

WILLIAM FURLEY

MORE NEW FRAGMENTS OF MENANDER'S EPITREPONTES:  
C. RÖMER, ZPE 196, 2015, 49–54

aus: Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik 198 (2016) 19–21

© Dr. Rudolf Habelt GmbH, Bonn



MORE NEW FRAGMENTS OF MENANDER'S EPITREPONTES:  
C. RÖMER, ZPE 196, 2015, 49–54

We are grateful to Cornelia Römer for presenting some more new snippets of Menander's *Epitrepontes* from the book roll known to Menandrians as P.Mich.<sup>1</sup> What follows are a few notes of excited response to her publication, in the hope of placing a few more stepping stones through this central debate of the play. The fragments of different manuscripts which have contributed to our reconstructions of this section of text are bigger than confetti, but not much.<sup>2</sup>

As Römer says, the new fragment<sup>3</sup> springs a couple of real surprises. In line 786 we now have 'treacherous potions', φάρμακα ἐπίβουλα, where before it had been universally believed that before the -κα of the first word must have stood γυναῑ-κα. So now Smikrines is imputing to Habrotonon the use of 'treacherous potions' in her bid to oust Pamphile from her marriage, like Medea.<sup>4</sup> Of course, this is a wild exaggeration on Smikrines' part. Only slightly less surprising is the new beginning of line 787; now we read that Habrotonon will 'oust' (ἐκβαλεῖ) Pamphile from her home, whereas before we had guessed that she would only 'diffame' her (διαβαλεῖ).<sup>5</sup> And thirdly, as Römer says, a new speaker's name in the left margin shows that Pamphile began her speech in answer to Smikrines at line 799 and not at 801, as had universally been thought beforehand.

One of the major gaps still demanding explanation comes in line 787. It seems that a participle lurked in the gap, with visible ending -μένη. To date we have had αἰτουμένη (Römer 'being asked') to work with, and, now, ἀρνούμενη 'refusing' followed by οὐσία]ν (Gronewald, in a written suggestion to Römer): Habrotonon would be 'refusing to invest wealth in this' ('this' being the affair with Charisios). This has its attractions, but rho in ἀρνούμενη is unlikely palaeographically, and -νου- is possibly a little short for the gap. Comparison with other lines shows that we should expect four letters in the gap. Also, it's a question whether Habrotonon has any οὐσία to invest in the first place. I now suggest going back to Römer's original suggestion for the line ending οὐδὲ ἐν (possibly mis-written as οὐδὲν or οὐθὲν) combined with ἀλ[ίσκο]μένη before that, with a participle in the next line instead of infinitive: ἀλίσκομένη μὲν οὐδὲ ἐν / εἰς τοῦτ' ἐνεγκαμένη: 'but being found not to contribute a single thing to this' (sc. the relationship with Charisios). Of the two visible letters before the gap,<sup>6</sup> the first might be lamda or alpha (the lower diagonal of alpha is missing), probably not delta. The second letter is even more rubbed: a trace at the top looks like the top of the main descending diagonal of alpha or lamda (or delta): αλ- looks possible though anything but certain. After the gap there is a small trace which looks like it should belong to the right tip of mu. A participle ending in -μένη looks more than likely, particular given μετέχουσα in the following line, connected by μὲν ... δέ. If this is right, Smikrines' thought is that Habrotonon will be shown ('found out', 'exposed') to be contributing nothing, but enjoying all the advantages of the liaison with Charisios. The quasi-judicial term ἀλίσκομαι with participle suits Smikrines who sees the problems of Charisios' household in terms of financial arrangements and contracts. For the construction we may compare Aris-

<sup>1</sup> News from Smikrines and Pamphile. Two New Fragments of *Epitrepontes* 786–803 and 812–820 Sandbach–Furley, *ZPE* 196, 2015, 49–54.

<sup>2</sup> For the available readings prior to 2009 see W. D. Furley, *Menander Epitrepontes*, London (ICS) 2009; subsequent to that see C. Römer, New Fragments of Act IV, *Epitrepontes* 786–823, *ZPE* 182, 2012, 112–120, and A New Fragment of End of Act III, *Epitrepontes* 690–701 Sandbach (P. Mich. 4805), *ZPE* 183, 2012, 33–36, followed by W. Furley, Pamphile Regains her Voice: on the Newly Published Fragments of Menander's *Epitrepontes*, *ZPE* 185, 2013, 82–90.

<sup>3</sup> Given the number 4803/26/B17F/A (c).

<sup>4</sup> For the idea of a woman rival using wicked spells and substances to oust her rival cf. Euripides' *Andromache* 205. There is, of course, a huge wealth of material relating to love magic in *PMG*; this includes spells to compel a person's love, and spells to defeat a rival.

<sup>5</sup> And now we see that Pamphile returns to this point in line 829.

<sup>6</sup> σε beforehand is written with *scriptio plena*, as is common in this papyrus.

tophanes Clouds 1079 μοιχὸς γὰρ ἦν τύχης ἀλούς (sc. ὄν); Plato Ap. 29c εἰν ἀλωῖς ἔτι τοῦτο πρᾶττων. Menander uses ἀλίσκομαι elsewhere, but not (yet) in the sense required here (e.g. Menander cf. fr. 351 K–A Ἀρκαδικὸς τούναντιον ἀθάλαπτος ὢν τοῖς λοπαδίους ἀλίσκεται). All reconstructions with something like αἰτουμένη do not square well with οὐδὲ ἔν at line end, which should then be μηδὲ ἔν.<sup>7</sup>

797 ἐξ[ῆς μ]άλ' ὥς νῦν. The new fragment gives us ἐξ at line beginning, then a gap, then αλωc on the adjoining fragment. Römer now suggests ἔξε[ι κ]αλωc νῦν ταῦτά σοι (said ironically by Smikrines) and translates ‘This will now be a real mess for you!’ (Gronewald per litteras: ἐξῆ[ς κ]αλωc νῦν ταῦτά σοι τὴν Πυθία[v] – εἶρη[κέ]ναι ‘‘that Pythia has told you this beautifully in strict order’’.) But future ἔξει combined with νῦν is not ideal (should be τότε), and the remark is abrupt and ill-fitted to its context. I suggest we adopt Gronewald’s ἐξῆς and articulate ]αλωc as μάλ' ὥς. This will give the sense, combined with the previous line, αἰσχρῶν ἄπτεται / ἐξῆς μάλ' ‘she resorts to very dirty tricks one after another’. Then ὥς leads in well to Smikrines’ final sentence: ὥς νῦν ταῦτά σοι τὴν Πυθία[v] / εἶρη[κέ]ναι νόμιζ' ἀκριβῶς ἐξόμενα, ‘as if the Pythia had told you, be sure that exactly these things will be’, or more idiomatically: ‘as surely as if the Pythia had told you, this is how things will be’.

799–800. As Römer says, the new fragment tells us unequivocally that Pamphile begins her speech at 799, not 801 as we had previously thought. So this couple of lines preface her speech and are not Smikrines’ parting shot. Römer reads π.[ at line beginning and π[ in her restored text; the traces on the photograph here are anything but clear, but it seems to me there is doubt about pi; lamda also looks like a possibility. What one can see is the lower parts of two descenders; it seems to me that the angle of the second trace points more to lamda than pi. The letter following that is totally obscure. I suggest reading λ[ at line beginning, marking the beginning of Pamphile’s speech, and according with the rest of the line which concerns some prefatory remark to the speech she is about to make. Römer punctuates after λόγῳ, leaving this opening sentence without a verb, only the participle προθεμένη. She suggests that τοῦτο points to the next line, in which ‘Pamphile now bursts out into “you cannot do anything without HIS consent ever”’. But this would be a very abrupt beginning of a speech which Pamphile leads into in the following lines most circumspcctly. The referent of τοῦδε is not obvious, either, as Smikrines has just finished a tirade concerning Habrotonon’s (putative) behaviour toward Pamphile in their ménage-à-trois, and has hardly mentioned Charisios. If we leave 799–800 as one sentence, Pamphile might be addressing herself, telling herself that if she puts something (προθεμένη) at the beginning of her speech, τοῦδε, Smikrines presumably, cannot be against it. But I cannot work out what she should put at the beginning of her speech, nor where it might fit in grammatically.

A different approach is opened up by splitting ποησαιου in 800 differently, viz. ποιῆσαι σοῦ as opposed to ποιῆσαις οὐ, which editors have preferred to date. I suggest as a possible reconstruction:

λέγω προθεμένη τοῦτο πάντι τῶι λόγῳ  
τό μ' [οὐδ]ὲν ἄκοντος ποιῆσαι σοῦ ποτ' ἄν.

‘I speak, setting this at the beginning of my whole speech, the fact that I could never do anything against your will’.

Pamphile will be saying, suitably in context, as her opener, that she does not want to act contrary to her father’s wishes (sc. that she leave Charisios). λέγω, if correct, might be indicative or subjunctive; one might also consider λέξω. τό at line beginning of 800 can be clearly read; then follows a trace which might be the left side of mu. The construction τό μ' οὐδὲν ... ποιῆσαι ἄν, ‘the fact that I could never ...’ might be considered more emphatic than plain οὐδὲν ποιῆσαι ἄν (with an understood nominative ἐγώ after λέγω προθεμένη in the previous line).

<sup>7</sup> Conjectural ‘chaff’, for the interested reader, here were: ἀλλ' οἰομένη, ‘but thinking/intending’ (my second favourite); ἀναινομένη, ‘refuse’ (but the negative should be μή); ἀνασχομένη, ‘tolerating’; ἀβρυνομένη (but what’s the construction with ἐνεγκα- in the next line?); αἰτουμένη, ἀρνούμενη (Gronewald) both unlikely palaeographically, αἰτουμένη unlikely with negative οὐ.

The new information can be combined with what we already knew (or guessed) for this section of the play as follows:

(ΣΜ) φάρμακ' ἐπίβο[υ]λα, λ[ο]ιδορία καθ['] ἡμ[έ]ραν,  
 ὡς ἐκβαλεῖ σ' ἀλ[ι]σκομ[έ]νη μ[έ]ν ο[υ]δὲ ἔν  
 εἰς τοῦτ' ἐνεγκα[μ[έ]νη], μετέχουσ[α δ' ἐ]ξ ἴσου,  
 ἰλαρῶς βιώσετ' [εἰκ]ότως κᾶ[νευ] κακῶν  
 – ἔσται τ[ε] τοῦτ' αὐτῇ παραμύθιον ποτε – 790  
 σὺ [δ]ὲ σκυθρωπάζουσα, νουθετοῦσ' αἰεί,  
 γα[μ]ετῆς ἔχουσα σχῆμα κατακεκλασμένη[ς]  
 ἐν[ταῦ]θα παραλύσει σε. Χαλεπόν, Παμφίλη,  
 ἐλευθέραι γυναικί πρὸς πόρνην μάχη.  
 πλείονα πανουργεῖ, πλείον' οἶδ', αἰσχύνεται 795  
 οὐδὲν, κολακεύει μᾶλλον, αἰσχροῶν [ἄπ]τετα[ι]  
 ἐξ[ῆς μ]άλ'. ὡς νῦν ταῦτά σοι τὴν Πυθία[ν]  
 εἶρη[κέ]ναι νόμιζ' ἀκριβῶς ἐσόμενα.  
 ΠΑ. λέ[γω π]ροθεμένη τοῦτο παντὶ τῶι λόγωι  
 τό μ' [οὐ]δὲν ἄκοντος ποῆσαι σοῦ ποτ' ἄν· 800  
 καί, π[ά]τερ, ἐμὴν γνώ[μην] λέγειν πεπλα[

SMIKRINES:

... vengeful potions, daily aspersions  
 that he'll reject you. Discovered contributing  
 nothing to this, but enjoying on equal terms,  
 she'll live merrily no doubt, trouble-free  
 – and this will be an encouragement to her – 790  
 unlike you, constantly frowning and nagging  
 with the appearance of a brow-beaten wife.  
 She'll oust you there. It's hard, Pamphile,  
 for a free woman to compete with a prostitute.  
 She knows more tricks, feels no shame, 795  
 flatters more, resorts to foul play  
 repeatedly. As if the Pythia herself had spoken,  
 be sure this is exactly how it will be.

PAMPHILE:

I speak, saying at the beginning of my whole speech  
 that I never could do anything against your will. 800  
 And, father, to state my opinion ...