

WILLIAM FURLEY

PAMPHILE REGAINS HER VOICE: ON THE NEWLY PUBLISHED
FRAGMENTS OF MENANDER'S *EPITREPONTES*

aus: Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik 185 (2013) 82–90

© Dr. Rudolf Habelt GmbH, Bonn

PAMPHILE REGAINS HER VOICE: ON THE NEWLY PUBLISHED
FRAGMENTS OF MENANDER'S *EPITREPONTES**

In Memory of Eric W. Handley

In *ZPE* 182 and 183 Cornelia Römer has published some welcome new fragments of the Michigan papyrus containing lines of Menander's *Epitrepontes*. For details of the fragments and their location I refer the reader to her publications.¹ The new fragments, albeit small, help our reconstruction of the end of act three of *Epitrepontes* and the beginning of act four. They come, therefore, at a dramatic moment of the play, when Smikrines is bent on extracting his daughter Pamphile from what seems to him an irreparably damaged marriage, and Pamphile is equally determined not to give up on her marriage to Charisios so quickly. The publication of these new pieces came, unfortunately, after I had completed my edition of the play (London 2009) so I had no opportunity to incorporate the new evidence in my treatment of these lines. This paper contains suggestions on the interpretation of the new evidence where I think the *editio princeps* leaves room for further development; I hope to publish a full commentary on the lines as now restored in a future contribution.

Lines 692–702

In *ZPE* 183 Römer published a small fragment which fills a gap in the previously known Michigan fragments from lines 692 to 702², thus bridging the gap between acts three and four. The first letter of χοροῦ is duly visible after line 701. The first five lines of the new piece (692–696) serve only to confirm what we already knew or successfully conjectured from other sources for these lines.³ From 697 to the end of the act, however, the new fragment does indeed supply new readings for the left half of the lines. I give a supplemented version of these lines and discuss divergences from the *editio princeps* after that. The newly read letters are in bold type:

Text

(ΣΜΙΚΡΙΝΗΣ)	
αὐτὴν μὲν ἔξει, τὴν δ' ἐπ[ει]σάξει λαβῶν	697
ἐκεῖνος εὐθὺς ὦ[ς] ἑαυτὸν δηλαδὴ. [<i>exit</i>]	698
(ΧΑΙΡΕΣΤΡΑΤΟΣ)	
[πά]ξ· διατέτραπ[αι] τοῦμόν, [ὦ]ς ἔμοι δοκεῖ	699
[δια]κονητέον δ[ε] κ[α]ὶ πορευ[τέον]	700
[ἐφ'] ἦν ἐτάχθη[ν] ἐπιμέλ[ειάν] ἐσ[τ]ί μοι. [<i>exit. End of Act 3</i>]	701

Translation

(*Smikrines:*)

... he'll keep *her* and bring the other woman
back home with him without a moment's hesitation, he will! [*exit*]

(*Chairestratos:*)

Oh dear, that's really messed up my plans, it seems.
I must perform my service and be on my way
on the undertaking which I've been sent on. [*exit. End of Act 3*]

* My thanks go to Professors Alan Sommerstein and Rudolf Kassel for helpful critical remarks on this paper.

¹ *ZPE* 182, 2012, 112–120 (P.Mich. 4752); 183, 2012, 33–36 (P.Mich. 4805).

² Not 690–701, as Römer takes from Sandbach 1990.

³ See my edition for details.

Select commentary

698 After εὐθύς Römer prints ἄ[λλ'] ἑαυτὸν δηλαδὴ ... letting Smikrines' sentence tail off without a verb (*aposiopesis*, she says). In her opinion Smikrines goes on to say the next three lines 699–701 (down to the end of the act) and does not give them to Chairestratos, as Koenen–Gagos and I did. There are several objections to this. Römer's reconstruction leaves Chairestratos on stage at the end of the act, unprecedented in Menander. Secondly, the *aposiopesis* in line 698 is awkward, as we have no idea what verb should be supplied. In addition δηλαδὴ is usually the last word in an utterance, which it would not be in Smikrines' speech if he had really cut off this sentence before getting to the verb. Thirdly, Smikrines has not been sent on any errand (ἐτάχθην); it is by his own volition and on his own initiative that he has come knocking on Charisios' door now in order to extract his daughter from her marriage. Chairestratos, on the other hand, seems to have been sent on an errand as he enters (possibly in line 631) to find Smikrines ranting on stage.⁴ Chairestratos returns at the beginning of act five, probably from this very errand. Koenen–Gagos suggested that he had been dispatched by Charisios to buy Habrotonon from her owner, now that he thinks she is the mother of his child. Now Sommerstein has confirmed this reconstruction with further arguments.⁵ It seems, then, that lines 699–701 are spoken by Chairestratos, confirming that he is now on his way to complete the job he has been given (probably by his friend Charisios). He speaks the lines after Smikrines has left the stage into Charisios' house to speak with Pamphile inside. When Chairestratos now says 'I must be on my way', Menander has neatly cleared the stage at the end of the act, as is his wont.

In line 698 (Smikrines' last line, if I am right) Römer's version lacks a verb governing ἑαυτόν, as we have seen. She is right that there is no room for a verb between εὐθύς and ἑαυτόν. She supplies ἄλλ' to fill the gap; Gronewald suggests εἰς (apud Römer), a preposition going with ἑαυτόν. But the expression is not ideal; with εἰς we would expect ἑαυτοῦ, if anything, but the final nu is clear. ὡς on the other hand, with the accusative, meaning 'to/to the home of' someone, gives appropriate sense and syntax. On the photograph supplied by Römer it seems to me that ὡς is sufficient to fill the gap between sigma and epsilon; omega is also a wide letter. With this supplement Smikrines' sentence is completed with suitable sense and the sentence is allowed to end with an appropriate flourish δηλαδὴ.

700 [δ~~ια~~]κονητέον. Römer supplements φρονητέον with [β~~ά~~δ]ην at line end to fill out the required number of metrical positions. There is, in my opinion, space for more than just two letters before -ονητέον which we can read in the new fragment. Moreover, I see absolutely no ink traces where Römer makes out]ην at line end. διακονέω seems to me, therefore, both palaeographically and semantically preferable to φρονητέον. Chairestratos has been sent (by Charisios?) on an errand (lines 700–1 are quite explicit on that point) and here he tells himself that he 'must do this service'. Note that Chairestratos appears to use the same verb in line 642 which begins διακ[ο]νε[ι]. He may at this point be explaining his mission to Smikrines (or the audience). διακονέω has long alpha. Finally I would submit that the minimal ink traces before -ονητέον match kappa excellently.

Lines 786–800

In *ZPE* 182 Römer published two additional fragments (H and I) of the Michigan papyrus giving further letters in the second halves of lines 786–823. She divided her edition of these lines between the speeches of first Smikrines, then Pamphile. I will follow suit. The following is my suggested text now for lines 786–792 (1–7 of the new fragment)⁶, incorporating Römer's readings and supplements, revised where I see fit. Again I give the newly read letters in bold face. Where the manuscript has *scriptio plena* (lines 786, 787, 795) I give the elisions necessary for metre.

⁴ Note διακ[ο]νε[ι]- in line 642, indicating some 'service' to be performed by Chairestratos, with my note below on line 700.

⁵ 'Menander and the pallake', paper read at the Nottingham conference 'Menander in Contexts', July 2012, London (forthcoming).

⁶ I omit the rest – lines 8–15 – as they do not add substantially to our knowledge of these lines; at the end of line 796 we still cannot decide whether ἄρχεται or ἄπτεται is preferable. The new fragment seems to have]ετ[α[.

Text

ΣΜΙΚΡΙΝΗΣ

[γυναῖ]κ' ἐπίβο[υλον λ]οιδορίαὶ κάβ[ε]λ[ε]ράν,	786
[ἡ δια]βαλεῖ σ' αἰ[του]μένη μὲν οὐδὲν ἅπ[αν]	787
[ἐς τα]ῦτ' ἐνέγκα[σθαι], μετέχουσα δ' [ἐ]ξ ἴσου,	788
[ἀπὸ]ν[ως] βιώσετ' [εἰκ]ότως κά[νευ κ]ακῶν.	789
[ὄρα δὲ] τοῦτ' αὐτῇ παραμύθιον ποτε	790
[ἔση σ]κυθρωπάζουσα, νοθετοῦσ' αἰεί,	791
[γαμε]τῆς ἔχουσα σχῆμα κατακεκλῶσμένη[ς]	792

Translation

Smikrines:

... a woman attacking you with insults and shameless,
 who will badmouth you. She'll demand that everything
 be held in common, and that she gets equal shares;
 she'll lead a comfortable life, no doubt, untroubled.
 Consider this point: you'll end up being an encouragement
 to her, with your scowling face and constant criticism,
 presenting the figure of the broken-hearted housewife.

Again, to save space, I concentrate only on those places where I differ from, or comment on, Römer's *editio princeps*. For other details the reader is referred to her paper as well as editions of the previously known fragments.⁷

787 οὐδὲν ἅπ[αν] Furley: οὐδέ[ν] (= οὐδὲ ἔ[ν]) Römer. Römer's construction of αἰτουμένη μὲν οὐδὲν / εἰς ταῦτ' ἐνέγκασθαι, 'without being asked to contribute anything to this household', is not without difficulties. First, the passive sense of αἰτέω is less natural than a middle; after it one would expect μή with the following infinitive (μηδὲ ἔν); finally, it is questionable whether the scribe would have written οὐδὲν for οὐδὲ ἔν. For my suggestion it is essential that there is enough room in the gap for four letters. I have calculated as well as I can with the available photograph, by comparison with ἀβελτέρων in the previous line, how much space is available, and it seems to me that Römer has underestimated the space. In ἀβελτέρων we can just see the left edge of beta and the right edge of the second epsilon: this is equivalent to four letters. In the next line we can see omikron and a trace after that and, on the other side of the gap, nu. That also leaves four letters, so is strictly comparable to the above line, in my opinion. Incidentally one can see that the fragments are not quite aligned properly in the photograph mounting. The fibres of fragment I curve noticeably to the left at the top: the top half of fragment I should be bent outwards from fragment H somewhat (making the gap larger). My suggestion restores good sense to middle αἰτουμένη and gives a good first limb to the μὲν-δέ construction: Habrotonon will demand that Charisios' income be pooled, then demand equal shares with Pamphile. I.e., although Pamphile is the wife, she, Habrotonon, will be on a par with her economically.

789 [ἀπὸ]ν[ως] Furley: καλῶς Römer: οὕτως Merkelbach. καλῶς seems too short for the space. Koenen–Gagos assumed 4 or 5 missing letters at line beginning. Furthermore καλῶς ... καὶ ἄνευ κακῶν is uncomfortably close to tautology. I therefore suggest a different adverb giving the sense that Habrotonon will have an easy life in the position envisaged by Smikrines: something like ἀπόνως, 'trouble-free', μαλακῶς, 'easy', 'comfortable', or perhaps λαμπρῶς, 'brilliant'.

⁷ Gro = M. Gronewald, *ZPE* 66, 1986, 1–13 and cited (from letters) in K–G; K–G = L. Koenen and T. Gagos, *Menander Epitrepontes*. Neue Michigan Fragmente von Akt III–IV. Unpublished lecture handout (Seminar-Tischvorlage), August 21 2002; A. Martina, *Menandri Epitrepontes* Rome 1997; W. Furley, *Menander Epitrepontes*, London 2009; Au = C. Austin, *Marriage on the Rocks: Pamphile in Menander's Epitrepontes*, *Acta Antiqua of the Hungarian Academy* 48, 2008, 19–27; Ar = W. G. Arnott, *Menander's Epitrepontes in the Light of the New Papyri*, in D. L. Cairns, R. A. Knox (edd.), *Law, Rhetoric and Comedy in Classical Athens. Essays in Honour of Douglas M. MacDowell*, Swansea 2004, 269–292.

789 Fr. I has *scriptio plena* here (καί); ακων at line end is clear, so a single long syllable is needed between καί and ακων. The krasis of καὶ ἄνευ is rare (once in Aristoph. *Ekk.* 525) but I can think of no plausible alternative.

790 [ὄρα δὲ] τοῦτ' (Gronewald) seems preferable to Römer's ἔση δὲ τοῦτ', which involves a very harsh accusative of respect (I assume): 'you will be in this respect'; τοῦτ' taken like this is also awkward with the following παραμύθιον. The eye and ear naturally assume τοῦτ' goes with παραμύθιον (not the case in Römer's reconstruction; she omits τοῦτ' in her translation).

790 I keep Römer's αὐτῆ, 'to her' (sc. Habrotonon), but one could also read αὐτή, 'you yourself will be ...'.

791 But Römer's ἔση from 790 goes very nicely at the beginning of this line (where she has ἀεί from Merkelbach).

792 κατακεκλασμένη[ς] Furley: κατακεκ[δ]ομένης Römer. The new fragments show that a perfect participle passive stood at line end, and, with a little imagination, one can now see that this is compatible with P.Oxy. 3533, which has σχημα followed by a punctuation mark, then κατακεκ..⁸ So, combining the two papyri now, we have the indisputable letters κατακεκ...μένη[(assuming no variants). Römer suggests reading κατακεκ[[δ]]ομένης with the meaning 'bored to death' (116). Palaeographically, this entails reading the letter after kappa in P.Oxy. 3533 as an erroneous delta: it does indeed look like a delta, but it could also be alpha or lamda (possibly after correction). There is only a minimal trace of what Römer thinks might be a first mu of -μένης. The proposed meaning 'bored to death' seems problematic to me both in context and with reference to the usual meanings of κατακόπτω. True, Menander uses the verb twice in the active voice in *Samia* (285, 292) to mean 'bore to death' (by speaking too much), but we nowhere find this verb in the passive with the sense 'bored to death'. And Pamphile in this situation is not bored to death, but worried to death! The imagined ménage-à-trois with Habrotonon is likely to make her deeply insecure, but hardly bored. Römer might have noted *Dysk.* 398 κατακέκομμι' ἐγώ, 'I'm quite exhausted', but this is said by Sikon the μάγειρος after dragging a reluctant sacrificial animal along a path. Does Smikrines want to say that Pamphile will be 'exhausted' here? By itself, one would expect the expression γαμετῆς κατακεκομμένης to mean rather, 'a battered wife', as κατακόπτω normally means 'cut down', 'cut in pieces', 'destroy'; if it ever had a metaphorical sense like our 'cut up' (= upset) it might suit, but there would still be the alpha/delta in P.Oxy. 3533 to contend with. According to Römer the delta was written here erroneously, but the scribe certainly did not cross it out or cancel it with a mark.

Handley proposed κατακεκλειμένης (= -ημένης), 'in the position of a housebound woman' (quoted by Römer). Here one can say that the sequence -κλε- can be squared with P.Oxy. 3533 on the assumption that the alpha/delta letter was meant to be lamda; there is a little extension to the left descender of this letter which seems to have been added afterwards. Perhaps this was the scribe's way of correcting his erroneous delta to an alpha or, indeed lamda. The letter after that might well be epsilon, with a section of the left arc rubbed off. But the sense is perhaps less than ideal in the context of rivalry between Pamphile and Habrotonon: it's what goes on *in* Charisios' two homes which is at stake, not whether Habrotonon can come and go, whereas Pamphile cannot. Nor did Greek males typically see being housebound as a problem for the married woman. *We* may think the ancient Greek wife's position intolerably restricted at home, but the ancient Athenians certainly did not. It is not likely that the greater mobility of a prostitute (such as Habrotonon) was generally perceived as an *advantage* in life style. On the contrary, the security, financial and otherwise, of being firmly ensconced in a home was considered desirable for a woman. One can compare Demeas' description of Chrysis' insecurity if he ejects her from his home in *Samia* (390–398). A further objection is the proximity of κατακεκλειμένης to ἐλευθέρα (two lines down) in this construction: would Smikrines not be contradicting himself?

So, to my suggestion: κατακεκλασμένη[ς]. As mentioned above, the letter after the last kappa in P.Oxy. 3533 looks most like delta but might be alpha or lamda. After that come traces which are hard to identify but look most like the left half of theta or epsilon, with a section of the left arc missing. I believe the

⁸ Römer rightly says that the letters -ημακατ- are badly damaged in this papyrus.

traces are compatible with alpha, possibly after some correction by the scribe. As an hypothesis I suggest he initially omitted the lamda and wrote κεκασ-, then corrected the mistake by slightly changing the alpha to lamda and the sigma to alpha. Römer suggests that the minimal trace before .μενη[in the new fragment is another mu. I suggest that it is the top right corner of sigma.⁹

I take κατακεκλασμένη[ς], from κατακλάω, to mean ‘broken in spirit’, ‘downcast’, ‘despairing’: see LSJ s.v. II. In addition to the examples quoted by LSJ, see especially Euripides *Hipp.* 764–766 ἀνθ’ ὧν οὐχ ὀσίων ἐρώ/των δεινῶι φρένας Ἀφροδί/τας νόσῳι κατακλάσθη, rendered ‘Wherefore a dread malady of unhallowed passion from Aphrodite broke her soul’ by Barrett.¹⁰ A more literal rendering would be ‘For this she (sc. Phaidra) was broken in spirit by a dreadful malady from Aphrodite’. For the perfect participle passive κατακεκλασμένος denoting a mental state, see further Dion. Halicarn. *De compositione verborum* 18 p. 79.10 Usener–Radermacher (οἱ μὲν ταπεινάς, οἱ δὲ κατακεκλασμένας, οἱ δ’ ἄλλην τινὰ αἰσχύνην καὶ ἀμορφίαν ἐχούσας ἐξήνεγκαν τὰς γραφάς); Aesop *Fab.* 285.9 Chambry (ἐλέησόν με τὸν κατακεκλασμένον); Com. Adesp. *PCG* vol. VIII 137.2 (οὐδὲ κατακεκλασμένος [or -μένως. Of a man: ‘degenerate’, ‘effeminate’ LSJ] πλάγιον ποιήσας τὸν τράχηλον περιπατεῖν); Hippokr. *Prorrhethikon* 1.71.5 (τοὺς ἐν πυρετῷ κωματώδει κατακεκλασμένους); Hesychius glosses θηλυδριῶδες (Aristoph. *Th.* 131) with τὸ κατακεκλασμένον; i.e. an effeminate, ‘weepy’ manner. I suggest that Smikrines is pointing out to Pamphile that if she is constantly getting at Charisios with angry looks, scolding words and a generally abject (or distraught) appearance (σχῆμα κατακεκλασμένης) that will act as an incentive and encouragement to Habrotonon: if she sees her rival upset and on the defensive, that will boost her confidence.¹¹

Lines 801–823 (speech of Pamphile)

For these lines the new fragments H, I and J of P.Mich. 4752 give more letters from the second half of these lines. Apart from these, we have the already known fragments A and B of the same manuscript (first ‘published’ in the hand-out of Koenen–Gagos) and P.Oxy. 3532 fragments 1 and 2. Dirk Obbink kindly sent me high-quality digital images of P.Oxy. 3532 to work with in connection with the *Epitrepointes* edition; now Cornelia Römer has kindly made available to me the images she has of the Michigan fragments; for P.Oxy. 3533 I have used the image available at the website of *Papyri Oxyrhynchi*. In the following text I have not distinguished between the readings of the various manuscripts, but give an amalgam of all known readings, with dots under letters in one or more manuscript whose status is uncertain. Here I have not printed readings from the new fragments in bold face, as the situation is complicated. Readers are referred to Römer’s publication for more details.¹² Since there are still significant gaps at some points in these lines, the restorations should be regarded with all due caution.

Restored text

[δεῖ, πάτε]ρ, ἐμὴν γνώμην λέγειν πεπ[λα]σμένην]	801
[ήκιστα] πάντων, ὅτι ποθ’ ἤγει συμφέρε[ιν.]	802
[ἀεὶ δ’ ἀφ]ελη· καὶ γὰρ φρονεῖν εἰμ’ [ἐνδικος]	803
[τό γ’ ἴδ]ιον, ἢ τ’ εὖνοι’ ἀνέριστά μ’ ἐνν[οεῖν]	804
[τούτοι]ς σε πείθεσθα[ι] δὲ μᾶλλον ἐπά[γεται.]	805
[ἐπεὶ δ]ὲ τοῦτο, πάπ[κ]α, λυπηρὸν δοκεῖ,	806
[γυναῖκα] μηδὲν ἡδικηκυῖαν τυχεῖν	807
[ἄλλας θ’] ἀμαρτούσας ἐῶμεν. δεύτερο[ν.]	808

⁹ As an alternative I tried to retain the sequence -κδε in P.Oxy. 3533 with a line such as γαμετῆς ἔχουσα σχῆμα κᾶτ’ ἐκδεδομένης, ‘having the appearance of a wife then of one betrayed’ (or ‘given away’) but the clear reading of both fr. H of P.Mich. κατακε[], and P.Oxy. 3533 at this point (κατακεκ-) tells against this.

¹⁰ W. S. Barrett, *Euripides Hippolytos*, Oxford 1964. Thanks to A. Sommerstein for the reference.

¹¹ I considered the following possibilities but found them less appropriate either palaeographically or semantically: κατακεκαμμένης – κατακάμπω (this seemed to me second most likely), κατακεκαρμένης – κείρομαι, κατακεχημένης – καταχράω, κᾶτ’ ἐκδεδομένης – ἐκδίδομι, κατακεκνισμένης – κατακνίζω (cf. Aristophanes *Plut.* 973), κατακεκαυμένης – κατακαίω, κατακεκασμένης – κατακαίνυμαι.

¹² And to Furley 2009 for detailed information about the already known fragments.

[ταῖσχρο̅ν] παρὰ τούτου γ' αἴτιον τοῦτον τίθη[ς:]	809
[ἀλλ' οὐ]δὲν αἰσχρο̅ν ἐν ὀλίγοις εὐρί[σ]κ[ε]ται	810
[τάκρι]βές· οἱ πολλοὶ [δὲ] τὸ γεγονὸς [μ]όνον	811
[ἴσ]ασι καὶ λέγουσιν, ὡς με τίνεται	812
ἀτυχῶν ἐπίπροσθε τῆ[ς] ἀληθείας ὄ[λ]ης.	813
“φ[υ]γεῖν δὲ δεῖ τοῦτόν σ' ὅσον γ' Ὀνήσιμον”	814
ἃ μὲν γὰρ εἶπας ἀρτίως, αἰσχρο̅ν τί [μοι]	815
ἐ[φ]ήκας. “ἀπολειθ' οὗτος” εἶτ' αὐτὴ [φύ]γ[ω]	816
διὰ τοῦτο; πότερον ἤλθ[ον] εὐποροῦ[ν]τι μὲν	817
συνευτυχήσουσ', ἂν ἄ[πο]ρος δ' [ἦ]ι, μηκέτι	818
αὐτῶι προϊδωμ'; “ἄτοπον” σὺ μὲν φ[ή]ς ἀλλ' [ἐγὼ]	819
κοινωνὸς ἤλθον το[ῦ βί]ου κα[ὶ] τῆς τύ[χη]ς.	820
ἔπταικεν; οἴσω τοῦτ[ο]. λοιπὸν ὡς λέγεις	821
“δύ' οἰκίας οἰκοῦνθ' ὑπ' [ἐκ]είνης ἀγόμε[νον].	822
προσέχοντ' ἐκείνη μᾶλ[λον] αἰσθᾶν[οιό] γ' [ἄ]γ.”	823

Critical apparatus¹³

801	δεῖ Fu: οὐ Au: ὦ al. πεπλασμένην Tu: πέπλακάς με γὰρ Gro
802	ἤκιστα Fu: ἀεὶ περι οἱ ἔχω περι Gro: δεῖ περι Au
803	ἀεὶ δ' Au: ἢ κάφελῃ οἱ ὁ μή μ' ἀφέλη Gro ἔνδικος Fu: εὐπορος K-G: οὐ κακὴ Gro
804	τὸ δ' ἴδιον (γ' Fu), τῶκεῖον, τοῖκεῖον Gro: τὸ βέλτιον, τὸ καίριον K-G ἢ τ' εὐνοῖα K-G ἀνέριστά μ' ἔννοεῖν (vel μὲν νοεῖν) leg. et suppl. Fu: [.]νερίσταμένη Rō: ὑπερίσταμένη Gro, Ar: παρίσταμένη K-G, al.
805	τούτοις Fu: χρηστοῖς Au: ταχέως, τελέως Gro δὲ Fu: θ' ὁ K-G: γ' ὁ Au ἐπάγεται K-G
806	ἐπεὶ δὲ Fu: πρῶτον δὲ Rō: νικᾶν τε K-G, Au πάππια K-G λυπηρὸν POxy 3532 leg. Fu: δυνατὸν al.: [σ]οῖ παρὸν P.Mich. leg. Rō
807	γυναῖκα Fu: ἔμ' ἄνδρα Rō: ἢ τήν τε K-G: ἦδη διὰ Gro: νυνὶ διὰ Au τυχεῖν Rō: τύχην edd. priores
808	ἄλλας θ' Fu: πάξ· τὰς Rō: κόρας e.g. K-G: αὐτὰς Gro: πόρνας Au
809	ταῖσχρο̅ν Au: τῶν μοι Gro, K-G, Rō τίθης Fu: τιθει[P. Mich.: ἐτίθεις leg. et suppl. Rō
810	ἀλλ' οὐδὲν K-G εὐρίσκεται Rō: εὐρήσεται (sensu pass.) possis
811	τάκριβές Bathrellou: ἀκριβές K-G fin. Rō
812	ἴσασι Gro: ὅ φασι Tu fin. Rō: τεινεται Π
813	τῆς ἁ. μόνης Rō: ὄλης Fu
814	φυγεῖν Tu fin. leg. et suppl. Rō
815	ἃ Rō: ὁ Tu fin. leg. et suppl. Rō
816	ἐφῆκας Rō: ἀφῆκας Tu fin. leg. et suppl. Rō
817	εὐποροῦντι μὲν Fu: εὐπορωτάτῳ Rō
818	μηκέτι Fu, al. Rō
819	leg. et suppl. Fu: προϊδω; μὰ τὸν εὐμενοῦντά μοι Δία Rō
820	fin. leg. et suppl. Rō
821	λέγεις Fu: al. Rō. (quae fin. ἀεὶ suppl.)
822	fin. leg. et suppl. Rō
823	fin. leg. et suppl. Fu: εκεινει P.Mich., εκεινη P.Oxy. 3532: ἐκείνη ταῖς θαλα..[Rō

Translation

Father, that I tailor my opinion artificially
to what you think most advantageous, is out of the question.
I must be plain. For I am entitled to think independently
about my lot, and goodwill calls for uncontentious words

¹³ See above n. 7 for key to abbreviations; **Rō** = C. Römer in *ZPE* 182; **Fu** = Furley in this publication; **Tu** = E. G. Turner, *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri*, vol. L, 1983; **Bathrellou** = Bathrellou *apud Au*.

and that you should rather be persuaded thereby.
 Since this matter, father, seems a painful topic,
 let us leave a wife who happens to have done no wrong,
 and other girls who have, out of this. Your second point:
 the shame he's caused. You say it's all his fault.
 But there's no shame. The real truth will out among
 a few. People at large only see what's happened
 and then they say that he's taking revenge on me
 because beforehand he'd completely missed the truth.
 "I should run from him as much as from Onesimos"?
 That remark of yours just now is a truly underhand
 blow to me. "He's had it." Well, should I leave him
 too therefore? Did I come to share a fortunate person's
 fate and when that person falls, should I no longer
 take thought for him? "Impossible!" you say, but I
 came as his companion in life and fortune.
 He's stumbled? I'll shoulder that. On your last point:
 "He'll have to keep two households forced by *her*;
 and you may see him paying *her* more attention."

Selective commentary on the new readings

804 ἢ τ' εὐνοί' ἀνέριστά μ' ἐννοεῖν. Before the new discovery we read εὐνοία... ρισταμένη. Editors tried εὐνοία περισταμένη (involving a split anapaest) or εὐνοί' ὑπερισταμένη (a rare verb of questionable sense). Now the new fragment fills in the gap with]νερ.[about which, as Römer says, there is 'little doubt'. This effectively rules out both ὑπερίσταμαι and παρίσταμαι. Römer says the only letter which might conceivably be read differently is the rho, which might be a rubbed phi. But the rho is confirmed by both Oxyrhynchus texts; Turner prints the rho in P.Oxy. 3533 without even a dot. Unless we are prepared simply to reject the combined evidence of the manuscripts, I see no alternative to a sequence of letters involving ἐριστά, 'disputing/disputable things' or ἀνέριστα, 'uncombative' or 'uncontentious' (i.e. words). We find ἐριστά in Soph. *El.* τάδε -- τοῖς δυνατοῖς οὐκ ἐριστά -- τλάθι, 'endure these things – one cannot fight with the powerful'.¹⁴ εὐεριστα[occurs in an uncertain construction in *PMG* 925e.18. ἀνέριστος is not even listed in LSJ but it is defined by several ancient lexica (Hesychius, Suda, Photius, Lexica Segueriana) as being equivalent to ἀφιλονείκτης, 'not fond of strife' (LSJ), or perhaps 'uncontentious', 'not acrimonious'. Eustathius uses the word in his commentary on the *Iliad* (2.622.18 and 4.630.6) as does a scholion on Lukian 54.8.1. One might surmise that Pamphile is saying something like 'goodwill requires we ('I' or 'you') avoid using acrimonious language', or more colloquially, 'I would prefer not to argue with you'. Metrically, ἀνέριστα is marginally preferable to ὄν ἐριστά (for example), as it avoids word-divide in the double short. I assume that P.Mich. had *scriptio plena* for εὐνοία, then ἀνεριστα. That would account for the gap of approximately one letter between fragments B and H. After that I propose μ' ἐννοεῖν as giving a tighter construction than the equally possible μὲν νοεῖν. Pamphile means, I suggest, that she feels obliged by 'goodwill' (filial respect) not to answer her father's fighting language with equally acrimonious words. ἐννοέω is almost *t.t.* for the deliberation of an orator. The infinitive in this line and the next, I propose, depends on ἐπάγεται at the end of 805. For what it is worth, I believe the small traces at the end of line 804 in P.Oxy. 3532 are consistent with nu; previously they had been taken for the eta of some compound of -ισταμένη. ἀνέριστα, if accepted, needs then to be added to our dictionaries; but it is a perfectly reasonable verbal adjective from ἐρίζω, is documented in ancient lexica with the appropriate meaning, and, above all, it accounts for all letters now read in the three sources.

¹⁴ Lines 219–220. For text and interpretation see P. Finglass, *Sophocles Electra*, Cambridge 2007. The *paradosis* is τάδε τοῖς δυνατοῖς οὐκ ἐριστά πλαθεῖν, 'but those things cannot be waged with the powerful so that one should come into conflict with them' (Jebb).

805 'And that you should rather be persuaded thereby (by these things)'. Most of this had already been read by Koenen–Gagos, except for τούτοις which I suggest refers to the ἀνέριστα of the previous line (i.e. Pamphile's measured arguments). I would also be happy with χρηστοῖς (Austin) in its place. Where P.Oxy. 3532 quite clearly has]εμαλλον Römer now reads]εμοιμαλλο[in the new fragment, which she reconstructs as πείθεσθα[ί τ'] ἐμοὶ μᾶλλον ἐπά[γει. There are two serious objections to this. For one thing we have an intolerable 'split dactyl' in μᾶλλον ἐπ-. This is enough to indicate that something is wrong with the line. Handley writes 'In the third metron, as throughout Attic drama, the break blbb is scrupulously avoided both after long anceps and after short'.¹⁵ Secondly, in my opinion, Römer has misaligned the letters she reads in the new fragment. What we have in fact is].εμαλλ..[which agrees with P.Oxy. 3532. The crossbar of epsilon before mu can, in my opinion, be clearly made out, thus distinguishing the letter from omikron (as had been read previously in P.Oxy. 3532). Before that there is a minimal ink trace bottom right, compatible with delta but not e.g. theta or tau. I suggest therefore, that we read δέ rather than τε (Römer: τ' ἐμοί).

806 λυπηρὸν δοκεῖ. Already in 2009 I suggested this reading of P.Oxy. 3532 instead of what previous editors had read as δυνατὸν δοκεῖ. Now the new fragment of P.Mich. gives us]οιπαρονδο[according to Römer, which she reconstructs as τοῦτο, πάππα, σοὶ παρὸν δοκεῖ. She omits this line in her translation and also fails to gloss her reconstruction in the commentary, pointing to the alleged disparity between the readings of the two manuscripts and suggesting that Pamphile is using deliberately veiled language to mask the truth of her situation from her father. Nevertheless, we should be able to understand her words. I think in fact that P.Mich. here, too, confirms P.Oxy. 3532. I take -οι- as equivalent to ypsilon in P.Oxy. 3532 by itacism. There are further examples of this in line 812 (τείνεταί for τίνεταί), line 807 (-κειαν for -κυιαν), 696 (γεινωσκείν for γινωσκείν) and others. The alpha in -παρ- is by no means clear; I suggest eta is possible. I conclude that the new fragment confirms pi and rho in -π.ρον and that the reading in both manuscripts is λυπηρὸν. Pamphile means that since this is a delicate matter (the rival sexual relations between herself and Charisios and Habrotonon and Charisios in the putative ménage-à-trois) it is better if they simply leave out that aspect in their discussion. Smikrines had harped on this topic in his speech lines 793–96. At line beginning Römer suggests πρῶτον δέ but I do not think it is strictly necessary for a πρῶτον to precede δεύτερον in line 808, nor is πρῶτον δέ happy, as the regular expression is πρῶτον μὲν.

807–808 Pamphile is alluding, in my opinion, to herself and other girls/women (i.e. Habrotonon). Smikrines had gone on about the unfair competition which will obtain between Pamphile and Habrotonon both competing for the favours of Charisios. Pamphile wishes to drop that subject as it is unsavoury. At the same time, she asserts her own innocence in line 807 and alludes to 'others' errors' in 808. At this stage of the play Smikrines thinks he knows Charisios has had an illegitimate child by Habrotonon (645–46), and presumably he has told Pamphile about that in the lost portion of his speech. In 807 P.Mich. now clearly has τυχεῖν at line end; one might consider another itacism here for τύχην (going grammatically with ἡδικηκυῖαν) but comparison with P.Oxy. 3532 shows that -εῖν here, too, is more likely.

809 τοῦτον τίθη[ς; It seems to me that there is no room for an epsilon augment between the two words as Römer supposes (ἐτίθεις); likewise, the word break in the double-short -ον ἐτί- again runs counter to normal prosody. One might consider writing a thematic ending τιθεῖς (cf. Eupolis *Bapt.* fr. 88.4 K–A, where Goettling conjectured τιθεῖς for ms. πείθεις) but it is perhaps easier to assume another itacism here (like ἐκείναι in 823) on the scribe's part for original τίθης.

812–813 I suggest that δ[ί]λης is better than Römer's μιᾶς, and matches what I can see of the ink traces. In context, the subject of τίνεταί must be Charisios rather than Onesimos. Pamphile is saying that her marital situation appears (to the many) to be the following: they think Charisios is punishing her by going off with Habrotonon because he 'was completely wrong about the truth' i.e. when he married her. He thought he was marrying a virgin wife, but in fact she was already four months pregnant and gave birth to a baby five months after their marriage. When Pamphile says that 'the exact truth is established in a small (private) circle' she means that the story of her rape at the Tauropolia and ensuing pregnancy actually exonerates her of the charge of infidelity, but can only be aired among a small circle of trusted people. And, by typical

¹⁵ E. W. Handley, *The Dyskolos of Menander*, London 1965, 67.

Menandrian irony, her words can be understood by the audience on another level: the truth is really that Charisios raped his own future wife at the Tauropolia, and this truth will ‘out’ by the end of the play.

814 ὄσον γ’ Ὀνήσιμον. The reference is to Onesimos’ denunciation of Pamphile’s alleged extra-marital relations to Charisios (the fuse which sets off the drama; see lines 422–23 and, no doubt, the lost prologue). Smikrines means that Pamphile should now shun Charisios (because of his taking up with Habrotonon) as much as she should Onesimos (for his denunciation of her).

817 εὐποροῦντι μὲν, ‘just when he’s prospering’. I do not see the point of the superlative in Römer’s εὐπορωτάτω. Do we know that Charisios was ‘very well off’ when he married? Does Pamphile mean she married someone ‘very well off’? There seems to be more point to the simple antithesis εὐποροῦντι and ἄπορος in the next line. Römer says there are traces in the papyrus which match her reading, but they look terribly faint to me in the picture, and open to other interpretations.

819 The key point here is that μὰ τόν (in any reconstruction) is now shown to be impossible. There is space for two letters (at least) between the fragments B and H of P.Mich., as shown by the preceding and following lines. On B one reads ματ[and on H now]ον, so one cannot simply connect these letters into μὰ τόν. A reexamination of P.Oxy. 3532 shows that the letter after ματο is likely to be pi not nu. One can take the preceding mu with προίδωμ’ (middle, cf. Thuc. 1.17; Lys. 33.7) rather than the active προίδω, and supplement ἄτοπον after it. Then, after -ον in fragment H Römer read the letters ευμενοῦ[. I suggest that the first letter here is sigma, not epsilon (one can see no crossbar, only left arc) and the last but one phi (the downstroke is not visible at all, but the surface of the papyrus is very rubbed here; the circle is clearly visible and could be omikron *vel sim.*): σὺ μὲν φή[ς] suits. I suggest that Pamphile is here picking up on Smikrines’ earlier dig at her that ‘one virtue lies in always avoiding an impossible person (or ‘an impossible situation’): μί’ ἐστὶν ἀρετὴ τὸν ἄτοπον φεύγειν ἀεὶ (line 704).¹⁶ It seems that Pamphile is saying ‘You may say it’s mad (or ‘he’s crazy’) but I came as companion in [sc. his] life and fortune’ (i.e. ‘in his life’s fortune’). Charisios (who is eavesdropping on the present speech) refers to this remark later in lines 919–920: εἶπεν ... / [πρὸς] τὸν πατέρα, κοινῶς ἤκειν τοῦ βίου, ‘she said to her father that she had come as [my] companion in life’. This formulation makes it likely that Pamphile in lines 819–820 here had expressed herself positively and not as a question (οὐκ ἐγὼ / κοινῶς ἦλθον ...; *vel sim.*). With this new reconstruction, one perhaps needs to reconsider the question of τὸν ἄτοπον *versus* τᾶτοπον in line 704. Perhaps better sense is to be had with the neuter form in 819 ‘you say *it’s* misguided’ (rather than ‘he’). Römer supplemented μὰ τὸν εὐμενοῦντά μοι Δία but, apart from the impossibility of μὰ τόν here (as explained above), the expression τὸν εὐμενοῦντά μοι Δία would be unique in the language of devotion.

821 λέγεις. The first letter can, it seems to me, equally well be lamda as Römer’s alpha. I think Pamphile is coming to the next point in Smikrines’ ‘case’ against Charisios as a husband.

823 προσέχοντ’ ἐκείνη μᾶλλον αἰσθάν[οιό] γ’ [ἄ]ν. The first point is that P.Mich. has εκειναις, as some have thought. So there is no disparity between the two sources here: P.Mich. simply has another itacism for ἐκείνη (i.e. Habrotonon). After εκειναις the traces in P.Mich. are well consistent with a partially rubbed mu; after that alpha-lamda do not need to be dotted. Then, after the break between fragments B and H, αἰσθαγ are also clear. I suggest an optative with ἄν as the most idiomatic expression for Smikrines here: ‘you’ll probably notice’, ‘you may well notice’, with αἰσθάνομαι governing an accusative-with-participle construction, as is normal. The gamma is still visible after some minimal traces, as is an ink trace at the end of the line: hence γ’ ἄν rather than e.g. σύ γε at line end (with indicative αἰσθάνη). Smikrines’ use of αἰσθάνομαι appears to be picked up by Pamphile in her rejoinder in line 830 (still incomplete). The end of this line is not necessarily the end of the quote from Smikrines.

William Furley, Universität Heidelberg, Seminar für Klassische Philologie
william.furley@skph.uni-heidelberg.de

¹⁶ Our sources give two different versions of this *gnōmē*, one with τὸν ἄτοπον, which here in context would point in the direction of Charisios as the ‘impossible man’, and another in *Monostichoi* 464 Jäkel, with τᾶτοπον (= τὸ ἄτοπον), ‘the impossible situation’; see my note (2009 p. 211).