Textual Observations on *Philogelos*

R. D. Dawe

After the excellent edition with commentary by Andreas Thierfelder (Munich 1968), which itself was able to profit from the fundamental work of Boissonade (Paris 1848) and Alfred Eberhard (Berlin 1869), there is not a great deal left for an editor to do. The manuscript tradition, and the editorial role of Minas Minoides in the last century, have been clarified by B. E. Perry, and the collection’s linguistic usage by Gerhard Ritter.\(^1\) The two main versions of the various jokes that comprise the collection do not contain serious divergences within themselves. The present paper is therefore devoted only to the proposal of a handful of conjectures. In the excerpts printed below (a) versions are represented by the manuscripts ACM and (b) versions by EPV, or as many of them as are extant for any particular item.

6 (a) AM Σχολαστικός ἰδῶν τὸν κατὰ συνήθειαν αὐτὸν ἱατρὸν ἐρχόμενον περιστέλλετο αὐτῷ ὁφθήναι. Ἐπεροτηθείς δὲ παρὰ τινος αὐτοῦ ἑταίρου, διὰ τί αὐτὸ ποιεῖ, ἀπεκρίθη: Πολὺς χρόνος ἔστιν ἄφ᾽ ὦ ὦν ἐνός, καὶ ἑντρέπομαι αὐτόν.

ἡμῶν Α αὐτὸ[ ] τοῦτο Minas

περιστέλλειν ("bedecken") gives roughly the necessary idea, but, as Thierfelder notes, the following infinitive ὁφθήναι reads strangely without μὴ. But there is a simple remedy that obviates such solutions as Boissonade’s ὑποστέλλετο, namely to insert (τὸ) after περιστέλλετο. For the construction compare Clem. Aī. Strom., *PG* VIII 1285b: οὗτος δ᾽ ἐν εἴη ὁ μὴ περιστελλόμενος τὸν διωγμόν.

The variation of word order is best explained on the supposition that μῦν was written above the line in a common ancestor, having first been accidentally omitted. How omitted? If by haplography, then the most likely place for μῦν would be after θέλων, and this gives what is in any case the most appealing order on stylistic grounds: the same word order θέλων + object + infinitive is found in the next item (Σχολαστικὸς θέλων αὐτοῦ τῶν ὅνων διδάξατε) and the same in no. 161. No contrary examples are found in Philogelos.

But there is a second point to consider. Why should the scholasticus chew meat? The meat must be for the mouse, so read δικεία, with ἐκάθισεν active: he put down the meat for the mouse to chew. Only on some such supposition may we hope to avoid the incongruous explanation whereby the scholasticus has meat between his teeth, imitating a mousetrap—"was mir selbst für diesen schwachen Witz zu dumm vorkommt" (Thierfelder). The anecdote seems unfinished—and it is by no means the only one in the collection to have suffered that fate. In the missing part there was doubtless some rôle for the darkness to play: otherwise it would hardly have been mentioned.

The final τὸ βαλάνειον sounds superfluous, and comparison with 130, which ends καθὼς βλέπω, οὐ λούει, confirms this suspicion. ἦγουν μνῆμα in 26, and ἤτει τὴν σφαίραν, deleted in 33 by Thierfelder, are other intrusions in the vicinity.
υδ' ὤπο ἀνθρώπου ("and perhaps not even by man") has elicited some contorted explanations from the commentators. Of our two manuscripts here, one, M, writes ἀνθρώπου as ἄνου, but without a line above it which would indicate a compendium was intended. Read ἄνου: the father's informant was either out to cause mischief, or was possibly crazy.

40 (a) AM Σχολαστικός μικρὸν υἱὸν ἀπολέσας, θεασάμενος πολλοὺς ἐπὶ τὸ κῆδος ἀπαντήσαντας διὰ τὴν ἀποσίαν αὐτοῦ ἔλεγεν· Αἴδούμαι μικρὸν παιδίον εἰς τοσοῦτον ὄχλον ἐκφέρων.

ἀπολέσας Μ ἐπὶ τὴν κηδείαν Μ

Unfortunately the (b) version has nothing that would throw any light on the motive given in (a) as διὰ τὴν ἀποσίαν. ἐξουσίαν (Eberhard) and περιοσίαν (Boissonade) are both sensible, but so might the bare ὤσίαν be, “property.” But the original text may once have been more explicit, with the adjective πλουσίαν, followed by a noun now lost.

43 AM Σχολαστικὸς ἄκουσας παρά τινων ὅτι ὁ πόγον σου ἡδη ἔρχεται, ἀπελθὼν εἰς τὴν πύλην ἐξεδέχετο αὐτὸν. ἔτερος δὲ τὴν πρώφασιν ἐρωτήσας καὶ γνοὺς· Εἰκότως, εἶπε, μοροὶ νομιζόμεθα· πόθεν γὰρ οἶδας εἰ διὰ τῆς ἐτέρας πύλης ἔρχεται; ἔτερου ... ἐρωτήσαντος Μ

Minas’ motives in conjecturing (οὐκ) ἔρχεται are obvious. Thierfelder believes that the same sense can be obtained without any alteration of the text by invoking Kühner-Gerth II 533 §589.14. Those who believe that the examples cited there do not justify the translation here, “How do you know if it is not coming through the other gate?,” may care to construe differently, taking the εἰ clause not as an indirect question but as an ordinary conditional: “If it comes through the other gate, how do you know?” One might perhaps have expected a potential optative with ἄν instead of the plain indicative οἶδας, but one can say the same of νομιζόμεθα. Philogelos does not indulge in the potential optative. The only exceptions are at 28 (ἄν εἰη) and, if I am right in suggesting it, another (ἄν) εἰη just two items before, at 26. Boissonade rightly compared δικαίως μοροὶ καλούμεθα (15) and μορός εἰμι (52).

47 AM Σχολαστικὸς διὰ χρόνου εἰς τὸν ἄχρον παραγενόμενος ἐθεάσατο τὰ ὀμματα ἐξίοντα ἐπὶ βόσκησιν. καὶ ὦς εἰθεθ
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blechōmena ἴδων ἡρώτα τὴν αἰτίαν. τοῦ δὲ οἴκονόμου προσπαίξαντος καὶ εἰπόντος Ἀσπάζονται σε, Τὴν ἐμὴν σοι σοφηρίαν, φησίν, ἐμὸν ἔνεκα ἀργίαν αὐτοῖς δός καὶ τρεῖς ἡμέρας μὴ ἐξαγάγῃς αὐτὰ εἰς νομὴν.

χρόνον Μ βλεχόμενα Α: γλυκόμενα Μ σοι ομ. Μ*, add. Μ¹ ἀργίαν in ras. scr. Μ¹ αὐτὴ δός Μ ἐξαγάγεις Μ

Bleating, given us by A, the most complete manuscript, and the most highly esteemed, of Philogelos, is something you hear, not something you see, and so Thierfelder adds (καὶ σκιρτῶντα). But M, which we invoked on 36, has the extraordinary variant γλυκόμενα. Now Philo Carpasionus, Cant. 206 has καθάπερ γλυκόνεοταί βουλομένοις (where Migne would prefer γλυκαίνεσθαι), “to enjoy sweetness.” The same stress would fit well here too, of flocks full of joie de vivre. Read γλυκυνόμενα.

προσπαίξαντος looks as though its tense has been assimilated to that of εἰπόντος. Read προσπαίξαντος.

48 ΑΜ Σχολαστικὸς καὶ νὰ υποδήματα ὑπεδήσατο, τριζόντων οὖν αὐτῶν ἐπισχῶν Μ ἢ τρίζετε, εἰπέν, ἐπεὶ τὰ σκῆλη ἡμῶν ἀκλάσητε.

κενὰ Μ υποδήσατο Μ οὖν αὐτῶν in ras. scr. Μ¹ τρίζεται AM: corr. Minas ἡμῶν Μ: ἡμῶν Α

Thierfelder has a long and imaginative note considering the possibility that “die Schuhe unausgesprochen mit Heuschrecken (Grillen) verglichen werden,” ἔμων and κλάσετε (Minas) giving us grasshoppers breaking their own legs with excessive rubbing. Less far-fetched and more humorous would be ὅκλαζεται. The scholasticus does not wish it to be thought that he has creaking joints.

51 (a) ΑΜ Σχολαστικὸς ἴδων ἐν τοίς ἀγρῳ οὗτος φρέαρ βαθὺ ἡρώτα εἰ καλὸν ἢν τὸ ὕδωρ, τῶν δὲ γεωργῶν εἰπόντων ὅτι Καλὸν· καὶ γὰρ οἱ γονεῖς σου ἐντεῦθεν ἐπίνον, Καὶ πηλίκους, φησίν, εἶχον τραχήλους ὅτι εἰς τοσοῦτον βάθος πίνειν ἡδύνατο;

(b) ΕΡΒ Σχολαστικὸς ἐν τοίς ἴδιωι ἀγρῳ ἔξισον ἡρώτα πειν ὕδωρ, εἰ καλὸν ἐν τοῖς αὐτῶθι φρέατι. τῶν δὲ φησάντων ὅτι Καλὸν· καὶ γὰρ καὶ οἱ γονεῖς σου εἰς αὐτὸν ἐπίνον, καὶ πηλίκους, ἐφε, εἶχον τραχήλους ὑνα ἀπὸ τοσοῦτον βάθους πίνειν ἡδύνατο;

(a) βαθὸ οἱ Α ἐνταῦθα Μ
(b) πειν] ποιεῖν ΕΡ*, corr. Ρ² τῶν δὲ (γεωργῶν) Thierfelder καὶ γὰρ καὶ] καὶ γὰρ Ρ
In the (a) version the *scholasticus* asks if the water is good. For ἂν we should expect ἐστὶ, or an ellipse of ἐστὶ: hence [ἂν] bracketed in the forthcoming Teubner text. In the (b) version something different is said: the man asks to drink water if it is good, the “if” being this time not interrogative but conditional. Here ἂν so far from being either superfluous or incorrect in tense, is positively welcome, and is easily supplied before ἕν. The waters are, however, muddied again by the λέγοντος ὅτι ὁμ ἄν δικαίων πρόβατα σφάζεσθαι discussed below on 129.

The joke hinges on ἐσωλον, and the word order καλὴν ὅρνιν ἐσωλον σιτευτὴν ἐδείηνησε, proselθῶν τοῦ σιτευταρίων ἔλεγεν. ἑσωλον μοι ὅρνιν θὸσον.

The *scholasticus* did not see an athlete having been beaten (aorist) and crying (present), but a defeated athlete crying. Delete καί. As close as 64 we shall find an intrusive δὲ, and at 107 and 214 Eberhard plausibly deletes another καί ostensibly linking two participles. See also below on 81 and 111.

Eberhard felt that ἄτοπον requires a noun or pronoun to agree with, and suggested ἄτοπον (τι), which nicely foreshadows τι τῶν συνεκτικῶν λέγω; δικὴν ὑπὲρ Minas: διαθήκην ὑπὸ AM

Eberhard felt that ἄτοπον requires a noun or pronoun to agree with, and suggested ἄτοπον (τι), which nicely foreshadows τι τῶν συνεκτικῶν. But palaeographically easier, and with no loss of style, would be ὅτι (τι) ἄτοπον. The evidence,
however, of Kühner–Gerth I 268 should make us stay our hand.

69 ΑΜ Σχολαστικός ὑποθανόντος συμφοιτητοῦ ἐπεσκέπτετο τοὺς γονέας, τοῦ δὲ πατρὸς αὐτοῦ ὀδυρομένου καὶ λέγοντος: Τέκνον, ἦπορησόμενε με....

*Prima facie* this would mean that the *scholasticus*, on the death of his companion, visited his own parents. αὐτοῦ should follow or precede τοὺς γονέας, and be omitted after πατρός. The error may well have been facilitated by 70: Σχολαστικός νοσοῦντα φίλον ἀπῆλθεν ἐπισκέψασθαι. τῆς γυναικὸς δ’ αὐτοῦ εἰπόνησης....

71 Α Σχολαστικός ὑπόδειγμα λαβὼν μήκους καὶ πλάτους ἐπὶ τοῦ ἀκρόπτυχα ἐισκοίμισαι, ζητήσαι ἐπινυκάνετο ποῖον ἔστι τὸ μήκος καὶ ποιὼν τὸ πλάτος.

Thierfelder accepts Eberhard’s version of ἀκρόπτυχα as “genus quoddam amiculi vel lintei in mensa ponendi,” but confesses that the ἀκρο- part of the word remains baffling. But ἄβρο- would not be. In what follows Thierfelder deletes ζητήσαι as a gloss on εἰσκοίμισαι. But it is εἰσκοίμισαι that is inexplicable. It must either be ejected, or another word found, which could reasonably be glossed by ζητήσαι. Such a word does not immediately come to mind, but since the joke is concerned with matching dimensions we may wonder if the εἰς- may not conceal part of ἴσος: e.g. ἴσα κοίμισασθαι, or ἴσην if ἄβροπτυχα is a feminine singular.

74 Α Σχολαστικών λεπτὸν ὑπὸν ἔχοντι προσελθὼν τις ὁ ὑπος σου, ἐφη, εἰς Αἴδου ὄρατι, καὶ ο Σχολαστικός: Κάγῳ βλέπω.

It is not just symmetry that suggests εἰς Αἴδου βλέπει. The figurative use of βλέπω preponderates in such expressions of how some one or some thing looks: *cf.* LSJ s.v. βλέπω II with its entry s.v. ὄραω I.5.

81 ΑΜ Σχολαστικός ἐν πλοίῳ χειμαζομένων καὶ κλαιόντων τῶν συμπλεόντων, Τὶ γὰρ, ἐφη, μικρολόγιοι ἔστε; ἐγὼ δὲ δέκα Ἀττικὰς πλείωνας δίδους κινδύνωι τοῦ κυβερνήτου πλέω. κλαιόντων Α: συμπλεόντων Α: ἐν τῶι πλοίοι Μ ἔσται Μ δίδοις Thierfelder: δοὺς ΑΜ κυβερνήτου ΑΜ: corr. Minas

The sense can hardly be “said on a ship,” or “his fellow sailors storm-tossed and crying on a ship” as if the *scholasticus* were himself somehow exempt from the storm. Read χειμαζομένωι and compare the first sentence of 80: Σχολαστικὸς πλεόντος ἐκινδύνευεν ὕπο χειμῶνος τὸ πλοῖον. The *scholasticus* finds
R. D. DAWE

εκινδύνευεν ὑπὸ χειμώνος τὸ πλοῖον. The scholasticus finds himself on a storm-tossed ship, and with his fellow-sailors crying. It is possible, but not necessary, to delete the καὶ before κλαμώτων as a connective wrongly introduced after the corruption to χειμαζομένων.

96 AM Δύο σχολαστικοὶ δειλοὶ, οὗ μὲν ἔκρυψεν εἰς φρέαρ αὐτόν, οὔ δὲ εἰς καλαμῶνα. χαλασάντων οὖν κράνος τῶν στρατιωτῶν ἐπὶ τὸ ὕδωρ ἀρύσασθαι, νομίζας στρατιῶτην κατιέναι ἱκετεύων ἐλήφθη. ὡς δὲ ἔφασαν οἱ στρατιώται ὅτι εἰ ἐσιώπησα, παρῆλθον ἄν αὐτόν, ὃ ἐν τοῖς καλαμῶνι κρυφόμενοις ὦκου, εἴπεν, ἐμὲ παρέλθατε· σιωπῶ γάρ.

δόα ομ. Μ ιαυτόν Μ εἰ ομ. Μ ὃ δὲ ἐν Μ

Minas’ text begins with the word order Σχολαστικοὶ δύο δειλοὶ. This may well be right: it is the uniform practice elsewhere in Philogelos to put δύο after the initial noun: see nos. 13, 20, 39, 152, 178, 211.

What makes the two cowards hide themselves, and who are “the soldiers”? Something must have fallen out of the text: e.g. δύο σχολαστικοὶ δειλοὶ (ἦδιώκοντο ὑπὸ πολέμιων, καὶ) ὁ μὲν.... Later in the story the participle νομίζας has no point of attachment. We need ὃ μὲν ἔτερος νομίζας, where ὁ μὲν is contrasted with ὃ ἐν τοῖς καλαμῶνι κρυφόμενοις.

96 bis A Σχολαστικός ἐπὶ δεῖπνον κληθεῖς οὐκ ἦσθεν. ἐρομένου οὖν τινὸς τῶν κεκλήμενων διὰ τί οὐκ ἔσθιοι, ὃ δὲ "Ἰνα μὴ τὸν φαγεῖν ἕνεκα δόξον παρεῖναι.

There can be occasions when the omission of a verb of saying, as in 3 or 22 for example, can be stylish. This does not seem to be one of them, and comparison with the very similar 32 διὰ τί οὐκ ἐσθίεις; ἔφη Ἰνα μὴ suggests we either replace ὃ δὲ by ἔφη or else—a more gentle remedy—insert ἔφη after μὴ.

99 AM Σχολαστικός τις λέγει Χρῆσόν μοι βίρρον μέχρις ἄγρου. ὃ δὲ Μέχρι σφυροῦ, εἴπεν, ἔχω· μέχρι δὲ ἄγρου οὐκ ἔχω.

Σχολαστικός Μ βίρρον Α: μέχριν Μ

Will anyone dispute that this joke would end much more pungently without the repetition of ἔχω? viz. μέχρι δὲ ἄγρου οὖ. The question is similar to the one posed of τὸ βαλανεῖον in 23 above.

107 AM Ἀλλος ὥμοιος μεγαλαυχομένους, τελείως δὲ πενητεύων [καὶ] κατὰ τύχην νοσήσας, τῆς δὲ φίλης αὐτῶν αἰφνίδιον ἐπεισελθούσης καὶ εὐρούς ὅτι αὐτῶν ἐπὶ ψιάθου
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The grammar of οἱ καλοὶ ἱατροὶ καὶ δόκιμοι τῆς πόλεως is bizarre. Straightforward would be οἱ καλοὶ ἱατροὶ καὶ (οἱ) δόκιμοι τῆς πόλεως. True, the text says only the doctors were blamed. But the anecdote is about a μεγαλαυχούμενος, who might well wish to boast about his important connections.

"One is asleep and one is standing." So Eberhard’s explanation in his apparatus, but he writes (76): “įσταται vix ac ne vix quidem sanum est; expectem ἐστιτάται, κείμενα vel tale quid.” "Mir unklar der Grund seiner Bedenken," says Thierfelder, but the feebleness of ‘one is standing’ speaks for itself. ἐστιτάται is clever, but the story is likely to be couched in terms whereby the παῖς is excusing himself for not being on watch, not confessing that something terminal has happened to half the "flock." I suggest τὸ μὲν καθεύδει, τὸ δὲ ἔφτισταται. One is asleep, the other is <doing what I ought to be doing, viz.> watching over him. Cf. Ar. Vesp. 955 ὅσος τε πολλοὶ προβατίοις ἐφεστάναι. Only these προβάτια are not πολλά.

Who are οἱ at the beginning of the second sentence? "The citizens of Abdera" will be the reply. But this is as awkward as saying “In London a horse ran amok, and they came together.” Secondly, what is the point of “they came together and sent for...”? Doubtless people might cluster round, but what does “coming together” actually do in the telling of the story, and why does it appear to stand on the same plane as “sending for”? All difficulties disappear if we consider what sort of people would naturally be in a gymnasium, and read οἱ δὲ συνάθλούντες [καὶ] μεταπεμψάμενοι.
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115 AM Ἀβδηρίτης εὐνούχον ἰδὼν γυναικὶ ὁμιλοῦντα ἡρώτα ἄλλον εἰ ἄρα γυνῆ αὐτοῦ ἔστι, τοῦ δὲ εἰπόντος εὐνούχον γυναῖκα ἔχειν μὴ δύνασθαι ἔσθη. Οὐκοῦν θυγάτηρ αὐτοῦ ἔστιν.

προσομιλοῦντα M θυγάτηρ om. M

The Abderite infers that the woman might be the eunuch’s daughter. Why? She could be any one. What we need is a second question, indicating that the Abderite has failed to grasp the full significance of the answer he has just been given: “Is she then his daughter?”

123 Ἀβδηρίτης τὸν πατέρα τελευτήσαντα κατὰ τὸν νόμον καύσας δραμὼν εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν πρὸς τὴν μητέρα αὐτοῦ νοσοῦσαν εἶπεν: Ὅλιγα ἔτι περιττεύει ξύλα· εάν οὖν βούλησατε καὶ δύνασσατε, τοῖς αὐτοῖς κατακαθισθῆτι.

τόμων Minas: ὁμον A

A strange invitation to a sick woman: “If you are willing and able, get burnt up.” The only reason why the woman might consent to be burnt is that in this way she might put an end once and for all to her pain. But we have heard nothing about her pain. We need some such reference. For βούλησατε καὶ δύνασσατε ἐπὶ (or μηκέτι) ὁδυνάσθαι.

129 Σιδόνιος ῥήτωρ μετὰ δύο ἐπαίρων διελέγετο. τοῦ δὲ ἐνὸς λέγοντος ὅτι οὐκ ἦν δίκαιον πρόβατα σφάζεσθαι διὰ τὸ φέρειν γάλα καὶ ἔριον, καὶ τοῦ ἄλλου εἰπόντος ὅτι μηδὲ βοῦν (προσήκει) ἀναιρεῖσθαι γάλα παρέχουσαν καὶ ἀροτριῶσαν, ὁ ῥήτωρ ἐσθι ἐνδὲ χοίρων εἶναι δίκαιον σφάζεσθαι ἤπερ παρέχοντα καὶ σύμπαρ καὶ νηφρία.

(προσήκει) Eberhard γάλα παρέχοντα καὶ ἀροτριῶντα A: corr. Boissonade ἤπερ παρέχουσαν Boissonade

(προσήκει) Eberhard, which Thierfelder would like to alter to προσέφηκεν. But it would be more rational to change οὐκ ἦν δίκαιον to οὐκ ἔστι δίκαιον. The present tense is what is offered in the closely similar version that appears as 103, itself the source of Eberhard’s supplement.

132 AM Σιδόνιος πραγματευτὴς μετὰ ἐτέρου ὠδευ. τῆς δὲ γαστρὸς ἀναγκαζόμενης μικρὸν ἀπολειψθῆναι προσαπέμειν. ὁ δὲ συνοδούσιος ἀρήκεν αὐτῶν, γράφως ἐν τινὶ [κόινῳ] τῶν μιλίων· Τάχυνον, φθάσαν με. ὁ δὲ, ὡς ἀνέγιν ἐπέγραφε κατωθεν· Καὶ αὐτὸς μείναν με.

ἀπολιπθῆναι M τινὶ] τῇ M [κόινοι] Eberhard προσθασον M μείνων με A: μείνομεν M
Travelling with “another,” or travelling with a friend, ἔταιρον? In many of these entries in Philogelos the tale is told of X and an ἐταιρός, though once (39b) it is necessary to make the reverse emendation from ἐταιρός to ἔτερος. Here the nature of the story itself, and the use of συνοδοιπόρος (“travelling companion”) favours something more intimate than the bare “another.”

προσαπέμεινεν is an unbelievable compound. πρὸς(ω) ἀπέμεινεν seems an inoffensive solution.

136 Α. Σιδόνιος γραμματικὸς ἡράτα τὸν διδάσκαλον. Ἡ πεντακότυλος λήκυθος πόσον χωρεῖ; ὁ δὲ· Ὅινον λέγεις ἢ ἐλαιόν;

πεντακόντυλος Α: corr. Minas

In these stories it is the Sidonian who is stupid. Equally at 140, 196, and 197 it is the γραμματικὸς who is the butt of the joke. A stupid pupil is not funny: a stupid master is. It follows that the answer Ὅινον λέγεις ἢ ἐλαιόν; is spoken by the Sidonian schoolmaster. Thierfelder’s diagnosis διδάσκαλον] μαθητήν vid. opus esse is then unlikely to be correct, likewise Cataudella’s διδασκόμενον. We shall have to recast the sentence more drastically. Σιδόνιον γραμματικὸν ἡρώτα ὁ διδασκόμενος is only one of any number of possibilities. It will be noted that in the similar 92 the question Ἡ πεντακότυλος λήκυθος πόσον χωρεῖ; is in the same way addressed to the more authoritative figure, there the father of the scholasticus.

137 Μ. Σιδόνιωι μηγείρῳ λέγει τις· Δάνεισον μοι μάχαιραν ἐως Σμύρνης. ὁ δὲ ἔφη· Ὄυκ ἔχω μάχαιραν ἐὼς ἕκει φθάζουσαν.

μάχαερος Μ

The request made to the cook rather presupposes a condition not mentioned in the joke. Something like (ἐν τῶν αὐτῶι πλοίωι πορευόμενοι) may have fallen out after τις.

150 Α. Εὐτράπελος δύο ξύστρων παρ’ αὐτοῦ ἐν βαλανείω ἐπιζητούμενων, ὑπὸ ἐνός μὲν ἀγνωρίστου, ὑπὸ δὲ ἔτερου γνωρίμου μὲν ἀλλὰ κλέπτου, ὁ εὐτράπελος ἔφη· Σὲ μὲν (μή) γνωρίζων οὐ δώσω· σὲ δὲ [μή] γνωρίζων οὐ δώσω.

(μή) et [μή] Thierfelder

Thierfelder rightly finds the anecdote clumsily written. He has vastly improved the point of the story by moving μή from the second to the first γνωρίζων. But in addition ὁ εὐτράπελος in front of ἔφη needs to be deleted, or more likely replaced by a
resumptive ὃ δὲ such as we find in nos. 67, 196, 225. We are left with the inept beginning. "Zwei Leute wollten sich von ihm den Kamm leihen" is plainly the sense required, but on the face of it the text appears to be talking about two strigils. Possibly there has been a kind of semi-haplography taking place in an original ΑΥΤΟΥΠΙΔΑΥΟ, and we should read ξύστρον παρ’ αὐτόν ὑπὸ δύο ἐν βαλανεῖω ἐπίζητουμένων. We have to resist the temptation to write δύοιν, a form not found in Philogelos: see Thierfelder on 196. Whether the further alteration to ξύστρον ... ἐπίζητουμένου is called for is more disputable. The learned Thierfelder refers us to the plurality of strigils at Pers. 5.126 and Juv. 3.163.

151 bis (b) EV Εὐτράπελος ἰδῶν ιστρῶν νεανίδα ὑπαλείφοντα ὁραίαν ἐφί. Μὴ τὴν ψίνθ θεραπεύων τὸ βάθος φθείρης.

Thierfelder would like to add ὅφθαλμισσαν after νεανίδα. That damage has occurred seems likely from the anomalous position of ὁραίαν, which ought to be put in front of νεανίδα: the phonetic equivalence of αι and ε may explain the error arising from ὁραίαν νεαν-.

162 AM Κυμαῖών πολίν τειχιζόντων εἰς τῶν πολιτῶν Λολλιανῶς καλούμενος δύο κορτίνας ἰδίως ἐτείχισεν ἀναλώμασι. πολεμίων δὲ ἐπιστάντων ὄργισθέντες οἱ Κυμαῖοι συνεφώνησαν ἵνα τὸ Λολλιανὸν τείχος μηδεῖς φυλάξῃ ἄλλ᾽ ἐκεῖνος μόνος.

(tὴν) πόλιν Eberhard Λολλιανὸς Μ Λουλιάνον Μ φυλάξει Μ

The Cymaeans are angry, presumably with Lollianus. Thierfelder very reasonably asks, "Warum?" We need to be told, and a lacuna after ὄργισθέντες seems inescapable.

169 A ὁ αὐτὸς, τινὸς αὐτῶν εἰπόντος ὅτι Ἑσύλησάς με· Μὴ ὑποστρέψο (ἐίπεν) ἐνθὲν ἀπειμί, εἰ ἑσύλησα.

(ἐίπεν) Boissonade

The explanation of haplography recommends Boissonade’s εἰπεν rather than his alternative ἐφη, which Thierfelder strangely prefers. At the end ε ἑσύλησα or ε ἑσύλησα (σε) is what we might expect to see.

176 A Κυμαῖος ιστρὸς ἀπεγνωσμένον ἀρρωστόν ἐνημάτισεν, ἐκέλευσε δὲ τὰ ἐκκεχωρισμένα ἑδέν. τοῦ δὲ δειξαντος καὶ εἰπόντος ὅτι ἀπέθανεν, ὁ ιστρὸς μεθ’ ὅρκου ἀπεκρίνατο. Ὁδός, εἰ μὴ ἐκλύσθη, ἐλάκτισεν ἀν.

Who is τοῦ at the start of the second sentence? There must be an antecedent, e.g. (θεράπωντα) after ἐκέλευσε δὲ. Eberhard's ἐκκεχωρισμένα has been called "fraglich," but the parallel of Arist. Hist.An. 551a7 is a good one, even if it does rest on a conjecture by Dittmeyer, for τὰ μὲν ἐκκεχωρισμένων there would form a perfect contrast with τὰ δὲ ἐτί δόντων ἐν τοῖς ζώοις.

If the meaning is "not from his own but from the other one," the text is not to be altered. But since ἐτέρος ... ἐτέρων has so far referred to the Cymaeans, we should perhaps read "not from his own, but from the other fellow's," i.e., ἀλλ' ἐκ (τοῦ) τοῦ ἐτέρου. τοῖς ἀλλήλων seems to support this suggestion.

There seems to be no point in this story. "Wären wir etwa dumm, wenn wir in Zukunft auch nicht kämen" (Thierfelder) is meaningless, and in any case where is the Greek equivalent of "waren wir?" There must be a lacuna, e.g. (φανείσθε), after ἐφασαν. "Won't you look stupid if in future we too don't turn up?"

Poured water in to see when it would come streaming out? Stop-watch in hand? And why the corruption from πότε or ὅποτε to τὸ πότε? A more obvious experiment would be to see whether liquid poured into the mouth would come streaming out of the hole made by surgery. Read ἵνα ἴδη (ei) διὰ τοῦ χειρουργηθέντος τὸ πότε ἐκρέουσε. The omission of (ei) after ἴδη and before διὰ is even easier than its necessary insertion after ἐρωτηθεῖς (Eberhard) in 250, and gives a more plausible word order than that scholar's (ei) πότ' here. χειρουργηθέντος
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urgently needs a noun to go with it if it is not to yield the vapid sense "through the person operated on." For τόπος referring to a part of the body see 217 and LSJ s.v. I.3.

190 (a) A Δυσκόλοι ταυλίζοντας κατεπέτασε τις ἀργος καθήμενος, ἀ δεθυμούμενος ἤρωτησεν αὐτὸν. Ποίας τέχνης; καὶ διά τὶ ἀργεῖς; κ.π.τ.

κατεπέτασε Α: corr. Minas

The genitive ποίας τέχνης without so much as an εἶ is inexplicable. The (b) version offers the unobjectionable ἤρωτησεν εἰ τέχνην οἶδεν. We either need a word that will fulfil the same function as οἶδεν but explain both the genitive case and the reason, e.g. haplography, for its own omission: e.g. ποίας (ἐπαίεις) τέχνης; or else, less adventurously, with the (b) version as our guide, we should write ποίαν οἶδεν τέχνην;

194 (a) Δύσκολος σκάλαν καταβαίνων σφαλείς κατέπεσε. τοῦ δὲ οἰκουροῦ εἰπόντος Τίς ἐνὶ ἐκεῖ; ἀπεκρίνατο: Ἐγὼ ἐνοικίου μου ἑλάκησα. τί πρὸς σέ;

(b) ΕΥ Δύσκολος ἀπὸ σκάλας καταβαίνων ἔπεσε. τοῦ δὲ αὐθέντου εἰπόντος Ἐκεῖ τίς ἔπεσεν; ἔφη Ἐγὼ ἐνοικίου μου. τί πρὸς σέ;

(a) εἰπόντος οἰκουροῦ Α: ordinem corr. Boissonade (b) Δύσκολος τις Β

Thierfelder explains τοῦ ἐνοικίου as a genitive of price, keeping ἐνοικίον in its most common meaning "rent." "Wenn ich meine Miete bezahle, kann ich in meiner Wohnung machen, was ich will." But what we expect to see is simply "ich kann in meiner Wohnung machen, was ich will" without the "Wenn ich meine Miete bezahle," and that alleged genitive of price must be the strangest one ever to be so classified. We must assume the sense to be "I can do what I like inside my own house," and accept the admittedly rarer sense of ἐνοικίον as "dwelling." Read therefore ἐγὼ (ἐσω) τοῦ ἐνοικίου μου.

195 Δυσκόλοι τις συγκλητικῶι ἔλεγε: Μικρόν σε ποθῶ ἱδεῖν καὶ συντυχεῖν. ὃ δὲ ἀπεκρίνατο: Κἀγὼ σὲ ἱδεῖν θέλω τυφλὸν καὶ χόλον.

"I’d like to see you for a minute" or "I’d like to see you small." On that ambiguity rests the joke. It is ruined by the intrusion of καὶ συντυχεῖν, which has no counterpart in the reply and has all the hallmarks of an unimaginative gloss intended to explain that ἱδεῖν means "have an interview with."
201 A Ἀφεῖ μάντει προσελθών τις ἐξ ἀποδημίας ἄνιων ἠρώτα περὶ τῶν οἴκειαν. ὦ δὲ εἶπεν. Ὑγιαίνουσι πάντες, καί ὁ πατήρ σου. τοῦ δὲ εἰπόντος ὦτι 'Ὁ πατήρ μου δέκατον ἕτος ἔχει ἀρ' ὦν ἀπέβαλεν, ἀπεκρίνατο. Οὐδὲν γὰρ οἶδας τὸν κατὰ ἀλήθειαν σου πατέρα.

The last sentence poses problems. οὐδέν in a sentence with an accusative object is, as Thierfelder says, “ungewöhnlich,” and Minas’ οὐδὲ “not even” or “not ... either” only makes matters worse. The γὰρ is also not easily explicable except on the assumption that there is an ellipse of some such idea as <you say that, but are mistaken>. A more economical way to a mantic pronouncement would be οὐδέν ἃρ’ οἶδας κατὰ τὸν κατὰ ἀληθείαν σου πατέρα, the first κατὰ in the sense exemplified by LSJ s.v. B.IV.2.

205 Α Ἀφυῆς μάντις ἐμπεσὼν εἰς πολέμιον καὶ εἰπὼν ὅτι Μάντις εἴμι ... μελλούσης πρὸς ἀντίπαλον μάχης συνάπτεσθαι. Νικήσετε, εἰπε, τὸν πόλεμον ἕαν τὰς ἐξοπισθέν τρίχας τῶν κεφαλῶν ὑμῶν ἐν τῇ παρατάξει τῆς μάχης μὴ βλέψωσιν.

lacunam indicavit Eberhard νικήσεσθε Α: corr. Boissonade ἐξοπίσθην Α ὑμῶν Minas: ἡμῶν Α βλέψωσιν Boissonade: κλέψωσιν Α

The construction νικήσετε τὸν πόλεμον is sufficiently abnormal for Haupt to conjecture τὸν πολέμιον, but a more plausible suggestion would be τὸν πολέμιον, notwithstanding the following plurals. Such a familiar use hardly needs illustrating, but ὅμω τῶν Πέρσων (“with the Persians”) at Hdt. 6.133 or τῶν ἑκατόρφων (“the foreigners”) 9.9.2 may stand for countless formal parallels. For an identical πολέμιον (Haase for πόλεμον mss.) see Thuc. 2.36.4.

209 Α Δειλὸς πῦκτης συνεχῶς ὑπὸ ἀντιδίκου χοσκινζόμενος ἀνεβόθησε. Δέομαι ὑμῖν ἅμα πᾶσιν.

In the similar 218 the last words are δέομαι ὑμῖν, μὴ πάντες ὑμοῦ, which Minas adopted for 209 also. But A’s version could point to something else: δέομαι ὑμῖν, (μή) ἅμα παύσειν “do not hit me all at once.” For the future infinitive after δέομαι see Thuc. 1.27 (with an eye on the apparatus criticus).

212 (a) Α Ὑκνηρῶι ύιῶι ἐκέλευσεν ὦ πατήρ εἰς τῶν γείτονα ἀπελθεῖν καὶ χρησασθαι ἄξιζην. ὦ δὲ ἔφη· Οὐ δίδει, τοῦ δὲ πατρὸς ἐπιμένοντος ἀπεκρίνατο· Ἐγὼ εἰμὶ ὁ γείτων καὶ ἄξιζην οὐκ ἔχω.
Thierfelder gives us a lacuna in (b), while conceding, as we all must, that the joke as it stands seems devoid of any merit. Although positing a lacuna is not in itself going to restore humour to a pointless story, we surely have to assume one in (a) after ἐπιμένοντος to give ἀπεκρίνατο something to latch on to, a second urging from the father: e.g. (καὶ αὐθίς τὸ αὐτὸ κελεύοντος), eliciting the not very funny reply: “I am the one next to you; I haven’t got an axe.”

216 Α Φθονερὸς ἵδων τὸν γείτονα θηριομαχοῦντα λέγει τῷ κυβερνητῇ: Ἀρκος.

Αρκος can stand for ἀρκτος, on the evidence of Anth. Pal. 11. 231, and some suppose that the jealous neighbour is calling for a bear to be produced, since this was a notoriously dangerous animal. There would be marginally more humour in the story if the cry were for the neighbour who is fighting to be left without any kind of protection. The verdict of Boissonade “narratio lacuna laborare videtur. Quod superest non potest intelligi” leads me suggest (.....) ἀρκυς, the missing verb containing the suggestion that the neighbour’s only protection be removed. The reference is to a retiarius; reference to a secutor is made in no. 87.

217 Α “Ἀλλος διὰ δειλίαν ἐπέγραψεν ἐπὶ τοῦ μετώπου: Ὁ τόπος τῶν κατριῶν. παῖόμενος οὖν συνεχῶς εἶπε πρὸς τὸν παῖόντα: Μή τι οὕτως γράμματα οὐκ οἶδεν καὶ ἀναιρεῖ με;

παῖόντα cannot be sound, since the appeal is made to a third party. Thierfelder boldly alters τὸν παῖόντα to τοὺς παρόντας. But if ancient practice in any way resembled modern, the appeal would be made to a referee, who would have the power to step in to end the fight, in short τὸν παῖόντα. The referee’s rôle in governing the conditions of the fight would be analogous to that of the κυβερνήτης in the preceding anecdote.

222 Α Λιμόξηρον ἄρρωστον ἵατρός ἐπισκευάμενος ἐκέλευσεν ἁλῆκα αὐτώι εἰς πόμα γενέσθαι: εἰ δὲ μὴ εὔροι ἁλῆκα, ποιήσαι αὐτῷ ὁμοίως τράγον. ὃ δὲ λιμόξηρος ἔφη: Ἐάν μὴ εὔρω τράγον, φάγω δύο ἔρημια.
The first instruction ἄληκα αὐτῶι εἰς πόμα γενέσθαι prescribes the diet. Thereafter the joke proceeds as if directions are given directly to the sick man, εὑροι, ἔφη, εὗρω and φάγω all being indicators of this. It follows that ποίησαι αὐτῶι should be ποίησαι ἑαυτῶι (or αὐτῶι). The final words perhaps should be punctuated as a naïve question.

224 AC ... ως δε εἶδεν εἰς ὑψος σαλεύοντα τοὺς κλάδους καὶ ἐσθίοντα, ἄγανακτήσας εἶπε. Κάτω ἐστός οὐκ ἡδύνω ἐκ τῶν ἐπικειμένων κλάδων φαγεῖν; ὁ δὲ ἀπεκρίνατο· Ἕκείνα ὡς καταβαίνω· τρόφῳ.

ηδύνω C τῶν ἄνω ἐπικειμένων C ἀπεκρίνατο Α: εἰςεν C

ἐπικειμένων may be right: "plastisch-übertriebend: die, den Untenstehenden gewissermassen auf die Schulter reichen." That this is not entirely obvious is evident from the interpolation in C, τῶν ἄνω ἐπικειμένων. There must be at least some possibility that the original was ὑποκειμένων.

229 (a) Α Μέθυσος ἀτυχῆς ἀμπελῶνα κτησάμενος τοῖ τρυγητῶι ἀπέθανεν.

(b) ΕV Ἀτυχῆς μέθυσος ἀμπελῶνα κληρονομήσας ἐν καιρῷ τοῦ τρυγητοῦ ἀπέθανεν.

In the (b) version the point of the story emerges more clearly: ἐν καιρῷ τοῦ τρυγητοῦ τοῦ τρυγητῶι ἀπέθανεν gives us an unqualified temporal dative, which takes some effort of will to accept: "ohne Attribut selten und vorwiegend dichterisch" says K.-G. (I.445.2). (盦μα) τοῦ τρυγητῶι would give a smooth text, but (盦μα) ἀμπελῶνα κτησάμενος [τοῦ τρυγητοῦ] ἀπέθανεν would be more pungent: the unfortunate alcoholic on acquiring a vineyard promptly died.

237 Α Ὀζόστοις λουκάνικον ὁπτῶι καὶ πολὺ προσφυσῶν κυνέαν αὐτῷ ἀπειργάσατο. αὐτὸς συνεχῶς βδέων οὐκ ἐπιστεύετο.

λουκάνικον ὁπτῶι Α: corr. Boissonade κυνέαν Α

van Thiel (Hermes 100 [1972] 509) has cracked the main difficulty by citing the parallel Mart. 3.17. He argues convincingly that κυνέαν ("merda") is not to be tampered with. But then he goes on to suggest that what follows ἀπειργάσατο should be deleted as a mistaken addition intended to bring this story into line with items like 233, 240, and 241, which dwell on confusion
over the orifice emitting the smell. I believe this diagnosis is close to the truth, but that the cure slightly different. Granted there is no contrast between the sausage and the man ‘himself’, we may prefer to consider what van Thiel deletes to be a separate story told of (ὁ) αὐτός, the same man. We find this same ὁ αὐτός introduction in 73, 84, and 169. There remains the question of whether the words are correctly transmitted. As they stand, they would most naturally mean “he was not believed to be continually breaking wind.” It might be more prudent to be explicit: (ὁ αὐτός) συνεχῶς βδέων (βδείν) οὐκ ἐπιστεύετο.

243 ΑΔ Λειξουρος εἰς τρύγην ὑπὸ φίλου κληθείς καὶ ἀπλήστας φαγὼν σύκα καὶ σταφυλᾶς, ὑπὸ τῆς γαστρός αὐτοῦ νυσθείς ἐδοξέν ὠρᾶν,... ὅ δὲ πρὸς αὐτὸν ἁναβλέγας εἶπε· Πάλιν μοι θέλεις ἐμπαίξαι, ἵνα ἀπὸ τῆς συκῆς ἄνωθεν δόξας χέζειν τὰ στρώματα ἔρημώσω κ.τ.έ.

ἀνωθεν post χέζειν collocat C

ἐδοξέν ὠρᾶν leads into a dream. We expect therefore some reference to night-time. (τῇ νυκτὶ) is inserted by Thierfelder after σταφυλᾶς, but a more plausible place for it would be before νυσθείς. In the second excerpt printed above from this unusually long anecdote the meaning of τὰ στρώματα ἔρημώσω has to be “dirty the bedclothes.” ῥυπώσω, conjectured by Eberhard, is accepted by Thierfelder, but the change is a violent one. Unlikely as it may seem, ἔρημώσω can give the desired sense, if we may trust Ephraem Syrus I 205b: ἔπεσεν ἐν πηλῷ καὶ τὴν ἔξαλλον στολὴν παντοῖος ἠρήμωσεν. In Migne (PG LXV 301A) we shall find ἔδω ἠρήμωται used of food that has spoiled—a translation that will fit all three passages.

245 (a) ΑΔ Νεανίσκος γραίας δύο καπρώσας ἐκάλεσε, πρὸς δὲ τούς οἰκείους διακόνους ἔφη· Τὴν μίαν κεράσατε, τὴν δὲ θέλουσαν ἄφροδισιάσαστε. αἱ δὲ ὑπὶ ἐκποιοῦν ἦμεις οὐ διψόμεν.

δύο γραίας γαυρώσας C τὴν μὲν μίαν κυράσατε C

For τοὺς οἰκείους διακόνους the (b) version has simply τοὺς παῖδας αὐτοῦ. διάκόνος is not found elsewhere in Philogelos, and διακόνους may be a gloss on οἰκείους, a word as ambiguous as παῖδας, intended to make it clear that servants, not family members (as in 201), are meant. Where at 123 a σοφιστῆς speaks πρὸς τοὺς ἰδίους οἰκέτας, there is presumably differentiation from bath attendants.
The mistress of the household sees her slave in a state of sexual arousal. Thierfelder is much exercised by €mpavan, but all problems over this word would disappear if the kai is placed in front of €mpavan rather than after it. The servant is visibly excited. Later in the story we must assume the loss of some words explaining how and when δ δεσπότης came on the scene, and posit a lacuna after αυτή. Just before then οὐκεκακάθεν needs more than division into οὐκεκακάθεν if it is to yield an intelligible sense, but οὐκεκακάθεν would do no violence to the Greek language. In the course of flirting the slave realises who the masked figure is, and has intercourse with her.  
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