The Classical Review

<http://journals.cambridge.org/CAR>

Additional services for *The Classical Review*:

Email alerts: [Click here](#)

Subscriptions: [Click here](#)

Commercial reprints: [Click here](#)

Terms of use : [Click here](#)

Menander's Γεωργς1F79ς

Nowell Smith

The Classical Review / Volume 12 / Issue 06 / July 1898, pp 301 - 304

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00032595, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00032595

How to cite this article:

Nowell Smith (1898). Menander's Γεωργς. The Classical Review, 12, pp 301-304
doi:10.1017/S0009840X00032595

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

unexamined manuscript. But if we look to Cod. El. for fresh light in such matters, we shall hardly find it. Its ascription of the treatise is the traditional one, the name of Longinus being found on one of the blank leaves at its commencement. Nor is there any variation from tradition in the form of the names *Κεκκλίον* and *Φλωρεντιανὸν* which occur in the opening sentence. The usual lacunae, again, are indicated in ii. 3, ix. 4, xii. 2, xviii. 2, xxx. 2, xxxvii. The marginal additions in El. are couched, as has already been indicated, in Latin or Italian, while Greek alternatives are introduced by the customary contractions *γρ.* or *ἰρ.* In the earlier part of the text there occurs more than once a special symbol of which the significance is not clear; perhaps it is meant for the guidance of the printer, though it can hardly indicate the beginning or end of paragraphs. At the conclusion of the treatise El. terminates abruptly with the word *ἡμῶν*, but a Latin note (*'nam cecilius aliter scribebat, vide 6. 7'*) implies that *δοκεῖ* must be added to complete the sense.

With regard to the history of the MS. little is known. It owes its title of *Eliensis* to the fact that it was once in the possession of John Moore (b. 1646, d. 1714), a Fellow

of Clare College, who was bishop successively of Norwich and Ely. Moore's famous library of manuscripts and books was purchased by George the First, and by him given to the University of Cambridge. I see some reason to suppose that the Codex Eliensis thus acquired may be identical with that which since Langbaine's time has been called *Dudithianus* or *Junianus*, but which exists nobody seems to know where. Andrew Dudith, the Hungarian divine, was a friend of Robortello and Paul Manutius. He had travelled in Italy, and was conversant with the Italian language. In the year 1555 (the date of the publication of Manutius' edition, that of Robortello having appeared in the previous year) Dudith was in England in the train of Cardinal Pole. That he was interested in 'Longinus' to the extent of completing a translation of his work, we know from a passage in the Preface (1571 A.D.) to his version of the *De Thucyd. Histor. Iudicium* of Dionysius of Halicarnassus. It is possible that in translating the *De Sublimitate* he made use of the codex subsequently called both by his name and by that of the Patrick Young (*Junius*) from whose hands it passed into those of Langbaine.

W. RHYS ROBERTS.

MENANDER'S *Γεωργός*.

SINCE Prof. Blass discovered that the six fragments of the Menander papyrus edited last year by Prof. Nicole, form only one leaf, and that the 87 lines or parts of lines are therefore to be read continuously, there is even less upon which to reconstruct the plot of the play than there was in Prof. Nicole's arrangement of the fragments. At the same time, what there is of course more intelligible, and the foundation given more secure. I venture to offer, not a reconstruction, which would be folly, but a few remarks on the situation, as it may be gathered from the fragments themselves. I give, in the first place, the situation as I gathered it from reading the text of the papyrus as edited by Messrs. Grenfell and Hunt, and from the 'other known fragments of the *Γεωργός*,' printed at the end of their edition. I purposely refrained from reading their Note on the *Dramatis Personae*, Translation, and Commentary, until after I had arrived at the conclusions here offered:

NO. CVII. VOL. XII.

a fact I mention merely because any slight value that my remarks may have arises solely from the fact that they are an independent corroboration of Messrs. Grenfell and Hunt's view of the piece.

The young man who is speaking when our papyrus fragment begins, and who may be called, for brevity, the Lover, is the lover of a girl (*τὴν κόρην* l. 30, *τὴν παῖδα* l. 74), has already seduced her (*ἡδίκηκός* l. 30, cp. Fragments (2) (3) (4)), and would gladly marry her, as is evident from his desire to escape the *γάμος* arranged for him by his father (ll. 5-21): but though she is free-born (Fragm. (5) *κόρης ἐλευθέρης*), her family is poor (Fragm. (2) *τὴν ὑμετέραν πενίαν*, where *ὑμετέραν* implies at least two persons: cp. Fraggm. (3) [P.S. also l. 80 *τῶν δυστυχῶν*: see below]), and the Lover has not ventured to tell his own father of the *liaison* (Fragm. (5): cp. the evident ignorance of the Lover's father in arranging the *γάμος* for his son). *ἡ κόρη* has a brother, *ὁ μισρακίσκος* (l. 4:

Α Α

l. 18 τὸν ἀδελφόν, ll. 46, 67 τὸ μεράκιον, l. 70 τῆς ἀδελφῆς), who at some time previous to the opening of the play has gone to work in the country on the farm of Cleaenetus, ὁ γεωργός,—the title- *rôle* (ll. 4, 18, 46). The mother of these two, Myrrhine by name, is one of the speaking characters of the papyrus (l. 58 ὁ μερακίσκος is called her son; cp. her helpless grief in the scene with Philinna ll. 22–31, and ll. 86, 87). Myrrhine is aware of her daughter's condition, and knows who the seducer is; facts she has communicated to an elderly (l. 25 ὁ τέκνον, l. 54 γράδιον) friend, Philinna, who is indignantly sympathetic and quite ready to bring τὸν ἀλαζονα (l. 26) to book.

Matters have now reached a crisis, because the Lover's father, taking the opportunity of his son's absence on business at Corinth, has prepared a surprise for him on his return in the shape of a marriage with his own daughter, his son's half-sister (l. 10 ἡμοπατρία). The papyrus introduces us to the Lover, lately arrived home to find the marriage preparations well advanced. In the conflict of his fear of disclosing his *liaison* and his desire to avoid the γάμος, he has left his father's house without making any disclosure or objection, and is now hesitating whether or no to knock at his sweetheart's door. His hesitation is due to his ignorance as to whether the brother has come back from the country or not; but whether he wishes to find or to avoid the brother is not absolutely clear (see below). In these first 20 lines then, we have the normal young lover of the New Comedy, so familiar to us in Plautus, timid and hesitating, not at all devoid of good feeling, but incapable of forming a plan of action, and one feels sure that there was the confidential slave somewhere in the play to get him out of one difficulty and into another.

As the Lover goes out, *enter* Myrrhine and her elderly friend, Philinna. Myrrhine has just confided her troubles to Philinna, who has more than half a mind to break in upon the marriage preparations with the announcement of the bridegroom's 'villainy.' Myrrhine, of a temper more apt to lachrymose resignation, is inclined to wash her hands of the young man. To these *enters* Davus, whom Myrrhine recognises at once as "the servant, Davus, coming from the country" (ll. 31, 32), and who, with an inferior fellow-slave, ὁ Σύρος, is bringing flowers and evergreens for the wedding. That Davus and Myrrhine are well acquainted is evident from the whole scene; that Davus does not belong to Myrrhine's

household follows of course from the situation as here conceived, because he is evidently a servant of the house where the γάμος is to take place. Further, his mode of addressing Myrrhine, *γεννική καὶ κοσμία γύναι*, is more natural if Myrrhine is a neighbour than if she is his master's wife, or a lady of the family. Davus brings news from the farm of Cleaenetus: and in all probability it is the same farm which has supplied the flowers and which Davus characterises (ll. 35–39) in the usual mocking manner of the comic slave. That there should be some connection between the *Γεωργός* and the Lover's family on the one hand and the *Γεωργός* and the wronged girl's family on the other, is probably one element in the entanglement of the plot. The news that Davus brings to Myrrhine is that, her son having nursed Cleaenetus through an illness consequent upon a self-inflicted spade-wound in the leg, the latter, in gratitude for such filial attention (l. 58 οἶονεὶ νομίσας ἐαντὸν πατέρ'), has promised to marry the youth's sister, Myrrhine's daughter (l. 74). 'They (*i.e.* Cleaenetus and ὁ μερακίσκος) will be here directly,' says Davus: 'he (Cleaenetus) will go back with the girl to the country'; and he apparently adds something to the effect that the family will be satisfied, and that the girl might do worse than accept the retirement that this match with an elderly farmer offers. Lines 77–79 are, however, almost entirely wanting. This news of Davus only sends the anxious and tearful mother into greater agitation, and the papyrus leaves her wringing her hands and exclaiming, 'I don't know *what* to do now! O dear, *τίως ἡ παῖς ἐστὶ*!'

So far it seems fairly plain sailing. But lines 67–71 raise an interesting question. There we are told that the old farmer, as he lies idle and convalescent, 'inquires into the young fellow's affairs.' 'What affairs?' says Myrrhine (according to the text of Grenfell and Hunt, which seems probable). Unfortunately the answer of Davus is considerably mutilated. He seems to say that perhaps the farmer was not altogether unacquainted with the young fellow's affairs; but that the latter told him about his sister, and (if Grenfell and Hunt are right in inserting <τε>) about Myrrhine and somebody else whose name is lost. Now one's first impulse is to suppose that the μερακίσκος had learnt, either before leaving home or since he was on the farm, of his sister's situation, and that this is the subject of his conversation with the farmer. But would it not be carrying gratitude to a high pitch of absurdity, even

for a sentimental ἄγρικός of the New Comedy, to promise to marry the sister knowing that her good name is already compromised? And it is not necessary to suppose that the conversation between the invalid and his young nurse related to more than the poverty of the latter's family, the charms of his sister, and his desire to see her comfortably settled. Whether we suppose the μειρακίσκος to be acquainted with his sister's situation or not, will depend partly on our interpretation of the Lover's speech (l. 4 and ll. 18, 19). It is evident from l. 4 (whether ἐν ᾧ δὲ be the right supplement or not) that the μειρακίσκος 'was still in the country' at the time of the Lover's visit to Corinth. And it is probable that in ll. 18, 19 the Lover is anxious to avoid the μειρακίσκος. He hesitates about knocking because he does not know whether or no the μειρακίσκος is at home again. Suppose he wishes to find the μειρακίσκος. Then what is he afraid of? Evidently of meeting some other occupant of the house. But that danger is present in any case, and therefore his ignorance of the presence or absence of the μειρακίσκος would, on this supposition, be no reason (γὰρ) for his hesitation. But if he wants to find his sweetheart or her mother, and to avoid the μειρακίσκος, his hesitation is naturally caused simply by his ignorance of the latter's whereabouts. Now why is it that the Lover wishes to avoid the μειρακίσκος? From the indication afforded by ll. 4-6, connecting in some way the absence of both the μειρακίσκος and the Lover with the paternally arranged γάμος, it is plausible to suppose that what the Lover fears is that the μειρακίσκος, coming home, has learnt, from the marriage preparations next door, or from his sister's confession, or both, to regard him as the treacherous seducer of his sister. This still leaves us in doubt whether the μειρακίσκος was formerly (as would be quite in keeping with the typical New Comedy) an accomplice of his sister's Lover, until he discovered the impending γάμος with another; or whether the love-affair had been unknown to him. On the whole I prefer the latter alternative, partly because, if he had been the Lover's accomplice, the Lover's first idea would probably be to find him and explain how matters stood, partly because the conversation of the μειρακίσκος and the γεωργός seems to me better understood in accordance with this theory.

The shorter fragments throw practically no light upon the plot, other than the slight indications I have noted above. (5) is ad-

dressed to the Lover, probably by his confidential slave. It might on the other hand be spoken by the Lover's father after the *dénouement*, the present tenses being merely exclamatory. (1) is of course a remark of the farmer after he has come to town. (2) should also, I fancy, be given to the farmer. He addresses this bit of proverbial philosophy to Myrrhine perhaps, or to the μειρακίσκος, but anyhow includes the family in its scope (ἑμετέραν). (3) and (4), both addressed to Gorgias, whose name appears nowhere else, are both, I believe, spoken by one person on one occasion. The speaker is attempting to restrain Gorgias from resenting his wrongs in a rash or unmeasured manner: and he appeals to his reason, pointing out that, however much he may have right on his side, he is only a poor man, and εὐκαταφρόνητος in consequence, and, if he goes to the Lover's father to complain, he will be treated as a mere συκοφάντης, telling his tale merely for the sake of τοῦ λαβεῖν. If this reading of the two fragments be correct, Gorgias can hardly be any other than the μειρακίσκος himself (or his father, if his father is alive, which seems rather unlikely). The speaker is not unlikely to be a slave, whose object is to prevent an inopportune *dénouement*: if so he is probably in league with the Lover's slave; or maybe he is our friend Davus himself, who was evidently on friendly terms with Myrrhine's household.

Messrs. Grenfell and Hunt say (p. 17): 'following Nicole and Blass we should identify Gorgias with the father' of the Lover. This, of course, is quite possible. But εὐκαταφρόνητος does not seem to me to be so *naturally* addressed to the Lover's father by someone attempting to win his attention to the tale of wrong, as to the girl's brother burning to go to the Lover's father with the said tale. And I venture with diffidence to suggest that the two pieces, both in tone and subject, harmonise very well in the account given of them above; whereas the suggestion (Grenfell and Hunt, p. 26) that (3), as well as (4), is an 'ex-postulation addressed to Gorgias by someone who wished to reconcile him to the marriage of his son with the poor girl in place of the ὁμοπατρία,' seems to leave the expressions κἂν πάντῃ λέγῃ δίκαια, συκοφάντης, κἂν ἀδικούμενος τύχη, quite untouched.

In the above account I assumed that Davus was a slave of the Lover's father's household. I see that Messrs. Grenfell and Hunt (p. 17) make him the servant of Cleaenetus. Line 32, to which they refer, leaves this point doubtful, since ἐξ ἀγρῶν may

be taken with *προσέρχεται*. But I prefer their assumption, because it suits the lines in which Davus talks about the farm better than the supposition that he is a town slave. And, if this is the right assumption, τοῦ δυστυχῆν in l. 80 probably refers merely to the poverty of Myrrhine's family, which is clearly of great importance to the play, and which may have been the result of some special δυστύχημα and therefore particularly sensitive to τοὺς ὀρώντας.

How the plot of the play was complicated and then unravelled it is impossible to say. No doubt a good deal was made of the old-fashioned honesty of the farmer in contact with the manners and customs of the town. And of course the marriage preparations

with which the play opens are not wasted; nor can one doubt that the Lover and his sweetheart are finally united. That the farmer should be tricked into courting the ὁμοπατρία instead of Myrrhine's daughter; or that there should be one of the favourite ἀναγνωρίσεις of the New Comedy and the farmer turn out to be Myrrhine's husband, or the ὁμοπατρία's true father, and the ὁμοπατρία be left to pair off with the μειρακίσκος (if he were old enough)—any of these and many other suppositions might be true and probably would be false. Messrs. Grenfell and Hunt must find some more of the papyrus!

NOWELL SMITH.

THE NAME DOULICHION.

IN the long controversy concerning the site of the Homeric 'Doulichion' scarcely enough attention seems to have been given to the name itself and its unusual termination. It is derived, no doubt, from δολιχός, 'long,' the *ov* being due to a lengthening of the *o* for metrical convenience, as in δολιχόχειρος. In this and similar words, e.g. *Περίβοος*, *ὀλεστίκαρπος*, we must suppose a variation in pronunciation which came to be marked in writing either by a 'hybrid' diphthong (*Περίβοος*) or a long vowel (*ὀλεστίκαρπος*).¹ Apart from its ending, the name sufficiently explains itself as a makeshift poetical designation of a 'long' coast-line, which I would identify on other grounds (see my 'Greek Epic,' note on *Od.* ix. 1, ff.) with Leucadia. But we cannot regard the termination as one which went originally with the name as that of an island or peninsula; for all the names of Greek islands, which are adjectival, are feminine in -ια or -η, and the rest end in -ος; whereas -ιον regularly belongs to a promontory, ἄκρον being understood. I would meet this difficulty by two suppositions. First, that the region in question was called by the early Greek navigators and the poets after them simply Δολιχόν, 'the long,' no authentic local name being known to them. Secondly, that one of its promontories (Kap Dukato?) was called correspondingly Δολίχιον, and this, though properly belonging to the promontory, happened to

find its way into the loose Homeric nomenclature and, in particular, into the recurring 'tag,' Δουλίχιόν τε Σάμη τε καὶ Ἰλήεσσα Ζάκυνθος, denoting vaguely the coast lying somewhere beyond Same (Cephalonia) and Ithaca. The geographer of *Od.* ix., who placed Ithaca to the west instead of north-east of Same, must have known less of Leucadia, but he knew enough to group it with Ithaca as a land which might own Odysseus as suzerain. The name Leucadia only came in when Leucas, the city, was founded from Corinth in the seventh century. The germ of it, however, may possibly be found in the λευκή πέτρα of *Od.* xxiv. 5 and the name Λευκός as a companion of Odysseus (*Il.* iv. 498). If so, it may be considered as in favour of the view suggested that such a 'rock,' i.e. promontory, appears in this connection as within the ken of the Odyssey. It may have been the same headland which, under the other name 'Dolichion,' stood for the intermediate coast-land between the islands known by real names (Ithaca, Same, Zacynthus) and the more northerly and all but unknown 'Phaiakie.' It is no wonder that a name so vague and, so to speak, accidental, disappeared without leaving any trace in Greek geography. As the true name 'Leucadia' took hold, 'Doulichion' went adrift, and the geographers from the poet of the Catalogue to Strabo sought a place for it among the Echinades!

G. C. W. WARR.

¹ Cf. Wilamowitz 'Homerische Untersuchungen,' ii. 3.