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I. INTRODUCTION.

MENANDER wrote over 100 plays in 30 years, i.e. between three and four a year; this is corroborated by two facts: first, we have over 90 titles of plays recorded in literary sources; secondly, we know that the Imbrians, written in his twentieth year of authorship, was numbered between 70 and 80. Of this vast production nine plays survive in adaptations by Plautus and Terence, three on papyri of sufficient extent to permit of reconstruction; ten more have considerable papyrus fragments and of another twenty something at least can be said. Thus we can form some idea of about half of Menander’s production.

Although our estimate of Menander must rest primarily on the best preserved plays, the fragments are valuable for checking the accuracy of the picture. Just as the archaeologist can reconstruct a vase from a few small fragments, a few random lines, preserved in the original Greek or in a Roman translation, may give a clue to the shape of a lost play and show with what surviving plays its closest analogies lay. To take one instance, in Terence’ Adelphi the slave Geta (320 f.) tells Sostrata that the rich young man Aeschinus intends to abandon her daughter whom he has seduced but had promised to marry. We know that a somewhat similar scene occurred in the Plokion between a slave and the girl’s father who was a poor man (404-8K; Ribbeck 63, IV-VI, VIII-IX). The ideas there, the defencelessness of poverty against the outrages of the rich and the misery of old age, which only lives on to see disasters, recur in slightly

¹ An amplification of the lecture delivered in the John Rylands Library on Wednesday, the 11th of December, 1946.
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different form in the *Theophoroumene* (223K) and *Hypobolimaios* (481K, 485K) and may reasonably be supposed to have had similar contexts in those plays. In the *Adelphi* Geta and Canthara advise Sostrata to take no action but to try and conceal the misfortune (335 f.); a fragment of the *Hypobolimaios* (489K), ‘it is no small folly to air your misfortune before witnesses when it could be hidden’ clearly belongs to the same situation. Sostrata, however, sends to Hegio for help (in Menander, Hegio was her brother, not a relation of her husband as in Terence); fragments of similar appeals survive from the *Dyskolos* (135K) and *Epikleros* (Ribbeck, 91, II). Hegio undertakes to do his utmost whatever the father of the young man says (493, cf. *Plokion*, Ribbeck, XVI) and sees the issue as wealth exploiting the defencelessness of poverty (500 f., cf. *Plokion*, Ribbeck, XVIII); in due course Micio, the adoptive father of the young man, says that he will do his duty (593), a phrase which is found again in the *Epikleros* (Ribbeck, XI). Thus from random coincidences with lines in the *Adelphi*, we can infer similar situations in the *Plokion*, *Hypobolimaios*, *Epikleros*, *Dyskolos* and *Theophoroumene*.

On the other hand, the fragments sometimes show a full treatment of situations which have only left traces in the surviving plays. In the *Aulularia* (475 f.) the rich man, who is proposing to marry a poor girl, fulminates at length against wives with large dowries; although Plautus has undoubtedly Romanised, exaggerated and extended, the basic idea is Menander’s and the fragments show us that in four plays at least the rich wife was a character and took a considerable part in the action—*Epikleros*, *Plokion*, *Hypobolimaios*, *Misogynes*. The fully preserved plays have no instance of the man who advises his friend against marriage because of his own matrimonial sufferings; but he occurs in fragments of the *Arrhephoros* (65K) and *Paidion* (371K; cf. Ribbeck, 105, X) and in a difficult passage in the *Misoumenos* (45). The domineering and greedy hetaira apparently played a larger part in the *Paidion*, *Demiourgos* and *Thais* than in any of the surviving plays; the picture which Phaedria (quite unjustifiably) draws of Thais in the first act of the *Eunuch* is a final pale reflection of the much fuller
portrait, which we can sense in these other plays.\(^1\) Thus the fragments perform the double function of confirming and enlarging our view of Menander’s art, which must chiefly be formed from the fully preserved plays.

For convenience of study, Menander’s plays must be arranged in groups. One group consists of the Plays of Reconciliation studied in the last volume of the Ryland’s Bulletin.\(^2\) In these plays two lovers (or husband and wife) become estranged through an act of folly; reconciliation is finally affected by a nice appreciation that the wrongdoing was not deliberate but due to some

\(^{1}\) Other instances of vestigial survival: (a) Eunuch, 440 f. Thraso is advised to make Thais, whom he believes unfaithful, jealous by pretending to be in love with Pamphila. In the Leucadia, the girl suspected her lover (Ribbeck, 100, X) and accepted the advances of a foreign soldier and this was evidently the central situation of the play; (b) Heautontimoroumenos 1061, Clitipho rejects a suggested wife because of her appearance. A fuller treatment of this motif apparently occurred in the Demiourgos (Ribbeck, 90, VII); (c) Heautontimoroumenos 1024 f., Clitipho suggests to his mother that he is a bastard; here it is a minor comic scene, in the Hierieia a similar suggestion introduced the recognition scene.

\(^{2}\) Epitrepontes is further discussed, Rylands Bulletin, XXX, 123 f. Leucadia should be added to the Plays of Reconciliation. The fragments show that the setting was the temple of Apollo at Leucas (312K) and Fraenkel (Plautinisches, 112, n. 3) has suggested that it may have inspired the setting of the Rudens. The anapaests describing Sappho’s leap (312-3K) are sung to Apollo by a temple servant, presumably the priestess (she is named 311K, cf. 437K). This, I think, gives the clue to Ribbeck, 99, X: verita sum, ne amoris causa cum illa limassis caput. ‘I was afraid that you had made love to her’; the girl from Leucas had suspected the youth of making love to the priestess, and then adopting the strategy recommended to Thraso (Eun. 440 f.), accepted the advances of a foreign soldier of the type of Bias in the Kolax (cf. Ribbeck II with Kolax 29 f., 50 f.), reducing thereby her rejected lover (Ribbeck VI, cf. Poen., 350) to extremes of misery (Ribbeck I, III, IV), which culminated in a speech overheard by his slave; Cicero regarded this as ‘love not far removed from insanity’ (Ribbeck XII). After this, according to Ribbeck, the girl, but according to Wilamowitz (Sappho u. Simonides, 26 f.) the youth, jumped into the sea and was fished out. This is a remnant of the old confusion (rightly ridiculed by Wilamowitz) that Phaon himself took part in the play; there is no evidence that anyone jumped into the sea; it is much more likely that the soldier carried the girl off and was shipwrecked with her, again as in the Rudens; she was picked up by the youth (Ribbeck XIV), and when she had been duly warmed (Ribbeck XV, cf. fr. 832K), the lovers were reconciled (Ribbeck XVI). It is perhaps permissible to guess that the original reason of the quarrel was the same as in the Perikeiromene and that the suspected lovers were brother and sister. Two fragments refer to a drunken slave (Ribbeck XVIII, XIX).
cause out of the doer's control, such as ignorance, anger or drunkenness. Menander called his first play Orge (Anger) and another early play Methe (Drunkenness); these may well be ancestors of the plays of reconciliation. Whether that is so or not, the grouping has no chronological significance since the Perikeirromene was probably produced soon after 314 B.C. and the Epitrepontes after 304 B.C.¹

Three other groups can be distinguished: Adventure or Intrigue plays (e.g. the Dis Exapaton—Plautus’ Bacchides),² Single-Character plays (e.g. the original of Plautus’ Aulularia),³ and the plays of Social Criticism (e.g. the Second Adelphoi—Terence’ Adelphi).⁴ I hope to study the other groups on another occasion; I am here concerned only with the last group, in which a rich young man loves, seduces, or has seduced, a poor girl. Where Menander lays emphasis on the young man’s misuse of his position and particularly when he goes further to ask how such situations arise, I call the play a play of Social Criticism, but I do not include all seduction stories under this heading. The emphasis in the Perinthia lay on the deception of the old father and it must be reckoned as an Intrigue Play. In the Aulularia the seduction story is a background to the character of the old man Euclio and the play must therefore be reckoned as a Single-Character play. The satirical representation of misers, braggart soldiers, brothel-keepers, and greedy hetairas in the Intrigues and Single-Character plays is, of course, itself

¹ See Appendix on Chronology.
² Add also Kekryphalos, Pseudherakles, Karchedonios (original of Plautus’ Pænulus), Heauton Penthon (= Comoedia Florentina), Perinthia (see below, Sect. IV), Koneiazomenai (see RYLANDS BULLETIN,XXX, 142), and the soldier plays—Aspis, Thrasyleon, Sikyonian, Kolax (see below, Sect. III). Probably also Arrhephoros: fr. 69K certainly refers to a slave intrigue (cf. Heauton, 707), fr. 67K belongs to a slave narration (cf. Bacchides, 249 f.).
³ Add also Samia (see RYLANDS BULLETIN, XXX, 129 f.), Dyskolos, First Adelphoi and the hetaira plays, Demiourgos, Paidion, Thais. Probably also Apistos (possibly the original of the Aulularia), Deisidaimon, Thesauros, Hierieia, Misogynes.
⁴ Add the following plays discussed in RYLANDS BULLETIN, XXX, 115 f.: Heros, Georgos, Theophoroumene, Kitharistes, and the following plays discussed below: Synaristosai, Kanephoros, Hypopolimaios, Plokion, Epikleros, Phasma, Eunuch, Andria, Heautontimoroumenos, Imbrians, Anepsioi.
social criticism of a kind traditional in Greek comedy, but in the plays to which I am here restricting the name, the criticism is constructive instead of destructive because the villains are not purely black nor the heroes purely white, but both are treated with the same sympathetic understanding as the characters in the Reconciliation plays. Social criticism so defined can be found in other plays as we shall have occasion to notice, and the difference between the groups is largely a difference of emphasis, but the seduction plays with social criticism form a compact group, in which it is possible to trace some development in Menander’s thought.

II. Menander’s Social Criticism.

Each of the plays in this group raises detailed problems of restoration; some of these I have discussed already and the rest will be discussed below. I want, however, to consider first the more general question of Menander’s social criticism. These plays have a common formula: a rich young man loves, seduces, or has seduced a poor girl, whom in every case he intends to marry. Frequently the girl bears a child during the course of the play. In the Eunuch (and probably in the Phasma) the girl is seduced during the play. In the Synaristosai (and probably in the Kanephoros) the girl is keeping house for the young man (Cist., 85, 111, 319). The technical phrase for this relationship is παλλακὴν ἐπ᾽ ἐλευθέρους παυσὶν ἔχειν. The girl has not been recognised as a citizen and the legal formalities of marriage cannot be completed, but the young man regards her as his wife and has given her a trousseau (Cist., 485 f.). Menedemus in the Heautontimoroumenos (98, 104) describes the relationship between Clinia and Antiphila in the same terms: amicam ut habeas prope iam in uxoris loco, and the phrase pro uxor habere is twice used of Pamphilus and Glycerium in the

---

1 Cf. Rylands Bulletin, XXIX, 153 f. 2 See last note but one.
4 Cf. Perik, iromene, 236 f. γαμητὴν γυναῖκα, 266 f. trousseau.
The relationship can be broken by either side at any moment: Clinia in the *Heautontimoroumenos* is afraid that the old Corinthian woman who brought up Antiphila may have allowed her to become a hetaira during his absence in Asia (231), and Melaenis tries to withdraw her supposed daughter (*Cist.* 486 f.) when Alcesimarchus is to marry his Lemnian relative. Where the girl is a citizen, as in the *Second Adelphoi,* no such relationship is possible and she can only wait on the young man's promises of marriage. Marriage is the final solution in all cases and is achieved for the non-citizens by the Comedy machinery of Recognition, but the interest of these plays for us lies not in the solution but in the views of the four parties, the young man and the girl, his parents or relatives, and hers.

The match is a love-match, however it began. We can only judge of the girl's views from the two plays in which we see something of her, the *Synaristosai* and the *Heautontimoroumenos.* The first scene of the *Synaristosai* contrasts Selenium, who is desperately in love with Alcesimarchus (*Cist.*, 60 f., particularly 113) and only rebuffs him when her mother compels her (449 f.), with the good-hearted but realistic Gymnasium, who has been brought up to the trade of the greedy hetaira (40, 78, 96). Similarly Antiphila in the *Heautontimoroumenos* is contrasted with the hetaira Bacchis (*potens, procax, magnifica, sumptuosa, nobilis, 227*), who arrives with a retinue of slaves (245 f.) and is ruthless with her lovers (730). Antiphila paid for her loyalty to Clinia with hard work and poverty (275 f.) while he was away, and nearly swoons for joy when he comes back to her (404 f.).

But what the girl regards as a love-match, the girl's relatives see as exploitation of the poor by the rich and are readily led thereby to reflect on the miseries of old age or the advantages of life in the country, where loneliness conceals misfortune (relevant

---

1 Cf. *Plokion, Epikleros, Theophoroumenae, Hypobolimaios, Kitharistes.* Sostrata refers to the impossibility of this relationship when she says that there has been no money transaction between her and Aeschinus (349). Her brother is recognised by Aeschinus' father as not only a man of the old school of morals but 'a friend from boyhood' (440); her husband had grown up with Hegio (494). In Menander (unlike Terence, 933) Micio did not object to marrying her (the meaning of Donatus' *non gravatur* is fixed by *ne gravare* in 942).
passages from the Second Adelphoi, Theophoroumene, Hypobolimaios, Plokion and Epikleros are mentioned above). In the Georgos, Dao all unwittingly preaches to the girl’s mother the advantages of living in the country ‘where one will not have many witnesses to one’s misery’ (79), but the chief critic of the rich in that play is naturally Gorgias, the girl’s brother; it so happens that we only have the replies of the old man Kleainetos, who had himself found an anodyne in the country.¹ His experience (97K) warns Gorgias that however just the plea of poverty, it is apt to be misinterpreted as interested (129 f.) and that excessive anger is incompatible with proper pride (95K); wealth is in any case an uncertain possession (94K). This means, I think, that Gorgias has suggested violent action and Kleainetos argues for an attempt at negotiation, which in fact results in marriage. In the Synaristosai the lena, Gymnasium’s mother, sees the poor hetairae as a closed society always on the defensive against the rich (Cist. 21 f.) and Melaenis naturally sees the treachery of the rich in the news that Alcesimarchus is to marry his Lemnian relation (492). But Melaenis had tried to bridge the gap by bringing up Selenium bene ac pudice (173) and consenting to a liaison which she believed would end in marriage: Chrysis in the Andria tried to achieve the same end by entrusting Glycerium to Pamphilus (283 f.). Thais in the Eunuch makes every effort to restore Pamphila to her family, undeterred by either her very real affection for Phaedria or her fear of violence from the soldier; for this reason she regards Chaerea’s action as ἕβρος (contumelia) unworthy of his standards as a freeborn Athenian (865). But she accepts Chaerea’s defence that his action was due to love and his readiness to marry the girl; she protects him from the justifiable fury of the girl’s brother, Chremes,² and this protection earns her the gratitude of Chaerea’s father.

The older generation on the young man’s side see these love-matches as attempts by greedy hetairae to fleece their sons. Chaerea’s father has long hated Thais as a typical hetaira (1000)

¹ Cf. Rylands Bulletin, XXX, 138 f. I have argued there also that Gorgias in the Heros took the same sort of stand in defence of his sister.
² Pythias’ exaggerations (951-958) conceal a real struggle.
and his slave Parmeno, having introduced Chaerea disguised as the Eunuch into Thais’ house, prides himself ‘on having discovered a method by which the young man can learn early the character and customs of hetairae, in order that when he knows them he may hate them always’ (929 f.); in their eyes, Thais is the typical greedy hetaira. Simo in the Andria has the same preconceptions ¹ and views everything that happens in Glycerium’s house as an attempt to capture Pamphilus (475, 492, 834). Alcesimarchus’ father in the Synaristosai (Cist. 305 f.), having mistaken Gymnasium for Selenium, proceeds to make love to her himself. Similarly, the watchers in the Theophoroumene regard the girl as a whore. ² The older generation can apparently only conceive of two relationships, liaison with a hetaira involving no obligations and marriage of convenience; they themselves had run away when the woman they had violated was found to be with child. ³

The alternative which the older generation offer their sons is formal marriage, and in many of these plays marriage arrangements are already going ahead. ⁴ The son is sometimes not consulted; in the Georgos (7 f.), perhaps also in the Kitharistes, the son arrives from a journey to find the marriage arrangements far advanced; in the Andria (236 f.) Pamphilus meets his father in the market-place and is told to go home and get ready for the wedding. The bride in the Andria is the daughter of a friend (as also in the Samia) but in the Synaristosai, Plokion and Georgos, a relation. The son seldom protests openly. However a fragmentary scene in the Kitharistes (75 f.) preserves a clash between father and son, in which at least it is clear that the father demands that the lady must be free-born and of blameless family. In another play, the young man protests that his mother only worships pedigree, but pedigree is no

¹ Compare the terminology of Andria, 93 f. with Eunuch, 930 f.
² Cf. RYLANDS BULLETIN, XXX, 140.
³ Laches in the Heros, Kleainetos in the Georgos, Demipho in the Synaristosai (= Cistellaria), the father in the Hiereia.
⁴ Synaristosai, Plokion, Epikleros, Georgos, Andria, Kitharistes. Kanephoros can be added, as Ribbeck 86, II, probably refers to a will which compels the young man to marry an heiress. No marriage arrangements in Eunuch, Second Adelphoi, Heautontimoroumenos; of the rest nothing can be said.
guarantee of worth; the man of character is noble even if he is an Aethiopian (533K). This protest may well belong to the Plokion, in which the mother is an ugly, jealous and domineering heiress. The misery of the husband in a marriage of convenience is an old comic theme which goes back at least to the Clouds of Aristophanes; Menander made full use of it in the Plokion, in the Epikleros (in which husband and wife had a dispute before the son as arbitrator), and probably also in the Hypobolimaios (484K). These were solemn warnings against such marriages.

In the eyes of their parents the young men have been caught by hetairae, but in several of these plays ¹ Menander contrasts them with other young men who have in fact been so caught. In the Heautontimoroumenos the contrast between Bacchis and Antiphila (see above) is repeated in the young men. Both are very young (113, 1045). Clitipho has not dared to tell his father about Bacchis, and Syrus justly rebukes his lack of spirit (322 f.); he has no self-control and may at any moment give away the whole intrigue which has been conceived for his benefit (371, 563, 904). Finally, when he is afraid of losing his inheritance, he consents to marry. Clinia on the other hand has a single love to which are due both his exaggerated apprehensions (256) and his transports of joy (683 f.). It does not, however, prevent his being loyal both to his father (100 ff.) and to his friend (694 f.) at whatever cost to himself.² He has a strength and singlemindedness which Clitipho lacks.

Clinia's fears and trepidations are seen in an exaggerated form in Alcesimarchus (Synaristosai—Cistellaria). The swift, stormy inconsistency of his opening speech (203 f.) unlike similar outbursts in the Andria (236) and Adelphi (610), has no immediate reason except that he has been away for six days. A sudden desire for an army as soon forgotten (284), preparations for suicide dropped at once (639), a final capture of Selenium (650) as speedy as their first intimacy (558K) betray something more

¹ Heautontimoroumenos, Second Adelphoi, Eunuch; also Hypobolimaios, Imbrians, and probably Plokion (see below).

² Note that at 690, when Syrus has already begun to talk about Clitipho, Clinia pursuing his own train of thought exclaims O Juppiter and then Antiphila mea nubet mihi; this is the true parallel to Polemon's ὁ γὰρ, Perikeiremene, 448 (cf. Rylands Bulletin, XXIX, 16, n. 1).
than normal wayward violence.\textsuperscript{1} Clinia’s transports of joy are paralleled by Chaerea’s in the \textit{Eunuch}\textsuperscript{2} and by a fragment which should perhaps be ascribed to the \textit{Phasma}; ‘I touched and kissed and at once I was drowned’ (536K).\textsuperscript{3} In the \textit{Phasma}, the course of the youth’s love was described from his first terror at what he thought was an apparition to a passion for which the only remedy was marriage.

Of course, this passion is irrational. The slave in the \textit{Phasma} tells his love-stricken master that he is only suffering from the self-indulgence of the rich (27 f.) and Pamphilus in the \textit{Andria} (55 f.) has deserted his well-balanced routine;\textsuperscript{4} sometimes at least these youths are so obsessed that they are ineffective.\textsuperscript{5} But they are loyal and prepared for the consequences of their actions. The youth in the \textit{Georgos} says it would be impious to desert and wrong his dearest Hedeia (14 f.). Pamphilus in the \textit{Andria} is determined to keep his word to the woman of Andros (282 f., 694 f.) and has decided to rear the child, which Davus regards as madness (401).\textsuperscript{6} He necessarily falls foul of Simo’s conventional view of hetairae and neither father nor son has ever been frank with the other; but ‘respect for my father who has till now so generously allowed me to do whatever I liked’ (262 f.) is a real factor in his conduct and at the end the idea of deceiving his father is as repugnant to him as to Simo himself (896-902).\textsuperscript{7}

\textsuperscript{1} Suess, \textit{Rh. Mus.}, 1935, 169; 1938, 104, thinks he is characterised as a Sicyonian.

\textsuperscript{2} The course of Chaerea’s love is told 293 f., 559 f. (a monologue in the original, cf. \textit{Phasma}, 1 f.), 1031 f. (to which \textit{Andria} 959 f. also belongs according to Donatus but Pamphilus must have expressed a similar joy there). Alciphron (III, 31) is evidence for the same kind of speedy and overwhelming passion in the \textit{Kanephoros}.

\textsuperscript{3} See below, Sect. VIII.

\textsuperscript{4} Cf. Charisios in the \textit{Epitrepontes} (\textit{RYLANDS BULLETIN}, XXIX, 386). In the \textit{Kanephoros} someone, presumably the young man, complains that it is very difficult to reach wisdom (Ribbeck, 86, I) and is warned against the misfortunes that necessarily come to the irrational (253K).

\textsuperscript{5} \textit{Georgos} (100K), \textit{Andria}, 607, \textit{Adelphi}, 610 f., 630 f.

\textsuperscript{6} Cf. Moschion’s appeal to Laches in the \textit{Kitaristes} (283K), the son’s appeal for \textit{λογισμός} in the \textit{Imbrians} (247-8K), and Chaerea’s self-defence in the \textit{Eunuch} (877 f.).

\textsuperscript{7} See the interpretation of Oppermann, \textit{Hermes}, 1934, 273 f.; cf. also the young man in the \textit{Epikleros} (Ribbeck, 91, VII).
Father and son are nearer to each other in the *Andria* than in the *Eunuch* or *Synaristolosai*; but in the *Heautontimoroumenos* and the *Second Adelphoi* the relations between father and son (or adopted son) and their characters are the primary interest. Chremes, the father of Clitipho in the *Heautontimoroumenos*, is officious: he thrusts his unwanted attentions on Menedemus, cloaking his curiosity with a pretence of ‘philanthropy’ (77). A more serious defect is insincerity, for which he criticises Menedemus (154); yet Clitipho knows that his father’s sermons are inconsistent with his father’s youthful escapades (200 f., 220 f.) and later Chremes himself preaches insincerity both to Menedemus and to Clitipho (478, 575). He deplores his wife’s lack of foresight and prudence (632) but shows none himself. The light-weight Clitipho is the son he deserves. Menedemus’ criticism of his son, like Simo’s in the *Andria*, is irrelevant because Antiphila is not a hetaira, and his self-punishment, which gives the play its name, is excessive; Cicero, basing himself on Peripatetic sources, quotes him as an example of the *sibi inimicus*, who, as whether the result of grief, passion, or anger, rushes willingly into evil. But his excesses proceed from genuine emotion and Clinia turns out better than Clitipho. The keyword of the *Second Adelphoi* is *liberalitas* (*δεοθερπώτης*), the conduct that befits a free man. The old men had both been too poor in youth to enjoy themselves (106) but had then become well-to-do. Micio had followed the town life of soft irresponsibility, Demea the hard life of agriculture and family cares.

1 Further instances of Chremes’ officiousness (περιεργία: Theophrastus, *Characters*, XIII): 170, 185, 410, 497, 508. Walzer (*Hermes*, lxx, 198 f.) interprets Chremes’ *φιλανθρωπία* as lacking in *φρόνησις*. Demea’s use of the idea in the *Adelphi* (734) is near the sense in Aristotle, *Poetics*, 1452b, 38, and Xenophon, *Cyropedia*, VII, 7, 25; for Micio on the other hand it is a skilful use of the dice (739 f.; cf. Plato, *Rep.*, 604c; Sophocles, fr. 947) to achieve the most humane result (cf. 104).

2 Demea similarly regards Micio’s whole way of life as insincere (*Adelphi*, 987).

3 *De Finibus*, V, 10, 28. See Walzer, *loc. cit.*

4 E.g. 57, 464, 664, 828. Aristotle, *Ethics*, IV, 1, contrasts *δεοθερπώτης* (liberality) with *ἀδοτία* (prodigality) and *ἀνεδεοθερπή* (meanness).

5 Perhaps the two poor men in the *Imbrians* had similarly become well off before the play started.

Demea is ‘thrifty’ by nature (45, fr. 10K) and not only because he is old. He educates his son by fear (75) and by precepts (415=631K?), like Chremes in the *Heautontimoroumenos* (210); Ctesipho as a result is neither stable (274) nor candid. Demea regards the conduct of Micio not as ‘liberality’ but as ‘prodigality,’ and expects for Aeschinus the typical prodigal’s end, military service in Asia (384); when Demea apes Micio at the end (877 f.), he conforms to the bad type of prodigal in Aristotle, who ‘take from the wrong source and are to this extent mean’ (1121a, 30).

Aristotle describes another kind of prodigal, who ‘is much better than the mean man. He is easily cured both by growing up and by lack of money, and he may easily move towards the mean. For he has the characteristics of the liberal man: he gives and does not take, but does neither rightly or well. If he were accustomed to this or changed in some other way, he would be liberal’ (1121a, 19). This is the foundation of Micio’s theory of education. He claims that there are signs which make it possible to distinguish between those who can do something safely and those who cannot (821 f.); Aeschinus and Ctesipho are sensitive and intelligent, have some sense of shame, are fond of each other (cf. 271); in fact show all the signs of a liberal character; therefore they can be guided by their sense of honour and their ‘liberality’ rather than by fear (57), and their excesses will be over in their youth when they do not greatly matter (108). Aeschinus at least, except for his long hesitation in telling his father about Pamphila (684), justified the confidence placed in him, and though, as in the *Heautontimoroumenos*, the truth lies somewhere between the views of the two old men, Micio is more nearly right than Demea.

It is justifiable to call these plays Social Criticism because Menander is criticising views prevalent in Athenian society and suggesting a remedy. Young men may be ruined by greedy hetairae but marriages on a cash or family basis may also be disastrous. In both cases a human relationship is spoiled by

---

1 Wehrli, op. cit., 72 f., compares 834 with Aristotle, 1121b, 12.
a wrong value set on money; that is why the contrasted terms ‘prodigality, liberality, meanness’ bulk so large in the Second Adelphoi. Human relationship is only possible where neither party considers financial gain: for this reason Selenium is contrasted with Gymnasium and Antiphila with Bacchis. On the other hand, ‘liberality’ can be confused with ‘prodigality’ and there is a truth in Demea’s criticism of Micio: ‘your reputation for being easy-going and cheerful does not come from living sincerely or from your fairness and goodness but from your acquiescence and indulgence’ (Ad. 986 f.). In practice Micio had crossed the boundary which separates the προδόσις and ἡδίως from the μαλακός (cf. particularly 147 f.); but in theory he is right when he pleads for a nice discrimination applied to each individual case, which is what Demea really means by ‘living sincerely’ and by ‘fairness and goodness.’ Menander has allowed Demea a true criticism of Micio and he allows Chremes in the Heautontimoroumenos, in spite of his general insincerity, a true criticism of Menedemus, who had mistaken Antiphila for the conventional hetaira (151): ‘you did not know Clinia well enough nor he you: how does this happen? Where life is not sincere.’ The conventional judgment of the older generation excluded as impossible the idealism of a Melaenis or Thais. Yet in these relationships where strong physical forces are released (how strong can be seen from Chaerea in the Eunuch and the youth in the Phasma) the ready-made judgments of convention are useless and the nicest discrimination is needed. This is Menander’s view, essentially the same view that he puts forward in the Plays of Reconciliation or when he calls Greeks (617K) ‘men of judgment who do nothing without consideration.’

III. Kolax and Eunuch.

Terence says that he introduced a parasite and boastful soldier from Menander’s Kolax into Menander’s Eunuch (Eun. 30); and three of the fragments of the Kolax recur in Terence’s Eunuch, proving that 11. 238 (= fr. 296K), 426 (= fr. 300K), 498 (= fr. 297K) were transferred to that play from the Kolax; moreover Donatus notes on 228 haec apud Menandrum in
Eunucho non sunt . . . sed de Colace translata sunt. The papyrus fragments of the Kolax show the general situation: a young man is in love with a girl, who is in the power of a leno, and fears that the leno may give her to a soldier. In the Eunuch on the other hand, Thais is an independent hetaira with two rival lovers. Menander called her Chrysis (Persius, Sat. 5, 165), and as Chrysis is a hetaira-name in fr. 295K, it seems to me impossible to follow Kuiper in believing that she turned out in the end to be an Athenian woman of noble birth.

The safest starting ground for separating the Eunuch and the Kolax is the quadruple quotation from the Kolax in Eunuch, 228, 238, 426, 498. Phaedria (Chairestratos in Menander) has given his last instructions to Parmeno (Daos in Menander) and has gone. As Parmeno soliloquises, he sees Gnatho bring Pamphila to Thais' house. The long soliloquy of Gnatho belongs to the Kolax (238 = fr. 296K), and that Gnatho spoke it in the Kolax, is proved by the play on Gnathonici and Platonici in 264; his name occurs in the papyrus fragment (68-69). The following dialogue between Gnatho and Parmeno (265 f.) belongs to the Eunuch, since Parmeno must see Pamphila arrive in order to be able to find her again for Chaerea, but in Menander Gnatho's place must have been taken either by Phaedria's rival or by that rival's parasite or slave. Gnatho appears again with Thraso at the beginning of Terence's third act; after the first line everything except the interjections of Parmeno (394, 418, 431) comes from the Kolax until l. 434, where Thraso mentions Thais' suspicion that he is in love with the girl. There Terence returns to the Eunuch, presumably a dialogue between Phaedria's rival and whoever had talked with Parmeno before (265 f.); the latter goes before the next scene, probably with the words that Terence has delayed till 499-500: X.—

1 Grieksche Origineelen, 16: he makes her the daughter of Simon and finally marries her to Phaedria.
2 Buechner, Stud. ital., 1937, 156, disagrees on insufficient grounds.
3 Drexler, Hermes, 1938, 83, assumes a slave; Kuiper, op. cit., 42, the rival himself. The younger Bacchis was brought to her sister by a slave (Bacch., 577), but a parasite brought the elder Bacchis the first ultimatum from the soldier (575).
4 This motif was used in a much fuller form in the Leucadia.
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But Thais is coming out. Rival—'You run on ahead and see that all is ready at home.' X.—'It shall be done.' Phaedria's rival and Thais are alone until Parmeno comes out with the disguised Chaerea.¹ With 498 (= fr. 297K² repeating 426 = fr. 300K) we return for a moment to the Kolax and Kuiper ³ is surely right in thinking that Terence has also adapted 494-495 from that play.

In these two scenes, the Kolax characters supplant the Eunuch character (or characters) in the Eunuch situation but bring with them also a recognisable stretch of a Kolax scene. They next appear in the siege scene (771-783, 811-816). Körte says that 'in no scene of Menander so far have more than three speakers been proved.' ⁴ As Chremes and Thais must both be present in the Eunuch scene, Gnatho cannot be there as well as Thraso, and the siege scene must belong to the Kolax. In the Kolax siege Sanga was probably silent like Habrotonon in the Perikeiromene (226 f.) and Gnatho-Strouthias and Bias met a single speaking adversary. Here too Terence has worked in the same way, but in the final appearance of Thraso and Gnatho (1025 to the end) I can see nothing except minor touches come from the Kolax,⁶ because in the Kolax the soldier cannot share the girl, if Pheidias marries her. That Phaedria's rival in the Eunuch should hope to share Thais is possible; the situation is roughly parallel to the Nicobulus, Cleomachus, Chrysalus triangle in the Bacchides (842 f.), and I suspect that here, too, the go-between is Parmeno (Daos).

¹ His first lines are 394 (cf. Perik., 61) followed by 462. 457-8 and 459-61 are Terence's 'padding' (cf. Drexler, op. cit., 85), as are Gnatho's remarks in this scene.
² Plutarch quotes fr. 297K, which Terence gives to Gnatho, in the following context: 'like Strouthias meeting Bias and trampling on his tastelessness by complimenting him 'You have drunk more than Alexander the King' and 'I am laughing because I remember your jest against the Cyprian'. Plutarch's first quotation occurs again in a longer quotation from the Kolax (293K), which names Strouthias in the vocative; Bias is attested by the papyrus fragment (33); either there were two parasites in the Kolax or Gnatho became Strouthias when he talked to Bias (Jensen quotes the Curculio where Curculio becomes Summanus to hoodwink the leno). This is preferable.³ Mnemosyne, LIX, 182.
⁵ Cf. however, Kuiper, Mnemosyne, LIX, 183.
Finally the Antipho scene. According to Donatus (on 539) Antipho was introduced to prevent the long soliloquy which Chaerea spoke in the Menander play. It is easy to strike out all Antipho's interruptions, the exposition (560-574) and the conclusion (607-614). But the admirable opening speech of Antipho (539-545) seems to come from Menander, and if from Menander, what source is more likely than the Kolax?

We can now consider the plays separately. How much had Terence altered the beginning of the Eunuch? Persius' summary (5, 161 f.) gives a little more of the opening than Terence's version. The dialogue slides perfectly naturally into the scene between Thais and Phaedria; Parmeno is not needed in this scene and his dismissal (189) is a doublet of the opening line of the next act (207); his presence while Pamphila's citizenship is discussed (110) is undesirable in view of his future role. The complicated past history of Pamphila; the state of the negotiations between Thais and Chremes (203), and the innovation of a kindly-disposed hetaira need explaining in a divine monologue. In the plays of Menander where we have some check (e.g. Perikeirömene) the divine monologue is framed by at least one other scene. Therefore in the Eunuch another scene should precede the divine monologue. The most obvious loose end later in the play is Parmeno's remark (1000): 'The old man had long been looking for a reason to do something special to them (Thais and her household).’ The opening scene may therefore have been a dialogue between Simon and Parmeno in which Simon, after stating his views on hetairae, was persuaded to go into the country by the news that Thais had shut Phaedria out of her house.

The first scene of the second act is a short scene marking the departure of Phaedria. In the second scene Pamphila arrives; as has been mentioned above, the dialogue of rogues (265 f.) belongs to the Eunuch; it seems therefore more likely that Pamphila is not brought by the rival himself but by a slave or by a comparatively colourless parasite; the scene has a general

1 So also Kuiper, Grieksche Origineelen, 19, 40.
likeness to the Daos-Sosias scenes of the *Perikeiromene.*

The rest of the act is occupied by Chaerea.

The rival makes his first appearance in the third act. There is no proof that he did not come alone and soliloquise on the situation; in any case his companion must have gone before Parmeno arrived in l. 461, as has already been said, but there is no good reason to suppose that the opening scene was not a dialogue. It is not possible to decide who the rival's companion is until we have decided who the rival is himself. This is partly a question of deciding how violent Terence's surgery has been. The principle must be to assume faithful translation unless strong arguments can be brought to disprove it. The suggestion, therefore, that the *hospes* of l. 119 is identical with the soldier of l. 125 because only he could have recognised Pamphila and known that she was Thais' supposed sister seems to me untenable even without the further extension that he turned out to be Pamphila's brother. Wehrli sagely remarks that 'Comedy, so far as we can see, only knows of *vetulus* or *miles* as discomfited rivals of the young man;' therefore Phaedria's rival was either a soldier or an old man in Menander and there seems no good reason to suppose that he was not a soldier.

If Phaedria's rival is a soldier, his companion is likely to be a

---

1 Drexler thinks that the reference to six months (277) implies that Thais has promised herself to Phaedria's rival for this time, but this is perhaps to read too much into the promise (or threat) of one rogue to another.

2 Drexler, *op. cit.,* 77; Kuiper, *op. cit.,* 27.

3 Two arguments must be met: (a) if the purchaser of Pamphila did not know her identity, how could Thais know who she was before she saw her? the answer is that the soldier could have told Thais the girl's name and the name of the seller; 134-6 shows that he did not know of the relationship; (b) Thais appears to know of another child stolen with Pamphila (522): the answer is that Thais was extremely cautious in her examination of Chremes and guarded against mistakes. What evidence is there elsewhere of children of considerably differing ages disappearing?

4 *Motivstudien,* 104.

5 The obscenity of l. 479 seems to fit a soldier better than any other character, and the cross-references between *Eunuch* and *Thrauloen* are more easily explained thus (*Eun.,* 480, with Ribbeck, 109, II; *Eun.,* 486, with 244K). If Phaedria's rival is a soldier and Chremes a rustic (*Donatus* on 507), it is tempting to suggest that they are pale reminiscences of an earlier play where their relations to a grasping hetaira was the central interest (such a play is preserved in the *Truculentus*).
parasite rather than a slave, since it is difficult to imagine, e.g. Sosias of the *Perikeiromene* advising Polemon how to behave at dinner. Terence's innovation lies in making the soldier and his parasite much more important by introducing stretches of the *Kolax*. Phaedria's rival has no great importance in the *Eunuch* and it is unlikely that any long discussion took place between him and Thais in Act III, Scene ii, before the arrival of Parmeno with the disguised Chaerea.\(^1\) Parmeno vanishes when he has fulfilled his commission (491), and like Parmenon in the *Samia* (86/296) does not reappear until the fifth act (923). The reminiscence of the *Kolax* (498) has probably been substituted for a short monologue by the soldier while Thais takes Chaerea inside. Then she gives her parting instructions to Pythias through the door.

Drexler\(^2\) argues that Chremes' soliloquy (507 f.) implies that he has already met Thais, which is incompatible with her earlier statement (203-206). But when Thais says there 'I hope I have almost found her brother,' she surely means that she has found (and presumably has seen) her man but cannot clinch the identification until Pamphila herself arrives; when she knows that Pamphila has arrived, she sends again for Chremes.\(^3\) According to Kuiper\(^4\) the act ends with the withdrawal of Chremes, and Chaerea's monologue belongs to the beginning of the next act. Although this has the advantage of giving Chaerea more time, it brings his monologue much too close to the monologue of the returning Phaedria. A parallel for a long monologue late in the act is Moschion's monologue in Act III of the *Perikeiromene*.

Act IV begins with Dorias' description of the dinner party at which Thraso mistakes Chremes for Phaedria. The description is a good preparation for later scenes, like Onesimos' description in the *Epitrepontes* (558). The reason for Dorias'

---

\(^1\) Cf. however, Drexler, *op. cit.*, p. 88. Chaerea is mute in this scene.

\(^2\) *Op. cit.*, 75. Note the parallel between Chremes' attitude here and Pistoclerus' at the beginning of the *Bacchides*.

\(^3\) This is argued at great length against Drexler by Knoche in *Hermes*, 1941, 252 f.

\(^4\) *Grieksche Origineelen*, 41.
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return—to save Thais’ jewellery \(^1\) from a possible rough house (628)—is sufficient, but it is intolerable that Dorias should hang about the stage during Phaedria’s monologue; \(^2\) she is unnecessary in the succeeding scene with Pythias and cannot be present in the scene with Dorus, in which the three speaking actors must take the parts of Phaedria, Pythias, and Dorus. In fact Dorias seems to be the result of Terentian multiplication and thickening up. Pythias was told by Thais to bring Chremes to the dinner-party, while other women watched Pamphila (503-506). In Menander therefore Pythias probably carried out this order herself (538). Pythias returns at the beginning of Act IV with the account of the dinner party and goes into the house before Phaedria arrives (628). She soliloquises briefly while Phaedria fetches Dorus (664) and again at the end of the interrogation scene (718-726). As soon as Thais appears, Pythias probably retires, because she does not want an interview with Thais until she must. Thais calls her out to fetch the chest of tokens (753).\(^3\)

Why Chremes, having left the party after Thais (735), arrives before her is an unsolved problem.\(^4\) If we agree with Wehrli\(^5\) that the drunk Chremes reads like pure Menander and is much too good to lose, we must assume that Menander admitted the inconsistency so as to introduce the scene. In the next scene Chremes is sober but fearful of what the soldier may do; but when the soldier arrives Chremes drives him away. This swift change of moods has also found critics\(^6\) and the sequence may have been clearer in Menander than it is in Terence. Instead of the siege party, which comes from the Kolax, the

---

\(^1\) Parry quotes Heaut., 288, Aul., 747, for this. Cf. Caecilius Statius’ Nauclerus (from Menander), fr. III Ribbeck 55: suppilatum est aurum-atque ormenta omnia. Knoche has proposed a more elaborate solution (Hermes, 1941, 266 f.).

\(^2\) Cf. Drexler, Hermes, 1938, 92-93, who, however, has another solution.

\(^3\) Cf. Perikeiromene, 328.

\(^4\) The similar case in Aulularia, 701 f. is fully explained.


\(^6\) E.g. Kuiper, Griekse Originelen, 21 f.; Drexler, Hermes, 1938, 95 f. Cf., however, Pistoclerus in the Bacchides, Alcesimarchus in the Cistellaria, Moschion in the Samia.
soldier arrives alone; he wants Pamphila and not Thais now, and is foiled by Chremes' claim that Pamphila is an Athenian citizen.

The fifth act returns to the Chaerea story. Thais' promise to Chaerea that he shall be present when the final identification of Pamphila is made (893) ¹ precludes the possibility of a recognition scene on the stage,² since no less than five people would be present and speaking—Thais, Pamphila, Chremes, Sophrona and Chaerea. The return of Parmeno (after a long absence as in the Samia), the duel of Parmeno and Pythias, the scene between the old man Simon and Parmeno (again like the Demeas-Parmenon scene of the Samia), and Parmeno’s further duel with Pythias seem to come straight from the original and should lead directly into the next scene with Chaerea (1031); the introduction of Thraso and Gnatho here (1025) is Terence's padding. The following seems to me the most likely reconstruction of the rest. Chaerea returns home at last to change his clothes soon after the arrival of Phaedria. Phaedria goes into Thais' house and Parmeno is left on the stage. Thraso then appears to surrender to Thais (1025 f.) and Parmeno tells him what, in Terence's version, he overhears. He begs Parmeno to persuade Phaedria that he may still have some share of Thais (1055). Then Thais' door sounds and he is astonished to see Phaedria whom he had thought of as Chremes (1029; this refers to Chaerea in Terence, but in Menander to Phaedria, cf. 794). Parmeno acts as go-between (1068) and Thraso retires contented if deceived. Perhaps no further scene is necessary.

The main lines of the story of the Kolax have been made out

¹ Chaerea's embarrassment at his clothing (906) is paralleled in fr. 736K, which suggests that this touch is Menander and not Terence.
² Drexler, Hermes, 1938, 76; Kuiper, Grieksche Origineelen, 21 f., have made ingenious suggestions for restoring it, but it should be noticed that the three surviving scenes of Menander where tokens are displayed are very special variations of the well-worn theme: in the Epitreontes (200) the supervention of Onesimos converts the counting of swag into a recognition; in the Perikeiromene (338) the routine scene is given a new flavour by the gradual enlightenment of the eavesdropping Moschion; in the Cistellaria (658) the tokens are themselves 'foundlings' at the moment when they are recognised. In the Eunuch no such variation is possible and Menander omits the routine scene.
He has suggested that Gnatho is the ancestor of Apollodorus' Phormio; his chief object is to help the youth Pheidias, and he calls himself Strouthias in order to deceive the soldier, Bias. The following notes agree with Kuiper in the main. In the first papyrus fragment (1-14) Pheidias laments the cruelty of his father who has left him without money. Either before this, or perhaps more probably in the gap which follows, Pheidias has tried to extract the girl from the leno and has been told that the soldier Bias is both a rich and a powerful rival (Kuiper deduces this from 111). Soon after this Gnatho, who, according to Kuiper, has been buying supplies for the feast of the Tetradistai (11, 47), arrives for the first time and makes the soliloquy preserved by Terence in the *Eunuch* (232 f.). At the end Pheidias comes out and prays for the vengeance of heaven on his rival (15 f.). Gnatho, rather like Onesimos with Smikrines in the *Epitrepontes*, 726, comments on the injustice of the gods and instances Bias' rise to wealth and power, thereby confirming Pheidias' fears. Pheidias then tells Gnatho about the girl, whom he thinks the leno has already sold to Bias (56). Gnatho suggests some sort of action (ll. 62-65, cf. *Georgos*, 100K). Daos comes in and, when Gnatho has gone, warns Pheidias against flatterers (85 f.) and perhaps goes on to offer Pheidias his savings (71-84).

The soliloquy of the leno (99 f.) should come soon after this; in the preserved portion of this the argument seems to be: 'Suppose you let Pheidias have the girl, you can tell the soldier various lies, but he will summon his companions and the result will be disaster either for Pheidias or for you. But now Bias trusts you and is off his guard and you will be able to arrange things in any way you like. Bias has the money. Pheidias wanted to buy, but if Bias sees it he will bring a storming party. It would be much more profitable to hire the girl out for three minae a day. But then Pheidias might steal her on the way and there might be a lawsuit' (120-122: these last lines suggest

2 Alcesimarchus in the *Cistellaria* (225) was kept at home by his father. Cf. also *Heautontimoroumenos*, 213 f.
3 Plautus, *Colax*, fr. 2, belongs in this context.
that the leno knows that the girl is a citizen and fears proceedings to establish her identity; Naevius, Colax, fr. II, may belong to this context.\(^1\) The leno seems to be on his way home (107) and probably has not appeared since Pheidias met him earlier; perhaps, like the leno of the Poenulus (449), he has meanwhile sacrificed to Aphrodite Pandemos on the day of her festival; like him also he may have met the soldier on his way home and is now expecting his arrival.

The arrival of Bias with Gnatho in the character of Strouthias is preserved in the Eunuch (395 f.). After the soldier/flatterer scene presumably the leno is called out of his house and agrees to Bias' terms. He returns into the house to fetch the girl and Bias (according to Kuiper's brilliant suggestion based on Eunuch, 494-495) leaves Gnatho to bring her to his quarters; Gnatho hands her over to Pheidias. Bias is told by Gnatho that the girl was taken from Gnatho by force, and for that reason describes the action as contumelia (Eun., 771), Terence's normal translation of ἐξεπλήρωσεν; Gnatho admits that he himself had run away in a panic (Naevius, Colax, fr. IV). Bias determines on a siege of Pheidias' house, as the leno had expected; Gnatho naturally plays the part of a 'discourager of battle' (as Donatus calls him in his note on Eun., 771). Bias is of course routed by the claim that the girl is a citizen, but how this is worked we cannot say. It seems to me at least possible that Antipho, who as we have seen probably came from the Kolax, proved to be the girl's brother, and that this was discovered when he came to discuss the feast with Pheidias after Pheidias had carried off the girl and before the siege.\(^2\) The leno presumably has also to face the unpleasant truth, and Naevius, fr. III (Ribbeck) may belong to his recognition of the claim. The play probably ended with the feast of the tetraphidastei (fr. 292). More than this we cannot say; but it seems likely that Menander's chief interest was the new conception of the parasite and the picture of the miles gloriosus.

---

\(^1\) The general situation is very like that of the Diphilus scene preserved in Terence, Adelphi (155-196) as interpreted by Drexler.

\(^2\) Kunst, Studien zur gr.-röm. Komödie, 73, also notes this possibility.
IV. ANDRIA AND PERINTHIA

Donatus (on l. 14) says that Terence transferred the first scene of the *Andria* from the *Perinthia*,1 'where the old man talks with his wife as in Terence with his freedman but in Menander's *Andria* the old man is alone.' The first scene of the *Perinthia* was therefore a scene between Laches and his wife (Laches' name appears in the papyrus fragment): the papyrus fragment proves the existence of a Sosias; but, as Terence habitually altered names, no connection need exist between this Sosias and the Sosias of his *Andria*. Sosias appears to be a freedman of Simo and to have set up as a cook.2 If in the *Perinthia* Simo had had a cook in the house, Davus would not have been so suspicious (359 f.; fixed as *Perinthia* by 369 = 398K). Sosias should therefore belong to Menander's *Andria*, nor, unless we assume that the whole of the opening (172-183) was the work of Terence, is it easy to see how Act I, Sc. ii (Terence's enumeration), which is fixed for Menander's *Andria* by l. 204 = fr. 38K, could have been intelligible without a preceding Simo-Sosias scene. The beginning of the Simo-Sosias scene (28-47) reads like genuine Menander; but on Donatus' evidence evidently followed instead of preceding Simo's monologue.3 The uncomfortable transition from Sosias to Davus in 171 f. of Terence' play was avoided in Menander by the insertion at this point of the divine prologue,4 which told the facts about the parentage of Glycerium.

Thus the run of opening scenes for Menander's *Andria* seems to have been I. 1, Simo (alone); 2, Simo, Sosias; 3, Divine

---

1 Körte, introduction, liii f., finds evidence for similarity of subject and dissimilarity of style, which Terence notes between the two plays (*Andria*, 9 f.), in the scenes with the midwife and the punishment of Daos. See also Prehn, *Quaestiones Plantinae*, 25 f.

2 So Donatus on 30, 171. The elderly Syrus of the *Adelphi* is cook as well as slave (376, 420 f.).

3 A similar scene has been assumed at the beginning of the *Georgos* (RYLANDS BULLETIN, XXX, 137); *Samia*, 80 f., has affinities.

4 ll. 215-225 are probably the remains of the divine prologue, although some parallel for the disclosure at this stage of Glycerium's condition is afforded by *Georgos*, 85 f. The equation of l. 218 with fr. 48K is unlikely: cf. Oppermann, *Hermes*, 1934, 262 f.
monologue; 4, Simo, Davus; 5, Davus. The opening scenes of the Perinthia were I. 1, Laches and wife; 2, Laches and Davus; 3, Divine monologue. It at least seems likely that Davus' remark about 'deceiving a useless and idle master' (393K) was made (and overheard by Laches) in the first act and certain that Davus in the Perinthia went off to find his young master in the market place (302, 357). The first Mysis scene was presumably common to both plays and in both plays introduced Pamphilus to the audience. Mysis' opening words about the drunken midwife (228 f.) are more likely to be Terence quoting the Perinthia than Menander recalling his own earlier play; in Menander's Andria Pamphilus may have soliloquised before Mysis came out. Kuiper has suggested that this scene was the first scene of Act II in the Andria to be followed by the arrival of Davus with more cheerful news; this seems very likely, although too much stress must not be put on the awkwardness of the transition in ll. 225-227, since Menander does sometimes leave the stage empty, particularly in the first act. The first act of the Andria therefore probably ended with Davus' departure to find his master and the second act began with Pamphilus' arrival followed by Mysis coming out on her errand.

The opening of Terence' Act II with the arrival of Charinus and Byrria reads like a Menandrian act opening and the second line (302) agrees with Davus' account in 357 shortly before the attested translation from the Perinthia (369). The whole scene therefore, including the figures of Charinus and Byrria, comes from the Perinthia. The swift dismissal of Byrria (337) in order to avoid having more than three actors on the stage is clearly Menander. An earlier scene is necessary to explain Charinus' position (303) and the friendship between the old men (373, cf. 539). In this earlier scene, Charinus explained his hopes and fears. We thus get the following run of scenes for the Perinthia; I, 4, Charinus (or Charinus and Byrria); 5, Mysis and Pamphilus; II, 1, Charinus and Byrria; 2, Charinus, Byrria and Pamphilus; 3, Charinus, Pamphilus, Daos.

1 The pair are similar to Pistoclerus and Lydus in the Bacchides (cf. Andria, 333 f., with Bacchides, 638 f.), Chairestratos and Simias in the Epitrepontes. Cf. also Phasma, 50 f., with Andria, 305 f. See also Kunst, op. cit., 88, n. 3.
The beginning of II, 4 (Terence’ notation), is *Andria* according to l. 406 (= 39K) and presumably carries with it the preceding scene (375 f.). The next scene (412 f.), as we have it, appears to be compounded both from the *Perinthia* and from the *Andria*. In the *Perinthia* Byrria played the well-known part of scouting slave and therefore Dao was presumably not present; he must therefore have left Pamphilus after they had finally decided on a line of action, namely that Pamphilus should pretend to acquiesce in the marriage; this seems certain as the misinterpretation by Byrria is a good Menandrian motif not unlike Geta’s mistake in the *Adelphi* (299). Simo and Pamphilus both go in at the end of the scene and Byrria soliloquises and then goes off to tell Charinus: this would seem to have been the end of the second act of the *Perinthia*. In the *Andria* the scene with Simo (416 f.) runs straight out of the Pamphilus/Davus scene, and when Pamphilus is sent inside (425), Davus unwisely elaborates his intrigue with Simo. Is this the last scene of the second act of Menander’s *Andria*? There seems no reason for a break at all; Simo and Davus must be on the stage when Mysis and Lesbia arrive (473 and 483 are fixed as *Andria* by quotation). The act ends in l. 531 when Simo goes off to fetch Chremes. It seems possible that here again Terence has taken his act division from the *Perinthia* and that there the Third Act opened with a longer dialogue between Mysis and the drunken midwife.

The run of scenes numbered in our Terence as III, 3, 4, 5, are fixed for the *Andria* by 543, 592, 611 (= fr. 49, 43, 44K). The insertion of the Charinus scene from the *Perinthia* at 625 makes it difficult to see how the Third Act of the *Andria* ran. Chremes does not, as far as we know, occupy one of the houses on the stage and goes home at 594 to get preparations made for the marriage; there must be an Act end before he returns (740) and sees Mysis and the baby: to this scene belongs, of course, the scene before, which is fixed as *Andria* by 727.

---

1 Cf. *Aul.*, 607; *Perikeiromene*, 52 f., etc.; *Misoumenos*, 1 f.
2 Lesbia was, of course, mute in her first scene in Menander; she only speaks in 481, i.e. when Mysis no longer appears.
3 So also Legrand, *New Comedy*, 382; Kuiper, *op. cit.*, 105.
The clearly marked parallelism and contrast between the Chremes-Mysis-Davus scene in Act IV here and the Simo-Mysis or Lesbia-Davus scenes in Act II suggest that Act IV also began with the Pamphilus-Mysis scene (684), in which case 682-683 are ‘Terentian mortar’ and 702-714 are intrusions from the Perinthia planning scene.

In the Perinthia (625 f.) Charinus returns because he has heard from Byrria of Pamphilus’ treachery. Pamphilus’ brief relation of what has happened (655 f.) has probably been shortened by Terence; what remains proves that Pamphilus knows that the marriage was fictitious and has now become real; the story of the Perinthia (however different the staging) cannot have differed much from Act III of the Andria. It is, however, difficult to believe that the dangerous play with the conventions of comedy—Simo’s disbelief in Glycerium’s birth pangs (473) and ridicule for the midwife giving her instructions through the door (490)—came in the early Perinthia as well as the Andria. If Laches in the Perinthia overheard the drunken midwife or the screams of Glycerium, he suspected the truth but possibly Daos succeeded in persuading him that the story was all a lie. Symmetry with the beginning of Act II suggests that the Charinus scene begins Act IV; further fragments of it are preserved (691-692, 702-714). The two young friends have quarrelled and then are reconciled as in the Bacchides: the slave supervenes (we do not know whether Davus comes out with Pamphilus or whether Pamphilus later summons him out) and a new plan is worked out. Part of the new plan is the careful arrangement, by the slave, of a tableau (dinner party in the Bacchides: baby here), which has a far greater effect than expected because of an unexpected arrival (the soldier in the Bacchides, Chremes in the Andria).

1 Note as a very minor point 756 = 461.
2 635 = 427. With this scene cf. Bacchides, 500 f., 530 f.
4 Compare Bacchides, 692; ut ad senem etiam alteram facias viam with Andria, 670; hac non successit, alia adoriamur via. This is the δείσερος πλοῖος quoted from Menander Theophoroumene (228K), Thrasyleon (241K), Kekryphalos (279K).
5 Compare Bacchides, 844, with Andria, 732.
ings also is violent treatment of the slave by his master (Bacch. 799; Perinthia papyrus fragment; Andria, 860). If the close relationship between the characters and action of the Bacchides and Perinthia be allowed, then the tableau scene must have occurred in the Perinthia as well as in the Andria for which it is attested (727 = 45K). The scenes in the Perinthia here presumably ran IV, 1, Quarrel and reconciliation; 2, Plan making with Daos (Charinus off at end); 3, Mysis, Pamphilus, Daos; then probably as in Andria.

In the last act of the Andria, the recognition scene appears as a four-speaker scene: Crito, Chremes, Simo, Pamphilus. Terence wants to shorten because he still has a Perinthia scene to use. Donatus' quotation of 1. 919 (= fr. 47K) proves that the three speakers in the first part are Chremes, Simo, Crito; Pamphilus therefore does not come out with Crito. Crito must go off after he has contributed the essential fact that Glycerium was Phanias' niece; Pamphilus then comes out and overhears the two old friends talking (like Moschion in the recognition scene of the Perikeiromene). The play ends with the liberation of Davus (956).

How far does the Perinthia run parallel with the Andria here? Kötte assumes that the burning scene preserved in the papyrus fragment belongs to the same situation as the binding scene of the Andria (860 f.). The major difference is that Daos is being burnt at an altar on the stage, whereas in the Andria he is removed out of sight and the action can go on without him. The action of the Perinthia cannot go on until Daos has either been burnt up, which is impossible, or extinguished, which must therefore happen. What can cause Laches to stop burning Daos? Nothing new can be extracted from the dialogue; Tibeios and Getas are fellow slaves of Daos to whom he appeals in vain; so presumably is . . . ρίας (8); if ρ is certain, Pyrrhias is the most likely name as the character must be a slave; if ρ is wrong, Simias is possible. The sense of 1. 13 f. seems to

1 Mnesilochus = Pamphilus, Pistoclerus = Charinus, Lydus = Byrrias, Chrysalus = Daos, Nicobulus = Laches.

2 On 796 f. Kuiper (108) argues that Crito must have noticed the baby: in Menander, Davus perhaps took the baby in on his sententia 795.
be: "Yes, Daos, it is easy to cheat an idle and easy going master." "Ugh." "But if you try it on a peach of intellects—do I touch you?" "Not you, master." "He who was so wicked and so bold is now terrified. Why didn't you find yourself some escape?" "I thought my information would win some gratitude from you." 1 "Light up the wood." Then Sosias breaks in: Körte remarks, "Sosia (?) nuntium afferre videtur, quo Davi res mutetur," but Sosias has apparently already spoken approximately six lines before the preserved fragment begins; he brings no news, nor can anyone else as long as there are three speakers on the stage. The only course for Daos would seem to be surrender; and he is then presumably confined within the house and the action continues as in the Andria; at any rate when he next appears (Andria, 965), he does not know that Glycerium has discovered her parents.

If the scene ends with Daos' surrender, how does it begin? Did Daos cause his own troubles as in the Andria or was Sosias the cause? Sosias appears to be triumphing over a fallen enemy in his preserved words. 2 Sosias must be a slave; Laches is unlikely to have two slaves with speaking parts and Chremes' slave is unlikely to appear at this moment. But if Sosias is in fact Terence' Byrria, he should appear again on a scouting expedition, which has no effect on the action except that his return with the news that Daos is being punished (for quoting evidence that Glycerium was an Attic citizen?) duly sends Charinus back to find Pamphilus. 3 The end of the Perinthia is preserved, though probably somewhat shortened by Terence (e.g. 973), in the two last scenes 4 including the 'alter exitus suppositicius'.

1 κατὰ τῶν σκελῶν can hardly stand by itself without a verb; φιλτατο may conceal the verb, e.g. κατέβαλεν. I am also assuming ἐκπόδων in 19 and something like ὀμηρεῖς φερομένους in 20.

2 The most likely meaning of 21 f. is 'Yes, for he has recently come with a rush (to complete disaster) and is surrounded (by fire).'

3 The presence of Sosias/Byrria in the papyrus fragment stands in the same relation to Andria, 714 (preceding) and 957 (succeeding), as Andria, 412-431 stands to 374 (preceding) and 625 (succeeding).

4 Notice the likeness in thought and expression between Andria, 971, and Koneiazomenai, 2 f.
Something has already been said of the sympathetic characterisation in the *Andria*, particularly of Simo and Pamphilus. There is some evidence that the lines were harder and more satirical in the *Perinthia*. The drunken midwife and the burning of Daos were scenes of boisterous comedy. Charinus and Byrria were an amusing pair like Moschion and Daos in the *Perikeiromene*. Of ‘Pamphilus’ we know nothing but Daos and Laches were different from their counterparts in the *Andria*: Daos, like Chrysalus in the *Bacchides*, considered difficult deceit the object of his life and Laches was πολυπράγμων καὶ βρυσ. The *Perinthia* was in fact an intrigue play or in Terence’ phraseology *motoria* as distinct from *stataria*.

V. *HEAUTONTIMOROUMENOS.*

Whatever may be the exact interpretation of the difficult words *duplex-simplici* in the prologue (6), Terence has here adapted a single Greek play to the Roman stage. Apart from the impossibility of dissection, the fragments of Menander prove that his play as well as Terence’ had a double plot: a line from Bacchis’ speech to Antiphila (fr. 143K—*Heautontim.*, 384) and more than a line of Syrus’ description of Antiphila (fr. 142K—*Heautontim.*, 285, 293) are preserved and the presence of Bacchis and Antiphila implies that Clitipho and Clinia were both characters in Menander’s play.

There seems, therefore, no reason to doubt that Terence has kept the main lines of Menander, and difficulties would

---

2 The essential text is fr. 393K with papyrus fragment 13.
3 i.e. he refers to the same distinction in *Andria*, 9 f., as in *Heautontimoroumenos*, 36 f. (cf. Donatus on *Adelphi*, 24).
4 Cf. e.g. Wehrli, Motivstudien, 89; Kuiper, Grieksche Origineelen, 53, and bibliography quoted by them. The Bembinus reads *duplex . . . duplici* as Mr. J. A. Davison has pointed out to me.
5 Kuiper (75 f.) thinks Sostrata had been violated by Chremes before marriage and therefore exposed Antiphila. But cf. Posidippus, fr. IIK, ‘Everyone brings up a son even if he is poor and exposes a daughter even if he is rich’ (cf. also Rostowtzeff, Hellenistic World, 623). Kuiper (54 f.) also thinks Antiphila was pledged to Bacchis for 1000 drachmae and was paying off her debt; but there is no parallel for this relationship between a hetaira and a free girl. Syrus
hardly have arisen if he had also kept Menander’s divine prologue, which no doubt explained the exact position of Antiphila. As in other plays, Terence has altered the first act; the question is how much. The dialogue of the two old men is presumably the first scene of original and copy, and although in theory Chremes talks to Menedemus while he is working (88), in practice Chremes leads Menedemus out of his house carrying his mattocks and Menedemus goes into his house again at the end of the scene (167).¹ In Terence, Chremes goes off to invite Phanias to dinner and returns at once, saying that he has been told Phanias has already gone (170-171). Although Chremes’ fussy ins and outs are in character, here alone there is no break between his departure and return. Terence had no reason for inventing Phanias, and he must therefore belong to Menander; here then is the place, as Kuiper² has seen, for the divine prologue.

Terence may have cut yet another scene between the departure of Chremes and the divine prologue: the arrival of Clinia and Clitipho. Kuiper and Drexler³ assume that they arrive before or after the prologue with Chremes’ other guests; but, though anonymous guests may be able to arrive thus (they may do so also in the Perikeiromene), no parallel is adduced for characters arriving speechless under cover of a divine prologue. When Chremes returns from Phanias, he finds Clitipho coming out to meet him; after listening to his father’s wisdom, Clitipho not unnaturally gives vent to his feelings (213-229); this speech must belong to what has gone before and the first act cannot end until he finishes. In Menander, he probably withdrew because he saw the revellers coming to form the chorus.⁴

The second act then opens with the impatient Clinia coming out to see if Antiphila has arrived; he is followed by the more timorous Clitipho (235); then Syrus arrives with Dromo, who invents this fiction to satisfy Chremes (600) on the presence of Antiphila as well as Bacchis (cf. 336) and later successfully resuscitates the story when Antiphila has been recognised as Chremes’ daughter (790 f.); his prime concern is to get money for Clitipho to give Bacchis.

¹ Menander used the refused invitation to the festival again in the Dyskolos.
³ Hermes, 1938, 72.
⁴ This does not imply that the chorus had any more importance here than in the other plays of Menander (cf., however, Körte, RE, Menandros, 747).
in Menander was, of course, a mute character. According to
Syrus, "it is getting to evening and they don't know the way" (248); Körte ¹ has argued that Terence has altered the timing
in order to spare his Roman audience the impropriety of a meal
with heavy drinking early in the day and notes the ἀριστοτον of
fragment 146K, which he thinks belongs to the context of I. 455.
The night is mentioned in so many places ² that it is hard to
believe that Terence introduced it. Probably, therefore, as in
the Plutus, a night elapsed in Menander's play and the reference
to ἀριστοτον is in fact a reference to the breakfast of the next
morning. Syrus goes in with Clitipho at the end of the scene
(380), and the next scene is played by the two women and Clinia,
but it is possibly not incompatible with the three actor rule that
Syrus should speak the last line (409) from the door of the house;
Menander had at the back of his mind the recognition of Orestes
and Electra in Sophocles' Electra and the entry of the pedagogue
to cut short their excessive and premature rejoicings (S. El.
1326).³

The fourth act cannot begin with the Sostrata, Chremes,
Syrus scene (614—the nurse in any case is added by Terence;
Sostrata talked back into the house as she comes out and Terence
has worked her words up into a dialogue). Sostrata must be
overheard by Chremes and Syrus and therefore they must be
already on the stage. But where does the act start? An obvious
break comes after Syrus' brief soliloquy (561) and before Chremes
comes out with Clitipho, but three arguments can be urged
against this: Syrus should be on the stage when they come out;
Clitipho's deambulatio (587) should start in the act before he
returns (805); there seems to be a kind of balance within the
third act made by Chremes' fussy departures and returns (502,
558), separated in each case by a brief soliloquy (possibly cut
shorter by Terence than Menander's original design). The
other possible break is after the departure of Clitipho (590);
the next lines then represent the end of Chremes and Syrus'
conversation as they come out of Chremes' house at the beginning

¹ Loc. cit. ² 410, 461, 491, 519, 568. So also Kuiper, op. cit., 85.
³ Other tragic reminiscences: 125 with Aesch., Ag., 410 f.; 161 with
of the new act; this has the further advantage of lengthening
the third act and shortening the very long fourth act. Very
minor points of difficulty arise in the fourth and fifth acts. In
the scene where Bacchis transfers her lodgings (723 f.) Dromo
and Phrygia were both mute in Menander. In the last scene
(1045) Menedemus is probably an insertion by Terence.

VI. SECOND ADELPHOI

Kock’s edition of the comic fragments quotes twelve frag-
ments from Menander’s Adelphoi. One of these (9K), which is
translated by Terence in the Adelphi (804), is quoted from
Adelphoi β, which implies the existence of an Adelphoi α. Of
the others, frs. 1, 2, 3, 6, 7, 10K are securely anchored in
Terence’ play (43, 200, 295, 605, 693, 866); frs. 4, 5, 12K can
probably be ascribed to it; but no place can be found for
frs. 8 and 11K, which should therefore belong to Adelphoi α.3
Terence’ play also contains two quotations from other plays of
Menander: Syrus’ remark to Demea at 385 appears to translate
fr. 123K of the Dis Exapaton, for which no suitable place can
be found in the Bacchides of Plautus; this appears to be a slip
of Fulgentius’ memory—Demea in the Adelphi is also “twice
deceived”—and therefore fixes Demea as Menander’s name
for this character; Micio was called Lamprias by Menander.4
The second quotation is from the Homopatrioi (fr. 361K =
Ad. 643); of the other two fragments of this play one is too
corrupt to use (fr. 362K); the other (360K), as Kuiper has seen,5
fits admirably into the context of Micio’s defence of the two young
men (826 f.). It is therefore very likely that this play had the
double title of Homopatrioi or Adelphoi.

1 Compare 748 with Eun., 722, where also Terence had made a dialogue out
of a monologue.
2 Fr. 4 may have been contracted by Terence into alius nemo respicet nos
(353). Fr. 5 perhaps also belongs to Geta, particularly to his early mood (310 f.),
and, however, Kuiper, 135. Fr. 12K could belong to the later Micio/Demea
scenes (i.e. 834, 880 or 954).
3 I hope to treat First Adelphoi or Philadelphoi (= Plautus, Stichus) later.
4 Fr. 6K is translated in its entirety by Terence (605-607): quibus res sunt
minus secundae covers both πένης and μετρίως πράττων; ad contumeliam
accipiam—περισκελέστερον φέρετ; claudier = καταφρονεῖν.
5 Grieksche Origneelen, 162.
As in the other plays of Menander which he adapted Terence here, too, has altered the earlier part of the play; the major alteration is the insertion of a scene from Diphilus' *Synapothneskontes* and the first problem is to define the limits of the insertion and to discover what the insertion has supplanted. The opening scene is so like the attested opening scenes of the *Heautontimoroumenos*, *Andria* and *Perinthia*, and the assumed opening scenes of the *Eunuch* and *Georgos* (see above) that it must be Menander's opening.\(^1\) After Micio's departure (154) the *leno* enters crying for help and the Diphilus scene begins.\(^2\) Drexler\(^3\) has shown that in the Diphilus play the young man has just seized the woman and the action takes place in the street outside the *leno*'s house; he also notes that the name Sannio does not occur in this scene, while Parmeno occurs nowhere else. In Diphilus the *leno* fears that the young man, with whom he has never had anything to do before (177), will claim that his action was involuntary (162, 165); Sannio on the other hand knows Aeschinus and has done well out of him in the past (201) and this fits with Micio's account of Aeschinus (149), with Syrus' belief that Sannio will accept the price (209), and Sannio's later assessment of Aeschinus (237). Sannio's monologue, therefore, and the scene which follows it belong together, are compatible with the first scene but incompatible with the Diphilus scene; it seems, therefore, wanton to reject the identification of the opening lines of Sannio's monologue as Menander, when it is supported by quotation (2K), nor in view of the *Kolax* fragment (99 f.) is there any reason to be disturbed by Sannio's confused argumentation.\(^4\)

The last words of the young man before Sannio's monologue

\(^1\) Drexler, _Philologus_, Supplbd. XXVI, 31-32, 36 inclines to a prologue of Syrus before the opening dialogue, but I see no justification for this; Varro's preference for Terence' *principium* rather than Menander's can surely refer to the alterations after the first scene.


\(^4\) Cf., however, Drexler, 7. With Donatus' *secundum illud Menandri* (on 200) compare his note on *Eunuch*, 46: *iungunt qui secundum Menandri exemplum legunt.*
raise a problem. He says (193): "Nor do I think she should be sold when she is free: for I claim her as free." Two choices are open: either this belongs to the Menander play and in the end the psaltria was recognised and married off to Ctesipho, or Terence has been loose in his earlier description of the girl in the Diphilus play as a meretrix (9) and in that play as in the Kolax the girl was finally freed, as the young man here threatens. The second solution seems to me right as there is no hint that the girl in the Adelphi is later recognised.¹

With Sannio's monologue Terence is back in Menander; but how much intervening Menander has been lost? At the end of the first scene Demea has already departed to the agora, as we later understand (355), and Micio goes to the forum to find Aeschinus; Aeschinus himself and Syrus have not returned from a dinner party (1), and Ctesipho has been left by his father in the country (94). When Sannio pronounces his monologue, Aeschinus and Syrus are already in the house and expecting him (209), and Ctesipho arrives shortly afterwards, also expected (260). We are left with the double question: What is the past history and how did Menander tell it? The following seems to me the most likely reconstruction. At the dinner party Ctesipho told Aeschinus that the psaltria was being taken to Cyprus by Sannio on the next day and that he therefore proposed suicide (274 with Donatus ad loc.); the proposal was probably not more serious than Alcesimarchus' in the Cistellaria (639), although it frightened Aeschinus, seemed exaggerated to Terence, and has led to daring reconstructions.² Ctesipho then went home, perhaps after Syrus had proposed that Aeschinus should steal the girl (315, 367). The party went on and in the early morning (we cannot discount the eye-witness Geta (329) who would scarcely be abroad in the night) Aeschinus and his friends broke into Sannio's house and removed the girl, promising payment; Syrus apparently saw the business started and then went to tell Ctesipho—he did not meet Sannio (210). Aeschinus then took the girl back to a friend's house until Micio should

¹ I cannot accept Kuiper's ingenious suggestion that she is finally recognised as Demea's daughter.
² E.g. Kuiper, op. cit., 129.
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have gone out in the morning. Demea, who came into town early, heard the news on the way (88 f.) and on his return to the agora collected the false rumour that Ctesipho had also been in the raid (355), chiefly to provide material for Syrus’ trickery. Menander’s normal method of telling past history is a divine monologue and there is no reason to suppose that he did not use it in this play. If the divine monologue immediately followed the Demea-Micio scene, it was itself followed by the arrival of Aeschinus with the psaltria: Syrus then joined them to say that Ctesipho was coming. This completed the first act.

Sannio’s monologue opened the second act of Menander’s play and was followed by his scene with Syrus. The retention of Sannio through the scenes with Ctesipho and Aeschinus is Terence’s “thickening-up.” In Menander Sannio went when he had enlisted the services of Syrus (251). Geta’s arrival (299) must also belong to this act, since he is even so slow enough in returning from the agora after seeing the raid. The stage is empty for a moment when Ctesipho goes in (287), but Menander does not confine this usage to the first act (cf. e.g. Epitrepontes, 557). On the other hand, when Demea and Syrus return (355, 364), they discuss what happened in the agora after Aeschinus arrived there (406) and this must belong to a new act; the second act ends therefore when Geta and Canthara depart (354). Canthara never returns with the midwife whom she has been sent to fetch, and the child is born before the third act is finished (486). It is useless to provide, as Kuiper does, an occasion for their return after the child is born; either they return at the beginning of the act before Demea’s entry (355) or they return by a back door. Terence might have cut out their return because with his change of the act end it would have immediately followed Canthara’s departure, but, if we assume their return, we have to assume yet another scene in which the midwife leaves for home, and it seems more likely that Menander, if he thought any more about the midwife, assumed that she used the back door.


2 The evidence for the back door (assumed by Dziatzko-Kauer) is given by Dalman, de aedibus scaeniciis, 92.
Kuiper \(^1\) has suggested that the third act (according to him the second act) should end with Demea’s departure (510). This has the advantage of giving Hegio more time to talk with Sostrata; on the other hand Hegio then goes to the agora and returns within the compass of the fourth act (516, 592), which seems to disagree with the convention of this play. It is therefore perhaps better to keep the break where Terence puts it. The fourth act ends at 712 as Kuiper has seen; \(^2\) Demea cannot return from his lengthy wanderings in the same act (586-713) and Micio needs longer for his preparations (706-719). The fifth act is both long and eventful but has in fact no break as Demea is on the stage the whole time. With his more drastic reconstruction Kuiper \(^3\) by telescoping the second and third acts, continues the fourth act to Micio’s withdrawal (854). According to him Demea goes in too and at the feast, which is described by a slave (fr. 8K), Demea gets drunk and his ‘recantation’ is maudlin. This is attractive at first sight, but the telescoping of the second and third act seems to me inadmissible for the reasons given above (an act break is essential between Syrus’ departure to the market (286) and his return (361); moreover the stern father’s discovery of the truth (789) should belong to the fifth act).\(^4\) Demea’s recantation, though completely different in matter, has affinities with Demea’s second monologue in the *Samia* (110 ff., particularly 134); there, too, an old man decides on a course of action which is ‘out of character.’ Nevertheless it is true that behind this monologue of Demea stand scenes like the rejuvenation of Demos in the *Knights* and the succeeding short balancing scenes are also in the tradition of the iambic scenes of Old Comedy. Terence has slightly obscured the structure by his usual process of “thickening up,” by keeping Geta on the stage for the scene with Aeschinus (899-917); his editors have wantonly retained Syrus for the Geta scene (889-898); in the last scene of all there is no need for Syrus to be present.
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VII. SYNARISTOSAI.

Following the identification of the Synaristosai as the original of Plautus' Cistellaria by Fraenkel, Suess published two articles in which he established the relations of the fragments of Menander to Plautus' play and discussed the play as a whole; what follows is deeply indebted to Suess. The Cistellaria poses a double problem: the reconstruction of Plautus' text and through it the reconstruction of Menander's original.

The play starts with its name-scene, illustrated by Dioscurides' mosaic, the visit of the lena and her daughter Gymnasium to Selenium in Alcesimarchus' house; Selenium is distracted because Alcesimarchus is to marry a relation from Lemnos "who lives next door here" (100), being, as is later (173) explained, the daughter of Demipho by his Lemnian wife. At the end of the scene Gymnasium takes over Alcesimarchus' house, Selenium goes home to her mother, the lena stays to reminisce on the circumstances of Selenium's birth (125, 130-132 are insertions from the succeeding speech) and then goes home. The half-tipsy loquacity of the lena is contrasted with the serenity of Auxilium who tells the whole story. Auxilium is the Greek Boetheia, assistance to an injured innocent, here Selenium; Plautus appears to have altered this prologue in some respects; the end (197 f.) is clearly Roman and we may doubt whether Menander omitted all reference to Demipho's Lemnian daughter who was to marry Alcesimarchus.

In Plautus the divine monologue is immediately followed by the arrival of Alcesimarchus; as this must be reckoned to the second act (see below), it must have been preceded by the chorus in the original. But this would bring the chorus next to the

---

1 Philologus, LXXXVII, 114.
2 Rheinisches Museum, 1935, 16 f.; 1938, 97 f., quoted below as '35/ and '38/. He has located the fragments in the Cistellaria as follows: 449K, context of Cist., 515; 450 K, end of play; 451K = Cist., 19; 452K, context of Cist., 689; 453K = Cist., 193; 454K = Cist., 498; 455K, context of Cist., 19; 456K, end of play; 558K = Cist. 89.
3 Marx, Rh. Mus., 1933, 192.
4 Suess, '35/166 quotes Perik., 18; cf. also, Epitr., 180.
5 Kuiper, Grieksche Origineelen, 173, founds on this his theory that Demipho is away in Lemnos to fetch the Lemnian daughter.
divine prologue and neither in the surviving originals of Menander nor in the Latin adaptations is there any evidence that Menander ever introduced the chorus immediately after the divine prologue. Therefore it seems likely that Plautus scrapped a scene after the divine prologue—the last scene of the first act. Such a scene is desirable from another point of view. We have seen Selenium and heard her case; we have had various references to the next door house of Demipho and Phanostrata but we have seen nobody leave that house, although Lampadio returns during the next act and Demipho in the fifth act. It is a desperate shift to assume that Demipho returns from a foreign journey in the fifth act and this does not account for Lampadio; Lampadio must leave in the first act, if he is to return in the second act. Phanostrata also, if she has not appeared before, should be named when she comes out (543). Menander therefore probably had a scene after the prologue in which Demipho discussed with Phanostrata the preparations for the marriage and Phanostrata persuaded him to send Lampadio to search for her daughter; Demipho then went off to the Boule (776). Plautus has scrapped this scene and substituted for it some lines of prologue (180-189).

The second act begins with a long monologue by the lovesick Alcesimarchus, who has been kept six days in the country by his father; then after a gap of about 90 lines he is talking to his slave (231 f.), who at the end appears to be persuading him to tell Selenium about the marriage (254: dari iussit pater)¹ and the scene ends six lines later when Gymnasium comes out (260: sed quem hinc . . . foras, 266: traces of Gymnasium's name).² After another gap, which Suess assesses as 76 lines, the Gymnasium scene continues with Gymnasium's suggestion that he will marry the Lemnian if Selenium is kept from him (267-270) and then the wilder suggestion that he and Selenium ought to be shut up together. This produces Alcesimarchus' demand for an armed force to carry off Selenium but Gymnasium finally persuades him to go and try to win over Selenium's mother (301). There appears to be a certain parallelism in shape between the two scenes as both end with a wild outburst from

¹ Suess, '38/114.
² Kuiper, op. cit., 192.
Alcesimarchus, who finally yields to persuasion (231 f. = 283 f.; 249 f. = 301 f.); it is probably therefore justifiable to assume a considerable opening section for the scene between Alcesimarchus and the slave to balance the 90 or so lines of the Gymnasium scene before it. 283. It follows that no other character enters in the 90 line gap after l. 228; it is difficult in any case to see who could intervene between Alcesimarchus and his slave. Alcesimarchus has still to explain how he escaped from his father in the country and presumably how he came to be imprisoned there; he will also have something to say about the proposed marriage with the Lemnian. Suess suggests the possibility that "the slave has been in the house during Alcesimarchus' absence and that Alcesimarchus obtained his first information about the new situation from him." By the new situation he means presumably the substitution of Gymnasium for Selenium. The only argument for this seems to be that somebody told Selenium about the proposed marriage (100, resciverim; add probably Caecilius, Ribbeck, 68, 1) and it would be neater if the somebody were this slave. The chief argument against is the loss of the moment when Alcesimarchus, having screwed up his courage at last to tell his mistress about the marriage, expects to see Selenium and sees instead Gymnasium (260 f.). If, however, the slave comes with Alcesimarchus from the country, then the whole scene leading up to Gymnasium's appearance is paralleled in miniature by the scene in the Adelphi in which Aeschines, having similarly taken his resolve, finds his father instead of Pamphila (610-636).

Having sent Alcesimarchus off to Melaenis and Selenium, Gymnasium is then faced with his father. A gap of 76 lines separates the scenes and is probably accounted for by the termination of the scene with Alcesimarchus and parallel soliloquies by Gymnasium and the old man who do not see each other until our text resumes (306). The old man has presumably pursued Alcesimarchus from the country; being, however, as weak a character as Antipho in the Stichus and Nicobulus in

1 Suess, '38/106 compares Poenulus, 308 f., and thinks that here, too, a new section starts. For the general tone, cf. Perikeiromene, 77-161, Samia, 313 f.
2 So Kuiper, op. cit., 190.
3 '38/106.
the *Bacchides*, he is not proof against Gymnasium’s charms and sets up as his son’s rival, at least this seems the easiest interpretation of the difficult lines at the end of the preserved portion of the scene (371 f.). But what in fact does Gymnasium plan to do with the old man? She is clearly loyal both to Selenium and to Alcesimarchus. In the role of Selenium she can either (1) desert Alcesimarchus for the old man and so get him away with his suspicions lulled—but then no obstacle remains to the marriage of Alcesimarchus and the Lemnian, or (2) remain true to Alcesimarchus and drive the old man away in the hope that he will see the seriousness of the position and call off the marriage. The second seems more likely because we know that shortly afterwards Gymnasium was fetched away by the *lena* (546). Less than 40 lines separate the old man’s declaration of love (371) and the re-opening of the text (385), where Lampadio seems to be speaking. In these 40 lines the old man has gone, the *lena* has come, and both women have gone into the house before Lampadio arrives. Therefore, on mere grounds of space it is probable that the *lena* arrives before the old man departs and possible that they choose her as arbitrator (cf. 372). The old man says: “I demand (*stipulor*) that you promise (*spondere*) me your daughter”; the *lena* answers (374): “You ask me to answer with a promise (*respondere*). I always make my own demands (*stipulari*) from men. That is my trade to promise nothing to men”; then the old man (377): “if you would make your demand, as far as my small fortune allows, . . . .” The old man is sent packing, because the *lena* has better business for Gymnasium—that is probably the reason why she has come at all; Gymnasium on her part is ready to go because the return of Alcesimarchus has released her (309). The two women go into the house to fetch Gymnasium’s belongings and Lampadio arrives. Lampadio describes his loyalty to his mistress (381), his fruitless search and the miserable women he has met (382-408).

---

2 Suess, ‘38/130.  
3 Ibid., ‘38/122, proposes another explanation.  
4 Ox. Pap., 1803, 1, seems to belong here and shows that the play contained a scene in trochaic tetrameters.
the women come out and go off (378-380, misplaced by Lindsay); Lampadio recognises them and after a short monologue follows. Fragments of this monologue make the sense clear, particularly 420 = 549, the exclamation of recognition (422), and 424 = 167. The act ended at 433.

Some 40 lines at the beginning of the third act are lost. When the text resumes (449), first Selenium refuses Alcesimarchus' advances and goes home (460, cf. 528, 630), then Melaenis scorns Alcesimarchus' oaths of fidelity. Suess ¹ has given the most likely interpretation of this situation. Alcesimarchus had failed to find Melaenis and Selenium because they were visiting the lena and comes back to find them outside his house. Melaenis has brought Selenium back because the lena told her that she proposed to withdraw Gymnasium, but only on condition that Selenium will leave if Alcesimarchus returns; the compulsion to return is Selenium's position as housekeeper (111) and Melaenis does not yet know (because the lena did not then know) that Alcesimarchus has in fact returned. Selenium goes at 460; Melaenis dallies for a moment after Alcesimarchus has gone in (528) and sees Lampadio arrive. She overhears Lampadio's report to Phanostrata (the form of the scene recalls Pinacium's report in the Stichus); she then makes certain of her facts by interrogating Lampadio. Not unlike Demea in the Samia (134 f.), she sacrifices her own desires to the interests of her foster-child, but she wishes at least to have the credit for this. Therefore she forestalls Lampadio by warning the lena to be silent, so that when the lena keeps her rendezvous with him she merely delays him (653 f.); the meeting between Melaenis and the lena takes place in the interval between the third and fourth act. The lena then goes to her rendezvous with Lampadio, while Melaenis brings Selenium back.

Melaenis' plan is to a certain extent upset because, when she returns with Selenium at the beginning of the fourth act (631) and has already sent Halisca with the box of tokens to knock at Phanostrata's door (637), she is diverted by Alcesimarchus. Alcesimarchus is playing Ajax and like Ajax is seen

¹ Suess, '38/132.
meditating suicide through the door of the house; \(^1\) when he sees Selenium he carries her into the house, pursued by Melaenis and by Halisca, who in her hurry leaves the box of tokens on Phanostrata's doorstep. By this time Lampadio has returned from his rendezvous with the lena, and Phanostrata comes out of the house in answer to Halisca's knocking (658 = 637). \(^2\) Suess \(^3\) suggested that the stages of Halisca's search (671) are modelled on Sophocles' Ichneutae; but the style is more reminiscent of the monody in the Frogs (1330 f.) and it may be therefore that Halisca sang like the girl in the Theophoroumene, who also had two spectators. At the end of the scene Phanostrata follows Halisca into Alcesimarchus' house. Lampadio presumably comments in a short monologue and goes to find Demipho, with whom he wants to be first with the good news, as it may mean emancipation for him (775, cf. 592).

Demipho returns before Lampadio, who probably arrives, as in Plautus, immediately after him. Plautus has scrapped the rest of Menander's fifth act and we can only guess at what it contained. Demipho must have an interview with Phanostrata and it seems likely that Lampadio is liberated as a result. The marriage of Alcesimarchus and Selenium must be ratified and only the two fathers can do this. Alcesimarchus' father should now return after a fruitless search for his son. The two fathers decide to acquiesce in the fait accompli and Demipho apparently felt no need to provide a marriage feast (or perhaps even a dowry). The fragment preserved from this scene \(^4\) is a rather ironical commentary by the father of Alcesimarchus: "You are clever not to have to invite women or feast a crowd but to have made the marriage self-supporting." The charge of meanness \(^5\) reflects the speaker's character rather than Demipho's.

\(^1\) I have discussed the setting of the Ajax in Introduction to Sophocles, 119. An earlier reminiscence of Ajax in 527 = Aj. 480 f.; later in conscious opposition 649 = Aj. 589.

\(^2\) For the delayed entry in answer to a knock, cf. Doris in Periheiromene, 182 f. (Rylands Bulletin, XXIX, 375).

\(^3\) Suess, '38/134.

\(^4\) Fr. 450K interpreted by Suess, '38/140 f.

\(^5\) Suess, loc. cit., points out that in Theophrastus (xxii, 4) the mean man when marrying off his daughter hires self-supporting (oikosirous) attendants for the marriage feast.
Alcesimarchus' father is mean (305, 365) as well as prurient, like Antipho in the Stichus.

VIII. OTHER PLAYS.

ANEPSIOI. A fragment of Afranius' adaptation (Ribbeck, 170, I): "parents' lives are worth little in their children's eyes when they prefer fear to respect" is so close to Adelphi, 57, that this may also have been an education play (cf. also 730K).

FIRST EPIKLEROS. Only two of the fragments distinguish the two plays; 172K from the Second Epikleros gives no clue; 167-168K from the First Epikleros seems to be a husband's account of the fussiness of his wife, who cannot bear the noise made by the birds and forces a girl to drive them away. This situation is incompatible with all we know of the Comoedia Florentina, which has been identified with the Epikleros,¹ but might suit the Epikleros of which we know that "a man and his wife went to law and their son gave the verdict";² this play may therefore be the First Epikleros. Fragments of the Turpilius version seem to refer to this quarrel (Ribbeck, 91, III, VI, and possibly VIII). The quarrel between mother and father can hardly be anything that is known to affect the son, though its further consequence may be vital for the play, like the consequences of the arbitration in the Epitrepontes; possibly the mother tries to get rid of a slave girl as being inefficient (cf. Plokion) and the father explains that her domination as head of the household is intolerable (167-168K)². Certainly the son objects to a marriage proposed by his father (Ribbeck, IV, V), although like Pamphilus in the Andria he hates opposing his father (Andria, 262, Ribbeck, VII).³ He has probably raped a poor girl, since someone is asked to "take pity on Calliphon's children" (Ribbeck, II) and then seeks out the father, tells him the truth, and he consents to the son's marriage (Ribbeck, X, IX, XI, cf. Adelphi, 438 ff.). Another fragment clearly derives

¹ Ulbricht, Kritische u. Exegetische Studien, I ff., follows Herzog in identifying the Comoedia Florentina with the Second Epikleros. I hope to argue later that the play's title was probably Heauton Penthon or Second Epikleros.
² See Wilamowitz, Kl. Schr., i, 468.
³ Reading conqueri Med (or Meque) esse suae parum obsequelae.
from the night-walking prologue of Menander's play (Ribbeck, 91, I = 164K); neither fragment gives the name of the speaker; PH in the Latin version may be an old man Phania or a young man Phaedria. Two other fragments refer to a drunken slave, cf. Syrus in the Adelphi (763; Ribbeck, XII, XIII). Who is the Heiress? Not, I think, the girl whom the son refuses to marry; possibly the girl whom he does marry, but more probably the tiresome mother.

Imbrians. The Summary (Körte, 149) breaks off after a few lines and only tells that two poor Imbrians (friends, not brothers) married twin sisters and lived a communal life: one of them is presumably Demeas of the preserved opening line. One of them has a son who urges on him the virtues of "reasoning" (247-248K): this is a fourth-century version of Sophocles' Haemon (Ant. 683) and presumably here, too, is an appeal to an indignant parent not to take summary action in a love affair; Kock notes the relationship between S. Ant., 728 and fr. 638K; whether the latter fragment belongs to the Imbrians or not, it is evidence for the Haemon/Kreon relationship in Menander. The young man (or his brother, who, like Moschion in the Perikeiromene, is often drunk (Ribbeck, 51, III, V, VII)) has raped a girl and concealment of her pregnancy is no longer possible (Ribbeck, II, said either by her mother, cf. Georgos, 87, or an old slave, cf. Aulularia, 74); she is presumably the daughter of the other Imbrian. We may guess that this play was not unlike the Adelphi.

Kanephoros. Alciphron's reminiscence of this play (III, 31) shows that the youth fell in love with the girl when she was a basket-bearer in a procession (cf. Arrhephoros). The young man spoke of the difficulties of philosophy and was warned of the certain misfortunes of the passionate (Ribbeck, 86, I; 253K). Perhaps like Selenium in the Cistellaria, the girl kept house for him and she had to provide a substitute (254K = Cist. 104) when her mother, in the young man's opinion "a foul-tongued old woman" (256K, cf. Cist. 536; Heaut., 234), fetched her home. The mother perhaps saw his conduct as thoughtless exploitation by the rich (252K, cf. Cist., 493). The reason was apparently that the young man had to marry an heiress (Ribbeck,
PLOKION. The word Plokon according to Hesychius means a necklace and the play should therefore be a recognition play, like the similarly titled “Kerchief” (Kekryphalos). If it is a recognition play, it is a play with a double plot, since the parentage of the girl who has been raped by the young man is known (404K). There is, however, the maidservant (fr. 402K) whom Gellius describes as “haud illiberali facie”; this probably translates πάντα ἐλευθέρως, the phrase used to describe Plangon in the Heros (40). She therefore was probably recognised, but it is impossible to guess whose child she was or whom she ultimately married. The other plot concerns a young man (X), who is the son of an old man (A) and a domineering and unlovely heiress. A complains to an old neighbour (B) of his wife’s appearance and of her behaviour to himself, to his daughter and to X (402, 403, 409K). X had raped the daughter of a poor man (C) at a night festival (404K; Ribbeck, 65, VI). His mother wants him to marry a relative (929K: said by the father?) and the marriage has been arranged for the day on which the action of the play takes place (Ribbeck, XII, said by the young man to his slave; cf. Andria, 328); the young man’s protests against ‘family’ as the only criterion in choosing a wife (533K, cf. also Ribbeck, XV) have been unavailing and his slave, after a false start, has to think out ‘a second way’ (415K). C’s slave, Parmeno (like C himself), knew nothing of the girl’s condition; he first hears her cries in childbirth, then finds out the story (404K; Ribbeck, IV, V) and comments, like Daos in the Georgos (77 f.), on the disadvantages of town-life for the poor (405/6K). Two fragments survive of a dialogue between C and Parmeno (407, 649K, Ribbeck, VIII). Parmeno’s part had clearly some likeness to Geta’s in the Adelphi (335 f., 447 f.). That C does not go straight to A, but finds a patron, is shown by one of the Caecilius fragments (Ribbeck, XVI): ‘I will go to the forum and act in defence of poverty’ (cf. Hegio in Adelphi, 493). This is presumably said by B, A’s neighbour, and he apparently intended legal proceedings (Ribbeck, XVII). A has then to explain (to his wife?) that C regarded the rape
as a crime of wealth against poverty (Ribbeck, XVIII; cf. again Adelphi, 500 f.). All will end happily: perhaps the mother’s tyranny is broken by the discovery that the maid-servant is her own illegitimate child? The play apparently began, like the Misoumenos, Epikleros and Dyskolos, with a night-walking scene in which presumably X told of his love (Ribbeck, VII).

Hypobolimaios. Menander called this play ‘The suppositional son or the rustic.’ The alternatives probably represent two characters as in the Arrhephoros or Flute-Girl. The two sons of Demea in the Adelphi afford the obvious parallel. Here Moschion is a character: ‘the mother of the girl’ saw him driving a chariot at the Little Panathenaea (494K). On the analogy of other Moschions ¹ he is likely to be the suppositional son, to live in the town, and to have raped a maiden. This last is supported by fragments which recall the Sostrata-Hegio scenes of the Adelphi (489K with Ad. 335 f.; 485K with Ad. 500 f., 605 f.). 481K, addressed to Parmenon, is a variation on the theme, miseries of old age (cf. Theophoroumene, 223K, Plokion, 407K), and should belong to the same situation. It was presumably the girl who was living in a miserable hutment

¹ Kock and others have connected with 494K a passage of Choricius where he says that ‘of Menander’s characters Moschion prepared us to rape maidens, Chairestratos to love flute-girls, Knemon made us irritable and Smikrines misers, for he feared that the smoke might carry off some of his possessions.’ Smikrines is tied down by the smoke to the original of the Aulularia but a miserly Smikrines occurs also in the Epitrepontes and Heauton Penthon (= Com. Flor.); Knemon is only known from the Dyskolos; Chairestratos loves a harpist in the Epitrepontes and Chairestratos (Terence Phaedria) loves a hetaira in the Eunuch; Moschion in the Perikeiromene was given to Myrrhine as a baby; in the Samia he was possibly a bastard (131) and certainly raped a maiden; in the Kitharistes Laches claims that Moschion’s wild behaviour is proof of his parentage and he probably raped a maiden (cf. RYLANDS BULLETIN, XXX, 142). There is no reason therefore to restrict Choricius’ reference to the Moschion of the Hypobolimaios and still less to refer his Chairestratos to that play. Caecilius’ play contained a Chaerestratus and a passage in Cicero (Pro Roscio Amerino, 16, 46), if rightly referred to this play, shows that Chaerestratus was the little loved town son and Eutychus the much loved country son. Wilamowitz (Schiedsgericht, 138) suggests that Charippos (491K) is not the contemporary glutton but the second son and that Caecilius (like Terence later) changed the names of the original. This seems more likely than that the original had three (or even four) young men.
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(Ribbeck, 49, VII). The father’s preference for the country son and the complaint about women playing the leading part in the house (484K) suggests that Moschion was forced on his father by his (supposed) mother, as presumably his namesake in the Perikeiromene. That the country son himself is wholly virtuous is unlikely; Ribbeck, 49, V, may possibly refer to a quarrel between the two brothers (cf. Andria, 625; Bacch., 534). Herzog ¹ has made the very attractive suggestion that the Didot prologue was spoken by the country boy. The father was in any case cheated by a clever slave (493K), and the large sum put down to the account of ‘harpers and geometers’ (495K) was presumably diverted to other purposes; perhaps 482-483K is also said by the clever slave (cf. Epitrepontes, 722 f., especially 750).

PHASMA. The story is outlined by Donatus on Terence, Eunuch, prol. 9; a long papyrus fragment survives and two short fragments which tell us nothing except that a cook was one of the characters (501K). The father (A) of a young man, Pheidias, having lost his wife while the child was still young, married a woman, who had recently given birth to a daughter. The daughter’s father (B), who was a next-door neighbour of (A), had an old nurse; she brought the child up in B’s house, which had a secret passage to A’s house known only to the mother. Pheidias saw the girl in the passage and first thought that she was a ghost: ‘then little by little learning the truth fell so deeply in love with the girl that marriage was the only remedy for his passion.’ The papyrus fragment consists of a long narrative speech and after it (the reverse order is impossible as there would be no space for the beginning of the narrative) a dialogue between Pheidias and a slave, who tells him that his sleeplessness and weakness is the unreal sickness of the over-rich and suggests an unreal religious cure. In the narrative speech someone (presumably the nurse, but possibly the girl’s father) has warned a young man that, if he regards himself as the girl’s bridegroom, he must be careful not to harm (?) the girl’s mother by telling ‘someone who has the same mother’;

¹ Philologus, 1934, 195.
after reporting this advice the speaker goes on to describe the life of the girl and the secret passage. Who speaks this? Wilamowitz argues for a god as speaker; Kötte for the young man; ll. 7-10 seem to me decisive; a god must have indicated the reaction of the young man to the advice given to him and there is no room for this; l. 19 ‘for you (plural) probably still want [to learn this]’ can be said by the young man; the audience are addressed three times in the Samia. But who is the young man and who the ‘someone who has the same mother’? According to Kötte the speaker is a rival of Pheidias who is warned not to tell Pheidias’ step-brother who has the same mother as the girl. The obvious objection to this is that there are three young men in the play, which is unlikely. Why cannot the speaker be Pheidias himself, and the other Pheidias’ step-brother, as Kötte has seen? All editors have assumed that this is a prologue; this assumption rules out Pheidias because he only gradually learnt the truth. But why should it be a prologue? The real prologue must have told the story of the secret passage but may have told it in much less detail. This is Pheidias soliloquising on his discovery perhaps at the beginning of the third act (like Demeas in the Samia). The occasion when Pheidias was terrified at the first sight of the girl must have been earlier and it seems to me possible that a fragment of it is preserved: ‘Master, what is on your mind? Why do you talk to yourself alone? You seem to be suffering from some great grief the way you walk about with the pale face of a philosopher.’ How the play developed we cannot say, but presumably both the step-brother and the father provided hindrances. I should like to think that fr. 536K is a further description by Pheidias of his love (the only parallel situation that we can detect is in the Eunuch) and that fr. 531K, attributed by Wilamowitz to this play, contains the slave’s comments.

1 Schiedsgericht, 143, 1.
2 Similar remnants of the Old Comedy manner of addressing the audience, Aulularia, 715, Cistellaria, 678 ff.
3 Freiburg papyrus 12, quoted by Wilamowitz, op. cit., 107, 1.
APPENDIX: THE CHRONOLOGY OF MENANDER’S PLAYS

Any attempt to trace the development of Menander’s art must rest on a chronological framework or at least a division of plays into early or late. The necessity of erecting this framework justifies the examination of the fragments of Menander in the hope that dates secured for fragmentary plays may confirm or support the dating of better preserved plays which cannot themselves be dated. The starting point must be the few dates provided by outside sources: 321 Orge, 312 Heniochos, 302 Imbrians. 1 A few more dates are provided by certain references to external events: the Kekryphalos (272 K) and the Aulularia (498 f.) refer to the Gynaihonomoi, magistrates introduced by Demetrius of Phalerum (317-07) and abolished with his removal—they appear to be a new institution when the Kekryphalos was written; 2 the Perikeiromene refers to the ‘Corinthian evils,’ which have been interpreted as the first war between Antigonus and the coalition (315 B.C.), and more specifically (90) to ‘a manager of armies’ killed by his mercenaries, which probably recalls the murder of Alexander, son of Polyperchon, in 314 B.C.; 3 this would not be news for long and therefore both the Perikeiromene and the Aspis, which has a similar allusion (74 K), can be dated soon after 314 B.C. In the Eunuch Chaereas is doing garrison duty as an Ephebe at the Peiraeus (290)—this dates the play before 301 B.C. when Ephebes ceased to serve outside Athens; 4 an upper limit can also be suggested: Thais’ mother was a Samian, who migrated to Rhodes (107). Kuiper 5 assumes that she moved when the Athenian cleruchs were driven out in 322 B.C. and this is undoubtedly the event which ‘Samian’ suggested to an Athenian audience. Pamphila, the little Athenian girl who was given to Thais’ mother in Rhodes, is 16 years old at the time of the play; if she was stolen by pirates at the age of two, the play cannot have been produced before 308 B.C., and it is perhaps more natural to assume that Thais came to Athens before the siege of Rhodes (305-304 B.C.) and Pamphila after it. 6 The relations between Athens and Rhodes were also mentioned in the Thesauros; considerably less than ten years before the play, at a time when Athens was at war with the Rhodians, the old man claimed to have buried the treasure because of a threat of invasion; it has been plausibly suggested 7 that the reference is to the Rhodian alliance with Antigonus in 314 B.C. and Antigonus’ invasion of Attica in 313 B.C.; the play was then produced between 313 and 304 B.C.

These dated plays provide some help in dating other plays. Körte 8 notes that the Orge fragments (321 B.C.) ridicule Chaerephon, Ktesippos and Philippides, and infers that such jests only occurred in the early plays (there is no trace of them in the Perikeiromene, although more than a third of the play is

1 Körte, RE, Menandros, 709 f. 2 Körte, op. cit., 721.
3 Schwartz, Hermes, LXIV, 3. 4 Ferguson, Hellenistic Athens, 121.
5 Grieksche Origineelen, 247.
6 The upper limit is 306 B.C. if, as Donatus says, Andria, 959 f, belongs to the Eunuch and quotes Epicurus (supported ably by Bignone, Riv. de fil., II, 1924, 145).
7 Kock, I11, 67.
8 Körte, RE, Menandros, 721 f.; Capps, Four Plays of Menander, 231 f.
preserved, or in the much longer surviving fragments of the Epitrepontes). Chaerephon was also mentioned in the Kekryphalos (soon after 317 B.C.), Androgynos (refers also to Lamia, 323 B.C.), Samia (Chrysis, as a Samian, probably came to Athens in 322 B.C., but her relations with Demeas need not be of long standing), and Methe (allied to Orge by title: possibly the reference to Kallimedu^2 implies a date not much later than 322 B.C.). They are all quoted as figures of fun, a manner that goes back to Aristophanes. Other names also can be dated: Kö rte^4 quotes the reference to the naval commander Aristoteles in the Olynthia and to the athlete Astyanax in the Kolax. Both need consideration: according to Kö rte 'earning four obols a day with Aristoteles' (357 K) certainly refers to Aristoteles' expedition to Lemnos in the summer of 314 B.C., which ended in complete disaster. The Menander quotation sounds like the half-envious, half-scornful comment of a civilian on a soldier or sailor (cf. Perikeiromene, 189-202), and is therefore much more likely to have been written before the disaster of 314 B.C. A scholiast's note on the papyrus of the Kolax shows that Menander referred to the athlete Astyanax, who won six victories in the Olympiad, 316-312 B.C.; presumably the soldier Bias compared himself (or was compared) to Astyanax. Bias is also credited with having known five hetairae, two of whom were favourites of Demetrius Poliorcetes (i.e. 307 B.C. or later); Kö rte therefore suggests that the Kolax was produced several years after 316 B.C.; 312 B.C. or soon after is perhaps a reasonable date.

Another hetaira, Nannion, is mentioned in the Pseudherakles (524 K); as she is also named by the Middle Comedy poets Antiphanes and Alexis and by the orator Hyperides, who died in 322 B.C., the Pseudherakles should belong to Menander's earliest period.

In Plautus' Bacchides, Menander's Dis Exapaton, Chrysalus says that Mnesiolochnus shall be more abused than ever Clinias has been by Demetrius (910); the reference is presumably to the sumptuary legislation of Demetrius of Phalerum and the time probably early in his rule (317-307 B.C.), because Clinias as a figure probably belongs to the Chaerephon group considered above and the two Bacchides

1 Blake, Classical Philology, XXXVI, 397, agrees: he assumes Polyperchon's proclamation in 319 as a bottom date.
2 Kallimedu escaped with Demetrius of Phalerum to Nikanor in the Peiraeus in 322 B.C. (Ferguson, Hell. Ath., 33).
3 I have omitted Charippos (Hypobolimaios) and Metagenes (Empimprimare): the former may be a character, the latter not a proper name.
4 Büchner (St. it. Fil., XIV (1937), 151 f.) dates Kolax to 304/3 (a) by Eunuch, 247. He says that the idea of invention and the image of the road are Epicurean and the whole speech a parody of an Epicurean sermon and a satire on Epicurean hedonism. The image of the road is a common enough metaphor and I doubt if either parody or satire are intended, except satire on the parasite, which is as old as Epicharmus. (b) by Kolax, 70 ff., which he takes as a reference to the Athenian flattery of Demetrius Poliorcetes in 307 B.C. Isocrates had used very similar language about flatterers in Peace, 3-4; and it seems to me unlikely that such a reference to the flattery of Demetrius and his hetairae would have been permissible in 304/3 B.C.
probably left Samos in 322 B.C.; one stayed in the East, the other came to Athens, but the memory of Samos should still be fairly recent.

Menander is not Aristophanes and his plays were not political in the sense that the Old Comedy was political, but his audiences must at least have demanded that his references to events in Athens, Greece, the Greek islands, or the East should make sense; we are therefore justified in trying to interpret these references chronologically. In the *Andria*, Chremes' brother brought Glykerium to Andros (935): *bellum hinc fugiens meque in Asiam persequens*. This event was some fourteen years before, as Glykerium in the play is sixteen years old; alternative suggestions for 'the war in Athens' are Chaironeia (338), the Lamian War and its aftermath (322-317), the invasion of Antigonus (313 B.C.), and the four years' war (307-304 B.C.). Another factor is the position of Andros. The *Imbrians* was produced in 302 B.C., four years after Imbros had been handed over to Athens; Andros was 'liberated' by Ptolemy in 308 B.C. and must have been news for the next few years; if the *Andria* was produced some four years after 308 B.C., then the 'war in Athens' means the disturbances that followed the death of Antipater, and Chremes was in Asia about 320 B.C. Lemnos freed herself from Athens in 315 B.C. and did not become Athenian again until 305 B.C. Between these dates plays in which a Lemnian takes a considerable part or in which travellers visit Lemnos are unlikely. The *Synaristosai* (Plautus' *Cistellaria*) and the *Heros* (cf. l. 46) have various marks which suggest that they are early rather than late and may therefore perhaps be dated before 315 B.C. Perhaps we may see a gesture of friendliness to Polyperchon, who had tried to give Samos back to Athens in 319 B.C. and ruled Corinth and Sikyon until 308 B.C., in the Sicyonian setting of the *Synaristosai*, in the name of the *Sikyonios*, in the Corinthian setting of the *Perikeiromene* and the reference to Corinth in the *Georgos* (6). In the *Heautontimoroumenos* the old woman who brought up Antiphila had migrated from Corinth some sixteen or more years before the date of the play (96, 629): if Menander was again thinking of the 'Corinthian evils' of 315 B.C. (cf. *Perikeiromene*) as the cause of her migration, the play can be dated about 298 B.C.; then Menedemus' foreign service (111) was in the time of Alexander or before, and Clinia went to Asia (117) to serve under one who Ambracia was occupied by the Macedonians.

1 Cf. Kuiper, *op. cit.*, 247, n. 2, who decides for Chaironeia because he believes the *Andria* to be a very early play. Johnson, *AJP.*, 1914, 326, decides for the four years' war because Athens then had control of the seas, but surely individuals could slip across the Aegean at any time (cf. date proposed for *Dis Exapaton*).

2 Mr. J. A. Davison pointed out to me that Pausanias, i, 29, proves that Athenians could distinguish themselves in the service of the King of Persia. Dietze, *de Philomene comico*, 13, n. 2, dates Clinia's service between the adoption of the kingly title by Ptolemy, etc. (305 B.C.), and the battle of Ipsus (301 B.C.), of the kings about the time of the Battle of Ipsus; he returns to find Athens 'safe' (194), which would perhaps be a reasonable description of the government of the Moderates after 301 B.C. and before Demetrius' siege in 295 B.C. It is possible that the *Olynthia* and *Perinthia* owed their names to some memory of the gallant defences put up against Philip and may have therefore have been
Neither Clinia in the _Heautontimoroumenos_ nor the soldier of the _Eunuch_ seem to have won much spoil in the East; the great days of Eastern spoil are earlier. They are reflected in the _Stichus_ (Menander’s _First Adelphoi_ or _Philadelphoi_), in the _Halieis_, which speaks of gold from Kyinda (the Persian treasure was transferred there from Susa in 321 B.C.) and in the wealth of Bias in the _Kolax_. Though only recently rich, Bias was an old soldier and it is unnecessary to decide in which of the many campaigns in Cappadocia down to the defeat of Cassander in 315 B.C. he had distinguished himself as a drinker (293K). The soldier of the _Eunuch_ left Thais to go to Caria (125); if the dating suggested above is right, he may have been in Caria when Ptolemy seized bases there in 309 B.C. The soldier of the _Misoumenos_ did very well under one of the kings in Cyprus (340K); the kings were liquidated by Ptolemy in 310 B.C. A date soon after 317 B.C. has been suggested for the _Bacchides_ ( _Dis Exapaton_); Meniliochus has been some two years in Ephesus collecting a debt; perhaps Menander chose Ephesus because Antigonus had captured it in 319 B.C. In the _Kitharistes_ also, both Phanias and Moschion have been visiting Ephesus, but this connection is too slight on which to build.

External evidence gives us no help in dating the _Epitrepontes_, Terence’ _Adelphi_ (Menander’s _Second Adelphoi_ or _Homopatrioi_), or Plautus’ _Poenulus_ (Menander’s _Karchedonios_). The general scheme and problem of the _Adelphi_ is so like that of the _Heautontimoroumenos_ that it is difficult to believe that a long interval separates them. Wehrli has argued that the _Adelphi_ is the earlier because the _Heautontimoroumenos_ goes a stage further in characterising the old men. The _Adelphi_ has also more tradition elements: the comic Sannio, the drunken Syrus, and the parallel short scenes in the last act. The _Epitrepontes_ has a subtlety of characterisation which joins it to the _Adelphi_ and _Heautontimoroumenos_, while, as in the _Adelphi_, the figure of Smikrines grows out of an older, satirical tradition. The _Poenulus_ has no subtlety and no problem, nor is there any reason to suppose that this lack is due to Plautus; an the other hand, the element of fooling is strong in the scenes between Agorastocles and Milphio, Milphio and Syncerastus, Hanno and Milphio, and in the satirical portraits of the _leno_ and the soldier; the whole feeling suggests the time of the _Kolax_ or before. The Aetolian setting may then be due to the part played by the Aetolians in the Lamian war and their subsequent resistance to Antipater and Cassander.

Written during the democratic revolution after Antipater’s death. The _Leucadia_ may perhaps be connected with the success of Leukas in withstanding Cassander’s attacks from 314 B.C. The ‘embassy from Ambracia’ in the _Stichus_ (Menander’s _First Adelphoi_ or _Philadelphoi_ ) according to Enk dates the play before 312 B.C.

1 The reference to Pyrrhus ( _Eun. 783_) is presumably elaboration by Terence. The _rex_ of 357, 401, is unidentified; it is not safe to build on the references to Cyprus (297, 300K; but cf. _Misoumenos_ 340K).

2 _Motivistudien_, 87 f.

3 For the present at any rate I am not prepared to use the supposed Epicurean and Stoic echoes (cf. e.g. Morpurgo, _Stud. Ital._, N.3, III (1923), 5, on 726 ff.; Ferguson, _Hellenistic Athens_, 82 on 605) for dating (cf. Wilamowitz, _Schiedsgericht_, 111). Zeno had been in Athens since 314 B.C. and Epicurus since 306 B.C.

4 Enk, _Mnemosyne_, 1916, 43.
I have referred before to the possibility of tracing a chronological sequence of decreasing fooling. The most significant facts are the differences between the early Perinthia and the late Andria and between the early Kolax and the late Eunuch. Other plays in which this element is noticeably prominent are the Samia, Perikeiromene, Synaristosai, First Adelphoi or Philadelphoi, and the original of the Aulularia, all of which are dated early on other grounds. It follows, therefore, that for our purposes the division between early and late must separate these two groups of plays, must in fact fall between the Kolax (312 B.C. or soon after) and the Andria (about 304 B.C.).

One other technical criterion can be used: although nearly three-quarters of the Epitrepontes has survived, all the preserved lines or parts of lines are in iambic trimeters, whereas the Perikeiromene has one scene of 86 lines (out of 449 preserved) and the Samia one scene of 68 and one of 17 lines (out of 341 preserved) in trochaic tetrameters, in both plays scenes of fooling such as the later plays eschew. Fragments in trochaic tetrameters also survive from other plays which we have supposed to be early: Orge (367K), Sikyonios (442K), Philadelphoi (= First Adelphoi, Stichus) (508K), Halieis (23-26K), Georgos (100K), Heniochos (205K), Synaristosai (Ox. Pap. 1803). Other probably early plays show that Menander used other metres: Leukadia, anapaestic (312K), Sikyonios, dactylic (443K), Georgos (101K) telesillean. Halica's song in the Synaristosai (Cistellaria, 671 f.) also seems to be derived from a sung original.2 Undated plays with fragments in trochaic or other non-iambic metres, which may therefore tentatively be classed as 'early,' are as follows: Theophoroumena: the girl sang, Schol. to E. Andr., 103. Another sign of early date is the coarse word, ἀπομοσαίον (19). Phasma: contained ithyphallics according to Atilius Fortunatianus (Kock, iii, 144). Misogynes: 333K, anapaests. Didymai: 120K, anapaests. Thrasyleon: 244K, trochaics. Thyroros: Demianczuk, Suppl. Comm., 260/5 with 923K. Trochaic. Hieria: Wilamowitz suggested that Periochai 92-94 contains fragments of trochaic lines. Naukleros: 352K, trochaic. Palleke: 379K, trochaic. Plokion: 929K, trochaic. (The name Krobyle and the sentiment make this certainly a fragment of the Plokion). Rhapizomene: 433K, trochaic. Play of reconciliation. Hydra: 470K, trochaic. Hypobolirnaios: 494K, trochaic.

On this evidence the following table can be constructed:—

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>321.</td>
<td>Orge.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>321-316 (approx.).</td>
<td>Androgynos, Methe, Samia, Pseudherakles.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>319-317.</td>
<td>Olymnia, Perinthia.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>317-307.</td>
<td>Dis Exapaton, Kekryphalos (soon after 317), First Adelphoi, (before 312), Halieis, original of Aulularia (= Apistos).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Before 315.</td>
<td>Synaristosai, Heros.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>313-304.</td>
<td>Thesauros.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>312.</td>
<td>Heniochos.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Rylands Bulletin, XXIX, 383 f.
2 I have omitted 299K (anapaest) because (a) Athenaeus quotes it elsewhere as by Mnesimachus; (b) it is not clear whether he is quoting here Dy kolos or Kolx.
312 or soon after.  Kolax.
Before 310.  Misoumenos.
Before 304.  Didymai, Theophoroumene, Thrasyleon, Thyroros, Hieria,
             Karchedonios, Misogynes, Naukleros, Pallake, Plokion,
             Rhapizomene, Hydria, Hypobolimaios, Phasma.
304 or soon after.  Andria.
304-301.  Eunuch.
After 304.  Second Adelphoi, Epitrepones.
302.  Imbrians.
298 approx.  Heautontimoroumenos.