Changes of Speaker in Papyrus Bodmer IV

by Maurice Pope

Papyrus Bodmer IV, the recently discovered 3rd century papyrus containing the Dyiskolos of Menander, has three ways of indicating which character of the play is supposed to be speaking. The first method is to write the character's name (or the first few letters of it) in the margin. This is not done every time. The second method is to put a paragraphus (a short horizontal stroke) beneath the beginning of every line in which a speech ends. Unfortunately the paragraphus is a somewhat blunt tool. It cannot show the actual place in the line where the speech terminates. And worse still, if the speaker changes more than once within the line, the paragraphus is unable to warn us of the fact. It is therefore supplemented by a third method — a double point (like an English colon) placed after the final word of each speech.

It is obviously of cardinal importance in emending and restoring the text to know what degree of reliance can be placed in the papyrus' use of these signs. Its first editor, Victor Martin, was sceptical. 'Il arrive naturellement' he says (intr. p. 11), 'que ces signes (viz. the paragraphus and the double point) soient omis ou mal placés', and concludes that: 'L'analyse du dialogue reste le meilleur moyen de déterminer l'identité des interlocuteurs dans les cas douteux.' Martin's own restored text makes not infrequent use of the freedom thus claimed, as do many of the suggestions that have since been published by others. On the other hand a great many satisfactory emendations have been made which respect the papyrus' punctuation of the dialogue in places where Martin has disregarded it.

The purpose of this article is to enquire how far a complete text of the play can be satisfactorily established in accordance with the papyrus notation.

The first essential is to have as accurate a record as possible of what the papyrus contains. Unfortunately Martin's diplomatic text is full of mistakes in the matter of punctuation. Corrections to it have been published, notably by E. G. Turner Emendations to Menander's Dyiskolos, BICS 6 (1959) 61ff. and by P. W. Harsh Gnomon 31 (1959) 577ff., and the following alterations should be made:

Insert a double point (or a lacuna sign to show its possibility): 52, 188, 293, 361, 480, 573, 783 (lacuna), 893 (lacuna).
Delete double colon: 165, 196 (?), 254, 343, 417, 581 (?), 665 (?), 896 (?).

To these corrections I would add the following, though without having seen the original papyrus it is not possible to be certain about them:

144 After βέλτιστα it is not possible to tell whether the punctuation is a single or a double point.
191 ? double point after φρεάρ. From the photograph there seems to be a crack in the surface of the papyrus where the lower dot should have been.
766 ? single point after τρωφερὸς οὖν. The apparent under dot belongs to the
preceding *nu*. Cf. 774, 777, 783 on the same page where the lower dot of the double point is placed appreciably higher on the line in relation to the preceding *nu*.

787 The papyrus is torn where the lower dot of the double point at the end of the line should be.

In many cases these corrections bring the allocation of speakers made in the papyrus into line with the allocation made in Martin’s restored text. In many others a different restoration — generally in itself preferable — will do so.

52 (Bi., Gall., Gr., ICS, Kr., PN)
92ff. (various solutions, of which all save the paragraphi)
122f. (Gall., H., ICS, PN)
139-140 (Bi., Gall., ICS)
179 & 181 (Bi., Gall., ICS, PN)
201ff. (Bi., Gall., ICS, Kr.)
378 (Bi., Gall., ICS)
406 (Bi., Gall.)
503 (Bi., Z.)
556 (Bi., Gall., ICS, T.)
581-3 (Bi., Gall.)
597 (Bi., Gall., Gr., ICS)
603 (Bi., Gall, ICS, PN)
618 (Bi., Gall.)
727-9 (omnes)
760ff. (Bi., Gall., ICS)
837ff. (ICS; less well Bi., Gall.)
867 (Bi., Gall., T.)
870 (Bi., Gall., H., ICS, PN, T.) — but a double point must be missing after τοιούτος or χαίρετα.
924ff. (ICS et alii aliter)
926f. (Bi., Gall.)
930 (Bar., Bi., Gall.)


2 The ICS restoration (by Webster) of 837—841 is most attractive, particularly for 838. But it does not give a sufficiently compelling reason for Gorgias’ conversion. He has already refused the incentive of money and financial security. Even though we are at the end of a comedy some new argument or idea, however briefly expressed, is necessary. Now both ἀδίκητος and σοφίης are words with a slightly religious flavour. So instead of Webster’s γιόμενος I would suggest μικρός, which the audience would understand as a tacit reference to Pan — the patron of the play. His statue is certainly on the stage as is shown by 545, 572, and perhaps 659—661. After this plea by Kallippides it would appear not only inopportune, but also blasphemous for Gorgias to refuse.

41
The discrepancies that still remain are as follows:

83 A paragraphus is required both by the sense and by the double points clearly given in the papyrus.

140-146 A difficult passage. There are various ways in which good sense can be made of 140-143, but so far the suggestions offered all involve altering the papyrus punctuation. The restoration offered by PN assumes that a double point has been omitted after θεός in 139, and wrongly inserted after σωστράτε in 140. The differing restorations of Bi. and ICS both assume the omission of a double point after ηλαθη in 141.

In line 144 βέλτιστε must be spoken by Pyrrhias and not to him since a slave cannot be so addressed except perhaps ironically. The examples of ὑπάγω given by LS-J sub voc. B II do not prove that the word can be used on its own to mean ‘go ahead’ ‘advance’ (the Eup. fr. is a clear para prosdokian, and in the Xen. examples to tell a vanguard to ‘move off’ the word receives the implication of ‘forwards’ from the context). The word’s natural meaning is ‘go away’ ‘withdraw’ as in 378. There is no double point after βέλτιστε in the Hermopolis papyrus and the Bodmer papyrus is uncertain. It is in any case unlikely that Sostratos asks his slave to address Knemon at this stage, or that Pyrrhias speaks 145. This leaves only the first word of the line in doubt. For Sostratos to speak it would seem somewhat pointless. But in Pyrrhias’ mouth it would make an acceptable antithesis to σο δέ: ‘This is where I’m off, sir. You talk to him.’ The remark will come better if the preceding speech announcing Knemon’s appearance was made by Sostratos, and indeed the papyrus gives a double point after οὕτωσι in 143. The first half of 143 (before the double point) must then go to Pyrrhias as a re-iterated protestation of innocence. The end of 142 will therefore be a statement, and the dialogue will run: SOSTR. ‘But somebody whipped you.’ PYRRH. ‘When I’d done nothing wrong though.’ SOSTR. ‘And here he is!’ PYRRH. ‘I’m off, sir. You talk to him.’ This interpretation assumes only the omission of a double point at the end of 142, and no wrong insertions.

This leaves 146 — a tantalising line as Goold calls it. One would like to save the paragraphus and double point by thinking of a suitable parting shot for Pyrrhias to make in the few letters at his disposal. But I confess that none has occurred to me that would warrant his remaining on the stage after the suitable exit line of 144. The alternative is to give the whole line to Sostratos. It is then comparatively easy to fill, but the cost is to assume the wrong insertion of a paragraphus and double point — a mistake that the papyrus can nowhere else be convicted of with certainty.

For the passage a whole I would suggest:

\[\Sigma\Omega\]

\[\kappa\alpha\kappaον \delta \varepsilon \sigmaε\]

\[κακος \varepsilonπ\]αντες \varepsilonπολε\varepsilonιαν οι \varepsilonθε\varepsilonι \varepsilonπ\]ς \varepsilonμι\varepsilonρι\varepsilonς. (ΠΠ) τι \varepsilon\delta]\[ε\]

\[\varepsilonικικρα, \Sigma\varepsilon\varepsilon\varepsilonτρατε; : 140\]

\[\Sigma\Omega\]

\[\varepsilonμι\varepsilonς \varepsilon\gamma\varepsilon\] \varepsilon\varepsilonκ \varepsilon\varepsilonπ \varepsilon\varepsilon\tauο \varepsilon\varepsilonπ\varepsilon\varepsilonι \varepsilon\varepsilonτη\varepsilonλα\varepsilonθη \varepsilonκακο\varepsilonν. (ΠΠ) \varepsilon\varepsilon\varepsilonικ\varepsilon\varepsilon\varepsilonκ \varepsilon\varepsilonκ\varepsilon\varepsilonλ\varepsilon\varepsilonπ\varepsilon\varepsilonν. : (\Sigma\Omega) \varepsilon\varepsilonλλι \varepsilon\varepsilon\varepsilon\varepsilonμι\varepsilon\varepsilon\varepsilonτι\varepsilon\varepsilon\varepsilonν \varepsilon\varepsilon\varepsilonι\varepsilon\varepsilonς. [:]

\[42\]
(ΠΥ) οδιδὲν ἀδικοῦντα: (ΣΩ) καὶ πάντες τι γ' ὁτοσί: 
(ΠΥ) οὖς ὑπάγοι, βέλτιστον σι δὲ τούτῳ λάλει: εκι 
(ΣΩ) οὖκ ἀν ὑπαιμῆν. ἀπιθανός τις εἰμ' ἀει 
ἐν τῷ λαλεῖν. ποιον λέγει ν' ἰη τους ν' [;]

140 ICS. 141 ICS puncto post ὕπαλαθι posito. 142 ἄλλῳ οὖς ICS, οδιδὲν ἐν Biagen, 
qui Pyrrhiae attribuunt. 143 Sostrotos et Pyrrhiae attribuunt ceteri. 144 alii alii modis. 
146 λέγεις σι νεὶ λέγατες δὲ αλί, sed Pyrrhia nunc absente non debet restituī: fortassē 
ποιον λέγειν τοσίν γ' ἐνι;.

On this restoration the papyrus is to be charged with the omission of one 
double point, and — more seriously — the inserzione of a double point and 
paragraphus.

177 Knemon has been addressing Sostratos. He now turns back to his house, 
and utters the soliloquy 177-8 as he crosses the stage. The double point 
marks the change of direction of his speech.

213 The tritagonist has left the stage as the daughter at 
204-5 and entered 
the house. During Daos' speech (with its time-consuming apostrophe 
to Poverty) he has opportunity to change into the costume of Pyrrhias. 
But he remains where he is to be able to answer φωνὲ δὲ θὲρο to Sostratos. Sostratos crosses the stage in the time occupied by Daos' speech 
212-3, and speaks the remainder of 213 as if to the daughter inside the 
house. But the tritagonist is in fact on his way back-stage to the sanctuary from which he will emerge as Pyrrhias at the end of 214. Sostratos 
then himself turns back from the house and crosses towards the cave 
with the lover's sigh οἷοι κακοδαίμων. The double point at the end of 
213 thus signifies the change of direction of his speech.

343 The necessary paragraphus has been omitted.

359ff. If the commonly accepted emendation of ὁ τὰν for the papyrus οτὰν 
in 359 is correct, the succeeding words must be given to Sostratos 
(despite Gallavotti) and the omission of a paragraphus and double point 
assumed. In 361 there is a certain double point after εὐτοιμὸς and a 
probable one after οἰλεγές, both of which are generally disregarded 
and the whole speech βαδίζειν ἐλευμὸς το συναγώνισι μοι: 
allocated to Sostratos. This has two minor disadvantages. It is somewhat 
inaesthetic for Sostratos to repeat the same phrase οὶ λέγεις twice in three 
lines. Moreover the ἄλλα of 362 would come more convincingly if 
Gorgias had spoken the previous words. I would therefore suggest giving 
the end of 361 to Gorgias, perhaps reading (with Gallavotti but in a 
different sense) ὅ τοι λέγας. But the οὗ φρονεῖς of 363 may have 
displaced Gorgias' words completely, in which case a discouragement of 
the type οὗ φρονεῖς would fill the gap.

371 The necessary paragraphus has been omitted.

456 The papyrus has ἑντράξεις η — perhaps a simple error. But Bingen may 
be right in supposing that the double point has been misplaced from 
after περιμένοντες. If so, Getas will speak 436-7 and the necessary par 
agraphus has been omitted.

466-7 ἄνθρωπος should be spoken by Knemon, and a missing double point 
assumed after it a.

---

7 This punctuation — obviously correct, cf. 109, 702 — is due to E. W. Handley.
591 A double point is missing at the end of the line.
594 False iota? — see below.
616ff. Whether or not Gallavotti’s emendation is right in 616, Sostratos must be addressing Daos. In 617-9 Gorgias forbids Daos to accept Sostratos’ invitation. Gorgias then enters the sanctuary from which he must reappear in 635, while Daos returns to the house disappointed, and, since he is a κωφός πρόσωπον, speechless.
624 Double point missing.
633 Paragraphus missing and falsa iota — see below.
634 False iota — see below.
638 I agree with Gallavotti as against Kassel and Goold that ἕγος...τάχυ is spoken by Simiche. It is she that realises the urgency of the situation, not Gorgias. No part of the line can be given to Sostratos (who would in any case be more likely to ask the need for haste than to emphasise it) since there are already three characters on the stage, and his mask must be worn by a mute.
698 699-700 should be spoken by Gorgias. Not only will the opportunity to speak afford him a more dignified departure, but the sententia expressed is more appropriate to his character than to Knemon’s. We must therefore assume a paragraphus and double point to be missing at 700. The punctuation at the end of 698 is not certain from the photograph. It could be a double point whose upper half has run into the iota that descends from the line above.

Zuntz and PN emend to τάχιστα and give the lines to Knemon. But there is no reason why Knemon should express himself so urgently. He is not dying. Indeed his next remark is to ask his daughter to help him up, and immediately after that he barks angrily at Sostratos.
733 οὕτως may be spoken by Sostratos himself, as Gallavotti suggests. Otherwise one of the double points must represent (as in 177 and 213) a change of direction of speech. The πρῶτε σύ addressed to Sostratos would then form either the end of Gorgias’ speech or the beginning of Knemon’s.

774 (after πατήρ), 779 (in fine), 819 (after the second ἔκων), 846 (after ἔχω), 870 (after τοῦτος or κατέστω—more probably in view of the writing in the papyrus the former). Double point omitted.
896 ‘Paragraphem habet, sed in mg. puncto delente signatam’ Gall. It is clear from the dialogue that the paragraphus ought to have been deleted, but the photograph does not convince me that it was. (The line ending is very similar to that of 698).
911/2 If we disregard 911 (as we probably should) as a botched attempt at the succeeding line, then the only fault we need find in the papyrus punctuation of this passage is the omission of a double point at the end of 913. The Cook will claim the right to attack first in 910. This is reasonable as it was he who first suggested (in 896) the idea of asking for something, and moreover he has the right to be first as his status is superior to that of Geras. In 912 the words οἶγοι οἰμώ can belong to the ragging, as Turner suggested.

Knemon for the first time: Sikon: Hallo, who's this? Do you belong to this house? Knemon: Of course I do. What do you want? The Cook then continues as the interlocutor until 918. The cooking utensils are the natural things for him to ask for — also the tables in 916 (cf. 943 where he explicitly states that the tables are his province since he is the cook). Again his tone of command and importance in 916-7 are more appropriate to his position in the world than they are to that of Getas. Getas then takes over in 920, and appropriately demands rugs since it was these that he had been responsible for providing — as we are told in 405.

I am inclined to read:

\[GE\] δόας σ' είς τώ πρόσθε σκηνήν;
\[KN\] ἢπαγε \[δή\] καὶ σό \(<\>\); \[GE\] καὶ δή

The Cook has yielded his turn at 918 and Getas comes up: Getas: It was him, sir. He brought you out here. Knemon: I don't want you either. Go away. Getas: As you say, sir... (goes up to door and starts beating it).

This reading assumes an omitted double point after προηχθην̄; and another after καὶ σο.

False iota, and perhaps an omitted double point at the end of the line.

Double point omitted after τῶπτ' ἐκ, or perhaps at end of 954.

Double point omitted after πρός θέαν. Note that the photograph shows an interlinear double dot above the καρπα of the succeeding ὀδύν (cf. 436 and Bingen's restoration).

Two double points omitted each side of τὶ ποήσαω.

The most striking result of this examination is to show how rare are the instances of wrongly inserted punctuation. The only line where both paragraphus and double point appear wrongly placed is 146, but since the line itself contains a lacuna, we cannot be sure. In 361 the pair of double points may be wrong, but again the line itself is incomplete as it stands in the papyrus. In 896 there is a false paragraphus — a pardonable error in any case, since it follows six paragraphi in the previous six lines, and one which in the opinion of Gallavotti was corrected by a deleting mark in the margin. In 436 there is a double point placed in the middle of a word, and there is perhaps one to be seen above the line in 956. These are the only errors of commission with which the papyrus punctuation can be convincingly charged, and none except the last two are certain.

Errors of omission on the other hand are more frequent, particularly in the last two hundred lines of the play. They are as follows:

Paragraphus omitted: 83, 343, 359 (and double point) ? , 371, 633 (and double point*), 700 (and double point), 954 (and double point).


In some cases (marked with an asterisk in the above list) the omitted double point is represented in our papyrus by a false iota. This was pointed out first by Harsh (p. 579). The relevant lines are: 338 (?) with later addition of double
point), 361 (same comment — my own addition to Harsh’s list), 594? (though Harsh thinks that what we have is in fact a blurred double point), 633 (my own addition), 634, 639 (iota for single colon), 945. This excellent observation reduces still further the errors with which the tradition can be charged.

The puzzling thing about these figures is the frequency with which our papyrus omits double points — but not paragraphi — towards the end of the play. In the first 770 lines only six paragraphi are omitted from a total of nearly 200, and some eight double points (not counting the ‘false iotas’) from a total of approximately 250. In the last two hundred lines of the play the paragraphi are still regularly recorded: there should be 80 of them and there is only one missing. But of the 110 or so double points there should be, there are 12 absent. So sudden an increase of a particular class of mistakes calls for an explanation. One might argue that the play ends with a knockabout scene and that therefore the scholar who first punctuated the dialogue was either not particularly interested in working out the exact allocation of parts, or that the actors had — as might be natural in such a scene — corrupted the tradition. One could further point out that such an explanation is not contradicted by the apparent accuracy of the paragraphi. All the double points in the last 200 lines that have been listed as missing are, as it were, surplus to requirement. That is to say there is no instance in these lines where a correct paragraphus does not have a double point present to justify it. 945 is only an apparent exception, since the false iota shows that a double point was present in the exemplar. The real objection to this explanation is that the onset of faults begins in 774, long before the knockabout scene, before the plot has been completed and while the play is still serious. It is therefore more plausible to suppose that the blame lies with the condition of the exemplar, whose final pages or columns may have been badly faded and some of the double points rendered invisible. Illegibility in the exemplar towards the end is strongly suggested by the accurately spaced blanks which the scribe of our papyrus has left at 913 and 931. This explanation may also account for the different hand of page 39 (PL 19). On reaching 850 the scribe may have despaired of reading his exemplar and have left the whole page until another copy could be obtained. It is noticeable that on the page thus later copied in there is only one punctuation error — the omission of the double point after τομοῖς in 870.

So far I have made no mention of the third and most useful way in which the speaker is indicated — the writing of his name. This is normally written in the left-hand margin if the speaker’s words begin the line, and in the right-hand margin if they begin at any point in the middle of the line. On five occasions, for no apparent reason, the left-hand margin is preferred in defiance of the normal practice (102, 116, 135, 206, 365). Twice (129 & 212) the speaker’s name is written over the words he speaks in the centre of the line.

Harsh (p. 159) gives a list (not intended to be complete) of wrong notations in the papyrus. Of the four wrong insertions which he cites that in 196 is dubious (ICS took the lower dot as uncertain, and Martin checked their readings with the papyrus), and that in 870 is now cured by common consent (even by Harsh himself on p. 581!). This leaves 361, for which I have suggested a cure though admittedly a drastic one, and 926, where there is no objective reason to doubt the papyrus attribution. Of the score of omissions he only cites three exempli gratia: 52 and 726 are now cured by general consent; for 911/2 see my remarks.

5 Harsh (p. 159) gives a list (not intended to be complete) of wrong notations in the papyrus. Of the four wrong insertions which he cites that in 196 is dubious (ICS took the lower dot as uncertain, and Martin checked their readings with the papyrus), and that in 870 is now cured by common consent (even by Harsh himself on p. 581!). This leaves 361, for which I have suggested a cure though admittedly a drastic one, and 926, where there is no objective reason to doubt the papyrus attribution. Of the score of omissions he only cites three exempli gratia: 52 and 726 are now cured by general consent; for 911/2 see my remarks.
The names are not written in every time, and the principles guiding their insertion are by no means clear. Every character is named on his first appearance, except perhaps Pan — in 402 we may be confident that Getas' name was written in the torn away right margin. Re-entrances are not quite so certain. There are eighteen occasions where a character who has left the stage is mentioned on his re-appearance. In three others (Getas 546 & 599, Knemon 601) we cannot tell because the margin is missing. In 456 the fact that Getas' name is not written in may indicate that he has not left the stage at 441, but merely remained at the entrance of the cave and busied himself with the picnic preparations during Knemon's soliloquy. Similarly the fact that Gorgias is mentioned at 637 and not at 635 may mean that he does not appear till then, the previous lines having been spoken from within the sanctuary. But unfortunately there are a few instances where re-appearing characters are not named at all — Sikon at 434 and 890, Sostratos at 666 (or is his name faintly visible in the margin?), Kalippides at 785, and Knemon at 913. These few instances of omission are perhaps not enough to make us doubt the intention to record all re-entrances, but they may sap our confidence in arguing from particular cases.

Another possible principle would be that in three-cornered conversations the contributions or the protagonist were specifically assigned. This works well until 375 and 378 where Daos should be named and is not.

Soliloquies are often assigned, but not always — e.g. Sostratos at 382 and 666, Getas at 456 and 602.

The attributions are not always obvious — e.g. Chaireas at 102, 112, 116, Daos at 365, Getas at 901. But it is not completely true to say with Martin 'Elles répondent bien à une intention de faciliter au lecteur la compréhension du texte.' There are quite a few instances where we are left in doubt — e.g. 123, 363, and often in the last scene. And there are many others in which the name is assigned though there could be no doubt about it at all — e.g. 169, 552, 813, and particularly at the beginning of the second act where the duologue between Gorgias and Daos is tagged every time.

Most noteworthy is the fact that though the assignations are often omitted where we would like them and inserted where we do not need them, there is no example of a wrong attribution. It is therefore unlikely that it had been the practice of the copyists to assign speakers on their own initiative. Certainly our own scribe was concerned to reproduce what he saw before him and not to follow the drama, or he could not have written what he did in 630ff., to cite but one instance. It is far more likely that the tendency was the other way — to omit the names in the margin through either laziness or oversight. Indeed in our own papyrus the paucity of assignations at the end may be due to what we have seen independent reason to suppose was the poor state of the exemplar. And if earlier copies than ours had more names written in, we may ask how many. I think that the number of unnecessary assignations made in our papyrus suggests that at some time in the tradition many more speeches were assigned. It would then be natural that the assignations most necessary for the understanding of the play — first entrances, re-entrances, soliloquies, third speakers — would be the longest to withstand omission. It is hard to think of any other
process that would account for the appearance of partial selectivity that we find in our papyrus.

The dramatic punctuation of the papyrus is also, as I have attempted to show, free (almost or entirely) from faults of commission, whereas faults of omission occur a number of times. There is therefore every reason to suppose that the ancestor of our papyrus was correctly punctuated. It is important to note in passing that the conception of 'correctness' here does not entirely depend upon our subjective notions of ancient dramatic probability. It has been shown that the Dyskolos was performed with three actors. There are places (e.g. 200ff.) where this has required extremely skilful management on the part of the dramatist, and other places where the limitation has necessitated certain superficial awkwardnesses (e.g. the silence of Daos at 619 and of Sostratos at 638). In these cases and in others a 'common-sense' allocation of parts made without detailed awareness of actual stage requirements could be expected to lead to a text that would require further actors. Indeed many of the recently published emendations and restorations do so. But the punctuation and assignations in the papyrus tradition never make this mistake.

The question that now arises is how far this tradition goes back. There is a general reluctance to believe that it goes back very far, let alone to the time of the author. My belief is that this reluctance is ill-founded. One basis for it is our information that Aristophanes of Byzantium established or at least systematised the usage of critical signs. But his rules are only rarely followed in our papyri, and in any case the dramatic punctuation with which we are concerned here is a quite different thing from critical signs, and from punctuation in our modern sense of the term. Another basis for this reluctance is one that is never expressly stated. One may call it the argument of the increasing intelligibility of texts. Inscriptions contain no word division. Nor do the papyri until a late period. Marks of punctuation (in the normal sense) are rare to begin with, and only gradually become specialised and frequent. Standardisation is later still. The same is true with accents. If reading aids were so slow to be invented — so runs the argument — it would be strange to find them in dramatic texts at an early date.

Some confirmation of this assumption is given by the papyrus fragment of Menander's Perikeiromene (Ox. Pap. 211 — late 1st century). In the space of fifty lines there are three stage directions — εἴσορχ δορυς 13, εἰσαρχ [πολεμῶν] 28, πόλε εἰσιν παντών [εἴσαρχ 49. If the entrances had been regularly marked by stage directions, it would explain why the assignations tend to survive in our papyrus at these points. If cheaper 'reading copies' omitted the full directions, the scribe would not have to work out 'Knemon must have re-entered here'. It would be immediately apparent from his exemplar. There is a slight indication that the same may have happened with soliloquies. In the Dyskolos papyrus there seems to be a tendency for them to be given favoured treatment in the matter of assignation (e.g. 179, 218, 639, 861 though not 382, 456, 602, 666). The possibility that soliloquies may have been specially noted in the tradition is suggested by the marginal comment καθ' ἑαυτὸν λέγει at 41 in a 5th cent. papyrus of the Clouds (Ox. Pap. 1371). In both papyri these comments are by a later hand.

First appearances are recorded every time in the Dyskolos, sometimes with a slight description of the character (189, 393, 574). A reason for this regularity can now be explained without assuming keen intelligence on the copyist's part.

7 By Goold (ref. in n.1), who not only proves the point convincingly but shows in detail how the parts were allocated. The references to the use of the three actor convention elsewhere in this article depend on his argument.
But this conclusion itself is extremely strange if it means that the contemporaries of the men who carved the finest inscriptions in human history were not concerned with clarity of presentation. The fallacy, I think, rests on our assumption of the importance of word division. Our whole training leads us to think of words as separate entities. The Greek did not. Indeed his language contained no word for 'a word'. ἐπος means a remark or a saying, λέξις means speech, as opposed to song or action. When grammatical discussion in the fifth century required a term for 'single word', the one it adopted was δομα — because names were the only words that were normally thought of as existing separately. It is indeed quite probable that the separate writing of words would have confused rather than facilitated the classical reader. Later of course with the diffusion of grammatical concepts and terminology, and with the fact that the language of literature and of the old masters had become divorced from the spoken language so that it had to be taught, word-division will have become a desirable aid to understanding, of which writing conventions eventually took count.

If this line of thought is correct, the uneasy assumption that the book-producer of classical times was obliged (by parsimony, ignorance, or malice) to make things inconvenient for his reader can be abandoned. The holophrastic approach to language made word-division inconceivable. The fact that the language was a living one made accentuation unnecessary — indeed unthought of. Good writing (see Arist. Rhet. 1409 a 20) could make the need for punctuation unfelt. But dramatic or philosophic dialogues are in a different category. For them sign-posting is inevitably desirable — one might say necessary. There is no a priori reason why it should not have existed. Is there any proof that it did?

Now it is remarkable that the practice of our papyri in respect of their use of the paragraphus and double point differs according to the genre of the work and not according to the date of the copying. In epic poetry, the earliest genre, the practice is for neither to be used. Occasionally a coronis marks the end of a book, or a paragraphus each hundredth line, but such instances are rare and do not affect the general rule.

In lyric poetry the custom is for the end of each stanza or movement to be marked by a paragraphus, and the end of the poem by a more elaborate paragraphus or coronis. Again the rare exceptions (P. Oxy. 1604 (Pindar) and P. Oxy. 2165 (Alcaeus) — both 2nd century A.D.) cannot invalidate the general rule.

In tragedy the paragraphus is not only used for dividing the movements of the choral lyric, but also for marking the end of each character's speech. This practice is attested for well back into the 3rd century B.C. by the Oineus and Antiope fragments. In P. Oxy 1370 (5th century) and P. Oxy. 2356 (late 1st century B.C.) the paragraphi may have been omitted and the same function served by outsetting the first letter of the new speech. But these exceptions are not only rare but also uncertain. In the same late Euripides papyrus (P. Oxy. 1370), and perhaps also in a 2nd or 3rd century Aeschylus fragment (P. Oxy. 2256) the termination of speeches is further marked by single dots. But this is most unusual. As for the double point, I have found no instance of its use in a tragic papyrus.

8 Just as the adult reader today would find his reading slowed by the division of words into syllables, though this is the method by which some children are taught.
The practice in Satyric drama is the same as in Tragedy — paragraphi and no double colon.

In Old Comedy the paragraphus is regular at changes of speaker. Beyond this there is some variation. In *P. Oxy.* 1372 (5th century) the termination of speeches seems to be marked by a single point, though there are many omissions and the papyrus is said to be in a poor condition. In *P. Oxy.* 1373 the first hand put a double point where the speaker changed in the middle of the line, and later a second hand added the double point to speeches which finished at the end of a line. In *P. Oxy.* 1617 the double point is used both in the middle and at the end of lines.

In the later papyri of New Comedy the pattern of paragraphus and double point to denote changes of speaker is constant. In earlier ones the paragraphus is universal, but the nature of its reinforcement varies. The normal double points occur in *P. Lit. Lond.* 92 of the 3rd or 2nd century B.C. But in *P. Hibeh* 6 (early 3rd century B.C.) and in the fragment published in *BCH* 30 (1906) pp. 123—149 (3rd—2nd century B.C.) the double point is used only where a verse is divided between speakers. In *P. Heid.* 184 (280—240 B.C.) mid-verse changes of speaker were denoted by a horizontal dash. In the 3rd century B.C. fragment (*BCH* 30 (1906) pp. 103—123) and in the 2nd—3rd century A.D. *P. Oxy.* 431, neither double point nor dash is used but a blank space is left where the speaker changes in the middle of a line.

In 4th century prose dialogue change of speaker is normally signalled by paragraphus and double point, though instead of the double point a dash is employed in two 3rd century B.C. papyri, *P. Petrie* i 5—8 containing the *Phaedo* of Plato, and *P. Heid.* 206 containing Xenophon's *Memorabilia.* This is unambiguous enough, but in another respect confusion does exist. The paragraphus is occasionally used as it is in the papyri of Herodotus and Thucydides to denote a reading pause where there is no change of speaker. The double point also is sometimes found in the same way as a mark of strong punctuation, both in prose dialogue and in New Comedy (e.g. *Dyskolos* 177 & 213). These inconsistencies are far more likely to date back to original experiment in the fourth century than to reflect the fiat of Aristophanes of Byzantium or any other Alexandrian scholar.

In the light of this survey (and here I must stress that it is only a survey and of a tentative nature since I have not had the opportunity to examine all the papyrus evidence) it is possible to give a reasoned account of the early stages of the development of Greek punctuation. In the writing of epic poetry — and this may have been the purpose for which the Greek alphabet was first evolved⁹ — punctuation was unnecessary since the sense is continuous and the verse uniform. But in lyric poetry the signposting of metrical units was desirable. The most obvious way of doing this was by a short stroke — the paragraphus. It would be easy to transfer the same sign to the dialogue of tragedy to mark speech endings. Moreover, in early tragedy it would be a fully efficient device since speech endings and line endings always correspond.

⁹ See Wade-Gery *The Poet of the Iliad* — one need not believe that it was invented by Homer! Boardman (BSA 52 (1957) p. 1ff.) shows good reason to suppose that Chalkis was the place where writing was first introduced into Greece. And Chalkis is frequently stated to have been the site of poetry contests in the archaic period.
Similarly in prose it could be adequately used to show where the treatment of a particular subject comes to an end (not necessarily where we would put a full stop — the papyri of Herodotus and Thucydides often have paragraphi after a genitive absolute or a μετ’ clause where it is dismissing a previous theme). The problem of marking changes of speaker in split lines of verse dialogue and in prose was perhaps first solved by leaving a blank space. Exemplars of this nature seem to have survived to a comparatively late date to judge from the instances where double points are added by a second hand (e.g. the 2nd century Plato fragment P. Oxy. 1248 and the 1st century Menander fragment P. Oxy. 211). But blank spaces, it must have been soon obvious, are particularly liable to transmission errors. Various experiments were tried, until eventually the double point became standard. But it looks as if at first the double point had been used for the marking of strong pauses. It is natural to suppose that such a use of the double point could only have evolved as an intensification of a previous single mid-point. The single mid-point so used would on this assumption date back into the 5th century. When Aristophanes of Byzantium made his rather unsatisfactory suggestions for marking different degrees of pause by the position of the single dot, it is likely that the double point had already been standardised for use in dialogue. As for the paragraphus, its use in prose dialogue and in comedy was now unnecessary, but it continued to be copied in texts, though in original compositions (to judge from the Hellenistic farce P. Oxy. 413a) it may have been dropped.

If this outline history is correct the original edition of the Dyskolos will have certainly contained the paragraphi that we find in our papyrus. It may have contained the double points as well: if not, it will have left a blank space in divided lines. The question of assignations is more difficult, but of less immediate importance in textual restoration. But the dramatic punctuation itself, insofar as it goes back to the time of the author, should be regarded by critics with the same seriousness as the transmitted text. It may have been corrupted in parts, but its origins were respectable10.

To an article that has been concerned with the allocation of speakers in the Dyskolos it is perhaps relevant to add a tailpiece on the question of asides, especially as their alleged abundance in the play has been made the subject of adverse comment (Harsh p. 582 n. 2). Asides may be thought to occur at the following places: 69, 135ff., 168 & 171, 191 & 194, 201, 371ff., 475, 479, 701. Of these 69 (correctly interpreted by van Groningen Mnem. xii (1959) 290) and 475 can equally well or better be spoken as part of the dialogue. But the paragraphus itself, insofar as it goes back to the time of the author, should be regarded by critics with the same seriousness as the transmitted text. It may have been corrupted in parts, but its origins were respectable10.

10 The reliability of the dramatic punctuation of the Cairo papyrus (of which I have not seen photographs) is thus described by Koerte (Menandri quae vestigium, Teubner 3rd ed., prefact xiii): 'At tenendum nonnunquam deesse paragraphos (e.g. Ep. 176, 179, 206, 725; Per. 254, Sam. 160) vel puncta geminata (e.g. Ep. 725, Sam. 160, 169 in fine), perraro falsa posta sunt (e.g. Ep. 42, Sam. 332). But in the two instances he quotes of wrong insertion good sense can be made without departing from the papyrus. Nor is it necessary to suppose a wrong omission in Ep. 725 or in Sam. 160.

It would be invidious to list the numerous conjectures that have been made in defiance of the papyrus punctuation. In particular conjectures which assume that a wrong punctuation has been inserted into the papyrus should only be made as a last resort.
Knemon, who then notices him. 479-480 is probably addressed to the Cook by Getas as he returns to the cave (cf. 427, 430 for another pair of balancing remarks from different parts of the stage). 135-138, which Harsh mentions as particularly awkward, is not an aside as Chaireas has left the stage at 134. The other passage which Harsh picks out is 371ff., but here the μνήμη of 374 indicates that the words are spoken to Gorgias — presumably while Sostratos has retired to change. (Incidentally Barrett (in PNF) has shown that 375ff. should also be given to Davus, and I would be inclined to give him 363ff. as well. It is important to realise that the scheme here suggested is not intended to recommend Sostratos to Knemon, nor is it put forward as a character-test. It is a comic plan, appropriately invented by the slave Davus, to discomfit Sostratos and to get rid of him (see 378, 382, 561). Only in the 4th Act (755) does Gorgias have the bright idea of utilising Sostratos’ blisters to help persuade Knemon of his eligibility.)

The only ‘asides’ that remain are those spoken by Sostratos in front of Knemon and in front of his daughter. But in 168 & 171 and in 191 & 194 though the two characters are present on the stage, they have not yet spoken to each other. In each case we have two sets of independent monologues rather than asides. And in 201-2 Sostratos has turned away from the girl and is walking back to the grotto with the jug. (Incidentally the remarkable brevity of his conversation with the girl confirms the absence of ‘honorable courtship’ in Athens, and I do not see how Harsh (p. 583) can cite line 64 to prove the reverse. What Chaireas there offers is to reconnoitre the ground for an honourable marriage — a quite different thing.)

Thus though there are plenty of monologues (both short and extended) in the Dyskolos, there is no instance of the ‘aside’ proper, where a conversation is unrealistically interrupted by a remark that the interlocutor is not supposed to hear.
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