

W. GEOFFREY ARNOTT

SECOND NOTES ON MENANDER'S SAMIA (ACTS II–V)

aus: Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik 122 (1998) 7–20

© Dr. Rudolf Habelt GmbH, Bonn

SECOND NOTES ON MENANDER'S SAMIA (ACTS II–V)

These notes, like the paper recently published in *ZPE* 121 (1998) 35–44, 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 opening of Act II

The gap between lines 119 and 120 in B covers some 12 to 16 lines of text, together presumably with space for the XOPOY sign at the end of the first act. A few of these lines of text would be taken up with the completion of Demeas' speech that ended Act I, doubtless expressing the usual apprehension of the character on stage over the approach of a tipsy chorus¹, before he made an exit into his house. That would leave probably between 8 and 13 lines missing from the opening of the second act before the Bodmer codex resumes at 120. Their structure and contents are easily surmised from information given by the extant texts.

(1) Lines 121–28 in B contain the close of Moschion's monologue after he has returned from a brief excursion to a lonely spot (cf. 94), where he had originally planned to work out what he was going to say when he encountered Demeas. When Moschion returns here, Demeas is already on stage but not observed until 127–28 by Moschion, who then wonders whether Demeas has overheard him (ἀκήκο' ἄρα; punctuated as a question²). This implies that Act II began with Demeas entering from his house and delivering a monologue, perhaps expressing his indignation at having seen in his house Chrysis nursing a baby (cf. 130ff.).

(2) P. Oxyrhynchus 2943 (O.17 in Sandbach's edition) preserves the ends of 3 lines before 120 (] . 119b,] . α . 119c,]τα 119d), as well as of 120–25, where they provide useful supplementation of B's mutilated text. At the end of 122 O.17 appears to have μo(σχίτων) written in the right margin as identification of a new speaker, although this must be misplaced³; Moschion entered before this, for B's text shows that he was already speaking at 121.

It seems most likely that Demeas' monologue ends either at the end of 119d or the beginning of 120, followed directly by Moschion's first words. Since characters on stage often signal the entry of a

¹ Cf. Asp. 245–49, Dysk. 230–32, Epitr. 169–71, Pk. 261–66, and my commentary (Cambridge 1996) on Alexis fr. 112, pp. 300–301.

² So C. Austin's edition (Berlin and New York 1970) 2.59, and A. Barigazzi, *RFIC* 98 (1970) 331. Two points need to be made in favour of this punctuation. Postponed ἄρα is common as an interrogative particle; Sandbach's objection to it (in the Gomme–Sandbach commentary, ad loc.) as last word in its clause is hardly to be taken seriously when the clause consists of only two words. More important is the fact that there are parallels for placing the particle after the verb (e.g. Eur. *Held.* 640, Ar. *Ach.* 238) and for its presence as penultimate word in the sentence (e.g. Eur. *Hec.* 469, Ar. *Eccl.* 462). Secondly, ἀκήκο' ἄρα here can be punctuated as a question without ἄρα having to be interpreted as an interrogative particle; 'in drama, it is often difficult to determine whether the interrogative force resides in the particle (ἄρα) or is independent of it' (Denniston, *Greek Particles*², Oxford 1954, 48).

³ Cf. E. G. Turner, *Oxyrhynchus Papyri* XLI (1972) 2 (apparatus on his 119g).

new person with an announcement of his approach⁴, it is tempting to supplement 120d with προσέρχεται or ἔρχεται⁵ spoken by Demeas, and to assume that Moschion said, either right at, or near the beginning of, his entry monologue (121 ending, 122) [οὐδὲ] ἔν | ἐ]γὼ μελετήσας ὧν τό[τ' ἐνόουν ἔρ]χομαι⁶.

For the remainder of 121 B preserves a mutilated × – ◊] . . οντο εἰ καὶ δι . [– × – ◊ ◊. Plausible supplementation here has proved impossible, and it is uncertain whether this part of the line was spoken by Demeas or by Moschion. When characters enter by one of the parodoi, they more commonly begin speaking at the opening of a line (e.g. Dysk. 81, 153, 259, 393, 521, Epitr. 1062, Dysk. 96), but there are enough instances of mid-line interventions by such characters (e.g. Dysk. 206, 775, Epitr. 442, almost certainly Asp. 431) to make a decision here hazardous.

II. Details of Text in Act II

136

Many attempts have been made to supplement the missing five or so letters in this verse, now that the Bodmer papyrus and P. Oxy. 2943 combine to provide the rest:

136 νόθον; [. . . .]ν γ' οὐ τοῦ τρόπου τοῦμοῦ λέγεις.

For instance [λόγο]ν apogr., [λέγω]ν (with τοῦτ' οὐ τρόπου) Handley in CR 21 (1971) 354 and Oxyrhynchus Papyri XLI (London 1972) 3–4, [πόνου]ν Barigazzi, RFIC 100 (1972) 341, [μανία]ν Austin, CGFP 186; but none of these suggestions is wholly convincing. Here Demeas is responding, rather indignantly, to Moschion's protest (135) against Demeas' threat to expel Chrysis and the baby from his house. With a change of one letter in the paradosis acceptable sense and idiom can perhaps be restored:

νόθον; [μιαρὸ]ν κοῦ τοῦ τρόπου τοῦμοῦ λέγεις.

An exactly parallel structure with this idiom occurs in Asp. 368, εὖ γ' ἐστ]ιν ὃ λέγεις, Δᾶε, τοῦ τ' ἐμοῦ τρόπου, as Barigazzi noted, and Kasser (in Austin's edition of the play) anticipated me in suggesting κοῦ to replace γ' οὐ. Yet the doubled article in B's text may be otiose: could Menander possibly have written γε κοῦ τρόπου?

156–58

Here B has paragraphi under 156 and 158, deletes its dicolon after ποεῖν (156), and converts a dicolon after λεγεις (157) to a single point⁷. Supplementation at the end of 156 depends partly on how one interprets B's information over speech assignments, partly on the most plausible assessments of the contents of a mutilated and lacunose text. More of the positive and practical ideas hereabouts, however, appear to come from Demeas (e.g. 154–56), although we cannot gauge how far this may have been true of the dialogue in the gap before 144; accordingly it seems to me preferable to take λέγεις in 156 as part of an acknowledgement of this by Moschion. Of the supplements suggested ταῦ[τά γ' εὖ | λέγεις (Austin and Jacques), assigned to Moschion, deserves most support, but perhaps it should be interpreted

⁴ For example, ἔρχεται at Dysk. 256, Epitr. 170, Sik. 123, 124; προσέρχεται at Georg. 31, Dysk. 607, Pk. 261, Perinthia 7, possibly Asp. 534. Cf. K. B. Frost, Exits and Entrances in Menander (Oxford 1984) 5.

⁵ E.g. ἀλλὰ γὰρ προσέρχεται | [ὁ παῖς or [ὁ Μοσχίων?

⁶ [οὐδὲ] F. Sisti in his edition, ἐ]γὼ Photiades and Austin, τό[τ' ἐνόουν Barigazzi, RFIC 98 (1970) 161 (τό[τ' also Austin), ἔρ]χομαι Turner p. 2 (on 119f).

⁷ See here the apparatus criticus and plate 6 of ed. pr., Barigazzi, RFIC 98 (1970) 163–64 and 331, 100 (1972) 342 (cf. Dedoussi, ZPE 99, 1993, 20), Blume, Menanders »Samia« (Darmstadt 1974) 65 n. 15, Kamerbeek, Mnemosyne 25 (1972) 383, and the Gomme–Sandbach commentary on Sam. 156–59.

as the first remark in a speech that then extends to μέτειμι in 159. For such approving comments in Menander cf. e.g. Asp. 387, Epitr. 972, Pk. 995, 1012, 1022 (with ὀρθῶς); Mis. 442 Sandbach = 972 Arnott (ἀγαθά); Epitr. 510 (οὐ κακῶς); Sik. 350 (πολὸν . . . βέλτιον); and Pk. 473, 981–82, Sik. 112 (εἶδ'). In Aristophanes compare especially Ar. Av. 517, 1614, Ran. 1480–81.

162

ἐστ' ἀπρε[πές, ἀλλ' ἀπέρχομαι (M. L. West in Austin's edition), or ὅστ' ἀπέρχομαι (Oguse in Jacques' edition)? At first sight ὅστ' (as introducing a logical consequence) seems preferable; in comedy ὅστε introduces a first-person-singular verb indicating intended or contemplated action at Ar. Nub. 668–69, Vesp. 727, Pax 569, Av. 196, Eccl. 1047–48, Men. Dysk. 445, Mis. 283 Sandbach = 684 Arnott. Yet when such action indicates movement, it is normally introduced by ἀλλά, in cases where 'the speaker breaks off his reflections, and announces his plan of action. Especially with verbs of motion' (Denniston, Greek Particles² 8). Austin's edition (2.61) well compares an exact parallel for this use of ἀλλά in Menander at Sik. 270–71 τ[ὰ δ' ὕστερα | οὐκέτι λέγειν ἔχοιμ' ἄν, ἀλλ' ἀπέρχομαι, but it is possible to cite also a large number of instances in tragedy (where ἀλλ' εἶμι becomes a standard formula) and earlier comedy: A. Pers. 849, Agam. 1313, Choeph. 781, Soph. Ajax 810, Trach. 86, O. C. 503, Eur. Alc. 209, Andr. 89, Hcl. 677–78, Hec. 1053–54, I. T. 636, Tro. 1153, El. 1132, Ion 76, Phoen. 753, 1009, Bacch. 857, Hypsipyle fr. 21.13 (p. 36 Bond, pp. 86–87 Cockle), Phaethon 266 Diggle, Ar. Pax 49, Thesm. 457; see especially E. Fraenkel, Zu den Phoenissen des Euripides (Munich 1963) 28–30; O. Taplin, The Stagecraft of Aeschylus (Oxford 1977) 320–21; and D. J. Mastrorarde's commentary on Eur. Phoen. 753.

167–71

The mutilation in B here is too severe for confident supplementation, but something (exempli gratia) may be worth attempting, if it uses a Menandrian phraseology that is appropriate to its context:

(ΔΗΜΕΑΣ)
 167] . [.] ἐκεῖνον βού[λομαι.
 (325J) ἔξω καλεῖν δεῦ]ρ'. — εἰς τὸ πρόσθεν δ[ε]ῦρό μοι,
 Νικήρατ', ἔξελθ'.
 ΝΙΚΗΡΑΤΟΣ
 ἐπὶ τί;
 ΔΗΜΕΑΣ
 χαῖρε πολλά σύ.
 ΝΙΚΗΡΑΤΟΣ
 170 καὶ σύ γε. τί ἐστί]ν;
 ΔΗΜΕΑΣ
 μνημονεύεις, εἰπέ μοι,
 (328J) ὡς οὐ τὸ πρῶτο]ν ἐθέμεθ' ἡμέραν;
 ΝΙΚΗΡΑΤΟΣ
 ἐγώ;

167 βού[λομαι suppl. Austin.

168 ἔξω καλεῖν δεῦ]ρ' suppl. Arnott (ἐκκαλεῖ]ν already Austin II.61, before ἐκεῖνον in 167); cf. Georg. 26–27 καλέσσασα . . . | ἔξω, Sam. 723 ἔξω . . . δεῦρο, Epitr. 904 δεῦρ' ἔξω, Ar. Plut. 1196 ἔξω τις κάλει.

168–69 εἰς τὸ πρόσθεν δ[ε]ῦρό μοι, | Νικήρατ', ἔξελθ'] would then be shouted at the door of Nikeratos' house. At the end of 168 B has δ[.] . ρομαι with traces of one or two letters above the α. These traces I formerly interpreted as part of a marginal indication of speaker (νικ]ηρ', Gnomon 42,

1970, 19), but Kasser (in Austin's edition, II.104) reads them as $\sigma\iota$; this combination of letters, however, makes no sense as a supralineal mark of correction. Handley's suggestion (BICS 16, 1969, 104) that the traces might be identified as \omicron , correcting B's $\mu\alpha\iota$ to $\mu\omicron\iota$, may be palaeographically less satisfactory, but restores more acceptable sense to the context. Before $\rho\omicron\mu\alpha\iota$ there is a short vertical stroke cut off by a tear; it seems to me to match the bottom of a ν better than that of a χ ⁸.

169 (i) Νικῆρατ' , ἔξελθ' was supplied here by Barigazzi, RFIC 98 (1970) 165, but at the beginning of 168 by Handley, BICS 16 (1969) 104 (cf. the Gomme–Sandbach commentary, ad loc.); cf. Dysk. 737–38 $\Sigma\acute{\omega}\sigma\tau\rho\alpha\tau\epsilon$, | ἔξελθε δεῦρο, Ar. Equ. 725–26 $\acute{\omega}$ Δῆμε, δεῦρ' ἔξελθε; cf. also E. Dickie, Greek Forms of Address (Oxford 1996) 47–48.

(ii) ἐπὶ τί: cf. e.g. Soph. O. C. 524, ἀλλ' ἐς τί;

170 Suppl. Barigazzi (but with τί δ' ἐστὶν);

(i) Although at times the response to a greeting is lacking, for various reasons (anger: e.g. Dysk. 512–13; deep emotion, over-eagerness, etc.: e.g. Mis. 213 Sandbach = 614 Arnott, Sam. 431, com. adesp. fr. 1017.26 Kassel–Austin; social disparity: e.g. Epitr. 860, Mis. 323S = 724A, Sam. 296, 657; or even comic convenience, as often in Aristophanes), the usual polite return in Menander appears to be $\nu\grave{\eta}$ καὶ σὺ γε, with $\acute{\omega}$ + vocative (Sam. 129; cf. Leukadia v. 4 Arnott, com. adesp. fr. 1017.77–78 KA, Lucian Tim. 46, Dial. Deor. 2(22).1, Dial. Mort. 6(20).3; cf. M. D. Macleod, CR 20, 1970, 289) or καὶ σὺ γε (Kith. 73; cf. Ar. Pax 718, Lys. 6, Xen. Cyr. 7.2.9; καὶ γὰρ σὺ in Pl. Symp. 214b).

(ii) For τί ἐστὶ; note especially Georg. 106, Pk. 989, Sam. 386, Sik. 369, and cf. e.g. com. adesp. fr. 1084.24 KA, Ar. Av. 1586–87.

(iii) Cf. e.g. Dysk. 184, where Sandbach keeps B's text. However, B often writes $\epsilon\sigma\tau\iota\nu$ incorrectly where ἐστὶ or ἐστ' is required (e.g. Dysk. 389, 593, 694, 772, Sam. 383, 497, 556, 600, 664; cf. Austin II.62), and so ἐστὶ might be preferable here.

171 Suppl. Arnott (after Sandbach's $\acute{\omega}\varsigma$ οὐχὶ πρότερον). For τίθεμαι ἡμέραν = 'I fix/arrange a day' for some future event, cf. e.g. [Dem]. 42.1, 13. In this context a supplement such as $\acute{\omega}\varsigma$ οὐχὶ ῥητὴν ἐθέμεθ' ἡμέραν would at first sight appear even more desirable (for ῥητὴν . . . ἡμέραν 'a specific day' cf. e.g. Thuc. 6.29.3, 30.1, 64.2, 8.67.1, 93.3, Xen. Hell. 3.5.6, Lucian Alex. 19), but in comedy a syllable ending with a short vowel is lengthened before an initial rho when that rho begins a new word (cf. M. L. West, Greek Metre, Oxford 1982, 16), and exceptions in comic iambic trimeters are too few (only Pherecrates fr. 113.29, Plato fr. 147) to justify such a supplement here.

194–95

In the lively exchanges between a determined Demeas and rather slow-witted Parmenon about what the latter will soon do in the market, Parmenon responds to Demeas' [ἄγε καὶ μ]άγειρον at the beginning of 194 with:

καὶ μάγειρον; πριάμενος
195 [ἄ δεῖ:]

This punctuation is advisable because, as the Gomme–Sandbach commentary on vv. 194–95 points out, there is some doubt "whether μάγειρον can be the object of πριάμενος, since a cook must be 'hired'⁹ not 'bought'." The object of πριάμενος, accordingly, is likely to have been written in the four or five

⁸ Austin's conjecture and supplement δ' [ἐ]ρχομαι at the end of 168 is printed in his edition and by some other editors (Paduano, Sandbach, Sbordone), but it has three weaknesses. It requires B to have a corrupt text δ' [.]ρχομαι, where (pace Kasser in Austin II.164) χ seems unlikely; it makes B's letter(s) written above the α harder to explain; and it produces less satisfactory sense in the dramatic context ('but I come forward' seems inappropriate if spoken by a Demeas already on stage, and implausible for a Nikeratos whose first remark is likely to be ἐπὶ τί in v. 169, otherwise the greeting by Demeas that follows ($\chi\alpha\acute{\iota}\rho\epsilon$ πολλὰ σὺ) would be impolitely delayed.

⁹ The verb normally used is λαμβάνω; see my commentary on Alexis frs. 209.1–2 and 216.1.

letters of B's gap before Demeas responds by picking up Parmenon's *πριόμενος*. In his first edition of the Oxford text (1972) Sandbach suggested that 195 might have begun with *τᾶλλα*, but this would have required the sequence *-λα πρ-* to be scanned as a long, against normal comic practice. Accordingly I should prefer to supplement with *ὄ δεῖ* (cf. Sam. 221), with Parmenon thus asking whether he should hire the cook after making his other purchases (garlands, sesame: v. 190).

203–205

Mutilation at the bottom of B's page leaves only the endings of the last three lines:

203	περ]ί[ερ]γος ἡ γυνή
] . ἰκετεύω. τί οὖν;
205] . . [. .]ς ἡλίκων

203 Suppl. Barigazzi, RFIC 98 (1970) 168. 205 ἡλίκων read by Dedoussi, ZPE 90 (1993) 20.

Editors either assume that lines 203–205 continue the speech begun by Demeas in v. 200 or leave the question of the speaker's identity open. However, it is rightly agreed by editors and others¹⁰ that Nikeratos must re-emerge from his house before the end of this act and follow Parmenon to market, as he promised at v. 198, and from which he returns with a sheep at v. 399. The mutilation in 203–205 removes any possible paragraphi and dicola, but it seems to me that the remnants of these lines suit better an entering Nikeratos, complaining about his wife ('my wife's inquisitive' 203), perhaps quoting what she has just said to him ('I beseech [you]') and giving his reaction ('So what?' 205), and summing up his grumbles with 'How she does go on!' 205f.). In that case ἡλίκων would be followed at the beginning of 206 probably with *λαλεῖ* or *βοᾷ* (cf. Sam. 255, 553).

206–208

206] . δρόμον καλο[ῶ
	χει]μῶν ἀπ[ροσδ]όκητος ἐξαίφνης [μέγας
	ἔλθῶν.

If an adjective in agreement with *χει]μῶν* is the correct supplement at the end of 206, Sisti's *μέγας* (in his edition) wins the vote over Austin's *πολύς* (his text) or *λαβρός* (his edition II.63); although parallels can be found for *χειμῶν* with *πολύς* (e.g. H. Od. 4.566, Xen. Anab. 4.1.15, Plut. Coriolanus 32) and other adjectives (such as *σφοδρός*: e.g. Lucian, Ver. Hist. 2.47), *χειμῶν μέγας* is undoubtedly the standard expression in both Ionic and Attic (e.g. Hdt. 7.34, 170.2, 188.2, Hippocr. Vet. Med. 9; S. Ajax 1148–49, Eur. Phaethon 267 Diggle, Thuc. 4.6.1, 8.34, Pl. Protag. 344d¹¹).

215

215 *πληγ]ήν τιν' ἀνυπέμβλητον ἐξ[αίφνης λαβῶν.*

In support of Jacques' *πληγ]ήν* and Lloyd-Jones' *λαβῶν* Austin cites Heliodorus 2.32.3 (II.64 and ZPE 4, 1969, 167), but it may also be noted that *πληγ]ήν/πληγ]ᾶς λαμβάνω* is the normal expression in Attic: e.g. Ar. Vesp. 1325, Pax 493, Ran. 673, 747, Eccl. 324, Cratinus fr. 92.1–2, Philyllius fr. 9.2–3, Timocles fr. 24.6, Men. Dysk. 205; Thuc. 5.50.4, Xen. Cyrop. 1.3.16, Anab. 4.6.15, Isocr. 12.212, Dem. 21.1, 6, 37.37, 54.13, 14, 41; cf. Diphilus fr. 42.32.

¹⁰ See e.g. Blume (op. cit. in n. 7) 76, Frost (op. cit. in n. 4) 106.

¹¹ Cf. N. Bissinger, *Das Adjektiv ΜΕΓΑΣ in der griechischen Dichtung* (Munich 1966) 106–108, 286, 308, noting that the expression is found first in Alcaeus 338.1–2 Page.

216

Before σ in C the traces appear¹² to suit the right-hand hasta of ν better than the right edges of the bottom two cross-strokes of ϵ . Cf. Turner, CR 21 (1971) 353, and the Gomme–Sandbach commentary ad loc.

218

218

ἐπάγομαι μέγ' ἀτύχημα [

Here Austin supplements with [διὰ κενῆς (his edition, cf. II.64), but a contrast with the τότε supplemented at the end of 217 may be preferable here: hence either Sisti's [νῦν ἐγώ or perhaps even [νῦν ἐμοί (with ἐμοί in place of ἐμαντῶ: cf. e.g. Pl. Apol. 38d θρηνοῦντός τέ μου καὶ . . . λέγοντος πολλὰ καὶ ἀνάξια ἐμοῦ and the common expression δοκῶ μοι; Smyth, Greek Grammar, para. 1222–24).

225–36, 251–52, 265–66

If Demeas is presented as a wealthy Athenian, we may expect Menander to have imagined that his house conformed to the grander urban examples of the writer's time¹³. At least part of it was an οἰκία διπλοῦς (cf. Lysias 1.19), with female slaves having access to both its floors. The plan of the rooms described by Menander is clear. On the ground floor was a weaving-room, probably with a door to the courtyard. In that room there was a couch (on which the baby was dumped, 225–26), and either stairs or a ladder up to the first floor (232–33). The pantry was next to the weaving-room, which one had to cross to reach it if one was coming from some other parts of the house. The weaving-room's position obviously meant that the women's part of the house included the ground floor. At 251–52 a slave girl runs in (εἶσ-) from outside (ἔξωθεν); at 265–66 Demeas on his way from the pantry to his house's front door and the stage sees Chrysis breast-feeding the baby outside (ἔξω). This implies that the weaving-room fronted the open-air αὐλή, and that Chrysis was feeding the baby either in the courtyard or in a portico to one side, and that the front door, as its Athenian name (αὐλειος θύρα) suggests, opened onto that courtyard. The vertical loom of antiquity was light enough to be moved out to the yard or to a portico for work during the hot days of summer, and babies were easier to look after in ground-floor rooms with readier access to the house's well. Since the courtyard, being normally adjacent to the women's part of the house, was much used by women, it should occasion no surprise if a baby was breast-fed there¹⁴.

230

Sudhaus suggests (v. 15 in his first edition, Bonn 1909) σκοπούμενος σ[χολῆ; cf. Andocides 2.19 οἱ μὲν γε σχολῆ περὶ τῶν εἰσαγγελλομένων σκοποῦντες.

¹² For C here and elsewhere I rely particularly on a set of photographs sent to me some years ago by Professor F. H. Sandbach, helpful and generous on that occasion as always.

¹³ A drawing of such an οἰκία διπλοῦς in the Athens of Menander's time appears in H. A. Thompson and R. E. Wycherley, *The Agora of Athens* (The Athenian Agora 14: Princeton 1972) 181 fig. 44. On the arrangement of rooms in Demeas' house see especially J. van Leeuwen's third edition of *Menander* (Leiden 1919) pp. 226–27 on his vv. 19–21 (with a suggested but inaccurate plan: the couch on which Plangon's baby was dumped and the ladder or stairs leading to the upper storey are more likely to have been in the weaving-room itself), and C. Dedoussi's edition of *Samia* (Athens 1965), commentary on her v. 19. On houses of the period see especially C. O. Dalman, *De aedibus scaenicae comoediae novae* (Leipzig 1929) 38ff., 54–55; D. Robinson and J. Graham, *The Hellenic House* (Excavations at Olynthus 8: Baltimore 1938); Thompson and Wycherley, op. cit. 173–85; G. Morgan, *TAPA* 112 (1982) 115–23; V. Hoepfner and E.-L. Schwandner, *Haus und Stadt im klassischen Griechenland* (Munich 1986); and M. Jameson in O. Murray and S. Price, *The Greek City* (Oxford 1995) 171–95.

¹⁴ See e.g. Lys. 3.6, [Dem.] 47.55, and Jameson, op. cit. in n. 13, 186–87.

248

If [ῆ]δη καὶ τόδ[ε is correctly supplemented at the end of this line¹⁵, the next line could have continued in several different ways: e.g. ἐγὼ τιθνοῦμαι (cf. the Gomme–Sandbach commentary ad loc., ‘Now I’m already fondling this baby, too’), or even φώνην ἀπ’ ἴσης ἴησι μεγάλην, with the nurse thus claiming that Moschion’s baby ‘also already’ screams as loudly as Moschion himself used to.

251

Sudhaus’ supplement τοιαῦτ’ ἐλάλησε (v. 36 in his first edition) is right for length and appropriate for sense, but in such contexts Menander more commonly uses ἔλεγε(v) (Epitr. 804–805, Heros 24, Mis. 438 Sandbach = 968 Arnott, Sik. 353), εἶπε(v) (Epitr. 919) and ἔφη (Epitr. 406–407). Hence perhaps τοιαῦτά γ’ ἔλεγεν or εἶπεν (cf. Denniston, *Greek Particles*² 122–23) might be suggested.

302, 373

At 302 Parmenon tells Chrysis and Demeas’ slaves to keep τὴν γραῦν away from the wine jars, at 373 Demeas presents Chrysis with τὴν γραῦν. The Gomme–Sandbach commentary on v. 373 writes “probably the τίτθη of 237, who might accompany Chrysis of her own free will, . . . she might have belonged to Chrysis before the association with Demeas.” This is judicious, but a little more needs to be said. If the singular used at both 302 and 373 implies that there was only one aged woman employed in Demeas’ house, this would support the suggestion that this old woman was identical with the ex-nurse described in 236–61; and that the ex-nurse’s experience as Moschion’s nanny would make Demeas’ assignment of her to Chrysis with the baby particularly suitable¹⁶. Such arguments, however, run the danger of falling into the documentary fallacy much discussed half a century ago¹⁷; characters in drama do not exist outside of the written text, and Menander does not himself in the extant portions of *Samia* identify the nurse of v. 237 with the γραῦς of either 302 or 373, nor does he specify that the γραῦς of 302 was identical with the γραῦς of 373.

304–305

The traces of ink deciphered after θυράς by Sudhaus in his second edition and confirmed by Guéraud, BIFAO 27 (1927) 149 (see also Austin, ZPE 4, 1969, 167) resemble the bottom left-hand corners of two letters that could be a permutation of any one or two from α, ε, ο, θ, σ, φ, ω.

305

ἄκουε δὴ νυν (C) or δὴ μου (B)? The Gomme–Sandbach commentary here sums up the evidence for both locutions and rightly opts for δὴ νυν because it is much more common. It may be useful, however, to list the dramatic occurrences of these and related locutions in more detail:

ἄκουε δὴ νυν: S. El. 947, Eur. Cycl. 441, Hec. 833, Suppl. 857, Heracles 1255, I.T. 753, Ion 1539, Hel. 1035, Phoen. 911, 1427, Or. 237, 1181, I.A. 1009, 1146, Ar. Equ. 1014, Av. 1513.

ἄκουε δὴ μου: Men. Inc. 27.

ἄκουε (-ετε, -ετον) δὴ: Eur. Ion 336, Ar. Ach. 733, Plut. 76, Pl. com. frs. 188.11, 189.5.

ἄκουέ μου: Eur. Alc. 781, Suppl. 1196, I.T. 1322, Men. Georg. 49.

ἄκουέ νυν (or νῦν: see Denniston, *Greek Particles*² 218): S. Aj. 1332, Ar. Plut. 975, Eupolis fr. 195.1.

ἄκουσόν νυν ἐμοῦ: Ar. Vesp. 1381.

ἄκουε τοίνυν: Eur. Ion 936, 987, Ar. Plut. 649.

¹⁵ [ῆ]δη was deciphered and supplemented by Sudhaus in his second edition (Bonn 1914); cf. O. Guéraud, BIFAO 27 (1927) 149. τόδ[ε was supplemented by several.

¹⁶ Cf. here also R. F. Thomas, ZPE 83 (1990) 216, additionally identifying the *θεραπιάνας* (so clearly C as well as B) of v. 382 as the old woman and the servant girl to whom she was talking in vv. 251–61.

¹⁷ See e.g. (for Shakespeare) L. C. Knights, *How many children had Lady Macbeth?* (Cambridge 1933), and (for Greek drama) A. J. A. Waldock, *Sophocles the Dramatist* (Cambridge 1951) 11–24.

(i) The two nouns ἄκρατος and νεότης act in combination as if they formed a singular subject, and so take a singular verb; cf. e.g. Eur. Heracles 774–76 ὁ χρυσὸς ἅ τ' εὐτυχία | φρενῶν βροτοὺς ἐξάγεται | δύνασιν ἄδικον ἐφέλκων, Pl. Legg. 6.775e ἀρχὴ γὰρ καὶ θεὸς ἐν ἀνθρώποις ἰδρυμένη σφάζει πάντα; K.G. 1.79–80.

(ii) λάβη (-βη B, -βη C) is supported by both papyri as the subjunctive in an open frequentative clause ('if ever' B, 'whenever' C), and, in the absence of any separately expressed subject, it seems wiser to assume that ἄκρατος καὶ νεότης also governs λάβη.

(iii) τὸν συνεπιβουλεύσαντα τούτοις πλησίον can mean only 'the person who has plotted close at hand along with these', where the 'person' is a generalised (and so masculine) expression referring here specifically to Chrysis, and the 'these' are (Moschion)'s wine and youthfulness, the two things which in Demeas' view would have helped Chrysis to seduce Moschion. συνεπιβουλεύω is not a common verb; elsewhere (as the Thesaurus Linguae Graecae disc confirms²¹) it occurs both intransitively on its own (Xen. Hell. 5.4.22, Diod. Sic. 5.50.2, Plut. Mor. 64c, [Apollod. Myth.] 2.44) and (as here) with a dative, which can refer either to the person collaborated with (thus governed by the συν-: Josephus A.J. 13.308, Cassius Dio 44.21.4) or to the person/thing plotted against/for (thus governed by the ἐπι-, as commonly with ἐπιβουλεύω itself: e.g. Dion. Hal. Ant. Rom. 3.39.2, 4.40.4, Appian B.C. 2.118, Cassius Dio 38.9.3, 60.15.4), or even both together, as the passage of Isaeus 6.55 cited incompletely by Luppe clearly demonstrates: μετὰ τῆς Ἀλκῆς ἐκείνης τούτῳ καὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις (the collaborators) συνεπιβουλεύσας τοῖς τοῦ Εὐκτῆμονος χρήμασι (the objectives of the plot).

357

At the penthemimeral caesura B has προσθε των, C προσθεν των. Attic drama uses both πρόσθεν and πρόσθε, choosing normally the form metrically convenient (thus for ◡ —: -θε before a consonant, -θεν or θ' before a vowel)²², but a problem arises in those sedes where ◡ — is the allowed scansion: across the penthemimeral caesura in both tragedy and comedy, and in the first half of the third metron in comedy alone. The relevant passages are:

(a) at penthemimeral caesura:

S. Ant. 434 πρόσθε τάς: -θε LSV.

El. 918 πρόσθε(ν) στυγνός: -θε LNGRT, -θεν cett.

Eur. Andr. 54 πρόσθε(ν) σφάλμα: -θε MBOAV and Σ^{νny}, -θεν LP and Σ^{ylm}.

Suppl. 416 πρόσθε σφάλμα: -θε L.

I.A. 619 πρόσθεν στήτε: -θεν L.

Ar. Equ. 751 πρόσθε(ν). χρῆ: -θε RΦ, -θεν A.

Men. Mis. 68 Sandbach = 468 Arnott πρόσθε μοι: -θε O.

Sam. 357 πρόσθε(ν) τῶν: -θε B. -θεν C.

(b) at first half of third metron:

Ephippus fr. 3.2 πρόσθε(ν) τῶν: (Ath. 9.370c) -θε AE, -θεν C.

Men. Sam. 168 πρόσθεν δ[B (see above).

Sam. 214 πρόσθεν π[B.

Sam. 405 πρόσθε τῶν: -θε BC.

Cf. also Men. Pk. 299 (at the end of a trochaic tetrameter) πρόσθε τῶν θυρῶν: -θε C.

Manuscripts are here clearly unreliable and inconsistent guides to orthography, as L's variations show in the passages of Euripides listed. Although we should probably be unjustified to demand here any greater degree of consistency from the dramatists themselves, it might be advisable to standardise

²¹ I should like here to express my gratitude to Mr Lionel Scott for his time, instruction and generous assistance with this material.

²² Ellendt's judicious remarks in his Lexicon Sophocleum (Berlin 1872) pp. 664–65 are still authoritative; see also F. Selvers, De mediae comoediae sermone (Diss. Münster 1909) 14, Kassel–Austin on Ephippus fr. 3.2, and Dover's commentary on Ar. Ran. 286.

our printed texts, by using as our guides the orthographical practice of Attic inscriptions contemporary with the relevant author. In Menander's time *πρόσθεν* was the form used normally on inscriptions²³, and so perhaps should be adopted for the passages of Menander's text listed above.

366

My photographs (see above, n. 12) clearly confirm Sandbach's statement (ZPE 40, 1980, 51) that here C (as well as B) has *ποιησαι*.

400

Remarkably both B and C here present *θυθεν* (B -*θεν*) as the aorist passive participle of *θύω*, and even more remarkably virtually all editors from Sudhaus and Körte down to Sandbach and Bain accept *θυθεν* as the Menandrian orthography. Yet the facts are unambiguous.

(i) The manuscripts of Ionic and Attic writers always – apart from this one passage – preserve *ἐτύθη* as the aorist passive form (e.g. Hdt. 1.216.3, 6.57.1, A. Choeph. 242, [Dem.] proem. 54, Arist. Poet. 17, 1455b3 and 11; cf. the pluperfect at Antiphon 1.17).

(ii) In Attic, aspirate assimilations of the type instanced in *θυθέν*, where successive syllables correctly containing an aspirated and a voiceless stop are spelled with both stops aspirated (e.g. *ἐθέθη*, *θήθημι*, *ἐνθαῦθα*), are not rare in inscriptions of the fifth century B.C., less frequent in the fourth century, and extremely rare after 300 B.C. (cf. Threatte, 1.455–62). No example, however, of the *θυθείς* form is preserved in Attica.

(iii) Outside Attica *θυ(σ)θείς* infrequently occurs:

(1) on inscriptions, e.g. from Amorgos in the third century B.C. (IG 12(7).241.14) and from Tegea c. 400 B.C. (V. Bérard, BCH 13, 1889, 281–93: line 23)²⁴;

(2) on papyri of the imperial period, as here and e.g. Melito De Pascha 71 (P. Bodmer 13, end 3rd century; Chester Beatty papyrus, 4th century²⁵), Didymus Caecus, Comm. on Psalms 35–39 p. 284 Gronewald (4th century or later).

Consequently van Leeuwen's correction of Sam. 400 to *τυθεν* (in his editions) deserves support.

450

.] . [. . .] οὐκ ἄριστ' ἐγὼ < > ὡς ἔχω νῦν. ἀλλὰ τί;

The line provides a further instance of the difficulties that B provides when it is both corrupt and mutilated. Here, early in the trochaic tetrameters of the fourth act, Demeas has been praying to Apollo for help with his efforts to proceed with Moschion's wedding. The most convincing addition after *ἐγὼ* must be Barigazzi's *γὰρ* (RFIC 98, 1970, 262), which would presumably have been omitted by a scribe nonplussed by its postponement to fifth word in its clause. Attempts to supplement the opening of the line need to take account of the lofty traces remaining from its second letter, which can be identified only as either the top of a *ξ* or a rough breathing. Hence Barigazzi's *ἄξ[ομ] οὐκ* (loc. cit.: 'I'll conduct [the wedding]') has won some support, although the absence of an object with this verb here counts against it. Menander may rather have written *ἄρξομ' οὐκ*, and the scribe then have originally mistranscribed it as *αρομ'* (or rather perhaps *αρομαι* in *scriptio plena*) *οὐκ*, adding the omitted *ξ* above *ρ* or *ρο* as so often elsewhere in this papyrus. The appropriateness of *ἄρξομ'* here is underlined by LSJ's

²³ See especially Threatte I.640–43, noting that in Attic manuscripts there is a gradual increase in frequency of ephelecytic *v* 'until Hellenistic times, by which the use of it is virtually universal before vowels and pauses, and certainly normal before consonants'. Cf. also Meisterhans–Schwyzer 113–14 and LSJ s.v. *πρόσθεν*.

²⁴ The Gomme–Sandbach commentary ad loc. cites BCH 7 (1883) 65 for a Delphic inscription of the 3rd century B.C., but this is a wrong reference.

²⁵ But not P. Oxy. 1300, which does not preserve this part of the text.

note (s.v. ἄρχω) that the middle of this verb is used in Attic particularly 'where personal action is emphasized'.

458–60

ΜΟΣΧΙΩΝ
 458 [τί τ]οὺς φίλους
 προσδοκᾶς ἐρεῖν πυθομένους;
 ΔΗΜΕΑΣ
 . [. . . .] . ω Μοσχίων,
 460 τοὺς φίλους. ἕα μ'.

In this exchange the traces of the letter after πυθομένους are too scanty for plausible identification, while before ω Μοσχίων there is only a small spot that could be the top of a right-hand vertical amongst other things. Despite claims that Demeas' response to Moschion might have been cut off by a deliberate aposiopesis (thus μηδαμῶς, ὧ Blume, Menanders »Samia«, Darmstadt 1974, 177–78 and n. 22; π[ροσδο]κῶ <γῶ> Sandbach, edition and Gomme–Sandbach commentary ad loc.), it is inherently more probable that Demeas' reply included a verb governing τοὺς φίλους in 460. Lloyd-Jones originally suggested (YCS 22, 1972, 135 n. 26) μ[ὴ λέγῃ]ς, ὧ, but perhaps something more forceful and dismissive would be expected from Demeas: e.g. ο[ὐ προτι]μῶ, Μοσχίων, | τοὺς φίλους: 'I care nothing about our friends'; for this use of προτιμῶ see LSJ s.v. II and Dover on Ar. Ran. 638, and cf. especially A. Agam. 1415 οὐ προτιμῶν, ὡσπερὶ βοτοῦ μόρον and Eum. 739, Eur. Hipp. 48 τὸ γὰρ τῆσδ' οὐ προτιμήσω κακόν, the preponderance of manuscripts at Thuc. 8.64 τὴν . . . εὐνομίαν οὐ προτιμήσαντες (with the Gomme–Andrewes commentary ad loc.), and Hesych. s.v. οὐ προτιμᾶ: οὐκ ἔχει λόγον.

478–79

B's text here, ὥστε μηκετι | προς εμε παιζει, poses two problems which defy assured solution.

(i) B's end of 478 has two syllables too many; Menander must have written either ὥστε μὴ (Austin's text) or μηκέτι (Austin's apparatus). Elsewhere Menander has ὥστε introducing positive (but not negative) commands (present imperative fr. 740.18 K.Th. = 602.18 K.A., cf. com. adesp. fr. 1063.2 Kassel–Austin; aorist Pk. 167–68), and μηκέτι followed by a present imperative (Asp. 202, fr. 177.4 K.Th. = 155.4 K.A.). Instances are too few to settle doubts here, but μηκέτι | . . . παίζ' may have a slight edge.

(ii) Do we print πρὸς ἐμέ or emend (with Jacques in his edition) to πρὸς με? με is six times as common in Menander as ἐμέ, but in many places where one form is presented by a papyrus, the other would also scan (e.g., after πρὸς: Asp. 167, 391, Pk. 267, 327, Sam. 308, 454, 719, as well as here). Since there appears to be less difference in emphasis between the two forms in comedy than one would expect, it would be wise to keep the transmitted reading wherever it scans and makes acceptable sense.

482–83

B here has εἰπέ μοι εἰς σεαυτὸν ἀναδεχει την αιτιαν, where scansion reveals that εἰπέ μοι is misplaced by the scribe. But should it be moved after σεαυτόν, necessitating further the transposition of τὴν αἰτίαν and ἀναδέχει (so Austin in his edition), or right to the end of its sentence, after αἰτίαν (so at least five scholars)? The latter suggestion seems preferable, if we compare Menander's placing of a parenthetic εἰπέ μοι in questions elsewhere. Most commonly εἰπέ is third to sixth word in its sentence (sixth at e.g. Dysk. 466, Sam. 453); only once does it introduce the question (Asp. 310, where the question is confined to the one word γαμειν).

505–506

The lacuna at the end of 505 is too long for confident restoration of Demeas' remark, but even *exempli-gratia* attempts must satisfy two requirements.

(a) The traces after $\tau\alpha$ suit χ better than ν ; the foot of the letter curls more to the left than is normal with this scribe's ν .

(b) Demeas' remark comes between two by Nikeratos, one threatening Moschion with blindness and cancelling his wedding, the other apparently accusing Demeas of a slave's spineless behaviour. Demeas' words must suit that context.

There are many possibilities. I suggest two, without stating a preference. $\tau\acute{\alpha}\chi['] \delta\acute{\nu} \acute{\epsilon}\gamma\acute{\omega}$, Νικήρατε would translate 'Perhaps, Nikeratos, although wronged, I might be curbing (my anger)', with $\kappa\alpha\tau\acute{\epsilon}\chi\omega$ intransitive as at Pk. 824, and $\tau\alpha\chi' \acute{\alpha}\nu$ + imperfect indicative as at Dem. 36.55. Secondly $\tau\alpha\hat{\upsilon}[\tau' \acute{\alpha}\kappa\omicron\upsilon\sigma\alpha\varsigma, \tau\eta\acute{\nu} \chi\omicron\lambda\eta\acute{\nu}$, where the comparison would be with S. El. 1011, Men. fr. 517 K.Th. = 740 K.A. ~ Philemon fr. 157 Kassel–Austin ($\kappa\alpha\tau\acute{\epsilon}\chi\epsilon\upsilon\iota\nu$ + $\delta\omicron\rho\gamma\eta\acute{\nu}$), and S. O.C. 874 (+ $\theta\upsilon\mu\acute{\omicron}\nu$).

544

F. H. Sandbach (in the second edition of his *Oxford Text of Menander*, Oxford 1990, p. 345) claims that Philostratus, *Apoll. Vit.* 7.22 cites this verse (or part of it). This is incorrect; the passage of Philostratus, which runs " $\pi\omicron\iota\ \pi\alpha\rho\alpha\tau\epsilon\nu\acute{\epsilon}\iota\varsigma$ ", $\acute{\epsilon}\phi\eta$, " $\delta\epsilon\delta\iota\omega\varsigma \tau\alpha\hat{\upsilon}\tau\alpha$ ", is relevant only as a parallel for the use of $\pi\alpha\rho\alpha\tau\epsilon\nu\acute{\epsilon}\iota\varsigma$ with a participle.

560–61, 580–81, 584–85

The Gomme–Sandbach commentary at v. 561 rightly upholds the view that the woman threatened there with murder is Chrysis, not Nikeratos' wife²⁶; in Nikeratos' belief (but see also vv. 76–85) it was Chrysis who had masterminded the plot to conceal the identity of the baby's mother, and so deserved the death penalty. However, at v. 580 in the commentary (as also in Austin's edition, II.90f.), Sandbach maintains that the intended victim of attack had changed in the intervening 19 lines from Chrysis to Nikeratos' wife, because "the idea of killing Chrysis . . . would now incidentally be pointless because it would not secure the child, the house being full of other men and women", and would "not do justice to Menander's ability to give continued new turns to events"; thus $\tau\eta\acute{\nu} \gamma\upsilon\nu\alpha\acute{\iota}\kappa\alpha$ in v. 580 (and presumably also $\tau\eta\grave{\eta} \gamma\upsilon\nu\alpha\iota\kappa\acute{\iota}$ in v. 585) would denote Nikeratos' wife.

These statements fail to take account of several dramatically relevant points.

(i) In this act Nikeratos is not presented as a man behaving calmly and logically, but as one enraged into making manic threats (to burn the baby 553–55, to kill Chrysis 560–61, to attack her 577–78); his madness is recognised by Demeas (563)²⁷. In such a state Nikeratos would hardly be expected to consider rationally any possibility of access to the baby, or to worry about the number of people in his way.

(ii) If Nikeratos' fury is directed throughout solely at Chrysis and the baby as his victims, it can be argued that the plot gains in focus, power and consistency.

(iii) Demeas would be more likely to raise his fists against Nikeratos (as he does at v. 582) in defence of Chrysis and his own house than in defence of Nikeratos' house and wife.

The Gomme–Sandbach commentary at v. 580 seeks to bolster the argument opposed above by claiming that $\acute{\epsilon}\iota\sigma\iota\omega\acute{\nu}$ (581) refers to Nikeratos entering "his own house (the usual meaning of $\acute{\epsilon}\iota\sigma\iota\omega\acute{\nu}$)"; $\acute{\epsilon}\iota\sigma\acute{\epsilon}\rho\chi\omicron\mu\alpha\iota$ in fact is frequently applied by Menander to characters entering other people's houses (e.g.

²⁶ Cf. van Leeuwen's commentary ad loc. (on his v. 236, p. 236 in his third edition, Leiden 1919).

²⁷ But not at 573, where $\mu\eta\theta\alpha\mu\acute{\omega}\varsigma$ (B after correction) is preferable to $\mu\acute{\alpha}\iota\nu\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota$ (C) and (pace A. H. Groton, *AJP* 108, 1987, 440–41) $\mu\acute{\alpha}\iota\nu\omicron\mu\alpha\iota$ (B before correction).

Asp. 428–29, Dysk. 670, 781, 882, 896, Epitr. 515, Mis. 286 Sandbach = 687 Arnott, 300S = 701A, Pk. 525, Sam. 390, 425).

675

ΜΟΣΧΙΩΝ
675 οὔτος, οὐ φέρεις;
ΠΑΡΜΕΝΩΝ
σε γὰρ () περιμένουσ' οὔτοι πάλαι.

So both B and C, omitting a syllable in Parmenon's answer to Moschion's question. The transmitted text, however, makes complete sense: "No, for they've been waiting a long while for you". Virtually all the editors print Sudhaus' (σέ), palaeographically acceptable but perhaps overemphasising the "you". Leo's supplement γάρ (τοι) was firmly dismissed by Wilamowitz²⁸ because this collocation of particles was becoming, if it had not yet totally become, obsolete in Menander's day; even so, it is remarkable that Wilamowitz failed to note a remarkably close parallel in Heliodorus 4.6.3, ὁ δὲ "χαίρει" εἶπεν "ὦ Καλάσιρι, καὶ ἄκουε· σε γὰρ τοι περιέμενον".

680–81

Parmenon's words βαδίζω· νῆ Δί', ἐξεύρηκά γε (so B: τε C) | τόδε κακόν have in recent times been variously interpreted (Austin's edition, II.97; Sandbach in the commentary, ad loc.; Gronewald, ZPE 93, 1992, 23), but the superiority of Austin's ("τόδε κακόν: ad διακέκομμαι τὸ στόμα (sc. in v. 679) pertinet") is revealed more clearly when the syntax is correctly explained. Parmenon has failed to obey Moschion's orders and been punished by Moschion striking him in the face and splitting his lip. Parmenon reacts by feeling his lip and saying "I am going. Yes, by Zeus (cf. Denniston, Greek Particles² 128, and the Gomme–Sandbach commentary ad loc.), I have discovered that this (not 'the lip' precisely but rather its present soreness) is bad." For this use of ἐξευρίσκω + object and predicate, with the participle of εἰμί to be supplied, cf. Sophocles Ajax 1054 (αὐτόν) ἐξηύρομεν . . . ἐχθίω Φρυγῶν and O.T. 303–304 σε προστάτην | σωτήρᾳ τ' . . . μῦνον ἐξευρίσκομεν.

693–94

ὡς ὀρᾶς, ἤδη βαδίζει κάστιν ἐν ὀδῷ. [νῦν δὲ δεῖ
κάμῃ τοὺς ἔνδον προσειπεῖν.

Editors who prefer to supplement some of the gaps in B here have preferred νῦν δὲ χρή (Blume, Lowe, Page) to νῦν δὲ δεῖ (West: cf. Austin, ZPE 4, 1969, 169), but it may be worth pointing out that elsewhere χρή occurs some 12 times in Menander and δεῖ at least 120.

703–705

ἠγνόησ' ἡμαρτον· ἐμάνην. ἀλλ' ἐκεῖν' ὀρθῶς σκόπει·
εἷς γε τοὺς ἄλλους ἀμαρτῶν, σοῦ πρόνοιαν ἠλίκη[ν
705 εἶχον . . .

Austin's supplement ὀρθῶς σκόπει at 703 (see his edition) deserves wider support. Photographs can be deceitful, but that of B here seems to have traces of an elision mark after ἐκεῖν, and the long tail that survives from the letter after o can be part only of an ρ or ι. For the collocation ὀρθῶς σκοπεῖν there are many parallels (Thuc. 3.12.3, Eur. Phoen. 155, Ar. Nub. 742, Pl. Crat. 405e, Charm. 171b, 172e, Legg.

²⁸ SB Berlin (1916) 84 = Kleine Schriften, I.436; cf. H.-D. Blume, Menanders »Samia« (Darmstadt 1974) 268 and n. 36.

7.803b, Antiphanes fr. 80.1, Dem. 14.24, 19.115, 21.1, 24.69, 25.36, Arist. Magn. Mor. 1.2.10 1184^a 30 and 33–34, 2.7.21 1206^a3, Men. fr. 625.1 K.Th. = 848 K.A.); for the use of σκόπει in the imperative introducing a direct or indirect question cf. e.g. Ar. Nub. 1096, Philemon fr. 113.1; and for the general structure cf. especially Men. Sam. 697 ἀλλ' ἐκεῖν' ὅμως θεώρει, followed apparently by a question introduced by τίτι.

University of Leeds

W. Geoffrey Arnott