

ὁ πρωκτός itself received a nickname from his proper name.¹³ In the *Banqueters* of Aristophanes, one of the forerunners of the symposiacal dialogues, we learn that a similar phallic joke was made at the expense of Alcibiades, who was said to have been born ἐπὶ Φαλληνίου (for ἐπὶ Φαλινίου), with a pun on ὁ Φαλῆς.¹⁴

JOSEPH COTTER

Pennsylvania State University

13. Cf. A. C. Cassio, *Aristofane, Banchetti: I frammenti* (Pisa, 1977), p. 85, on Aristophanes fr. 38 (= 231 K).

14. *Ibid.*, fr. 54 (= 554 K). I would like to thank the Editor of *CP* and his anonymous referees for their comments and suggestions.

PRAXINOA'S SPEECH AND THE TEXT OF THEOCRITUS 15.15–17

The manuscripts of Theocritus 15.15–17 agree in reading thus:¹

ἀπφῦς μὲν τήνος τὰ πρόαν λέγομεν δὲ πρόαν θην
πάντα νίτρον καὶ φύκος ἀπὸ σκανᾶς ἀγοράσδων
ἦνθε φέρων ἄλλας ἄμμιν ἀνὴρ τρισκαίδεκάπαχυς. 15

Some nineteenth-century editors made no sense of this, and emended. Seidler read προαθρεῖν for πρόαν θην, and Meinecke agreed: “libri fere quod intellegi non potest.” But he added that he would prefer ἔλεγον for λέγομεν. Indeed, the manuscripts’ present plural verb remains an embarrassment for all current interpretations.²

Ahrens objected to πάντα in 16, emending it to βάντα, and changed ἀγοράσδων to ἀγοράσδεν—construed as infinitive for imperative: “I told him [λέγομεν], ‘go and buy (βάντα ἀγοράσδεν).’” He found many followers.³ Fritzsche’s third edition (1870) still used the manuscripts’ text;⁴ but Cholmeley in 1901 was the last editor to print the manuscripts’ reading. Yet even he was disturbed by πάντα: “πάντα is awkward; but it should probably be taken as direct object with πρόαν ‘tertiary predicate’.”⁵

In his 1905 O.C.T. text Wilamowitz thought πάντα worse than awkward, and rejected it. Keeping Ahrens’ ἀγοράσδεν, for Ahrens’ βάντα (and the manuscripts’

1. See A. S. F. Gow, ed., *Theocritus*², vol. 1 (Cambridge, 1952), p. 108 (a few MSS read μέν for μὲν in 15).

2. A. Meinecke, ed., *Theocritus, Bion, et Moschus*³ (Berlin, 1856); this seems to mean, “I told him (λέγομεν) to foresee everything” (LSJ attests προαθρεῖν only in Eustathius). R. W. Daniel, “Three Notes on Theocritus,” *ZPE* 27 (1977): 77–83, gives a similar interpretation, somehow extracting it even from the MSS readings (though he clearly prefers Wilamowitz’ text [below]). Yet Daniel’s exegesis has many difficulties. He translates λέγομεν as “I told (him)” (= “to command”) and construes it “as an unaugmented imperfect.” But why would Praxinoa say λέγομεν for ἔλεξα? And λέγω “command” is followed by the infinitive, not the participle. Daniel translates “just the other day I told (him) everything (he should do),” injecting padding but omitting the second πρόαν.

3. L. Ahrens, *Bucolicorum Graecorum reliquiae* (Leipzig, 1855). Ahrens’ full text appears, e.g., in O. Könnicke, *Bucolici Graeci* (Brunswick, 1914), and is still printed in Ph.-D. Legrand, *Bucoliques Grecs*, Budé vol. 1: *Théocrite* (Paris, 1967). His infinitive is still printed in all standard current texts.

4. H. Fritzsche, *Theocriti idyllia*, vol. 2³ (Leipzig, 1870), p. 40; but he defended the MSS with an opaque argument which convinced no one.

5. R. J. Cholmeley, *Idylls of Theocritus*² (London, 1901), ad loc.

πάντα) Wilamowitz printed—πάπα. His only justification was, “cf. *Etym. Magn.* 651,5.”⁶ Latte, too, thought πάντα corrupt,⁷ but viewed Wilamowitz’ emendation as unlikely: “Gibt es einen Beleg dafür, dass eine Griechin ihren Mann schlechthin als ‘Vater’ angeredet hat, wie eine deutsche Kleinbürgerfrau?”⁸ Virtually all other twentieth-century scholars agree that πάντα is corrupt; but unlike Latte, they eagerly accept Wilamowitz’ emendation. His πάπα, in fact, became our *textus receptus*.

A papyrus found in 1930 gave minor new readings: γε for τὰ in 15 (Maas: γα); ἴκτο for ἦνθε in 17. But the papyrus has no πάπα in 16. It has πάντα. It has 16 precisely as the manuscripts do, including ἀγαράσδων, not ἀγοράσδων.⁹ Subsequent editors have read the papyrus readings at 15 and 17; yet at 16—where the paradosis shows no variation—they still slavishly print Wilamowitz’ πάπα and Ahrens’ infinitive. Here is the standard text as our editors print it (their punctuation and quotation marks; my emphasis).¹⁰

ἀπφῦς μὲν τῆνός γα πρόαν—λέγομες δὲ πρόαν θην 15
 ‘πάπα, νίτρον καὶ φῦκος ἀπὸ σκανᾶς ἀγοράσδων’—
 ἴκτο φέρων ἄλας ἄμμιν, ἀνὴρ τρισκαίδεκάπαχυς.

Gow: “Still, that daddy the other day—it was only the other day I said to him, ‘Pa, go and get some soda and ruddle at the stall,’ and he brought me back salt, and he a great giant of a man.”¹¹

But these same editors’ exegeses are so tentative as to undermine all confidence in their emended text. Gow writes, “The infinitive for imperative may, like πάπα, be baby-talk.” Perhaps seeing that it seems, instead, overly formal here, Dover states that the infinitive for imperative may be used “where we cannot honestly say why.” Dover feels he must defend the “narrative present” (λέγομες for “I said”), but ignores the strange plural. And, though he reads πάπα, he writes, “One difficulty is that a Greek wife does not seem to have called her husband ‘father.’” Finally, if that were not enough to condemn what he prints, Dover says of the δέ (line 15): “δέ is not easily explained, and may be subliterate.”¹²

When emendations leave a text so problematic as this, the manuscripts’ readings should be restored if they make perfect sense. I here print the manuscripts’

6. U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorf, *Bucolici Graeci* (Oxford, 1905). The *Etym. Magn.* indeed says that πάπα is a Syracusan word for πατήρ. But there is nothing to connect its entry with our passage.

7. Latte himself prints Ahrens’ infinitive and marks πάντα corrupt (“†πάντα†”): K. Latte, *Theocriti carmina* (Iserlohn, 1948); his apparatus suggests yet another emendation for πάντα, “τάνδοι?”

8. Review of Gow, *Gnomon* 23 (1951): 252–57 (255).

9. A. Hunt and J. Johnson, *Two Theocritus Papyri* (London, 1930); Gow’s apparatus has all the readings.

10. J. M. Edmonds, *Greek Bucolic Poets* (London, 1957; 1st ed., 1912, Loeb); Gow, *Theocritus*²; C. Gallavotti, *Theocritus quique feruntur bucolici Graeci*² (Rome, 1955); A. Horstmann, *Ironie und Humor bei Theokrit* (Meisenheim, 1976), p. 25; K. J. Dover, *Theocritus: Select Poems* (Glasgow, 1971); H. Beckby, *Die griechischen Bukoliker* (Meisenheim am Glan, 1975); M. García Teijeiro, *Bucólicos Griegos* (Madrid, 1986); F. P. Fritz, *Theokrit: Gedichte* (Tübingen, 1970); et al. Even Wilamowitz’ anacoluthic dashes seem part of our *textus receptus*.

11. Of Ahrens’ βάντα and Wilamowitz’ πάπα Gow says, “Either provides satisfactory sense.” He chooses πάπα, but then translates as if accepting both emendations at once: “Pa, go and get.” Most translations of Wilamowitz’ text ignore the second πρόαν. Gow includes it, awkwardly (there is no word for “only” in Theocritus).

12. Dover, *Theocritus*, p. 199. Dover considers Stark’s emendation of πάντα νίτρον το ἀφρόνιτρον (“Theocritea,” *Maia* 15 [1963]: 359–85). Since the manuscripts’ πάντα makes perfect sense, I do not comment further on so violent an emendation.

readings, altered only by the minor new readings of the papyrus,¹³ and punctuation and quotation marks other than Gow's.

ἀπφῶς μὰν τῆνός γε πρόαν—λέγομες δὲ “πρόαν” θην 15
 πάντα—νίτρον καὶ φῦκος ἀπὸ σκανᾶς ἀγοράσδων
 ἱκτο φέρων ἅλας ἄμμιν, ἀνὴρ τρισκαιδεκάπαχυς.

I take λέγομες to mean “we say.” The δὲ in 15 is not “subliterate.” It is standard parenthetical δὲ, which may set off a whole clause within a longer sentence. Such δέ's occur in both poetry and prose. I give but two examples from many in Pindar:¹⁴ *Pythian* 10.44–46: θρασεῖα δὲ πνέων καρδίᾳ / μόλεν Δανάας ποτὲ παῖς, ἀγεῖτο δ' Ἀθάνα, / ἐς ἀνδρῶν μακάρων ὁμίλον; *Nemean* 2.21–24: ἐν ἐσλοῦ Πέλοπος πτυχαῖς / ὀκτῶ στεφάνοις ἔμιχθεν ἥδη / ἐπτά δ' ἐν Νεμέᾳ, τὰ δ' οἴκοι μάσσον' ἀριθμοῦ, / Διὸς ἀγῶνι. (Here the Διὸς ἀγών is in Nemea; οἴκοι is Athens.)

In Theocritus 15.15, Praxinoa introspectively notes her (and others') use of πρόαν and interjects a parenthetical comment on it.¹⁵ Gow objected to this interpretation as he rejected the manuscripts: “Those who accept [the manuscripts] understand the words λέγομες δὲ πρόαν θην πάντα to be a parenthesis commenting on the excessive frequency of the adverb πρόαν in common speech. Common it certainly is in T., but even if the words can mean *we call everything 'the other day'* the parenthesis would be strangely irrelevant.”¹⁶

But herein lies the solution. πάντα—the source of everyone's dissatisfaction with the text—does not here mean “everything.” Rather, it means “all the time,” “always.” If not well known, this temporal value of πάντα is well attested.¹⁷ Cf. Lucian *Asinus* 22: Τί γὰρ ἡμῖν δοκεῖ τρέφειν τὸν ὄνον τοῦτον πάντα καταπίπτοντα; Macleod translates, “Why do we choose to keep this ass in food, when he's *always* falling down” (emphasis added).¹⁸ This temporal use, first attested in Herodotus, became so prevalent that, in modern Greek, πάντα has lost all other values and replaces ἀεί/αἰεῖ for “always, all the time.” As for πρόαν, Praxinoa is noting that the word is not only frequent but also inclusive. While it may mean precisely the “day before yesterday,” it may also refer vaguely to anything that happened “not long ago” (cf. Pl. *Symp.* 172A). We use the term “the other day” in precisely the same vague way. I would translate Theocritus 15.15–16 thus: “Well, that daddy the other day—we always say ‘the other day’—when buying. . . .”¹⁹

13. Maas' γὰ seems unnecessary since Theocritus uses it only after pronouns and γε occurs throughout the MSS (Gow, *Theocritus*², ad 1.148).

14. W. Slater, *Lexicon to Pindar* (Berlin, 1969), s.v. δέ, “f,” “introducing parenthesis.” Slater also lists *Ol.* 8.28, 10.66; *Pyth.* 2.17, 3.11, 4.23, 12.30; *Nem.* 3.78, 7.34 (especially apposite); *Isthm.* 1.49, 4.48. The manuscripts' δ' should be restored at *Ol.* 13.99. Cf. Thuc. 4.66: ἦν δὲ σταδίων (which Jones' *O.C.T.* prints in parentheses).

15. So E. Hiller *apud* H. Fritzsche, *Theokrits Gedichte*³ (Leipzig, 1881), p. 180: “kürzlich sagen wir von allem.”

16. Gow, *Theocritus*, ad loc. Gow's statistics (ad 14.5) tend to support the notion that Praxinoa refers to the frequency of the word: “T. has πρόαν (4.60, 5.4, 15.15) . . . and in eight places, πᾶν.”

17. E. A. Barber, ed., *Supplement to LSJ, Greek-English Lexicon* (Oxford, 1968), p. 116, s.v. πᾶς “D.II.4 add ‘all the time.’”

18. M. MacLeod, *Lucian*, Loeb vol. 8 (Cambridge, Mass., 1979), p. 87.

19. ἀγοράσδων is conative (cf. Cholmeley, *Idylls*, p. 295: “ἀγοράσδων: probably represents ἡγόραζε = tried to buy”); or better, progressive, “in the process of buying.”

Gow objected that such a comment on the frequency of *πρόαν* “would be strangely irrelevant.” But irrelevance is not always enough reason to emend the text, especially in a mime, where the goal concerns character-drawing as much as relevance. Praxinoa is drawn as something of a chatterbox, prone to some irrelevance; and 15–16 is not the only passage where she comments on what she says or how she speaks. At 77, safely inside the palace, Praxinoa remarks, *ἔνδοι πᾶσαι, ὁ τὰν νυὸν εἶπ’ ἀποκλάξας*. The reference of this quotation, which the scholiast refers to a *παροιμία*, is not known.²⁰ But whatever Praxinoa’s point may be, her situation does not seem much like that of a new bridegroom. To cite a bridegroom here, we might think, is somewhat irrelevant—but that is how Praxinoa is.

Finally, Praxinoa comments on her own speech again in 92–93.²¹ A man inside the palace chides the two women for being chatterboxes, and for the broad alphas of their dialect (87–88). Praxinoa defiantly defends her manner of speech: *Πελοποννασιῶσι λαλεῦμεν, Δωρίσδεν δ’ ἔξεστι, δοκῶ, Δωριέεσσι*. At 16 we should follow the manuscripts, rather than make her talk “wie eine deutsche Kleinbürgerfrau.”

DAVID C. YOUNG
University of Florida

20. See Gow, *ad loc.* Lying behind the quotation there may well be some sexual suggestion or double entendre.

21. Cf. Hiller *apud* Fritzsche, *Theokrits Gedichte*³. For Theocritus’ use of proverbs and sayings in character-drawing, see K. Hartigan, “Dramatic Dialogue in Theocritus,” *Zant* 26 (1976): 335–44; for dialect and the case of Praxinoa, see C. J. Ruijgh, “Le Dorien de Théocrite: Dialecte cyrénien d’Alexandrie et d’Egypte,” *Mnemosyne* 37 (1984): 56–88.

AN OWNER OF LITERARY PAPYRI

In an interesting article W. Clarysse has canvassed the possibilities for knowing the owners of the surviving literary papyri, particularly those that may have some connection to archives.¹ His conclusions are rather discouraging, for he argues that many supposed connections must be discarded, particularly those of literary texts found in the Italian excavations at Tebtunis with family archives found in the same excavations.² An additional case of literary papyri connected to persons known from documents, though hardly constituting an “archive,” deserves brief attention. In the description of *POxy.* 14.1690 (which they did not publish in full), Grenfell and Hunt state that it was “found with [*POxy.* 11.] 1365, 1386, and

1. “Literary Papyri in Documentary ‘Archives,’” in *Egypt and the Hellenistic World*, Stud. Hellenistica 27 (Louvain, 1983), pp. 43–61. Cf. also E. G. Turner, “Roman Oxyrhynchus,” *JEA* 38 (1952): 78–93; and “Scribes and Scholars of Oxyrhynchus,” in *Akten des VIII. Internationalen Kongresses für Papyrologie, Wien 1955*, MPER n.s. 5 (Vienna, 1956), pp. 141–46; as well as J. Krüger, *Oxyrhynchus in der Kaiserzeit: Studien zur topographie und Literaturrezeption*, Europäische Hochschulschriften 3 ser. 441 (Frankfurt am Main, 1990). The literary papyri from the Ptolemaic Sarapeion finds are discussed in D. J. Thompson, *Memphis under the Ptolemies* (Princeton, 1988), pp. 259–65; and M. L. Nardelli, “Testi letterari dall’archivio del Serapeo di Memfi: Ipotesi di una biblioteca,” in *Proceedings of the XVIII International Congress of Papyrology, Athens 25–31 May 1986*, vol. 1 (Athens, 1988), pp. 179–88.

2. Cf. now, confirming this skepticism, C. Gallazzi, “Fouilles anciennes et nouvelles sur le site de Tebtynis,” *BIAO* 89 (1989): 179–91.