

LEXIS

Poetica, retorica e comunicazione nella tradizione classica

35.2017

ADOLF M. HAKKERT EDITORE

LEXIS

Poetica, retorica e comunicazione nella tradizione classica

SOMMARIO

ARTICOLI

Francesco Bertolini, <i>Critica del testo, storia del testo, storia della lingua</i>	1
Biagio Santorelli, <i>Cecità e insegnamento retorico antico</i>	10
Ettore Cingano, <i>Interpreting epic and lyric fragments: Stesichorus, Simonides, Corinna, the Theban epics, the Hesiodic corpus and other epic fragments</i>	28
Stefano Vecchiato, <i>Una nuova testimonianza su Alcmane in 'P.Oxy.' XXIX 2506, fr. 131? ...</i>	58
Federico Condello, <i>Di alcune possibili sequenze simposiali nei 'Theognidea' (vv. 323-8, 595-8, 1171-6)</i>	63
Marios Skempis, <i>Bacchylides' YΠΙΟΡΧΗΜΑ Fr. 16 Blass</i>	90
Maria Luisa Maino, <i>Per una lettura di Aesch. 'Suppl.' 828</i>	99
Martina Loberti, <i>L'enjambement in Sofocle</i>	110
Francesco Lupi, <i>Una nota a Soph. fr. 83 R.²</i>	123
Christine Mauduit, <i>Annunci, attese, sorprese: riflessioni sulla struttura dell' 'Alceste' di Euripide</i>	128
Nadia Rosso, <i>La colometria antica del I stasimo delle 'Supplici' di Euripide</i>	147
Valeria Andò, <i>Introduzione ovvero 'Ifigenia in Aulide' tra cerchietti e parentesi</i>	159
Luigi Battezzato, <i>Change of mind, persuasion, and the emotions: debates in Euripides from 'Medea' to 'Iphigenia at Aulis'</i>	164
Sotera Fornaro, <i>Il finale dell' 'Ifigenia in Aulide' sulla scena moderna e contemporanea</i>	178
Ester Cerbo, <i>Ritmo e ritmi della 'performance' nell' 'Ifigenia in Aulide' di Euripide</i>	192
Anna Beltrametti, <i>'...e infatti quella che supplica non somiglia affatto a quella che vien dopo' (Aristotele 'Poetica' 1454a 31-3). L'ἀνώμαλον come marchio di autenticità</i>	210
Paolo Cipolla, <i>Il dramma satiresco e l'erudizione antica: sull'uso delle citazioni satiresche nelle fonti di tradizione indiretta</i>	221
Lucía Rodríguez-Noriega Guillén, <i>Menander's 'Carchedonius' fr. 2 (227 K.-Th.) and its sources: a critical note</i>	249
Graziana Brescia, <i>'Utinam nunc matrescam ingenio!' Pacuvio, fr. 18.139 R.³ e il paradosso della somiglianza materna nella cultura romana</i>	265
Francesco Ginelli, <i>Difendere la tradizione. Nota a Nep. 'Paus.' 5.5 e Thuc. 1.134.4</i>	281
Valentino D'Urso, <i>Un intertesto ovidiano nella descrizione della fuga di Pompeo (Lucan. 8.4 s.)</i>	288
Lucia Degiovanni, <i>Note critiche ed esegetiche all' 'Hercules Oetaeus'</i>	305
Alessandro Fusi, <i>Nota al testo di Marziale 2.7</i>	321
Amedeo Alessandro Raschieri, <i>Alla ricerca del lettore ideale: insegnamento retorico e modelli letterari tra Quintiliano e Dione di Prusa</i>	335
Barbara Del Giovane, <i>Seneca, Quintiliano, Gellio e Frontone: critica, superamento e rovesciamento del modello educativo senecano (con una lettura di Fronto 'ad M. Caesarem' 3.16, pp. 47.19-22 e 48.1-25 vdH²)</i>	354
Giuseppe Dimatteo, <i>È stata tua la colpa. Nota a Ps.-Quint. 'decl. min.' 275</i>	373

Maria Chiara Scappaticcio, <i>'Auctores', 'scuole', multilinguismo: forme della circolazione e delle pratiche del latino nell'Egitto prediocleziano</i>	378
Ornella Fuoco, <i>Roma in lontananza: per l'esegesi di Rut. Nam. I.189-204</i>	397
Antonella Prenner, <i>I 'Gynaecia' di Mustione: 'utilitas' di una riscrittura</i>	411
Immacolata Eramo, <i>Sulla tradizione della 'Storia romana' di Appiano: la seconda 'adnotatio' del 'Laurentianus' 70.5</i>	424

RECENSIONI

Fabio Roscalla, <i>Greco, che farne?</i> (P. Rosa)	437
Frédérique Biville – Isabelle Boehm, <i>Autour de Michel Lejeune</i> (H. Perdicoyanni Paléologou)	441
Ἀνεξέστατος βίος οὐ βιωτός. <i>Giuseppe Schiassi filologo classico</i> , a c. di Matteo Taufer (V. Citti)	446
Gabriel Bergounioux – Charles de Lamberterie, <i>Meillet aujourd'hui</i> (H. Perdicoyanni Paléologou)	448
Felice Stama, <i>Frinico. Introduzione, traduzione e commento</i> (F. Conti Bizzarro)	450
Jessica Priestley – Vasiliki Zali (ed. by), <i>Brill's Companion to the Reception of Herodotus in Antiquity and Beyond</i> (I. Matijašić)	454
Aristophane, <i>'Les Thesmophories' ou 'La Fête des femmes'</i> , traduction commentée de Rossella Saetta Cottone (S. Pagni)	458

Direzione

VITTORIO CITTI
PAOLO MASTANDREA
ENRICO MEDDA

Redazione

STEFANO AMENDOLA, GUIDO AVEZZÙ, FEDERICO BOSCHETTI, CLAUDIA CASALI, LIA DE FINIS, CARLO FRANCO, ALESSANDRO FRANZOI, MASSIMO MANCA, STEFANO MASO, LUCA MONDIN, GABRIELLA MORETTI, MARIA ANTONIETTA NENCINI, PIETRO NOVELLI, STEFANO NOVELLI, GIOVANNA PACE, ANTONIO PISTELLATO, RENATA RACCANELLI, GIOVANNI RAVENNA, ANDREA RODIGHIERO, GIANCARLO SCARPA, PAOLO SCATTOLIN, LINDA SPINAZZÈ, MATTEO TAUFER

Comitato scientifico

MARIA GRAZIA BONANNO, ANGELO CASANOVA, ALBERTO CAVARZERE, GENNARO D'IPPOLITO, LOWELL EDMUNDS, PAOLO FEDELI, ENRICO FLORES, PAOLO GATTI, MAURIZIO GIANGIULIO, GIAN FRANCO GIANOTTI, PIERRE JUDET DE LA COMBE, MARIE MADELEINE MACTOUX, GIUSEPPINA MAGNALDI, GIUSEPPE MASTROMARCO, GIANCARLO MAZZOLI, GIAN FRANCO NIEDDU, CARLO ODO PAVESE, WOLFGANG RÖSLER, PAOLO VALESIO, MARIO VEGETTI, PAOLA VOLPE CACCIATORE, BERNHARD ZIMMERMANN

LEXIS – Poetica, retorica e comunicazione nella tradizione classica

<http://www.lexisonline.eu/>

info@lexisonline.eu, infolexisonline@gmail.com

Direzione e Redazione:

Università Ca' Foscari Venezia
Dipartimento di Studi Umanistici
Palazzo Malcanton Marcorà – Dorsoduro 3484/D
I-30123 Venezia

Vittorio Citti vittorio.citti@gmail.it

Paolo Mastandrea mast@unive.it

Enrico Medda enrico.medda@unipi.it

Pubblicato con il contributo di:

Dipartimento di Studi Umanistici (Università Ca' Foscari Venezia)

Copyright by Vittorio Citti

ISSN 2210-8823

ISBN 978-90-256-1329-7

Lexis, in accordo ai principi internazionali di trasparenza in sede di pubblicazioni di carattere scientifico, sottopone tutti i testi che giungono in redazione a un processo di doppia lettura anonima (*double-blind peer review*, ovvero *refereeing*) affidato a specialisti di Università o altri Enti italiani ed esteri. Circa l'80% dei revisori è esterno alla redazione della rivista. Ogni due anni la lista dei revisori che hanno collaborato con la rivista è pubblicata sia online sia in calce a questa pagina.

Lexis figura tra le riviste di carattere scientifico a cui è riconosciuta la classe A nella lista di valutazione pubblicata dall'**ANVUR** (*Agenzia Nazionale di Valutazione del Sistema Universitario e della Ricerca*). È stata censita dalla banca dati internazionale **Scopus-Elsevier**, mentre è in corso la procedura di valutazione da parte della banca dati internazionale **Web of Science-ISI**.

Informazioni per i contributori: gli articoli e le recensioni proposti alla rivista vanno inviati all'indirizzo di posta elettronica **infolexisonline@gmail.com**. Essi debbono rispettare scrupolosamente le norme editoriali della rivista, scaricabili dal sito **www.lexisonline.eu** (si richiede, in particolare, l'utilizzo esclusivo di un font greco di tipo unicode). Qualsiasi contributo che non rispetti tali norme non sarà preso in considerazione da parte della redazione.

Si raccomanda di inviare due files separati del proprio lavoro, uno dei quali reso compiutamente anonimo. Il file anonimo dovrà essere accompagnato da una pagina contenente nome, cognome e recapiti dell'autore (tale pagina sarà poi eliminata dalla copia trasmessa ai revisori).

Revisori anni 2015-2016:

Gianfranco Agosti	Stefania De Vido	Jean-Philippe Magué	Giovanni Ravenna
Jaume Almirall i Sardà	Carlo Di Giovine	Giacomo Mancuso	Andrea Rodighiero
Alex Agnesini	Rosalba Dimundo	Claudio Marangoni	Alessandra Romeo
Mario Giusto Anselmi	Angela Donati	Antonio Marchetta	Wolfgang Rösler
Silvia Barbantani	Marco Ercoles	Antonia Marchiori	Livio Rossetti
Alessandro Barchiesi	Marco Fernandelli	Stefano Maso	Alessandro Russo
Giuseppina Basta	Franco Ferrari	Giulio Massimilla	Carla Salvaterra
Donzelli	Patrick J. Finglass	Paolo Mastandrea	Enrica Salvatori
Luigi Battezzato	Alessandro Franzoi	Giuseppe Mastromarco	Federico Santangelo
Anna Maria	Alessandro Fusi	Silvia Mattiacci	Stefania Santelia
Belardinelli	Ivan Garofalo	Christine Mauduit	Anna Santoni
Federico Boschetti	Alex Garvie	Enrico Medda	Michela Sassi
Alfredo Buonopane	Gianfranco Gianotti	Francesca Mestre	Maria Teresa
Claude Calame	Helena Gimeno	Luca Mondin	Sblendorio Cugusi
Alberto Camerotto	Pascual	Patrizia Mureddu	Giancarlo Scarpa
Domitilla Campanile	Massimo Gioseffi	Simonetta Nannini	Paolo Scattolin
Alberto Cavarzere	Pilar Gómez Cardó	Michele Napolitano	Antonio Stramaglia
Louis Charlet	Luca Graverini	Camillo Neri	José Pablo Suárez
Emanuele Ciampini	Giuseppe Grilli	Gianfranco Nieddu	Chiara Ombretta
Francesco Citti	Alessandro Iannucci	Cecilia Nobili	Tommasi
Vittorio Citti	Paola Ingrosso	Stefano Novelli	Renzo Tosi
Emanuela Colombi	Diego Lanza	Maria Pia Pattoni	Piero Totaro
Aldo Corcella	Walter Lapini	Matteo Pellegrino	Giuseppe Uccardiello
Adele Cozzoli	Giuseppe Lentini	Antonio Pistellato	Maria Veronese
Carmelo Crimi	Liana Lomiento	Filippomaria Pontani	Paola Volpe
Lucio Cristante	Francesco Lubian	Federico Ponchio	Cacciatore
Alessandro Cristofori	Carlo Lucarini	Paolo Pontari	Onofrio Vox
Andrea Cucchiarelli	Maria Jagoda Luzzatto	Leone Porciani	Joop A. van Waarden
Nicola Cusumano	Maria Tanja Luzzatto	Ivan Radman	Michael Winterbottom
Giambattista D'Alessio	Enrico Magnelli	Manuel Ramírez	
Casper de Jonge	Massimo Manca	Sánchez	

Menander's 'Carchedonius' fr. 2 (227 K.-Th.) and its sources: a critical note^{*}

1. Introduction.

Menander's *Carchedonius* fr. 2¹, consisting of two iambic trimeters, has come down to us through three indirect sources: Ioannes Stobaeus' *Anthologium*, a scholion to the *Odyssey* and Eustathius of Thessalonica's commentary on the *Odyssey*. The text of the three sources diverges in several respects and, in view of the variants, not all editors have taken the same decisions, nor have any of them provided commentaries to justify their choices. The aim of this paper is to contribute arguments based on the present state of the art in order to achieve the best possible reconstruction of the text. To that end, we will take into account, among other data, the relationships between the sources of the passage.

2. The text of the fragment in its sources.

2.1. *The fragment in the Homeric scholia.*

The Sch.*Od.* (DEHM^{a+1}s) α 215b, I p. 116 Pontani, which quotes the fragment as belonging to an undetermined play of Menander, offers the following text:

αὐτὸν γὰρ οὐδεὶς οἶδε πῶς ποτ' ἐγένετο,
ἀλλ' ὑπονοοῦμεν πάντες ἢ πιστεύομεν.

For no one knows how he was ever born,
but all of us surmise it, or take it on trust².

There are no variants in the manuscripts that transmit the scholion.

2.2. *The fragment in Stobaeus.*

Stobaeus is the only source that mentions the title of the play from which the fragment comes, but he only quotes its first line, which, in addition, in his version does not constitute a complete iambic trimeter. The citation is part of the current chapter 24b of book IV of the *Anthologium*, which, together with book III, makes up the so-called *Florilegium*, transmitted separately from books I and II of the work, which in turn are known as the *Eclogae*. The *Florilegium* (and likewise the *Eclogae*) has a

^{*} This work was supported by the Spanish Ministry of Economy and Competitiveness, Research Project FFI2014-52808-C2-1-P.

¹ The fragment bears the same number in the editions of Sandbach 1976, Arnott 1996 and Austin 2012, and appears as fr. 227 in that of Körte – Thierfelder 1959². On the play in general, see Webster 1950, 132-9; id. 1974, 153 f.; Gomme – Sandbach 1973, 408-10 (a brief commentary that does not include fr. 2); and Arnott 1996, 83-9. The commonly held view is now that this play was not the major source of Plautus' *Poenulus*, which was instead inspired by the homonymous play by Alexis, see Arnott 2004, with full bibliography.

² Unless otherwise indicated, translations are my own.

very complex manuscript transmission³, with two families that show significant differences in terms of the order and number of quotations they contain, one represented by manuscripts *M* (Escor. Σ II 14 [gr. 94], XII century) and *A* (Paris. gr. 1984, end of the XIII century), and the other by manuscript *S* (Vind. phil. gr. 67, s. X)⁴. The fragment we are dealing with does not appear in *S*, and can be read in *MA* in this way:

αὐτὸς γὰρ οὐθεις (ουθεις *M*) οἶδε πῶς ἐγένετο.

For no one, on his own, knows how he was born.

This, except for the reading οὐδεῖς instead of οὐθεις, is how the fragment appears in the first of Stobaeus' editions to include it⁵, that of Gessner 1549. Almost the same text appears in Grotius' 1623 edition with Latin translation of the sentences in verse transmitted by Stobaeus, where, however, the verb appears as ἐγγείνατο. Two centuries later, in Gaisford 1822, the fragment is again edited as in Gessner. None of these

³ On the transmission of the *Florilegium* (and the peculiarities of the edition in several volumes of the *Antologium* by Wachsmuth 1884 and Hense 1894-1912, still considered canonical), see Hense 1884, id. 1894, VII-LXI, Piccione 1994b, 176-8, 188-97, Id. 2010a, 32-41, and Id. 2010b, 620 f., with bibliography.

⁴ Given the great number of divergences in the organization of the lemmata between *MA* and *S* (the latter codex especially shows a distinctly personal arrangement of the quotations, as well as a clear tendency to summarize names and lemmata) the prevailing view (see, for instance, Hense 1894, XXII, LV-LXI) is that *S* reveals the personal work of its copyist, who tended to regroup sentences from the same author (normally indicated by a single lemma written vertically in the margin, which, curiously, never appears in the case of Menander's quotations), consequently saving space (and maybe ink). This idea is not shared, however, by Piccione, 1994b, 196 f., who argues that «sembra inconciliabile con qualunque economia di lavoro presupporre un metodo di strutturazione che porta un copista -che in più ha per le mani una copia di uso personale- ad agglutinare intenzionalmente le sentenze di un medesimo autore, andandole a cercare qua e là all'interno del capitolo»; see also Piccione 2010a, 408. Nevertheless, the rearrangement of the quotations according to their authors may be for other reasons, such as the personal taste of the copyist, and, indeed, this would not be the only known instance of a late Greek work whose structure was drastically altered through a new Byzantine wording. For instance, the copyist of manuscript *F* (Laur. 86, 9, 15th century) of Aelian's *Historia Animalium* opted to rearrange the different chapters thematically, even though in the original they are in no apparent order; this forced him to make a systematic search of the stories dealing with each animal or type of animal throughout the 15 books of the work and in doing so he also dispensed with several chapters and altered the original text in many respects; for details see González Suárez 2009. Also illustrative of a similar procedure is the so-called *Recensio* χ of Porphyrius' *Homeric Questions*, the work of a scholar who completely rearranged the original material, going to the trouble of reordering it according to the particular Homeric poem, book and line; see Sodano 1965, Id. 1966-67 and Id. 1970, XVII-XXI. I do not therefore see any forceful reasons to be opposed to the *communis opinio* that *MA* attest a version of the *Florilegium* which is more faithful to the original than *S*.

⁵ The fragment, in fact, did not appear in the first edition of Stobaeus, that of Trincavelli 1536, which followed a codex related to manuscript *S*, which does not contain the passage. As for the next three editions, all by Gessner (1543, 1549 and 1559), the first, based on that of Trincavelli, did not include the fragment either: it eventually appears in the succeeding two, for which Gessner consulted manuscript *M*. On the editions of Stobaeus, both partial and complete, prior to that of Wachsmuth – Hense, see Curnis 2008, with full bibliography.

authors chose to complete the line in their editions of the anthologist; Meineke, in the mid-18th century, was the first to do it, following the parallel testimony of Eustathius (see below), from whom he took the reading τοῦ ποτ' instead of the πῶς attested by the manuscripts of Stobaeus. Thus, what we read in Meineke 1856 is this:

αὐτὸς γὰρ οὐδεὶς οἶδε τοῦ ποτ' ἐγένετο.

For no one, on his own, knows from what father he was ever born.

Finally, in Wachsmuth-Hense, the current canonical edition of the *Anthologium* (whose corresponding volume is dated 1909), the verse appears in this way (Stob. 4.24b.27):

αὐτὸς γὰρ οὐδεὶς οἶδε πῶς <ποτ'> ἐγένετο.

For no one, on his own, knows how he was ever born.

As can be seen, Hense opted to approach Stobaeus' text to that of the Homeric scholion by: 1) maintaining the reading πῶς shared by both sources, 2) completing the verse with the addition of ποτ' (which is read in both the scholion and Eustathius, see below). He, nevertheless, did not emend to αὐτόν the αὐτός attested by the manuscripts (which until this point had been respected also by all of Stobaeus' previous editors), because neither the metre, the syntax or the sense made this change necessary, a subject to which we will return. Apart from this, Hense did not keep in the text the form οὐθείς, transmitted by *MA*, but printed οὐδεὶς, which is also read in all the previous editions.

2.3. The fragment in Eustathius.

In Eustathius (*ad Od.*) 1412.15, where, like in the Homeric scholion, the lines are attributed to Menander without mentioning the comedy's title, the fragment appears as follows:

αὐτόν γὰρ οὐδεὶς οἶδε τοῦ ποτ' ἐγένετο,
ἀλλ' ὑπονοοῦμεν πάντες ἢ πιστεύομεν.

For no one knows from what father he was ever born,
but all of us surmise it, or take it on trust.

As already mentioned, Eustathius agrees with the Homeric scholion in the readings αὐτόν and ποτ' (the latter added by Hense in his edition of Stobaeus), whereas he diverges from these other two sources in transmitting τοῦ rather than πῶς. In the next chapter we will see how Eustathius' version prevailed over the others in the editions of Menander until the 21st century.

3. The fragment in the different editions of Menander.

3.1. *The fragment in the editions of Menander until the 18th century.*

The current *Carchedonios* fr. 2 (in fact only the first of its two lines, the one quoted by Stobaeus) appears for the first time in an edition of Menander in Grotius 1626⁶. Although Grotius mentions the comedy's title as *Carchedonius* on p. 727, he does not ascribe to it any fragment, the one we are concerned with appearing on p. 759 among Menander's *adespota* in this way:

αὐτὸν γὰρ οὐδείς οἶδε τοῦ ποτ' ἐγένετο.

This is Eustathius' version of line 1, which Grotius chose, as he himself indicates in the notes on p. 989, since in 'Clement' (Grotius' slip for 'Stobaeus'; Clement does not quote the fragment in any of his preserved works) what is read is αὐτὸς γὰρ οὐδείς οἶδε πῶς ἐγένετο⁷. It seems that Grotius, who did not know the Homeric scholion, opted to follow Eustathius' testimony on every point (note that he also adopted the reading αὐτόν in place of αὐτός, which, as we have seen, he had kept in his edition of Stobaeus), because in the *Anthologium* the verse is incomplete. It is curious, however, that Grotius did not also include the fragment's second line, despite its being in Eustathius, limiting himself to printing only the first, the sole line transmitted by Stobaeus. Also striking is that he edited the fragment as being from an undetermined play, when in his edition of Stobaeus the passage appears with the indication 'Menander *Poenulo*'⁸.

Clericus 1709, which pretended to be the first complete edition of the fragments of Menander known at that point, is the next that includes the passage⁹, this time with its two lines, but not among the fragments of the *Carchedonius* (cf. pp. 96-98), but once more as fr. 'ex incertis comoediis' 157. Clericus (p. 243, preceding the Latin translation of the passage) mentions Eustathius as the only source¹⁰, and edits the text in this way:

⁶ The fragment was not included either in Hertel 1560, in Morel 1564, or in Stephanus 1569.

⁷ Grotius corrected here the form ἐγείνατο, read on p. 331 of his edition of Stobaeus instead of ἐγένετο, as we have seen. Furthermore, in manuscripts *MA* of Stobaeus, what is read is not actually οὐδείς, but rather οὐθείς, as mentioned above.

⁸ Which, according to the use adopted in the edition, appears, not accompanying the Greek text (p. 331), but rather its Latin translation (p. 330), to the left of the text. In the previous editions of Stobaeus, the fragment either did not appear (as was the case in those by Trincavelli 1536 and Gessner 1543, as we have already highlighted), or was not correctly identified; in fact, in Gessner 1549 and 1559 it appears in the text without any corresponding indication of author or work (although both data are stated in manuscript *M*), neither accompanying the fragment nor in the indexes, which in fact made its identification difficult for the editors of Menander.

⁹ Which did not appear, therefore, in Winterton 1684 (either among Menander's maxims, pp. 487-93, or among the monostichs from different unnamed poets, pp. 501-33), or in Hemsterhuis 1708, both of which were based mainly on Stephanus, as they themselves indicate: cf. Winterton 1684, 2 (unnumbered page) in his *Greeting to the reader (Lectori candido salutem)* and Hemsterhuis 1708, 2.

¹⁰ I do not in fact quite understand Clericus' thinking here, as in his commentary to the passage (p. 244) he states that at first he had thought that this fragment was the same as that quoted by Stobaeus in section XCVI (error for LXXXVI) of Grotius' edition (¶hic aliud fragmentum e Stobei

αὐτὸν γὰρ οὐδεὶς οἶδέ του προὔγγνετο.

The reading του προὔγγνετο must be Clericus' own emendation (albeit unnecessary), as it does not coincide with the text of any of the sources, although Clericus says nothing in this regard; however, none of the subsequent editors echoes this version.

3.2. The fragment in the editions of Menander in the 19th century.

The next edition of Menander, that of Meineke 1823, is the first that includes the fragment within those of the *Carchedonius*, on p. 92. The editor indicates that he does so according with the testimony of Stobaeus. Meineke mentions the reading πῶς ποτ' ἐγένετο of the Homeric scholion, together with Stobaeus' variant πῶς ἐγένετο¹¹, but, like most of his predecessors after Grotius, he adopts Eustathius' version for l. 1. Thus, in his edition of the comic poet, the fragment appears as follows¹²:

αὐτὸν γὰρ οὐδεὶς οἶδε τοῦ ποτ' ἐγένετο
ἀλλ' ὑπονοοῦμεν πάντες, ἢ πιστεύομεν.

The same text as in Meineke 1823 reappears in all of Menander's 19th century editions, and it is found thus in Dindorf 1838 (who edits the passage as *Carchedonius* fr. 2), in Meineke 1841 (where it also figures as fr. 2 of the play), and Kock 1888 (where it constitutes Menander's fr. 261). Kock's critical apparatus includes for the first time the variant οὐθεὶς (which Kock perhaps knew thanks to the collation of the manuscripts of Stobaeus provided to him by Hense¹³, whose edition of the *Florilegium*, had not yet been published on that date), as well as the emendation οἶδ' ὅτου ποτ' proposed by Cobet 1858, 54, which is completely unnecessary.

3.3. The fragment in the editions of Menander in the 20th and 21st centuries.

Despite what has just been said above, Cobet's emendation appears in the text of two subsequent editions of Menander. The first is Allinson 1921, in the Loeb series.

Tit. XCVI. pro ordine Grotii primum adscripseram»), but that, as the latter is ascribed to a known comedy («sed eo ad certam Comoediam relato»), he decided to include the quotation from Eustathius among Menander's fragments of uncertain plays («aliud hic oportuit inseri»). What is odd is not only that Clericus eventually chose not to identify both quotations as being one and the same passage of the *Carchedonius* (which might be explained by the differences between both versions), but that he limited himself to collecting the quote from Eustathius among the fragments from unknown plays, while not including that of Stobaeus (who only quotes line 1) among those belonging to the *Carchedonius*.

¹¹ He also points out that, in his edition of Stobaeus, Grotius writes ἐγείνατο; he does not add, however, that, when editing Menander, the same author prints the transmitted ἐγένετο (see above).

¹² However, as we have seen, in his edition of Stobaeus Meineke maintains the αὐτός of the manuscripts.

¹³ See Kock 1888, VII.

The fragment, which appears on p. 368 (the editor does not give the fragment a number of his own, though he does mention the corresponding number in Kock's edition), has, therefore, this form:

αὐτὸν γὰρ οὐδεὶς οἶδ' ὅτου ποτ' ἐγένετο,
ἀλλ' ὑπονοοῦμεν πάντες, ἢ πιστεύομεν,

text for which Allinson gives the following translation on p. 369: «For no one knows his own father, but all of us have a conjecture or a belief». The editor does not mention the sources of the passage, and in his critical apparatus he only indicates the reading of the manuscripts on the point where he has chosen to follow Cobet's emendation, without indicating any other variant.

Körte – Thierfelder 1959, who edit the passage as Menander's fr. 227, opted again for Eustathius' version, the one sanctioned by the majority of their predecessors, but accept for the first time in their text the reading οὐθείς rather than οὐδεὶς, which they take from Hense's edition of Stobaeus¹⁴. In this edition the fragment therefore appears in this way:

αὐτὸν γὰρ οὐθείς οἶδε τοῦ ποτ' ἐγένετο
ἀλλ' ὑπονοοῦμεν πάντες, ἢ πιστεύομεν.

Edmonds 1961 (Men. fr. 261) is the second editor to accept Cobet's emendation (even though he does not mention Cobet by name in his apparatus, hence it looks as if it were his own amendment), but his text differs from that of Allinson in the reading οὐθείς, like in Körte and Thierfelder, and not οὐδεὶς. He does not mention the Homeric scholion as one of the sources of the passage, and in his apparatus he indicates that Stobaeus' reading αὐτός may be the right one. The author translates the fragment (p. 643) as follows: «whose child he is nobody really knows;/ we only can make guesses and suppose».

The same text as in Körte and Thierfelder 1959 is read again in Sandbach 1976 and Arnott 1996 (as fr. 2 from the *Carchedonius*, among the 'aliunde nota' and the 'quoted by ancient authors', respectively), neither of which adds any new information in their critical apparatus¹⁵.

As can be seen, from the 17th to the 20th century the fragment has basically been edited according to Eustathius' version, the one chosen by Menander's first editor, Grotius (who did not know the Homeric scholion), except for the variant οὐθείς, adopted by the editors of Menander since Körte and Thierfelder's edition.

Only in the second decade of the 21st century do we find an editor who, breaking away from the inertia of tradition, opts for the reading πῶς ποτ' of the Homeric

¹⁴ They also indicate, like Hense in his critical apparatus, that in manuscript *M* of the *Florilegium* the word appears without accent or spirit.

¹⁵ In the critical apparatus, Körte and Thierfelder ascribe to Eustathius the reading τοῦ ποτὶ (sic), no doubt an error for τοῦ ποτ', which is what is in fact read in that author. However, the same mistake appears again in Sandbach's apparatus. The same text as in these editors is read in Ferrari 2001, with no critical apparatus.

scholion, instead of following Eustathius on this point. This is, in fact, the text we read as fr. 2 *aliunde nota* of the *Carchedonius* in Austin's 2012 posthumous edition, which contains the eleven shortest pieces from among those plays of Menander which did not appear in *PCG* 6.2¹⁶:

αὐτὸν γὰρ οὐθείς οἶδε πῶς ποτ' ἐγένετο
ἀλλ' ὑπονοοῦμεν πάντες, ἢ πιστεύομεν.

Unlike his predecessors, Austin opts for the text of the Homeric scholion, except for the reading οὐθείς, which is taken from Stobaeus¹⁷.

Recapitulating what we have seen so far, 1) to date, most editors of Menander have preferred to reproduce the first line of the fragment as in Eustathius, with the exception of Austin, who has chosen to follow the Homeric scholion; it goes without saying that both versions, besides being metrically equivalent, make good sense. Nevertheless, the most recent editors, Austin among them, have all opted for the variant οὐθείς, only transmitted by Stobaeus, rather than the οὐδέεις of the other sources. 2) The manuscripts of Stobaeus (where the line is incomplete), coincide with the Homeric scholion and not with Eustathius in the reading πῶς, but diverge from the other two sources, apart from the mentioned variant οὐθείς, in another reading (αὐτός), which is not problematic neither metrically, nor in terms of the syntax or the sense. This reading, however, was consigned to the critical apparatus in all the edition of Menander, starting with Grotius, a decision that was no doubt influenced by the coincidence of the Homeric scholion and Eustathius in the reading αὐτόν.

4. The relationships between the sources and their importance for the establishment of the text.

In the editions of fragmentary texts, it is normal practice to reduce to the minimum the context within which the passages preserved by indirect transmission have been quoted. This is done in order to achieve greater clarity in the presentation of the fragments, and, sometimes, also to save space. Occasionally, however, this course of action may deprive the reader of essential information for the correct understanding of the fragment in question¹⁸, or for determining the intertextual relationships between different sources, relationships that, in turn, can be essential for the estab-

¹⁶ The critical apparatus contains the same information as the preceding editions, except that it does not indicate that οὐθείς is only read in Stobaeus, the other two sources having οὐδέεις.

¹⁷ Only when this paper was in its very final stage of editing did I become aware of A. Blanchard's new volume of Menander's plays in the Belles Lettres series (*Menandre*, vol. III, Paris 2016), which includes *Le carthaginois*. Nevertheless, his text of the fragment (fr. 2, among the *aliunde nota* of the play) is identical to that of C. Austin.

¹⁸ A very good example that perfectly illustrates this problem is analysed in Sansone 2011.

lishment of the text. This is the case with the fragment we are concerned with, as we will see next.

4.1. *The context of the quotation in the Homeric scholia.*

In the Sch.*Od.* (DEHM^{a+1}s) α 215b, I p. 116 Pontani, Menander's quotation is adduced in relation to some words addressed by Telemachus to Mentor (in fact, Athena disguised as Mentor) in *Od.* 1.215, in a passage where the young boy, asked if he is the son of Odysseus, answers that his mother says so, and that nothing but his trust in her word can assure him of his origin, as no one, on his own, can know who his father is. The scholion begins by quoting three passages with a similar subject, one also taken from the *Odyssey* (4.395), another from Euripides (fr. 1015), and, finally, Menander's *Car.* fr. 2:

μήτηρ μὲν τ' ἐμέ φησι [*Od.* 1.215]: καὶ ἀλλαχοῦ “τὸν δὲ τ' ἐμὸν πατέρα φάσ' ἔμμεναι” [*Od.* 4.387]. ὁμοίως Εὐριπίδης [fr. 1015] “μήτηρ φιλότεκνος μᾶλλον πατρός/ ἢ μὲν γὰρ αὐτῆς οἶδ' ἔόντας, ὁ δ' οἶεται”. καὶ Μένανδρος [fr. 227 Koerte = *Car.* fr. 2] “αὐτὸν γὰρ οὐδεὶς οἶδε πῶς ποτ' ἐγένετο,/ ἀλλ' ὑπονοοῦμεν πάντες ἢ πιστεύομεν”.

My mother says I am his son [*Od.* 1.215]: Also in another passage, “he is my father, they say” [*Od.* 4.387]. Similarly, Euripides [fr. 1015], “a mother loves her children more than a father/, for she knows that they are hers, but he only supposes they are”. And Menander [fr. 227 Körte = *Car.* fr. 2], “for no one knows how he was ever born,/ but all of us surmise it, or take it on trust”.

After these words, the scholion adduces the explanation given by some anonymous grammarians as to why Telemachus expresses himself in such a way, which is that his father left him when he was very little¹⁹. It then includes a short commentary on the expression οὐκ οἶδ', belonging to *Od.* 1.216²⁰, according to which Telemachus does not say these words because he distrusts his mother, but because he has not known his father, and nobody can, on his own, know who his parents are²¹. This latter commentary is explicitly attributed to Porphyrius in manuscripts *E* and *D*²², which caused Ludwig 1890, *ad l.*, to assert that the entire scholion comes from Porphyrius' *Homeric Questions*, and that the scholiast simply made a mistake by mentioning Porphyrius at this point and not at the beginning. This opinion, however, is not shared by Schrader 1890, who included in his edition of the *Homeric Questions* only the part of the scholion specifically attributed to Porphyrius in *E* and *D*, al-

¹⁹ τινὲς δὲ ταῦτα τὸν Τηλέμαχόν φησι λέγειν ἐπεὶ μικρὸς καταλέλειπται.

²⁰ Which is in fact the lemma of the scholion in manuscript *D*.

²¹ καὶ τὸ «οὐκ οἶδα» οὐκ ἀπιστοῦντός ἐστιν, ἀλλ' αὐτὸν τὸν Ὀδυσσεῖα φησὶν ἀγνοεῖν οὐκ ἑωρακώς. οὐδὲ γὰρ ἂν δύνατό τις τοὺς γονέας ἐξ αὐτοῦ γινῶναι.

²² In *E* by means of the words Πορφ. εἰς τὸ αὐτό, which precede the text ascribed to Porphyrius, and in *D*, merely through the genitive Πορφυρίου, which is written at the same point, but above the line. Regarding the different ways used in the manuscripts of the *Odyssey* to indicate that a scholion comes from Porphyrius' *Homeric Questions*, see Schrader 1890, 137-40.

though he mentions the rest in a long explanatory note²³. Pontani 2007 *ad l.* marks the possible attribution of the whole passage to Porphyrius with a 'forte recte', and describes the first part as an exegetical scholion, although with a question mark. There is another scholion, the Sch.Od. (HM^a) α 215a, I pp. 114-6, which does come entirely from Porphyrius' *Homeric Questions* and confirms that Porphyrius defended the stance that Telemachus' statement in *Od.* 1.216 (οὐ γὰρ πῶ τις ἐὼν γόνον αὐτὸς ἀνέγνω) should not be taken in the sense that nobody in general can possibly know who their father is, but should be understood in the particular situation of Telemachus, who does not know his father, absent from home since he was a nursling. In such a context, the commentator argues, no one can, on his own, know whose son he is, but must resort to the information provided by others, and in the first instance by his mother, whose word everybody trusts out of respect²⁴. Nevertheless, even though the fragments of Euripides and Menander gathered in the Sch.Od. α 215b, I. p. 116 Pontani might have perfectly illustrated or supported Porphyrius' point, the fact is that in the extract of the *Homeric Questions* transmitted in the Sch.Od. (HM^a) α 251a, I pp. 114-6 Pontani no poet is quoted²⁵, nor can it be deduced from what it says that the Sch.Od. α 215b, I p. 116 Pontani also comes from the *Homeric Questions* (beyond the part that is specifically assigned to them by manuscripts *ED*, which is in fact a very condensed summary of Porphyrius' commentary on the point, as the comparison of the two scholia shows).

4.2. The context of the quotation in Stobaeus.

In Stobaeus' *Anthologium* the quotation is part of chapter 24b of book IV of the current canonical edition, whose title is «That to have children is not advisable, and that it is uncertain if they belong to those that believe they do, and that one must not adopt them»²⁶. Menander's fragment²⁷ is quoted to illustrate the second point in the title (ἄδηλον εἰ [sc. τέκνα] ἴδια τῶν ἔχειν νομιζόντων), a subject similar to that which gives rise to mention of the passage in the Homeric scholion. For clarity, in what follows we reproduce the quotations mentioned in that section of the chapter, namely, Stob. 4.24b.22-7²⁸, in the order they appear, but including only the references and not the quotes themselves, according to Hense's text²⁹:

²³ See Schrader 1890, 9, n. 11.

²⁴ It must be said that in Antiquity not everybody interpreted the passage in that way. Thus, for instance, both D.Ch. 15.4 and Them. *Or.* 21 244a understood that Telemachus in fact mistrusted Penelope's word.

²⁵ At this point Porphyrius did though quote Seleucus' (19 Müller) commentary to the passage.

²⁶ Ὅτι ἀσύμφορον τὸ ἔχειν τέκνα, καὶ ἄδηλον εἰ ἴδια τῶν ἔχειν νομιζόντων, καὶ μηδὲ θεοῦς ποιεῖσθαι. In Photius' epitome of Stobaeus, the current chapter 4.24 of the *Anthologium* is summarized in this way: περὶ παίδων καὶ τὰ ἐξῆς τοῦ κεφαλαίου τούτου, 'On children and what has to do with that subject', without any particular subtitle for its different sections, unlike in the manuscripts of Stobaeus.

²⁷ Which, as has been said, is missing in manuscript *S*.

²⁸ As from 4.24b.28 onwards the quotations refer to the title's third section (that one must not adopt children), although some return to the first subject.

²⁹ Except for the references of the quotations, which are given according to the current canonical editions.

22 Ὀμήρου (*sequitur Od.* 1.215 f.).

23 Μενάνδρου ***

24 (*sequitur Eur.* fr. 1015).

25 Σοφοκλῆς Ἀλεάδαις (*sequitur Soph.* fr. 86).

26 Εὐριπίδου Μελανίππη (*sequitur Eur.* fr. 491).

27 Μενάνδρου Καρχηδονίῳ (*sequitur Car.* fr. 2).

The *Florilegium* not only coincides with the Homeric scholion in quoting Menander's *Car.* fr. 2, but, furthermore, the section about the uncertainty of paternity opens with precisely the line to which the scholion belongs, *Od.* 1.215³⁰, and includes *Eur.* fr. 1015³¹, also mentioned in the Homeric scholion before the quote of *Car.* fr. 2, which ends the section in Stobaeus. In manuscripts *MA* of the *Florilegium*, Euripides' fragment is preceded by the name 'Menander' in the genitive, which made Hense (*ad l.*) suppose that another quotation of the comic poet had been lost from the text (which the editor indicates with the three asterisks). If this is so, we must suppose that after the quotation in question Euripides' name is missing too, and perhaps also the title of the tragedy to which his fr. 1015 belongs, because, in fact, manuscripts *MA* attribute the Euripidean quote to Menander. It is also plausible, however, taking into account that errors in the attribution of quotes are not rare in the manuscripts of Stobaeus³², that 'Menander' is here simply an error for 'Euripides', and that, therefore, there is in reality nothing missing from the text. Furthermore, between the latter quotation and that of Menander's *Carchedonius*, two more quotes appear in the *Florilegium*, one from Sophocles (fr. 86) and another from Euripides (fr. 491)³³, the content of neither fitting well with the subject of the section³⁴, which, on the other hand, Menander's fragment matches to perfection, as previously noted by Hense (*ad l.*). It is evident that in the *Anthologium* more material than that offered by the Homeric scholion has been gathered, but it is possibly no mere coincidence that the quotations of *Od.* 1.215, *Eur.* fr. 1015³⁵ and *Men. Car.* fr. 2 appear together and in the same relative order in both the Homeric

³⁰ Quotation which appears in *S* as well as in *MA*, although not in exactly the same place since *eclogae* 21 and 22 of *MA* appear in the reverse order in *S*.

³¹ Which, as is the case with the fragment of Menander we are dealing with (see above), is missing in manuscript *S*.

³² Sometimes even the same quotation is adduced more than once, and ascribed to different authors; on the errors of attributions of quotes in the *Anthologium*, see Piccione 1994a, 281 n. 1.

³³ Which this time do appear in manuscript *S*.

³⁴ Sophocles' fragment, belonging to the lost play *Aleadaí*, contains a dialogue in which a character (Telephus?) states that for him it is enough to be called the son of such a father, and when his interlocutor insinuates his doubts on the matter, the former replies that opinion is stronger than truth. As for Euripides fr. 491, it deals with the foolishness of adopting children, which belongs to the third of the subjects mentioned in the title of chapter 4.24b of the *Anthologium*.

³⁵ As Piccione 1994b, 204 has pointed out regarding the origin of Euripides' quotations in Stobaeus, «è probabile che solo una quantità limitata di citazioni euripidee in Stobaeo debba essere ricondotta a collezioni di "thoughts of Euripides" [...] arrangiate alfabeticamente, ma non certo ad un'unica ipotetica *Ursammlung* [...] Se le sentenze euripidee in Stobaeo provenissero da tale presunta edizione completa di γνῶμαι, non si spiegherebbe la diversa tipologia degli excerpta». The passage we are dealing with is, we believe, a clear example of a Euripidean quote that has not been taken from any selection of verses of the tragedian, but from a work which used it, together with material from other authors, to illustrate the subject of the uncertainty of one's ancestry, whose first literary attestation is *Odyssey* 1.125; maybe it was even part of a commentary to the latter passage.

scholion and manuscripts *MA* of the *Florilegium*. Despite the additional fragments in Stobaeus (which, furthermore, break the chronological order of the quotes observed in the Homeric scholion), these three fragments may have already been together in a previous source, one on which both the ancient grammarian from whom the information of the Homeric scholion comes, and the *Florilegium*³⁶, may have ultimately relied, albeit by independent paths. However, in the present state of the art, it is not possible to specify this intermediate source, whose existence we can only surmise³⁷.

4.3. The context of the quotation in Eustathius.

In Eustathius the quotation appears in 1412.14, in the commentary on *Od.* 1.215-20, where the author analyses the sense of Telemachus' words when he is asked if he is Odysseus' son. Eustathius first upholds that Telemachus simply means that he only knows who his father is through his mother, and it is not something he knows for himself, and that this does not imply that the young boy mistrusts Penelope. Then, he goes on to say:

τὸ δὲ τοῦ μ' ἐκ φασὶ γενέσθαι [*Od.* 1.220], ὁμοίον ἐστὶ τῷ ἐν Ἰλιάδι [21.158-159]. τὸν με φασὶ γείνασθαι. ὅπερ ἐκεῖ ὁ Ἀστεροπαῖος φησί. καὶ τῷ [*Od.* 4.387], τὸν δὲ ἐμὸν πατέρα φασὶ ἔμμεναι. ὃ περὶ τοῦ Προτέως ἢ Εἰδοθέα φησίν. ὅτι δὲ τῇ μητρὶ ἀνάκειται ἢ περὶ τῶν παιδῶν ἀκριβῆς εἴδησις, δηλοῖ καὶ Εὐριπίδης [fr. 1015]. λέγων μῆτηρ, φιλότεκνος μᾶλλον πατρός. ἢ μὲν, γὰρ αὐτῆς οἶδεν ὄντα, ὃ δ' οἴεται. καὶ Μένανδρος [fr. 227 Körte = *Car.* fr. 2]. αὐτὸν γὰρ οὐδεὶς οἶδε τοῦ ποτ' ἐγένετο, ἀλλ' ὑπονοοῦμεν πάντες ἢ πιστεύομεν. ἢ γὰρ ἀκριβῆς εἴδησις ἐν τοῖς τοιούτοις, τῇ μητρὶ ἀνάκειται.

³⁶ If in Stobaeus the three quotations shared with the Homeric scholion were interspersed with the two extra ones at a later date, this would explain why the latter do not deal with exactly the same subject as the former. We must take into account that, as Piccione 1999, 169, puts it, «la costituzione dell'*Anthologion*, opera a tradizione fluida, è da considerare una stratificazione di fasi successive -già per quanto riguarda le fonti stesse dello Stobaeo-, con conseguente sovrapposizione ed infiltrazione di materiale eterogeneo e di eterogenea provenienza». Moreover, since in *S* the section ἄδηλον εἰ (sc. τέκνα ἐστὶ) ἴδια τῶν ἔχειν νομιζόντων (which also appears as part of the title in that manuscript) is illustrated by a single quotation, that of *Od.* 1.125, there is every indication that the fragments of Euripides and Menander we are dealing with were lost at some point in the transmission of that branch of the *Florilegium*. In fact, the mention of that particular subject in the title is better explained if originally there were at least three quotes dealing with the matter, and not just one.

³⁷ Two possible candidates, but of course not the only ones, may be a treatise by Aristophanes of Byzantium (see fr. 376 Slater = Men. *PCG* 6.2, test. 76) where the author listed parallels between Menander and other preceding and subsequent authors, or a work by Latinus (on this grammarian, see Gudeman 1924, col. 938) entitled Περὶ τῶν οὐκ ἰδίων Μενάνδρου, in six books (= Men. *PCG* 6.2, test. 81). Both treatises are only known thanks to Porphyrius (fr. 408.62ss Smith). However, in Antiquity there existed many anthologies and *gnomologia*, almost all entirely lost now, which gathered passages from many different authors (on that subject see, for instance, Collart 1943, 33-5, Piccione 1994a, 284 f., and Morgan 1998, 120-51, all with bibliography), any of which may, among other possibilities, have been the source where the three quotations we are dealing with were originally gathered.

As for “they say I was born from him” [*Od.* 1.220], it is similar to the passage in the *Iliad* [21.158-159] “they say he fathered me”, which is what Asteropaios says there, and to [*Od.* 4.387] “they say he is my father”, which is what Eidothea says about Proteus. That true knowledge of children’s parentage rests with the mother is also shown by Euripides [fr. 1015], who says “a mother loves her children more than a father/, for she knows that they are hers, but he only supposes they are”. Also Menander [fr. 227 Körte = *Car.* fr. 2] “for no one knows from what father he was ever born,/ but all of us surmise it, or take it on trust”. In fact, the exact knowledge in this subject relies on the mother.

The comparison of this text with the Homeric scholia shows that this part of Eustathius’ commentary is based on them, probably combining the above mentioned Sch.*Od.* (DEHM^{a+1s}) α 215b, I p. 116 Pontani with the Sch.*Od.* (M^a) δ 384d, II p. 291 Pontani (labelled with doubts by Pontani 2010 *ad l.* as exegetical), where *Od.* 4.387, *Od.* 1.215 and Eur. fr. 1015 are quoted together:

πωλεῖται τις [*Od.* 4.384]: ἐρώτησις. ἐκ ποίας διανοίας ἡ Εἰδοθεά ὀρμωμένη φησὶ πρὸς Μενέλαον τάδε· “πωλεῖται τις δεῦρο γέρον... τὸν δὲ τ’ ἐμόν φασιν πατέρ’ ἔμμεναι” [*Od.* 4.387]; τὸ γὰρ “φασίν” ἀμφιβαλλούσης ἐστὶ καὶ διαπορουμένης περὶ τοῦ πατρὸς. ἀπόκρισις· τὰ μὲν περὶ τῶν μητρῶν ἐκ γενέσεως ἱκανά φησιν Ὅμηρος ἔχειν τεκμήρια, τὸ δὲ τῶν πατρῶν ἀδιόριστον εἶναι. ἔφη γὰρ πού [*Od.* 1.215] “μήτηρ μὲν τ’ ἐμέ φησι τοῦ ἔμμεναι”, ὅθεν καὶ Εὐριπίδης [*sequitur* Eur. fr. 1015].

An old man frequents [*Od.* 4.387]. Question: Which intention prompted Eidothea to say this to Menelaus: “an old man frequents this place... they say he is my father” [*Od.* 4.387]? For the “they say” is typical of a woman who has doubts and is not sure about who is her father. Answer: Homer says that, since birth, the mothers’ contributions are sufficiently proved, whereas the fathers’ one is uncertain. In fact, he has said somewhere [*Od.* 1.215] “my mother says I am his son”. Whence also Euripides [*sequitur* Eur. fr. 1015].

This is not surprising, given that the Homeric scholia are, in fact, one of Eustathius’ main sources, and that he often amplifies the information taken from them with his personal commentaries, by adding to them material from other origins, or by combining data from several scholia, as no doubt is the case here³⁸.

5. Conclusions.

Based on these premises, we are now in a position to evaluate the several variants of Men. *Car.* fr. 1.2, and try to reach some conclusions.

The reading οὐθείς transmitted by the manuscripts of Stobaeus was not accepted in an edition of Menander until that of Körte and Thierfelder 1959³⁹. All subsequent editors of Menander have also chosen this variant instead the οὐδέις of the Homeric scholion and Eustathius. It has to be said that Menander’s sources, both from papyri or of indirect transmission, show much hesitation between the spellings οὐδέις/ οὐθείς and μηδέις/ μηθείς (for the

³⁸ See Van der Valk 1963, 86-106 and id. 1971, LIX-LX.

³⁹ Kock, who knew the reading through Hense’s notes, only mentions it in the critical apparatus.

data see Pompella 1996, s.vv.). In view of this, the most recent editors of the playwright have opted to edit the forms in question as they are attested each time. We might add that, as emerges from Threatte 1980, 472, this same hesitation can also be noticed in the Attic inscriptions (even sometimes within the same inscription) between 378/7 BCE, when forms with -θ- are attested for the first time in an Attic decree, and the end of the 4th century BCE, the approximate time when the forms with -θ- become the only ones used. In turn, the forms with -δ- start to reappear in the Attic inscriptions of the 1st century BCE, and become normal in the Roman period⁴⁰. Taking into account Menander's chronology (ca. 342-ca. 292 BCE), the solution adopted by the most recent editors of the playwright of giving precedence to οὐθείς in case of divergence between the sources seems correct. It is in fact unlikely that the medieval copyists emended on their own initiative forms of the οὐθείς type, which were perfectly familiar to them, replacing them with others with -θ-, which were far less common. In contrast, the replacement of forms of the οὐθείς type by others with -δ- is easily explained as a trivialization. In this case, therefore, it seems clear that the manuscript transmission of Stobaeus has preserved what was read in the model, and their testimony is preferable to that of the other sources, a point on which editors of Menander since the last century have concurred.

Regarding the variants πῶς/ τοῦ, given that, as we have seen, Eustathius is clearly dependent on the Homeric scholia, whereas Stobaeus contributes a testimony which is independent of them, we may conclude that the πῶς we read in both Stobaeus and the scholia is the original form, while the τοῦ of Eustathius is no doubt the result of a banalization of the text. The emendation, possibly ascribable to Eustathius himself, can be easily explained taking into account the predominance in the passage in question of the idea of the uncertainty of paternity, which makes the amendment almost natural. It seems clear, however, that originally the link between Menander's quotation and the Homeric passage did not lie specifically in doubts about the identity of a father but, rather, in the idea of the need to trust in other people's testimony when it comes to determining one's own origin. All in all, the analysis of the relationships between the different sources of the fragment demonstrates that the choice made by Grotius in the 17th century, and subsequently accepted by almost all of Menander's editors until the 21st century, was not actually right, and confirms the correctness of Austin's decision against all his predecessors.

As for the variants αὐτός/ αὐτόν, it is worth taking into account that if the αὐτός read in Stobaeus' manuscripts was relegated to the critical apparatus in the editio of Menander⁴¹ it was basically because the Homeric scholion also testifies αὐτόν at this point, the same as Eustathius, whose version of the fragment had always been preferred by the editors. These, besides, relegated Stobaeus' version from the beginning, because the *Anthologium* only preserves the first line of the fragment and in an incomplete way. However, following the arguments posited above, as Eustathius is dependent on the Homeric scholion, the coincidence of both sources in the reading αὐτόν does not give more strength to

⁴⁰ For the examples, see Threatte 1980, 473-6.

⁴¹ We must remember that all the editors of Stobaeus had kept the transmitted αὐτός in the text, see above.

this variant against Stobaeus' αὐτός; in fact, both readings must be considered in their own right, leaving aside any prejudice caused by the inertia of tradition.

In this case, it is difficult to make a choice, all the more so when both forms are metrically equivalent and make good sense. Nevertheless, and without denying that the αὐτόν of the Homeric scholion is defensible, in that version line 1 is somewhat banal⁴², as it simply says that no one knows how they were born. Αὐτός, however, adds the idea that nobody knows it on their own, i.e., unless others tell them, which I believe justifies better the πιστεύομεν of line 2, which implies we should trust in what other people (in the first instance, one's own mother) say. In addition, this is exactly what is said in *Od.* 4.216 (οὐ γὰρ πώ τις ἔδ' ὄν γόνον αὐτὸς ἀνέγνω) and it is the topic on which a large part of the commentaries to this Homeric passage turns, as can be seen in the Sch. *Od.* α 215a, I pp. 114-6 Pontani (from Porphyrius' *Homeric Questions*), and in Eustathius *ad l.* Thanks to the *P. Oxy.* 2654, which preserves some 60 (severely mutilated) lines of Menander's *Carchedonius*, we know that in the play the hero, questioned about his parents' identity (*Car.* ll. 31-4), declared that his mother was the daughter of a general of Carthage called Hamilcar (ll. 35-7). Then, the other speaker reproached him for intending to have (as a wife, we can presume) a free Athenian girl, not being an Athenian citizen himself (l. 38), something which was not legally permitted in Menander's times to those who were not of free Athenian parentage on both sides. The scant remnants of the comedy do not allow us to know how the plot evolved and how the difficulty was resolved. However, a plausible hypothesis (see, for instance, Arnott 1996, 87, or Ferrari 2001, 1982) is that the young man turned out to be a free-born Athenian and not a Carthaginian as he believed. If so, fr. 2 may have to do with the fact that the alleged Carthaginian had credited the false stories about his origin, trusting in the word of the people among whom he had been brought up and whom he believed his family, as he could not have that information on his own.

I believe, in short, that, leaving aside the omission of ποτ' (a scribal error perhaps favoured by the repetition of the sequence πω-/ πο- in two contiguous words, taking into account the aural confusion between ω and ο⁴³), Stobaeus'⁴⁴ version of the first line of the fragment may be right not only in the readings οὐθείς (only attested by him) and πῶς (shared with the Homeric scholia), but also as for the initial αὐτός, only read in the *Anthologium*.

With this paper I have also tried to 1) highlight how the decisions taken by the editors of the quoting texts interfere in those taken by the editors of the quoted authors, and 2) give a practical example of how, when dealing with fragments, sometimes editors reproduce for centuries the same text edited by others without giving it a second thought, not taking sufficiently into account, for instance, the context within which the passages have been quoted, or the relationships between their sources.

Universidad de Oviedo

Lucía Rodríguez-Noriega Guillén
lnoriega@uniovi.es

⁴² Cf. a similar expression, in a quite different context, in Philo of Alexandria's *Legum Allegoriae*, where the subject of the sentence is the νοῦς, Philo Iud. 1.78 M. ὁ ἐμὸς νοῦς αἴτιος τοῦ νοεῖν; πόθεν; ἑαυτὸν γὰρ οἶδεν, ὅστις ὄν τυγχάνει ἢ πῶς ἐγένετο;

⁴³ A sort of haplography, therefore.

⁴⁴ Who is, we must remember, the only source that mentions the play to which the fragment belongs.

BIBLIOGRAPHICAL REFERENCES

- Allinson 1921 = F.G. Allinson, *Menander, The Principal Fragments*, London-New York 1921.
- Austin 2012 = C. Austin, *Menander. Eleven Plays*, Cambridge 2012.
- Arnott 1996 = W.G. Arnott, *Menander*, vol. II, Cambridge MA-London 1996.
- Arnott 2004 = W.G. Arnott, *Alexis, Greek New Comedy and Plautus' 'Poenulus'*, in Th. Baier (ed. by), *Studien zu Plautus' 'Poenulus'*, Tübingen 2004, 61-91.
- Clericus 1709 = J. Clericus, *Menandri et Philemonis Reliquiae cum notis H. Grotii et J. Clerici*, Amstelodami 1709.
- Cobet 1858 = C.G. Cobet, *Novae lectiones quibus continentur observationes criticae in scriptores Graecos*, Lugduni Batavorum 1858.
- Curnis 2008 = M. Curnis, *L'Antologia di Giovanni Stobeo: una biblioteca antica dai manoscritti alle stampe*, Alessandria 2008.
- Dindorf 1838 = G. Dindorf, *Aristophanis comoediae et deperditarum fragmenta, accedunt Menandri et Philemonis fragmenta auctiora et emendatiora*, Parisiis 1838.
- Elter 1880 = A. Elter, *De Ioannis Stobaei codice Photiano*, Bonnae 1880.
- Ferrari 2001 = F. Ferrari, *Menandro e la Commedia*, nuova edizione con testo greco a fronte, Torino 2001.
- Gaisford 1822 = T. Gaisford, *Ioannis Stobaei Florilegium*, vol. III, Oxonii 1822.
- Gessner 1543 = C. Gessner, *Ioannis Stobaei Sententiae*, Zürich 1543.
- Gessner 1549 = C. Gessner, *Ioannis Stobaei Sententiae*, Basileae 1549.
- Gessner 1559 = C. Gessner, *Ioannis Stobaei Sententiae*, Zürich 1559.
- Gomme – Sandbach 1973 = A.W. Gomme – F.H. Sandbach, *Menander. A Commentary*, Oxford 1973.
- González Suárez 2009 = M. González Suárez, *El copista: ¿artesano o creador?*, Habis 40, 2009, 277-87.
- Grotius 1623 = H. Grotius, *Dicta poetarum quae apud Ioannem Stobaeum extant, emendata et Latino carmine reddita*, Parisiis 1623.
- Grotius 1626 = H. Grotius, *Excerpta ex tragoediis et comoediis Graecis tum quae exstant, tum quae perierunt, Emendata & Latinis versibus reddita, cum Notis & Indice auctorum ac rerum*, Parisiis 1626.
- Hemsterhuis 1708 = T. Hemsterhuis, *Menandri Sententiae Morales*, Amstelodami 1708.
- Hense 1884 = O. Hense, *Die Reihenfolge der Eklogen in der Vulgata des Stobäischen 'Florilegium' (Teil I, Teil II)*, RhM 39, 1884, 359-407; 521-57.
- Hense 1894-1912 = O. Hense, *Ioannis Stobaei Anthologii libri duo posteriores (III-V)*, Berolini 1894-1912.
- Hertel 1560 = J. Hertel, *Vetustissimorum sapientissimorum comicorum quinquaginta, quorum opera integra non extant, sententiae, quae supersunt*, Basileae 1560.
- Kock 1888 = T. Kock, *Comicorum Atticorum Fragmenta, vol. III. Novae Comoediae Fragmenta, Pars II. Comicorum Incertae Aetatis Fragmenta. Fragmenta Incertorum Poetarum. Indices. Supplementa*, Lipsiae 1888.
- Körte – Thierfelder 1959 = A. Körte – A. Thierfelder, *Menandri quae supersunt*, vol. II, Lipsiae 1959.
- Meineke 1823 = A. Meineke, *Menandri et Philemonis Reliquiae. Accedunt R. Bentleii in Menandrum et Philemonem emendationes integrae*, Berolini 1823.
- Meineke 1841 = A. Meineke, *Fragmenta Comicorum Graecorum, vol. IV. Fragmenta poetarum Comoediae Novae*, Berolini 1841.
- Meineke 1856 = A. Meineke, *Ioannis Stobaei Florilegium*, vol. III, Lipsiae 1856.

- Morel 1564 = G. Morel, *Ex veterum Comicoꝝ fabulis quae integrae non extant sententiae, nunc primum in sermonem Latinum conversae*, Parisiis 1564.
- Piccione 1994a = R.M. Piccione, *Sulle fonti e le metodologie compilative di Stobeo*, *Eikasmos* 5, 1994, 281-317.
- Piccione 1994b = R.M. Piccione, *Sulle citazioni euripidee in Stobeo e sulla struttura dell'‘Anthologion’*, *RFIC* 122, 1994, 174-218.
- Piccione 1999 = R.M. Piccione, *Caratterizzazione di lemmi nell'‘Anthologion’ di Giovanni Stobeo. Questioni di metodo*, *RFIC* 127, 1999, 139-75.
- Piccione 2010a = R.M. Piccione, *La presenza di Giamblico nell'‘Anthologion’ e i passi dalle epistole*, in D.P. Taormina – R.M. Piccione (ed. by), *Giamblico, I frammenti dalle epistole. Introduzione, testo, traduzione e commento*, Naples 2010, 23-85.
- Piccione 2010b = R.M. Piccione, *L'‘Anthologion’ di Giovanni Stobeo*, in M. Horster – Ch. Reitz (ed. by), *Condensing texts - Condensed texts*, Stuttgart 2010, 619-47.
- Pompella 1996 = G. Pompella, *Lexicon Menandream*, Hildesheim 1996.
- Pontani 2007 = F. Pontani, *Scholia Graeca in Odysseam, vol. 1. Scholia ad libros α-β*, Romae 2007.
- Pontani 2010 = F. Pontani, *Scholia Graeca in Odysseam, vol. 2. Scholia ad libros γ-δ*, Romae 2010.
- Sandbach 1976 = F. Sandbach, *Menandri reliquiae selectae*, Oxonii 1976.
- Sansone 2011 = D. Sansone, *Eupolis fr. 245 K.-A. (POLEIS)*, *RhM* 154, 2011, 232-4.
- Schrader 1890 = H. Schrader, *Porphyrii Quaestionum Homericarum ad Odysseam pertinentium reliquias*, Lipsiae 1890.
- Sodano 1965 = A.R. Sodano, *La tradizione manoscritta delle ‘Quaestiones homericae’ di Porfirio. Il codice Vaticano greco 305 e le edizioni umanistiche*, *Annali del Pontificio Istituto Superiore di Scienze e Lettere ‘S. Chiara’* 15, 1965, 97-122.
- Sodano 1966-67 = A.R. Sodano, *La tradizione manoscritta delle ‘Quaestiones homericae’ di Porfirio. Il codice Vaticano greco 305 e alcuni aspetti della tradizione scoliastica all'‘Iliade’*, *AAP* 16, 1966-67, 345-82.
- Sodano 1970 = A.R. Sodano, *Porphyrii Quaestionum Homericarum liber I*, Neapoli 1970.
- Stephanus 1569 = H. Stephanus, *Comicoꝝ Graecorum sententiae, id est γυνῶμαι*, Geneva 1569.
- Threatte 1980 = L. Threatte, *The Grammar of Attic Inscriptions I: Phonology*, Berlin 1980.
- Trincavelli 1536 = V. Trincavelli, *Ἰωάννου τοῦ Στοβαίου ἐκγλογαὶ ἀποφθεγμάτων*, Venetiis 1536.
- Van der Valk 1963 = M. van der Valk, *Researches on the Text and Scholia of the ‘Iliad’*, vol. I, Leiden 1963.
- Van der Valk 1971 = M. van der Valk, *Eustathii Commentarii ad Homeri Iliadem pertinentes*, vol. I, Lugduni Batavorum 1971.
- Wachsmuth, 1884 = C. Wachsmuth, *Ioannis Stobaei Anthologii libri duo priores*, I-II, Berolini 1884.
- Webster 1950 = T.B.L. Webster, *Studies in Menander*, Manchester 1950.
- Webster 1974 = T.B.L. Webster, *An Introduction to Menander*, Manchester 1974.
- Winterton 1684 = R. Winterton, *Poetae Minores Graeci*, Cambridge 1684.

Abstract: This paper raises some methodological issues concerning the edition of fragments from indirect sources, at the same time that it analyses and evaluates the textual variants of Menander's *Carchedonius* fr. 2, by studying: 1) how the passage appears in the manuscripts of the three indirect sources that transmit it; 2) how it has been edited over time in the different editions of both the sources and of Menander himself; and 3) the relationships between the sources, and the importance of those relationships for the reconstruction of the text. Finally, a proposal for the editing of the text is put forward.

Keywords: Menander, Textual criticism, Stobaeus, Homeric scholia, Eustathius.

Finito di stampare il 30 novembre 2017