Language and tradition: three studies on the text of Menander

D. M. Peter G. McC. Brown

This paper consists of three notes on the language of Menander, all of which have a bearing on the constitution of the text. Syntax (1), word-formation (2), and morphology (3) are the major diagnostic tools employed here, but etymology and pragmatics also play a role. Showing the way in which the mechanics of language can help us restore fragmentary texts has been a concern in previous papers of mine in this journal and elsewhere.[[1]](#footnote-1) The dedication reflects my deep gratitude to the scholar from whom I first learned about Menander, and whose wisdom and scholarship remain an aspiration.

1. The doctor’s diagnosis: Menander, *Aspis* 450-454 Sandbach[[2]](#footnote-2)

450 οὐ πάμπαν οὗτός ἐστί τοι βιώσιμος.

ἀνερεύγεταί τι τᾶς χολᾶς· ἐπισκοτεῖ

] εντ.̣[..] καὶ τοῖς ὄμμασι

453 ]υ̣κνον ἀναφρίζει τε καί

 ].ας ἐκφορὰν βλέπει.

453 [π]υ̣κνόν Austin dubitanter

The friend of Daos, imitating a doctor, speaks Doric – with a few mistakes, if our papyrus reflects Menander’s text accurately – but Doric nevertheless.[[3]](#footnote-3) It seems likely that he is trying to make a quick escape – in the sequel to our passage, the doctor is called back.[[4]](#footnote-4) After βλέπει, then, the doctor tries to leave the stage. His diagnosis consequently must have an air of finality: his medical opinion is given in full, and there is nothing more to be done for the unfortunate patient. The pseudo-doctor has every reason to leave quickly; no doubt being called back and prolonging the potential for his identity to be revealed added to the comic savour of the scene. But what has he diagnosed? Can we save anything more than what has already been preserved?[[5]](#footnote-5) Previous attempts on this passage have been sparse.[[6]](#footnote-6) However, a clue has been left, since what has survived for us are discourse particles.

It is this which has, perhaps, not been appreciated fully. Austin’s [π]υκνόν in 453 is the only restoration to these lines recorded in editions; syntactically, this is to be taken with the following verb ἀναφρίζει as an adverb, ‘he foams thickly at the mouth’. Austin qualified his conjecture with a question mark, and editors do not normally put it in the text.[[7]](#footnote-7) Indeed, there is an important syntactical objection to it: the combination adverb – verb – τε is extremely rare in extant Menander. Where τε comes in third place, the first two elements are the article and a nominal;[[8]](#footnote-8) an adjective and a noun;[[9]](#footnote-9) a preposition and a noun (or pronoun);[[10]](#footnote-10) or a negative particle and a verb (finite or non-finite).[[11]](#footnote-11) In other words, τε is positioned second in a group of words defined by a node at a higher level of syntax – a noun phrase or a verb phrase. Since adverbs are not part of the verb phrase, they cannot be defined as a group with a verb by a particle such as τε. The single exception is *Mis*. 663-4 (Arnott):

εἰ μὴ γὰρ οὗτος δοκιμάσει με, κυρίως
δώσει τε ταύτην, οἴχεται Θρασωνίδης
For if he doesn’t acknowledge me, and if formally
he doesn’t give her to me, Thrasonides is done for!

The phrase κυρίως διδόναι may have been a standard collocation.[[12]](#footnote-12) If not, it may indicate that κυρίως should be taken with δοκιμάσει.

In other words, Menander does not normally treat adverbs as cohering closely to a verb, unlike prepositional phrases, articles, negatives, and other constituents. If a group of an adverb and a verb are marked with τε, the particle comes between the two.[[13]](#footnote-13) Consequently [π]υκνόν as an adverb with ἀναφρίζει is not the most attractive solution.

To make the suggestion [π]υκνόν more likely one would therefore have to restore the lines so that there is something for it to qualify in the previous sentence. However, another course lies open to us. Once we interpret ]υκνόν as part of the preceding phrase, we might also ask what else it might be. Presumably it is some constituent in the phrase beginning καὶ τοῖς ὄμμασι in the previous line. In that case, we have another clue about what is missing from the beginning of 453: eyes are under discussion, and a word ending ]υκνον is somehow involved. Whether the word ἐπισκοτεῖ (451) is also relevant is unclear; it seems probable, but 452 has not been restored. The start of 453, however, may be amenable to supplementation.

It happens that we do have a Greek word for an eye product with the correct shape: κύκνος ‘eye salve’, attested in Galen *de comp. sec. loc.* 4.1 and 7 (12.708 and 759 Kühn):[[14]](#footnote-14)

καλεῖται δὲ παρὰ τῶν ἰατρῶν τὰ τοιαῦτα κολλύρια λιβιανὰ καὶ κύκνοι, διὰ μὲν τὴν χρόαν λευκὴν οὖσαν, ὡς οἱ κύκνοι, κρατοῦντος ἐν αὐτοῖς ἀμύλου τε καὶ γῆς Σαμίας καὶ ψιμυθίου τοῦ Ῥοδιακοῦ.[[15]](#footnote-15)

‘And things of this kind are called by doctors *kollyria libiana* and *kyknoi*, because they are white in colour, like swans, as there is a lot of starch, Samian earth and Rhodian white lead in them.’

ὁ κύκνος ἐπιγραφόμενος, ὁ τῆς βασιλίσσης πρὸς τὰς μεγίστας περιωδυνίας[[16]](#footnote-16) καὶ διαθέσεις.[[17]](#footnote-17)

‘Entitled *kyknos*, the recipe of the queen for the greatest pains and conditions.’[[18]](#footnote-18)

The term is absent from the Hippocratic corpus, though fairly well attested in later medical writers. The Greek medical papyri seem not to use the word very frequently; however it is found on a seventh-century papyrus *P. Ant*. 3. 127 fr. 5 (κο(λλύριον) κυκνο̣[.[[19]](#footnote-19) The *editio* *princeps* of this papyrus (by Barns) restores Κύκνο[υ] as a personal name, but in the light of the Galen passages the interpretation κύκνο[ν] seems preferable.

Recipes overlapping with the Galen prescriptions are also attested, sometimes termed κολλύριον λευκόν.[[20]](#footnote-20) The term entered Latin medical terminology, but not, as far as I have been able to ascertain, Coptic.[[21]](#footnote-21)

To restore the word to Menander is thus a daring move, bringing the first occurrence of the word several hundred years earlier. On the other hand, very few other words fit our passage; based on the available data, we must restore κύκνον or πύκνον.[[22]](#footnote-22) I therefore conjecture the following supplement:

οὐ πάμπαν οὗτός ἐστί τοι βιώσιμος.

ἀνερεύγεταί τι τᾶς χολᾶς· ἐπισκοτεῖ

 ] εντ.̣[..] καὶ τοῖς ὄμμασι

οὐ χρέος ἐπισμᾶν κ]ύ̣κνον· ἀναφρίζει τε καί

 ].ας ἐκφορὰν βλέπει.

Perhaps 454 continued by combining the foaming at the mouth with paradoxical thirst. The report of Menander’s comic exploitation of ὑδροφοβία (fr. 440 K.-A.) is suggestive; even though the source of this fragment, Caelius Aurelianus (translating an earlier work by Soranus of Ephesus), is unlikely to be basing his account on our passage of *Aspis*, he shows us another way in which Menander exploited medical terminology (and medical conditions?) for dramatic effect.

A final issue should be addressed. The restoration here proposed requires the first syllable of κύκνον to be metrically heavy. As a rule, Menander’s prosody prefers a mute-liquid cluster to be part of the onset of the following syllable, i.e. κύ.κνον, the first syllable remaining metrically light (as the second syllable of ἀναφρίζει in this very line). Given that we have a speaker with a foreign accent, this may not be fatal; in fact, it may be another means of de-familiarising his own dialect. If the word is, in addition, the kind of typically medical – i.e. non-Attic dialect – form familiar to us from other comic texts,[[23]](#footnote-23) there is an additional reason for its unusual prosody.

1. Menander, *Theophoroumene* 15[[24]](#footnote-24)

This line is a dispiriting start for conjecture. The line is at the damaged foot of a column, most of which has perished, so that even the preserved letters are hard to identify. Handley admitted that he could not ‘find, or devise, a convincing treatment of 15’, while Arnott called the line ‘one of the darkest mysteries is the interpretation of lines 15-17’.[[25]](#footnote-25) However, editors of Menander must often be courageous, and many have been here. Arnott turned the traces into ἐξηπ[ί]στατο,[[26]](#footnote-26) while Webster, more courageously still, conjectured ζιγ[ό]στατο[ν].[[27]](#footnote-27) This latter form, an *addendum lexicis*, has now, in the masculine plural ζιγόστατοι, entered editions by Austin and Blanchard; this has a bearing on the wider question of the passage’s syntax.[[28]](#footnote-28) It is therefore in need of a full discussion. There are two questions: one of palaeography, the other of morphology and semantics.

First the palaeography. Arnott’s conjecture can be ruled out almost immediately: the first letter is unquestionably Ζ not Ξ, as can be clearly seen by comparing the form of Ξ in the first line of the next column.[[29]](#footnote-29) The equivocation goes back to the *editio princeps* and the first full edition of the papyrus. Following Ζ are two[[30]](#footnote-30) upright hastae before a lacuna of one or two letters.[[31]](#footnote-31) These two hastae give us the ΙΓ of Webster’s conjecture, which thereby gains in credence. The second hasta, to judge from the online image, seems to have a small protrusion at the top, arguing still more cogently for Γ.

The problem with reading ΖΙΓ is the enormous difficulty of finding a single Greek word that fits; hence, no doubt, the desperate solution of Webster’s coinage. Plainly there are issues of method here that cut both ways. We should not be surprised when new words come to our knowledge on papyri and inscriptions; the previous note in this very paper argues that a papyrus might furnish evidence for a much earlier attestation of a lexeme than we had previously possessed. On the other hand, assuming that a highly broken and textually difficult passage contains a new word is special pleading. What we require, then, is an investigation of the form ζιγόστατον on its own merits. Is this a likely Greek word?

It transpires, in fact, that several problems coexist in these few syllables. First, the formations in Greek ending in –στατος are overwhelmingly deverbal, derived from compounds of ἵστημι with a preverb. To put it another way, they are in fact no compounds at all, but pseudo-compounds. If this is correct, they should be accented on their final syllable (e.g. ἀναστατός). However, because the preverbs (e.g. ἀνα-) were known also as independent words forming genuine compounds, the accentuation could be analogically altered to reflect compound accentuation.[[32]](#footnote-32) Examples of such forms in Menander (accented according to the editions indicated) are ἀνάστατος (*Col*. 87 Sandbach), διάστατος (fr. 406 K.-A.), and ὑπoστατός (fr. 296.13 K.-A.). Nominal first members are rare: ἀρκυο (A. *Ag*. 1375, A. *Eum*. 112, S. *El*. 1476, E. *Or.* 1422),and ὀρθοο (E. *Supp.* 497, *HF.* 980, *Ion* 1134, *Hel.* 547), both only in tragedy, are the only examples from the classical period;[[33]](#footnote-33) and even later the tendency is for triple compounds to be formed, the first member being derived from a compound verb (e.g. νεοοσύοστατος, Josephus, *B.J.* 2.148), rather than for nominal compounds with second member oστατος to be coined.

The first member stands on even more treacherous ground: a verb ζιγγοῦν in Photius (ζ 48, glossed as ὑποπίνειν) stands next to a variant ζιγοῦν, glossed in the Antiatticist (98.6) as πίνειν. Both are labelled Cilician,[[34]](#footnote-34) and the former is attributed to Nicostratus.[[35]](#footnote-35) It is unclear what ‘Cilician’ means linguistically in this period; Neumann connects it with wild, drunken behaviour, termed κιλικισμός (cf. Pherecrates fr. 176 K.-A., Aristophanes fr. 107 K.-A.), and traces ζιγγοῦν to Hittite *nink*- ‘sich satt trinken’, explaining the anlaut with a dissimilation (n-n > z-n), or via an earlier form (Luwic or ‘Proto-Cilician’) \*tink-.[[36]](#footnote-36) One would dearly like to know the context in which Nicostratus used the term; sadly the gloss is not even assigned to a play, let alone any other more helpful contextualisation. If one could be sure that the attribution of the term to the Κίλικες reflected the use of the word by a foreign character in the drama, this might lead to further conclusions, but there is simply no evidence. In order for the word to be incorporated into Greek word formation patterns in the way demanded by ζιγόστατον, we should have to assume the form ζιγγοῦν had been nativised; the use of the word in Nicostratus would therefore be of great interest. If Frisk (*s.v.*) is correct to suppose that ζίγγος (an onomatopoeic word for the sound of bees according to Hesychius) is etymologically connected, we must almost certainly assume that the Antiatticist has misspelled his entry. But this last is fairly doubtful, since Frisk’s justification ‘nach dem zischenden oder schlürfenden Laut’ hardly inspires confidence (bees hiss not, neither do they slurp). The reconstruction therefore fails tests of semantics, etymology and word-formation.

Consequently, another interpretation of the traces may be advisable. In a review of the most recent edition of the *Theophoroumene*, I made two suggestions, both certainly wrong, namely [ἀ]ζη[λέ]στατοι and [ἀλα]ζ<ο>ν[έ]στατο[ι].[[37]](#footnote-37) What binds them is that they restore Greek to the lacuna, which ζιγόστατον did not. However, the treatment of the traces is impossible: reinterpreting the two vertical hastae of ΙΓ as parts of Η and Ν respectively is, to say the least a bold move: there is, on the photograph at least, no sign of relevant damage to the surface; and any ink loss would have to have been preternaturally exact. Whether there is room for all the letters required for [ἀ]ζη[λέ]στατοι is in serious doubt. The second suggestion requires the additional assumption of the loss of a letter; furthermore it produces an unparalleled trimeter, in which the entire second half is taken up by a single word.[[38]](#footnote-38) All these two suggestions could ever be, therefore, is stimulus to further thought. It is at least possible that some other superlative formation in -έστατο- will provide the solution. The suggestion I explore in the remainder of this paper, however, takes another tack entirely.

Webster’s ζιγόστατον and my abortive earlier attempts on the passage have in common an assumption that the traces produce a single word. But this is not necessary. Furthermore, after the gamma there seem to be no traces of the following letter, which almost all these reconstructions assume is omicron. It would be equally possible to restore γ[ε] στατο[. If the last word of the line is the adjective στατός, this may, following Webster’s lead, be at home in a sympotic context of some kind; the reference could then be to a ψυκτήριον στατόν, a ψυκτηρίσκος στατός or a ψυκτὴρ στατός, i.e. a ‘standing cooler’. These artefacts are referred to in a number of papyrus texts and comic fragments. The ψυκτηρίσκος στατός is a vessel that holds around six pints (just over a single χοῦς) in a papyrus letter (*P*. *Cair*. *Zen*. 1 59038). A papyrus letter from the same archive refers to the same object as a ψυκτηρίδιoν στατόν (*P*. *Cair*. *Zen*. 1 59044). Bringing the diminutive forms to a close, a ψυκτήριον στατόν is attested on an inscription from Delos (*ID* 320. 70). A 314-drachma ψυκτὴρ στατός is attested on an Hellenistic inscription from the Troad (*IK* 3.151, IMT Skamander und Nebentäler 327).

This last has some bearing on a comic fragment with a corrupt text. At 11.502d, Athenaeus’ manuscripts give a fragment of Dioxippus (fr. 5 K.-A.) as follows:

παρ’ Ὀλυμπίχου δὲ Θηρικλείους ἔλαβεν ἐξιτάτους β` ψυκτῆρας

Casaubon understood the correct word division and turned ἐξιτάτους into ἕξ / εἶτα τοὺς. Schweighaeuser, to improve the metre changed εἶτα into ἔπειτα, which was accepted by Meineke.[[39]](#footnote-39) Kaibel printed the text’s ιτατους with cruces, suggesting in the apparatus ἁδρούς – or στατούς. Finally, Peppink suggested either ἀκάτους or κυάθους.[[40]](#footnote-40) This last suggestion deserves some credit; on the inscriptions, κύαθοι ‘ladles’ are frequently found in the immediate vicinity of wine-coolers. Plainly for the purposes of this paper it would be hugely desirable to read Kaibel’s στατούς, but this remains no more than one possibility. Even without this fragment, however, the collocation ‘standing wine-cooler’ is well-established in Greek of the period. A further attractive aspect of all this evidence is that it belongs in roughly the same period. Whatever the ψυκτὴρ στατός was, it seems to have been a third-century artefact.

We thus achieve the following restoration of the line as an interim result:

]ζι γε στατο[

Earlier in the line the artefact in question must have been mentioned, whether it was a ψυκτήρ, a ψυκτήριον, or something else entirely. The most likely explanation of the first word is that it is a verb in –ζω, in the third person singular, with an itacistic misspelling of -ζει as –ζι (on which see below). The prolific nature of the verbs in –ίζω or –άζω make further reconstruction somewhat speculative, as does uncertainty about the case, gender and number of στατός (-ός? –όν? -οῦ? –οί?). Various reconstructions are then possible, not all of which are given below:

[ x – u – ψυκτῆρος – ]ζει γε στατο[ῦ]

[ x – u – ψυκτῆρ᾿ u – ] ζει γε στατό[ν]

[ψυκτῆρα – x – u – ]ζει γε στατό[ν]

etc., etc.

To be clear: the only reason for positing the mention of a ψυκτήρ at all is the fact that the adjective στατός occurs frequently in this combination, and therefore this addition to the line is entirely dependent on the segmentation I propose. It is unclear to me what verb might have stood in the gap; I once thought of [ὦ] Κλ[<ε>ιν]ία, | [ψυκτῆρος ἥδε, νὴ Δί’, ὄ]ζει γε στάτο[υ] ‘By Zeus, O Kleinias, she *does* reek of the standing wine-cooler’, based roughly on Menander fr. 170, but I am increasingly doubtful this can be right. If Webster was right to restore Kλ[ιν]ία in 14, it requires exactly the same itacistic mistake as my argument about 15 assumes, and which is found on the papyrus itself in 22 (εγκεκλιμ[ενη] for ἐγκεκλειμένη). The spelling –ζι for –ζει thus does not rest on too unreasonable an additional assumption.

Discretion is, even in textual criticism, the better part of valour. As a result, I resist the temptation of boldly integrating an entirely new reconstruction of the text. How my suggestion in 15 fits with 16-17 is hard to work out, as we are left with little to build on beyond the presence of a singular finite verb. In any case, the important consequence of this section is that the conjecture †ζιγόστατον is untenable.

1. Perfecting the perfect: *Perikeiromene* 777[[41]](#footnote-41)

777 εἰ δὲ γεγένητ]αι τοῦτ᾿, ἀδελφὴ δ᾿ ἔστ᾿ ἐμὴ

αὕτη, κάκιστ᾿] ἔ̣φ̣θ̣α̣ρμ᾿ ὁ δυστυχὴς ἐγώ.[[42]](#footnote-42)

This line is the only case in Menander where the form γεγένηται is accepted as the perfect indicative of γίνομαι. Elsewhere, Menander uses only the perfect active γέγονα in the indicative (including the pluperfect indicative, cf. *Ep*. 259, 490), participle and infinitive. The stem γεγενη- only forms a participle, in variation with γεγον-.[[43]](#footnote-43) The restoration of *Pk*. 777 goes back to Sudhaus and has been accepted by all subsequent editors (though some leave the line unrestored). Sudhaus can hardly have known that the restoration would be rendered unlikely by the discovery of this distribution of the perfect stems in Menander, and the case is a salutary warning that old textual restorations must be checked against new evidence. As a result, the restoration of the line as [εἰ δὲ γεγένητ]αι τοῦτ᾿ is unlikely. I originally thought of τέτυκται (building on an earlier suggestion by Körte).[[44]](#footnote-44) Even if this were not almost solely an epicism, there is a further objection, which is space. The word must be longer, as, owing to a tear in the parchment precisely on the axis of our line, more of the line has been lost than in the two on either side. This same tear has obscured the last two letters of the word; at one time they were read as -εν, but now opinion seems to have changed and scholars have agreed on the reading -αι. [[45]](#footnote-45) The image I consulted does not allow a conclusive statement on the point, though -αι seems on balance more plausible than -εν. My proposal is [εἰ δὲ πεπόητ]αι, ‘if she has done this’. The first clause refers to the mother’s action (according to Furley’s restoration, exposing the children, [συνεκτίθ]ε̣σθαι),[[46]](#footnote-46) the second to Moschion’s realisation of the consequences: Glycera’s identity.

These notes as a whole have drawn on material culture, on medical terminology, on the investigation of manuscripts and physical evidence, and on considerations of syntax and grammar. The conclusions amount to a suggestion for a new reconstruction of *Asp*. 452-3; the rejection of an *addendum lexicis* ζιγόστατον (or ζιγόστατοι); and a more plausible restoration of *Pk*. 777 – all derived from looking in greater detail at the linguistic implications of our texts, while fitting them into broader cultural trends.
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1. See *ZPE* 196 (2015) 63-4; *ZPE* 199 (2016) 17-24; *ZPE* 201 (2017) 32-9; *CP* 112 (2017) 246-252. My thanks to the editors of *ZPE*, particularly to the late Prof. Dr. Rudolf Kassel for criticism of an earlier version of this paper, and for his long support of my work. Other acknowledgements are made in the appropriate places. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. This note was stimulated by an email exchange with Prof. Peter Parsons, to whom I express my deep thanks. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. On Doric doctors generally Impero (1998), Sanchis Llopis (2000), and Willi (2003) 86-87. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. Hurst (2000) = Hurst (2015) 133-143. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. For medical metaphors in the context of Menander scholarship see Austin (2013) xi-xii. [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. The ambitious restoration by Gil (1971) 138-139, based mainly on Hippocratic texts, is an exception. [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. Austin (1969) 21; Borgogno (1972) 37; Sandbach (1990) 21; Jacques (1998) 33; Ingrosso (2010) 110. Differently, Arnott (1979) 76-77 puts [π]υκνόν in the text, as does Gil (1971). [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. *Asp*. 109; *Dysk*. 21, 311, 719; *Ep*. 889; *Kol*. fr. 1.6; *Mis*. 45 [Arnott]; *Pk*. 136; fr. 110.3; fr. 602.17 (substantivised adverb, νυνί). Cf. Diphil. fr. 23.5; fr. 60.2. [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
9. *Dysk.* 26; *Pk*. 128; *Sik*. 263; fr. 508.8. [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
10. *Asp*. 5, 45; *Mis*. 2; *Pk*. 135; *Sam*. 672. Cf. Philem. fr. 74.2. [↑](#footnote-ref-10)
11. *Dysk*. 7; *Sam*. 560. [↑](#footnote-ref-11)
12. See now Furley (2021) 180. To the examples of Dem. 36.32 cited in Gomme / Sandbach (1973) 454 add S. *Ph*. 63, Plato *Lg*. 949c1, Joseph. *AJ*. 17.202, and Origen *Ep. ad Afr.* 11.77. [↑](#footnote-ref-12)
13. *Asp*. 13, 108, 392; *Dysk*. 234, 824; *Ep*. 161, 917; *Pk*. 271, 349; *Sam*. 64, 671; *Sic*. 98, 259. By way of control, Aristotle in the *NE* seems to follow the same rule: there are no sequences of adverb-verb-τε. [↑](#footnote-ref-13)
14. The diminutive κυκνάριον is attested in the same sense in [Galen] (14.765 Kühn), Aetius (7.8, 7.9, 7.17, 7.106) and Paulus (13.22, 7.16). [↑](#footnote-ref-14)
15. These ingredients are also found in Oribasius, *Synop. ad Eustath.* 3.124 (Raeder). [↑](#footnote-ref-15)
16. Cf. Oribasius, *Synop. ad Eustath.* 3.119 (Raeder) in a recipe for a κύκνος ξανθός. [↑](#footnote-ref-16)
17. Cf. also 12. 757 (Kühn). [↑](#footnote-ref-17)
18. This passage, according to Durling (1993) 213 is taken from Asclepiades, also found in Aetius 7.106 (there termed a κυκνάριον). See Fabricius (1972) 192-195. [↑](#footnote-ref-18)
19. Marganne (1994) 175 gives a survey of this terminology (note in particular the frequent colour terminology used in these recipes); see Marganne (1981) 98 for *P. Ant*. 3. 127. [↑](#footnote-ref-19)
20. See Andorlini / Flemming (2001-) 2.4, 51-69 (Toronto, University of Toronto F 812 Vo, early 2nd c. a.d.). The fourth prescription is designated λευκόν. [↑](#footnote-ref-20)
21. Grotefend (1867) 90 (no. 66), with references to the Greek medical literature on κύκνος; more up-to-date collection in Voinot (1999) 44 (note the presence of CYCNARIVM beside CYCNVM). Förster (2002) does not list the word. [↑](#footnote-ref-21)
22. In Buck-Petersen (1945) 278 only two further stems in –υκνο– are listed: one is a gloss μολύκνον· μεμολυσμένον in Hescyhius, the other the form λαμπρωτουκνα, of uncertain interpretation, on *P. Cair. Masp*. 1. 67006. 83 *verso* (566-570 a.d.). [↑](#footnote-ref-22)
23. The clearest metalinguistic demonstration of this discourse in Attic comedy is Alexis fr. 146 K.-A.; see Arnott (1996b) 430-434. [↑](#footnote-ref-23)
24. This note fulfils a promise made in my review of Austin (2013), see Cartlidge (2013) n.2; it will be noticed that the proposals I made there are rejected here. I acknowledge again with deep gratitude the help Peter Brown gave me at that time in my first academic review, and in subsequent discussions about Menander; I am also grateful to Wolfgang de Melo. [↑](#footnote-ref-24)
25. Handley (1969) 92; Arnott (1978) 8. [↑](#footnote-ref-25)
26. Arnott (1978) 9; (1996a) 62. [↑](#footnote-ref-26)
27. Webster (1973) 198-200. [↑](#footnote-ref-27)
28. Austin (2013) 36, Blanchard (2016) 101. [↑](#footnote-ref-28)
29. Norsa / Vitelli (1935) read ΞΙΠ, but this was rightly revised by Bartoletti (1951); the excellent image in Norsa (1939) 9D has been used to check readings for this note, as has the image online at <http://www.psi-online.it/images/orig/PSI%20XII%201280%20r.jpg?1365958812> (accessed 4/12/18). [↑](#footnote-ref-29)
30. The dark vertical visible on the photograph after the first two hastae is unlikely to be ink. [↑](#footnote-ref-30)
31. Handley (1969) 91 points out the occasional presence of spaces between words; if such a space existed in the gap there may be need to think again. [↑](#footnote-ref-31)
32. For a possible semantic distinction, Postgate (1924) 53; on these adjectives as a class, Probert (2003) 83, and on the problem in general, Probert (2003) 105. [↑](#footnote-ref-32)
33. Based on Buck / Petersen (1950). [↑](#footnote-ref-33)
34. The only other gloss attributed to the Κίλικες I have found is Antiatt. 85.27 βαμβάκου τοὺς φαρμάκους καλοῦσιν οἱ Κίλικες. See further Neumann (1961) 33-4. [↑](#footnote-ref-34)
35. Nicostr. fr. 36 K.-A., with full apparatus and references to the relevant glosses. [↑](#footnote-ref-35)
36. These explanations are, from a Greek perspective, even compatible: the Greek form might well be from the n-form via dissimilation, while the Hittite form might have been derived from earlier \*tink- (Neumann has parallels for the assimilation in Hittite). [↑](#footnote-ref-36)
37. Cartlidge (2013) fn.2. [↑](#footnote-ref-37)
38. Although there are lines in Menander with no caesura (e.g. *Ep*. 328, 578, *Sik*. 198, fr. 299.6, fr. 394.2; sometimes for special effect, cf. *Dysk*. 473, 574), I have yet to turn one up in which exactly half the line is occupied by a single word (contrast, e.g., fr. 722.3). [↑](#footnote-ref-38)
39. Schweighaeuser (1804) 303-4. [↑](#footnote-ref-39)
40. Peppink (1936) 67. [↑](#footnote-ref-40)
41. For provision of high-quality images of the Leipzig parchment of *Perikeiromene* I am indebted to Dr Almuth Märker (Universitätsbibliothek Leipzig). [↑](#footnote-ref-41)
42. δ̣ι̣ά̣κ̣ειμ᾿ Furley (2015); I am not convinced that the letter before mu is iota, nor does Furley’s reconstruction make sense of the vertical traces visible beneath the earlier part of the line. [↑](#footnote-ref-42)
43. γεγενημένος: *Ep*. 306, *Col*. 2, *Mis*. 406 Arnott, *Sam*. 600; γεγονώς: *Sam*. 351, 527. [↑](#footnote-ref-43)
44. Körte (1910) 131; see next fn. for more detail of this reading. [↑](#footnote-ref-44)
45. Körte (1910) 131 restored τετύχηκεν; Sudhaus (1914) 50 pointed out that the restoration was too long, and reread the traces as -αι, suggesting γεγένηται. Van Leeuwen (1919) was less categorical, but printed Sudhaus’ restoration, which has remained fixed in all subsequent editions (Lamagna 1994 does not discuss any alternatives). [↑](#footnote-ref-45)
46. See Furley (2015) 158. [↑](#footnote-ref-46)