

W. GEOFFREY ARNOTT

FIRST NOTES ON MENANDER'S SAMIA

aus: Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik 121 (1998) 35–44

© Dr. Rudolf Habelt GmbH, Bonn



## FIRST NOTES ON MENANDER'S SAMIA

These notes are a by-product of work devoted to Menander's *Samia* 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. Kasser and C. Austin in their editions of the play (Kasser–Austin, *Papyrus Bodmer XXV: Ménandre, La Samienne, Cologny-Geneva* 1969; Austin, *Menandri Aspis et Samia, I: Textus, Kleine Texte* 188a, Berlin 1969), 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). It will be useful for readers to have at their side the photographs of both the Cairo papyrus (C: *The Cairo Codex of Menander: P. Cair. J.43227*, Institute of Classical Studies, London 1978, plates XXXVII–XLVI) and the Bodmer codex (B: accompanying the Kasser–Austin edition).

## 1. The play's date

Although no didascalical notice survives for Menander's *Samia*, there are at least six<sup>1</sup> separate pieces or types of evidence embedded in its text that may be combined to produce a dating that is both precise and plausible.

(a) In 603–604 Demeas mentions Chaerephon as an ever-present on the Athenian scene. Chaerephon<sup>2</sup> was an Athenian parasite notorious for his habit of gatecrashing dinners, and he became a constant butt of comedians in the city from the time that Menander began writing (Men. fr. 304 Körte–Thierfelder = 265 Kassel–Austin from *Orge*, his first play<sup>3</sup>) until about 310 (Apollodorus fr. 29 Kassel–Austin II.499, referring to Ophellias of Cyrene's wedding-feast some time before 309 B.C., the date of his death).

(b) When at 570 Demeas is confronted by an infuriated Nikeratos, he exclaims *μονομαχήσω τήμερον*, 'Today I'll have to fight a duel!' One-to-one gladiatorial contests may have become a topic of conversation in the city after Cassander *μονομαχίας ἀγῶνα* ἔθηκεν at royal funeral games in Macedonia during 316/5 B.C. (Dyillus 73 F 1 quoted by Athenaeus 4.155a), and in a play produced in the first ten to fifteen years of Menander's dramatic career it is not unlikely that Demeas' remark at Sam. 578 was inspired a year or so later by news of that event<sup>4</sup>. In fact four further details in the play would chime in very well with a production date of 314 for the play.

<sup>1</sup> I ignore here both Demeas' reference at Sam. 606–608 to an otherwise unknown and undatable Androkles, and Nikeratos' reference at Sam. 504 to one Diomnestos in terms that represent him as an unsatisfactory son-in-law, most probably with reference to a recent Athenian scandal about which nothing is now known. A. Barigazzi, *RFIC* 98 (1970) 266, and C. Dedoussi in *Entr. Hardt* 16 (1970) 167 (cf. also Q. Cataudella, *Museum Criticum* 5–7 (1972) 149–54) have argued instead for identification of this Diomnestos with an Eretrian who is said to have come into possession of a Persian general's treasury in 490 B.C., before his family lost it through no moral fault of their own (so Heraclides of Ponticus fr. 58 Wehrli, in Athenaeus 12.536f–537b), but the person named by Nikeratos had clearly become a proverbial example of vicious behaviour, not of misfortune.

<sup>2</sup> See especially my commentary on Alexis fr. 213.1 Kassel–Austin (Cambridge 1996) p. 610, for a full discussion with bibliography.

<sup>3</sup> The date of Menander's *Orge* has long been disputed, but 322/1 B.C. seems most likely: see now St. Schröder's fine and convincing discussion in *ZPE* 113 (1996) 36–38.

<sup>4</sup> Admittedly duels (along with the use of *μονομαχῶ* and its congeners) were a feature of Greek history, myth and literature from Homer onwards (e.g. *Iliad* 3.264–372 Menelaus and Paris, 23.801–25 Ajax and Diomedes at funeral games, *Hdt.* 7.104, 9.26, *Eur. Phoen.* 1220, 1300, 1325 Eteocles and Polynices, cf. A. Septem 798), and it is possible (but, I believe, less likely) that *μονομαχήσω* at Sam. 578 was merely a comic echo of that tradition, without any contemporary historical link. Cf. here K. Meuli, *Der griechische Agon* (Cologne 1968) 39–50, and K.-D. Blume, *Menanders »Samia«* (Darmstadt 1974) 229–30.

(c) One of these is Menander's choice of nationality for the play's titular heroine. Chrysis was a native of Samos who was working in Athens as a hetaira and had fallen on hard times (21, 25, 392–97) when the elderly Athenian Demeas fell in love with her and took her into his house as his partner. In 319 B.C. the Athenian cleruchs returned to Samos after a three-year absence and expelled the native Samians who had returned there three years before. If Menander conceived of Chrysis as a young woman who came to Athens as a refugee directly after that expulsion, the period of four or five years before the suggested date of this play would realistically have covered a year or so for Chrysis in her impoverished state to embark on a career as a hetaira, after which would have come her meeting with Demeas, her decision to become his partner, and cohabitation long enough for her to become pregnant and bear a child that she lost but consequently was left with milk enough to suckle Moschion's baby<sup>5</sup>.

(d) In act V a disgruntled Moschion thinks of travelling to Bactria or Caria<sup>6</sup> as a mercenary soldier (628–29). Bactria was being developed and Hellenised from the 320's until well after Menander's death, and needed Greek mercenaries throughout this period to supervise these developments and to control an unruly native populace. During the same period military activity in and around Caria was virtually continuous, but it may be relevant to note that in 314 B.C. news would have just reached Athens about the despatch of 13000 mercenaries by Ptolemy son of Lagus to Cyprus and Caria in the previous year (Diod. Sic. 19.62)<sup>7</sup>.

(e) The fifth detail is provided by Demeas' chauvinistic praise of Athens in vv. 101–104, which contain a carefully worded implication (v. 102) that all is not well with life in the city. In 314 B.C. Demetrius of Phalerum was Athens' despotic ruler, and although Menander is said to have been his personal friend<sup>8</sup>, Demetrius' regime was unpopular with the vast majority of Athenians<sup>9</sup>, and so the vague reference here to the city's troubles could well have been a studied attempt by Menander to kowtow to his audience's feelings without going out of his way to annoy a friend.

(f) Finally, Moschion's remark in the prologue τῷ χορηγεῖν διέφερον (v. 13) would have had a topically nostalgic resonance in 314, since during Demetrius' regime, and most probably in the year 316–15, the χορηγία at Athens had been abolished and replaced by state-funding under the control of an elected ἀγωνοθέτης<sup>10</sup>.

## 2. Passages of Text

### 5–6

Lines 4 to 16 of the first page in the Bodmer codex (B) have sustained a near vertical tear which has removed the first 7 letters of v. 4, the first 6 letters of vv. 9, 11 and 14, the first 5 of v. 8 and the first 4 of v. 15. Confident supplementation is often impossible, but plausible suggestions need to satisfy the

<sup>5</sup> The papers by F. H. Sandbach, LCM 11 (1986) 158–60 and S. R. West, ZPE 88 (1991) 11–16 should by now have effectively settled the long dispute about whether Chrysis had become pregnant by Demeas before he set out for the Black Sea, and then lost the baby during his absence; see also n. 15.

<sup>6</sup> The main reason why Menander mentioned these two areas was obviously because they were associated with campaigns and Greek mercenaries, but his choice may also have been influenced, as Mr L. Scott, a Leeds research student, suggested to me, by the fact that they perhaps represented to Greeks towards the end of the fourth century B.C. the eastern and western limits of Hellenised Asia.

<sup>7</sup> See G. T. Griffith, *The Mercenaries of the Hellenistic World* (Cambridge 1935) 109, and A. Mastrocinque, *La Caria e la Ionia meridionale in epoca ellenistica* (Rome 1979) 15–51.

<sup>8</sup> See volume I of my *Loeb Menander*, pp. xvii–xviii.

<sup>9</sup> See W. S. Ferguson, *Hellenistic Athens* (London 1911) 61–62.

<sup>10</sup> See A. Pickard-Cambridge, *The Dramatic Festivals of Athens* (2nd edition, revised by J. Gould and D. M. Lewis, Oxford 1968) 91–93. The dating of this reform is disputed. Section CXIV = line 116 of the *Marmor Parium* (FGrH 239 B.13 = IG 12(5).444) gives 317/6 B.C., but W. S. Ferguson's arguments for 316/5 in *Klio* 11 (1911) 265–76 are convincing; cf. K. Bayer, *Demetrius Phalereus der Athener* (Stuttgart & Berlin 1942) 48–51, S. Dow and A. H. Travis, *Hesperia* 12 (1943) 144–65.

three criteria of matching the available space, providing contextually appropriate sense, and conforming wherever possible to known Menandrian language and style. In vv. 5–6 Moschion seems to be saying that he thinks it a good idea to clarify the situation for the audience by saying something about Demeas' personality, and B's otherwise faultless text may accordingly be supplemented as follows:

5 φανερόν] δὲ τοῦτ' ἄν εὐλόγως ὑμῖν ποεῖν  
θέλωμι] τὸν ἐκείνου διεξελθὼν τρόπον.

(i) Here φανερόν was suggested by A. Barigazzi (RFIC 97, 1970, 151) and J. C. Kamerbeek (Mnemosyne 25, 1972, 379) without their noting that the phrase φανερόν ποιεῖν was a favourite Attic expression in the fourth century, with φανερόν (-άν) either an objective predicate, as here (cf. Pl. Legg. 1.630b ποῖ δὴ τελευτᾶ νῦν ἡμῖν οὗτος ὁ λόγος, καὶ τί φανερόν ποιῆσαι βουλευθεὶς λέγει ταῦτα;, Isocr. 17.24 φανεράν ὑμῖν ποιήσιν τὴν τούτου πονηρίαν, Men. Epitr. 494–95 τοῦτο πρὸς τὸν δεσπότην / φανερόν ποιήσεις), or introducing a clause with ὅτι or ὡς (nine times in Isocr.: 4.91, 5.12, 8.66, 9.21, 15.3 and 260, 16.19, 17.2 and Epist. 8.10).

(ii) θέλωμι is my own suggestion, and although I can provide no parallel for θέλωμι ἄν + infinitive in Menander, it is a common locution of tragedy (A. Suppl. 787–88, Agam. 318–19, S. Aj. 525–26, Eur. Med. 250–51, Hcl. 678–79, Hipp. 1016–17, I.T. 1009, Ion 625–26, 834–35 φαῦλον χρηστὸν ἄν λαβεῖν φίλον / θέλωμι μᾶλλον ἢ κακὸν σοφώτερον with the position of ἄν, infinitive and θέλωμι corresponding exactly to that proposed here in Menander, Eur. frs. 714.2 and 814 Nauck<sup>2</sup>; cf. Satyrus 38.III.14–18).

10–13

Moschion is now discussing his own upbringing, and logically the most effective text seems to be:

10 εἶτ' ἐν]εγράφην, οὐδὲν διαφέρων οὐδενός,  
τὸ λεγόμενον δὴ τοῦτο, τῶν πολλῶν τις ὄν·  
ὃς γέγον]α μέντοι, νῆ Δί', ἀθλιώτερος·  
παχεῖς] γὰρ ἔσμεν.

10 Suppl. several. 11 Suppl. Jacques, Lloyd-Jones. δὴ Austin: δε B. 12 Suppl. Arnott (γέγον]α Austin, Sandbach). 13 Suppl. Arnott.

Lines 10–11 have been much discussed<sup>11</sup>, and the safest assumption is that here Menander wishes to seize his audience's attention by making Moschion deliver a series of paradoxes which will puzzle and surprise, although possessing a logic which at this stage is clear only to the speaker<sup>12</sup>: viz. he grew up in luxurious surroundings (vv. 7–9), but was then registered in the deme just like every citizen of Athens, and has now become even more wretched because he belongs to a wealthy family. The wretchedness is presumably the result of his rape or seduction of Plangon, and his fear of telling Demeas on Demeas' return from abroad about the consequences. Being a member of a wealthy family makes the problem worse for a young man in Moschion's position, since he would have expected Demeas to plan for him a

<sup>11</sup> See especially C. Austin (ZPE 4, 1969, 165 and Menandri Aspis et Samia, Berlin 1970, II.49–50), J. C. Kamerbeek, Mnemosyne 27 (1972) 380, W. Luppe, ZPE 9 (1972) 199 and 20 (1976) 295–96, R. Merkelbach, ZPE 10 (1973) 21, F. H. Sandbach (in the Gomme–Sandbach commentary, Oxford 1973, 545–46), F. Sisti in his edition of the play (Rome 1974) p. 115, and M. de Kat Eliassen, Symb. Osl. 50 (1975) 61–65.

<sup>12</sup> On such features in the openings of comedies see especially my paper in Drama 2 (1992) 14–32.

marriage with the daughter of an equally wealthy family, not with a girl like Plangon whose father was much poorer than Demeas<sup>13</sup>.

(i) In v. 12 γέγον]α is the appropriate supplement, but it does not fill the space on its own, while νὺν γέγον]α (cf. Austin in his edition) would occupy too much space. ὃς γέγον]α fits the gap perfectly, introducing an idiom (with the relative pronoun here becoming a connective equivalent to “and I”) favoured elsewhere by Menander: Dysk. 163–64, Pk. 1018 (1st person, as here), Georg. fr. 4.2 (2nd person), Dysk. 868, Sam. 413–16 (3rd person).

That μέντοι here is affirmative (“really”, “you know”): see Sandbach on Epitr. 510, Denniston, Greek Particles<sup>2</sup>, Oxford 1954, 399–402) is confirmed by its linkage with the oath νῆ Δί’; cf. e.g. Ar. Pax 1290, Av. 1651, Eccl. 1130.

(ii) Sandbach writes on v. 13 in the commentary “A word to mean ‘rich’ suggests itself as a supplement, but nothing convincing has been found” (p. 546; cf. Austin, ZPE 4, 1967, 165 and his edition II.20). παχεῖς in fact fits the space perfectly, and its use in the sense of “wealthy” may have originated in Ionic Greek (Hdt. 5.30.1, 77.2, 6.91.1, 7.156.2), and become colloquial or slang in Attic (Ar. Vesp. 288 with Σ<sup>v</sup> ἀντὶ τοῦ πλούσιος, Pax 639 τοὺς παχεῖς καὶ πλουσίους, possibly also Equ. 1139, but not Men. Sam. 98<sup>14</sup>; cf. also Photius and the Suda σ 830 s.v. παχεῖς, Ἀττικοὶ τοὺς πλουσίους καλοῦσι συνήθως, and Hesychius s.v. πάχητες).

27–28

27 τοῦτο (δὲ) ποῆσαι δι’ ἔμ’ ἴσως αἰσχύνεται  
28 λέγω λαβεῖν ταύτην· τὸ μὲν . . [ . ] . . π . [

27 τουτοποησαι B: corr. Arnott, Sandbach. 28 Suppl. Arnott.

It is surprising that hitherto the obvious supplement at 28 has not been suggested: ‘I tell him to take her’, with λαβεῖν colloquial shorthand here presumably for ἀναλαβεῖν (sc. to take into one’s house as a mistress: see my commentary on Alexis fr. 103.4). For λέγω used thus, without object expressed, LSJ (s.v., II.5) cite correctly S. O.C. 856 μὴ ψάθειν λέγω, less securely A. Agam. 925 (λέγω κατ’ ἄνδρα, μὴ θεόν, σέβειν ἐμέ, a line deleted by Wilamowitz for non-grammatical reasons: see Fraenkel’s commentary ad loc.); cf. also Xen. Anab. 7.6.14 πάντες μὲν ἐλέγετε σὺν Σεύθῃ ἰέναι, Pl. Theaet. 209d.

51–53

51 ἀλλὰ πρότερος ἐνέτυχον  
τῆ] μητρὶ τῆς κόρης· ὑπεσχόμην γαμεῖν  
53 καὶ ν]ῦν, ἐπὰν ἔλθῃ ποθ’ ὁ πατήρ· ὤμοσα.

51 Suppl. ed.pr. 53 καὶ (or κἄν) suppl. Handley, ν]ῦν ed. pr.

Although from vv. 36–55 only the first two to four letters are missing from each line in B, supplementation is occasionally still uncertain (39, 53). After prudishly confessing to his rape or seduction of Plangon (47–49), in vv. 51–53 Moschion claims to have met the girl’s mother, promised to marry her when Demeas returned, and confirmed that promise with an oath. At the beginning of 53

<sup>13</sup> See especially Wilamowitz, SB Berlin (1916) 68 and n. 2 = Kleine Schriften, I (Berlin 1935) 417 and n. 4, and E. Keuls, ZPE 10 (1973) 9 and n. 27.

<sup>14</sup> For obvious reasons the terms ‘fat’ and ‘rich’ are often interchangeable (cf. the modern application of the slang term ‘fat cat’ in English to a wealthy business executive). At Ar. Equ. 1139 the primary meaning is clearly ‘fat’, but an overtone of ‘rich’ may also be present (see R. A. Neil in his commentary, Cambridge 1903, ad loc.). On the παχεῖς γέροντες of Men. Sam. 98 see my discussion of this passage (96–111, ii.2) below. Cf. also J. Taillardat, Les images d’Aristophane (Paris 1962) pp. 264, 314.

three or four letters are lost, then ]υν is clear. Since a promise backed by an oath cannot be conditional, the supplement printed by Kasser and Austin in the ed. pr. of *Samia* (ὄν νῦ]ν, followed by ἐπανεῖλθη, compounded with a need to assume scribal omission of a syllable between πατήρ and ὄμοσα) is unacceptable. The simplest solution may be (with Handley, BICS 16, 1969, 104) to supply καὶ before ν]όν and (with several scholars) divide ἐπὸν ἔλθη, translating ‘I promised to marry (her daughter) now actually, as soon as ever my father arrives’. For this use of καὶ νῦν in Menander see Epitr. 316, Pk. 318, 1018 (Ἐπολλων, ὃς καὶ νῦν ἀπόλωλα πα[ρ’ ὀλίγον]), fr. 674 K.–Th. = 445 K.–A., and compare the use of κᾶν νῦν in Mis. 28 Arnott = A28 Sandbach; cf. also Denniston, *Greek Particles*<sup>2</sup> 316–21.

55–57

55 ἀπὸ] ταῦτομάτου δὲ συμβέβηκε καὶ μάλα  
εὐκαιο]ν ἡ Χρυσίς — καλοῦμεν τοῦτο γάρ  
57 [αὐτήν — ] . . . ονονεου πάλαι

55 Suppl. apogr., ed. pr. 56–57 Suppl. Sandbach (*Oxford Text of Menander*, 2nd edition 1990, p. 345: εἰς καιρό]ν previously Barigazzi, RFIC 98, 1970, 155–56, Blume, *Menanders »Samia«*, Darmstadt 1974, 15 n. 28). 57 ου B with ε written above ο.

After Moschion has announced the recent birth of Plangon’s baby and its installation in Moschion’s house, he describes a chance event that apparently involved Chrysis but is difficult to interpret with full confidence: the first five or six letters of 56 are lost, much of 57 has been cut off apart from its last eight letters and a few indistinct traces of a few letters that came before, and after 57 a total lacuna follows removing the end of Moschion’s prologue monologue. When in 1970 I suggested (*Gnomon* 42, p. 18; so also Austin in his Berlin edition, II.53) that the beginning of 56 might have originally run ὄστ’ ἔ(τε)κε]ν ἡ Χρυσίς, the supplement was based on an assumption that Chrysis herself must have borne a child at about the same time as Plangon, for otherwise Chrysis would not have been able to feed Plangon’s baby with milk from her own breast, as described by Demeas at 265–66 (cf. 77–79). That assumption must be correct, as papers by Sandbach (*LCM* 11, 1986, 158–60, with reference to earlier discussions) and Stephanie West (*ZPE* 88, 1991, 11–15, in response to C. Dedoussi, *LCM* 13, 1988, 1–3) have convincingly argued<sup>15</sup>. Yet any supplement based on this assumption now seems unlikely, partly because it requires a postulate of scribal error in the lost opening of 56, and partly because it leaves nothing for καὶ μάλα at the end of 55 to qualify. The most promising suggestion for the beginning of 56 to date is Sandbach’s εὐκαιο]ν, synonymous with but preferable to εἰς καιρό]ν, advanced independently by Barigazzi and Blume; μάλα very commonly qualifies adjectives in εὖ-, less commonly perhaps qualifies prepositional phrases<sup>16</sup>. But what then of the following ἡ Χρυσίς? Blume interpreted this as the subject of εἴληφ’ in 54, with 55 and the beginning of 56 taken as an interrupting parenthesis. This appears unnatural, and it is preferable (with Barigazzi and in 1990 Sandbach) to take ἡ Χρυσίς in 56 as the beginning of a new clause, itself briefly interrupted by καλοῦμεν τοῦτο γάρ (with or without αὐτήν at the beginning of the next verse: ‘for that’s what we call her’, thus introducing her name for the first time; cf. especially for the idiom a fragment of Callimachus’ *Hecale*, 342 Pfeiffer = 81 Hollis: τοῦτο γὰρ αὐτήν / κωμῆται κάλειον περιηγέες), and followed by a statement in 57 to the effect that Chrysis herself had borne a child at about the same time as Plangon, but that it had died, been stillborn or even perhaps exposed.

<sup>15</sup> The suggestion that Demeas might have misinterpreted what his eyes saw, and that Chrysis could have offered a milkless breast to the baby, is well refuted by S. R. West, who writes (loc. cit. in n. 5) “a breast-fed baby would be enraged, not placated, at the offer of a breast from which no milk was forthcoming”. As a grandparent to new-born twins, I totally endorse that remark. Cf. now also M. Krieter-Spiro, Sklaven, Köche und Hetären (Stuttgart & Leipzig 1997) 51–52. In his edition of the *Samia* Jacques (p. xlii n. 3) aptly compares the situation in *Epitrepontes*, where Syros’ wife undertook the rearing of a foundling after the death of her own baby (vv. 267–69 Sandbach).

<sup>16</sup> Cf. H. Thesleff, *Studies on Intensification in Early and Classical Greek* (Helsinki 1954) 33–34, 41.

59

The traces in B do not oppose Jacques' supplement ἐ[νθά]δ' (*pace* Austin, Berlin edition II.54); in v. 61 the ε of λέγουσ' similarly descends notably below the line.

60

At verse end the alternatives are ἀ[κούσομαι] (Barigazzi, RFIC 98, 1970, 155–56; Sandbach in the apparatus of Austin's Berlin edition) and ἀ[κροόσομαι] (Sandbach *ibid.*). Most editors adopt the latter, but elsewhere in Menander ἀκούσομαι is normal (Epitr. 238, Mis. 283 Sandbach = 684 Arnott, Sam. 521, probably Phasm. 91, fr. 38 K.–Th. = 42 K.–A. translated by Ter. Andr. 592) and should be printed here (cf. the editions of Sbordone and Sisti).

67–69

## ΜΟΣΧΙΩΝ

67 αἰσχύνομαι τὸν πατέρα.

## ΠΑΡΜΕΝΩΝ

τὴν δὲ παρθένον

ἣν ἠδίκηκας τὴν τε ταύτης μητέρα

69 ὅπως τρέμεις, ἀνδρόγυνε.

So B, with ὅπως unaccented in 69. The one word here that gives pause is ὅπως, which is never followed by a present indicative in the sense “(see to it) that”. Attempts to restore appropriate sense are numerous but unsatisfactory. Keeping ὅπως, Sandbach (in the Gomme–Sandbach commentary *ad loc.*; cf. Austin's edition, II.54) suggested aposiopesis, with the clause after ὅπως suppressed and replaced by a questioning τρέμεις, ἀνδρόγυνε; I formerly (Gnomon 42, 1970, 18) unconvincingly cited apparent parallels in post-classical constructions. Conjectures in place of ὅπως include Austin's οἴμ' ὡς (in his edition, citing Naber's conjecture at Philemon 2.1, which is relegated to the apparatus in the Kassel–Austin edition; cf. Austin II.54 and the Gomme–Sandbach commentary), Dedoussi's ὅμως (ZPE 99, 1993, 19, comparing Sam. 387–88), and Gronewald's τὴν δὲ παρθένον / ἣν ἠδίκηκας τὴν τε ταύτης μητέρα / οὐ; πῶς τρέμεις, ἀνδρόγυνε (ZPE 117, 1997, 19–20). It is surprising that one suggestion that restores both sense and syntax has not so far been advanced: πῶς οὐ τρέμεις, ἀνδρόγυνε; For the idiom (with πῶς οὐ = “why not” with the implication that “you ought rather to”) see Barrett's edition of Euripides' Hippolytus, commentary on vv. 1060–61, 1290–93; for the use of the vocative ἀνδρόγυνε in the sense of ‘wimp’ cf. [Plut.] Mor. 219f “ἀνδρόγυνε”, εἶπε, “τί δ' ἂν πάθοιμεν δεινὸν θανάτου καταφρονήσαντες;”; and for the textual error (an example of common verbal displacement) see e.g. Pl. Resp. 9.579c, where most manuscripts read ὡς μὴ but Θ and Stob. Flor. 4.8.34 give μὴ ὡς, and cf. Eur. Med. 1134 (δ' ὅπως AVB, δὲ πῶς LP) and Pl. Resp. 10.616a ὅτε εἰς some manuscripts, εἰς ὅ τι A).

71–75

71 βούλομ' εἶναι τοὺς γάμους  
ἥδη, πεπαῦσθαι τουτονὶ πρὸς ταῖς θύραις  
κλάοντα ταύταις, μηδ' ἐκεῖν' ἀμνημονεῖν  
ᾧν ὤμοσεν — θύειν, στεφανοῦσθαι, σησαμῆν  
75 κόπτειν — παρελθὼν αὐτός.

72 πεπαυσθαίτε B: corr. Austin. 74–75 Punctuation by Kamerbeek (Mnemosyne 25, 1972, 381–82) and Lowe (BICS 20, 1973, 96–97): παρελθὼν· αὐτός B. 75 σησαμην B with grave accent over the μ.

Parmenon's comments here have been much discussed, with the dominant subjects of controversy being the text and punctuation of vv. 74–75, where the interpretations of Kamerbeek and Lowe now seem totally convincing. These make θύειν, στεφανοῦσθαι, σησαμῆν κόπτειν the three components of the



oath that Moschion swore when he personally entered Nikeratos' house and promised to Nikeratos' wife that he would marry Plangon (cf. vv. 51–52). The infinitives in 74–75 name three actions in an Athenian wedding ceremony, probably listed in the order of their occurrence<sup>17</sup>.

θύειν must refer to the sacrifice conducted by the bridegroom himself (also Sam. 123, cf. 190) at a ceremony directly before his wedding, variously called the προτέλεια or προγάμια (Pollux 3.38, cf. Men. Sam. 713; Erdmann 251, Garland 219). At such a sacrifice the bridegroom would obviously be garlanded, but it seems more likely that στεφανοῦσθαι in v. 74 denotes a bridegroom's preparation for escorting (cf. Sam. 732–33!) or driving his bride to her new home; vase paintings of this part of the ceremony appear to highlight the garlands (Blech 75–81; Oakley and Sinos 11, 16); cf. also Sam. 190.

In that case σησαμῆν κόπτειν will follow the sacrifice and the drive to the bridegroom's house. Here the Gomme–Sandbach commentary (ad loc.) wrongly interprets the phrase as a reference to the chopping and pounding of sesame seeds in preparation of the wedding cake, made from roasted sesame seeds and honey (Steier; Oakley and Sinos 23); that preparation, however, would presumably have come at a much earlier stage in the ceremony, and there is no evidence that it involved the bridegroom personally. σησαμῆν κόπτειν here indicates rather that the bridegroom took part in cutting up the finished cake into pieces for distribution to the wedding guests (also Sam. 124–25, cf. 190), probably in the bridegroom's house. Thus in 74 σησαμῆν must be printed (pace Dedoussi, ZPE 99, 1993, 19); it (cf. Ar. Pax 869) and σησαμοῦν (Ar. Ach. 1092, Thesm. 570, Σ Ar. Equ. 277, etc.) are the forms in normal use for this cake.

77–79

77 : εγω μεν οιμαι : το δε παιδιον εχειν  
 ουτως εωμεν ος εχει ταυτην τρέφειν  
 αυτην τε φάσκει τετοκέναι :

B's text, printed above, is clearly corrupt; scansion demands οἴ(ο)μαι in place of οἰμαι, and sense demands not φάσκει but φάσκειν (so first the Photiades apograph: for this error cf. e.g. Aeschylus fr. 99 Radt, vv. 17, 19), but the identity of the speakers in 77–79 and the text at the end of 77 are still problematic. ἐγὼ μὲν οἴομαι is usually assigned to Chrysis rather than Parmenon, and the next two lines to either Parmenon or Moschion. εχειν was deleted by Austin, presumably as a scribal aberration influenced by the presence of ἔχει in the middle and τρέφειν at the end of the following line. Jacques' deletion of δε has won general support, because

(i) B contains many examples of intrusive δε elsewhere (the Gomme–Sandbach commentary ad loc. cites Dysk. 187, 242, 678 (probably), 729, Sam. 22, 356; Austin II.55 notes Dysk. 846, where B has το δε χωριον similarly at line end);

(ii) οἴομαι/οἴμαι with μέν solitarium (in the sense 'I think so': see also below) is an established idiom (e.g. Eur. Alc. 794, I.A. 392, Andocides 1.22; P. T. Stevens, Colloquial Expressions in Euripides, Hermes Einzelschrift 38, Wiesbaden 1976, pp. 23–24);

and (iii) τὸ δὲ παιδίον at line end introduces a split anapaest in the first half of the third metron with only one parallel (Eptr. 299) so far in Menander.

There are, however, two other ways of tackling vv. 77–79 which deserve consideration. The first is to assign all the passage cited above to one speaker (Parmenon), interpreting the dicolon before το as a change of direction, not of speaker. Secondly, the μέν in ἐγὼ μὲν οἴομαι ("I think so": cf. LSJ s.v.

<sup>17</sup> On the points discussed here see especially Steier in RE s.v. Sesamon (1923), 1849–53, W. Erdmann, Die Ehe im alten Griechenland (Munich 1934) 250–66, A. Brelich, Paides e Parthenoi (Rome 1969) I.288–89, G. Berthiaume, Les rôles du mágeiros (Leiden 1982) 32–37, M. Blech, Studien zum Kranz bei den Griechen (Berlin and New York 1982) 75–81, R. Garland, The Greek Way of Life (London) 217–25, J. Oakley and R. Sinos, The Wedding in Ancient Athens (Madison Wisc. and London 1993) 11–13, 16, 22–37, A. M. Belardinelli's edition of Men. Sik. (Bari 1994), commentary on 418–19, and my paper in ZPE 118 (1997) 99–101.

οἴομαι, V; in comedy elsewhere without μέν: Ar. Ach. 919, Pax 863, Thesm. 27, Ran. 491, Men. Dysk. 730, Epitr. 367, Apollodorus Car. fr. 5.9, fr. adesp. 1017.40) might alternatively lead us to expect the clause that follows to contain a balancing δέ, which B might here have misplaced in a corruption of a type common in the manuscripts of later comedy, where scribes move a postponed δέ back to its normal prose position (cf. my commentary on Alexis fr. 4.1). Could Menander have written τὸ παιδίον / δ'18 οὕτως ἐῶμεν? Elision of δέ at line end/beginning is found in Sophocles (Ant. 1031–32, O.R. 29–30, 785–86, 791–92, 1224–25, El. 1017–18, O.C. 17–18), possibly Euripides (ms. L at I.T. 961–62), certainly pre-Menandrian comedy (Ar. Av. 1716–17, Ran. 298–99, Eccl. 351–52, Dionysius 2.33–34), and there seems no reason to exclude it from Menander<sup>19</sup>.

96

Little attention has been paid to Barigazzi's repeated claim (RFIC 98, 1970, 159–60, 331; 100, 1972, 341) that Kasser and Austin's supplement οὐ]κουv in their ed. pr. is too long for the space<sup>20</sup>. The slight traces of the letter before ουv are not necessarily those of κ; they could equally well suit a descender of ρ crossed by the acute accent of ὄσων in the line below. Could Menander accordingly have written ᾠ]ρ' οὐv? This collocation of particles is common in fourth-century Attic (Denniston, Greek Particles<sup>2</sup> 50: e.g. Pl. Resp. 8.545a, Dem. 18.140, 282), and occurs elsewhere in Menander (Kith. 66) as well as in the (possibly comic) fr. adesp. 1026.14 Kassel–Austin.

96–111

(i) Sandbach's suggestion (Entr. Hardt 16, 1970, 121) that vv. 98–101 (up to ἀγάθ') should be assigned to Nikeratos because he is 'a man of short sentences, often in asyndeton' and these lines are 'in Nikeratos' style, not that of Demeas' has won considerable support, mainly in the English-speaking world<sup>21</sup>. It may be time to restate the evidence and weigh the arguments against this suggestion.

(1) The Bodmer papyrus assigns 96–105 all to one speaker; there are no dicola before the end of 105, and the presence of νικηρ'(ατος) in the left-hand margin of 106 would normally be taken as an indication that Nikeratos' first speech in the scene began there. Nevertheless, it must be admitted that the papyrus is not flawless in its speech divisions and assignments<sup>22</sup>.

(2) As Sandbach himself admits, the oath ἼΑπολλων in v. 100 is nowhere else used by Nikeratos, while Demeas commonly invokes Apollo in this play (ἼΑπολλων 444, 567, 570; μὰ τὸν ἸΑπόλλω 455, 596). Could the favoured use of this oath have indeed been intended by Menander as a linguistic element in Demeas' characterisation<sup>23</sup>?

<sup>18</sup> This may be preferable to τὸ παιδίον δ' / οὕτως ἐῶμεν: cf. N. Dunbar on Ar. Av. 1717, following the lead of R. Dawe in his edition of Sophocles (Leipzig, I<sup>1</sup> and II 1975, I<sup>2</sup> 1984).

<sup>19</sup> See e.g. Jebb's commentary on Soph. O.T. 29, J. Descroix, *Le trimètre iambique* (Macon 1931) 292–94, Handley's commentary on Men. Dysk. 437ff., P. Maas, *Greek Metre* (tr. Lloyd-Jones, Oxford 1962) 87–88, and M. L. West, *Greek Metre* (Oxford 1982) 83–84.

<sup>20</sup> Barigazzi's claim is justified, although the left margin of B on this folio moves slightly to the right as the lines descend.

<sup>21</sup> For instance in the editions of G. Paduano (Milan 1980) and D. M. Bain (Warminster 1983); cf. E. G. Turner, Entr. Hardt 16 (1970) 138, S. M. Goldberg, *The Making of Menander's Comedy* (London 1980) 95, K. B. Frost, *Exits and Entrances in Menander* (Oxford 1988) 104, N. Zagagi, *The Comedy of Menander* (London 1994) 95. Doubts are expressed by A. Blanchard, *Essai sur la composition des comédies de Ménandre* (Paris 1983) 133 n. 34, and H.-D. Blume (op. cit. in n. 4) 46 n. 90; cf. C. Collard, LCM 14 (1989) 101–102. The editions of F. Sisti (Rome 1974) and K. Offermann (Stuttgart 1980) give vv. 96–105 all to Demeas.

<sup>22</sup> Cf. Handley's edition of Men. Dysk. (London 1965) pp. 44–49, and my comments in *Gnomon* 42 (1970) 15. F. Stoessl's discussion of dicola and paragraphi in the Bodmer papyrus of *Samia* is still useful although over-dogmatic (*Anzeiger, Wiener Akademie, Phil.-Hist. Klasse*, 106, 1969, 349–67).

<sup>23</sup> Cf. M. H. de Kat Eliassen, *Symb. Osl.* 50 (1975) 55–56. On linguistic elements in Menander's individualisation of his characters the key paper is F. H. Sandbach, Entr. Hardt 16 (1970) 111–36; cf. also my discussion in F. De Martino and A. H. Sommerstein (edd.), *Lo spettacolo delle voci* (Bari 1995) 2.147–64 with additional material and bibliographical updating.

(3) At times Demeas too expresses himself in short sentences with asyndeton: e.g. 324–27, 380–83, 454–56, 547–50, 552–56, 563–67.

(4) The pithy comments on Πόντος (see below) and Byzantium in vv. 98–101 have a style, wit and point that in this play are associated mostly with Demeas: cf. e.g. 336–37 (Chrysis as Helen), 555–56, 570–71 (μονομαχίῳ, however it is interpreted<sup>24</sup>), 588–96 (Zeus, Danae, leaking roof), 603–604 and 606–608 (Chaerephon, Androcles). By comparison Nikeratos' phrasing and imagination seem generally far more pedestrian (e.g. 495–97, 498–500, 503–505), although even he has one moment of imaginative grandeur when he accuses Moschion of outdoing Tereus, Oedipus and Thyestes with his sexual misdemeanours (495–97).

(5) Sandbach's claim that the words ταῦτα δὲ / καθαρὰ πενήτων ἀγαθὰ suit the relatively poor Nikeratos better than the wealthy Demeas has been effectively refuted by R. Kassel (ZPE 114, 1996, 58), demonstrating that πενήτων ἀγαθὰ is a proverbial expression that need have no reference to its user's possession or lack of wealth.

The case I have presented is at one point (i.4) based on subjective interpretations and cannot be considered conclusive, but it may perhaps help those adherents of Sandbach who, like me, admire his outstanding scholarship elsewhere – in his Entr. Hardt paper, his text of Menander and the Gomme–Sandbach commentary, for instance – to pause here a little before they leap.

(ii) The descriptions of Πόντος and Βυζάντιον vv. 98–100, 106–109 and 417 have given rise to discussions<sup>25</sup> which at times are simultaneously well-informed and unfocussed. The following points need to be made.

(1) If Menander here is accurately recording information available to him, Πόντος in v. 98 will best be interpreted as the Black Sea itself (and especially its western and north-western seaboard, which Strabo 7.7.1 identifies as τὴν παραλίαν τὰ Ἀριστερὰ τοῦ Πόντου λεγομένην, ἀπὸ Ἰστρου ποταμοῦ μέχρι Βυζαντίου), not the territory called Pontus on the Sea's southern shore<sup>26</sup>. The key here is the reference in vv. 106–109 to long-lasting mist or thick cloud there that blotted out the sun. Ancient writers other than Menander attributed this climatic feature to the territory of the Scythians west and north of the Black Sea (e.g. Hippocr. Aër. 19 ἡὴρ τε κατέχει πολὺς τῆς ἡμέρης τὰ πεδία, with the inhabitants τὸν . . . ἡέρα ὑδατειὸν ἔλκοντες καὶ παχύν: cited by Blume (op. cit. in n. 4) 49; Greg. Naz. Epist. 4.4 τὸν ποθούμενον ἥλιον, ὃν ὡς διὰ κάπνης ἀγάζεσθε, ὦ Ποντικοὶ Κιμμέριοι: cited by Sandbach in the Gomme–Sandbach commentary p. 556; cf. also e.g. H. Od. 11.15–18, V. Georg. 3.357–59). The accuracy of these remarks has been confirmed by modern climatologists particularly for the area around Odessa, which is still bedevilled by week-long fogs<sup>27</sup>. No parallel feature has been singled out for the southern coastal belt of the Black Sea, although severe winters, storms and heavy rainfall are recorded there<sup>28</sup>.

<sup>24</sup> See above, on the play's dating (p. 35–36).

<sup>25</sup> E.g. Austin's edition II.56–57, the Gomme–Sandbach commentary pp. 554–56 and 592 (on Sam. 96–110 and 417 respectively), Blume (op. cit. in n. 4) 38–46, 49–51, Collard (op. cit. in n. 21) 101–102. Cf. also the introduction to the Ποντικός title in my commentary on Alexis (p. 573).

<sup>26</sup> The Gomme–Sandbach commentary on Sam. 417 makes two incorrect claims in support of the identification of Menander's Πόντος as the region to the south of the Black Sea. One is that the use of πόντος in the sense of 'sea' is poetic. This ignores the fact that Πόντος was regularly used from the fifth century B.C. onwards as a convenient abbreviation of Εὐξεινος Πόντος (18 times in Herodotus alone!). The other is that the identification in v. 417 of the Πόντος as a χωρίον can refer only to land on the south side of the Black Sea. This ignores the use of Πόντος as a convenient label for coastal land on any side of the Black Sea: e.g. in the references at Arist. G.A. 5.3, 782<sup>b</sup>33 to οἱ μὲν ἐν τῷ Πόντῳ Σκύθαι καὶ Θράκες, and H.A. 7(8).28, 696<sup>a</sup>20 to hornless rams ἐν τῷ Πόντῳ περὶ τὴν Σκυθικήν.

<sup>27</sup> See especially the excellent discussion by C. M. Danoff in RE Suppl. IX (1962) s.v. Pontos Euxeinus coll. 943–49.

<sup>28</sup> Cf. e.g. F. and E. Cumont, *Studia Pontica*, 2 (Brussels 1906) 118, 121, 213–14.

(2) With this identification of Πόντος, the *παχεῖς γέροντες* of v. 98 are likely to be Scythians, in view of the remark in the same passage of Hippocr. that τὰ εἶδεα αὐτῶν (sc. the Scythians) *παχέα ἐστὶ καὶ σαρκώδεα*; in that case Menander's *παχεῖς* at v. 98 will unambiguously mean 'fat'.

(3) Menander attributes ἀψίνθιον here to Byzantium, not to the Black Sea. The plant (wormwood, *Artemisia absinthium*: 'the most bitter herb except rue'<sup>29</sup>; e.g. Theophr. HP 1.12.1, 7.9.4–5) has been recorded during the twentieth century in the vicinity of Istanbul<sup>30</sup>. Its leaves have a toxin that is washed out by rain and then tends to affect neighbouring plants, and this fact, as well as the plant's presumed abundance in the area during Menander's time, may perhaps lie behind the comment *πικρὰ πάντ'* in v. 100<sup>31</sup>.

(4) Byzantium is presumably mentioned by the speaker because, on any voyage between Attica and the Black Sea, a merchant was obliged to stop off at Byzantium to pay his tolls before being allowed through the straits into the Black Sea (cf. Polybius 4.38)<sup>32</sup>.

University of Leeds

W. Geoffrey Arnott

<sup>29</sup> L. Bremness, *The Complete Book of Herbs* (London 1988) 50–51.

<sup>30</sup> See J. Cullen in P. H. Davis, *Flora of Turkey*, 5 (Edinburgh 1975) 318.

<sup>31</sup> See especially M. Schuster in RE VIII.A.2 (1958) s.v. Wermut, 1553–58. In the Gomme–Sandbach commentary (p. 555) Philostratus' remark (*Vit. Apollon.* 1.21), that in Babylonia the abundance of wormwood makes all the other wild plants ἀηδὴ καὶ πικρὰ, is appositely cited.

<sup>32</sup> Cf. Austin's edition II.56f., Blume (op. cit. in n. 4) 41 n. 74, and J. Hind in CAH VI<sup>2</sup> (1994) 500.