

W. GEOFFREY ARNOTT

FURTHER NOTES ON MENANDER'S SIKYONIOI (vv. 110–322)

aus: Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik 117 (1997) 21–34

© Dr. Rudolf Habelt GmbH, Bonn

In 113 the juxtaposition of mutilation and corruption makes a damage-limitation exercise the one acceptable course. After the lacuna]ασιν may well be the 3rd-person-plural ending of an active verb in either the perfect or (from a -μι verb) present tense, in a disjunctive conditional clause: cf. e.g. Eur. Hcl. 989 ἀλλ' εἴτ' ἔχρηζον εἴτε μή, Pl. Meno 92c εἴτ' οὖν ἄπειρος αὐτῶν εἰμι εἴτε μή, S. El. 560, Ar. Nub. 1243 and K.G. 2.299–300 (2c). The Blanchard–Bataille conjecture πεπράζεται for S's nonsensical πεπραζεται is close to the ductus (Ξ for Ζ), gives acceptable sense if taken as the verb in the apodosis of the disjunctive condition, and provides a form of the future passive of πράττω that is as common in Attic as the more regular form παραθήσομαι: e.g. S. O.C. 861, Eur. Hcl. 980, Eupolis fr. 99.44 K–A, Ar. Av. 847, Plut. 1027, 1200, Pl. Gorg. 510e, Dem. 19.74; cf. Veitch, Greek Verbs⁴ 561–562, Schwyzler 2.289, Jacques, REA 69 (1967) 307. In all the dramatic instances it is the 3rd-person singular πεπράζεται that occurs, always in the same *sedes* as here. Curiously the alternative form παραθήσεται is found only once in extant drama: at Men. Pk. 747.

If νῦν δοκεῖ μοι, νῆ Δία in 114 is correctly assigned to Stratophanes, he could well have finished his response with [τοῦτο γοῦν] or [ταῦτα γοῦν] at the beginning of 115; cf. e.g. Sam. 117 δέδοκται ταῦτ'; :: ἐμοὶ γοῦν. γοῦν here emphasises assent (Denniston, Greek Particles² 454).

115–119

Here too part-division, supplementation and interpretation are still generally unsolved problems, but the *communis opinio*, as evidenced in the editions of Kassel, Sandbach and Belardinelli, may not always be on the right track. Provisionally I should assign 115 (from before ἐ]νθάδ') to the beginning of 117 to Theron, 117 ('A]πολλων to line-end) to Stratophanes, 118 to Theron, and 119 with the lost beginning of 120 to Stratophanes.

115: διαλογισμὸν seems preferable to διὰ λογισμὸν if Stratophanes is being told by Theron that absence from Athens (115: did οὐκ precede ἐ]νθάδ') was the reason for Stratophanes' failure to draw up a διαλογισμός (= financial account: as elsewhere in Attic and early Koine, e.g. Dem 36.23 and the early papyri cited in Preisigke, Wörterbuch 1.34 and suppl. 1.71) of his property (booty from Caria, inheritance from his foster-parents, or both?); διαλογισμὸν would then probably need to be construed as the object of an aorist participle (λαβών or -λαβών?) or 2nd-person singular (ἔλαβες or -έλαβες?) lost at or near the beginning of 116.

116: Blanchard–Bataille's conjecture πρῶτον εὐφρονέστερον (in place of S's πρωτοτευθο-) deserves better support; with some slightly shorter equivalent of τοῦτ' ἂν ἦν ποεῖν supplied at the beginning of 117, relevant contextual sense would be produced, '[it would have been] more sensible [to do that] first', sc. to make a financial inventory. On the meaning of εὐφρονέστερον Kassel in his edition rightly refers to the excellent discussion of this adjective in Fraenkel's commentary on A. Ag. 806.

118: μηθέν' ἄλλον ἀλλὰ σέ: for the idiom (where ἀλλά replaces either πλήν or ἢ) cf. e.g. Xen. Anab. 6.4.2 ἄλλη μὲν πόλις οὐδεμία οὔτε φιλία οὔτε Ἑλληνίς, ἀλλὰ Θρᾷκες Βιθυνοί, Hom. Il. 18.403–405, 21.275–276, Od. 3.377–378, 8.311–312, with K.G. 2.283–284 and Denniston, Greek Particles² 4.

119: S's προυνοησαιτινες is obviously defective, but if Stratophanes is speaking here, he is just as likely to be describing what he himself didn't say or plan; hence εἶπον οὐδε προύνοησα <γ'> οἵτινες, cf. Denniston, Greek Particles² 156 (I.ii).

122–123

Here Franca Perusino (Stud. Urb. 39, 1965, 158), taking note of the fact that S has a one-letter space before but not after οἶδα, assigns οἶδα: πρὸς τὴν μητέρα / [10–12 letters]μεν all to Theron. There may be a further argument in favour of Perusino's attribution here. If]μεν here preserves the final three letters of a first person plural active verbal form (e.g. τόνδ' ἐπέμψα]μεν¹), as seems probable, the

¹ τόνδ' suppl. Arnott, ἐπέμψα]μεν Mette, Gnomon 28 (1965) 438.

in favour of emending ἑαυτοῦ (132 and 355) here to σεαυτοῦ (132: Handley, BICS 12, 1965, 44 and Papathomopoulos, Rev. Phil. 39, 1965, 223 n. 1; 355 myself), and ἑαυτῶν to σεαυτοῦ γ' (σεαυτοῦ Papathomopoulos 222; ἑαυτοῦ γ' several) that needs to be stressed. The scribe of S reveals a tendency to haplography with sigma when it ends one word and begins the next (γραυσφοδρ for γραῦς σφόδρ' 126, υγιεσχεδον for ὑγιές σχεδόν 153). The identical error occurs in other manuscripts too: e.g. at Eur. Hec. 1183, Xen. Comm. 2.1.30; contrast a corresponding dittographic error in the Cairensis at Men. Epitr. 1102.

141–145

ΣΤΡΑΤΟΦΑΝΗΣ

141 δὸς τὸ γραμματείδιον μοι.
 ΠΥΡΡΙΑΣ
 καὶ ταδὶ χωρὶς φέρω
 τῶν γεγραμμένων ἐκείνοις, Στρατοφάνη, γνωρίσματα
 καὶ τεκμήρι', ὡς ἐκείνην ἔφασαν οἱ δόντες λέγειν
 ζῶσαν.

ΘΗΡΩΝ

ὦ δέσποιν' Ἀθηναῖ, τουτονὶ σαυτῆς πόει,
 145 ἴνα λάβῃ τὴν παιῖδ', ἐγὼ δὲ Μαλθάκην.

141 λεγῶ S: corr. Kassel.

Pyrrhias has returned from the house of Stratophanes' foster-parents with news of his foster-mother's dying efforts to inform him about his true Athenian parentage. In 142 ἐκείνοις as an agent dative has been suspected, and conjectures such as ἐκείνη (so several) and ἐκεῖ σοι (Sandbach) have been proposed. Yet ἐκείνοις makes excellent sense if interpreted correctly: not as Stratophanes' blood-relations (so Oguse, Ant. Class. 35, 1966, 623), nor as the legal experts consulted by Stratophanes' foster-mother (138–139; so Barigazzi, SIFC 37, 1965, 11 and Handley, BICS 12, 1965, 45), but as the people mentioned in line 143: those who attended the old woman on her death-bed, then wrote down the words that she dictated, and finally handed the tablet to Pyrrhias. Presumably Menander wrote ἐκείνοις in 142 originally without realising its vagueness, and then added the explanatory ὡς clause in 143–144 as clarification.

145–147

ΣΤΡΑΤΟΦΑΝΗΣ

145 δεῦρο, Θήρων. βαδίζετε.
 ΘΗΡΩΝ
 οὐ λέγεις μοι;
 ΣΤΡΑΤΟΦΑΝΗΣ πρόαγε· μηθέν μοι λάλει.
 ΘΗΡΩΝ
 ἀλλ' ὅμως — κάγῳ βαδίζω.
 ΣΤΡΑΤΟΦΑΝΗΣ καὶ σὺ δεῦρο, Πυρρία.

145 βαδίζετε several: βιαζετε S. 146 πρόαγε Barigazzi, Evangelinos: παγαγε S. 146–147 Speech divisions and assignments uncertain; here I follow Barigazzi (SIFC 37, 1965, 14), Kassel (Eranos 6 = Kleine Schriften 277) and Webster (in BICS 12, 1965, 45).

In this passage of conversation between Stratophanes and Theron the only indications of part-division in S are paragraphi under 145, 146 and 147 and a rare dicolon before the final word of 145; there are no one-letter spaces in the middle of lines here with the same function as *dicola*. Even so the papyrus text, after its βιαζετε in 145 is corrected to βαδίζετε (so several) and its πράγε in 146 to πρόαγε (so first Barigazzi, SIFC 37, 1965, 14, and Evangelinos, Παρατηρήσεις στὰ ἀποσπάσματα τοῦ Σικυωνίου τοῦ Μενάνδρου, Athens 1965, 9), makes good sense provided that the words are correctly assigned to their speakers as above (so first Kassel, loc. cit. above), and then interpreted with due appreciation of the stage action involved. There is no need additionally to change S's βαδίζω in 147 to βιάδιζε (so Kassel in his edition).

If my interpretation of vv. 95–96 is correct (see ZPE 116, 1997, 10), this play elsewhere presents Theron as a chatterer, unable to recognise when a conversation is at an end, and requiring an intervention from Stratophanes to stop him blathering on. At 146–147 too Theron wishes to prolong the conversation, first with his οὐ λέγεις μοι (146), and then (despite Stratophanes' firm rejoinder πρόαγε· μηθέν μοι λάλει) with a further ἀλλ' ὅμως (147), used here as a colloquial protest on its own ('Even so') as often elsewhere in Greek drama: e.g. Eur. Hec. 843, El. 753, Heracles 1365 (1366 del. Nauck), Hel. 645, Bacch. 1027 (1028 del. Dobree), I.A. 604, Ar. Ach. 402, 408, 956, Men. Epitr. 230, possibly com. adesp. fr. 1007.24 K–A⁴. Theron's irritating ἀλλ' ὅμως would presumably lead to a menacing gesture from Stratophanes, which Theron then attempted to thwart by both his hasty addition of καὶ γὰρ βαδίζω, 'I am coming' (on this use of καὶ see Denniston, Greek Particles² 321–322), and presumably an equally hasty movement in the direction that Stratophanes wished him and Pyrrhias to go.

158–159

158 ὦ Ἡράκλεις, ἀπολεῖτέ μ' οἱ σφοδρ[
ὕμεῖς.

The supplement at the end of 158 is uncertain, whether the speaker is the democrat or Smikrines, but the vituperative tone here and the angry response that follows (τί γάρ μοι λοιδορεῖ;) tend to support the only plausible suggestion that has so far been put forward (οἱ σφοδρ[ροὶ πάνυ: Kassel, *Eranos* 16 = *Kleine Schriften* 286, and Kamerbeek, *Mnemosyne* 18, 1965, 309); in his edition Kassel compares Men. Pk. 128–129 Sandbach. It is, however, no less likely that Menander closed the verse with οἱ σφόδρ' and an attributive adjective beginning with a vowel: e.g. ἄθλιοι (cf. e.g. Men. Kolax 9 ἀθλίως οὕτω σφόδρα) or even εὐτελεῖς (cf. e.g. Men. Perinth. fr. 2 Körte, Arnott = 5 Sandbach, Diphilus fr. 37.6 and Epinicus fr. 1.4 K–A).

161–162

ΔΗΜΟΤΗΣ

160 μισῶ σε καὶ τοὺς τὰς ὀφρῶς ἐπη[ρκότας
ἅπαντας, ὄχλος ὦν δ' ὁμολογῶ [
ΣΜΙΚΡΙΝΗΣ (?)
οὐκ ἂν γένοιτο τοῦτ'.

160 Suppl. Chantraine.

Supplementation of 161 is a problem. Sandbach's suggestion (*Commentary ad loc.*) τις χρήσιμος is on the right lines, since it introduces an element of self-praise in the speaker's words which his colleague is then quick to reject. Yet that speaker can hardly *admit* here to being ὄχλος τις χρήσιμος, since the colleague in v. 150 called him only ὄχλος, with no laudatory addition of χρήσιμος. A better supplement

⁴ Cf. the commentaries of Kannicht on Eur. Hel. 640–645, Dodds on Bacch. 1027 and Gomme–Sandbach on Men. Epitr. 230, and J. Jackson, *Marginalia scaenica* (Oxford 1955) 173–174.

would confine the admission in 161 to ὄχλος, and then balance against it a word or so of self-praise: e.g. ὄχλος ὢν δ' ὁμολογῶ, [πιστός γε μήν. However, although exact parallels for this adversative use of γε μήν with a single word or short phrase can be found in Attic Greek (e.g. A. Agam. 1378 ἦλθε, σὺν χρηστῷ γε μήν, Eur. El. 754 μακρὰν γὰρ ἔρπει γῆρυς, ἐμφανῆς γε μήν, Or. 1053, the tragedian Ion (TrGF 18) fr. 44, Pl. Tim. 20d; Denniston, Greek Particles² 348–349), I have so far failed to find one in Menander and the fragments of New Comedy.

162–166

162 ἐγὼ σὲ . [
 τὸν πλούσιον κλέπτοντα σ . [
 σκεύη τε καὶ τούτων αποτ . [
 165 ἀργύριον. οὐκ ἐξ οἰκίας ἴσως φ[
 τῶν ἀγομένων ἐκεῖσε προ[

163 τομπλουσιον S. 164 ἐγὼ σὲ ν[ὸν ὀρῶ tentatively Arnott. 165 Punctuation suggested by Marzullo, op. cit. in n. 15, 49. φ[έρειν suppl. Barigazzi (SIFC 37, 1965, 16), φ[έρεις Kassel (Eranos 16 = Kleine Schriften 286).

These mutilated lines defy confident interpretation and supplementation, but the unidentified democrat who speaks here seems to be accusing a wealthy Smikrines of stealing property and money. These charges *may* have been wild and unsubstantiated (so Sandbach in the Gomme–Sandbach commentary on v. 162), but it would make better dramatic sense if they could be linked in some way to previous actions or statements in the plot⁵. Could Smikrines perhaps have been engaged by the Boeotian creditor as his representative in Athens, and so in a lost earlier scene of the play have threatened or attempted to seize the property of Stratophanes in payment of his late foster-father's debt? If so, the σκεύη (164) and ἀργύριον would have belonged to Stratophanes, and it is at least feasible that τῶν ἀγομένων ἐκεῖσε (166) were slaves such as Philoumene and Dromon, who were to be taken to Smikrines' house. There would also be an attractive irony if Smikrines was presented as a man who in ignorance of his blood ties intended to distraint his own son's goods; an obvious parallel is provided by *Epitrepontes*, where another Smikrines acted as the arbitrator of his own grandson's future in similar ignorance of the relationship.

169

ὦ γεραῖέ, μείνον εμπαραστα[

These are the first words of a messenger on entry⁶, addressed to a departing Smikrines. What is preserved in S here raises two problems.

(i) ὦ γεραῖέ, which scans only with correction of -αι-, has been too readily accepted by editors and commentators (e.g. the Gomme–Sandbach commentary *ad loc.*), citing allegedly relevant tragic parallels such as S. O.C. 200 (lyrics) and Eur. Herakles 447 (anapaestic dimeters). The facts need to be stated with greater accuracy and detail. In the iambic trimeters and trochaic tetrameters of tragedy γεραῖός *always* scans with αι long: x 4 in Aeschylus (with γεραῖέ at Suppl. 480), x 12 in Sophocles (including nine instances of γεραῖέ), x 51 at least in Euripides (including 26 instances of γεραῖέ, and leaving aside Heracles 747). In comedy elsewhere γεραῖός has αι long in the iambic trimeters of Ar. Ach. 419 and Alexis fr. 135 K–A (where the language and rhythms of tragedy are being parodied or imitated). In tragic lyrics and anapaests on the other hand γεραῖός scans αι sometimes long (x 2

⁵ Cf. Barigazzi, SIFC 37 (1965) 16–17 and R. Merkelbach, Mus. Helv. 23 (1966) 175–176; despite errors in their interpretations, both assume that the democrat's accusations refer seriously to actions on Smikrines' part, and Merkelbach anticipates me in suggesting that Stratophanes' property may have been an object of Smikrines' 'theft'.

⁶ So R. Kassel, Eranos 43 (1965) 8 = Kleine Schriften 279. Other identifications of the characters and stage movements at the opening of Act IV are conveniently listed by Belardinelli in her commentary on vv. 170–175.

Aeschylus, x 10 Euripides), sometimes short (x 2 Sophocles, x 7 Euripides, leaving aside Phoen. 1718); it is short too in Timotheus, Persai 227, where (as sometimes also in tragic manuscripts) the orthography γεράος appears.

The present passage of *Sikyonioi* is couched in tragic language and rhythms. Accordingly S's ω is best deleted (the scribal error could easily be explained by a saut des yeux to the previous line, with εγωγαρ written directly above). It has recently been noted that in Attic the use of ω̂ with vocatives seems to have 'decreased during the fourth century and particularly at the end of that century'⁷; the figures for Menander can be computed roughly as follows: with vocatives of proper names, x 27 with ω̂ and x 253 without; with other vocatives, x 24 with ω̂ and x 136 without.

(ii) At the end of the line Webster and Handley (BICS 12, 1965, 46) supplemented with ἐν παραστάσει δόμων⁸. This is attractive but by no means certain; in support of my alternative suggestion ἐμπαρστά[ς ἐνθάδε (CR 46, 1996, 222) compare Men. Theoph. 28–29 παράστα δ' ἐνθαδὶ πρὸς τὰς θύρας / τοῦ πανδοκείου, where a more colloquial tone justifies the presence of the deictic form ἐνθαδί. LSJ cite as their only reference for ἐμπαρίστημι Heliodorus 7.19.1 δορυφόρων τε ἐμπαρεστώτων⁹ (so VM, printed by Colonna; παρεστώτων BZAT, printed by Hirschig, Rattenbury–Lumb; -ότων P); in Heliodorus ἐμπαρ- is to be preferred, because 'Eine Eigentümlichkeit der κοινή ist es, für das Simplex ein Kompositum zu schreiben und anstelle eines einfachen Kompositums die Praefixe zu häufen.'¹⁰

171–172

ΕΛΕΥΣΙΝΙΟΣ

171 ὥς ἂν σὺ μικρὸν καὶ καπν[
ΣΜΙΚΡΙΝΗΣ
βουλόμεθ' ἀκοῦσαι τὰ περὶ τ[

So the papyrus in part of the exchanges before the messenger's speech (176–271). In v. 170 Smikrines had asked why he was requested to stay on stage, and the messenger, who appears to call himself Eleusinius¹¹, answers immediately with the purpose clause of 171. In 172 Smikrines' comment in 172 expresses a willingness to listen to what the other has to say. No certain supplementation of 171–172 is possible. Kassel rightly notes in his edition that the two lines are *Thebano aenigmate obscuriora*; his own supplements, however, καπν[ὸν βλέψης πυρὸς and τὰ περὶ τ[ὸν πυρὸς καπνόν have not won general approval, although they ingeniously suggest that the comment in 172 may pick up some of the words used in 171. Three points perhaps need to be made.

(a) In 171 μικρὸν can be taken in two different ways. It could perhaps agree with some noun (e.g. καπνο[v) later in the sentence, but in that event the insertion of καί between noun and adjective would be difficult to explain. More probably μικρὸν is an adverbial or internal accusative, as commonly in Menander when it does not qualify a juxtaposed noun, in the senses of 'a little time' (e.g. Epitr. 240, Pk. 336), 'a little distance' (e.g. Dysk. 557, fr. 317), or 'a little bit' (e.g. Sam. 597, fr. 515).

(b) καπνο[can be only some part of καπνός, used presumably as a vivid metaphor in a proverbial expression. There are three known possibilities:

⁷ Eleanor Dickey, *Greek Forms of Address* (Oxford 1996), especially 82–84 (on γεραίε) and 199–206 (on ω̂).

⁸ Flacelière in Blanchard–Bataille, *Recherches de Papyrologie* 3 (1964) 144 had already suggested παραστά[σει, and Barigazzi, *SIFC* 37 (1965) 21–22 suggested παράστ[ασιν. Handley and Webster eliminate the sandhi ἐμ πα-, which occurs elsewhere in S (127, 194, 214, 345, 380).

⁹ LSJ s.v. ἐμπαρίστημι wrongly call this form an 'aor. 2 active' participle; it is of course the commoner short form of the perfect participle. See KB 2.187, Oliphant, *AJP* 28 (1907) 419, Wackernagel, *Sprachliche Untersuchungen zu Homer* (Göttingen 1916) 113–17, and Schwyzler 1.774.

¹⁰ Zepernick, *Philologus* 77 (1921) 340; cf. my commentary on Alexis (Cambridge 1996) pp. 124, 546.

¹¹ See below on vv. 187–188.

(i) *καπνός* (with its plural *καπνοί*) elsewhere in Attic ‘*figur. de rebus nullius pretii dicitur*’ (TLG s.v., 950): e.g. Eur. Hipp. 954 πολλῶν γραμμάτων τιμῶν καπνοῦς, Ar. Nub. 320 περὶ καπνοῦ στενολεσχεῖν, Pl. Resp. 9.581d ἡγείται . . . τὴν ἀπὸ τοῦ μανθάνειν (sc. ἡδονῆν) . . . καπνὸν καὶ φλυαρίαν, Men. fr. 417.5–6 ἡ πρόνοια δ’ ἡ θνήτη καπνός / καὶ φλήναφος. Yet supplements such as Sandbach’s καπν[οῦς μάθης ἐμούς (Commentary p. 650: cf. also J. C. Kamerbeek, *Mnemosyne* 18, 1965, 309) do not convince.

(ii) *καπνοῦ σκιά* occurs proverbially in a similar sense: e.g. A. fr. 399 Radt (with his excellent note) τὸ γὰρ βρότειον σπέρμ’ . . . / . . . πιστὸν οὐδὲν μᾶλλον ἢ καπνοῦ σκιά, S. Phil. 946–947, Antig. 1170–71, App. Prov. 4.44 ~ Suda κ 346 Adler; cf. Eupolis fr. 59 K.–A. The introduction of this expression in 171, however (e.g. Barigazzi, *SIFC* 37, 1965, 21, καπν[οῦ δείξης σκιάν, cf. Kamerbeek, *loc. cit.*), is equally unpersuasive.

(iii) At Pindar, Nem. 1.24–25 the enigmatic *λέλογγε δὲ μεμφομένοις ἐσλοῦς ὕδωρ καπνῷ φέρειν / ἀντίον* was explained by Aristarchus τοῖς δὲ τοὺς ἀγαθοῦς μεμφομένοις τοῦτο λέλογγε καὶ ὑποκείμενόν ἐστιν, οἷον ἀκολουθεῖ, ὥσπερ καπνῷ ὕδωρ φέρειν ἀντίον κατασβεννύναι. If Pindar here used a proverb that was also familiar in Athens (it has not, however, found its way into any of the paroemiographic collections), and if it could be applied to the calming of rancorous disputes, Menander could have written here something like καπν[ῷ φέρης ὕδωρ, with μικρόν now qualifying ὕδωρ, ‘That you may bring a little water even to a smoking fire’.

(c) *περὶ* with the sense of ‘about/concerning’ takes a genitive in Menander more than twice as often as an accusative, and the verb in the clause is then often one of speaking or considering (Dysk. 797, Epitr. 414, 458, 1067, Fab. Inc. 50, Karch. 9, Mis. 2 Arnott = A2 Sandbach, Sam. 64, 512, frs. 395.3, 597, 932). This makes a supplement such as *περὶ τοῦ καπνοῦ, γέρον* in 172 at least possible, with a hint perhaps that Smikrines was more interested in hearing about the eruption of the dispute than its settlement.

175

ἄπασαν ἡμῖν εἶ[

This mutilated line, in a passage influenced by tragedy, apparently presents Smikrines requesting a full account of what has happened; the supplement εἶ[πε was suggested by several scholars, and Handley’s εἶ[πε τὴν κατάστασιν (BICS 12, 1965, 46) introduced a noun used by all three major tragedians (A. Agam. 23, S. Aj. 1247, Eur. Med. 1197, Hipp. 1296, Phoen. 1266; cf. Rhes. 111). Yet in all the tragic passages (as well as e.g. Ar. Thesm. 958) the basic sense of *κατάστασις* (settled/orderly condition/arrangement) is more appropriate than it would be here¹²; could Menander have written εἶ[πε τὴν γε συμφορὰν? For the expression cf. e.g. S. O.C. 596 ἢ τὴν παλαιὰν ξυμφορὰν γένους ἐρεῖς; Eur. Or. 153 τίνα τύχαν εἶπω; τίνα δὲ συμφορὰν; Alc. 812, Med. 1179 (φράζω), Bacch. 1154 (ἀναβοῶ), Hcl. 74 (δείκνυμι); for the position of γε cf. Denniston, *Greek Particles*² 146.

179–180

] καὶ τὰ τῶν ἄλλων κακὰ

180 σαφῶς πέπυσ]μαι φοβερὸς εἰς τριώβολον.

In his edition Kassel compares the wording of monost. 121 Jäkel, βλέπων πεπαίδευμ’ εἰς τὰ τῶν ἄλλων κακὰ. This provides a hint for my tentative supplementation of 180 above, where the first 8–10 letters have been removed in the mutilation of the papyrus. σαφῶς πυνθάνομαι is a common expres-

¹² Although Eur. Hipp. 1296 ἄκουε, Θησεῦ, τῶν κακῶν κατάστασιν at first sight provides a context arguably comparable to that of Sik. 175, its reference to the current position of Theseus’ troubles has a relevance not paralleled in Menander.

sion: e.g. Eur. I. A. 1540, Phaethon 56, fr. 773.8, Pl. Charm. 153c, Men. Epit. 161, 877, Sam. 527, probably Phasma 51; cf. also A. Choeph. 735–737, Pl. Laches 196c. On φοβερὸς εἰς τριώβολον see Sandbach in the Gomme–Sandbach Commentary p. 651, where for use in Attic of τριώβολον = ‘an insignificant sum of money’ (cf. Lloyd-Jones, *Emerita* 34, 1966, 145 = Greek Comedy, etc. 83) he compares Eubulus fr. 87.3, Philippides fr. 9.5, Nicophon fr. 20.3 K–A; add also Ar. Pax 848, Plut. 125. The turn of the expression suggests proverbial origins, although it does not appear in the paroemiographi.

187–188

187 τοῦ τῆς θεοῦ δήμου γάρ εἰμ' ἐπώνυμος
†βλεπητις† Ἐλευσίνιος.

So Kassel's text, with βλεπητις ‘one of the gravest critical problems that affect the text’ of *Sikyonioi* (Lloyd-Jones, *Emerita* 145 = Greek Comedy etc. 83). In departing from my earlier views (e.g. *Arethusa* 3, 1970, 60), I should now wish to stress the following points.

(i) If the speaker really does take his name from ‘the deme of the goddess’ (cf. LSJ s.v. ἐπώνυμος I.3), this implies that Eleusinius in v. 188 is not a demotic but his proper name (so correctly Kassel, *Eranos* 9 = *Kleine Schriften* 280), although the passage as a whole (183–188) implies that Eleusinius was also a member of the Eleusis deme (*pace* Lloyd-Jones, *Emerita* 146 = Greek Comedy etc. 83–84). Eleusinius was a common name in Menander's Athens: Osborne–Byrne pp.140–41 list 97 known occurrences.

(ii) This rules out the emendation by Sandbach (*BICS* 12, 1965, 49) and Thierfelder (in Kassel's edition) of βλεπητις in S to Βλέπητις as a proper name. Its one known occurrence in fourth-century Athens (a member of the Boule in 336–35: *The Athenian Agora* XV, 42.33 = Osborne–Byrne p. 88) thus becomes irrelevant.

(iii) Chantraine's conjecture βλέπεις (in Blanchard–Bataille, *Recherches de Papyrologie* 3, 1964, 125) has received much support, but that entails acceptance of the use of βλέπεις; (side by side with that commonly attested for ὀρᾶς;) as a parenthetic question (‘Do you see?’, i.e. ‘understand?’). The existence of such an idiom would blur the distinction that was made between βλέπω (I have the power of sight, I look) and ὀρῶ (I make real use of the power of sight, I see) by careful users of Greek: cf. e.g. Plotinus 6.7.37 ἀλλά τι ἕτερον προστιθέασιν αὐτῷ, ὡςπερ ὀφθαλμοῖς τὸ ὀρᾶν κατ' ἐνέργειαν, κἂν ἀεὶ βλέπωσιν. Of the two passages sometimes cited in support of βλέπεις; here, one (Men. Karch. 36 τί βλέπεις;) is irrelevant, since its meaning is ‘What does that look of yours mean?’ (so the Gomme–Sandbach commentary *ad loc.*), but the other (com. adesp. fr. 1063.8 K–A δειλὸς εἶ, νῆ τὴν Ἀθηνῶν, δειλὸς εἶ βλέπω) is more difficult; although it more probably means ‘I'm looking (at you)’, the interpretation ‘I understand’ cannot here be ruled out.

(iv) Tentatively I should now suggest βλέπ' εἷς <μ>', interpreted as a dramatic parenthesis (‘Keep looking at me’) intended to emphasise the key word that follows. For the idiom cf. e.g. Eur. El. 567, Ar. Equ. 292, Ran. 562, Alexis fr. 89.3 K–A, Pl. Euthyd. 275d.

222–226

222 ἔπειτα δ' οἴκτος] ἔλαβε τοὺς ἐστηκότας,
πάντες δ' ἐβόησαν "σὺ δ]ε τί βούλει; λέγε, λέγε."
"ἢ παῖς ἐμὴ 'στι," φησί]ν, "οὕτως ἡ θεὸς
225 δοίη τὸ λοιπὸν, ἄνδρες,] ὑμῖν εὐτυχεῖν.
τὴν γὰρ κόρην ἐκτέ]τροφα, μικρὸν παιδίον
αὐτὴν λαβὼν × — ∪]

222 Suppl. Arnott (οἶκτος already Kumaniecki, Athenaeum 43, 1965, 158; cf. Marzullo, *op. cit.* in n. 15, 71). 223 Suppl. Austin (in Kassel's edition). 224 Suppl. Arnott (φησί]ν already Kassel). 225 Suppl. Kassel. 226–227 Suppl. Arnott tentatively (τέ]τροφα already Blanchard–Bataille, cf. ταύτην ἔγωγε τέ]τροφα Marzullo, *op. cit.* 72).

Although the supplements printed above are *exempli gratia* and clearly challengeable over details, they seem to me in combination to provide the most plausible interpretation of a badly mutilated passage. In v. 222 the speaker describes the reactions of those participants in the Eleusis assembly to Stratophanes' emotional behaviour (219–221). They call on Stratophanes to explain that behaviour, and in 224–239 he satisfies that request.

Optative wishes of the type expressed in 224–25, introduced by οὕτως and calling for divine blessings or general good fortune, are normally preceded or followed (with or without a connecting ὡς) by an attendant clause providing either (i) a command on whose fulfilment that wish is conditional (e.g. Eur. Med. 711–715, Dem. 28.20, Men. Dysk. 299–300, Epitr. 159, 264–267, Pk. 400–401, Herodas 3.1–4), or (ii) a forceful statement for which the attached wish now becomes equivalent to an oath in support of the statement (e.g. Ar. Nub. 520–526, Thesm. 469–470, Men. Epitr. 1070–75, Pk. 402–403, fr. 97)¹³. In 224 I print such a statement, but a command such as τὴν παῖδ' ἔμοι δός (cf. e.g. Men. Epitr. 264–267) would be equally feasible¹⁴. The wish would then here be followed by the reasons for his command or strong statement, giving the history of Stratophanes' involvement with Philoumene.

262–263

260 καί φησι "ταυτὶ συμπέπεισθ', ὡς οὐτοσί
 νῦν ἔξαπίνης εἴληφε διαθήκας ποθέ[ν,
 ἔστί τε πολίτης ὑμέτερος, τραγωδία
 263 κενῆ τ' ἀγόμενος τὴν κόρην ἀφήσε[ται;"

260 συμπέπεισθ' Arnott (in Kassel's edition), Gallavotti: συμπεποιθ S. 261, 263 Suppl. Blanchard–Bataille. 262 τραγωδία S.

In discussions of this passage (the messenger's report of an outburst by Moschion at the Eleusis assembly) most emphasis has been laid on the theatrical metaphor τραγωδία κενῆ¹⁵, but it may be dramatically more important to pin down precisely the meaning of ἀγόμενος . . . ἀφήσε[ται, in view of the varied interpretations and translations of v. 263: “will let go the girl he is trying to get hold of” (Lloyd-Jones, GRBS 7, 1966, 142 = Greek Comedy etc. 63); “il valore di τραγωδία è nella frase che essa introduce . . . : il personale prelievo (ἀγόμενος) e la liberazione della ragazza (ἀφήσεται)” (Marzullo, *op. cit.* in n. 15, 82; cf. Vellacott's Penguin translation, London 1973²), “will take the girl away and then let go of her” or “keep his hands off her” (Sandbach, commentary: cf. Miller's Penguin translation, London 1987).

(i) ἀγόμενος as a middle here has *suam peculiarem et legitimam significationem, secum abducendi* (Ellendt's Lexicon Sophocleum, s.v. ἄγω 6); cf. e.g. Eur. Med. 1331, Tr. 875, Or. 246, fr. 132.1 (all are accounts of men taking women with them). There seems to be no designed ambiguous allusion here to the use of ἄγωμαι in the sense of “I marry (a wife)”, e.g. Ar. Thesm. 411, Eccl. 323, Plut. 529, Lysias 1.6, Isocr. 19.8, Pl. Legg. 6.771e.

¹³ Cf. Goodwin, Syntax of the Moods and Tenses of the Greek Verb (New York and London 1889) § 727 p. 291, K.G. 2.494f., and both Starkie's and Dover's editions of Ar. Nub., commentary on 520.

¹⁴ An alternative position for the command or positive statement would of course be the beginning of 226, with ἡ παῖς ἐμοῦ ἔστι or τὴν παῖδ' ἔμοι δός then followed by τέ]τροφα.

¹⁵ E.g. (in addition to the commentaries of Gomme–Sandbach and Belardinelli *ad loc.*) Marzullo, QIFG Cagliari 2 (1967) 82; Lanowski, Eos 55 (1965–68) 245–253; G. Xanthakis-Karamanos, Studies in Fourth-century Tragedy (London 1980) 4 and n. 7; A. Hurst, in Handley and Hurst (edd.), Relire Ménandre (Geneva 1990) 110–111).

(ii) The use of ἀφίημι in the sense “I set free (a slave)” is confined to the active, and even then the meaning is often clarified by the addition of a predicative accusative (ἐλεύθερον, -έρουσ, -έραν: e.g. ‘Old Oligarch’ 1.11, Pl. Resp. 9.591a, Aeschines 3.41, Men. Pk. 982–983). In the middle ἀφίεμαι (either intransitive or with accusative) means simply “I let go” (e.g. Eur. I.A. 310, Ar. Ach. 665, Eccl. 509), and that is the meaning of ἀφήσε[ται at Sik. 263, as indeed the dramatic situation confirms. Moschion could hardly allege that Stratophanes was intending on some future occasion to free Philoumene, when that freedom had already been claimed at the Eleusis assembly (cf. v. 197, implying further remarks on this subject in the gap between vv. 192 and 193).

264–266

"ἄρ' οὐκ ἀποκτενεῖς τὸν ἐξυρημένον;"
265 "μὰ Δί', ἀλλὰ †σοιτις†, οὐ γάρ;" "οὐκ ἐκ τοῦ μέσ[ου,
λάσταυρε;

264 αἰρουκαποτεινεις with the omitted κ written above στ S: corr. several. 265 σ', ὅστις — οὐ γάρ; Handley, BICS 12 (1965) 52–53. μέσ[ου suppl. several.

The context here in the messenger's speech is a series of quoted remarks at the Eleusis assembly, in which the speakers are sometimes identified (ἡμεῖς 197, πάντες 245, the assembly in general; τις 203, an individual at the assembly; ὁ θεράπων 267, the slave Dromon; μειράκιον . . . λευκόχρω[ν 200, ὁ λευκόχρως 253, Moschion; τις ἀνδρικός πάνυ 215, Stratophanes), and sometimes not (as in 264–66). The suggestion in 264 that the smooth-faced Moschion should be disposed of presumably emanated from an unnamed man in the crowd; μὰ Δί' — οὐ γάρ; would be Moschion's response, and οὐκ — λάσταυρε; the speaker of 264's angry rejoinder.

The corruption in σοιτις has prompted some discussion¹⁶ and one excellent emendation: Handley's σ' ὅστις, rightly recognising that the first σ(') represented an elided accusative of σύ, employed as “object of the understood verb ‘kill’”, while the indefinite use of ὅστις in the sense of ‘whoever (you are)’ could be paralleled by Ar. Ran. 39. Handley's emendation may well be what Menander originally wrote, but there is perhaps an alternative possibility, equally appropriate, equally idiomatic, and almost as close to the *ductus*: σ' εἴ τιν', with the whole remark then translated “No by Zeus, but (let them kill) you rather than anybody (else)!” For this use of εἴ τις in Attic cf. e.g. S. O.C. 733–734 πρὸς πόλιν δ' ἐπίσταμαι / σθένουσαν ἤκων, εἴ τιν' Ἑλλάδος, μέγα, Thuc. 5.1.6, and note the related aposiopetic use of εἴπερ (K.G. 2.572–574, Starkie and Dover's commentaries on Ar. Nub. 226–227).

280–311

The last scene of Act IV, part of which is preserved in a severely mutilated state on fr. XII Blanchard–Bataille = fr. I Jouguet of S, involves three active characters: Stratophanes (speaking probably at least 290–291), his mother (speaking probably 280–285, 292) and his father (by a plausible but unverifiable guess identified as the same character who at v. 156 was addressed by Eleusinius as συμ[, supplemented to Συ[ικρίνη with equal plausibility by members of the London seminar¹⁷; here speaking probably 286–289)¹⁸. This trio are handling an item of clothing which helps to confirm that Stratophanes is the son of Smikrines and his wife. Some of the most fragmentary lines in this passage, however, contain clues that may help to support some old and some new supplements, and also to explain the events surrounding Stratophanes' conception and birth.

¹⁶ E.g. Barigazzi, SIFC 37 (1965) 36; Handley, BICS 12 (1965) 52–53; Sandbach and Belardinelli in their commentaries *ad loc.*

¹⁷ See BICS 12 (1965) 46.

¹⁸ Cf. the distribution of parts in Barigazzi, SIFC 37 (1965) 49, based largely on those of Jouguet and Blass in BCH 30 (1906) 116–117.

(i) ὑπεραγωνιῶν (289) seems to imply great distress on the part of the speaker (Smikrines) – either in the dramatic present or – more probably – at the time that Stratophanes was born. That distress need not have been caused by a financial disaster of the sort that partly led to Pataikos in Pk. (806–12) fostering out his two babies.

(ii) Two contextless words in the passage *may* provide a more plausible reason for Smikrines' distress. One is λαμπαδηφόρου (288); torch-bearers ran races at night in festivals like the Panathenaea (cf. e.g. Ar. Ran. 1087–97), and night-festivals were a standard occasion for rape in New Comedy¹⁹. The other word is]αμουμένη (297), where Blass's supplement γ]αμουμένη is preferable to Kassel's δρ]αμουμένη because (a) if the present passage described a rape that led to Stratophanes' conception, the victim could have been a girl already betrothed, while (b) participants in a ritual λαμπαδηφορία were normally male. Further speculation at this point would be unprofitable; we do not know whether (1) the torch-bearer was Smikrines as an ephebe, or just an ancillary detail in the story, (2) the rape victim was actually betrothed to Smikrines, but unable to identify the raper in the dark, and (3) the disgrace to the girl and her family caused them to dispose of the baby to foster-parents (v. 297, and see iii below).

(iii) The supplement ἄλλων τέκνα printed by Blanchard–Bataille at v. 299 has been rightly resisted by scholars²⁰. Whoever spoke these words, they are perhaps more plausibly read as a generalised comment on the problem of unwanted births; could Menander have written ἐκβ]άλλων τέκνα? Cf. Eur. Ion 904, spoken to Kreousa about the abandonment of her baby, σοὶ δ' ἐς τί δόξ' εἰσῆλθεν ἐκβαλεῖν τέκνον;

312–317

At the opening of Act V Kichias asks Theron why he has made him walk so great a distance, but a mutilation which has removed virtually all the second half of each verse in this column makes all supplementation speculative. The following is merely a cockshy, based on a combination of old and new ideas. I append an explicatory apparatus:

ΚΙΧΗΣΙΑΣ

ἐμοὶ τί σὺ σπουδαῖο[ν, ὦ βέλτιστ', ἔχεις,
 ὥστ' ἄξιον ταύτης φ[ανῆναι τῆς ὁδοῦ
 ἦν κεκόμικας με, δεό[μενός μου συντόνωσ
 315 ἀεί τι μικρὸν ἔτι προελθεῖν; νῦν δ' ἐμοὶ
 ἄξιον, ἀκριβῶς ἴσθι, γιν[ώσκειν τίς εἶ.
 ΘΗΡΩΝ

τίς εἶμι; μὰ τὸν Ἥφαιστ[ον, οὐ πεύση τόδε.

312. Suppl. Arnott (σπουδαῖο[ν already Blass in BCH 34, 1906, 113). Kichiasias' suggested address ὦ βέλτιστ' is the one most appropriate in the present context, being addressed by a man to a stranger (see the Gomme–Sandbach commentary on Dysk. 319, and E. Dickey, *Greek Forms of Address*, Oxford 1996, 120, 139, 277).

313. ἀχιον S with χ corrected to ξ. Suppl. Lloyd-Jones, *Emerita* 34 (1966) 148 = *Greek Comedy*, etc. (Oxford 1990) 86 (τῆς ὁδοῦ already Blass).

¹⁹ On λαμπαδηφόροι see Jüthner in RE XII.1 (1924) s.v. λαμπαδηδρομία, 569–577, H. W. Parke, *Festivals of the Athenians* (London 1977) 45–46, 171–173, D. S. Kyle, *Athletics in Ancient Athens* (Mnemosyne suppl. 95, Leiden 1987) 190–193 and 240 (index s.v. Torch race), and N. V. Sekunda, ZPE 83 (1990) 149–182; and on the Athenian festivals in which they were involved L. Deubner, *Attische Feste* (Berlin 1932), Index s.v. Fackellauf, Parke (*loc. cit.* above), and E. Simon, *Festivals of Attica* (Madison & London 1983) 53–54, 64. Scholars have tended (with the salutary exception of Jouguet, BCH 30 (1906) 117) either to ignore or to misinterpret (e.g. Barigazzi, SIFC 37, 1965, 50) the relevance of v. 288 to the plot of this play.

²⁰ Cf. N. Evangelinos, *Παρατηρήσεις στὰ ἀποσπάσματα τοῦ Σικυωνίου τοῦ Μενάνδρου* (Athens 1965) 14.

314. δεό[μενός suppl. Blass, μου Sudhaus in O. Schroeder, *Novae Comoediae Fragmenta in Papyris reperta exceptis Menandreis* (Bonn 1915), συντόνωξ (or καρτερῶξ) Arnott. The adverb συντόνωξ is not found in extant Attic comedy, but for σύντονος cf. Dysk. 182.

315. προε[λθεῖν suppl. Blass, νῦν δ' ἐμοὶ tentatively Arnott. The normal Attic construction is ἄξιον + dative and infinitive: e.g. Ar. Ach. 205, Equ. 616, Nub. 1074, Av. 548; LSJ s.v. ἄξιος II.4.b.

316 and 317 in S have paragraphi under them.

316. Corr. Blass: ἴσοι S. γιν[ώσκειν suppl. Sudhaus, τίς εἶ Page, *Literary Papyri: Poetry* (London & Cambridge Mass. 1941) 312–313 (after a supplement suggested by Sudhaus in v. 316).

317. τόδε suppl. Arnott, the rest Blass.

318–322

σπουδαῖον ἄν δέξῃ μ[
λαλοῦντα γάρ σε θηρι[
320 πρὸς τὸν τελώνην λιθι[
σπασάμενον εὐθὺς ημ[
. .[]ρισμο[

319–322 εθηρι[, ηνλιοι[(λιοι[corr. to λιθι[by Blass), ευθυσημ[, ρισμο[were written on a scrap of S now lost.

By now the length of the walk and Theron's apparent refusal even to tell Kichesias his name have made Kichesias very angry, but the mutilation of this passage, which places words which at first sight seem disconnected (θηρι[, τελώνην, λιθι[, σπασάμενον) in puzzling conjunction, has made convincing supplementation impossible. Even so, if readers concentrate on the prime fact of Kichesias' anger, with his remarks here interpreted as a series of insults and vituperations, it may be possible to shed a little light amid the encircling gloom.

319. The only plausible supplements are parts of the noun θηρίον (so first Blass) and of the adjective θηριώδης/adverb θηριωδῶς (so tentatively Schroeder). Lloyd-Jones (*Emerita* 148 = *Greek Comedy*, etc. 86) suggested that Menander might have here written θηρίον as a vocative, and this can be supported by two different arguments. Elsewhere in comedy (and Attic prose, too) θηρίον is applied, usually discourteously, to human beings (e.g. Ar. Equ. 273, Nub. 184, Lys. 468, 1014, Eccl. 1104, Men. Dysk. 481, fr. 422; Xen. Comm. 3.11.11, Pl. Phdr. 240b), and parallels can be supplied for its use as an insultingly angry vocative (e.g. Ar. Vesp. 448, Av. 87, Plut. 439, Men. Pk. 366, [Dem.] 58.49). Secondly, it seems possible that θηριο[incorporates a subtle Hellenistic witticism of a sort favoured elsewhere by Menander (e.g. especially Dysk. 393–397, 608–609, 965–966, Heros 37–40²¹). If the supplements in the previous verses printed above come anywhere near what Menander originally wrote, Kichesias will (three lines before) have asked Theron his name, and Theron have refused to divulge it (315–317). If then Kichesias reacts by calling Theron θηρίον, he has unwittingly come very close to addressing him by name.

320. Tax-collectors in ancient Athens and elsewhere were feared (Herodas 6.64, cf. Dem. 22.50–54), disliked (Plut. Mor. 518e, cf. 842b) and classed with such people as money-lenders, pimps and thieves because they practised the most dishonourable of professions (Ar. Equ. 248, Apollodorus com. fr. 13.13 K–A, Theophr. Char. 6, Aspasius on Aristotle, Eth. Nic. = CAG XIX.1, p. 102.21 Heylbut, Polybius 12.13.9, Lucian, Pseudol. 30); cf. W. Schwan in *RE V A 1* (1934) s.v. τελῶναι, 418–425, H. Mitchell, *The Economics of Ancient Greece* (Cambridge 1940) 356–357. Although the correct interpretation of πρὸς in this verse is uncertain, it seems likely that Kichesias is either (more probably: cf. LSJ s.v. πρὸς C.III.4) comparing Theron to, or accusing him of association with, 'the tax-collector'. In that case λιθι[is presumably part of some case of λίθινος, referring here to Theron or the tax-collector as 'stony-hearted' (LXX Ez. 11.19, Alciphron 4.16.7, [Aeschines] epist. 10, Libanius or. 61.12, decl.

²¹ Cf. my Loeb edition of Menander, I (Cambridge, Mass. and London 1979) xxxviii–xlv, and a forthcoming paper on Menander's humour in a collection edited by S. Jäkel, *Laughter down the Centuries*, III (*Annales Universitatis Turkuensis*).

26.21, 30.4 and 37 = Foerster 4.335, 6.543, 620, 638, Rufinus in Anth. Pal. 5.41.2 = 14.2 Page, with a useful note) rather than ‘petrified/struck dumb’ (Antiphanes fr. 164.4 K–A).

321. *σπασόμενον* ημ[presents a more difficult problem, but if Theron is being called an animal and as hard-hearted as a tax-collector, could the next accusation turn a character who was in fact a parasite into a drunkard? *σπᾶν* is most commonly used in the active with reference to ‘*bibentibus . . . quum uno spiritu integra pocula exhauriunt*’ (TLG s.v. *σπάω*, col. 565): e.g. (wine) Eur. Cycl. 417 (with Ussher’s commentary *ad loc.*), 571, 573, Alexis frs. 5 (with my commentary), 286 K–A, Ath. 14.613a), but note the use of the middle in this sense at Apollodorus, Bibl. 1.9.27. If *σπασόμενον* has this sense here, then ημ[could possibly be part of a ἥμι- compound which continued the bibulous reference (e.g. -αμφάριον, -έκτεων, -έκτεον, -εκτον, -κάδιον, -μέθυσον, -χουν)²².

Leeds

W. Geoffrey Arnott

²² If a mention of wine in 321 led to conversation about wine and/or drunkenness for a few lines, it might be possible to supplement]ριον in 323 (probably five lines later than 321) to ποτή]ριον, but it needs to be remembered that Buck–Petersen’s reverse index lists many hundreds of diminutives with this ending, amongst which e.g. θηρίον and τεκμήριον would suit the context equally well.