

W. GEOFFREY ARNOTT

NOTES ON P. ANTINOOPOLIS 15 (FR. COM. ADESP. 1084 KASSEL–AUSTIN)

aus: Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik 125 (1999) 61–64

© Dr. Rudolf Habelt GmbH, Bonn

NOTES ON P. ANTINOOPOLIS 15 (FR. COM. ADESP. 1084 KASSEL–AUSTIN)

It seems now highly improbable that, without the discovery and identification of new papyri, any magical solutions will be found to the many problems posed by this papyrus¹. Decipherment of the extant text, often mutilated and abraded, has been taken as far as it can in the standard editions (Roberts, Barns–Lloyd-Jones, Austin, Sandbach, Kassel–Austin), and interpretation of the play opening that is preserved in P. Ant. 15 has been perceptively treated in a series of papers (especially those of Barns–Lloyd-Jones, Seeberg and Bandini). Two major points, to start with.

(i) In the heading to the play preserved in P. Ant. 15 the scribe wrote its title and the name of the author, but both are now badly abraded; only]ε[] ρο] ι[] ζ can be read with any confidence. The author's name is more likely to have been Μ]εν[ά]νδρου (so first Roberts, p. 35) than that of any other comedian – the readable traces seem consistent with this, although not enough ink remains for any positive identification – and there is nothing in the style and language of A. 15's text that conflicts with, but much that suggests, Menandrian authorship. Too little of the play's title, however, is preserved for confident supplementation there. All that can be made out in the ultra-violet photograph published by Barns–Lloyd-Jones is the top of a final sigma; in front of that, with the papyrus itself before him, Barns tentatively deciphered τo, but there is no sign in the photograph of a tau's crossbar, and this absence decreases the plausibility of Austin's suggestion (1967, p. 134) that the intended title was Ἄπιστος, the one preserved Menandrian title ending in -τος. Of the other two attempts to identify the play's title² Webster's Δακτύλιος is the more promising. It appears to be a feature of some opening scenes in Menander's plays that the play's title, or words associated with it, is/are unobtrusively inserted into the spoken text here (ἀσπίδα Asp. 16, δύσκολος Dysk. 7, Σαμίας ἐταίρας Sam. 21; cf. [μισεῖ νέον] με μίσος Mis. 43 Arnott = A43 Sandbach, ὁ Σικυώνιος Sik. 13)³. In P. Ant. 15's opening scene we find ὁ δακτύλιος mentioned at v. 27.

¹ The following bibliography is as complete as I can make it:

- C. H. Roberts, *The Antinoopolis Papyri I* (1950) 30–35 with plate (I) of introductory material on P. Ant. 15 and vv. 1–18: editio princeps.
 W. Schubart, *Griechische literarische Papyri* (SB Leipzig, phil.-hist. Klasse 97/5, 1950) 50–53: editio princeps of P. Berlin 13892.
 T. B. L. Webster, CR 2 (1952) 57–58; *Studies in Later Greek Comedy* (Manchester 1953¹) 217–20, (1970²) 237–40; C&M Dissertatio IX. *Francisco Blatt dedicata* (1973) 137–39; *An Introduction to Menander* (Manchester 1974) 127–29.
 E. G. Turner, CR 2 (1952) 184.
 R. Merkelbach, APF 16 (1958) 105.
 J. W. B. Barns and H. Lloyd-Jones, JHS 84 (1964) 21–34 with plates (I, II) of all P. Ant. 15 and P. Berlin 13892 = P. Schubart 23. Republished in Sir Hugh Lloyd-Jones, *Collected Papers: Greek Comedy, Hellenistic Literature, Greek Religion, and Miscellanea* (Oxford 1990) 94–114 with plates.
 W. Morel, *Philologus* 107 (1963) 145–51.
 H. J. Mette, *Lustrum* 10 (1965) 180–83; 13 (1968) 535.
 C. Austin, CR 17 (1967) 134; *Comicorum Graecorum fragmenta in papyris reperta* (Berlin 1973) 242–44 (P. Ant. 15), 244–46 (P. Berlin 13892), 368 (P. Berlin 21184: editio princeps, with H. Maehler).
 W. G. Arnott, *Arethusa* 3 (1970) 61–62.
 A. Seeberg, C&M 31 (1970) 214–22.
 F. H. Sandbach, *Menandri reliquiae selectae* (OCT 1972¹, 1990²) 326–28.
 W. T. MacCary, AJP 93 (1972) 294–95.
 A. W. Gomme and F. H. Sandbach, *Menander: A Commentary* (Oxford 1973) 722–23.
 Anna Bandini, *Annali della Facoltà di Lettere e Filosofia dell' Università di Siena* 5 (1984) 143–60.
 R. Kassel and C. Austin, *Poetae comici Graeci VIII* (Berlin 1995) 375–77 (P. Ant. 15), 378–79 (P. Berlin 13892), 449 (P. Berlin 21184).

² Δακτύλιος was first suggested by Webster (1973, 138–39), cf. also Bandini (1984, 158–59); and Θεσσαυρός by Seeberg (1970, 221–22).

³ Cf. W. G. Arnott, *Drama* 2 (1993) 29, and R. Nünlist, ZPE 99 (1993) 261 (on A 10).

(ii) The play's opening seems designed to engage its audience by its inclusion of features that are at the same time striking and puzzling⁴. A young man emerges from one of the stage houses, followed by a woman carrying a sizable container and trying in vain to attract his attention. He turns away from her, however, in order to face the audience, informing them that it is night, and that he has been married for over four months, during which time he has been faithful to his wife and both have come to love each other. He married at his father's bidding; at the time of the wedding apparently the young man was not in love with the bride.

By v. 13 the woman has induced the young man to notice the container, which conceals some recognition tokens, including half a moth-eaten old cloak. Presumably they had been placed there by a girl who, when violated before marriage by a drunken male, had snatched the cloak from him at the time of the rape. When that girl as a result of her forced pregnancy gave birth, she presumably had her offspring exposed along with the tokens. Two important details here have been shrewdly appraised by A. Seeberg (1970, 218–19). If the cloak was old and moth-eaten⁵, the rape could not have been recent or involved the young husband and wife of the opening scene; most probably it was committed a generation ago by a character now middle-aged or elderly on a woman old enough to be the young man's mother⁶. Secondly, only half a cloak is present in the container. Seeberg ingeniously suggests that the pregnancy might have produced twins, with the babies exposed separately, each accompanied by its own tokens and half of the snatched cloak.

The young man on stage, however, has more immediate problems on his mind that make him postpone further investigation of the items in the container. These problems clearly concern his marriage, but the lines preserved in P. Ant. 15 do not identify them. Menander here has chosen to open his play with a striking and puzzling mime that he does not immediately explain. He would have unravelled all the mysteries later in the play, but experience has taught us that Menander's solutions are usually more ingenious and effective than modern scholarship has been able to conjure up. It is accordingly more sensible here to admire the puzzle than to attempt its resolution.

A few further points deserve consideration:

(iii) The cast list prefixed to the play text in P. Ant. 15 seems originally to have contained nine or ten names, four or five of them in a torn and abraded left-hand column, five in a better preserved one on the right. If the names are arranged in the order of their first appearance on stage in the play, as they are in the cast list introducing the text of the *Dyskolos* in the Bodmer papyrus, it follows that the six decipherable names in the P. Ant. 15 list (Kratinos, Lysippos, Kantharos, Gorgias, Philinos and *θεράπαινα*), which would number four and six to ten in a sequence of ten, or three and five to nine in a sequence of nine, are characters who do not appear in that part of the opening scene preserved in the papyrus.

The young man and the female who follows him onto the stage at the opening of the play would originally have been numbers one and two in the list; we no longer know the name of the young man,

⁴ This interpretation of an opening mime, in which the young man enters with the woman behind him seeking his attention right at the start of the play before the first words are spoken, is based on Menandrian practice elsewhere. The *Aspis* opens similarly with a striking and puzzling mime – the entry of a group of Lycian captives and pack-animals carrying booty, along with a single slave carrying a badly buckled shield – before a single word is uttered, and the aim of the unexpected spectacle was clearly to puzzle the audience and thereby seize its attention. See the paper cited in n. 3.

⁵ Seeberg notes also that P. Berlin 13892 seems to mention a sword (v. 9) that cannot be drawn from its sheath (21–22) apparently because of rust (20). If this papyrus derives from the same play as P. Ant. 15, the rusty sword may be a further memento of that rape long ago. Could the victim of the rape have snatched both sword and cloak from her assailant, and left the sword and half the cloak with the twin boy as recognition tokens? The assailant would then have been young, perhaps an ephebe serving in the cavalry; did he later go on to be a mercenary soldier and thereby achieve wealth (cf. v. 23)? Was he in fact the Kantharos involved in this scene, given this name because, like other soldiers in later comedy (e.g. Bias in Menander's *Kolax*, cf. Thrasonides in *Mis.* 765–66, Polemon in *Pk.* 470–73; W. Hofmann and G. Wartenburg, *Der Brambarbas in der antiken Komödie*, Berlin 1973, 11, 29–39, 90–156), he was too fond of wine?

⁶ Indeed one possible interpretation of vv. 19–22 might make the young man's mother the victim: see below.

but some details in or at the side of the text may allow us to confirm the status and perhaps also to make a guess at the name of the young man's companion. δεικνύουσα (v. 13) indicates that this companion was female, and her receipt of and obedience to a series of commands given to her by the young man (23, 27, 30, 33) imply that she is a slave rather than a free woman; the young man's superior status is further confirmed by the fact that it is he, not the woman, who decides to seal the container after investigation of its contents (34). In the left-hand margin at v. 16 her name or status appears to be written, but a tear reduces the written information to a rho preceded by an attached high and slightly slanting crossbar. Elsewhere in the papyrus horizontal or slightly slanting crossbars attach α, γ, ε, π, τ, υ and χ to a following rho. Barns and Lloyd-Jones (1964) 26 interpret the marginal indication at v. 16 as a mutilated and abbreviated θ]ερ(ά)παινα), while Webster (1952) 58 and (1953) 218 = (1970) 238 identifies the young man's companion as the θεράπαινα who appears at the end of P. Ant. 45's cast list. This can hardly be correct; we have no reason to believe that the order of speakers in the cast list is inaccurate. It seems more likely that the young man's companion was actually named in the papyrus margin, and Σ]ύρ(α) here would be an appropriate name for an elderly female slave; we may compare Men. Misoumenos 555 Arnott = 155 Sandbach⁷, Philemon fr. 117, Plaut. Mercator and Truculentus; in Ter. Hecyra we have Donatus' testimony (on v. 59) that Syra there was a bawd, as also presumably in the Greek model by Apollodorus Car. (cf. fr. 8).

The entry in the cast list directly under Κρατίνοϲ was deciphered as] α[by Barns (1964, p. 22), where the alpha was probably preceded by only two or three letters. This makes Webster's suggestion (1974, 128) Β]ία tenable, but even if it is wrong, it seems likely that the name placed either directly above or directly below Κρατίνοϲ would have been that of a divinity who spoke the prologue after the opening scene or scenes.

(iv) In the papyrus vv. 6–10 run as follows; as a starting-point, I print a text based on Kassel–Austin:

| | |
|----|---|
| 6 | μί[αν οὐ γε]γέννημαι νύκτ' ἀπόκοιτ[ο]ς πόποτ[ε ἀπὸ τῆ[ς γυναι]κὸς †οσονηνεχεινεδ[οὐποτ[.....]οϲ γέγον[ουκ...] μετὰ τοὺς γάμους[|
| 10 | δίκαιον ἦρων· |

6–7 Suppl. Roberts. 7 ὅσον or ὄτον or ὄγον P. Ant. with one or two letters written above the second letter. 8 γέγονα or γέγονε P. Ant.

Mutilation of the papyrus provides most of the difficulties here, although in v. 7 most scholars have assumed an unhealable crux. Bandini (1984, 184) boldly suggested οὐ μόνην ἔχειν ἔδει[ι with Roberts' supplement, but P. Ant. 15's text here may need lesser correction than that. If the scribe wrote ὅσον with an omitted ι added later above the sigma, Menander might originally have written ὄσιον ἦν ἔχειν <μ'> ἔδει (or, taking account of the tendency of enclitics such as με to occupy the earliest possible position in their clause, ἦν <μ'> ἔχειν ἔδει⁸). For ὄσιος in the sense of '(sexually) chaste' cf. e.g. Eur. Hipp. 765 οὐχ ὄσιων ἐρώτων, Ion 150 ὄσιος ἀπ' εὐνᾶς ὄν, Suppl. 1028–29, IA 555⁹.

⁷ Cf. my edition of Mis. in the Loeb Menander (p. 294 n. 1) and N. Gonis, in *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri* 64 (1997) 48.

⁸ J. Wackernagel, *IF* 1 (1892) 333–436 = *Kleine Schriften* 1 (Göttingen 1954) 1–104; cf. Barrett's commentary on Eur. Hipp. 10–11. The addition of <μ'> here is not strictly necessary, but advisable because ὄσιος occasionally appears to be treated as of two terminations (e.g. Pl. Legg. 8.892d πρᾶξιν . . . ὄσιόν τε καὶ ἀνόσιον καὶ πάντως αἰσχράν, cf. Axioch. 371d, Dion. Hal. AR 5.71, Athenagoras Leg. 13.3), so that without <μ'> here the identity of the person claiming to be ὄσιος would be ambiguous. A scribe's omission of μ (in both places after ν) could be explained as virtual haplography.

⁹ Cf. also J. Rudhardt, *Notions fondamentales de la pensée religieuse et actes constitutifs du culte dans la Grèce classique* (Geneva 1958) 30ff., J. Diggle's commentary on Eur. Phaethon 107, W. Stockert's on Eur. IA 555.

In v. 8 Roberts supplemented with [ἀπόκοιτ]ος, but Lloyd-Jones (1964, 28 = 1990, 106; cf. Barns p. 23) noted the absence in the papyrus of the crossbar that normally in this hand links τ and ο. Bandini (1984, 150) suggested [ἀπόδημ]ος, but such a repetition of the claim that he has never been physically absent from his wife seems to me less likely than a reiteration of his sexual fidelity to her, and so perhaps vv. 8–10 might be supplemented, *exempli gratia*, as follows:

8 οὔποτ[ε πονηρ]ὸς γέγονα κούκ ἔρ[ωτ' ἐγὼ
μετὰ τοὺς γάμους [ἀνόσιον ἐνθάδ', ἀλλ' ἀεὶ
10 δίκαιον ἦρων·

For Menander's use elsewhere of πονηρός in a specifically sexual context see *Georgos* 3; cf. also e.g. *Pl. Symp.* 183d πονηρὸς δ' ἐστὶν ἐκεῖνος ὁ ἐραστὴς ὁ πάνδημος. For the use of ἐρῶ with a cognate accusative see *Eur. Hipp.* 32 ἐρῶσ' ἔρωτ' ἔκδημον, 337 οἶον . . . ἠράσθης ἔρον; cf. *Pl. Symp.* 181b. For the use of ἀνόσιος in a sexual context cf. *S. OC* 945–46, *Eur. Ion* 1092–93, *El.* 926, 1261. As an alternative to ἀνόσιον some other adjective of similar meaning (e.g. ἀναγνον) might be preferred.

(v) The mutilation in vv. 19–21 has damaged, but not totally removed, a possibly valuable clue in the mystery of the container and its contents. If ἐμ]ῆς γυναι[κός (ἐμ]ῆς suppl. Roberts) in v. 19 are the closing words of a speech by the young man that began in the lacuna before v. 19, and if everything thereafter up to the close of v. 22 is spoken by the female slave, that slave may be saying that the container originally belonged to the young man's mother (τῆς μητρὸς 20: suppl. Roberts), who had given it to the young man's wife (τῇ γυ[ναϊκί σου | ἔδωκε 20–21: σου suppl. Mette). Was the young man's mother the victim of a rape which had led her to bear twins, of whom the young man was one? Was the ring (v. 22) snatched from the raper, just as in *Epitrepontes*? The questions can be asked, but no longer answered.

(vi) At v. 31 τί [ποτε ταῦτα] βούλεται; (ποτε suppl. Roberts, ταῦτα Mette) undoubtedly introduces fillers that are too long for the 6 to 8 letter gap, but its resultant Greek here provides exactly the mots justes. It is worth noting that two lines later the five letters of ταῦτα are squeezed into a very narrow space, and that a scribe could easily have omitted the π of ποτε by virtual haplography after τι.