# W. Geoffrey Arnott

## Two Notes on Menander

aus: Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik 115 (1997) 73–74

© Dr. Rudolf Habelt GmbH, Bonn

#### Two Notes on Menander

#### I. Heros 45-46

ΔΑΟΣ τί λαμπρός; ἀποδημεῖ τρ[ πρᾶξιν ἰδίαν εἰς Λῆμ[νον

So the Cairensis, supplemented in verse 46 by Croenert and Leo. The speaker is explaining that his master Laches is away from home (Ptelea) on private business in Lemnos. Clearly here the supplement  $\tau \rho [i\mu\eta\nu o\nu]$  (Sudhaus and Wilamowitz) is preferable to  $\tau \rho [\iota\tau\alpha \hat{\imath}o\varsigma]$  (Croenert and Leo) for the reason given by J. van Leeuwen in his third edition of Menander (Leiden 1919) p. 7, 'maius temporis spatium poscitur contextu': business that took a man from Attica to Lemnos and back was likely to take three months, not three days. Yet it is odd that modern editors normally print  $\tau \rho [i\mu\eta\nu o\nu]$  rather than Sudhaus' alternative suggestion  $\tau \rho [i\mu\eta\nu o\varsigma^2]$ , since in this idiom an adjective indicating time is normally placed in the nominative either as predicate or in apposition to the subject; the verb often indicates movement and a destination is expressed. Note here especially Sophocles, Trachiniae 164–165,  $\tau \rho i\mu\eta\nu o\varsigma$  (corr. Wakefield: -ov mss.)  $\dot{\eta}\nu i\kappa$ '  $\dot{\alpha}\nu$  /  $\chi\dot{\omega}\rho\alpha\varsigma$   $\dot{\alpha}\pi\dot{\epsilon}i\eta$   $\kappa\dot{\alpha}\nu\iota\alpha\dot{\nu}\sigma\iota o\varsigma$   $\beta\epsilon\beta\dot{\omega}\varsigma^3$ ; and compare the parallel idioms with  $\tau \rho i\tau\alpha\hat{\iota}o\varsigma$  (see LSJ s.v., 'used with verbs so as to agree with the subject': e.g. Thuc. 1.61.5, 3.3.5, Diphilus 42.19 K–A),  $\tau \epsilon \tau \rho \tau \rho i\tau\alpha\hat{\iota}o\varsigma$  (e.g. Pl. Resp. 6.616b),  $\tau \epsilon \mu \tau \sigma i\sigma\varsigma$  (e.g. Ar. Av. 474, Xen. Anab. 6.4.9), etc.;  $\tau \rho i\tau\alpha\hat{\iota}o\varsigma$  (e.g. Cratinus 1.6 K–A, Ar. Equ. 339, 761 et saepe, Thuc. 1.123.21, Pl. Resp. 1.336d, 4.432c bis, Men. Dysk. 10, 910, Epitr. 239, 523, Sam. 51, 576),  $\ddot{\nu}o\tau\epsilon\rho \varsigma$  (e.g. Soph. O.T. 222, Ar. Vesp. 690, 691, Lys. 69, Eccl. 381, 867, Thuc. 4.90.1).

### II. Perikeiromene 1024–1026

After the betrothal of Polemon and Glykera has been conducted by Pataikos, Glykera's new-found father, the last few lines preserved in the Cairo papyrus yield a piquant surprise:

ПАТАІИОТ

	ΠΑΙΑΙΚΟΣ
1024	έτέρους ζη[τητέον
1025	έστὶν γάμους μοι· τῷ γὰρ ὑῷ λαμβάν[ω
1026	τὴν τοῦ Φιλίνου θυγατέρ'.
	ΜΟΣΧΙΩΝ
	ὧ Γῆ [καὶ θεοί

Here the papyrus breaks off, with probably only a small number of lines remaining before the play comes to an end. One way in which those missing lines might have been written by Menander is suggested by the ending of Terence's *Heauton Timorumenos*, adapted from the homonymous Menandrean

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Cf. the Gomme–Sandbach commentary (Oxford 1973) p. 392.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> It was first published apparently in the critical apparatus of Körte's first edition of Menander (Leipzig 1910), having presumably been communicated privately to Körte, and since then has been incorporated into a Menandrean text only by E. Capps in his *Four Plays by Menander*, (Boston 1910) p. 18, and by myself in the second volume of the Loeb edition of Menander (Boston Mass. 1996) p. 22.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> On the text here see H. Lloyd-Jones and N. G. Wilson, *Sophoclea* (Oxford 1990) p. 155; on the idiom, Kühner–Gerth 1.274 (b).

74 W. G. Arnott

original. Terence's play also ends with an old man (Chremes) ordering his son (Clitipho), who has been enjoying a very expensive affair with the *hetaira* Bacchis, to get married: (1056) *<impero> uxorem ut ducas*. Clitipho, after interjecting *pater* (1056) and *perii* (1057), finally agrees: *faciam, pater* (1059). As his projected bride Clitipho's mother (Sostrata) suggests *filiam Phanocratae nostrae* (1061), but Clitipho tells his father that she is not acceptable: but what about *Archonidi huiu' filiam* (1065)? Sostrata agrees. In Menander's *Perikeiromene* Moschion's  $\hat{\omega}$   $\Gamma \hat{\eta}$  [καὶ θεοί<sup>4</sup> seems closely similar to the first of Clitipho's demurrers, and one is tempted to assume that *Perikeiromene* and *Heauton Timorumenos* (both Menander's and Terence's) travelled speedily to their respective endings on closely parallel lines<sup>5</sup>, with Moschion also suggesting an alternative girl as his projected bride. Menander's productivity may well have led him to adopt similar solutions in more than one play (cf. e.g. Terence's and Donatus' comments on the similarities between Menander's *Andria* and *Perinthia*), and in any case an initial opposition followed by an alternative proposal on Moschion's part would yield a dramatically more effective ending, and be more in keeping with Moschion's previous characterisation.

Leeds W. Geoffrey Arnott

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup> On the assignment of the four final words to Moschion see my paper in *ZPE* 109 (1995) 30.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>5</sup> Admittedly, the source of Terence's ending here has been disputed. The view that Clitipho's marriage was a Terentian innovation and not in the Menandrean original was advanced by F. Nencini, *De Terentio eiusque fontibus* (Livorno 1891) 68, and strongly supported by E. Lefèvre, *Terenz' und Menanders Heautontimorumenos* (Zetemata 91, Munich 1994) 120–121, cf. 173. This seems to me mistaken, and I agree rather with A. J. Brothers in his edition of Terence's play (*The Self-Tormentor*, Warminster 1988, commentary on v. 1056) that Terence took his ending from the Greek original; see also M. Lamagna's recent edition of Menander's *Perikeiromene* (Naples 1994) pp. 300–301.