

S. R. SLINGS

MENANDER, EPITREPONTES 284

aus: Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik 80 (1990) 11–12

© Dr. Rudolf Habelt GmbH, Bonn

MENANDER, EPITREPONTES 284

εἰ καὶ βαδίζων εὗρεν ἅμ' ἐμοὶ ταῦτα καὶ
 ἦν κοινὸς Ἑρμῆς, τὸ μὲν ἄν οὗτος ἔλαβ[εν ἄν,
 τὸ δ' ἐγώ·

All editors agree on the supplement ἔλαβεν ἄν, about which Sandbach remarks "suppl. multi"; Croiset's alternative conjecture δῆ (apud Lefebvre) is sometimes (not often) reported in the apparatus. Yet whereas δῆ is an unattractive stopgap, I am certain that ἄν is false.

Apart from Aeschylus, fifth-century tragedians and comedians are very fond of putting ἄν twice with one verb form. In fourth-century Greek, this idiom is used more sparingly and subjected to heavier restrictions; this tendency is foreshadowed by Euripides, in whose latest works repetition of ἄν becomes very rare (only two occurrences in Or., one each in Phoen. and IA, none in Ba. - the average I have calculated for all tragedies from Alc. through Hel. is 4.2 per play, for Aeschylus this number is 1.3, for Sophocles 6.7, for Aristophanes 4.0). This is not the place for a detailed study - I may be permitted a reference to my note on Pl. R. 366b3 f., to appear Mnemos. IV 42 (1989); cf. K.-G. I 246-248.

In Menander, there are only three or four cases, all of them falling well inside the boundaries of fourth-century prose usage, and certainly none of them a justification for putting ἄν twice in a clause which consists of no more than three short constituents (Object - Subject - Predicate):

Epitr. 441 f. πῶς ἄν οὖν, πρὸς τῶν θεῶν,
 πῶς ἄν, ἰκετεύω

the repetition of ἄν is conditioned by that of πῶς. A highly rhetorical idiom, perhaps paratragic (cf. Ar. Thesm. 715, where S. Ai. 879 and E. Hipp. 675 f. are among possible tragic models).

Sam. 607 f. λευκὸς οὐκ ἄν ἀποθάνοι,
 οὐδ' ἄν εἰ σφάττοι τις αὐτόν.
 fr. 554 K.-T. κομψὸς στρατιώτης οὐδ' ἄν εἰ πλάττοι θεὸς
 οὐδεὶς γένοιτ' ἄν.

οὐκ ἄν ... οὐδὲ ἄν (or the reverse) remains normal in fourth-century Greek.

fr. 622,1 f. K.-T. ὁ πάντα βουληθεὶς (ἄν) ἄνθρωπος πονεῖν
 πῶς ἄν γένοιτ' ο(ὐ) πλούσιος τρόπον (τινά)

when a participle precedes an optative or past indicative, ἄν may be put with both, though this occurrence is slightly eccentric in that the participle is attributive, not predicative. Perhaps ἄν has a semantic value of its own: ὁ πάντα βουληθεὶς ἄν ... πονεῖν equals ὅστις πάντα ἄν βουληθείη ... πονεῖν rather than ὅστις ἄν πάντα βουληθῆι: "any man who *would be* (not: *is*) prepared". For ἄν with the articular participle see J.M.Stahl,

Kritisch-historische Syntax des griechischen Verbuns der klassischen Zeit, Heidelberg 1907, 704 f. ὄν is a reasonably certain conjecture by Gesner, for which it would be hard to think of a good alternative.

At Sam. 501 the lacuna must have contained a finite verb.

As I wish this note to be not only destructive but also constructive I propose to supply ἔλαβ[έ τι: "he would have got *some* part of it." See LSJ, s.v. τι A II 10 c. I hasten to add that I have found no parallels for ὄ ... τι in Menander, but cf. Ar.Nub. 1138; adesp. com. fr. 1288 K.

Amsterdam, Free University

S.R.Slings