

W. GEOFFREY ARNOTT

FURTHER NOTES ON MENANDER'S PERIKEIROMENE

aus: Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik 109 (1995) 11–30

© Dr. Rudolf Habelt GmbH, Bonn

FURTHER NOTES ON MENANDER'S PERIKEIROMENE

These notes are the by-products of work devoted to Menander's *Perikeiromene* during preparation of a second volume for the new Loeb edition of Menander. They supplement and in places revise my earlier discussions of problems and passages of that play in CQ 18 (1968) 232ff., 19 (1969) 205, and ZPE 71 (1988) 11ff. In all the passages treated here the primary line-numberings are those in F. H. Sandbach's Oxford text of Menander (1st edition 1972, 2nd 1990); it will be useful for readers to have the same editor's *Menander: A Commentary* (with A. W. Gomme, Oxford 1973; hereafter referred to as the Oxford commentary) by them for reference.

155–158 (35–38 Körte)

155 εὐθὺ προσδραμὼν (35)

ἐφίλει, περιέβ[α]λλ', ἢ δὲ τῷ προειδέ[ναι]

157 ἀδελφὸν ὄντ' οὐκ ἔφυγε, προσιῶν δ' [—υ] (37)

ὄρῳ.

In a postponed prologue *Agnoia* here describes how the loving embrace of Glykera and her brother Moschion was observed by an unsuspected eye-witness, whose identity appears originally to have been given at the end of 157, now torn off in C. Doubtless that identification would have come as no surprise to an audience likely to have been informed about the event in one of the lost scenes preceding the prologue, but it is remarkable that the obvious supplement in 157, although first advanced more than sixty years ago by W. E. J. Kuiper (*Neophilologus* 13, 1930, 226), has since then been largely ignored by subsequent editors.

That supplement is the only one that provides the mot juste: [ὁ θεράπων. It identifies the eye-witness precisely¹ (but characteristically without naming him) as *Sosias*, Polemon's slave. He had been sent by his master on the previous evening to announce to Glykera that Polemon had just returned from campaigning abroad, acting as messenger and scout exactly as he does again twice later in the preserved portions of the play (172ff., 354ff.)². *θεράπων* is frequently used from the end of the fifth century onwards in Attic and later in the Koine as a (probably polite or palliative) synonym of *δοῦλος* (e. g. *Ar. Plut.* 3 and 5~2, 518, 816, 1105, *Men. Dysk.* 496, 560, *Georg.* 32, *Perinth. fr.* 3.2 Sandbach, *Sik.* 8~5, 107, 200 and 204~208, 267, 353, *fr.* 614.7; *Antiphon* 6.27 and *Tetr. A γ* 2, *δ* 7, *Lysias* 1.42, 5.3 and 5, 7.16 and 43, *Isocr. Aegin.* 39, *Pl. Resp.* 9.579a, *Leg.* 1.633c, *Arist. Polit.* 2.1, 2, 3 =

¹ The imprecision of Wilamowitz's [ἄτερος (SB Berlin 49 [1907] 860), which has won considerable support, ought to make it unacceptable; Menander's prologues are normally clearly focussed, and not blurred by such ambiguities; cf. both G. Paduano's and M. Lamagna's comments *ad loc.* in their editions of this play (Milan 1980, Naples 1994 respectively), rightly countering Gomme and Sandbach in the Oxford commentary (p. 473 on 157).

² In view of this I do not find G. Mastromarco's arguments convincing (*Studi in onore di Adelmo Barigazzi*, 2 (Rome 1986) 33ff.) when he attempts to re-open the case for identifying the eye-witness as Polemon.

1261^b37, 1263^a19, 1265^a16, Alciphron 4.17, [Aristaenetus] 1.3, 2.15)³. Yet a careful reading of extant texts suggests that although *θεράπων* can be applied to any slave, it seems also specifically employed to define the status of *δοῦλοι* like Sosias in Menander's *Perikeiromene*: a soldier's slave who acts as batman to his master when the latter is campaigning, and as house slave when the soldier is back at home. Daos, the slave of the soldier Kleostratos, is similarly called *θεράπων* in Men. Asp. 122 (cf. 195); cf. also e.g. Thuc. 4.16.1 and (possibly) 7.13.2, Xen. Cyrop. 6.1.14, 8.5.6, Hellen. 6.2.23, the scholion on Hom. Il. 13.600 *θεράπων· δοῦλος ὄπλοφόρος κατὰ Κρήτας*⁴ and Eustathius 1090.47ff. where the same explanation is identified as *κατὰ τοὺς γλωσσογράφους*.

For the rhythm of *ὁ θεράπων* at the end of a Menandrian iambic trimeter cf. Sik. 267 (same words), Dysk. 15, 325, Epitr. 496, Sam. 399, and see J. Descroix, *Le trimètre iambique des iambographes à la comédie nouvelle* (Macon 1931) 191, 193f., and E. W. Handley's edition of Men. Dysk. (London 1965) p. 68.

162–168 (42–48 Körte)

162 πάντα δ' ἐξεκάετο (42)

ταῦθ' ἔνεκα τοῦ μέλλοντος, εἰς ὀργὴν θ' ἵνα
οὗτος ἀφίκητ' – ἐγὼ γὰρ ἦγον οὐ φύσει

165 τοιοῦτον ὄντα τοῦτον – ἀρχὴν δ' ἵνα λάβῃ (45)

μηνύσεως τὰ λοιπά, τοὺς θ' αὐτῶν ποτε
εὔροιεν· ὅστ' εἰ τοῦτ' ἐδυσχέρανέ (οἱ -ραινέ) τις

168 ἀτιμίαν τ' ἐνόμισε, μεταθέσθω πάλιν. (48)

Towards the end of her prologue *Agnoia* attempts to forestall any unfavourable reaction by members of the audience to the events she has described. The lines quoted above provide two small textual problems that are difficult to resolve.

(i) In 162 (*πάντα*) – 167 (*εὔροιεν*) it seems better to reject Sandbach's punctuation and to go back (with M. Lamagna in his edition of the play, Naples 1994) to that of C. Jensen (Berlin 1929) and Körte, limiting the explanatory parenthesis to 164 (*ἐγὼ γάρ*) – 165 (*τοῦτον*). This produces a final clause entirely outside the parenthesis, articulated with the particles *θ' . . . δ' . . . θ' . . .* in what seems at first sight an irregular sequence. However, J. D. Denniston in *Greek Particles*² (Oxford 1954) 513f. has provided an extensive list of such sequences, most of them justifiable⁵, and warned those scholars who wish to emend them out of their texts⁶ that 'the explanation of the irregularity probably is that the idea of contrast

³ Cf. Hesychius and the Suda, *θεράποντες· δοῦλοί τε καὶ ὑπηρέται*. Ammonius' attempt to distinguish *θεράποντες* from *οἰκέται* (Diff. no. 227 p. 60 K. Nickau: *θεράποντες μὲν γὰρ οἱ ὑποτεταγμένοι φίλοι, ὑφ' ὧν θεραπεύονται οἱ προσήκοντες, οἰκέται δὲ δεσποτῶν*) is based on only a selected portion of the evidence and ignores the rest.

⁴ See also K. Latte, *Philologus* 80 (1925) 145 = *Kleine Schriften* (Munich 1980) 639.

⁵ From Denniston's list Eur. Phoen. 1606 (an error for the equally unjustifiable 1608–10?), Thuc. 1.11.1 and probably 7.81.3, Xen. Hellen. 4.5.15, Pl. Resp. 10.618a, Andocides 1.5, Isocrates 3.33 and 15.232 need to be deleted.

⁶ Denniston's warning is ignored, for more or less defensible reasons, in authoritative editions of Soph. El. 1099, Phil. 1312f. (H. Lloyd-Jones and N. G. Wilson), Eur. Alc. 197, Tro. 380, I.T. 994f., 1414f. (J. Diggle), Lysias 25.34 (C. Hude), Aeschines 3.80 (F. Blass).

is added to the original idea of addition'. Hence there is no call to adopt Sudhaus's replacement of the transmitted δ' with θ' here, even if in this passage of the Perikeiromene the sequence of particles is more complex than the relatively common pairing of τε . . . δέ . . . ; note for instance the comparable oddities of τε . . . δὲ . . . καί . . . καί at Pl. Symp. 186e, and τε . . . δὲ . . . καί at Xen. Hellen. 7.1.24.

(ii) In 167 C has ἐδυσχέρανε, H (P. Heidelberg 219, first published by G. A. Gerhard in SB Heidelberg 1911, 4ff.) ἐδυσχέρανε. Since 1911 editors of Menander have all printed H's aorist, but it seems to me that a good case can be made for C's imperfect. In the present context both ingressive aorist ('became displeased') and imperfect ('was displeased') make acceptable sense, but in the indicative mood the imperfect of this verb (e.g. Xen. Hellen. 7.4.2, Pl. Theaet. 169d, mss. rightly at Aeschines 1.54 and 158, Dem. 21.86, Arist. Rhet. 2.24.11 1402^a25) is far commoner than the aorist (Pl. Epist. 7.325a, Isocr. Panath. 201, Arist. Metaph. 1.3.12 984^a29), although the aorist participle is frequently in evidence (e.g. Soph. O.C. 1282, Pl. Theaet. 195c, Polit. 301c, Leg. 10.887c, Isocr. Phil. 24, [Dem.] 25.63, Arist. Polit. 5.6 1306^b4, Poet. 17.2 1455^a 28). Oddly this passage of Perikeiromene is the verb's only extant occurrence in comedy. Secondly, where two verbs are linked together as here in the protasis of a condition, a scribe is more likely to have assimilated two verbs in different tenses to the same tense than to have altered one of two verbs in the same tense to a different one. It is notable too that in the other places where C and H disagree over readings, C is right three times (163 C's θ' omitted by H, 175 H γαρτι for ἄρτι, 178 H γε[for C's γινόμεν') and perhaps wrong once (174 where κατέλαβον H appears to me preferable to κατέλιπον C)⁷.

174–176 (54–56 Körte)

174 κατέλαβον ποούμενον (54)
 ἄριστον αὐτοῖς ἄρτι, καὶ συνηγμένοι
 εἰς ταύτόν εἰσιν οἱ συνηθεῖς . . .

Sosias describes what Polemon and his friends were doing when he last saw them, but the variant readings in the two papyri (κατελιπον and αρτι C, κατελαβον and] . γαρτι H) which preserve (H partially) this passage have given rise to much discussion: most recently Gomme–Sandbach in the Oxford commentary ad loc., J. Rea, ZPE 16 (1975) 126–128, M. Gronewald, ZPE 99 (1993) 25 and M. Lamagna in his 1994 edition. Two further points, however, may be added to their and earlier discussions in the hope that they may help to decide what Menander wrote here.

(i) Rea provides useful notes on the meaning of ἄριστον ποιῶμαι, correctly stating that in this expression ποιῶμαι is commonly middle, but he goes wrong when he claims that at Hdt. 6.78 and Thuc. 7.40 the verb can mean either 'I eat' or 'I prepare' (lunch). The Greek for 'I prepare lunch' is ἄριστον ποιῶ at Antiphanes 271 (here as elsewhere I use the Kassel–Austin numeration) where the verb's subject is a μάγειρος; hence the middle correctly means 'I have (lunch) prepared', grading to 'I eat (lunch)', although elsewhere in Menander

⁷ See my discussion of 174–175 below.

‘they eat lunch’ is ἄριστον ἄριστῶσιν, Epitr. 610. In view of these facts ποιούμενον at v. 174 here is best taken as passive (as by Sandbach and Gronewald), ‘(lunch) being prepared (for them)’. Although I can find no other passive use of ποιῶ in this phrase, the synonymous ἀριστοποιῶ/-ποιουῦμαι does occur in the passive, τὰ ἀριστοποιούμενα at Xen. Hellen. 4.5.1. This interpretation effectively removes Polemon from any limelight at this point; while he weeps, recumbent and numbed into inertia, others (Doris presumably and any other slaves in the house where Polemon is staying) are left to get on with the normal business of life.

(ii) The participial phrase ποιούμενον ἄριστον is governed by either H’s κατέλαβον or C’s κατέλιπον, but which of the two aorists did Menander write? Both καταλαμβάνω and καταλείπω are at times constructed with accusative and participle (‘I find/come across’⁸ and ‘I leave X doing something/being or becoming something’), but this construction is far more common with καταλαμβάνω (e.g. in comedy Ar. Lys. 721, Plut. 297, Philyllius 21, Eubulus 88.3, Nicostratus 20.1f., Alexis 125.1f., Men. Georg. 7f., Dysk. 259, Sam. 39f., 535f., 540f.) than with καταλείπω (Ar. Eccl. 541f., fr. 376, Antiphanes 220.3), but all the examples of this construction with the latter verb known to me in comedy and elsewhere have a personal object, while καταλαμβάνω does sometimes govern a non-personal object (in comedy Alexis 125.1f. ἄρτους, Men. Georg. 7f. γάμους; elsewhere e.g. Pl. Symp. 174de τὴν θύραν). Oddly both verbs occur in this construction qualified with ἀρτίως⁹ (καταλαμβάνω Men. Sam. 540f., cf. Nicostratus 26.1f. where the adverb qualifies the participle; καταλείπω Ar. fr. 376.

178–180 (58–60 Körte–Thierfelder)

178 ἐκπέπομφέ με (58)
 ἰμάτιον οἴσονται ἐξεπίτηδες, οὐδὲ ἐν
 δεόμενος. ἀλλ’ ἦ περιπατεῖν με βούλεται;

Sosias explains why he has now returned to Polemon’s house. By 180 we have lost the help of H, and C writes ἀλλ’ ἦ without accents or breathings, as normally. E. Capps interpreted it as ἀλλ’ ἦ in his edition (Boston etc. 1910), persuading the early editors and Sandbach; C. Meister (per epistulam: see Körte’s third edition of Menander, Leipzig 1938, p. 151) suggested rather ἀλλ’ ἦ, introducing a question. The latter is clearly right and ἀλλ’ ἦ

⁸ Editors have always preferred to print C’s κατέλιπον rather than H’s κατέλαβον here because, it appears, of slightly misinterpreting the latter verb in this construction. It means simply ‘I found/came across’ without any presumption that the verb’s subject had just arrived, and so is no less appropriate in its context at that point (pace G. A. Gerhard, SB Heidelberg 4 [1911] 7) than κατέλιπεν; Sosias in fact does not turn to the subject of his leaving the house until 178, four lines later.

⁹ Rea attempts to make a case for H’s γάρ τι, reading αὐτὸ]ν before it in that papyrus rather than αὐτοῖ]ς. The traces in G. A. Gerhard’s photograph (printed with the paper cited in the previous note) suit both]ν and]ς, but the clear presence of αυτοῖς in C makes interpretation of the traces in H as]ς more likely. ἄρτι too makes good sense, while γάρ τι would provide a problematic connection in this context (see Gomme–Sandbach in the Oxford commentary). Rea finds the previously unexplained αὐτοῖς in C difficult, but does that pronoun there provide the reason why Menander in the very next clause goes on to identify this vague ‘them’ as the friends (οἱ συνήθεις) of Polemon who had come to help him bear his distress?

impossible. As J. D. Denniston, *Greek Particles*² 24–27 clearly demonstrates, ἄλλ' ἢ normally follows a negative clause or a question expecting a negative answer, and itself introduces either a clause which continues the construction of the preceding clause or a single word or short phrase subordinated to the previous construction. Neither would apply here; the preceding clause is participial, and ἄλλ' ἢ would introduce a clause in the indicative.

ἄλλ' ἢ περιπατεῖν με βούλεται as a question, on the other hand, restores both syntax and structure to normality. Questions introduced by ἄλλ' ἢ have been much discussed (e.g. in their commentaries by W. J. M. Starkie (London 1897) and D. M. MacDowell (Oxford 1971) on Ar. Vesp. 8, R. A. Neil (Cambridge 1909) on Equ. 951–953, W. S. Barrett (Oxford 1964) on Eur. Hipp. 858–859; see also Kühner–Gerth 2.528f. and Denniston, *Greek Particles*² 27f.). The facts are given most succinctly, accurately and sensitively by Barrett, and need not be repeated here. Parallels for this use in Perikeiromene, where it closes a speech and follows a negative or puzzled statement or question voiced by the same speaker, occur more frequently than Denniston's account would lead one to believe: e.g. in Greek drama Eur. Bacch. 918–922 καὶ μὴν ὄρᾶν μοι δύο μὲν ἡλίους δοκῶ, / δισσὰς δὲ Θήβας καὶ πόλισμ' ἐπτάστομον· / καὶ ταύρος ἡμῖν πρόσθεν ἠγεῖσθαι δοκεῖς / καὶ σῶ κέρατα κρατὶ προσπεφυκέναι. / ἄλλ' ἢ ποτ' ἦσθα θήρ; τεταύρωσαι γὰρ οὖν; Ar. Equ. 951–953 οὐκ ἔσθ' ὅπως ὁ δακτύλιός ἐσθ' οὕτως / οὐμός· τὸ γοῦν σημεῖον ἕτερον φαίνεται. / ἄλλ' ἢ οὐ καθορῶ; and Men. Epitir. 541–542 οὐ γὰρ οἶσθα σύ; / ἄλλ' [ἦ] χάρις τις, Ἀβρότονον, τούτων ἐμοί; In the second passage the manuscripts incorrectly write ἦ, as frequently elsewhere (cf. Denniston here).

270 (80 Körte–Thierfelder

270 χρῆσαι πολεμίου τοίνυν [⋮] (80)

Daos tries to think of a suitable punishment for himself if convicted of lying – something more savage than being hung up for a beating – and he suggests 'Well then, treat (me) [. . .] of an enemy'. Crönert and others supplemented with τρόπον, Körte with δίκην, both in the sense of 'in the manner' of an enemy; most editors either print or (cf. Gomme–Sandbach in the Oxford commentary here and at Perikeiromene 812) tentatively support the former. This accusative idiom is commoner in Attic comedy than sometimes realised (e.g. with τρόπον Pherecrates 160, Antiphanes 132.4, possibly com. adesp. 1035.29 Kassel–Austin, probably not Men. Perikeiromene 812 in a stylistically elevated passage; with δίκην Araros 8.3), and its introduction here may be justified, although then the absence of a μοι governed by χρῆσαι becomes more awkward after the switch from verbs (269 πλανῶς με followed by a κρέμασον where με is easily supplied from the immediately preceding context) governing a direct object in the accusative to one constructed with the dative. Accordingly other supplements which eliminate any need for a μοι need to be considered: for instance Sudhaus's μέρει, or perhaps either τρόποις (cf. e.g. with χρῶμαι Eur. Hec. 867, Or. 769, Ar. Equ. 889, monost. 193 Jäkel, Pl. Leg. 9.862b) or τέχναις (cf. e.g. Eur. Phoen. 954, Nicolaus com. 1.3, Dionysius com. 2.34, Xen. Mem. 3.10.1, Oecon. 4.4, Pl. Protag. 216e). The latter suggestions cannot be advanced with full confidence, however, since they

involve a use of nouns which in comedy would be normally accompanied by the definite article in this idiom.

277–278 (87–88 Körte–Thierfelder)

277 (Mo.) εἰς μυλῶν' ἀφίξεται
οὐτοσὶ φερόμενος ἡ[μ]ῖν. ; (Δα.) μηδ[α]μ[ῶς] τέχνη[ν λ]έγ[ε].

Here I print C's badly abraded text as reported by those who have examined the original papyrus most carefully, along with J. C. B. Lowe's plausible supplement ἀφίξεται (BICS 20 (1973) 100) at the end of 277, which interprets Moschion's remark here as a prediction that Daos is more likely to be sent to a mill in punishment¹⁰ for his misdemeanours than to be employed here as its manager¹¹. Before εἰς in 277 there is a dicolon (but no paragraphus under the line), before μηδ[α]μ[ῶς] in 288 almost certainly another.

However, the ἡ[μ]ῖν which C adds to Moschion's response remains a problem. Attempts to identify it as an ethic dative are unconvincing, as Gomme–Sandbach in the Oxford commentary admit, and it may be preferable to assume that in 288 the dicolon has been misplaced, and that its correct position is before, not after, ἡμῖν¹². Then it becomes a far more natural part of Daos' response: 'Don't mention to us a job involving skill'.

291–292 (101–102 Körte–Thierfelder)

291 (Δα.) ταῦτα μὲ[ν δ]ή, φα]σίν, εὐχθῶ· δι
ο]ικίαν ἄνοι[γε], τρώφιμε. (Mo.) δεῖ μ[

The bottom of this page in C (J1^v = pl. xxix in Koenen: see n. 29) is badly abraded and the ends of the lines are torn off. Confident supplementation seems impossible, but the implausibility of at least one idea that is supported by several editors can perhaps be demonstrated. That idea is to accept an anarthrous οἰκίαν as object of ἄνοιγε; thus Sandbach in the Oxford commentary alleges that 'οἰκίαν may, as at 342 and Epitr. 165, be used without the article', but although this claim by an outstanding and much lamented scholar is not untrue, here it is misleading, for two reasons.

(i) When οἰκία refers to a specific house in comedy (more than 30 times in Menander) and elsewhere, the article is invariably used. The article is omitted only when the reference is non-specific, to a house or houses in general (Epitr. 165, 629, frs. 178.2, 577.2, 592.3, 614.7, 623.1, 645, 716, probably Sik. 165; Perikeiromene 342, where Daos says that Glykera καταλέλοιπεν οἰκίαν, is no exception; the slave there is being unspecific about a house that in fact belonged to Polemon: 'she has left a home and <her> lover'). At Perikeiromene 291–292 on the other hand the reference must be specific and accordingly a definite article is needed, expressed presumably at or near the end of 291: e.g. J. van Leeuwen's τὴν δὲ

¹⁰ The punishment consisted of pushing saddle-querns backwards and forwards in the flour mill, often with the feet fettered (cf. e.g. Plautus *Mostellaria* 15–19, Terence *Phormio* 249).

¹¹ Cf. Gomme–Sandbach in the Oxford commentary p. 482 (writing correctly on this passage), but note also H. Lloyd-Jones, *ZPE* 15 (1974) 210 n. 2.

¹² On such misplaced dicola in papyri see also M. Gronewald, *ZPE* 78 (1989) 37, discussing P. Oxy. 3369 (Men. *Misoumenos*).

σὴν, in his third edition of Menander (Leiden 1919), or alternatively τὴν τε σὴν, τὴν γε σὴν, perhaps even just τὴν (if the licence of placing a definite article at the very end of one line and its noun at the beginning of the next, which is common in the iambic trimeter¹³, may be extended to the trochaic tetrameter).

(ii) In parallel expressions with the imperative ἄνοιγε, the verb's object is not anarthrous: e.g. τὴν θύραν Alexis 207.1, Men. Dysk. 454, cf. carmen popolare 2.18 Page (PMG 450f.), τὰς θύρας Asp. 303, τὸ φροντιστήριον Ar. Nub. 181.

304 (114 Körte–Thierfelder)

304 τὴν δ' Ἀδράστειαν μάλιστα νῦν ἀρ[9–12 letters]ν.

Here Moschion kowtows to Adrasteia, θεὰ τις τοὺς ὑπερηφάνους τιμωροῦσα (scholion on P. V. 936), in an attempt to apologise for boasting at 302–303 about his sex-appeal. Many attempts have been made to supplement the lacuna in 304, and in CQ 18 (1968) 233f. I tentatively proposed νῦν ἀρ[εστὸν προσκυνεῖ]ν or νῦν ἀρ[έστ' εἰ προσκυν]ῶ. However the new photographs of C published by Koenen (see n. 29: pl. XXX = J2^f) enable the length of the lacuna to be more securely defined, and confirm (i) that the letters preceding the gap are ἀρ[(only the long tail of the ρ is preserved, written too close to the preceding alpha to be identified as a φ or ψ, while ψ in any case would be excluded by the metre), and (ii) that the fragment of a letter preserved at the end of the lacuna comes from a ν and not (as sometimes wrongly claimed¹⁴) an ω. Since the verb used for kowtowing to vengeful deities is προσκυνεῖν (Ἀδράστειαν also P. V. 936, Pl. Resp. 5.451a; Νέμεσιν Alciphron 4.6.5, Chariton 3.8; Φθόνον as a divinity with initial capital (pace editors) S. Phil. 776)¹⁵, 304 must end with προσκυνεῖ]ν, which takes up 9 of the available letters of the lacuna. Before it there have been advanced only two supplements that do not overload the available space: Wilamowitz's ἄρ[αρε and Capps' ἄρ' [ῶρα. No parallel is known to me for such a use of ἄραρε with the infinitive, but ῶρα, both with and without ἐστί, is regularly constructed with a (normally present) infinitive in Attic Greek; instances without ἐστί include in comedy Ar. Vesp. 346, 648, Av. 714, Eccl. 30, Hermippus 54.1, 76, Posidippus 15.1; elsewhere e.g. Eur. Hcl. 288, Phoen. 1584, fr. 718, Pl. Protag. 361e, 362a.

321–323 (131–133 Körte–Thierfelder)

321 " . . . μὴ ὥρας σύ γε",
 φή]σ', "ἴκοι', ἀλλ' [11 or 12 letters]ν βὰδιζε, παιδίον,
 323 ἐκ]ποδῶν" [7 or 8 letters] . λλ[. .] πάντ' [ἀν]ήρπαστ' ἐκ μέσου.

¹³ The examples in Menander are Asp. 55, 144, Georg. 26, Dysk. 264, 407, Sam. 493; cf. also my commentary on Alexis, fr. 20.4 (forthcoming: Cambridge 1996).

¹⁴ The right-hand hasta and part of the cross-stroke of the nu are clearly visible, the straightness of the two strokes and the sharpness of the angle they form confirming that the letter is a nu, written exactly like the nus in γενοῦ at 296 and ἔδειξεν at 300 on the same page of C. Hence I fail to understand how Sandbach could claim in the Oxford commentary that here 'ω after the gap, not ν, is almost certain'.

¹⁵ Cf. also in their commentaries ad loc. E. Capps (Boston 1910: v.184 in his numbering) and Sandbach.

Here I give basically Sandbach's text. 321 is the reading of C; in 322 Headlam and Wilamowitz supplemented φή]σ', in 323 Körte ἐκ]ποδὼν and [ἀν]ήρπαστ'. Daos describes his reception by Myrrhine, Moschion's mother, when he went inside the house to investigate developments; he first quotes Myrrhine's angry dismissal of him, then comments on the situation. Many conjectures have been made to fill the longer gaps in these lines, none of them convincing; it may be presumptuous to advance new ones, but their excuse is that they are intended to provide a more natural sequence of ideas not uncharacteristic of Menander.

(i) After ἴκοι', ἀλλ' in 322, various supplements have been suggested for that line and the one following, some totally impossible (e.g. [ἀσχολῶ γὰρ νῦ]ν E. Schwartz, *Hermes* 64 (1929) 7 and n. 5, but see the *Suda* s. v. ἄσχυλος = *Συναγωγὴ λέξεων χρησίμων* 157.22ff. Bachmann), some highly improbable (e.g. [ἐκφθάρηθι κα]ἰ Sudhaus, but see Körte³ ad loc.). It may be imprudent to risk adding further items to the vast rubbish heap of implausible conjectures, yet I should prefer to restore 322–323 as follows:

"ἴκοι', ἀλλ' [ἐκποδὼν δὴ νῦ]ν βᾶδιζε, παιδίον,
ἐκ]ποδὼν [ἐνθέ]ν[δ']." Ἄπ]ολλ[ον], πάντ' [ἀν]ήρπαστ' ἐκ μέσου.

On the adversative use of ἀλλὰ (. . .) δὴ in 322 see Denniston, *Greek Particles*² 240ff.; this combination of particles does not always follow a strong stop, see e.g. *Pl. Leg.* 3.689b ὁπότεν καλοὶ ἐν ψυχῇ λόγοι ἐνόητες μηδὲν ποιῶσιν ἀλλὰ δὴ τούτοις πᾶν τὸναντίον. Repetition of key words such as ἐκποδὼν is a method of emphasis employed elsewhere by Menander, both in commands (e.g. *Sam.* 465 *Μοσχίων*, ἔα μ', ἔα με, *Μοσχίων*, 470f. τοὺς γάμους ἔα ποεῖν, / τοὺς γάμους ἔα με ποεῖν)¹⁶ and with single words (e.g. *Perikeiromene* 366f. ὑμεῖς δ' ἀφήκαθ', *ιερόσυλα θηρία*, / ἀφή]κατ' ἔξω τῆς θύρ[α]ς, perhaps also *Dysk.* 596f.). In 423 [Ἄπ]ολλ[ον] can be interpreted either as Daos' own oath, expressing alarm¹⁷ at a new development which has suddenly thrown cold water onto Moschion's amorous schemes, or possibly (cf. e.g. *Men. Dysk.* 293, 415) as a one-word interjection by Moschion. The oath often precedes, as it would here when taken as part of Daos' speech, the remark which it qualifies (cf. *Men. Epitr.* 396, *Perikeiromene* 1018, *Sam.* 570, *Inc.* 57, fr. 423.1, com. adesp. 1014.355, 1093.35 *Kassel–Austin*). On the interpretation of the traces of the three letters of [Ἄπ]ολλ[ον] preserved in C, see Guéraud, *Bulletin de l'Institut français d'archéologie* 27 (1927) 143: 'Après la lacune, ΑΛΛ et ΟΛΛ sont également possibles'; the gap before them is probably not of 7 (so Sandbach) but of 8 letters, for on this page the scribe writes his letters a little smaller in the middle of each line than he does at its beginning. The supplement [ἐνθέ]ν[δ'] before Ἄπ]ολλ[ον] is of course purely speculative, but a slight trace of ink in the papyrus is compatible with the bottom of the right hasta of a nu.

329 (139 Körte–Thierfelder)

329 ψε]ῦδο[ς τρ]όφ[ι]μέ μου σοῦ καταψεύδεσ[θ' ἔ]τι.

¹⁶ Cf. my discussion of this Menandrian device in F. de Martino and A. H. Sommerstein (editors), *Lo spettacolo delle voci* (Bari 1995) 2.145ff.

¹⁷ The oath Ἄπολλων is always used by males and has the primary intention of averting ills; see F. W. Wright, *Studies in Menander* (Diss. Princeton: Baltimore 1911) 16ff.

I print C's text, as supplemented by Sudhaus in his 1914 edition, but without imposing any punctuation. Daos has just denied making any attempt to persuade Glykera to move over to Myrrhine's house, and in this lacunose verse he continues to address Moschion with a puzzling statement about lying. Although here a convincing restoration has eluded scholars, one error at least that still infects modern editions may be eliminated.

(i) Elsewhere in later Greek comedy addresses in the vocative by slaves to their young masters are always in the form τρόφιμε (Men. Dysk. 378, Kol. 86, Perikeiromene 292, Phasm. 41, frs. 740.1, 16, Philippides 28.2, com. adesp. 1093.2 Kassel–Austin). Hence if μου here is correctly transmitted, it is best not interpreted as a possessive genitive that goes with the vocative.

(ii) The most plausible sense in this context is something of the nature 'Are you accusing me of telling you a lie, master?': e.g. ἄρα or νῦν δὲ φῆς ψεῦδος με, [τρ]όφι[τι]με, σοῦ καταψεύδεις[θ' ἔ]τι, with question mark or full stop as appropriate. Yet since this requires a double assumption of one or two scribes first misplacing με after τρόφιμε and then assimilating its ending to that of the following σοῦ¹⁸, such a conjecture deserves no higher place than an apparatus criticus.

377 (187 Körte–Thierfelder)

Gomme–Sandbach in the Oxford commentary (p. 496) discuss the 'barely legible marginal note of the speaker, which Jensen and Sudhaus interpreted as Δ]Ω . . . Guéraud considers Δ]Α more likely, and observes, for what it is worth, that Doris' name is abbreviated ΔΩΡ at 754.' Two further arguments can be made adduced against Δ]Ω.

(i) Nowhere in the extant text hereabouts is there any reference to an entry by Doris before she speaks to Sosias on Daos' departure at 397; cf. here D. Bain, *Actors and Audience* (Oxford 1977) 121 and n. 4, K. B. Frost, *Exits and Entrances in Menander* (Oxford 1988) 94.

(ii) Körte's belief (introduction to his third edition of *Menander*, p. xxxiii), which Bain approves, that Doris remained in Polemon's house after Glykera moved to Myrrhina's, can be given one additional support. At 366f. Sosias, when re-entering the stage after his short visit to Polemon's house, addresses unnamed people inside with ὑμεῖς δ' ἀφήκαθ', ἱερόσυλα θηρία, / [ἀφή]κατ' ἔξω τῆς θύρ[α]ς. These must be Polemon's slaves (a slave is unlikely to address free persons as ἱερόσυλα θηρία), and it would make dramatic sense if Doris, as one of the slaves now addressed, were also visible at Polemon's door, remaining there as a mute spectator until she addresses Sosias at 397.

380–382 (190–192 Körte–Thierfelder)

ναὶ μὰ Δία, τ[ετρω]β[όλους].

381 ὅταν δὲ τετραδράχοις τοιούτ[ι] . . .]λα[
ἦ ῥαδίως μαχοῦμεθ' ὑμῖν.

¹⁸ In the apparatus to his edition Sudhaus claimed that C's ΜΟΥΣΟΥ itself had been corrected from an originally written ΜΕΠΟΥ.

Daos' response to Sosias's claim that he and his henchmen are real, hot-blooded (if the supplements in 379: ἤ[μᾶς Körte, χολὴν Wilamowitz are accepted) men is clearly intended to be contemptuous. In 380 Sudhaus's supplement τ[ετρῶ]β[όλους is confirmed by Sosias's reference back to this remark later at 393, but 381 remains a problem. Comic logic and the speaker's bravado appear to require something such as 'Your rabble are four-obols-a-day men. When he (Polemon) can provide men worth four drachmas a day, then we'll fight you – and beat you easily'. Thus in 381 Sudhaus' τετραδράχμους seems the most plausible correction, whether or not the iota in C's τετραδράχμοις was cancelled by the scribe as an error¹⁹. After τοιουτ[there is a gap of 4 to 6 letters before λα[, and this rules out supplements that do not fill this space (e.g. K. F. W. Schmidt's τοιουτ[ους] λα[μβάνη, leaving as more acceptable possibilities only A. W. Gomme's τοιούτ[ους τις] λά[βη (see Sandbach's Oxford Text: but τις seems less plausible in a context where the subject is clearly Polemon), or my own suggestion τοιούτ[ους ἀνα]λά[βη. ἀναλαμβάνω in the sense 'I take (troops with me)' is very common in military contexts: e.g. Thuc. 5.7.2, 63.5, 65.2, 7.1.5, 4.2, 43.2, 8.27.4, Xen. Hellen. 2.1.3, 2.8, 3.2.29, 4.4.13, 7.3, Anab. 7.3.36, Cyrop. 1.4.19, 5.14, Ages. 1.16, Polybius 1.25.6, 29.10.

386–387 (196–197 Körte–Thierfelder)

In this exchange between Daos and Sosias on the present whereabouts of Glykera the Cairo papyrus yields the following text, gaps and traces:

386 οὐκ[.] . . εν[. . . : ὄ]ψ[ο]μαί τινας
ὕμῶν [.]τας.

ἐν[δον: ὄ]ψ[ο]μαί here was supplied by Jensen in his edition; cf. also Guéraud, *op. cit.* above on 321–323. Dramatic logic requires Daos to deny that Glykera is staying in Myrrhine's house and Sosias to respond angrily to the denial. Given the traces and spaces, something like

(Δα.) οὐκ [ἔχομεν. (Σοσ.) ἀλλ' ἔ]στ' ἐν[δον. (Δα.) ὄ]ψ[ο]μαί τινας
ὕμῶν [στένον]τας

seems plausible; I take ἔχομεν from Jensen in his edition, στένον]τας from van Leeuwen in his 1919 edition. For Daos' laconic οὐκ ἔχομεν, cf. his reiteration ἀλλ' οὐκ ἔχομεν in 395; for the use of στένω in comedy cf. Ar. Ach. 30, 162, Vesp. 89, 180, Thesm. 73, Eccl. 462, fr. (dub.) 967, Eupolis 260.30 Kassel–Austin, Eubulus 67.10, Timocles 6.19, Men. Heros 5, Kith. fr. 1.2, Diphilus 49.

396–397 (206–207 Körte–Thierfelder)

396 [ὠ]ς εἴσειμ' ἐγὼ
ἕως εἰκοκας α.[. . . .]τφ.

The badly holed and abraded papyrus has Daos making this final remark to Sosias before going in. The published photographs of C at this point do not reveal clearly enough what the letter before the gap in 397 was, but Guéraud (*loc. cit.* above on 321–323) claims that

¹⁹ So Jensen, *Hermes* 49 (1914) 419.

'après EOIKAC, A est sûr, Π possible'. Two supplements need to be eliminated: ἀπ[ονο-εἶσ]θαῖ (Sudhaus in his 1914 edition, cf. Jensen, *Hermes* 49 [1914] 421) and ἀπ[ονοή]τῶ (Körte tentatively in his third edition). The former suggestion makes excellent sense (Daos has already accused Sosias and his associates of being mad, ἀπονοεῖσθε 375), but according to Guéraud it seems 'cadrer très mal' with the traces in the papyrus. Körte's ἀπονοήτῶ invents a non-existent adjective; Menander uses the verb ἀπονοοῦμαι in line 375, but as adjective only ἀνόητος (Sam. 327, 341, 641, Phasm. 47, frs. 79, 488, 615, 800). In any case, the gap here is more than four letters.

This leaves only Jensen's ἀ[θηκός]τῶ, which he prints in his edition. It fits the space admirably. In the Oxford commentary Gomme–Sandbach oddly claim that this supplement 'will hardly do', with a cross-reference to Sandbach's long and wholly admirable note at Sam. 550 on the adjective. That note discusses the meanings 'blunt/harsh/unsympathetic' and cites Phryn. Praep. Soph. 28.6 de Borries, which says that Menander applies this adjective ἐπὶ τοῦ πικροῦ καὶ ἀηδούς (Men. fr. 736). At Sam. 550 Demeas so describes Nikeratos (τραχὺς ἄνθρωπος, σκατοφάγος, ἀυθέκαστος τῶ τρόπῳ), where it is interesting to observe that the adjective stands next to σκατοφάγος, which Daos here in *Perikeiromene* had applied to Sosias just before (394). Accordingly Jensen's supplement here seems totally appropriate.

406–467 (216–217 Körte–Thierfelder)

The lacuna between line 406 Gomme–Sandbach = 216 Körte and 467 G.–S. = 217 K. is now generally estimated as 'uersus fere lx' (Gomme–Sandbach in the Oxford commentary, p. 500; cf. the editions of Jensen, Körte³, Paduano, Lamagna). A more precise figure can be given. The break between acts II and III occurred in this lacuna, during which Sosias returned to Polemon and came back with him and his raggie-taggle army. Act-breaks in C regularly occupy four lines of space if in mid-page (cf. in Koenen, *op. cit.* in n. 29, pls. X = Epitr. 418, XXIV = Epitr. 978, XXIX = *Perikeiromene* 267), although this figure may diminish to nothing when the break comes at the top of a page (XLV = Sam. 615). Since we do not know where on C's page this particular act-break came, we must allow a space of either 0 or 4 lines. The lacuna itself occupies one leaf of C, containing two pages of text. The extant complete pages of *Perikeiromene* contain 35, 35, 33 + 4 for an act-break, 37, 38, 38, 35 and 36 lines of text, ranging thus from 35 to 38 with an average of 36.375 lines. The two pages of C would have occupied between 66 and 74 lines, most probably 68 or 69. However, the Leipzig parchment (L) overlaps C here, containing the last 13 lines missing in C. The total gap in our text can be calculated as between 53 and 61 lines, most probably 55 or 56.

524–525 (274–275 Körte–Thierfelder)

At 524 the text is preserved in two different versions; the Leipzig parchment (L) has ματονδι'ουδεν : ουγαρ αλ[. . .]ειγεσε where there is every reason to assume that the lacuna held the three letters λαδ, and the Cairo papyrus (C) an unmetrical ματονδι'ουδ'εν : ουγαραλλαδειπαταικεσε, both manuscripts beginning the next line with ιδεινβαδιζε-

δευρο before a dicolon. The opening words are spoken by Pataikos, politely dismissing Polemon's admission that he had been gabbling on insanely, before Polemon repeats his request to Pataikos that the latter should see Glykera's wardrobe. Most scholars mend the metre in 524 either by deleting οὐδέν and then following C with (Πατ.) μὰ τὸν Δί'. (Πολ.) οὐ γάρ; ἀλλὰ δεῖ Πάταικέ σε . . . (so Wilamowitz), or by preferring γε to Πάταικε and writing (Πατ.) μὰ τὸν Δί' οὐδέν. (Πολ.) ἀλλὰ δεῖ γέ σε . . . (Körte). Although each rejected word can be interpreted as a gloss (Πάταικε for σε, οὐδέν confirming the negative use of μὰ), they both fit admirably into the context. Sudhaus first drew attention (see his 1914 edition) to the way in which Polemon repeatedly addresses Pataikos in the vocative in the second part of this scene (also 488, 507, 512 twice, 517), with Menander presumably thus emphasising the urgency of Polemon's pleading²⁰. At the same time the use of οὐ, οὐδέ, οὐδέν, οὐπω and οὔτε in conjunction with the oath μὰ (τὸν) Δία is abundant in Attic comedy (e.g. x 26 Aristophanes, x 3 Menander, x 2 adespota). Accordingly Sudhaus proposed retention of both οὐδέν and Πάταικε, and removal of τὸν from the oath; evidence from Attic usage suggests that he may well be right²¹. In comedy (and presumably popular speech) both μὰ Δία and μὰ τὸν Δία are used so frequently and (apparently) interchangeably as intensives that the presence or absence of the article makes little or no apparent difference in emphasis. Yet it needs to be noted that in Attic comedy μὰ Δία is far commoner (x 117 Ar., x 11 Menander apart from here) than μὰ τὸν Δία (x 33 Ar., never yet Men. with μὰ τὸν Δία on its own, but once with ναὶ μὰ, two or three times with τὸν Δία emphasised by the addition of epithet and second god in the oath). Furthermore the sequence οὐ / οὐδέν μὰ Δία with ἀλλά following immediately or shortly afterwards is relatively even more common (x 55 Ar.) than the same sequence with μὰ τὸν Δία (x 6 in Ar.), although that sequence elsewhere is never split between two speakers²².

742 (319 Körte–Thierfelder)

When the Cairo papyrus returns at this verse after a short gap of almost certainly 15 to 18 lines²³, Glykera is talking about the recognition tokens with which she and Moschion were exposed as twin babies. All that is preserved in the first extant line on this page is εγ[(9 or so letters)]λαμβ[α]. Supplementation is uncertain, but Menander could not have written ἐγ[ὼ δ' ἐκεῖν' ἐ]λάμβ[α]νον γνωρίσματα, which Körte conjectured and printed in his third edition, since the article would be needed with ἐκεῖν' . . . γνωρίσματα. Perhaps rather ἐγ[ὼ δ' ἐκεῖν' ἐ]λάμβ[α]νον· γνωρίσματ' ἦν, in which case ἐκεῖνα would presumably be picking up a reference to some expression such as ποικίλματα (cf. 773: C. Dedoussi's supplement,

²⁰ Cf. Sudhaus' note in his apparatus, 'hic ipse vocativus precantis et instantis est'.

²¹ On intrusive articles in comic papyri see especially the commentaries of B. A. van Groningen (Amsterdam 1960) and E. W. Handley (London 1965) on Men. Dysk. 18.

²² Cf. here especially F. W. Wright, op. cit. in n. 17 above, pp. 31ff., 71f., and J. Werres, *Beteuerungsformeln in der attischen Komödie* (Diss. Bonn 1936) 40ff.

²³ The last 19 lines of this page of C are preserved wholly or in part; the number of lines per page in this papyrus range normally between 34 and 37 (but one maverick page has 33, another 38).

Χαρις I. Βουρβερη, Athens 1964, 289f.) or τὰ ποικίλα (cf. 756) in a (now lost) previous context?

751–760 (328–337 Körte–Thierfelder)

This sequence contains two problems, both involving Doris, the slave of Polemon previously employed as Glykera's maid.

(i) At 751f. Pataikos orders καλεσάτω τὴν Δωρίδα / ἔξω τις (suppl. F. Leo, *Hermes* 43 [1908] 158). He then addresses Glykera for just over two badly preserved lines, during which Doris must enter from Polemon's house, since at the end of 754 the maid addresses her mistress. How is the summoning of Doris staged? The general view is that Pataikos is attended by a slave throughout this scene, with no other dramatic function apparently than to knock on Polemon's door at this point and (presumably by mime) to call Doris out onto the stage²⁴. There is, however, no need to assume the presence here of any mute characters. Pataikos and Glykera could be alone on stage at 751. And since Glykera could hardly be expected, after her angry departure from Polemon's house, to obey Pataikos' order herself and bring Doris onto the stage, we are left with the possibility that Pataikos obeyed his own command, went to Polemon's door and mimed the action of calling Doris out, before turning back to address Glykera. It is interesting to observe that at 1009 Pataikos summons Polemon out with a parallel command, ἀλλ' ἐκκαλείτω τις δ[ραμῶ]ν ἀύ[τὸν ταχύ (δ[ραμῶ]ν suppl. H. Weil, ἀύ[τὸν ταχύ H. van Herwerden, *Mnemosyne* 28 [1900] 122 respectively). On that occasion Polemon appears immediately by a convenient dramatic coincidence, but there is no reason to imagine that the stage action would have begun differently.

(ii) Doris apparently enters in an emotional state. After addressing her mistress she exclaims in 755 οἴον τὸ κακόν, and when asked by Glykera at 758 to fetch her mistress's recognition tokens from Polemon's house, she is in tears. Gaps in the text from 725 to 742 and 760 to 768 may well have given the reason for Doris's distress, but M. Hombert's suggestion, *Revue Belge* 6 (1927) 26, endorsed by the Oxford commentary, that it was caused simply by her general sorrow for Glykera's afflictions, is not supported by previous presentations of Doris in this play. At 181ff. she is unhappy at her mistress's situation but does not weep, nor is there any trace of tears at 397ff. This makes it far more likely that 'Doris prodit . . . lacrimans, quia vestimentum pictum, quod ei mandavit Glycera, evanuit; portat illud, ni fallor, Pataecus secum, qui agnovit, cum ei Polemo Glycerae ornamenta monstrabat' (Körte in his third edition, ad loc.).²⁵

²⁴ Thus in his third edition Körte writes simply 'servum mittit in Polemonis aedes, Doridem evocaturum'; cf. K. B. Frost, *Exits and Entrances in Menander* (Oxford 1988) 97. In the Oxford commentary Gomme–Sandbach ask 'Have some of Myrrhine's servants come out with Pataikos and Glykera? Or are some of Polemon's sitting outside his door?'

²⁵ It must be noted, however, that some objections to Körte's theory are excellently presented by D. Bain, *Actors and Audience* (Oxford 1977) 122ff.

754–755 (331–332 Körte–Thierfelder)

At the end of 754 Doris addresses Glykera with ὦ κεκτημένη, followed by a dicolon, which implies that Glykera responded in the lacuna (of three quarters of a metron) at the beginning of 755 before Doris then goes on to say οἶον τὸ κακόν. There cannot be much doubt that both Jensen's supplement τί ἐστίν; (accepted by Körte³ and Sandbach) and Sudhaus's τί δ' ἐστίν (Rh. Mus. 63 [1908] 296, accepted by him and Lamagna in their editions) make excellent sense in this context, but neither suggestion fills the space (10 or 11 letters) of the lacuna. For this reason τί ποτ' ἐστίν; appears to me a preferable substitute, emphasising Glykera's surprise²⁶ at Doris's sorrow and tears when she enters at 754.

774–778 (344–348 Körte–Thierfelder)

- 774 οὐ τῶν] ἀδυνάτων ἐστί, τουτί μοι δοκεῖ (344)
 σκοποῦν]τι, τὴν ἐμὴν τεκοῦσαν μητέρα
 ἄμ' ἐμοὶ προ]έσθαι θυγατέρ' αὐτῆ γενομένην·
 εἰ δὲ γεγένητ]αι τοῦτ', ἀδελφὴ δ' ἔστ' ἐμή,
 778 ἔξ]ἐφθάρμ' ὁ δυστυχῆς ἐγώ. (348)

The above text of Moschion's entrance monologue²⁷, during the recognition scene primarily involving Glykera and Pataikos, differs at two points from that generally accepted and now printed by Sandbach.

(i) At 776 the Leipzig parchment (L) simply writes αὐτη without accent, breathing or iota adscript, and all editors known to me have interpreted this as αὐτῆ. The reflexive form αὐτῆ would be preferable; when in Attic Greek a reflexive refers back to a noun or pronoun other than a subject in the nominative, that noun or pronoun is placed at the head of its clause (cf. Kühner–Gerth 1.560, H. W. Smyth, *Greek Grammar*² [Cambridge Mass. 1956] § 1218). Cf. e.g. in Menander Asp. 55ff. τῶ]ν τ' ἀνδραποδίων . . . / ἀκούω θόρυβον . . . / . . . ἀνακαλοῦντας αὐτοὺς ὀνόματι, 266f. τὴν δὲ παιδίσκην τυχεῖν / καθ' ἡλικίαν αὐτῆς ἔασον νυμφίου, Sam. 265f. αὐτὴν δ' ἔχουσαν αὐτὸ τὴν Σαμίαν ὀρῶ / ἔξω καθ' αὐτήν, and elsewhere e.g. com. adesp. fr. 257.46f. Kassel–Austin, Xen. Hellen. 6.5.21, Anab. 4.5.35.

(ii) At 778 Jensen read (in his edition) the first visible traces as]εφθάρμ, but Körte (in his first edition of the parchment, SB Leipzig 60 [1908] 161) could make out only]ρμ, and this is all that the photograph published with the ed. princ. now reveals. If]εφθάρμ is accepted as plausible, the supplements at the beginning of the line that have found their way into many of the standard editions: αὐτῆ (Sudhaus, linking up with the last four words of 777) κάκιστ' (Körte)] ἐφθάρμ' are less worthy of support. αὐτῆ is an unnecessary adjunct to what precedes, and κάκιστ'] ἐφθάρμ' becomes unlikely once it is realised that in the colloquial Attic of Moschion's monologue (in this scene tragic rhythm and diction are

²⁶ Could it be a female softening of the common male question τουτί τὸ κακόν τί ποτ' ἐστίν; (on which see e.g. E. W. Handley's commentary on Men. Dysk. 464f.)? W. E. Muir's objection to τί ἐστίν; (and presumably similar phrases: CR 53 [1939] 63) appears unfounded.

²⁷ Cf. especially Bain, *op. cit.* in n. 25, 113f.

largely confined to the other two characters present²⁸), an uncompounded and passive ἔφθαρμ(αι) seems inappropriate; the passive use of this verb is largely confined to the curse φθείρου/φθείρεσθε (Ar. Ach. 460, Plut. 598, 610, Sannyrion 11), and the two alleged instances of a different use are uncertain: Cratinus 277, where the text has given rise to suspicion, and Men. Heros 13, where]εφθαρμαι is preserved in the Cairensis and although editors generally interpret this as an uncompounded ἔφθαρμαι, a compounded δι]έφθαρμαι cannot be ruled out²⁹. Hence I should prefer to supplement with πρόρριζος or κάκιστά γ' ἐξ]έφθαρμ', assuming that on this sheet a scribe has tended, as often elsewhere, to allow the beginnings of his lines to creep slightly to the left as he moves down the page.

824–826 (394–396 Körte–Thierfelder)

This badly torn and abraded pair of lines continues to baffle scholars, and little profit comes any longer from either the photograph (IV) attached to Körte's first publication of the Leipzig sheets (see above, on 774–778, ii) or the published decipherments by Jensen

824 (Πατ.) φιλτατ[η] (Μοσ.) εἰ δ' ἐγὼ
]ι τί προσέχεσθε μ[.]νο[
 826 πάρειμι τοῦτον πα[.]α[.] ἐγώ.

and Körte (with μ[. . . .]α . νο . at the end of 825). Both note a suprascript letter above the ν in 825: λ according to Jensen, α Körte. Plausible supplements here obviously need to make sense both of the traces and of the heightened dramatic situation on stage, where Pataikos and Glykera are just now finally convinced that they are father and daughter, with their conversation overheard in the background by an unobserved Moschion who has learnt that Pataikos was his father too. The three puzzling lines quoted come at the point where Pataikos and Glykera embrace, and Moschion steps forward to address them. The following cockshy (it cannot be more than that) at least makes dramatic sense, even if its fidelity to the alleged traces is not always as close as one would like:

824 (Πα.) φιλτάτ[η, χαῖρ']. (Μο.) εἰ δ' ἐγὼ
 [πρόειμ]ι, "τί προσέχεσθ'", ἐρῶ, "τὸν διά]λο[γον
 826 πάρειμι τοῦτον πά[ντα παρακούσ]α[ς] ἐγώ".

Here I take over Sandbach's [χαῖρ'] at 824 (in the Oxford text, and cf. the Oxford commentary ad loc.), Jensen's [τὸν διά]λο[γον at 825 (in his edition), and Körte's supplements at 826; we may translate Moschion's words, delivered as he prepares to move forward and address the happy pair, as follows: If I go forward, I can say "Why are you embracing? I've been present, overhearing all this conversation". A dialectician might doubtless object to this cockshy by saying that if Moschion had overheard all that Pataikos and Glykera said, he would have no need to ask why they were embracing; but impromptu speech does not always obey the rules of logic, and Moschion has no degree in philosophy. The use of ἐρῶ

²⁸ Cf. most recently F. H. Sandbach in Entr. Hardt 16 (1970) 126ff., and Bain, op. cit. in n. 25, 113ff.

²⁹ Guéraud's (op. cit. on 321–323, 130) decipherment before the epsilon of 'une petite trace oblique, vers le haut de la ligne, peut être soit une apostrophe, soit le reste d'un Δ', which agrees exactly with what is now visible in the new photograph (L. Koenen and others, The Cairo Codex of Menander, Institute of Classical Studies, London 1978), goes some way to supporting a supplement δι]έφθαρμαι.

(as an alternative to φήσω) for introducing a quotation of projected speech appears in Menander elsewhere at Epitr. 533ff. τὸ πέρασ δὲ πάντων "παιδίον τοίνυν" ἔρω / "[ἔστ]ὶ γεγονός σοι" and 929ff. ἔρῳ διαρρήδην "ἔμοι σύ, Σμικρίνη, / μὴ πάρεχε πράγματ'".

980–982 (402–404 Körte–Thierfelder)

980 (Δω.) ἐὰν προθυμήθης ἀκ[άκ]ως – [(Πο.) προθυμίας
οὐκ ἐνλίπομι' ἂν οὐθέν, εὖ τοῦ]τ' ἴσθι. (Δω.) δεῖ.
(Πο.) ὑπέρευ λέγεις.

In this scene between Polemon and the slave Doris the textual problems are caused almost entirely by the loss of the line-ends in the papyrus (P. Oxyrhynchus 207), which was first published by B. P. Grenfell and A. S. Hunt, *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri* 2 (London 1899) 11ff., and re-edited with a splendid photograph by G. M. Browne, *BICS* 21 (1974) 43ff. In 979–982 Doris promises an unconvinced Polemon that Glykera will return to him if he behaves better in future. At the end of line 980 M. Gronewald's supplement (ZPE 102, 1994, 73f.) is uncertain but attractive, because it both produces a formulaic expression with many parallels in Attic and the Koine, as its author shows, and also makes Polemon here interrupt Doris a second time before she has completed her sentence, just as he had already done in 979.

In 981 the papyrus has ἐνλίπομι'. Under this line, as well as under 980, there is a paragraphus, but it seems clear that Polemon was speaking in the first part of both lines 981 and 982. If the papyrus is not at fault here, then Doris must have intervened at or near the end of 981, as Grenfell and Hunt were the first to realise. They accordingly supplemented Polemon's words in 981 with εὖ τοῦ]τ' ἴσθ', making Doris respond with ἰδοῦ. Polemon's phrase seems contextually and idiomatically plausible, but ἰδοῦ is an inappropriate response from one whom the context here requires rather to agree with and encourage Polemon in his decision. I should prefer to conjecture δεῖ³⁰ for Doris, as a monosyllabic response (after Polemon's ἴσθι) that both approves and seeks to confirm Polemon in his promise. Although I can trace no exactly parallel use of δεῖ as an answer in Menander, *Perikeiromene* 512 ἀλλὰ μὴν, Πάταικε, δεῖ, Sam. 666 δεῖ γάρ· (in mid-speech), and fr. 223.2f. εἰ θεὸν καλεῖν σε δεῖ. / δεῖ δέ· come very close.

984–986 (406–408 Körte–Thierfelder)

After noticing that Doris has made her exit on his orders before he has finished saying what he needed to, Polemon continues with

984 εἰσελήλυθ'. οἶμ[.]ι[
ὡς κατὰ κράτος μ' εἴληφας. εἰ[
986 ἀδελφόν, οὐχὶ μοιχόν.

³⁰ Not χρή, which is far less common than δεῖ in Menander (cf. W. S. Barrett's commentary [Oxford 1964] on Eur. Hipp. 41), and tends to be used in this kind of context only in the phrase ἀλλὰ χρή (in Menander Dysk. 849, cf. fr. 820).

The opening of 984 implies that 985 originally ended with a reference to Glykera's embrace of Moschion on the previous evening, so that supplementation must probably begin with ἐφιλ. If the preceding εἴληφας apostrophises Glykera rather than a divinity such as Ἐρως, ἐφιλ is also likely to have had a second-person-singular ending. Sandbach in his Oxford Text suggested the imperfect ἐφίλεις, but an aorist seems preferable here to me, ἐφιλησας followed by either C. Robert's τότε, or perhaps γ' ἄρα, with γε emphasising the verb in exclamatory fashion ('ha!') and ἄρα ('after all') expressing the speaker's late realisation of the facts of a situation. In an important paper J. C. B. Lowe, *Glotta* 51 (1973) 34ff.³¹ demonstrates that this and other uses of γ' ἄρα, with the two particles sometimes juxtaposed, sometimes separated by one or more words, sometimes too with ἄρα replaced by ἄρα for metrical reasons, are far commoner in comedy and elsewhere than often realised. Although there are no recorded instances of juxtaposed γ' ἄρα so far in Menander, in Aristophanes see *Lys.* 31, *Eccl.* 558f., probably *Thesm.* 248; for γ' ἄρα see *Av.* 1358, 1542, *Plut.* 920, probably *Vesp.* 217. All these passages are fully discussed by Lowe.

990 (412 Körte–Thierfelder)

κατεγέλα υἱ.

It is generally agreed that here, in Polemon's hesitant response to Doris' announcement that Glykera will be reunited with him, we should supply δέ + the first personal pronoun in the genitive (δ' ἐμοῦ Capps, *op. cit.* in n. 15, p. 214) or dative (δ' ἐμοί Lamagna in his edition of the play). Yet since the emphasis here is clearly on the verb, not the pronoun, we should write δέ μοι or (better³²) δέ μου.

992–994 (414–416 Körte–Thierfelder)

992 ὁ πατήρ ἐπεσκ[εῦ]αζ'· ἐχρῆν σε νῦν τα[χὺ
εὐα(γ)γέλια τῶ[v] γεγονότων ποθ[(415)
994 θ[ύε]ι[v] ἐκ[ε]ίνης εὐτυχηκυῖης [τόδε.

Doris is asking Polemon to offer a thanksgiving sacrifice. In 992 ἐπεσκ[εῦ]αζε was deciphered by Browne (see above, on 980–982), τα[χὺ supplemented by H. van Herwerden, *Mnemosyne* 28 (1900) 121; the other supplements were provided by Grenfell and Hunt in the ed. princ. In 993 the gap after ποθ[is hard to fill because the sense in Doris' injunction seems already complete, so the lost word or words probably duplicated or mildly qualified something stated in the preserved portions of text. Could Menander have written τῶν γεγο-

³¹ Cf. also J. D. Denniston's discussion in *Greek Particles*² (Oxford 1954) 43, which Lowe expands and modifies, and K. J. Dover on *Ar. Nub.* 680 (Oxford 1968).

³² Although καταγελῶ can take both genitive and dative in the sense 'I mock (a person)', in the Attic of comedy we find only the genitive (*Ar. Ach.* 1081, 1107, *Equ.* 713, *Vesp.* 1406, *Pax* 476, *Av.* 98, 1407, perhaps *Damoxenus* 2.14 if that corrupt line is not spurious. Cf. also e.g. *Andocides* 4.29, *Pl. Gorg.* 482d. The only exception in comedy is *com. adesp.* fr. 182 Kassel–Austin, where the verb takes a (non-personal: τοῖς παθήμασιν) dative. *Men. Epitr.* fr. 10 Sandbach, which Lamagna in his edition cites as a parallel for the dative, is not relevant; ἐλευθέρῳ there construes with αἰσχίον ἐστί, and the articulated καταγελᾶσθαι is in any case passive.

νότων ποθ' ἠδέως, 'these pleasant events at last'? For this conjunction of γίγνομαι and ἠδέως, cf. e.g. Plut. Alex. 69 παρεκάλει τὴν ἡμέραν ἠδέως γενέσθαι and Mor. 189b "πῶς γέγονεν;" "ἠδέως".

1001 (423 Körte–Thierfelder)

In Polemon's speech, apparently requesting Glykera to be brought onto the stage out of Myrrhine's house, Browne's re-examination of the papyrus (see above on 980–982) reveals that the text runs ἄγετε [. . .]ξ[, where the presence of the ξ eliminates several earlier conjectures. Browne's own suggestion, ἄγετε [γ' ἔ]ξ[ω τὴν κόρην (p. 50), however, is only partly acceptable. Polemon never refers to Glykera elsewhere in the play as ἡ κόρη, and although such a term can be applied to a mistress as early as Homer (Il. 1.98, 337, 2.689 of Briseis), ἄγετε [γ' ἔ]ξ[ω Γλυκέριον would sound more appropriate in Polemon's mouth.

1003 (425 Körte–Thierfelder)

When sounds of the arrival of Glykera with her father terrify Polemon into dashing off stage, Doris cries out ὦ τα[—]υ. It is odd that nobody so far, to the best of my knowledge, has suggested the obvious supplement: ὦ τά[λαιν' ἐγώ, although Sudhaus apparently did once hazard τά[λαιν'. The expression is in comedy a feminine formula: at the end of a trimeter similarly in Men. Dysk 620, Sam. 245, and cf. τάλαιν' ἐγώ Dysk. 203, ὦ τάλαιν' ἐγώ Epitir. 529, τάλαιν' ἐγῶγε Sam. 398, Perikeiromene 810.

1010–12 (432–434 Körte–Thierfelder)

1010 (Πολ.) ἐξέρχομ' ἀλλ' ἔθυον [ύ]περευ[
Γλυκέραν γ]ἄρ εὐρηκ[υ]ῖαν οὖς [
π[υθό]με[νο]ς

So Polemon to Pataikos directly after being called out. If the supplements printed here (ἐξέρχομ' 1110 van Leeuwen in his 1908 edition, the rest Grenfell and Hunt, in ed. princ.), together with the reading]αρ in 1011 ('the rho is certain', Browne p. 48: see above on 980–982), are accepted, three further problems emerge.

(i) What followed οὖς in 1011? Glykera has found her close relatives; as a cockshy I should suggest, but without full confidence, οὖς [εἶχ' ἐν γένει; for this use of ἐν γένει cf. Soph. O. R. 1016, 1430, Eur. Alc. 903f., Dicaeogenes 1b.3 Snell, [Dem.] 47.70.

(ii) Whether]αρ in 1011 is interpreted as ὄρ' or part of γ]ἄρ, either particle would be expected to introduce a clause with a main verb. Unless that verb is concealed in the opening of 1011 (? ἐ[χάτην γ]ἄρ, but that seems too short for the space, and the absence of a pronoun or noun with εὐρηκ[υ]ῖαν would cause some qualms) or its end (but it is difficult to find a first-person-singular verb of suitable meaning – e.g. 'I rejoice/rejoiced, I celebrate/was celebrating' – that could be fitted in after the verb in the relative clause), we are forced to assume that Polemon's words are interrupted by Pataikos after π[υθό]με[νο]ς before the sentence is completed.

(iii) At the end of 1110 Grenfell and Hunt supplemented with [ύ]πὲρ εὐ[πραξίας, and this has been universally accepted. But in such a context would we not expect the article to

be present? With [ὄ]πὲρ εὐ[πραξίας (or its alternative εὐ[καιρίας) there seems to be a slight lack of the emotional warmth that Polemon normally displays elsewhere in this play in regard to Glykera, and I should prefer at the end of 1010 [ὄ]περευ[δαιμονῶν, 'being overjoyed'.

1019–20 (441–442 Körte–Thierfelder)

1019 πάλιν τι πράξω προπετ[έ]ς; οὐδὲ μ[
Γλυκέρῃ. διαλλάγηθι, φιλτάτη, μό[vov.

Printed supplements are by Grenfell and Hunt in the ed. princ. In a passage that still has the power to move readers by its restrained humanity, Polemon's request to Glykera for reconciliation needs its customary end-line supplements, and here most editors print Wilamowitz's οὐδὲ μ[έμφομαι at 1019 because that verb seems the most *juste* in its context. Yet is a future the most appropriate tense? In accepting that Glykera was right to have left him after his violent assault on her, Polemon is reacting in the present to past actions; and although one or two parallels can be found for the use of the future μέμφομαι in such contexts (e.g. Eur. Suppl. 297, Ar. Av. 137), the present tense μέμφομαι is far more common when blame is – or is not – imputed for a past offence (e.g. Eur. Alc. 1017, Med. 558 with οὐδὲ μέμφομαι in the same sedes, 1011, Or. 285, Ar. Ach. 676, Nub. 525, 576, Plut. 10). μ[έμφομαι is at least a viable alternative here.

1003–26 (425–448 Körte–Thierfelder)

The difficulty of staging the closing extant scenes of the play with three speaking actors, one of them playing the rôle of Glykera, is clearly discussed by Sandbach in the Oxford commentary (on lines 1006ff., pp. 529f.; cf. Frost, *op. cit.* in n. 24, pp. 99f.). However, a careful reading of (i) the stage directions incorporated by Menander in his text and (ii) the marginal or interlinear indications added on the papyrus by a second hand makes a solution feasible that accepts all these indications and also allows Glykera to speak 1021f. and 1023.

The relevant data are as follows; those provided in Menander's text precede the papyrus' marginal or interlinear notes.

1003: Polemon and Doris are on stage, and in 1003 Polemon rushes into his house; the papyrus notes εἰσερχ(εται) [(?)πολεμ(ων)].

1005: Doris exits into Polemon's house. The stage is empty.

1006: Pataikos enters from Myrrhine's house, speaking to Glykera.

1009: Pataikos summons Polemon from the latter's house.

1010: Polemon enters and speaks; [πο]λεμ(ων) in left margin.

1013: Glykera is by now clearly on stage, addressed as ταύτην and being betrothed to Polemon.

1021: γλυκε(ρα) in the left margin, identifying that line's speaker.

1024: πολεμ(ων) εἰσε(ε)ἰσι above the second half of the line.

This sequence points to Polemon (actor A) exiting 1003, followed by Doris (actor C) at 1005. Pataikos (actor B) then enters at 1006, speaking back through an open door to Glykera, who is still inside. At 1009 the time taken by Pataikos to summon Polemon could be

extended by stage business: e.g. summoning one of Myrrhine's slaves and miming to him an order that he should knock on Polemon's door. During this stage business Polemon himself (still actor A) enters at 1010. Glykera (actor B) need not enter until 1012, when Pataikos says [ὄ δ' οὖν ἐγὼ / μ]έλλω λέγειν σοι (supplements by Grenfell and Hunt). Menander has carefully constructed his text, as he did similarly at e.g. Dysk. 381–392³³, to give time for actor C to exit as Doris into one house at 1005, exchange her mask and costume to the more elaborate one of Glykera, and re-enter at 1012 or shortly before by the adjacent door of a second house. Six lines is time enough for a quick change which involves no long-distance physical movement, and even if the actor is out of breath on entry at 1012, he is given a further eight lines before he actually has to make the two crucial speeches at 1021f. and 1023 in which Glykera forgives Polemon and looks forward to a happy future for herself and him. These lines are more effective when spoken by Glykera than when Pataikos is made to speak them as her proxy.

Since all the stage directions written by the second hand on the papyrus and discussed above seem to be correct, there is no reason to reject the interlinear note that at 1024 Polemon leaves the stage. Whether he takes Glykera with him is now uncertain, but either way an opportunity is given for a departing actor to make a quick change and burst out of next door's house as Moschion, blurting out ὦ γῆ [καὶ θεοί at the end of 1026. ωγη are the last words preserved in the papyrus; before the ω there is a stigme which can be interpreted as the upper dot of a dicolon³⁴. Oddly enough Sandbach ignores that trace in his Oxford Text of Menander, continuing the speech to Pataikos, and in the Oxford commentary he dismisses R. Kauer's early attribution of these final words to Moschion (Wien. Stud. 26 (1904) 205ff.) with the claim that 'nothing suggests (Moschion's) presence'. That is a strange remark; Pataikos' reference to the plan for Moschion's marriage is an obvious cue for an entry by that young man, just as Polemon's unexpected departure two lines before makes that entry just about possible for a cast limited normally to three speaking actors. The clinching argument for giving ὦ γῆ [καὶ θεοί to Moschion is the oath itself. Elsewhere in drama and other literature an oath by the earth gives weight to a (usually disgusted) complaint³⁵ (e.g. against Alcibiades, com. adesp. 123.1 Kassel–Austin; against a ταραχοπώλης, Nicostratus 5; against being the victim of a confidence trick, Men. Inc. 63), and the only character with good reason to complain at this point in Perikeiromene is the spoiled and conceited Moschion, first deprived of any possibility of amorous pursuit of Glykera, and now being forced into a marriage arranged without reference to his own wishes.

Leeds

W. Geoffrey Arnott

³³ See ZPE 76 (1989) 31ff. There an actor has under ten lines to exit by one parodos, change dress and mask, and re-enter by the opposite parodos, but those lines too have been carefully written to allow opportunities for time-consuming comic business.

³⁴ So Grenfell and Hunt, cf. Browne, p.40 (see above on 980–982).

³⁵ See especially F. W. Wright, op. cit. in n. 17, pp. 23ff., with a good discussion of this passage. On the use of this oath by Demosthenes see H. Wankel's commentary of De Corona (Heidelberg 1976) 2.755 (on section 139).