

W. GEOFFREY ARNOTT

FINAL NOTES ON MENANDER'S SIKYONIOI (VV. 343–423 WITH FRGS. 1, 2 AND 7)

aus: Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik 118 (1997) 95–103

© Dr. Rudolf Habelt GmbH, Bonn

FINAL NOTES ON MENANDER'S SIKYONIOI
(VV. 343–423 WITH FRs. 1, 2 AND 7)

These notes, like the earlier ones published in ZPE 116 (1997) 1–10 and 117 (1997) 21–34, are by-products of work devoted to Menander's *Sikyonioides* during the preparation of a third volume for the new Loeb edition of Menander. In all passages of this play the line-numberings are 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 by them 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).

343

Sandbach's suggestion (edition; Gomme–Sandbach commentary pp. 663–664) that *χαλεπὸς ἦσθα* was interjected by Theron merits approval, although it gains only partial support from a papyrus admittedly unreliable in such matters (S has a one-letter space before *χαλεπος*, but none after *ἦσθα*; there is no paragraphus under the line, and no dicola). The suggestion at one blow removes any aspect of “flatness” (Lloyd-Jones, *Emerita* 34, 1966, 148 = *Greek Comedy*, etc. 86) from the remark. Sandbach himself points out that in this scene it is Kichesias and not Theron who regularly proves himself uncooperative and awkward to deal with (a small-scale parallel to Knemon, the paradigmatic *χαλεπός* of Menandrian comedy, cf. *Dysk.* 325, 628, 697, 747). Two further arguments may be advanced in support of the assignment.

(i) Open (thus not “sotto voce”, as Sandbach guesses) accusations that an addressed person is *χαλεπός* are a standard feature of Greek dialogues: e.g. *Eur. Cycl.* 569 *χαλεπὸν τόδ' εἶπας*, *Ar. Vesp.* 821 *ὡς χαλεπὸς ἄρ' ἦσθ' ἰδεῖν*, *Pl. Resp.* 1.336e *μὴ χαλεπὸς ἡμῖν ἔσθι*, *Meno* 92b *τί οὕτως χαλεπὸς εἶ*; cf. [Aristaenetus] 1.13.74 Mazal.

(ii) See below on 346.

346

S has paragraphi under vv. 346 and 347, but no dicola or one-letter spaces, and Theron's remark in 349–350 *Κιχησίας / Σκαμβωνίδης γε – πολὺ σὺ βέλτιον λέγεις* clearly indicates that in 346–347 Kichesias said *Κιχησίαν / Σκαμβωνίδην γενόμενον*. Since Kichesias speaks from 343 up to *ἀργύριον* in 346, the paragraphus under 346 requires us to give *ἀδίκου πράγματος* to Theron as a second brief interjection, here commenting ironically on what Kichesias has previously said. This assignment would make the remark an exact parallel to that of Daos in *Epitr.* 371 (there seriously meant). Could such an assignment of two pithy critical remarks to Theron be an intended part of the linguistic presentation of Theron in this play? I argued in an earlier paper (ZPE 117, 1997, 25) that a parallel device might have been used at 95–96 and 146–47 of the play, with Theron there twice presented as a man who would go on talking when his companion wanted to close a conversation.

357–358

ἀνέμνησας πάθους
τὸν ἄθλιόν με καὶ ἴθουρας† οἰκτρᾶς ἐμοί.

Kassel obelised $\theta\upsilon\rho\alpha\varsigma$ in 358 in the total absence of any evidence for a metaphorical use of $\theta\upsilon\rho\alpha\varsigma$ in a sense approaching to that of “disaster”. Four conjectures deserve consideration; one of them maybe what Menander wrote.

(i) $\theta\upsilon\gamma\alpha\tau\rho\acute{o}\varsigma$ (Barigazzi, SIFC 37, 1965, 57; Post, AJP 87, 1966, 40; followed by Sisti in Gallavotti’s 1972 edition). This is palaeographically attractive, and the coupling “disaster and daughter” seems acceptable, but in Greek usage $\omicron\iota\kappa\tau\rho\acute{o}\varsigma$ is more commonly applied to the person who has sustained a loss (e.g. A. Suppl. 61, S. O.R. 58, Eur. Heracles 1237, El. 132, Bacch. 1324) than to the mourned or missing victim (H. II. 11.242).

(ii) $\Sigma\upsilon\rho\alpha\varsigma$ (Gronewald, ZPE 99, 1993, 26 and n. 18), very close to the ductus. This would be the name of the nurse left behind (alive or murdered) by the kidnappers of Philoumene (vv. 4–5). Although Syra is an appropriate name for an old slave (to the instances collected by Gronewald, add now Men. Misoumenos¹), it would nevertheless be odd if a father lamented the loss of an old servant before that of his own daughter.

(iii) $\tau\acute{\upsilon}\chi\eta\varsigma$ (Kassel, Eranos 43, 1965, 17 = Kleine Schriften, Berlin 1991, 287, and in his edition): excellent in sense, but how would one explain its corruption to $\theta\upsilon\rho\alpha\varsigma$?

(iv) $\phi\theta\omicron\rho\acute{\omega}\varsigma$ (Oguse–Schwartz, BFL Strasbourg 43, 1965, 536), the one conjecture that completely satisfies both sense (pace Lloyd-Jones, Emerita 34, 1966, 149 = Greek Comedy, etc. 86) and palaeography. The word is admittedly rare in comedy, but does occur (lyrics in Eupolis fr. 98 Kassel–Austin, iambics in Antiphanes fr. 181.5). $\phi\theta\omicron\rho\acute{\alpha}$ covers various types of disaster, but many involve some sort of loss: loss of life (e.g. S. Ant. 122–123, O.C. 369, Eur. Helen 766, fr. 813.2–3; cf. Thuc. 2.47.3, Pl. Tim. 20e, Legg. 3.677e), loss of virginity (commonly in Hellenistic Greek: e.g. Plut. Mor. 89f, 242b, especially 712c, Parthenius 35.3, Strabo 6.1.6).² At this point in the play Kichesias knows only that his daughter was kidnapped as a four-year-old girl; he does not yet know if she is alive or dead; yet is it irrelevant to note here that when he learns about her survival, the first question that he asks is whether she is still a virgin (371–373)?

362

If $\pi\lambda\acute{\alpha}\tau\epsilon\rho$ is correctly supplemented at the end of this mutilated line (but see R. Coles, Emerita 34, 1966, 136), it must be addressed to Kichesias by Theron (so first Lloyd-Jones, GRBS 7, 1966, 145 n. 13 = Greek Comedy etc., Oxford 1990, 65 n. 13; cf. D. Bain, Actors and Audience, Oxford 1977, 205 n. 1), and not by Dromon, as generally supposed. Slaves such as Dromon address their old masters with $\delta\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\pi\omicron\tau\alpha$ (so v. 373); $\pi\acute{\alpha}\tau\epsilon\rho$, on the other hand, is the polite form of address used in Menander by slaves (Dysk. 107, Epitr. 231, 296, 301, 320, 340, 344) and free men (Dysk. 171 Sostratos to Knemon, Sik. 379, 381 Stratophanes to Kichesias; cf. Sikon at Dysk. 494) when talking to old men who are complete strangers, and so here is as appropriate to Theron as it is inappropriate to Dromon³. Presumably in the lost part of 362 Theron called Kichesias’ attention to Dromon’s arrival, and the reunion of Dromon and Kichesias would have taken place in the short gap between vv. 362 and 363.

382–386

These badly damaged lines, originally published by Jouguet (BCH 30, 1906, 103–123) as his frs. V (ends of 382–386) and VI (middles of 383–386), and skilfully placed in their correct position by Blanchard and Bataille on their fr. XII, have been much discussed, and I have no wish to replough overcultivated fields. Three disputed readings, however, may merit further consideration.

¹ See my paper in ZPE 110, 1996, 34–35 and my edition of Menander in the Loeb series (II, Cambridge, Mass. 1996) on Mis. 155 Sandbach = 555 Arnott, where $\sigma\upsilon\rho\alpha$ in a papyrus had previously been misread as $\theta\upsilon\rho\alpha$.

² Cf. also P. Chantraine, Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque, 2 (Paris 1974–80) 1199 s.v. $\phi\theta\epsilon\acute{\iota}\rho\omega$.

³ ‘The slave Dromon would not use this mode of address’ (Lloyd-Jones; cf. E. Dickey, Greek Forms of Address (Oxford 1996) 78–81, 95–98).

(i) At 382 Barigazzi (SIFC 37, 1965, 62) interpreted the trace after την as the top part of the hasta of a φ running into the descender of the τ of πατερ in the line above, and on that basis he suggested as supplement πρὸς τὴν Φ[ιλουμένην βαδί]ζωμεν ταχύ. This appears to match on the photograph the visible traces and spacings, and since it also provides the most appropriate sense, it deserves more support than it has previously received.

(ii) At 383–384 Stratophanes clearly declines Dromon's suggestion that they should go together, along with Kichesias, to the priestess at Eleusis in order to be reunited with Philoumene, and he gives family business as his reason (384). Accordingly the most relevant supplements here would be ἡγοῦ μ[όνος σύ] κατὰ πόδας / [ἐγὼ δι]ώκω (μ[όνος σύ] Arnott, after Lloyd-Jones' μόνον σύ, Emerita 34, 1966, 149 = Greek Comedy, etc. 86; ἐγὼ suppl. Kassel in his edition and Barigazzi, δι[ώκω Blass in Jouguet); Dromon alone is told to take Kichesias to Eleusis, and Stratophanes will follow later. ἐγὼ here seems better than Austin's ἐκεῖ (in Lloyd-Jones, *loc. cit.*) before δι[ώκω; it provides a needed contrast with the preceding σύ.

(iii) At 385 Barigazzi's supplement προάγω]μεν ἡμεῖς, ὦ Κ]ιχησία has been rejected because the traces of the letter after ημε have been interpreted rather as ρ⁴ rather than ι. All that remains now is the top of a hasta well above the line, and its foot well below it bending slightly to the left; these traces closely resemble those of several neighbouring iotas: e.g. in και 376 and 390, σοι and δοκη 380, εἰσιων 386.

385–396

Continuity in Stratophanes' speech to a presumably off-stage Donax is marred by (i) the loss (in 387–96) of the right-hand edge of column D in fr. XII of the papyrus, robbing us normally of 3/4 of the third metron, and (ii) rubbing and corruption in 390. Stratophanes tells Donax to pass on his instructions to Malthake, requiring her to move from Stratophanes' house to that of Smikrines, apparently with mountains of luggage — portmanteaux in particular. If these all belong to her, as seems likely, she seems to be presented as a typically greedy and wealthy (? ex-)hetaira of New Comedy⁵, although this fact does not necessarily clarify any relationship with Stratophanes or Theron in the play. Other goods and various personnel belonging just as clearly to Stratophanes are to be left in Stratophanes' own house.

The following cockshy is an attempt to provide a fuller text of the speech, *exempli gratia*, with a brief apparatus and one comment appended:

ΣΤΡΑΤΟΦΑΝΗΣ

385	Δόναξ	
		παῖ, παῖ] Δόναξ, φράσον εἰσιῶν πρὸς Μαλθάκην
		εἰς γειτόνων ἅπαντα δεῦρ[ο μεταγαγεῖν,
		τοὺς κανδύτανας, τοὺς ἀόρτ[ας, τὰ πλόκανα
		ἅπαντα, τοὺς ρίσκους ἅπαντ[ας οἰκόθεν·
390		καὶ μηκέθ' εὔρισκ' ὄντας ἐνθά[δ' ὕστερον·
		αὐτὴν τ' ἀπιέναι δεῦρο πρὸς [τὴν μητέρα
		κέλευε τὴν ἐμὴν μεθ' ὑμῶ[ν, τῶν δ' ἐμῶν
		τοὺς βαρβάρους παῖδας καταλ[εῖπειν βούλομαι
		ἐνταῦθα καὶ Θήρωνα τούς τ' ὀ[νηλάτας
395		καὶ τοὺς ὄνους. ταῦτα λέγ' ἐγὼ [δ' αὐτῇ ταχὺ
		ἐντεύξομ' αὐτός· τᾶλλα τῷ τ . [

⁴ So Kassel in his edition, Austin in the Gomme–Sandbach commentary, p. 667; they are opposed, however, by Coles, Emerita 34, 1966, 137, and Jacques, REA 69, 1967, 303 n. 2.

⁵ Cf. H. Hauschild, Die Gestalt der Hetäre in der griechischen Komödie (Diss. Leipzig 1935) 22–40, and my introductory note on Alexis fr. 103 K.–A. in my commentary (Cambridge 1996) 272–73, with further bibliography.

385 S has a space before δοναξ. 386 Suppl. Handley. 387 μεταγαγεῖν suppl. Austin, Kumaniecki. 388 Suppl. Handley (cf. Gallavotti at 387); alternatively ἀόρτ[ας, τᾶπιπλα Arnott. 389 οἰκόθεν suppl. Arnott. 390 μηκέθ' εὔρισκ' Arnott: μη..ευρησκ S. ὕστερον suppl. Arnott. 391 Suppl. Oguse, Webster. 392 τῶν δ' ἐμῶν suppl. Arnott. 393 Suppl. Arnott (other parts of καταλείπω suppl. several). 394 Suppl. Gallavotti, Kassel. 395 Suppl. Arnott (δ' ὁμῖν ταχὺ Kassel). 396 εντευζομεντος S with the second ν crossed out, a correcting α written under that ν, and υ written above the second ντ.

390: in S καιμη is clear, then a badly rubbed and indecipherable letter, then ρ or ι. My conjecture and supplement are offered in an attempt to provide relevant sense in the context ('And see they're no longer here afterwards'), without departing too far from the ductus.

397–402

Moschion's speech directly follows that of Stratophanes in the same column of the papyrus, with identical mutilation as far as v. 405, and worse from 406 to 410. Yet enough remains to indicate that the speaker is being portrayed consistently as a self-pitying, petulant moaner, and this fact may support the following supplementations:

397 νῦν οὐδὲ προσβλέψαι σε, Μοσχίω[ν, ἔτι
πρὸς τὴν κόρην δεῖ. Μοσχίων, [κακοδαιμονεῖς.
λευκή, σφόδρ' εὐόφθαλμός ἐστιν· οὐδὲ[ν εἶ.
400 ἀδελφὸς ὁ γαμῶν, μακάριος κα[ὶ πλούσιος.
οἶον γὰρ οὗτος ἔτι λέγεις· ὄν ἄντ[ικρυς
402 πράγμ' ἐστ' ἐπαινεῖν . . .

397 ἔτι suppl. Kassel (edition), Oguse. 398 Suppl. Barigazzi. 399 σφοδρεστευφαλμος S with θ written above the α: εὐόφθαλμος Blanchard and Bataille, ἐστ' transposed by Handley, Lloyd-Jones, Kassel, οὐδὲ[ν εἶ suppl. Arnott (οὐδὲ[ν λέγεις Handley). 400 πλούσιος suppl. Arnott. 401 Or λέγει σ'. ἄντ[ικρυς suppl. Austin (in Kassel's edition).

399 For οὐδὲ[ν εἶ cf. e.g. Eur. Andr. 641, Ar. Eccl. 144; this idiom with οὐδέν occurs most frequently in tragedy⁶, but is widespread also in comedy (e.g. Ar. Ach. 681, Equ. 158, 1243, Vesp. 997, 1504, Eupolis fr. 237, Dionysius fr. 7.2: not always in paratragic contexts) and Attic (e.g. Xen. Anab. 6.2.10, Hell. 4.8.4, Pl. Gorg. 512c, Resp. 1.341c, 8.562d, [Dem]. 47.67) and koine (e.g. NT 1 Cor. 13.2). Cf. also A. C. Moorhouse, CQ 15 (1965) 31–40.

400 Cf. Menander fr. 739 πλούσιος / καλοῦμ' ὑπὸ πάντων, μακάριος δ' ὑπ' οὐδενός.

410–411

In his edition Kassel writes *quot versus desint* (between 410 and 411) *non constat*; this is true, but it may be possible to fix the parameters⁷:

(i) The total length of Sikyonioi was originally between 1000 and 1099 lines, according to the scribe's note in the colophon of the Sorbonne papyrus.

(ii) According to the same scribe's admittedly inexact calculations, the second line of Act IV (v. 151 Kassel) was the 700th of his task (not necessarily of the play, if prefatory matter such as we find in the Bodmer papyrus of Dyskolos and the Cairensis of Heros was included in the calculations).

⁶ I list just those tragic instances where the referent is personal and the neuter form is οὐδέν: Aeschylus Suppl. 749, 923, Eum. 38, fr. 78a.67 and perhaps 68 Radt; Sophocles Aj. 1231, El. 245, 677, 1129, Phil. 951, 1030, 1217, fr. 583.3 Radt; Euripides Cycl. 355, 667, Alc. 381, 390, Andr. 134, 641, 1077, Suppl. 425, Heracles 157, 314, 635, Tro. 109, 1007, 1161, I.T. 115, 569, Helen 1194, Phoen. 403, 598, Or. 1115, I.A. 351, 968, fr. 326.3 Nauck².

⁷ Cf. Barigazzi, SIFC 37 (1965) 67–68, and Gallavotti's Athena edition (Rome 1965) 40–46, with the criticisms of Jacques, REA 69 (1967) 299. Lloyd-Jones, GRBS 7 (1966) 154–155 = Greek Comedy etc. (Oxford 1990) 73–75 thus correctly assumes that v. 411 comes at no great distance after Moschion's speech.

(ii) The fourth act of the play lasted c. 165 lines, plus the two, three or four columns missing between vv. 279 and 280: i.e. c. 211, c. 234 or c. 257 lines, if we assume an average length of 23 lines per column. The scribe writes the figure 800 against a line (254 Kassel) 25 lines before that gap, with 32 lines still to go in the act after the gap. The act must accordingly have ended at around line 901, 924, or 947 of the scribe's task.

(iii) The maximum length of the fifth act would accordingly have been c. 198, 175 or 154 lines. From the extant papyrus we can calculate that c. 111 lines came before v. 410 Kassel, and that after the gap between 410 and 411 another c. 38 lines remained (including column A of fr. XXI Blanchard-Bataille). Thus that gap must have been of two columns at its longest, of none (i.e. with column A of fr. XXI following directly after column D of XI) at its smallest.

411–423

Mutilation and the absence of character names in fr. XXI.B of the papyrus, which contains the final thirteen lines of the play, combine to make interpretation of exactly what is happening as difficult as the identification of the speakers involved. Even so a careful reading of what is preserved here, when allied to the information that in all probability Pollux 4.119 (= fr. 377 Körte, Sik. fr. 9 Kassel, Sandbach, Belardinelli) seems to supply about the play's ending, enables one to suggest an elucidation of this passage which would be theatrically effective and also cleverly interweave New Comedy's traditional closing motifs (requests for torch and garlands, 418–19) with a dramatic resolution of the relationship between Malthake and the parasite Theron.

It will be useful first to sum up what other parts of the play allow us to know or guess about these two characters.

(i) The scene directly after the prologue (?25–51) introduces two characters, one of whom is definitely, and the other probably, female⁸. They mention donkeys (ἰς ὄνοις) or possibly hard work/troubles (?] πόνοις: 27), [το]ύτω τῷ κακῷ (31) and the possibility that the speaker should be made to live with someone (συνοικίσειν: 32). This is followed by a definite “No” (οὐδεμία μὰ τὸ θεῶ: 33). Shortly afterwards there is a reference to a man who is ἄπληστος and πᾶντ' ἐσθίει. (43, 44, 45). All this suggests a context where Malthake is discussing her reluctance to be railroaded (by Stratophanes and Theron?) into a marriage with a gormandising parasite who can only be Theron.

(ii) When Theron learns that Stratophanes has evidence of free Athenian birth, he exclaims ὦ δέσποιν' Ἀθηνᾶ, τουτονὶ σαυτῆς πόει, / ἵνα λάβῃ τὴν παῖδ', ἐγὼ δὲ Μαλθάκην (144–145). This appears to confirm Theron's wish to cohabit with Malthake, in marriage apparently if both are Athenian citizens.

(iii) At 385–396 (see the comments above on these lines) Stratophanes orders a message to be given to Malthake requesting her to transfer a large quantity of luggage (mainly containers suitable for clothes: 387–89) and herself (391–92) to the house of Smikrines, leaving foreign slaves, Theron, donkeymen and donkeys in his own house.

(iv) Pollux 4.119 claims that in comedy καὶ πορφυρᾶ δ' ἐσθῆτι χρώνται οἱ νεανίσκοι, οἱ δὲ παράσιτοι μελαίνῃ ἢ φαιῷ, πλὴν ἐν Σικυωνίῳ λευκῇ, ὅτε μέλλει γαμεῖν ὁ παράσιτος. Although Pollux does not name the author of this “Sikyonios”⁹, it is more likely here to be Menander than Alexis, the only other comic playwright to whom this title is ascribed¹⁰. Pollux' comment, however, does not say that Theron married Malthake: only that he was going to do so.

⁸ See my discussion in ZPE 116 (1997) 5–6.

⁹ On the recorded variation between -ιος and -ιος in the title of Menander's play see especially ZPE 116 (1997) 1–3.

¹⁰ Cf. my commentary on Alexis (Cambridge 1996) p. 601 n. 1.

With the above evidence taken into account, it is possible to interpret the final lines of the play as an animated discussion between Theron and Malthake. The following text divides the speeches in line with the paragraphi:

ΜΑΛΘΑΚΗ

411 φέρουσα κριθῶν τοῖς ὄνοις καθ' ἡμέραν
 ἐν ταῖς πορείαις, ὡς παν[
 ΘΗΡΩΝ
 ἀεὶ τοιαύτην εὐχόμην ἔχγειν τύχην.

ΜΑΛΘΑΚΗ

415 εὐχου τοιαύτην; τί δ' ἀδικεῖτ'; οἷς ὤμοσεν
 οὐκ ἐμμεμένηκεν ὁ βαθύ[πλουτος οὐτοσί.
 ΘΗΡΩΝ
 ἄνθρωπον ἐλπίσαντα δεο[
 ΜΑΛΘΑΚΗ
 καὶ τὴν δέησίν ἐστι σου δρ[
 πῶς δ' ἂν διακόψαις;
 ΘΗΡΩΝ
 δᾶδᾶ [μοί τις ἐκδότω.

ΜΑΛΘΑΚΗ

πρὶν ὁμολογήσαι;
 ΘΗΡΩΝ
 καὶ στεφάν[ους. πείσθητί μοι.

ΜΑΛΘΑΚΗ

420 δρᾶσω.
 ΘΗΡΩΝ
 κατάπνευσον. μειράκ[ι', ἄνδρες, παιδία,
 προφράσατ' ἐκτείναντες, ἐπ[ικροτήσατε.
 ἢ δ' εὐπάτειρα φιλόγελῶς τε [παρθένος
 Νίκη μεθ' ἡμῶν εὐμενῆ[ς ἔποιτ' ἀεὶ.

412, 413, 415, 416, 417, 418 and 419 have paragraphi under them in S. 411 καθ' ἡμέραν suppl. *exempli gratia* Arnott. 413 Suppl. Lloyd-Jones (ἔχγειν also Barigazzi). 414 Suppl. Lloyd-Jones. 415 ἐμμεμένηκεν S: corr. Blanchard and Bataille. Suppl. Lloyd-Jones. 418–419 Suppl. Handley (418 τις νῦν ἐκδότω Barigazzi). 420 δρᾶσω or δωσω S (but see Coles, *Emerita* 34, 1966, 137). Ending suppl. Kassel. 421 προφράσατ' Lloyd-Jones (cf. Barigazzi, *SIFC* 37, 1965, 70, and Quincey, *Phoenix* 20, 1966, 116): προφρασετ S. ἐπ[ικροτήσατε suppl. several. 422–423 Suppl. Blanchard and Bataille.

The statement about a woman “Feeding barley to the donkeys . . . on the marches” (411–412) presumably refers to past events when Stratophanes was campaigning abroad; if Malthake was the woman concerned, she must have been in the soldier’s entourage and helped Theron with the donkeys. I take Theron’s response (413) to be an attempt to return to the main point (his wish to marry Malthake) after she had been reflecting on all the work that previous collaboration with him had involved. Malthake’s next remark (414–15) is clearly dismissive, but its details are puzzling; with Lloyd-Jones’ supplements¹¹, she would be implying that Theron and Stratophanes are both misusing her — Theron presumably by pressing his suit so vigorously, Stratophanes by failing to honour promises (presumably involving money) that he had previously made to her. The following two and a half lines (416–18)

¹¹ If Stratophanes was acting as Malthake’s κύριος (see below), he would have been involved in any arrangements for her marriage to Theron, and this perhaps makes Lloyd-Jones’ suggestion ἀδικεῖτ' here preferable to his alternative ἀδικεῖς, which has been more widely accepted.

remain something of a mystery, even if Theron's hopes (416) and "request" (417) there are most probably linked with his marriage proposal.

It is at 418 that Menander appears to produce his dramatic master stroke. His audiences had long been familiar¹² with the formulas that typically ended Athenian comedies: the introduction of torches and garlands and the final prayer to Victory. Torches and garlands, however, were also an important feature of wedding processions, when after the wedding feast at the bride's parents' house the bridegroom drove or walked his bride home to his own house¹³. Thus Theron's request for torch(es) and garland(s) (418–19) is in all probability not just the conventional closing formula of comedy, but also a symbolic request that Malthake should accompany Theron off stage at the play's end in a wedding procession that confirmed their marriage¹⁴. This interpretation makes effective sense of πρὶν ὁμολογήσαι (419: Malthake saying "Before I've agreed to the marriage"), and δρᾶσω (which seems to me as likely a reading of the traces as δῶσω) and κατόνευσον (420: Malthake finally agreeing, and Theron asking her to confirm her agreement with a nod). It would be interesting to know whether Theron wore the white clothes of a bridegroom throughout this scene, or whether he put them on only after Malthake had nodded her agreement; the latter would provide a more spectacular theatrical effect.

My interpretation of these lines must inevitably be based on uncertain but (I believe) reasonable assumptions: that Malthake is an Athenian citizen without living parents, that as a member of Stratophanes' entourage she has effectually recognised him as her κύριος, that Theron had previously obtained Stratophanes' agreement to his marriage with Malthake, and that Stratophanes had promised a dowry for Malthake. If Malthake was previously a successful hetaira, her position would significantly differ from that of a typical Athenian sixteen-year-old bride who had lived all her life in her parents' house. If she needed persuasion of a more substantial kind before accepting Theron, Menander's exploitation of some features of the traditional comic finale might well have provided this — theatrically, at least!

Fragment 1 Kassel, Sandbach, Belardinelli = 4 Arnott = 371 Körte–Thierfelder

Photius s.v. ἄβραι (α 50 Theodoridis) and *Suda* s.v. ἄβρα (α 68 Adler), cf. Eustathius 1854.17ff., citing Aelius Dionysius α 6 Erbse: ἄβραι· νέαι· δοῦλαι· οἱ· δέ· φασιν (so Photius: these six words replaced simply by the heading ἄβρα in Aelius Dionysius and the *Suda*) οὔτε ἀπλῶς ἢ θεράπαινα ἄβρα λέγεται οὔτε ἢ εὐμορφος, ἀλλ' ἢ οἰκότριψ γυναικὸς κόρη καὶ ἔντιμος, εἴτε οἰκογενὴς εἴτε μὴ. Μένανδρος Ψευδηρακαλεῖ (fr. 453 K–T) . . . καὶ Σικωνίῳ (so Ael. Dion.: καὶ misplaced after Σικωνίῳ in Phot., *Suda*).

ἄβραν γὰρ ἀντωνούμενος
ἔρωμένην† ταύτη μὲν οὐ παρέδωκ' ἔχειν
ἔτρεφε δὲ χωρὶς ὡς ἐλευθέρῳ πρέπει.

Fragment 1, lines 1–2 ἀντωνούμενος and ταύτην mss. b, z of Photius. 2 ἐρωμένην all mss. of citers. 3 τρέφειν mss. of *Suda*.

¹² See Belardinelli's discussion in her commentary on Sik. 420–423, with a useful bibliography.

¹³ The best modern account is J. H. Oakley and R. H. Sinos, *The Wedding in Ancient Athens* (Madison, Wisc. and London 1993) 26–34. Cf. also W. Erdmann, *Die Ehe im alten Griechenland* (Munich 1934) 256–258, R. Garland, *The Greek Way of Life* (London 1990) 217–225, and Belardinelli's edition on Sik. 418–419 (pp. 227–230).

¹⁴ Both Handley (*BICS* 12, 1965, 58–59) and Lloyd-Jones (*Emerita* 142–143, *GRBS* 154–155 = *Greek Comedy* etc. 73–75, 80–81) identify the speakers in this scene as Theron and Malthake, while Sandbach in the Gomme–Sandbach commentary (p. 669 on Sik. 411ff.) suggests that here Theron may have been successful with Malthake, but only Webster (*An Introduction to Menander*, Manchester 1974, 187) noted the possibility that the ending might have changed into Theron's wedding procession.

This puzzling fragment¹⁵ appears to refer to the early life of Philoumene after she was purchased in the Mylasa slave market by ‘a very fine and wealthy’ Sicyonian officer (cf. vv. 5–15) clearly identifiable as Stratophanes or his foster-father. Thierfelder’s suggestion (Körte–Thierfelder p. 134) that this fragment seems to derive from somewhere in the prologue (presumably in the gap between vv. 19 and 20) is probably correct. Most of its message is straightforward; Stratophanes (or his foster-father), ‘buying instead a lady’s maid, did not hand her (presumably Philoumene) ἐρωμένην over into this woman’s possession, but brought her up separately as befits a free woman’. Who ‘this woman’ was is uncertain — most probably the lady’s maid just mentioned — but doubtless the lost context answered this question. However, ἐρωμένην in v. 2 makes little sense. It can hardly refer to Philoumene, who was still a very young girl (as ἔτρεφε in v. 2 of the fragment appears to indicate), and I am tempted to suggest that the word is a careless error, perhaps already made in an earlier extract from which the cited lexica took their texts, for Φιλουμένην, the *nomen proprium* of the wealthy officer’s original purchase. Errors of this kind, whether due to a misinterpreting gloss or substitution of an apparent synonym, are too common to need cited instances, but if the fragment does derive from Menander’s divine prologue, this conjecture has to face one possible objection. In his prologues Menander very rarely names the characters that he presents — only Kleostratos in *Aspis* 110, Knemon in *Dyskolos* 6, nobody in the extant portion of *Perikeiromene*, for instance¹⁶ — but in the context of *Sikyonioi* fragment 1 the naming of Philoumene would be welcome in order to avoid confusion with either the lady’s maid or with ταύτη.

Fragment 2 Kassel, Sandbach, Belardinelli = 5 Arnott = 372 Körte–Thierfelder

On line 2 of this fragment, τὸ τοῦ στρατιώτου σχῆμα καὶ τὸ τοῦ ξένου, cited by Stobaeus, *Eclogae* 4.12.4, Kassel’s critical apparatus has ‘τοῦ om. A’ Hense (*utrum non dicit*). It is in fact the τοῦ before στρατιώτου that is omitted by A; for this information I am grateful to Dr Christian Förstel in the Department of Manuscripts of the Bibliothèque Nationale in Paris.

Fragment 7 Kassel, Sandbach, Belardinelli = 10 Arnott

The Photius entry¹⁷ that quotes Menander’s Sikyonios (*sic*) for a feminine singular aorist participle in an unusual meaning is desperately corrupt in the Zavorda manuscript (z), which writes: ἐμπριάσσα· ἀντὶ τοῦ ἀπῆλθε φασὶν ἀπολιπούσα ὡς ὀργιζομένην. Μένανδρος Σικυωνίῳ.

The difficulties are twofold: ἐμπριάσσα is not a known form, while ἀπῆλθε φασὶν ἀπολιπούσα ὡς ὀργιζομένην does not explain the lemma with the pithy precision characteristic of Photius when he introduces an explanation with ἀντὶ τοῦ. Tsantsanoglou’s correction of the lemma to ἐμπρίασσα and of the accusative ὀργιζομένην to -ομένη (in Handley) is persuasive¹⁸. πρία and συμπρία are both used in the sense of ‘I gnash (my teeth)/ bite (my lips) in anger’, usually with τοὺς ὀδόντας or a synonym expressed (e.g. Ar. Ran. 927 μὴ πρία τοὺς ὀδόντας, Lucian Somn. 14 ἡγανάκτει . . . καὶ τοὺς ὀδόντας συνέπριε), but once without (Men. Dysk. 934 πρία σαυτόν, with Handley’s commentary); and since ἐμπρία τοὺς ὀδόντας / τὸν γένυ is attested for the literal use ‘I clamp my teeth tight’ (Diod. Sic.

¹⁵ It has been widely discussed: in addition to the commentaries of Gomme–Sandbach (p. 671) and Belardinelli (pp. 234–237) see especially Fernández Galiano, *Est. Clás.* 9 (1965) 329–331, Oguse, *Ant. Class.* 34 (1965) 526, Lloyd-Jones, *Emerita* 34 (1966) 142 = Greek Comedy etc. 80, Marzullo, *Quad. Cagliari* 2 (1967) 15–18, Gallavotti, *GIF* 22 (1970) 47–50, Barigazzi, *Prometheus* 12 (1986) 189, and Belardinelli, *Annali Bari* 29 (1986) 5–18 (with a useful bibliography of earlier work on this fr. before the Sorbonne papyrus was discovered, 5–6 n. 1).

¹⁶ See e.g. C. Corbato in *Atti dell’ XI Congresso Internazionale di Papirologia* (Milan 1966) 158–161, E. W. Handley’s edition of Menander’s *Dyskolos* (London 1965), commentary on vv. 5ff., and my paper in *Drama* 2 (1993) 27.

¹⁷ See Handley, *BICS* 12, 1965, 61–62 n. 15 and K. Tsantsanoglou, *New Fragments of Greek Literature from the Lexicon of Photius*, Athens 1984, p. 131 no. 162, s.v. ἐμβριμήσσα; it will be ε 770 in the forthcoming second volume of Theodoridis’ edition of Photius.

¹⁸ More so than Theodoridis’ conjecture ἐμβριμήσσα for the lemma (ZPE 58, 1985, 35–36), accepted by Belardinelli in her edition: no word with four juxtaposed long syllables could scan in either trimeters or tetrameters.

17.92, Oppian Hal. 5.185–186, cf. Cyn. 2.261), it would not be difficult to accept a metaphorical intransitive extension for this compound also.

But what of ἀπῆλθε φασὶν ἀπολιποῦσα ὡς? This cannot all be intended to explain ἐμπρίσσασα, and it seems preferable to assume that one word (ὀργιζομένη) in the entry has been misplaced, another (ἐμπρίσσασα) lost by haplography, and a brief citation from Menander's *Sikyonioides* thereby misread as part of Photius' grammatical explanation. Thus Photius would have written ἐμπρίσσασα· ἀντὶ τοῦ ὀργιζομένη. <ἐμπρίσσασά σε> / ἀπῆλθεν ἀπολιποῦσα, ὡς Μένανδρος Σικυωνίῳ. Brief citations in Photius are not infrequently identified thus with ὡς introducing the name of the author and the title of his work: e.g. in the entries s.vv. ἀδιάφορον (Pl. Phaed. 106e), ἀδώρητος (Eur. Hec. 42–43, Thuc. 2.65.8), κρόκην νήθην (H. Od. 4.134).

The Menander fragment can then be translated “She left you¹⁹ and went off, they say, gnashing her teeth in anger”. The words would be spoken by a character such as Theron (? in the fractured text and gap between 69 and 74) to Stratophanes, reporting what the house slaves had told Theron about Philoumene's departure with Dromon from Stratophanes' house to the precinct at Eleusis; cf. Handley's own remark, *BICS* 12, 1965, 61–62 n. 15.

Leeds

W. Geoffrey Arnott

¹⁹ For the position of σε see K. J. Dover, *Greek Word Order* (Cambridge 1960) 12–14, and the works he cites at 13 n. 1.