

P. G. McC. BROWN

MENANDER, MISOUMENOS A31–6

aus: Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik 84 (1990) 8–10

© Dr. Rudolf Habelt GmbH, Bonn

## MENANDER, MISOUMENOS A31-6

	(Thrasonides)	ἐχθὲς γὰρ εἰς τὴν οἰκ[ί]αν ἐλήλυθα <sup>c</sup> τὴν ἡμετέ[ρα]ν <sup>c</sup> ὸ διὰ χρο[νο]υ.
	(Getas)	]πέδου γὰρ [...] ἀπῆρα καταλιπὼν ].ω <sup>c</sup> εὐψυχ <sup>o</sup> <sup>c</sup> · [ὄτ]ι δὲ τάττομαι
A35		ἐπὶ τῆς π]αραπομπῆς τ[ῶ]ν λαφύρων ἔ[cχ]ατος ἦκω· τί δὲ τὸ λ]υποῦν <sup>c</sup> ; (Thras) ἐλείν' ὑβρίζομαι.

The above distribution of speakers was suggested by me in CR N.S. 30 (1980), 5, against the proposal of Professor E.G.Turner (in the editio princeps) to give lines A31-2 to Getas and A33-the first word of A36 to Thrasonides; in my view it is Getas who has escorted home the spoils which belong to Thrasonides, just as Daos (in different circumstances) was put in charge of his master's spoils at Aspis 34ff. (At the beginning of A36 Turner himself printed the supplement Μυ<sup>c</sup>ῶν, about which I expressed doubts on pp.5-6 of my review; ἦκω is suggested independently by A.M.Belardinelli, ZPE 78 (1989), 32-4 and M.Gronewald, ZPE 78 (1989), 36, 38-9.)

My suggestion has found favour in some quarters and is accepted (for instance) by F.Sisti in his edition of this play (Menandro Misumenos, Genova 1986); but it was criticised by Turner in Chronique d'Égypte 54 (1979), 114, on three grounds: (1) if Getas speaks lines A34-5, "Thrasonides is being given information he already knows"; (2) "it is not only meaningless, it is an artistic crime of which Menander would not be guilty, to focus attention on whether or not Getas was εὐψυχ<sup>o</sup>, when it is the εὐψυχία of Thrasonides alone that interests us; the relatively rare adjective εὐψυχ<sup>o</sup> appears in Menander twice in this play, and the other time it is used (v.400) it again seems to be applied to Thrasonides"; (3) "in the overlap of A35-6, how do we return from Getas' excuses to the distress of Thrasonides? To achieve it we need more than, for example, ἔ[cχ]ατος [ἦκων] and a δέ." (Arguments (2) and (3) are also found in the version of Turner's paper published in Actes du VII<sup>e</sup> Congrès de la F.I.E.C., vol. I (Budapest, 1983), 249). A fourth argument is now adduced by A.M.Belardinelli, ZPE 78 (1989), 32: (4) λάφυρον (A35) is a technical term for booty which belongs to the entire army, not the personal booty of individual soldiers, and the difficult task of escorting it is more likely to have been entrusted to a distinguished soldier such as Thrasonides than to a slave such as Getas.

I shall comment on each of these points in turn.

(1) I agree with A.Borgogno, QUCC N.S. 30 (1988), 93, that this objection is too subtle and could just as well be used (with "Getas" for "Thrasonides") against Turner's distribution of speakers; if Thrasonides returned the day before, it is unlikely that he withheld this

information from Getas until this moment. It is provided now for the benefit of the audience, and we should not be surprised to find a degree of artificiality in this type of exposition. (Borgogno in fact argues that there is no artificiality, and that Getas in repeating something which Thrasonides must already know is not so much communicating information to him as giving vent to his own feelings. This could be true, but Borgogno's own interpretation of the lines depends heavily on the supplement Μυϰῶν at the beginning of A36, on which see above. If we read ἤκω, it is not so easy to see what feelings are being expressed.)

(2) I do not see that there would be any harm in having the focus briefly on Getas' state of mind, and I am not convinced that the adjective εὐψυχος could not have been used of different men at different stages of the play. (Borgogno, 93-4 sees sarcasm in Getas' application of the word to himself here. But again this depends on accepting Μυϰῶν as the first word of A36.) But in any case Gronewald, 36, 38 now reconstructs A33-4 in such a way as to make the adjective apply to Thrasonides, with Getas saying [ἐκ στρατο]πέδου γὰρ [ὄς εἰ] ἀπῆρα καταλιπὼν, | [ἦθ'...] τῷ εὐψυχῷ. It is at least possible that this is on the right lines; if so, Turner's objection falls to the ground.

(3) I see no difficulty about the transition by means of δέ at this point.

(4) This claim about the meaning of λάφυρον is not supported by the modern works to which Belardinelli refers at p.32 n.5 (U.Kahrstedt, RE XII 1, 1924, s.v. λάφυρον, coll.770-773; W.Kendrick Pritchett, The Greek State at War [original title: Ancient Greek Military Practices], vol. I, Berkeley-Los Angeles-London 1971, pp.54-58). In Polybius, as Pritchett says on p.58, "Kahrstedt and Walbank [A Historical Commentary on Polybius, vol. I, Oxford 1957, p.474] both note that λάφυρον sometimes has a technical meaning of "plundering by private individuals" - the opposite of Belardinelli's claim. But in general what these works make clear is that private plundering was common on military expeditions, as well as the collection of booty on behalf of the whole army, and that there was no consistent terminology to distinguish the two. (λεία, for example, is used by Xenophon of both private and communal booty; and in Polybius the same booty is referred to as λεία at 5.13.1 and as λάφυρα at 5.16.5.)

Not all of their discussion is relevant to the sort of mercenary army in which Thrasonides has been serving, and (for example) Pritchett's section 'Distribution of Booty' (pp.82-84) is not helpful for mercenary armies. But one point to note is that booty belonging to an army was not necessarily kept together as one unit after (or even until) the end of a campaign. It was not uncommon to sell it on the spot and pay the soldiers with the proceeds; also, prizes were awarded for distinguished service. (cf. H.W.Parke, Greek Mercenary Soldiers, Oxford 1933, p.232: "Success brought booty; in addition the army received an allotted share of any proceeds of victory", and p.234 on special prizes; also Pritchett p.87 n.19 on "the practice in the armies of the condottieri".) There may even (though this is my speculation, and our sources do not tell us who bought the booty when it was sold) have been opportunities for a soldier who had amassed some private wealth on campaign to profit further by buying up

some of the army's communal booty when it was put up for sale; as Pritchett p.77 notes, "[t]he fact that booty was sometimes sold on the spot must have resulted in much reduced prices". In this case, any distinction between private and public booty will have broken down by the end of the campaign - and in any case those soldiers who then left (not all to the same place) will have had to make their own arrangements for bringing their portion to their own home.

Thrasonides has been fighting as a mercenary "under one of the kings" in Cyprus (fr.5 Sandbach), where he has either enriched or distinguished himself or both (depending on the precise interpretation of λαμπρῶς πάνυ πράττων in the same fragment). The setting of the play is uncertain (cf. A.W.Gomme and F.H.Sandbach, *Menander, A Commentary*, Oxford 1973, p.438; T.B.L.Webster, *An introduction to Menander*, Manchester 1974, p.10 thinks that it is most probably Rhodes), but it is not in Cyprus (cf. lines 231-232; Krateia's father has come from there). Thrasonides has bought Krateia as a prisoner of war (A37); the fact that he here refers to her as τῆς αἰχμαλώτου suggests that her capture was fairly recent, but A37-40 make it clear that they have been living together for a while. The most economical hypothesis is that Krateia formed part of the booty captured in Cyprus by the army with which Thrasonides was serving, and that Thrasonides bought her either during or at the end of the campaign. Perhaps at the same time he bought some other booty, and perhaps he had won some private booty during the campaign; however he had acquired it, we need not doubt that he had enriched himself every bit as much as Kleostratos in Aspis, nor that his booty could be referred to as λάφυρα. We certainly do not have to believe that the booty of the entire army had remained undistributed up to this point. I suggested in CR 1980 that Thrasonides has brought Krateia straight home, leaving Getas in charge of the more complicated task of organising the transport of the rest of the booty. This may not be right, but I am not yet convinced that it is wrong.