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Chapter 1

Revised Text

1.1 Introduction

Since my edition of Menander’s Epitrepontes was published in 2009, some important new fragments of text stemming from the so-called Michigan Papyrus (M) have been published by Cornelia Römer in Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik and Archiv für Papyrusforschung.\(^1\) In particular some quite large chunks have augmented a vital part of the play, the dialogue between an irate Smikrines and his daughter Pamphile in act four. Although there are still gaps, we now have more or less continuous text for the latter half of Smikrines’ speech and the first section of Pamphile’s reply, so that one gets a fairly good idea of the give and take between the two, centering on the issue of whether Pamphile should leave her husband Charisios now that he has taken up with a harp-girl Habrotonon and, in effect, moved out to be with her. As readers familiar with Epitrepontes already know, however, the situation is complicated. Charisios has only left Pamphile because he is under the mistaken impression that she has had an illegitimate child by another man five months after their marriage. Moreover, he does not desire the harp-girl at all, but shuns her. Nor is Pamphile in possession of the true facts. As will eventuate, the baby which she did indeed have, was fathered by Charisios himself when he raped her, or as people used to say, forced her, at a nighttime festival called the Tauropolia. From the point of view of Menander’s audience, this was a ‘lucky’ circumstance: the man who raped her and got her pregnant, subsequently became her husband. Modern readers will not feel so happy for Pamphile that she was raped by her future husband: rape even within marriage has become a criminal offence in some jurisdictions. However, according to the conventions of New Comedy, the only thing which mattered for a citizen daughter was that sex, whether forced or

\(^1\) My thanks go to her for providing usable images of the fragments she has discovered and published.
not, and pregnancy should be sanctioned by marriage. Or, to put it another way, a citizen girl whose lover/rapist did not marry her was lost. The highly charged conversation between Smikrines and Pamphile is conducted around these sensitive issues.

The new discoveries of text relate to separate sections of the play. These are now presented in consecutive order according to the plan of the original edition. First text, then papyrological readings where these are a composite of two or more manuscripts, then translation, and finally commentary. An appendix gives a complete updated text (with apparatus) of the play. Commentary and bibliography given in the first edition is assumed, in order to avoid undue repetition.

**Manuscripts**

C = Cairo Codex (Cairensis)

M = Michigan Papyrus 4733 + 4801 + 4807

O\(^{23}\) = P.Oxy. 3532

O\(^{24}\) = P.Oxy. 3533

O\(^{27}\) = P.Oxy. 4023

P = Petersburg Parchment (P. gr. 388)

### 1.2 Lines 171-183

A small piece of M (4801 fr. g) has been placed here by Furley (2014), giving line endings which may be combined with a few line beginnings in P. When act two begins, Onesimos is the most likely speaker. First published by Koenen & Gagos (Aug. 20, 2002).

**(Χαι)**  
[ΧΟΡΟΥ]

**(Ου)**  
ἐπ[ὶ Πονα] πάντα τάνθ[β]άδ’ ὦ[χ ύ]περευφρατ[εί]  
o[ιομ[ ]ως τελείν  
kαὶ το[π[  
ό δεσπό[της ο]νο[ι λέγει,  
ὁ γέρω[ν]  
o[υδὲ λό[γον]γ]  

172 ἐπίπονα Furley: ἐπισφαλῆ Jernstedt: ἐπίμεμπτα Austin  
tάνθάδ’ Austin:  
tάνθ[ρωπων] Jernstedt  
o[χ ύ]περευφρατ[εί] Austin

4
1.3 Lines 645-661

For this section see (apart from previous editions) Römer (2016).

See readings. See translation.
1.4 Lines 697-701

For this section see (apart from previous editions) Römer (2012a), Furley (2013). See readings. See translation.

Σμ αὐτὴν μὲν ἔξε[i], τὴν δ’ ἐπ[ει]σάξει λαβῶν ἐκεῖνος εὐθὺς ὡς[ς] ἐστὶν δηλαδὴ.


ΧΟΡ[ΟΥ]

1.5 Lines 786-823


---


6
Παμφίλ(η)

ἐ[πω π]ροθεμένη τοῦτο παντὶ τωὶ λ[όγωι τό γ᾿] [ου]δὲν ἄκουτος ποιήσαι σοῦ ποτ’ ἄ[ν].
γυναῖκα μηδὲν’ ἥδικηκυῖαν τυχεῖν τόρνας θ[ὰ] αμαρτοῦσας ἔξωμεν. δεύτερο[ν,]
«ταῖσχρόν» παρὰ τοῦτο γ᾿ ˙ αἴτιον τοῦτον τί[θε]σι; ἀλλ᾿ οὐδὲν αἰσχρόν ἐν ἀλήθειαν πρὸς τῆς[α]πάντων,
πεπλακάς με γάρ Grневałd ap. Römer 801 καὶ, πάτερ Römer (πάτερ iam Grневałd) πεπλασμένην Turner:

ἐπταιευ; οίσω τοῦτ[ο]. λοιπὸν ὡς λ[έγεις
«δῦ’ οἰκίας οἰκοὺνθ’ ὑπ’ [ἐκ]είνις ἀγόμε[ν ουν,
προσέχοιτ’ έκείνη μᾶλ[λον] οἰσθάν[οι] γ’ [ἄ]υν.»

1.6 Unplaced Fragments

For this section see Römer (2014).

1.6.1 Fragment under Glass 136

There are only a few legible letters on this very abraded fragment.

Six lines missing at column top probably

| 1 | π  |
| 2 | ... |
| 3 | blank |
| 4 | blank |
| 5 | ει |
| 6 | [ |
| 7 | blank |
| 8 | blank |
| 9 | blank |
| 10 | [ |
| 11 | blank |
| 12 | blank |
| 13 | blank |
| 14 | blank |
| 15 | [ |
| 16 | [ |
| 17 | blank |
| 18 | φ’ |
| 19 | [ |
| 20 | blank |
| 21 | [ |
| 22 | κ.φαι |

1.6.2 Fragment under Glass 149

There are more legible letters on this fragment, but they do not produce words. I give Römer’s original readings with minor modifications.

Six lines missing at column top probably

1. \[ \pi_\ldots \nu \nu \] 
2. \[ \ldots \tau_\ldots \xi \] 
3. \[ \ldots \] 
4. \[ \sigma_\ldots \] 
5. \[ \ldots \sigma_\ldots \] 
6. \[ \mu_\ldots \] 
7. \[ \ldots \tau_\ldots \omicron \] 
8. \[ \omicron_\ldots \] 
9. \[ \ldots \omicron_\ldots \] 
10. \[ \delta_\ldots \] 
11. \[ \ldots \chi_\ldots \] 
12. \[ \ldots \epsilon_\ldots \] 
13. \[ \ldots \alpha_\ldots \] 
14. \[ \ldots \omicron_\ldots \] 
15. \[ \ldots \] 
16. \[ \ldots \tau_\ldots \omicron \] 
17. \[ \omega_\ldots \] 
18. \[ \epsilon_\ldots \omicron \alpha_\ldots \lambda \] 
19. \[ \omicron \rho_\ldots \] 
20. \[ \omicron_\ldots \ou \] 
21. \[ \delta_\ldots \] 
22. \[ \ldots \] 
23. \[ \ldots \omicron \mu_\ldots \]
nine missing lines expected here
Chapter 2

Composite Readings

2.1 Lines 171-183

No need for composite readings here as P gives only line beginnings and M only line endings, with no overlap.

2.2 Lines 645-661

{ C θυμων εταρωσ ουτος . . . . . . . [ M ] . . . [ . . . ] . . προ[ 645


{ C παρ . . [ M ] . . . ] . . . , ωι π . . . [ 650


 Fragmentary line endings preserved in C, the rest in fragments of M.

2.3 Lines 697-701

C μεθ ων .[
O27 ]πεμψα .[

C 2.3 Lines 697-701

Fragmentary line endings preserved in C, the rest in fragments of M.

C μεθ ων .[
O27 ]πεμψα .[

{ C } εμοι
{ M [..] η διατετραπτ[..] τουμ[..] , μοι [ ...
{ C } , ν
{ M [..] , ουντεον δ[..]αι πορευ[ ...
{ C } εστι μοι
{ M [..] ην εταξθη[..] επι[..] μελ[..] , [ ...

|ΧΟ | P|

2.4 Lines 786-823

Μ φαρμακα επιβο[..] οιδοριαι κα [..] ιραν
Μ ος εκβαλει κε λ [±2-3] μενη μεν ο [..] ν
{ M εις τουτ ενεγκ[..] μετεχος[..] ξ ισου
O23
...... ] ...... , χ . . . σα δ'[ ...
{ M ίλαρως βιωςετ[..] οτως κα [..] ιακων
O23
...... ] ες κα ....... κακ[ ...
{ M ες , αι [..] τουτο αυ[..] θαμυθιον [ ...
O23
 ...... ] , αραμυθι , ν πο [ ...
O24
] αυτη παραμυθιον ποτε[ ...
{ M κυ , ε σκυθρωπα , [..] α νουθετο[..] ει
O23
 ...... ] ...... . .
O24
] παξουσα/νουθετου' αει
{ M γα[..] ετης εξους[..] , μα κατακε[3-4] μενη[ ...
O23
...... ] , ακ . . . . . η[ ...
O24
] , ουσα σχη .. κ. τακεκλε'[ ...
{ M ε , [..] θα παραλυ[..] χαλητων [..] Φιλη
O23
 ...... ] , ν παμ [ ...
O24
] ραλυςει κε / χα , επον πα [ ...
{ M ελ[..] ερα γυναικ[..] πορφυν μα[ ...
O23
 ...... ] , ν , ν μα [ ...
O24
] ναικι προς πο . . . ν μα . [ ...
M πλ[...] πανουργ[...]ον, οἰδὲ α[...], νεται
O²³
...
...
...

O²⁴]
ο, ργει / πλε[...] οἰδ'Υ'α[...]

O²⁴]
Μ ου[...] κολακευ[...]λον, σχρ[...]...

O²³
...
...

O²⁴]
λακευ[...] μαλλον/αιςχρω[...

O²⁴]
Μ εξ[...] αλως νυν[...]α αοι[...]η[...].

O²³
....
...
...

O²⁴]
, ε νυν ταυτα κοι την πυθ[...

O²⁴]
Μ ειρ[...] ναι νομιζε []βως .[

O²³
.......
.......
.

O²⁴]
, νις' ακρεβως εκομεν[...

O²⁴]
Μ (Π)αμφι[... ]ροθεμεν[...]ο παντ[...

O²³
....
...
...

O²⁴]
μενη τουτ[... ]ντι τω[...

O²⁴]
Μ το[... ] ἐν ακοντ[...]ηεκαι[...

O²³
.......
.......
...

O²⁴]
κουντος ποηκαι σου ποτ' α[...

O²⁴]
Μ κα[... ]3-4] , εμην γν[... ] λεγει[...

O²³
.......
...
...

O²⁴]
ην γνωμην λεγειν π[...]

O²⁴]
Μ χ... [3-4]παντων . οτ[...]θηγ[...

O²³
.......
...
...

O²⁴]
τι ποτ' ηγει εμ

O²⁴]
Μ... [3-4]ελη και γαρ φρο[ν]ειν ει[...].

O²³
.......
...
...

O²⁴]
]γαρ φρονειν ει[...

O²⁴]
Μ... [3-4] , αν η τ ευνοια[...]νερι[...]

O²³
.......
...
...

O²⁴]
]οι σ[... ]ριπτα μ[...

O²⁴]
Μ... [3-4], σε πειθεθα[...] ε μ[...

O²³
.......
...
...

O²⁴]
]ει μαλλον επα[...]

O²⁴]
εκ[... ]λλο[...]

O²⁴]
M ... ]ε touto παπ[ ... ]οιτηρον δο[ ... ], !
O 23 ... ]λυπ ... ου δοκ ... i
O 24 ]υτ ... ν ... [  

M ... ]μηδεν ηδικη[ ... ]εια[ ... ]τυχει[  
O 23 ... ]ηκυιαιν τυχ ... γ[  
O 24 ] ... ] ... [  

M ... ]αμα ... του ... ac ε]ω ... en δ ... υτ ... [  
O 23 ... ] ... ] ... [  
O 24 ... ] ... ] ... [  

M[ ... ] ... ]ερα touto[ ... ]α[ ... ]τιον ... [ ... ]γει[ ... ]θει[  
O 23 ... ] ... ] ... [  

M ... ]δεν αισχρον ε[ ... ]λιγοιευ ... i ... ]κ ... ]ται[  
O 23 ... ] ... ] ... [  

M ... ]εκ οι πολλαι[ ... ]το γεγονος μονον[  
O 23 ... ] ... ] ... [  

M[ ... ] ... ] ... [ ] ... ου[ ... ]ε γεινεται[  
O 23 ... ] ... ] ... [  

M[ ... ] ... ] ... [ ] ... ει και λε[  

M[ ... ] ... ] ... [ ] ... πιπροσεθε ... τ ... ] ... [ ] ... αληθειας[ ... ] ... [  
O 23 ... ] ... ] ... [  

M[ ... ] ... ] ... ] ... [ ] ... γειν ... δε δει[ ... ] ... ] ... [  

M ... ] ... ] ... [ ] ... ρε ... πας αρτιωπα] ... αισχρον τι[ ... ] ... ] ... [  
O 23 ... ] ... ] ... [  

M ... ] ... ] ... [ ] ... α μεν γαρ ειπα ... αρτ ... [  

M ... ] ... ] ... [ ] ... απολειθ]ου ... ] ... [ ] ... αει ... ] ... [  
O 23 ... ] ... ] ... [  

M ... ] ... ] ... [ ] ... ηκας απο ... ] ... θ ... ou[  

M ... ] ... ] ... [ ] ... ιοτερον η ... ] ... ] ... θ ... ] ... ] ... eu ... ] ... [  
O 23 ... ] ... ] ... [  

M ... ] ... ] ... [ ] ... ιδι ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... eu ... ] ... [  
O 23 ... ] ... ] ... [  

M ... ] ... ] ... [ ] ... κυνευτυχες ... av[  

M ... ] ... ] ... [ ] ... αυ ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ου κα ... ] ... τ ... [  
O 23 ... ] ... ] ... [  

M ... ] ... ] ... [ ] ... λθσ [ ... ]ου κα ... ] ... τ ... [  
O 23 ... ] ... ] ... [  

M ... ] ... ] ... [ ] ... ων ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... ] ... }
{M . . . . .} ν οἰς ω τούτοις λοιπὸν ως λι
O θ᾽ ἐπταίκευν οἰς ω τούτοις
{M . . . . .} οἰκουνθυπο[. . .]εινης αγ[. . .]
O δυ οἰκιας οἰκουνταυ[. . .]
{M . . . . .}ντ εκει μαλ[. . .]αὶσθα . . . . γ
O προσεχοντ εκεινη [ . . ]
Chapter 3

Translation

3.1 171-183

(Chair.)
not bumping into them seems sensible to me.

[Chorus]

[Act Two]
On. Everything’s troublesome here. It won’t delight
...[ing]...end
...[...]
the master[ ] says, 175
the old guy [ will call] witnesses
not ca[re]...[ ] of the...[ ] by god!
...[...]
...[...]
180
is ashamed
] has become [
]...[

3.2 645-661

Sm. Your friend here [ ±8 ][ a child from a prostitute [ ] will recognize
further[ . . . . ] ...[ ].... this [ ] has taken[ ]... of him[...[ ]
(Chai.) . . . . [happen to me?

[ . . . . indeed]

(Sm.) [ . . . . induce.

(Chai.) [arduous life

[ . . . . of the unfortunate

Sm. [he unfortunate

man, by Dionysos. But probably I’m being a busy-body, overstepping my paternal role when it’s perfectly possible to leave, taking my daughter with me. That’s what I’ll do, I’ve very nearly decided to do that. I call you to witness, Chairestratos, and swear (by god), with whom I sent (my daughter to her marriage)... 655

3.3 697-701

(Sm.) He’ll keep his wife, and bring her in addition into his ménage without delay, no doubt.

(Chai.) [That’s that. A major setback for me, it seems. Well, I must help out, and best be on my way on the errand on which I’ve been dispatched.

Chor[us]

3.4 786-823

Sm. ...poisonous potions and daily threats that he’ll throw you out. With no resources of her own to contribute here, but enjoying an equal share, she’ll live merrily, of course, without a care. Then there’s this: You’ll only encourage her with your frowns and endless scolding, your position as down-at-heel housewife. Finally she’ll out you. It’s not easy, Pamphile, for a free-born woman to compete with a harlot. She knows more tricks, has more experience, knows no shame, uses flattery, resorts to one low trick after another. Enough! Believe you me: the Pythia

18
Pam. I’ll speak on one assumption throughout, that I could never do anything against your will. For, Father, I should tailor my remarks on everything to what you think is advantageous, as being helpful. For you are entitled to judge what’s right, and well-meaning made you say these indisputable truths, and tempts me to comply. But since, Father, it seems a painful matter, let’s leave a wife who happens to have injured no one and wicked harlots out of this. Your second point, the shame he’s brought on us. You think he’s guilty? There is no shame. The truth is known only to the inner circle; common people only know, and talk about, the surface facts, such that any old story becomes preferable to the truth. I should shun him as vehemently as Onesimos? What you said just now is a vile imputation to me. He’s a lost soul? So then I should run for that reason? Did I marry him just to share in his good fortune, and if that fails, I should no longer care? ‘Hopeless’, you say, but I say I came as companion in his life and fortune. He’s stumbled? I’ll put up with that. Your last point: he’ll have two families, pressurized by her; he’ll pay her more attention, as you’ll see …
Chapter 4

Commentary

4.1 Lines 171-183

171 The placement of the fragment itself receives some slight corroboration from the traces above the gap in the Michigan fragment. Koenen-Gagos had read an omikron followed perhaps by kappa (or something else). If οκ is right, this clearly tallies with δοκεῖ, a nearly certain supplement of P in the final line of act one.

172 Jernstedt’s suggested reconstruction of this line is now ruled out by M. We need something shorter than his ἐπι[σφαλῆ μὲν] πάντα τἀνθ[ρώπων]. How many letters stood between επι and πάντα in P remains to be checked against an image. Austin’s suggestion (per litt.) is possible, although ἐπίμεμπτος is only attested late and can mean ‘blaming’ rather than ‘blameworthy’ (LSJ). Perhaps ἐπίπονα here, ‘troublesome’, recurring in line 1091 of this play (Smikrines speaking) and Men. fr. 576, if four letters are enough to fill the gap. Instances of τάνθαδε, ‘the things here’, or ‘the things up to this point’, occur e.g. at Menander Dysk. 265; Thuc. 6.85.3; Plato Tim. 22d4. οὐχ ὑπευφραν[εῖ, ‘it(thesituation?) won’t overplease(him?)’. The traces permit either εὐφραν[ (i.e. a future form of εὐφραίνω) or εὐφραι[ν (present); however, if αιν- is the penultimate syllable of the line, it is unmetrical. Εὐφραίνω and εὐφραινομαι are frequent in comedy, but ὑπευφραίνω is not attested until Lucian (Ikaromenippos 2.7), who, however, often reflects comic vocabulary. I assume Onesimos is being ironical: the situation won’t ‘overplease’ Charisios (?), i.e. he will be horrified to hear that Smikrines is intent on removing Pamphile, and the dowry, from him. Alternatively, Onesimos could be referring to the fact that Smikrines will be annoyed to discover what is going on with his daughter (Charisios taking up with Habrotonon and moving out).

173 οἰομ[ The word is not likely to be οἴομαι (unmetrical) unless the scribe of P used scriptio plena. οἰόμενος (-ον), οἰόμεθα are possible.
175 Koenen-Gagos read λέγειν but I cannot see any trace after iota in the photograph.

176 ὁ γέρων. Koenen-Gagos had already pointed to the possible connection here between μάρτυρας and line 659, where Smikrines also calls the spectators to witness. The connection between P and M is given some additional support, I think, by the combination of these words in this line.

177 λό[. A form of λόγος, presumably.

177-78 K.-G. note before 178 (line 10 of the fragment) ‘wohl Sprecherwechsel’, presumably because of πρὸς θεῶν at the end of the line, indicating the onset of dialogue. In 177 they say]: τ᾿ is ‘möglich’, although I cannot discern anything resembling that on the photograph. If they are right, we would have change of speaker already in 177. If, on the other hand, this is Smikrines’ entry already, we get into difficulties with our interpretation of the following fragment (P.Oxy. 4021 fr. 3, with Nünlist’s revised text in ZPE 144, 2003, 59-61), where it seems that Onesimos is continuing his monologue. Perhaps πρὸς θεῶν does not mark a new speaker’s entry. Certainly Smikrines does not have a monopoly on the expression although he does use it 1083; otherwise Karion utters it in line 1, Syriskos in 232. We might expect paragraphs after 177 in P if the speaker changed at the beginning of 178, but, without a photograph, I do not know how much is visible beneath οὐδὲ λό[. And there might still be change of speaker in mid-line of 178, before πρὸς θεῶν.

4.2 Lines 645-661

Chairestratos has joined Smikrines on stage at line 631, after the latter had been talking to the cook Karion. In 636 he announced some trepidation (ὀκνηρο[), probably his own in confronting the irate Smikrines. In 639 there is talk of someone ‘having given birth’ (τέτοκε) but one can only guess who: the candidates are Habrotonon or Pamphile. In 643 Smikrines probably mentions Charisios’ name (Χαρ[ισι‐) then in the first line of our revised text it becomes clear that Smikrines is referring to Chairestratos’ friend Charisios. The new letters we have of the following lines come from a fragment of M giving letters either at, or close to the right margin of text. It was published by C. Römer in 2016. The most exciting new discoveries are probably γνώσεται in line 646 referring to Charisios ‘recognizing’ something, and the new reading in 656 πατρίων.

645 Unfortunately the traces of the second half of this line in C are impossible to read. Reading from original and photo Römer’s best attempt is οὐδὲ ... νετ[αι or κετ[ο. But M seems to have προ[ or πρε[ in last position, which is not easily reconcilable with C. Römer states that the two manuscripts must have had diver-
gent readings here, but, with much imagination, I could make out something resembling προ- in the final traces of C. ὑμῶν ἔταφιος. It is clear at any rate that Smikrines is here talking to Chairestratos about his profligate friend Charisios. In lines 660-61 Smikrines refers to Chairestratos’ role at Pamphile’s wedding. It seems that Chairestratos was Charisios’ ‘best man’ (παράνυμφος) at the wedding, responsible for escorting Pamphile to the groom’s home.

646 παιδάριο[ν ἐ]κ πόρνηϲ κτλ. ‘A child from the prostitute’. But Smikrines cannot have discovered that Habrotonon has had a child by Charisios as Habrotonon has only just now had the idea of pretending that the baby is hers and Smikrines entered in 583 immediately after Habrotonon had exited to set her plan in motion. It is unlikely, in my opinion, that Sandbach’s e.g. supplement of line 621 (Smikrines asking Karion whether Charisios has had a child by the psaltria) is correct. What Smikrines has discovered is that Charisios has taken up with Habrotonon and is consorting with her in Chairestratos’ house. Presumably he now fears that Charisios will have a child with her, which will have fatal consequences for his daughter’s marriage, as Charisios will have to free Habrotonon and recognize the child as his own. This may be the point of γνώσεται: he will recognize (= come to understand) that he has had a child by the ‘prostitute’; cf. line 896 where Charisios comes to precisely this (false) realization. ὃς This could be any number of things; Römer thought of ἕκαστος, ‘anyone will recognize’; but it might be the relative pronoun ὅς or a participle γεγονός (said of the παιδάριον), or perhaps a derogatory term for Charisios ὁ πονηρός. Better not to make assumptions.

647 προσώunakan. Probably πρόσωθεν, ‘from a distance’, with Römer. μένη. Probably part of a feminine participle but hard to know to whom Smikrines might be referring: the πορνή or his daughter?

648 εἰληφ[ And who is doing the taking of what, is equally uncertain. Römer’s εἰληφ[έναι] is by no means the only possible form. For what it is worth, ἄν cannot go with perfect tense.

649 M has a curious vertical line (|) after πάθω, possibly marking change of speaker. Again in line 654. πάθω (Römer) is not the only possibility, it seems to me. One might also entertain πλέω (< πλέως), ‘full’. πάθω, if correct, must be aorist subjunctive; a fairly common expression in Menander is τί πάθως; (vel sim.) meaning ‘what can I do about it?’ but τωι is not readily compatible with that.

650 καὶ μάλα, probably the interjection ‘indeed!’ or ‘exactly!’ as used by Onesimos in line 479 (cf. 1008). Cf. Aristoph. Frogs 890 (Euripides speaking).

652 διδυμηρου. What Römer read as πὶ (πρὸς βίου) is more likely to be eta, in my opinion. Then διδυμηροῦ βίου suggests itself, matching the traces reasonably well, as Pamphile uses the word in line 825.

653 τοῦ δυστυχοῦϲ, ‘of the unfortunate man’. As a vaguely sympathetic expres-
tion more likely said by Chairestratos, taken up sarcastically then in the next line by Smikrines: τὸν δυστυχῆ τοῦτον, ‘that wretch…’ Chairestratos is presumably referring to Charisios who is the subject of this conversation. Presumably Chairestratos knows the reason for Charisios’ estrangement from Pamphile (‘poor fellow!’) but Smikrines does not.

654-5 τὸν δυστυχῆ τοῦτον. ‘That wretch!’ These cannot have been Smikrines’ first words as we need some verb. The | sign here at the end of 654 likewise cannot mark change of speaker, as these three words clearly belong together. It is possible that line 654 was split between Chairestratos and Smikrines.

655 μὰ τὸν Διόνυσον seems an odd choice of oath by the straight-laced Smikrines, or could it be a reflection on Charisios’ carousing? In line 689 he swears by Demeter and the goddess suits the issue (Pamphile’s marriage) quite well.

656 πολυπραγμονῶ κτλ.. ‘I’m overstepping the mark’, or ‘meddling’, the point being that Smikrines is occupying himself with Charisios’ dissolute behaviour, in particular the possibility of an illegitimate child which he suspects Charisios of having with Habrotonon, whilst all he really needs to do to save the situation from his own point of view is to remove his daughter from her toxic marriage (657-8). [πλείω τῶν πατρίων ποῶ, ‘and I’m going beyond my fatherly duty’. If we keep Wilamowitz’ πλείω in the middle of the line, and accommodate the relatively secure new reading πατρίων near the line-end in M, we need to modify the remaining evidence of C considerably. I suggest replacing C’s πραττῶ at line end with ποῶ for metrical reasons; the scribe of C might have written πραττῶ for ποῶ under the influence of πολυπραγμονῶ earlier. Then we need to dispense with εμῶν in C in order to reduce the line to the necessary length. If the changes are accepted we get good sense, which links up well with the next line with its adversative ἔξον, ‘while it is perfectly possible’. As Römer herself acknowledges, Gronewald’s reconstruction πράττω τῶν πατρίων ἐμῶν, blurs the connection with the ἔξον construction in the next line. πάτριος has the meaning ‘belonging to the father’ (literally: Smikrines’ rights and duties), or indeed ‘hereditary (sc. custom)’ (LSJ s.v. II). Smikrines’ thought, then, is that what he is concerning himself with – Charisios’ dissolute (as Smikrines thinks) behaviour, involving a possible illegitimate child – need not concern Smikrines if he sticks to his paternal duty pure and simple and rescues his daughter from a broken marriage.

657 κατὰ λόγον, ‘according to reason’, ‘logical’. A favoured expression in Menander, in this play again in 452, Asp. 285, Kith. 58, 85 etc. ἀπιέναι, ‘quit the scene’. Smikrines means that he could stop knocking on Charisios’ or Chairestratos’ door and go home (with Pamphile).

658-9 ‘I will do this and I’ve nearly decided to do so’. One notices a rather engaging indecisiveness on Smikrines’ part really to remove Pamphile. For all his blustering
– which we will see more of in the conversation between father and daughter which is coming up – he shows a certain reluctance to act.

660 In the gap at the end of this line one feels there must have been some reference to gods. Smikrines can appeal to Chairestratos as his witness (μαρτύρομαι) but he cannot swear an oath by him (ομόσας). Römer is content with Austin’s [αὐτοὺς τοὺς θεοὺς (suggested in Nünlist, ZPE 128, 1999, 55, before the discovery of this fragment of M) although the last six letters all require dots: there are indistinct traces of the line end in both C and M. She translates ‘by the same gods’, but it would have to be ‘by the very gods’.

661 ἐπέμψα has the specific meaning of a father ‘sending his daughter’ to a man in marriage at Od. 4.5, but one might also consider a compound: e.g. ἐκπέμπω, παραμέμπω, προπέμπω. Smikrines is referring to the marriage procession in which the bride was escorted by the paranymphos (= Chairestratos) from the father’s to the bridegroom’s house, accompanied by the wedding song (Hymenaios) and torches. Austin has suggested either μεθ᾿ οὖν θ[υγάτερ᾿ ἔ]πεμψα π[ρὸς τὸν νυμφίον] or μεθ᾿ οὖν ὥ[δῳ προὔπεμψα παῖδε τὴν ἐμήν]. The overall sense is anyway clear (Smikrines sending his daughter as bride to Charisios) but there are a multitude of ways of supplementing the gaps.

4.3 Lines 697-701

In ZPE 183 Römer published a small fragment which fills a gap in the previously known Michigan fragments from lines 692 to 702, 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. From 697 to the end of the act, however, the new fragment does indeed supply new readings for the beginning of the lines.

697 αὐτὴν being Pamphile, the wife, and τὴν δ᾿ the new girlfriend Habrotonon, in Smikrines’ imagination. ἐξει and -άξει emphasise the reduplication of women by their jingle. ἐπεισάγω, ‘bring in addition’, is almost t.t. for ‘introduce a second woman into the household’. Examples in comedy and Attic prose: LSJ s.v. 1.

698 After εὐθὺς Römer prints ἀ[λλὰ] ἑαυτὸν δηλαδή…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.

1 Not 690-701, as Römer takes from Sandbach 1990. 2 See my 2009 edition for details.
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 δηλαδή is usually the last word in an utterance or in a line (cf. 473), 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 (ἔταξαν); it is 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. 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 (2014, 15) has confirmed this reconstruction with further arguments. 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 ἑαυτὸν, as we have seen. She is right that there is no room for a verb between εὐθὺς and ἑαυτὸν. She supplies ἀλλ’ to fill the gap; Gronewald suggests εἰς (apud Römer), a preposition going with ἑαυτὸν. 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; cf. line 876 of this play ὡς σεαυτήν, ‘to your house’. 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 δηλαδή.

699 πάξ is ‘well, that’s that’, drawing a line under previous remarks. Chairestratos repeats this word in 987. Perhaps it is characterizing: Chairestratos is constantly saying, ‘That’s that, then’ with a shrug of his shoulders. διατρέπω[ai] is much less common than ἀνατρέπω, ‘turn (a thing) on its head’, which had been conjectured before the new fragment was discovered. This form itself is found elsewhere only in Polybius 3.111.1, but there are other instances of the perfect passive. The basic meaning seems to be ‘to turn aside’, ‘deflect’, ‘avert’. So Chairestratos may be saying ‘my plans have experienced a setback, as it appears’, rather than ‘now my plans are ruined’. And his luck does change by the end of the play, because Habrotonon becomes available again once Charisios returns to his wife. So διατρέπο here may be carefully chosen to reflect the later turn-for-the-better. At
this point, however, Chairestratos is merely commenting that things look bad for
him if Charisios really does set up a ménage-à-trois with both women at home, as
Smikrines has just averred.

700 [δια]κοντέον. Römers supplements φρονητέον with [βάδ]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 -ονητεον 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 prefer-
able to φρονητέον, and is approved by Bathrellou. διακονέω, rather surprisingly,
has long alpha. The trace before -ονητεον suits a kappa well enough, but could be
almost anything.

Chairestratos has been sent (by Charisios?) on an errand (lines 700-1 are quite ex-

cplicit on that point) and here he tells himself that he ‘must do this service’. It is likely
(see above) that the errand consists in buying Habrotonon free, now that Charisios
thinks he is the father of her baby (‘Habrotonon’s ruse’). Note that Chairestratos
appears to use the same verb in line 642 which begins διακονέον. Presumably
Smikrines exited at the end of 698 so this is a remark addressed by Chairestratos to
himself, i.e. to the audience. It is also equivalent to a stage direction: exit Chaire-
stratos.

700 Note the assimilated structure and word-order of the relative clause, for ἐπὶ
τὴν ἐπιμέλειαν ἐφ᾿ ἣν ἐτάχθην, and the hyperbaton from the verbal adjectives to
ἔστι μοι at the end. A small example of the subtle syntax used by Menander in
expressing even quite mundane thoughts.

4.4 Lines 786-823

4.4.1 Smikrines’ speech

In ZPE no. 182 Römer published three new fragments (H, I, J) of Michigan papyrus
4752 giving further letters in the second halves of lines 786-823. Then in ZPE 196
she published a further fragment from the same section of the play (lines 786-803)
which gives line beginnings ranging from five-six letters to two or three. When
the new material is assembled we can read considerably more of the latter half of
Smikrines’ speech to Pamphile and her answer to him, although there are still several
frustrating uncertainties. We have then a major section of the debate between father
and daughter on the question of her marriage. This is an agôn in almost Euripidean
style and represents a key point in the play: here the issues surrounding Pamphile’s
family situation are debated by the father and daughter, and Pamphile as second
speaker comes out on top. Emancipation is perhaps the wrong word (because she
vows allegiance to her husband) but certainly valour and integrity in the face of an irate father are remarkably displayed.

Where we pick up the thread, Smikrines is in mid rant, having begun speaking in 715, 71 lines earlier. In other words, this is a massive speech and the section which is now augmented represents its concluding section, its peroration, as it were. Smikrines’ basic message is that Pamphile’s marriage to Charisios is a disaster, as the man has gone off with a prostitute, wasting his money (Smikrines’ dowry) on wine, women and song (Habrotonon is a psaltria). Smikrines has, of course, no idea why Charisios has left Pamphile, nor that Charisios has in fact no desire for Habrotonon but yearns for his young wife, who he believes is involved in a scandal. Nor can Pamphile enlighten him on the true background of their estrangement, as she does not yet know the baby in Chairestratos’ household (being looked after by Syriskos’ wife) is in fact hers by Charisios. If she did tell her father the truth (as she sees it in the present moment) it would be a scandal which might destroy him. We have to be aware of this psychological moment in this section as it explains why Pamphile has to beat about the bush in her reply to her father. I slightly hesitate about this point – that Smikrines knows nothing of Pamphile’s faux-pas, as in line 814 Pamphile quotes her father to the effect that Onesimos is to be avoided by her, which might point to the fact that Smikrines knows Onesimos ‘ratted on’ Pamphile to his master.

786 φάρμακα ἐπίβουλα, ‘noxious potions’. Here the new fragment giving line beginnings (4803/26/B17F/A (c)) has brought a surprise. Previously we thought a woman was plotting (γυναῖκα ἐπίβουλον) against Pamphile, but now it turns out that Smikrines is even more radical: Pamphile’s rival will use noxious substances against her in the tradition of magical recipes which either induce love (Theocritus’ Pharmateutria) or disable a rival. For the idea of a woman rival using wicked spells and substances to oust her rival cf. Euripides Andromache 205. The magical papyri (PMG) are full of such recipes. Plutarch Mor. 727f4 τὰ γάρ ἐπίβουλα καὶ πολέμια τῶν ἀνθρώπων, φρύνους καὶ ὄφεις, ‘things threatening and hostile to humans like toads and snakes’, gives an idea how ἐπίβουλος is meant here; cf. Aristotle Hist. Anim. 488b16; Theophr. Char. 1.7.2 (snakes again). Since in these examples it is the snakes’ and toads’ poison which is life-threatening, the word might be particularly suitable here together with φάρμακα. The great literary sorceress was, of course, Medea (e.g. in Euripides’ play line 718). Metrically, we now have a split double-short (−|−|−−−) in the first iamb but that is permissible in the first metron. λοιδορίαι, ‘quarrels’ or ‘taunts’ here, rather than ‘reproaches’, e.g. Aristoph. Clouds 934; plural: Lysias 21.8; Plato Theaet. 174c7. Smikrines means Habrotonon will wage a war of verbal attrition against Pamphile. Possibly the φάρμακα before are also meant figuratively: ‘her poisonous tongue’. ‘Daily insults’ is a phrase which occurs several times in the ecclesiastical author Joannes Chrysostomus, e.g. Ad Demetrium de compunctione vol. 47, p. 396 line 5.
This line is the end of a sentence of which the beginning is missing. Smikrines seems to be listing the weapons Habrotonon will, in his imagination, deploy against Pamphile in order to humiliate her and usurp her place beside Charisios. In fact Habrotonon does all she can to reunite Pamphile with her husband! She is about the opposite of an asp.

787 ὡς ἐκβαλεῖ σε. Whether σε was elided or not (depending on the reading one chooses after it), this must be the personal pronoun ‘you’ (i.e. Pamphile). But who is subject of ἐκβαλεῖ ? Habrotonon or Charisios? More likely Charisios, I would think, as in line 829, where Pamphile comes to consider the question whether Charisios will throw her out on the instigation of Habrotonon. Römer thinks it is Habrotonon who will ‘throw out’ Pamphile. But can she do that? ὡς. I take this as ‘that’, giving the substance of Habrotonon’s ‘scolding’, or, colloquially, ‘bitching’ (λοιδορίαι): ‘taunts that he’ll chuck you out’. ὡς + fut. indic. can be an object clause after verbs of caring for (e.g. ἐπιμελέομαι), but there is no such verb in sight, and φάρμακα and λοιδορίαι are nominative, hence the subject of their sentence. Alternatively, ὡς might be demonstrative adverb: ‘like that’, ‘in that way’.

ληξομένη, ‘with nothing coming her way’, lit. ‘not going to get anything as her portion’. Palaeographically difficult, the traces after σε suit lambda better than either alpha or delta, and after that eta is quite satisfactory; for the curl at the top of the left descender of eta compare M’s first eta in ἡδικηκυῖα in line 807. The invisible right side of eta plus xi-omikron-(most of)mu are probably enough to fill the gap in M here. I take Smikrines’ meaning to be that Habrotonon will take nothing into the relationship with Charisios in the way of a dowry (unlike Pamphile), but will ‘share equally’ with Pamphile in Charisios’ wealth.

The conjectures so far have been σ(ε)·ἀρνυμένη, ‘refusing’ (Gronewald, with ἐνεγκασθαι in the next line), or αἰτουμένη, ‘being asked’ (Römer, likewise with ἐνεγκασθαι). But either of these makes Römer’s probable supplement at line end οὐδὲ ἐν difficult, as the negative of these infinitive constructions should be μηδὲ ἐν. To counter that objection, Gronewald later suggested at line end οὐσίαν, ‘wealth’, but the alpha is incompatible with the visible trace, and, anyway, Habrotonon can have no ‘wealth’ to ‘contribute’. For the interested reader I list other possibilities which I or others have considered: ἡλ[λ']οιο]μένη, ‘but thinking/intending’ (my second favourite); ἄγ[αλλο]μένη, ‘refusing’ (but the following infinitive should be negated by μή); ἅλ[σικο]μένη, ‘proved to be contributing nothing’.

οὐδὲ ἐν. The gap in M is probably not wide enough for all these letters and Gronewald and Römer suggest that the scribe probably wrote, mistakenly, οὐδὲν, as the scribe of C does at the end of line 286.
Infinitive or participle ἐνεγκαμένη is metrically possible. I assume here a ‘final’ or ‘consecutive’ infinitive after ληξομένη: ‘she’ll get nothing as her share to bring to (this arrangement)’, more colloquially, ‘she’ll have nothing to contribute to this arrangement’. λαγχάνω + infinitive illustrated by e.g. Eur. *Troad. 277 Ἰθάκης Ὀδυσσέως ἐλάχ’ ἀναξ διόλην ο’ ἔχειν, ‘the Lord of Ithaka, Odysseus, obtained you (by lot) to have as his servant’. Concretely, a wife brings a dowry (as Pamphile has) but a freed prostitute, or pallakē, of course would not. So Habrotonon brings nothing with her, but profits equally with Pamphile. Middle voice of φέρω usually means ‘win’ or ‘gain’, but it can mean ‘bring with one’ and is attested with precisely the meaning (said of a woman) ‘bring dowry with one’ (Eur. *Androm. 1281-2). 

δ᾿ ἐξ ἴσου, ‘equally’. Aristophanes has the expression at least twice (*Knights 1160, Frogs 867). The materialistic thought suits Smikrines who, as we have seen, is concerned about his dowry, and Charisios’ financial ruin as the result of shouldering two households. Smikrines is concerned about money and the standing of his family, concerns which are still widespread and prevalent even in the so-called liberal democracies, let alone more traditional societies. He is concerned, too, about his daughter’s welfare but not at all about the couple’s ‘happiness’, let alone how Charisios may be ‘feeling’. He imputes a similar mindset to Habrotonon, imagining that she has only her material gain in mind (as does Onesimos when he hears about Habrotonon’s plan), which, as pointed out, couldn’t be further from the truth.

ἱλαρῶς, ‘cheerfully’, ‘gleefully’. Only one other instance of ἱλαρός in extant Menander: *fr. 577.3 K-Th. οὐκ ἀσφαλῆτὴν κτῆσιν οὐδ’ ἱλαρὰν ἔχει, ‘his ownership is neither secure nor happy’.

790-92. It is hard to make out the syntax of these two lines. The lines cannot form one continuous sentence as ἔσται cannot have σὺ γε (or σὺ δέ), nominative, as its subject; the verb would have to be ἔσηι or ἔσει, ‘you will be’. If we want the sense ‘the fact that you (sc. are always dejected) will be an encouragement to her’, Greek uses a construction such as τό with acc. + infin. A bare nominative + participle(s) is quite impossible. Römer translates (reading σὺ δέ) ‘That will be a consolation to her time and again, while you will have a gloomy face etc.’ But σὺ δέ must have a predicate, even if only understood from before (not possible here). Römer’s English ‘while you will have etc.’ would be either a subordinate clause or a genitive absolute (σοῦ γε σκύθρωπαξιούσης etc.). I see as the only possibility to punctuate after τοῦτ’, with Bathrellou, and take the following words as an independent sentence (explanation of τοῦτ’) with ellipse of εἶναι: ‘you yourself (will be) an encouragement to her etc.’ although I do not find this totally satisfactory. For a nagging wife ‘driving a husband deeper into the arms of a ἑταίρα’ Bathrellou appositely cites Plautus *Men. 790-91; Terence *Hec. 833-36.

790 τοῦτ’, αὐτή. For explanation of this see previous note. 

παραμύθιαν,
‘encouragement’, ‘motivation’ (the verb is παραμυθέομαι). **ποτε.** Although τότε has been read in Ο23, and accepted by Bathrellou, I believe ποτε may be the reading in Ο23, as it clearly is in Ο24. The sense is probably ‘at length’, ‘ultimately’ rather than ‘at some stage’ (LSJ s.v. πότε III 2, and lines 366 and 719 of this play): ‘and at length you’ll be’ = ‘and you’ll turn out to be’.

791-2 The three things Smikrines says of Pamphile here form a tricolon without connecting particle (‘asynthetic’). Smikrines’ point is that Pamphile’s dejection will be Habrotonon’s encouragement: she’ll feel she’s winning. It is a well-known phenomenon in sport psychology that a dejected opponent encourages a player. Again, the reality turns out to be diametrically opposite: Habrotonon congratulates Pamphile on her luck on discovering that the baby is hers by Charisios (873-4). She is happy for her. This disparity has the very subtle effect of showing Smikrines to be out of touch, and Habrotonon to be quite different to conventional expectations.

792 Κατακεκλασμένη[ς]. 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 compatiable with Ο24, which has σχημα followed by a punctuation mark, then κατακεκ...[.ι.]

So, combining the two papyri now, we have, as plausible letters, κατακεκ...μένη[ (assuming no variants). Römer suggests reading κατακεκ[8]|ήμενης with the meaning ‘bored to death’ (116). Palaeographically, this entails reading the letter after kappa in Ο24 as an erroneous delta: it does indeed look like a delta, but it could also be alpha or lambda (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 κατακέκομμ’ ἐγὼ, ‘I’m quite exhausted’, but this is said by Sikon the mageiros 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 κατακεκομένης 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 Ο24 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.

3 Römer rightly says that the letters -ημακατ- are badly damaged in this papyrus. Bathrellou disputes that κατα- can be read in O23, saying that the third letter looks more like sigma. She is right, but the surface of the papyrus may be so damaged that a tau looks like a sigma.
Handley proposed κατακεκλεμένης (= ᾶμενης), ‘in the position of a housebound woman’ (quoted by Römer). Here one can say that the sequence -κλε- can be squared with Ω24 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 house-bound 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 (390-98). A further objection is the proximity of κατακεκλεμένης to ἐλευθέραι (two lines down) in this construction: would Smikrines not be contradicting himself?

So, to my suggestion: κατακεκλασμένης. As mentioned above, the letter after the last kappa in Ω24 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 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.4

I take κατακεκλασμένης, 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. 764-66 ἀνθ’ ὧν οὐχ ὡσὶν ἐρώ/των δεινὰς Ἀφροδι/τας νόσωι κατακλάσθη, rendered ‘Wherefore a dreadful malady from Aphrodite broke her soul’ by Barrett (1964).5 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 de-

4 As an alternative I tried to retain the sequence -κδε in Ω24 with a line such as γαμετῆς ἔχουσα σχῆμα κάτ’ ἱδεομένης, ‘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 Ω24 at this point (κατακεκ-) tells against this.

5 Thanks to A. Sommerstein for the reference.
noting a mental state, see further Dion. Hal. De compositione verborum 18 p. 79.10
Usener-Radermacher (οἳ μὲν ταπεινάς, οἳ δὲ κατακεκλασμένας, οἳ δ’ ἄλλην τινὰ αἰσχύνην καὶ ἀμορφίαν ἐχούσας ἐξήνεγκαν τὰς γραφὰς): Aesop Fab. 285.9
Chambry (ἐλέησον με τὸν κατακεκλασμένον); Com. Adesp. PCG vol. VIII 137.2
(οὔδὲ κατακεκλασμένος [or -μένως. Of a man: ‘degenerate’, ‘effeminate’ LSJ]
πλάγιον ποιήσας τὸν τράχηλον περιπατεῖν); Hippokr. Prorrhetikon 1.71.5
(τοὺς ἐν πυρετῷ κωματώδεις κατακεκλασμένους); Hesychius glosses θηλυδριωδες
(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 dis-
traught) 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.6

793 παραλύσει, ‘(in that situation) she’ll oust you’. The most likely nuance of
παραλύσω here seems to be LSJ s.v. I 2: ‘put an end to’, ‘undo’, ‘get rid of’. Our
word ‘paralysis’ comes from παραλύω, and conceivably that might apply here:
‘she’ll render you impotent’ (LSJ s.v. IV). In what follows, Smikrines says a hetaira
has so many more tricks up her sleeve than a (respectable) woman: perhaps here
Smikrines means something like ‘she’ll run rings round you’.

793-796 (...μᾶλλον). Two ancient writers quote or paraphrase these words in part
or in whole: 793-796 (with μάχεσθαι instead of μάχη) Palladius, Dialogus de vita
S. Ioannis Chrysostomi XVI, 40–44 (p. 304 Malingrey–Leclercq): χαλεπὸν...μά-
χη: Cyrilus Contra Iulianum 7.229a (PG 76.849b). Both quoted in full by Bathrel-
lou. Unfortunately the quoted words do not extend far enough to decide the doubt-
ful reading ἄπτεται in 796.

796 [ἀπ]τεται, ‘she employs, resorts to’ (+ gen.). Unfortunately the new letters
stop short of revealing what verb stood here. Theoretically, διγγάνει is also possi-
bile, but possibly a higher register than ἄπτεται, so less suitable in Smikrines’ tirade.

797 εξη[ς] καλῶς. νῦν. The new fragment gives us εξ at line beginning, then a
gap of perhaps three letters, then αλῶς on the adjoining fragment. Römer now
suggests εξη[ι] καλῶς νῦν ταυτά σοι (said ironically by Smikrines) and trans-
lates ‘This will now be a real mess for you!’ But future εξη combined with νῦν
is not ideal (should be τότε), and the remark is abrupt and ill-fitted to its context.
Gronewald (ap. Römer) has suggested: εξη[ις] καλῶς νῦν ταυτά σοι τὴν Πυθίαν[ν]
| εἰρη[κέ]ναι “that the Pythia has told you this beautifully in strict order”), but two

6 I considered the following possibilities but found them less appropriate either palaeographi-
cally or semantically: κατακεκαμμένης - κατακάμπτω (this seemed to me second most likely),
κατακεκαρμένης ‐ κείρομαι, κατακεχρημένης ‐ καταχράω, κατ’ ἐκδεδομένης ‐ ἐκδίδωμι,
κατακεκαυμένης ‐ κατακαίω, κατακεκασμένης‐κατακαίνυμαι.
adverbs, καλῶς and ἀκριβῶς, with εἰρηκέναι is perhaps awkward. I suggest we retain Gronewald’s ἑξῆς (cf. line 583) καλῶς, but punctuate differently. Putting a half-stop after ἑξῆς (going with the previous clause) and a full stop after καλῶς will give καλῶς the closing sense ‘well and good!’ or ‘enough of that!’, as in line 293 of this play (Smikrines again!); cf. ibid. 354 (Daos). The word would mark the conclusion of Smikrines’ speech. There follows only a rhetorical flourish without further argumentation: ‘consider this spoken as truly as the Delphic Oracle!’

797 τὴν Πυθίαν. Smikrines means that his predictions are as certain as word from the Delphic Oracle. In a reference to Heaut. Tim. (84 K-A) we find ταστά σοι καὶ Πυθία καὶ Δήλια, ‘these are your Pythian and Delian rites’, which Menander is said to have alluded to in his play. Zenobius explains the proverb ἡ παροιμία εἰρηκέναι ἐπὶ τῶν τά ὅστατα καὶ τελευταῖα ποιοῦντων, ‘the proverb is said of those doing their last and final actions’. The story was told that Polykrates of Samos once celebrated the ‘Pythian and Delian’ rites of Apollo simultaneously on Delos; at the same time he sent to Delphi and asked the oracle whether he was celebrating these at the correct time; the Pythia replied that these (sc. actions) were his ‘Pythia kai Delia’; shortly after that he died: Photius Lex. π p. 473.1. The proverb does not, then, appear to connect with Smikrines’ words here, unless Smikrines somehow wants to allude to the fact that Pamphile is heading toward disaster. Rather, the point is surely that what he has just described will come true as surely as if the Pythia had prophesied it. It is a splendid last rhetorical flourish, as bold as it was proved false.

The combination τὴν Πυθίαν εἰρηκέναι was said of Delphi’s pronouncement that no one was wiser than Sokrates: Aelius Aristides, Πρὸς Πλάτωνα περὶ ρητορικῆς Dindorf (Jebb p. 21, line 9).

When we survey this section of Smikrines’ speech, we see that he is intent on showing Pamphile that her lot, if she has to ‘share’ Charisios with Habrotonon, will not be a happy one. It will be a situation in which she will lose out to the wily prostitute in all respects. Habrotonon will flourish, Pamphile despair. A real life example of women’s rivalry leading to the attempted suicide of one party is found in Andokides De Myst. 124-128. Andokides relates how Kallias married the daughter of Ischomachos; then he desired her mother and introduced her into his house, creating a ménage-à-trois. In this situation the daughter, despairing of her life, attempted suicide, but was freed from the noose, and recovered. She fled the house. The mother had driven the daughter out (ἐξήλασεν). Kallias eventually tired of her, too, and ejected her. She, however, being a brazen hussy, τολμηροτάτη (127.2), conspired, by means of the baby she was carrying, to persuade Kallias to take up with her again, and recognize her child. We see how the more resourceful of the women (the mother) managed to oust her own daughter and steal a march over Kallias himself. Smikrines says Habrotonon is just that kind of ‘brazen’ woman, and there is a baby in play here, too, similarly used by Habrotonon to
pressurize Charisios, though to a good end. In tragedy we have various other parallels: Hermione and Andromache in Eur. Androm., Klytaimneta and Kassandra in Aesch. Ag.; Deianeira and Iole in Eur. Her.; Medea and Glauke in Med. The list could no doubt be extended. Possibly we have here one of those tragic structures underlying a Menandren plot (see my edition 2009, Introduction 1.2).

Smikrines had begun his speech 715f. with a prediction that Charisios’ situation would be his ruin. He would have to pay for two women’s participation in religious festivals, an idea which clearly sends shudders down Smikrines’ back. Then he moved on to depict Pamphile’s life beside this profligate husband as one of anxious waiting and loneliness. Unfortunately long sections of the speech are lost. When Pamphile speaks, as we shall see, she addresses other points which clearly belong to the lost lines. Smikrines seems to have referred to the ‘scandal’ of the situation (809 ταῖς χρόνοις); whether this involved the illegitimate child thought to have been fathered by Charisios, or merely to the infidelity generally, we do not know. Pamphile goes on to quote Smikrines that she should shun Charisios as much as Onesimos; that too is missing in our extant text. In 816 she mentions her father’s point that Charisios ‘will be ruined’ (816) which he had mentioned at the beginning of his speech. Considering the fact that at the beginning of her speech she refers to rivalry and offence between women (807-8) it seems that, to a degree, she picks up Smikrines’ points in reverse order, beginning with the last (which she dismisses) and then moving back to the beginning. An excellent tactic by Menander, I would judge, as the most recent argument is freshest in the audience’s mind. We do not need to believe that Pamphile’s quotes from her father’s words (809, 814, 816, 819, 822-23) occurred verbatim in his speech; rather, we can imagine that they pick up and summarize her father’s points. So this agōn is carefully constructed, with much influence of Attic rhetoric, such as we can observe in Antiphon’s Tetralogies. In fact this is a particularly forensic play, with the arbitration scene itself, of course, being modelled on forensic arbitration. Just as Euripides had loved such agōnes so Menander follows suit: another point supporting Satyros’ observation that Menander’s New Comedy was Euripidean to a marked degree.

4.4.2 Pamphile’s answer

799-805 We now know that Pamphile began her speech in 799, and not 801, as previously thought. If my and others’ main assumptions here are on the mark, Pamphile begins with a prologue running to seven lines. Extant text shows that Pamphile’s speech went on at least until 835 and possibly for another twenty lines or so as fr. 8 K-Th and its context may well belong in Pamphile’s mouth as well. If that is the case, her speech was a good fifty lines long, comparable to that of Smikrines and balancing the agōn. So a prologue of seven lines would not be out of
proportion. Pamphile is intent at the outset on calming her father with a declaration of polite respect (captatio benevolentiae). ‘Father, all that you say is true but...’ and what follows is then a spirited defence against his allegations and statement of her own point of view. Pamphile retains in this way both filial piety and independence of mind. Pamphile is squarely in line with Euripidean heroines such as Iphigeneia, Makaria, Polyxene (not to mention Medea!) who stand up (at least emotionally) to the men around them with extraordinary courage. Perhaps real-life daughters did sometimes rebel against the will of their fathers but certainly only behind closed doors, whilst theatre convention requires that Pamphile argues with Smikrines on her front doorstep. Presumably the name Pamphile has been chosen by Menander to signify ‘all-loving’ rather than ‘loving-all’!

As already indicated, the first section of Pamphile’s speech picks up Smikrines’ points one by one, and probably more or less in reverse order, in order to refute them. In the remaining part of her speech, mainly lost, she seems to have gone on to consider further aspects of her case. Although the sense of these first seven lines can be garnered in outline, line beginnings and endings are often missing, leaving the precise train of thought maddeningly uncertain. My own reconstruction in 2013 (ZPE 185) is different from that presented now in important respects. These revisions derive mainly from reconsideration of the question whose eunoia, goodwill, in line 804 is at issue: Pamphile’s toward her father (then), or her father’s toward her (now). They also reflect Bathrellou’s careful discussion of the new fragments known then, and critique of my paper.

799 ἐ[ρῶ]. The first letter is indistinct and the verb may have been something else, e.g. λέγω, ἄρχω. προθεμένη, ‘stating as principle’ or ‘premise’ (sc. ‘throughout my speech’) (Germ. ‘zugrundelegen’). Bathrellou observes that προτίθεμαι is elsewhere construed with a dative of a person (‘I propose to you’), as Smikrines uses the same verb in 718 (with my note). Accordingly παντὶ τῶι λόγωι is not indirect object, but rather adverbial ‘throughout my speech’. So Pamphile means that, throughout her speech, she wants Smikrines to bear this initial premise in mind. Even if she appears to contradict him, she respects him as pater familias. The new fragment of M shows that Pamphile began here, and that 799-800 are not Smikrines’ closing flourish. Line 799 prefaces the preface, so to speak, as Pamphile announces: ‘this is going to be my premise in the whole speech’.

800 τὸ γ’. The new fragment of M shows the line beginning, although Römer reads the third trace as an upsilon, which is unlikely in my opinion: all we see is a left upright (gamma, eta, iota, pi etc.). I reconstruct the syntax as τὸ + (potential) infinitive, with understood subject ‘I’ (= Pamphile), extended by a genitive absolute (ἀκοντος σοῦ). The third letter after τὸ does not appear to have been μ (μ’-). The line is an example of how small changes in our reconstructions of the text lead to quite different meanings. Römer reconstructs τούιοδ’ οὐ|βδὲν ἀκοντος ποίσαισ
οὔποτ’ ἃν, ‘that you could never do anything against his will’ (my italics), meaning Smikrines could never go against Charisios’ will. Some of the difficulties arise because the Greeks wrote literary manuscripts without gaps between words! (ποιήσαι σοῦ or ποιήσαις οὖ-). In this case, I believe what Charisios wants or thinks is completely irrelevant to the debate between father and daughter. He has gone off and left Pamphile and taken up with another woman in another man’s house. Effectively he has forfeited his rights as husband.

801 πεπλα[σμένυν], ‘with artifice’. For the nuances of πλάττω here see my note in the main edition.

802 χρη. Although the traces in the new fragment are very difficult to interpret, at least they show that previous suggestions are not right. χ-ρ-η followed by an upright seem plausible enough, although completely uncertain. Each of the letters read by Römer: σ-ο-γ seems to be disputable. Austin had already conjectured δεῖ here (although negated in his sentence), so equivalent in sense to my idea now. π[ερὶ ἀ]–: περὶ stands before a word beginning with a vowel in Com., περὶ Ἀθηνῶν, περὶ ἐμοῦ, Arist. Knights 1005f.’ (LSJ)

803 [ὡς λυσιτελῆ], ‘as being advantageous’ (with ἐμὴν γνώμην), i.e. ‘my opinion if given in accord with your wishes’. The supplement is probably not too long as in 801 and 802 we have assumed (at least) seven missing letters (before the discovery of the new fragment) missing from line beginnings in M ([καὶ πάτερ, [χρη περὶ ἀ]–). Gronewald’s conjecture here ἀφελῆς, in various combinations, remains a possibility of course. It was based on an assumed opposition between πεπλασμένην (801), ‘constructed’, or a variant of that, and ἀφελῆς, ‘simple’, ‘plain’, both terms used to characterize modes of speech. The big question is: who is the subject of this clause? Is it Pamphile or Smikrines? In 2013 I assumed Pamphile was claiming her own right to think for herself (φρονεῖν) following a common reading of the traces as ε-ι-μ, i.e. εἰμί. Since then I have changed my mind however, and believe Pamphile is, overtly anyway, deferring to Smikrines, saying he has the authority to understand ‘what is just’. Bathrellou has pointed out that the third trace is not likely to be μ, but may be the left upright of a number of letters, including kappa (as I assume here). Great uncertainty, then, here as to the sense. I take a decision for the benefit of readers, but beware! κύριος. Bathrellou agrees that the initial trace may be part of the downstroke of e.g. kappa. Another line in which different supplements will give widely divergent meanings. However all suggestions to date point in roughly the same direction as κύριος with the infinitive φρονεῖν – being ‘good’, or ‘authorized’ to ‘think’ – seems to be what is required here.

The overall sense of 801-3, then is that Pamphile says, at least, that she must defer to her father. What she goes on to argue, however, gives the lie to this. Since the audience (surely) wishes the unhappy couple to discover their misunderstandings and make up, they are likely to sympathize more with Pamphile than Smikrines at
this point, as he wants to dissolve the marriage.

804 τὸ δίκαιον, ‘what is right’. Although supplements have varied (see app.), as in the case of κύριος in the previous line, they all point in roughly the same direction, forming an object to φρονεῖν. ἐνεργητικά, ‘incontestable’, ‘uncontroversial’. Bathrellou has now endorsed this reading and given it contemporary support by pointing to proper names such as Ανέριστος/Ἀνήριστος and feminine Ἀνηρίστα attested for the period either in literary or epigraphic sources. She points out, however, that the meaning is more likely to be ‘incontestible’, that which one cannot dispute (ἐρίζω), rather than what I suggested in 2013, ‘uncombative’ or ‘uncontentious’ (applied to Pamphile), and I agree with her, applied now to what Smikrines had told Pamphile, not what Pamphile is about to tell him. As Bathrellou points out in n. 20, Bechtel 1917, 195 glosses the name Aneristos as ‘der, gegen den keine ἔρις möglich ist’, which, applied to things, would mean ‘incontravertible’, ‘incontestable’. It seems to me now that εὔνοια is more appropriately said of Smikrines’ good will toward Pamphile: ‘Father, I know you mean only the best for me but…’ Pamphile would be (deferentially) saying to her father that she realizes all he had said was really out of ‘good will’ toward her. Bathrellou: ‘probably, but not necessarily, Smikrines’ goodwill towards her, rather than vice versa’. μοι λέγειν. The end of the line is again unfortunately shrouded in darkness, and my supplement now depends on the assumption that it is Smikrines’ εὔνοια toward Pamphile which dictates (ἐκέλευσε) that he says ‘incontravertible’ truths to her, and which induces her (ἐπάγεται) to obey.

805 ἐκέλευσε, ‘dictated’ (see previous note). The trace before sigma in M is slight but suits upsilon, as well as, perhaps, epsilon or sigma (see app. for other suggestions, most of which read sigma for the trace). The visible letters in M ēe have led editors to believe unanimously that the personal pronoun σε must have stood here. κελεύω, order, can be used of inanimate things such as νόμος and θυμός, but these might be said to represent human planning or will; likewise εὔνοια is a quality of the human mind. ἐπάγει (Gronewald ap. Römer), by the way, is improbable metrically (split double-short).

When we survey this sentence thus reconstructed, Pamphile is attributing two connected things to the good will which she assumes her father feels toward her: that he said all he has said to her out of a fundamental desire for her well-being, and that this good will is a force bearing on Pamphile to obey. The sentiment is part of Pamphile’s deferential overture to her father, before contesting everything he said. Thus she manages to preserve an appearance of filial piety while preparing for her own fierce self-defence.

806-8 Bathrellou suggests e.g.: ἐπεὶ δὲ τοῦτο, πάπα, λυπηρὸν δοκεῖ, / κακῶν μηδὲν ἠδικηκυῖαν τυχεῖν, / νύμφας ἁμαρτούσας ἧμεν, ‘Because’, dad,
this seems distressing, namely that I meet with [troubles] although I’ve done no wrong, let us not talk about [brides] who erred.’ But this probably mistakes the syntax of the main clause, which seems to take the form of ἐάω + acc. & infin.: ‘leave someone alone to do something’, or, as here, ‘let someone (doing or being something: participle) be’ (LSJ s.v. 1a). I.e. in this case, ‘let’s leave women(?) in peace who happen to err’. τυγχάνω + part. seems in this case well-rendered by ‘happen to’ do something, and is not here, with Bathrellou, the construction with genitive ([κακῶν]) ‘chance upon’, ‘hit on’. The infinitive goes with both participles ἠδικηκυῖαν and ἁμαρτούσας. λυπηρόν. Bathrellou now accepts my reading of this word, where previous editors had read δυνατόν. Römer’s σοὶ παρὸν δοκεῖ is unsatisfactory Greek (δοκεῖ goes with an infinitive; παρὸν would normally be the absolute accusative). μηδέν’, perhaps marginally better than μηδέν, as it is people who matter in the constellation of man plus two women described by Smikrines.

807-8 [γυναῖκα], [πόρνας]. But what are the missing words at both line beginnings? The participles tell us only that their antecedents are feminine singular in the one case, and plural in the second. The accusative case belongs to the acc.+ infin. construction dependent on ἐῶμεν as indicated in the previous note. I take the lines to be an abbreviated dismissal of Smikrines’ account of all the harm and injustice Habrotonon will do to Pamphile if Charisios accommodates both women. As already outlined, this is the last, vitriolic section of Smikrines’ speech, whose content runs (at least) from 786 down to 797. So Pamphile would be picking up on this last argument, only to dismiss it summarily as being ‘painful’ (λυπηρόν). If this is correct the singular feminine noun/pronoun should be Pamphile herself, who ‘happens to have done no wrong’, and Habrotonon and her ilk, ‘who may happen to have erred’. γυναῖκα might refer specifically enough to Pamphile, the wife (δάμαρτα metrically possible but not a comic word), and πόρνας to harlots. Again, however, what we supplement will affect sense, as the alternatives proposed to date show. ἁμαρτούσας is aorist, so probably refers to sins committed rather than ‘being committed’ in a general sense. This is the first of Pamphile’s points which is expressed in a deliberately vague way (she mentions no names); in what follows that remains the tendency. Probably Pamphile wants to keep the literal truth from her father (she has had, as she thinks, an illegitimate baby and that is why Charisios is estranged from her), and perhaps protect her own honour; it is unfortunate for the modern reader, however, who would like to know exactly what she means at all points.

808-813 This is the second of Pamphile’s points (δεύτερον 808) so we are right to consider 806-7 her first. This point is expressed in an obfuscating way (see previous note), as she leaves us (and her father) to guess what she means by ταῖσχρὸν. That it stems from Charisios in her father’s opinion is a fair guess from παρὰ τούτου
and αἴτιον τοῦτον τίθης; who else can οὗτος be if not Charisios? So the point seems to be about some ‘dishonour’ which Charisios has done her. Is it the fact of his having left her and taken up with Habrotonon, or can it be the baby already which Smikrines has gotten wind of, guessing that it is Habrotonon’s by Charisios? Smikrines certainly mentions a ‘child by a prostitute’ in line 646 but perhaps only as a possibility in the future rather than a known fact. But then Pamphile denies that there is any ‘dishonour’ or perhaps ‘scandal’. What can she mean? She can hardly deny that Charisios is humiliating her by hiring Habrotonon. And she cannot be denying that scandal attaches to the baby as she has no idea yet that it is hers by Charisios. Bathrellou’s explanation of these lines is unfortunately weakened by reading ἀτυχῶν at the beginning of 813, and thinking it refersto Charisios’ misfortune in fathering Habrotonon’s baby (she wrote before the new little fragment of M showed the line beginning to be ὁ τυχὼν). ταἰσχρόν is no doubt one of Menander’s typical euphemisms but is it a euphemism for an illegitimate child, or for a husband living ‘in sin’ with a harlot? Then Pamphile goes on to say that in a small closed circle (ἐν ὀλίγοις) the truth can be found out, whilst the wider public (οἱ πολλοί) only knows ‘what has happened’ (sc. on the surface) and for them, ‘any story to hand is preferable to the truth’. But that does not help us much, either. What truth does Pamphile mean which can be revealed in a small private circle? Surely not that she has had a baby herself after rape, as, I repeat, she has no idea yet that Charisios is its father. Or does she mean that her husband can hardly be blamed for taking offence having heard about her extra-marital baby; therefore there’s no ‘shame’ in that. Just possibly that is what she means (from her point of view), only she cannot spell that out to her father for obvious reasons. In short I think we do best to see here one of those impasse situations which Menander likes to create. Pamphile cannot tell her father the truth which would exonerate Charisios to a considerable degree and must keep her words ambiguous. For another example of the impasse see the conversation between Demeas and Thrasonides in act four of Mis., reported by Getas, who was present.

810-813 ‘The truth can only be discovered in a small circle. The general public is happy with some superficial story’. This sentiment, though here of course with specific meaning and application in the play, reads as a rather undemocratic view. For an Athenian it might mean that the Assembly can never discover the truth, which was reserved for the few, the ὀλίγοι. There had been many notorious oligarchs in the turbulence of the previous century, and two periods of oligarchic rule. Plato indeed favorizes this viewpoint (for example in the Republic) that only the educated few should have access to government as the uneducated masses simply do not have the intellectual equipment to think straight (εὐβουλία). We know that Menander nearly went down with Demetrios of Phaleron when he was ousted in 307 BC, and education in a philosophical school such as the Lyceum was the pre-
serve of the relatively rich and privileged, i.e., not the *oi polloi*. I fear that such a remark by Pamphile might have been enough to have had its author sent to the gulag under some regimes. One is reminded also of the, at times, life-threatening mental stress caused to people nowadays caught up in some scandal when they are hounded by the media, who only want to serve up stories (ὁ τυχὼν λόγος) to their tabloid readership. The truth is, indeed, only accessible to the small inner circle. It is interesting how Pamphile admits in this remark that she knows ‘people are talking about her’; and see lines 665-6 where Charisios is said to be ‘the talk of the town’.

Smikrines in *Sik.* 150-155 expresses a very similar sentiment to that of Pamphile here and is castigated as ‘oligarchic’ (ὀλιγαρχικός) by Blepes for it (156). Like Pamphile he says that the truth cannot be ascertained in public but only in a small circle (ἐν ὀλίγωι συνεδρίωι). But unlike Pamphile, he is an unsympathetic character so the same sentiment acquires two valences (as the structuralists would say) in Menander’s plays. Hard to pin him down.7

812-13 γίνεται. The breakthrough in deciphering this sentence came when Bathrellou realized that what had been read as a tau (τεινεται) in M was in fact a gamma. This can then be combined with ὁ τυχὼν [λόγος] in the next line to produce very satisfactory sense: ‘so that any chance story becomes preferable to the truth’.

[λόγος] is of course a supplement, but final sigma is clear and omikron before that quite plausible. That there is space in the gap for three letters is corroborated by Bathrellou’s suggested supplement [σὺ φήις, ‘you say’. Bathrellou did not know then that 813 in fact began with στ[, rather than ατ[ so she supplemented ἄτυχὼν, which has turned out to be wrong. ὁ τυχὼν...λόγος as an expression is recorded (at least) three times in the *TLG*, ‘a chance account’, ‘any old story’, and the participle of τυγχάνω is regularly used adjectivally, ‘chance’, ‘random’.

ἐπίπροσθε, ‘before’, is usually not used of time, only spatial order, whether literal, or, as in this case, theoretical.

814 Another quote from Smikrines’ speech (note σ’, ‘you’), but not necessarily literal. In lines 422-3 we learned from Onesimos himself that he had told Charisios previously of other indiscretions (τῶν προτέρων μηνυμάτων), which can only point to the revelation about Pamphile’s baby, which she had while Charisios was away. Charisios had reacted badly then, being annoyed with the conveyor of such bad news (423-5). Onesimos also tells us there that he had not confronted Charisios with the ring (evidence of the rape that night at the Tauropolia), because he knew that his master was angry with him anyway. So now, when Smikrines tells Pamphile that ‘she should avoid Charisios as much as Onesimos’, one wonders what exactly he had meant. Is this a reference to Onesimos’ having ‘told on her’ before? In that case Smikrines must know what Onesimos had told and all Pamphile’s at-

7 Thanks to Alan Sommerstein for the reference.
tempts at discretion now would seem to be pointless. I do not know the answer. I would assume from extant evidence in the play that Smikrines does not know about Pamphile’s baby. Perhaps there were lines in the play, missing now, which showed the threat Onesimos posed to Pamphile.

815-16 Pamphile says it is a ‘shameful’ thing her father has just said to her, that she should shun Charisios. Presumably she means: ‘that is not what a good wife should do, come what may’. She goes on to spell this position out to Smikrines, saying that she married Charisios for the good times and the bad. εἶπας. Menander shows a distinct preference for the ‘weak’ aorist forms of ‘say’ as well as φέρω (Ἦνεγκα). ἐνῄκας, ‘introduce’, ‘insinuate’, ‘cast (aspersion)’, (Germ. ‘in den Raum stellen’) preferable to ἐφῆκας (edd.) as there is no trace of upper vertical of phi in M, which one would expect to see. The basic meaning of ἐνίημα is ‘send in against’, but it can be used of a missile, or poison, courage etc. (LSJ s.v.).

816-17 The sentence begins with another quote from Smikrines, that Charisios is doomed. In line 751 Smikrines has said ἀπόλωλεν. Perhaps this shows the relation between Pamphile’s ‘quotes’ from her father’s speech and what he really says: she is, in effect, summarizing his words. Then Pamphile repeats the verb φεύγω from before showing that this point belongs in the same context: should Pamphile run from Charisios now that he has become entangled in scandalous behaviour?

817-18 Pamphile says she married Charisios for the good times and the bad. For the opposition between εὐπορέω and ἀπορέω cf. Timokles fr. 11 K-A: ἀγοράν ἱδίων εὔοσμον εὔπορονήμην / ἡδιστον, ον δὲ ἀπορὴ τις ἀθλιώτατον, ‘to see a well-stocked market is the sweetest thing for a well-off person, most bitter however if someone is destitute’; cf. Antiphanes fr. 232.7: ὅταν εὐπορῶν γάρ σιφρά ρά πράττη πράγματα, / τί τοῦτον ἀπορήσαντ’ ἄν οὐκ οἶει ποιεῖν, ‘When he commits vile acts while well-off, what do you think he will refrain from when badly off?’ That a person can fall on bad times after prosperity was obviously something of a cliché. Pamphile’s point goes a step further, however: if a woman’s husband falls on bad times, she should not run from him like a rat leaving a sinking ship. The point is enshrined in modern marriage vows at a Church wedding.

819 προίδωμ᾿ (= προίδωμαι). The middle of προοράω with the sense ‘provide for’, ‘take care for’, is documented in LSJ s.v. II 3, but usually with a genitive object or prepositional phrase (περί, πρός). However the combination with a dative of advantage (commodi) seems natural enough: ‘for him’. «ἀτοπόν». Smikrines appears to have said this about Charisios in line 704, right at the beginning of the altercation between himself and Pamphile, not in his main speech. A fair translation might be ‘impossible’. There Smikrines had said ‘one virtue is always to steer clear of an impossible character’. Bathrellou pointed out that ἀτοποῦν may not be a quote from Smikrines but might be Pamphile’s comment on the previous thought, that she should leave Charisios now that he is in poor shape as a husband. Römer
accepts this point from Bathrellou and supplements σὺ μὲν σὺ[νοι]ςθ’ α μον’ after it (‘Impossible! You know this as well as I do!’). But this is to overlook the point that Smikrines had called Charisios ἀτοπο and told Pamphile that she should leave him (703). The letters after μὲν in this line are totally unclear. Römer has objected to my φης that phi after μὲν is ‘impossible’, preferring sigma herself (above). However, I am prepared to stick with phi: one only has to assume that the descender has become abraded. Sigma is indeed a possibility but I cannot think of a suitable word or construction which will connect well with the next line. With omikron one could imagine something like σὺ μὲν ὅ[ei]γῳ δὲ [μὴν] which would not change the sense greatly.

820 κοινωνὸς το[ῦ βί]ου, ‘life companion’. Smikrines had already used the word back in line 594, possibly in the same context, and Charisios picks up on this expression when he comes to brood over Pamphile’s noble words compared to his own pusillanimity (920). Antiphanes is quoted as having used an almost identical expression (Athen. 2.1.92 Kaibel) κοινωνὸς ἀμφοῖν τῆς τύχης καὶ τοῦ βίου (said of a parasite), and the expression (with variants) κοινωνὸς βίου is a commonplace. το[ῦ βί]ου κα[ὶ] τῆς τύ[χη]ς is best taken as hendiadys ‘the vagaries of life’, ‘life’s vicissitudes’.

821-23 Pamphile comes to the last of Smikrines’ points which she will address. It concerns the prediction that Charisios will have to service two households because of Habrotonon and will pay her more attention than Pamphile (Habrotonon can never be his wife as she is not a citizen).

823 ἐκείνη. M has only ἐκει- so the error may be put down to haplography (ἐ-κει-νη). μαλ[λον] αἰσθάν[οι] γ’, ‘you may well notice’. Bathrellou suggests πάλ[λιν] ὅ[ι]οισθάνουθ’ [ὅρις], ‘I see him slipping up again’, but where she wants lama in ὅ[ιοισθάνουθ’], alpha is more likely. Πι in πάλιν is, in my opinion, wrong, too. Nor does the sense with ὅρω, ‘I see’, entirely convince: Smikrines does not see, only predict. ὁλισθάνω (‘slip’ = ‘get into trouble’) is, in my mind, too much of a euphemism for Smikrines, who tends to exaggerate. Finally, there is split double-short between πάλιν and ὅ[ιοισθάνουθ’]. Unfortunately the traces in M after α-ι-θ-α are indistinct, so my supplement is little more than e.g. An alternative would be αἰσθάνοιμεθ’ ἂν.

824ff. Pamphile goes on to discuss the possibility of remarriage if she leaves Charisios.
Appendix: complete updated text version 2.0

The cast

In order of appearance:

- Karion, the cook, *mageíros*
- Onesimos, household slave of Charisios
- Chairestratos, friend of Charisios
- Habrotonon, harp-girl, *psaltria* and *hetaïra*
- Smikrines, father-in-law of Charisios
- Daos, slave, a herdsman
- Syriskos, slave of Chairestratos, a charcoal-burner
- Pamphile, wife of Charisios, daughter of Smikrines
- Charisios, young man
- Sophrone, old woman, nurse of Pamphile

The scene is a rural deme of Attica, probably not far from Athens, with two house doors opening onto a street: one belongs to Charisios, the other to his friend Chaire-

---

8 An asterisk beside a *word indicates a change from the 2009 text. Here I can only record the change in the app, as there is no space for commentary.
stratos.

Hypothesis

O²⁸ = P.Oxy. 4020

Ἐπὶ
Ἐπιτρέπουντες
Οὐχ ὁ τρόφιμός σοι πρὸς θεῶν, [ 5

τὸ δράμα τῶν ἁρίστων
περιγέγογον γὰρ δηλώσει
ἡθῶν ἀπάγτων [ἐχον δούλους
dῦο, τὸν μὲν σωφρόνως τὸν
d᾿αἰσχυνομένως δικάζοντα,
γαμετὴν κοσμῶς ἐξουσαν,
ἐταίραν ἀφελῶς, ἔροντα
φιλάργυρον λογισμὸν ἔχοντα,
θεράποντα δικαιολογοῦντα
[—unknown number of lines missing—] 15

1-14 suppl. Parsons 7 Furley: δείξει Parsons: μιμήσει Kassel 11 Martina in app.: ἐρῶσαν
Parsons: λέγουσαν Kassel 12 γ[ vel τ[ Parsons 14 δικαιολογοῦντα Kassel

Text

Act One

The play opens with two slaves conversing. The cook, Karion, addresses Onesimos, Charisios’ servant:

fr. 1 K.-Th.

ΚΑΡΙΩΝ

οὐχ ὁ τρόφιμός σου πρὸς θεῶν, Ὀνήσιμε,
ὁ νῦν ἔχων τὴν Ἀβρότονον τῆν ψάλτριαν
ἔγημεν ἐναγχος:

44
ΟΝΗΣΙΜΟΣ

πάνυ μὲν οὖν [fr. 2a and b K.-Th.]

Καρ

φίλῳ σ’, Ὀνήσιμε·
καὶ οὐ περίεργος εἶ…
…οὐδὲν ἔστι γὰρ
γλυκύτερον ἢ πάντ’ εἰδέναι

P.Oxy. 4936

In the following fragment, which Handley places between fr. 1 and the beginning of the Petersburg parchment, we have scraps of conversation between Karion the cook, Chairestratos and Onesimos. Column i contains line ends, column ii line beginnings, including notae personae and paragrapheoi. Column length appears to have been thirty-five lines. For both columns I give a combination of Handley’s diplomatic text (where only single letters can be discerned) and his restored text (where whole words can be plausibly restored). All the suggested supplements given in the apparatus stem from Handley’s textual commentary. For ‘Handley’, then, one can read ‘Handley in comm.’.

Column i

(minimal traces of 4 lines)

] . . . ςιον 5
] . . . ο . . .
] traces [ ]
] . . . εςε
] traces [
] . . . [ . . . ] o . .
] . . . φ[
] . . . [ . . . ] o
] γενομεν[-
] . . . αςι
] . . . ςφ όλην 15
] ον.
καλή[ . ] κορη .
] φφδρ’ οίςθ’ ὅτι
] . τι
] . . . μεις ἵας
] ν οὐδέπω
κριβαδιον 20

45
Χαρίϲιον

5 Χαριϲιον dubitanter Handley 15 e.g. [ἡμέραν οἰκίαν πόλιν] Handley κα[λε]ϲ possis
notam personae intell. Handley 19 e.g. οἰκονο[με]ϲ vel -μι ειϲ έα Handley : ύ[με]ϲ/ή[με]ϲ possis
χαρειϲιον[Π] 26 ]κειϲ vel [θε]ϲ leg. Handley et suppl. e.g. ἀφειϲτή[κειϲ φρενῶν: φρονῶν possis
27 e.g. ἐμοὶ δο[κε]ϲ vel τε[κέ]ϲ Handley 28 Χαρέιϲιον fortasse Handley 30 e.g. ὅπερ [ἐμο]ϲ vel
τ]ὸ περ[ὶ co]ϲ Handley 32 e.g. τ]ὰμα συ Handley

Column ii

Καρ

Ον

Χαι πεφυκα

κα[ν] [

notam personae intell. Handley 19 e.g. οἰκονο[με]ϲ vel -μι ειϲ έα Handley : ύ[με]ϲ/ή[με]ϲ possis
χαρειϲιον[Π] 26 ]κειϲ vel [θε]ϲ leg. Handley et suppl. e.g. ἀφειϲτή[κειϲ φρενῶν: φρονῶν possis
27 e.g. ἐμοὶ δο[κε]ϲ vel τε[κέ]ϲ Handley 28 Χαρέιϲιον fortasse Handley 30 e.g. ὅπερ [ἐμο]ϲ vel
τ]ὸ περ[ὶ co]ϲ Handley 32 e.g. τ]ὰμα συ Handley

Column ii

Καρ

Ον

Χαι πεφυκα

κα[ν] [
αὐτὸν πι[‐
κρεμαν. [ 20
... [ ]
εὐς δεύρο [ ]
τηρ[азвание] γὰρ [ ]
κλεῖω π[‐
περὶμε[‐n‐
τίν μία[v

Καρ
αὐτὸς καλ[[[ 25

Ον
καὶ Θα[‐

Χαί
εὐς πειθ[-

(Καρ)
οίνου Θά[‐

Όν
ἄν ἐτί λα[‐

Between the end of this fragment and the beginning of the next scene must have come the lost prologue. Someone – probably a deified abstraction (Diallage, ‘Reconciliation’?) – told the audience what lay behind the rift in Charisios’ and Pamphile’s marriage: a baby conceived before their marriage, considered illegitimate and exposed before Charisios’ return from his business trip, but in fact his very own child by Pamphile.

Before the Petersburg fragment commences we may place, conjecturally, two further fragments. For their attribution to Epitrepontes see commentary.

Fr. 10 K.-Th.

Stobaeus, Ecl. 4.29.58 Hense. Μενάνδρου Επιτρέποντες: 30

έλευθερωι τὸ καταγελᾶσθαι μὲν πολὺ
αἰσχίον ἔστι· τὸ δὲ ὀδυνᾶσθ᾿ ἄνθρωποι.

1. μὲν Heringa: γάρ Hense  2. αἰσχίον codd.: αἰσχίστου Heringa.
The Petersburg fragment begins in the middle of a speech by Smikrines as he paces angrily up and down outside Charisios’ door.

(ΣΜΙΚΡΙΝΗΣ)

...
Χαρίσιός σε προσμένει, Χαιρέ[στρατε.

τίς δὴ ἔσῃ τῇ δ[ή], γλυκύταθι:

(Χαι) ὁ τῆς [νύμφης π]ιὰτήρ.

δριμὺ βλέπ[ων] ο[ς] ἄθλιός τις φίλόσοφος ἀκριβολογεῖθι.

(Σμ) οὐ τρισκακοδα[ίμων ψάλ]τριαν

[σα]ν γυναῖκα [ ]

]οι [ ]

]ε

[— gap of 1 line —]

... []-

προσε[ ]

ἀλλ’ ἕ[ ]

ἀποδοὺς δ[ὲ]

Ἀβρ τὴν προῖκα ν . . [ ]

ὁ γ’ ἑρῶ.

Σμ [π]ερὶ τῶ[ν] . . [ ]

ἄγχου[ ] . κειτο[ ]

Ἀβρ [ ] . . [ ] . [ ]

τῆς νυ[κ]τὸς.

Χαι[ ] ευ[ ] . . [ ] . . . Αβρό[τον]ν.

Ἀβρ ἀλλ’ οὐκ ἐκάλο[υν]

(?Χαι) ]οω[ ]

(Ἀβρ) οὔτως ἄγαθόν τι σοὶ γένοιτο, [μ]ή λέγε

αʹ γʹ ἐποῦ—

Χαι[ ] εἰσε[ ] . . [ ] . . . Αβρό[τον]ν.

Σμ οὐκ ἐς κόρακας: οἰμώξει μακρά.

(Ἀβρ) ωἀσκό[ς]

(?Ἀβρ) φάρσα[ς]ειν αὐτῶι τοῦτον ἥκοντ’ ἐνήδιε;

(Χαι)  φράσ[ω]μεν ὁ[μ]ον κίναδος οἰκίαν ποεὶ 

(Αβρ)  πολλάς ἐβουλόμην ἀμα.

(Χαι)  μίαν μὲν τὴν ἑφεξῆς.

(Αβρ)  τὴν ἐμήν δεῦρο πρὸς Χαρίσιον.

(Χαι)  ἑωμ[εν] ὡς καὶ μειρακυλλίσων ὄχλος 

εἰς τὸν τόπον τις ἔρχεθ᾿ ὑποβεβρεγμέν[ων


[ΧΟΡΟ]Υ̣

Act Two

(Ον)  ἐπ[πονα] πάντα τὰν[άδ᾿ οὐχ ὑ]περευφραν[εῖ

οἰομ[ ]]ως τελεῖν 

καὶ τοπ[ ] ]...ε.

ὁ δεσπο[τῆς 

ὁ γέρω[ν μ]άρτυρας 

οὐδὲ λό[γγει, 

μι]άρτυρας 

τῆς ἠ...[ 

πρὸς θεῶν 

λος καὶ τα...[ 

χο. . .[ 180

αἰσχύνεται 

γέγονεν α...[ 

. .[5-6] .[ 

[— gap of several lines —]

Ο25 fr. 3

(Ον)  . . .[ . εἰ . . . η[ 

. .][ζεί . . σα[ 

. ] ου. α. η[ 

πά]ρατρίβομ[αι 

. ]ώρας ἀγατ[ 

165

τὸ γὰρ πέρας ἀπαλλάγῃς. ἀγαθὰ γένοιτὸ κἀθεῦδ᾿ ἀναστὶ κλίνην ἐμοί ἀπώλεσεν. ἀγαθὸν γένοιτο ἐλάλει δὲ μοι Χ. αὐτὸν ἐθέλει ὑμᾶς ἐνοχλεῖ ὡς τοι τυχόντι. τόσο ἐλάλει ἐμοί ἔφε. ἄπο δακών. 


Then, conjecturally, unplaced fragments of O

See Weinstein (1971); Austin (1973, no. 135).

V
]
]είσομαι ο]σθαῖ κ[ ]... ει]...
]... λ[ ]

VI
]
]είσομαι ο]σθαῖ κ[ ]... ει]...
]... λ[ ]

VII
[... ]... [ 51
εἰληφ’ ἄλως
ἐβουλεῖτο [ ]
] ; ηπεισμε ; [ 

VIII

......
] ... λεθ[ 
] ; ἀναξ[ ]
193-214 Ο"νον see Nünlist (2003)

(?Σμ) 
... τ]ούτων θυγατέρ[...
... το] δή λεγόμενον η[...
... ]επείσηι καρτέρης[...]
... ]ν το μή παρά το[ι[ούτου...
... ]δεήσ[ει...
... ]iat, μεθύω, κραιπαλώ,» [195
... ]ρ[... ]δ' οὖν αυτώι φράσω ν[...]
π]ειραν προσάγειν, ός υνν α[...]
ο']θείς λέγει τούτωι γάρ: ε[...]
ἐ]ρρωσοκαὶ τὸ κατὰ σὲ πρόσ[μεινον μόνος...
π]αρ' ἐνα γάρ ἐσθ' ἕκαστον ο]σ[τηρία. [200

(ΔΑΟΣ)
π]ροσμείνατ': ὁ δειλῆς μετα[...

(ΣΥΡΙΣΚΟΣ)
ἐρρωσο καὶ τὸ κατὰ σὲ πρόσ[μεινον μόνος...
π]αρ' ἐνα γάρ ἐσθ' ἕκαστον ο]σ[τηρία. [210

---


53
(Δα) οίονθεν λέγεις δίκαιουν.
Συ οὐ μα[ ἔ, πρὸς τύν δεισιτήν [ 
. . . ]ον. κατοικεὶ δ’ ἐνβά[δ- 
. . . ] . [ . ]μεν οἰκε . . οὐ[ 

[−gap of not more than three lines−]

(Συ) φεύγεις τό δίκαιουν.
(Δα) συκοφαντεῖς, δυστυχής.
(Συ) έπιτρεπτέον τινι 
έστι περὶ τούτων.
(Δα) βούλομαι: κρινώμεθα.
(Συ) τούτον λαβεῖν 
(Σμ) 
(Δα) βούλει κριτήν:
(Συ) άγαθῆι τύχηι.
(Δα) πρὸς τονθεών,
(Σμ) 
(Συ) 
(Σμ) 
(Συ) 
(Σμ) 
(Συ) 
(Σμ) 
(Συ) 
(Σμ) 
(Συ) 

211 μ’ ἀποστρέφεις Austin 212 ἐγὼ δ’ἐ...[τραπήσομαι Austin 213 τον 
(Σμ) 
(Συ) 

Stob. Flor. III 9.11 Hense 235 post πρόνοιαν interp. van Lécuwen
πάντων.

Δα μετρίωι γε συμπέπλεγμαι ρήτορι.

(Σμ) ἐμμενεῖτ' οὖν, εἴπέ μοι,

οἷς ἂν δικάσω;

Συ πάντως.

(Σμ) ἀκούσομαι· τί γὰρ
tὸ με κωλύου; οὐ πρότερος ὁ σιωπῶν λέγε.

Δα μικρὸν γ’ ἄνωθεν, οὐ τὰ πρὸς τοῦτον μόνον

πραχθὲνθ’, ἣν’ ἦτοι καὶ σαφῆ τὰ πράγματα.

ἐν τοῖς δασεῖ τῶι πλησίον τῶι χωρίων

tούτων ἐποίημαι τριακοστῆν ἱσώς,

βέλτιστω, ταύτην ἠμέραν αὐτὸς μόνος
kάκκειμενον παιδάριον εὕρον νῆπιον

ἔχον δέραια καὶ τοιοῦτοι τίνα
kόσμον.

(Συ) περὶ τούτων ἐστὶν.

Δα οὐκ εἶλεγεν.

(Σμ) ἐὰν λαλῆις μεταξύ, τῇ βακτηρίᾳ

καθίζομαι σου.

(Συ) καὶ δικαίως.

(Σμ) λέγε.

(Δα) λέγω.

ἀνειλόμην, ἀπῆλθον οἶκαθ’ αὔτ’ ἔχον,

τρέφειν ἐμελλον. ταύτ’ ἐδοξὲ μοι τότε·

ἐν νυκτὶ βουλήν δ’, ὅπερ ἄπαι εἶνεται,

dιδοὺς ἐμαυτῷ διελογιζόμην <ἐμοὶ>

τὸ παιδοτροφία καὶ κακῶν; πόθεν δ’ ἐγὼ

tοσαύτ’ ἀναλώσω; τί φροντίδων ἐμοί;»

tοιοῦτοι τις ἦν. ἐποίημαι πάλιν

ἔωθεν, ἦλθεν οὕτος – ἐστὶ δ’ ἀνθρακεὺς –

eἰς τὸ τόπον τὸν αὐτὸν ἐκπρίσσων ἐκεῖ

στελέχη· πρότερον δὲ μοι συνήθης ἐγεγόνει.

ἐλαλοῦμεν ἀλλήλοις. σκυθρωπὸν ὄντα με

ἰδών, «τί σύννοις» φησὶ «Δᾶος;» «τί γάρ;» ἐγώ,

«πεἰρεγός εἰμι,» καὶ τὸ πράγμ’ αὐτῶι λέγω,
ὡς εὗρον, ὡς ἀνειλόμην. ὁ δὲ τότε μὲν
εὐθὺς πρὶν εἰπεῖν πάντ᾽ ἐδείη, «οὐτω τί σοι
ἀγαθὸν γένοιτο, Δᾶε,» παρ᾽ ἐκαστὸν λέγων,
«ἐμοὶ τὸ παιδίου δός· οὔτω ἐντυχής,
οὔτως ἔλευθερος. γυναίκα,» φησί, «γὰρ
ἔχω, τεκούσῃ δ᾽ ἀπεθάνειν τὸ παιδίου,»
tαύτην λέγων, ἢ νῦν ἕξει τὸ παιδίου.

Σμ ἐδέου <οὐ γε;

(Δα) οὐ>, Σύρισκ᾽; ὅλην τὴν ἡμέραν
ekατέτριψε. λιπαροῦντι καὶ πείθοντι με
ὑπεσχόμην. ἔδωκ᾽, ἀπῆλθεν μυρία
eὐχόμενος ἀγαθὰ· λαμβάνων μοι κατεφίλει
tὰς χεῖρας.

(Σμ) ἐπόεις ταῦτα;
(Συ) ἐπόουν.
(Δα) ἀπηλλάγη.

μετὰ τῆς γυναικὸς περιτυχῶν μοι νῦν ἀφίω
τὰ τότε συνεκτεθέντα τούτῳ—μικρὰ δὲ
ἡν ταῦτα καὶ ληρός τις, οὐθὲν—ἀξίοι
ἀπολαμβάνειν καὶ δεινά πάσχειν φῆς', ὁτι
οὐκ ἀποδιδωμ᾽, αὐτὸς δ᾽ ἔχειν ταῦτ᾽ ἀξίω.
ἔγω δὲ γ᾽ αὐτὸν φημί δεῖν ἔχειν χάριν
οὐ μετέλαβεν δεόμενος· εἰ μὴ πάντα δὲ
tούτῳ δίδωμι, οὐκ ἕξετασθήναι με δεῖ.
εἰ καὶ βαδίζων εὑρέν ἁμ᾽ ἐμοὶ ταῦτα καὶ
ἡν κοινὸς Ἐρμῆς, τὸ μὲν ἀν ὡς ἔλα[βέ] ποι
tὸ δ᾽ ἔγω· μόνου δ᾽ εὐρύντος, οὐ παρὼν τῇ
tάπαντ᾽ ἔχειν οἰεὶ σε δεῖν, ἔμε δ᾽ οὐδὲ ἔνιν
tὸ πέρας· δέδωκα οἱ τοῦ ἐμῶν ἐγ᾽ ἔγω·
ei τοῦτ᾽ ἄρ[πε]στον ἐστὶ σοι, καὶ νῦν ἔχε·
ei δ᾽ οὐκ ἀρέσκει, μετανοεῖς δ᾽; ἀπόδος πάλιν
καὶ μηδὲν ἄδικε[ι] μηδ᾽ ἐλλαττοῦ. πάντα δὲ,
tὰ μὲν παρ᾽ ἐκνύτος τὰ δὲ κατετιθύματα με,
oὐ δεῖ στρεφομεῖν. εἰρήκα τὸν γ᾽ ἐμὸν λόγον.

(Συ) εἰρήκεν;

264 ἐδειτ᾽ C 269 παιδίου: C 270 ἐδείου <οὐ γ᾽>: Bodin-Mazon σμίκ (in marg.)
Ellis: εἰρήκων Lefebvre 289 Lefebvre
οὐκ ἠκούσας; εἴρηκεν. 

καλῶς.


κάγω συναπαιτῶ κύριος γεγενημένος τούτου· οὗ δ’ ἐπόροσας με δούς, νῦν γνωστέον, βέλτιστο, οἰς ταῦτ’ ἐστίν, ὡς ἔμοι δοκεῖ, τὰ χρυσί’ ἢ ταῦθ’ – ὅτι ποτ’ ἐστι – πότερα δε♭ 

cατὰ τὴν δόσιν τῆς μητρός, ἤτις ἦν ποτε, τοῖς παιδίοις τηρεώθ’, ἔως ἂν ἐκτραφῆ, ἢ τὸν λελωποδυτηκότ’ αὐτὸν ταῦτ’ ἐχειν, εἰ πρῶτος εὑρεί τάλλορία. τί οὗν τότε, ὅτ‘ ἐλάμβαναν τοῦτ’, οὐκ ἀπήιτου ταῦτά σε; οὐπώ παρ’ ἐμοὶ τοῦτ’ ἦν ὑπὲρ τοῦτον λέγων ἤκα δὲ καὶ νῦν, οὐκ ἐμαυτοῦ τ’ οὐδὲ ἔν ιδιον ἀπαιτῶν. κοινὸς Ἑρμῆς; μηδὲ ἐν εὐφριστ’, ὅπως πρόσεστι σῶμι’ ἀδικοῦμενοι’ οὐχ] εὑρείς τοῦτ’ ἐστιν ἀλλ’ ἀφαίρεσις. 

βλέψον δὲ κάκει, πάτερ: ἔως έσθ’ ο[ὑτο]σι οocytes ἄν υπὲρ ἴμας καὶ τραφεῖς ἐν ἑργάταις ύπέρρομεται ταῦτ’, εἰς δὲ τὴν αὐτοῦ φύσιν *ἐκβ’ ἀσ εὐθερόν τι τολμήσει πορνεῖν, θηράν λένοντας, ὁπλα βαστάζειν, τρέχειν ἐν ἄγωσι. τεθέασαι τραγωδοῖς, οἶδ’ ὅτι, 325

(Συ) πόλλ’ ἀγαθά σοι γένοιτο.
(Δα) δεινή γ’ ἢ [κρίσις;
υὴ τὸν Διὰ τὸν Σωτῆρα· πάνθ’ εὑρὼν ἔγῳ ἀπαντά περιέσπασμ’. ὁ δ’ οὐχ εὑρὼν *ἀ|γει. 360
οὐκὼν ἀποδιδῶ;

(Σμ) φημι.
(Δα) δεινή γ’ ἢ κρίσις;

η μηθὲν ἀγαθὸν μοι γένοιτο.

(Συ) φέρε τ|αχύ.
(Δα) ὦ Ἡράκλεις, ἀ πέπονθα.
(Συ) τὴν πήραν χάλα καὶ δεῖξον· ἐν ταῦτῃ περιφέρεις γάρ. βραχὺ πρόσμειν, ικετεύως σ’, ἵν’ ἀποδῶι.

(Δα) τί γάρ ἐγώ 365
ἐπέτρεψα τούτωι;

(Σμ) δός ποτ’, ἐργαστήριον.
<Δα> αἰσχρά γ’ ἀ πέπονθα.
(Σμ) πάν[τ’] ἡχεις;
Συ Ὺ οἶμαι γε δή,
ei μη τι καταπέπωκε τὴν δίκην ἐμοῦ λέγοντος, ὡς ἥλιοκτ’.

(Σμ) οὔκ ἄν [ὡι]όμην.
(Συ) ἀλλ’ εὐτύχει, βέλτιστε. τοιοῦ[του]ς ἐδ[ει] 370
θὰ[τ[ου] δικάζειν πάντας.
(Δα) ᾧ Ἡράκλεις, οὐ γέγονε δε]ι[νοτέρα κρίσις.
Συ ποιηρός ἥθας.
<Δα> ὥ πο[ν]ήρ’, ὥπως σύ] νῦν τούτωι φυλάξεις αὐτ[ά …
εὐ[ι]θι, τηρήσω σε π[ά]γιτα [τὸν] [χρό]νου. 375 Τ Ο26
(Συ) οἴμωζε καὶ βάδιζε. ὦ δὲ ταυτί, γύναι λαβούσα πρὸς τὸν τρόφιμον ἐνθάδ’ εἰσφέρε Χαρέστρατον. νῦν γάρ μενούμεν ἐνθάδε, εἰς αὐριον δ’ ἐπ’ ἐργόν ἐξορμήσουμεν τὴν ἀποφορὰν ἀποδόντες. ἀλλὰ ταυτά μοι 380
πρῶτ᾿ ἀπαρίθμησαι καθ᾿ ἐν. ἔχεις κοιτίδα τινά; βάλλει εἰς τὸ προκόλπιον.

Οὐ μάγειρον βραδύτερον
οὐδὲις ἐόρακε τηνικαῦτ’ ἐχθὲς πάλαι
ἐπινον.

Σὺ οὐτοσι μὲν εἶναι φαίνεται
ἀλεκτρυών τις καὶ μάλα στιφρός· λαβέ.
τουτί δὲ διάλιθον τι. πέλεκυς οὐτοσι.

Οὐ τί ταῦθ᾿;
(Σὺ) ὑπόκρυσος δακτύλιος· τις οὐτοσι,
αὐτὸς αἰσθηρός· γλύμμα ταῦρος ἢ τράγος·
οὐκ ἄν διαγνοίης· Κλεόστρατος δὲ τις
ἐσῖν ὁ ποῆσας, ὡς λέγει τὰ γράμματα.

(Οὐ) ἦν. οὐ δ᾿ εἶ τίς;
(Οὐ) [ο]ὕτος ἐστὶ—
(Σὺ) τίς;
(Οὐ) [ὁ δ]ακτύλιος—
(Σὺ) ὁ ποῖος; οὐ γάρ μανθάνω.
(Οὐ) [τοῦ] δεσπότου τούμου Χαρ[ι]οίου.
(Σὺ) χολαῖς;
(Οὐ) ὅν ἀπώλεσεν,
(Σὺ) τὸν δακτύλιον θές, ἀθλιε,
τὸν ἢμέτερον.

Οὐ οἰ βῶ; πόθεν δ᾿ αὐτὸν λαβὼν

ἐχεις;

Σὺ Ἀπολλον καὶ θεοὶ, δεινοῦ κακοῦ.
ο[ίον ὑε σῶσαι χρήματ’ ἐστίν ὁρφ[α]νοῦ
πιαῖδος· ὁ προσελθὼν εὐθὺς ἀρπάζειν βλέπει.
τοῦ δακτύλιον θές, φημί.

(Οὐ) ποπαίζεις εἰμι;
(Σὐ) τοῦ δεσποτοῦ τοῦ ὅτι, ἂ τὸν Ἀπόλλω καὶ θεοὺς.

381 καθεν’ C 382 οὐς (=Onesimos) s.l. hab. O
384 ὃς οὐκοῦν οὐτοσι μὲν φαίνεται Parsons
385 στιφ[..] τις C 386 πεκυ[...]
O26 389 , αγνοησ C 390 ποὶςας C 391 suppl. Sudhaus
O26 392 -396 Lefebvre 393 fin. punct. interrog. Furley
394 τὸν i.e. πο(μὴν)?
O26 396 απολλ[ i.e. πο(μὴν) Συρ. Ο26 397 οὐν’ ἐν vel - τε O26, οἶνον τε cum p. interrog. post παιδὸς Austin ap. Parsons: οἶνον τὸ σῶσαι Lefebvre: [οἶνον ἃ]π[ο]σῶσαι
al.
(Συ) ἀποσφαγείην [π]ρότερον ἄν δὴπουθεν ἢ
toύτωι τι κ[ά]θεφειμην. ἄραρε, δικάσομαι
ἀπασι καθ’ ἑνα. π[α]ϊδίου ‘στιν, ὅκ εἴμα—
streptόν τι τούτι λαβέ σύ. πορφυρά πτέρυξ,
eἰσω δὲ πάρ[αγ]ε.—[ο]ὐ δὲ τί μοι λέγεις;

(Ον) ἐγώ; 405

Χαρισίου ‘στιν οὐτοσι— τούτων ποτε
μεθ[ύων] ἀπώλ[εια], ὡς ἔφη.

(Συ) Χαιρεστράτου
eιμ’ [οικέτης.] ἢ σώιζε τούτων ἀσφαλῶς,

(Ου) βούλομαι

αὐτ[ός] [φυλάττειν.]

(Συ) οὐδὲ ἐν μοι διαφέρει 410
eἰς ταύτο [γ]ἀρ παράγομεν, ὡς ἐμοὶ δοκεῖ,
δεῦρ’ ἀμφότεροι.

(Ου) νυνι μὲν οὖν συνάγουσι καὶ
οὐκ ἐστιν εὐκαίριον τὸ μηνύειν ἱσως
αὐτῶι περί τούτων, αὐριον δὲ.

(Συ) καταμενῶ, 415
καταμενῶ, αὐριον ὅτωι βούλεσθ’ ἐπιτρέπειν εἰνά ἱόγωι
ἐτοιμος. οὐδὲ νῦν κακῶς ἀπήλλαξα.
πάντων δ’ ἀμελήσανθ’, ὡς ἐοικε, δεῖ δίκας
μελετάν’ διά τούτι πάντα νυνι σώιζεται.

ΧΟΡΟΥ

Act Three

Ον τὸν δακτύλιον ὡρμηκα πλεῖν ἢ πεντάκις
tοὶ δεσπότηι δείξαι προσελθών, καὶ σφόδρα
ὡν ἔγγυς ἢ[δη] καὶ πρὸς αὐτῶι παντελῶς
ἀναδύομαι. καὶ τῶν προτέρων μοι μεταμέλει
μημιμάτων· λέγει γάρ ἐπιεικῶς πικνά
«ὡς τὸν φράσαντα ταύτα μοι κακὸν κακ[ῶς]
ὁ Ζεὺς ἀπολέσαι.» μὴ με δὴ διαλλαγ[είς

409 Jensen 410 Croiset 415 αυριον ὅτωι C 418 τούτων Croiset, al. 422 προτέρων
O26: πρότερον C 425 διαλλαγ[είς C: κατα| O26 i.e. κατα[λλαγείς
πρὸς τὴν γυναῖκα τὸν φράσαν ταῦτα καὶ συνειδότ’ ἀφανίση λαβὼν. καλῶς τοῦτο ἐπέρθη ἐν τῷ θυγατρὶ κούκαν ὡς [βούλουμαι.] κάνταυθα κακὸν ἐνεστὶν ἐπεικῶς μ[έγα.]

Ἀβρ. ἐάτε μ’ ἰκετεύω σε καὶ μὴ μοι κακὰ παρέχετ’. ἐμαυτὴν, ὡς ἔοικεν, ἁθλία λέληθα χλευάζου’ ἐράσθαι προσ[ε]δ[όκων], θεῖοι δὲ μισοὶ μίσος ἄνθρωπός με τι. οὐκέτι μ’ ἐδεί γάρ οὔθε κατακείσθαι, τάλαν, παρ’ αὐτόν, ἀλλὰ χωρίς.

Ὀν. ἀλλ’ ἀποδῶ πάλιν παρ’ ο’ παρέλαβον ἀρτίως; ἀτόπον. τάλας ὅποτος, τι τοσοῦτον ἀργύριον ἀπολλύει: ἐπεὶ τὸ γ’ ἐπὶ τούτωι τὸ τῆς θεοῦ φέριει κανονὶ ἔμοιον’ οἷον τε νῦν ἐστιν, τάλαν ἀγνὴ γάμου γάρ, φαοῖν, ἥμεραν τρίτην ἔστιν κάθημαι.

Οὐ. πῶς ἂν οὖν, πρὸς τῶν θεῶν, πῶς ἂν, ἰκετεύωι— ἐπεὶ τὸ γ’ ἐπὶ τούτωι τῆς θεοῦ φέριει κανονὶ ἔμοιον’ οἷον τε νῦν ἐστιν, τάλαν ἀγνὴ γάμου γάρ, φαοῖν, ἥμεραν τρίτην ἔστιν κάθημαι.


Ὠν. τοιουτο[νί] ἐστιν τὸ πράγμ’, ἄνθρωπε’ τοῦ μὲν δεσπότου ἐστ’, οἰδ’ ἀκριβῶς, οὔτοι Χαρισίου, ὁκνῶ δὲ δεῖξαί πατέρα γάρ τοῦ παιδίου αὐτοῦ ποῦ ὁχέσθαι τὸ τούτων προσφέρων μεθ’ οὐ συνεξέκειτο.

(Συ) πῶς, ἀβέλτερε:

(Οὐ) Ταυροπολιόις ἀπώλεσαν τούτων ποτὲ παυννυχίδος οὐσὶς καὶ γυναικῶν. Κατὰ λόγον ἐστὶν βιασμὸν τοῦτον εἶναι παρθένους.

ἡ δ᾿ ἐτεκε τούτο καζέθηκε δηλαδή.
ei μὲν τις οὖν εὐρῶν ἐκείην προσφέροι
tούτον, σαφὲς ἂν τι δεικνύ[οι] τεκμήριον·
υνὶ δ᾿ ύπόνοιαν καὶ ταραχὴν ἔχει.
(Συ) σκόπει
αὐτὸς περὶ τούτων. εἰ δ᾿ ἀνασείεις, ἀπολαβεῖν
τὸν δακτύλιόν με βουλόμενος δοῦναί τέ σοι
µικρόν τι, λητρείς. οὐκ ἔνεστιν οὐδὲ εἶς
πιπρέ ἐμοι μερισμός.

(Οὐ)
oὐδὲ δέομαι.

Συ ἥξωδιαδραμών—εἰς πόλιν γὰρ ἔρχομαι

(AΒρ)
τὸν παιδάριον, ὃν τιν τινι τροφίμος ἐν δούλῳ μέρει
κοῦκ ἂν δικαίως ἀποθάνοις;

(Οὐ)
τὴν μητέρ᾿ οὐδεὶς οἶδεν.

(AΒρ)
ὀς κομψόν, τάλαν.

(Οὐ)
καὶ τουτοῦ
τὸν δακτύλιον ἐπόντα τοῦμοῦ δεσπότου.

(AΒρ)
αῖ, δύσιορ· εἰτ᾿ εἰ τρόφιμος ὅντως ἑστὶ σου,
τρεφόμενον ὄψει τούτον ἐν δούλῳ μέρει
κοῦκ ἂν δικαίως ἀποθάνοις;

(Οὐ)
ὑπὸ λέγω,

(AΒρ)
ἀπέβαλεν δὲ, φῆις,
Ταυροπολίοις αὐτών;

(Οὐ)
παροινῶν γ᾿, ὃς ἐμοὶ
τὸ παιδαρί[ο]ν ἐφ᾿ ἀκόλουθος.

(ΑΒρ)
δηλαδὴ
eis τὰς [γ]υναικᾶς παννυχιζόυσας μόνος
ἐνε[πασε] καμοῦ γὰρ παρουσίας ἐγένετο
τοιοῦτον ἔτερον.

(Οὐ)
σοῦ παρούσης;

(ΑΒρ)
πέρυσι, ναί,
Ταυροπο[λίοις] πιαῖον γὰρ ἐξαλλὸν κόρας,
*a[υ]τή θ᾿ ἵμου συνήπαίζειν· οὐδ᾿ ἐγώ τότε

462 -463 suppl. Wilamowitz 466 ὡς Furley: [ναι,] Lefebvre, al. 474 C: μόνας
Herwerden, al. 475 ἐνε[πασε] Koerte, [καμοῦ van Arnim 476 του[ου]ν C 477
Capps 478 Capps: αὐτή .. συνήπαίζον Headlam, van Leeuwen: αὐτ[α]ί Sudhaus:
αὐτή .. συ[νήπαίζε] Wilamowitz
—οὔπω γάρ—ἀνδρὸς ἤδειν τί ἔστι. καὶ μάλα.

(Ου) μὰ τὴν Ἀφροδίτην.

(Αβρ) τὴν δὲ παῖδις γ’ ἦτις ἤν

(Ου) οἶσθας;

(Αβρ) πυθομένην ἀν· παρ’ αῖς γὰρ ἤν ἐγὼ γυναιξί, τοῦτων ἢν φίλη.

(Ου) πατρὸς τίνος ἤκουσας;

(Αβρ) οὐδὲν οἴδα· πλὴν ἵδούσα γε γνοῖν ἄν αὐτὴν. εὑπρεπῆς τις, ὦ θεοί· καὶ πλουσίαν ἐφασάν τινα.

(Ου) αὐτήν ἄν τινι τυχόν;

(Αβρ) οὐκ οἶδ’· ἐπιλαμῆθη γὰρ μεθ’ ἤμων οὐσί ἐκεῖ, εἰτ’ ἐξαπέφη κλάουσα προστρέχει μόνη τίλλουσ’ ἐαυτῆς τὰς τρίχας, καλὸν πάνω καὶ λεπτὸν, ὦ θεοί, ταραντίουσα ὀφθαρά ἀπολογεκύμ. ὁλον γὰρ ἐγεγόνει ῥάκος.

(Ου) καὶ τοῦτον [ἐίχ]εν;

(Αβρ) εἰχ’ ἴσως, ἄλλ’ οὐκ ἐμοὶ ἐδείξεν· οὐ γὰρ ψεύσομαι. ἐπὶ τούτωι δὲν θεό νῦν ἔμοι γ’ οὐνῦν ὡς·

(Ου) τί χρῆ ποιεῖν

(Αβρ) ὀρα σοὶ τοῦτ’· ἐὰν δὲ νοοῦν ἔχης ἔμοι τε πείθη, τοῦτο πρὸς τὸν δεισότ’ ἕναν φανερὸν ποισίς· εἰ γὰρ ἐστ’ ἐλευθέρας, παϊδός, τί τοῦτον λαυθάνειν δεῖ τὸ γεγονός;

(Ου) πρότερον ἐκεῖνην ἄντι τοῦτον ἐκείνων ἠθνότονον, εὔρομεν. ἐπὶ τοῦτω δὲ ἐμοί ὕπον [δ]ρομεί:

(Αβρ) οὐκ ἀν δυναίμην, τὸν ἄδικοντα πρὶν σοφὸς τίς ἔστιν εἴδειν. φοβοῦμαι τοῦτ’ ἐγ’ ὡς, μάτην τι μὴν ἔστιν πρὸς ἐκεῖνας ἀλ’ ἐγώ. τίς ὅτι ἐμοὶ καὶ τοῦτον ἐνέχυρον λαβάτων τότε τις παρ’ αὐτοῦ τῶν παρόντων ἄπεβαλεν ἔτερος; κυβευόν τυχὸν ἰσος εἰς συμβολὰς.
ὑπόθημ᾿ ἔδωκ᾿, ἢ συντιθέμενος περὶ τινὸς περιείλετ᾿, εἰτ᾿ ἔδωκεν ἐτέρα μιρία ἐν τοῖς πότοις τοιαύτα γίνεσθαι φιλεῖ. πρὶν εἰδέναι δὲ τὸν ἀδίκουντ᾿ οὐ βούλομαι ζητεῖν εἰκείνην οὐδὲ μηνύειν ἐγὼ τοιούτοιν οὐδέν.

Οὐ οὐ [κ]άκω[ς] μέντοι λέγεις. τί οὖν ποίησιν τις;

Ἀβρ ϑέας', Ὀνήσιμε, ἂν συναρέση σοι τούμον ἐνυθιμῇ ἅρα. ἐμὸν ποίησομαι τὸ πρᾶγμα τούτ᾿ ἐγώ, τὸν δακτύλιον λαβοῦ[σ]ά τ᾿ εἶσω τοιούτῳ εἰσείμι πρὸς ἐκείνων.

(Οὐ) λέγ᾿ ὦ λέγεις. ἀρτὶ γὰρ νοῶ. (Ἀβρ) κατιδὼν μ᾿ ἔχουσαν ἀνακρινεῖ πόθεν εἰληφά. φήσω «Ταυροπολίοις παρθένος ἦν οὕσα», τὰ τ᾿ ἔκεινη γενόμενα πάντ᾿ ἐμὰ ποιμενὴν· τὰ πλείστα δ᾿ αὐτῶν οἶδ᾿ ἐγώ. ἀριστά γ᾿ ἀνθρώπων.

(Ἀβρ) εἴαν δ᾿ οἰκεῖον ἢι αὐτῷ τὸ πράγμα, ὦν· εὐθὺς ἢ εἰς φερόμενος ἐπὶ τὸν ἐλεγχὸν καὶ μεθύων γε νῦν ἔρει πρότερος ἀπαντᾶ καὶ προπητῶς; ἂ δ᾿ ἄν λέγη προσομολογήσω τοῦ διαμαρτεῖν μηδὲ ἐν προτέρα λέγουσ᾿.

(Οὐ) ὑπέρευγε, νὴ τὸν Ἡλίουν. (Ἀβρ) τὰ κοινὰ ταυτὶ δ᾿ ἀκκιοῦμαι τῶι λόγῳ τοῦ μὴ διαμαρτεῖν «ὡς ἀναιδὴς ἦσθα καὶ ἱταμός τις».

(Οὐ) εὔγε. (Ἀβρ) «κατέβαλες δὲ μ᾿ ὡς σφόδρα. ἱματία δ᾿ οἱ ἀπώλεσ᾿ ἢ τάλαιν ἐγὼ» φῆσω. πρὸ τοῦτο δ᾿ ἐνδόθαν αὐτὸ βούλομαι λαῖβοσα κλαῦσαι καὶ φιλῆσαι καὶ πόθεν ἐλα[βεν ἐρώταν τὴν ἔχουσαν.

Οὐ Ὡράκλεις.


65
τὸ πέρας δὲ πάντων, «παιδίου τοίνυν» ἔρω
«eos τί γεγονός σοι», καὶ τὸ υἱὸν εὐρημένον
dεῖξο. 535

πανούργος καὶ κακοῦθως, Ἀβρότονον. (Ou)

ἀγυ δ’ ἔξετασθή ταῦτα καὶ φανῇ πατήρ
ὁυ οὐτος αὐτοῦ, τὴν κόρην ζητήσομεν
κατὰ σχολήν. (Aβρ)

ἐκεῖνο δ’ οὐ λέγεις, ὅτι
ἐλευθέρα γίνη σοῦ τοῦ γὰρ παιδίου
μητέρα σε νομίσας λύσετ’ εὐθὺς δηλιδῆ. 540

οὐκ οἴδα: βουλοίμην δ’ ἂν. (Ou)

οὐ γὰρ οἴδα οὐ; (Ou)

ἀλλ’ [ἡ] χάρις τίς, Ἀβροτονον, τούτων ἑμοί;
νὴ τῆς θεός, π[άν]των γ´ ἐμαυτῆ β’ αὐτίνων
ηγήσομαι τούτων. (Aβρ)

ἐὰν δὲ μηκέτι
ζητῆς ἐκεῖνην ἐξεπίτηδες, ἀλλ’ ἔας
παρακοπουσμένη με, πᾶς τὸ τοιοῦθ’ ἔξει; 545

τάλαν,

τίνος ἐνεκεν; παίδων ἐπιθυμεῖν σοι δοκῶ;
ἐλευθέρα μόνον γενοῦμη, ὁ θεός.
τοῦτον λάβοι[μ]ι μισθὸν ἐκ τούτων. (Αβρ)

λάβοις. (Ou)


συναρέσκει διαφόρως; 550

ἀν γὰρ κακοθεύσῃ, μαχοῦμαι σοι τότε;
δυνῆσομαι γὰρ, ἐν δὲ τῶι παρόντι υἱὸν
ἰδῶμεν ἐκ τούτ’ ἔστιν.

οὐκοῦν συνδοκεῖ; (Ou)

μάλιστα. (Ou)

τῶν δακτύλιον ἀποδίδου ταχύ, (Αβρ)

λάμβανε. (Ou)

φίλη Πειθοῖ, παροῦσα σύμμαχος
ποίει καταρθοῦν τοὺς λόγους ύψος ἐκ τοῦ ὑψοῦ
τοποστικὸν τὸ γύναιον. ὡς ἰδιοθῆ οἴτι
κατὰ τὸν ἐρωτ’ οὐκ ἐστ’ ἐλευθερίας τουχεῖν
ἀλλός δ’ ἀλλεργεῖ, τὴν ἐτέραν πορευέσται.
ὁδόν. ἀλλ’ ἐγὼ τὸν πάντα δουλεύσω χρόνον, λεύφος, ἀπόπληκτος, οὐδαμῶς προνοητικός τὰ τοιαῦτα. παρά ταύτης δ’ ἱσως τι λήψομαι, ἂν ἐπιτύχῃ καὶ γὰρ δίκαιον. ὡς κενά καὶ διαλογίζομ’ ὁ κακοδαιμὼν, προσδοκῶν χάριν κομιεῖται παρὰ γυναικός· μὴ μόνον κακὸν τι προσλάβομι, νῦν ἐπισφαλῇ τὰ πράγματ’ ἐστὶ τὰ περὶ τὴν κεκτημένην· ταχέως ἐὰν γὰρ εὑρεθῇ πατρός κόρη ἐλευθέρου μήτρη τοῦ νῦν παιδίου γεγονυῖ’, ἐκείνην λήμψομαι ταύτην [ἰςως εὐθὺς κελεύσας αὐτόν ἀπολείπειν. δὴ[κεις καὶ νῦν χαριέντως ἐκκενεύκειν δο[κῶ τώ μη δι’ ἐμ[0]ὐ ταυτι κυκάθα. χαρί[ς τὸ πολλά πράττειν· ἄν δὲ τις λάβῃ μ’ ἐτι περιεργασάμενον ἢ λαλῆσαι’ ἐκτείνη]

διδοῦ / ἡμαῖστα τοῦς — ἄλλ’ ὁδι

(Σμ) *ἐξῆλ[θον ἀσωτ[] ἡ πόλις

ὅλη χαρ’ ἀδείει τὸ κακὸν, εὐθὺς [δη

πίνειν [ιὼν
τούνομ[α- ψ]αλτρίας
ζήν αὐτό, [Ης ἐφη 590
πλέον ἡμ[ερών
αὐτὸν διαλλ[ένον.
οἶμοι τάλιας [Η
κοινώνο[ή
προσήλθ[έγω 595

οἴμοι ταλαί[α
κοινω[ή
προσῆλθ[έγω 595
øτε τὴν [ημ[ερῶν
πυθαν[ηπά]τησε με
φιλαρ[γυρ-

ευα... [.] ἀπλούν
] και ψάλτρια[κάποιοι συνεχέως, κύβοι τυχόν
]. λα χαιρέτω.

(?Kar) πολλῶν ἐγὼ
[ων ἐκπαθήμην
]. φαίνο ... 605
[η μοι μόνη
]ν εἶναι στά[σιν

.................................

οὐδεις...[,]έτερος υμῖν.

(Σμ) ποικίλον

(Kar) ἀριστον ἀριστάρθειν.

ω τρισάθλιος 610
ἐγὼ κατὰ πολλά, νῦν μὲν οὖν οὐκ οἰδ᾿ ὁπως
d[ια]σκεδάς
[π[[μαγείρου [τί]ς τύχη
,. ν[.]ε.σ. [.]... καριας. 615

Σμ [ις τινος 615

.................................

.................................

κα[ μ]ενον 620
Σμ Χα[ρισι- τῆς ψαλ]τρίας: 621
Καρ νῦ[ν 
μηθύουσι.
(Σμ) ]άρα γ'ε
[?Καρ] ο[ }
(Σμ) ο[ }
(Καρ) πέ[μπειν ἴνα 625
. ]
α[ ]
ε[ ]
ε[п]
ὁ Ἱρ[άκλεις] ἀπίωμ[εν
(Χαι) νή τ]όν Ἡλιον
. ]
πρώην αρ[ ]
ἔγωγ᾿ ἀπολ[ ]
(Σμ) έπειτα δ[ ]
(Χαι) λαβόντ᾿ ἁ[ ]
(Σμ) Χαρισι- τό . [ ]
Σμ ύμων ἐταίρος οὔτος [ ±8 ] προ[ ]
παιδάριον ἐφ κόρης [ ]ς γνώσις[αι ]
προσο[ . . . . . ] ... [ ]μένη τούτο [ ]
(Χαι) παρ... [ ]τω πάθω | 
ένε[ ] , ει , καὶ μάλα 650
(Σμ?) [ ] ον ἐπάγεται.
(Χαι) [ ] οδύνηροι βίου
[ ] , το του δυστυχος 655
Σμ [ ] τ'ὸν δυστυχη | 
τοῦτο[ν, μὰ τ]όν Διό[νυσον] ἀλλ' ἵκως ἕγω 655 
πολυπραγμονῶ [πλείω] τε τῶν πατριών ποῦ, 
κατὰ λόγον ἔξον ἀπείνας τὴν θυγατέρα 
λαβόντα. τοῦτο μὲν πολιήσω καὶ σχέδων 
δεδογμένον μοι τυγχάνει. 
μαρτύρομαι 
ὑμᾶς δ' ὀμό[πασι, Χ]αιρέστρατ', [ ].....[ ] 660
μὲν δ' ἄνω .[.]— ἐπέμψα.[ ]
<Χαι> θυγατέρα τη[ν] σὴν λαμβάν , [ ]
ἀνάξι' ἠμῶν [ ± 9 ] ... [ ]
Σμ ... 
μηδὲ λέγε. τ[.... , λ]έγων π[ ]
καὶ περιβόητον πάσιν ἀνθρώποις 'ποῦν'.
αὐτόν, ἀκρατής καὶ τοῦτο δη τὸ λεγόμενον 
ἡττων ἑαυτοῦ, πορνιὸν παρανοικίω 
ἕαυτον οὖτω παραδέδωκεν,[ ]
[—c. seven lines missing—] 665
[ ] . [ ] [ ] . [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]
Τ M
[Σμ] μισεῖ τόν ἡδύν λεγόμενον τοῦτον βίου; 680
ἐπινεμέτα τῆ[ν] διεύ̣νος, εἰχεν ἑστέρας 
[ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]
Τ L


(Xαι) μῆτω, Σμ[ικ]ρίνη.


Χαι οὔθ' ἐκεῖνος οίεται.

Σμ ὑψιλός ὃν τις αὐτὸς ὁ σῶμα ὑμόδεται: καταφθαρεὶς τ' ἐν ματρυλεῖω τὸν βίον, μετὰ τῆς καλῆς γυναικὸς ἦν ἐπεισάγει! 695


ΧΟΡΟΥ

Act Four

Σμ οὐκ οἶδα τούτων τῶν κακῶν ἀλλὰν λύσιν ἀλλ' ἄπιενα δεῖ, Παμφίλη· τοῖς ἐμφρόσιν

μί᾿ ἐστὶν ἄρετὴ τὸν ἀτόπον φεύγειν ἀεί.

ΠΑΜΦΙΛΗ

πάντα, τί τούτ᾿ ἔστ᾿ [ 705

(Σμ) [ταύτ᾿ ὄνος]

σκιὰς σχολὴ γὰρ ἐ[ . . . . . . . . . ]

(Πα) τάμφιβόλα δεῖ[ται φροντίδος πολλῆς ἀεί.]

(Σμ) πάλαι προτεί[νω σοι]

(Πα) ύπερ ὑ[έ] μο[υ] τοῦθ᾿ [ 710 — Μ M

[— gap of 2 lines —]

άλλ᾿ εἰ με σωζόνων τοῦτο μὴ πείσας ἐμὲ,

(Σμ) λόγου δε δεῖ[ται ταῦτα καὶ συμπείσως;

(Πα) ὑπὲρ ἐμοῦ τοῦθ᾿[ ὡς τις ἀλλότριος λέγεις/ε.α.προτείνωσοι τὰ λῶιστα, Παμφίλη.]

(Σμ) ὑπὲρ δ᾿ ὕπο τοῦθ᾿ [ 715 — Τ C

[— gap of about 24 lines —]

τὴν πολυτέλειαν. Θεσμοφόρια δὶς τίθει,

Σκίρα δὶς· τὸν ὀλθρὸν τοῦ βίου καταμάνθανε.

τούτοις ὀδυνήσει, περιμενεῖς πανυχίον· ὅ δὲ πίνει μετ᾽ ἐκέλευσις δὴ λαβὴ
eυ... ἵς ἐξῆλθε
*διαν... υκτερεύει πάντ[...]
... σοι βουλο[μ...]
... λοι[...]

τὸ γαρ προδιδομένη τούτο παντὶ τῶι λόγῳ
tο γ’ [ου]δεν ἀκοῦσαι σοῦ ποτ’ ἄν.
καὶ, [πάτε]ρ, ἐμὴν γνώμην λέγειν πεπλασμένην
χρὴ[πι]ρ [πάντων, ὅ τι [π’ οθ’ ἄρχεται συμφέρειν,]
[Ἀς· λυσιτέλη] καὶ γὰρ φρονεῖν εἰ κύριος

754 in. τούτοις Guéraud: τούτ’ οἶδ’ Sudhaus περιμενεῖς Wilamowitz: περιμένεις
Guéraud fin. πανυχίον Guéraud, ὅλην Furley: πολυν χρόνον Wilamowitz: πάλιν
vid. supra καθ’ ἡμέραν Gronewald ap. Römer 787 vid. supra 788 ἐνέγκας εβαὶ
791 σὺ γε Furley: αὐ δὲ Gronewald 792 γαμετής Gronewald κατακεκλαμένης
Furley (vid. supra): κατακεκλαμένης Handley: κατακεκλαμένης Römer 793 ἐνταῦθα
Gronewald 794–796 (→μᾶλλον) cf. testimonia 796 αἰσχρῶν ἀπεται iam Turner
797 ἐξίς καλῶς Gronewald sine punct. ap. Römer (ἐξει καλῶς) Römer 798 εἴρηκεναι
Gronewald 799 ἐρῶ Furley: πά[πε]ρ Römer 800 τὸ γ’ Furley: τοῦ [θ’ Römer, οὐδὲν
iam Gronewald 801 καὶ, πάτερ Römer (πάτερ iam Gronewald) πεπλασμένην
Turner: πεπλακαίς με γὰρ Gronewald ap. Römer 802 χρῆ περὶ α- Furley: ἂεὶ περὶ vel
ἐχῶ περὶ Gronewald: δὲ περὶ ἀπάντων iam Austin 803 in. ὃς λυσιτελὴ e.g. Furley:
ἡ κάφελη (i.e. καὶ αφρο-) vel ὃ μὴ ἄφη Gronewald: ἂεὶ δ’ ἀφ’ Austin fin. κύριος
Furley (ἐνδικοσ olim): εὐπορος K-G: οὐ κακὴ Gronewald

73
καλῶς ἔχει μοι τουτ[ ]
ei ὅτι ἔστ᾿ ἀδηλον τουτ[ ]
tαῦτ᾿ εἰς τοιαύθ᾿ ἡξου[ ]
άλλ᾿ ἐκβαλεῖ μέ; τώι Χα[ ]
αἰ-σ-θῆσετ᾿ εύνουν οὖσ[ ]
tιμῶν ἐκείνην e [ ]
... ὁν ἡρ ἀπο[ ]
όραι τὸ χεῖρον ραίδίως [ ]
[ἡ]μᾶς ἐκείνη διαβ[ ]
[ ἐκ] [θεν δι[α]λλη[ ]
[— gap of 17 or 18 lines perhaps containing fr. 8 —]

Fr. 8 K.-Th.

Fr. 8. Σ Eur. Phoen. 1154. τύφεσθαι ἐστὶ τὸ τοὺς ὀρθολυμοὺς συγκεχύσθαι. Μένανδρος

ἐξέτύφην μὲν οὖν
κλαίουσ᾿ ὁλωσ

ἐν Ἐπιτρέπουσιν

(Ἀβρ) [τὸ παιδίον]

ἐξειμ᾿ ἑξουσα· κλαμυμοἱ[ζ]εται, τάλαν,
pάλαι γάρ· οὐκ οἴδ᾿ ὅτι κακὸν πέπονθέ μοι.

(Πα) τίς ὁν θεῶν τάλαιναν ἐλησείε με;

Ἀβρ ό φίλτατον [παιδάριον], ἤψει μητ[έ]ρα;
καὶ [γάρ]ρ [ ]

(Πα) πορεύομαι.

(Ἀβρ) μικρόν, γυναί, πρόσμεινον.

(Πα) ἐμὲ καλεῖς;

(Ἀβρ) ἐγὼ.

ἐναντίον βλ[ε]π᾿.

[Πα] [ἡ μ]ε γισύσκεις, γυναί;


75
(Αβρ) αὕτη ἡ στίν ἦν ἐξ[ρ]ακα: χαίρε, φιλτάτη. 860
(Πα) τίς δ’ εἶ σὺ:

[Αβρ] [χεί]ρα δεύρῳ μοι τὴν οῆν δίδουν. λέγε μοι, γλυκεία, πέρῳ̣ν ἤλθες ἐπὶ θέαν τοῖς Ταυροπολίοις ἐ[ν γυναίξι] — —

(Πα) γύναι, πόθεν ἐχεῖς, εἰπέ μοι, τὸ παιδί[ῖ]ν λ]αβούσα;

(Αβρ) ὁράς τι, φιλτάτη, σοι γνώριμον ἤν τοῦτ᾿ ἔχεις; μηδὲν με δείσῃς, ὦ γύναι.

(Πα) ὅποι εἰς τούτ’ ἔχεις; ὡς μὲν δὲν ἔοικ’ ἐγὼ γαρ βοήσας?

(Πα) ὡς τίς δ’ ἔστιν πατρός;

(Αβρ) Χαρισίου.

(Πα) τοῦτ᾿ οἶσθ᾿ ἀκριβῶς, φιλτάτη;

(Αβρ) εὐ ὁ ἢ[γγυγ’]· ἀλλ’ ὦ σὲ τὴν νῦμφῃν ὁρῶ τὴν ἐνδον οὖσαν:

(Πα) ναιχί.

(Αβρ) μακαρία γύναι, θεῶν τις υμᾶς ἠλέησε. — τὴν βύραν τῶν γειτῶν τῆς ἐνσεληκτὲς ἐξιον.

[Πα] ἔοικ’ οδ’ ἀπομαίνεθ᾿ ὧντὸν ἀληθῶς· μαίνεται, νὴ τοὺς θεούς.

Ον ὑπομαίνεθ’ οὖτος, νὴ τὸν Ἀπόλλω, μαίνεται μεμάνθῃ ἄλληθος· μαίνεται, νὴ τῶν βους,

τὸν δεσπότην λέγω Χαρίσιον. χολὴ ἀντὶς εἰκάσει χρόνον διακύπτων ἐνθρεπτωμένος, ὁ πατήρ δὲ τῆς υἱῆς τι περὶ τοῦ πράγματος ἐλάλει πρὸς ἐκεῖνην, ως ἐσιχ’, ὦ δ’ οία μὲν 

ὦ γλυκυτάτη δὲ «τῶν λόγων οἵους λέγεις» ἀνέκραγε, τὴν κεφαλὴν τ᾿ ἄνεπάταξε σφόδρα αὐτοῦ. πάλιν δὲ διαλιπῶν, «οἶαν λαβῶν γυναῖχ᾿ ὁμέλεος ἠτύχηκα.» τὸ δὲ πέρας, ὡς πάντα διακοόσας ἀπῆλθ᾿ εἰσῶ ποτε, βρυχηθμός ἔνδου, τιλμός, ἔκστασις συχνή.

«γράφν δὲ Ἀλιτήριος σπύνοι πάνω ἔλεγεν· «τοιοῦτον ἔργον ἐξειργασμένος αὐτὸς γεγονὼς τε παιδίου νόθου πατήρ οὐκ ἔσχον οὐδ᾿ ἔδωκα συγγνώμης μέρος οὐθὲν ἀτυχούσῃ ταύτ᾿ ἐκείνη, βάρβαρος ἀνηλεής τε.» λοιδορεῖ τ᾿ ἐρρωμένος αὐτῷ βλέπει τ᾿ ὑφαίμον ἀτυχούσῃκαὶ ποῖ τράπωμαι γ᾿; εἰς τί βουλῆς; οἶχομαι. ἀπόλωλα· τὴν θύραν πέπληξεν ἐξιών· Ζεὺς οὐτερ, εἶπερ ἐστὶ δυσαντον, οὐδὲξε με.

ΧΑΡΙΣΙΟΣ

ἐγὼ τις ἄναμάρτητος, εἰς δόξαν βλέπων καὶ τὸ καλὸν ὦτι τότ᾿ ἔστι καὶ ταῖσχρόν σκόπων, ἀκέραιος, ανεπίπληκτος αὐτὸς τῶι βίωι—

εὐ μοι κέχρηται καὶ προσηκότως πάνω τὸ δαιμόνιον—ἐνταύθ᾿ ἐδείξεις ἀνθρώπος ᾧν. «ὦ τρισκακόδαιμων, μεγάλα φυσάς καὶ λαλεῖς, ἀκούσιον γυναικὸς ἀτύχημι οὐ φέρεις, αὐτὸν δὲ δείξω σ᾿ εἰς ὄμοι ἐπτακότα, καὶ χρῆσται αὐτῇ σοι τότ᾿ ἡπίως, σὺ δὲ ταύτην ἀτιμάζεις· ἐπιδειχθήσει θ᾿ ἄμα ἄτυχης σκαιὸς καὶ σκαιὸς ἀγνώσιοι τ᾿ ἀνήρ.» ὡμοία γ᾿ εἰπεν οῖς οὐ διενδόου τότε πρός τὸν πατέρα, κοινοῦνος ἤκειν τοῦ βίου.
ἔπειτα δ᾿ οὐ δεῖν τάτυχημ’ αὐτῆν φυγεῖν
tὸ σοµβλέβη[η]κός, οὐ δὲ τις ύψηλὸς σφόδρα

βάρβαρος
ο[ῦ]ν ταύτηι σοφῶς

Τῶν δαίμόνων τις; ὁ δὲ πατήρ
χαλέ[π]ῶστατ’ αὐτήι σχῆσεται. τί δὲ μοι πατρός;
ἐρ[ε]ώς διαρρήδην «ἐµοί σὺ, Σιμκρίνη,
µη] πάρεχε πράγματ’ οὐκ ἁπολείπει µ’ ἡ γυνῆ.
τί συνταράττεις καὶ βιάζῃ Παµφίλην;»—
τ]ί ο’ αὐ βλέπω ᾑγώ;

Ου

πάνυ κακῶς ἔχω σφόδρα,
ο[ῦ]µοι τάλας, καὶ σο[ῦ δ]έοµαι τούτοις, [φίλη,
µη µ’ ἐγκαταλίπης.

<Χαρ> ούτος ἐπακροῶμε[ν]ος

ἔστι εἰρόουλεί, µου;
[Ου]

[µ]ὰ τούς θεούς,

[Χαρ] άλλος ἀρτίως ἐξῆλθον.

[Χαρ] ἔσται σε πρα... µια... η[ς]

πάντι ἐπακροάσει;

Ου

ποτ... οὐθ[]

ἐγώ σε λαυθάνειν πον[]

βροντῶντα.

Χαρ

δια... ἐ[]

Αβρ

αλλ’ οὐθὲν όφθησ[ε]

Χαρ

τις εἰς... αὐ... εἰς...

Αβρ

οὐκ αἰς[θ]α[ν]ηί;

Χαρ...

Αβρ

οὐκ ἢν ἐµ[ν] τὸ π[α]ίδιον]

Χαρ

οὐκ ἢν ὁ[ν];

(Αβρ) βούλει μ᾽ ἀπί[
(Χαρ) ἀλλ᾽ ἔξεστὶνης
(??) ἐμ᾽ ἐπρ[‐
(??) 
(Χαρ) τί φῆς, Ὀν[ήσιμ᾽], ἔξεπειράθη[τέ μου:
(Ου) αὐτῇ μ᾽ ἔπεισε, νὴ τὸν Ἀπόλλω [καὶ θε]οὺς.
(Χαρ) καὶ σὺ μὲ περιστάσις, ἱεροσυλε;
(Αβρ) μὴ μάχου,
γλυκύτατε· τής γαμητῆς γυναικὸς ἐστὶ σου
toutι γ[ά]ρ, οὐκ ἀλλότριον.
(Χαρ) ei γάρ ὀφελεν.
(Αβρ) νὴ τήν φίλην Δήμητρα.
(Χαρ) τίνα λόγου λέγεις:
(Αβρ) τίνα; τὸν ἀληθῆ.
(Χαρ) Παμφιλῆς τὸ παιδίον:
*ἀπρ᾽ οὐκ] ἐμὸν;
(Αβρ) καὶ σὸν γ᾽ ὀμοίως.
(Χαρ) Παμφιλῆς:
Αβρότοι]ου ικε[τ]εύω σε, μ[ή] μ᾽ ἀναπτέρου
[— (gap of 10-13 lines) —]
]αι γάρ . [
(Αβρ) πῶς ἐγώ, τάλαν,
(Χαρ) τὴν μητέρ᾽ έξήτοιν γε πριν πάντ᾽ εἰδέναι;
(Χαρ) ὅρθως λέγεις,
ο μοι:
ἀβέλτερε
ὁμώς
τοιοῦτο δὴ
] βούλομαι
ματα.

[XOROY]
Act Five

[?Χαί] εἰμενον

ταύτη[.] ]οϲ[ 980


οπουδήθι δὲ καὶ παιδάριον ἢδ’ | ἔτεκεν τρόπος ἐλευθερος. πάξ. μή βλεπ’ εἰς τ[ὴν] ψάλτραν.

καὶ πρῶτον αὐτὴν κατὰ μόνα[ς] τὸν φίλα[τ]ον καὶ τὸν γυ[λ]κύτατον [ον

[— gap of approximately ten lines —]

... ]ιτρε[.] , καλ[ 1000

eῦ τὸ καλὸν , [ ὁστέρ λύκ[ος χανὼν γέ, φαοὺ, διὰ κενῆς ἀπεληλυθ].

ἀποστ[ 1005

φιλο[ ό[ 1010

δια[ 1015

οὐ κρί[ καὶ[ 1020

ὅσα μ[ 1025

ἡν μο[ 1030

ἐνδον πο[ 1035

ἔοικεν: οὐ[ 1040

.. ]οϲπ[ [— gap of max. 4 lines —]
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ἐπ’ αὐτὸ [ δυτως , β] ἀλλ’ ἐξαπατ[ ἀπέσωσε συ , [ ἑγὼ δ[ε] προς[ αν [— gap of between 10-14 lines —]

[— gap of max. 4 lines —]

ἀπα[τωμένου: τ]ῶν Διὰ [αὐτοῦ τῶι σφόδρα] ὡς ὁμολογῶ: [εἰ]ς ἐμὲ βλέπει [ ... [ ... ] αἰε . . . [— gap of max. 3 lines —]

[?Χαί] σωφρονα· τοιαυτηι γὰρ οὐκ ἀπέσχετ’ ἂν ἐκεῖνος, εὖ τοῦτ’ οἶδε’ ἐγὼ δ’ ἀφέξομαι.

1019 [Ἀ]βρότον Lefebvre, Guéraud  1021 συλλαβοῦσα Sudhaus
Σμ ἂν μὴ κατάξω τὴν κεφαλὴν σου, Σωφρόνη, κάκιστ᾿ ἀπολοίμην. νουθετήσεις καὶ σὺ με; προπετῶς ἀπάγω τὴν θυγατέρα, ἱερὸς χαλκός ή τὸν θρηστὸν αὐτῆς ἄνδρα καὶ λόγους λέγω περὶ τῶν ἔμαυτοῦ; ταῦτα συμπείθεις με σύ; οὐκ ὀξυλαβῆσαι κρεῖττον; οἴμωξέ με μακρά, ἂν ἐξιτι λαλῆσις. τί; κρίνομαι πρὸς Σωφρόνην: «μετάπεισον αὐτὴν, ὅταν ἰδῆς,» σύ τι μοι ἄγαθόν γένοιτο—Σωφρόνη γάρ, οἴκαδε ἄπιστον—τό τέλμι' εἴες παριοῦσ᾿;—ἐνταῦθα σὲ τὴν νῦκτα βαπτίζων ὅλην ἀποκτενῶ, καὶ γώ σε ταῦτ᾽ ἐμοὶ φρονεῖν ἀναγκάσω καὶ μή στασίζων τις. παῖδες, παιδίον: ἀνοιξάτω τις. παῖδες, σὺχ ὑμῖν λέγω; ὅ τις ἐσθ᾽ ὁ κόπτων τὴν θύραν; οὕτωτι μοι ἄγαθόν γένοιτο—Σωφρόνη γάρ, ὡς ἔγωγε, τρισκατάρατε. καὶ μάλα ὀρθῶς: λογιστικοῦ γάρ ἄνδρός καὶ σφόδρα φρονοῦντος ἡ στουδῆ, τό θ′ ἀρπασμ' Ἡράκλεις, ἄκαθον ὡς τοῦ τὸν τρόπον συν. ἂς τὸς θεοὺς ἄγειν σχολὴν—ὅταν ἦν τὸ κακὸν καὶ τάγαθον καθ᾽ ἡμέραν νέμειν ἑκάστωι, Σμικρίνη; πῶς: λέγεις γὰρ ἐπίπον ὁμῶν ταῦτος σιδερέων; ὅκατον ἦν τὸν τρόπον συν. λέγεις δὲ τί: σαφῶς διδάξω σοί, εἰςοι σαί πᾶσαι πόλεις, ὅμοιον εἴπειν, χίλιαι τρισμύριοι οἰκοῦν ἐκάστην. καθ᾽ ἔνα τΟῦΤΟΙΝ ἔνοικοι ἔκαστον ἐπιτρίβουσιν ἢ σώζουσι; πώς: λέγεις γὰρ ἐπίπον τιν' αὐτοὺς ζῷον [βιόν]. οὐκ ἄρα φρον[τί]ζουσιν ἡμῶν [οί] ἡθοί, φήσεις: ἐκάστωι τῶν τρόπων συν[izzlyan 1065 ἀλλαπεριμένω C; corr. Croener: ἀλλ' ἡ περι- Wilamowitz 1069 Coppola: λαλῆσις τι. al.: τί κρίνομαι Lefebvre: τί κρίνομαι al. 1070 ἰδῆς C 1072 ἰδες C 1074 σε: σοι C, corr. von Armin 1082 στουδῆ C 1083 deest interpunctio 1091 Lefebvre 1092 von Armin 1093 suppl. Sudhaus 82
φρούραρχον· οὗτος ἑυδήλεξης ἐγκείμενος ἐπέτριψεν, ἂν αὐτῶι κακῶς χρησώμεθα, ἐπεροῦ δ᾽ ἑσσοσεν. οὗτὸς ἑσθ᾽ ἡμῖν θεὸς ο ὑ ᾗ θίτος καὶ τοῦ καλῶς καὶ τοῦ κακῶς πράττειν ἐκάστωι· τούτων ἱλάσκουπο μηδὲν ἄτοπον μὴ ἀμαθῆς, ἵνα πράττηις καλῶς.

εἴθ᾽ οὐμός, ἱερόσυλε, νῦν τρόπος ποεῖ ἀμαθῆς τι; 1095

(Σμ) οὗτος ἐγκείμενος
tίς παρρησίας.
(Σμ) ἄλλ᾽ ἀπαγαγεῖν παρ᾽ ἀνδρὸς αὐτοῦ θυγατέρα ἀγαθόν οὐ κρίνεις, Σμικρίνη;
(Σμ) λέγει δὲ τίς τούτ᾽ ἀγαθόν; ἄλλα νῦν ἀναγκαῖον.
(Ου) θεάι;
(Σμ) τὸ κακὸν ἀναγκαίον λογίζεθ᾽ οὐ[τ]οι.
(Ου) τούτων τις ἄλλος, οὕς ὁ τρόπος, ἀπολλυει; καὶ νῦν μὲν ὄρμωντ᾽ ἐπὶ πονηρῶν πράγμα σε ταύτων μοι ἰσοσκελεῖ, καὶ καταλαμβάνεις διαλλαγάς λύσεις τ᾽ ἐκείνων τῶν κακῶν. αὕτης δ᾽ ὅπως μὴ λήψομαι σε, Σμικρίνη, προπετῇ λέγω σοι; νῦν δὲ τῶν ἕγκλημάτων ἀφεῖς σοι πρὸς τῶν, τὸν δὲ ἰσοσκελεί τὸν λαβὼν πρόσει περιμένει.

(Σμ) ἅγαιρισθώσι, μαστιγία;
(Ου) παχύδερμος ἁθανατί αὐτὸ σὺ, νοῦν ἐχειν δοκῶν. οὕτως ἐτίθεις παῖδ᾽ ἐπίγαμον; τοιγαροῦν τέρασιν ὁμοία πεντάμηνα παιδία ἐκτρέφομεν. 1100

(Σμ) οὐκ οἴδ᾽ ὁ τι λέγεις.
(Ου) ἢ γραφᾶς δὲ γε οἴδ᾽, ὡς ἐγώμαι· τότε γὰρ οὐμός δεσπότης τοῖς Ταυροπολίοις—
(Σμ) Σωφρόνη—
(Ου) ταύτην λαβὼν
(Σμ) χορῶν ἀποσπασθείσαι—

αἰσθάνει γε; νη, 1120

υψί δ' ἀναγνωρισμὸς αὐτοῖς γέγονε καὶ ἀπαντ' ἀγαθά.

τί φησιν, ιερόσυλε γραῦ; 1125

«ἡ φύσις ἐβούλεθ', ἢ νόμων οὐδὲν μέλει; γυνῇ δ' ἐπ' αὐτῶι τοίδ' ἐρυ.»

μῶρος εἶ: 1130

τραγικὴν ἔρων οἱ ῥήσιν εἰς Ἀὐγής ὅλην ἄν μή ποτ' αἰσθη. Σμικρίνη.

οὐ μοι χολὴν [κ]ινεῖς παθαινομένην οὐ γὰρ σφόδρ' οἰσθ' ὅτι οὔτοις λέγει νῦν;

οἴδεν, ο[[δ']',εὐ ἠθ' ὅτι ἠ γραῦ]'ς προτέρα συνήκε.

πάνδεινον λέγεις, 1135

ο[ὐ] γέγονεν εὐτύχημα μεῖζον οὐδὲ ἐν.

εἰ τούτῳ ἄληθες ἐσθ' ὅ λέγεις, τὸ παιδίον ἐκ τῆς γʹσμετῆς γν[αίκος ἄν Χαρίοι]ωι ζ[ήνοιτο.]

ταύτην η[ ±5-6 ] Ἀβρότ]σονον. 1140

τασαί, Σμικρ[ίνη], (traces of six more lines)

1120 αἰσθάνει: C cum paragrapho νη: C: ναι Lefebvre, al: OnesimotribuitLegrand,
Sophronae al. 1121 τινή C, corr. Croenert, al. 1122 απανταταγαθα C, corr. von
Arnim, al. 1124 τί; Smikr. trib. Sudhaus: τιμωροϲει· C cum paragrapho: (Σμ) τί,

μῶρος εἶ: Koerte: toto versum Ones. trib. Sandbach 1126 χολὴ C 1128 -1144
P.Mich. 4801g frr. 1,2,3. in. von Arnim οἴδεν ο[ι] C: οἴδενυ C: οἰδε[ν] iam Guéraud
1129 Sudhaus 0 -1131 Wilamowitz 1132 in. Furley: εἰς ο[lescope] γαμετῆς γυν[αίκος
-ής Furley Σμικρίνη] Nünlist: Ζ] hic et 1138 Σμικρ[ι] M 1137 e.g. Furley
Unplaced Fragments

For the remaining unplaced fragments, whether from papyri or ancient book fragments, see main edition.
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