

W. GEOFFREY ARNOTT

NOTES ON P. ANTINOOPOLIS 55 (FR. COM. ADESP. 1096 KASSEL-AUSTIN)

aus: Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik 128 (1999) 49–53

© Dr. Rudolf Habelt GmbH, Bonn

NOTES ON P. ANTINOOPOLIS 55 (FR. COM. ADESP. 1096 KASSEL–AUSTIN)

1. The order of recto and verso in fragment a

The editor princeps of P. Antinoopolis 55¹ prints the recto of fragment a before the verso, followed by Mette² and others since, even though the ordering of these parchment fragments and the priority in each case of verso or recto are acknowledged to be uncertain³. Logic here, however, indicates that the verso of fr. a must come before its recto, as Webster and Borgogno already noted without positively arguing the case⁴, even though the length of gap between the end of column i of a's verso and the extant lines of column ii of a's recto cannot be certainly established but must be considerable. Each side of an Ant. 55 page seems originally to have contained two columns, so the distance between the end of column i in a's verso (v. 27 K–A) and the beginning of the better preserved portion of column ii in a's recto (v. 10 K–A) amounts to three columns minus seven lines⁵. The original height of the columns in the A. 55 parchment codex is unknown, as is the number of lines in each column, since we have no fragment of Ant. 55 preserved with both top and bottom margins. Fragment b of Ant. 55, however, gives us a minimum figure: it has 20 lines preserved on both recto and verso, and neither side has top or bottom margins. Papyrus codices of the period (such as the Bodmer Menander) average about 50 lines to the column, and Turner has shown⁶ that the St Petersburg parchment codex of Menander's *Phasma* could have had 50 lines in its columns too, though there again we have no complete column with top and bottom margins surviving. This suggests a maximum gap of about 140 lines if the Ant. 55 columns each held 50 lines, and about 80 if they held 30. Since the script of Ant. 55's scribe is very small – about half the size of that in the Codex Sinaiticus – the gap is likely to be nearer to the higher than to the lower figure.

With the size of the gap thus provisionally established, we can now pursue the arguments for placing verso before recto. The first argument is based simply on the logic of dramatic development and congruity. Lines 20–27 of the verso in K–A's numbering reveal two characters on stage who catch sight of a burning altar and a tablet containing a *πρόκλησις* placed upon it – Williams was surely right to

¹ J. B. Barns (with assistance from other scholars), *The Antinoopolis Papyri II* (London 1960) 8–29, with photographs (plates I, II). I append the following bibliography, which is as complete as I can make it:

W. G. Arnott, *Arethusa* 3 (1970) 62; Menander III (Loeb Classical Library, Cambridge Mass. & London), forthcoming (*fabula incerta* 7).

C. Austin, *Gnomon* 39 (1967) 124; *Comicorum Graecorum Fragmenta in Papyris Reperta* (Berlin & New York 1973) 246–51 (no. 242).

A. Borgogno, *Prometheus* 12 (1986) 33–38; *Studi Italiani di Filologia Classica* 5 (1987) 51–61.

R. Kassel and C. Austin, *Poetae Comici Graeci VIII* (Berlin & New York 1995) 408–15 (no. 1096).

K. Latte, *Gnomon* 34 (1962) 152–54.

H. J. Mette, *Menandros Dyskolos* (2nd edition, Göttingen 1961) 60–64; *Lustrum* 10 (1965) 186–91 (*fabula incerta* IV).

C. Préaux, *Chronique d'Égypte* 71–72 (1961) 209–10.

F. H. Sandbach, *Menandri Reliquiae Selectae* (2nd edition, Oxford 1990) 354–55.

E. G. Turner, *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library* 42 (1959) 241–42.

T. B. L. Webster, *Studies in Later Greek Comedy* (2nd edition, Manchester 1970) 207; *An Introduction to Menander* (Manchester 1974) 196–98.

T. Williams, *Rheinisches Museum* 105 (1962) 193–226.

² (1961) 62–63, (1965) 186–87.

³ So first Barns (1960) 8; cf. Borgogno (1987) 51–53, Kassel–Austin (1995) 408.

⁴ Webster (1974) 196, Borgogno (1987) 52–53.

⁵ The interval between column i of fr. a verso and the final seven lines (vv. 10–16 K–A) of column ii of fr. a recto consists of column ii of fr. a recto + column i of fr. a verso + all the lines in column ii of a verso before those final seven lines.

⁶ *Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies* 10 (1969) 311–12.

follow Ockham's razor in assuming that the *πρόκλησις* was written on the tablet, and not a separate item⁷. The remarks of this pair of characters suggest that they have only just come on stage. In this passage the two characters are unidentified, but one is shown to be male (*εὐνοο[ύστατ]ον* 27). The demand by one of them to see the tablet first, and his assertion that he is being driven to distraction (presumably by it: vv. 24–25, 26) may perhaps imply that he is free, and the other person his slave. This assumption is perhaps supported by the former's flattery of the latter at v. 27, since if he is a young man in trouble (and young men in New Comedy are often in trouble), he is more likely to preface a request for the slave's help with such flattery.

When we come to the readable part of the recto – 80 to 140 lines further on, remember, if the verso does precede the recto – a slave named Dromon (v. 13 K–A) and his lovesick young master (v. 16) are on stage together. These are probably, but not certainly, the same two characters as appear on the verso. The young man tells Dromon to act – presumably the nature of that action had been indicated during the gap – and after saying that he has no objection to Dromon's proposals, the young man disappears off stage, leaving Dromon alone and ready to burgeon into a monologue emphasising the problem which he (vicariously for his master, in all probability) faces and the difficulties in the way of its solution. Such monologues were a conventional feature of later comedy – here Williams⁸ was the first perceptively to draw our attention to Plautus *Epidicus* 81–103, *Pseudolus* 394–414 and *Trinummus* 717–28, passages which provide dramatic parallels all the more valuable because the bottom of a column cuts Dromon's monologue off in P. Ant. 55 after a measly four verses. The sequence of imagined events would most probably be (i) Dromon and his master's discovery of a *πρόκλησις* whose message we may guess caused the problem by threatening the young man's hopes of happiness in love, (ii) the young man's consequent panic at this and Dromon's insouciance, then (iii) presumably a long discussion of the problem thrust upon the young man by the *πρόκλησις* and (iv) the slave's willingness to help and suggestion of a scheme whereby the difficulty might be solved. Such a sequence has a dramatic logic which would be removed if one took the recto side of fragment a to precede its verso.

There is also a second but subsidiary argument in favour of the projected sequence. Moschion appears to leave the stage at v. 12, after saying 'Well, if you think this (presumably Dromon's scheme) expedient for yourself, do it! What reason would I have to contradict you?' Dromon is then left alone to deliver his monologue. With the sides of the parchment read the other way round, Moschion's departure and Dromon's monologue about his (vicarious) problem would come some time before the *πρόκλησις* that seems to have been part of that problem had been discovered – and discovered apparently by Dromon and a young master who must then have returned to the stage in the interim. This argument is worth adding to the other, even though it must always be admitted that vv. 17–25 K–A do not specifically identify the two characters involved in the exchanges there as Dromon and his young master.

Before we pass on to discuss why the *πρόκλησις* should create panic in the young man's breast, there is one further consequence to be drawn from placing the verso of fragment a before its recto. This consequence concerns the very mutilated remains of fragment b. The recto of fragment b contains two references to the *γραμματείδιον* (the document: vv. 44, 48), and one reference to the altar (45). Note too that Dromon is addressed here at v. 38. All this at first sight seems to suggest that the recto of fragment b comes just after the discovery of the document on the altar at vv. 22–25. However, a more careful consideration of the physical shapes and their relation to the contents of frs. a and b makes it unlikely that the recto of fr. b comes from the gap between the two sides of fr. a (that is, between vv. 27 and 11 K–A). If one attempts to find a place for fragment b's recto in that gap, it follows that the verso of the same fragment would also have to be inserted in the same gap. That would necessarily involve the introduction of a soldier (who speaks v. 55, according to the abbreviated name in the left margin: see

⁷ (1962) 211–12.

⁸ (1962) 199–200; cf. also Borgogno (1986) 34–35.

section 3 below), and possibly also it would require an absence from the stage of Dromon's young master, if he was identical with the Moschion named at v. 66 in terms that seem to imply he was not then on the stage. A plausible integration of the soldier's presence and Dromon's master's absence into the assumed dramatic developments at this point seems very difficult to envisage. For this reason it is preferable to assume that the recto of fr. b presents a later discussion⁹ about the document on the altar between Dromon and somebody else – probably not his master – while fr. b's verso would come from a scene preceding or following the recto in which the soldier and an unidentified character are involved.

2. The πρόκλησις

The discovered document – doubtless a πρόκλησις written on a waxed or whitened wooden tablet (the γραμματείδιον of vv. 44, 48)¹⁰ – produces, it seems to me, just the sort of problem that New-Comedy dramatists loved to introduce into their plots as blocks to the happy union or reunion of a besotted young man with the girl of his dreams, whether hetaira or free teenager, whether a native of the city where the dramatic action is imagined or from abroad, whether wealthy or poor. The verso of fragment b is severely mutilated, but it mentions in quick succession a daughter (v. 56: probably the same person who has borne a child to an unidentified 'him', v. 58), and an adulterer (59) who may be identical with the Moschion named a little later (66). These details have their own ambiguities, but it is at least possible – though a warning here is needed against pressing the evidence of these mutilated scraps of parchment harder than they will tolerate – that the πρόκλησις which Dromon and his young master found may have been one consequence of a series of events in which the young man was alleged to have fathered a baby on a girl who had either already or subsequently another partner, possibly the soldier involved as a character on this side of fragment b¹¹. Why then should this result in a πρόκλησις?

The extant scraps of this play do not provide a certain answer¹², although they provide enough groundwork to show that the comic dramatist is likely here to have been following current legal practice in Athens. In Attic law a πρόκλησις¹³ often involved a statement sworn on oath, and an altar provided a dramatically appropriate site for both the swearing itself and the deposition afterwards of a document recording the oath¹⁴. Webster¹⁵ was the first to suggest that the πρόκλησις might be connected with the birth of the girl's baby. The girl herself could not bring an action against Moschion or his family, but in a private lawsuit or arbitration initiated by her κύριος (whether her father, the soldier if she had been his wife or partner, or a προστάτης if she was not a free citizen of the town where the staged activities of the play were imagined to occur), the girl could have been required to swear an oath in a πρόκλησις.

It is remarkable that so far nobody to my knowledge has cited in this connection Demosthenes' 39th speech, which was written for a remarkably parallel real-life case brought probably in 348 B.C.¹⁶ There a certain Mantias had a legitimate son by his wife, and allegedly two other sons by another Athenian woman named Plangon, who claimed that Mantias was their father, while he denied paternity. Mantias thereupon made a private arrangement with Plangon, who received a bribe of 30 minae. This arrange-

⁹ Cf. Webster (1974) 196–97.

¹⁰ Cf. F. G. Kenyon, *Books and Readers in Ancient Greece and Rome* (2nd edition, Oxford 1951) 42–43, 92.

¹¹ Cf. Barns (1960) 12–17.

¹² Webster notes that 'the action cannot be reconstructed' (1974, p. 196).

¹³ See especially J. H. Lipsius, *Das Attische Recht und Rechtsverfahren* I (Leipzig 1905) 224 and III (1915) 866–900; A. R. W. Harrison, *The Law of Athens* II (Oxford 1971) 135–36, 150–53; D. M. MacDowell, *The Law in Classical Athens* (London 1978) 242–47; C. Carey and R. A. Reid, *Demosthenes: Selected Private Speeches* (Cambridge 1985), commentary on 54.27; and M. Gagarin in *Symposium 1995: Akten der Gesellschaft für griechische und hellenistische Rechtsgeschichte* 11 (1997) 125–34.

¹⁴ Cf. Williams (1962) 207–21.

¹⁵ (1974) 196.

¹⁶ See especially Carey and Reid (op. cit. in n. 13) pp. 160–68.

ment required Plangon to refuse to swear on oath, when asked to do so in a *πρόκλησις*, that Mantias was the father of Boeotus, one of the two sons. In fact she broke her promise and actually took the oath, swearing then that both her sons were fathered by Mantias.

Demosthenes' speech shows that a woman could be required to swear an oath in a *πρόκλησις* concerning the paternity of her children, and the suggestion that our comic dramatist made the girl of vv. 56–58 inspire panic in Dromon's young master by a similar oath in a similar *πρόκλησις* is obviously attractive. It is just unfortunate that the information supplied by these dramatic fragments does not tell us whom she named as the father – whether Dromon's young master or the soldier, and whether the young master was still in love with the young mother or had now fallen in love with another girl.

3. The play's title

Although these fragments do not contain any ties with previously known quotations from Menander, their language, style, metrics and imaginative quality combine to indicate a common source in one of his plays. So far, however, its title remains a mystery. The first editor of the parchment opted for Menander's *Misogynes*, and Williams for Menander's *Proenkalon*¹⁷, but there are no identifiable links with either play, no solid arguments to support the attributions, and one counter at least to the former suggestion: the absence of any misogynistic character or expressions in the Antinoopolis fragments.

A third suggestion may perhaps be tentatively advanced: Menander's *Thrasyleon*. Admittedly there are no links with known quotations from this play (frs. 181–85 K–A) either, but two small details may point in its direction. Firstly, a speaker in one of the fragments of this play has his name abbreviated in the left margin of v. 55 to either *θρασυ*¹⁸ or *θρασ'*¹⁹. If *θρασ'* is right, the name would most plausibly be filled out to *Thras(on)*, *Thras(onides)* or *Thras(yleon)*, presumably as the name of a soldier. If *θρασυ* is right, however, *Thras(yleon)* is the only available name attested for Menander²⁰. Up to now Menander is not known to have given the same name to different soldiers in different plays. *Thrasonides* was used for the title figure in Menander's *Misoumenos*, while *Thrason* may have been the soldier's name in his *Eunouchos*, unless Terence changed it when adapting that play for his own *Eunuchus*. This makes *Thrasyleon* the most plausible supplement in P. Ant. 55, with the play named after him. Secondly, in one of the essays that he wrote to oppose Epicureanism, Plutarch (Mor. 1095d) referred to *Θρασωνίδα*ς τινὰς καὶ *Θρασυλέοντα*ς (Men. *Thrasyleon* test. ii K–A) *ὄλολυγμοὺς καὶ κροτοθορύβους ποιοῦντας*, 'characters like *Thrasonides* and *Thrasyleon*, with their howls and noisy applause'. Although Plutarch does not mention Menander's name here as the author who invented these celebrated characters, and although the words *κροτοθορύβους* and *ὄλολυγμοὺς* seem to have been introduced into this passage primarily for their Epicurean resonances²¹, it is worth noting that in a very mutilated fr. (b) of our parchment codex (v. 47) some unidentified characters *ὄλο]λύζουσιν*, 'howl'. Could the howlers there have been associates of *Thrasyleon*, and Plutarch have recalled that passage too at Mor. 1095d?

4. Marginalia

20–21. Barns²² rightly takes *ὦ δέσπ[ο]τα* / *Ἄπολλον* here as one expression; for parallels compare *ὦ δέσποτ'* *Ἄγυιεύ* Pherecrates fr. 92, *ὦ δέσποθ'* *Ἐρμῆ* Teleclides fr. 35, *ὦ Διόνυσε δέσποτα* Ar. Ach.

¹⁷ Barns (1960) 12–15, Williams (1962) 223–35; arguments against these attributions are marshalled by Préaux (1961) 209–10, Latte (1962) 152–53, Mette (1965) 191, and Webster (1974) 198.

¹⁸ So J. Rea and P. J. Parsons in Austin (1967) 124 n. 3; cf. K–A ad loc.

¹⁹ So Austin (1973) in his apparatus to v. 55.

²⁰ Cf. Austin (1973) 249.

²¹ Cf. 1117a later in Plutarch's essay, and Epicurus fr. 143 Usener.

²² (1960) p. 28. Cf. also Williams (1962) 208–09.

257, ὦ δέσποτ' ἄναξ . . . Ἄηρ Nub. 264, ὦ Λύκε δέσποτα Vesp. 389, ὦ δέσποθ' Ἑρμῆ Pax 385, 648, 711, ὦ Ζεῦ δέσποτα Lys. 940, κισσοφόρε Βάκχειε δέσποτ' Thesm. 988, δέσποτα . . . Βάκχε Eur. fr. 477, δέσποτα δέσποτα . . . ὦ Βρόμει Βρόμει Eur. Bacch. 582. Apollo is addressed simply as δέσποτ' in Men. Sam. 448, as (ὦ) δέσποτ' ἄναξ in Men. Leukadia 15 Arnott = Leuk. fr. 1 K–A and Ar. Vesp. 875.

23. Barns writes that γε 'should, as Lloyd-Jones points out, almost certainly be emended to τε; so also Webster'²³, but γε can in fact be defended as focussing attention on a single idea – here the presence of a recently kindled fire²⁴.

25. Under this verse the manuscript has a paragraphus, together with a dicolon before but not after γραμματείδιον. Yet in the discussion at this point between young master and slave (? Dromon, as in vv. 10–12), the slave appears to be presented as the more aware character but down to earth, and the master as excitable but still authoritative. Consequently it is tempting to assign vv. 24 and 25 as far as τοῦτο to the master, then just γραμματείδιον in v. 25 to the slave (in response to his master's question), and θεο[ί] με νοῦ κενοῦσιν in v. 26 to the master.

72. οὐ]τως?

86. Editors have universally printed Lloyd-Jones' and Webster's supplement <τὸ> τρίτον²⁵; in proposing it Lloyd-Jones noted the presence of the same error, corrected by Bentley, in a similar sequence of three at Menander fr. 120.3 K–A. Even so, an alternative supplement is equally possible: τρίτον <δ'>; for the use of τρίτον δέ without the article in such sequences cf. e.g. Eur. Hipp. 393–402, Pl. Resp. 2.358c, Diod. Sic. 4.59.2–4.

113–15. Austin's comment²⁶ here on these badly mutilated lines well defines the problem: 'utrum hic adventus chori ebriorum adulescentium in fine Actus I . . . an catervae iuvenum domum puellae per vim expugnantorum . . . nuntietur non constat'. It may, however, be worth noting that announcements of the chorus' arrival at the end of first acts elsewhere in later Greek comedy never use a future tense such as ἥξουσ' here, but always the present: ὀρῶ . . . προσιών Alexis fr. 112.1–2, προσιώντα . . . ὀρῶ Men. Asp. 246–48, προσιώντας . . . ὀρῶ Dysk. 230–31, ἔρχεθ' Epir. 170, προσέρχεται Pk. 191, προ]σιόντας . . . ὀρῶ fr. com. adesp. 1153.8 K–A.

University of Leeds

W. Geoffrey Arnott

²³ (1960) p. 28.

²⁴ Cf. J. D. Denniston, *The Greek Particles* (2nd edition, Oxford 1954) 114–19.

²⁵ In Barns (1960) 29.

²⁶ (1973) 251; cf. K–A ad loc. See also Barns (1960) 10, Webster (1974) 197.