

W. GEOFFREY ARNOTT

FURTHER NOTES ON FR. COM. ADESP. 1147 KASSEL-AUSTIN

aus: Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik 125 (1999) 65–66

© Dr. Rudolf Habelt GmbH, Bonn



## FURTHER NOTES ON FR. COM. ADESP. 1147 KASSEL–AUSTIN

10

Here and elsewhere I adopt the line-numbering of Kassel–Austin. Towards the end of the verse [ο]ύχ έορακώ[ς – υ – is certain, but various supplements have been suggested after the participle: ούποτε or πώποτε or τής κόρης by Kassel, έγγύθεν or έμφανή or ούδέπω by Austin<sup>1</sup>. The most plausible seem to be those linking ού with an adverb in the sense ‘never/not yet’. In New Comedy ούκ . . . ούδέπω occurs once (Men. Sam. 271), ούδέν . . . ούποτε once (Men. Pk. 800), but ούκ or ούδεις . . . πώποτε three times (Men. Dysk. 725, Sik. 115–16, fr. 446.2 Kassel–Austin), and should be preferred here.

26–27

Maresch and others read P. Cologne 203 here as intending ὦ πότνια λ[υ – / κληδοῦχ’ Έφεσία, but this scribe’s alphas are sometimes written almost indistinguishably from his lambdas (e.g. at 12 δαιμον, 15 ατοπον, 51 παλιν)<sup>2</sup>, and if he wrote ποτνια α[ here with scriptio plena<sup>3</sup>, ὦ πότνι’ Ἄρτεμι provides an obvious supplement which would make interpretation of the following κληδοῦχ’ Έφεσία much easier for the audience<sup>4</sup>. For πότνι’ Ἄρτεμι cf. Eur. Med. 160 πότνι’ Ἄρτεμι, Hipp. 61–65 πότνια πότνια . . . ὦ κόρα Λατοῦς Ἄρτεμι καὶ Δίος, Philemon fr. 70 Ἄρτεμι . . . ὦ πότνια, Ar. Lys. 742 and Eccl. 369 ὦ πότνι’ Εἰλείθυ(α) (along with Eur. IT 463, 533, 1082, IA 1524). For anapaests thus split in the first half of the third metron see Handley’s edition of Men. Dysk. pp. 63–64; here both elision and close connection in thought help to palliate the anomaly<sup>5</sup>.

117

A speaker in this mutilated passage (fr. a + b of P. Cologne 243) seems to begin a speech with ἀπόδου μ’, ‘sell me’. Three lines later it is likely to be the same character who adds καὶ κατάλ[υσο]ν, ‘and kill me’<sup>6</sup>. Although the context of these remarks remains doubtful, it seems likely that a slave had shortly before committed some offence<sup>7</sup> that justified him in expecting to be sold by his master or even executed.

<sup>1</sup> In Maresch, *Kölner Papyri* 5 (1984) 10.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. R. Nünlist, *ZPE* 99 (1993) 251 (on his a II 16).

<sup>3</sup> Although in this roll the scribe normally omits elided vowels, scriptio plena occurs in 57 φιλάτατε and 116 ειτ[ε], perhaps also in 112 if Austin’s ν[υ]μ[υ]τε is accepted.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. especially N. Zagagi, *ZPE* 62 (1986) 39 n. 2.

<sup>5</sup> After completing this note, I found that this supplement had already been proposed by J. S. Sheldon in *Classicum* 14 (1988) 11–16. Since this periodical is not listed in *Année Philologique* and not generally available (it is published by the New South Wales Classical Association, and can be obtained from the School of Archaeology, Classics and Ancient History in the University of Sydney), and since Sheldon advances no arguments in favour of the supplement, it seems better to let this paragraph stand.

<sup>6</sup> Austin’s supplement (in Maresch, *Kölner Papyri* 6 (1986) 57) and its translation as ‘kill’ (cf. Kassel–Austin, *PCG* VII p. 485) must be correct here; the alternative interpretation ‘take a lodging’ (cf. e.g. Pl. *Protag.* 315d) would be much less appropriate in a context where a miscreant slave was following up a ‘sell me!’ with a climactic ‘and even κατάλυσον me!’

<sup>7</sup> Speculation about that offence is probably unwise, but if the young man of frs. A, B, C of P. Cologne 203 (vv. 1–58 Kassel–Austin) had continued to pursue the hetaira he loved and had needed money to pay for both her services and their alcoholic entertainment (cf. vv. 83, 42–43 and 123–24 K–A in that order), the slave (who might be named Dromon, if the supplement of Austin and Lloyd-Jones at v. 119 is accepted, and might be the character involved in vv. 1–58) could have attempted to steal a sizable sum from the young man’s father (? the old man of v. 119), and been caught in the attempt. It is worth noting that in Athens any man (free or slave) taken in the act of stealing 50 drachmas or more could be summarily killed or arrested and then in due course publicly executed (cf. e.g. A. R. W. Harrison, *The Law of Athens*, II: Procedure

In a recent note (ZPE 123, 1998, 59 f.) I tentatively suggested that fr. com. adesp. 1147 might well derive from Menander's *Ephesios*, without adducing what might perhaps be the strongest argument for this attribution. Menander fr. 171 Kassel–Austin derives from the *Ephesios*:

ἐγὼ μὲν ἤδη μοι δοκῶ, νῆ τοὺς θεοὺς  
 ἐν τοῖς κύκλοις ἑμαυτὸν ἐκδεδυκότα  
 ὄραν κύκλω τρέχοντα καὶ πωλούμενον.

If v. 117 of fr. com. adesp. 1147 was spoken by a guilty slave just before leaving the stage at the end of that play's first act, Men. fr. 171 would then fit very neatly into an entrance monologue by the same slave at or near the beginning of the second act, where he developed the idea by imagining himself already in the slave market.

Leeds

W. Geoffrey Arnott

---

(Oxford 1971) 225–26, E. Cohen, *Theft in Athenian Law* (Munich 1983) 70–79, and S. J. Todd, *The Shape of Athenian Law* (Oxford 1993) 117–18, 140–41). A similar crime seems to have led to the threatened burning of the slave Daos in Menander's *Perinthia* (cf. vv. 17–18).