More Evidence of Menander Rhetor on the Wedding Speech:  
*Angelo Poliziano’s Transcription in the Statius Commentary* (1480-81)  
Re-edited with a Discussion of the Manuscript Sources and Earlier Editions*

_Pernille Harsting_

This article forms part of a comprehensive investigation of the transmission of Menander Rhetor’s two late-classical epideictic treatises and the reception of the work in the Latin West from 1400 to 1600. Determining to what extent and in which form the Greek rhetorical treatises were known in the period requires identifying the manuscripts or printed sources used by Renaissance copyists, translators, editors, and printers, as well as by those who commented on the texts or merely referred to or quoted them in their own works.

Localizing the evidence of the _fortuna_ of Menander Rhetor’s work often reminds of looking for a needle in a particularly bulky haystack. Nevertheless, the continued search in manuscripts and in printed material of nearly all kinds and genres sometimes results in a lucky find.

The subject of this article is one of these lucky finds. Or rather: re-finds, since the material in question, i.e. Angelo Poliziano’s transcription of a chapter from Menander Rhetor’s epideictic treatises, was in fact already published in 1978. However, as I discovered, the modern edition cannot be used as accurate testimony, neither to the tradition of Menander Rhetor’s late-classical text, nor to Poliziano’s autograph copy of it.¹ Moreover, when trying to identify the manuscript source used by Poliziano, I realized that there was little help to be had in the most recent edition of Menander Rhetor’s work.

---

¹ The research on the Menander Rhetor tradition of course involves discussion with my immediate predecessors. A singularly important predecessor in the context of this article is the Poliziano specialist, Lucia Cesarini Martinelli, who died last year. I find it necessary to state the obvious, namely that my critical remarks about the few pages that contain Menander Rhetor’s text do not detract from the high esteem in which I hold her editorial work on the whole of Poliziano’s extensive Statius commentary.
In this article, then, I have re-edited Poliziano’s autograph copy of the Menander Rhetor chapter with critical notes on the modern editions of the Renaissance and the late-classical text, respectively. Furthermore, the *apparatus criticus* gives information on Poliziano’s probable Greek exemplar manuscript as well as on Poliziano’s transcription of this, based on my inspection of the original material in the Bibliothèque nationale de France in Paris and in the Biblioteca Nazionale Centrale in Florence. By way of introduction, I first describe the context of Poliziano’s transcription, then I present the manuscript sources, and finally I discuss the problems I have met when consulting the two earlier editions.

*Poliziano and Statius*

When in 1480 Angelo Poliziano (1454-94) was appointed professor of rhetoric and poetry at the *Studio fiorentino*, he chose as the subject for his first courses in the academic year 1480-81 to lecture on Quintilian’s *Institutio oratoria* and on Statius’ *Silvae*. Both of these texts had been rediscovered in the beginning of the 15th century. In 1416 the Papal Secretary Poggio Bracciolini reported the finding of a complete manuscript of the *Institutio oratoria* in St. Gall. Two years later, in 1418, Poggio was able to send back to Italy a complete copy of Statius’ *Silvae*. The exemplar manuscript, which was discovered in one of the libraries in the area around Constance, is lost, whereas Poggio’s copy now belongs to the Biblioteca Nacional in Madrid.\(^2\) It is the oldest surviving source of the *Silvae*\(^3\), and the ancestor of all the preserved manuscript copies and the printed editions. An anonymous *editio princeps* of Statius’ *Silvae* appeared in Venice in 1472, but already in the following year Franciscus Puteolanus published what was soon recognized as a far better edition. Commentators also began to work on the rediscovered text: In 1475 Domizio Calderini (1446-78)\(^4\)

---


\(^3\) With the exception of a 9th century copy of *Silvae* 2.7 (“Genethliacon Lucani”) found in the ms. Laur. 29.31 of the Florentine Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana; see also Reeve in Reynolds 1983 (cit. in note 2 above), p. 397.

had his commentary on the Silvae printed in Rome, whereas the commentary by another renowned humanist, Niccolò Perotti (1429-80) is as yet unpublished.\footnote{Giancarlo Abbamonte is currently preparing an edition of Perotti's commentary on the Silvae, based on the autograph manuscript, ms. Vat. lat. 6835, in the Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana.}

**Poliziano's Commentary on the Silvae**

Thus, it was a newly discovered and much discussed text that Poliziano chose for his first course on classical poetry at the *studio* in Florence. Poliziano’s extant lecture notes, *Angeli Politiani in Statis Sylvas tumultuaria commentatio*, which are preserved in the ms. Magl. VII. 973 of the Biblioteca Nazionale Centrale in Florence, make it clear that he had decided to approach the text from a completely new angle. In his notes, Poliziano often — and with characteristic acuteness — discusses, criticizes, and corrects the 1475 commentary by Domizio Calderini.\footnote{Poliziano states his disagreement with Calderini in the end of his brief "Vita Stati" (ms. cit., fol. 1-4v) which like a traditional *accessus* introduces the commentary, but then takes the shape of an academic and personal manifesto: "In quinque autem libros quas in manibus Sylvas habemus digestae sunt. Eas et publice primus narravit et scripto interpretatus est vir nostra aetate non incelebris, Veronensis Domitius, quem nos eateus sequemur, quatenus probabimus. Quod siquando ab eo veritatis ergo desciero, rogo obtestorque vos, ne tam hominis auctoritati, quam rationibus ipsis credendum animum induxeritis. Ego, quantum in me erit, dabo operam ne paenitendus vobis hic meus labor videri possit" (fol. 4r-v). [The Silvae, which we are now dealing with, are divided into five books. The first to comment on them in public and elucidate them in writing was a man of not little fame in our day, namely Domizio of Verona, whom we shall follow whenever we approve of him. But I beg and pray of you that — if I part from him for the sake of the truth — you do not decide to place more trust in a man's authority than in reasoned arguments. As for me, I shall do my best to avoid my work appearing embarrassing to you."] On Poliziano's rivalry with Calderini, see Lucia Cesarini Martinelli, "In margine al commento di Angelo Poliziano alle Selve di Stazio", *Interpres* 1 (1978), pp. 96-145.} More importantly in the present context, however, in order to elucidate Statius' work, Poliziano employs other texts from antiquity that were apparently unknown to his predecessors. A striking example of this is his inclusion in the lecture notes of excerpts from or paraphrases of parts of the two late-classical treatises on epideictic rhetoric traditionally attributed to Menander Rhetor of Laodicea (3rd-4th centuries AD).\footnote{Poliziano's eight excerpts from and paraphrases of (the latter are indicated by "cf.") Menander are the following (the references to Poliziano's text give the page and line numbers in Lucia Cesarini Martinelli (ed.), Angelo Poliziano, *Commento inedito alle Selve di Stazio*, Istituto Nazionale di Studi sul Rinascimento, Studi e testi 5 (Firenze:}
The most extensive of Poliziano’s excerpts from Menander Rhetor’s Greek treatises is included in the commentaries “In Epithalamion Stellae, Sylvam secundam” (ms. cit., fols 39v-56v). Under this rubric Poliziano gives the complete “title” (inscriptio) of the poem: “Epithalamion in Stellam et Violentillam: haec huius secundae Sylvae inscriptio est”. There follows (on fols 39v-42v): (1) a brief excerpt from one of the two chapters on wedding speeches (μέθοδος ἐπιθαλαμίων) from the Pseudo-Dionysius Ars rhetorica;8 (2) the whole of Menander Rhetor’s chapter on the wedding speech (περὶ ἐπιθαλαμίου);9 (3) a brief excerpt from Pseudo-Dionysius’ other chapter on wedding speeches (μέθοδος γαμηλίων);10 (4) references to and quotations from classical Greek and Latin wedding poems (e.g. Theocritus, Catullus and Claudian); (5) a general definition of the epideictic genre, including a paraphrase of the introductory chapter of Menander Rhetor’s first epideictic treatise; and, in conclusion, (6) Poliziano’s evaluation of Statius’ epithalamium and its place in the epideictic tradition. After this follow glosses to specific words and phrases in the poem (fols 42v-56v).


9 Listed as no. (b) in note 7 above.

10 Cf. note 8 above.
Poliziano and Menander Rhetor

Poliziano’s introduction to Statius’ epithalamium constitutes a critical analysis of the literary genre and its history. Thus, Poliziano emphasizes the poem’s background in epideictic rhetoric, gives an account of its parallels in classical Greek and Latin poetry, and describes the poem’s contents and “genre form” on the basis of Menander Rhetor’s and Pseudo-Dionysius’ late-classical prescriptions for the wedding speech. In Poliziano’s view, Statius’ “Epithalamium in Stellam et Violentillam” is a genuine epideictic work. Indeed, in this poem, so Poliziano writes, Statius revealed himself to be unsparing in his efforts to unfold his writing secundum omnem artem:

Sed cum maxime ad voluptatem sit pars haec demonstrativi generis accomodata, omnes in hac Sylvae nervos suos poeta intendit. [...] Atque, ut concludam, nihil quod aut orationem aperiat, aut distinguat, aut exornet, aut illuminet, aut amplifìcet, aut etiam extollat atque efferat, in hac una Sylvae a poeta nostro desiderabitur” (fols 42r-42v).11

[Although this demonstrative sub-genre is especially intended to be pleasing, in this poem the poet strikes all chords. (...) Let me conclude by saying that in this Sylva alone our poet leaves nothing to be desired that unfolds, or adorns, or embellishes, or gives brilliance to, or amplifies, or even extols and exalts the discourse.]

In order to determine the quality of Statius’ poem, Poliziano compared it to the relevant prescriptions for the epideictic sub-genre. In fact, Poliziano is to my knowledge the first to refer to Menander Rhetor’s (and Pseudo-Dionysius’) epideictic treatises as an authoritative text in connection with the investigation and teaching of classical occasional poetry.12 At least part of the late-classical prescriptions was known in the Latin West in the beginning of the 15th century,

11 Quoted from Lucia Cesarini Martinelli (ed.), Angelo Poliziano, Commento inedito alle Selve di Stazio (cit. in note 7 above), p. 192, lines 11-13 and 26-29.

when Menander Rhetor’s chapter on the monody was first translated into Latin.\textsuperscript{13} However, the epideictic treatises only reached a wide audience after 1508 when they were published by Aldus in Venice in the first volume of the renowned \textit{Rhetores graeci}.\textsuperscript{14} Until then, the treatises probably only reached the limited, yet influential readership which had access to manuscript copies of the Greek text and command of the Greek language. In the 16th century the whole of Menander Rhetor’s work was translated into Latin, and the epideictic prescriptions were introduced to serve as \textit{exempla} for literary practice.\textsuperscript{15} Furthermore, the Greek treatises were read, first and foremost by the period’s literary theorists and critics,\textsuperscript{16} as an important key to the history of classical literature. Poliziano’s readings of the late-classical rhetorical treatises and his transcription of Menander Rhetor’s chapter on the epithalamium offer an extraordinarily early example of this activity.

\textit{Poliziano’s Manuscript Source}

Menander Rhetor’s prescriptions for the wedding speech form part of the second of the two epideictic treatises. The chapter is preserved in most of the Menander Rhetor manuscripts from before 1500.\textsuperscript{17} I have collated Poliziano’s


\textsuperscript{14} Along with, among other works, Aristotle’s \textit{Rhetoric} . — Niccolò Perotti apparently was not familiar with Menander Rhetor’s prescriptions for the monody, neither in the original Greek nor in the Latin version, when, in 1470-71, he believed himself to be the first to make use of the genre in the Latin West. See Harsting 1997 (cit. in note 13 above), pp. 16-18.


\textsuperscript{17} We know that Poliziano had access to part of Menander Rhetor’s work in the manuscript which is now know as ms. plut. 56.1 of the Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana in Florence, cf. V. Branca, \textit{Poliziano e l’Umanesimo della parola} (Torino: Einaudi, 1983), pp. 201, 209, 170ff; and Lucia Cesarini Martinelli & Alessandro Daneloni, “XV. Manoscritti e edizioni”, in Pico, Poliziano e l’Umanesimo di fine Quattrocento (Firenze: Olschki, 1994), pp. 305-343: 311-312. However, this cannot be the manuscript used by Poliziano in the context we are dealing with here, since the ms. plut. 56.1 was brought to Florence by Constantin Lascaris in the spring of 1492 (cf. Branca, op. et loc.cit. above) and only contains part of Menander Rhetor’s treatise, not including the chapter on the epithalamium. — My collation of the material indicates
autograph text with the pre-1500 Menander Rhetor manuscripts in the Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, the Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana, and the Bibliothèque nationale de France. My collations indicate that Poliziano copied his text from the 10th century ms. Par. gr. 1741 (hereafter: P) (or from a next-to-perfect copy — as yet unknown to me — of this manuscript), which is the oldest of the representatives of the so-called first branch of the Menander Rhetor manuscript tradition. The few variant readings mainly reflect the differences between classical and Byzantine pronunciation of Greek vowels, e.g. line 33 with note 27 in my edition below: ἐκῃρυττεν (Poliziano) vs. ἐκῃρυττεν (P); line 35 with note 31: ἕλλος (Poliziano) vs. ἕλλως (P); and line 40 with note 39: δώσει (Poliziano) vs. δώση (P). In line 47 with note 46, the variant ὅεια (Poliziano) vs. ἦραί (P) may result from Poliziano’s emendation of his exemplar text.

Before I examined the original manuscripts containing Poliziano’s and Menander Rhetor’s works in the libraries of Florence, Rome, and Paris, I naturally consulted the modern printed versions of the texts in question. Unfortunately, neither the recent editio princeps of Poliziano’s commentary on the Silvae, nor the most recent edition of Menander Rhetor’s Greek treatises was of much help in identifying Poliziano’s manuscript source.

The Editio Princeps of Poliziano’s Commentary
Poliziano’s partly autograph commentary on Statius’ Silvae appeared in 1978 in a printed edition by Lucia Cesari Martinelli, as Angelo Poliziano, Commento inedito alle Selve di Stazio. Cesarini Martinelli’s edition offers three apparatus: one that lists the lemmata in Poliziano’s text, an apparatus fontium, and an apparatus criticus. The sources mentioned in the apparatus fontium are listed in a useful “Index locorum”.

Poliziano’s autograph copy of Menander Rhetor’s chapter on the epitalamion is found on p. 185, line 12- p. 190, line 6 in the editio princeps of 1978. Unfortunately, the modern edition does not do complete justice to

that the ms. plut. 56.1 is closely related to the ms. Vat. gr. 1890 of the Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana.


19 See complete reference in note 7 above.
Poliziano’s Greek text. Thus, among the misreadings of the autograph text are the following: οὖγαν for σωπάν (cf. line 16 with note 15 in my edition below) ἀνευάξουν for ἀνευάξουσιν (cf. line 34 with note 29); ἡδὶν for ἡμῖν (cf. line 60 with note 64); γάμους for γαμοῦντας (cf. line 100 with note 121); and ἱδίνός for ἱδίνος (cf. line 147 with note 203). In the sparse apparatus criticus, the editor reports on most of the corrections made by Poliziano himself, e.g., “πυγχάνοι ex πυγχάνει int. lin.” (ad p. 186, line 5; cf. line 18 with note 16 in my edition below). In some cases, Cesarini Martinelli comments on her own emendations of Poliziano’s text, e.g., “σκιρτῶσιν: σκιτῶσιν cod.” (ad p. 186, line 20; cf. below, line 34 with note 28), whereas she overlooks Poliziano’s reading (following P): “τρίτος τρότος” for “τρίτος τόπος” (cf. below, lines 116-117 with note 146). Generally, however, Cesarini Martinelli does not remark upon her own emendations, e.g., “οῖος” for “οἶον” (cf. below, line 129 with note 167); “παρθένου” for “παρθένος” (cf. below, line 131 with note 169); and “ἀκίδας” for “οἰκίδας” (cf. below, line 138 with note 183). The silent emendation and normalization of the text makes it difficult for the reader to reconstruct Poliziano’s own version.

The indication in Cesarini Martinelli’s edition of four “lacunae” in Poliziano’s copy of the Menander Rhetor chapter is still more confusing (cf. notes 35, 151, 171, and 212 in my edition below). Yet, on a second glance, the “lacunae” reveal the fact that the editor relied heavily on the Menander Rhetor edition that was available to her, namely Spengel’s standard text that was published in the third volume of Rhetores graeci (1856). Spengel’s edition generally follows the Parisian ms. Par. gr. 1874, which has been ascribed to a third branch of the manuscript tradition. In fact, in the four places indicated by Lucia Cesarini Martinelli in the Poliziano edition, the ms. Par. gr. 1874 provides text (words or whole paragraphs) that is not found in the manuscripts ascribed to the first branch of the Menander Rhetor tradition. This branch is first and foremost represented by the Parisian ms. Par. gr. 1741, which, as I

---

20 See complete reference in note 7 above.
22 In one case, cf. note 171, the text is also found in manuscripts of the so-called second branch of the Menander Rhetor tradition, viz. the Florentine ms. Laur. 81.8 and the Vatican ms. Vat. gr. 306. Cf. Russell and Wilson 1981 (cit. in note 8 above), pp. xli-xlii, and p. 144, §404, lines 12-14, with the corresponding apparatus criticus.
have argued above, must be regarded as the ultimate source for Poliziano's transcription of Menander Rhetor's chapter on the epithalamium. In other words, the "lacunae" indicated by Cesarini Martinelli are non-existent in Poliziano’s exemplar manuscript and do not have any bearing on his transcription of the Menander Rhetor chapter.

Russell and Wilson's Edition of Menander Rhetor
In fact, the 1981 edition of Menander Rhetor's work by D. A. Russell and N. G. Wilson cannot be used as a reliable tool for identifying Poliziano's source either. Not only is the *apparatus criticus* generally extremely sparse, the very selective information that it does offer is in some places marred by errors and misprints. Unfortunately, this problem is most noticeable with regards to the documentation in the *apparatus criticus* of the Parisian ms. Par. gr. 1741.

I surmise that these errors stem from the editor's reliance on a microfilm copy of this manuscript. Owning a copy of the microfilm myself, and having used another in the manuscript room of the Bibliothèque nationale de France, I can attest that the microfilm is not a trustworthy reproduction of the ms. Par. gr. 1741. It is badly photographed, and in places it even truncates the manuscript's text. A re-edition of Russell and Wilson's useful Menander Rhetor volume — which would be very welcome indeed, since the 1981 edition has long been out of print — would benefit greatly from a fresh and complete collation with the original Parisian manuscript.

Here I shall only indicate the errors found among Russell and Wilson’s readings of the ms. Par. gr. 1741 which are listed in their *apparatus criticus* to the chapter περὶ ἐπιθαλαμίου (op.cit., pp. 134-146, §399, line 11- §405, line 13). These errors unfortunately lead to a somewhat distorted picture of the contents of the manuscript and — together with the fact that many variant readings are simply omitted from the *apparatus criticus* — make it difficult to use the 1981 edition as a means of identifying the source of Poliziano’s transcription of Menander Rhetor's chapter.

---

24 See complete reference in note 8 above.
25 Cf. the brief description of Par. gr. 1741 in op.cit., p. xli: "We have made a fresh collation of the text from microfilm, and have found that there are some places where it appears to have been misread by previous editors".
This is not correct; P certainly has the word, which is divided between two lines: “ἡλ” at the end of fol. 61v, line 25, and “θον” at the beginning of the following line. (Cf. line 12, note 9, in my edition below.)

(2) R&W, app.crit. ad 399,30: “ἀγάν p: σωμπάν mWp”
The last “p” should probably be read as “P”, for P certainly has “σωμπάν”.
(Cf. below, line 16, note 15.)

(3) R&W, app.crit. ad 401,21: “μόνον Pmp”
This is not correct; P has “ἡμῖν”. (Cf. below, line 59, note 61.)

(4) R&W, app.crit. ad 405,2: “ἐξέσται PmW”
This is not correct; P has “ἐξεσται”. (Cf. below, line 149, note 209.)

(5) R&W, app.crit. ad 405,5: “τὸν Γάμον P”
This is not correct; P has “τὸν θάλαμον”. (Cf. below, line 151, notes 213 and 214.)

(6) R&W, app.crit. ad 405,8: “παρ’ ὄμηρῳ Pp”
This is not correct; P has the totally different reading: “πρωῆν”. (Cf. below, line 153, note 223.)

(7) R&W, app.crit. ad 405,9: “πρέποι … λέγειν Pp”
This is not correct; P has the reading: “ἐπειδ’ ἄν ταῦτα λέγειν”. (Cf. below, line 154, note 224.)

A New Edition of Poliziano’s Transcription
The following new edition of Angelo Poliziano’s autograph copy of Menander Rhetor’s chapter on the epithalamium is based on the original manuscripts in Florence and Paris. The Greek text follows Poliziano’s transcription and is based on the principle of “no fictionalizing”. This implies that it does not include any editorial emendations, but reproduces Poliziano’s original version — including all inconsistencies and errors — to the best of the present editor’s ability.

The apparatus criticus on the other hand reports on:
(a) Poliziano’s own additions and corrections in the transcription;
(b) readings in Poliziano’s probable manuscript source, the ms. Par. gr. 1741, that differ from those in Poliziano’s transcription;
(c) emendations and misreadings of Poliziano’s transcription in Lucia Cesarini Martinelli’s 1978 editio princeps;
(d) readings in the main text of Russell and Wilson’s 1981 edition of Menander Rhetor that differ from Poliziano’s readings or from those of the ms. Par. gr. 1741. When the differing readings of the ms. Par. gr. 1741 are left unmentioned by Russell and Wilson in their *apparatus criticus*, I mark this with an asterisk (= P* or y*);

(e) erroneous reports on the ms. Par. gr. 1741 in the *apparatus criticus* of Russell and Wilson’s edition.

By proposing the principle of "no fictionalizing", I do not mean to suggest that all editions must reproduce only the text of a single manuscript, nor that every *apparatus criticus* should contain a complete list of variant readings. However, a scientific edition must bear witness to the manuscript tradition and aim at giving a satisfactory account of the extant evidence rather than maintain the illusion of a perfect text.

The electronic media make it easier to publish ever more complete and complex editions. Since the *fortuna* of the classical texts undeniably also includes their transmission in the 15th and 16th century, it is important that future re-editions of these texts take into account the growing research interest in the later part of the manuscript tradition, at least by giving the necessary information to reconstruct and identify the manuscripts that served as sources for 15th and 16th century transcriptions.
Sigla

F: Poliziano’s Menander Rhetor transcription in the ms. Magl. VII. 973 (Biblioteca Nazionale Centrale, Firenze), fol. 39v, from line 22,26 and fols 41-42r, line 2

P: Menander Rhetor’s prescriptions on the wedding speech, in the ms. Par. gr. 1741 (Bibliothèque nationale de France, Paris), fols 61v-63v

P*: Readings in the ms. Par. gr. 1741 that are not reported in Russell and Wilson’s 1981 edition (cf. “y” below)

x: Editio princeps of F, by Lucia Cesarini Martinelli in Angelo Poliziano, Commento inedito alle Selve di Stazio, Istituto Nazionale di Studi sul Rinascimento, Studi e testi 5 (Firenze: Sansoni editore, 1978), pp. 185-190


y*: Readings in Russell and Wilson’s 1981 edition that differ tacitly from those of the ms. Par. gr. 1741

---

26 NB: fol. 40 is an inserted page that does not belong in the context.
Angeli Politiani in Statii Sylvas tumultuaria commentatio.
In epithalamion Stellae, Sylvam secundam.

[F 39v; P 61v; x 185; y 399.12] Menander. ὁ ἐπιθαλάμιος λέγεται ὑπὸ τινών καὶ γαμήλιος. λόγος δὲ ἔστιν ὑμνῶν θαλάμιος καὶ παστάδας καὶ νυμφίου καὶ γένος καὶ πρὸ γε πάντων αὐτῶν τὸν θεόν τῶν γάμων. χαίρει δὲ διηγήμασιν ἐπαφροδίτοις τε καὶ ἔρωτικῶς. ταῦτα γὰρ οἰκεῖα τῇ ὑποθέσει: μετεχειρίσαντο δὲ τὸ εἴδος οἱ μὲν συντονως οἱ δὲ συνυγραφικῶτερον. καὶ δῆλον ὡς ὁ μὲν σύντονος συνεστραπται λόγος άτε πολιτικός προϊόν. δὲ ἔξει τάς ἀρετάς τοῦ πολιτικοῦ λόγου. προοίμια τε ἐγκατεσκευασμένα ἡ μέγεθος περιθέσεις τῇ ὑποθέσει, αὐξῶν αὐτὴν ἀπὸ τῶν προσώπων τῶν ζευγνυμένων, ἤν ὅσιν οἱ νυμφίοι τῶν ἑνδόξων. εἶτα τὴν αἰτίαν ἐν αὐτοῖς ἔρεις δι’ ἡν παρεκληθέτως ἐπὶ τὸν λόγον. ὅτι συγγενεῖς τῶν γαμοῦντων, ὅτι παρακληθεῖσι ἡλθον ἐπὶ τὸν λόγον, ἢ ὅτι ξαναν ἀποδίδοις, αὐτός προειληφῶς πρότερον χάριτας. ἢ καὶ ἄλλως. ὅτι φιλία χαριζόμενος ἢ ὅτι περὶ τὸν πόλεων καὶ ἐνδόξων καὶ συνεφεύρετε αὑρομένων.

---

1 δὲ] δὲ Π x
2 θαλάμιος] τε add. y*
3 μετεχειρίσαντο] μετεχειρίσαντο Π*
4 πολιτικός] πολιτικῶς y*
5 προϊόν] προϊόν καὶ Π : προϊόν, καὶ y
6 αὐξῶν] αὐξῶν Π*
7 τὸν λόγον] τὸ λέγειν y
8 συγγενεῖς] συγγενῆς Π*
9 ἡλθον] om. Π teste y; reversa autem ἡλθον in Π extat
10 αὐτός] αὐτῷ y*
11 φιλία] φιλία x y*
12 ὅτι s.l. F
13 περὶ ἄν] ὁσπερ ἄν F a.c. x : περὰν Π
14 παραπέσου] παραπέσῃ y*
ἀτοπον ἦν αὐτὸν σιωπᾶν¹⁵ καὶ μὴ χαρίζεσθαι τοσαύτη συνόδῳ καὶ συνεορτάζειν ἐθέλειν τοῖς παροῦσιν ἁπασιν. [y 400] μὴ ἁμοιρείτω μέντοι τὰ προσόμια χάριτος καὶ σύντονα τυγχάνοις.¹⁶ ἀλλ' ἐχέτω μὲν ἐννοιάς ἡδίστας ὡς ἐν μάλιστα πρεποῦσας [P 41r] τῇ ὑποθέσει. εἰ δὲ μὴ ὀνόματα γοῦν ἑπαφρόδιτα καὶ κεχαρισμένα, παστάδων, ὑμεναίων, γάμων ἀφροδίτης, ἐρώτων, ἵνα καὶ οἰκεία γενηται τῇ ὑποθέσει. καὶ τοῖς ἀκούουσιν ἡδίστα. καὶ τὰ μὲν προσόμια τοῦ συντόνου [P 62r] ταύτα. καὶ τούτοις παραπλήσια. τοῦ δὲ ἄνετου καὶ συγγραφικοῦ¹⁷ λόγου ἤττων. μὲν ἑγκατάσκευα. οὐκ ἐμπερίβολα δὲ, ἀλλ' ὡς ἐν συγγραφῇ ἡπλωμένα, μᾶλλον ἐννοιας ἔχουντα ταύτας¹⁸. ἔστιν¹⁹ δὲ ποτε ἐν ἄνετῳ λόγῳ καὶ ἀπὸ διηγήματος ἀρξασθαί, ἀνύοντά τι²⁰ ἀπὸ²¹ τοῦ διηγήματος τῶν προειρημένων ἐννοιῶν. οἶχον εἰ λέγοις νέος ἃν²² ὅτι γαμοῦντος διονύσου²³ ἀριάδνην παρῆν ὁ ἀπόλλων²⁴ καὶ τὴν λύραν ἐπληττέν. ἢ ὅτι πηλέως γαμοῦντος παρῆσαν μὲν ἄπαντες οἱ θεοί. προσῆσαι δὲ μοῦσαι, καὶ οὐκ ἡμέλει τῶν παρόντων. ἐκαστος πρεποῦσαι αὐτῷ²⁵ δωρεάν χαρίζεσθαι τῷ γάμῳ. ἀλλ' ὁ μὲν ἐδίδου δῶρα ὁ δὲ ἐπληττέν²⁶ λύραν. αἱ δὲ ηὖλουν, αἱ δὲ ἢδουν. ἐρμής δὲ ἐκήρυττεν²⁷ τῶν ὑμέναιον. ὅρω δὲ, καὶ νῦν παρ' ἡμῖν ὃμοια καὶ γὰρ οἱ
μὲν σκιτωσιν\textsuperscript{28} οι δὲ ἀνευάζουσιν\textsuperscript{29}. ἐγὼ δὲ λέγω καὶ ἄγω\textsuperscript{30} τοὺς
gάμους. ἥ ἄλλος\textsuperscript{31}. ὅτι\textsuperscript{32} ὁ μεγακλῆς ἐγάμει τὴν ἄγαρίστην καὶ
συνῆλθον τῶν ἔλληνων, οἱ ἄριστοι. τότε οὐδεὶς μὲν ποιητής, οὐδεὶς
δὲ λογοποιὸς ὑστερεί. ἀλλ' ὁ μὲν ῥήτωρ ἔλεγεν. ὁ δὲ συγγραφεὺς
βίβλους ἐν μέσοις ἀνεγίνωσκεν\textsuperscript{33}. πάντες\textsuperscript{34} δὲ ἀνύμνουν τὸν γάμον\textsuperscript{35}
tῆς\textsuperscript{36} παρ' ἤμιν\textsuperscript{37}. ὠστε καὶ τοιαῦτα\textsuperscript{38} δεύτερα γίνεσθαι. καὶ περὶ μὲν
προοίμιων τοσαῦτα δώσει\textsuperscript{39} γὰρ ἤμιν ἡ ὑπόθεσις πρὸς τὰ τότε
παρόντα πρόσφορα ἀληθεστέρας ἐννοιάς. καὶ μᾶλλον ἵσως οἰκείας.
τὰ δὲ μετὰ ταῦτα\textsuperscript{40} προοίμια. ἑστώ περὶ τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ γάμου λόγος
ὕστερ\textsuperscript{[y 401]} θετικὸς καθόλου τὴν ἐξέτασιν περιέχων ὅτι καλὸν ὁ
γάμος. ἀρξῇ δὲ ἀνωθεν ὅτι μετὰ λύσιν τοῦ χάους\textsuperscript{41} εὐθὺς ὑπὸ τῆς
φύσεως ἐδημιουργήθη γάμος\textsuperscript{42}. εἰ δὲ βούλει ὡς ἐμπεδοκλῆς\textsuperscript{[x 187]}
φησιν\textsuperscript{43}, καὶ ἔρως, γενόμενος δὲ καὶ\textsuperscript{44} ὁ θεὸς οὕτως συνάπτει μὲν
οὐρανὸν τῇ γῆ. συνάπτει δὲ κρόνων\textsuperscript{45} τῇ πεία\textsuperscript{46}. συνεργοῦντος δὲ\textsuperscript{47}

\textsuperscript{28} σκιτωσιν] σκιτωσιν x y*
\textsuperscript{29} ἀνευάζουσιν] ἀνευάζουσιν x
\textsuperscript{30} ἄγω] ἄδω y*
\textsuperscript{31} ἄλλος] ἄλλος P x y
\textsuperscript{32} ὅτι] ὅτε P y
\textsuperscript{33} ἀνεγίνωσκεν] ἀνεγίνωσκε y*
\textsuperscript{34} πάντες] ἄπαντες y*
\textsuperscript{35} γάμον] lacunam indicat x
\textsuperscript{36} τῆς] δὲ [τῆς] Σικυωνιᾶς οὐ χείρων ἢ add. y
\textsuperscript{37} παρ' ἤμιν] παρημῖν P
\textsuperscript{38} τοιαῦτα] ταῦτα P
\textsuperscript{39} δώσει] δώσῃ P*
\textsuperscript{40} ταῦτα] τὰ y*
\textsuperscript{41} χάους] γάμου F a.c.
\textsuperscript{42} γάμος] ὁ γάμος y*
\textsuperscript{43} φησιν] φησίν y*
\textsuperscript{44} καὶ] om. P y
\textsuperscript{45} κρόνων] κρόνων P*
\textsuperscript{46} ἤ] om. P: 'Ρέα y*
\textsuperscript{47} δὲ] om. y*
αὐτῷ πρὸς ταύτα τοῦ ἔρωτος. ἔτα ἐφεξῆς ἔρεις ὅτι ἡ τῶν ὅλων διακόσμησις διὰ τὸν γάμον γέγονεν. ἀέρος ἀστέρων, θαλάσσης. τοῦ γὰρ ἐρμοῦ ὁ τοῦ στάσιν παῦσαντος καὶ συνάψαντος ὄμοιον καὶ τελετῇ γαμηλίῳ τὸν οὐρανὸν πρὸς τὴν γῆν ἀπάντα διεκρίθη καὶ στάσιν οἰκεῖαν ἔλαβεν. ὑποβαίνων ὅτι καὶ αὐτὸς τῇ βασιλείᾳ τῶν ὅλων τὸν δία δημιουργῆσας ἐπέστησεν. καὶ οὐκ ἀχρί τῶν θεῶν ἔστη μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ τοὺς ἡμιθέους αὐτὴν. παρήγαγεν πείσας θεοὶ συνελθεῖν τοὺς μὲν γυναιξὶν, τοὺς δὲ νύμφαις. μετὰ ταύτα πάλιν ἔρεις ὅτι αὐτὸς τὸν οὐρανὸν ὁμοίως φησὶν παρεσκέυασε. καὶ σχεδὸν ἄθανατον ἐφιλοτέχνησεν συμπαραπέμπων ἀεὶ τὰς διαδοχὰς τοῦ γένους τῷ μήκει τοῦ χρόνου καὶ ὅτι διόνυσος ἐβλέπουν προμθεῖς ἡμῖν. ὁ μὲν γὰρ τὸ πῦρ ἡμῖν κλέψας ἔδωκεν. ὁ δὲ γάμον ἀθανασίας ἡμῖν ὁρίζεται. ἐμπλεονάσεις δὲ. τούτῳ τῷ μέρει δεικνύς ὅτι δὲ αὐτὸν θάλαττα
πλεῖται, δι' αὐτὸν ἡγεργεῖται γῇ. φιλοσοφία καὶ γνώσις τῶν ούρανίων, δι' ἐκείνων εἰσίν, καὶ νόμοι καὶ πολιτεία. [P 62v] καὶ πάντα ἀπλώς τὰ ἀνθρώπινα. ἐπάυρ εὑρέθη τούτων στήση ἀλλ' ὅτι καὶ μέχρι πηγῶν καὶ ποταμῶν διηκεῖ ο θεός καὶ νηστῶν καὶ θρήσκων. ἐὰν δὲ τούτων ἄπασι διηγήματα θήσεις. ποταμῶν μὲν ὁ ἄλφειας ὁ πιστῶν ἐρὰ πηγῆς σικελίκης ἀρετοῦσι καὶ βιάζεται τὴν φύσιν καὶ καθάπερ νυμφίος ἔρωτικὸς κελαρύζων διὰ τῆς θαλάττης ἀπεισὶ, καὶ τὴν νῆσον εἰς σικελίαν, [y 402] καὶ εἰς κόλπους ἐμπίπτει τῆς ἐρωμένης ἀρετοῦσι καὶ μέγιστα. νηστῶν δὲ, δὴλον γὰρ ὅτι καὶ αὐτά τὰ ζῶα τὰ κατὰ θάλασσαν τελετήν ὁμοίως καὶ τὰ χερσαία καὶ τὰ πτηνά καὶ πάντα τὸν ἀνήμερον λέοντα φοβερὰ βρυχώμενον ἔγαγεν εἰς τὴν τελετήν καὶ ὑπέξευξεν ἀφροδίτης νόμῳ καὶ τὰς ἀγριοτάτας παρθένες καὶ ὅσα τοιαῦτα, περὶ δὲ δένδρων ἑρεῖς ὅτι κάκεινα οὐκ ἄμοιρα γάμων. οἱ γὰρ ἐπὶ ταῖς

67 αὐτόν] αὐτῶν P*
68 γῇ] γῇ P x y: ὅτι add. y*
69 ἐκείνων εἰσίν] ἐκείνον ἐστὶ η y*
70 πολιτείαι] πολιτείαι P: πολιτείαι x y*
71 στήση] στήση P: στήσῃ x y
72 θρήσκων] ἀερίων y
73 ἐὰν] ἐν y*
74 ἄπασι] ἄπασιν P*
75 ποταμῶν] ποταμῶν P*
76 ἄλφειας] ἄλφειας F a c.: Ἀλφεῖας x y*
77 ἔρωτικῶς] ἔρωτικὸς P y
78 ἀπεισὶ] ἐπεισὶ y
79 δὲ] δὲ y*
80 ζῶα] ζώα P: ζῶα y*
81 πτηνά] πτερινά y*
82 καὶ πάντα] πάντα, καὶ y
83 λέοντα] καὶ add. y*
84 βρυχώμενον] βρυχώμενον P*
85 ἀγριοτάτας] ἀγριωτάτας x y*
κόμας σύνθεσιμοι φιλοτεχνήματα γαμούντων, δένδρων εἰσὶν\(^{86}\) καὶ
tοῦ θεοῦ ταῦτα ἔστιν\(^{87}\) εὐρήματα. ἔτι δὲ τούτων\(^{88}\) ἀνωτέρω ἐν τῇ
μνήμῃ τῶν θεῶν ἔρεις διηγήματα. ἐν\(^{89}\) ὧ\(^{90}\) δεύτερον ἤ περὶ
ποσειδώνος γαμούντος τὴν τύρω\(^{91}\) ἐν ταῖς προοχαῖς\(^{92}\) ἐνιπέως [F 41v]
ποταμὸς δὲ θεταλίας ὁ ἐνπεύς. ἦ περὶ διὸς γῆμαντος τὴν εὐρώπην
καὶ τὴν ἱώ\(^{93}\) καὶ δόσι παραπλῆσια τούτοις, πολλὴ δὲ ἱστορία τοιαύτη
παρὰ ποιηταῖς καὶ συγγραφεῖαι\(^{x 188}\) -φεῦσιν\(^{94}\). παρ’ ὧν \(^{95}\) καὶ λήψῃ τὴν
χωρηγίαν\(^{96}\). ἐπιφωνήσεις δὲ καὶ τῶν σαπφοὺς ἐρωτικῶν\(^{97}\) καὶ τῶν
ομῆρου καὶ ἱσιόδου. πολλὰ δὲ αὐτῶν\(^{98}\) ἐν τοῖς καταλόγοις τῶν
γυναικῶν εἴρηται περὶ θεῶν συνουσίας καὶ γάμου. μετὰ τὸν περὶ\(^{99}\)
γάμου λόγου, ἐν δὲ τὸν θεὸν ὑμνησας. ἤξεις ἐπὶ τὰ τῶν γαμούντων
ἐγκώμια. κοινὰ δὲ τὰ προειρημένα πάντα καὶ ῥηθησόμενα\(^{100}\) τοῦ τε
συντόνου καὶ\(^{101}\) ἀνέτου λόγου. διοίσοσι\(^{102}\) δὲ τῷ χαρακτῆρι μόνῳ τῆς
ἀπαγγελίας τὰ τοιαύτα ἐγκώμια. διττὴν δ’\(^{103}\) ἔχει τὴν μέθοδον καὶ\(^{104}\)

---

\(^{86}\) εἰσὶν] εἰσί \(y^*\)

\(^{87}\) ταῦτα ἔστιν] ταῦτα ἔστιν \(x\) \(y^*\)

\(^{88}\) τοῦτων] τοῦτου \(y^*\)

\(^{89}\) ἐν] ἐν \(P\) \(y\)

\(^{90}\) ὧ] ὧ \(P:\) ὧ καὶ \(y^*\)

\(^{91}\) τύρω] Τυρῷ \(x\) \(y^*\)

\(^{92}\) προοχαῖς] προοχεῖς \(P^\ast\)

\(^{93}\) ἱώ] ἱώ \(x\)

\(^{94}\) συγγραφεύσιν] συγγραφεύσι \(y^*\)

\(^{95}\) παρ’ ὧν] παρῶν \(P^\ast\)

\(^{96}\) χωρηγίαν] χωρηγίαν \(y^*\)

\(^{97}\) ἐρωτικῶν] ἐρωτικῶν \(P^\ast\)

\(^{98}\) αὐτῶν] αὐτῶ \(y\)

\(^{99}\) περὶ] τοῦ \(add.\) \(y^*\)

\(^{100}\) ῥηθησόμενα] ῥηθησόμενα \(F \, a\, c.\)

\(^{101}\) καὶ] τοῦ \(add.\) \(y^*\)

\(^{102}\) διοίσοσι] διοίσοσιν \(P^\ast\)

\(^{103}\) δὲ \(ante\) τοιαύτα ἐγκώμια \(transposuit\) \(y\)

\(^{104}\) καὶ] ὧ \(y\)

---

105 συνάψειςιν] οὐ add. y
106 δοκής] δοκής P*
107 τὸν] τὸ y
108 τὸν] τὸ y
109 προάγειν] προάγων y*
110 μίξιν] μίξιν P: μίξιν x y*
111 προσάγειν] προάγειν y
112 ἀντεξέτασις] ἀντεξέτασις P*
113 ἔιδα] ἔιδα x y*
114 τὰ] τὸ y*
115 τὰ] τὸ y*
116 πράττειν] προτάττειν y
117 ἀνθελίαν] ἀνθελίαν x y*
118 τὸ] τῷ y*
119 μήτε] μηδὲ y
120 ταύτην] τούτο y
121 γαμοῦντας] γάμους x y
122 τῷ σοὶ] τῷ σοὶ x y*
123 τυγχάνει] τυγχάνῃ y*
124 συλλαβόντα] συλλαμβάνοντα y
δι’ ὀλίγων, εἰς τὰ ἀπὸ τῶν ἴδιων πάλιν αὔξειν. ἀεὶ πρᾶξεις αὐτῶι λέγοντα καὶ φιλοτιμίας. εὰν δὲ τῶν μετρίων καὶ μὴ περιβλέπτων τυγχάνει, δεὶ ζητεῖν τοὺς πατέρας, εἰ λαμπροί εἴεν κατὰ τὴν πόλιν εἰ ἐν εὐδόκιμοι καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦτων μᾶλλον ἐπιχειρεῖν. εἰ δὲ. οἱ ἐγγὺς πατέρες, ἀφανεῖς. τὸ δὲ ἔθνος ἐπισημότερον, μᾶλλον ἀπὸ τοῦ γένους πειράσθαι χρὴ τὰ ἐγκώμια παραλαμβάνειν. θηρευέτω γὰρ ὁ λόγος τὰ ἐνδοξότερα. ἂν δὲ, τὸ μὲν ἐνδοξότερον τῶν γονέων τυγχάνει. τὸ δὲ μὴ πάνω, ἀντίθεσ τῶν ἐνδόξων ἄρετάς, σωφροσύνη, ἐπισκείλαι τοῦ ἔτερου γένους. οὐ γὰρ ἀπορήσεις ἀφορμῶν. εἰ δὲ μηδέτερον τῶν γενῶν ἐχοι μηδεμίαν λαμπρότητα. χρὴ τὸ ἱθος καὶ τὸν τρόπον καὶ τὴν ἐπισκείλειν ἑπανεύσατα διὰ βραχέων καὶ παρακαλέσαντα τὸν περὶ αὐτῶν λόγον ἀναδραμεῖν ἐπὶ τοὺς νυμφίους. 

---

125 εἰς τὰ | εἶτα γ*  
126 ἴδιων | ἴδιῳ P : ἴδιῳ x y  
127 αὔξειν | αὔξειν P x y  
128 αὐτῶι | αὐτῷ P : αὐτῶι y*  
129 τυγχάνει | τυγχάνῃ y*  
130 τοὺς | ἐγγὺς add. y*  
131 εἴεν | εἰσεῖν P a.c.  
132 εἰ | ἦ γ*  
133 εὐδόκιμοι | εὐδόκιμοι P a.c.  
134 ἐγγὺς | μὲν add. y  
135 δὲ ἔθνος | δὲ γένος y  
136 πειράσθαι | πειράσθαι P*  
137 ἂν | ἦν y*  
138 ἐνδοξότερον | ἐνδοξὸν y  
139 γονέων | γενῶν y*  
140 τυγχάνει | τυγχάνῃ P : τυγχάνῃ y*  
141 τῶν ἐνδόξων | τῷ ἐνδόξῳ y : τὰς add. y*  
142 ἐπισκείλαι | ἐπισκείλαι P x y  
143 παρακαλέσαντα | παρακλέσαντα y  
144 αὐτῶν | αὐτῶι P y  
145 ἐπὶ | ἐπὶ P
τρόπος ἐστὶν ὁ ἀπὸ τῶν νυμφῶν. χαριέστατος δὲ ὁ οὕτος γένοιτο. εἰ κατὰ συμπλοκὴν ἀντεξεταστικῶς προέλθοι. ὅτι θαυμάσιος ὁ νεανίας. θαυμασία δὲ ἡ κόρη ἐν παιδίᾳ. σοφὸς οὗτος. ἐν μούσαις καὶ ἐν λύραις οὗτος ἁρίζηλος. ἐκείνης εἰς ἔχεις τοῦτο λέγε. ὅτι οὗτος μὲν ἐν λόγοις. ἐκείνη δὲ, ἐν ἱστοργίαις. καὶ ἄθνη καὶ χαρίτων ἐρ—[y 404]—γοισ. καὶ ἄνευ μὲν ἀντεξετάσεως. κατὰ συμπλοκὴν δὲ ἄλλων, ἀμφοτέρων δὲ τις οὐκ ἂν τὰς ἄρετὰς ἐπενέσειεν καὶ τὴν προσοῦσιαν σωφροσύνην, καὶ τὴν ὑπάρχουσαν ἐπιείκιαν. δυνατον δὲ καὶ ἰδίᾳ καὶ χωρὶς ἑκάστου διελόμενον τὸν ἑπαυνον, ἑπαινεῖν. κάλλος δὲ παρ’ ἀμφοῖν κατὰ ἀντεξεταιν πάντως. οὐχ ὁ μὲν φυτῶν καλλίστων ἐλαῖα. ἡ δὲ φοίνικη παραπλησία. καὶ ὅτι ὁ μὲν ρόδῳ προσέοικεν. ἡ δὲ, μὴλω.
διαγράφεις δὲ καὶ τὸν νεανίαν οἶον ἰδεῖν οἶος ὡφθηναι. ὡς χαρίεις καὶ εὐπρόσωπος, ὡς ιοῦλος κατάκομος, ὡς ἀρτι ἡβάσκων. 

παρθένος ἐφαλαξη διὰ τὰς ἀντιπυπτούσας διαβολὰς. τέταρτος τόπος ἐστὶν ἀπὸ τῶν περὶ τὸν θάλαμον καὶ παστάδας καὶ θεοὺς γαμηλίους. ὡς ὅτι ἄν 174 λέγωμεν, συνελήλυθεν μὲν οὖν ἡ πόλις. 

συνεορτάζει δὲ, ἄπασι 176. πεπήγασι δὲ παστάδες οὐαὶ 177. οὐχ ἔτέρως ποτὲ. θάλαμος δὲ, πεποικιλται, ἀνθεσι καὶ γραφαῖς παντοῖαι, 

πόλιν 179. δὲ τὴν ἀφροδίτην ἔχει. πεῖδομαι 180. δὲ καὶ ἔρωτας παρεῖναι. τόξα μὲν ἐντειναμένους, βέλη δὲ ἐφαρμότοντας, φαινόκος παθῶν 182. τὰς οἰκίδας 183. χρήσαντας 184. δὴ ὁν ἐν τὰς ψυχὰς 

συγκυρώσουσιν ἀναπνειν ἀλλήλαις. ὡμέναιοι δὲ, ἀνάψει λαμπάδα 186. 

ὕμων 187. καὶ δαδας 188. γαμηλίω πυρί. χαρίτων τε 189. μνημονεύσεις καὶ

167 οἰον] οἶος x y*
168 ὡφθηναι] ὡφθηναι x y*
169 παρθένος] παρθένου x : τῆς παρθένου δὲ y
170 φυλαξη] φυλαξη x y*
171 διαβολὰς] lacunam indicat x : κάλλος ἐκφράζειν, πλὴν εἰ μὴ 

συγγενής εἰς καὶ ως εἰδὼς ἀναγκαίως <λέγοις, ἦ> λύοις τὸ 

ἀντιπύπτων τῷ λέγειν ἀκηκόαμεν ταῦτα add. y

172 τῶν] τοῦ P y
173 γαμηλίους] ἐρεῖν add. y
174 ὅτι ἄν] ὦταν x y*
175 συνελήλυθεν] συνελήλυθε y*
176 ἄπασι] ἄπασα y
177 οἰα] οἶαι P*
178 ἔτέρως] ἐτέρω Ῥ : ἔτέρω y*
179 πόλιν] πολλὴν y*
180 πεῖδομαι] πεῖδομαι P*
181 ἐντειναμένους] ἐντεινομένους P x
182 παθῶν] πόθων y*
183 οἰκίδας] ἀκίδας x y*
184 χρήσαντας] χρήσαντας y*
185 δὴ ὁν] διων P
186 λαμπάδα] λαμπάδας y*
187 ύμων] ὑμῶν y*
άφροδίτης καὶ μετὰ μικρὸν λοχίας ἀρτέμιδος, ὅτι ὀλίγῳ ὑστερὸν διαδέξεται λοχία ἀρτεμίς. καὶ μαντεύσεται καὶ τεῦξεται παῖδας ὑμῶν των ὁμοίων. καὶ ἐν ἀρτηλή λαμπρόσ. ἐστα εἰς εὐχᾶς ἀποστρέψεις τὸν λόγον. ἔξεσται δὲ σοι [P 63v] ποτὲ καὶ φιλοτιμοῦμένων τῶν θεῶν τῶν γάμων ἐκφράσαι οἷος ἐστι καταρχὰς τοῦ λόγου ἐν τῇ θέσει. ὅτι νεός ἐστίν ἀειθαλὴς γάμος λαμπάδα φέρων ἐν ταῖν χερῶν ῥαδινὸς ἐρυ— [y 405] θήματι πρόσωπον καταλαμπτόμενος ἡμεροῦ ἀποστάζων ἐκ τῶν ὁμμάτων. ἐκ τῶν ὀφρών. ἔξεσται ποτὲ καὶ ἀντὶ τοῦ γάμου τὸν ἔρωτα ἐκφράσαι, ἢ ἐν ἀρχῇ τοῦ λόγου ἢ πρὸς τῇ τέλει. οὕνεν

188 δᾶδας] δᾶδας P : δᾶδας x y*
189 τε] δὲ F.a.c.
190 λοχίας] λοχείας x y*
191 λοχία] λοχεία x y*
192 μαντεύσεται] μαντεύεται y
193 τεῦξεται] τεύξετε y*
194 ὑμῖν] ὑμῖν y*
195 εὐχᾶς] εὐχῆν y
196 ἀποστρέψεις] καταστρέψεις y
197 ἔξεσται] ἔξεσται x y*
198 σοι ποτὲ ] σοὶ ποτὲ x y*
199 τῶν] τῶν P
200 ἐκφράσαι] ἐκφράσαι x y*
201 καταρχᾶς] κατʼ ἄρχᾶς y*
202 γάμος] ὁ Γάμος y*
203 ῥαδινός] ῥοδινὸς x
204 ἐρυθήματι] τὸ add. y*
205 καταλαμπτόμενος] καταλαμπτόμενον x
206 ἡμεροῦ] ἡμερὸν x y*
207 ἐκ] ἀπὸ F.a.c.
208 ἐκ] καὶ y
209 ἔξεσται] ἔξεσται x y*
210 δὲ] σοὶ add. y
211 ἐκφράσαι] ἐκφράσαι x y*
γὰρν αὐτὸν θάλαμον ἐκφράσεις δηλούσιν. [x 190] ἐὰν δὲ τὸν ἔρωτα τούτων θεὸν ἐκφράσεις, ἀκολούθως δὲ ποτὲ χοροῦς παρθένων καὶ χοροῦς ἡμιθέων, καὶ κυβιστῶν τοῖς πρῶτοι ἐν τῷ ἀσπίδιοι. ἐπειδ' ἀν τούτα λέγειν πρὸς τῷ τέλει τοῦ λόγου, ὅτε ἀν ὁ λόγος εἰς τὸν θάλαμον καταντήσῃ. τοιοῦτος γὰρ ἐνταῦθα καιρὸς. ἐν δὲ τῷ θετικῷ λόγῳ καὶ χρόνον ἔχειν μᾶλλον ἐκφράζειν τὸν θεῶν τῶν γάμων ἢ τῶν ἔρωτα, ὅπως ἐν τούτων ὑποστήσῃ. haec Menander.

---

212 γὰρ] lacunam indicat x
213 τὸν] Γάμον ὑποστήσῃ κατ' ἀρχάς, τὸν add. y
214 θάλαμον] Γάμον y (et P teste y; revera autem haec lectio in P non extat)
215 τούτων] τὸν add. y*
216 ἐκφράσεις, ἐκφράσεις δὲ add. y
217 δὲ] om. y*
218 ποτὲ] potē y*
219 χοροῦς] χωροῦς P*
220 χοροῦς] χωροῦς P*
221 ἡμιθέων] ἡμιθέων y*
222 κυβιστῶν τοῖς] κυβιστῶντας y*
223 πρῶτον] οἷα παρ' ὀμήρῳ y (et P teste y; revera autem haec lectio in P non extat)
224 ἐπειδ'[ ἀν] ἐπειδ' ἀν x : πρέπει δ' ἀν y (et P teste y; revera autem haec lectio in P non extat)
225 ὅτ['] ἀν] ὅταν x y*
226 καταντήσῃ] καταντήσῃ P : καταντήσῃ x y
227 τοιοῦτος] τοιοῦτων y*
228 ἐνταῦθα] ὁ add. y
229 λόγῳ] καταρχᾶς add. P : κατ' ἀρχάς add. y*
230 ἔχειν] ἔχει x : ἔχεις y
231 τῶν θεῶν] τῶν θεῶν P a.c. : τῶν θεῶν P*
232 τῶν] τῶν P x y