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FIRST NOTES ON MENANDER’S SIKYONIOI

These notes are a by-product of work devoted to Menander’s Sikyonioi during preparation of a third volume for the new Loeb edition of Menander. In all passages of this play the line-numberings will be those adopted by R. Kassel in his edition of the play (Kleine Texte 185, Berlin 1965) and followed by F. H. Sandbach in his Oxford text of Menander (1st edition 1972, 2nd 1990; cf. his and A. W. Gomme’s Menander: A Commentary, Oxford 1973, hereafter referred to as the Gomme–Sandbach commentary) and by A. M. Belardinelli in her edition of the play (Bari 1994). Book fragments are numbered as in all three editions. It will be useful for readers to have at their side the photographs of the Sorbonne papyrus which provided a most valuable accompaniment to A. Blanchard and A. Bataille’s editio princeps of the new fragments of the play (Recherches de Papyrologie 3, 1965, 103–176, plates VI–XII).

I. The play title

Three forms of the title are transmitted. The commonest is Σικυώνιος in the masculine singular, given eight times by the citers of book fragments 1, 3–5, 7–8; book fragment 9, which is cited with the name of the title but not of the author, is also plausibly assigned to Menander’s play:

3. -ιω Photius α 95 Theodoridis, Suda α 165 Adler (Aelius Dionysius α 16 Erbse).
5. -ιω Photius ε 770 Theodoridis (cf. K. Tsantsanoglu, New Fragments of Greek Literature from the Lexicon of Photius (Athens 1984) 162, s.v. ἕμβριμησάσσα).
6. -ιω Harpocration p. 22 Keaney.
7. -ιω Photius e 770 Theodoridis (cf. K. Tsantsanoglu, New Fragments of Greek Literature from the Lexicon of Photius (Athens 1984) 162, s.v. ἕμβριμησάσσα).

On three other occasions the title is given as Σικυώνιοι, masculine plural:

3. -ιω Photius α 95 Theodoridis, Suda α 165 Adler (Aelius Dionysius α 16 Erbse).
5. -ιω Photius e 770 Theodoridis (cf. K. Tsantsanoglu, New Fragments of Greek Literature from the Lexicon of Photius (Athens 1984) 162, s.v. ἕμβριμησάσσα).

Manuscripts of the excerptors of frs. 2 and 6, however, opt for the feminine singular title Σικυώνια:

3. -ιω Photius α 95 Theodoridis, Suda α 165 Adler (Aelius Dionysius α 16 Erbse).
5. -ιω Photius e 770 Theodoridis (cf. K. Tsantsanoglu, New Fragments of Greek Literature from the Lexicon of Photius (Athens 1984) 162, s.v. ἕμβριμησάσσα).

On three other occasions the title is given as Σικυώνια, feminine plural:

(a) the colophon of S (here P. Sorbonne 2272e, written in the last third of the third century B.C.) clearly writes σικυώνιοι μενανδροῦ?
(b) σικυώνιοι, written in white paint, appears as the identification tag for a scene from Menander’s play portrayed in the late second century A.D. on the wall of a house in Ephesus.

2 A. Blanchard and A. Bataille, Recherches de Papyrologie 3 (1964) provide a clear photograph (plate XIII).
3 See especially V. M. Strocka, Die Wandmalerei der Hanghäuser in Ephesus (Forschungen in Ephesus VIII/1, Vienna 1977) 48, 54–55, with colour plates 62 and 64. The latter plate is reproduced on the front cover of A. M. Belardinelli’s edition of the play. The painting is listed in T. B. L. Webster’s Monuments Illustrating New Comedy, 3rd edition revised and enlarged by J. R. Green and A. Seeberg (BICS Supplement 50, London 1995) as XZ 32 = 6DP 1.1, 1.93 and 2.472 respectively.
(c) σικυωλίοι (sic!) is miswritten for σικυωνίοι in a shorthand list (P. Brit. Mus. 2652), written in the third or fourth century A.D., of what seem at this point (tetrad 510) to be Menandrean titles⁴.

Alciphron 4.19.19 (the fictive letter Γλυκέρα Μενανδρῳ) includes this play in a list of six Menandrean titles, but all the manuscripts are defective at the key point: εἶτε σικυων[........] οὖν ἄλλο ms. Φ, εἶτε σικυων[........] οὖν ἄλλο Vat. 2, σικυων[........] οὖν ἄλλο Flor., σικυων[........................] οὖν ἄλλο mss. Π, Δ. Meineke (partly following Bergler)⁵ plausibly supplemented the gap with Σικυωνίον, εἰθ' ὀπιτοῦ ἄλλο, but Fernández Galiano⁶ notes that (despite φ’s accent) Alciphron might originally have written Σικυωνίος, εἰθ’ ὀπιτοῦ ἄλλο.

In any attempt to identify the correct title of this play, improbabilities must first be eliminated.

(1) Citers of dramatic fragments (and their manuscripts) are notorious for corrupting the declined endings of titles. It is generally recognised⁷ that “in practically all the cases, the divergence in the title’s ending will be due to error: a scribe’s careless copying, or the incorrect expansion of a title that was abbreviated either in the mss. . . . or in the didascalic inscriptions themselves”. Thus we may safely reject (for one of the reasons given above) the ending Σικυωνία here, because in the extant portions of the play there is no single Sicyonian woman who plays a dramatically important part; the role of the Sicyonian foster-mother, who on her deathbed despatched to Stratophanes a truth-revealing letter and recognition tokens (vv. 130–144), could hardly be so interpreted.

(2) The evidence of the shorthand text in P. Brit. Mus. 2652 is unreliable. Although M. Gronewald (op. cit. in n. 4) was clearly right in confirming the presence of four Menander titles in tetrad 510, this tetrad is preceded by another (509) containing four ethnics that may also be identified as Menandrean titles (καρχηδόνιοι, περινθιοί, βωσιτία, ιμβριοί), but two of those titles would then have a correct singular (Καρχηδόνιος, Περινθίος) replaced by a masculine plural, and these plurals may have been influenced by the fact that tetrads 508 and 511 are also ethnic lists in the masculine plural. Thus σικυωλίοι, like καρχηδόνιοι and περινθιοί, could have been changed into plural forms under the influence of the other ethnics present.

Consequently, we are left with Σικυωνίος and Σικυωνίοι as forms of the title. Both can be supported.

(a) The singular form is attested by the combined evidence of several citers, none of whom gives a plural form. The singular title makes dramatic sense; it would designate Stratophanes, the play’s hero, since, although Athenian born, he believed himself to be a Sicyonian in the early part of the play (cf. 125–145, 246f.). It is noticeable, too, that either he or his foster-father is in the prologue referred to as ὁ Σικυωνίος . . . ἥγεμον (vv. 13–14), and Menander more than once appears deliberately to introduce his chosen title into the wording of an opening scene or a prologue⁸.

(b) The plural form is given by the colophon of a play-text copied within 50 to 90 years after Menander’s death, and on a wall-painting. In neither place would one expect to have a careless, uncorrected error of this magnitude – although admittedly in the same room as the latter a wall painting

---

⁴ First published by H. J. M. Milne, Greek Shorthand Manuals (London 1934) p. 49, and later identified as a Menandrean title by M. Gronewald, ZPE 33 (1979) 6–7, correcting the λ of σικυωλίοι to ν.

⁵ Menandr et Philomenis reliquiae (Berlin 1823) 155. Bergler had already suggested Σικυωνίον in his edition of Alciphron (Leipzig 1715).

⁶ ECīás 9 (1965) 30.


⁸ E.g. Aspis 16, 72, 109, Dysk. 6, Samia 13; possibly δοκτύλιος at fr. com. adesp. 1084.22 Kassel–Austin. See my paper in Drama 2 (1994) 29.
of Euripides’ Orestes has the title misspelled ὀρέσστης! The plural title makes good sense, too: it would refer to Stratophanes, along with the man and wife from Sicyon who adopted him⁹.

Since the evidence for both forms seems reasonably strong, it appears most likely that the play in antiquity went under both titles – an original didascalic title Σικυόνιοι, authenticated in the Sorbonne papyrus; and Σικυόνιος too, taking its alternative title from its chief character, like many such second titles given to plays of later Greek comedy either by popular usage or by Alexandrian scholarship¹⁰.

II. The speaker of the prologue

The scene of the play is not specifically identified in the preserved portions of the prologue or elsewhere in the play, but passing references indicate that it was most probably Eleusis or a neighbouring deme. In lines 176–271 one character describes events that he has just witnessed at Eleusis, including a successful request for Philoumene to be given sanctuary by the priestess of a temple there (240–242), and the same deme is mentioned at 57 in a puzzlingly mutilated context which may or may not imply that it was the dramatic setting. In such circumstances it has been recognised that the prologue to Sikyonioi might well have been delivered by a deity from Eleusis, and both Demeter and Kalligeneia have been suggested¹¹.

In a play about a girl who at the age of four was kidnapped by pirates (vv. 2, 354–357) and is now being pursued by Moschion apparently against her will (199–210, 258–266, 397–398), however, it seems to me that Persephone, herself the victim of a celebrated abduction, would have been no less an appropriate choice as prologue speaker.

III. Two details of the plot

(a) Lines 354–357, however they are distributed between Theron and Kichesias¹², inform us that at the age of four Philoumene, along with the family slave Dromon and an old woman who was probably Philoumene’s nurse, were kidnapped by pirates at Halai. Attica has two demes with this name, both situated on the coast: Halai Aixonides, 16 kilometres south east of Athens, and Halai Araphenides, on the north-east coast of Attica 25 kilometres from the city¹³. The extant text does not indicate which of the two was the scene of Philoumene’s abduction, nor indeed whether it was her and Kichesias’ home. Halai Araphenides was the site of the Tauropolia, and only three kilometres away from that of the Brauronia¹⁴; in both festivals young girls danced wearing attractive costumes. Such occasions might

⁹ Admittedly these foster-parents died before the action of the play begins (cf. Belardinelli in her edition, p. 58). It is unlikely that a plural title could refer alternatively to Stratophanes and others of his retinue returning from Caria (so A. Barigazzi, SIFC 37, 1965, 83); the only known member of that retinue featuring in the extant fragments of the play is the parasite Theron, and he was an Athenian (cf. v. 144).


¹¹ Lloyd-Jones (GRBS 7, 1966, 155 = Greek Comedy etc., Oxford 1990, 74f.) suggests Demeter or Kalligeneia; cf. Guida (op. cit. in n. 10) 211 n. 2.


well have attracted a young girl like Philoumene, and it is possible that Halai was not the girl’s home, but that she was simply on her way, escorted by Dromon and a nurse, to or from one of these festivals when she was kidnapped.

(b) Two other characters are involved in some of the play’s activities: Malthake and the parasite Theron. The latter’s cry at 144–145 (ὁ δέσποιν’ Ἀθηνᾷ τούτῳ (Stratophanes) σαυτῆς πάει / ἵνα λάβῃ τὴν παιδ’ (Philoumene), ἐγὼ δὲ Μαλλάκην) implies that he was an Athenian. Theron wants to marry Malthake (145), and if fr. 12 is correctly assigned to this play, it appears that he succeeds in doing so. This would require Malthake also to have been free and Athenian, and the name was borne by many such girls in Menander’s Athens15. In comedy, however, the name is associated only with hetairai16, but if that was her role too in Menander’s Sikyonioi, her antecedent sexual relationship (or relationships) can no longer be safely identified.

IV. Passages of text (1–109 Kassel)

13–15

13 ὁ Σικυώνιος

15 καὶ πλούσιος τουτω[. .].]υχον[

The prologue speaker describes the Sicyonian purchaser of Philoumene and Dromon as a military officer who is ‘very fine and rich . . .’, but at line 15 the papyrus becomes badly mutilated. Editors normally print a full stop after πλούσιος, and begin a new sentence with τοῦτοι( i) μην (suppl. E. W. Handley, BICS 12, 1965, 40). This may be right; the first tau here is clearly written. Even so, I am tempted to wonder whether Menander may not rather have described his purchaser as χρηστός πάνυ / καὶ πλούσιος γ’. οὐ τῶν τυχόντων: ‘very fine, and rich too – not one of your run-of-the-mill folk’. This correction and supplement I scribbled a long time ago on a piece of paper and copied it in the margin of my copy of Kassel’s edition of the play, but whether it was my own idea or a suggestion by someone else I no longer remember. J. D. Denniston (Greek Particles2, Oxford 1954, 127–128) identifies this use of γε as an attempt ‘to stress the addition given by καί’; for τῶν τυχόντων note especially Aspis 427–428, Ἐσπερίδου τοῦτ’ ἔστι, τόδε Χατηρήμονος, / οὐ τῶν τυχόντων; cf. also fr. 680.3 and LSJ s.v. τυχάνοις A.2.b.

19–20

The gap between lines 19–20 (i.e. between fragments III and IV.A of the Sorbonne papyrus) can be measured within limits, as scholars have generally recognised, but it may be worth while to restate the relevant facts briefly and precisely. When top and bottom margins are preserved, the individual columns of the Sorbonne papyrus can be shown to contain 21 (V.B, VII.B), 22 (VI.B, VI.C), 23 (X.A, X.B, X.C) or 24 (XI.B, XI.C) lines of text. In the published photographs, which were all presumably taken with the same scale, the distance between top and bottom margins varies little: from 12.1 to 13 cm.; the distance

---

15 See M. J. Osborne and S. G. Byrne, A Lexicon of Greek Personal Names, 2 (Oxford 1994) 296, where Menander’s Malthake is included among 27 Athenian women with this name, at least eight of them demonstrably free.

16 Malthake is a hetaira in Theophilus fr. 11.5; the one surviving fragment (146) of Antiphanes’ Malthake concerns hetairai; Lucian, Rhet. Pracc. 12 links a comic character Malthake with hetairai like Thais and Glykera. If she was free and Athenian, she could not have been the lady’s maid of fr. 1 Kassel, as H. Lloyd-Jones suggests in Emerita 34 (1966) 141–142 (= Greek Comedy etc., 80).
between the tops of successive lines is between 0.5 and 0.6 cm. Fragment XII.A, where the top margin is clearly visible, has 24 lines of text cut off directly below the bottom line, but one further line originally followed in this column, on the evidence of a minuscule scrap of papyrus now lost (P. Jouguet, BCH 30, 1906, 106).

Fragment III contains lines 1 to 19; its top and bottom margins are lost. Line 19 may be anything from 0 to 6 lines from the bottom of its column. Fragment IV.A, whose bottom margin is preserved, contains the final 16 lines (20–35) of its column; between 5 and 9 lines are lost at its head. If III and IV.A are adjacent columns, the gap between them will have been 5 to 15 lines; it may be noted that at line 19 the prologue speaker is still describing events of eleven or so years before the dramatic present, but at line 20 (after the gap) that speaker is probably only 5 lines or so from the end of her speech. If a column has been lost between III and IV.A, 21 to 25 lines need to be added to the gap, making it 26 to 40 lines.

25–51

Fragment IV of the Sorbonne papyrus is seriously mutilated, but if lines 23–24 preserve the final letters of a Menandrean formula used at Dysk. 45–46 to introduce a five-line coda to its divine prologue, it is likely that the Sikyonioi speaker departed immediately after v. 24, leaving the stage empty before the arrival of two human characters. Their dialogue continued up to and perhaps beyond 51, where fragment IV breaks off. Who were the new arrivals, and what were they discussing? The remains of 29–51 may yield more information than has sometimes been recognised:

(a) The address γύναι (32) and the use of female expressions such as the oath μᾶ τὸ θεό (34) and τάλαν (35) clearly indicate that one at least of the two speakers was female. Elsewhere in Menander the vocative γύναι is used by (1) husbands to wives (Epitr. 303, 376, Heros 69, Samia 421, fr. 592.1 Körte; probably also fr. adesp. 1014.42 Kassel–Austin), (2) women to women (Epitr. 858, 860, 864, ὁ γ. 866, μακρυigm γ. 873, (3) slaves to their mistresses, but then accompanied with a laudatory attribute (γεννικὸς καὶ κοσμικὰ γ. Georgos 42–43, γεννινέα γ. P. Hamburg 656.10 = fr. 951.10 Körte).

(b) The broken fragments reveal talk of ἀλογίσμων ἀνδρῶν (‘male calculation’ 25), either ἔνδρον ἐνδρῶν (27), καὶ συνατικὸς (‘and to make (me) live with’ 32, addressed to a woman), ὁ δὲ τρόμος (35); then, after a gap of between 5 and 9 lines, θρέψις (‘you’ll be feeding’ 39), ἀπληστός and ἀνήρ (43, 46) and πάντως ἐσθῆτει (44). Taken together, these appear to indicate a conversation partly about the parasite Theron, described here (typically for a parasite) as an insatiable gormandiser whom the addressee will be feeding. The addressee at this point must be Malthake, who may have just before expressed her fears of a future life with Theron as her husband or partner. A reference then to ‘the donkeys’ would be appropriate, if such a partnership involved her in looking after them (cf. 411, with its allusion to a woman bringing them their food). It is possible that Malthake speaks 25–32; if she does speak 32, the other character on stage with her will also be female. At this stage of the plot the latter is perhaps less likely to be Smikrines’ wife (as yet not known to be Stratophares’ mother) than some protatic figure (Philoumene or another female slave), introduced here to provide a listener and respondent while Malthake outlined details about her and Theron (? his calculation on...
marrying her, her reluctance to support a gourmand) not mentioned in the divine prologue. I should tentatively assign 33–35 and 39–47\textsuperscript{22} to this respondent, 48–51 to Malthake.

27

Kassel prints Ἰ.όνος ὡς γίγνεται. However the opening traces are interpreted, it is worth considering whether ὡς γίγνεται here may provide a further example of a koine usage (‘as happens’, like ut fit commonly in Latin) preserved elsewhere in only four known texts: Alexis fr. 76.3 Kassel–Austin (see my commentary, Cambridge 1996, p. 209) and Alexander of Aphrodisias’ commentaries on Aristotle, Anal. Pr. CAG 2.1, 46.32f., Top. 2.2, 33.9ff. and Meteor. 3.2, 24.22ff. It is unfortunate that mutilation in the Sorbonne papyrus here prevents a certain judgement.

29

οὐτοσί, the one word preserved from this verse, cannot safely be used as an argument against the presence of only two women speakers in this scene. Although in Menander this pronoun most commonly (some 47 certain instances may be counted) refers to a living creature (human or animal\textsuperscript{23}) already on stage or rapidly approaching it, there are a significant number of uses with other referents:

(a) objects either visible on stage (15 times) or imagined as just off it (Knemon’s farm, Dysk. 5); among these instances οὐτοσί occurs in the same sedes as at Sik. 29 at least four times as a nominative masculine singular (Epitr. 386, 387, Pk. 768, fr. 56.1 Körte), twice as an accusative masculine singular (Epitr. 466, 514);

(b) characters imagined as living in stage houses, having been seen in previous scenes, but now off stage (Aspis 139, Pk. 531, Samia 155); here presumably the speaker identifies the referent by pointing to the relevant stage house\textsuperscript{24}. To these three instances Georgos 63 (and the non-Menandrean papyrus fragment 1017.2 Kassel–Austin) may perhaps be added; the referents there are certainly off stage at this point, but we do not know whether they were recently on stage or not.

(c) characters described as present at events described later in a narrative (Sik. 247, 260).

If οὐτοσί here fell into group (b) above, it might follow that Theron had appeared previously in a scene before the prologue.

52–62

ΣΤΡΑΤΟΦΑΝΗΣ (?)

52 Ἰ.ὸν ἀπολειπάντων παιδίον Ἰ.ὸντον τρέφειν ἢ τὸν τόπον ἱγεγραμμένον ἅλλας ἐκεί.

ΘΗΡΩΝ (?)

55 τι δὴ τὸ κακὸν ποτ’ ἐστὶν οὕτω μαρτυρεῖν μάρτυρα; τοιούτων ἄν τις εὔροι πολλαχοῦ ἐνταῦθ’ ἐν ἀστεί τοῦτο; Ἐλευσίς ἐστι, καὶ πανηγυρίς ποι., τίς νοήσει, πρὸς θεῶν; εἰ συνδραμεῖται δῆμος, εἰς τις οὐ ταχὺ

60 τὴν παι ἐρεκλύσαιτ’ ἄν. εἰ δὲ περιμένω ἐνθάδε, γένοιτ’ ἄν] ἐτι λέγοντος ἐσσέρα

62 ]τ[...[\textsuperscript{22}

22 Thus θρέψεις in 39 would in all probability be this second woman’s reference to the chore that Malthake (as Theron’s partner) would have in feeding Theron and/or the donkeys.

23 Animals at Dysk. 393, Samia 399, probably also fr. 620.3 Körte. Included among the humans are two instances of self-reference: Sik. 144, fr. 409.2.

24 See e.g. Handley’s commentary (London 1973) on Dysk. 173, the Gomme–Sandbach commentary on Georgos 63, Samia 155, K. J. Dover on Ar. Nub. 83, 1473; and cf. LSJ s.v. -i, Schwyzer 2.566 § 20.
52–62 contain the mutilated remains of the first column of fragment VIII (Blanchard–Bataille: = fr. VII Jouguet) of the Sorbonne papyrus. Its position in the play is uncertain, although Kassel is clearly right to assign both fragments VII and VIII to an early stage in the plot[25]. Identification of speakers here is disputed; A. Barigazzi (SIFC 37, 1965, 39–43) identified the characters involved in this scene as Moschion (in love with the girl Philoumene) and the slave Dromon[26], while J.-M. Jacques (REA 69, 1967, 307 n. 1) opted for Theron and Kichesias. Over 90 years ago[27] Ph.-E. Legrand divined the subject of these lines as a plot to pass off a girl as a free Athenian, and the plotters as a lover and an intriguing agent; he seems to me right on target. Theron is the character who later in the play (343–360) attempts to suborn Kichesias into an allegedly false declaration that he was Philoumene’s real father; at vv. 52–62, however, Stratophanes would be a more likely receiver of Theron’s villainous confidences. If Stratophanes spoke the now irretrievably fractured verses 52–54, perhaps casting doubts on the feasibility of any scheme to prove Philoumene a free Athenian, 55–61 (if supplemented as above) would be Theron’s irritated but confident response to those doubts.[29]

For the supplement suggested above at 55 compare e.g. Dysk. 218 τούτῳ τὸ κακόν τὶ ποιήσειν; Mis. 311 and Ar. Aves 1207, along with C. Austin’s note on Menander, Samia 362 and E. W. Handley’s on Dysk. 464f.

Jouguet’s supplement at 58 has been opposed because it is same spatio breuis (so Sandbach’s Oxford text ad loc.), adding only five letters to fill a space wide enough for seven. In this scribe’s handwriting, however, π α ν η are all broad letters, γ is of average width, and the left-hand edge of the υ also is missing in the space; there is thus no need to assume scribal error in this gap[30]. Furthermore, Jouguet’s supplement is the only one appropriate in this context, providing as it does dramatic preparation for the later narrative (176–271) about the πανηγυρίς at Eleusis in which steps were taken to proclaim Philoumene’s free Athenian status. The passage translates ‘In this way one could find such a witness of this to testify in many places here in the city – this is Eleusis, and there is, if I’m not mistaken, a public meeting. In heaven’s name, who will notice?’ On πρὸς θεόν (in a question) at 58 see W. S. Barrett’s commentary (Oxford 1964) on Eur. Hipp. 219.

72–109

Fragment VII Blanchard (= II and IV Jouguet[31]) is badly mutilated and in places barely legible, but a new identification of one of its speakers may yield a more satisfactory interpretation of the action and

25 Vv. 57–58, with their references to Eleusis and (by a plausible supplement) a town-meeting there, seem like dramatic preparation for the events described later at 176–271.

26 Followed by T. B. L. Webster, Introduction to Menander (Manchester 1974) 186.

27 Followed by C. Gallavotti in his 1972 edition of the play.


29 O. Schroeder, Nouæ comœidia fragmenta in papyris reperta (Bonn 1915) p. 22 first suggested the change of speaker at v. 55. Any paragraphus that may originally have been inserted in S under line 54 has been lost along with all the openings of vv. 52–61.

30 So the Gomme–Sandbach commentary, ad loc. However, in checking the scribal spellings of this word where it appears throughout classical literature, I have found no manuscript errors apart from a tendency to substitute Attic for non-Attic forms (e.g. Hdt. 2.58, 59; [Dem.] 18.91. Two papyri deriving from the same century as the Sorbonne papyrus (P. Cair. Zen. 59341(a).11, 247 B.C.; P. Hibeh 27.36, early 3rd century B.C.) spell and decline the word correctly.

at the same time give solid support to Kassel’s printing of this fragment after fragment VIII in the first half of the play.

Although the paragraphi under vv. 95, 96 and 97 have been described as uncertain, the one under 95 is confirmed by the space (which in this early papyrus has the same significance as a dicolon after εστὶν in the same line. This immediately undermines Sandbach’s suggestion (in the Gomme–Sandbach commentary on vv. 72–108) that up to v. 108 we have a monologue. But who (and how many) are the speakers in this fragment, and what are their movements?

(a) Up to v. 96 there are further indications pointing to dialogue: particularly the second-person singulars at 82, 92 and 95, and the responsive remark at 96 τίς δ’ οὐκ ἔχει σέ; (on this correction of a mutilated text, see below on vv. 95–96), which picks up the other speaker’s words in the previous line. The curse in 80 Ἰ διὸ Διόνυσος ἀπολέσας appears to be directed at a man accused of ‘not having a sound or straightforward idea’ in his mind, οὐχ ὡς ἤδεις οὐδείς ἂπλοιον φρονῶν (81), and of ruining the speaker (82). An unmarried girl (τὴν . . . παρθένον 86, cf. παρθένον 84) seems to be involved in this catastrophe. Previous scholars have identified the speakers either as Moschion and Dromon, or as Stratophanes and Dromon, but neither pairing seems totally appropriate to what is preserved of the dialogue or to the most likely dramatic action at this stage of the plot, scanty though the remains of the first half of this play are. The angry man in ruin here is almost certainly Stratophanes, but the most plausible victim of his present wrath appears to me to be Theron. Fragment VIII is interpreted above (see on 52–62) also as a conversation between Stratophanes and Theron, in which the latter is apparently advising the use of a perjurious witness in order to persuade an Athenian court that Philoumene was a free Athenian, and thus fraudulently to pave the way for a marriage between Stratophanes and the girl. At vv. 97–98 in fragment VII someone allegedly διέδοξε . . . δεσποτὴν ξένον[v] . . . τρίτον τ’ ἐρωτ’, ‘fears a master, a foreigner . . . and thirdly a lover’. The fearing character must be Philoumene, but the object of her apprehensions has been disputed. R. Merkelbach suggested that Philoumene might have felt herself threatened by three different men: her master Stratophanes, a foreigner such as the Boeotian creditor of Stratophanes’ foster-father, and thirdly Moschion as the alleged lover. This interpretation, however, is probably ruled out by the presence of the singular participle λέγοντα in the next line, almost certainly in agreement with and referring to the one person mentioned in vv. 97–98. Philoumene is thus described here as fearing Stratophanes alone, combining in his own person the three aspects of owner, foreigner (because still a Sicyonian in Philoumene’s eyes) and lover: a lover moreover who was pressing her to agree to an unlawful marriage. If Theron’s stratagem was aimed to inveigle Philoumene into such a union, we can easily imagine that an honourable girl like her might run away and seek asylum as a suppliant in Eleusis, at the place where she is found sitting in vv. 190 and 192, in fear that her ‘owner would do her an injury’ (ὁ κύριος κακὸν ποίησῃ, 194). She would have been accompanied by her

32 Cf. also A. Barigazzi, SIFC 37 (1965) 39, 41.
33 By R. Coles, Emerita 34 (1966) 134.
34 Cf. J. Bingen, Chronique d’Égypte 40 (1965) 111–120.
35 A. Barigazzi, op. cit. in n. 32, 39–43, followed by T. B. L. Webster, op. cit. in n. 26, 184.
36 B. Marzullo, QIFG 2 (1967) 34–44, followed by Belardinelli in her edition (commentary on vv. 72ff.).
37 Cf. L. A. Post, AJP 87 (1966) 489, suggesting that Stratophanes and Theron were the speakers at vv. 96–101. With my identification of speakers in vv. 75–96 Theron is the character who (i) complains that he is not given a proper chance to speak (95), and (ii) is brusquely cut off (and possibly dismissed: see below on vv. 95–96) by Stratophanes (96). A similar scenario is presented at vv. 145–147; when the soldier there orders Theron to move off, Theron twice tries to interpose statements, but is brusquely interrupted and told to get on his way. The two passages would thus provide a further instance of Menander’s use of linguistic patterns to individualise his characters (see especially F. H. Sandbach, Entretiens Hardt 16, 1970, 111–143, and W. G. Arnott in F. Di Martino and A. H. Sommerstein, Lo spettacolo delle voci 2, Bari 1995, 147–164.
38 Mus. Helv. 23 (1966) 174. Barigazzi (op. cit. in n. 32) 43 had already opted for the singular reference; cf. also Marzullo (op. cit. in n. 36) 41.
39 This passage can itself be used to support the argument that vv. 97–98 refer to Stratophanes alone.
devoted protector (cf. vv. 7–8), the slave Dromon; this is implied by his presence at her side during the
town-meeting in Eleusis (267), and if they had run away from Stratophanes’ house together, Dromon
could hardly have appeared as a character in fragment VII. The report of Philoumene’s flight would
have driven Stratophanes distraught and made him vent his fury on Theron as the precipitator of this
catastrophe. With this interpretation fragment VIII would clearly precede VII, even though the
number of lines between the two remains incalculable.

The scene between Stratophanes and Theron probably ended at v. 96, with Stratophanes possibly
dismissing Theron with τίς δ’ ὁκ ἔξι σε; ἐδώκε, ἐδέξων νύν ἦθι, ‘Who doesn’t let you? I gave, you
received – now go!’40 Theron was being ordered off on a mission to contact Philoumene and persuade
her to return, as the broken remains of v. 93 seem to imply (καὶ νῦν δραμα τὴν παῖδα παρακάλει,
with Kassel’s supplement, ‘And now run off and [summon] the girl’). Stratophanes may have followed
Theron off the stage, but it seems more likely that he stayed on stage during what followed, if the
interpretation in (b) below of v. 109 is accepted.

(b) Lines 97–108 have the appearance of a monologue by a third character who probably had
overheard at least some of the preceding scene without being seen. He now makes a comment on what
he had heard about the girl’s41 fear of Stratophanes (97–98), quotes or paraphrases words previously
spoken by Stratophanes (99–101: presumably just before in a lost part of his speech42), sets himself up
to become Stratophanes’ rival for the girl’s favours (cf. τολμήσον γάρ ἔστιν, ‘You see, I’ve got to
force myself to do it’, 102), but apparently is uncertain and apprehensive (cf. 107) in view of certain
developments in the action which involve the slave Dromon (103), Philoumene and ‘all the citizens’
(103–104)43. A character named Moschion shilly-shallies at times in Menander’s Samia, and is
portrayed as an unsuccessful rival to the soldier hero for the latter’s girl-friend in Perikeiromene;
accordingly Barigazzi’s identification of the speaker of vv. 97–108 as Moschion seems a reasonable
hypothesis44. Then at v. 109 Stratophanes may well have intervened; there is a paragraphus under 108,
and the lack of an article with μειρόκιον, ‘young man’, the opening word of 109, suggests that there it
is a vocative, addressed presumably to Moschion by Stratophanes, if the soldier was still on stage.

At line end here S has ] Διόνυσος ἀπολέσαι. In third-person-singular curses in comedy the god’s
name always has the article (ὁ Ζεὺς Men. Epitr. 425, Samia 689, com. adesp. 1093.161 and 1103.46
Kassel–Austin; similarly third-person-plural curses, always with οἱ θεοί, Men. Dysk. 138f., 220f., 600f.,
in n. 29, 113–114) here supplied the necessary article before Διόνυσος; but whether Menander wrote
e.g. ὁ Διόνυσος (σ’) ἀπολέσαι, cursing the companion present on stage, or e.g. τοῦτον ὁ Διόνυσος
ἀπολέσαι, cursing Dromon in absentia, remains uncertain.

95–96

ΟΗΡΩΝ

95      οὐκ ἔξις ἐς κοινώσαι λέγων.

40 On corrections, supplementation and interpretation at this point, see below on vv. 95–96.
41 Although the subject of δὲδοικε in v. 97 is not specified in the mutilated remains of the payrus, there can be no
doubt that it was Philoumene; Kassel’s references in his edition ad loc. to vv. 194, 214 and 241 are conclusive.
42 Presumably earlier in the scene Theron had warned Stratophanes about Moschion’s rivalry, and been ordered not to
discuss that subject.
43 The reference here is hard to pinpoint exactly, but it seems very likely that when Dromon and Philoumene sought
sanctuary in Eleusis, they were officially interrogated at a meeting of the citizens, who reacted favourably to the girl (ὁκ
ἀλλοπρία 105).
An interpretation of these two difficult lines in an equally difficult context has already been given (above, 72–109), but the constitution of its text needs separate treatment.

(a) In v. 95 Austin’s supplement (in Kassel’s edition) όλγον provides an acceptable Euripidean idiom (Medea 811 ἥμιν τόν δ’ εκοίνωσας λόγον; cf. IA 44 κοινός μύθον, and Pl. Laches 196c κοινομεθα . . . τὸν λόγον).

(b) At the beginning of v. 96 τίς was read by Kassel before οὐκ (noting, however, lectio incerta, distinx dubitanter), but R. A. Coles, (Emerita 34, 1966, 114) confirmed that there was space for four letters before the οὐκ. After S’s edition before Belardinelli printed δεδωκ’, ἔδεξο, but M. Gronewald (ZPE 99, 1993, 25–26) observed the incongruity of asyndetically juxtaposed perfect and aorist here, and drew attention to the asyndetic coupling of aorists at Sik. 10, where Kassel cited as parallels Men. Epitr. 272 and fr. 685; a scribal tendency (more noticeable perhaps in mediaeval manuscripts) to confuse the active aorist and perfect forms of διδωμι (cf. my commentary on Alexis fr. 2.7, Cambridge 1996), might also be mentioned. Consequently Gronewald (25 n. 1) conjectured τίς δ’ οὐκ ἔξε δ’; ἔδωκ’, this may represent what S’s scribe wrote here, but I should prefer to think that Menander originally wrote τίς δ’ οὐκ ἔξε σ’; ἔδωκ’, thus providing a more exact parallel to Theron’s own question in the previous line, οὐκ ἔξε με.

(c) A precise interpretation of ἔδωκ’ and ἔδεξο here is impossible in such a mutilated and contextless fragment. λόγον could perhaps be supplied with both verbs: λόγον διδωμι is a very common expression with several grades of meaning (e.g. Eur. Hipp. 968, Ar. Thesp. 471, Plut. 467, cf. Ephippus fr. 20.4 Kassel–Austen, Men. Samia 201, Pl. Phaedo 78c), while in Ar. Equ. 632 the Athenian council is described as ἄνθρωποι τοῦ λόγου. In that case Stratophanes would be informing his companion that Theron had already been given and had accepted an opportunity to speak. However, in a broken context four lines earlier Stratophanes appears to have said ἔδωκα τίνι δίκαιον, and his remark at 96 might refer rather to a transaction in which the soldier had provided the parasite with money to bribe the perjurious witness.

(d) νῦν ή’ Τιτ or νῦν ή’ Τιτ would provide a suitable end to the scene, with Stratophanes shooing Theron off on his mission to visit Philoumen. Similar expressions are frequently used in comedy to persuade a character off stage: e.g. Ar. Equ. 498 = Nub. 510 = Pax 729, Vesp. 1154, Av. 647, Men. Dysk. 375.
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