

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 rôle 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 Σχολαστικὸς ἰδὼν τὸν κατὰ συνήθειαν αὐτοῦ ἱατρὸν ἐρχόμενον περιεστέλλετο αὐτῷ ὄφθῆναι. ἐπερωτηθεὶς δὲ παρὰ τινος αὐτοῦ ἐταίρου, διὰ τί αὐτὸ ποιεῖ, ἀπεκρίθη· Πολὺς χρόνος ἐστὶν ἀφ' οὗ οὐκ ἐνόσησα, καὶ ἐντρέπομαι αὐτόν.

ἱατρὸν A αὐτὸ] τοῦτο Minas

περιεστέλλειν ("bedecken") gives roughly the necessary idea, but, as Thierfelder notes, the following infinitive ὄφθῆναι reads strangely without μή. But there is a simple remedy that obviates such solutions as Boissonade's ὑποστέλλετο, namely to insert (τό) after περιεστέλλετο. For the construction compare Clem. Al. *Strom.*, PG VIII 1285B: οὗτος δ' ἂν εἴη ὁ μὴ περιεστέλλομενος τὸν διωγμὸν.

¹ B. E. Perry, *Classical Studies in Honor of W. A. Oldfather* (Urbana 1945–46) 157–166; G. Ritter, *Studien zur Sprache des Philogelos* (Zürich 1955).

8 AM + EPV Σχολαστικὸς θέλων πιάσαι μὲν συνεχῶς τὰ βιβλία αὐτοῦ τρώγοντα κρέας δακῶν ἐν τῆι σκοταίαι ἐκάθισεν.

θέλων πιάσαι μὲν AM: μὲν ἐθέλων (θέλων V) πιάσαι EPV συνεχῶς] τὸν AM ἐν τῆι] ἐν EPV σκοταίαι M ἐκάθητο AM

The variation of word order is best explained on the supposition that μὲν 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 μὲν 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 τὸν ὄνον διδάξαι) 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 δακεῖν, 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.

23 AM Σχολαστικὸς κατὰ πρώτην ἄνοιξιν τοῦ βαλανείου εἰσελθὼν, καὶ μηδένα εὐρὼν ἔσω, λέγει πρὸς τὸν δοῦλον αὐτοῦ· Ἐξ ὧν βλέπω, μὴ οὐ λούει τὸ βαλανεῖον.

μηδ' ἓνα M μὴ del. Thierfelder λούει M post βαλανεῖον notam interrogationis M

The final τὸ βαλάνειον sounds superfluous, and comparison with 130, which ends καθὼς βλέπω, οὐ λούει, confirms this suspicion. ἤγουν μνημα in 26, and ἦτις τὴν σφαῖραν, deleted in 33 by Thierfelder, are other intrusions in the vicinity.

36 AM Σχολαστικὸς τῶν ἀπαντῶντων τὰ ἱμάτια ἐτιμᾶτο. τούτου δὲ τοῦ πατρὸς παρά τινων τοῦτο ἀκούσαντος καὶ ἐπιτιμῶντος αὐτῷ· Πάτερ, εἶπεν, ὑπὸ διαβολῆς πέπεισαι τοῦτο, καὶ ἴσως οὐδ' ὑπὸ ἀνθρώπου. τοῦ δὲ εἰπόντος· Ὁ δεινὰ μοι εἶρηκε, Καὶ σύ, ἔφησεν, ἐκείνῳ προσέχεις, ὃς οὐδὲ πενήτηκοντα δραχμῶν ἱμάτιον ἔχει;

τινων Α: τινος Μ πάτερ, εἶπεν Α: εἶπε, πάτερ Μ ἀνθρώπου Α:
ἄνου Μ ἐκείνῳ Α: ἐκεῖνο Μ

οὐδ' ὑπὸ ἀνθρώπου ("and perhaps not even by man") has elicited some contorted explanations from the commentators. Of our two manuscripts here, one, Μ, writes ἀνθρώπου as ἄνου, but without a line above it which would indicate a compendium was intended. Read ἔννου: the father's informant was either out to cause mischief, or was possibly crazy.

40 (a) ΑΜ Σχολαστικὸς μικρὸν υἱὸν ἀπολέσας, θεασάμενος πολλοὺς ἐπὶ τὸ κῆδος ἀπαντήσαντας διὰ τὴν ἀπουσίαν αὐτοῦ ἔλεγεν· Αἰδοῦμαι μικρὸν παιδίον εἰς τοσοῦτον ὄχλον ἐκφέρων.

ἀπωλέσας 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 ἀπουσίαν. ἐξουσίαν (Eberhard) and περιουσίαν (Boissonade) are both sensible, but so might the bare οὐσίαν be, "property." But the original text may once have been more explicit, with the adjective πλουσίαν, followed by a noun now lost.

43 ΑΜ Σχολαστικὸς ἀκούσας παρά τινων ὅτι Ὁ πάγων σου ἤδη ἔρχεται, ἀπελθὼν εἰς τὴν πύλην ἐξεδέχετο αὐτόν. ἕτερος δὲ τὴν πρόφασιν ἐρωτήσας καὶ γνούς· Εἰκότως, εἶπε, μωροὶ νομιζόμεθα· πόθεν γὰρ οἶδας εἰ διὰ τῆς ἐτέρας πύλης ἔρχεται;

ἐτέρου ... 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 εἶη) and, if I am right in suggesting it, another (ἄν) εἶη just two items before, at 26. Boissonade rightly compared δικαίως μωροὶ καλούμεθα (15) and μωρός εἰμι (52).

47 ΑΜ Σχολαστικὸς διὰ χρόνου εἰς τὸν ἀγρὸν παραγενόμενος ἐθεάσατο τὰ θρέμματα ἐξιόντα ἐπὶ βόσκησιν. καὶ ὡς εἶπτε

βληχόμενα ἰδὼν ἡρώτα τὴν αἰτίαν. τοῦ δὲ οἰκονόμου προσπαίξαντος καὶ εἰπόντος Ἀσπάζονται σε, Τὴν ἐμήν σοι σωτηρίαν, φησὶν, ἐμοῦ ἕνεκα ἀργίαν αὐτοῖς δὸς καὶ τρεῖς ἡμέρας μὴ ἐξαγάγεις αὐτὰ εἰς νομήν.

χρόνον M βληχόμενα A: γλυκόμενα M σοι om. M^α, add. M¹ ἀργίαν in ras. scr. M¹ αὐτῇ δὸς M ἐξαγάγεις M

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 Carpasianus, *Cant.* 206 has καθάπερ γλυκύνεσθαι 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 προσπαίζοντος.

48 AM Σχολαστικός καινὰ ὑποδήματα ὑπεδήσατο. τριζόντων οὖν αὐτῶν ἐπισχῶν Μὴ τρίζετε, εἶπεν, ἐπεὶ τὰ σκέλη ἡμῶν κλάσητε†.

κενᾶ M ὑποδήσατο M οὖν αὐτῶν in ras. scr. M¹ τρίζεται AM: corr. Minas ἡμῶν M: ὑμῶν A

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

51 (a) AM Σχολαστικός ἰδὼν ἐν τῷ ἀγρῷ αὐτοῦ φρέαρ βαθὺ ἡρώτα εἰ καλὸν ἦν τὸ ὕδωρ. τῶν δὲ γεωργῶν εἰπόντων ὅτι Καλόν· καὶ γὰρ οἱ γονεῖς σου ἐντεῦθεν ἔπινον, Καὶ πηλίκους, φησὶν, εἶχον τραχήλους ὅτι εἰς τοσοῦτον βάθος πίνειν ἠδύναντο;

(b) EPV Σχολαστικός ἐν τῷ ἰδίῳ ἀγρῷ ἐξῶν ἡρώτα πιεῖν ὕδωρ, εἰ καλὸν ἐν τῷ αὐτόθι φρέατι. τῶν δὲ φησάντων ὅτι Καλόν· καὶ γὰρ καὶ οἱ γονεῖς σου ἐξ αὐτοῦ ἔπινον, Καὶ πηλίκους, ἔφη, εἶχον τραχήλους ἵνα ἀπὸ τοσοῦτου βάθους πίνειν ἠδύναντο;

(a) βαθὺ om. A ἐνταῦθα M

(b) πιεῖν] ποιεῖν EP^α, corr. P² τῶν δὲ (γεωργῶν) Thierfelder καὶ γὰρ καὶ] καὶ γὰρ P

In the (a) version the *scholasticus* asks if the water is good. For ἦν we should expect ἐστί, or an ellipse of ἐστί: hence [ἦν] 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 ἦν so far from being either superfluous or incorrect in tense, is positively welcome, and is easily supplied before ἐν. The waters are, however, muddied again by the λέγοντος ὅτι οὐκ ἦν δίκαιον πρόβατα σφάζεσθαι discussed below on 129.

59 AM Σχολαστικὸς ἀκούσας τινὸς ὅτι καλὴν ὄρνιν ἔωλον σιτευτὴν ἐδείπνησε, προσελθὼν τῷ σιτευταρίῳ ἔλεγεν· Ἐωλὸν μοι ὄρνιν θύσον.

σιτευτῶρι M

The joke hinges on ἔωλον, and the word order καλὴν ὄρνιν ἔωλον σιτευτὴν, adj. + noun + adj. + noun used adjectivally, putting the most important word in the least important position, is displeasing. Read ὅτι καλὴν ὄρνιν σιτευτὴν ἔωλον ἐδείπνησε, to make it clear that ἔωλον is not on the same plane as καλὴν, but describes the condition of the fine fattened bird when eaten.

62 A Σχολαστικὸς τῇ ἐτηρίδι, ἥ διὰ χιλίων ἐτῶν ἄγεται ἐν Ῥώμῃ, ἠττηθέντα ἀθλητὴν καὶ δακρύνοντα ἰδὼν, παραμυθούμενος Μὴ λυποῦ, ἔφη, τὴν γὰρ ἄλλην χιλιετηρίδα σὺ νικήσεις.

ἐταιρίδι A: corr. Minas

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 δέ, and at 107 and 214 Eberhard plausibly deletes another καί ostensibly linking two participles. See also below on 81 and 111.

68 AM Σχολαστικὸς γράψας δίκην ὑπὲρ τινος, δημοσίᾳ προανεγίνωσκε. τοῦ δὲ συνηγορουμένου εἰπόντος ὅτι ἄτοπον ποιεῖ, τὰ ἀπόρητα τῆς δίκης τοῖς ἀντιδίκους φανερὰ ποιῶν, Κάθαρχα, εἶπε, μὴ γάρ τι τῶν συνεκτικῶν λέγοι;

δίκην ὑπὲρ Minas: διαθήκην ὑπό AM

Eberhard felt that ἄτοπον requires a noun or pronoun to agree with, and suggested ἄτοπόν (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 AM Σχολαστικός ἀποθανόντος συμφοιτητοῦ ἐπεσκέπτετο τοὺς γονέας. τοῦ δὲ πατρὸς αὐτοῦ ὀδυρομένου καὶ λέγοντος· Τέκνον, ἠπόρησάς 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 πατρὸς. The error may well have been facilitated by 70: Σχολαστικός νοσοῦντα φίλον ἀπῆλθεν ἐπισκέψασθαι. τῆς γυναικὸς δ' αὐτοῦ εἰπούσης....

71 A Σχολαστικός ὑπόδειγμα λαβὼν μήκους καὶ πλάτους ἐπὶ τῷ ἀκρόπτυχα εἰσκομίσαι, ζητῆσαι ἐπυνθάνετο ποῖόν ἐστι τὸ μήκος καὶ ποῖον 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 ζητῆσαι as a gloss on εἰσκομίσαι. But it is εἰσκομίσαι that is inexplicable. It must either be ejected, or another word found, which could reasonably be glossed by ζητῆσαι. 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 κομίσασθαι, or ἴσην if ἀβρόπτυχα is a feminine singular.

74 A Σχολαστικῶι λεπτὸν ἵππον ἔχοντι προσελθὼν τις Ὁ ἵππος σου, ἔφη, εἰς Αἴδου ὄραϊ. καὶ ὁ 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.* ὀράω I.5.

81 AM Σχολαστικός ἐν πλοίωι χειμαζομένων καὶ κλαιόντων τῶν συμπλεόντων, Τί γάρ, ἔφη, μικρολόγοι ἐστέ; ἐγὼ δὲ δέκα Ἀττικὰς πλείονας διδούς κινδύνωι τοῦ κυβερνήτου πλέω.

κλεόντων A συμπλεόντων A: ἐν τῷ πλοίωι M ἐσταί M διδούς Thierfelder: δούς AM κυβερνίτου AM: 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: Σχολαστικοῦ πλείοντος ἐκινδύνευεν ὑπὸ χειμῶνος τὸ πλοῖον. The *scholasticus* finds

ἐκινδύνευεν ὑπὸ χειμῶνος 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 καί before κλαιόντων as a connective wrongly introduced after the corruption to χειμαζομένων.

96 AM Δύο σχολαστικοὶ δειλοί, ὁ μὲν ἔκρυσεν εἰς φρέαρ αὐτόν, ὁ δὲ εἰς καλαμῶνα. χαλασάντων οὖν κράνος τῶν στρατιωτῶν ἐπὶ τὸ ὕδωρ ἀρύσασθαι, νομίσας στρατιώτην κατιέναι ἰκετεύων ἐλήφθη. ὡς δὲ ἔφασαν οἱ στρατιῶται ὅτι εἰ ἐσιώπησε, παρήλθον ἄν αὐτόν, ὁ ἐν τῷ καλαμῶνι κρυβόμενος Οὐκοῦν, εἶπεν, ἐμὲ παρέλθατε· σιωπῶ γάρ.

δύο om. M εαυτόν M εἰ om. M ὁ δὲ ἐν M

Minas' text begins with the word order Σχολαστικοὶ δύο δειλοί. 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 (ἐδιώκοντο ὑπὸ πολεμίων, καὶ) ὁ μὲν.... Later in the story the participle νομίσας has no point of attachment. We need (ὁ μὲν ἕτερος) νομίσας, where ὁ μὲν is contrasted with ὁ ἐν τῷ καλαμῶνι κρυβόμενος.

96 bis A Σχολαστικὸς ἐπὶ δεῖπνον κληθεὶς οὐκ ἤσθιεν. ἐρομένου οὖν τινος τῶν κεκλημένων διὰ τί οὐκ ἐσθίει, ὁ δὲ "Ἰνα μὴ τοῦ φαγεῖν ἔνεκα δόξω 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 ὁ δὲ by ἔφη or else—a more gentle remedy—insert (ἔφη) after μὴ.

99 AM Σχολαστικῶι τις λέγει Χρῆσόν μοι βίρρον μέχρις ἀγροῦ. ὁ δὲ Μέχρι σφυροῦ, εἶπεν, ἔχω· μέχρι δὲ ἀγροῦ οὐκ ἔχω.

Σχολαστικός M βίρρον A: μῦρον M

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

107 AM "Ἄλλος ὁμοίως μεγαλαυχούμενος, τελείως δὲ πενητεύων [καὶ] κατὰ τύχην νοσήσας, τῆς δὲ φίλης αὐτοῦ αἰφνίδιον ἐπεισελθούσης καὶ εὐρούσης αὐτόν ἐπὶ ψιάθου

κείμενον, ἐντραπείς ἠτιμᾶτο τοὺς ἰατροὺς λέγων· Οἱ καλοὶ ἰατροὶ καὶ δόκιμοι τῆς πόλεως ἐκέλευσάν με ψιαθισθῆναι.

τελείως τε A [καὶ] Eberhard αἰφνῆδριον M

The grammar of οἱ καλοὶ ἰατροὶ καὶ δόκιμοι τῆς πόλεως is bizarre. Straightforward would be οἱ καλοὶ ἰατροὶ 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.

108 AM Ἄλαζὼν ἐν ἀγορᾷ παῖδα ἑαυτοῦ θεασάμενος ἐκ τοῦ ἀγροῦ νεωστὶ ἐλληλυθότα εἶπε· Τί ποιούσι τὰ πρόβατα; ὁ δὲ εἶπε· Τὸ μὲν καθεύδει, τὸ δὲ ἴσταται.

τὰ μὲν ... τὰ δὲ M ἴστανται M

“One is asleep and one is standing.” So Eberhard’s explanation in his apparatus, but he writes (76): “ἴσταται vix ac ne vix quidem sanum est; expectem ἐστιᾶται, κείρεται vel tale quid.” “Mir unklar der Grund seiner Bedenken,” says Thierfelder, but the feebleness of ‘one is standing’ speaks for itself. ἐστιᾶται 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 <ἐφ>ίσταται. One is asleep, the other is <doing what I ought to be doing, viz.> watching over him. Cf. Ar. *Vesp.* 955 οἷός τε πολλοῖς προβατίοις ἐφροστᾶναι. Only these προβάτια are not πολλὰ.

111 AM Ἐν Ἀβδήροις ὄνος λαθὼν εἰς τὸ γυμνάσιον εἰσῆλθε καὶ τὸ ἔλαιον ἐξέχεεν. οἱ δὲ συνελθόντες καὶ μεταπεμψάμενοι πάντας τοὺς ἐν τῇ πόλει ὄνους καὶ εἰς ἓνα συναγαγόντες τόπον, πρὸς τὸ ἀσφαλίσασθαι ἐνώπιον αὐτῶν τὸν ὄνον ἐμαστίγωσαν.

μεταπεμψάμενοι A τοὺς ὄνους τοὺς ἐν τῇ πόλει A ἐμαστίγωσεν M

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 συναθροῦντες [καὶ] μεταπεμψάμενοι.

115 AM Ἀβδηρίτης εὐνοῦχον ἰδὼν γυναικὶ ὁμιλοῦντα ἠρώτα ἄλλον εἰ ἄρα γυνὴ αὐτοῦ ἐστὶ. τοῦ δὲ εἰπόντος εὐνοῦχον γυναικὰ ἔχειν μὴ δύνασθαι ἔφη· Οὐκοῦν θυγάτηρ αὐτοῦ ἐστίν.

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 A Ἀβδηρίτης τὸν πατέρα τελευτήσαντα κατὰ τὸν νόμον καύσας δραμῶν εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν πρὸς τὴν μητέρα αὐτοῦ νοσοῦσαν εἶπεν· Ὀλίγα ἔτι περιττεύει ξύλα· ἐὰν οὖν βούληται καὶ δύνασαι, τοῖς αὐτοῖς κατακαύθητι.

νόμον Minas: ὦμον 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 βούληται καὶ δύνασαι read βούληται μὴ (or μηκέτι) ὀδυνᾶσθαι.

129 A Σιδόνιος ῥήτωρ μετὰ δύο ἑταίρων διελέγετο. τοῦ δὲ ἐνὸς λέγοντος ὅτι οὐκ ἦν δίκαιον πρόβατα σφάζεσθαι διὰ τὸ φέρειν γάλα καὶ ἔριον, καὶ τοῦ ἄλλου εἰπόντος ὅτι μηδὲ βοῦν (προσῆκει) ἀναιρεῖσθαι γάλα παρέχουσιν καὶ ἀροτριῶσαν, ὁ ῥήτωρ ἔφη μηδὲ χοῖρον εἶναι δίκαιον σφάζεσθαι ἦπαρ παρέχοντα καὶ οὐθαρ καὶ νεφρία.

(προσῆκει) Eberhard γάλα παρέχοντα καὶ ἀροτριῶντα A: corr. Boissonade ἦπαρ παρέχουσιν Boissonade

(προσῆκει) Eberhard, which Thierfelder would like to alter to προσῆκεν. But it would be more rational to change οὐκ ἦν δίκαιον to οὐκ ἐστὶ 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 πραγματευτῆς μετὰ ἑτέρου ὤδευε. τῆς δὲ γαστρὸς ἀναγκαζούσης μικρὸν ἀπολειφθῆναι προσαπέμεινεν. ὁ δὲ συνοδοιπόρος ἀφῆκεν αὐτόν, γράψας ἔν τινι [κίονι] τῶν μιλίων· Τάχυνον, φθάσον με. ὁ δὲ, ὡς ἀνέγνω, ἐπέγραψε κάτωθεν· Καὶ αὐτὸς μεῖνόν με.

ἀποληφθῆναι M τινι] τῆ M [κίονι] Eberhard πρόφθασον M μεῖνόν με A: μένομεν M

Travelling with "another," or travelling with a friend, *ἑταίρου*? In many of these entries in *Philogelos* the tale is told of X and an *ἑταῖρος*, though once (39b) it is necessary to make the reverse emendation from *ἑταῖρος* to *ἕτερος*. 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. *πρόσ(ω) ἀπέμεινεν* seems an inoffensive solution.

136 A Σιδόνιος γραμματικὸς ἠρώτα τὸν διδάσκαλον· Ἦ πεντακότυλος λήκυθος πόσον χωρεῖ; ὁ δὲ· Οἶνον λέγεις ἢ ἔλαιον;

πεντακόνδυλος A: corr. Minas

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

137 M Σιδονίωι μαγειρῶι λέγει τις· Δάνεισόν μοι μάχαιραν ἕως Σμύρνης. ὁ δὲ ἔφη· Οὐκ ἔχω μάχαιραν ἕως ἐκεῖ φθάζουσιν.

μάγειρος M

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

150 A Εὐτράπελος δύο ξύστρων παρ' αὐτοῦ ἐν βαλανεῖωι ἐπιζητουμένων, ὑπὸ ἐνὸς μὲν ἀγνωρίστου, ὑπὸ δὲ ἑτέρου γνωρίμου μὲν ἀλλὰ κλέπτου, ὁ εὐτράπελος ἔφη· Σὲ μὲν (μὴ) γνωρίζων οὐ δώσω· σὲ δὲ [μὴ] γνωρίζων οὐ δώσω.

(μὴ) et [μὴ] Thierfelder

Thierfelder rightly finds the anecdote clumsily written. He has vastly improved the point of the story by moving *μὴ* 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 ὁ δέ 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 ΑΥΤΟΥΥΠΟΔΥΟ, and we should read ξύστρων παρ' αὐτοῦ ὑπὸ δύο ἐν βαλανείῳ ἐπιζητουμένων. We have to resist the temptation to write δυοῖν, a form not found in *Philogelos*: see Thierfelder on 196. Whether the further alteration to ξύστρου ... ἐπιζητουμένου 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) ΕΥ Εὐτράπελος ἰδὼν ἰατρὸν νεανίδα ὑπαλείφοντα ὠραίαν ἔφη· Μὴ τὴν ὄψιν θεραπεύων τὸ βάθος φθειρήεις.

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

162 ΑΜ Κυμαίων πόλιν τειχιζόντων εἰς τῶν πολιτῶν Λολλιανὸς καλούμενος δύο κορτίνας ἰδίῳ ἐτείχισεν ἀναλώμασι. πολεμίων δὲ ἐπιστάντων ὀργισθέντες οἱ Κυμαῖοι συνεφώνησαν ἵνα τὸ Λολλιανοῦ τεῖχος μηδεὶς φυλάξῃ ἀλλ' ἐκεῖνος μόνος.

(τὴν) πόλιν Eberhard Λολλιανὸς M Λουλιάνου M φυλάξει M

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

169 Α Ὁ αὐτός, τινὸς αὐτῷ εἰπόντος ὅτι Ἐσύλησάς με· Μὴ ὑποστρέψω (εἶπεν) ἔνθεν ἄπειμι, εἰ ἐσύλησα.

(εἶπεν) Boissonade

The explanation of haplography recommends Boissonade's εἶπεν rather than his alternative ἔφη, which Thierfelder strangely prefers. At the end εἰ (σ') ἐσύλησα or εἰ ἐσύλησά (σε) is what we might expect to see.

176 Α Κυμαῖος ἰατρὸς ἀπεγνωσμένον ἄρρωστον ἐνημάτισεν, ἐκέλευσε δὲ τὰ ἐκκεχωρισμένα ἰδεῖν. τοῦ δὲ δεῖξαντος καὶ εἰπόντος ὅτι ἀπέθανεν, ὁ ἰατρὸς μεθ' ὄρκου ἀπεκρίνατο· Οὗτος, εἰ μὴ ἐκλύσθη, ἐλάκησεν ἄν.

ἐνεύματισεν A: corr. Boissonade ἐκκεχωρημένα A: corr. Eberhard οὗτος Kurtz: οὕτως A

Who is τοῦ at the start of the second sentence? There must be an antecedent, e.g. (θεράποντα) after ἐκέλευσε δέ. 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 ἔτι ὄντων ἐν τοῖς ζώοις.

178 AC Κυμαῖοι δύο ἰσχάδων κεράμια δύο ἐπρίαντο. τούτων δὲ ὁ ἕτερος τὸν ἕτερον λανθάνων οὐκ ἐκ τοῦ ἰδίου ἀλλ' ἐκ τοῦ ἑτέρου κατήσθιεν. ὡς δὲ τοῖς ἀλλήλων κατεχρήσαντο, ἕκαστος ἐπὶ τὸ ἴδιον ἐπιστρέψας εὐρεν αὐτὸ κενόν.

τοῖς] τῆς C κατεχρήσατο C

If the meaning is "not from his own but from the other one," the text is not to be altered. But since ἕτερος ... ἕτερον 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 ἑτέρου. τοῖς ἀλλήλων seems to support this suggestion.

181 A Κυμαῖοι εἰς ψηφοφορίαν ἀπαντήσαντες καὶ γνόντες πολλοὺς ἐκ τῶν ἄλλων πόλεων ἀπολειφθέντας, αἰτιωμένους τὴν ἀτραπὸν, Μῆ μῶροι, ἔφασαν, ἐὰν καὶ ἡμεῖς εἰς τὸ μέλλον οὐκ ἐρχόμεθα;

αἰτιώμενοι A: corr. Thierfelder ἔφασαν Eberhard: ἔφη A

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 "wären wir?" There must be a lacuna, e.g. (φανεῖσθε), after ἔφασαν. "Won't you look stupid if in future we too don't turn up?"

182 AC Κυμαῖος (ἰατρός) τετραμμένην κεφαλὴν τέμνων ὑπτιον θεῖς τὸν πάσχοντα ὕδωρ εἰς τὸ στόμα ἐνέβαλεν ἵνα ἴδη διὰ τοῦ χειρουργηθέντος τὸ πότε ἐκρεύσει.

(ἰατρός) Thierfelder τετριμμένην C ἔβαλεν C τὸ πότε A: ὁπότε C

Poured water in to see *when* it would come streaming out? Stop-watch in hand? And why the corruption from πότε or ὁπότε 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 (εἰ) διὰ τοῦ χειρουργηθέντος τόπου ἐκρεύσει. The omission of (εἰ) 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 (εἰ) πότε here. χειρουργηθέντος

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) Α Δυσκόλου ταυλίζοντας κατεπέτασέ τις άργός καθήμενος. ό δέ θυμούμενος ήρώτησεν αυτόν· Ποίας τέχνης; και διά τί άργείς; κ.τ.έ.

κατεπέτασέ Α: corr. Minas

The genitive ποίας τέχνης without so much as an εἶ is inexplicable. The (b) version offers the unobjectionable ήρώτησεν 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 (έπαίεις) τέχνης; or else, less adventurously, with the (b) version as our guide, we should write ποίαν οἶδεν τέχνην;

194(a) Α Δύσκολος σκάλαν καταβαίνων σφαλεις κατέπεσε. τοῦ δέ οἰκοκυροῦ εἰπόντος Τίς ἐνι ἐκεῖ; ἀπεκρίνατο· Ἐγὼ ἐνοικίου μου ἐλάκησα. τί πρὸς σέ;

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

(a) εἰπόντος οἰκοκυροῦ Α: ordinem corr. Boissonade (b) Δύσκολός τις V

Thierfelder explains τοῦ ἐνοικίου as a genitive of price, keeping ἐνοίκιον 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 ἐνοίκιον as "dwelling." Read therefore ἐγὼ (ἔσω) τοῦ ἐνοικίου μου.

195 Δυσκόλωι τις συγκλητικῶι ἔλεγε· Μικρόν σε ποθῶ ιδεῖν και συντυχεῖν. ό δέ ἀπεκρίνατο· Κάγώ σε ιδεῖν θέλω τυφλόν και χωλόν.

"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 και συντυχεῖν, which has no counterpart in the reply and has all the hallmarks of an unimaginative gloss intended to explain that ιδεῖν means "have an interview with."

201 A Ἀφυεὶ μάντει προσελθὼν τις ἐξ ἀποδημίας ἀνίων ἠρώτα περὶ τῶν οἰκείων. ὁ δὲ εἶπεν· Ὑγιαίνουσι πάντες, καὶ ὁ πατήρ σου. τοῦ δὲ εἰπόντος ὅτι Ὁ πατήρ μου δέκατον ἔτος ἔχει ἀφ' οὗ ἀπέθανεν, ἀπεκρίνατο· Οὐδὲν γὰρ οἶδας τὸν κατὰ ἀλήθειάν σου πατέρα.

The last sentence poses problems. οὐδὲν in a sentence with an accusative object is, as Thierfelder says, “ungewöhnlich,” and Minas’ οὐδέ “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 οὐδὲν ἄρ' οἶδας κατὰ τὸν κατὰ ἀλήθειάν σου πατέρα, the first κατὰ in the sense exemplified by LSJ *s.v.* B.IV.2.

205 A Ἀφυῆς μάντις ἐμπεσὼν εἰς πολεμίους καὶ εἰπὼν ὅτι Μάντις εἰμί ... μελλούσης πρὸς ἀντιπάλους μάχης συνάπτεσθαι, Νικήσετε, εἶπε, τὸν πόλεμον ἐὰν τὰς ἐξόπισθεν τρίχας τῶν κεφαλῶν ὑμῶν ἐν τῇ παρατάξει τῆς μάχης μὴ βλέψωσιν.

lacunam indicavit Eberhard νικήσεσθε A: corr. Boissonade ἐξώπισθεν A ὑμῶν Minas: ἡμῶν A βλέψωσιν Boissonade: κλέψωσιν A

The construction νικήσετε τὸν πόλεμον is sufficiently abnormal for Haupt to conjecture τοὺς πολεμίους, but a more plausible suggestion would be τὸν πολέμιον, notwithstanding the following plurals. Such a familiar use hardly needs illustrating, but ἅμα τῷ Πέρσῃ (“with the Persians”) at Hdt. 6.133 or τῷ βαρβάρῳ (“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 A Δειλὸς πύκτης συνεχῶς ὑπὸ ἀντιδίκου κοσκινιζόμενος ἀνεβόησε· Δέομαι ὑμῖν ἅμα πάσιν.

In the similar 218 the last words are δέομαι ὑμῶν, μὴ πάντες ὁμοῦ, which Minas adopted for 209 also. But A’s version could point to something else: δέομαι ὑμῖν, (μὴ) ἅμα παίσειν “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) A Ὀκνηρῶι υἱῶι ἐκέλευσεν ὁ πατήρ εἰς τὸν γείτονα ἀπελθεῖν καὶ χρήσασθαι ἀξίνην. ὁ δὲ ἔφη· Οὐ δίδει. τοῦ δὲ πατρὸς ἐπιμένοντος ἀπεκρίνατο· Ἐγὼ εἰμι ὁ γείτων καὶ ἀξίνην οὐκ ἔχω.

(b) EV Ὁκνηρῶι υἱῶι ἐπέταξεν ὁ πατήρ ἀπελθεῖν εἰς τὸν γείτονα καὶ χρήσασθαι ἀξίνην. ὁ δὲ ἔφη· Ἐγὼ εἰμι ὁ γείτων· ἀξίνην οὐκ ἔχω.

(b) lacunam post ἔφη statuit Thierfelder

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 αὐθις τὸ αὐτὸ κελεύοντος), eliciting the not very funny reply: "I am the one next to you; I haven't got an axe."

216 A Φθονερός ἰδὼν τὸν γείτονα θηριομαχοῦντα λέγει τῶι κυβερνήτη· Ἄρκος.

ἄρκος can stand for ἄρκτος, 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 (<....>) ἄρκυς, 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 A Ἄλλος διὰ δειλίαν ἐπέγραψεν ἐπὶ τοῦ μετώπου· Ὁ τόπος τῶν καιρίων. παιόμενος οὖν συνεχῶς εἶπε πρὸς τὸν παίοντα· Μὴ τι οὗτος γράμματα οὐκ οἶδεν καὶ ἀναιρεῖ με;

παίοντα cannot be sound, since the appeal is made to a third party. Thierfelder boldly alters τὸν παίοντα 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 παύοντα. The referee's rôle in governing the conditions of the fight would be analogous to that of the κυβερνήτης in the preceding anecdote.

222 A Λιμόξηρον ἄρρωστον ἰατρὸς ἐπισκεψάμενος ἐκέλευσεν ἄλῃκα αὐτῶι εἰς πόμα γενέσθαι· εἰ δὲ μὴ εὔροι ἄλῃκα, ποιῆσαι αὐτῶι ὁμοίως τράγον. ὁ δὲ λιμόξηρος ἔφη· Ἐὰν μὴ εὔρω τράγον, φάγω δύο ἐρίφια.

ἄρρωστος A: corr. Minas

The first instruction ἄλῃκα αὐτῶι εἰς πόμα γενέσθαι prescribes the diet. Thereafter the joke proceeds as if directions are given directly to the sick man, εὔροι, ἔφη, εὔρω and φάγω all being indicators of this. It follows that ποιῆσαι αὐτῶι should be ποιῆσαι ἑαυτῶι (or αὐτῶι). The final words perhaps should be punctuated as a naïve question.

224 AC ... ὡς δὲ εἶδεν εἰς ὕψος σαλεύοντα τοὺς κλάδους καὶ ἐσθίοντα, ἀγανακτήσας εἶπε· Κάτω ἐστὼς οὐκ ἠδύνω ἐκ τῶν ἐπικειμένων κλάδων φαγεῖν; ὁ δὲ ἀπεκρίνατο· Ἐκεῖνα ὡς καταβαίνω τρώγω.

ἠδύνου C τῶν ἄνω ἐπικειμένων C ἀπεκρίνατο A: εἶπεν C

ἐπικειμένων may be right: "plastisch-übertreibend: 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) A Μέθυσος ἀτυχῆς ἀμπελῶνα κτησάμενος τῶι τρυγητῶι ἀπέθανεν.

(b) E V Ἄτυχῆς μέθυσος ἀμπελῶνα κληρονομήσας ἐν καιρῶι τοῦ τρυγητοῦ ἀπέθανεν.

In the (b) version the point of the story emerges more clearly: ἐν καιρῶι τοῦ τρυγητοῦ. τῶι 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). ⟨ἄμα⟩ τῶι τρυγητῶι would give a smooth text, but ⟨ἄμα⟩ ἀμπελῶνα κτησάμενος [τῶι τρυγητῶι] ἀπέθανεν would be more pungent: the unfortunate alcoholic on acquiring a vineyard promptly died.

237 A Ὀζόστομος λουκάνικον ὀπτῶν καὶ πολὺ προσφυσῶν κυνέαν αὐτὸ ἀπειργάσατο. αὐτὸς συνεχῶς βδέων οὐκ ἐπιστεύετο.

λοκάνικον ὀπτων A: corr. Boissonade κυνέαν A

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 (βδεῖν) οὐκ ἐπιστεύετο.

243 AC Λειξουρος εἰς τρύγην ὑπὸ φίλου κληθεὶς καὶ ἀπλήστως φαγὼν σῦκα καὶ σταφυλάς, ὑπὸ τῆς γαστρὸς αὐτοῦ νυχθεὶς ἔδοξεν ὄρᾶν.... ὁ δὲ πρὸς αὐτὸν ἀναβλέψας εἶπε· Πάλιν μοι θέλεις ἐμπαῖξαι, ἵνα ἀπὸ τῆς συκῆς ἄνωθεν δόξας χέζειν τὰ στρώματα ἐρημώσω κ.τ.ἔ.

ἄνωθεν post χέζειν collocat C

ἔδοξεν ὄρᾶν leads into a dream. We expect therefore some reference to night-time. (τῆι νυκτί) is inserted by Thierfelder after σταφυλάς, but a more plausible place for it would be before νυχθεὶς. In the second excerpt printed above from this unusually long anecdote the meaning of τὰ στρώματα ἐρημώσω 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, ἐρημώσω can give the desired sense, if we may trust Ephraem Syrus I 205B: ἔπεσεν ἐν πηλῶι καὶ τὴν ἔξαλλον στολὴν παντοίως ἠρήμωσεν. In Migne (*PG* LXV 301 A) we shall find ἐὰν ἠρήμωται used of food that has *spoiled*—a translation that will fit all three passages.

245 (a) AC Νεανίσκος γραίας δύο καπριώσας ἐκάλεσε, πρὸς δὲ τοὺς οἰκείους διακόνους ἔφη· Τὴν μίαν κεράσατε, τὴν δὲ θέλουσαν ἀφροδισιάσατε. αἱ δὲ ὑφ' ἐν εἶπον· Ἡμεῖς οὐ διψῶμεν.

δύο γραίας γαυριώσας C τὴν μὲν μίαν κυράσατε C

For τοὺς οἰκείους διακόνους the (b) version has simply τοὺς παῖδας αὐτοῦ. διάκονος 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 σοφιστής speaks πρὸς τοὺς ἰδίους οἰκέτας, there is presumably differentiation from bath attendants.

251 AC Οἰκοδέσποινα μῶρον οἰκέτην ἔχουσα ἐμφανῆ καὶ ἰδοῦσα αὐτὸν ἀδροκέφαλον, ἐπιθυμήσασα αὐτοῦ, φημάριον εἰς τὸ πρόσωπον βαλοῦσα ἵνα μὴ ἐπιγνωσθῆι, συνέπαιζεν αὐτῷ. ὁ δὲ ἐν τῷ παίζειν συνεισηλθεν αὐτῇ καὶ τῷ δεσπότῃ συνηθῶς προσγελῶν εἶπε· Κύρι, κύρι, τὸν ὄρχηστὴν ἐβίνησα, καὶ ἡ κύρα ἦν ἕσωθεν.

ἀδρο- AC φημάριον Haase: φημάριον AC εἰς] περὶ Eberhard
ὄρχηστὴν A ἐβίνησα Boissonade: ἐβήνησα A: ἐβίνισα C

The mistress of the household sees her slave in a state of sexual arousal. Thierfelder is much exercised by ἐμφανῆ, but all problems over this word would disappear if the καί is placed in front of ἐμφανῆ instead of after it. The servant is visibly excited. Later in the story we must assume the loss of some words explaining how and when ὁ δεσπότης came on the scene, and posit a lacuna after αὐτῇ. Just before then συνεισηλθεν needs more than division into συνεῖς ἦλθεν if it is to yield an intelligible sense, but συνεῖς (συν)ἦλθεν 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.²

TRINITY COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE
January, 1999

² I wish to acknowledge the helpful criticisms made by my colleague Dr N. Hopkinson on an earlier draft of this paper.