is missing. Meineke tentatively suggested ⟨ἐκάλησεν ἡμᾶς ἔναγχος (ἡ δεῖνα) εἰς τοῦ⟩ ἐραστοῦ; this reading has been adopted by most translators, starting with Hercher ‘... invitaverat nos nuper in] amatoris praedium ad sacra facienda, ut aiebat, Nymphis debita’. Meineke rightly argued that this letter is connected with 4.14 and that it had a similar introduction. In the first German translation of this letter, Melissa has been supplied as the subject of the sentence, cf. Fischer (1906) 67 ‘Melissa lud uns alle auf das Landgut ihres Liebhabers ein, weil man den Nymphen ein Opfer schulde’ (adopted in the translation by Benner-Fobes). This is not impossible considering 4.13.6 Ἡμεῖς ἔφη ἡ Μέλισσα ὥστε καὶ κατακλινῶμεν; but a more likely subject would perhaps be Glycera, cf. 4.14.1 κληθεῖσα ὑπὸ Γλυκέρας ἐπὶ θυσίαν. The recipient of the letter may well have been Bacchis like in 4.14. Some passages are unusually explicit and have even been omitted in the first French translation, cf. Rouville (1875) 174 ‘Certaines endroits de cette lettre sont vraiment intraduisibles. On nous pardonnera d’avoir omis les passages où il n’était pas possible d’atténuer les hardiesses du texte.’

κυπαρίττια καὶ μυρρίναι: Seiler’s μυρρίνα (adopted by Schepers (1905)) is probably correct. The manuscripts have μυρρίνη (D: μυρρίνη VFP), but the change from the plural κυπαρίττια to the singular μυρρίνη is peculiar. The plural form is supported by the use of the word μυρρίνη in this letter: 4.13.4 μυρρίνης ... θάμνοι, 4.13.6 ὑπὸ ταῖς μυρρίναις, 4.13.8 μυρρίνης κλάδους, 3.13.15 κλωνία μυρρίνης.

2. ἄφοδος: the manuscripts have ἄμφοδος ‘street’ but this can hardly be right. The simplest solution from a palaeographical point is Meineke’s ἄφοδος ‘departure’ (adopted by Schepers). But Seiler’s ὅνω ὄδος ‘way up, ascent’ (adopted by Benner-Obes) would also be possible, cf. Xen. An. 3.1.8, Pl. Resp. 621c, Lucian Luct. 2. Note also 4.13.3 ἔλαθε δ’ ἡμᾶς ή
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ὁδὸς διὰ τὴν παιδιὰν ὡς οὖδ’ ὤήθημεν ταχέως ἄνυσθείσα, 4.14.7, ὡχό-μεθα ἔξοινοι, καὶ πολλὰ κατὰ τὴν ὄδον κρατηλαίσθεσα ἐπεκκώμασμεν Δεξιμάχῳ κατὰ τὸν χρυσοῦν στενωπόν. Meineke’s ἄνοδος (adopted by Hercher) is used by Alciphron but in a different context, cf. 2.37.2 ἢ μὲν οὖν Ἄνοδος κατὰ τὴν πρῶτην γέγονεν ἦμέραν (to indicate the first day of the Thesmophoria).

ἐκπιεῖν: a word used of the draining of cups, cf. 2.34.3 ὥ δὲ καὶ ταύ-την (sc. κύλικα) καὶ πλείονας ἐπὶ ταύτη καὶ ἀδροτέρας ἐκπίωμεν ὡκ ἐπαύσατο τῆς ἄδολεσχίας. But it can also be used in a metaphorical sense, cf. LSJ I.3, Eur. Hipp. 626 ὅλβον δωμάτων ἐκπίωμεν (ἐκτίνομεν var. lect.), Plato Com. fr. 9 K-A οὖδ’ ὡστὶς αὐτῆς ἐκπίεται τὰ χρήματα. Cobet’s καταπιεῖν (adopted by Hercher and Schepers) is therefore not needed, although it is used by Alciphron in 2.31.2 (a wife complaining to her husband who has fallen in love with a courtesan)

Παρθένιον (toup: παρθενίαν cod.: σοι παρθενίῳ· η δὲ reiske) δὲ ⟨ἡ⟩ (toup) ἱππόπορνος μεθ’ ὑποκορισμῶν ἐκθεραπεύεται ὅλον σε αὐτοῖς (Bergler: σεαυτόν cod.) ἄγροις καταπιοῦσα (cod.: καταπιόουσα Naber).

4. ἀποθεῖν: this is the form preserved in the manuscripts of Alciphron, with the exception of D in this passage and Γ in 3.2.1, cf. 1.1.4 μικρὸν δὲ ἀπώθεν (Ald: ἀποθεῖν codd.) τῆς ἀκτῆς, 3.2.1 μικρὸν ἀπώθεν (Γ: ἀποθεῖν rel.) τοῦ Λεωκορίου, 4.13.4 μικρὸν ἀπώθεν (Meineke: ἀποθεῖν codd.) συνηρεφῆ τινα λόχμην εὕρομεν. The Attic form is ἀπ̅ωθεῖν (conjectured by Meineke and adopted by all subsequent editors, also in §13), cf. Schwyzer 1.628, 2.444.

ἐξ ἐπιπολῆς: ‘from the top, from above’ (LSJ II.3). There is no need for Hercher’s ἐπιπλοκῆς ‘plaiting together’ (adopted by Schepers and Benner-Fobes) or Meineke’s ἐπιβολῆς ‘gleichsam schichtenweise’ (Meineke (1853) 167).

6. ήδέως άν ... ἰδίοι: Seiler’s άν (adopted by Meineke, Hercher and Schepers) is probably correct; we need an άν with the optative. The variants in the manuscripts (οὖν PD: ἀλλ’ V: [2 litt.] F) suggests that the corruption derives from a confusion of the letters ο/α and ν/λλ.

7. ἰδία: the reading of the manuscripts is probably correct; a similar adverbial use of ἰδία ‘in private’ (LSJ ίδιος VI.2) is found in 4.17.10 ποσάκις οἶει με, Λάμια, πρὸς αὐτὸν ἰδία παραγενομένην εἰπεῖν. But D’Orville’s νη Δία (adopted by all editors) cannot be completely disregarded, cf. Dem. 19.222 συκοφαντῷ νη Δία (συκοφαντῶν ἰδία Sυ).
9. οἴους ἔφης καδίσκους: the manuscripts have ἔφη which makes little sense; D’Orville’s change to ἔφης is the best solution. Most editors and translators prefer Meineke’s οἶος ἔφης but specific details like the number of jars would seem strange in this context.

10. χιμαιρίδος: Herings’ χιμαιρίδος ‘kid, she-goat’, although not attested, is a likely correction for the manuscripts corrupted reading χειμερίδος. Herings made a similar conjecture to Ananius fr. 5 West (Ath. 7.282b) ἤδυ δ’ ἔσθιεν χιμαίρης (Herings: χειμερίς Α) φθινοπωρισμῷ κρέας, cf. Herings (1749) 177.

ταγήνου: ‘frying pan’, a correction by Meineke for the reading of the manuscripts, ταγηνοῦς (V) and ταγηνούς (FPD), which probably is a simple error of assimilation to πυτίας.

εἶτα πεμμάτια: by changing τα to εiTα the problems presented by the asyndeton and the article are removed; the structure of the period is οἶνος ἦν ... ὁ τε ... καὶ ... τεμάχη καὶ ... εἶτα πεμμάτια. The diminutive form of τέμμα ‘pastry, cake, sweetmeat’ is very rare so it is probably not a marginal gloss as Hercher seems to suggest by deleting the words; this is the only example of πεμμάτιον in Alciphron but τέμμα is found at 3.4.6, 3.19.7, 3.39.1, 4.19.16.

11. μετὰ δὲ τούτο συνεχῶς περιεσόβουν αἱ κύλικες καὶ τὸ πιεῖν μέτρον ἢ τρεῖς φιλοτησίας, οὐ τὸ ποσόν. ἐπιεικῶς δὲ τῶς τὰ μὴ προσηναγκασμένα τῶν συμποσίων τῷ συνεχεῖ τὸ πλεῖον ἀναλαμβάνει: Alciphron is describing the practice of drinking the ‘cup of friendship’ or friendship toast (ἡ φιλοτησία κύλιξ). In Attic symposia a cup or bowl was passed around from guest to guest from left to right with each guest drinking to the health of the next person and then passing on the cup. Similar scenes are found in 3.19.6 οἱ φιλόσοφοι δὲ, προίοντος τοῦ συμποσίου καὶ τῆς φιλοτησίας συνεχῶς περισσοβουμένης, ὁλος ἄλλην τερατείαν ἔπεδειξαν, 3.39.2, οἱ δὲ καὶ τὸ ἐντραγεῖν ἐπὶ μήκιστον ἐξέτεινον καὶ τῆς (Hercber) κύλικος συνεχῶς περισσοβουμένης διατριβὰς καὶ μελλησμοὺς ἐνεποίουν. Note also Lucian Symp. 15 ἢδη δὲ καὶ ἐς τοὺς ἄλλους συνεχῶς περιεσοβεῖτο ἡ κύλιξ καὶ φιλοτησία καὶ ὡμίλιαι καὶ φῶτα εἰσεκεκόμιστο.

The phrase for drinking to someone’s health is προπίνειν or πίνειν πιλοτησίαν/-ίας, cf. Theopomp. Com. fr. 33 ΚΑ πιλοτησίαν δὲ τὴνδὲ σοι προπίνωμαι, Dem. 19.128 πιλοτησίας προοἵνειν, Alexis fr. 59 ΚΑ τρεῖς (Jacobs: τῆς codd.) πιλοτησίας ἐγὼ | μεστὰς προπίνης ἵσον ἵσον κεκραμένα, Alexis fr. 202.1 ΚΑ προπίνω σοι πιλοτησίαν λαβὼν, Alexis fr. 293 ΚΑ πιλοτησίαν σοι τὴνδ’ ἐγὼ | ἱδία τε καὶ κοινῆ κύλι-
κα προπίομαι, Lucian Gall. 12 φιλοτησίας προπίνοντα, Lucian Gall. 26 πίνειν ἀπὸ χρυσῆς φιάλης κονείῳ ή ἀκονίτῳ συνανακραθεῖσαν φιλοτησίαν, Lucian Pseudol. 31 φιλοτησίας προτίνειν, Lucian Sat. 33 προπινόντων φιλοτησίας, Lucian Hermol. 11 φιλοτησίας προπινόντων. See also Mau (1900) 613–4, and Arnott on Alexis fr. 55 K-A and fr. 59.1 K-A.

The phrase τὸ πιεῖν μέτρον ἦν τρεῖς φιλοτησίας, οὐ τὸ ποσόν is problematic and possibly corrupt; Seiler deemed it a ‘locus desperatus’. But perhaps it could be read in the following way: τὸ πιεῖν μέτρον ἦν τρεῖς φιλοτησίας (sc. κύλικας), οὐ τὸ ποσόν (sc. πιεῖν) ‘there was a limit to drink three friendship toasts, but not (to drink) a certain quantity’. Alciphron uses the infinitive with the article (K-G 2.37–9, Smyth §2025–30) elsewhere (e.g.1.10.5 οὐ γὰρ άμισθον τὸ εὖ ποιεῖν, 3.39.2 οἴ δὲ καὶ τὸ ἐντραγεῖν ἐπὶ μήκιστον ἐξέτεινον, 4.3.2 οὐκέτι τὸ ἐταιρεῖν αἰτσασάμεθα, 4.7.4 ἵνα ἁμοτετέροις τέλος πρόκειται τὸ λαβεῖν) so perhaps τὸ πιεῖν ... τρεῖς φιλοτησίας (sc. κύλικας) could be taken as the subject to μέτρον ἦν. For τὸ ποσόν = ποσότης ‘quantity’, cf. LSJ πόσος II.2. Usually the presiding officer or symposiarch decided on the amount to drink at each toast but in this unregulated symposium (τὰ μὴ προσηναγκασμένα τῶν συμποσίων) there are no rules. A similar interpretation is offered by Meiser who reads τοῦ πιεῖν, cf. Meiser (1905) 238 ‘und das Maß unseres Trinkens war drei Gesundheiten zu trinken, nicht eine bestimmte Bechergröße’.

ὕπεψεκάζομεν μικρὸις τισι κυμβίοις ἀλλ᾽ ἐπαλλήλοις: the manuscripts have ὑπεψέκαζε μὲν, which is difficult to defend. Seiler’s ὑπεψεκάζομεν (adopted by Schepers (1901)) offers the simplest solution. The corruption from ὑπεψεκάζομεν τὸ ὑπεψέκαζε μὲν may have been influenced by the preceding ἀναλαμβάνει. The verb ὑποψεκάζω ‘tipple a little’ is only attested in this passage and in Poll. Onom. 6.20 ὑποπτίνειν δ καὶ ὑποψακάζειν λέγουσι, Poll. Onom. 6.30 τὰς κύλικας ἐν κύκλῳ περιελαύνειν, πυκνὸν ὑποψεκάζειν. Seiler’s correction κυμβίοις ‘small cup’ for κυβίοις ‘salted tuna’ is no doubt correct.

Κρουμάτιον: Seiler’s Κρουμάτιον for κρουμάτιον (VFPD) is probably correct, cf. 1.15.4 άν μὲν γὰρ ἐκαλεῖτο Κρουμάτιον καὶ ήν αὐλητρίς.

Σιμμίχη: Hercher’s Σιμίχη might be correct, cf. Men. Dys. 636, 926, 931, Lucian Dial. metet. 4.1 Σιμίχην (Σιμίχην var. lect.), 4.3, Lucian Catapl. 22 εἰ καλλίων Φρύνης Σιμίχη (Σιμίχην var. lect.) and the scholion, Φρύνης Σιμίχηνι ὁνόμασα πορνῶν. But since the spelling varies in the manuscripts of Lucian Σιμίχη should perhaps be preserved here. Schepers (1901) compares Σιμίχη with the spelling of the name Σιμίας.
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πρὸς τὰ μέλη καὶ πρὸς τὴν ἁρμονίαν ἦδεν: Meineke’s ἐρωτικὰ μέλη for πρὸς τὰ μέλη καὶ is adopted by most editors and translators. But the reading in VF can be defended; the stylistic device of heaping up of synonyms or περιβολή is common in Alciphron, see note on 4.2.5. See also 3.19.7 ὁ Πυθαγόρειος ὑπέρ θαῦμα καὶ τὴν σιωπὴν λύσας τῶν χρυσῶν ἐπῶν τινα κατὰ (Maehly: κατὰ τινα codd.) μουσικὴν ἁρμονίαν ἐτερέτιζεν.

13. πρὸς Διονύσῳ ἐπαιζόμενοι: literally means ‘we fooled around in the presence of Dionysus’ (LSJ πρὸς B.1.2 and παιζω 1.5) but since Dionysus is frequently used as a metonymy for wine (for the ‘mythological metonymy’ see Lausberg (1998) §568.1b) it could be translated ‘we fooled around in a state of intoxication’. Dionysus, or wine, is often mentioned as a stimulant for sexual desire, cf. 4.8.2 ἀνερρίπισε (sc. ὁ ἄκρατος) γάρ μου τὴν ἐπιθυμίαν, 4.13.18 ἐκραιπαλῶμεν μάλα νεανίκως μέχρι μηδὲ λανθάνειν ἀλλὰ λαμβάνειν ἁρμονίαν τῆς ἀφροδίτης παρακλέπτειν, Ach. Tat. 2.3.3 Ἐρως δὲ καὶ Διόνυσος, δύο βίαιοι θεοί, ποιητικὴν κατασχόντες ἐκμαίνουσιν εἰς ἀναισχυντίαν, ὁ μὲν καὶ τὸν σιωπῆν τοῦ τοῦτον ψυχῆν κατασχόντες ἐκμαίνουσιν εἰς ἀναισχυντίαν, ὁ μὲν καὶ τὸν σιωπῆν τοῦ τοῦτον ψυχῆν κατασχόντες ἐκμαίνουσιν εἰς ἀναισχυντίαν, ὁ μὲν καὶ τὸν σιωπῆν τοῦ τοῦτον ψυχῆν κατασχόντες ἐκμαίνουσιν εἰς ἀναισχυντίαν.

14. τοὺς χιτωνίσκους ἀπιθάνως εἰσεπαίομεν: the manuscripts have τοῖς χιτωνίσκοις ἀπιθάνως εἰσεπαίομεν but this makes little sense; εἰσεπαίω is either used with an accusative/εἰς + accusative (e.g. Eur. Or. 1315 στείχει γάρ ἐσπάισουσα δικτύων βρόχους, Diog. Laer. 1.46 εἰσεπαίοσαν εἰς τὴν ἀγοράν) or absolutely (e.g. Soph. OT 1252 βοῶν γάρ εἰσέπαισεν Οἰδίπους, Xenarch. fr. 1.3 K-A ἀλάστωρ τι’ εἰσέπαισαν Πελοπίδων). The simplest solution is to change τοῖς χιτωνίσκοις to τοὺς χιτωνίσκους and take it as the object of εἰσεπαίομεν, ‘we jumped into our chitons’. For ἀπιθάνως, cf. 4.9.3 θαυμάζω δέ σου καὶ τὰ δάκρυα ὡς ἐστίν ἀπίθανα.

16. ἐμφαγεῖν δή πάλιν ... ἦσαν ἐξ ἄστεος οἱ κομισθέντες: there is no need to supply δὴ τὴν ἐπιθυμίαν (Meineke, adopted by all subsequent editors) or δὴ πάλιν τὴν ἐπιθυμίαν (Seiler); the main verb is postponed, ἐμφαγεῖν ... ἦσαν. For δὴ πάλιν, cf. 4.4.3 προσδέχου δὴ πάλιν ἀτὶ αὐτοῦ δεήσεις καὶ λιτανείας καὶ πολὺ χρυσίον. Seiler unnecessarily deleted οἱ δὲ ἦσαν ἐξ ἄστεος οἱ κομισθέντες is probably a form of prolepsis or displacement, cf. K-G 2.574–82, Slings (1992) 105–9.

18. δ’ οὖν: the manuscripts have γοῦν but the sense requires δ’ οὖν (Seiler); γοῦν is mostly used as a limitative or emphatic particle (Den-
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niston 448–59) whereas δ᾽ οὖν is used as a contrasting or resumptive particle (Denniston 460–8), as in this passage. γοῦν and δ᾽ οὖν are often confused in the manuscripts (cf. Denniston 467–8), which the examples from Alciphron confirm, 1.3.1 οὐ μάτην γοῦν ἀνησίδωραν ταύτην ὀνομάζουσιν Αθηναῖοι ἀνιεῖσαν δῶρα δι᾽ ὧν ἔστι ζῆν καὶ σώζεσθαι (deleted as a marginal gloss by Meineke), 3.18.4 τέλος δ᾽ οὖν (Seiler: οὖν Γ Vat. 1: γοῦν rell.) λιποθυμήσας ἀφῆκα τοῖς ἐναγέσι λαμβάνειν, 4.5.3 ίσθι γοῦν ὅτι παρὰ πάσαις ἡμῖν ταῖς τὴν φιλανθρωπίαν ἀφαιρέσας παρασκευάσας τέρψιν, 4.13.14 ἐκραιπαλῶμεν ἀλλὰ νεανικῶς which makes little sense; Seiler’s μάλα is a simple correction, cf. 2.15.2 ἐστάθησον μὲ μάλα ἡδέως.

19. ἐρωτικὴ φιλία: The relationship between a courtesan and her client was often referred to as friendship, cf. 4.19.12 ἡ ἐμπαθὴς φιλία, Xen. Mem. 3.11.4 (the courtesans Theodote to Socrates) ἡν τῖς, ἡμη, φίλος μοι γενόμενος εὑ ποιεῖν ἐθέλη, οὗτός μοι βίον ἔστι, Ar. Thesm. 346, Ar. Eccl. 931 and 952. See further Konstan (1997) 91. Meineke’s ὁμιλία (adopted by all subsequent editors) is therefore unnecessary. The phrase τρυφερὸν γὰρ ἦν καὶ πρέπον ἐρωτικῇ φιλίᾳ seems to echo 4.13.9 τρυφερὸν τινα παρεῖχον ψόφον ἐαρινῷ πρέποντα συμπόσιῳ.

ei μὲν ὄντως ἐσχηκας μαρακάς: Meineke’s ὅτι is needed; ὅτως (Vf: οὖν ὅτως PD) does not fit the context. ὅτως and ὅτως are quite often mixed up in manuscripts.

οὐκ ἄλογως οἰκουρεῖτι: Meineke suggested deleting οὐκ or, as an alternative, reading οὐκ εὐλόγως (adopted by Schepers) but the text is most likely sound; the expression also occurs in 4.8.1 οὐκ ἄλογως ἡμῖν ἐντρυφάς.

4.14

MEGARA TO BACCHIS

1. ὡστε μηδὲ ἀκαρὴ πως αὐτοῦ διαζευγθήναι δύνασθαι: the scribal conjecture ὡστε (W) is most likely correct; the manuscripts have ὅς τὸ (VFP, with ὡστε is added in the margin in P) and ὡστε τὸ (D). It
is unclear whether the marginal addition ὧστε in P refers to ὤς τὸ or just to ὤς.

The manuscripts’ ἀκριβῶς ‘in the strict sense of the word’ (LSJ ἀκριβής II.2) makes little sense although it was defended by Beaudouin (1902) 332–3. The simplest solution is to read ἀκαρῆ πως (D’Arnaud, adopted by Wagner, Seiler, Schepers (1905) and Benner-Fobes) ‘for a moment’ which is supported by 2.22.1 τὸν ἄγρον οὐδ’ ἀκαρή θελεις ὁράν. For similar use of πως, cf. 4.13.11 ἐπιεικῶς δὲ πως, 4.13.13 ἥρέμα πως. D’Arnaud’s μηδ’ is not necessary, cf. 4.14.5 οὐδὲ ἀκκιζομένη, 4.18.17 οὐδὲ ἀκαροτέραν.

The verb διαζεύγνυμι ‘part, separate’ can also mean ‘divorce’, e.g. Pl. Leg. 84b, which in conjunction with ἔραστής here gives an ironic twist. The marital theme is also present in the next paragraph where Megara tells that Philoumene was present despite being recently married, 4.14.2 καίτοι γεγαμημένη προσφάτως.

κληθείσα ... εἰς τοσούτον χρόνον: ‘having been invited for such a long time’, εἰς can be used to determine a time period (LSJ ΙΙ.2, K-G 1.470). Cobet’s ἐκ τοσούτου χρόνου (adopted by Schepers) and Bergler’s τοσούτον χρόνον (adopted by Meineke and Hercher) are therefore unnecessary.

eι μὴ δι’ ἑκεῖνην ... ἀνασχομένη: Schepers (1905) and Benner-Fobes print οἴμαι, δι’ ἑκείνου (Bergler) but we should not change the text. εἰ μὴ can be used adverbially with a participle (LSJ εἰ Β.ΙΙ.3.a, K-G 2.487). Megara, who is aware of the friendship between Glycera and Bacchis (see 4.1), is being ironical; perhaps it is on account of Glycera that Bacchis will not come. A similar ironical phrase is found in 4.7.5 εἰ μὴ δι᾽ ὅτι τὰς νεφέλας ὅπως ἔτει καὶ τὰς ἄτομους ὅποιας ἀγνοοῦμεν, διὰ τοῦτο ἣττους δοκοῦμεν σοι τῶν σοφιστῶν.

2. ὑπῆρξε καὶ Φίλωνι συκίνη βακτηρία: the origin of this proverbial expression is unknown but it probably alludes to fig-wood being weak and unreliable (cf. Hsch. σ 2233, Suda σ 1324) as in the common proverb συκίνη ἐπικουρία, cf. Lib. Επ. 52.4, 228.2, 530.2, 701.2, 1439.4 and Macar. 7.83 (CPG 2.210–1) Συκίνη βακτηρία: καὶ Συκίνη ἐπικουρία: ἐπὶ τῶν ἀθενῶς βοηθοῦντων. For other use of σύκινος in this metaphorical sense see Ar. Πλυτ. 945–6 σύζυγον ... σύκινον, Antiph. fr. 120.4–5 Κ-Α σοφιστῶν ... συκίνων, Theoc. Ιδ. 10.45 σύκινοι ἄνδρες, Lucian Ind. 6 συκίνην τὴν γνώμην, Hsch. σ 2232 συκίνη μάχαιρα· συκοφάντρια.

Tsirimbas (1936) 54–5, draws a parallel to Zen. 3.44 (CPG 1.68) ἐγένετο καὶ Μάνδρωνι συκίνη ναῦς, and suggests that βακτηρία refers to
the insignia of office carried by judges in Athens (LSJ βακτηρία II) and that Philo was a former judge who now rested on his former laurels (i.e. his insignia are now useless). But Tsirimbas’ argument is weakened by the fact that he sees the phrase as a quote from a comedy when it is in fact taken from this passage in Alciphron: Com. Adesp. fr. 251 CAF ἦν (Meineke: ὑπῆρξε codd.) καὶ Φίλωνι συκίνη βακτηρία, Com. Adesp. fr. 252 Kock ὄργιζομαι γὰρ ναὶ μὰ (Kock: νῆ codd.) τὴν μεγάλην θεόν.

παρῆμεν: Bergler’s correction for γὰρ ἦμεν (VFPD) is most likely correct, cf. παρὴν a few lines below; γὰρ ἦμεν is probably a scribal error deriving from a misreading of uncial characters (ΠΑΡ > ΓΑΡ).

tὸν καλὸν ἀποκοιμίσασα τὸν ἄνδρα: ἀποκοιμίζω is rare but is attested in the passive form in Socr. Ep. 1.6 with the meaning ‘sleep’; it is probably synonymous with the much more common κατακοιμίζω ‘put to sleep’; hence Cobet’s κατακοιμίσασα, adopted by Schepers who also prints τὸ καλὸν (Hemsterhuis) in analogy with 4.9.3 ἐγὼ δὲ ἣν μὴ τὶς ὅ διδοὺς ἦν, πεινήσω τὸ καλὸν where τὸ καλὸν is used adverbially. But here the attributive adjective is preferable, cf. 4.17.4 Τίμαρχον τὸν καλὸν οἶσθα τὸν Κηφισιάθεν.

3. ὑπόσκιος τισι δάφναις ἦν ἢ κατάκλισις: ὑπόσκιος (an anonymous conjecture reported by Wagner) for ὑποσκίοις (VFPD) is no doubt correct; ὑποσκίοις is a simple error of assimilation to τισι δάφναις.

5. οὐ φιλεῖ προφάσεις ἄγών: a common proverbial expression, cf. Tsirimbas (1936) 41–2. There is no need for ὅ ἄγών (Seiler) or ἄγών (Meineke, adopted by all subsequent editors), cf. Pl. Crat. 421δ οὐ μέντοι μοι δοκεῖ προφάσεις ἄγών δέχεσθαι, Pl. Leg. 751δ ὅλλα γὰρ ἄγώνα προφάσεις φασίν οὐ πάνυ δέχεσθαι.

σκόπει τὸ χρῶμα ... ὡς ἀκριβῶς: ‘look closely at the skin’, a similar passage with ὡς + positive adverb (LSJ ὡς Ab.III.1.a) is found in 4.3.3 τότε ἢν ὡς ἀληθῶς χρυσοῦν αἱ ἐταίραι στήσαμεν ὅτη ποτὲ βουλεῖ τῆς Ἑλλάδος. Nauck’s ὡς ἀκριβῆς ‘wie jugendlich’ (adopted by Schepers (1905) and Benner-Fobes) cannot be defended since ἀκριβῆς is only attested as a substantive, ‘youth in his prime’; the adjective form should be ἀκριβῆς, cf. Theoc. Id. 8.93 νῦμφαν ἀκριβῶς.

τὴν ἐπὶ τοὺς μηροὺς ἐγκλισίν: Hemsterhuis’ ἐγκλισίν ‘inclination, slope’ is probably correct: ἐγκρίσιν (VFPD) which means ‘judgment, approval’ (from ἐγκρίνω) cannot be correct, although LSJ notes this passage with the translation ‘junction, meeting’. For the common confusion of ρ and λ, see Diggle (1994) 469.
COMMENTARY: 4.14

6. ἅμ᾽ ὑπομειδίωσα: this is a comment from Megara and not part of Thryallis’ speech; Jacobs ἅμ’ for ἀλλ’ (VFPD) is a simple correction for the uncial corruption (ΑΜ > ΑΛ). Meineke’s ⟨φησίν⟩ ἅμ’ is superfluous since φησίν is implied from the previous sentence. See also 1.13.2 ἀνεῖς τὰς ὄψεις ὑπεμειδία πρὸς με.

νίκην ἀποφήνασθαι τῆς Θρυαλλίδος: Schepers prints νικᾶν ἀποφήνασθαι τὴν Θρυαλλίδα (Cobet) but the reading in the manuscripts is unobjectionable, cf. 1.20.2 τῶν πλησίον τινὰς ἐκαλοῦμεν μερίτας ἀποφανεῖν (Meineke: ἀποφαίνειν codd.) ἐπαγγελλόμενοι.

περιάλλων: Meineke’s περιάλλων ‘haunches’ for περὶ ἀλλῶν (VFPD) is a likely conjecture considering 4.14.5 τὰ παραπόρφυρα τῶν ἰσχίων. For περιάλλων, cf. Hdn. Gr. 1.158, Hsch. π 1572 περιάλλος τὸ ἰσχύον.

τῆς μὲν γὰρ Φιλουμένης γαστρὶ: Seiler and all subsequent editors print τῇ (a conjecture in W) but the change is unnecessary since τῆς (VFPD) makes perfect sense.

7. δ᾽ οὖν: Seiler’s correction for γοῦν (FPD: γοῦν V) is most likely correct since it is partly supported by the reading in V. We need a resumptive δ᾽ οὖν here, see note on 4.13.18. Hercher’s οὖν (adopted by Schepers (1901)) is less suitable.

ὡς ... κάτιμεν: the present κάτιμεν (from κάτειμι ‘go down, return’) gives acceptable sense ‘as you are going down, where you go down’ but Seiler’s imperfect κατῇμεν would be preferable since Alciphron elsewhere uses the past tense with the temporal conjunction ὡς, e.g. 1.1.3 ὡς γὰρ ὠφθη μὲν ὁ ἥλιος, πρώτη δὲ ἀκτίς εἰς τὸ πέλαγος ἀπέστιλβε, 2.36.1 ὡς γὰρ τῇ ἑνή καὶ νέα κατ’ ἐκλογήν τοῦτον ἑπριάμην, Νουμῆνιον μὲν εὐθὺς ἐθέμην καλείσθαι, 3.24.1 ὡς γὰρ ἐλούσαντο οἱ πολλοὶ καὶ μεσοῦσα ἦν ἡμέρα, στωμύλους ἐθεασάμην καὶ εὐφυεῖς νεανίσκους, 3.30.2 ὡς γὰρ ἀφικόμην ξυρεῖσθαι (l. Dindorf: ξυριεῖσθαι codd.) τὴν γενειάδα βουλόμενος, ἀσμένως τε ἐδέξατο καὶ ... πράως εὖ μάλα κατέφερέ μοι τῶν γνάθων τὸν ξυρὸν ἀποψιλῶν τὸ πύκνωμα τῶν τριχῶν. The confusion between η and i is very common. Note also the conjecture κατιόντι in the Aldine.

ἐρᾷ: the manuscripts have ἔραν but we need a finite verb; the conjecture in W and the Aldine is no doubt correct.

8. Ἀδωνίοις: the context clearly shows that they are celebrating the Adonis festival and not the Halooa so Pierson’s Ἀδωνίοις for Ἀλώοις (VFPD) is most likely correct, cf. Walton (1938) 70, Detienne (1993) 155 n. 35; note also 4.14.3 σῦ δ᾽ ἡμῖν μόνη τὸν Ἀδωνίν περιέψυχες. The
Halosa is mentioned more frequently (2.37.1, 4.6.3, 4.18.4, 4.18.17) than the Adonia (4.10.1) which may explain why the scribe would have made the wrong association.

κηπίον καὶ κοράλλιον: Bast’s κηπίον ‘small garden’ is a good correction of the manuscripts’ κήτιον ‘dice-box’ (W has γήτειον ‘horn onion’), cf. Detienne (1993) 155 n. 35. A part of the Adonis festival consisted in sowing quickly growing plants in baskets and bowls. Small statues of Adonis were also used in the celebrations.

4.15

PHILOUMENE TO CRITO

σεαυτόν: most editors print σαυτόν, a scribal conjecture in W, but since the primary manuscripts have σεαυτόν (not reported by Schepers) and both forms are attested in Alciphron we should not change the text, cf. 1.12.2 σεαυτήν, 2.7.2 σεαυτόν, 4.1.1 σεαυτοῦ, 4.3.3 σεαυτῶ, 4.5.3 σεαυτήν, 4.9.5 σεαυτόν, 4.17.9 σεαυτήν (FDP: ἐαυτήν VP), and 2.16.1 σαυτοῦ, 2.24.2 σαυτήν, 3.20.1 σαυτόν, 4.19.17 σαυτοῦ.

πεντήκοντα σοι χρυσῶν δεὶ καὶ γραμμάτων οὐ δεὶ: perhaps μοι (Leid and D’Arnaud, adopted by Meineke, Hercher and Schepers) would be more suitable in this context, cf. 4.9.1 νῦν δεὶ δεὶ χρυσίου ἥμεν, ἱματίων, κόσμου, θεραπαινιδίων.

4.16

LAMIA TO DEMETRIUS

1. σὺ ταύτης τῆς παρρησίας αἴτιος, τοσοῦτος ὡς βασιλεύς εἶτα ἐπέτρεψας ... καὶ οὐχ ἡγησάμενος: Meineke’s (δς) τοσοῦτος ... ἐπέτρεψας ... [καὶ] οὐχ ἡγησάμενος (adopted by Hercher and Schepers) is unnecessary as pointed out by Wilamowitz (1909) 468: ‘dies konnte gar nicht besser gesagt werden, und nur dem Schüler sollte man es erklären müssen und auflösen αἴτιος εἶ ἐπειδή κατέρ βασιλεύς ὡς ἐπέτρεψας οὖδ’ ἡγησόμενος τοῖς γράμμασιν ἐντυγχάνειν, ἐπειδή οἶλη μοι ἐντυγχάνεις. Und wie oft müssen sie ändern, um es zu verderben.’

πέφρικα καὶ δέδοικα καὶ ταράττομαι: this reading is only found in D; καὶ δέδοικα is omitted in VFP but should not be deleted as a marginal gloss (Schepers) since it is probably a paraphrase of Ar. Nub. 1133.

184
δέδοικα καὶ πέφρικα καὶ βδελύττομαι, cf. Kock (1888) 32 and Herwerden (1905) 453. Note also how the four verbs πέφρικα καὶ δέδοικα καὶ ταράττομαι, καὶ ἀποστρέφομαι echo the enumeration in the previous line: σε θεάσωμαι καὶ ἀκούσω μετὰ τῶν δορυφόρων καὶ τῶν στρατοπέδων καὶ τῶν πρέσβεων καὶ τῶν διαδημάτων.

τότε μοι ὄντως ὁ πολιορκητής εἶναι δοκεῖσ. Δάματερ: all editors print Δημήτριος (Aldine, Schepers wrongly reports that PD have Δημήτριος) but no change is needed since the epithet ὁ πολιορκητής is elsewhere used independently (4.16.3 οὐτός ἐστιν ὁ πολιορκητής, 4.17.3 ὄντως ἐγὼ πολιορκητὴν ἔχω τοιούτον, οὕχ οἶον σὺ Λάμια Δημήτριον) and it is unlikely that a Byzantine scribe would have substituted Δημήτριος with the Doric form Δάματερ, which is also found in 4.17.6. An alternative would be to print δοκεῖσ. Δάματερ· (Wilamowitz).

2. καὶ ἡλογημένη σιωπῶ καὶ εὐχομένη σε θεάσασθαι παρ᾽ ἑαυτῇ καὶ ὃταν ἑλθῃς προσκυνοῦσα: the Aldine has a full stop after ἑαυτῇ and προσκυνῶ (adopted by all editors) but the sentence makes perfect sense by connecting the participles καὶ ἠλογημένη ... καὶ εὐχομένη ... καὶ ... προσκυνοῦσα with σιωπῶ.

3. μέγα φιλής: ‘you kiss me intensely’ (LSJ φιλέω I.4); the lack of an object has prompted some unnecessary conjectures: με φιλής (Meineke, adopted by Hercher) and με καταφιλής (Hirschig, adopted by Schepers); but cf. 4.13.13 καὶ τις ἐφίλησεν ὑπτιάσασα καὶ μασταρίων ἅψασθαι.

Μακεδονία: in V the article ἡ is added above the line by a different hand (not reported by Schepers), cf. Castiglioni (1911) 18. This was also suggested by Meineke (adopted by Hercher and Schepers), perhaps rightly, on account of the following ἡ Ἑλλάς ... ἡ Θρᾴκη.

σήμερον αὐτὸν τοῖς αὐλοῖς ἐκπολιορκήσω καὶ ὄψομαι τί με διαθήσει, μᾶλλον εἰς τρίτην: this passage does not need to be emended: μένου εἰς τρίτην (Aldine, adopted by Bergler, Wagner, Seiler, Hercher and Schepers (1901)) or lacuna before μᾶλλον (Meineke, adopted by Schepers (1905) and Benner-Fobes). μᾶλλον is used in a similar way as μᾶλλον δὲ ‘or rather’ (LSJ II.3), e.g. 1.18.1 ἐργε τὸς χείρας, μᾶλλον δὲ τὸς ἀπλήστους ἐπιθυμίας, 4.17.6 οὐ ζυγοστατήσω πάντας αὐτοὺς πρὸς τὸν Τιμάρχου βραχίονα, μᾶλλον δὲ οὐδὲ πρὸς τὸν δάκτυλον. This use without δὲ is attested in 4.19.19 ὡστε πειρῶ μᾶλλον, ἐμὴ φιλότης, θάσσον εἰς ἄστυ παραγενέσθαι.

εἰ τὰ πρότερα τοῖς ὑστέροις νικῶ: the manuscripts have νικᾶ but the switch from the first person ποιῶ and ἔχω to an impersonal νικᾶ...
with τὰ πρότερα as object and τοῖς υστέροις as instrumental dative is odd; a simple solution is to read νικῶ (Reiske, adopted by Meineke and Benner-Fobes).

5. ἐμοὶ ... προσέπεμψαν ... οὐδὲ ἐπείρασαν: the manuscripts offer two variants: προσέπεμψαν ‘send to’ (VFP, adopted by Wagner, Hercher, Schepers (1905) and Benner-Fobes) and προσέβλεψαν ‘look at’ (PmsgD, adopted by Bergler, Seiler, Meineke and Schepers (1901)). προσέπεμψαν is perhaps more suitable here; furthermore προσβλέπω usually takes the accusative, as in 3.19.8 Ζηνοκράτης ... τὴν ψάλτριαν ... τακερόν καὶ ύγρόν προσβλέπτων ὑπομεμυκόσι τοῖς δίμμασι, although a few examples with the dative are attested elsewhere, cf. Xen. Symp. 3.14 πάντες προσέβλεψαν αὐτῷ, Lucian Alex. 42 καὶ ἦν μέγα καὶ εὐκτόν ἔκαστῳ, εἰ τίνος γυναικὶ προσβλέψειεν.

ἐλπίσας πτεροῦται, καὶ ἀπελπίσας ταχύ πτεροφρεύειν εἰώθεν ἀπογνωσθεὶς: the participles ἀπελπίσας and ἀπογνωσθεὶς are virtually synonymous which made Cobet delete ἀπογνωσθεὶς as a marginal gloss to ἀπελπίσας (followed by Hercher and Schepers (1901)) and Maehly delete ἀπελπίσας. But the text is most likely sound since the whole paragraph is quoted verbatim in Aristaen. 2.1 ὃς ἐστὶν ὁ Ἔρως καὶ ἐλθεῖν καὶ ἀναπτῆναι: ἐλπίσας πτεροῦται καὶ ἀπελπίσας ταχύ πτερορρυεῖν εἰώθεν ἀπογνωσθεὶς. διὸ καὶ μέγα τῶν ἔταιρων ἐστὶ σόφισμα ἀεὶ τὸ παρὸν τῆς ἀπολαύσεως ὑπερτιθεμένας ταῖς ἐλπίσι διακρατεῖν τοὺς ἐραστάς. See further Lesky (1929) 56–8, whose concluding words are worth quoting: ‘Wir wollen [...] uns hüten, den Autor zu korrigieren, weil wir ihn glatter lesen möchten als er schrieb.’

6. ἡμᾶς δεῖ τὰ μὲν πονεῖν ... τὰ δὲ κοσμεῖσθαι τὸν οἶκον, τὰς δὲ ... μεσολαβοῦσας χρήσεις: the logical word order is ἡμᾶς δεῖ δεῖ μεσολαβοῦσας τὰς χρήσεις, ὁπωσοῦ ἀλλὰς ταχύ μαραινόμενας, τὰ μὲν πονεῖν ... τὰ δὲ κοσμεῖσθαι τὸν οἶκον. The manuscripts have ποιεῖν which makes no sense without an object; Reiske’s ⟨ἱερὰ⟩ ποιεῖν and Meineke’s ⟨τὴ⟩ ποιεῖν are not as attractive as D’Arnaud’s πονεῖν ‘be sick’ (LSJ A.I.2).

κοσμεῖσθαι τὸν οἶκον: the presence of σοι in κοσμεῖν σοι τὸν οἶκον is problematic and has resulted in two emendations: κοσμήσας τὸν οἶκον (Jacobs) and κοσμεῖν σοι τὸν οἶκον (Bergler, adopted by Hercher, Schepers and Benner-Fobes). But neither offer a satisfactory solution; the aorist infinitive κοσμήσας would be incongruous with the other present infinitives, and the deletion of σοι does not solve the
problem of how the addition came there in the first place. However, if we change κοσμεῖν σοι to κοσμεῖσθαι we get the needed present infinitive and a more likely explanation of σοι as a corruption of -σθαι.

χρήσεις is rightly defended by Meiser (1905) 224, and should not be changed into χάρης (Ruhnken, adopted by Wagner, Seiler, Meineke, Hercher and Schepers); for χρήσις ‘intimacy, sexual intercourse’, cf. LSJ 1.3, BDAG 3, Pl. Leg. 541a τη των ἀφροδισίων χρήσις, Lucian Am. 25 ἡδονὴν ἐπιδείξω παιδικῆς χρήσεως πολύ τὴν γυναικεῖαν ἀμείνω.

σύνολούστεραι: the positive σύνολούστεραι (Meiser, adopted by Ben-ner-Fobes) from σύναλεός ‘dry, parched’, is unattested but it is formed in analogy with ἀπλούστερος and εὐαλέστερος. It fits well with the imagery in μᾶλλον εξάπτωνται which is elsewhere used in an erotic context, cf. Chor. 20.2.49, 42.2.73. The manuscripts have εὐαλούστεραι which has been interpreted as a corrupted positive form of εὐάλωτος ‘easily caught’ by some: εὐσυλότεραι (Lobeck) and εὐσλέστεραι (Meineke, adopted by Schepers (1905)). But εὐάλωτος does not fit in this context. The same goes for ἀπλούστεραι (Hercher) from ἀπλοῦς ‘simple, silly’ and νεαλέστεραι (Lobeck) from νεαλής ‘newly caught’.

7. φυλάττεσθαι: Bergler suggested reading πλάττεσθαι (adopted by Seiler, Meineke, Hercher and Schepers) but the repetition of πλάττε-σθαι a few lines down would be a bit odd, which is not solved by the deletion of πλάττεσθαι (Hirschig, adopted by Schepers).

LEONTION TO LAMIA

1. ἑπιστολάς ἀδιαλύτους μοι γράφων: a reference to Epicurus’ theory of the atoms, cf. Epicurus Ep. Hdt. 54; it has nevertheless prompted numerous unnecessary conjectures: ἀδιαλείπτους (D’Arnaud, adopted by Seiler and Meineke), διωλυγίους (Cobet, adopted by Hercher), ἀδιανύτους (Hermann), ἀδιαπαύστους (Herwerden), ἀδιαλήπτους (Capps).

2. ἠδή ἐγγύς ὑγδοήκοντα ἑτη: the Aldine added γεγονὼς (adopted by all editors; Schepers wrongly reports that FD have γεγονὼς) after ὑγδοήκοντα. But since there is no support in the manuscripts, and also no need for a participle, it should not be added.

φιλονοσοῦντος: ‘sickly, prone to sickness’, the word is only found
here and is probably formed in analogy with other similar compounds, e.g. φιλοτενθής, ‘indulging in mourning’ and φιλοκαμπής ‘easily bending, lithe’.

ἐμὲ δὲ ἀφέτω ζῆν φυσικῶς κυρίαν ἐμαυτῆς: the reading ζῆν (VF, not reported by Schepers) is preferable to τὴν (PD) by being a lectio difficilior and giving an easier syntax; for ἀφίημι with acc. + inf., cf. LSJ IV. The reading ἐμὲ δὲ ἀφέτω τὴν φυσικῶς κυρίαν ἐμαυτῆς in PD would require a supplied verb, e.g. ἔχειν.

ἀστομάχητον: a rare word which has been subjected to many unnecessary conjectures (see appendix); it literally means ‘one who does not have a disorder in the stomach’ and in a metaphorical sense ‘not easily angered’, cf. BDAG ἀστομάχητος.

3. ὡς ἡ ἡμέρα ἐγὼ πολιορκητὴν ἔχω τοιοῦτον, οὐχ οἷον σὺ Λάμια Δημήτριον: Kayser’s ἐγὼ πολιορκητὴν (adopted by Schepers) is an attractive correction for the unattested ἐπιπολιορκητὴν (the verb ἐπιπολιορκέω is attested in Att. FGrH 156 F 10); ἐγὼ is reflected by σὺ. For πολιορκητῆς, see note on 4.16.1.

Ἀλκιβιάδην τινὰ τὸν Πυθοκλέα νομίζει καὶ Ξανθίππην ἐμὲ οἴεται ποιῆσειν: Cobet rightly changed τινὰ ἢ Πυθοκλέα (VFPD) to τινὰ τὸν Πυθοκλέα; an abbreviated τὸν was probably misread for an ἢ. The other solutions are less attractive: Ἀλκιβιάδην τινὰ καὶ Πυθοκλέα νομίζει (Bergler), Ἀλκιβιάδην τινὰ δὴ Πυθοκλέα νομίζει (D’Arnaud), Ἀλκιβιάδην τινὰ {ἤ} Πυθοκλέα νομίζει (Medenbach-Wakker), Ἀλκιβιάδην εἶναι Πυθοκλέα νομίζει (Lennep), Ἀλκιβιάδην τὸν {ἤ} Πυθοκλέα {νομίζει} (Hirschig).

4. τετόλμηκεν: the archetype was probably difficult to read which resulted in all primary manuscripts having different readings: τετόλμηκεν (F), τετόλμηκας (V), τετόλμησεν (P), ἔτόλμησεν (D). The perfect τετόλμηκεν is no doubt correct; the readings in PD represent different stages of corruption and τετόλμηκας in V is probably a misreading of an abbreviation.

οὐκ ἀρνοῦμαι πρὸς τὸν νεανίσκον οἰκείως ἐχεῖν: the variant οὐκ οἰκείως (PD) should probably be attributed to scribal confusion. The normal construction after a verb of denying which itself is negated is μὴ οὐ with the infinitive (cf. K-G 2.210, Smyth §2742), but μὴ οὐ can also be omitted as here (cf. K-G 2.215b).

5. τοιοῦτον οὕν ἐραστὴν: the reading νῦν (PD, adopted by Bergler, Wagner and Seiler) is probably a scribal error; the resumptive οὕν is
needed here.

οὔτε ὠς Ἀττικὸς οὔτε ὡς φιλόσοφος *** ἡ Καππαδοκίας πρῶτος εἰς τὴν Ἑλλάδα ἢκων: something is clearly missing in this sentence; the conjecture in the Aldine ἐκ Καππαδοκίας (adopted by Bergler, Wagner, Seiler, Meineke, Hercher, Schepers (1901)) does not alone solve the problem. Bergler (1715) 217, first pointed out the problem in his translation: ‘sed ut ex Cappadocia aliquid’. There are numerous conjectures but none very convincing: ⟨ἀλλ᾽ ὡς φορτηγὸς⟩ or ⟨όνηλάτης⟩ ἐκ Καππαδοκίας πρῶην (Reiske), ἐκ Καππαδοκίας προσφάτως (Stanger), ἐκ Καππαδοκίας (ἀλλ᾽ πρῶτον) ἐκ Καππαδοκίας (Polak), ἐκ Καππαδοκίας πρῶτος (Polak), ἐκ Καππαδοκίας ἀγροῖκος (Meiser).

6. ἐμὲ δὲ οὐδὲν θάλπει τι δόξα, ἀλλ᾽ ὃ θέλω· (θέλω) δὲ Τίμαρχον: the manuscripts have ἐμὲ δὲ οὐδὲν θάλπει τι (τι VF) δόξα, ἀλλ᾽ ὃ (ὁν PD) θέλω δὲ Τίμαρχον which does not give acceptable syntax. The phrase ἀλλ᾽ ὃ (ὁν PD) θέλω δὲ makes little sense and was corrected in the Aldine to ἀλλ᾽ ὃν θέλω δος Τίμαρχον (adopted by all editors). But the particle δὲ of the manuscripts can be preserved if we add θέλω as in Aristaen. 1.24 ἐμὲ γὰρ οὐδὲν θάλπει κέρδος, ἀλλ᾽ ὃν θέλω δὸς Τίμαρχον (adopted by all editors). But the particle δὲ of the manuscripts can be preserved if we add θέλω as in Aristaen. 1.24 ἐμὲ γὰρ οὐδὲν θάλπει κέρδος, ἀλλ᾽ ὃ θέλω δὲ Τίμαρχον (adopted by all editors). But the particle δὲ of the manuscripts can be preserved if we add θέλω as in Aristaen. 1.24 ἐμὲ γὰρ οὐδὲν θάλπει κέρδος, ἀλλ᾽ ὃ θέλω δὸς Τίμαρχον (adopted by all editors). But the particle δὲ of the manuscripts can be preserved if we add θέλω as in Aristaen. 1.24 ἐμὲ γὰρ οὐδὲν θάλπει κέρδος, ἀλλ᾽ ὃ θέλω δὸς Τίμαρχον (adopted by all editors). But the particle δὲ of the manuscripts can be preserved if we add θέλω as in Aristaen. 1.24 ἐμὲ γὰρ οὐδὲν θάλπει κέρδος, ἀλλ᾽ ὃ θέλω δὸς Τίμαρχον (adopted by all editors). But the particle δὲ of the manuscripts can be preserved if we add θέλω as in Aristaen. 1.24 ἐμὲ γὰρ οὐδὲν θάλπει κέρδος, ἀλλ᾽ ὃ θέλω δὸς Τίμαρχον (adopted by all editors). But the particle δὲ of the manuscripts can be preserved if we add θέλω as in Aristaen. 1.24 ἐμὲ γὰρ οὐδὲν θάλπει κέρδος, ἀλλ᾽ ὃ θέλω δὸς Τίμαρχο

Reiske’s ἡ δόξα (adopted by Meineke, Schepers and Benner-Fobes) for τι δόξα is not necessary; Alciphron frequently separates the indefinite article and the main word, e.g. 4.2.2 κάμοι τινα φέρειν φιλοτιμίαν τούτο λογίζομαι, 4.19.15 καὶ γὰρ ἔχω τινὰ νεωστὶ γυναῖκα ἀπὸ Φρυγίας ἢκουσαν.

8. ἀπέψυγμαι καὶ ἱδρῶκα τὰ ἄκρα καὶ ἡ καρδία μου ἀνέστραπται: Meineke’s ἱδρῶκα τὰ ἄκρα for ἱδρῶ καὶ τὰ ἄκρα (VFPD) is probably correct; the present ἱδρῶ would be odd with the perfect ἀπέψυγμαι and ἀνέστραπται. The imagery recalls Sappho fr. 31 L-P.

9. οὐκέτι φέρει τὸν κόρον: there is no need to change κόρον ‘the result of satiety, boredom’ (LSJ A.2); it is used in the same sense in 4.16.6 πρὸς ύμᾶς δὲ οὐδὲ ὑπερτίθεσθαι ἐξεστίν, ὡς τε φόβον εἶναι κόρον.

10. διακωμῳδεῖ σε Τιμοκράτης ἐκ Μητροδώρου (ἀδελφός): the arche-
type was probably illegible since there is a gap of several letters after Μη­­τροδώρου in VPD and a gap of half a line after διακω[…] in f. Bergler suggested reading this phrase as an ellipse with ἀδελφὸς suppressed, cf. K-G 1.265–6. However, since the manuscripts indicate that something is missing it is probable that ἀδελφὸς is what Alciphron wrote. Timocrates and Metrodorus were brothers and followers of Epicurus; Timocrates later became a harsh critic of Epicurus, cf. BNP s.v. Metrodorus 3 and Timocrates 4.

ἀναίσχυντὸς ἦστι τὸ ἔραν. καὶ ἐγὼ ἔσομαι τοιόνυν ὁμοία τις αὐτῶ, ἀναίσχυντος: Meineke deleted the second ἀναίσχυντος (followed by Schepers and Benner-Fobes) as a marginal gloss to ὁμοία τις. But the repetition of ἀναίσχυντος adds emphasis and should not be deleted.

### 4.18

**MENANDER TO GLYCERA**

1. ὡς οὐδὲν ἐπαίρω τὰ ἐμὰ, οὐδὲ βουλόμενός σοι χαρίζεσθαι ταῦτα καὶ λέγω καὶ γράφω: the text in the manuscripts is sound, but perhaps we should read τὰμὰ (Meineke) since Alciphron elsewhere uses the crisis form, cf. 1.7.1, 1.16.1, 2.11.1, 2.26.2, 3.42.3, 4.18.17, 4.19.4. Schepers’ ὡς οὐδὲν ἐπαίρω τὰμὰ οὐδὲ βουλομαι σου χωρίζεσθαι, ταῦτα καὶ λέγω καὶ γράφω gives a strained syntax with the asyndetic ταῦτα καὶ λέγω καὶ γράφω; Bergler suggested σου χωρίζεσθαι (adopted by all subsequent editors) for σοι χαρίζεσθαι because he found it inconsistent with the rest of the letter but this is not the case; Menander clearly states that he does not want to go to Egypt in 4.18.8 πλεῖν μὲν καὶ εἰς Αἰγυπτον ἀπιέναι μακρὰν οὕτω καὶ ἀπωκισμένη βασιλείαν οὖσαν, μὰ τοὺς δώδεκα θεοὺς, οὐδὲ ἐνθυμοῦμαι. For χαρίζομαι, cf. 4.6.2 ἤ δὲ καλῶς ἡμᾶς ἁμαρτών ἠμείψατο τῇ κακίστῃ ἀπολου­­μένῃ Μεγάρα χαρίζεσθαι θέλουσα.

2. τοὺς σοὺς τρόπους καὶ τὰ ἡθη: D’Orville’s τὰ ⟨σὰ⟩ ἡθη (adopted by Meineke, Hercher, Schepers and Benner-Fobes) is defended by Bungarten (1967) 24, for the sake of isocolon; but it is an unnecessary cosmetic conjecture.

3. συγκαταβαίη τις ξῆλος, εἰ τινῶν ἄλλων ὁ σωθεῖς πειράσεται ἀγαθῶν: VPF have ἡλος (‘nail’) ἢ τινῶν which makes no sense; in F
there is a gap of four letters before ἦ τινῶν. The Aldine’s ζῆλος ‘jealousy’ (adopted by all editors, although Schepers wrongfully attributes it to L) is most likely the correct reading for ζῆλος, as is Bergler’s εἴ τινων for ἦ τινῶν. Schepers (possibly following Seiler) reports that L has εἴ τινων but the unclear letters in the manuscript look rather like ἦ τινῶν.

μὴ δὴ: it is certainly possible to read μηδὲ (VFPD, although accented μηδὲ) but Meineke’s μὴ δὴ (adopted by all subsequent editors) is most likely the correct reading; δὴ and δέ are often confused in the manuscripts, e.g. 4.5.1 μὴ δὴ (μὴ δὲ N: μηδὲ Ald) κρείττονος εἴῃ σοι τυχεῖν ἐραστοῦ.

5. φασί: the reading of the manuscripts is rightly defended by Bungarten (1967) 39, against φησί (Hirschig, adopted by Schepers and Benner-Fobes). Although the impersonal φασί is normally used in more general sayings (e.g. 4.19.15 καὶ οὐ δὲ θεοὺς πιστεύειν, ἀλλ’ ἰδεῖν, ὡς φασί) it is sometimes used about rumours, cf. Chor. 26.2 τοὺς γάμους, φασί, μικρὸν ὡστε τελεῖν ἐβουλεύετο ἐπειγόμενον δήλησις πατέρα τὸν παῖδα θεάσασθαι, Lucian Gall. 9 ἐπεὶ δὲ τινὰ φασίν αὐτῶν μαλακῶς ἔχοντα οὐχ οἷόν τε εἶναι συνεπιπένειν μεθ’ ἡμῶν.

7. τὰς ἐπιστολὰς τοῦ βασιλέως σοι διεπεμψάμην, ἣν μὴ κόπτω σε δίς καὶ τοῖς ἐμοῖς καὶ τοῖς ἐκείνου γράμμασιν ἐντυγχάνουσαν: the sentence has prompted numerous unnecessary conjectures (see appendix), but the text is sound. Menander does not want to disturb Glycera twice (δίς) and therefore attaches the king’s letter to his own. It will be less trouble for Glycera to receive two letters at once than two letters separately. Menander is perhaps playing with the double meaning of ἐντυγχάνειν ‘meet with, encounter’ and ‘read’.

Bungarten (1967) 43–4, suggested that Menander only sent the king’s letter so that Glycera does not have to read two letters at the same time, by interpreting δίς as ‘doppelt im gleichem Zeitpunkt’; but this is not convincing for several reasons. The phrase ἐπιστολὴν διαπέμπειν is frequently used for forwarding letters, e.g. Thuc. 1.129.1–2 ἐπιστολὴν ἀντεπετίθει αὐτῷ ὡς τάχιστα διαπέμψαι ... τὴν ἐπιστολὴν διέπεμψεν and usually with the verb in the aorist, the so-called ‘Brieftempus’, cf. K-G 1.168–9, Smyth §1942. See further Koskenniemi (1956) 193–5 (quoted by Bungarten (1967) 43 n. 4). Note also how the same phrase is picked up in Glycera’s response (4.19.1 ὡς διεπέμψω μοι τοῦ βασιλέως ἐπιστολὰς εὐθὺς ἀνέγγειλε). Menander would not have sent the king’s letter without any kind of explanation from his side, as Philemon did by attaching the king’s letter to his own (4.18.5.
καὶ αὐτὸς δὲ ὁ Φιλήμων ἐπέστειλέ μοι τὰ ἴδια δηλῶν ἐλαφρότερα καὶ ὡς οὐ Μενάνδρῳ γεγραμμένα ἦττον λαμπρά. Furthermore Menander would not need to write to Glycera that Ptolemy had sent him a letter (4.18.5 ἐδεξάμην ἀπὸ Πτολεμαίου τοῦ βασιλέως Αἰγύπτου γράμματα) if she had already received it. Finally Glycera seems to be well aware of Menander’s decision not to go to Egypt (4.19.19 ὡστε πειρῷ μᾶλλον, ἐμὴ φιλότης, θᾶσσον εἰς ἄστυ παραγενέσθαι, ὅπως εἴ γε μεταβουλέυσαι τῆς πρὸς βασιλέα ἀφίξεως, ἔχης εὗτρεπισμένα τὰ δράματα ἐξ αὐτῶν ἀ μάλιστα ὠνήσαι δύναται Πτολεμαίοι).

9. τὰς σὰς θεραπεύω μᾶλλον ἀγκάλας ἢ τὰς ἀπάντων τῶν σατραπῶν καὶ βασιλέων: if θεραπεύω ἀγκάλας is correct then it is a bold image. Perhaps θεραπεύειν ἀγκάλας is a playful allusion on the phrase θεραπεύειν αὐλάς, cf. Diph. fr. 97 Κ-Α αὐλάς θεραπεύειν δ’ ἐστίν, ὡς ἐμοί δοκεῖ, ἢ φυγάδος ἢ πεινῶντος ἢ μαστιγίου, Men. fr. inc. 436 Κ-Α αὐλάς θεραπεύειν καὶ σατράπας (both fragments quoted at Ath. 5.189e). See also Kock (1888) 437, who put the whole passage into trimeters: Com. Adesp. 145 CAF τὰς σὰς θεραπεύω μᾶλλον ἀγκάλας ἢ τὰς ἁπάντων τῶν σατραπῶν καὶ βασιλέων | αὐλάς. The text is probably sound, but Bergler’s τὰς σὰς θεραπεύω μᾶλλον ἀγκάλας, ἢ τὰς (αὐλάς) ἀπάντων τῶν σατραπῶν καὶ βασιλέων (adopted by Meineke, Hercher and Benner-Fobes) has some merit to it since αὐλάς could easily have dropped out after τὰς. But Cobet’s changing of ἀγκάλας to αὐλάς (adopted by Schepers and Bungarten) should be rejected; it is unlikely that αὐλάς would get corrupted into ἀγκάλας, which was contended by Bungarten (1967) 50: ‘Der Fehler ist entstanden durch psychologisch bedingtes Verlesen’.

ἐπικίνδυνον μὲν τὸ ἀνελεύθερον: there is no need to change ἀνελεύθερον to ἐλευθεριάζον (Meineke), ἐλεύθερον (Cobet, adopted by Hercher), λίαν ἐλεύθερον (Maehtml, adopted by Benner-Fobes) or ἄγαν ἐλεύθερον (Schepers). Menander seems to imply that the life of a poet at Ptolemy’s court could be dangerous since he would be at the mercy of the king’s will and lose his personal freedom. This theme reoccurs in 4.18.13 ἢ μέγα τὸ συμβιοῦν Πτολεμαίω καὶ σατράπαις καὶ τοιούτοις ψόφοις, ὃν οὔτε τὸ φιλικὸν βέβαιον οὔτε τὸ διεχθρεῦον ἄκινδυνον.

10. τὰς Θηρικλείους: Bergler is probably right in correcting τὰς ήρακλείους (VFPD) to τὰς Θηρικλείους (sc. κύλικας). Although ‘Hera-clean cups’ could mean enormous cups, cf. Ath 469d–470d (a discussion about the goblet which carried Heracles across the ocean), it is more likely that Alciphron wrote Θηρικλείους as a reference to Theri-
cles, a famous Corinthian potter (late 5th or early 4th cent. BC) whose work was often praised in ancient literature, cf. Ath. 11.470ε–472ε who quotes numerous passages from Greek comedy, e.g. Men. Theoph. 4 K-Th μέσως μεθύον (τὴν) (Schweighäuser) Θηρίκλειον έστασεν, Men. fr. 235 K-A προπίνων Θηρικλεία τρικότυλον. See also the discussion by Arnott on Alexis fr. 5.1 K-A.

τῆς χθιζῆς ἀμαλογίας: this passage has spawned numerous fanciful conjectures (see appendix) but the reading χθιζῆς ἀμαλογίας (V: ἀμαλογίας F: ἀμαλογίας PD) should not be altered as was pointed out by Bücheler (1903) 457–8, Wilamowitz (1909) 466 n. 1 and Latte (1953) 37–8. The meaning of ἀμαλογία is uncertain but it probably means ‘singing at the sheaf-gathering/harvesting’, cf. EDG ἀμαλογία.

Bücheler translated ἀμαλογία ‘idle talk’ and based his interpretation on some passages from a Latin-Greek glossary attributed to Philoxenus: CGL 2.19.31 Apinae ἀμαλογίας, CGL 2.32.17 Garrulus φλοιαρος (φλυαρος var. lect.) βαττολάλος· ἀμάλογος, CGL 2.57.40 Effutat ομολογεῖ (codd.: ἀμαλογεῖ Goetz ap. CGL 6.377 s.v. Effutat), CGL 2.561.16 γενεσία μαλογίας. On the last passage Bücheler notes: ‘Endlich 561,16 (Papyrusfragment wo die lat. mit G anfangenden Vocabeln jetzt wegeschnitten sind) εἰ ἐγένετο wodurch generaizitas erklärt war, ἀμαλογία für garrulitas, folgt στερρότης für gravitas. In unserer Glosse musste ὁ punktirt sein, zweifellos is ἀμαλογία gemeint.’

Wilamowitz hypothetically interpreted ἀμαλογία as a haplography of *ἀμαλλολογία meaning a kind of ritual sheaf-gathering at the Haloa festival: ‘Sollte es nicht eine rituelle ἀμαλλολογία [sic], zusammenzogen ἀμαλογία, gegeben haben? ἀμαλα βείνα ἀμαλλα existirt (ἀμαληφόρος), und die “Garbenlese” paßt zur Tenne; man muß doch die Garben auflesen und hinbringen, wo sie gedroschen werden.’

The Haloa was not a harvesting festival, see Dillon (2002) 120–4. But Alciphron perhaps assumed that it was since there is a passage in Harpocration (s.v. Ἀλῶα) where the Haloa is wrongly connected with harvesting, cf. Latte (1953) 38, who further states ‘So viel steht aber jedenfalls fest, daß ἀμαλογία nicht die Garbenlese als solche, sondern das dabei gesungene Lied bezeichnet. Davon läßt sich die in den Glossen gegebene Bedeutung “Geschwätzigkeit” ableiten. [...] Von hier ist es nicht mehr weit zu der Bedeutung “leeres Geschwätz”.’

Another speculative interpretation is offered by Grošelj (1957) 40: ‘Sed propius ad garrulitatem accedere videmur, si vocem ex *ἀμαλ[ο-λ] ὁγος, ἀμαλός “schwach” (Frisk) ortam suspicabimur. Garrulus enim vana, inania loquitur.’
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12. διέλθω: there is no need to change to ἀπέλθω (Schepers (1905), adopted by Benner-Fobes); διέρχομαι can be used of movement towards a destination, cf. BDAG 1.b.α.

13. ἦ μέγα τὸ συμβιοῦν Πτολεμαίω: VFPD have ἦ but the affirmative and ironical ἦ (conjecture in Z) is more suited here, as in 4.18.15 ἦ (F: ἦ VPD) μέγα καὶ θαυμαστὸν ἰδεῖν τὸν καλὸν Νεῖλον, cf. LSJ ἦ I.1, Denniston 280.

14. ἐγὼ γὰρ αὐτῇ εἰμι πάντα: the manuscripts have αὐτῆς but Irmsch’s αὐτῇ (adopted by Seiler and subsequent editors) is a more likely reading, cf. 4.18.6 σὺ μοι, Γλυκέρα, ... ἀπαντα, νὴ τὴν Ἀθηνᾶν, ἀεὶ γέγονας καὶ νῦν ἔση.

15. ὁ Ῥῆνος: the Rhine is first mentioned by the geographer Pytheas of Massalia (4th cent. bc). Menander would probably not have known about the river Rhine but it should not be deleted (Meineke, adopted by Schepers). Another historical inaccuracy is found in 4.19.7 which most likely refers to the singing statues of Memnon, which are not attested before Strabo (c. 64 bc–24 AD), cf. Baldwin (1982). For so-called ‘historical errors’, see Schmitz (1997) 204–5.

καταβαπτισθήσεται μοι τὸ ζῆν μὴ βλέποντι μοι Γλυκέραν: the editors omit the second μοι (Aldine, which has μὴ βλέπον Γλυκέραν) but the repetition is not objectionable, cf. 4.8.3 μικρὰ δ᾽ ἔπεστί μοι παρασυχὴ καὶ μαραινόμενον ἥδη παραμύθιον ὅ μοι ὑπὸ τὴν λυπρὰν τῷ συμποσίῳ μέμψιν προσέρριψας ἀπ᾽ αὐτῶν περισπάσασα τῶν πλοκάμων.

16. οὐκ ἔστιν οὐδὲ προσελθεῖν: Seiler is right in reading an adverbial οὐδὲ for οὔτε (VPD). In Alciphron μήτε and οὔτε are always repeated, see note on 4.3.1.

ἐμοὶ γένοιτο, βασιλεὺ Πτολεμαῖε, τὸν Ἀττικὸν ἀεὶ στέφεσθαι κισσόν. ἐμοὶ γένοιτο χώματος καὶ τάφου πατρῶφι τυχεῖν καὶ τὸν ἐπ’ ἐσχάρας ὑμνῆσαι κατ᾽ ἔτος Διόνυσον: the position of ἐμοὶ γένοιτο χώματος καὶ τάφου πατρῶφι τυχεῖν seems out of place since it breaks apart τὸν Ἀττικὸν ἀεὶ στέφεσθαι κισσόν καὶ τὸν ἐπ’ ἐσχάρας ὑμνῆσαι κατ᾽ ἔτος Διόνυσον which belong together; it would be more natural to speak of the grave first after having described the dangers of the Nile in the previous sentence which prompted Meineke’s ἐμοὶ γένοιτο, βασιλεὺ Πτολεμαῖε, χώματος καὶ τάφου πατρῶφι τυχεῖν. ἐμοὶ γένοιτο τὸν Ἀττικὸν ἀεὶ στέφεσθαι κισσόν καὶ τὸν ἐπ’ ἐσχάρας
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ὑμνῆσαι κατ’ ἔτος Διόνυσον and Vahlen’s ἐμοὶ γένοιτο χώματος καὶ τάφου πατρῴου τυχεῖν. ἐμοὶ γένοιτο, βασιλεύ Πτολεμαίε, τὸν Ἀττικὸν ἀεὶ στέφεσθαι κισσὸν καὶ τὸν ἐπ’ ἐσχάρας ὑμνῆσαι κατ’ ἔτος Διόνυσον (adopted by Benner-Fobes and Bungarten). But perhaps we should excuse Menander’s lack of logic in this passionate address to Ptolemy.

17. ἐορτὴν ... ἀκαιροτέραν: the manuscripts have ἀκεραιοτέραν (ἀκέ­ραιος ‘pure, unmixed’) which makes no sense; the Aldine’s ἀκαιρο­τέραν (adopted by all editors) is no doubt the correct reading. the confusion between ε and αι was common since they were pronounced in the same way; a good example is the variant reading ἀκαιραιοτέραν found in P (before correction).

4.19

GLYCERA TO MENANDER

1. ὡς διεπέμψω μοι τοῦ βασιλέως τὰς ἐπιστολὰς, εὐθὺς ἀνέγνων: the variation in the initial letter of the sentence (ὡς VF: ὦς P: [1 litt.]5 D) would indicate that it was omitted in the archetype; the reading ὦς found in P (and in KC Ald, probably by conjecture since their exemplar D had [1 litt.]5) was adopted by Bergler, Wagner and Seiler; the temporal conjunction ὡς with the aorist (cf. LSJ Ad, BDAG 8a) looks like a lectio difficilior compared with ὡς (VF, adopted by Meineke, Hercher, Schepers and Benner-Fobes) and is perhaps therefore a more likely reading in this passage; for a similar construction, cf. 2.36.1 ὡς γὰρ τῇ ἕνῃ (Cobet: ἕνη B) καὶ νέας κατ’ ἐκλογὴν τοῦτον ἐπριάμην, Νουμήνιον μὲν εὐθὺς ἐθέμην καλεῖσθαι. The reading τὰς ἐπιστολὰς (PD, by Bergler, Wagner and Seiler) is preferable to ἐπιστολὰς (VF, adopted by Meineke, Hercher, Schepers and Benner-Fobes), cf. 4.18.7 τὰς μὲν οὖν ἐπιστολὰς τοῦ βασιλέως σοι διεπεμψάμην, 4.19.2 σοβοῦσα ταῖς χερσίν ἐμαυτῆς τὴν ἐπιστολὴν σὺν τῇ βασιλικῇ σφραγίδι. The problem, however, lies in ἐν ᾗ νῦν εἰμι, κατέχαιρον: Calligenea is interpreted as either an epithet to Demeter ‘the giver of beautiful birth’ or as a separate goddess who was celebrated on the third day of the Thesmophoria festival which was called τὰ Καλλιγένεια, cf. 2.23.72 τὰ Καλλιγένεια (B: τῇ Καλλιγενείᾳ Bergler) δὲ εἰς τὴν ἐπιοῦσαν θύουσιν.

The problem, however, lies in ἐν ᾗ νῦν εἰμι which Bergler changed
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to ἐν ἦς νῦν εἰμὶ (adopted by all editors; Seiler wrongfully reports that D has ἐν ἦς, reproduced by Schepers). Bergler’s ἐν ἦς νῦν εἰμὶ ‘in cujus aedem nunc sum’ was criticized by Meineke (1853) 116, on the assumption that Calligenea did not have a temple, and suggested either deleting ἐν ἦς νῦν εἰμὶ as a marginal note or reading ἐν ἦς νῦν εἰμὶ (τελεταῖς), neither of which is very convincing. Schepers adopted Polak’s ἐν ἦς νῦν εἰμὶ κατ’(ευχαῖς) ἔχαρον which at least is more easily explainable on palaeographical grounds.

But why would Glycera who apparently is celebrating the Haloa (cf. 4.18.17 σὺ δὲ ἐκ τῶν Ἁλῴων, δέομαι, Γλυκέριον, εὐθὺς πετομένη πρὸς ἴμας ἐπὶ τῆς ἀστράβης φέρου) be invoking Calligenea who is celebrated at the Thesmophoria festival? Perhaps because Glycera is pregnant and wishing for a good birth. This slightly speculative solution would solve the textual problem by interpreting ἐν ἦς νῦν εἰμὶ ‘in whose hands I now am’ (LSJ ἐν A.I.6, Soph. OT 314 ἐν σοὶ γὰρ ἐσμὲν, Eur. Alc. 278 ἐν σοὶ δ” ἐσμὲν καὶ ζῆν καὶ μή).

ἐκπαλῆς ύπὸ ἥδονῆς γινομένη: the Aldine’s ἐκπαθῆς ‘passionate’ is adopted by most editors, although Meineke’s ἐκπλαγῆς … γενομένη ‘possessed, maddened’ is adopted by Hercher (reading γινομένη) and Schepers (1901). The manuscripts have ἐκ πάλης (or ἐκπάλης) which would mean ‘from the wrestling, fight’ but with a change in the accentuation (suggested by Seiler (1853) 66) we get ἐκπαλῆς ‘dislocated, out of joint’, which is a rare medical term but perhaps possible in this context, cf. the figurative use of the German ‘verrückt’ and Swedish ‘vrickad’.

Εὐφρόνιον: the name Εὐφόριον (VFPD) is not attested as a female name; hence Meineke and Nauck suggested Εὐφρόνιον. A courtesan by this name is the probable sender of Aristaen. 1.19 Εὐφρόνιον (Mercier: ὕφοριον V) Θελξινόῃ.

ὅτε: various conjectures have been suggested: ὅθεν (Reiske), ὅτου (Jacobs), ὅ τι (Seiler), ὅτι (Schepers). But the reading of the manuscripts is defended by Keil (1853) 46; the logical word order is οὐ μέμνησαι, Μένανδρε, ὅτε καὶ μειδιάσασα θερμότερόν σε κατεφίλησα.

2. θεασάμεναι δὲ: the manuscripts have θεασάμενος which would make Menander the subject but this cannot be correct. The Aldine’s θεασάμε­ναι δὲ (adopted by all editors) is a very likely correction.

ἀγαθόν … ἐπιχάριτόν τι καὶ εὐκτάιον: the hyperbaton is harsh (cf. K-G 2.600–1, Smyth §3028); most editors read διαλάμπεις ἐπιχάριτόν τι καὶ εὐκτάιον and put a question mark after πέφηνας but this makes little sense. Hyperbaton occurs frequently in Alciphron, e.g. 2.35.3 εἶς
γάρ με τὸ συνηρεφὲς ἄγαγών, 4.19.14 καὶ γάρ ἔχω τινὰ νεωστὶ γυναίκα ἀπὸ Φρυγίας ἤκουσαν.

Μένανδρον ... τὸν ἐμὸν (ὅν) ... μεταπέμπεται: deleting the relative pronoun (Aldine, adopted by all editors) gives an easier syntax but perhaps we are to supply α moi γέγονεν from the question above, τὶ σοι τῇ λικοῦτον γέγονεν ἀγαθῶν, thus reading Μένανδρον ἔφη τὸν ἐμὸν (sc. μοι γεγονέναι) ὅν ὁ Αἰγύπτου βασιλεὺς Πτολεμαῖος ἔπτι τῷ ἡμίσει τῆς βασιλείας τρόπον τινὰ μεταπέμπεται.

τὴν ἐπιστολὴν: Scheper’s τὰς ἐπιστολὰς deserves some attention since Alciphron only uses the plural form elsewhere (4.17.1, 4.17.3, 4.18.7, 4.19.1, 4.19.4). But perhaps the singular τὴν ἐπιστολὴν refers to the actual letter which Glyceria is holding in her hand, whereas the plural τὰς ἐπιστολὰς is used for the message.

3. ἔφρασαν: there is no need to read ἔφασαν (Bergler, adopted by Seiler, Hercher, Scheper and Benner-Fobes), cf. 2.36.2 ἰἱ φράσαν, 3.2 ἐφάσας παρ’ ὅτου καλοῖτο, 3.2.2 ἐγὼ δὴ τὰ σοὶ φράσω καὶ πρὶν ἐρέσθαι.

τὸ λεγόμενον: Alciphron elsewhere uses the phrase with δὴ (1.2.1 τὸ λεγόμενον δὴ, 4.18.5 τὸ δὴ λεγόμενον) but there is no need for τὸ (δὴ) λεγόμενον (Meineke, adopted by Hercher and Scheper); the phrase can be used both with and without δὴ.

4. ἀλλὰ καὶ τοῦτό γε δῆλος ἐκ τῶν ἐπιστολῶν ὡν ἀνέγνων ἦν ὁ βασιλεὺς, τἀμὰ πεπυσμένος: this sentence seems to have caused trouble with the scribe of D who has added an extra δῆλος (wrongly attributed to the Aldine by Scheper) before ἦν which has been the basis for the numerous conjectures on this passage (see appendix). But no change is needed as was pointed out by Bungarten (1967) 103–4. We should supply an additional πεπυσμένος after τοῦτό γε (a zeugma or ἀπὸ κοινοῦ construction, cf. Lausberg (1998) §697–9) reading τοῦτό γε πεπυσμένος δῆλος ἦν ὁ βασιλεὺς. For similar examples of δῆλος cf. 2.5.3 ἐμοῦ δὲ παρὰ συνήγορος τὴν ὑπερβολὴν διέπτυεν εὐθέως καὶ δῆλος ἦν δυσχεραίνων, 4.4.3 ὁ μὲν γὰρ διὰ τὴν τῆς συνηγορίας χάριν δῆλος ἐστὶ σπουδάζεσθαι βουλόμενος καὶ ἐρωμένον ἕαυτὸν ποιῶν, 4.10.2 νῦν μέντοι δῆλος ἐστὶ μηδ’ ἄλως ἡμῖν ἐνευστείμονος.

τάμα ... περὶ σοῦ: Reiske’s περὶ σὲ (adopted by Scheper) is not necessary, cf. 4.6.5 ἐμοὶ μὲν οὖν βροχὺ μέλει περὶ τούτων, 4.11.9 ἦν γὰρ μοὶ τὸ δοκεῖ περὶ ἐκείνης καὶ λαλεῖν καὶ γράφειν.

ἀτρέμα ... διατωθάζειν: Meineke suggested ἧρέμα (adopted by Scheper) but ἀτρέμα ‘without trembling, gently, slightly’ is defended
by Bungarten (1967) 104, who compares it with the phrase ὅτρεμα μεῖδιᾶν found in Plut. Per. 28 and Plut. Alex. 46. The composite δια­τωθάζω ‘tease’ is a rare word, but not a hapax as LSJ seems to suggest; it is attested at At. Epit. 2.2.123, Philostr. VS 1.544, 2.574, Philostr. Imag. 1.28.2. The simple τωθάζω is much more common.

Αἰγυπτίοις ... ἀττικισμοῖς: this expression is no doubt intended as an oxymoron and can be contrasted with 4.19.1 ἐπῄνεις αὐτῆς τὸν ἐπιχώριον ἀττικισμόν. The text is rightly defended by Bungarten (1967) 104–5, who compares this passage with Cic. Att. 4.19.1 an Vestorio dandi sunt dies et ille Latinus Ἀττικισμὸς ex intervallo regustandus?

5. κἂν τοῖς προσκηνίοις ἐστηκα: the editors have adopted Meineke’s παρασκηνίοις ‘side-scene, side-wings’ for προσκηνίοις (VFPD) ‘stage, painted scenery at the back of the stage’. The problem is that we know nothing about Alciphron’s knowledge of theatre, whether he is describing a Roman theatre, which did not have parascenia, or a Hellenistic theatre, which did. But there is an interesting parallel in Plautus which gives support to reading προσκηνίοις: Plaut. Poen. 17–8 scortum exoletum ne quis in proscaenio sedeat. This passage is discussed by Benndorf (1875) 86–7, who defends προσκηνίοις in this passage. He also argues that it was not uncommon for courtesans to stand behind the scenes during performances.

9. ναυτὶς ἐσομαι: The manuscripts have αὐτῆς ἐσομαί (αὐτῆς PD) but Hemsterhuis’ ναυτὶς is probably correct. The word is only attested by Theopomp. Com. fr. 82 Κ-Α γυναῖκας ναυτίδας and Phot. ν 289, but Alciphron uses a similar rare feminine form in 4.19.19 ἵδιωτις.

εὖ {δ’} οἶδα: the particle δ’ is deleted in the Aldine (adopted by all editors), perhaps rightly so, cf. 4.16.8 εὖ οἶδα γάρ ὅτι οὐ μόνον ἐν τῇ Θηριππιδίου οἰκίᾳ ... ἔχει διαβόητος ἡ παρασκευή, 4.17.9 καὶ οὐκέτι φέρει τὸν κόρον, εὖ οἶδα, 4.19.10 κἂν πέτραν οἰκῶμεν, εὖ οἶδα ἄφροδισιών αὐτὴν τὸ εὔνου ποιήσει, 4.19.12 σὺ μὲν οὐδέποτε περὶ οὔδενος αἰτίασθε μὲ οὔτε μικροῦ οὔτε μεγάλου, τοῦτο εὖ οἶδα.

καὶ ἐκκλωμένης κόπτης ναυτίας ἐγὼ θεραπεύσῳ, θάλψω σου τὸ ἀσθενοῦν τῶν πελαγισμῶν: Schepers, supported by Bungarten, reads κἂν ἐκκλωμένης κόπτης ναυτίας ἐγὼ (θεραπεύσω) θάλψῳ σου τὸ ἀσθενοῦν τῶν πελαγισμῶν. Schepers attributed this conjecture to Hermann but he actually prints ἐκ κλωμένης. Dobree should be attributed with κἂν ἐκκλωμένης κόπτης ναυτίας as noted by Benner-Fobes and the deletion of θεραπεύσῳ should be attributed to La Croze (see appendix). Another alternative is presented by Benner-Fobes who read
κἂν ἐκκλωμένης κώπης ναυτίας ἐγὼ θεραπεύσω. θάλψω σου τὸ ἁπάντων τῶν πελαγισμῶν.

But there is no need for conjecture since the text is sound and gives perfect sense; the asyndeton in θεραπεύσω, θάλψω is harsh but not uncommon in Alciphron, cf. note on 4.7.2. Alciphron elsewhere uses θεραπεύω in the sense ‘serve, flatter’ (2.39.5 καὶ ἄλλως δὲ εἰδέναι σε χρή, ὡς αἱ ταλασίαι ἀγαπώσαι καὶ τὴν Ἑργάνην θεραπεύουσαι κόσμῳ βιού καὶ σωροφύτης σχολάζουσιν, 3.28.4 ἐξ ἐκείνου γάρ θεραπεύουμαι λιταρώς ἄλλοτε ἄλλαις δωροφορίαις, 4.18.9 τὰς σὰς θεραπεύω μᾶλλον ἄγκαλας ἢ τὰς ἁπάντων τῶν σπατροπῶν καὶ βασιλέων) but here it means ‘take care of’, cf. LSJ II.4.

ἀξοὶ δὲ σε ἄτερ μίτων Ἀριάδνη: Bergler’s μίτων ‘thread’ (adopted by all editors) is most likely correct; μύθων (VFPD) looks like a scribal correction of μίτων, an itacistic corruption of μίτος. The use of μίτος for Ariadne’s thread is not attested before late 2nd cent. AD, cf. Vett. Val. 7.5 τῆς γάρ ἀρχής δραξάμενοι καθάπερ μίτου ὁδηγούση τῆς Ἀριάδνης, Bas. Caes. Ep. 3.34 ἐδει πάλιν καὶ τὴν τάξιν ἐπιζητεῖν ἀναπόδιζοντα καὶ παρεπόμενον τῷ αὐλακί, καθάπερ τὸν Θησέα τῷ μίτῳ τῆς Ἀριάδνης φασί.

11. ἂλλ’ οἱ συγγενεῖς, ἂλλ’ ἡ πατρίς, ἂλλ’ οἱ φίλοι, σχεδὸν οἴσθα, πάντῃ πάντες πολλῶν δέονται: Schepers and Bungarten adopted Meineke’s οἱ πατέρες (based on οἱ πατρίς in LS) but there are parallels to this slightly odd list, eg. Diod. Sic. 20.89.4 ἐπιθυμοῦντες δὲ συγγενεῖς καὶ φίλους καὶ πατρίδος καὶ τῶν ἐν ταύτῃ καλῶν διελύσαντο πρὸς Ἀγαθοκλέα, Arr. Epict. diss. 2.22.18 ἐν δ᾽ ἄλλαχοι μὲν τὸ συμφέρον, ἄλλαχοὶ δὲ τῶν φίλων καὶ τῆς πατρίδας καὶ τῶν συγγενεῖς καὶ αὐτὸ τὸ δίκαιον, οἴχεται πάντα ταῦτα καταβαρούμενα ὑπὸ τοῦ συμφέροντος.

12. ἡττημένος μοι πάθει καὶ ἐρωτὶ: Bergler’s πάθει is a likely correction for πάσι (VFPD) which does not make any sense.

κρίσιν: should not be translated ‘decision’ (cf. Bungarten (1967) 139) but ‘judgement’, as in 1.8.1 οἱ τὴν γνώμην ἀμφίβολην τὴν παρὰ τῶν εὐνοούντων κρίσιν ἐκδέχονται.

ἔστι γάρ ὡς βιαῖος ή ἐμπαθὴς φιλία οὔτω καὶ εὐδιάλυτος: the term ἐμπαθὴς φιλία is not attested before Alciphron; this passage was perhaps influenced by Aristotle’s discussion on friendship in the Nicomachean Ethics, cf. Bungarten (1967) 139–41. The adjective εὐδιάλυτος ‘easy to dissolve’ is an Aristotelian coinage, cf. Aristot. Eth. Nic. 1156α φιλίαι ... εὐδιάλυτοι.
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'οἷς δὲ περιβέβληται καὶ βουλής, ἀρραγέστερον ἐν τούτοις ἡδή τὸ ἔργον οὔτε ἄμιγες ἡδοναῖς τε καὶ διὰ τὸ πλῆθος οὔτε περιδεές’: this passage is corrupt and emendation is difficult. The manuscripts are divided between περιβέβληται (V)/περιβέβληνται (V³FP) and παραβέβληται (P⁴D); all editors read παραβέβληται with βουλαί (Aldine) or παραβέβληται (Meineke) ‘add’ (cf. Arr. Epict. diss. 2.18.5 πυρὶ φρύγανα παρέβαλες), but περιβέβληται/περιβέβληνται ‘put upon, invest, adorn’ might also be possible (cf. LSJ 1.2, Hdt. 1.129 δικαιότερον εἶναι Μήδων τέω περιβαλεῖν τούτο τὸ ἁγαθὸν ἢ Περσέων).

The plural βουλαί (Aldine) is not an impossible reading (cf. 4.18.6 ἐγὼ δὲ οὐ περιμενῶ βουλάς, where βουλή means ‘advice’), but in this context it should rather mean ‘deliberation, reasoning’ which would make the singular more suitable (as in the lines above, πάλαι μὲν ἡττημένος μου πάθει καὶ ἔρωτι, νῦν δὲ ἡδή καὶ κρίσιν προστεθείσῳ αὐτῷ). Benner-Fobes defend βουλής but a change to ⟨τι⟩ βουλῆς (Meineke, adopted by Schepers (1905) and Conca-Zanetto) or to βουλή would give a less strained syntax. In any case a verb in the singular is needed; περιβέβληται is printed in the text since it is found in V (although with περιβέβληνται as variant/correction).

τὸ ἔργον is a vague term but perhaps it should be translated ‘matter’ or ‘love’, cf. Philostr. Ep. 57 πέπεισαι μὲν, ὡς εἰκάζειν ἔχω, τοῦ δὲ ἔργου τὴν αἰσχύνην ὀκνεῖς, mentioned by Conca-Zanetto (2005) 127 n. 197.

It is also difficult to make sense from τὸ πλῆθος; perhaps we should read τὸ πάθος (Meineke), cf. Aristot. Eth. Nic. 1156α ἢ δὲ τῶν νέων φιλία δι’ ἡδονὴν εἶναι δοκεῖ: κατὰ πάθος γάρ οὔτοι ζῶσι, καὶ μάλιστα διώκουσι τὸ ἡδὺ αὐτοῖς καὶ τὸ παρόν and 1156b κατὰ πάθος γάρ καὶ δι’ ἡδονὴν τὸ πολὺ τῆς ἐρωτικῆς.

The sense of the passage is obscure but the point Glycera seems to be making is that passionate love is fickle whereas rational people have a stronger relationship which does not lack passion and pleasure, and does not fear abandonment.

13. ‘λύσει δὲ τὴν γνώμην’: probably corrupt; perhaps we should read λύσεις (Aldine, adopted by all editors except Schepers). For λύω ‘solve’, cf. LSJ III, Soph. OT 406–7 τὰ τοῦ θεοῦ | μαντεῖα λύσομεν. Similar thoughts are expressed in 1.8.1 οἱ τὴν γνώμην ἀμφίβολοι τὴν παρὰ τῶν εὐνοούντων κρίσιν ἐκδέχονται and 1.8.4 ἀποκόπτειν γὰρ εἶσαι τῆς γνώμης ἢ τῶν φίλων συμβουλή τὸ ὁμφίβολον.

ὡς με πολλάκις περί τούτων αὐτοὺς νουθετῶν διδάσκεις: Seiler, Meineke, Hercher and Schepers print δὲ γε πολλάκις περί τούτων
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αὐτὸς νουθετῶν με διδάσκεις adopting Meineke’s ὁς γε and the scribal conjecture με found in C (not L as Schepers reports). But no change is necessary.

14. πάτριος ἡμῶν ἔστι θεός: Schepers (1905) reads πάτριος ἡμῖν ἔστιν ὁ θεός but ἡμῖν is only found in C (not F as Schepers reports) and ἔστιν ὁ is an unnecessary conjecture by the Aldine.

15. καὶ οὐ δεῖ λεγούση πιστεύειν, ἀλλ’ ἰδεῖν, ὡς φασί: the Aldine’s οὐ δεῖ for οὔδε (VFPD) is no doubt correct; δεῖ is needed for the infinitives.

16. τὰ ἄγρια φῦλα τῶν ἄγνων: the manuscripts have τὰ ἄγρια φῦλα (VFP: ἄγρια φῦλα D) τῶν ἀνθρῶπων (ἀνθρώπων is abbreviated in the manuscripts, except in C and Ald) which makes no sense; but the abbreviated ἀνθρώπων is most likely a misreading of ἄγνων (Cobet, adopted by Schepers and Benner-Fobes); for ἄγνως ‘chaste-tree’, cf. 3.5.1 and 4.14.7. The reading φῦλα (VFP: φῦλα D) was probably a scribal correction of φῦλα to make it fit with ἀνθρώπων. For ἄγρια φῦλα, cf. Theoc. Id. 26.3 λασίας δρυὸς ἄγρια φῦλα.

17. ἐκεῖ ἄγαρ ἀλλὰ τοῦτο σαυτὸς με, τὸν Πειραιᾶ καὶ τὸ ἄγριδιον καὶ τὴν Μουνυχίαν, καὶ κατ’ ὀλίγον, ὡς ἐκπέσωσι τῆς ψυχῆς, οὐ δύναμαι πάντα ποιεῖν: this passage is corrupt and emendation is difficult, but the following tentative solution gives some sense at least: καὶ εἰ (Jacobs: εἰ VFPD) μελετᾶν πειράζει (Granholm: πειράζεις VFPD) (sc. ἡ Φρυγία) ἀπὸ σαυτὸς με, ὡς τὸν Πειραιᾶ καὶ τὸ ἄγριδιον καὶ τὴν Μουνυχίαν καὶ (πάντα) (Jacobs) κατ’ ὀλίγον ἐκπέσωσι τῆς ψυχῆς, οὐ δύναμοι ταῦτα (Jacobs: πάντα VFPD) ποιεῖν ‘and if she tries to wean me away from you, so that the Pireus, your small estate, Munychia and everything will gradually fall out of my mind, this I can’t do’. The changes, however, are too substantial and speculative to be included in the text.

19. τὰ δράματα ἐξ αὐτῶν ἀ: there is no need to change the text, see note on 4.13.16 ἐξ ἄστεος οἱ κομισθέντες.

Θαΐδα: the title of Menander’s play Thais should be in the singular (Meineke) like the rest of the plays mentioned.

eἴτε Σικυών(ιον) εἰθ᾽ ὅτι οὖν ἀλλο: Meineke’s conjecture is very reasonable (Σικυώνιον was suggested already by Bergler) although the play is quoted as Σικυώνιοι in some sources, cf. Arnott (2000) 196–
8. The manuscripts have gaps in the text ranging from 10 letters to a whole line; the gap in the archetype was probably due to a saut du même au même (σαύτου ... οὕνων). There is a similar enumeration at 4.16.6 ending with τὰς δὲ ὄπωσον ἀλλάς.

ἔγώ θρασεία καὶ τολμηρά τίς εἰμι τὰ Μενάνδρου διακρίνειν ἰδιώτις οὖσα: the conjecture εἰμι τὰ by the Aldine is no doubt correct for εἰ μετὰ (VFPD) which breaks the syntax; the infinitive διακρίνειν is governed by θρασεία καὶ τολμηρά τίς εἰμι.

20. ἀλλ᾽ οἰκονομοῦσιν (οἱ) ἔρωτες σπεύδουντες: ὥρατε (VFPD) is difficult to defend; ὥρατ is used parenthetically in the singular (1.10.1 τὴν μὲν θάλατταν, ὡς ὥρας, φρίκη κατέχει, 3.6.1 πιναροῖς, ὡς ὥρας, καὶ τρυχίνους βασίοις τὴν αἰδώ περισκέπω) but the plural form would be very out of place in a letter. All editors have adopted the Aldine’s ἔρωτες but this makes the text more difficult to understand by changing the subject from the lovers (παρ᾽ ἐραστοῦ) to the loves (ἔρωτες). It is the lovers who dispense their wisdom, not love itself. So it is better to read οἱ ἔρωτες. For σπεύδουντες ‘in haste’, cf. LSJ σπεύδω II.1. The verb οἰκονομέω normally means ‘manage, administer’ but here it should be translated ‘dispense’ as in Pl. Phdr. 256e–257a τοῦτα τοσάυτα, ὡ παῖ, καὶ θεία οὕτω σοι δωρήσει τὴν Ἁρτέμιν, ἀνάξιοι ὑμῶν εἶναι μὴ θάττον μανθάνουσαι: Bergler (1715) 271, takes τὴν Ἁρτέμιν to be the object of οἰκονομέα translating ‘veremur Dianam si vobis indignae simus tardius discentes’ but this cannot be correct since εἰμι is governed by οἰκονομέα and τὴν Ἁρτέμιν must be taken as an invocation; hence we need the particle μὰ (C and Herel, adopted by Seiler, Meineke, Hercher, Schepers and Benner-Fobes). The invocations μὰ τὴν Ἁρτέμιν is also used in 4.16.5, 4.17.6.

ὑμῶν: The manuscripts have ἠμῶν but this makes little sense; ὑμῶν (Aldine, adopted by all editors) is needed as referring to the lovers, including Menander.

μὲ γέγραφας: this scribal correction found in P (and independently conjectured in the Aldine) is probably the correct reading. Although μεταγέγραφας (VFPα-D) ‘copy, transcribe, translate’ cannot be ruled out completely it is perhaps too technical and would in any case need an object: (μὲ) μεταγέγραφας. Schepers’ ἐμὲ γέγραφας is not necessary. Glycera is a character in several of Menander’s plays, most notably Periceiromene, but here she is referring to a play entitled Glycera accord-
ing to Körte (1931) 719. Note also Glyceria’s fearful remark in 4.2.5 δεηοι με ἐπὶ τῆς σκηνῆς ὑπὸ Χρέμητος τινος ἤ Φειδύλου πικρῶς λαοδορεῖσθαι.

δι᾽ ἄλλου: ‘in another form’ or ‘in another’s person’ (Benner-Fobes). διὰ σοῦ (Jacobs, adopted by Schepers and Bungarten) is not needed since the reading of the manuscripts gives perfect sense. καὶ μᾶλλον αἰσθηται ὁ βασιλεὺς ὀσον ἰσχύει καὶ παρὰ σοὶ γεγραμμένος φέρειν ἕαυτοι τοὺς ἐρωτας ἀφεῖς ἐν ἀστεῖ τοὺς ἀληθινοὺς: the manuscripts have κάν but Seiler’s καί is needed; Polak’s ὀσον ἰσχύω {καὶ} παρὰ σοι (ὦστε) is not necessary; the infinitive φέρειν is governed by αἰσθηται as in 3.40.3 ὡς οὖν ἡσθόμην οὐκ εἶναι μοι εἰς ταύτας εἰσιτητόν.

21. φανείῃ ... δο κοινή λυσιτελέσῃ ἣ: Meineke conjectured λυσιτελήσει (adopted by all subsequent editors) finding traces of the verb in λυσιτελέσει εῇ (VFP); but εἴ is probably an itacistic error of ἣ (D). The subjunctive in the relative clause is uncommon but not unprecedented, cf. Schwyzer 2.312, Thgn. 466 μηδὲ σε νικάτω κέρδος, ὃ τ’ αἰσχρόν ἔηι. Furthermore Alciphron uses the adjective elsewhere but not the verb, cf. 1.14.3 τοῦ μένειν ὄντος ἀλυσιτελοῦς τὸ φεύγειν ἐφάνη λυσιτελέστερον, 4.11.3 ὡς πρός τὸ λυσιτελέσι βλέπουσαι μόνον.

**FRAGM. 5**

**THE COURTESANS IN CORINTH TO THE COURTESANS IN TOWN**

This letter, which is missing the ending, was deemed spurious by Schepers on account of the use of χαίρειν in the title and the plural sender and recipient which are not found elsewhere in Alciphron, cf. Schepers (1901) 160 and Schepers (1905) 156.

But it was regarded as authentic by Lesky (1929), who argues that the title is a later scribal addition after the original title was lost in the transmission. According to Lesky the name Lais would have been associated with the famous courtesan from Corinth and the plural forms οὐκ ἐπύθεσθε ... οὐκ ἠκούσατε ... ἡμῖν ... κλείσατε ... ἀποκλείσατε would have given a scribe enough information needed for the supplementary title. Lesky also shows that plural forms are attested elsewhere in Alciphron (although not in titles), cf. 4.3.1 πᾶσαι σοι ἵσμεν
COMMENTARY: FRAGM. 5

αἱ ἑταῖραι χάριν καὶ ἐκάστη γε ἡμῶν οὐχ ἦττον ἡ Φρύνη ... εἰ γὰρ αἴτούσαι παρὰ τῶν ἐραστῶν ἄργυριον οὐ τυγχάνομεν. A further example, not noted by Lesky, is found in 3.31.2 καταλεύσατε με πάντες εἰς ταῦτον συνελθόντες.

Lesky also found stylistic similarities between Fragm. 5 and Alciphron: laboured phrases like ὧδ᾽ πόσον ἡμῖν ἐπιτετείχισται χρήμα and θηριοτροφηθέεσσα, enumerations like Λαίς ἐν τοῖς κουρείοις, Λαίς ἐν τοῖς θεάτροις, ἐν ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις, ἐν τοῖς δικαστηρίοις, ἐν τῇ βουλῇ, πανταχῇ (cf. 4.19.6 ἀκούσαι φιλαργύρων καὶ ἐρώτων καὶ δεισιδαιμόνων καὶ ἄρτιτων καὶ πατέρων καὶ βουλευτῶν καὶ παντὸς ἄνθρωπου) and similar use of words like δια­σοβοῦσα (cf. σοβέω 4.7.1, 4.11.4, 4.19.2; ἀποσοβέω 2.15.1, 3.15.1, 4.13.3; περισοβέω 3.19.6, 3.39.2, 4.13.11).

However, the strongest argument for the authenticity of Fragm. 5 is, according to Lesky, the fact that it is quoted several times by Aristae­netus (1.1). In this letter (purportedly by Aristaenetus to Philocalus) a certain Lais (not the famous courtesan) is praised for her beauty and grace by her lover Aristaenetus. The following passages are taken almost verbatim from Fragm. 5:

Fragm. 5

οἱ κωφοὶ διανεύουσιν ἀλλήλοις τὸ ἐκείνης κάλλος
ἐνδεδυμένη μὲν γὰρ εὐπροσω­
ποτάτη ἐστίν, ἐκδῦσα δὲ ὅλη
πρόσωπον φαίνεται
τρίχες ἐνουλισμέναι φύσει
καὶ τὸ μέλαν κοραι μελάνται καὶ τὸ κύκλω λευκὸν

Aristae­netus 1.1

οἱ κωφοὶ διανεύουσιν ἀλλήλοις τής Λαΐδος τὸ κάλλος (59–61)
ἐνδεδυμένη μὲν εὐπροσωποτάτη ἐστίν, ἐκδῦσα δὲ ὅλη
πρόσωπον φαίνεται
η δὲ κόμη ἐνούλισμεν (18–9)

καὶ τὸ μέλαν κοραι μελάνται καὶ τὸ κύκλω λευκὸν (14–5)
Aristaenetus often quotes or paraphrases other authors, including Alciphron (see notes on 4.9.4, 4.11.5, 4.11.7, 4.16.5, 4.17.6), so there is no doubt that Fragm. 5 is one of the sources for Aristaen. 1.1. But this does not necessarily prove the authenticity of Fragm. 5 which could be an example of a rhetorical exercise or belong to another collection of courtesan letters. For the numerous sources used by Aristaenetus, cf. the apparatus in Mazal (1971). Also the position of Fragm. 5 in the manuscript tradition after letters 4.18–19 is suspicious. These letters between Menander and Glycera are the highlight of the whole collection and it would be very strange if they were followed by another letter. If Fragm. 5 is authentic then it must have been misplaced here at a later stage in the transmission due to damage in the manuscript; perhaps it originally stood between the now fragmentary letters 4.12 and 4.13 or before 4.1. But a more likely explanation is that Fragm. 5 does not belong to Alciphron but was added later as a place filler at the end of a manuscript. A similar interpolation can be found in the manuscripts after 1.22 (the last letter of book 1) and 3.36 (fragmentary in the beginning) where Crates’ letter 9 and the first sentence of letter 10 have been added (the scribe of D has omitted Crates 10). These letters are also preserved among the letters of Crates preserved in VPD, but not F, see the description of the manuscripts on pp. 27–8 and 32.

1. ἰσχυεγχύλους: a compound from ἰσχύος ‘thin, lean’ and ἐγχύλος ‘juicy, succulent’ which occurs only here.

καὶ τὸ μέλαν αἱ κόραι μελάνταται καὶ τὸ κύκλω λευκὸν ***: the end is missing in the manuscripts. Several suggestions have been made to complete the sentence (see appendix).
παρεγγυήσω

ὑπὸ ἀπὸ

κἀμοί καί μοι

φέρει

αὐτὸν οὐκ ἔλαττον

ἑνεκεν ἑνεκα

ἡγοῦμαι

εὖντα τῆς

διαμαρτεῖν

芟ητεῖν

φιλτάτη θρηστὸν

εὐτυχίαν

μὲν

τῷ ΤΟΥΤΟΥ

Μὴ δὲ ΜΗΔ’

Εὐθίας εὐτυχίας

στέρξει

μὴ δὲ μηδὲ

Εὐθίου εὐτυχίου

μαστάρια

ὁ Ο

Μὴ δὴ ΜΗΔΕΝ

Εὐθίας εὐτυχίας

στέρξει

βεβουλῆσθαι

βεβουλεῦσθαι

προτιμώσαις

δηλονότι Μυρρίνην ὑπεριδών

ὑπεριδών δηλονότι στέρξει

μυρρίνην

βεβουλεῦσθαι

προτιμώσας

αὐτῇ

ἀργυρίου

ἀργύριον

ποτὲ μὲν τυγχάνειν

ποτὲ μὲν τυγχάνειν

ποτὲ συντυγχάνειν
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In the Appendix critica selected readings which can be regarded as scribal conjectures from the secondary manuscripts and the Aldine edition are reported. The Appendix coniecturarum lists conjectures made by modern scholars in a chronological order with bibliographical references (conjectures published posthumously are ordered according to the year of death of the scholar). The Appendix emendationum lists all conjectures which have been adopted into the text of the present edition.
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4.2 66.3 βεβούληται| βεβούλευται Z  6 παρεγγυήσω| παρεγγυήσαι W 7 βουλόμενον| βουλόμενος KCNM 8 υπό| ἀπὸ KCNM Ald κάμι| καὶ μοι L. φέρει| φέρει W Ald 12–13 Βάσκηδος| βασκήδης LS 13 οὐδ’ ἄν| οὐκ ἄν (γρ. οὐδ’ ἄν in marg.) K 14 αὐτὸν οὐκ ἔλαττον| αὐτὸν οὐκ ἔλαττον αὐτὸν Z 15 ἐνεκα| ἐποδήμησιν] ἐποδημίαν W Ald 18 ἡγούμαι| ἡγούμεθα αδιαμαρτέει| διαμαρτυρεῖν C 19 ἐπὶ om. Ald 20 γένηται| γενήσεται Z  ἔπανέλθῃ| ἔπανέλθοι Z

4.3 68.2 έταιρα| έταίραι σοι W 3 ήττον| ήσου W 7 τοῦ| τοῦτον om. Ald 9 έταιρεῖν| επαιρεῖν Z 12 περιεσώσω| περιεποιήσω W, def. Wagner (1798) 1.173 15 στήσαιμεν| σε στήσαιμεν Ald

4.4 70.2 σοι| σου Z  φιλτάτη| ὁ φιλτάτη W 3 έραστο| έραστοι χρηστόν| ύπερίδης C 4 ὑπερίδην| ύπερειδῆς C 5 εὑτυχίαν| τὴν εὐτυχίαν Ald 7 μὲν om. C 13 τῷ om. Z 16 μηδὲ PDZ: μηδὲ W: μή δὲ VFKCNM Ald 17 Εὐθίου| εὐτυχίου Ald 19 μαστάρια W 20 ὁ om. KCNM Ald

4.5 72.2 Μῆ δῆ| μή δὲ N: μηδὲ Ald 3 Εὐθίας| εὐτυχίας Ald 6 στέρει| δηλονότι Μυρρίνην ύπερειδῆς W 7 βεβουλήσθαι| βεβουλεύσθαι W 12 προτιμώσας VFPW Ald: προτιμώσας DKCNMZ

4.6 74.4 αὐτῇ| Αὐτῇ W Ald 6 ἀργύρου| ἄργυροι W 6–7 ποτὲ μὲν| εὐνυγχάνειν] ποτὲ μὲν τυχάνειν KCNM: ποτὲ συνυγχάνειν W:
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86.2 πιθανῶς] ἰκανῶς WK αποσκήπτει] ἀποσκήπτει W Ald

APPENDIX CRITICA 4.6–4.16

100.9 ταῦτά] ταῦταν W  11 δὲ καθεῖτο] δ᾽ ἐκεῖ θεῖτο Leid
104.1 ἂνεσάλευσεν] ἐσάλευσεν W  12 ἐπηγγέλθη] ἀπήγγελθη C Ald
114.8 ἐρωτοῦσι] ἐρωτοῦσιν Κοντός
116.7 καὶ] καί W  10 ἀλκιφρονος post ἔρρωσο add. M


APPENDIX CRITICA 4.17–4.19
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II APPENDIX CONJECTURARUM

4.1 64.1 (ΑΛΚΙΦΡΟΝΟΣ ΡΗΤΟΡΟΣ ΕΠΙΣΤΟΛΑΙ ΕΤΑΙΡΙΚΑΙ) Schepers (1901) 110, Rycke ap. Schepers (1905) 109
64.2 (Φρύνη Προξιτέλει) Jacobs (1830) 462
64.3 lac. ante μή δείσης ind. Wagner (1798) 2.219
64.4–5 ἡδη τίς σοι τῶν πώποτε; οὐδέις τῶν μετὰ χειρῶν πονηθέντων] δή τι οὐδεὶς εἰδε πώποτε πάντων τῶν διὰ χειρῶν πονηθέντων Seiler (1853) 390: ἡδη γ´ ἀντισοιτ´ αν ποτε οὐδεὶς τῶν καταχειροτονηθέντων Post (1946) 32
64.6 εἵπι secl. Bast (1805) 98, (1809) 135: ἀπὸ της τοῦ σοῦ. μὴ φθονῆσῃς δέ...
64.12 οὐς αὐτοὶ πεποιήκαμεν susp. Meineke (1853) 164

4.2 66.2 ἡμῶν] ἡμῖν Bergler (1715) 118
66.4 οἶδος] οὔδα Cobet (1854) 118
66.5 ύστερησαι] ἑστερησαί Dobree (1874) 66, Meineke (1853) 102, Cobet (1854) 118: στέρεσαί Cobet (1854) 118
66.6 εἰσωθότα] εἰσώθοτος Meineke (1853) 102
66.6–7 οὐδ’ ὀπωσ ... οὐδ’ ὀπωσ] οὐθ’ ὀπωσ ... οὐθ’ ὀπωσ Meiser (1905) 208
66.6 παρεγγυήσω] παρεγγυήσω σοι Reiske (1829) 25
66.7 ἐπιθημησε] ἐπιθημεῖν Schepers (1901) 110
66.7 μὴ βουλόμενον] μὴ. βουλώμαι μὲν οὖν Wagner (1798) 1.168: μὴ. βουλώμαι μὲν Boissevain ap. Schepers (1905) 110
66.7 αὐτόν] γε Bergler (1715) 119
66.8–9 ύπό σοῦ κάμοι τινα φέρειν φιλοτιμίαν τοῦτο λογίζομαι] ύπό σοῦ, κάμοι τινα φέρει φιλοτιμίαν τοῦτο, δ λογίζομαι Bergler (1715) 120: ύπό σοῦ. κάμοι τινα φέρει φιλοτιμίαν τοῦτο λογίζομεν χεὶ ύπό σοῦ, κάμοι τινα φέρει φιλοτιμίαν τοῦτο, ἐκλογίζομαι Reiske (1829) 25
66.9 οἶδα] οὔδε Cobet (1854) 118
66.9 ἐταιρείαιn VF, def. Nauck (1877) 99: ἐταιρίας PD, cf. 4.17.7
66.10 ἀλλήλαις] ἀλλήλαις Meineke (1823) 341 (err. typ.)
66.13 τις] οὐδείς Cobet (1854) 118
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66.13–16 τὸ ... πείθομαι susp. Cobet (1854) 118
66.15 πεποιήσαται] ποιήσεσθαι Schepers (1901) 111: πεποιήσαται ἔψευσθαι Meiser (1905) 208
66.15–16 οὐ πάνυ πείθομαι] καὶ πάνυ πείθομαι Bergler (1715) 122: οὐ πάνυ ἀπωθοῦμαι Polak ap. Schepers (1905) 110
66.18 (ἂν) ἡγοίμην Seiler (1853) 35: ἡγούμην VFPD
66.19–21 ἀλλως ... λοιδορεῖσθαι ante ἐγὼ (§4) transp. Polak ap. Schepers (1901) 111
66.19 κἂν] ἐάν Meineke (1853) 102
66.19–20 κἂν μοι κνισμός τις ἢ πρὸς αὐτόν ἢ διαφορά γένηται] κἂν μοι κνισμός τις πρὸς αὐτόν γένηται vel κἂν μοι κνισμός τις ἢ διαφορά πρὸς αὐτόν γένηται Hirschig (1855) 212
66.19 τις ᾖ] ᾖ om. Ald, secl. Cobet (1854) 118
66.21 Φειδύλου] Φειδώλου vel Φείδωνος Wagner (1798) 1.168

4.3 68.1 Ὑπερίδης| Ὑπερείδη Hercher (1873) xv
68.4 ἐπανεῖλετο| ἐνεστήσατο Cobet (1854) 118
68.6–7 τοῖς διδοῦσιν αἳ τυγχάνουσαι ἀσεβείας κριθησόμεθα] τυχοῦσαι τοῖς δεδωκόσιν ἀσεβείας κριθησόμεθα vel τοῖς διδοῦσιν αἳ τυγχάνουσαι ἀσεβείας κριθήσονται Cobet (1854) 118
68.8 μηκέτι ... μηδὲ] μηκέτι (μήτε) vel μηκέτι (μήτε αὐτὰς) ... μήτε Meineke (1853) 102: μήτ᾽ ἐτι ... μήτε Meiser (1905) 208
68.10 Ὑπερίδης Ὑπερείδης Hercher (1873) xv
68.11 ὡς ἀγαθὰ| κἀγαθὰ Hercher (1873) xv
68.15 δῆτῃ] δἐτοι Cobet (1854) 118

4.4 70.3–4 ἐραστοῦ χρηστὸν δὲ εὗρες Ὑπερίδην] ἐραστοῦ (Εὐθίου) χρηστὸν δὲ εὗρες Ὑπερίδην vel ἐραστοῦ χρηστὸν δὲ εὗρες Ὑπερίδην Meineke (1853) 102
70.4 Ὑπερίδην] Ὑπερείδην Hercher (1873) xv
70.7 μὲν γὰρ] μὲν οὖν Meineke (1853) 102: δ᾽ ἄρ᾽ Meiser (1905) 210
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70.8 στερούμενος] στερόμενος Cobet (1854) 118: ἐστερημένος vel στερθεὶς Schepers (1901) 113
70.9 κυνηθὲς secl. Polak ap. Schepers (1905) 112
70.11 Ὕπερείδην] Ὕπερειδὴν Hercher (1873) xv
70.14–15 προσδέχου δὴ πάλιν δι’ αὐτοῦ δεήσεις καὶ λιτανεῖας καὶ 
πολὺ χρυσίον, μὴ δὴ] ἧπη προσδέχου ... παρ’ αὐτοῦ ... (τὸ) 
pολὺ χρύσιον, μηδὲ Naber (1878) 243–4
70.14 δι’ αὐτοῦ] παρ’ αὐτοῦ Bergler (1715) 130, Cobet (1854) 118: 
ἀπ’ αὐτῶν Meineke (1853) 102: [δι’] αὐτοῦ Meiser (1905) 210
70.15 μὴ δὴ] σὺ δὲ μηδὲ Reiske (1829) 25: σὺ δὲ μὴ vel τότε δὴ μὴ
Schepers (1901) 113: μὴ μέντοι Meiser (1905) 210
70.16 μηδὲ] μηδ’ Seiler (1853) 37
70.16 Ὕπερειδὴν] Ὕπερειδὴν Hercher (1873) xv
70.19 μαστάρια pro μαστήρια coni. Bergler (1715) 130–1, conf.
VFPW; μαστίδια Casaubon (1600) 554
70.19 ἐπεδείξας pro ἐπέδειξας coni. Bergler (1715) 130, conf. VFP
70.20 πείθου] πείθοντι D’Orville (1750) 449
70.21 γένηται] γένοιτο Naber (1878) 244

4.5 72.2 εἰ οἱ τυχεῖν ἔραστοι, δέσποινα] δοίη οἱ τυχεῖν ἔραστοι
δέσποινα Valckenair ap. Schepers (1901) 113
72.3 Εὐθίας pro Εὐτυχίας coni. Bergler (1715) 133, conf. VFPD
72.6 δηλονότι] δηλον ὑπὶ Seiler (1853) 38
72.7 Ὕπερειδὴν] Ὕπερειδὴν Hercher (1873) xv
72.10 τοὺς νόμους] τὸν δὴν Hermann (1857) 69
72.12 μεμώκησαι] μεμώκησαι vel μεμώκησαι D’Orville (1750) 431

4.6 74.3 Εὐξιππην] Ζευξιππὴν Reiske (1829) 25
74.7 προσείμην W et Bergler (1715) 135: προσήμην VFPD:
προσείμην Cobet (1854) 118
74.8 κάκιστα] κακιστ’ Meineke (1853) 19: κακιστ’ Schepers (1905) 
114 (err. typ.?)
74.10 ὑπόνοια: ἄλλα] ὑπόνοια: διὸ Meiser (1905) 212: ὑπόνοια 
ἄλλη Capps ap. Benner-Fobes (1949) 260
74.10–11 ἄλλα ταύτην μὲν] ἄλλα] ταύτην μὲν (οὖν) Hirschig
(1855) 212
74.12 Ἀλῶσα] Ἀλῶσα Cobet (1854) 118
74.13 παρῆμεν pro παρ’ ἦμιν coni. Reiske (1829) 26, conf. VFP
74.15 Εὐξιππης] Ζευξιππῆς Reiske (1829) 25
74.15 ἐνεδείκνυτο] ἐνεδείκνυτο Wagner (1798) 1.184 (err. typ.?)
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74.16 ποιήματα] ποιημάτια Naber (1878) 244: ἱάμβους Meiser (1905) 212
74.20 ἐδει Bergler (1715) 138: οἴδει VFDP
74.21–22 ἐμοι ... βράχυ μέλει περὶ τούτων] ὄλγον μοι τούτων μέλει Cobet (1854) 118
74.22 περὶ secl. Meiser (1905) 212
74.23 Εὐξίππη] Ζευξίππη Reiske (1829) 25
74.24 μὴ μὲ τι Meineke (1853) 103: μὴ μ’ ἐτι VFDP
74.25 οὐκ ἐν σκώμμασιν] οὐ σκώμμασιν Hercher (1873) xv
74.25 ἐν οἷς secl. Hercher (1873) xv

4.7 76.4 Ἀκαδημίαν] Ἀκαδήμειαν Meineke (1853) 103
76.6 Εὐθύδημε] οὐκ οἶδας] Εὐθύδημε (ἡ) οὐκ οἶδας Meineke (1853) 103: Εὐθύδημε, οὐκ εἰδὼς Cobet (1854) 118: Εὐθύδημε (ἡ) οὐκ οἴσθα Hercher (1873) 55
76.10 τὸ τέως Kayser (1854) 422
76.11 προσέιμην] προσείμην Cobet (1854) 118
76.11 περιβάλλουσα] κοιμᾶσθα secl. Meineke (1853) 103
76.12 σοφιστῶν] (τῶν) σοφιστῶν Hercher (1873) xv, Herwerden (1902) 316
76.12–13 χρυσίον] χρυσίον (ἐχεῖν) Seiler (1853) 40, def. Kayser (1854) 422, Herwerden (1902) 316: χρυσίον (λαβεῖν) Meiser (1905) 212
76.16 ἀρκούμενον] πρὸ ἀρνούμενον coni. La Croze ap. Bergler (1715) 143, conf. VFDP
76.16 λῆρος ταῦτα εἰσι] λῆροι ταῦτα εἰσὶ vel λῆρος ταῦτα ἐστι Meineke (1853) 103: λῆρος ταῦτα ἐστι Cobet (1854) 118–9
76.17 τύφος Seiler (1853) 41: τύφος VFDP
76.17 ἐργολάβεια] ἐργολάβεια, μειρακίων ὦ ἀνόητε Meiser (1905) 212
76.17 ἐργολάβεια] μειρακίων ὦ ἀνόητε Bergler (1715) 144 (err. typ., corr. in errata)
76.19 πείθειν VFDP, def. D’Arnaud (1730) 229: πείθειν (εἰώθασι) Wagner (1798) 1.191: πείθουσιν W et Reiske (1829) 26
76.20 πρόκειται] πρὸ πρόσκειται coni. Bergler (1715) 145, conf. VFDP
76.20–21 εὐσεβέστεραι] οὐ εὐσεβέστεραι (οἳ) οὐ Naber (1878) 244–5
76.22 ἐν ϋνουσι] (θεοῦ) Meiser (1905) 212
76.22 τοῖς ἐρασταῖσ] ταῖς ἐρασταῖς Bergler (1715) 146 (err. typ., τοῖς in comm.)
76.24–78.6 οἴ] ... ἰρμεῖ secl. Hermann (1857) 69–70
76.24 ἐν εἰ] ἐν εἰσιν Meineke (1853) 103: εἰσὶ Hercher (1873) 55
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78.2 καὶ αὐτή] καὶ αὐτή (γάρ) Naber (1878) 244–5: καίτοι Radermacher (1924) 30
78.3 οὐδὲ εἰς ἐταίρας] οὐδεὶς ἐταίρας La Croze ap. Bergler (1715) 147–8
78.4 τυραννίδας] τυραννίδα Cobet (1854) 119
78.4 στασιάζει τὰ κοινά] εἰς τὴν πόλιν εἰς στάσιν καθίστησι vel ταράττει Cobet (1854) 119
78.5 τὸν VFPD, def. Meineke (1853) 104: τὸ Bergler (1715) 148–9
78.13 ἐπανελθὼν] ἐπανελθῶν Reiske (1829) 26: ἐπανήλθες Meiser (1905) 213
78.13 Λυκείου pro Λυκίου coni. Wagner (1798) 1.194, conf. VF: (τοῦ) Λυκείου Schepers (1905) 116
78.15 καλὸν secl. Naber (1878) 244–5
78.15–16 ἡδονῆς καὶ σοὶ νῦν μάλιστα φανοῦμαι σοφῆ] ἡδονῆς καὶ ... φανῶμεν σοφαι Naber (1878) 244–5: καὶ (ἵνα) ... φανῶμαι σοφῆ, οὔ Boissevain ap. Schepers (1905) 116 (ἡδονῆς ante καὶ om. err. typ.?)

4.8 80.1 Πετάλη pro Πεπάλη coni. Bergler (1715) 152, conf. VFPD
80.2–3 φέρειν ... οἴει] φέρει ... [οἴει] Cobet (1854) 119, Hirschig (1855) 212
80.2–3 πρὸς τινας τῶν διαλεγομένων οἴει] οἴει πρὸς τινας τῶν διαλεγομένων (σοι) Meineke (1853) 104
80.2 τινας susp. Schepers (1905) 117
80.9 παρηγόρημα Bergler (1715) 154: κατηγόρημα VFPD
80.10 τρίτην ἐσπέραν] τρίτην (ταύτην) ἐσπέραν Herwerden (1905) 452
80.10 πολὺν τινα ἐνεφορησάμην pro πολλῆν τινα ἐφορησάμην coni. Bergler (1715) 154, conf. FPD
80.10 ἐνεφορησάμην] ἐνεφορῆθην Cobet (1854) 119
80.11 τὸ pro τότε coni. Bergler (1715) 155, conf. VFP
80.13 κλαίοντα] κλάοντα Cobet (1854) 119
80.15 ἐπεστί] ἔτι ἐστὶ vel περίστι Cobet (1854) 119, Kayser (1854) 422–3: ἔτι ἐστὶ def. Meiser (1905) 214
80.16 δ Ald, def. Herel (1768) 6–7: ὁν VFPD: ὁ τί Seiler (1853) 43: (τὸ ῥόδον) δ Keil (1854) 608, Meiser (1905) 214: (ὁ στέφανος) ὁν Schepers (1901) 118
80.16 τῷ συμποσίῳ] ἐν τῷ συμποσίῳ Bergler (1715) 155
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80.18 δὴ VFPD, def. Cobet (1854) 119, Keil (1854) 608: μὴ Bergler (1715) 157; δὴ μὴ Wagner (1798) 1.207
80.21 ἐξοστὶ] ἐρωστὶ Naber (1878) 245

4.9 82.6 ἐν Muryrinonτι] ἐν Muryrinonti Cobet (1854) 102: ἦτι Muryrinonti Naber (1878) 245
82.7 μέταλλον| ἐργον Cobet (1854) 119
82.8 καὶ αἰ| καὶ secl. Polak ap. Schepers (1905) 118
82.11 ιδοὺσα] ιδῶ Wagner (1798) 1.211 (err. typ.?): ιδοῦσαν (1853) 104
82.11 ἀρχαία] ἀραῖα vel ἀραχνιαῖα Reiske (1829) 26
82.12 περιβαλλομένη προ προβαλλομένη coni. Bergler (1715) 160–1, conf. VFP: περιβαλλομένη Meineke (1853) 104
82.12 περιβαλλομένη ταραντινίδια] παραβαλλομένη Tarantinidía D’Arnaud (1734) 56
82.14 πόθεν| τὸ λοιπὸν Kayser (1854) 423: αὐτόθεν Keil (1854) 608: ποθεῖν Hermann (1857) 70
82.14–15 ἀλλὰ δακρύεις: πεπαύσῃ μετὰ μικρὸν post τὸ καλὸν transp. Hercher (1873) xvi
82.14 δακρύεις] δακρύσεις ed. 1606
82.15 τις secl. Hirschig (1855) 212
82.17 φιλεῖν Reiske (1829) 26, Valckenaer ap. Schepers (1901) 119, Cobet (1854) 119
82.17 φῆς| ὡς φῆ Wagner (1798) 1.213
82.19–21 τί ... κοιμούμενος| τί οὖν οὐ ποτήρια ἦλθες ἀπὸ τῆς οἰκίας ἡμῖν, μὴ χρυσία ... κοιμούμενος; D’Arnaud (1734) 56
82.19 ποτήρια] ποτήρια ἔστιν Schepers (1905) 119: ποτήρια έστιν Meineke (1853) 22
82.20 ὑμῖν (μὴ οὖν τὸ λοιπὸν φοιτάν παρ’ ἡμᾶς ἐθελήσῃς εἰ)| Meineke (1853) 104–5: ὑμῖν: ἔρρε Meiser (1905) 215–6
82.20–21 ὑμῖν μὴ χρυσία τῆς μητρός μὴ δάνεια τοῦ πατρός κοιμούμενος| ὑμῖν, μὴ (ὁτι) χρυσία – ἢ δάνεια τοῦ πατρός, κοιμούμενον (σοῦ:) Capps ap. Benner-Fobes (1949) 272
82.20–21 μὴ δάνεια τοῦ πατρός κοιμούμενος] μὴ ... κοιμομένην: post ζήσεν in § 3 transp. Hermann (1857) 70–1
82.21 κοιμούμενος] ‘videtur autem apud Nostrum ad κοιμούμενος aliquid verbum deesse’ Bergler (1715) 163: κοιμουμένοις: Wagner (1798) 1.213: (εἰ) κοιμούμενος Reiske (1829) 26
82.21 Φιλωτίς Seiler (1853) 44: φιλότης VFPD
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82.21 τοῖς εὐμενεστέροις [τοῖς εὐμενεστέροις D’Arnaud (1734) 57: εὐμενεστέροις τοῖς Seiler (1853) 44
82.21–22 τοῖς εὐμενεστέροις διμασίν εἶδον ἐκείνην οἱ Χάριτες secl. Meineke (1853) 105
82.24 ἐχω] ἐχω, (δί) Wagner (1798) 1.214
82.25 ἀώρω τάφῳ] ἀώρου τάφου Kayser (1854) 423
82.27 κλαίνων] κλάων Seiler (1853) 45
82.27 ἀνιάσεις] αἰτίασει Hermann (1857) 71: αἰτίασαι Schepers (1905) 119

4.10 84.2 τὸν νοῦν] τὰ νῦν Schepers (1905) 119
84.2 ὁ secl. Bergler (1715) 164 (err. typ.?)
84.2 Δίφιλος Bergler (1715) 164: διφιλος VFPD
84.2 ἀλλὰ άττας] ἀλλʼ άττας Meineke (1853) 23
84.4 ἐπίκκωμος VFPD, def. Hermann (1857) 71: ἐπὶ κόμων Cobet (1854) 119
84.4 κοιμηθησόμενος] κοιμηθησόμενος hic et in §3 vel κοιμηθησόμενος hic et in §3 Meineke (1853) 105
84.8 ἡγάττα] ἡγαπά Wagner (1798) 1.220
84.9 μηδὲ δῶς Wagner (1798) 2.218: μηδὲ δῶς Cobet (1854) 119
84.13–14 θεραπαινιδῶν] θεραπαινιδῶν Naber (1878) 244
84.15 έξ αὐτῶν] έτι αὐτῶν Naber (1878) 245
84.17 κοιμηθησόμενος VFPD, def. Wagner (1798) 1.220: κοιμηθησόμενος hic et in §3 vel κοιμηθησόμενος hic et in §3 Meineke (1853) 105: κοιμηθησόμενος Cobet (1854) 119
84.19 έάν] έι Meineke (1853) 105
84.25–86.1 δ ... ἐκκορήσειε] δ ... ἐκκορήσει Meineke (1853) 105: δ ... ἐκκορήσει Cobet (1854) 119
84.25 τύφον Seiler (1853) 46: τύφον VFPD
86.3 εἰμέ] µε Hercher (1873) xvi
86.5 καιομένην] καιομένην Hercher (1873) 57
86.9 καὶ ἀποσκήπτειν] καὶ ἀποσκήπτειν vel καὶ ἀποσκήπτειν Meineke (1853) 105: καὶ ἀποσκήπτειν εἰς ἀποσκήπτειν (ἐνίοτε) vel καὶ ἀποσκήπτειν ἐκθ' ὀτε Cobet (1854) 119: καὶ ἀποσκήπτειν Schepers (1905) 121
86.9 ὀλεθρουν] ὀλεθρὸν έξοθ' ὀτε Polak ap. Schepers (1901) 121

4.11 88.3–4 ἔρωτος ὅσον ἡδίστου τότε οὕτω πονηροῦ νῦν μνήμην Granholm: ἔρωτος ὅσον ἡδίστου τό τέλος οὐ πονηροῦ νῦν μνήμην VFPD: ἔρωτος ὅσον ἡδίστου τό τέλος οὐ πονηροῦ τὴν μνήμην Bergler (1715) 172: ἔρωτος ὅσοι ἡδίστου ποτέ τὸ τέλος
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88.5 οὕτως] οὗτος Bergler (1715) 172 (err. tyr.?)
88.5 χρόνος] (ὁ) χρόνος Seiler (1853) 47
88.9 δοκούσι] δοκώσιν Wagner (1798) 1.229
88.12 διδόντος] διδόντος (οὕσα) Schepers (1901) 122
88.12 ὡς τίνος γὰρ οὐκ] καὶ τίνος (γάρ) οὐκ Bergler (1715) 174:
88.13 δευρὶ] δεῦρο D’Orville (1750) 422
88.15 Μήδειον] Μήδιον Meineke (1853) 106
88.15 τῆς Συρίας] Συρίας Bergler (1715) 174 (err. tyr.?)
88.15 θεραπείας καὶ παρασκευῆς] παρασκευῆς καὶ θεραπείας Bergler (1715) 174 (err. tyr.?)
88.17–18 κόσμον τινά βαρβαρικὸν] κόσμον πάνυ βασιλικὸν Kayser (1854) 423
88.18 ἀκούσα αὐτὸν οὐ προσίετο] ἀκούσα, αὐτὸν οὐ προσίετο vel ἡκοῦσα αὐτὸν οὐ προσίετο vel ἀκουσα αὐτὸν προσίετο Bergler (1715) 176
88.22 διωθεῖτο] διεισδύετο Cobet (1854) 119
88.23 τί διαί] τί λέξω τὸν Meineke (1853) 106
88.23 ἐμπορον] ἐμπορον (ἐπικαταραντα) Reiske (1829) 26
88.24 οἶδα] οἶδ᾽ Bergler (1715) 176
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88.24–26 ώς χρηστόν ἦθος οὖκ εἰς εὐδαίμονα βίου προαιρέσιν διαίμων τις ὑπήγεγκεν secl. Schepers (1901) 123
88.25 εὐδαίμονα VFPD, def. Meiser (1905) 218: ‘felicis vitae conditionem’ Bergler (1715) 179: εὐδαίμονος Seiler (1853) 254, Papabasileios (1882) 255: εὐσχήμονα Cobet (1854) 120
88.26 ὑπήγεγκεν] ἀπήγεγκεν Meineke (1853) 106: ὑπήγαγεν Hirschig (1855) 213
88.27 λοιπῶν] τὸ λοιπὸν Schepers (1901) 123
88.27 ώς ἀδίκων] ἀδίκως Cobet (1854) 120
88.27 φίλαι] σχέτλια vel ὅλωσι Meiser (1905) 218
90.2 ψάυω] ψαύω Reiske (1829) 26, Cobet (1854) 120
90.2 διαλέξομαι] διαλέγομαι Wagner (1798) 1.231
90.3 δψεται] προσβλέπεται Cobet (1854) 120
90.4–5 τοῖς ἡδίστοις] ἐν τοῖς ἡδίστοις Hercher (1873) xvi
90.4–5 τοῖς ἡδίστοις ἐκείνοις κολάσμασιν ἄρτιος μὲν] τάς ἡδίστας ἐκείνας ἄγκαλας ἔμοι συνηρμοσμένη Kayser (1854) 423–4
90.8–9 ἐπι ἀκροις μοι δοκεῖ τοῖς χείλεσιν αὐτῆς ἐκάθισεν ή Πειθώ post ἐνίδρυντο transp. Meineke (1853) 106
90.8 δοκεῖ] δοκῶ Hercher (1873) 58
90.9 ἐκάθισεν] ἐκάθιζεν Meineke (1853) 106
90.9 ἀπαντα] ἵμαντα Friederich (1870) 542–3
90.9 ἀπαντα ἐκείνη γε τὸν κέστον] ἵμαντα γε ἐκεῖνον τὸν κέστον Schepers (1901) 123
90.9 ἐκείνη] ἐκῆλε, ἢ Meiser (1905) 219
90.10 ύπεξόσατο] ύπεξώστο Meineke (1853) 106
90.10 δλασι] αὐταῖς Reiske (1837) 26: ὁμοί Meineke (1853) 106: κόλπαι, ἵμαντ Meiser (1905) 219
90.10 χάρισι] χερσὶ Hercher (1873) xvi
90.16 ἀνηλεόδος] νηλεόδος Cobet (1854) 120
90.20 μοι τι] μοι Wagner (1798) 1.228 (err. typ.?)

4.12 92.5 γυναικός] τῆς] γυναικός Meineke (1853) 164
92.6–7 τῆς κορυφῆς D’Orville (1750) 489: τοῖς κορυφαῖς VFPD
92.9 ἄλωσι] ἄλωσιν (χρυσῆν) Herwerden (1902) 317
92.10 φάσματος ἤχουσα πρόσωπον susp. Meineke (1853) 164–5
92.11 ἄρθροι Seiler (1853) 158: ἄρθροι PD: ἄρθροι V: αὖ [2 litt.] ἄμωμοι V: ἄρθροι vel ἄρθροι D’Orville (1750) 361
92.11 αὖ ἄμωμοι Seiler (1853) 158: αὖ, αὖ V: αὖ αὖ PD


92.12 δοκεῖ] δοκεῖν Meineke (1853) 79 (err. typ.?): ἐδόκει Cobet (1854) 145
92.13 προστνεέιν] προστνεέιν Cobet (1854) 145
92.13 εἰλόμην] ἐλοίμην Wagner (1798) 2.220
92.14–15 δέσποινα. ἐμβλέψαι † τί μὴ δωρίδι † βούλομαι ἢ μετὰ τῆς ἀλύσεως καὶ τῶν περισκελίδων † συγκαρ *** δέσποινα, ἐμβλέψαι τινὶ δωρίδι βούλομαι, ἢ μετὰ τῆς ἀλύσεως καὶ τῶν περισκελίδων συγκεκράσθαι ἐκείνη Polak ap. Schepers (1901) 154

4.13 94.2 ἐραστοῦ] *** ἐραστοῦ Seiler (1853) 160: ἐκάλησεν ἡμᾶς ἠναγχός (ἢ δὲίνα) εἰς τὸ τοῦ ἐραστοῦ Meineke (1853) 165
94.4 παρὰ ... ἀνεῖται] περὶ ... κεῖται Seiler (1853) 394
94.5 μυρρίναι Seiler (1853) 160: μυρρίνῃ VFPD, def. Meineke (1853) 166
94.7 ἄφοδος vel ἄνοδος Meineke (1853) 166: ἄφοδος VFPD: ἄνω ὀδος Seiler (1853) 394
94.9 ἐρρινώμεθα Seiler (1853) 394–5: ἐρρινώμεθα VFPD
94.10 οἶδα πόθεν] οἶδ᾽ ὁπόθεν Cobet (1854) 146
94.10 ποῦ VFPD, def. Meineke (1853) 166: ποῖ Seiler (1853) 395, Cobet (1854) 146
94.10 ἡμῖν "ἀθρόαι:] "ήμιν ἀθρόαι: vel "ὑμεῖς ἀθρόαι: Seiler (1853) 160
94.10–11 ἀθρόαι: τίνος] ἀθρόαι τίνος Meineke (1853) 166
94.11 ἐκπιεῖν] καταπιεῖν vel καταπιόμεναι Cobet (1854) 146
94.12 δῶσα ... συκᾶς] δῶσα ... σῦκα Herwerden (1902) 317
94.13 γάρ] δὲ Seiler (1853) 161: οὖν Meineke (1853) 166
94.14 ἀπεφθάρη] ἀπεπτάρη Metropulos (1855) 114
94.14–15 τυρακάνθους Seiler (1853) 161: τυρακάνθους VFPD
94.16 αἰφνιδίως] αἰφνιδίως Seiler (1853) 161 (err. typ.?): αἰφνιδίως Meineke (1853) 166
94.17 ως οὐδ᾽ ὁθῆσαν susp. Schepers (1901) 155
94.17 ὁθῆσαν] (ἂν) φήθησαν Polak ap. Schepers (1901) 155
94.18 ἀποθέτη] ἀπωθήθη Meineke (1853) 126, 166
94.20 μυρρίνης pro μυρίνης coni. Seiler (1853) 161, conf. D
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94.21 ἐπιτολῆς VFPD, def. Meiser (1905) 238: ἐπιβολῆς Meineke (1853) 166–7: ἐπιτιλοκῆς Hercher (1873) xix
94.22 τῇ] τῷ Hercher (1873) xix
94.23 ύπο] ἐπὶ Meineke (1853) 167
94.24 ἰδρυνται] ἰδρυντο Meineke (1853) 167
94.24 Πᾶν D’Orville (1750) 556: πᾶν VFPD
96.1 ὑπερέκυπτεν πρὸ ὑπερέκυπτεν coni. D’Orville (1750) 556, conf. VFPD
96.2 καταρχόμεθα] καταρχόμεθα Seiler (1853) 161: καταρχόμεθα vel καταρχόμεθα Hercher (1873) xix
96.7 τῷ λοιπόν] τῷ secl. Schepers (1901) 155
96.9 πρὸς γε] πρὸς te Cobet (1854) 146: πρὸς [γε] Hercher (1873) xix
96.9–10 τούτου] τοιουτ Βast ap. Schäfer (1811) 286
96.9–11 τοῦτο όρς γὰρ ὃς ἐστὶν ἐρωτικός ἡδέως ἂν ἡμᾶς ἐνταῦθα κραιπαλώσας ἰδοὶ] τοποτ. (ὑπὸ ταῖς μυρρίναις ἔναν ὑπὸ ταῖς μυρρίναις ἔναν ἡμᾶς ἐνταῦθα κραιπαλώσας ἰδοὶ: ἀλλ’ ἰδοὺ Schäfer (1811) 286
96.10 ἂν vel ἂν οὐν Seiler (1853) 161: οὐν PD: ἀλλ’ V: [2 litt.] F
96.11–12 ἢν ἰδοὺ Pierson (1759) 375: ἢν ἰδοὺ VF: ἢν ἰδοὺ PD: ἢν ἰδοῦ D’Orville (1750) 656: ἢν. (sc. ὁ Πᾶν) ἰδοὺ Βast ap. Schäfer (1811) 286
96.12 ἐν κύκλῳ secl. Hercher (1873) xix
96.12–13 τρυφερὸσ ἀνθεσι ποικίλον] τρυφερὸν ἀνθεσι ποικίλοις Meiser (1905) 238
96.13 ἐπὶ ταύτης] ἐπὶ αὐτῆς D’Orville (1750) 656
96.14 κατακλιθῆναι] κατακλινῆται Cobet (1854) 146
96.14 ταπτήτων] ταπτήτων Cobet (1854) 146
96.14–15 μαλακῶν] μαλακῶν Hercher (1873) xix
96.15 ύποστρωμάτων ἰδια] ὑποστρωμάτων, νη Δία D’Orville (1750) 656: ὑποστρωμάτων, νη Δία Cobet (1854) 146
96.15 ἐξέτω] ἔχει τοῖ Seiler (1853) 162: ἐχεῖ γε Cobet (1854) 146: ἔχει Hercher (1873) xix
96.19 χλανίσκια] χλανίδισκια Bast ap. Boissonade (1822) 394: χλανίδια Meineke (1853) 167
96.19 αὐτοσχεδίωσ] lac. ante αὐτοσχεδίωσ ind. Schepers (1901) 156
96.20 μαλακῶν] μαλακῶν Hercher (1873) xix
APPENDIX CONJECTURARUM 4.13

96.21 ἀνθεμα διαποίκιλα D’Orville (1750) 716–7: ἀνθεμάδια ποικίλα VFPD
96.22 όρφαί[ζον] όραζον Cobet (1854) 146, Hercher (1873) xix
96.23 ἐπιθυρί[ζον] ἐμινυρί[ζον] Meiser (1905) 238
96.26 οίους ἔφης D’Orville (1750) 452: οἴους ἔφη VFPD: οἴους ἔφης κ’ Seiler (1853) 162: οἴου έξ ἔφης Meineke (1853) 167: οἴου αὐτὸς ἔφης Hercher (1873) xix
96.27 ἐξ Ἐλευσίνως] ἐξ Ἐλευσώτι Hercher (1873) xix
96.28 αἱ πυγαί] λίσπαι Hercher (1873) 96, λίσπας Hercher (1873) xix (err. typ.?)
96.28 πυγαί] πυγαί (τῆς Θρυαλλίδος) Meineke (1853) 168: lac. ante πυγαί indic. Schepers (1901) 157
98.1 χιμαιρίδος Herings (1749) 280: χειμερίδος VFPD
98.2 γαλάκτια] γαλάκτινα Hercher (1873) xix
98.3 ταγηνοῦ Meineke (1853) 168: ταγηνοῦς V: ταγηνοὺς FPD: ταγηνοῦ Bernard (1795) 77
98.3 πυτίας] καπύρια vel καπυρίδια Hercher (1873) xix
98.3–4 πυτίας μοι δοκῶ καλοῦσιν αὐτὰ καὶ σκώληκας: εἶτα πεμμάτια] πυριάτας μοι δοκῶ καλοῦσιν) καὶ κόλλικας καὶ πεμμάτα Meineke (1853) 168–9
98.3 δοκῶ] δοκεῖ Seiler (1853) 162–3
98.4 εἶτα πεμμάτια Granholm: τὰ πεμμάτια VFPD, secl. Hercher (1873) xix
98.5 ὀπώρας] ὀράς Meineke (1853) 169
98.6 αἱ κύλικες Seiler (1853) 163: οἱ κύλικες VFPD
98.9 τῶν συνεχεῖ τὸ πλεῖον] τὸν νουνεχῆ πλεῖον vel τὸν νουνεχῆ πλέον Bergk ap. Seiler (1853) 397
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98.9 πλείου... πλέον Hercher (1873) 96: τασπείνου Polak ap. Schepers (1905) 127

98.9-10 ἀναλαμβάνει· ὑπεψεκάζομεν] ἀναλαμβάνει ὑποψεκάζοντα Hercher (1873) xix


98.10 μικροῖς] μικροῖς (μὲν) Hercher (1873) xix

98.11 κυμβίοις Seiler (1853) 163: κυμβίοις VFPD

98.10 ἀλλ' ἐπισκόλλησι] ἀλλεπισκόλλησι Bergk ap. Seiler (1853) 397; Cobet (1854) 146

98.11 Κρουμάτιον Seiler (1853) 163: κρουματίου VFPD

98.11 Μεγάρας] Μεγαρίς Maehly (1859) 204: { Hercher (1873) xix

98.12 Σιμίχη] Σίμιχη Hercher (1873) lxxxvi

98.12 πρὸς τὰ μέλη καὶ πρὸς τὴν ἁρμονίαν] ἐρωτικὰ μέλη πρὸς τὴν ἁρμονίαν Meineke (1853) 170: πρέποντα μέλη πρὸς τὴν ἁρμονίαν Meiser (1905) 239, def. Vahlen (1908) 992

98.15 Πᾶν D’Orville (1750) 157: πᾶν VFPD

98.15 πυγήν πρὸ πυγήν coni. Meineke (1830) 22, conf. FPD

98.16 ἐνδου secl. Hercher (1873) xix

98.17 ὑποβεβρεγμέναι FPD, def. Meiser (1905) 239: ὑποβεβρεγμένον Meineke (1853) 170

98.17 οἴδασι] οἴσθα Cobet (1854) 146: οἴσθα Hercher (1873) xix

98.18 τὰς] τὰς (δὲ) Hercher (1873) xix

98.19-20 πρὸς Διονύσῳ] οὐκ ἀπροσδιούσως Hercher (1873) xix

98.20 ἐφίλησεν] ἐφίλησεν (τὸν ἑραστήν) Meineke (1853) 170

98.22 ἄτεχνος Seiler (1853) 163: ἄτεχνος VFPD

98.23-100.12 (§14) διανίστατο δὲ ... (§16) οὕτως μικρὰ] (§15) κάπετα ... παρήχροντο. (§14) διανιστατο ... πλήθη, τῶν ἀνδρῶν δὲ ἐξείμεν ... ἀπωθεν ... κοινονίσκοις ἀπιθάνως εἴσεπαίσομεν. (§16) οὕτως μικρὰ Meineke (1853) 170–1: (§15) κάπετα ... φίλε ... ἐπήηνε ... πᾶσαι [γάρ] ... ἐβουλήμεθα (§14) διανίστατο ... πλήθη, τῶν ἀνδρῶν δὲ ἐξείμεν ... ἀπωθεν ... θάλαμον. (§15) θατέρα δὲ οἱ ἀνθρωποὶ ὑπὸ τὴν λόχην παρήχροντο. (§14) ἐνταύθα διανεπαύσαμεθα τοῦ πότου (vel πόθου) καὶ τῶν κοινονίσκοις πιθάνως συνεπαίσομεν. (§16) οὕτως μικρὰ Herwerden (1905) 452–3

98.23–24 ἡμῶν μὲν τῶν γυναικῶν] ἡμῖν μὲν ταῖς γυναίξι Seiler (1853) 163: ἡμῶν [μὲν] τῶν γυναικῶν Meineke (1853) 170
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Διέτρωγεν ὥσπερ ἀκκιζομένη διέτρωγεν ὥσπερ ἀκκιζομένη


tοὺς χιτωνίσκους τοὺς χιτωνίσκους
tοῖς χιτωνίσκοις τοῖς χιτωνίσκοις
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100.26 ἄλλαι] ἄλλα Meineke (1853) 171
100.27 ἐκέχρωστο] ἐγκέχρωστο Meineke (1853) 171: ἐνεκέχρωστο Hercher (1873) 97
102.1 δ᾽ οὖν Seiler (1853) 164: γοῦν VFPD
102.2 μάλα Seiler (1853) 164: ἀλλά VFPD
102.2 μέχρι] μέχρι Τοῦ Seiler (1853) 164, Cobet (1854) 146
102.3 τῆς ἄφροδίτης] τῆς ἄφροδίτην Seiler (1853) 400
102.9 φίλα] φιλία Meineke (1853) 172
102.10 προύτραπτην VFPD, def. Meiser (1905) 240: προύτραπτην (ἐπί τούτο προθυμότατα) Meineke (1853) 172
102.11 ὑμών Meineke (1853) 172, Cobet (1854) 146: οὐτῶς VF: οὖν οὖτος PD
102.11 ἔσχηκαν] ἔσχηκαν Cobet (1854) 147
102.13 οὐκ ἀλόγως] {οὐκ} ἀλόγως Meineke (1853) 82, οὐκ εὐλόγως Meineke (1853) 172

104.3 διαζευγήθηναι] διαζευγήθηναι Cobet (1854) 120
104.4 δέσποιναι] δέσποιν' Cobet (1854) 120
104.5 εἰς τοσοῦτον χρόνον] εἰς τοσοῦτον χρόνον Bergler (1715) 185: ἐκ τοσοῦτον χρόνου Cobet (1854) 120
ἈΠΕΝΔΙΧΝΩΝ ὈΝΩΝ ΘΕΙΩΝ ΒΕΑΥΔΟΥΙΝ (1902) 332–3: οὐχ ἥκεις, ἡμῖν οὐδ᾽ ἐκεῖνην (διὰ τί;)
ἐπὶ μή δι᾽ ἐκεῖνον ΜΕΙΣΕΡ (1905) 220
104.10 παρῆμεν ΒΕΡΓΛΕΡ (1715) 185: γὰρ ἡμεν Βفد
104.12 Εὐέξιππη ΖΕΥΧΙΠΠΗ ΗΡΕΧΕΡ (1873) xvi
104.12 διοικ. ΣΧΕΠΕΡΣ (1905) 131: ὑπὲρ ῼμὲν Σχεπερς
(1901) 124: ἐπεὶ ΠΟΛΑΚ ἈΠ. ΣΧΕΠΕΡΣ (1901) 124
104.13–14 τὸν καλὸν] τὸ καλὸν ΗΜΕΡΗΣΤΗΡΗΣ ΆΠ. ΒΑΛΚΕΝΕΡ (1773)
68
104.14 ἀποκοιμίσασα] ἀποκοιμήσασα ΜΕΙΝΚΕ (1853) 106:
κατακοιμίσασα ΚΟΒΕΤ (1854) 120
104.15 ἡμῖν] ἡμῶν ΗΕΡΕΖΖΟΣ (1766) 92
104.16 ΠΕΡΣΕΦΟΝΗ] ΓΕΡΣΕΦΟΝΗ ΚΟΒΕΤ (1854) 120
104.18 ἡμῶν] ἡμῖν ΒΑΓΝΕΙΕΡ (1798) 1.245
104.21 ὑπόσκιος ΤΙΣ ΑΝΩΝΥΜΟΣΙΣ ΑΠ. ΒΑΓΝΕΙΕΡ (1798) 1.246:
ὑποσκίος ΤΙΣ Βفد:
ὑπὸ συσκίος ΤΙΣ ΒΕΡΓΛΕΡ (1715) 187–8:
ὑπόσκιος ΤΙΣ
ΗΡΕΧΕΡ (1873) xvi:
ὑπὸ παλινσκίος ΤΙΣ ΜΕΙΣΕΡ (1905) 221
104.21–106.2 ἐν μονὸν ἡμῖν ἔλιπε, σὺ, τὰ δ᾽ ἄλλα οὐ.
πολλάκις ἑκατόπληςαμεν, οὕτω δὲ Ἰδέως οἰλιγάκις] ἐν μόνον ἡμῖν ἔλιπε,
σὺ: τὰ δ᾽ ἄλλα οὐ πολλάκις ἑκατόπληςαμεν, οὕτω δὲ Ἰδέως
{οἰλιγάκις} ΝΑΒΕΡ (1871) 29–30
106.1 ἔλιπε] ἐνέλειπε ΔΩΒΡΕ (1874) 66
106.2 γοῦν] δ᾽ οὖν ΣΕΙΛΕΡ (1853) 50
106.6 πρώτῃ] πρότερα ΜΕΙΣΕΡ (1905) 221
106.7 τι μελίπτηκτον Βفد:
ΜΕΙΣΕΡ (1902) 333:
τι νεὀπτήκτον
ΒΕΡΓΛΕΡ (1715) 188:
πιμελὴν ἢ πηκτὸν
Δ’ΑΡΝΟΥ (1734) 63
106.8 ὑποβλέπουσα] ἀποβλέπουσα ΗΙΡΟΧΙΓ (1855) 213
106.10 τι μελίπτηκτον] τι νεὀπτήκτον
ΗΕΡΕΧΕΡ (1873) xvi
106.10 ὡστε ἐμέ] ὡστε µε ΗΕΡΕΧΕΡ (1873) xvi
106.12–13 παρευδοκίμησα] παρηυδοκίμησα ΗΕΡΕΧΕΡ (1873) 59
106.14 ἄγωνοι] ἄγωνοι ΜΕΙΝΚΕ (1853) 107
106.15 ἄγων] ἄγων ΣΕΙΛΕΡ (1853) 261: ἄγων ΜΕΙΝΚΕ (1853)
107
106.15–16 ἀπεδύσατο] ἀπωδύσα δὴ ΚΟΒΕΤ (1854) 120: καὶ
ἀπωδύσα ΗΕΡΕΧΕΡ (1873) xvi
106.16 ὑποποιμόωσα] ἀποποιμόωσα ΣΚΕΙΝΗ (1819) 183 (s.v.
ἀποποιμάω), def. ΝΑΥΚ (1855) 24
106.17–18 ως ἀκριβῶς, ΜΥΡΡΙΝΗ, ως ἀκήρατον] ως ἀκρηβες,
ΜΥΡΡΙΝΗ, ὡς ἀκήρατον ΝΑΥΚ (1855) 24: ὡς ἀκραιφνὲς,
ΜΥΡΡΙΝΗ, ὡς ἀκήρατον ΗΕΡΕΧΕΡ (1873) 59: ὡς ἀκριβῶς,
ΜΥΡΡΙΝΗ, ὡς ἀκήρατον ΜΕΙΣΕΡ (1905) 221
106.18 παραπόρφυρα] παρὰ πορφυρᾶ ΜΕΙΝΚΕ (1853)
107
227
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106.19 ἔγκλησιν Hemsterhuis ap. Schepers (1901) 126, Keil (1853) 53: ἔγκρισιν VFPD
106.20 αὐτῶν προ αὐτῶν coni. D’Arnaud (1734) 63, conf. VFPD: αὐτῆς Hercher (1873) 59
106.21–22 ὑπομειδιῶσα—“ὡστερ ἡ Μυρρίνης”, καὶ τοσοῦτον] ὑπομειδιῶσα, (καὶ ἐπιστρεφομένη) ὡστερ ἡ Μυρρίνη, τοσοῦτον Reiske (1829) 26
106.24 ὡστερ ἰεσοῦσαν ἀσπαῦρουσα Lennep (1747) 93
106.25 νικῆν ... τῆς Ὑρυαλλίδος] τήν νικῆν ... τῆς Ὑρυαλλίδος vel νικῶν ... τήν Ὑρυαλλίδα Cobet (1854) 120
106.26 περιόλλων Meineke (1853) 107: περὶ ἄλλων VFPD: [περὶ] ἄλλων Cobet (1854) 120
106.27 τῆς] ὥστε μὴν περὶ γαστέρων ἡμιφιλητοῦμεν’ τῇ Meineke (1853) 108
106.28 εὐθαρσησε] εὐθαρσησεν Hercher (1873) 59
106.29 δ’ ὅν Seiler (1853) 52: γοῦν VFPD: οὖν Hercher (1873) xvi
108.5 διγνο[] Ἀγνο Schepers (1905) 133
108.5 κατίμεν] κατήμεν Seiler (1853) 52
108.5 πλησιῶν] τῆς πλησίων Herwerden (1902) 316
108.6 κακῶς] διακακῶς Meineke (1853) 108, Keil (1853) 53
108.7 πλούσιον ... πατέρα] πλουσίου ... πατρος Cobet (1854) 120
108.10 Ἀδωνίας Pierson (1752) 95: ἀλώοις VFPD
108.10 ἐστιώμεθα] ἐστιασώμεθα Cobet (1854) 120
108.12 στέλλει] περιστελλεῖ Hirschig (1855) 213: περιστέλλει Schepers (1901) 127
108.12 κητίον Bast (1805) 157–60, (1809) 194–6: κήτιον VFPD: νητίτιον Reiske (1829) 26
108.13 σον om. D, secl. Cobet (1854) 120

4.15 110.2 σοι VFPD, def. Hemsterhuis ap. Schepers (1901) 128: μοι D’Arnaud (1734) 63, Schrader (1742) 322–3
110.3 καὶ secl. Hirschig (1855) 213

228
4.16 112.2 τοσοῦτος] ὁς τοσοῦτος Meineke (1853) 109  
112.3 ἐπιτρέψας VFPD, def. Hermann (1857) 73: ἐπέτρεψας Wagner (1798) 1.262, def. Hirschig (1851) 91  
112.3 καὶ οὕχι καὶ secl. Hirschig (1851) 91, Meineke (1853) 109  
112.6 καὶ ἀκόουσω secl. Hercher (1873) xvi  
112.8 πέφρικα καὶ δέδοικα] δέδοικα καὶ πέφρικα Herwerden (1902) 316  
112.10 δοκεῖς, Δάματερ.] δοκεῖς. Δάματερ· Wilamowitz (1909) 468–9  
112.10 Δάματερ secl. Polak ap. Schepers (1905) 134  
112.11 πικρὸν pro μικρὸν coni. Herel (1766) 92, Reiske (1829) 26, conf. VFPD: φρικτὸν pro μικρὸν coni. Bergler (1715) 197  
112.12 Λάμια] ἰἈἀαααμα Jacobs ap. Schepers (1901) 128  
112.13 αὐτὸν] τοῦτον Schepers (1901) 128  
112.15 ἢλογημένη] διηπορημένη Cobet (1854) 120: ἢωρημένη Polak ap. Schepers (1901) 128  
112.16 ἐστι] ἐστὶ Hercher (1873) xvi  
112.18–19 ἐν τοῖς στρατοπέδοι] ἐπὶ τοῖς στρατοπέδοις Wilamowitz (1909) 470  
112.19 Μακεδονία] η (man. rec. sl) μακεδονία V: η Μακεδονία Meineke (1853) 109  
112.20 νῆ τῆν `Αφροδίτην secl. Wilamowitz (1909) 470 (err. typ.?)  
112.21–22 τί με διαθήσει] εἰ μειδιάσει Hermann (1857) 73: πῶς με διαθήσει Herwerden (1902) 316: τί με διαθήσει ἦ δεινόν Meiser (1905) 222  
112.24 εἰ ... νικῶ Reiske (1829) 26, def. Meineke (1853) 109: εἰ ... νικά VFPD: ιεὶ ... νικά Cobet (1854) 120: εἰ ... νικάται Bergler (1715) 200, def. Keil (1853) 54: εἰ] ... νικάν Hemsterhuis ap. Schepers (1901) 129, Hermann (1857) 73  
112.25 πιθανῶς VFPD, def. Hermann (1857) 73: ἐπιφανῶς Reiske (1829) 26, Jacobs (1830) 537  
112.25–26 ἄν μοι περιουσίασαι γένηται] ἄρμοι (sic, ἄρμοι ?) ἀρμό] ἐν περιουσίαις γεγένημαι ὑπὸ σοῦ Reiske (1829) 26: καὶ ἀρμό
μοι περιουσιάσας γεγένηται ὑπὸ σου Seiler (1853) 55: (ἐπεί)
μοι περιουσιάσας γεγένηται ὑπὸ σου Meineke (1853) 109: ἄν
μοι παρρησιάσας γένηται ἐπὶ σου Hermann (1857) 73–74: καὶ
(γάρ) μοι περιουσία γεγένηται παρὰ σου Hercher (1873) xvi:
ליםαι μοι περιουσιάσας γεγένηται ὑπὸ σου Meiser (1905) 222

114.1 ὀγαθῶν] ὀγκαλὼν Friedrich (1870) 543
114.2 γε Bergler (1715) 200, Reiske (1829) 26: τε VFPD
114.3 ἕμδο secl. Cobet (1854) 120
114.6–7 οὐδὲ προσέπεμψαν ἐτί πολλοὶ οὐδὲ ἐπείρασαν
αἰδούμενοι] ὑπὸ σοῦ Hirschig (1855) 213: οὐτε προσέπεμψαν
ἐτί πολλοὶ οὐτε ἐπείρασαν, αἰδούμενοι Hercher (1873) xvi
114.6–7 οὐδὲ ἐπείρασαν secl. Cobet (1854) 120
114.8–9 ἀναστήμαται] ἀποτημάται Hercher (1873) xvi
114.9 καὶ ἀπελπίσασ] [καὶ] ἀπελπίσασ Hercher (1873) xvi: καὶ
[ἀπελπίσασ] Maehly (1859) 194
114.10 ἀπογυνωδεῖς secl. Cobet (1854) 120–121
114.12 διακρατεῖν] διάγειν Cobet (1854) 121
114.12–13 πρὸς υμᾶς δὲ οὐδὲ ὑπερτίθεσθαι ἐξετίν ὡστε φόβον
εἶναι κόρου secl. Jacobs ap. Schepers (1901) 130
114.13 ὡστε φόβον εἶναι κόρου] ὡς πεφοβημέναι κόρον Bergler
Wagner (1798) 1.267: φοβουμέναι κόρον Reiske (1829) 26
114.13–14 λοιπὸν ἡμᾶς δεῖ] λοιπὸν ὡστε Hercher (1873) xvi
114.14–16 τὰ μὲν ποιεῖν ... τὰς δὲ ὀπωσοῦν] τὰ μὲν, (ἱερὰ)
pοιεῖν ... τὰ δὲ ὀπωσοῦν Reiske (1829) 26
114.14 ποιεῖν D’Arnaud (1734) 275–6, def. Hermann (1857) 74:
pοιεῖν VFPD, def. Keil (1853) 54–5: (τι) ποιεῖν Meineke (1853)
110: σκῶππειν Hercher (1873) xvi
114.14 τὰ δὲ μαλακίζεσθαι post ὀρχεῖσθαι transp. Hercher (1873) 61
114.14–15 τὰ δὲ ἀδειν, τὰ δὲ αὐλεῖν, τὰ δὲ ὀρχεῖσθαι secl. Jacobs
ap. Schepers (1901) 130
114.14–16 τὰ δὲ ἀδειν ... οἶκον secl. Meineke (1853) 109–110
114.16 κοσμεῖσθαι Granholm: κοσμεῖν soi VFPD: κοσμεῖν [soi]
Bergler (1715) 213, Kayser (1854) 424: κοσμῆσαι Jacobs (1814)
318
114.16 τὸν οἶκον susp. Polak ap. Schepers (1901) 130
114.16 τὰς δὲ ὀπωσοῦν] τὰς [δὲ] ὀπωσοῦν Bergler (1715) 213,
Ruhnken (1772) 235
114.17 χρῆσεις VFPD, def. Meiser (1905) 224: χάριτας Ruhnken
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(1772) 235: προφάσεις vel χρείας Gloss. Eichst. ap. Wagner (1798) 1.268: ἐγχειρήσεις vel χρείας vel προφάσεις Reiske (1829) 26

114.18 αὐσαλούστερα Meiser (1905) 224: εὐαλούστερα VFPD: εὐαλοτότερα vel νεάλεστερα Lobeck (1837) 39: εὐαλότερα Meineke (1853) 110: ἀπλούστερα Hercher (1873) xvi

114.21 ταύτα δὲ ταύτα δὴ Schepers (1901) 131

114.22 φυλάττεσθαι] πλάττεσθαι Bergler (1715) 214: φυλαφεὶς Reiske (1829) 26: φυλάττειν Jacobs (1830) 538: θρύπτεσθαι Keil (1853) 55

114.22–23 οὕτως ἤδη ἔχεις ἐπ᾽ ἐμοὶ ὡς Reiske (1829) 26: οὕτως ἥδῃ {ἔχεις} ἀφεῖσα σοι Reiske (1829) 26

114.23 ἡλίθια Naber (1871) 29


114.26 λιθίνη] ἡλιθία Naber (1871) 29

114.27 εἰς τὴν σὴν ἀρέσκειαν] ἀρέσκειάν σου vel ἀρέσκειάν σου Meineke (1853) 110

114.28 δαπανῆσαι] δεδαπανῆσθαι Meineke (1853) 173: δαπανήσασα βλάπτεσθαι Meiser (1895) 224

114.29 εὖ] ἀλλ᾽ εὖ Polak ap. Schepers (1901) 131

116.1 ἐν] ἐν secl. Wilamowitz (1909) 472 (err. typ.)

116.2 μισητοὶ] μισητοὶ θεοῖς Reiske (1829) 26

116.3 αὐτοὶ] οὗτοι Seiler (1853) 57

116.4 δὲ δέ μοι pro δ᾽ εἵμοι coni. Hercher (1873) xvi

118.2 ἄρτι πάλιν VFPD, def. Meineke (1853) 110: ἄρα πάλιν Cobet (1854) 121: ἄρτι {πάλιν} Polak ap. Schepers (1901) 132: αὐθις πάλιν Meiser (1905) 225

118.3 διοικεῖ] διοικεῖ vel διεθηκε Cobet (1854) 121: διότι Metropulos (1855) 135: διότι Maehly (1859) 195: ἀδικεῖ Hercher (1873) xvi

118.4–5 ἀδιαλύτουσ] ἀδιαλείπτουσ D’Arnaud (1734) 276, def. 231
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Meiser (1905) 225: διωλυγίους Cobet (1854) 121: ἀδιαινύτους

118.5 ἐκδικών] (τὸν ἔροντα μου) ἐκδικών Meiser (1905) 225
118.6 ἢ δὴ] μὴ δὲ Naber (1871) 18
118.7 φιλονοσοῦντος] πολυνοσοῦντος Herwerden (1905) 453
118.8 ἄντι] πίλων secl. Meiser (1905) 225–6
118.9 ὑπομενεῖ] υπομενεί Hercher (1873) xvi

118.12 ἀστομάχητον VFPD, def. Keil (1853) 55: ἀστόβαστον
Hemsterhuis ap. Schepers (1901) 132: ἀνενόχλητον Meineke (1853) 110: ἀστοιχείωτον
Kaiser (1854) 425: ἀστονάχητον Maehly (1859) 195: ἀμετάχητον
Naber (1871) 18: ἀπεριμάχητον Naber (1878) 246: ἀνενόχλητον


118.13 τοιούτων] ὁ [ὑπελθέτω κατεχέτω] ἃ ἔχω Meiser (1905) 226
118.14 ἢ δὲ] ἢ ὡς φορτηγὸς φής Reiske (1829) 26: ἢ ὡς φορτηγὸς φής Meiser (1905) 226
118.15 στωμώλευσθαι] στωμύλλεσθαι Lennep (1777) 333, Cobet (1854) 121


118.17 καὶ πέρας] lac. ante καὶ πέρας ind. Meineke (1853) 110: [καὶ] πέρας Schepers (1901) 133
118.18 ἄναστάσα] ἀναστάσα Naber (1871) 18
118.19 διαπαύστους] διαπαύστους Hermann (1857) 75
118.20 δὲ] ὡς ὡς Meineke (1853) 110
118.21 γνώμην] γνώμην Secl. Meineke (1853) 111: [τὴν στὴν] γνώμην Hercher (1873) xvi
118.21 λαβεῖν] μαθεῖν Hirschig (1855) 213
120.3 οικεῖως V: [4 litt.] oikeíos F: οὐκ oikeíos PD: οὐκ ἀνοικείως Meineke (1853) 111
120.3–4 καὶ τὴν πρώτην ἀφροδίτην ἔμαθον ταρ’ αὐτοῦ secl vel post oikoússan transp. Hercher (1873) xvi
120.4 ἔμαθον] ἐμυήθη Nauck (1877) 99
120.4–6 αὐτοῦ σχεδόν οὔτος γὰρ με διεπαρθένευσεν ἐκ γειτόνων oikeússan] αὐτοῦ, σχεδόν [οὔτος γὰρ με διεπαρθένευσεν] ἐκ γειτόνων oikoússan vel oikoúntos Nauck (1855) 24
120.5 σχεδόν secl. Polak ap. Schepers (1901) 133: σχεδόν [παιδίον] Meiser (1905) 226
120.5–6 οἰκείως] ἰκκούσιν Metropulos (1855) 135
120.7 ἐσθῆτα] ἐσθῆτας Schepers (1901) 133
120.8 ἐπικύρων Μέστη γένοιτο] ἐπικύρων Meineke (1853) 111
120.9 τὸς ὁρασ] τῆς ὁρασ Μαχλή (1859) 196
120.9 γευσάμενος] [τῆς ὁπώρας] γευσάμενος Reiske (1829) 26
120.13 δῆλη γένοιτο] δῆλη γένοιτο Stanger (1870) 702: ἢ γενότοι Meineke (1853) 111
120.14 ἢ Ἐπικύρων] ἢ Ἐπικύρων (πλέα) Meiser (1905) 227
120.18–20 καὶ μὴ δὴ ... “ἀλλά ... κεχρημένος” Polak ap. Schepers (1901) 134: “καὶ μὴν ... κεχρημένος” Reiske (1829) 26: [καὶ] “μὴ ... ἐπελθέτω· ἀλλὰ ... κεχρημένος” Meineke (1853) 111
120.19 ὑπελθέτω] ὑπελθέτω Dobree ap. Hercher (1873) xvi, Cobet (1854) 121, Meiser (1905) 227
120.20 λαβέτω καὶ ἃ ἔχω] λαβέτω κατεχέτω Lennep (1777) 333:
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λαβέτω καὶ ἁγ. ἔχω Cobet (1854) 121: προσλαβέτω καὶ οἷς ἔχει Hirschig (1855) 213–4: λαβέτω καὶ ἀ ἔχω (παρ᾽ αὐτοῦ) Meiser (1905) 227

120.21 ἐμὲ δὲ ἐμὲ γε Seiler (1853) 59: ἐμὲ γὰρ Schepers (1901) 134
120.21 τι δόξα] ἡ δόξα Reiske (1829) 26

120.21–22 ἀλλ' ὁ θέλω· ἄνθρωπος θεών δὲ Granholm: ἀλλ' ὁ θέλω δὲ VF: ἀλλ' ὁν θέλω δὲ PD: ἀλλ' ὁν θέλω δὲ Schepers (1905) 140

120.24 νέοτητα] σεμινότητα Metropulos (1855) 135: κοινότητα Meiser (1905) 227

120.26 Ἅτρευς] (δὲ) Ἅτρευς Meineke (1853) 111: ἄγρευς Maehly (1859) 196

120.27 μοναχρίασι] μοναχρίας Bergler (1715) 220

120.27 καὶ μὴ πρόσθι[] ἢ μὴ πρόσθι Meineke (1853) 112

122.2 ύστερον ... γέροντα ... γέροντα] Kayser (1854) 426: πέπειρον ... γέροντα] Metropulos (1855) 135: γεραίτερον ... γέροντα] Hercher (1873) xvi

122.2–3 δικαιότερον] νεώτερον Herwerden (1905) 454

122.5–6 ὡς ἐνθυμηθεῖσα] παρενθυμηθεῖσα Reiske (1829) 26

122.6–8 ἢτοι ἀπένεγμαι καὶ ἰδρωκα τὰ ἄκρα καὶ ἡ καρδία μου ἀνέστραπται] ἢτοι ἰδρω. καὶ ἀπένεγμαι τὰ ἄκρα. καὶ ἡ καρδία μου ἀνέστραπται Mai (1716) 145


122.9 ὀπήλαυεν] ὀπήλαυεν Cobet (1854) 102

122.10 με] ἐμὲ Schepers (1901) 135

122.10–11 φέρει ... οἴδα] φέρων ... οἴδα, Hirschig (1855) 214


122.17 αὐτῷ] αὐτὸν Meineke (1853) 112

122.17 τὸ ἔρπων Reiske (1829) 26: γέρων Meineke (1853) 112: τὸ ἔρπων Polak ap. Schepers (1901) 136

122.17–18 καὶ ἡγ. ἐσομαί τοῖνυν) κάγῳ ἐσομαί τοῖνυν Cobet (1854) 121: κάγῳ γενήσομα τοῖνυν Hirschig (1855) 214: κάγῳ τοῖνυν ἐσομαί Hercher (1873) xvi

234

4.18 124.3 ἐκείνων secl. Wagner (1798) 1.297 (err. typ.?)
124.4 μόνοι] καὶ μόνοι Meiser (1905) 228
124.4 ὡς secl. Cobet (1854) 122
124.4 ἐπαίρω τὰ ἐμὰ οὐδὲ βουλόμενός VFPD (ἐπαίρων LS): ἐπαίρων τὰ ἐμὰ, οὐδὲ βουλόμενος Meineke (1823) 342: ἐπαίρειν τὰ ἐμὰ βουλόμενος, οὐδὲ Reiske (1829) 26: ἐπαίρων τὰμὰ οὐδὲ βουλόμενος Meineke (1853) 113: ἐπαίρω τὰμὰ οὐδὲ βούλομαι Schepers (1901) 136
124.5 σοι χαρίζεσθαι] σου χωρίζεσθαι Bergler (1715) 224
124.5–6 τί γὰρ ἐμοὶ χωρὶς σοῦ; τί γὰρ ἐμοὶ χωρὶς σοῦ: (τί σοῦ) γένοιτʼ ἂν ἥδιον; Meiser (1905) 228
124.6 ἥδιον] ἡδὺ Meineke (1853) 113: ἡδὺς Hirschig (1855) 214: ἡδὸν Meachly (1859) 196
124.6 δὲ] ἡμῶν secl. Bergler (1715) 224 (err. typ.)
124.8 τὰ ἤθη] τὰ σὰ ἤθη D’Orville (1750) 351
124.11–12 εἰ Ἂδω] ἐς Ἀιδου Reiske (1829) 26
124.12 εἰ τινῶν Bergler (1715) 224: ἡ τινῶν VFPD: {ἡ} τινῶν Reiske (1829) 26: μὴ τινῶν Meineke (1853) 113
124.13 μὴ δὴ Meineke (1823) 343: μὴ δὲ VFPD (μηδὲ Ζ): {ὁ}ν Meise ap. Schepers (1901) 137
124.18 τῆς θεοῦ] σῆς θεοῦ Hercher (1873) xvi
124.19 ἀπὸ] παρὰ Cobet (1854) 122
124.20 δεήσεις] δεήσεις ἦλθεῖν εἰς Αἴγυπτον Meiser (1905) 228
124.20–21 καὶ προτρέπεται post ἅγαθα transp. Hercher (1873) xvi
124.22 καὶ γάρ] καὶ γάρ Meiser (1798) 1.302 (cf. App. II)
124.22–23 καὶ γάρ ἐκείνῳ γράμματα κεκομίσθαι φασί secl. Herwerden (1902) 317
124.23 κεκομίσθαι] κεκόμισται Herel (1768) 9–10
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9–10: φησὶ Hirschig (1855) 214: σαφὲς Maehly (1859) 196: Meiser (1905) 229
124.24 δηλῶν δήλον ὅτι vel δήλα δή Meineke (1853) 113: δελτία Meiser (1905) 229
124.24–126.1 ὡς ὁμ Μενάνδρω γεγραμμένα ἦττον λαμπρά] (οὐκ) ὡς [οὐ] Μενάνδρῳ γεγραμμένα [ἤττον λαμπρά] Naber (1878) 246
126.3 ἐγὼ δὲ ἐγὼ δὲ ἄλλων Reiske (1829) 26: ἐγὼ δὲ ᾧτοι Seiler (1853) 62
126.4–5 ἤπαντα ... γέγονας] (καὶ) ἤπαντα ... (τε) γέγονας Cobet (1854) 122
126.6–7 σοι διεπεμψάμην ἵνα μὴ κόπτο σε] σοι (οὐ) διεπεμψάμην, ἵνα μὴ κοπιῶ σε ἵνα μὴ κόπτω σε Seiler (1853) 63: σοι (οὐ) διεπεμψάμην, ἵνα μὴ κοπιῶ σε Reiske (1829) 26: σοι διεπεμψάμην, ἵνα δὴ κόπτο σε Meineke (1853) 113: (ὑπὸς) σοι διεπεμψάμην, ἵνα μὴ κόπτο σε Polak ap. Schepers (1901) 138: σοι προπεμψάμην, ἵνα μὴ κόπτο σε Meiser (1905) 229
126.6 διεπεμψάμην] lac. post διεπεμψάμην ind. Keil (1853) 57
126.7 δις] δἰς (τοῖς αὐτοῖς) Jacobs (1830) 505
126.8 σε] (καὶ) σε Reiske (1829) 26
126.10 οὕτως] οὕτως Schepers (1901) 138, (1905) 143 (err. typ.?}
126.12 ταῦτη γε] ταῦτη Cobet (1854) 122
126.12–13 τῇ διηλείαν οὕτως σοι Meiser (1853) 228: τὰς σταθέρας τῶν σατράπων καὶ βασιλέωςvel τὰς (σταθέρας) τῶν σατράπων καὶ βασιλέως Schepers (1901) 138
126.14 τῆς σῆς φιλίας] τῆς σῆς φιλίας Naber (1878) 246
126.17 μᾶλλον] μᾶς Hermann (1857) 75
126.17 ἀγκάλας] αὐλᾶς Cobet (1854) 122
126.17–18 ταύτων τῶν σατράπων καὶ βασιλέων τῶν (αὐλᾶς) ἀπάντων τῶν σατράπων καὶ βασιλέων vel τὰς (αὐλᾶς) ἀπάντων τῶν σατράπων καὶ βασιλέων Bergler (1715) 228: τὰς (αὐλᾶς) ἀπάντων τῶν σατραπῶν καὶ βασιλέων vel τὰς (ομαλίας) ἀπάντων τῶν σατραπῶν καὶ βασιλέων Meahly (1859) 197: τὰ ἀπάντων τῶν σατραπῶν καὶ βασιλείων Meiser (1905) 229: τὰς (ἀκοάς, οὕτερ) ἀπάντων τῶν σατραπῶν καὶ βασιλείων Capps ap. Benner–Fobes (1949) 318
126.18 ἐπικίνδυνον] ἐπικίνδυνον Cobet (1854) 122

236
237
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126.20 εὐτυχοῦμενον] εὐτυχοῦ Bergler (1715) 229
126.22 ἐπίφθονα] ἐφθονα Cobet (1854) 123
126.22 παρά τούτοις susp. Meineke (1853) 114: παρά τούτοις def. Bücheler (1903) 456
126.22 φυόμενα] καλούμενα vel ὑμνούμενα Meineke (1853) 114: 
126.25 Ἀκαδημίας] Ἀκαδημείας Meineke (1853) 114
128.2 ὁρώσης] παρούσης Naber (1878) 246
128.7 αἵρεσιν VFPD, def. Maehly (1859) 197–8: ἀρχαιρεσίαν Seiler (1853) 64: ἰδρυσιν Meineke (1853) 115: ἐν Διονυσίοις Meineke (1853) 115: 
128.7 Ψυττάλειαν Meineke (1823) 347
128.10 τὰ στενά] τὰ στήνια D'Orville (1750) 449: τὰ Σιλήνια Meineke (1823) 346–7, Meineke (1841) 725–6
128.10 Ψυττάλαιαν] Ψυττάλαιαν Meineke (1823) 347
128.13 χρυσὸν λαβεῖν καὶ ἄργυρον καὶ πλοῦτον] χρυσοῦν λαβεῖν καὶ ἀργυροῦν καὶ πλοῦτον Cobet (1854) 123
128.14 χρήσσομαι; μετὰ] χρήσσομαι τῆς Bergler (1715) 234
128.16 σεμνοὺς] ἐμοὺς Maehly (1859) 198
128.19 ἱσχύουσιν] ἱγνεύουσιν Reiske (1829) 26
128.23 ἐὰν δὲ διοργισθῆ] ἐὰν ἔτι ὀργίζηται Meineke (1823) 347: ἐὰν δὲ (δὴ) ὀργισθῇ Meineke (1853) 115

237
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128.26 δεδάκρυκα] ἐδάκρυσα Herwerden (1905) 454
128.27 λύπας, δείται] λιτάς αἰδεῖται Jacobs (1814) 330
128.27 δείται] κεῖται vel ἀνείται Reiske (1829) 26: κεῖται Metropulos (1855) 136: κηλεῖται Hercher (1873) xvi: ίται Polak ap. Schepers (1905) 146
128.27 λοιπὸν] lac. post λοιπὸν ind. Meineke (1853) 115
130.3 ο Ρήνος secl. Meineke (1853) 115
130.3 τοὺς ποταμοῦς] τοὺς (μεγάλους) ποταμοὺς Naber (1878) 246
130.6 οὐδὲ Seiler (1853) 65: οὗτε VFPD
130.8–10 έμοι γένοιτο, βασιλεὺς Πτολεμαίε, τὸν Ἄττικὸν αἵ ἑστεφθαι κισσόν. έμοι γένοιτο, βασιλεὺς Πτολεμαίε, χώματος καὶ τάφου πατρῴου τυχεῖν. έμοι γένοιτο, τὸν Ἀττικὸν αἵ ἑστεφθαι κισσόν Meineke (1853) 115: έμοι γένοιτο, βασιλεὺς Πτολεμαίε, τὸν Ἄττικὸν αἵ ἑστεφθαι κισσόν Vahlen (1908) 993–4, def. Bungarten (1967) 84–5
130.9–10 έμοι γένοιτο χώματος καὶ τάφου πατρῴου τυχεῖν post vnikόνta transp. Meiser (1905) 232
130.10 ἐπὶ ἐσχάρας ὑμνήσατο] ἐπὶ ἐσχάρας ὑμνήσατε Meineke (1853) 115–6: ἐπειδὲ χαράς ὑμεῖν Metropulos (1855) 136: ἐπίχαριν ὑμνήσατε Maehly (1859) 198
130.12 δράμα secl. Schepers (1901) 142
130.13 καὶ φοβούμενον secl. Cobet (1854) 123
130.16 τοιοῦτο] τοσοῦτο Cobet (1854) 123

132.4 ἐκπολίης Seiler (1853) 66: ἐκ πόλις VFPD: ἐκπολίης Meineke (1853) 116
132.4 γενομένη] γενομένη Meineke (1853) 116
132.6 Εὐφρόνιον Meineke (1829) 348, Nauck (1855) 24: Εὐφρόνιον VFPD
132.6–7 καὶ παρὰ] καὶ (γὰρ) παρὰ Meineke (1829) 348
132.8 ἐπιχώριον | ἐπίχαριν Naber (1878) 246–7: ἐπιχάριτον Polak ap. Schepers (1901) 143

132.9 ἐπίχωρον | ἐπίχαριν Naber (1878) 246–7: ἐπιχάριτον Polak ap. Schepers (1901) 143

132.12 τί | τί ἦν Naber (1878) 246–7: τί ἦν Polak ap. Schepers (1901) 143

132.14 καὶ πᾶσιν | καὶ πάσιν Lennep (1777) 286: καὶ πάσιν polak ap. Schepers (1901) 143

132.15 τὸ σῶμα | τὸ ὄμμα Meineke (1823) 349: τὸ σῷμα Meineke (1823) 349:

132.18 τρόπον τινὰ | τὸ λεγόμενον VFPD, def. Meiser (1905) 232

132.22 ἔφρασον PD, def. Meineke (1853) 116: ἔφρασεν VF: ἔφασαν Bergler (1715) 247

132.24 βοῦς | βοῦς Meineke (1853) 117

132.25 δυνήσεται | διανοησαν Naber (1878) 247


134.2 ὡς ἔοικε | ὡς ἔχει Meiser (1905) 232

134.2–3 περί σου | περί σὲ Reiske (1829) 26, Meiser (1905) 232: περισσῶς Maehly (1859) 198–9
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134.3 ὀτρέμα] ἡρέμα Meineke (1853) 117
134.5 πρὸς αὐτῶν secl. Polak ap. Schepers (1905) 148
134.6 ἀδύνατα σπουδάζειν] ἀδύνατα θηρᾶν Meiser (1905) 232
134.10 καὶ ἐπὶ τοῖς] καὶ ἐπί τοῖς Bergler (1715) 249
134.10 προσκηπνίοισ] παρασκηπνίοι Meineke (1841) 722–4
134.11–12 πιέζουσα ἐσομαι τὸ κροτάλισι τὸ θεάτρον καὶ τρέμουσα] πιέζουσα καὶ τρέμουσα ἐσομαι ἄν κροταλίσῃ τὸ θέατρον Hirschig (1855) 214
134.11 ἐσομαι] ἐστὶ ἄν Jacobs (1830) 511
134.15 ἐφη] ἐφήν Naber (1878) 247
134.16 υἱῶν] υἱῶν (καὶ γραῶν) Reiske (1829) 26
134.23 ἐνσκηνοβατομένοι] σκηνοβατομένου Cobet (1854) 123, Hercher (1873) xvi: (τοῦ) ἐνσκηνοβατομένου Schepers (1905) 149
134.25–26 τὸν πάντῃ διὰ τὸ κλέος αὐτοῦ Μένανδρου] τὸν πάνυ [διὰ τὸ κλέος αὐτοῦ] Μένανδρου Hercher (1873) xvi: τὸν πάντῃ ὀνομαστὸν Μένανδρου Meiser (1905) 234
134.27 περικείμενον] προσκείμενον Meineke (1853) 117
134.29–136.1 χρήματος] καὶ χρήματος Maehly (1859) 199

240

...
ἔσομαι Seiler (1853) 70: αὐτής ἔσομαι σύμπλους Cobet (1854) 123: αὐτίκα ἔσομαι Hirschig (1855) 214: ναυτίς συμπλεύσωμαι Friederich (1870) 543: Ἀριάδνη ἔσομαι Meiser (1905) 234

136.11 γεγένημαι γεγενήσομαι Hemsterhuis ap. Schepers (1901) 146, Reiske (1829) 26, Maehly (1859) 199, Friedrich (1870) 543


136.12 θεραπεύσω secl. La Croze ap. Wagner (1798) 1.332–3, Hermann (1857) 77

136.13 τῶν (ἐκ) τῶν Hemsterhuis ap. Schepers (1901) 146

136.14 Ἀριάδνη εἰς Αἴγυπτον οὐκ ἐν Κρήτῃ λαβύρινθον, ἀλλ᾽ εἰς Αἴγυπτον, δεξιώσομαι Meineke (1853) 118, Friederich (1870) 543: καὶ ἑκκαιομένης κόπῳ τῆς ναυτίας Keil (1853) 59: καὶ ἑκκαιομένης κόπῳ τῆς ναυτίας Hermann (1857) 77: καὶ ἑκκλωμένης κώπης ναυτιλίας Meiser (1905) 234


136.14 Διόνυσον] Ὀησέα Meiser Meiser (1905) 234

136.16 ναυτικαῖς vel ἀκταίαις Meineke (1853) 118: ποντικαῖς Maehly (1859) 200: νησιωτικαῖς Hercher (1873) xvi: νυστακτίς Polak ap. Schepers (1905) 150

136.18 ἀπισταὶ vel αἴσχιστα pro ἁμαρτανταὶ coni. Reiske (1829) 26, ἀπιστάτα conf. VF

136.20–21 τοὺς ἔρωτας ... πλήρεις] τοὺς ἔρωτας ... εὐμενέσ Cobet (1854) 123–4: τοὺς ἔρωτας ... εὐμενές Polak ap. Schepers (1901) 147: τοὺς ἔρωτας ... πλήρεις Polak ap. Schepers (1905) 151

136.22–23 μήτε περιουσίας] μήτε secl. Meineke (1853) 118


138.3 πάθει Bergler (1715) 261: πάθει VFPD: πάθει Lenner (1777) 286

138.3 ήδη καὶ κρίσιν] ήδη καὶ κρίσιν Wagner (1798) 1.335

138.5 φοβουμένη] (μὴ) φοβουμένη Bergler (1715) 261

138.6 ή ἐμπαθὴς φιλία secl. Polak ap. Schepers (1905) 151

138.7 περιβέβληται καὶ βουλητὰς] προβέβληται βουλοῖ Reiske (1829)
26: παραβέβληται καί (τι) βουλής Meineke (1853) 119: παραβέβληται καί βουλής Fobes ap. Benner-Fobes (1949) 332


138.8 ἡδοναῖς Cobet (1854) 124


138.9 ὡς με] ὡς γε Meineke (1823) 352

138.10 διδάσκει] με διδάσκει Maehly (1859) 200

138.11 μη με τι] μήτε Bergler (1715) 262, Wagner (1798) 1.327 (err. typ.)

138.11 μη δε] μήτε Wagner (1798) 1.327 (err. typ.)

138.13 αυτόν] αὑτωσ Meineke (1823) 352: τούτον Schepers (1901) 148


138.16 ἄκου] ἀκοῦ (ἀν) Schepers (1905) 152

138.17 καὶ Θεοφράστου] καὶ Θεοφράστου Schepers (1901) 148

138.18–19 μᾶλλον δε καὶ] καὶ secl. Hercher (1873) xvi

138.20 χρηστηριασθομεν] χρηστηριασθομεθα Hercher (1873) xvi

138.21 πέμψαντες secl. Hemsterhuis ap. Schepers (1901) 148
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καὶ πορευόμενοι καὶ μένοντες secl. Cobet (1854) 124
καὶ γὰρ ἔχω Jacobs (1830) 514: καὶ γὰρ ἔχω
〈φιλὴν〉 Meiser (1905) 235
καὶ πορευόμενοι καὶ μένοντες Hirschig (1855) 214
καὶ γὰρ ἔχω
Jacobs (1830) 514:
καὶ γὰρ ἔχω
Meiser (1905) 235
⟨φίλην⟩ Meiser (1905) 235
νεωστὶ γυναῖκα Hirschig (1855) 214
γαστρομαντεύεσθαι Schneider (1819) 248 (s.v. γαστρομαντεύομαι): μαντεύεσθαι Schepers (1905) 152
δεινὴν δεινὴν Meiser (1905) 235: καὶ μαντεύεσθαι Seiler (1853) 72
δεινὴν Meineke (1853) 119: δεινὴν καὶ χρᾶν Meiser (1905) 235
σπαρτῶν διατάσει D'Arnaud (1734) 283
νύκτωρ νύκτωρ Meineke (1853) 119: νύκτωρ δέ Meineke (1853) 119
θεῶν νεκρῶν Hercher (1873) xvi
ὥς φασι ὥς φησι Wagner (1798) 1.337: ὦμασιν vel ὄμμασιν Jacobs (1830) 514: ὦμασιν Seiler (1853) 72
ὡς ἔφη ὡς ἔφυ Wagner (1798) 1.337: ὡς ἔοικε Jacobs (1814) 318–9: ὥς φασι Seiler (1853) 72
ἱερεῦσαι ἱερὰ Meineke (1853) 119: ἱερεῦσαι secl. Schepers (1905) 153
στύρακα πικρὸν Eitrem (1929) 52
πέμματα σελήνας Meineke (1853) 119–20: πέμματα σεληναῖα Schepers (1905) 153
τὰ ἄγρια φύλλα τῶν ἄγνων ἄγριόφυλλον καὶ ἀγριόφυλλα Meineke (1853) 72: ἀγριόφυλλα vel ἀνθερίκων Eitrem (1929) 52
φῆλα Bergler (1715) 267 (φῦλα Ald): φῦλα VFP: φῦλα D
φῦλα Bergler (1715) 267 (φῦλα Ald): φῦλα VFP: φῦλα D
ἂνρωτόμορφον Seiler (1853) 119: ἄγριόφυλλα vel ἀνθερίκων Eitrem (1929) 52
τὴν δὲ Φρυγίαν ταύτην ἑτοὶ μάσωμαι ἤδη καὶ ἃ μελετᾶν πειράζεις ἀπὸ σαυτοῦ με τὸν Πειραιᾶ τὴν δὲ Φρυγίαν ταύτην ἑρωτήσομαι εἰ δεῖ καὶ ἐμὲ τὰ νῦν πειράζειν ἀπῶσαι σοῦ μετὰ τὸν Πειραιᾶ D'Arnaud (1734) 284
ἤδη. καὶ ἃ καὶ γὰρ ἃ Maehly (1859) 201
ἠδῆ καὶ γὰρ ἃ: ἢ ἢ Jacobs (1814) 319: ἢ ἢ καὶ σὺ τάχα Jacobs (1830) 515: ἢ ἢ καὶ δὴ vel el δὲ καὶ Meineke (1853) 120: καὶ γὰρ ἢ Maehly (1859) 201
תוארον τινιν Φρυγιαν ταυτην ἑτοι μασωμαι ἢδη καὶ ἄ μελετην πειραζεις ἀπο σαυτου με τον Πειραιατη την δε Φρυγιαν ταυτην ἑρωτησομαι ει δει και εμε τα νυν πειραζειν απωσαι σου μετα τον Πειραια D'Arnaud (1734) 284
ἤδη καὶ ἃ Καὶ ει Jacobs (1814) 319: ἢ ἢ καὶ συ ταχα Jacobs (1830) 515: ἢ ἢ καὶ δη vel ei δε και Meineke (1853) 120: καὶ γαρ και Maehly (1859) 201
την δε Φρυγιαν ταυτην ἑτοι μασωμαι ἢδη καὶ ἄ μελετην πειραζεις ἀπο σαυτου με τον Πειραιατη την δε Φρυγιαν ταυτην ἑρωτησομαι ει δει και εμε τα νυν πειραζειν απωσαι σου μετα τον Πειραια D'Arnaud (1734) 284
ἤδη. καὶ ἃ καὶ γὰρ ἃ Maehly (1859) 201
ἠδῆ καὶ γὰρ ἃ: ἢ ἢ Jacobs (1814) 319: ἢ ἢ καὶ συ ταχα Jacobs (1830) 515: ἢ ἢ καὶ δη vel ei δε και Meineke (1853) 120: καὶ γαρ και Maehly (1859) 201
ἠδη καὶ ἄ μελετην πειραζεις ἀπο σαυτου με τον Πειραιατη την δε Φρυγιαν ταυτην ἑρωτησομαι ει δει και εμε τα νυν πειραζειν απωσαι σου μετα τον Πειραια D'Arnaud (1734) 284
ἤδη καὶ ἃ Καὶ ει Jacobs (1814) 319: ἢ ἢ καὶ συ ταχα Jacobs (1830) 515: ἢ ἢ καὶ δη vel ei δε και Meineke (1853) 120: καὶ γαρ και Maehly (1859) 201
ἀπὸ σαυτου] ἀπὸ σου Jacobs (1814) 319 (err. typ.):
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ἀποσταυροῦσ | Μeiser (1905) 236: ἀποσυλάν Post ap. Benner-Fobes (1949) 334
140.8 μὲν | καὶ Jacobs (1814) 319: μοι Meiser (1905) 236
140.8 τὸ ἄγριδιον | τὸν 'Αγρίππειον Meurs (1617) 324
140.8–9 Μουνυχίαν καὶ κατ᾽ ὀλίγον] Μουνυχίαν [καὶ] κατ᾽ ὀλίγον | D’Arnaud (1734) 284, Meiser (1905) 236: Μουνυχίαν καὶ πάντα ὀλίγον Jacobs (1814) 319: Μουνυχίαν, πάντα κατ’ ὀλίγον Jacobs (1830) 515
140.10 πάντα ποιεῖν] πάντα παρεῖναι Bergler (1715) 268: πάντα | λείπειν Meiser (1905) 236
140.10 σὺ δὲ οὐ] σὺ τε οὐ vel σὺ δὲ | οὐδὲ σὺ Jacobs (1814) 319
140.11 ὀδώρ] οἴδος Cobet (1854) 124, Meiser (1905) 236
140.16 εἰ | τε VEFPD: εἰ τί Meineke (1853) 120
140.16–17 τῆς πρὸς βασιλέα ἀφίξεως] (περὶ) vel (ὑπὲρ) τῆς πρὸς βασιλέα ἀφίξεως Reiske (1829) 26
140.17 εὐτρεπισμένα] ἡ ὑπαρκεῖσιν Hercher (1873) 67
140.17–18 τὰ δράματα ἡς αὐτῶν ἂ μάλιστα] τῶν δραμάτων ἂ μάλιστα vel τὰ δράματα, καὶ ἡς αὐτῶν μάλιστα, ἂ Reiske (1829) 26
140.18 ὅν ἤσαι] ἦσαι Cobet (1854) 124: κινήσαι Polak ap. Schepers (1901) 150
140.18 αὐτοῦ] σαυτοῦ Hercher (1873) xvi
140.19 Θαῖδα Meineke (1853) 120: θαίδης VF: θαίδες PD
140.21 Σικυών(1ον) εἰθ᾽ ὁτι(οὖν) ἄλλο. τί Meineke (1853) 38, 120–1: Σικυών(1ον) ἄλλα ὁτι Bergler (1715) 271
140.21–22 Σικυών(1ον) εἰθ᾽ ὁτι(οὖν) ἄλλο. τί δὲ: ἐγὼ] Σικυών(1ον) εἰθ᾽ ἄλλο τί. ἡ ἐγὼ Seiler (1853) 74
140.23 ἐρωτα] ἐρῶτα (ὦστε) Meahly (1859) 201
142.1 παρ᾽ ἐρωταν] παρ᾽ ἀνδρῶν Metropoulos (1855) 137: περιεργον γίγνεσθαι τῷ Hermann (1857) 77: παρ᾽ ἐρωταν Meahly (1859) 201: περιεργον Polak ap. Schepers (1901) 150
142.1–2 ἄλλα οἰκονομοῦσιν] ἄλλα εἰ κοινωνοῦσιν Hermann (1857) 77–8: ἄλλα κοινωνοῦσιν Meahly (1859) 201
142.2 οἱ ἔρωτες Granholm: ἄρτατ VEFPD (ἔρωτες Ald): (οἱ) ἔρωτες Metropoulos (1855) 137
142.2–3 (μᾶ) τὴν 'Αρτεμιν Herel (1768) 10–11
142.4 πάντως δέομαι] πάντως (δὲ) δέομαι Meineke (1823) 354
142.5 με γέγραφα] ἐμὲ γέγραφα Schepers (1905) 154
142.6 δι᾽ ἄλλου VEFPD, def. Wagner (1798) 1.343: δι᾽ αὐτοῦ Bergler
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(1715) 272: διὰ σοῦ Jacobs (1830) 517: διὰ βιβλίου Meiser (1905) 237

142.6 καὶ Seiler (1853) 74: κἂν VFPD
142.7 δόσον ἵσχύει καὶ παρά σοι VFPD: δόσον ἵσχύω [καὶ] παρά σοι
(&oacute;stē) Polak ap. Schepers (1901) 151: δτι τοσοῦτον ἵσχύω [καὶ]
pαρά σοι (&oacute;stē) Schepers (1905) 155
142.10 ἀφήσεις εὖ ἴσθι: ἀφήσεις, εὖ ἴσθι, Meineke (1853) 121
142.12 μαθήσομαι μαθήσομαι Cobet (1854) 124
142.12 ἀκύμονα] ἀπήμονα Bergler (1715) 272
142.13 πλέουσα] πλέουσα Polak ap. Schepers (1905) 155
142.14 λυσιτελής] D: λυσιτελές εἰ VFP: λυσιτελήσει Meineke (1853) 121

Fr. 5 144.4 χρήμα] ἔρυμα Meineke (1853) 165
144.4–5 θησιοτροφηθεῖσα] κηρογραφηθεῖσα Valckenaeer ap. Schepers (1901) 160
144.5 αὐτῶν] ψυμῶν Hercher (1873) xix
144.15 ἰσχυεγχύλους] ἰσχύως ἐγχύλους Abresch (1749) 2.115:
ἰσχύως ἐγχύλους D’Orville (1750) 160
144.17 δῆλη] δῆλη (τῆς) Wagner (1798) 2.222: αὐτῆς Hercher (1873) xix
144.18 μέλαν] μέλαν (αὐτῶν) Meiser (1905) 240
144.18 αἱ κόραι μελάνταται] αὐτῶν μελάντατον Hercher (1873) xix
144.18–19 καὶ τὸ κύκλῳ λευκὸν] γαλάκτος λευκότερον Meiser (1905) 240
144.19 λευκὸν] λευκόν (λευκότατον) Naber (1878) 252
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III APPENDIX EMENDATIONUM

4.1 64.1 (ἈΛΚΙΦΡΟΝΟΣ ΡΗΤΟΡΟΣ ΕΠΙΣΤΟΛΑΙ ΕΤΑΙΡΙΚΑΙ) Rycke
64.2 (Φρύνη Πραξιτέλει) Jacobs

4.2 66.10 (σὲ) add. W Ald
66.18 (ἀν) ήγοιμην Seiler: ήγοομην VFPD
66.21 φειδύλου WZ: φιδύλου VFPD

4.3 68.8 μηδὲ Seiler: μήτε VFPD

4.4 70.20 οὐδὲν (ἀν) Seiler

4.5 72.9 ἔραστὴν σοι Schepers: ἔραστὴν σοι VFPD

4.6 74.1 Θεττάλη] Ald: θεττάλη W: θετταλή VFPD θετταλή PD
74.7 προσιέμην W et Bergler: προσίμην VFPD
74.20 εἶδεν Bergler: οἶδεν VFPD
74.24 μέ τι Meineke: μ᾽ ἔτι VFPD

4.7 76.10 ἔρπυλλίδι Ald: ἔρπυλλίδι VFPD
76.17 τύφος Seiler: τύφος VFPD

4.8 80.9 παρηγόρημα] Bergler: κατηγόρημα VFPD
80.16 παραμύθιον ὃ Ald: παραμύθιον ὃν VFPD

4.9 82.6 μυρρινοῦντι W Ald: μυρρινοῦντι VFPD
82.7 ἀργυρείοις W: ἀργυρίοις VFPD
82.17 φιλεῖν Valckenaer: φιλεῖς VFPD
82.21 Φιλότις Seiler: φιλότης VFPD
82.21 [τοῖς] εὐμενεστέροις D’Arnaud

4.10 84.2 Δίφιλος Bergler: διφίλος VFPD
84.7 ἔρπυλλίδος Ald: ἔρπυλλίδος VFPD
84.9 μηδὲ ὡς Wagner: μηδόδως VFPD
84.10 [Ἀυστίδος] ἕξης W Ald
84.25 τύφον Seiler: τύφον VFPD

4.11 88.4 τότε οὕτω Granholm: τὸ τέλος οὐ VFPD
90.14 μέλουσα Bergler: μέλλουσα VFPD
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4.12 92.6–7 τῆς κορυφῆς D’Orville: τοῖς κορυφαίς VFPD
92.11 ἄρρυθμοι Seiler: ἄρωμοι PD: ἄρδημοι V: ἄρ[2 litt.]θμοι F
92.11 αὖθεν Seiler: αὕτη VF: αἰ̂ VF: αἰ VF PD

4.13 94.5 μυρρίνοι Seiler: μυρρίνη D: μυρίνη VFP
94.7 ἄρρυθμοι Meineke: ἄμφοδοι VFPD
94.9 ἐρρινώμεθα Seiler: ἐρινώμεθα VFPD
96.7 εὐπρεπεῖς Seiler: εὐπρεπεῖς VFPD
96.10 ἄνθεμα διαποίκιλα D’Orville: ἀνθεμάδια ποικίλα VFPD
96.26 ἐφη D’Orville: ἐφη VFPD
96.28 τε τά τρέμοντα Schepers: τέ τε τρέμοντα V: τά τε τρέμοντα FPD

98.1 χειμερίδος Herings: χειμερίδος VFPD
98.3 ταγηνοῦς Meineke: ταγηνοῦς V: ταγηνοῦς FPD
98.4 ἄρχων Granholm: τὰ VFPD
98.6 αἱ κύλικες Seiler: οἱ κύλικες VFPD
98.10 ύπεψεκάζομεν Seiler: ύπεψέκαζε μὲν VFPD
98.10 κυβίοις Seiler: κυβίοις VFPD
98.11 Κρουσμάτιον Seiler: οἱ κύλικες VFPD
98.22 ἀρέθμοι Seiler: ἄρεθμοι VFPD
100.1 τοὺς χιτωνίσκους Granholm: τοῖς χιτωνίσκοις VFPD
100.12 παρεμπορευσάμεναι Seiler: παρεμπορευσάμεναι VFPD
102.1 δ’ οὖν Seiler: γοῦν VFPD
102.2 μάλα Seiler: ἀλλὰ VFPD
102.11 δάντως Meineke: οὐτως V: οὖν οὔτως PD

4.14 104.2 ὁστε W: ὁστό τὸ VFP: ὁστό τὸ (ὁστε in marg.) P: ὁστε τὸ D
104.3 ἀκριβῶς D’Arnaud: ἀκριβῶς VFPD
104.10 παρῆμεν Bergler: γὰρ ήμεν VFPD
104.21 ύποσκίος τισι Anonymus ap. Wagner: ύποσκίοις τισι VFPD
106.19 ἐγκρισιν Hemsterhuis: ἐγκρισιν VFPD
106.21 ἀλλ’ Jacobs: ἀλλ’ VFPD
106.26 περιάλλων Meineke: περὶ ἄλλων VFPD
106.29 δ’ οὖν Seiler: γοῦν V: γοῦν FPD
108.6 ἔραν W Ald: ἔραν VFPD
108.10 Ἀδωνίους Pierson: ἀλώοις VFPD
108.12 κήπιον Bast: κήπιον VFPD

4.16 112.24 νικᾶ Reiske: νικᾶ VFPD
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114.2 γε Bergler: τε VFPD
114.14 ποιεῖν D’Arnaud: ποιεῖν VFPD
114.16 κοσμεῖσθαι Granholm: κοσμεῖν σοι VFPD
114.18 αὐαλούστεαι Meiser: εὐαλούστεαι VFPD

4.17 118.12–13 ἐγὼ πολιορκητὴν Hercher: ἐπιπολιορκητὴν VFP: ἐπὶ πολιορκητὴν D
118.16 τὸν Cobet: ἦ VFPD
120.2 Κηφισιάθεν Seiler: κηφισιάθεν VFPD
120.7 χρυσία Meineke: χρυσέια VFPD
120.12 *** ή] lac. ind. Reiske
120.22 θέλω: θέλω Granholm
122.7 ἵδρωκα τὰ ἅκρα Meineke: ἵδρω καὶ τὰ ἅκρα VFPD
122.15 Μητροδώρου ⟨ἀδελφὸς⟩ Schepers: Μητροδώρου [7 litt.] V: Μητροδώρου [10 litt.] PD

4.18 124.12 ζηλὸς Ald: ἦλος VFPD: [4 litt.] F
124.12 εἴ τινων Bergler: ἦ τινῶν VFPD
124.13 μὴ δὴ Meineke: μὴ δὲ VFPD
126.20 Θηρικλείους Bergler: ἠρακλείους VFPD
128.28 αὐτῆς Irmisch: αὐτῆς VFPD
130.6 οὕτω Seiler: οὔτε VFPD
130.19 ἀκαιροτέραν Ald: ἀκεραιοτέραν VFPacD: ἀκαιροτέραν P

4.19 132.4 ἐκταλῆς Seiler: ἐκ πάλης VFPD
132.6 Εὐφρόνιον Meineke: εὐφόριον VFPD
132.11 θεασάμενος δὲ Ald: θεασάμενος VFPD
132.16 τὸν ἐμὸν [δὲν] Ald
136.10 ναυτὶς ἔσομαι Hemsterhuis: αὐτῆς ἔσομαι VF: αὐτῆς ἔσομαι PD
136.11–12 εὖ {δ᾽} oίδα Ald
136.14 μίτων Bergler: μύθων VFPD
138.3 πάθει Bergler: πάσι VFPD
140.3 φύλα Bergler (φύλλα Ald): φύλα VFP: φύλα D
140.3 ἄγνων Cobet: ἄν (θρῶπ)ων VFPD
140.8 τὸ ἀγρίδιον Ald: τὸν ἀγρίδιον VFPD
140.16 εἰ γε Ald: εἰ τε VFPD
140.17 ἔχεις Ald: ἔχεις D: ἔχοις VFP
140.19 Ὁσίδα Meineke: θαίδης VF: Θαίδες PD
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140.22 εἰμι τὰ Ald: εἰ μετὰ VFPD
142.2 ⟨οἱ⟩ ἕρωντες Granholm: ὁρὰτε VFPD: ἕρωτες Ald
142.2–3 ⟨μὰ⟩ τὴν Ἄρτεμιν C\textsuperscript{nd} Here
142.3 ἡμῶν Ald: ἡμῶν VFPD
142.6 καὶ Seiler: καὶ VFPD
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