

W. GEOFFREY ARNOTT

NOTES ON MENANDER'S KOLAX, KONEIAZOMENAI, LEUKADIA, MISOUMENOS
AND PERINTHIA

aus: Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik 111 (1996) 21–25

© Dr. Rudolf Habelt GmbH, Bonn

NOTES ON MENANDER'S KOLAX, KONEIAZOMENAI, LEUKADIA,
MISOUMENOS AND PERINTHIA

These notes, like those in two earlier papers published in this periodical,¹ are the by-products of work devoted to the papyrus and book fragments of the plays named in the title while I was preparing the second volume of the new Loeb edition of Menander.

Kolax 40–42 Sandbach

40 .. κ[.....] κατέπηκέν ποθε[ν
πόλ[ιν προδούς τι]ν' ἢ σατράπην ἢ στ[ρατόπεδον
42 π . [.....]νεστι δῆλός ἐστι.

In their commentary (Oxford 1973, p. 425) Gomme and Sandbach rather surprisingly miss the point when they write 'κατέπηκεν: This is known only as the perfect of καταπήσσω, "cower". LSJ suppose that it here comes from καταπέτομαι, which seems better suited to the context.' There is in fact no evidence that κατέπηκα ever existed as an irregular perfect active of καταπέτομαι, but as an easily emended form of the perfect of καταπήσσω it makes relevant sense. In this extract (P. Oxyrhynchus 409 + 2655) Pheidias appears to be upset because his wealthy rival, the soldier Bias, has been able to secure the services of the hetaira whom they both love. Gnathon (or whoever else the man speaking with him in this extract may be)² is trying to cheer Pheidias up by suggesting to him that Bias' wealth can only be ill-gotten; and so, after betraying a city or satrap or army (the respective supplements of Wilamowitz and Sudhaus here are plausible if not certain), Bias is imagined now to be living in the city of the play because 'he has cringed in fear of vengeance from some source or other' (i. e. from one of the victims whom he has despoiled to make himself rich). The normal form of the perfect active from πτήσσω is ἔπηχα (Isocrates 5.58; κατ- Lycurgus 40, Hyperides epit. col. 4 (5).38, Dem. 4.8, probably also Themistius or. 24.309b³; ὑπ- Lucian praeccept. rhet. 13), and so κατέπηκεν should be restored in the Kolax papyrus. For this type of corruption in Menandrian papyri note especially the regular misspelling of Σιμίχη as -κη in Dyskolos by B⁴.

¹ ZPE 109 (1995) 11–30 (on Perikeiromene), and 110 (1996) 27–39 (on Misoumenos).

² The singularity of Menander's title (Κόλαξ, not Κόλακες) gave some support to those scholars who followed W. E. J. Kuiper (Mnemosyne 59, 1932, 165ff.; cf. his Grieksche Origineelen en latijnsche navolgingen, Amsterdam 1936, 15 n. 2) in assuming that in the Greek play there was only one parasite: Gnathon, who adopted the alias Strouthias for his association with Bias the soldier; see most recently the Gomme–Sandbach Commentary 420–421. It is true that three Plautine parasites similarly use two names: Curculio in the play named after him adopts the soubriquet Summanus for a confidence trick (413), while Ergasilus in Captivi has the nickname Scortum (69) and Gelasimus in Stichus once calls himself Miccotrogus (242). However, P. Oxyrhynchus 3534, recently published and identified as a tiny scrap from Menander's Κόλαξ by E. W. Handley, essentially demolishes the Kuiper argument. In it Strouthias is not only named in the dramatic text (v. 5), but also identified by an interlinear note (above line 3) as one of the speakers in the papyrus scene. Cast lists and interlinear notes name only separate characters, not aliases. It is tempting to assume that Gnathon and Strouthias supported Pheidias and Bias respectively in the latter pair's attempts to secure the favours and control of the one hetaira with whom they were both besotted, and that the ending of Terence's Eunuchus is taken from that of Menander's Κόλαξ with the sharing of the hetaira both piquantly surprising and dramatically no less appropriate than a judgement of Solomon. Cf. here especially L. Gil, Est. Clás. 25 (1981–1983) 55, A. Blanchard, Essai sur la composition des comédies de Ménandre (Paris 1983) 208–222, H. G. Nesselrath, Lukians Parasitendialog (Berlin and New York 1985) 108f., and P. G. McC. Brown in Relire Ménandre (edd. E. W. Handley and A. Hurst, Geneva 1990) 49–61 and ZPE 92 (1992) 103–106; there is also an excellent discussion in the forthcoming edition of Terence's Eunuchus by John Barsby.

³ LSJ attributes the form κατέπηκα to Themistius here, but the new Downey–Norman Teubner edition (Leipzig 1970) confirms that the mss. have κατεπηχότος; the -πηκότος form is an unwanted conjecture by Harduin.

⁴ See E. W. Handley's commentary (London 1965), pp. 125f. Cf. also Misoumenos 387 Sandbach = 790 Arnott, where P. Oxy. 2656 and 3967 both spell the same name with -χη.

Kolax fr. 10 Sandbach² = P. Oxyrhynchus 3534

In addition to identifying Strouthias as a separate character in Menander's Κόλαξ (see n. 2 here), P. Oxyrhynchus 3534⁵ gives τραχ (above line 2) as the abbreviated form of the name of another character in the play. Handley tentatively supplements this as either Βά]τραχ(ος) (the name of a brothel-keeper in Plut. Mor. 18c) or Βα]τραχ(ίων) (a cook in Lucian adv. ind. 21), but these suggestions would require the interlinear abbreviation of a speaker's name to be abnormally long. Could Τραχ(ηλίων) perhaps be proposed instead? Trachalio is the name of a slave in Plautus' Rudens, and a real-life Τράχαλος appears on the Delphic records for 331/330 B. C. as a shipbuilder from Lacedaemon.⁶

Koneiazomenai 3–4

] τάλαντα πένθ' ἄμα
] κόσμον

The mutilated papyrus from Menander's Koneiazomenai, first published by Gregor Zereteli,⁷ appears in these two lines to be reporting first the size of the dowry offered or requested at a betrothal ceremony, and secondly (introduced by πενθ') other incidental expenses or payments. Körte accordingly supplemented v. 3 with προῖκα δὲ δίδωσι τρία] τάλαντα. In later Greek comedy, however, there is considerable variation in the size of dowries offered and accepted:

1 talent: Men. Dysk. 844f., anon. fr. 707 K.-A.

2 talents: Men. Asp. 136, 268f., Mis. 446, probably anon. fr. 1098 K.-A. (if vv. 6f. and 11 are taken together).

3 talents: Men. Dysk. 844f., Pk. 1015.

4 talents: Men. Epitr. 134.

Since 2 talents is the commonest figure, it may perhaps be preferable to substitute δύο for Körte's τρία.

Leukadia fragment 257 Körte–Thierfelder

Three Byzantine lexica – the Etymologicum Genuinum,⁸ Photius and the Suda (ζ 9 Adler) – cite this fragment under the heading ζάκορος as if it were a simple iambic trimeter: ἐπίθες τὸ πῦρ ἢ ζάκορος οὕτωςι καλῶς. Citations in such lexica, however, are often mutilated; the excerptors tend to forget that they are dealing with a play text. In all probability Menander's line originally had dicola and in a modern edition would be printed:

(?)
ἐπίθες τὸ πῦρ, ἢ ζάκορος.
ΖΑΚΟΡΟΣ
οὕτωςι;
(?)
καλῶς.

For the use of καλῶς as an approving response to an order obeyed see e. g. Ar. Equ. 23, Nub. 848, Ran. 512, and for similar failures by scribes or excerptors to be aware of this use of καλῶς probably Alexis 116.4 (with P. P. Dobree, Adversaria (edited by J. Scholefield, Cambridge 1833–1837) 2.312)

⁵ E. W. Handley, The Oxyrhynchus Papyri 50 (1983) 49f. and photograph (pl. I).

⁶ E. Bourguet, BCH 20 (1896) 206, K. Schmidt, Hermes 37 (1902) 211, Dittenberger SIG I³ (table appended to p. 340), F. Bechtel, Die einstämmigen männlichen Personennamen des Griechischen, die aus Spitznamen hervorgegangen sind (Abh. Göttingen 2/5, Berlin 1898) 31, F. Marx's commentary on Plaut. Rud. 306ff. Professor R. H. Martin tells me that on reading the papyrus he too had the same idea.

⁷ This name is now more commonly transliterated as Tsereteli. Since all editors of Menander so far have given the publication details of the first edition of this papyrus incompletely and in a German translation of the name of the relevant Russian periodical, it may be useful to provide here the full bibliographical details: Zhurnal Ministersva narodnago prosvesheniya (St Petersburg), 19 n. s. (January–February 1909), part V, pp. 89–96. The papyrus itself is now reported to be in the Kekelidze Institute for Manuscripts, Library of the Georgian Academy of Sciences, Tbilisi, Georgia.

⁸ See R. Reitzenstein, Geschichte der griechischen Etymologica (Leipzig 1897) 194.

and 232.2 (with G. Kaibel's edition of Athenaeus 10.421ab and J. M. Edmonds, *The Fragments of Attic Comedy*, Leiden 1957–1961, 2.484).⁹

Misoumenos 297 Sandbach = 698 Arnott

- 297 ἔν τούτο δ' εἴρει· “τὴν ἑμαυτοῦ σ' ἀξιῶ (698)
ἦκων ἀπολυτροῦν ὦν πατήρ.” “ἐγὼ δέ γε
299 αἰτῶ γυναικῶ σ' ἐντετυχηκῶς, Δημέα”. (700)

The meaning – and indeed the textual acceptability – of εἴρει here has been much discussed with little measure of agreement,¹⁰ but one possibility so far has not been explored. In Homer's *Odyssey* εἴρω occurs several times, always in the first person singular, in the sense simply of ‘I say’ (2.162, 11.137, 13.7; LSJ s. v. εἴρω B). Grammarians, other scholars and Hellenistic poets were aware of this use throughout antiquity. Thus in his *Cratylus* Plato commented τὸ γὰρ εἴρειν λέγειν ἐστίν (398d) and τὸ εἴρειν λόγου χρεῖα ἐστίν (408a, cf. 408b), Aratus uses both εἴρει (739) and the passive εἴρεται (172, 261), and the lexicon of Hesychius (probably incorporating a Cyrillian gloss) has the entry εἴρει· λέγει, ῥητορεύει. εἴροντες· λέγοντες, σπείροντες (ε 1039; cf. also ε 1050, ι 873). Is it possible that for a short time in Menander's Athens this use of εἴρω flourished again as slang?

Perinthia 13–17

- 13 ΛΑΧΗΣ
ναί, Δᾶε, τὸ μὲν ἀπράγμονα
καὶ κούφον ἐξαπατᾶν γὰρ ἐστι δεσπότην
15 φλύαρος.
ΔΑΟΣ
ἠήν.
ΛΑΧΗΣ
εἰ δέ τις τὴν τῶν φρενῶν
στακτὴν – ἐκνίσθης;
ΔΑΟΣ
οὐχὶ πρὸς σοῦ, δέσποτα.
ΣΩΣΙΑΣ (?)
17 ὁ μὲν πονηρός, ὁ θρασὺς ἐνθάδ' ἀρτίως
κατὰ τῶν σκελῶν . . .

Part-divisions in, and general interpretation of, lines 15-17 are still disputed.¹¹ No photograph of the papyrus that preserves just over 20 trimeters of Menander's *Perinthia* (P. Oxyrhynchus 855) has ever been published, but a clear print kindly supplied to me by the Bodleian Library at Oxford, where the papyrus is now preserved, may enable a little of the fog and darkness to be removed. Three points need to be made.

(i) The name σωσ (Σωσ(ίας)) is clearly written in the left margin of line 17, separated by less than two letters' width from the first letter of that line. It seems quite certain, despite the somewhat tentative remarks of the late F. H. Sandbach,¹² that this marginal abbreviation of the speaker's name refers to line 17, and not to the corresponding line in the previous column of the papyrus.

(ii) A dicolon is correctly identified between στακτὴν and ἐκνίσθης in line 16; the traces of the two dots are not absolutely clear, but the space between the ν of στακτὴν and the ε of ἐκνίσθης is too wide

⁹ See also my discussion of the two Alexis passages in my commentary ad loc. (Cambridge 1996/1997).

¹⁰ See e. g. C. Austin, CR 16 (1966) 296, my earlier discussion in BICS 15 (1968) 122, F. H. Sandbach in the Gomme–Sandbach Commentary ad loc. (p. 457), and F. Sisti's edition of *Men. Mis.* (Genoa 1985) ad loc. (p. 109).

¹¹ On this and the other points at issue in this passage see now the excellent discussion by Giovanna Silvestri in *Arcadia: Atti e Memorie* 7/4 (1980–1981) 333–335.

¹² In the apparatus to his Oxford Text ad loc., and the Gomme–Sandbach Commentary p. 636.

to admit of any other interpretation. Even so, it is necessary to remember that a dicolon is sometimes used in comic papyri to indicate change of direction in a speech, and not simply change of speaker. Here after *στακτήν* there is a sudden change of direction which needs to be signalled to the reader; the expected apodosis is replaced by a teasing question.¹³

(iii) Sandbach claims in the apparatus of his Oxford Text that under v. 15 ‘deest paragraphus’. The photograph shows that at the opening of this line the papyrus is severely abraded, removing virtually all trace of the first letter (φ) in the line. It is important to recognise that the paragraphi written under line beginnings by this scribe are remarkably short, not extending beyond the first letter.

Perinthia fr. 4 Sandbach, 5 Körte–Thierfelder

This fragment, which most probably describes the drinking habits of the Menandrian counterpart to the midwife Mysis in Terence’s *Andria*,¹⁴ is introduced by its citer, Athenaeus 11.504a, as follows: (ὁ Πλούταρχος) ἔδωκε (τὴν φιάλην) τῷ παιδί περισοβεῖν ἐν κύκλω κελεύσας, τὸ κύκλω πίνειν τοῦτ’ εἶναι λέγων, παρατιθέμενος Μενάνδρου ἐκ Περινηθίας:

οὐδεμίαν ἢ γραῶς ὄλωσ
κύλικα παρήκεν, ἀλλὰ πίνει τὴν κύκλω.

In v. 1 Musurus’ palmary emendation replaces the ἡγρευς’ of the codex Marcianus (A: this part of the fragment is omitted by the Epitome). In v. 2 the reading of the manuscripts (A and, for the last three words of the fragment, also those of the Epitome) is printed, but with no confidence that they represent what Menander wrote. The transmission here is in fact doubly problematic: it combines an aorist παρήκεν with a present πίνει in an account of two linked actions; and it contains the elliptical phrase τὴν κύκλω, although Athenaeus’ deipnosophist Ploutarchos seems to be claiming that the fragment exemplifies Menander’s use of the idiom (τὴν) ἐν κύκλω. It is always possible of course that something in the lost context of the comic citation justified such a collocation of two different tenses, and that Athenaeus’ introductory words were loosely written and implied only a Menandrian use of κύκλω. Yet there is something to be said in favour of at least two conjectures: Kaibel’s ἀλλ’ ἔπιν’ ἀεὶ κύκλω (in the apparatus to his edition of Athenaeus) and Ihne’s ἀλλ’ ἔπιεν αὐτὴν κύκλω (loc. cit. in n. 14), although neither incorporates the deipnosophist’s ἐν κύκλω. Could Menander perhaps have written ἀλλ’ ἔπιε τὴν (ἐν) κύκλω, with A’s corruption explained as an attempted (metrical) correction after EN had been omitted by haplography after HN? In comedy ἐν κύκλω is by no means an uncommon substitute for a simple κύκλω, sometimes qualifying verbal compounds in περι- just like κύκλω (Ar. Vesp. 924, Plut. 679, Metagenes fr. 6.11, Men. Phasm. 54, Perinth. 10), sometimes linked with πᾶς or ἅπας (Ar. Ach. 998, Equ. 170, Men. Asp. 360), sometimes with both the above (Ar. Plut. 708), and sometimes (as would apply here) with neither (Ar. Vesp. 132, Av. 118, Lys. 267, probably Eupolis fr. 108. 1).

Perinthia frs. 6 + 7 Sandbach = 3 + 8 Körte–Thierfelder

At line 796 of Terence’s *Andria* Crito arrives on stage. He has travelled from Andros to Athens as Chrysis’ cousin and heir (796), hoping to establish his claim to the estate after her death, but aware of the legal difficulties before him now that Glycerium has taken possession of all that property (809ff.). Crito converses first with Mysis, Glycerium’s slave (800ff.), later with Chremes and Simo (809ff.). The degree of similarity between the plot of Terence’s *Andria* and that of Menander’s *Perinthia* remains uncertain, despite the statements of Terence (*Andria* 9–14) and Donatus (commentary on *Andria* 10 and 14). Yet if Menander’s play featured a counterpart to Crito, the two book fragments 6 (cited by Pollux 10.12) and 7 (cited by the *Suda* s. v. ἀνέπαφον, α 2289 Adler)¹⁵ could well have been addressed to him

¹³ See e. g. E. W. Handley’s edition of Men. Dysk. (London 1965) p. 46, and Silvestri (op. cit. in n. 11) 334.

¹⁴ So first W. H. Grauert, *Historische und philologische Analekten* (Münster 1833) 189; cf. G. Ihne, *Quaestiones Terentianae* (Diss. Bonn 1843) 5 n. 1.

¹⁵ Here for convenience I give just the numbers used by Sandbach in his Oxford Text. See also the Gomme–Sandbach commentary on *Perinthia* fr. 6, p. 538.

by an interlocutor, advising him just how far he could go in any attempt to seize part of Chrysis' estate. It is in fact possible that these two fragments, if set out and interpreted in what seems to me the most acceptable way, could be a continuous extract from a single speech:

1 ὅσ' ἐστὶ μαλακὰ συλλαβῶν
ἐκ τῆς πόλεως τὸ σύνολον ἐκπήδα, (Ϸ —)
3 θᾶττον, τὰ δ' ἄλλ' ἀνέπαφα σώματ', οὐδ' ἔλη.

1–3 θᾶττον Pollux 10.12. 1 ὅσ' Bentley: ὡς mss. FS, ὃ CL. ἐστὶ CL. 2–3 ἐκπήδα θᾶττον FS, ἐκπήδα φίλος CL. 3 τὰ δ' – ἔλη Suda s. v. ἀνέπαφον. οὐδ' ἔλη ms. S.

Here the addressee is being urged to seize all that can be handled easily and then to leave Athens quickly, 'but the other items are non-seizable bodies (sc. house slaves),¹⁶ and these you will not take'. Two textual points, however, need more detailed discussion.

(i) In vv. 2–3 the readings of mss. FS and CL of Pollux are more likely to be alternative readings at the end of the first extract than complementary to each other.¹⁷ θᾶττον suits sense and syntax admirably (cf. e. g. Handley on Dysk. 430f.), but φίλος is lame; we should expect a vocative φίλε here, not a nominative.¹⁸ In all probability the original extract would have ended unmetrically and incorrectly with ἐκπήδα θᾶττον; the excerptor would have omitted a word scanning Ϸ — at the end of line 2 which was significant only in the unexcerpted text (? a name in the vocative, such as Κρίτων), and φίλος would have been added as a metrical stopgap.

(ii) At the end of v. 3 there is nothing objectionable in the reading οὐδ' ἔλη, 'and you will not take (them)'. ἐλοῦμαι is a late form of the future of αἰροῦμαι, particularly common in the middle voice; the Antiatticist (80.12 Bekker) cites the comedian Timostratus (fr. 5) for its use, and the instances of its occurrence cited by LSJ s. v. αἰρέω are easily and abundantly supplemented (e. g. Polybius 3.29, anon. in Anth. Pal. 9.108.1). For the use of οὐδέ (rather than ἄλλ' οὐ) thus 'holding apart incompatibles' see J. D. Denniston, *Greek Particles*² (Oxford 1954) 191 (I.ii) and cf. e. g. Aeschylus (?) P. V. 716 ἀνήμεροι γὰρ οὐδὲ πρόσπλατοι ξένοις.

Leeds

W. Geoffrey Arnott

¹⁶ For this use of σώμα in Menander cf. Epitr. 318 and Sik. 3, and see especially W. K. Pritchett, *The Greek State at War*, 5 (Berkeley, Los Angeles, Oxford 1991) 182–185, 339–341 and A. M. Belardinelli's edition of Men. Sik. (Bari 1994) pp. 110f.

¹⁷ The suggestion that the variant readings were complementary (producing a non-lacunose text ἐκπήδα, φίλος, | θᾶττον) was first made by Meineke, *Menandri et Philemonis reliquiae* (Berlin 1823) 141, and (despite his own later reservations: see n. 18 below) uncritically accepted by subsequent scholars.

¹⁸ Cf. Meineke, *Fragmenta Comicorum Graecorum* 4 (Berlin 1841) 187.