

W. GEOFFREY ARNOTT

NOTES ON MENANDER'S MISOUMENOS

aus: Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik 110 (1996) 27–39

© Dr. Rudolf Habelt GmbH, Bonn

NOTES ON MENANDER'S MISOUMENOS

These notes are by-products of work devoted to Menander's *Misoumenos* during preparation of a second volume for the new Loeb edition of Menander, in which I have decided (with considerable hesitation) to adopt a complete renumbering of the lines of the play. Editors of those papyri of the play discovered before the Second World War numbered their lines sequentially, without allowing for lacunae, and so when further fragments came to light in the last thirty years or so they could be accommodated to the pre-existing schemes only by the addition of letters and stars (thus A1–A100, 404*–418*), which are clumsy and confusing; E. G. Turner's decision to identify lines in P. Oxy. 2656 as 194a, 194b, 375a, 375b, 380a and 380b added a further complication. Hopefully my new scheme may prove both less cumbersome and also serviceable in the future if further portions of text surface from the Egyptian sands. It does not aim to be accurate after line 100, and does not imply any theories about the length of gaps in our text or the original length of the play, about which no information has survived. On the length of the last act see my discussion at the end of this paper. I have attempted to keep the last one or two digits, wherever possible, identical with those in the recent editions of E. G. Turner (*The Oxyrhynchus Papyri*, 33, 1968, 15ff., F. H. Sandbach [Oxford 1972¹, 1990²]) and F. Sisti (Genoa 1986).

	Arnott	Sandbach, Sisti
Act I	1–100	A1–A100
Act I	241–248	p. 364 Sandbach ² (unnumbered) = fr. 1 Sisti
?Act II	301–393	1–93
Act III	501–676	101–275 (including 194a, 194b)
Act IV	677–816	276–403 (including 375a, 375b, 380a, 380b) Sandbach, Sisti along with 404*–413* Maehler
Act V	817–821	414*–418* Maehler
Act V	919–932	404–417 Sisti
Act V	948–996	418–466 Sandbach, Sisti

In the passages treated here, however, the primary line-numbers will still be those found in Turner, Sandbach and Sisti, with the new ones added in brackets.

A8 (8)

πρὸς ταῖς ἐμαυτοῦ νῦν θύραις ἔστηκ' ἐγὼ
 ἐν τῷ στενωπῷ, περιπατῶ τ' ἄνω κάτω,
 ἴαμφοτεραστὶ μεχρὶ νῦν, μεσοῦσης σοῦ σχεδόν,
 ἔξδὸν καθεύδειν τήν τ' ἐρωμένην ἔχειν.

In the play's imaginative opening, where the dramatist envisages Thrasonides delivering this first speech in the darkness of a cold and stormy night, the actor is presumably intended alternately to slump motionless in the doorway of his house and to tramp up and down the stage both before and while he speaks. The opening of line A8 is already a notorious crux; of the two papyri that carry this part of the text, I (P. IFAO 89) gives]εχ[. .]νυμμεσουσησ and O.19 (P. Oxy. 3368) αμφοτερασμεχρ σουσησ, the two thus combining to produce neither sense nor metre. Sisti's commentary (pp. 86ff.) usefully surveys the various conjectures so far advanced and eliminates any need to repeat them here¹, leaving the way open for a further suggestion that may suit metre and sense without palaeographic implausibility:

. . . ἄνω κάτω,
ἀμφοτεράκις, μεχρὶ νῦν, μεσουσησ . . .

The adverb ἀμφοτεράκις ('in both ways', i.e. 'doing both things') is rare, but appears twice in the Aristotelian corpus (Mech. 24 855^b32, Probl. 11.31 902^b31), and so may be considered a usage of Menander's time in Athens. Here it could be interpreted (like an earlier conjecture by Martin West, ἀμφοτέρ' ἄει, in E. G. Turner, *The Lost Beginning of Menander Misoumenos* = PBA 63, 1978, 321) in two different ways. It could refer to the two pieces of comic business being described in these lines, the standing still and the nervy walking. Or it could be taken just with the two adverbs ἄνω κάτω, both up and back down again. In either event, ἀμφοτεράκις is a word that makes the scribal error very easy to explain, as a virtual haplography induced by the similarity of K and ΙΣ in this script.

A28–32 (28–32)

Thrasonides and his slave Getas converse in front of their house. Three papyri contribute to the text here: O.20 (P. Oxy. 3369) with the line endings, O.21 (P. Oxy. 3370) with parts towards the ends, and K (P. Cologne 282) with a narrow strip that derives originally from the same papyrus sheet as I (P. IFAO 89); all three are fractured and in places difficult to read. At A28 (28) Getas is asking his master to go inside out of the stormy weather, and at A31–32 (31–32) the speaker (whom I prefer to identify as Thrasonides, after Peter Brown, CR 30, 1980, 5 and ZPE 84, 1990, 8–10, and others) implies that his companion had arrived back at Thrasonides' house only yesterday, presumably from a campaign in Cyprus. In between, even exempli-gratia supplementation of a defective text is difficult; contextual plausibility here requires Thrasonides to begin explaining why he takes this walk on a rainy night and appears so miserable. The cooling of his relationship with Krateia was clearly at the root of his depression and odd behaviour, and the supplements suggested by M. Gronewald (ZPE 78, 1989, 35ff.) in A28–32 provide a sequence of sense and of speakers that is plausible but at times idiomatically less convincing. Gronewald's conjectures run as follows:

¹ Cf. now also G. Mastromarco, *Coroll. Lond.* 3 (1983) 81–84, A. Barigazzi, *Prometheus* 11 (1985) 103–104, M. Gronewald, ZPE 78 (1989) 35.

ΘΡΑΣΩΝΙΔΗΣ

- A29 (29) τίς; [ἀ]τυχῶ, δεινῶς π[άνυ·
 ἐρῶ γάρ, ὦ Γέ]τα, μέγιστ'· ἀλλ' οὐδέπω
 τοῦτ' ἦν καθο]ρῶν σ'· ἐχθὲς γὰρ εἰς τὴν οἰκ[ί]αν
- A32 (32) ἐλήλυθας τὴν ἡμετέ[ρα]ν σὺ διὰ χρό[νο]υ.

This text shows three significant improvements over its predecessors. In A29 one papyrus (O.20: O.19 is illegible here) divides the speeches with a dicolon after, not before, τίς; Gronewald's recognition of an error here not merely produces better sense (a questioning τίς voiced by Thrasonides instead of an unnecessary τίς added by Getas), but also divides the speeches at the penthemimeral caesura. His publication of K's reading]τυχῶ later in the same line makes a convincing interpretation and supplementation of the second half of the second metron possible. His supplementation of the first half of A30, based on correct identification of Thrasonides' misery, is plausible and miraculously matches a lacuna of about nine letters to the metrical gap of one and a half metra.

Even so, not all of Gronewald's suggestions satisfy the logic of conversation and the late Attic idiom of Menander. Consequently I should prefer to make the following amendments:

ΘΡΑΣΩΝΙΔΗΣ

- A29 (29) τίς; [ἀ]τυχῶ δεινῶς, π[αθῶν
 ἤδη κάκ', ὦ Γέ]τα, <τὰ> μέγιστ'· ἀλλ' οὐδέπω
 καιρὸς καθο]ρῶν σ'· ἐχθὲς γὰρ εἰς τὴν οἰκ[ί]αν
- A32 (32) ἐλήλυθας τὴν ἡμετέ[ρα]ν σὺ διὰ χρό[νο]υ.

(i) Gronewald's supplements in A30 couple ἐρῶ with an adverbial μέγιστα, but this is unidiomatic for two reasons. Elsewhere in Greek I have found no instance of this coupling, and although an anarthrous μέγιστον is commonly used adverbially in the singular (e.g. Eur. Med. 1323 ὦ μέγιστον ἐχθίστη γύναι, Ar. Av. 322 ὦ μέγιστον ἐξαμαρτῶν, Men. fr. 599.2 ὁ μέγιστον ἀγαπῶν where in Stob. AM have μέγιστα, a papyrus has]τον), in the plural adverbial μέγιστα is more usually accompanied by the article (e.g. the lyrics of S. OT 1203 τὰ μέγιστ' ἐτιμάθης, Hippocr. Vet. Med. 9 τὰ μέγιστα ἐξαμαρτάνων, Xen. Hellen. 1.7.19 αὐτοὺς ἡμαρτηκότας τὰ μέγιστα). On the other hand non-adverbial μέγιστον and μέγιστα, both with and without article, are frequently coupled with κακόν and κακά: e.g. Eur. Med. 1080, Or. 755, Men. frs. 499.1, 626, Hippocr. Epid. 3.13, Isocrates 4.6 τῶν μεγίστων κακῶν (cf. also 12.60, 12.225, 15.317, 18.47), 8.34 ἐν τοῖς μεγίστοις κακοῖς (cf. 8.90), Dem. 18.143, Straton A.P. 12.186.5. Hence my supplements at the end of A29 and in the first half of A30; in this context I should prefer τὰ μέγιστα to just μέγιστα, but assume a lacuna of nine letters at the beginning of the verse and haplography of τὰ in the papyrus after γετα.

(ii) The gap in O.20 at the beginning of A31, computable by comparison with A28 and A32 as about eight letters, covers the first metron. It can be filled with more confidence once it is realised that the main clause beginning ἀλλ' οὐδέπω at the end of A30 needs a verbal idea that can be followed by the construction which is implied by the letters]ρανοσ' preserved after the gap. These were plausibly interpreted by E. G. Turner as the remains of an accusative and infinitive such as καθο]ρῶν σ', 'for you to notice'. The one supplement

A53–54 (53–54)

A53 (53) κέκραγα "παιδίσκη". "βαδίσαι γάρ", φημί, "δεῖ
ἤδη με πρὸς τὸν δεῖνα", εἶπας ὄνομά τι.

Thrasonides is telling Getas what he said to Krateia before he came outside. In A54 (54) the papyrus (O.19)² has the whole verse, but between the epsilon of εἶπας and the alpha of δεῖνα there is a space of one letter, filled by an extension to the tail of the alpha which links it to the following letter³. Several corrections and supplements have been suggested: δεῖνά <μ> with a repeated μ' (Handley in Turner 18), δεῖνά <γ> (Sisti in his edition, Genoa 1986), δεῖν' <ἐπ>εἶπας (West in Turner 18), δεῖν' ἀεὶ πᾶσ' ὄνοματι with a clever but ultimately unsatisfying new division of the letters (Gronewald, *op. cit.* above on A28–32, 37 and 39). The simplest and most acceptable of these would have been West's, if ἐπέπας had been standard Greek in Menander's Athens for 'adding (somebody's name)'. It is not; in this meaning ὑπεῖπον (and ὑπεῖπα) are preferred: e.g. Ar. *Vesp.* 55 ὀλίγ' ἄθ' ὑπεῖπὼν πρῶτον αὐτοῖσιν ταδί, Plut. 997f., Thuc. 1.90.4, cf. 2.102.5, Lysias In Theozot. fr. VI.2 Gernet–Bizos = P. Hibeh 1.14.30ff., Dem. 18.60, 25.91, and the transmitted text (A at Athenaeus 11.487a) of Philetaerus 1.2 ὑπεῖπὼν τῆς Ὑγιείας τοῦνομα, where Kassel–Austin wrongly print Schweighaeuser's conjecture ἐπειπὼν (*Animadv. in Athenaeum*, Strasbourg 1804, 6.218). These parallels support the conjecture δεῖν', <ὑπ>εἶπας in Menander here. The weak aorist form of the participle does not certainly occur elsewhere in Menander, but it is a possible supplement at *Misoumenos* 375b (777: see below), and it is attested for Philemon 43.3, Demonicus 1.3 and Dionysius 2.2 (where see Kassel–Austin *ad loc.*), while Menander does use the weak form of the first person singular indicative active (*Asp.* 130, Pk. 318), along with other comic poets (*Alexis* 2.3, *Athenion* 1.38, *Evangelus* 1.1, *Philemon* 133.1); cf. also Eur. *Cycl.* 101, *Theodectes* 6.8, and the full discussion in O. Lautensach, *Die Aoriste bei den attischen Tragikern und Komikern* (Göttingen 1911) 107ff.

A90–94 (90–94)

A90 (90) οὐδὲ γὰρ σφόδρ' εἶ
ἄκρωσ ἀηδῆς ὥστε γ' εἶπειν· ἀλλὰ σο[ι
τὸ μικρὸν ἀμέλε[ι] τοῦ στρατιωτικοῦ [βλάβη·
A93 (93) ἀλ[λ]' ὄψιν ὑπεράστειος· ἀλλὰ μὴν ἄγ[εις
...] ἡλικίας· []ναα . . ε . . . ποθεν . [4

Getas is presented as an impudent slave in this scene with Thrasonides, deflating any pretensions that the soldier may have⁵. He has just referred to Thrasonides as 'not too repul-

² O.20 yields nothing legible in this verse.

³ E. G. Turner, *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri* 48 (1981) 4, claims that this gap indicates punctuation.

⁴ A91–93 (91–93) *Suppl. Turner*. A91 (91) Continued to Thrasonides by Turner: paragraphus and a deleted speaker's name in left-hand margin of O.20. A93 (93) Continued to Thrasonides by Turner: paragraphus under the line in O.20.

⁵ Thus in this scene the slave of an apparently non-braggart soldier treats his master with a milder, more restrained version of the ridicule showered characteristically on braggart soldiers by parasites (cf. e.g. W. Hofmann and G. Wartenberg, *Der Bramarbas in der antiken Komödie*, *Abhandlungen der Akademie der*

sive, not unduly so, to speak of', continuing 'but of course the meagreness of army pay won't help! Your features, though, have charm'. At A93–94 (93–94) the context leads us to expect Getas to add a further insult, probably implicating Krateia, since Thrasonides intervenes at A95 (95) with a curse on Getas⁶. It seems impossible to make any continuous sense from the traces in the second half of A94, but before that ἀλλὰ μὴν ἄγ[εις] / ἐφ' ἡλικίας, 'but you are bringing (? an attractive young girl) at her prime' would provide an appropriate introduction to a further insult; for ἐφ' ἡλικίας with reference to a young lady cf. e.g. Alciphron 2.7.1 τὰς ἐφ' ἡλικίας ἀνθούσας ἡμᾶς, 4.10.4. Before ηλικιασ in O.19 there seems to be room for three letters; this papyrus regularly has scriptio plena (five instances in A4–9 alone), and could well have written ἐπιηλικιασ here.⁷ After ἡλικίας one is forbidden by the admittedly scanty traces from continuing with τ[ι]νὰ ἀκμάζουσας, but something on those lines would be expected.

68–70 (468–470)

68 (468) φέρ' εἰς τὸ πρόσθε μοι, γερ[
εἰς τὴν [ό]δόν. γελοῖον εἰ
70 (470) εἴσω λαβροῦσα· τουτονὶ δ. [

The 92 mutilated lines of O.11 (P. Oxyrhynchus 2657) pose an infuriating set of problems to which there are no certain answers, but in 68–70 the range of possibilities at least may be narrowed. In the ed. princ. of this papyrus (The Oxyrhynchus Papyri 33, London 1968, 56) E. G. Turner suggested that the two speakers⁸ are contriving to bring Krateia out onto the street, but φέρε is normally applied in Greek to things that can be held in the hands, and the use is extended to persons only when for some reason they need to be physically carried, like the crippled Knemon in Men. Dysk. 906, 957–960. Thus Krateia may be eliminated from consideration at Mis. 68–70.

132–141 (532–541)

Of these lines O.10 (P. Oxyrhynchus 2656) supplies the openings, B.3 (P. Berlin 13932) the middles and the ends. Identification of characters and division of speeches are rendered more difficult than usual by severe mutilation in the preceding lines and by the scribe's apparent use of dicola hereabouts also to mark off individual remarks in one character's report of a previous conversation. Since no presentation, supplementation or interpretation of the papyri has so far seemed wholly acceptable, a new tack may be attempted. It is linked

Wissenschaften der DDR, Berlin 1973, 122ff.). Here again Menander seems to be aiming at a controlled tension between familiar and unfamiliar, convention and reality, the typical and the exceptional, by simultaneously making an individual character both conform to and clash against his type; cf. my Menander, Plautus, Terence (Greece & Rome New Surveys 9, 1975, 23ff.).

⁶ See Turner, op. cit. in n. 3, p. 19 on A94.

⁷ Turner supplements the opening with τῆς, which is based on his report that O.20 seems to have τ[ι] at the beginning of A94 (94), but there are no clear traces of that letter on the published photograph (op. cit. in n. 3, plate II).

⁸ Demeas and Kleinias according to Turner (tentatively) and Sisti pp. 97f.; more plausibly Demeas and Kleinias' old female slave according to Sandbach (tentatively) in the Oxford commentary, p. 445.

to the assumption that three characters are on stage. *Krateia's* nurse has entered from *Thrasonides's* house, possibly carrying an olive-branch (122, 132 = 522, 532 Ar) in a gesture or ritual of supplication designed presumably to draw attention to *Krateia's* plight; she is conversing at this point most probably with *Kleinias's* old female slave (? named *Syra*: see below on 155 = 555 Ar). In the background *Thrasonides's* slave *Getas* eavesdrops, commenting in asides on what he hears:

		ΓΡΑΥΣ	
132 (532)	ἰκετηρίαν; τί λέγουσ';	ΤΡΟΦΟΣ (?)	"ἔμοι μαχεῖ, τάλαν;"
			"[μ]ὰ Δί', ἀλλ' ἐκεί[νω]", φ[ησ]ί, "δεινὸν γὰρ βίον
			ζῆ κ[α]ὶ ταλαίπωρόν τ[ι]ν' - -
		ΓΕΤΑΣ (?)	οὐ γάρ;
		ΤΡΟΦΟΣ	μακάριον
135 (535)	αὕτη δὲ καὶ ζηλωτὸν ὄντ'.		
		ΓΕΤΑΣ	οὕτω [τ]ι[ς] ἦν
	Γύ]γης.	ΤΡΟΦΟΣ (?)	
			[ἄ]μεινον <δ'> οἶδε τά γ' ἑαυτῆς τινός.

Supplements and decipherments here are by the ed. princ., E. G. Turner, except for 133 (533) ἐκείνω Webster, 135 (535) δὲ Austin, 136 (536) Γύ]γης Arnott; identification of speakers and division of parts are largely my own, although Turner and Merkelbach⁹ already assumed the presence of *Krateia's* nurse.

It is tempting to guess that immediately before line 132 (532) the nurse mentioned a conversation held recently with *Getas*, who may have tried to stop her leaving *Thrasonides's* house on her mission of supplication. At 132 *Kleinias's* old slave interrupts her with (possibly) a questioning 'Olive-branch? What did you say?' In such a context λέγουσ' is perhaps best interpreted as feminine participle. *Krateia's* nurse then reports her conversation with *Getas*. 'Oh dear! Are you going to fight against me?' would have been her words to *Thrasonides's* slave as he blocked the exit door, and 'No by Zeus, I'm fighting *Thrasonides*, you see he's living a terrible and miserable life' *Getas's* reported response, implying that the slave was on *Krateia's* and the nurse's side. At this point *Getas* himself comments briefly aside, confirming the accuracy of the nurse's report. The nurse continues: 'Yes, while *Krateia* lives one (sc. a life) that's wealthy and envied.' Here *Getas* adds a further aside: 'That's because *Thrasonides* was a kind of *Gyges*.' *Gyges*, the seventh-century King of *Lydia*, became a legend for wealth and success in his battles against enemies and rivals (*Nicolaus Damascenus* FGrH 90 frs. 49, 62, 63, Hdt. 1.8–14, Pl. Resp. 2.359c–60a,

⁹ Rheinisches Museum 109 (1966) 101.

10.612b), and in the present context would be an appropriate comparison to a successful and wealthy mercenary like Thrasonides.

This interpretation assumes that one dicolon in B.3 has been misplaced in 135 (535) after ἦν instead of after ὄντ'. By requiring two remarks in 134 (534) and 135f. (535f.) to be explained as asides, it prepares the way for the comment at 139f. (539f.) by one of the other two characters, possibly the nurse, that ἔστι γὰρ / παρὰ τινος οὗτος ὁ ψιθυρισμός, οἶδ' ἐγώ, 'You see, this whispering is coming from a certain person, I'm quite sure.' It accepts Austin's reading of δὲ in 135 (535) rather than τι, and tentatively adds a δ' (omitted by haplography before the following οἶδε?) after ἄμ[ει]νον in 136 (536); the nurse would be implying that although Krateia was living a life of luxury in Thrasonides' house, she presumably knew her own business best in proposing the mission of supplication. Krateia would not yet have divulged to her nurse her discovery of her brother's sword in Thrasonides' house, which formed the reason for her hostility to Thrasonides.

142–143 (542–543)

The text here is provided by O.10 (line beginnings) and B.3 (middles and ends):

142 (542)] παρ' ἐμοῦ[.]φειον δ' ἔχεις,
 ὦ θῦ[γα]τρίδιο[v].

In 143 (543) ὦ was deciphered by Austin, θῦ[γα]τρίδιο[v] supplemented by Turner. If the speaker is Krateia's nurse, as seems likely, here she must be apostrophising Krateia as the surrogate daughter whom she fed as a baby. The most apposite supplement in 142 (542) would then be παρ' ἐμοῦ[γε τὸ τρο]φείον δ' ἔχεις. τροφείον does not appear in literature elsewhere as a singular, but for a parallel use in the plural (= nourishment from a mother's milk) cf. Eur. Ion 1493 μαστῶ τροφεία ματρὸς (sc. ἐπέσχον)¹⁰.

155 (555)

Towards the end of their conversation, one of the two women (provisionally identified above on 132–141 (532–541) as Kleinias' old slave and Krateia's nurse) says to the other ἀπίω[μεν] . ὑρᾶ (or . ὑρᾶ .), according to O.10, at this point the sole (but very mutilated) witness. Turner interpreted the final word as θύρας; in comedy, however, as he himself pointed out (*The Oxyrhynchus Papyri* 33, 1968, 25), we should expect Menander to write not an anarthrous θύρας without a preposition, but ἀπὸ τῆς θύρας. In the photograph of the papyrus the letter before ὑρᾶ is damaged, but could be a sigma, and after the alpha the traces can be interpreted as simply the upper stigmata of a dicolon. I should prefer myself to read ἀπίω[μεν], Σύρᾶ, thus giving to one of the women (probably Kleinias' old slave) a name which is in itself entirely appropriate. Although Σύρᾶ is not attested as a slave name in Menander, it occurs frequently enough elsewhere in Graeco-Roman comedy: Aristophanes Pax 1146 (slave girl mentioned in passing), Philemon 117 (aged servant), Apollodorus

¹⁰ It is true that when W. Schubart first published B.3, he suspected that the letter before φ was not ο but ι (*Griechische Literarische Papyri*, SB Leipzig 97/5, 1950, 49; cf. the Körte–Thierfelder edition of Menander 2².287); however, the only word ending φειον in ancient or mediaeval Greek is ἀλοιφείον, inapposite here.

of Carystus 8 in the original of Terence's *Hecyra* (cf. Donatus on *Hec.* 59), Plautus *Mercator* (cf. 670, 673: a slave woman 84 years old!) and *Truculentus* 405 (a hairdresser working for hire); cf. also perhaps Alciphron 2.22 (Σύραξ Bergler: σισύραξ mss.). For the comic use of ἀπίωμεν in conjunction with a vocative or an addressee's name cf. *Ar. Pax* 1260 ἀπίωμεν, ὦ δορυζέ and *Men. Epitr.* 630f. Σιμίνας, / ἀπίωμεν.

The papyrus identifies the speaker here as]ρυ[, for which Turner offered various supplementations: X]ρυ[σίς, T]ρυ[φή, Φ]ρυ[γία. If one of these was the name of Krateia's nurse, she must then be different from the Σιμίχη who apparently came on stage at or near 386–387 (789–790), being most probably a further slave in Thrasonides' household¹¹.

172–173 (572–573)

Getas is vituperating his master's host; at 160f. (560f.) he calls him fat-faced, at 170 (570) he suspects him of doing them an injury. Accordingly, at 172f. (572f.) φανερώς ἐστι γὰρ / : β]αδιοῦμαι the most appropriate supplement would be an adjective imputing general villainy: e.g. μιαιρός (cf. *Dem.* 21.69). The gap at the beginning of the line can be computed as 6 or 7 letters, from a comparison with the similar gaps in B.2 in the previous lines.

184 (584)

Here in a dialogue between Demeas and Kleinias' old female slave, the badly mutilated O.10 gives]δειξο[ν] : αὐτάς θήσομαι, where Turner's supplementaion cannot be faulted. O.10, however, must have misplaced the dicolon; an unemphatic αὐτάς (referring here doubtless to the swords recently handled by Demeas in Kleinias' dining-room) cannot come first word in its clause. Menander presumably wrote δειξον αὐτάς. : θήσομαι. On such displaced dicola in papyri, see above on A29–32 (29–32).

227–229 (628–630)

O.3 preserves only line-beginnings, but the drift of the conversation is largely clear. Getas, at first bewildered by the claim that Demeas is Krateia's father, becomes less incredulous after the answers he receives to his questions. At 226–227 (627–628) Getas must be asking Krateia if 'this old man really is' her father, and Sandbach's supplement ἀληθῶς γ[άρ, Κράτειά, σοι πατήρ] / ὅδ' ἐστὶν ὁ γέρον; is likely to represent or at least be close to what Menander wrote. Accordingly Krateia must be the speaker of the rest of 227 (628), beginning λαμ[. Getas's surprised response at the beginning of 228 (629) to her answer, followed by his address to Krateia's old nurse, who must be played by a mute in a scene where Krateia, Demeas and Getas are the three speaking characters, implies that Krateia's words in 227 (628) were focussed on the nurse. Could these have been λάμ[βαν' αὐτήν μάρτυρα]? Getas' rejoinder, τί τοῦτο; καὶ σύ, γράδ[ι]ο[ν, x - υ - / καλεῖς is harder to supplement. The address to the nurse is perhaps most likely to have been a question on the

¹¹ Here a doubtful reading in O.10 is now confirmed by P. Oxy. 3967 (see M. Maehler, *op. cit.* on 390–397 = 793–800 *Ar.*, pp. 61f.; the new papyrus has]σιμιχ[, O.10 apparently σεμιχη or σεμιχη).

lines of ‘Old woman, do you in fact call him your master?’ (followed by a silent gesture conveying the answer ‘yes’), but a supplement such as γράδ[ι]ο[ν, αὐτὸν δεσπότην / καλεῖς; introduces a divided resolution into the second half of a metron, and although division after the second short in the second half of a metron is not unparalleled (see CQ 7, 1957, 189), it is better not to increase the number of instances by speculative conjecture.

268–269 (669–670)

The end of Thrasonides’ speech is usually printed with Turner’s supplement βέλτιον δ’ ἀπαξάπ[αντα τ]ῆς / οἰήσεως, but βέλτιον is better taken as a predicative adjective, and I should prefer to supplement ἀπαξάπ[αν γε τ]ῆς.

289–295 (690–696)

In this scene, where Getas vividly describes Demeas’ and Krateia’s stony-hearted rejection of Thrasonides, with Kleinias an interested onlooker, the combination of O.3 and O.10 provides at many points a lacunose text. Even so, some supplementation beyond what is suggested in the editions of Turner, Sandbach and Sisti may still be possible, and for two of the exchanges in 289–291 (690–692) I should suggest as cockshies:

- (a) ΚΛΕΙΝΙΑΣ
 289 (690) πῶς του]τὶ λάβω;
- (b) ΓΕΤΑΣ
 291 (692) ἐκεῖ]νος οὐδὲ γρῦ¹².

(a) Kleinias’ opening speech in this scene ends with the confident assertion πάντ’ ἀκούσομαι σαφῶς (283 = 684 Ar), but his attempt to question Getas is totally ignored (286ff. = 687ff. Ar). The story that Getas tells to the audience is puzzling to one like Kleinias who is unaware of the circumstances that lead Demeas and Krateia to reject Thrasonides; hence πῶς του]τὶ λάβω; ‘‘how am I to understand these things?’’ seems most in keeping with the situation at 289 (690).

(b) When Getas goes on to describe the meeting of Thrasonides with Demeas and his daughter, Demeas’ total refusal to listen to anything that the soldier has to say was the fact that had imprinted itself most strongly on Getas’ mind (cf. 284f. and 287 = 685f. and 688 Ar); hence the relevance of ἐκεῖ]νος (sc. Demeas) οὐδὲ γρῦ (sc. λέγει) at 291 (992).

320–322 (721–723)

- 320 (721) βοήσεται δὲ καὶ βουλεύσεται
κ[τα]γεῖν ἑαυτὸν στάς. βλέπει δὲ πῦρ ἅμα
 322 (723) ου[. . .] ἐκεῖ [κ]αὶ δράττεται <γε> τῶν τριχῶν.

¹² 289 (690)]τιλαβῶ O.3 followed by dicolon,]ιλαλω O.10: πῶς suppl. Arnott, του]τὶ Jensen. κλει^v in right margin of O.3. 291 (692) ἐκεῖ]νος suppl. Arnott:]γοσουδεγρυ O.3,]οσμ[.]δεγρυ O.10.

So Getas ends his speech, reflecting on Thrasonides' future and present behaviour after his confrontation with Demeas and Krateia. These lines pose several difficulties: the apparently unique occurrence of the strong aorist form κ[τα]γείν in later Greek comedy, supplementation of the opening of 322 (723), interpretation of στάς in 321 (722), and the switch from futures in 320 (721) to presents in 321 (722). At least the last two of these difficulties would be eased if 321 (722) were repunctuated *ἑαυτόν. στάς βλέπει δέ*: Thrasonides *will* shout and decide on suicide, but now he *stands* with eyes aflame. Postponement of δέ to third word or later in its clause is a common feature of later Greek comedy¹³ which scribes often failed to understand; in O.10, however, there is no sign of punctuation either before or after στάς.

339–356 (740–757)

Although O.10 is so badly abraded and holed hereabouts as often to be totally indecipherable, enough clues can be detected in readable scraps of text and in identifiable indications of change of speaker (paraphrasi, abbreviated marginal names) for us to work out with some probability when Kleinias and Getas left and Thrasonides arrived on the stage, and also to some extent where changes of speaker occurred. There are paraphrasi certainly under lines 339 (740), 340 (741), probably under 348 (749), 349 (750), possibly also under 353 (754) and 355 (756). Abbreviated names of speakers originally appeared in the left margin at 340 (741): τ, 341 (742) and (possibly) 356 (757). At 340 (741) one character says εἰσέρχο[μαι], at 350 (751) the vocative παῖ most probably implies that a slave was being addressed.

At 339 (740) Kleinias and Getas are alone on stage, now joined in conversation after a long spell during which Getas failed to notice Kleinias' presence. Which of them expressed his intention to go in at 340 (741)? Almost certainly Kleinias, because παῖ in 350 (751) is most satisfactorily interpreted as an address to Getas by his master Thrasonides, who on entry finds the slave alone on stage. The changes of speaker at 341 (742), 348 (749) and 349 (750) will then imply that after Kleinias announced his intention to depart, he went on conversing with Getas until he actually left at 349 (750), directly before Thrasonides' entry. If the traces of ink under lines 353 (754) and 355 (756) are correctly interpreted as paraphrasi (so R. A. Coles, *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri* 33, 1968, 45) while those in the left margin of 356 (757) are rightly seen as naming the speaker from then on (so E. G. Turner, *op. cit.* above on 339–356 = 740–757 Ar, p. 58), it follows that Thrasonides addressed Getas on entry (350–353 = 751–754 Ar), and that the slave responded (354–355 = 755–756 Ar) before departing at the end of 355 (756) most probably into Thrasonides' house, leaving his master to launch into the long monologue that closed the fourth act.

¹³ See e.g. E. W. Handley's commentary on Men. Dysk. 10 (London 1965), K. J. Dover, CQ 35 (1985) 337ff., and my own forthcoming commentary on Alexis (Cambridge 1996) fr. 4.1.

348 (749) and 437 (967)

(i) Turner's supplement $\pi\omicron[\epsilon\iota] \delta\grave{\epsilon} \tau[\omicron\upsilon]\tau\omicron$ at 348 (749) almost certainly restores the letters that Menander wrote here, but the imperative $\pi\acute{\omicron}[\epsilon\iota]$ seems preferable, as a final command by Kleinias to Getas or Getas to Kleinias before Kleinias made his exit at 349 (750).

(ii) Similarly at 437 (967): Turner divides and supplements O.10's $\lambda\epsilon\gamma\omega\nu\tau\alpha\chi\alpha\tau\rho\epsilon\chi\epsilon\iota$ into $\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\omega\nu \tau\acute{\alpha}\chi\alpha \tau\rho\acute{\epsilon}\chi\epsilon\iota[\zeta]$. This may be correct, but if Thrasonides is telling Getas here to hurry up with his account, the imperative $\tau\rho\acute{\epsilon}\chi' \epsilon\iota[\]$ is just as likely.

375b (777)

O.10 is severely abraded, holed, torn and unsupported in this section of Thrasonides' monologue, but here supplementation to $\epsilon\acute{\iota}\pi\alpha[\zeta] \acute{\epsilon}\kappa\lambda\alpha[\omicron\nu]$ suggests itself. On the use of the participial form $\epsilon\acute{\iota}\pi\alpha\varsigma$ in later Greek comedy see above on A53–54 (53–54).

390–397 (793–800)

M. Maehler's exemplary publication of P. Oxy. 3967 (The Oxyrhynchus Papyri 59, London 1992, 59ff. and pl. V), along with her re-examination of O.10 (P. Oxy. 2656), has shed a great deal of new light on the interpretation of Thrasonides' monologue. Here I should like to offer one small speculation. If at 396–397 (799–800) M. Maehler's decipherment and supplementation of the traces $\pi\omicron\upsilon \tau\omicron \tau\eta[\zeta] \sigma[\omega]\tau\eta\rho\acute{\iota}\alpha\varsigma / \acute{\epsilon}\pi\acute{\iota}\sigma\eta\mu\omicron\nu$; is correct, the use of $\tau\omicron \acute{\epsilon}\pi\acute{\iota}\sigma\eta\mu\omicron\nu$ here may have dramatic significance. Thrasonides is a soldier, and $\tau\omicron \acute{\epsilon}\pi\acute{\iota}\sigma\eta\mu\omicron\nu$ accordingly would most fittingly mean here 'the device' such as a soldier carried on his shield (cf. the gloss disfiguring the text at Hdt. 9.74, and the use of $\tau\omicron \acute{\epsilon}\pi\acute{\iota}\sigma\eta\mu\alpha$ at A. Sept. 659, Eur. Phoen. 1107, 1125, with D. J. Mastronarde's commentary ad loc. on the latter play). If in a lost earlier scene of the play Thrasonides' shield had been described as emblazoned with a figure of (e.g.) Ζεὺς Σωτήρ or ἡ Σώτειρα (Artemis, Athena or Demeter), the present passage might be a wry reference to that; in effect Thrasonides would be asking himself 'What is the point of that device of "safety" on your shield, if now you sink into despair so easily?'

The length of Act V

The information provided by O.10 (see E. G. Turner, op. cit. on 339–356, 5ff.) and O.23 (see M. Maehler, op. cit. on 390–397 = 793–800 Ar, 59f.) enables us to calculate the original length of this act with some precision. The extant pages of O.10 contain between 36 and 40 lines of writing. There is a gap in it of four pages between its lines 403 (= 806 Ar: towards the end of Act IV) and 429 (= 959 Ar: with 38 lines of Act V still to come). The missing four pages would have begun with the last 10 lines of Act IV and the sign XOPOY, which would normally occupy a space of four lines. Thereafter there would be space for the opening 130–46 lines of Act V. Act V then must have originally contained between 168 and 184 lines; Maehler's suggestion of 'about 178 verses' comes within the correct limits but ignores the possible confines. In order to make at least the last digit of my numeration agree

with those in recent editions, I have in the Loeb edition (see above) made Act V begin at 817 and close at 996.

404–466 (919–932, 948–996)

O.7 (P. Oxyrhynchus 1065) contains the very ends of 14 lines from one column and the beginnings of 27 from the next. The length of the gap between the two is uncertain, because the number of lines in a column on this papyrus is unknown. Editors, however, have so far ignored this gap in their numbering of lines and thus given a false impression of continuity (404–417, 418–444). If the column was of a common length (say 34 to 40 lines), the length of the gap could be estimated. The second column of O.7 preserves parts of its top 27 lines, while the preserved fraction of the first column ends four lines above the preserved part of the second. This would imply that the gap between the two would be 11 to 17 lines.

418–428 (948–958)

The speaker of these lines is uncertain, but one possibility emerges from the fractured lines that follow his speech. If in O.7 the paragraphus under 429 (959) and the presence of $\gamma\epsilon$ in the left margin between 428 (958) and 429 implies that Getas entered and began speaking in 429 and not 428, the previous speaker would have been withdrawing (428 ἀγαγέ[O.7) and been addressed by Getas as ἄνθρ[ωπε at 429. As Sandbach notes in the Oxford commentary (p. 461), if the vocative ἄνθρ[ωπε stood on its own, the slave would hardly have addressed free men such as Demeas, Kleinias or Thrasonides so abruptly, although, as Sandbach with his usual acumen adds, we cannot exclude the possibility that the harshness of ἄνθρ[ωπε here was toned down by an attributive adjective such as μακάριε. The character thus addressed would, in all probability, have been a stranger to Getas, and the likeliest candidate must be Krateia's brother, newly returned and so far unknown to Getas. Getas goes on to say to his master διδόασί σοι γυναῖκα (431 (961)), and the plural there, as Webster notes (*The Oxyrhynchus Papyri* 33, 1968, 52), implies that the decision was taken not by Demeas alone but also by a further male member of his family, and that could only have been Krateia's brother.

438–439 (968–969)

Getas is reporting what he heard indoors about the preliminaries to Krateia's betrothal to Thrasonides. O.10 provides a text in 438 (968) with ἔλεγεν (sc. Demeas) "θυγάτριον [, in 439 (969) "νάί", φησί (sc. Krateia), "πάπα, βούλωμαι (suppl. Turner). This implies that Demeas' words in 438 (968) need to be supplemented with something like "θυγάτριον, [τοῦτον ἂν βούλοι' ἔχειν;"