

Heterocclisis in Menander and the authorship of *P. Ant.* 15 (= *fr. com. adesp.* 1084 K.-A.)¹

This paper has two aims, both technical, and one perhaps of more general interest than the other. The first part of the paper reviews the evidence for heterocclisis in Menander. It presents the data with primarily historical and philological discussion; how the Greek facts might best be synchronically described is a problem I will leave to others. What concerns us here is the history of individual lexemes and stem types, so far as it can be known, and what variations in stem realisation are in fact attested in which cells of nominal paradigms. This is a necessary preliminary for discussion of the question of the authorship of *P. Ant.* 15. This paper argues that the evidence for heterocclisis in Menander gives us some significant counterevidence for Menandrian authorship of *P. Ant.* 15; the paper therefore rehearses the arguments for Menandrian authorship. The discussion of heterocclisis provides us with secure grounds for judging the papyrus to be by another comic poet. This means that non-Menandrian New Comedy may have survived longer than normally assumed.

1. Heterocclisis: a preliminary definition

Heterocclisis is the phenomenon by which a lexeme is inflected, in different parts of its paradigm, according to different morphosyntactic patterns.² This is not the same as allomorphy, in which a single morphological cell can be filled by one of two or more endings in free variation. Thus the endings of the DPl. $-οις$ and $-οισι$ are allomorphs, since they are two different endings added to identical stems in identical function. The variation in Homeric

¹ My thanks go to Dr Daniela Colomo (Oxford), who kindly arranged for me to inspect *P. Ant.* 15 myself.

² For Greek, cf. Egli (1954); Rix (1976) 126-127; older treatments in Kühner / Blass (1890) 495-519, Schwyzler (1939) 582-4 (with the note on the neuter plural on 581). For two complementary theoretical accounts of heterocclisis see Stump (2006) for the synchronic perspective and Maiden (2009) for the diachronic perspective. As will become apparent, this paper suggests that Maiden's approach is more conducive for analysis of the Greek data.

Greek between κύκλοι and κύκλα ‘wheels’, on the other hand, is heteroclisis, since the plural endings –α and –οι cannot normally both be added to a second declension (o-stem) noun.

2. The data

Heteroclisis in the fourth century is most frequently found among the consonant stems (the ‘third declension’ of didactic grammars). The *o*- and *a*-stems remain generally stable as such. Some consonant stems are remade into diminutives (and thus join the neuter *o*-stems) over the course of the Koiné; this process does not seem to have yet been underway when Menander was writing.³ Several kinds of consonant stem are still productive in the Koiné; as a result, the consonant stems as a type remain fairly stable. A number of categories, however, show heteroclisis or full-scale remodelling. In some cases, competing (and mutual) analogies lead to different stem types being generalised; in others, differing stem types had long been part of the language. The following sections survey the material class by class.

2.1 *i*- and *u*-stems

The inflection of *i*-stems in Menander shows the effects of competing analogical processes. In addition, there are some examples of genuine heteroclitic inflection, in which a lexeme shows differing stem formations in different cases.

Thus ὄρνις is inflected both as a consonantal stem in –θ– and as an *i*-stem; the latter inflection is attested at fr. 115.1 (APl. ὄρνεις; contrast the dental stem in the following line of the fragment), fr. 132.3, 4 (APl. ὄρνις); this inflection is already found S. *OT*. 966, E. *Hipp*.

³ Cartlidge (2014) 37-58 is a collection of Menander’s diminutives with analysis of their derivation patterns; since the diminutive suffixes remain productive, the diminutive lexemes need not be explained as lexicalised replacements for third declension nouns.

1059, Ar. *Av.* 717, 1250, 1610, Dem. 19. 245.⁴ Inherited *i*-stem inflection can also be found in ὄφεις ‘bracelet’ with APl. ὄφεις (fr. 292).⁵

The *u*-stems were part of the consonantal inflection pattern in the parent language; but in the historical period, Greek remade them into vowel stems following the loss of intervocalic /u/. The *u*-stem APl. (originally $-\bar{u}\zeta < *-\text{uns}$) was redetermined in the Koiné by addition of the consonantal APl. ending $-\alpha\zeta$ (ἰχθύας Mt 14:17); although Menander does not record this ending (cf. e.g. τὰς ὀφρῶς),⁶ the ASg. in $-\nu\alpha$ (e.g. ἰχθυῖα Theoc. 21. 45) requires the rise of the APl. ἰχθυῖας to have taken place.⁷

Two forms of the nominative plural are attested: *Sam.* 98 ἰχθῦς vs. fr.224.5 ἐγγέλεις.⁸ The ending $-\epsilon\iota\varsigma$ is the expected outcome of $*-eyes$ (reconstructed on the basis of Sanskrit $-\text{avaḥ}$, Gothic $-\text{jus}$). In inscriptions and papyri the form $-\nu\epsilon\varsigma$ is also attested, with a similar redetermination of the nominative plural that we saw above in the accusative plural.⁹ NPl. $-\epsilon\iota\varsigma$ may have been remodelled to $-\bar{u}\zeta$ either on the basis of the old APl. or by generalisation of the stem vowel down the paradigm (ἰχθύς : ἰχθεῖς » ἰχθῦς), supported in part by the parallel of the *i*-stems: ὄφεις : ὄφεις :: ἰχθύς : X, X = ἰχθῦς.

2.2 *s*-stems and *n*-stems

The inflection of *s*-stems was generally stable in the Koiné, notwithstanding some changes in the distribution of the suffix, up to the first century A.D., when they begin to decline.¹⁰ There were however three categories of *s*-stem whose inflection was adjusted in late Attic. The first

⁴ Contrast the papyri, in which the by-forms ὀρνέον and (Doric) ὀρνιξ are found but never the *i*-stem; Mayser (1938) 31.

⁵ On the implications of this for the text of Menander, see Cartlidge (2016).

⁶ The word is only attested in the APl. in Menander: fr.37.2, fr.349.1, fr.857. 3, *Dysk.* 423, *Ep.* 633.

⁷ Egli (1954) 14.

⁸ See Sommerstein (2013) 98 on $-\bar{u}\zeta$.

⁹ Threatte (1996) 219-220; Mayser (1938) 25.

¹⁰ Meissner (2006) 182.

of these are compounded personal names in –ης (type Σω^οκράτης).¹¹ Like other animate *s*-stem nouns, the vocative usually shows the plain suffix –ες with recessive accentuation, e.g. Σώκρατες.¹² However, in the course of the fourth century there is increasing confusion between *ā*-stem masculine nouns (also common as personal names, the Ἀλκιβιάδης type) and the *s*-stem forms.¹³ The forms most susceptible to this change are the vocative and accusative. In Menander, we read the VSg. Στρατοφάνη (*Sik.* 135, 142, 377, 381, fr.3.1;¹⁴ restored 128) and ASg. Στρατοφάνην (*Sik.* 365) for classical *Στρατόφανες, *Στρατοφάνη. Menander's usage in this case is reflected by contemporary non-Attic inscriptions.¹⁵ The *s*-stem inflection is however still attested: GSg. Ἀριστοτέλους fr.258.¹⁶

Of particular importance to this paper is an unusual and isolated *s*-stem noun, namely σῆς ‘moth’. The *s*-stem inflection is attested in the fifth century (GPI. σέων Ar. *Lys.* 730, Hermippus fr.91); other forms are attested by grammarians, e.g. NPI. σέες by Moeris p.339 P. Menander, by contrast has a *t*-stem, cf. NPI. σῆτες fr. 761.5. This is shared more generally by the post-classical language, cf. σητός Philo *de post. Caini* 56, *de somn.* 1.77; σῆτες Arist. *HA.* 557b3; σῆτας Thphr. *HP.* 1.10.4; 9.11.11; σητῶν Philo *de Abr.* 11.3, *de spec. leg.* 4.149. By the time of Pollux, the forms of the word with *s*-stem inflections had become hard to understand: he glosses σέων as σητῶν (this is our source for Hermippus fr. 91). A scholion to Lucian (151.6 Rabe) glosses σέα as σῆτας, again showing the distinction between Lucian's learned Atticising and what had become standard Greek. The fifth-century evidence shows

¹¹ Meissner (2006) 171-172, 178-182, 197 for onomastic evidence.

¹² Menander also attests the vocative in –εις to names compounded in –κλῆς, especially Ἡρακλεῖς in exclamations, but this reflects a different situation (–κλεῖς < *–κλέφες).

¹³ Meissner (2006) 179; Chantraine (1933) 429; Schwyzler (1939) 579. The papyri remained in flux until the turn of the millennium, though the accusative was rebuilt first; see Mayser (1938) 38-40, and more generally Niehoff-Panagiotidis (1994) 65-66.

¹⁴ This fragment is quoted by Photius specifically in order to demonstrate the form of the vocative (κλητικὴ πτωσίς) in Menander.

¹⁵ Cf. Krieter-Spiro (1997) 211-2.

¹⁶ Other *s*-stem names are only attested in the NSg.: Ἀνδροκλῆς *Sam.* 606, Καλλικλῆς fr. 246.7, Πολυνείκης fr. 248.

that the *s*-stem forms persisted surprisingly late; many other irregular stems of this kind (e.g. the γέλως type) had been remade at a much earlier stage.¹⁷

Menander apparently preserves both *s*- and *t*-stem inflection of the nouns in –ας (cf. γήρως fr. 852. 1, κρέα *Dysk.* 519 vs. τέρασιν *Ep.* 1116).

In the classical period, comparative adjectives in –ων inflected as *n*-stems, but there were *s*-stem allomorphs of the masculine-feminine accusative singular, and the nominative and accusative plural in all genders. These are attested in the Mycenaean period (*me-zo-a*₂, /mezoha/, giving μέζω by contraction and Attic μείζω by a lengthening in the first syllable that is somewhat obscure), and go back to the proto-language.¹⁸ These allomorphs are still attested in Menander (APl. βελτίω fr.322.2),¹⁹ but are less frequent than the *n*-stem alternatives (βελτιον- *Dysk.* 283, fr.273.3, fr.871.4 (corrupt); further ἐλάττονος *Ph.* 16, κρειπτον- *Theoph.* fr.1.13, *Ep.* 329). It is however true that these comparatives are most commonly attested in the neuter singular, where no *s*-stem alternative was available; cf. βέλτιον *Asp.* 209, *Dysk.* 149, 251, 418, *Mis.* 669, *Sik.* 340; αἴσχιον *Ep.* fr.10.2; ἄμεινον *Mis.* 536, fr.602.9; ἔλαττον fr.708.3; ἥδιον fr.825.1; θᾶπτον *Asp.* 222, *Dysk.* 430, 454, 596, 866, *889, *Ep.* 371, *Pk.* 364, 526, *Per.* fr.6.3, *Sam.* 574, 658, 679, 691, 720, fr.65.5, fr.460, fr.602.11; κάλλιον fr.786.2; κρεῖπτον *Dysk.* 811, 957, *Ep.* 1068, *Kar.* fr.4, *Theoph.* fr.1.18, fr.695, fr.713.2, fr.727, fr.787, fr.841.1, fr.843.1. The high frequency of the neuter singular is due to the gnomic style of the book fragments and the comparative adverb.

The relevant numbers are therefore small but seem to indicate a preference for the *n*-stem inflection (1: 6); this can be interpreted as paradigm levelling characteristic of a koineising variety. It is not necessary to posit contact with Ionic, but Ionic inscriptions in several areas

¹⁷ Meissner (2006) 132-3.

¹⁸ Sihler (1995) 362; Szemerényi (1996) 194-6. For the lengthened first syllable of Att. μείζω and similar forms see Sihler (1995) 363.

¹⁹ *Sent.* 738 Jäkel has καλλίω, but as the ι scans short it cannot be a Menandrian line.

do not use *s*-stem forms;²⁰ this may also have contributed to the generalisation of the *n*-stem paradigm in the fourth century.

2.3 The inflection of γυνή

The noun γυνή is inflected with a stem γυναικ- in most Greek dialects. This paradigm is attested in Menander, and in fact remains relatively stable in the later language.²¹ Evidence for the normal paradigm in Menander is frequent, including e.g. ASg. γυναικα (*Dysk.* 828), GSg. γυναικός (*Asp.* 134), DSg. γυναικί (*Ep.* 794), NPl. γυναικες (*Sam.* 426), etc.²²

However, beside this Menander also attests an *ā*-stem plural form (γυναιί fr.457); this is paralleled elsewhere in comedy, cf. Alc. com. fr.32 VSg. γυνή, Pher. fr.96 ASg. γυνήν, Philippid. fr.2 NPl. γυναιί, and Pher. fr.206 APl. γυνάς. Apparently this form is not attested on the Attic inscriptions.²³ Presumably this form can be compared with learner errors such as *childs for children, or *we was for we were; such forms are sometimes corrected and relearned, but others can become the majority forms in a group of speakers.²⁴

2.4 Summary

Menander's heteroclitic paradigms can therefore be divided into old stem variation (e.g. the comparative suffix; ὄρνις) and innovative types (the *u*-stems; the *s*-stem names; σής; γυνή).

Most variation is found in the nominative and accusative singular and plural, while the dative

²⁰ See Garbrah (1978) §66 for Erythrae. A similar consideration applies to the form εικόν: though attested in Herodotus, the Ionic dialects and isolated Attic inscriptions as εικό (Smyth (1894) 408; Threatte (1996) 122-3) with an *oi*-stem (for which see Schwyzer (1939) 479), it inflects in Menander exclusively with the *n*-stem endings; cf. fr.420, fr.535.

²¹ Though in the Byzantine period γυνή is apparently treated as an indeclinable word; see Gignac (1977) 52 for examples and Mayer (1938) 30 for a possible Ptolemaic forerunner which he does not think should be read as γυνῆ (see below).

²² That this is a Pan-Hellenic, not only an Attic paradigm, can be inferred from the Hesychius glosses βανά: γυνή. ὑπὸ τοῖς Βοιωτοῖς and βανῆκας: γυναικας. Βοιωτοί (1. 311 Latte). The implication that the development of the –αι(κ)– extension to the stem is older than the development of the labiovelars may find support in Armenian *kin* 'woman', pl. *kanay-k^c*; see Schwyzer (1939) 583 in favour, Clackson (1994) 136-7 against.

²³ Threatte (1996) 274; Schwyzer (1939) 582-3.

²⁴ Niehoff-Panagiotidis (1994) 94-95 notes that this form behaves exceptionally among third declension nouns in not generalising the consonantal stem.

and genitive are usually stable (we do not find GSg. γυνῆς, or DSg. γυνῆ, for example; the accusative of the *s*-stem names is the most vulnerable to variation while GSg. Ἀριστοτέλους is unaffected). This corresponds with the conclusion reached by Stump, who uses Ancient Greek data in his cross-linguistic survey of heteroclisis.²⁵

In addition to asking ourselves where heteroclisis comes from in Greek, we also need to ask where it ends up; as will become apparent, this is a key question in our assessment of heteroclisis in Menander. The simplification of inflectional paradigms observed in the development of the Koiné has already been flagged, for example in the rise of indeclinable γυνή (and ultimately the generalisation of the accusative γύναικα). This shows that the spread of heteroclisis in the word in post-classical comedy was a short-lived trend (indeed, it seems to have been a feature predominantly of comic language). By contrast, the case of σής shows that the reanalysis of the noun as a *t*-stem was successful: the *s*-stem inflection becomes a feature of learned language while the (fully inflected) dental stem was established elsewhere.

3. The authorship of *P. Ant.* 15

The issue of heteroclisis in Menander has implications for the authorship of the comic fragment *P. Ant.* 15 (cited in this paper according to the line numbers in K.-A.).²⁶ This is a page of a codex dated palaeographically to the fourth century, with iambic trimeters on both sides; one side begins with a cast list and a large asterisk, while the other has continuous text. The trimeters clearly belong to New Comedy – but are they by Menander? Above the cast list are some traces of ink that some have restored to read as an author and a title; the physical

²⁵ Stump (2006) 317. His ‘direct’ cases are the nominative, vocative and accusative. An important case of heteroclisis neglected by Stump is the comparative inflection, which has (in his terminology) ‘fractured’ heteroclisis in the plural as well as the singular. The existence of this kind of heteroclisis acts as support for the contention (see Maiden (2008) 61) that all heteroclitic paradigms ultimately go back to the ‘fractured’ type, of which Stump’s ‘cloven’ type is a special case. But since heteroclisis in the comparative is in the process of being levelled at the time Menander is writing, these considerations take us away from the main thrust of this paper.

²⁶ Editions: Roberts (1950); Morel (1963); Barns / Lloyd-Jones (1964) = Lloyd-Jones (1990); Austin (1973) 242-4; Kassel / Austin (1995) 375-7; Sandbach (1999) 327-8; Arnott (2000) 505-527.

evidence will be discussed briefly below, but it is important to note that the restoration has never been greeted with total confidence in the literature.²⁷ Various criteria have been brought up in this discussion, on both sides of the case. Roberts, who took the side without the cast list to be the recto, thought that we had the end of one play and the beginning of another. Consequently, the recognition scene of the play would have to be ‘compressed to a degree without parallel in Menander’.²⁸ Morel disagreed, as have most who have studied the papyrus. He ascribed it ‘mit aller Entschiedenheit’ to Menander.²⁹ The basis of this was the word *περισκελίς* (1084. 27), attributed to Menander by Pollux (fr. 618), and, more importantly, the parallel in thought between 1084. 11-12 and *Dysk.* 764. Barns / Lloyd-Jones are more cautious, suggesting that there is ‘nothing inconsistent with Menander’s authorship’.³⁰ They remove the non-Menandrian word *ἄσσον* from 1084. 7 (though the line remains difficult); they find positive indication in the use of *ἐλεύθερος* for *ἐλευθέριος*; in an addendum, Lloyd-Jones adds *Men. Mis.* 307-308 (= 708-709 Arnott) as a parallel to the use of *ἀγαπάω* in 1084.³¹ Barns / Lloyd-Jones also point out that Roberts has misinterpreted the order of the pages: the side on which the page numbers are written indicates that the side with the cast list is the real recto.³² This therefore disposes of Roberts’ principle objection to Menandrian authorship. Bandini, however, was more definite, noting ‘numerosi e significativi i punti di contatto fra il nostro testo e ciò che conosciamo come sicuramente menandro’.³³ Arnott is also optimistic: ‘there is nothing in the style and language of A. 15’s text that conflicts with, but much that suggests, Menandrian authorship’.³⁴ He points out that

²⁷ By far the most positive statement about it was Austin (1967), but this is based entirely on the date of the papyrus; the date of the papyrus and its relevance to the argument will be discussed below.

²⁸ Roberts (1950) 30.

²⁹ Morel (1963) 150.

³⁰ Barns / Lloyd-Jones (1964) 31 = Lloyd-Jones (1990) 110. I cite the reprint in Lloyd-Jones’ collected papers for convenience and several addenda, but note that there are several typographical errors. The plate is also clearer in the original publication.

³¹ Lloyd-Jones (1990) 107 fn. 4, apparently independently noticed by Borgogno (2002) 57 fn. 2.

³² Barns / Lloyd-Jones (1964) 27 = Lloyd-Jones (1990) 103-4.

³³ Bandini (1984) 144-5.

³⁴ Arnott (1999) 61; to the full bibliography in this paper add now Borgogno (2002) and Handley (2006).

if the fragment is part of Menander's *Daktylios*, as Webster had suggested,³⁵ then the mention of a ring early on in the opening speech (1084. 22) accords well with a known habit of Menander to mention a key object early on in the play (cf. e.g. *Asp.* 16). Borgogno, in a study of the plot presupposed by the fragments, suggests that the similarity to the *Aspis* indicates a plot 'tipicamente menandrea', and that this accords with the equally Menandrian language and style.³⁶ For Handley, the key comparandum is the *Misoumenos*, the prologue of which 'is like enough to this play to increase the probability that it too was written by Menander'.³⁷ He is however forced to admit that this motif is not sufficient for proof of authorship: the motif of address to forces of nature also occurs, for example, in the *Mercator*, which is adapted from Philemon.³⁸ His restoration of lines 7-8 includes a passage of speech-within-speech, a phenomenon also known as a Menandrian device.

Thought, plot, vocabulary, style and language have thus all been held to point to Menandrian authorship. A methodological observation must first be made. When we restore a passage of New Comedy, it is not unreasonable that we look to Menander's usage first and foremost. He is after all the poet of New Comedy we know best, and have always known best, by a considerable margin. But as a result it is impossible to say with even reasonable assurance what is 'Menandrian' about a plot when we do not know what is 'non-Menandrian' (or indeed what is 'Diphilan' or 'Philemonic'). In other words, I doubt our ability to distinguish 'Menander' from 'New Comedy', especially as regards 'tone' or plot structure. I am not the first to make this move: Barns / Lloyd-Jones already pointed this out in their discussion of

³⁵ Webster (1973).

³⁶ Borgogno (2002) 60.

³⁷ Handley (2006) 23. See already Bandini (1984) 146-147.

³⁸ Handley (2006) 24.

Morel.³⁹ The force of this observation has however not been fully appreciated in the literature on this papyrus.

Methodology apart, two linguistic details which argue decisively against Menandrian authorship can be identified in our text. The first occurs in the following lines:

χλαμύδο[ς] ἥμισυ⁴⁰
διεσπαραγμένης παλαιᾶς, ὑπὸ [σέ]ων
σχεδόν τι καταβεβρωμ[έ]νης (1084. 24-6)

‘Half a cloak, ripped and ancient, almost munched through entirely by moths’

Although the papyrus has the odd hole, the restored letters in this passage are not in any serious doubt – what else would be found feeding on a cloak? But as we saw above, by the time of Menander, the form for ‘moth’ had been remodelled into a *t*-stem, of which the expected genitive plural is σῆτων (recall fr. 761.5). It might be countered that we have no reason to suppose that the genitive had been remodelled; but as we saw, the *t*-stem was in the process of spreading, until the whole paradigm was remodelled. The burden of proof then has to be on those who would argue for a heteroclitic, rather than a uniform paradigm of this word.

How can we account for this? To adduce Hermippus and Aristophanes as models for Menander can only get us so far: why would Menander precisely here use an older form? Such a line of influence would be an interesting comment on our tendency to divide Old and New Comedy rather sharply; but our two examples hardly make a trope so striking that its connotation could be recognised. Alternatively, we could say that while Menander used the ‘new’ nominative plural σῆτες, the old genitive plural was still in use; the paradigm, then,

³⁹ Barns / Lloyd-Jones (1964) 27 = Lloyd-Jones (1990) 104. See also in a similar connection the remarks of Barns in Barns / Zilliacus (1960) 15-16.

⁴⁰ The reading is difficult, but the emendation is certain.

was heteroclitic. But as we have seen, the general rule is that if the nominative has been remodelled, the genitive has too. Therefore such an hypothesis can be ruled out. Barns / Lloyd-Jones call the tone of the opening ‘not only excited but exalted’ – is it possible that this tone also includes the dialogue with the Therapaina, and that this exalted tone conditioned the use of an archaic sounding genitive plural? I am not convinced that this argument is plausible: a monologue (even if overheard) is one thing, dialogue with a servant quite another.⁴¹ In short, the easiest solution is to conclude that the text cannot be by Menander. I add to this a lexical observation: the negative οὔποτε (1084. 8) is not attested in Menander, or in fact any post-classical comedy, save Nicostratus fr. 6.1 and Philemon fr. 178.4. It is striking that neither of these fragments is in trimeters. The presence of οὔποτε in this context is therefore highly suspect.

There are therefore two definite linguistic problems with the assumption that Menander is the author of our text. What of the physical evidence? The recto preserves a decorative cast list; above this list the papyrus is highly abraded and broken. A recent re-examination of the papyrus has shown that it has deteriorated badly, and many of the traces on the edges are now lost. The following traces were read by Barns / Lloyd-Jones:

]ε . [. .] . ρο . | [] . . c

The traces before the *sigma* were read by Barns as τo;⁴² if this is right, then, assuming that the traces of the first line should be restored as [M]εγ[α]ν[δ]ρο[υ], the only play that qualifies is the *Apistos*.⁴³ Webster has adopted different hypotheses at different times. When Roberts’ ordering of recto and verso was still accepted, he argued that, since the *dramatis personae* were too few for a play and too many for a scene, the ρο must belong to [μέ]ρο[υ]c ‘act’; the

⁴¹ For similar reasons I am opposed to the view (e.g. Zini (1938) 3) that accords an archaic character to the expletive ἐχθρὸς θεοῖσιν in *Pk.* 268; see Cartlidge (2014) 196-202 for full discussion.

⁴² Barns / Lloyd-Jones (1964) 22 = Lloyd-Jones (1990) 95.

⁴³ Austin (1967) 134.

monologue must therefore open an act, somewhere in the middle of the play.⁴⁴ The ‘tone’ and some similarities with Terence’s *Hecyra* led Webster to propose Apollodorus of Gela as the author,⁴⁵ but it is unclear to me that we know enough of the original of the *Hecyra*, or enough about the play our papyrus has come from, or enough of Apollodorus’ language, to make this case convincing.⁴⁶ In an alarming volte-face, Webster later stated baldly that ‘the papyrus gives the first two pages of a play by Menander’, and observing that the traces of the title identified by Austin could also be restored as]ιoc, and that the *Daktylios* would therefore also fit.⁴⁷ This proposal has often been found attractive, particularly given the mention of a ring in line 22.⁴⁸ It is deeply to be regretted that the relevant portions of the papyrus have now perished; nor is the photo clear enough to allow confident pronouncements. Roberts, at the start of our journey with this papyrus, wrote ‘Μ]εγ[α]ν]δρoυ cannot be said to be impossible, but could never be read on its palaeographical merits’.⁴⁹ I do not therefore count these traces as a case to be answered.

Supposing my argument is accepted, it requires texts of non-Menandrian comedy to have survived rather longer than our record would normally allow us to believe. However, the argument from papyrus date is less water-tight than often stated. Although later papyri may be more *likely* to be by Menander,⁵⁰ the survival of other comedy cannot be taken to be impossible.⁵¹ Our adespota may yet prove to have more non-Menandrian comedy than we expect. One consideration remains. We can never prove that a given text *is* Menandrian without direct physical evidence (e.g. a colophon or a textual overlap with a known

⁴⁴ Webster (1952).

⁴⁵ Webster (1970) 237-240; the parallel with *Hecyra* was noted already in (1952).

⁴⁶ For the problem of the identity and chronology of Apollodorus of Gela and Apollodorus of Carystius, see Krause (1903); Schuster (1907); Webster (1970) 225-226.

⁴⁷ Webster (1973) 138-9.

⁴⁸ Bandini (1984) 145; Arnott (1993) 29, (2000) 508.

⁴⁹ Roberts (1950) 35.

⁵⁰ Thus Austin (1967), Barns / Lloyd-Jones (1964) = Lloyd-Jones (1990), Bandini (1984) 145, Arnott (1999)

⁵¹ Nesselrath (2006) comes to the conclusion, in fact, that more non-Menandrian comedy than we often suppose may well have survived into later antiquity, and that we therefore have to be more cautious in assigning authorship to anonymous texts than perhaps we have been.

fragment); we can only demonstrate that certain texts *cannot* be by Menander. This article has set out to do just that for *P. Ant.* 15, presenting both lexical and morphological evidence, and discussing *en route* the evidence for heteroclisia in the fourth century B.C.

Bibliography

- Arnott, G. W., (1993), 'Comic Openings', in Slater, N. / Zimmermann, B. (edd.), *Intertextualität in der griechisch-römische Komödie*. Stuttgart: 14-32
- Arnott, G. W., (1999), 'Notes on P. Antinoopolis 15 (fr. com. adesp. 1084 Kassel-Austin)', *ZPE* 125: 61-64.
- Arnott, G. W., (2000), *Menander. Volume III*. Cambridge, Mass. / London.
- Austin, C. F. L., (1967), 'Pap. Antinoop. 15', *CR* 17/2: 134
- Austin, C. F. L., (1973), *Comicorum Graecorum Fragmenta in Papyris Reperta*. Berlin / New York.
- Bandini, A., (1984), 'Sul papiro d'Antinoopolis 15', *AFLS* 5: 143-160.
- Barns, J. W. B. / Zilliacus, H., (1960), *The Antinoopolis Papyri. Part II*. London
- Barns, J. W. B. / Lloyd-Jones, P. H. J., (1964), 'A fragment of New Comedy: *P. Antinoopolis 15*', *JHS*. 84: 21-34.
- Borgogno, A., (2002), 'Sulla trama della commedia del P. Antinoopolis 15', *Prometheus* 28: 57-60.
- Cartlidge, B., (2014), *The Language of Menander Comicus and its Relation to the Koiné*. Diss. Oxon.
- Cartlidge, B., (2016) 'Menander, Misoumenos 42', *ZPE* 199: 16
- Chantraine, P., (1933), *La formation des noms en grec ancien*. Paris.
- Clackson, J. P. T., (1994) *The Linguistic Relationship between Armenian and Greek*. Oxford.
- Egli, J., (1954), *Heteroklisie im Griechischen, mit besondere Berücksichtigung der Fälle von Gelenkheteroklisie*. Zürich.
- Garbrah, K. A., (1978), *A Grammar of the Ionic Inscriptions from Erythrae: Phonology and Morphology*. Meisenheim am Glan.
- Gignac, F. T., (1977), *A Grammar of the Greek Papyri of the Roman and Byzantine Periods. Volume II: Morphology*. Milan.

- Handley, E. W., (2006), 'Dialogue with the Night (PAnt 1.15 = PCG VIII 1084)', *ZPE* 155: 23-25.
- Kassel, R. / Austin, C. F. L., (1995), *Poetae Comici Graeci. VIII: Adespota*. Berlin / New York.
- Krause, E. F., (1903), *De Apollodoris comicis*. Diss. Berol.
- Krieter-Spiro, M., (1997), *Sklaven, Köche und Hetären: Das Dienstpersonal bei Menander*. Stuttgart.
- Kühner, R. / Blass, F., (1890), *Ausführliche Grammatik der griechischen Sprache. Erster Band*. Hannover.
- Lloyd-Jones, P. H. J., (1990), *Greek Comedy, Hellenistic Literature, Greek Religion, and Miscellanea. The Academic Papers of Sir Hugh Lloyd-Jones*. Oxford.
- Maiden, M., (2009), 'Where does heteroclisis come from? Evidence from Romanian dialects', *Morphology* 19: 59-86.
- Mayser, E., (1938), *Grammatik der griechischen Papyri aus der Ptolemäerzeit. Band I: Laut- und Wortlehre. 2. Teil: Flexionslehre*. Berlin / Leipzig.
- Meissner, T., (2006), *S-stem Nouns and Adjectives in Greek and Indo-European*. Oxford.
- Morel, W., (1963), 'P. Ant. 15', *Philologus* 107: 145-151
- Nesselrath, H.-G., (2006), 'Menander and his rivals: new light from the comic adespota?' 119-137 in Obbink, D. / Rutherford, R. (edd.) *Culture in Pieces. Essays on Ancient Texts in Honour of Peter Parsons*. Oxford.
- Niehoff-Panagiotidis, J., (1994), *Koiné und Diglossie*. Wiesbaden.
- Rix, H., (1976), *Historische Grammatik des Griechischen*. Darmstadt.
- Roberts, C. H., (1950), *The Antinoopolis Papyri. Part I*. London.
- Sandbach, F. H., (1999), *Menandri Reliquiae Selectae*. Oxford.
- Schuster, M., (1907), *De Apollodoris poetis comicis*. Progr. Wiener-Neustadt.
- Schwyzler, E., (1939), *Griechische Grammatik. Allgemeiner Teil, Lautlehre, Wortbildung, Flexion*. München.
- Sihler, A., (1995), *New Comparative Grammar of Greek and Latin*. Oxford.
- Smyth, H. W., (1894), *Sounds and Inflections of the Greek Dialects. I: Ionic*.
- Sommerstein, A. J., (2013), *Menander: Samia*. Cambridge.
- Stump, G. T., (2006), 'Heteroclisis and paradigm linkage', *Language* 82/2: 279-322

- Szemerényi, O., (1996), *Indo-European Linguistics*. Oxford.
- Threatte, L., (1996), *The Grammar of Attic Inscriptions II: Morphology*. Berlin / New York.
- Webster, T. B. L., (1952), 'Two comic fragments', *CR* N.S. 2/2: 57-60.
- Webster, T. B. L., (1970), *Studies in Later Greek Comedy*. Second edition. Manchester.
- Webster, T. B. L., (1973), 'Notes on Menander' 137-9 in Due, O. S. / Fris Johansen, H. / Dalsgaard Larsen, B. (edd.) *Classica et Mediaevalia. Francisco Blatt septuagenario dedicata*. Copenhagen.
- Webster, T. B. L., (1974), *An Introduction to Menander*. Manchester.
- Zini, S., (1938), *Il linguaggio dei personaggi nelle commedie di Menandro*. Florence.

Ben Cartlidge, St John's College, St Giles, Oxford OX1 3JP, United Kingdom

benjamin.cartlidge@sjc.ox.ac.uk