



Kent Academic Repository

La'da, Csaba A. and Papatthomas, Amphilochios (2019) *A Late Hellenistic Fragment of a Tractate on Classical and Post-Classical (?) Literature: New Information on Aristophanes' Daitales?* *Rheinisches Museum für Philologie*, 162 (1-2). pp. 68-83. ISSN 0035-449X.

Downloaded from

<https://kar.kent.ac.uk/66609/> The University of Kent's Academic Repository KAR

The version of record is available from

<http://rhm.phil-fak.uni-koeln.de/>

This document version

Author's Accepted Manuscript

DOI for this version

Licence for this version

UNSPECIFIED

Additional information

Versions of research works

Versions of Record

If this version is the version of record, it is the same as the published version available on the publisher's web site. Cite as the published version.

Author Accepted Manuscripts

If this document is identified as the Author Accepted Manuscript it is the version after peer review but before type setting, copy editing or publisher branding. Cite as Surname, Initial. (Year) 'Title of article'. To be published in *Title of Journal*, Volume and issue numbers [peer-reviewed accepted version]. Available at: DOI or URL (Accessed: date).

Enquiries

If you have questions about this document contact ResearchSupport@kent.ac.uk. Please include the URL of the record in KAR. If you believe that your, or a third party's rights have been compromised through this document please see our [Take Down policy](https://www.kent.ac.uk/guides/kar-the-kent-academic-repository#policies) (available from <https://www.kent.ac.uk/guides/kar-the-kent-academic-repository#policies>).

A Late Hellenistic Fragment of a Tractate on Classical and
Post-Classical (?) Literature: New Information on Aristophanes'
Daitales?¹

by Csaba A. Láda – Amphilochios Papathomas

Papyri of Hellenistic date that discuss classical and postclassical literature are extremely rare. In this article, we offer the first edition of a fragment of a text from the second half of the Ptolemaic period that apparently discusses aspects of classical and perhaps also early Hellenistic dramatic literature as well as classical history. Although it seems more likely to us that we are dealing with a formal work, the possibility that this text is merely from private notes, which is suggested by the cursive handwriting, cannot be ruled out completely.

In what follows, we provide a papyrological description of the text, three possible interpretations for this work, a diplomatic transcription with a hypothetical reconstruction, an English translation and a detailed line-by-line commentary that reflects the three alternative interpretations we offer.

Our papyrus is a medium brown fragment, roughly the right half of which has a slightly lighter colour. The fragment contains the upper middle portion of a column of text without any margins on either side or at the bottom being preserved. The upper margin is 2.5 cm wide. This is well within the range common for literary texts, although closer to the lower end of the scale, and is more typical for informal and cursive texts; see W.A. Johnson, *Bookrolls and Scribes in Oxyrhynchus*, Toronto 2004, 77–82, 132–135 and 185–200. Most of the surviving parts of lines 6 and 13 are left blank. This suggests that the text was divided into shorter sections. In this case, the shorter lines may be either the end of the last line of a section or the heading of a new section (see further below).

The papyrus is inscribed in black ink. The script runs against the fibres. The style of the handwriting may be defined as a semi-cursive documentary hand which writes fast and with a tendency to use abbreviations (for parallels, see our discussion of the dating below). Roughly in the middle of the column, there is a collesis of approximately 1.6 to 1.9 cm running parallel with the fibres and against the script on the verso and having a slightly darker colour than the right-hand portion of the fragment.

The papyrus sheet is broken on three sides and so we can only speculate about the width of the column. If our supplements in l. 1 and ll. 14–15 are correct, not much of the column is missing on either side. In addition to the loss of text on either side, another source of difficulty in calculating the width of the column is the frequent use of abbreviations by the scribe. If we assume that no words in the unpreserved parts of lines 14 and 15 were abbreviated, we estimate the width of the column to have been not much more than 7 cm: in l. 14, 3.9 cm of space contain 11 letters, meaning that for our proposed reconstruction of the line (18 letters in total) approximately 6.38 cm of space

¹ Papyrological literature is abbreviated in accordance with the conventions laid down in J.F. Oates et al., *Checklist of Editions of Greek, Latin, Demotic, and Coptic Papyri, Ostraca and Tablets*, available at <http://papyri.info/docs/checklist>. However, in a small number of cases we use fuller abbreviations for the benefit of non-papyrologist readers. We would like to thank Professor Dr Bernhard Palme, Director of the Papyrus Collection of the Austrian National Library, for permission to publish this text. A. Papathomas wishes to thank the Austrian Science Foundation (FWF) for financial support for research on this papyrus. We are very grateful to Professors Peter J. Parsons and Bernhard Zimmermann for valuable comments on an earlier draft of this article. All dates are B.C.

would be required; in l. 15 3.9 cm of space contain 11 letters, meaning that for the proposed reconstruction (20 letters in total) 7.09 cm of space would be needed. According to the same method of calculation, 8.8 cm of space would be required for our reconstruction of line 1 (22 letters in total), which is significantly more than the space required for lines 14 and 15. This suggests that the word supplemented at the end of l. 1 was probably abbreviated; cf., for example, the abbreviations ἡγωνισμέ(νος) in l. 3 and ποιη(τής?) in l. 12. The abbreviation κωμω[δο(ποιός)] is an attractive supplement as it would yield 6.8 cm for the length of the whole line and as the scribe abbreviates words at a vowel (see also the commentaries on ll. 1 and 2 below). Our calculation that the width of the column was not much more than 7 cm is well within the expected range of column width for prose literary texts: see Johnson, *Bookrolls*, 66–73, 100–108, 152–155, 162–174 and 208–212. However, we must bear in mind that our text is a late Ptolemaic informal copy written in a semi-cursive hand on the verso of a document and does not therefore necessarily conform to the conventions of formal literary papyri, which Johnson predominantly used to produce his statistics. In addition, we are fully aware of the difficulties involved in the reconstruction suggested above in that some lines could easily be expanded (see, for example, the commentary on ll. 14–15 below) and that a narrower column would make it more difficult to reconstruct a continuous text rather than mere notes or a list.

Lines 6 and 13 are much shorter than the average width of the inscribed column and the writer leaves most of these lines blank. There are two possibilities for interpreting these short lines, either as the last words closing the sections or as short headings immediately preceding the entries that follow. In the latter case, the question whether these headings were marked by indentation or exdentation is impossible to answer because of the loss of the left-hand side of the sheet. The first possibility seems to be very slightly more likely to us for the following reason: in the preserved part of the text we seem to be dealing with two sections of similar length (section 1: ll. 1–6, and section 2: ll. 7–13) and the beginning of a third section. The upper margin seems to suggest that l. 1 is the beginning of a section and this section has no title as one would expect on the latter hypothesis.

The dating is based on two considerations. First, this text was written on the verso of a document, a piece of official correspondence, published a few years ago as *Corpus Papyrorum Raineri* XXVIII 13, which is dated to the “mid- to late II century BC (120/119?)” on both paleographical and internal criteria. As with most versos, we are assuming that the verso of our papyrus was inscribed subsequently to the recto after a relatively short period of time, as the paleography of our text suggests. Secondly, the parallels to this hand point towards the late second century and the first half of the first century B.C.; cf. *Sammelbuch* XIV 11626 (= P.Med. 31 = R. Seider, *Paläographie der griechischen Papyri*, Vol. III.1: *Text. Erster Teil. Urkundenschrift* I, Stuttgart 1990, II Abb. 85, pp. 344–345; 125 B.C.) and *Papiri greci e latini* X 1097 (= R. Seider, *ibid.*, II Abb. 108, pp. 402–403; 54/53 B.C.). If the supplement and identification of Menander with the most famous exponent of Attic New Comedy and the identification of Timotheos with one of the two Athenian comedy writers is correct (see further below), then our text is only about two centuries, perhaps even less, later than some of the authors it discusses.

There are no internal indications as to the provenance in the text of the recto. However, H. Loebenstein offers the information that inventory numbers G 13000–15999 of the Papyrus Collection of the Austrian National Library originate from the

Hermopolite nome². In addition, Wessely's handwritten catalogue states clearly that the papyrus comes from Hermupolis Magna. Although in some cases the information provided by Loebenstein and Wessely has turned out to be incorrect³, the nature of our text suggests an urban centre with sophisticated Greek culture as its provenance. Given these pieces of information, the capital of the Hermopolite nome appears to be the most likely place of origin for our text.

P.Vindob. G 14990 verso

16 × 5.9 cm

mid-II to mid-I c. BC

Provenance unknown (Hermupolis Magna?)

plate □

Diplomatic transcription

1]στοφανησκωμφ[
 2]υτερονληνια[
 3] νηγωνισμ^ε vac. [
 4] κωμοδιανποιητ[
 5]νατ . δυοδα[
 6] . c vac.
 7] . σφρ^ωηγμ . ε[
 8]ανδροονειδι . [
 9]αμπροτερονη[
 10] νεισφρεαρεμ[
 11] . ασοεπιτροπευ[
 12]τιμοθεοσοποι^η . [
 13] . αι vac.
 14]εν^ηοπαυσανι[
 15]σιλεωσπιτρ[
 16] . . . ε . . .^ω . . . [

Hypothetical reconstruction

1 [Ἄρι]στοφάνης κωμφ[δο(ποιός?)
 2 [δε]ύτερον Λήνια [
 3 [c. 3?] ν ἡγωνισμέ(νος) [
 4 [c. 3?] . ς κωμoδίαν ποιητ[
 5 [c. 3?]]νατ . δύο δα[
 6 [c. 3?]] . ς.
 7 [c. 3?]] . σφρω(ν) ηγμ . ε[
 8 [c. 3?]]ανδρος ὄνειδι . [
 9 [c. 3?]]αι πρότερον ηγ[
 10 [c. 3?]] ν εἰς φρέαρ ἐμ[
 11 [c. 3?]] . αος ὁ ἐπιτροπεύω[ν
 12 [c. 3?]] Τιμόθεος ὁ ποιη(τής?) . [

² H. Loebenstein, *Vom „Papyrus Erzherzog Rainer“ zur Papyrussammlung der Österreichischen Nationalbibliothek. 100 Jahre Sammeln, Bewahren, Edieren*, in *Festschrift zum 100-jährigen Bestehen der Papyrussammlung der Österreichischen Nationalbibliothek, Papyrus Erzherzog Rainer*, pp. 3–39 (esp. 21).

³ See, for example, *Corpus Papyrorum Raineri* XXV p. X and 2–3.

13 [c. 4?] .αι.
 14 [Κλεομ]ένη(ς), ὁ Πausανί[ου
 15 [τοῦ βα]σιλέως ἐπίτρ[οπος
 16 [c. 5?] . . . ἐδῆ[ω(σεν?) . . .]

“Aristophanes, comedy writer (?) ... second / for the second time (?) ... Lenaia ... having competed ... comedy ... poet (?) ... two ... virtuous / Sophron ... unmanly / Menander ... reproach (?) ... earlier ... into a well ... -aos being the guardian ... Timotheos, the poet (?) ... Kleomenes, the guardian of King Pausanias ... ravaged (?)”

As our text is short and highly fragmentary, it allows a variety of interpretations and supplements. One possibility (A) is that the preserved part of the text comes from a literary treatise mentioning a number of famous stage authors: Aristophanes of Athens and a poet called Timotheos, and probably also Menander of Athens and Sophron of Syracuse. Whilst Aristophanes’ identification in the text is beyond any doubt, there is some uncertainty about the identification of the other three. There are at least three candidates for the identification of Timotheos: Timotheos of Miletus, who died towards the middle of the fourth century B.C. (some time between 366/5 and 357/6 according to the Marmor Parium, FGrHist 239 A 76), Timotheos of Athens, a representative of the Middle Comedy, to whom the *Suda* (test. 1 K.-A.) attributes four titles⁴, and, finally, the Attic comedy writer Timotheos who achieved second prize at the Dionysia of perhaps 192 B.C. (Timoth. II test. 1 K.-A.).⁵ Further, the first half of Menanders’ (?) name is lost in a lacuna. Although the context could suggest that we are dealing with the most famous exponent of Attic New Comedy here, a different reconstruction of this personal name cannot be ruled out completely. On this general hypothesis (A) the identification of Sophron seems to be more certain. There appears to be only one author with this name known from the history of Greek literature: Sophron of Syracuse, a contemporary of Euripides, who was the main exponent of the so-called Syracusan mime and who lived in the second half of the fifth century B.C. Despite the various possible identifications for Timotheos and Menander (?), the majority of indications seems to suggest that this treatise discussed comedy and mime writers specifically. If this inference is correct, then either of the two Athenian comedy writers is more likely to have been meant here than their Milesian namesake. However, at the end of the preserved part of the papyrus, we also find references to two famous Spartan characters of Greek history of the second half of the fifth and the beginning of the fourth century B.C. This suggests that our text did not discuss comedy and mime exclusively.

Another possibility (B) would be to assume that we are dealing with a fragment of a literary treatise or, more specifically, with a biography of authors. Our dating of the papyrus would make the text an early example of literary biography. A common theme running through such a work that could bring together Aristophanes, Menander and Timotheos in this fragment could be criticism (cf. l. 8: ὀνειδι[]) of various aspects of their early works. Literary criticism and reproach as a literary theme in general are,

⁴ *Suda* T 619: Τιμόθεος, Ἀθηναῖος, κωμικὸς τῆς μέσης κωμωδίας. τῶν δραμάτων αὐτοῦ ἦν Πύκτης, Παρακαταθήκη, Μεταβαλλόμενος ἢ Μεταφερόμενος. καὶ Κυνάριον Τιμοθέου δράμα, ὡς φησιν Ἀθήναιος ἐν τοῖς αὐτοῖς αὐτοῦ. See also W.G. Arnott in G.W. Dobrov (ed.), *Brill’s Companion to the Study of Greek Comedy*, Leiden, Boston 2010, 296.

⁵ See H.-G. Nesselrath, *Der Neue Pauly*, Vol. 12 (2002) 599 s.v. 9.

of course, very well attested in Greek antiquity⁶. We know that Aristophanes was criticised and even prosecuted for his attacks on Cleon in the *Babylonians* (nevertheless, he continued his attacks on him in *Knights* – [δε]ύτερον in l. 2 might refer to this). It further seems possible that Menander was criticised in our fragment because of his use of the topos of falling into a well in his earliest surviving comedy *Dyscolus* (on this topos, which occurs in numerous other examples of New Comedy, see further the commentary on l. 10). Finally, it fits the theme of criticism that Timotheos writes in his *Persians* that in Sparta he was reproached for his musical innovations (Pers. 206–212: ὁ γάρ μ' εὐγενέτας μακραίῳν Σπάρτας μέγας ἀγεμῶν | βρύῳν ἄνθεσιν ἦβας | δονεῖ λαὸς ἐπιφλέγων | ἔλαϊ τ' αἴθοπι μῶμοι, | ὅτι παλαιότεραν νέοις ὕμνοις μοῦσαν ἀτιμῶ).

The third alternative (C), which the majority of indications seems to favour, is to assume that the arrangement of the text is chronological and that we are dealing with an early example of the well-known genre of *Zeittafel* (cf. the Marmor Parium, for instance). There are two indications that suggest that the preserved part of the text dealt with the year 427 B.C., providing important literary and historical information about this year. First, we know that Cleomenes (l. 14) led the Peloponnesian invasion of Attica in summer 427 B.C. Secondly, in this year Aristophanes' first play, the *Daitales*, won second prize⁷, to which [δε]ύτερον in line 2 could refer. We further know that Aristophanes and Timotheos the lyric poet were near contemporaries, which fits in well with the assumption of a chronological arrangement for this text. If these conclusions are indeed correct, then our text supplies important new information (a) for the plot of *Daitales* and (b) for the life or, more specifically, the literary career of Timotheos in the year 427 B.C. As to the plot of *Daitales*, we know that the play involved two youths, one σώφρων, the other καταπύγων, as Aristophanes himself writes (*Clouds*, 529: ὁ σώφρων τε χῶ καταπύγων = test. vi). In this case, ὄνειδι [in l. 8 could refer to criticism of the dissolute young man and]ανδρος might be reconstructed as ἄν]ανδρος in reference to him. A tempting possibility for the reconstruction of this part could be that the σώφρων is praised whereas the dissolute youth ὡς ἄν]ανδρος ὄνειδίζ[εται. Lines 9–11 would then offer entirely new information about the plot of *Daitales*, including the information that a well and an *epitropos* (?) played some role in the comedy. Although the hypothesis that lines 1–11 concern Aristophanes' *Daitales* seems at first sight to be undermined by the shortness of line 6, this is not necessarily the case as the short line may merely end one subsection on the same topic and the following line may start a new subsection offering new information, for example, on the plot of the play. In addition, the letter-string σωφρων does not begin the line, as might be expected if it were a poet's name starting a new entry. As to the life of Timotheos, it is likely that his victory over Phrynīs (PMG 802), presumably at Athens, and the first performance of his *Persians*, both only approximately dated, represented peaks of his poetic career.⁸ As the approximate date of the *Persians* is too late, it would not be impossible that his victory over Phrynīs is what is mentioned in this passage. If Timotheos was a young

⁶ See, for example, Thucydides and Plutarch on Herodotus or the general literary trope of criticism of women; cf. Stobaeus, 4.22g.

⁷ See test. iv (= fr. 590, 3-5 = P. Oxy. 2737, Fr. I, col. i 3-5): ἀπὸ Διοτίμου, ἐφ' οὗ [πρῶτ]ον οἱ Ἀριστοφάνους [Δαιτ]αλεῖς ἐδιδάχθησαν; v (Anon., De com. [Proleg. de com. III] 38 p. 9 Kost.): ἐδίδαξε δὲ (sc. Ἀριστοφάνης, test. 4,7) πρῶτος ἐπὶ ἄρχοντος Διοτίμου διὰ Καλλιστράτου and vi: Schol. (REMNP) Nub. 529b: ἄριστ' ἠκουσάτην: ἀντὶ τοῦ ἠδδοκίμησαν. οὐ γὰρ τότε ἐνίκησε, δεύτερος δὲ ἐκρίθη ἐν τῷ δράματι.

⁸ On Phrynīs, see J. H. Hordern, *The Fragments of Timotheus of Miletus*, Oxford 2002, 4, 7, 34, 259–260.

man and Phrynus was old by that time, 427 B.C. does seem possible for the date of this contest.

An alternative interpretation of lines 7–11 within the overall framework of a chronological arrangement would be to assume that these four lines refer to Sophron the mime writer and to Menander the playwright. Then ὀνειδι [could refer to some criticism of Menander. A wide range of grounds for criticism of Menander could be considered including the motif of falling into a well already mentioned above (see B) and his mixing in his language of Attic Greek and Hellenistic Koine elements⁹. In this case, line 10 could refer to Knemon in *Dyscolus* and might be reconstructed as Κνήμ]ων (or γέρ]ων) εἰς φρέαρ ἐμ]πεσών.

Commentary

1 [Ἀρι]στοφάνης κωμω[δο(ποιός?): For the supplement and the proposed abbreviation, see the introduction above. However, if we assume a wider column, a broader range of possibilities for the supplement offer themselves, such as [Ἀρι]στοφάνης κωμω[δίαν ἐδίδαξε or εἰσήγαγε.

For the word κωμωδοποιός used in reference to Aristophanes, see *Chronicon Paschale* p. 319,8: ... καὶ Σύμμαχος καὶ Ἀριστοφάνης κωμωδοποιὸς ἐγνωρίζοντο κτλ. For the supplement and the proposed abbreviation, see, in addition to the introduction above, the commentary on l. 2 below. The word κωμωδός employed in reference to comic poets appears to be Roman period usage (*LSJ*⁹ s.v. 3) and is therefore unlikely here.

2 [δε]ύτερον: [πρ]ότερον cannot be ruled out completely, but [δε]ύτερον is preferable palaeographically. Further, the reading of the penultimate letter is uncertain. The area is damaged and the remaining traces seem to be compatible with either an o or an α. If we assume that the traces to the right of the narrow vertical break in the sheet are alien ink imprinted on this surface from elsewhere, then an o seems to be preferable. But if we assume that these traces belonged to the letter originally, then the reading of an α is possible. However, this would be a rather small α and the way the scribe writes the letter combination αν at the end of the word κωμωδίαν in l. 4 is entirely different. If indeed we should read an α here, the suggested supplement at the end of l. 1 would need to be changed to a feminine noun such as κωμω[δίαν to agree with [δε]υτέρα. The supplement κωμω[δίαν would agree well with the hypothetical column width reconstructed in the introduction. This supplement would require a verb or a participle, which may have stood at the end of l. 2 or at the beginning of l. 3. It is tempting to consider a form of the verb εἰσάγω, which is well attested in dramatic contexts. However, such a construction would raise a number of problems, for example, the lack of a preposition before Λήναια or the asyndeton before ἠγωνισμέ(νος).

Theoretically, there seem to be three ways of understanding this line: (1) that Aristophanes took the second prize at a festival, which could be either the Lenaia (*Daitales?*, 427; *Wasps*, 422) or probably the City Dionysia (cf. *Pax*, 421; *Birds*, 414), in which case we would need to assume the loss of a reference to the festival concerned in the unpreserved part of line 1; (2) that he was successful at the Lenaia for the second time (*Knights?*, 424); or (3), perhaps least likely, that the second version of a comedy by Aristophanes is mentioned here (e.g. Αἰολοσίκων δεύτερος and Πλοῦτος δεύτερος).

If our reconstruction of the column width is correct (see the introduction above),

⁹ See Men. Test. 119 K.-A.

the lack of space available to supplement a noun to go with [δε]ύτερον seems to favour the second possibility. Aristophanes won the dramatic contest at the Lenaia at least three times (*Acharnes*, 425; *Knights*, 424; *Frogs*, 405), possibly four (*Proagon?*, 422). On one or possibly two occasions he came second at the Lenaia, with the *Wasps* and the *Daitales*, which interpretation seems to be favoured by hypothesis C (see the introduction). For Aristophanes' record at the Lenaia, see H.-G. Nesselrath, *Der Neue Pauly*, Vol. 1 (1996) 1122–30 s.v. 3 (esp. 1123); B. Zimmermann, *Die griechische Komödie*, Frankfurt am Main 2006, 61–62; id. (ed., with assistance from A. Schlichtmann), *Handbuch der griechischen Literatur der Antike 1. Die Literatur der archaischen und klassischen Zeit* (Handbuch der Altertumswissenschaft, Abt. 7.1), Munich 2011, 767, 769, 770, 772, 775, 778 and Z.P. Biles, *Aristophanes and the Poetics of Competition*, Cambridge 2011, 120–21.

Λήναια: The diagonal stroke of the second α is slightly prolonged to the right, which could be due to the fact that this is the last letter of the word or it might indicate that a break follows. On this Athenian festival, at which both comedies and tragedies were performed by the 430s at the latest, see e.g. A. W. Pickard-Cambridge, *The Dramatic Festivals of Athens*, second edition revised by J. Gould and D. M. Lewis, reissued with supplement and corrections, Oxford 1988, 25-42 and 359-361.

3 [c. 3?] v: The supplement διὰ | ἄλλων might at first sight seem to be tempting here (cf. test. vi. Tzetz.) but the trace between the edge of the lacuna and the first v does not appear to be compatible with it; cf. the letter combination ων in the following word. In addition, see *Daet.* test. v where only Kallistratos is named as Aristophanes' collaborator on the production of the piece.

ἠγωνισμέ(νος) [: After the raised ε an empty space follows, which could indicate either that the text of the entry ended here or that the writer deliberately left a blank space for the purpose of punctuation.

4 ποιητ[: A τ is more likely palaeographically than a σ.

5]γατ δύο: A small letter such as an α or an ο may have been lost in the narrow lacuna between the τ and the δ. Might δύο refer to the two youths who figured in *Daitales* and who might be described in lines 7-8 below (see the introduction above and the line commentary below)?

δα . . . [: The traces after the α are damaged and difficult to interpret. The first letter after the α could be either a ν or, more likely, an ι followed possibly by an ο. In the latter case we might consider words such as δαίς and δαίω. In the first case, a form of a word such as δανείζω, δάνειον, δανειστής *vel sim.* appears to be possible. These words seem to suit what we know about the plot of *Daitales*.

7 Only the right-hand side edge of the first letter survives. It has a round shape suggesting a large ο, the head of a ρ or of a φ. Above the line we can see a thin horizontal stroke rising slightly to the right. If this was a letter, we might interpret these traces as the genitival ending -ου.

σώφρω(ν): This word is either an adjective (σώφρων) or a personal name (Σώφρων); cf. the general introduction above (C and A respectively). On Sophron of Syracuse, see, for example, *PCG* I 187-253; A. Körte, *RE*, Vol. 3A.1 (1927) 1100–04; W.D. Furley, *Der Neue Pauly*, Vol. 11 (2001) 736–37 s.v. 1; Zimmermann, *Handbuch*, 666–670 and the short remarks by K. Boshier in M. Revermann (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Greek Comedy*, Cambridge 2014, 89, together with the earlier literature cited in these works.

νη μ . ε() [: At the end of the preserved part of the line, we prefer to read an ε written with two strokes rather than a lunate c raised above the line in abbreviation, as its shape is similar to the raised ε at the end of l. 3 and as the scribe tends to abbreviate

words at a vowel (ll. 3, 12, 14). Since no Greek word starts with the letters ηνμ-, it seems probable to us that the first two letters should be understood as ἦν or, less likely, as ἦν.

8 [c. 3?] ανδρος: This word may be supplemented either as an adjective ([ἄν]ανδρος) or as a personal name ([Μέν]ανδρος); cf. the introduction above. A third possibility would be the supplement [τοῦ] ἀνδρός. If we assume a personal name here, the most likely supplement is [Μέν]ανδρος, suggested by the mention of Aristophanes, Timotheos and, possibly, Sophron in our text. Menandros (fr. 32) and Sophron (fr. 169) are mentioned together in Zenob. Ath. I 58 and vulg. II 17: Ἀληθέστερα τῶν ἐπὶ Σάγγρα: ταύτης μέμνηται Μένανδρος καὶ Σώφρων καὶ Ἄλεξις. For other personal names ending in -ανδρος, see F. Bechtel, *Die historischen Personennamen des Griechischen bis zur Kaiserzeit*, Halle 1917, 49–52.

ὄνειδι [: The first letter has an angular shape; however, an ο is palaeographically more likely than an α or an ω. At the edge of the lacuna, two tiny, faint traces of ink may be seen, which do not allow any precise identification of the letter. Either a σ or, perhaps more likely, a ζ seems to be possible here, allowing reconstructions in either the active or the passive sense such as ὄνειδιζ[ων, ὄνειδις[ας or ὄνειδιζ[όμενος. Given the palaeographical difficulties, we have deliberately left our translation ambiguous (“reproaches / reproaching / (is) reproached”) to reflect these different possibilities.

[c. 3?] ανδρος ὄνειδι [: Under hypothesis C (see the introduction), the line might be reconstructed as ὡς ἄν]ανδρος ὄνειδιζ[εται vel sim. in opposition to the young man who is described as σῶφρων in the preceding line. The last letter before the lacuna is almost completely lost.

9]αι πρότερον ην[: The supplement κ]αι πρότερον is tempting in the light of the frequency of this phrase in prose. The reading]ει instead of]αι is also possible palaeographically. The reading ην[is slightly preferable palaeographically to ημ[. Reconstructions such as ὡς κ]αι πρότερον ἦν [could be considered.

10 [c. 3?] ν εἰς φρέαρ ἐμ[: The letter preceding the ν is connected to the ν through a horizontal stroke at the top of the line. An α, an ε, an ω or, less likely, an η seems possible here. The last two surviving letters (ἐμ[) probably come from a form of a verb such as ἐμβαίνω, ἐμβάλλω or ἐπίπτω. We may suggest the reconstruction Κνήμ]ων (or γέρ]ων) εἰς φρέαρ ἐμ[πεσόν, for which see the introduction above as well as the hypothesis of *Dyscolus*, l. 7: ἐμπεσὼν δὲ Κνήμων εἰς φρέαρ. It seems that we are dealing with a comic literary topos, that of falling into a well, which might also appear in some plays by Alexis (fr. 85 K.-A.), Anaxippos (fr. 8 K.-A.) and Diphilos (fr. 84 K.-A.) where the word φρέαρ figures as prominently as in the titles.

11] .ος: This is most probably the ending of an individual’s name who acts as ἐπίτροπος to a minor or a woman. The reading] .λος is also possible, but palaeographically less plausible given the angle of the two strokes. In the first case, a personal name ending in -λαος (e.g. Ἀρχέλαος, Μενέλαος) could be reconstructed (see Bechtel, *ibid.* 281–85), which the trace at the edge of the lacuna would conform to. Although in a Menandrian context the reconstruction]Δῆος is tempting and although palaeographically it cannot be ruled out completely, the immediately following context (ὁ ἐπιτροπέω[v) makes it unlikely. In the second case, names ending in -φίλος present tempting possibilities for the supplement (see Bechtel, *ibid.* 449–50).

ἐπιτροπέω[v: The surface of the papyrus is badly damaged after the π and so it is difficult to read anything with any degree of certainty. This reading is suggested by the shape of the letter after the ρ, which is more likely to be an ο than an ε, ruling out the alternative reading ἐπιτρέπων. After the π, traces compatible with a large ε seem to be visible, followed by traces suggesting an υ and possibly an ω.

12 ποιη(τής?): For the construction of the poet's name followed by the definite article and the noun ποιητής, cf. Athenaeus, III 95c: κατὰ γὰρ τὸν Μιλήσιον Τιμόθεον τὸν ποιητὴν κτλ. The supplement ποιή(σας) seems less probable here. For the identification of Timotheos, see the introduction above.

13] .αι: The traces at the edge of the lacuna might belong to a τ, which would open up a range of interesting possibilities for reconstruction, such as the plural nominative ending (e.g. ποιηταί) or the verbal ending –ται (cf., for example, in a dramatic context, ἀγωνίζεται or γνωρίζεται).

The short thin stroke above the ι appears to be alien ink or a scribal mistake rather than an abbreviation as most of the line is left blank by the scribe.

14–15 [Κλεομ]ένη(ς), ὁ Πausανί[ου | [τοῦ βα]σιλέως ἐπίτρ[οπος: The clear mention of the name Pausanias (l. 14) and of the noun 'king' (l. 15) point to the Spartan king with this name of the Agiad line, who ruled in the second half of the fifth and at the beginning of the fourth century B.C. During his father Pleistoanax's exile (445/4–427/6 B.C.) he was king for the first time under the guardianship of his uncle Cleomenes¹⁰, and then again between the death of his father in 408/7 and 395/94 B.C.¹¹ These historical circumstances appear to be reflected in this passage of our fragment as well. At the beginning of l. 14 the clear νη(), preceded by a trace which could conform to an ε, leads one to assume the name Cleomenes, all the more so as the letters επι-, suggesting the supplement ἐπίτρ[οπος, are entirely clear to read at the end of l. 15. These readings and supplements, together with the virtually certain βα]σιλέως, rule out the possibility that in our text the Spartan regent Pausanias, who played a key role in the Persian wars¹², or that the homonymous Athenian individual who appears as κωμωδὸς συναγωνιστής and representative of the Athenian corporation of τεχνίται in Delphi around 97 B.C.¹³, is meant. The latter individual is also ruled out by his chronological closeness to our text. If we assume a broader column, we might consider a longer supplement such as [Κλεομ]ένη(ς), ὁ Πausανί[ου τοῦ Πλειστοάνακτος τοῦ τῆς(?) Σπάρτης βα]σιλέως ἐπίτρ[οπος.

16 In this line only the upper part of a string of characters is preserved, of which the first three seem to be tall letters protruding into the space between the two lines. Only the ω seems to be raised above the line in abbreviation.

As it seems likely that the author of our text had Thucydides 3.26.1-3 as his source for this part and as the verb ἐδήωσαν occurs in this Thucydidean passage, the supplement ἐδήω(σεν) is tempting; cf. Thuc. 3.26.1-3: Τοῦ δ' ἐπιγιγνομένου θέρους οἱ Πελοποννήσιοι ... αὐτοὶ ἐς τὴν Ἀττικὴν καὶ οἱ ξύμμαχοι ἐσέβαλον, ... ἠγείτο δὲ τῆς ἐσβολῆς ταύτης Κλεομένης ὑπὲρ Πausανίου τοῦ Πλειστοάνακτος υἱέος βασιλέως ὄντος καὶ νεωτέρου ἔτι, πατρὸς δὲ ἀδελφὸς ὢν. ἐδήωσαν δὲ τῆς Ἀττικῆς τὰ τε πρότερον τετμημένα εἴ τι ἐβεβλαστήκει καὶ ὅσα ἐν ταῖς πρὶν ἐσβολαῖς παρελέλειπτο.

The traces of the last letter in the line could conform to a π or a τ.

¹⁰ See Thuc. III 26,2: ἠγείτο δὲ τῆς ἐσβολῆς ταύτης Κλεομένης ὑπὲρ Πausανίου τοῦ Πλειστοάνακτος υἱέος βασιλέως ὄντος καὶ νεωτέρου ἔτι, πατρὸς δὲ ἀδελφὸς ὢν.

¹¹ For further information on our Pausanias, see K.-W. Welwei, *Der Neue Pauly*, Vol. 9 (2000) 443–44 s.v. 2 with the previous literature cited there.

¹² K.-W. Welwei, *Der Neue Pauly*, Vol. 9 (2000) 442–43 s.v. 1.

¹³ M. Bonaria, *RE Suppl.*, Vol. 10 (1965) 529 s.v. 12a and I.E. Στεφανής, *Διονυσιακοὶ Τεχνίται. Συμβολές στην προσωπογραφία του θεάτρου και της μουσικῆς των αρχαίων Ελλήνων. Πανεπιστημιακές εκδόσεις Κρήτης (Ηράκλειο 1988) no. 2028.*