

W. GEOFFREY ARNOTT

FIRST NOTES ON MENANDER'S SIKYONIOI

aus: Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik 116 (1997) 1–10

© Dr. Rudolf Habelt GmbH, Bonn

FIRST NOTES ON MENANDER'S SIKYONIOI

These notes are a by-product of work devoted to Menander's *Sikyonioi* 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. Kassel in his edition of the play (*Kleine Texte* 185, Berlin 1965) 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) and by A. M. Belardinelli in her edition of the play (Bari 1994). Book fragments are numbered as in all three editions. It will be useful for readers to have at their side the photographs of the Sorbonne papyrus which provided a most valuable accompaniment to A. Blanchard and A. Bataille's *editio princeps* of the new fragments of the play (*Recherches de Papyrologie* 3, 1965, 103–176, plates VI–XII).

I. The play title¹

Three forms of the title are transmitted. The commonest is *Σικυώνιος* in the masculine singular, given eight times by the citers of book fragments 1, 3–5, 7–8; book fragment 9, which is cited with the name of the title but not of the author, is also plausibly assigned to Menander's play:

1. -ίφ Photius α 50 Theodoridis, Suda α 68 Adler (Aelius Dionysius α 6 Erbse, cf. Aristophanes of Byz. 326 Slater).

3. -ίφ Photius p. 542.23–25 Porson.

4. -ίφ Photius α 95 Theodoridis, Suda α 165 Adler (Aelius Dionysius α 16 Erbse).

5. -ίφ Photius p. 124.21–22 Porson, Suda κ 149 Adler.

7. -ίφ Photius ε 770 Theodoridis (cf. K. Tsantsanoglou, *New Fragments of Greek Literature from the Lexicon of Photius* (Athens 1984) 162, s.v. ἐμβριμήσσα).

8. -ίφ Harpocration p. 22 Keaney.

(9. -ίφ Pollux 4.119).

Manuscripts of the excerptors of frs. 2 and 6, however, opt for the feminine singular title *Σικυωνία*:

2. *σικυωνί* with α suprascript above the ί, ms. M of Stob. Ecl. 4.12.4 (S abbreviates to *σικυωνί*, A to *σικυω*).

6. -ίφ Σ Plato, *Symposium* 195b.

On three other occasions the title is given as *Σικυώνιοι*, masculine plural:

(a) the colophon of S (here P. Sorbonne 2272e, written in the last third of the third century B.C.) clearly writes *σικυωνιοι μενανδρου*².

(b) *σικυωνιοι*, written in white paint, appears as the identification tag for a scene from Menander's play portrayed in the late second century A.D. on the wall of a house in Ephesus³.

¹ See especially A. M. Belardinelli, *Corolla Londiniensis* 2 (1982) 15–20 and her edition of *Sikyonioi* pp. 56–59.

² A. Blanchard and A. Bataille, *Recherches de Papyrologie* 3 (1964) provide a clear photograph (plate XIII).

³ See especially V. M. Strocka, *Die Wandmalerei der Hanghäuser in Ephesus* (*Forschungen in Ephesus VIII/1*, Vienna 1977) 48, 54–55, with colour plates 62 and 64. The latter plate is reproduced on the front cover of A. M. Belardinelli's edition of the play. The painting is listed in T. B. L. Webster's *Monuments Illustrating New Comedy*, 3rd edition revised and enlarged by J. R. Green and A. Seeberg (*BICS Supplement* 50, London 1995) as XZ 32 = 6DP 1.1, 1.93 and 2.472 respectively.

(c) σικυωλιοι (sic!) is miswritten for σικυωνιοι in a shorthand list (P. Brit. Mus. 2652), written in the third or fourth century A.D., of what seem at this point (tetrad 510) to be Menandrian titles⁴.

Alciphron 4.19.19 (the fictive letter Γλυκέρα Μενάνδρῳ) includes this play in a list of six Menandrian titles, but all the manuscripts are defective at the key point: εἴτε σικυών[.....] οὖν ἄλλο ms. Φ, εἴτε συών.ν[.....]οὖν ἄλλο Vat. 2, σικυω[.....] οὖν ἄλλο Flor., σικυων[.....] οὖν ἄλλο mss. Π, Δ. Meineke (partly following Bergler)⁵ plausibly supplemented the gap with Σικυών[τον, εἴθ' ὅτι]οὖν ἄλλο, but Fernández Galiano⁶ notes that (despite φ's accent) Alciphron might originally have written Σικυων[ίους, εἴθ' ὅτι]οὖν ἄλλο.

In any attempt to identify the correct title of this play, improbabilities must first be eliminated.

(1) Citers of dramatic fragments (and their manuscripts) are notorious for corrupting the declined endings of titles. It is generally recognised⁷ that “in practically all the cases, the divergence in the title's ending will be due to error: a scribe's careless copying, or the incorrect expansion of a title that was abbreviated either in the mss. . . . or in the didascalical inscriptions themselves”. Thus we may safely reject (for one of the reasons given above) the ending Σικυωνία here, because in the extant portions of the play there is no single Sicyonian woman who plays a dramatically important part; the role of the Sicyonian foster-mother, who on her deathbed despatched to Stratophanes a truth-revealing letter and recognition tokens (vv. 130–144), could hardly be so interpreted.

(2) The evidence of the shorthand text in P. Brit. Mus. 2652 is unreliable. Although M. Gronewald (op. cit. in n. 4) was clearly right in confirming the presence of four Menander titles in tetrad 510, this tetrad is preceded by another (509) containing four ethnics that may also be identified as Menandrian titles (καρχηδονιοι, περινθιοι, βοιωτια, ιμβριοι), but two of those titles would then have a correct singular (Καρχηδόνιος, Περινθία) replaced by a masculine plural, and these plurals may have been influenced by the fact that tetrads 508 and 511 are also ethnic lists in the masculine plural. Thus σικυωλιοι, like καρχηδονιοι and περινθιοι, could have been changed into plural forms under the influence of the other ethnics present.

Consequently, we are left with Σικυώνιος and Σικυώνιοι as forms of the title. Both can be supported.

(a) The singular form is attested by the combined evidence of several citers, none of whom gives a plural form. The singular title makes dramatic sense; it would designate Stratophanes, the play's hero, since, although Athenian born, he believed himself to be a Sicyonian in the early part of the play (cf. 125–145, 246f.). It is noticeable, too, that either he or his foster-father is in the prologue referred to as ὁ Σικυώνιος . . . ἡγεμών (vv. 13–14), and Menander more than once appears deliberately to introduce his chosen title into the wording of an opening scene or a prologue⁸.

(b) The plural form is given by the colophon of a play-text copied within 50 to 90 years after Menander's death, and on a wall-painting. In neither place would one *expect* to have a careless, uncorrected error of this magnitude – although admittedly in the same room as the latter a wall painting

⁴ First published by H. J. M. Milne, *Greek Shorthand Manuals* (London 1934) p. 49, and later identified as a Menandrian title by M. Gronewald, *ZPE* 33 (1979) 6–7, correcting the λ of σικυωλιοι to ν.

⁵ *Menandri et Philemonis reliquiae* (Berlin 1823) 155. Bergler had already suggested Σικυών[τον] in his edition of Alciphron (Leipzig 1715).

⁶ *EClás* 9 (1965) 30.

⁷ See N. Terzaghi, *Fabula* 1 (Milan 1912) 5ff., especially 21f.; A. Blanchard and A. Bataille, op. cit. in n. 2, 162; A. M. Belardinelli, *Corolla Londinensis* 2 (1982) 15ff.; R. L. Hunter's edition of Eubulus (Cambridge 1983) 95; and my commentary on Alexis (Cambridge 1996) 108, from which the quotation is taken.

⁸ E.g. *Aspis* 16, 72, 109, *Dysk.* 6, *Samia* 13; possibly *δακτύλιος* at fr. com. adesp. 1084.22 Kassel–Austin. See my paper in *Drama* 2 (1994) 29.

of Euripides' Orestes has the title misspelled ορεσστης! The plural title makes good sense, too: it would refer to Stratophanes, along with the man and wife from Sicyon who adopted him⁹.

Since the evidence for both forms seems reasonably strong, it appears most likely that the play in antiquity went under both titles – an original didascalical title Σικυώνιοι, authenticated in the Sorbonne papyrus; and Σικυώνιος too, taking its alternative title from its chief character, like many such second titles given to plays of later Greek comedy either by popular usage or by Alexandrian scholarship¹⁰.

II. The speaker of the prologue

The scene of the play is not specifically identified in the preserved portions of the prologue or elsewhere in the play, but passing references indicate that it was most probably Eleusis or a neighbouring deme. In lines 176–271 one character describes events that he has just witnessed at Eleusis, including a successful request for Philoumene to be given sanctuary by the priestess of a temple there (240–242), and the same deme is mentioned at 57 in a puzzlingly mutilated context which may or may not imply that it was the dramatic setting. In such circumstances it has been recognised that the prologue to *Sikyonioi* might well have been delivered by a deity from Eleusis, and both Demeter and Kalligeneia have been suggested¹¹. In a play about a girl who at the age of four was kidnapped by pirates (vv. 2, 354–357) and is now being pursued by Moschion apparently against her will (199–210, 258–266, 397–398), however, it seems to me that Persephone, herself the victim of a celebrated abduction, would have been no less an appropriate choice as prologue speaker.

III. Two details of the plot

(a) Lines 354–357, however they are distributed between Theron and Kichesias¹², inform us that at the age of four Philoumene, along with the family slave Dromon and an old woman who was probably Philoumene's nurse, were kidnapped by pirates at Halai. Attica has two demes with this name, both situated on the coast: Halai Aixonides, 16 kilometres south east of Athens, and Halai Araphenides, on the north-east coast of Attica 25 kilometres from the city¹³. The extant text does not indicate which of the two was the scene of Philoumene's abduction, nor indeed whether it was her and Kichesias' home. Halai Araphenides was the site of the Tauropolia, and only three kilometres away from that of the Brauronia¹⁴; in both festivals young girls danced wearing attractive costumes. Such occasions might

⁹ Admittedly these foster-parents died before the action of the play begins (cf. Belardinelli in her edition, p. 58). It is unlikely that a plural title could refer alternatively to Stratophanes and others of his retinue returning from Caria (so A. Barigazzi, SIFC 37, 1965, 83); the only known member of that retinue featuring in the extant fragments of the play is the parasite Theron, and he was an Athenian (cf. v. 144).

¹⁰ So also A. Guida, SIFC 46 (1974) 233–234. On alternative titles see especially I. Capovilla, SIFC 19 (1912) 360ff., Terzaghi (above n. 7) 76f., R. Cantarella, Rend. Ist. Lomb. 93 (1959) 79f., the Gomme–Sandbach commentary pp. 129f., O. Taplin, JHS 95 (1975) 185, Hunter's edition of Eubulus (Cambridge 1983) 146ff., and my commentary on Alexis (Cambridge 1996) 51.

¹¹ Lloyd-Jones (GRBS 7, 1966, 155 = Greek Comedy etc., Oxford 1990, 74f.) suggests Demeter or Kalligeneia; cf. Guida (op. cit. in n. 10) 211 n. 2.

¹² On the part-assignments see e.g. Handley, BICS 12 (1965) 55, Kassel, *Eranos* 63 (1965) 25 = *Kleine Schriften* (Berlin and New York 1991) 286–287 (with a contribution from C. Austin), C. Gallavotti, 3rd edition of the play (Rome 1972) 34–35, the Gomme–Sandbach commentary p. 665, G. Mastromarco, *AFLB* 25–26 (1982–83) 119 n. 20, the Belardinelli edition p. 202.

¹³ On Halai Aixonides see Kolbe in *RE* (1912) s.v. Halai (1) 2226.33–2227.20, C. W. J. Eliot, *Coastal Demes of Attica* (Phoenix Suppl. 5, Toronto 1962) 25–34, R. Osborne, *Demos* (Cambridge 1985) 22–26, and J. S. Traill, *Demos and Trittys* (Toronto 1986) 136. On Halai Araphenides see Kolbe in *RE* s.v. Halai (2) 2227.21–41, and Traill 128. Lloyd-Jones (op. cit. in n. 11) 155 = 74 opts for Araphenides.

¹⁴ See especially L. Deubner, *Attische Feste* (Berlin 1932) 207–209, A. Brelich, *Paides e parthenoi* (Rome 1969) 229–311, L. Kahil in J. N. Coldstream and M. A. R. Colledge (edd.), *Greece and Italy in the Classical World: Acta of the XIth*

between the tops of successive lines is between 0.5 and 0.6 cm. Fragment XII.A, where the top margin is clearly visible, has 24 lines of text cut off directly below the bottom line, but one further line originally followed in this column, on the evidence of a minuscule scrap of papyrus now lost (P. Jouguet, BCH 30, 1906, 106).

Fragment III contains lines 1 to 19; its top and bottom margins are lost. Line 19 may be anything from 0 to 6 lines from the bottom of its column. Fragment IV.A, whose bottom margin is preserved, contains the final 16 lines (20–35) of its column; between 5 and 9 lines are lost at its head. If III and IV.A are adjacent columns, the gap between them will have been 5 to 15 lines; it may be noted that at line 19 the prologue speaker is still describing events of eleven or so years before the dramatic present, but at line 20 (after the gap) that speaker is probably only 5 lines or so from the end of her speech. If a column has been lost between III and IV.A, 21 to 25 lines need to be added to the gap, making it 26 to 40 lines.

25–51

Fragment IV of the Sorbonne papyrus is seriously mutilated, but if lines 23–24 preserve the final letters of a Menandrian formula used at Dysk. 45–46 to introduce a five-line coda to its divine prologue, it is likely that the *Sikyonioi* speaker departed immediately after v. 24, leaving the stage empty before the arrival of two human characters. Their dialogue¹⁷ continued up to and perhaps beyond 51, where fragment IV breaks off. Who were the new arrivals, and what were they discussing? The remains of 29–51 may yield more information than has sometimes been recognised:

(a) The address γύναι (32) and the use of female expressions such as the oath μὲν τὸ θεῷ (34) and τάλαν (35)¹⁸ clearly indicate that one at least of the two speakers was female. Elsewhere in Menander the vocative γύναι is used by (1) husbands to wives (Epitr. 303, 376, Heros 69, Samia 421, fr. 592.1 Körte; probably also fr. adesp. 1014.42 Kassel–Austin), (2) women to women (Epitr. 858, 860, 864, ὦ γ. 866, μακαρία γ. 873), (3) slaves to their mistresses, but then accompanied with a laudatory attribute (γεννικὴ καὶ κοσμία γ. Georgos 42–43, γενναία γ. P. Hamburg 656.10 = fr. 951.10 Körte).

(b) The broken fragments reveal talk of λογισμὸν ἀνδρικόν ('male calculation' 25), either] πόνους or τοῖς ὄνοις (27), καὶ συνοικίξειν ('and to make (me) live with' 32, addressed to a woman), ὁ δὲ τρόμος (35); then, after a gap of between 5 and 9 lines, θρέψεις ('you'll be feeding' 39), ἄπληστος and ἀνήρ¹⁹ ἄπληστο[ς (43, 46) and πάντ' ἐσθίει. (44). Taken together, these appear to indicate a conversation partly about the parasite Theron, described here (typically for a parasite) as an insatiable gormandiser whom the addressee will be feeding. The addressee at this point must be Malthake²⁰, who may have just before expressed her fears of a future life with Theron as her husband or partner. A reference then to 'the donkeys' would be appropriate, if such a partnership involved her in looking after them (cf. 411, with its allusion to a woman bringing them their food). It is possible that Malthake speaks 25–32; if she does speak 32, the other character on stage with her will also be female²¹. At this stage of the plot the latter is perhaps less likely to be Smikrines' wife (as yet not known to be Stratophanes' mother) than some protatic figure (Philoumene or another female slave), introduced here to provide a listener and respondent while Malthake outlined details about her and Theron (? his calculation on

¹⁷ That lines 25–51 consist of dialogue is confirmed by (a) the paragraphi under 36, 37, 38, 47 and 51, (b) the vocative γύναι at 32, and (c) the second-person singulars πύθοῦ (30) and θρέψεις (39). Cf. the Belardinelli edition, commentary on vv. 25ff.

¹⁸ Cf. especially D. Bain, *Antichthon* 18 (1984) 24–42, and A. H. Sommerstein in F. De Martino and Sommerstein (edd.), *Lo spettacolo delle voci*, 2 (Bari 1995) 61–85.

¹⁹ So M. L. West, *JHS* 88 (1968) 163.

²⁰ Cf. e.g. the Gomme–Sandbach commentary on 25–35, and Belardinelli's on 25ff., citing earlier identifications of the characters involved here (with Barigazzi, Gallavotti and Webster picking out Malthake).

²¹ So first Lloyd-Jones, *GRBS* 7 (1966) 153–155, *Emerita* 34 (1966) 141 (= *Greek Comedy etc.* 73–75 and 79 respectively). But see also the discussion of 29 (οὔτοςί) below.

marrying her, her reluctance to support a gourmand) not mentioned in the divine prologue. I should tentatively assign 33–35 and 39–47²² to this respondent, 48–51 to Malthake.

27

Kassel prints]όνοις ὡς γίγνεται. However the opening traces are interpreted, it is worth considering whether ὡς γίγνεται here may provide a further example of a koine usage ('as happens', like *ut fit* commonly in Latin) preserved elsewhere in only four known texts: Alexis fr. 76.3 Kassel–Austin (see my commentary, Cambridge 1996, p. 209) and Alexander of Aphrodisias' commentaries on Aristotle, Anal. Pr. CAG 2.1, 46.32f., Top. 2.2, 33.9ff. and Meteor. 3.2, 24.22ff. It is unfortunate that mutilation in the Sorbonne papyrus here prevents a certain judgement.

29

οὐτοσὶ, the one word preserved from this verse, cannot safely be used as an argument against the presence of only two women speakers in this scene. Although in Menander this pronoun most commonly (some 47 certain instances may be counted) refers to a living creature (human or animal²³) already on stage or rapidly approaching it, there are a significant number of uses with other referents:

(a) objects either visible on stage (15 times) or imagined as just off it (Knemon's farm, Dysk. 5); among these instances οὐτοσὶ occurs in the same *sedes* as at Sik. 29 at least four times as a nominative masculine singular (Epir. 386, 387, Pk. 768, fr. 56.1 Körte), twice as an accusative masculine singular (Epir. 466, 514);

(b) characters imagined as living in stage houses, having been seen in previous scenes, but now off stage (Aspis 139, Pk. 531, Samia 155); here presumably the speaker identifies the referent by pointing to the relevant stage house²⁴. To these three instances Georgos 63 (and the non-Menandrian papyrus fragment 1017.2 Kassel–Austin) may perhaps be added; the referents there are certainly off stage at this point, but we do not know whether they were recently on stage or not.

(c) characters described as present at events described later in a narrative (Sik. 247, 260).

If οὐτοσὶ here fell into group (b) above, it might follow that Theron had appeared previously in a scene before the prologue.

52–62

	ΣΤΡΑΤΟΦΑΝΗΣ (?)
52]ων ἀπολεσάντων παιδίων]δόντων τρέφειν ἢ τὸν τόπον]γεγραμμένων ἄλλως ἐκεῖ.
	ΘΗΡΩΝ (?)
55	τί δὴ τὸ κακ]όν ποτ' ἐστίν; οὕτω μαρτυρεῖν μάρτυρα] τοιοῦτον ἂν τις εὔροι πολλαχοῦ ἐνταῦθ' ἐ]ν ἄστει τοῦδ'· Ἐλευσίς ἐστι, καὶ πανηγ]υρίς που. τίς νοήσει, πρὸς θεῶν; εἰ συνδρα]μεῖται δῆμος, εἷς τις οὐ ταχὺ
60	τὴν παῖδ'] ἀφελκύσαιτ' ἄν. εἰ δὲ περιμένω ἐνθάδε, γένοιτ' ἂν] ἔτι λέγοντος ἐσπέρα
62]τ[.].[

²² Thus θρέψεις in 39 would in all probability be this second woman's reference to the chore that Malthake (as Theron's partner) would have in feeding Theron and/or the donkeys.

²³ Animals at Dysk. 393, Samia 399, probably also fr. 620.3 Körte. Included among the humans are two instances of self-reference: Sik. 144, fr. 409.2.

²⁴ See e.g. Handley's commentary (London 1973) on Dysk. 173, the Gomme–Sandbach commentary on Georgos 63, Samia 155, K. J. Dover on Ar. Nub. 83, 1473; and cf. LSJ s.v. -ι, Schwyzler 2.566 § 20.

54 Or ἀλλ' ὥς. 55 Suppl. *exempli gratia* Arnott. 56 ἐνταῦθ' suppl. Schroeder, ἐν Jouguet. 57 Suppl. Schroeder. τουδεελευσις S. 58 Suppl. Jouguet. 59 εἰ suppl. Page, συνδραμείται Austin. 60 Suppl. and corr. Sandbach: ἀφειλκυσαις S. 61 ἐνθάδε suppl. Arnott, γένοιτ' ἄν Blass.

52–62 contain the mutilated remains of the first column of fragment VIII (Blanchard–Bataille: = fr. VII Jouguet) of the Sorbonne papyrus. Its position in the play is uncertain, although Kassel is clearly right to assign both fragments VII and VIII to an early stage in the plot²⁵. Identification of speakers here is disputed; A. Barigazzi (SIFC 37, 1965, 39–43) identified the characters involved in this scene as Moschion (in love with the girl Philoumene) and the slave Dromon²⁶, while J.-M. Jacques (REA 69, 1967, 307 n. 1)²⁷ opted for Theron and Kichesias. Over 90 years ago²⁸ Ph.-E. Legrand divined the subject of these lines as a plot to pass off a girl as a free Athenian, and the plotters as a lover and an intriguing agent; he seems to me right on target. Theron is the character who later in the play (343–360) attempts to suborn Kichesias into an allegedly false declaration that he was Philoumene's real father; at vv. 52–62, however, Stratophanes would be a more likely receiver of Theron's villainous confidences. If Stratophanes spoke the now irretrievably fractured verses 52–54, perhaps casting doubts on the feasibility of any scheme to prove Philoumene a free Athenian, 55–61 (if supplemented as above) would be Theron's irritated but confident response to those doubts.²⁹

For the supplement suggested above at 55 compare e.g. Dysk. 218 τουτὶ τὸ κακὸν τί ποτ' ἐστίν;, Mis. 311 and Ar. Aves 1207, along with C. Austin's note on Menander, *Samia* 362 and E. W. Handley's on Dysk. 464f.

Jouguet's supplement at 58 has been opposed because it is *sane spatio breuius* (so Sandbach's Oxford text ad loc.), adding only five letters to fill a space wide enough for seven. In this scribe's handwriting, however, π α ν η are all broad letters, γ is of average width, and the left-hand edge of the υ also is missing in the space; there is thus no need to assume scribal error in this gap³⁰. Furthermore, Jouguet's supplement is the only one appropriate in this context, providing as it does dramatic preparation for the later narrative (176–271) about the πανήγυρις at Eleusis in which steps were taken to proclaim Philoumene's free Athenian status. The passage translates 'In this way one could find such a witness of this to testify in many places here in the city – this is Eleusis, and there is, if I'm not mistaken, a public meeting. In heaven's name, who will notice?' On πρὸς θεῶν (in a question) at 58 see W. S. Barrett's commentary (Oxford 1964) on Eur. *Hipp.* 219.

72–109

Fragment VII Blanchard (= II and IV Jouguet³¹) is badly mutilated and in places barely legible, but a new identification of one of its speakers may yield a more satisfactory interpretation of the action and

²⁵ Vv. 57–58, with their references to Eleusis and (by a plausible supplement) a town-meeting there, seem like dramatic preparation for the events described later at 176–271.

²⁶ Followed by T. B. L. Webster, *Introduction to Menander* (Manchester 1974) 186.

²⁷ Followed by C. Gallavotti in his 1972 edition of the play.

²⁸ In P. Jouguet's original publication of this fragment, REG 30 (1906) 122–123. Cf. also his remarks in *Daos* (Lyon–Paris 1910) 93 n. 1 (omitted in the English translation by J. Loeb of 1917: *The New Greek Comedy*, London and New York).

²⁹ O. Schroeder, *Nouae comoediae fragmenta in papyris reperta* (Bonn 1915) p. 22 first suggested the change of speaker at v. 55. Any paragraphus that may originally have been inserted in S under line 54 has been lost along with all the openings of vv. 52–61.

³⁰ So the Gomme–Sandbach commentary, ad loc. However, in checking the scribal spellings of this word where it appears throughout classical literature, I have found no manuscript errors apart from a tendency to substitute Attic for non-Attic forms (e.g. Hdt. 2.58, 59; [Dem.] 18.91. Two papyri deriving from the same century as the Sorbonne papyrus (P. Cair. Zen. 59341(a).11, 247 B.C.; P. Hibeh 27.36, early 3rd century B.C.) spell and decline the word correctly.

³¹ Op. cit. in n. 28, pp. 107–108, 109–110, 113–114, 114–115, 119–120, 120–121.

at the same time give solid support to Kassel's³² printing of this fragment after fragment VIII in the first half of the play.

Although the paragraphi under vv. 95, 96 and 97 have been described as uncertain³³, the one under 95 is confirmed by the space (which in this early papyrus has the same significance as a dicolon³⁴) after εστιν in the same line. This immediately undermines Sandbach's suggestion (in the Gomme–Sandbach commentary on vv. 72–108) that up to v. 108 we have a monologue. But who (and how many) are the speakers in this fragment, and what are their movements?

(a) Up to v. 96 there are further indications pointing to dialogue: particularly the second-person singulars at 82, 92 and 95, and the responsive remark at 96 τίς δ' οὐκ ἐᾷ σ'; (on this correction of a mutilated text, see below on vv. 95–96), which picks up the other speaker's words in the previous line. The curse in 80 ὁ Διόνυσος ἀπολέσαι appears to be directed at a man accused of 'not having a sound or straightforward idea' in his mind, οὐχ ὑγιεὺς οὐδ' ἀπλοῦν φρονῶν (81), and of ruining the speaker (82). An unmarried girl (τὴν . . . παρθένον 86, cf. παιδίον 84) seems to be involved in this catastrophe. Previous scholars have identified the speakers either as Moschion and Dromon³⁵, or as Stratophanes and Dromon³⁶, but neither pairing seems totally appropriate to what is preserved of the dialogue or to the most likely dramatic action at this stage of the plot, scanty though the remains of the first half of this play are. The angry man in ruin here is almost certainly Stratophanes, but the most plausible victim of his present wrath appears to me to be Theron³⁷. Fragment VIII is interpreted above (see on 52–62) also as a conversation between Stratophanes and Theron, in which the latter is apparently advising the use of a perjurious witness in order to persuade an Athenian court that Philoumene was a free Athenian, and thus fraudulently to pave the way for a marriage between Stratophanes and the girl. At vv. 97–98 in fragment VII someone allegedly δ]έδοικε . . . δεσπότην ζένο[v] . . . τρίτον τ' ἐρώντ', 'fears a master, a foreigner . . . and thirdly a lover'. The fearing character must be Philoumene, but the object of her apprehensions has been disputed. R. Merkelbach suggested³⁸ that Philoumene might have felt herself threatened by three different men: her master Stratophanes, a foreigner such as the Boeotian creditor of Stratophanes' foster-father, and thirdly Moschion as the alleged lover. This interpretation, however, is probably ruled out by the presence of the singular participle λέγοντα in the next line, almost certainly in agreement with and referring to the one person mentioned in vv. 97–98. Philoumene is thus described here as fearing Stratophanes alone, combining in his own person the three aspects of owner, foreigner (because still a Sicyonian in Philoumene's eyes) and lover: a lover moreover who was pressing her to agree to an unlawful marriage. If Theron's stratagem was aimed to inveigle Philoumene into such a union, we can easily imagine that an honourable girl like her might run away and seek asylum as a suppliant in Eleusis, at the place where she is found sitting in vv. 190 and 192, in fear that her 'owner would do her an injury' (ὁ κύριος κακὸν ποιήσῃ, 194³⁹). She would have been accompanied by her

³² Cf. also A. Barigazzi, SIFC 37 (1965) 39, 41.

³³ By R. Coles, Emerita 34 (1966) 134.

³⁴ Cf. J. Bingen, Chronique d'Égypte 40 (1965) 111–120.

³⁵ A. Barigazzi, op. cit. in n. 32, 39–43, followed by T. B. L. Webster, op. cit. in n. 26, 184.

³⁶ B. Marzullo, QIFG 2 (1967) 34–44, followed by Belardinelli in her edition (commentary on vv. 72ff.).

³⁷ Cf. L. A. Post, AJP 87 (1966) 489, suggesting that Stratophanes and Theron were the speakers at vv. 96–101. With my identification of speakers in vv. 75–96 Theron is the character who (i) complains that he is not given a proper chance to speak (95), and (ii) is brusquely cut off (and possibly dismissed: see below on vv. 95–96) by Stratophanes (96). A similar scenario is presented at vv. 145–147; when the soldier there orders Theron to move off, Theron twice tries to interpose statements, but is brusquely interrupted and told to get on his way. The two passages would thus provide a further instance of Menander's use of linguistic patterns to individualise his characters (see especially F. H. Sandbach, Entretiens Hardt 16, 1970, 111–143, and W. G. Arnott in F. Di Martino and A. H. Sommerstein, Lo spettacolo delle voci 2, Bari 1995, 147–164.

³⁸ Mus. Helv. 23 (1966) 174. Barigazzi (op. cit. in n. 32) 43 had already opted for the singular reference; cf. also Marzullo (op. cit. in n. 36) 41.

³⁹ This passage can itself be used to support the argument that vv. 97–98 refer to Stratophanes alone.

devoted protector (cf. vv. 7–8), the slave Dromon; this is implied by his presence at her side during the town-meeting in Eleusis (267), and if they had run away from Stratophanes' house together, Dromon could hardly have appeared as a character in fragment VII. The report of Philoumene's flight would have driven Stratophanes distraught and made him vent his fury on Theron as the precipitator of this catastrophe. With this interpretation fragment VIII would clearly precede VII, even though the number of lines between the two remains incalculable.

The scene between Stratophanes and Theron probably ended at v. 96, with Stratophanes possibly dismissing Theron with τίς δ' οὐκ ἐῶ σ'; ἔδωκ', ἐδέξω· νῦν ἴθι, 'Who doesn't let you? I gave, you received – now go!'⁴⁰ Theron was being ordered off on a mission to contact Philoumene and persuade her to return, as the broken remains of v. 93 seem to imply (καὶ νῦν δραμῶν τὴν παῖδα παρ[ακάλει, with Kassel's supplement, 'And now run off and [summon] the girl'). Stratophanes may have followed Theron off the stage, but it seems more likely that he stayed on stage during what followed, if the interpretation in (b) below of v. 109 is accepted.

(b) Lines 97–108 have the appearance of a monologue by a third character who probably had overheard at least some of the preceding scene without being seen. He now makes a comment on what he had heard about the girl's⁴¹ fear of Stratophanes (97–98), quotes or paraphrases words previously spoken by Stratophanes (99–101: presumably just before in a lost part of his speech⁴²), sets himself up to become Stratophanes' rival for the girl's favours (cf. τολμητέον γὰρ ἐστίν, 'You see, I've got to force myself to do it', 102), but apparently is uncertain and apprehensive (cf. 107) in view of certain developments in the action which involve the slave Dromon (103), Philoumene and 'all the citizens' (103–104)⁴³. A character named Moschion shilly-shallies at times in Menander's *Samia*, and is portrayed as an unsuccessful rival to the soldier hero for the latter's girl-friend in *Perikeiromene*; accordingly Barigazzi's identification of the speaker of vv. 97–108 as Moschion seems a reasonable hypothesis⁴⁴. Then at v. 109 Stratophanes may well have intervened; there is a paragraphus under 108, and the lack of an article with μειράκιο[v], 'young man', the opening word of 109, suggests that there it is a vocative, addressed presumably to Moschion by Stratophanes, if the soldier was still on stage.

80

At line end here S has] Διόνυσος ἀπολέσαι. In third-person-singular curses in comedy the god's name always has the article (ὁ Ζεὺς Men. Epitr. 425, *Samia* 689, com. adesp. 1093.161 and 1103.46 Kassel–Austin; similarly third-person-plural curses, always with οἱ θεοί, Men. Dysk. 138f., 220f., 600f., 926f., Ar. Equ. 2f., Thesm. 1056f.), and the person cursed is always specified. Blass (in Jouguet, op. cit. in n. 29, 113–114) here supplied the necessary article before Διόνυσος; but whether Menander wrote e.g. ὁ Διόνυσος (σ') ἀπολέσαι, cursing the companion present on stage, or e.g. τοῦτον ὁ Διόνυσος ἀπολέσαι, cursing Dromon in absentia, remains uncertain.

95–96

ΘΗΡΩΝ

95 οὐκ ἐῶς με κοινῶσαι λόγον.

⁴⁰ On corrections, supplementation and interpretation at this point, see below on vv. 95–96.

⁴¹ Although the subject of δῖέδοικε in v. 97 is not specified in the mutilated remains of the papyrus, there can be no doubt that it was Philoumene; Kassel's references in his edition ad loc. to vv. 194, 214 and 241 are conclusive.

⁴² Presumably earlier in the scene Theron had warned Stratophanes about Moschion's rivalry, and been ordered not to discuss that subject.

⁴³ The reference here is hard to pinpoint exactly, but it seems very likely that when Dromon and Philoumene sought sanctuary in Eleusis, they were officially interrogated at a meeting of the citizens, who reacted favourably to the girl (οὐκ ἄλλοτρία 105).

⁴⁴ Op. cit. in n. 32, p. 43.

ΣΤΡΑΤΟΦΑΝΗΣ

τίς δ'] οὐκ ἐῶ σ'; ἔδωκ', ἐδέξω· νῦ[ν ἴθι.

95 Suppl. Austin: ? or λ[όγους. 96 Suppl. and corr. Arnott (but already νῦ[ν Austin, τίς σ'] οὐκ ἐῶ δ'; ἔδωκ' Gronewald): ...ουκεαι δεδωκεδεξωνυ[S.

An interpretation of these two difficult lines in an equally difficult context has already been given (above, 72–109), but the constitution of its text needs separate treatment.

(a) In v. 95 Austin's supplement (in Kassel's edition) λ[όγον⁴⁵ provides an acceptable Euripidean idiom (Medea 811 ἡμῖν τόνδ' ἐκοίνωσας λόγον; cf. IA 44 κοίνωσον μῦθον, and Pl. Laches 196c κοινοῦμεθα . . . τὸν λόγον).

(b) At the beginning of v. 96 τίς was read by Kassel before οὐκ (noting, however, *lectio incerta, distinxi dubitanter*), but R. A. Coles, (*Emerita* 34, 1966, 114) confirmed that there was space for four letters before the οὐκ. After S's εαι editors before Belardinelli printed δέδωκ', ἐδέξω, but M. Gronewald (*ZPE* 99, 1993, 25–26) observed the incongruity of asyndetically juxtaposed perfect and aorist here, and drew attention to the asyndetic coupling of aorists at Sik. 10, where Kassel cited as parallels Men. Epitr. 272 and fr. 685; a scribal tendency (more noticeable perhaps in mediaeval manuscripts) to confuse the active aorist and perfect forms of δίδωμι (cf. my commentary on Alexis fr. 2.7, Cambridge 1996), might also be mentioned. Consequently Gronewald (25 n. 1) conjectured τίς σ'] οὐκ ἐῶ δ'; ἔδωκ'; this may represent what S's scribe wrote here, but I should prefer to think that Menander originally wrote τίς δ'] οὐκ ἐῶ σ'; ἔδωκ', thus providing a more exact parallel to Theron's own question in the previous line, οὐκ ἐῶς με⁴⁶.

(c) A precise interpretation of ἔδωκ' and ἐδέξω here is impossible in such a mutilated and contextless fragment. λόγον could perhaps be supplied with both verbs; λόγον δίδωμι is a very common expression with several grades of meaning (e.g. Eur. Hipp. 968, Ar. Thesm. 471, Plut. 467, cf. Ephippus fr. 20.4 Kassel–Austin, Men. Samia 201, Pl. Phaedo 78c), while in Ar. Equ. 632 the Athenian council is described as ἐνδεχομένην τοὺς λόγους. In that case Stratophanes would be informing his companion that Theron had already been given and had accepted an opportunity to speak. However, in a broken context four lines earlier Stratophanes appears to have said ἔδωκας ἂν δίς, and his remark at 96 might refer rather to a transaction in which the soldier had provided the parasite with money to bribe the perjurious witness.

(d) νῦ[ν δ' ἴθι or νῦ[ν ἴθι would provide a suitable end to the scene, with Stratophanes shooing Theron off on his mission to visit Philoumene. Similar expressions are frequently used in comedy to persuade a character off stage: e.g. Ar. Equ. 498 = Nub. 510 = Pax 729, Vesp. 1154, Av. 647, Men. Dysk. 375.

Leeds

W. Geoffrey Arnott

⁴⁵ The plural λ[όγους would also be possible.

⁴⁶ It must be admitted that δέ is not infrequently postponed to fifth word in its clause in later comedy (see my commentary on Alexis fr. 4.1), but there seems to be neither metrical nor any other reason for such a postponement here.