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I. INTRODUCTION.

THE plays of Reconciliation and the plays of Social Criticism form two main groups of Menander’s plays. The other plays of which something is known may be classified as Adventure (or Intrigue) plays and Single Character plays. Although the grouping does not pretend to be chronological, it is worth noting that of the six plays which can be dated after 304 B.C. five are plays of Social Criticism and one is a play of Reconciliation, while all the Adventure and Single Character plays that can be dated appear, for one reason or another, to have been written before 304 B.C. and nine of them can confidently be placed in the first ten years of Menander’s production. These plays are therefore the best guide to Menander’s art in his early years when he was still writing in the tradition of the Middle Comedy, although the beginnings of the more serious Menander can already be seen.

Four of these plays (Apistos = Aulularia, First Adelphoi = Stichus, Dis Exapaton = Bacchides, Karchedonios = Poenulus) survive in Plautine adaptations; considerable papyrus fragments have been recovered of five (Samia, Heauton Penthon = Comoedia Florentina, Kolax, Koneiazomenai, Perinthia); the Hiereia is known from an epitome probably of the first century A.D.; of the rest nothing remains but short fragments of the Greek originals and of Roman adaptations. The original of Plautus'
Truculentus certainly had some resemblance to Menander's Thais (see Appendix). The detailed problems of restoration are discussed below or have already been discussed.

Certain of these plays belong together. Enough is known of the Dyskolos to show that it was very like the Apistos and the fragments suggest that the Deisiphaimon and Misogynes were character studies of the same kind. Demeas in the Samia is an elderly man of a different type who cannot be summed up in a single adjective. The old miser in the Thesauros and the father in the Hiereia seem to have been the most important characters of those plays, and the First Adelphoi is dominated by the old man Antipho's reactions first to the sisters' loyalty and then to the brothers' wealth; for these reasons these plays are reckoned as the Single Character plays. In the Demiourgos, Paidion, and Thais (perhaps also in the Parakatatheke and Phanion, of which little remains), the chief character was a hetaira.

The Adventure or Intrigue plays can be divided into two main groups, intrigues against a father and intrigues against a leno. The Karchedonios and Kolax are intrigues against a leno, probably also the Aspis and Thrasyleon. In the Dis Exapaton, Heauton Penthon, Perinthia, Koneiazomenai the intrigue is directed against the father, probably also in the Arrhephoros and the Pseudherakles, since in both the girl evidently has a child and therefore the intrigue is likely to be directed against the father of the girl or of the young man.

II. TRADITIONAL COMEDY.

The comedy of intrigue and the single character play have themselves ancestors in Middle Comedy. A third kind of comedy, the comedy of the dominant idea, which derives from Aristophanes, also influenced Menander. Just as Aristophanes' Plutus shows the results on various sorts of people of making Wealth see, so in the First Adelphoi Menander shows the effects

1 Sikyonios offers no clue but is included here because it is a soldier play. Kekryphalos had intrigue (279K) and recognition. Other recognition plays: Daktylios, Karine, Knidia, perhaps also Didymai, Hydria, Messenia, Olynthia. Epangellomenos also had an intrigue.

2 Cf. RYLANDS BULLETIN, XXIX, 151 f.
on Antipho, Gelasimus, and the slaves of making the brothers rich. In rather the same way, the Apistos (and perhaps also the Dyskolos) is a study of the effect of sudden wealth on a thrifty peasant whom it converts into a miser, but in this play the effect is confined to a single character and his psychology is Menander's chief interest. It is also justifiable to see a survival of Aristophanes' 'wittiest conceptions' in the special situations which Menander introduces early in his plays and which, to some extent, determine the course of the play. Aristophanes' conceptions are essentially fantastic and impossible, 'the man who fetched a tragic poet from the Underworld' or 'the man who made a private peace'; the situations which Menander invents for the starting point of his comedies are not impossible, if unusual; an obvious instance is the shearing of Glykera, which gives the Perikeiromene its name. In the plays under discussion, further instances may be seen in the introduction of Moschion's baby into Demes' house in the first act of the Samia, which is the cause of all the trouble, and presumably the women's threat to take hemlock in the Koneiazomenai.

To the same class of 'witty conceptions', though with a more limited effect on the plot, belong the more extravagant deceptions concocted by slaves. The feigned death prescribed for Chaireas in the Heauton Penthon and the feigned 'possession' of the slave in the Hiereia show that there is no need to suspect the invention of Plautus in the fabricated tale of Ephesian robbers, the dictated letter, and the prearranged tableau of the Dis Exapaton or in the dressing up of the bailiff in the Karchedonios. The same sort of extravagant comedy appears in the scenes of misunderstanding: in the Apistos Euclio and Lyconides are at cross purposes for a whole scene before Euclio realises that Lyconides is talking about his daughter and not about the stolen gold (Aul. 727 f.), and in the Hiereia the father identified the wrong boy as his son and then the right boy refused to accept him as father.

1 Cf. with Bacch. 251 ff. Arrhephoros 67K, which should belong to a similar intrigue, Halieis 15K; perhaps also Naukleros 348K, but there the situation may be a return without intrigue as in the Kitharistes and Synaristosai. The "Bogus Herakles" is presumably an impersonation.

2 Cf. also in the Synaristosai where Gymnasium is twice mistaken for Selenium.
Boisterous knockabout in the tradition of fifth century comedy is also more common in Menander's earlier plays. Three such scenes, which have an Aristophanic ancestry, are banter between master and slave (e.g. Sam. 325 f.), contest between slaves (e.g. Poen. 851 f.), and the siege scene in the Kolax (Eun. 771 f.). The slave and the donkey in the opening scene of Aristophanes' Frogs are recalled by a fragment which may also belong to the Kolax (534K, cf. Kol. 32). Middle Comedy audiences evidently greatly enjoyed feasting on the stage, and this tradition also survives in the slave banquet at the end of the First Adelphoi.¹ The violent punishment of slaves,² the grumbling arrival of the advocati (Poenulus) and the quarrels between old men and cooks are in the same tradition. Menander particularly liked the comedy of running in and out of houses, exemplified in the Apistos by Euclio in his first scene with Megadorus (Aul. 202, 243).³ Much of this kind of boisterous comedy depends on acting for its effect, but we can appreciate well enough the enchanting situation when Euclio is trying to hide his pot of gold; he sees Megadorus and knows that he cannot escape him; he probably puts the pot on the ground; that is why he looks so strange and slovenly (536-539) and remains rooted to the ground so that Megadorus finally has to leave him there (579). Megadorus' tirade against women with dowries has an added piquancy for the audience who know that Euclio has the bride's dowry with him in the pot (cf. 26).

III. Satire.

Earlier comedy provided Menander with satirical sketches of traditional characters: hetairae who ruined their lovers, boastful soldiers, parasites and flatterers, miserly old men and stern fathers, as well as minor figures such as bibulous nurses and midwives and the loathly leno. My purpose here is not to trace their ancestry but to notice how far Menander uses them in the early plays and where he crosses the borderline from satire to

¹ Drinking scenes also occurred on the stage in the Synaristosai (451, 455), Pallake (377K), Kekryphalos (273K), Kolax (292K).
² See J. J. Tierney, P.R.I.A., L (C), 54.
sympathy. We can see something of the transition in these plays, but the full portraits of sympathetic hetairae and soldiers are found in the plays of reconciliation and social criticism. Gelasimus, the unfortunate parasite of the First Adelphoi, who is spurned by his friends when they have become rich and leaves the stage intending suicide, is only introduced to raise derisive laughter; though much Romanised by Plautus, he belongs to a tradition which goes back to Eupolis and Epicharmus. Gnatho in the Kolax scorns the old-fashioned jester like Gelasimus (Eun. 244-247); he is characterised by Daos as the new type of flatterer and so behaves to the soldier, Bias; but Kuiper has made a very good case for supposing that his chief object is to help the youthful Pheidias and that therefore he is the first sympathetic parasite.

Bias in the Kolax is the typical soldier, full of extravagant boasts; there is no reason to suppose that Menander treated him with any sympathy but he may have shifted the emphasis somewhat in the Thais; according to Propertius one of her victims was the miles non factus amori (cf. Menander, 732K: 'a soldier could not be elegant even if god were to fashion him'). This type of soldier appears in the Truculentus; Stratophanes rather self consciously suppresses the exuberance of self-praise (482). He spends his wealth ungrudgingly on Phronesium, whom he regards as his wife and believes to have borne him a son; she, however, is only concerned to extract the maximum of money from him and has pretended to be a mother for this sole purpose. For her he is simply a convenience, an uncultured brute; and it is in this sense, i.e. from the hetaira's point of view, that the soldier of the Thais was not 'made for love'. Stratophanes is not represented sympathetically; he is a figure of fun, but a slight change of emphasis would make him into a sympathetic character; he represents an intervening stage

1 Kock (III, 676) notes the parallel between 632-640 and Alciphrhon, III, 49, which shows that the substratum is Menander. In 195K (Ephesios) a parasite (?) expects to be sold as a slave.
2 Mnem., 1938, 165 f.
3 The soldier in the Sikyonios had also only recently made his money; the wild soldier in the Thrasyleon was probably like Bias as the plays seem to have run on similar lines. The soldiers in the Karchedonios and Kolax are slight sketches.
between Bias of the Kolax and Thrasonides of the Misoumenos, who is also ‘hated’ by his girl but finally wins her affection.

Phronesium in the Truculentus is a full portrait of the hetaira who is only interested in money and accepts or rejects lovers by their momentary ability to give, like the hetaira of the Demiourgos who ‘knew a young man for her own profit’ and ‘stripped him bare’ (Ribbeck, 90, IV, V). Phronesium’s door, like Thais’, only opens if the visitor has money (Propertius, IV, v. 46; Truc. 95 f.). She scorns the soldier’s gifts like the hetaira in the Paidion, who complains that a gold necklace, which has been given to her, is not set with gems (372-373K, Truc. 530 f.). In the Thais, as in the Truculentus, the hetaira evidently dominated the play and the chief theme was satire of her greed. The two Bacchides in the Dis Exapaton, though they only appear at the beginning and end of the play, are entirely mercenary and ruthless in their capture of the old men and their sons. These hetairae correspond to the conventional picture drawn by the fathers in the plays of Social Criticism.¹

The old men, of whom fathers form the largest group, are satirised for various characteristics; they interfere with other people’s business (particularly Smikrines in the Heauton Penthon); many of them are mean, if not actually misers; Knemon of the Dyskolos was the type of irritability and bad temper. ‘Close-fisted’ (philargyros), ‘irritable’ (dyskolos), ‘suspicious’ (apistos) are three adjectives naturally applied to those who have not inherited wealth but have suddenly found it or come by it; sometimes one, sometimes another of these qualities is dominant; the whole tenor of Euclio’s behaviour in the Aulularia² shows that his dominant characteristic, while he possesses the gold, is apistia; for this reason he confides the gold to Pisis (583 f.), and these suspicions have given him no peace night or day (65, 72, fr. IV). He had peace in the old days when he dug his land (fr. III) and he finds peace again when he is rid of the gold (fr. IV): as has been noted,³ the position is admirably illustrated

¹ The contrast between conventional judgment and reality noted there can also be seen in the Samia where Demeas treats loyal and faithful Chrysis as a conventional hetaira (121 f., 175 f.).
² E.g. 41, 60, 90 f., 110, 188, 437, 551, 574, 628 f.
³ Pokrowski, Wiener Studien, xlix, 128 f.
by a remark of Epicurus: ‘For many the acquirement of wealth
does not end their troubles, but changes them.’ In the view
of the slave Strobilos, Euclio is also ‘close-fisted’ (300, as inter-
preted by Choricius).

Antipho in the First Adelphoi is perhaps the least attractive
of all Menander’s old men. He has a reputation for virtue
(Stich. 12) like other mean men. His meanness is clear (555);
he wants his daughters married off to rich husbands (132 cf.
Papyrus Didot), because money creates friends (522); and he
drives his servants to get more work out of them (58). Less
amicable qualities are his refusal to act on his own authority (128),
his pretence that he wants a wife when in fact he wants a hetaira
(109 f., 545 f.), and his fawning subservience to his sons-in-law
because they are rich. These are qualities of the Dissembler
and Self-seeking Affable in Theophrastus. Antipho’s desire for
a hetaira is matched by the speedy capitulation of the two old
men in the Dis Exapaton.

They at first sight resemble the pair in the Second Adelphoi; Philoxenus has the same theory of education as Micio, although
unlike Micio he has a wild youth behind him (410, cf. Kith. 53),
and Nicobulus has the meanness of Demea (230, 324, 1184),
but the play shows little sympathy for either. Is the difference
due to Plautus and Terence or to Menander? It can also be
seen in the other characters; here Pistoclerus is allowed to fall
hopelessly in love with a hetaira and Mnesilochus has no hope
of conventional happiness in marriage; Bacchis has none of the
redeeming features of Thais in the Eunuch. Fraenkel has shown
that Plautus has greatly increased the part of the slave Chrysalus
and argues that he has done this at the expense of other char-
acters: ‘the Attic elements in this play, which in some places
are very faithfully preserved, as well as the analogy of the

1 Note, however, that in the Heautontimoroumenos 526, Syrus much more
unjustly describes Menedemus as avidum . . . atque aridum. Enk has made a good
2 Cf. also the father of Alcesimarchus in the Synaristosas (Cist. 305):
235-237K (Thesauros), 509K (Chalkeia).
3 Cf. Fraenkel, op. cit., 242; Wehrli, Motivstudien, 79 f.; compare particu-
larly Bacch. 417 with Ad. 107 f.; Bacch. 1052 with Ad. 50 f.; cf. also Bacch.
411 (Lydus) with Ad. 988 (Demea).
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Adelphi translated by Terence, make it certain that Menander's real interest in this play was the educational problem (in its widest sense) or, to be more precise, not the problem but the stretch of life, lived in the sphere of and under the influence of definite moral forces, which the poet views from the standpoint of paideia. It is however possible that Menander's real interest was the two deceits of the slave, which gave the play its name, and that his character-drawing was light and satirical. Lydus' praise of the Old Education is not to be taken too seriously: he cannot show his charge how to deal with temptation when it arises, and his wish picture of Mnesilochus (457 f. cf. 1084 f.) bears little relation to the facts. If all the Plautine expansion and colouring is removed, the slave still remains a dominant figure, but Daos in the Heauton Penthon and the Perinthia must have been equally important. The Dis Exapatton seems to me to be primarily boisterous comedy, secondly satire on the hetairae and the old men. For the young men Menander shows a flicker of sympathy which foreshadows the plays of Social Criticism, but this must not be exaggerated. Similarly, there is no reason to suppose that Menander was greatly interested in the young man of the Karchedonios. The girls are nicely contrasted but slightly drawn, and Wilamowitz goes too far in finding 'tragic tension' here. I doubt if Agorastocles would understand the 'even worse danger that the lover might buy his beloved as a hetaira and so damage himself, because he ought to marry her in whom he already half unconsciously feels his wife.'

1 See below (Sect. VI) for Kuiper's wholesale reconstruction with the same intent.
2 Alciphron, IV, 2, 3: 'even the most strait-laced could hardly keep his hand off Bacchis' seems to be a reminiscence of the original of Bacch. 111 (Leo, Pl. F., 1139).
3 Note that in both plays an earlier unguarded remark by the slave (Bacch. 326; Perinthia 393K) is later quoted against him by his master (Bacch. 775; Perinthia pap. fr. 13).
4 We have too little of Moschion in the Samia and Pheidias in the Kolax to say how they were handled. The young man in the Thais was completely enslaved to the hetaira; so also the youth in the Demiourgos, who, like Diniarchus in the Truculentus, apparently only married the girl whom he had violated when he was threatened with legal proceedings.
5 N. Jbb., 1899, 519 = Kl. Schr., I, 232.
Menander seems to me to have set himself here, too, the more obvious task of writing a good comedy with an extravagant intrigue and an interesting recognition.

IV. Positive Values.

Much of Menander's satire is directed against wrong values. The wrong value put on money by old men, lenos, and hetairae, who rate it higher than human relationships, and by soldiers, who think it can buy human relationships, is obvious, but parasites and the old and young men who fall for hetairae show another kind of wrong value, the excessive estimation of temporary physical pleasure. The other side is put most clearly by the sisters in the First Adelphoi, particularly by Pamphila, who plays Antigone to her sister's Ismene: to my mind it is right that all who are wise should do their duty (39); I like my beggar; I feel no differently from him now he is poor than I did before when he was rich (133). Where is there so much money, father, which would give me more joy than my husband? How is it either just or honourable for me to share the good things he had and not to share his difficulties? (Pap. Didot a. 22).

Here alone in this play we see the Menander of, e.g. the Pamphile-Charisios scenes in the Epitrepontes, elsewhere his seriousness is concealed in satire. But we can point to other instances of positive values in this group of plays.

Demeas in the Samia judges too hastily on the evidence that Moschion's baby is also Chrysis' baby and deduces unjustifiably that Chrysis is responsible, but the decision which he reaches is an attempt to judge his son dispassionately without reference to his own suffering but on the basis of his son's character and past life. He applies the Aristotelian discrimination between types of crime although it costs him his whole personal happiness (135, 'forget your desire, be through with love'). However mistakenly, he is trying to act by a higher standard just as his earlier decision to recognise and rear Chrysis' baby, when he thinks it

1 Perhaps the brothers were similarly contrasted: Gelasimus appears to distinguish Epignomus as the harder of the two (399, 605) and Epignomus has perhaps reached a truer sense of values (410 f.).
is his own, puts him above the conventional morality of Nikeratos, who dubs him 'soft'.

In the *Karchedonios* Lycus and Hanno are more seriously conceived than the rest. Here the forces for evil and good, which govern the lives of Agorastocles and Adelphasium, are contrasted. The idea which contrasts them is *eusebeia*, reverence towards the gods and the gods' reward for reverence. Lycus' offerings were refused by Aphrodite and he tried to cheat her by refusing her the *exta* (455). Adelphasium's offering is accepted because Hanno is pious: as soon as he arrives he prays to the gods to help him to find his daughters (950); he prays again when he knows from Gyddenis that he is going to find his daughters (1187) and thanks the gods when he has found them (1274 cf. 1251). Such a moral is not impossible for the poet who ended the prologue speech of the *Perikeiromene* with the words: 'for through god even evil may turn out in its course to be good'. Hanno's faith in the justice of the gods is again a real value.

A final instance in which a positive value is asserted can be seen at the end of the *Apistos*. Euclio gives the gold to Lyconides as the girl's dowry. His generosity has no analogy with the sudden liberality of Demea in the *Adelphi*, who is only prodigal of Micio's goods, nor with the final acquiescence of Smikrines in the *Epitrepontes*, because Euclio returns to a former serenity. The finding of the gold converted him from a thrifty peasant to a suspicious miser; what can shake him back? It is true that both Charisios in the *Epitrepontes* and Polemon in the *Perikeiromene* are thrown off their balance by a discovery and are finally reconciled by the generosity of the other party, but in both cases they have themselves repented their hasty decisions long before the reconciliation, while Euclio shows no sign of change in his scene with Lyconides (731). In the *Georgos*, Kleainetos, leading the hard life of a peasant perhaps as a

---

2 As Lyconides had promised (774 f.) to inform Euclio if he found the thief, it is most improbable that Lyconides refused to surrender the gold until Euclio had named a dowry or that the allocation of the gold was submitted to the arbitration of Megadorus, as Legrand suggested (*Daos*, 376).
self-imposed penance, is charmed into liberality by the unselfish and generous attention of his young labourer Gorgias. So in this play the final and decisive stroke must have been the return of the gold. Lyconides’ slave had found the gold and Euclio probably had no legal proof of ownership (hence his readiness to go shares); Lyconides nevertheless gave it back and destroyed at one stroke the whole mass of suspicion which had accumulated in Euclio’s mind; here was a man who was not out for money, but quite simply loved Euclio’s daughter.¹

The philosophy, if one may so call it, behind these plays is not pessimistic. There is much wrong in the world, most obviously the wrong value put on money, and this is dangerous not only to the person himself but to others who follow his example: ‘Why do you teach us evil, why do you prove to us that injustice is profitable?’ (Kolax 54 f.). If it is right to attribute fr. 534K to the beginning of the Kolax, the moral is pointed there: ‘We, in addition to the necessary evils (of the human body) add others of our own invention, . . . athletic contests, titles, ambitions, conventions.’ The wrong values are unnecessary additions to human life, which is not on the whole bad: ‘My abuse of fortune was unjust. I cursed her for being blind, and now her sight it seems has saved me. My own labours achieved nothing. For I should not have succeeded without her help. No one therefore must despair when he is in difficulties. For this may be a prophecy of success’ (Koneiazomenai 13). It is useless to try and deflect the will of the gods if your values are wrong, like the leno in the Karchedonios, or to try and control them by ritual (Hierieia, fr. 245K), but if your values are right, it is possible to live in the simple belief that the gods are just and this belief may be rewarded, as it is for the old Carthaginian explicitly, and implicitly for all the characters in Menander who have the right values.

How is this right sense of values achieved? By education perhaps, but not by repressive legislation. The three references to Demetrius of Phalerum’s legislation (in the Apistos, the

¹ Jachmann’s treatment of this is basically sound: Plautinisches, 138.
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Kekryphalos, and Dis Exapaton do not imply approval. The speakers themselves, Euclio in the Apistos and Chrysalus in the Dis Exapaton, are suspect. Lydus' praise of the Old Education in the Dis Exapaton is entirely academic because it has had no effect on Pistoclerus, and Megadorus' intention of promoting homonoia by marrying a poor wife, however much in accordance with Peripatetic theory, is entirely irrelevant to the actual situation of Phaedria. Menander seems to be saying that Demetrius' prescriptions are external conventions just as much as the wrong value set on wealth or pleasure is an external convention; what is needed is a right valuation of the real facts and a nice discrimination in dealing with them.

V. THE ORIGINAL OF THE AULULARIA.

The attribution of the original of the Aulularia to Menander rests on much more than Choricus' quotation of l. 301 (Kock, III, p. 37) and the parallel between ll. 91-97 and frs. 136, 476K. The strongest argument is, perhaps, the sustained likeness with the Samia and the close affinity with the Dyskolos.

1 (a) Aul. 504: Euclio underlines the reference to Demetrius' sumptuary legislation in Megadorus' speech (475 f.); (b) 292K 'some new-fangled law'; (c) Bacch. 912.

2 Bacch. 420 f., ultimately reminiscent of the Clouds.

3 Bacch. 475-493; 496-504; 532-536 certainly reproduce the original; the rest may be Plautus (but see the ingenious defence by J. J. Tierney, P.R.I.A., L., (C), 37 f.). Aristotle quotes Phaleas of Chalkedon as suggesting the regulation of dowries, so that the rich should give and not receive, the poor receive and not give, as the quickest method of securing equality of property (Politics, 1266 b 2); it is also a method of securing a large middle class, which Aristotle advocates.

4 Papyrus fragments Hibeh 5, Flind. Petr. 4, Grenfell II 8 (b); Rylands 16 (a), Heidelberg 180 have been connected with the original of the Aulularia largely because of the rare name Strobilos occurring in Hibeh 5 and Heidelberg 180. The fragments appear to come from the same play: Grenfell II 8 (b) contains the word nomarchos which suggests an Egyptian origin (Leo, Hermes, xli, 632) and Heidelberg 180 with its intrigue between two male slaves has no place in the Aulularia. It does not therefore seem necessary to discuss Blass' attribution of Hibeh 5 to Philemon (Rh. Mus., lxii, 102) or Kuiper's interpretation (Mnem., Suppl. II, 1940, 115). Kuiper equates Aul. 390 with Diphilus 41K, but the likeness is too weak to build on.

5 Other parallels are as follows: Aul. 3, arrival of deity, with Dyskolos 127K; 45 ff., old man's abuse of female slave, with Epitrepones 704 ff.; 74 (cf. 275), female slave's distress at her mistress' condition, with Georgos 84 f. (cf. 22 f.):
Several of Menander's plays have been suggested as the original. The case against identification with the *Dyskōlos* (particularly 128K) and *Thesauros* is well summed up by Kuiper. The *Hydria* has a rather better claim: but 467K seems to point to a recognition play, and it is not clear how 469K, 470K could belong to the *Aulularia*. Rather than assume an unknown *Philargyros* (derived from the Choricius quotation) I prefer to regard the *Apistos* as the original. The *apistos* is the 'Suspicious man' and Theophrastus' *Apistos* 'when anyone comes to ask for crockery, prefers not to give it' (XVIII, 7), because *apistia* is 'an assumption that everyone is bent on wronging you'. The one fragment (64K) 'I thought if the old man got the money, he would immediately buy a girl and instal her as a lady's maid' could perhaps belong to the prologue and refer either to 'Euclio' or to 'Euclio's grandfather'. The evidence for Euclio being an *apistos* has already been given above, and the 'First Argument' describes Euclio not only as *avarus* but also as *vix sibi credens*.

Menander's chief object is the portrayal of Euclio, just as in the *Samia* his chief object is the portrayal of Demeas. As in that play, the young man's problem matters less. Moschion probably appeared in all the acts of the *Samia* except the third; Lyconides, however, only appears in the fourth and fifth acts of the *Aulularia*. As most commentators have seen, his entrance with Eunomia (682) cannot be his first appearance. He himself says there (696): 'I wonder where my slave Strobilus is whom I had ordered to wait for me here'. Later, when he sees Strobilus, he says: 'I think he must have visited the girl's nurse (Staphyla), as I told him' (815). Both passages refer back to Strobilus' opening speech (587), two lines of which (603-604) have been inserted by Plautus to remind the audience of Lyconides' position because Lyconides is going to appear. It is only reasonable to conclude from the traces that in the
original Lyconides has already been told about Megadorus' marriage (603-604) and Staphyla about Lyconides' guilt (807), which she did not know when the play began (30) nor apparently in Act II (275). Kuiper¹ heroically suggests that in the original, Lyconides, not Eunomia, was informed by Megadorus of his proposed marriage. It is, however, simpler to suppose that Lyconides heard the news from Megadorus in the market-place (like Pamphilus in the *Andria*) and returned when Strobilus had just installed the cook with Staphyla (363). Lyconides and Strobilus then decided that Strobilus should tell Staphyla the true position and that Lyconides should consult Eunomia; Lyconides went into the house and Strobilus then told Staphyla;² they both withdrew to their respective houses when they saw Euclio coming. After making his report to his master, Strobilus was sent 'scouting' (605). Plautus substituted the Pythodicus scene³ because he was not interested in Lyconides but wanted to elaborate the cook scenes and the following Megadorus scene (475 ff.). If Lyconides heard the news in the market-place, he presumably went to the market-place in the first act and the play started with an opening scene between Lyconides and Strobilus, in which Lyconides discussed his difficulties with his slave. Such a scene is necessary to bring the divine prologue into the normal place and to introduce Strobilus to the audience, so that they understand Megadorus: *heus, Strobile, sequere propere me ad macellum strenue* (264). Plautus suppressed the first scene and substituted *de summo adulescens loco* (28) for some phrase such as *whom you have just seen* (cf. *Perik.* 8).⁴

This view is based on the assumption that Plautus has not

¹ Op. cit. 59. He also suggests (62 f.) a scene between Staphyla and Lyconides after 274 (Staphyla according to him knows Lyconides' guilt) and between Strobilus and Staphyla at 362. Krieger, *De Aul. ex. Graeco*, 64 f. put a Lyconides/Strobilus scene at the beginning of Act. IV.

² In the *Heros*, where also Pheidias knows but Plagion probably does not know, the liaison is probably done by the slaves of the two houses, Daos and Getas.

³ I think 363-370 are purely Plautine. For various conjectures on Pythodicus see Krieger, *op. cit.*, 37; Kuiper 63; Thierfelder, *Interpolationum*, 128.

⁴ Wilamowitz, *Schiedsgericht*, 136 also suggests an earlier scene with Lyconides. The end of the prologue is modelled on Euripides, *Hecuba* 52, and is therefore likely to belong to the original.
altered the essential relations between Megadorus, Lyconides, Eunomia and Strobilus. Lyconides is the nephew (and perhaps the adopted son) of Megadorus, lives in his house, and uses his slave Strobilus. That Eunomia lives in the same house is not certain. If she lives in the same house, the action is simpler. Strobilus goes in with his report from Staphyla (before 371); Lyconides then finally decides to ask for Eunomia’s help (as he had already explained to the audience) and while he goes to see Eunomia, sends Strobilus out to scout (586). Strobilus has the same relation to young and old master as Parmenon in the Samia, Daos in the Perikeiromene, etc., and his relation to the young master, which in Plautus does not appear until the fourth act (587 f.), was clear from the first scene of Menander’s play. He is named by Megadorus (264), the cook (334), Staphyla (354), and Lyconides (697, 804, 812). He describes Euclio’s character to the cook (296 f.) but hesitates about the identity of Euclio when he sees him (619): ‘this, as I think, is the father of the girl whom my master loves’. His hesitation is justified, as will appear, and this line should not be used as evidence for inventing a ‘slave of Lyconides’ other than Strobilus.

Menander’s play began with a scene between Lyconides and Strobilus. The divine prologue followed. The speaker in Plautus is the Lar familiaris. The suggestion for the original that has found most favour is Heros, but the references quoted suggest that the Greek Heros stood outside the house and the Lar, like Pan in the Dyskolos (127K = Aul. 3), comes from inside, and the emphasis on the hearth (7, 387) suggests that Menander’s figure was Hestia. The following scenes with Staphyla serve to characterise Euclio, as also Euclio’s final

1 The decisive line is 727 ante aedis nostras, certainly from the original as paralleled by Fab. Inc. 30 (this parallel disposes of Thierfelder’s suggestion, Interpolationum, 149 n. 1, that ante aedis nostras is erroneous amplification by Plautus).

2 The case on either side is put by Krieger, op. cit., 20 f.; Kuiper, 47 f. Note that Eunomia does not arrive at l. 120 but apparently comes out of the house (133). Advenio montium (145) is perhaps metaphorical.

3 The superscription of IV. 1 is Servus in B, of IV. 2 Euclio senex, Strobilus servus. On l. 619, see Krieger, op. cit., 75; Kuiper, 42, 69.

4 Leo, Pl. F., 211 n. 2; Krieger, op. cit., 9; Kuiper, 37; Skutsch, CR, 1936, 213.
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monologue (103 f.). Kuiper is possibly right in assigning the scene between Megadorus and Eunomia (or as he thinks Lyconides) to the first act: it belongs to the preparation rather than to the action proper; the act would then end with both returning into the house at the sight of the chorus approaching. The second act then starts with Megadorus' proposal of marriage and ends with Euclio's departure to the market (279); the duplication of Euclio's excursion into the house (203, 243) is paralleled in the three similar comedy scenes of the Perikeiromene (108, 120) and Samia (203, 217; 318, 336).

Menander's third act starts with the return of Strobilus (280); his departure to the market and his return must be separated by an act-ending. The gap between the housing of the cooks (362) and the return of Euclio (371) was probably filled, as has been said, with the scene between Lyconides and Strobilus and the scene between Strobilus and Staphyla both of whom disappear at the approach of Euclio. Anthrax' words at the door (398 f.) are good Menander (cf. Adelphi 375) and cover the few moments before Congrio bursts out of the house (405). Kuiper (87, n. 1) well says: 'the cook and his helpers, meant as a kind surprise, are considered by Euclio as a scouting patrol'. The act cannot end here and Megadorus, as well as his slave and Euclio, should return from the market before it closes. Leaving on one side the question of Plautine expansion in the rest of the act (406-585), we must ask whether he has altered its structure. The bare bones of the action are as follows: Congrio and his troop burst out of the house (406); Euclio pursues and stops them (415); Euclio goes back into the house (444), Congrio waits because his gear is inside (446); Euclio returns with his pot of gold (449 f.) and drives Congrio and his troop into the house (?). Euclio cannot then get away with his pot because Megadorus arrives (473). He refuses Megadorus'...

---

2 33 f.
3 Krieger's objections to 240-255 therefore are not justified (op. cit., 22 n. 2).
offer of wine (569); finally Megadorus goes in to sacrifice and Euclio goes with his pot to the Shrine of Fides. Kuiper (86 f.) thinks that 415-448, 451-459 are all additions of Plautus; Congrio vanishes for ever when he leaves the house and his elaborate exit gives Euclio time to dig up the pot, which according to Kuiper he cannot do in the space of the four and a half lines (444-448).\textsuperscript{1} Krieger (46 f.) also thinks that the cooks vanish for ever but not until they have done battle with Euclio; he refuses to believe that Euclio meets Megadorus carrying his pot; he therefore regards 441-458 as Plautine additions and sends Euclio in to drink with Megadorus at the end (571).\textsuperscript{2} Plautus himself has not made the destination of the cooks entirely clear (455 intro abi; 459 aut abi . . . ab aedibus; 460 illic hinc abiit); it is true, as Kuiper nicely remarks, that Euclio regards the cooks as ‘a scouting patrol’ and therefore after their departure might remove his pot in preparation for the main attack by Megadorus, but his behaviour, when he leaves Congrio by the door, fetches his pot, then drives Congrio inside is so like his treatment of Staphyla (40-89) that it should be in essence genuine Menander; the cook’s reason for staying—that his gear is inside (cf. Samia 149 f.)—also seems genuine. Euclio’s reason for stopping the cooks’ flight (415) is that he wants to make certain that they are not carrying the pot away (cf. 631 f.); of this dialogue at least 415, 423-444 may be Menander. Krieger misses the excellent comedy of Megadorus catching Euclio with his pot.

The main lines of the action seem therefore to be true to Menander; but where does Euclio hide his pot? He takes it into a shrine of Pistis (Fides) on the stage and spends the interval between the third and fourth acts hiding it there. At the beginning of the fourth act (587) Strobilus comes out of Megadorus’ house to scout; he takes up a position in front of the shrine

\textsuperscript{1} Kuiper (40) further argues on the basis of the scratching cock (467) that Euclio kept his gold in the garden. But surely a cock may scratch in a Greek kitchen and only in the kitchen could the cock be bribed by the cooks (470), which is certainly Menander because of the echo of Wasps 100. His other evidence for the garden (fr. III, 242-244) is also irrelevant.

\textsuperscript{2} For the acceptance of the invitation, Krieger quotes Micio and Demea (Adelphi, 754 f., 794 f.) but the true parallels are the refusals in Heautontimoroumenos (162) and Dyskolos (see Section IX).
from which he can see both houses (606). Euclio inside the shrine begs Pistis to keep his gold safe and then crosses over to his own house. Strobilus thinks that he recognises his back as he goes across (619) and himself goes into the shrine. Euclio dashes out again, warned by the crow that something is amiss (he is ‘superstitious’ as well as ‘suspicious’), dashes into the shrine and seizes Strobilus; when he has searched him and found nothing, he tries to drive him away while he searches in the shrine for an accomplice; Strobilus crouches up against the wall of the shrine, and sees Euclio come out with his pot and make off for the Grove of Pan (Silvanus); he disregards his master’s commands (680, cf. 605, 697) and pursues Euclio. As he goes off, Lyconides and Eunomia come out of Megadorus’ house.

Euclio’s actions may not be entirely sensible, but the sequence of scenes is admirable comedy. The argument that Plautus has invented the first of the two hiding-places (Fides) disregards Menander’s love of duplication in these comedy scenes (cf. above on Act II, 204 f., 244 f.). Moreover the hopelessness of finding a safe place for the gold may contribute to Euclio’s later willingness to part with it. Doubts have been expressed about the existence of a shrine of Pistis in Athens. There is, however, a single passage which supports a shrine of Pistis in Attica; and if Euclio is the Apistos, that the Apistos should come to grief with Pistis herself was a point too good to miss. There is no reason to follow Kuiper in objecting to the shrine as a third building on the stage. Three houses are necessary in the Perikeiromene: it is difficult to see how the Dyskolos could have been staged without two houses (the house of the dyskolos himself and the house where the injured girl lived) as well as the Nymphaion from which Pan entered to speak the prologue.

1 Krieger’s objection (op. cit. 61) that only a suppliant sits on an altar is valid; in Menander, Strobilus either sat on the steps of the shrine or near the altar.

2 A slight analogy for Strobilus’ desertion of his master may be seen in Parmeno’s flight, Samia 109. The scene between Euclio and Strobilus (631 f.) is milder than the papyrus fragment of the Perinthia, but of the same general kind.


4 Cf. also the Kapeleion of the Theophoroumene.
A clear break separates the departure of Lyconides and the arrival of Strobilus (701) and here the fourth act must end, since the journey to Pan's grove and back should need an interlude between acts to cover it and there is no later break; Euclio enters on the heels of Strobilus (713); Lyconides waits after his scene with Euclio for Strobilus to come out again (804 f.). That Euclio comes out before this scene between Strobilus and Lyconides finishes appears certain from the appearance of his name in the superscription of the scene. The argument and the fragments tell us a little more. According to the first argument, *per dolum mox Euclio cum perdidisset aulam, insperato invenit laetusque natam conlocat Lyconidi* : 'Euclio unexpectedly finds his pot again and joyfully bestows his daughter on Lyconides.' The second argument says that Lyconides reports the theft to Euclio and is presented by him with the gold, the girl and the child. Of the fragments, in IV Euclio says that he will be able to sleep now; he had no rest night or day (while he possessed the gold, cf. 67 f.); fr. II is perhaps spoken by Euclio, overhearing Lyconides dealing with Strobilus; fr. I may refer to the use of some of the gold; fr. V has been referred to the freeing of Strobilus. We cannot hope to reconstruct these last scenes nor are the details important since it is certain that the bride is properly dowered, possibly also trussed, which had been Hestia's intention in allowing Euclio to discover the gold originally.

VI. *Dis Exapaton.*

Plautus' *Bacchides* twice quotes Menander's *Dis Exapaton* (308 = 126K, 816 = 125K); of the other two quotations of Menander's play, 123K appears to be a fragment of the *Second Adelphoi*, and 124K is a routine formula which may belong in several places in Plautus' play. But, although an original by...

---

1 See Ritschl's apparatus.
3 Reitzenstein, *Hermes*, 1930, 77, suggests that 820 is also direct translation of the Greek. Menander was quoting Sophocles (fr. 945P).
4 Prehn, *Quaestiones Plautinae*, 66 equates with 1117-1118, but cf. also 579 f. and at least two similar occasions in the lost beginning.
Menander is therefore assured, scholars have widely differing views as to how much Plautus has altered the presuppositions, structure, and colouring of Menander's play.¹ The loss of the beginning of Plautus' play makes the situation obscure, but the main lines seem to be as follows: Mnesilochus fell in love with Bacchis II soon after he arrived in Ephesus (388; cf. Moschion in the *Kitharistes*); when the soldier outbid him and carried her off to Samos (574), he knew that she would try and set up on her own in Athens (though nothing was said about her twin sister) and asked Pistoclerus to look for her (176). Pistoclerus searched, like Lampadio in the *Synaristosai*, and finally found Bacchis I, who had recently come to live next door to Mnesilochus' father (205), just before Bacchis II arrived. Bacchis I saw that, if the bargain between the soldier and Bacchis II was ratified in the presence of an Athenian citizen, Bacchis II had a better chance of getting home at the end of her year. It was perhaps the same sort of advantage that Thais in the *Eunuch* hoped to get from the patronage of Simo (1039). Moreover, at the moment she fears actual violence and seeks a protector, as Thais also sought the protection of Chremes (*Bacch.* 592 with *Eun.* 797).

The fragments give some help in reconstructing the beginning, which may have run as follows: Sc. 1: Pistoclerus, probably accompanied by a protesting Lydus (XV,² I, II, XVII), has come to the end of his Odyssey and discovered Bacchis I; after a preliminary attempt to make love to him (XII, XIII, XIV, XVIII, XIX),³ she tells him that she has a twin sister (V, VI), who is in the possession of a soldier (VIII, IX) but is shortly returning: she is cleaning the house against her arrival (III, IV, cf. *Stichus* 347).⁴ Pistoclerus departs. Sc. 2: A divine prologue is not certain in this play, but would be useful to give a factual account of the past history, scene, and characters. Sc. 3:

¹ Kuiper, *Grieksche Origineelen*, 204 f., makes the play into a recognition play in which the two Bacchides are free Samian women of blameless reputation and daughters of Nicobulus.

² According to Fraenkel (*Pl.* and *Pl.* 9) the beginning of a monologue; possibly Lydus opened the scene with these words.

³ XIV may rather belong to the dialogue between the two Bacchises, i.e. 'are you out for money or marriage?'

A slave brings Bacchis II and states the soldier’s conditions (X, XI, cf. 577). Sc. 4: The sisters discuss the situation and decide to make use of Pistoclerus, who then returns without Lydus. The act ends with the withdrawal of the sisters before the arrival of the chorus (106, cf. Perikeiromene 71, Epitrepontes 33); the interval gives Pistoclerus time to go to the market and return. His attitude in the preserved portion of the first act, though undoubtedly exaggerated by Plautus, ¹ is not unlike that of Chremes in the Eunuch (507 f.).

The second act begins with the return of Lydus and Pistoclerus from the market (109). The stage is empty for a moment when Chrysalus enters and greets his native land (170, cf. Stichus 649). After learning the situation from Pistoclerus, he carries out his ‘first deceit’ of Nicobulus. According to Plautus, Nicobulus goes to the forum to look for his son (348), followed at the end of the scene by Chrysalus (366); but later Chrysalus waits for him to come out of his front door (768). There seems no reason to suppose that Plautus has suppressed the return of Nicobulus and therefore probably, in Menander, Nicobulus went into his house. ² Lydus enters as Chrysalus leaves; the original monologue of Chaerea at the end of the third act of the Eunuch (549) is a formal parallel and Lydus’ departure must be separated from his return by an act break. Similarly, Mnesilochus cannot return from the forum until after an act break (366, 391); the second act must, therefore, end at 1. 384.

The third act opens with Mnesilochus’ soliloquy (385) followed by his overhearing of Philoxenus and Lydus (405). The play is given a new movement by a disastrous but perfectly natural misunderstanding like that of Geta in the Adelphi (299) and Demeas in the Samia (1 f.). ³ When does the third act end? If the visit of the parasite (573) comes from the original (and dramatically we should be again reminded of the soldier’s immin-

¹ See Thierfelder, Interpolationum, 105 f.; Leo, Pl. F., 139 justifies 70 f. as Menander.

² Plautus has probably considerably extended the soliloquy of Chrysalus (cf. Fraenkel, op. cit., 23 on 361), as also the succeeding soliloquy of Lydus (ibid. 152-153).

³ Kunst, op. cit., 107 adds Andr. 420; he notes also the likeness of content between 477 f. and Heauton. 562 ff.
ence), it should be included in the third act since in the fourth act Cleomachus arrives as a result of the parasite's return (842). This division is possible if Mnesilochus only has to go into his father's house to pay back the money (525, cf. above). As the parasite scene has been suspected,¹ it is worth noting the likeness of the parasite's entrance to the entrance of Sosias in the *Perikeiromene* (52 f.) and of Pistoclerus' courage to Chremes' behaviour in the *Eunuch* (797). Menander, therefore, probably ended the third act with Pistoclerus' short soliloquy (609); 610-611 are Plautine cement.

The long fourth act contains the devising and execution of the 'Second Deceit'; no break seems possible between devising and execution (760). The scene sequence is similar in the *Andria-Perinthia*:² two friends in great distress are joined by a slave in high good humour, who devises a plan which he scarcely deigns to explain. The plan includes a tableau, which has an unexpected success because of the supervention of a further character. The slave is later punished. In the crucial tableau scene here, Chrysalus produces his result, like Chaireas in the *Koneiazomenai*, by playing off his unsuspecting partners against one another. Thus, this sequence consists of scenes and situations which can be paralleled elsewhere in Menander, and the Plautine elements which have been noted³ are an overlay on the original structure.

So far all is clear: but many scholars have rejected the 'Third Deceit' (979 f.) as Plautine. It should, however, be remembered that Menander likes duplications; in the *Aulularia* Euclio entrusts his pot to *Fides* before committing it to Silvanus.

In the *Heautontimoroumenos* (733 ff.) Syrus first transfers Bacchis and all her train to Menedemus' house, and then proceeds to extract money from Chremes on the flimsy pretext that his new-found daughter owes it to Bacchis (790 f.); the sequence of spectacle followed by intrigue, which both depend from a single half-revealed plan (*Heautont.* 696 f.), has the same

¹ E.g. by Kuiper, *op. cit.*, 229. I am however inclined to accept his argument that *Elatia* (591) is an allusion to Roman and not to Greek history.
³ See particularly Fraenkel's (*op. cit.*, 353) analysis of Chrysalus' *canticum* 640 f.
structural lines as the fourth act of the *Dis Exapaton* when freed of its Plautine accretions, notably 640 f., 709 f., 925-978, 987 f., 1053 f., 1069 f.¹ The great *canticum* destroys the structure of the scene; in Menander, Nicobulus’ soliloquy (913-924; 979) covered Chrysalus’ visit to Mnesilochus to get the second letter,² and *ad lacrimas hominem coegi castigando* (981) picks up Chrysalus’ parting remark *plura ex me audiet hodie mala quam audivit umquam Clinia ex Demetrio* (911); this is in itself a piece of effrontery which Menander used again in the *Adelphi* (558 f.).

The ‘Second and Third Deceits’ (and note that Galen speaks of slaves in Menander who think they must *thrice* deceive their masters, 946K) are in fact a single deceit in two parts and the double plan is made at the beginning (705-708); moreover, Chrysalus’ final acceptance of the gold (1059) is carefully prepared in the punishment scene (824), and this gold is finally used to break Nicobulus in the last act (1184 f.). The unity of the act has been masked by the insertion of two great *cantica* (640, 925), the first largely and the second entirely the work of Plautus.

The fifth act begins with the return of Philoxenus (1076), who then listens to Nicobulus’ self-reproach, like Demeas in the *Samia* (231) and Menedemus in the *Heautontimoroumenos* (915). Fraenkel³ has described how Plautus has converted the whole last act into a series of musical scenes and in particular, the elaboration of the metaphor of the sheep (1120-1148), which may itself be an image used by Menander (cf. *Ad*. 534). Although the identification of 1117-1118 with fr. 124K is uncertain, other elements in this last scene seem genuine, but Bacchis II was presumably a mute figure. The elderly lover is well known to us and the capitulation of Nicobulus to a mixture of greed and lust is true to his character all through; Philoxenus had no great strength anyway. The conscious balancing of the capture of Pistoclerus at the beginning by the capture of Nicobulus at the end has parallels in Menander; Fraenkel has noted the likeness of the end to the *Adelphi* and there, too, the reversal of

¹ See Fraenkel, *op. cit.*, 61 ff., 237 ff.
² On all this see Theiler, *Hermes*, 1938, 269 f.
the relations between Micio and Demea balances the picture of
them in the first act; similarly the shearing of Glykera at the
beginning of the *Perikeiromene* is balanced by the reconciliation
at the end.¹

VII. *Karchedonios.*

Plautus' *Poenulus* may be an adaptation of Menander's
*Karchedonios.* The only two plays known to have had this
title are by Alexis and Menander; Plautus is more likely to have
looked to Menander for an original. The preserved fragments
of neither play give a certain answer. Five of the Menander
fragments are too general in character to give any help (261, 262,
264, 265, 267K), but are certainly not incompatible with the
*Poenulus.* 'Need teaches the Carthaginian wisdom, even if he
is unlearned' (263K) agrees with *Poenulus* 111 'So with skill
and cunning he seeks his daughters', and *mursuppio* (782) may
be a translation of ἀσκοπναίνη (266K). On the other hand, it is
difficult to see how a sacrifice to Boreas (260K) can be fitted into
the *Poenulus,* but Athenaeus may have misquoted. The Alexis
fragment (100K) has been regarded as a translation of *Poen.* 1318
but is too slight as a basis of attribution.²

The case for Menander must rest on a comparison with
his other plays. The general shape of the *Poenulus,* deception
followed by recognition, is known from the *Epitrepontes,* *Andria,*
and other plays of Menander. Two plays have rather closer
connexions: the *Kolax,* in which a *leno* is discomfited, and the
*Misoumenos,* in which a father discovers his daughter in a foreign
town. In the *Kolax,* as in the *Poenulus,* the action takes place
on the day of a festival of Aphrodite (292K);³ a young man
is in love with a girl who is the slave of a *leno*; the *leno* is afraid
of a lawsuit, and therefore presumably knows that the girl is a
citizen; in the *Poenulus* this knowledge makes the *leno* particu-
larly unwilling to let her fellow-citizen Agorastocles have the
girl,⁴ and in the *Kolax,* someone must have arrived, like Hanno,

¹ Cf. the balance of Acts II and IV in the *Andria.*
² See Kunst, *Szenische Studien,* 123; Zuntz, *Mnemosyne,* 1937, 61; Lucas,
*Rh. Mus.,* 1939, 189.
³ See also Leo, *Plautinische Forschungen,* 159.
⁴ Mesk, *Wiener Studien,* liv. 51 f.
to prove the girl's birth. Bias (in the *Kolax*) and Antamoenides are a pair of similar braggart soldiers, but Bias, unlike Antamoenides, is in love with the same girl as Pheidias. The main lines must have been similar, but the first victim of the intrigue in the *Kolax* was the soldier and not the *leno*. In the *Misoumenos*, as in the *Poenulus*, a father travels abroad in search of his daughter, but before the recognition scene he has already been in communication, probably through his slave and Getas, with his daughter or her nurse. The recognition scene has two points of contact with the *Poenulus*: the nurse's opening words are much alike in both (*Mis. 12, Poen. 1122-1127, cf. also Andr. 801, Heaut. 405*) and the irruption of Antamoenides is so like the speech of Getas (Poen. 1296 f.; *Mis. 18 f.*)¹ that Plautus seems to have been adapting a very similar original.

The young master and slave in the *Poenulus* bear a general likeness to Moschion and Dao in the *Perikeiromene* and to the pair in the *Synaristosai* (= *Cistellaria*); of more moment perhaps than the general likeness is the slave's firm dealing with an anxious young master (427 f.), which recurs in the *Andria* (708 f.).² The two sisters may be compared with the pair of wives in the *First Adelphoi* (= *Stichus*); like the two wives the two girls here are differentiated;³ Adelphasium is more independent and high-minded than Anterastilis; she has listened more attentively to Gyddenis than to the *leno*, and so has preserved her standards like Selenium in the care of Melaenis (*Synaristosai*). There are also some minor points of contact with other Menander plays.⁴

¹ The parallel was originally noted by Körte and is well elaborated by Theiler, *Hermes*, lxxiii. 294.
² The allusion to Oedipus (443) is repeated *Andria* 194 (cf. Fraenkel, *Plautinisches im Plautus*, 13).
⁴ Compare 335 ff. with *Cist. 449 ff.*; 350 with Turpilius' *Leucadia*, 107, fr. VI R—dialogue of Agorastocles and Adelphasium; 765, mistaken ingenuity of *leno*, with *Andria* 470 (Theiler, op. cit., 290 notes use of *adlegare* 773, 1100 with *Andria* 899; *adsimulare* 560, 600, 1106 with *Andria* 168, etc.); 1326 = 1412, soldier's congratulations to Hanno with *Perik. 432*; 515 f., *advocati*, contrast between rich and poor, with *Kybernetai* 301K; 820, *advocati* afraid that they will not be paid, 303K; the idea of partisan witnesses with *Koneiazomenai* (fab. inc. 6 f.).
The cumulative evidence of these parallels seems to justify further examination of the *Poenulus* in the hope of being able to see something of the outline of a Menander play lying beneath the Plautine adaptation. How drastically Plautus handled his original here is suggested by the various theories which have been put forward in recent years.\(^1\) The bolder assumptions of contamination on the scale suggested by Leo and Jachmann or of complete remodelling as imagined by Barbara Krysiniel need not be accepted, if there is a reasonable probability that Menander's *Karchedonios* followed the general lines of the *Kolax* and Agorastocles first tried an intrigue against the leno before the solution was provided by the arrival of Hanno. It remains necessary, however, to discuss the difficulties, particularly Milphio's monologue (817 f.) and the exta motif (both claimed as 'bridges' by those who believe in 'contamination'), the early production of Milphio's plan (159 f.) and the supposed inconsistency between the characters as drawn in the earlier and later part of the play.

Plautus' play starts with a prologue, the latter part of which (59 f.) seems to be fairly close to Menander except for certain obvious jokes (62, 71, 79 f., 116 f., 125 f.). There is no sound reason for rejecting the lines (96 f.) which recur later in the play;\(^2\) a similar repetition occurs in the *Perikeiromene* (45 f. and 443), the only instance that we can check. Jachmann\(^3\) regards the account of Hanno's methods (106-113) as Plautine because they are an example of *Punica fides*, but I see no reason to suppose that *Poenus plane est* refers to more than the last line (112) and I suspect that the Roman poet has added Hanno's knowledge of languages because he wants to introduce the Carthaginian soliloquy later (930); there Menander's Hanno probably recalled his weary search because he thinks that he must start it

---


again; in fact, however, his host can save him the search. Who
spoke the prologue we cannot say; it comes first because Plautus
wanted to write the long and purely Roman introduction. There
is nothing to show whether either Agorastocles or Lycus have
already been seen. A play is, however, very unlikely to start
with a soliloquy by a leno, and the reference to hic adulescens (96)
may imply a previous appearance of Agorastocles; an opening
dialogue of Agorastocles and Milphio is a likely beginning and
parts of it may have been used by Plautus in 129 f. The leno
must, however, have appeared in the first act because, if he
belongs to a house on the stage, he must go out from it before
he can return. He returns from the temple of Aphrodite in the
second act (449, cf. 264); therefore he must have gone there in
the first act. It seems likely that in Menander the leno with
Syncerastus carrying the vasa set out for the temple after the
formal prologue. The leno would give instructions to Gyddenis
(86) to prepare the girls for the temple, in which case
Adelphasium's opening speech (217) refers back to this. The
suggestion that Gyddenis herself goes to the temple with
the girls (333) and returns with the vasa (821) seems to me impossible
for the simple reason that, if she goes as the girls' attendant, she
cannot return until they return. It is probable also that Agoras­
tocles met the leno setting out for the temple and was again
refused (cf. 752); Agorastocles would thus be informed of the
need for immediate action: the girls were to start their career
as hetairae after the Aphrodite festival.

This situation makes Agorastocles demand help from Milphio
who then formulates the Collybiscus intrigue. As Leo said,
this cannot belong to the first act, because it is not exposition but
action; it is in fact the beginning of the Second Act.\footnote{Krysiniel and Theiler, loc. cit.}
At the end of this scene, Agorastocles says: 'I am going to the temple'
(190). Milphio answers: 'Let us go inside to teach Collybiscus
his part first.' Agorastocles agrees; Milphio remains outside
and then calls Agorastocles out to see the girls, who are preparing
to go to the temple; after the girls have departed, Agorastocles

\footnote{Leo, op. cit., 160 f. For this reason I cannot accept the suggestions that the leno first came out at 155 (Karsten, op. cit., 377) or at 201 (Klotz, op. cit., 292).}
informs Milphio that he had handed over the money to Collybiscus before Milphio called him outside (415). The whole passage (189-415) has been subjected to all kinds of criticism. The starting point must be the necessities of the action: Agorastocles must go off to the agora in the Second Act (447) in order that he may bring the witnesses back in the third act (504); he must therefore give the money to Collybiscus before he goes. It follows that there must be an interlude between the formation of the plan and when he comes out again to go to the agora; the main lines of the lay-out must be Agorastocles/Milphio: (Agorastocles indoors): Agorastocles/Milphio,Agorastocles off. Secondly too much stress must not be laid on Milphio's *abeamus intro* (194) and his failure to go in at once; in the *Epitrepontes* Syriskos tells his wife to go in (201), then changes his mind and counts the trinkets (205); later, when he has told her again to go in (229), he agrees that Onesimos shall keep the ring until the next day (239), but an hour or two later demands it back (266); if this had been a Roman adaptation it would surely have been criticised. Milphio's soliloquy may have been altered by Plautus, but the first line at least sounds good Menander (198). Thirdly, the girls must go to the temple in order that they may later return from it, and the contrast between their successful sacrifice to Aphrodite and the *leno*'s failure to appease should belong to the original. It is difficult to see where the scene of their departure could be introduced except here or why Plautus should have moved its position. It is more natural to suppose that he has kept Menander's order and that Menander used the scene to divide the two necessary and necessarily separate Agorastocles/Milphio scenes and thus made the second scene (410 f.) come alive because Agorastocles is given a fresh reason for appealing to Milphio.

In Menander the girls went to the temple and Agorastocles saw them; but the present arrangement of the scene with four speaking parts must be due to Plautus. It seems to be more likely that Plautus elaborated a scene of the original than that he transferred a scene from another play, since the very passages

1 In the *Koneiazomenai* (12) the young man soliloquises for at least 7 lines after saying that he will go in.
which have made this scene suspect are the most obviously Roman in quality: 1 221 f.; 248 f.; 265 f.; 277 f.; 292 f.; 308 f.; 320 f.; 351-400 (except 359-364). Although this is the only play in which we see two free girls brought up by their nurse and a leno, it is not unexpected that one should have listened to Gyddenis and the other to the leno; this contrast has been preserved in places, e.g. 238 (cf. 1201), 250 f., 263-264, 300 f., and accounts for Adelphasium’s attitude to Agorastocles (335, 350, 359 ff.). Some of Agorastocles’ comments also belong to the original (255-256, 275-276 = Andria 759), and two of Milphio’s sound like Menander (281, 313); 2 they may have been transferred from the dialogue succeeding this scene. The easiest assumption is that in Menander Milphio went in to summon Agorastocles, who came out during the dialogue of the sisters and commented unseen (255 f., 275 f.); he only addressed them when they were ready to go; when they had gone, he called on Milphio. When Agorastocles finally goes off to the agora to find witnesses, the leno arrives back from the temple.

The third act begins with the arrival of Agorastocles and the advocati. As explained above, the bones of this seem to be Menander. As we cannot assume at this time that the leader of the advocati was the leader of the chorus, Plautus must have altered the second scene; presumably in the original Agorastocles summoned Milphio out and then himself went in before Collybiscus appeared: Collybiscus’ entreaty (604) was in the original addressed to Milphio. Similarly in the original Agorastocles was not recalled until Collybiscus and the leno had gone into the leno’s house (720). 3 The hasty departure of Lycus (795) makes it possible for Collybiscus to reappear; he could not be left in the leno’s house. The act ends with the withdrawal of the advocati.

Legrand 4 sought a solution of the difficulties at the beginning of the fourth act by transferring 817-929 (omitting 917-922) to

---

1 Cf. Fraenkel, op. cit., 179 on 210 f.; 39 on 248; 141 on 265; 217 on 277, 292.


3 Cf. Jachmann, op. cit., 203 f.

4 R.E.G., xvii, 359.
the beginning of the third act. The writer of 929 evidently intended this because Agorastocles' only visit to the forum is in the second act (448); he was no doubt troubled by Milphio's ignorance of what has happened and his statement that another weapon is threatening the leno before the first has been thrown (919); probably he also inserted the reference to Collybiscus eating the exta (804), but forgot a later reference to their non-arrival (617), where Lycus appears to expect them to be brought back at the same time as the girls. But the transference involves a greater difficulty: either Milphio waits until after Hanno's arrival to tell his master that according to Syncerastus the girls are Carthaginian or Agorastocles shows no reaction to the news; Agorastocles' words (961) should refer to something that he has recently heard (cf. e.g. Hegio in the Adelphi 447) and it is incredible that Milphio should be silent for so long.

If we keep the traditional order, we have the difficulty that Milphio appears not to know that the Collybiscus plan is complete. But is the Collybiscus plan in fact complete? Or are Milphio's phrases (817, 909, 919) compatible with the intermediate stage in which the intrigue has succeeded, but the leno has not yet been brought to justice? The only obstacle is priu' quam unumst iniectum telum (919), which Fraenkel interprets as Plautine carelessness; in any case, though the weapon may have been thrown, its full effect has not yet been felt. The sound reason for Milphio coming out is not that he is ignorant of Collybiscus' success but that the leno has run away (798) and Agorastocles wants to know whether he has returned. Otherwise apart from Plautine elaborations the scene with Syncerastus is sound; his confidences are more convincing if he has witnessed the meeting of Lycus and Agorastocles in the first act.

Hanno enters as Milphio goes in (950): perhaps he tells something of his methods of searching between his opening prayer and his reference to Antidamas. The parallel for the arrival of the recogniser in the fourth act is Crito in the Andria. The whole passage between Agorastocles' remark that Hanno is a Carthaginian and his greeting is Plautine invention (978-1035).

Milphio cannot be on the stage for the Gyddenis scene and therefore presumably is sent inside as soon as the recognition between Hanno and Agorastocles is complete (1078). Agorastocles then suggests that Hanno should pretend to be the father of the girls, a joke which, with a Sophoclean twist, turns out to be true (1086-1170). He must, of course, also tell him that they have a nurse to introduce the Gyddenis scene; this point Plautus has omitted. After the Gyddenis scene which proves Hanno to be the girls' father, Agorastocles asks for Adelphasium's hand. Here, with the two essential recognitions completed, the fourth act ends.

The return of the girls presents the same kind of problems as their earlier scene. If they are both to speak and the character contrast is genuine, as it seems to be (particularly 1184 ff., 1192 ff., 1201 ff.), only Hanno can be present, and an inspection of Agorastocles' lines often suggests Plautus, particularly 1191, 1206, 1209, 1212-1230. Does Hanno in fact threaten his daughters with the law? Parallels for this harmless trickery can be seen in Antiphon's story of his future marriage (Stichus 108) and Micio's fictitious visitor from Miletus (Adelphi 650). Menander may have introduced it as a light touch suitable for the last act when the main recognition has been clinched: the testatio is a Roman addition. Then Hanno greets his daughters with a reference to divine justice clearly of a piece with his earlier and later utterances (1251 = 1187, 1274). For them the proof is the reference to Gyddenis (1265). The irruption of Antamoenides seems to be Menander because of the parallel with the Misoumenos (see above); we must assume that Hanno sends Adelphasium in to Agorastocles before Antamoenides comes out (1280). Anterastilis then may be sent into the house as soon as Antamoenides turns on Hanno; Agorastocles comes out. The last scene was played with Agorastocles, Antamoenides and Lycus.

VIII. First Adelphoi.

Four preliminary questions have to be answered: Was the First Adelphoi the same as the Philadelphoi? Does the

2 Cf. Thierfelder, op. cit., 51 n. 1.
Papyrus Didot a belong to the *First Adelphoi*? Can the fragments of the *First Adelphoi* be identified in the *Stichus*? Does the end of the *Stichus* belong to the *First Adelphoi*?

The old suggestion of Hermann, elaborated by Ritschl, that the original of the *Stichus* was the *Philadelphoi* cannot be proved because there is no exact translation of any of the surviving fragments in the *Stichus*, but no fragment is incompatible with the original of the *Stichus*.\(^1\) It is at least tempting to suppose that the *First Adelphoi* like the *Second* had another title to distinguish it, although the only real gain is the suggestion of another scene between father and daughter (or daughters). This further scene becomes a certainty if we accept Hans Lucas’ identification of the Papyrus Didot a as a self-defence by one of the daughters;\(^2\) the strong argument lies in the likeness of Didot 19 to *Stichus* 133 and of Didot 6/7 to *Stichus* 43 f.

Hans Lucas also regards *Stichus* 523 f. (Epignomus’ return) as a free translation of fr. 13K, which Stobaeus quotes as from the *Adelphoi*; Kauer\(^3\), however, had shown that fr. 13K is more suitable in the mouth of a slave, either Stichus or, as he suggests, Sangarinus; Sangarinus in fact greets Athens as ‘nutrices Graeciae, . . . terra erilis patria’ (649). This identification is of great importance because it fixes the entrance of Sangarinus as part of Menander’s *First Adelphoi*. Of the other *Adelphoi* fragments to which no place could be assigned in Terence’ play, Kauer has argued cogently that fr. 11 belongs to the parasite’s monologue in the *Stichus*. Fr. 8 remains a problem: ‘Someone shouted for eight ladles of wine and twelve, until he had drunk his rivals under the table.’ It is a description of a feast in the past; there are several parallels in Menander,\(^4\) and

\(^1\) Fr. 503K belongs to the context of *Stichus* 374 f.; fr. 504, 506-507 might be an answer of one of the wives to her father; fr. 505 belongs to one of the wives (cf. fr. 184K Pamphile in the *Epitrepontes*): the most uncertain is fr. 508K which may be part of Gelasimus’ final speech (638 f.). The new fragment Ox. Pap. 1805: ‘Collect all you have and buy a little farm’ sounds like a piece of unkind advice to Gelasimus from one of the brothers.

\(^2\) Ph. W. 1938, 1101.


\(^4\) E.g. frs. 224, 226, 293, 607K.
many in the fragments of Middle Comedy; the object is, not to gain courage for a *komos*, as in an otherwise similar fragment of Sophilos (fr. 4K)—if it were, it could be ascribed to an account of Aeschinus’ dinner party in the *Second Adelphoi*—but to see who can last longest; the relevant parallel therefore seems to be a fragment of Menander’s *Chalkeia* (fr. 510K): ‘This is now the custom: they shouted “Unmixed in the big cup” and someone pledged them in the wine-cooler, ruining the poor devils.’ There the tone is clearly critical and our fragment should belong to an account of the past life of the two brothers.

It is generally assumed that the end of the *Stichus* is an addition by Plautus from some other Greek play. No alternative ending for the *Adelphoi* has, however, as far as I know, been proposed; yet it can hardly end with Gelasimus’ departure to commit suicide, and there is nobody to be recognised or married. The upstairs reconciliations have been effected; why should it not end with belowstairs junketings? Instances of feasting on the stage have already been quoted from Menander. The arrival of Sangarinus has considerable claims to be considered genuine and the one possible chronological indication in the last act points to a play of Menander’s time and not earlier. A further argument for genuineness can be found in the threads which lead back to the earlier part of the play. The curious little monologue of Stephanium (674 f.) has been regarded as a Plautine invention; but if Plautus took the end of the *Stichus* from another Greek comedy, it is difficult to see why he should want to show us Stephanium before her appearance at the feast (741), and why he should put her in the wrong house (674), when there is nothing in his play before to suggest how she got there. But if the last act also belonged to the original, the scene becomes necessary; Stephanium has got into the wrong house because she accompanied her mistress Pamphila thither (676 = 536).

1 E.g. Anaxandrides, fr. 2-3; Antiphanes, fr. 87, 145, 174, 185; Eubulus, fr. 37-38, 56; Alexis, fr. 168, 261K.

2 *Batioicis* (694) occurs Philemon fr. 87, Diphilus fr. 80K and in prose not before Aristotle. Cf. also Luschey, *Phiale*, 21. Suess, *Rh. Mus.*, 1910, 452 f. notes all the parallels in these closing scenes with Old Comedy, particularly with the *Ecclesiazusae* and *Platus*.

3 So also Dalman, *De aedibus scaenicis*, 17.
The downstairs junketings are inaugurated in the scene in which Stichus asks Epignomus for the day off (419-453). This scene has raised doubts on two counts: first, the repetition of *age abduce hasce intro* (418, 435), which is regarded as a mark of insertion; secondly, the improbability of Epignomus remaining on the stage to listen to Stichus’ monologue. The question is, however, not to be solved by excising the conversation between Epignomus and Stichus and the monologue of Stichus. If Plautus inserted these two passages after *abduce hasce intro* (418) and therefore kept Epignomus on the stage during Stichus’ monologue, why did he put the second *abduce hasce intro* (435) in the middle of the insertion instead of at the end? We have seen already in discussing the *Karchedonios* that this kind of delaying has a parallel in Menander. I see no reason to scrap the dialogue between master and slave. About the monologue I feel less certain; Epignomus evidently remains on the stage, because he does not announce that all is well at home until the next act (523); the monologue itself is full of repetitions and the apology for slaves feasting must be an insertion by the Roman poet (446-448).

One point, however, in the monologue of Stichus may well come from Menander and have been transferred from the dialogue. Stichus refers to the way through the garden between the houses, and the back door (437, 450). Dalman has shown that garden and back door must be assumed for Canthara and the midwife in the *Second Adelphoi*, and in the *Phasma* Menander describes a special passage between two houses. Here the ‘garden way’ is extremely useful; Stichus uses it for his shopping and the sisters use it. We do not see anyone tell Pamphila that her husband has come, nor do we see Pamphila and Stephanium cross over to Epignomus’ house, but we know from various references that both these things happened. They

2 Cf. above on *Poenulus* 194: J. J. Tierney, *P.R.I.A.*, L (C), 52 notes similar repetitions round Menander’s digressions in the *Perikeiromene*.
4 148; 536; 676. Pamphilippus also mentions and uses the garden way (614, 623).
could have been done on the stage, but they were not interesting, and therefore it was more convenient to use the garden way and explain Stephanium's presence in the wrong house when it became necessary. By these means the sisters appeared in the first two acts and the brothers in the next two acts; a reunion of husband and wife on the stage is more necessary for modern than for ancient eyes; the stage is no place for wives when husbands have returned.

The general shape of the latter part of the play seems clear: Act III—Arrival of Epignomus; Stichus scenes; Gelasimus scenes, ending with soliloquy of Gelasimus (497-504); Act IV—Arrival of Pamphilippus; Antipho scenes; Gelasimus scene ending with soliloquy of Gelasimus (632-640); Act V—Arrival of Sangarinus and slave junketings. The shape of the beginning of the play is less clear. Let us first put down the certainties: first, from the entry of Gelasimus (155) to his departure when Panegyris rejects his offer of assistance there is no break in the action—Gelasimus arrives, later Crocotium asks him to visit Panegyris, he waits and watches Pinacium arrive, and this scene leads up to a climax when he discovers that Epignomus has brought other parasites with him (385); therefore Act II begins before or with the arrival of Gelasimus (155). Secondly, Crocotium arrives from off stage to find Gelasimus in front of her mistress' house (196); it follows that the scene in which Crocotium was sent to find Gelasimus (150) belongs to Act I. Thirdly, Act I itself runs without a break at least from Antipho's introductory soliloquy (58) to the departure of Antipho, the return of the sisters to their houses, and the mission of Crocotium.¹

The earlier part of Act I is more problematical. From hints we learn that the brothers have been away two years (30), that before they went away Antipho had quarrelled violently with them because of their poverty (132, 406 f.), and that they had lost their patrimony in wild living (628). This is a story which

¹ Fraenkel, op. cit., 287, also assumes that the division between the acts occurs here (154). I do not see why he objects (op. cit. 281) to Panegyris' intention of sending Gelasimus to the harbour; it seems to me perfectly natural that in her nervousness she should not leave the whole responsibility to Pinacium (so also Enk, Mnemosyne, 1916, 28).
must have been told in the first act. The sisters probably do
not know the full facts; Antipho knows them but Antipho
comes out of his house for the first time at the beginning of the
second scene (58), and if this scene is in its original shape (on
which see below), it is difficult to see how there is room for
a long narrative speech. Moreover, on the analogy of other
prologues the audience should be told also of the brothers' su-
scessful return and something about the character of Antipho;
this can only be done by a god; a fragment of the divine nar-
rative about the past life of the brothers is perhaps preserved (fr.
8K). The most probable shape of the original seems therefore
to have been: I. 1, dialogue of the two sisters (Pamphila visits
Panegyris). This gives the emotional situation at the moment;
the two sisters go into Panegyris' house (1-47). [I. 2, Divine
monologue.] I. 3, Dialogue of sisters parallel to and balancing
monologues of Antiphon (48-88). Parallel monologues are
common enough at the beginning of scenes but normally take
the form: monologue A, monologue B, conversation. 1 Here
we have dialogue A, monologue B, dialogue A 1, monologue B 2,
conversation; that the iambic senarii (48-57) open this scene is
strongly suggested by the neat follow on from 'Let us then
consider what is profitable for us to do' (57) to 'What do we
do, sister, if our father refuses to listen to us' (68), and the clear
break at the end of the canticum (47). Antipho's first speech
(58 f.), although to a certain extent Romanised, becomes an
essential part of this symmetrical structure. 2

Antipho's second speech (75 f.) does not make sense as we
read it in Plautus; he says that he is going to pretend that they
have committed some fault and to use circumlocutions to frighten
them (84). He then tells a most unterrifying fiction to 'test'
them (126) and gives up the battle, saying 'I will go and tell your
views to my friends' (143). This is clearly a procedure 'perplexim
... leniter' (76, 78). 3 If in a later scene, which Plautus

1 E.g. Heaut. 874, Aul. 713; Ep. 243 f. is further complicated by the sup-
vention of a third speaker, Syriskos. 2 Cf., however, Fraenkel, op. cit., 162.
3 For perplexim cf. circumittione, Andria 202, regarded by Kuiper as an echo
of E. Phoen. 494; Fraenkel, op. cit., 285 notes on 143 that Antipho cannot give
up like this. The earlier lines (75-79) are well explained by Thierfelder, Inter-
polationum, 92 f.
scraped, Antipho after further consultation with his friends proceeded directly and minaciter, we could understand that Menander contrasted both techniques in Antipho's monologue but Plautus remodelled this because he only wanted one scene. Remnants of the second Antipho scene survive in the Papyrus Didot a and frs. 504, 507; the only place for it and the natural place is at the beginning of the second act before the arrival of Gelasimus. This then gives the probable shape of the first act and the beginning of the second.

From the entry of Gelasimus the substratum is clearly Menander though individual passages show Plautine rehandling.¹ In particular, the entry of Pinacium is paralleled by the entrance of Geta in the Adelphi (299 f. cf. also fr. 741K) and his report of the news to the joy of Panegyris and the consternation of Gelasimus is an old tragic theme,² which recurs in the Synaristosai (Cist. 543 f.). As has been said, Pamphila is informed of the arrival of the brothers and transfers herself with Stephanium to the house of Panegyris by the garden way. There is no need for Antipho to be told the news; he probably heard it in the market-place and hurried thence to the harbour (408 f.).

IX. Other Plays.

Arrhephoros or Flute-Girl.

The double title indicates two characters (cf. Hypobolimaios or Rustic). The Arrhephoros had presumably been seen in the procession by the young man. She evidently had a child as a talkative nurse, Myrtile, is mentioned (66K). Somebody tries to dissuade the young man from marriage (65K), from the tone a friend rather than his father; compare perhaps the attitude of Kleinias in the Misoumenos (45). Two fragments belong to a slave intrigue: 69K, the young master complains that the slave Sosias has thought out a plot too daring to be safely carried out (cf. Heautont. 707); 67K, the slave tells the old man a story of

¹ Cf. e.g. Fraenkel, op. cit., 289 on l. 155 f.; 284 n. 1 on l. 270 (add Thierfelder, Interpolationum, 48); 75 on l. 305; 228 on l. 316 f.
wild life in Byzantium presumably because he proposes to divert the money which the son has been sent to fetch (διὰ σέ). The role of the flute-girl remains obscure.

**Heauton Penthon.**

Ulbricht\(^1\) has shown that the fragments known as *Comedia Florentina* are by Menander. The first title is likely to have been *Heauton Penthon* from the scene in the second act in which Chaereas decides to sham dead (the *Epitrepontes* also took its name from the second act). It may have had the second title of *Epikleros*, because the certain effect of Chaereas' feigned death would be to make his daughter an heiress, and Chaereas' will may have provided for the marriage of Chaereas' daughter to the boy as well as of Chaereas' stepson to the girl (a will was produced in the *Kanephoros*, Ribbeck, 86, II). As Tyche speaks the prologue a recognition is likely; the boy and girl are evidently twins whose father is unknown, like the children of the *Georgos, Heros, Hiereia*; their mother is dead and the obvious candidate for father is Smikrines; the mother was presumably related to the brothers (5)\(^2\) and perhaps therefore Smikrines was their guardian, but only Chaereas honoured the relationship by taking pity on the girl. It seems certain that Smikrines and the slave Daos were seen before the prologue speech; Daos is presumably Chaereas' slave and had brought the gold and silver from Smikrines' house to Chaereas' house. The gold and silver may be a treasure jointly owned by the brothers, or could possibly be the boy's property left in Smikrines' keeping; in either case it seems likely that Chaereas is giving it as a dowry to the girl. It is not certain from the phraseology whether the boy has appeared yet or not.

**Demiourgos.**

The Demiourgos was a woman who looked after the arrangements for a marriage, including the food and the sacrifices. So here she congratulates a slave upon progress with the marriage

---

1 *Kritische und Exegetische Studien*, 1 ff.

2 The assumption that the boy is (a) the son of a mother related to Smikrines and Chaereas, (b) not yet recognised as the son of Smikrines, answers Körte's question (lix): *num sciebat Chaerea adulescentem sibi cognatum esse, Smicrines patrem se esse nesciebat?*
arrangements (113K). As the slave claims to have been up all night, this is probably the opening scene and the presence of the Demiourgos accounts for the play's name. The fragments of Turpilius' Demiurgus (Ribbeck 90) tell us a little more; the young man loathes the prospect of marriage (Ribbeck III) like the young man in the Georgos (12) or Pamphilus in the Andria/Perinthia (328). He remembers with horror the bare ankles and long arms of the young woman (Ribbeck VII); the parallel here is again Pamphilus in the Andria (250) and Clitipho in the Heautontimoroumenos (1061). Ribbeck assumes that this same young man has been involved with a hetaira, who 'knew him for her own profit' (Ribbeck IV), left him 'stripped bare' (Ribbeck V), and is advised by someone to treat her lover well if she wishes him to stay (Ribbeck I). If this is right, then the nearest parallel would seem to be the Truculentus, where Diniarchus had been engaged to the girl when he raped her, had then deserted her for Phronesium, and finally married her; Callicles threatened legal proceedings (840), as apparently did the father in the Demiourgos (Ribbeck VI).

DYSKOLOS.

Pack¹ has shown that the hero was called Knemon and not Smikrines; Smikrines was the hero of the Apistos, the original of the Aulularia. The two plays were much alike both in the chief characters (the irritable man and the suspicious man) and in the setting (two houses and a shrine). But while Smikrines had a daughter, Knemon had a son (128K). The play opened with a night scene in which someone cannot sleep, presumably the son of Knemon who is worried about his love affair with a poor girl (137K, cf. 341K Misoumenos, 164K Epikleros, Ribbeck 65, VII, Plokion); Pan speaks the formal prologue (127K). Then I suggest that, as in the Aulularia, a rich neighbour visits Knemon and arranges for his daughter to marry Knemon's son; the arrangements go forward in spite of Knemon's objection to any sort of festivity or geniality (Aelian, Ep. Rust. 13; 129, 130, 136K)²

¹ Classical Philology, XXX, 1935, 131.
² Note however that all sources except Etymol. Gud. quote 136K from the Hymnis.
and in spite of Knemon's son, who appeals to his father to use his money to help him marry the poor girl (128K). Knemon is frightened and moves his gold to the shrine of Pan (134K) but it is discovered by a slave who makes off with it (133K). Meanwhile the poor girl's mother appeals to her brother-in-law, Knemon's rich neighbour (135K) cf. Adelphi 350 f. and presumably, again as in the Aulularia, the marriage is rearranged in favour of the poor girl.

Thais.

Martial's epigram (XIV. 187) nec Glycera pueri Thais amica fuit is perhaps evidence that this was an early play. Propertius (IV, v, 42f.) makes it clear that Thais was the greedy type of hetaira. She tricked 'clever Getae' (presumably the slave of the young man; cf. Eun. 918 f., Truc. 699 f.). Getae perhaps tried to dissuade his master from pursuing Thais like Lydus in the Dis Exapaton (218K cf. Bacch. 117). Her door only opens if the nocturnal serenader has money. For money she accepts the unlovable soldier (cf. 732K) and the horny-handed sailor and the ex-slave. The young man in the prologue (217K) has evidently contrasted her with the good hetaira, who had been presented by Philemon (see Athenaeus, XIII, 594 f.).¹ 'She is utter disaster. Yet I think in spite of what she has made me suffer I would gladly have her now.' (Demianczuk 259/2).

Thesauros.

The story of part of the play is preserved by Donatus (on Terence, Eunuch, 9). The only certain scene that can be derived from it is the trial scene in which the old miser claimed that he had buried the treasure during an alarm and the young man claimed that the treasure was his. What relation this has to the fragments (235-236K) which appear to refer to the follies of an old man in love is impossible to say.

Thrasyleon.

Thrasyleon was a 'wild soldier', whom Plutarch names with Thrasonides of the Misoumenos. With the few Greek fragments, the fragments of Turpilius' Thrasyleon (Ribbeck, 109) allow us to

¹ See on this Suess, Rh. Mus., 1910, 449.
see the bare bones of the play which seems to have been somewhat like the *Kolax*. 'I want to see your wares' (Ribbeck V) should be said by the soldier to a *leno*; to the *leno* also belongs the ingratiating (or threatening): 'as I have never yet given you any reward or profit for your kindness and loyalty' (Ribbeck IX, cf. *Adelphi* 250). The young man (or his slave for him), presumably in trying to get the girl claims that (unlike Thrasyleon) he has 'never been seen drunk by day' (Ribbeck II, cf. *Perik.* 112, *Eunuch* 480) and appeals to someone to pity the girl's orphanhood (Ribbeck X). The father is too proud to countenance such a marriage for his son (Ribbeck VIII), and the slave, despised by the soldier or his toady (244K, cf. *Eunuch* 486) and having failed in his first attempt (241K) has to think out a more elaborate stratagem to win the girl for his young master (242K, Ribbeck VI).

**Hieredia.**

Our knowledge of this play is derived from a Summary and from two fragments. The priestess is a mother of twins; she kept the girl, but gave the boy (A) to a neighbour, who had only a daughter but later gave birth to a son (B). The father of the priestess' children had deserted (presumably before she became a priestess?), leaving some sort of tokens which the priestess buried (35 f.) until the children should grow up. The father came to the temple apparently for a cure, and over hearing the priestess meditating about her son suspected the truth (reading in 40 f.: *ἐπισκεπτομένης τὰ τοῦ παῖδος παρακούσας καὶ ἀπεικόσας τὰ πράγματα*); but the priestess does not recognise him. He then instructs his servant to feign 'possession' so that he can come to the priestess as a patient and discover the truth. The working out of this plot should on the analogy of other plays take place in the second act. Probably at the end of this act the boy (B) sends his mother to the priestess to propose that he shall marry the priestess' daughter (cf. *Aul.* 682 f. and possibly *Kith.* 1 f.). The third act starts with the women talking as the neighbour leaves the priestess; the father overhears (cf. *Epitr.* 266 f.) and then receives a report from his servant. There follow the Comedy of Error scenes in which the father greets the wrong boy (B) as his son (cf. *Cist.* 305 f.). B then tells A that the father is
mad and is declaring all young men to be his sons. A therefore drives his father away when after due consideration his father claims him as his son (Körte well compares Ion 517 ff. for this scene). B now begins to suspect the truth (Körte: ὑποψίαν in 77), perhaps because he overhears the slave reflecting on the disastrous result of his report to his master (rather like Onesimos in the Epitrepontes 243, etc.). This should be the beginning of the fourth act in which the main recognition scene should occur. The next lines are fragmentary: B must make an investigation (ἐξενεχθέται) and would naturally ask his mother (μητέρα); similarly in the Heautontimoroumenos (1024 f.). Clitipho suggests to his mother that he may be a bastard. The truth must be established by recognition tokens which only the priestess can provide and the play ends with the triple marriage, father and priestess, A and neighbour's daughter, B and priestess' daughter. It is not clear how the only surviving fragment of any length (245 K) fits into this story: Rhode is told that the rites of Cybele are merely inventions of mercenary men.\(^1\) There is much to be said for Kuiper's suggestion (Mnem. 1940, 286) that Rhode is the neighbour and that these words as well as 546 K are spoken to her in the prologue by her husband, who only returns at the end of the play to arrange the marriages (Kuiper reads in 83 ἐξ ἄγρων δὲ τοῦ γείτονος ἐλθόντος).

**PAIDION.**

This play has analogies with the Demiourgos (q.v.). The young man is involved with a rich hetaira who scorns his gifts (372-373 K). If the fragments of Turpilius come from Menander,\(^2\) we can perhaps guess that his father begs him to forget her (Ribbeck VIII, IV) and marry a girl who is educated, virtuous and honourable (Ribbeck V); the father is apparently prepared even to forego the marriage if the son will keep away from the hetaira (Ribbeck IX). It is presumably the father who is regarded as a monster of inhumanity (Ribbeck XI). The son has a friend

---

1. Körte, *Hermes*, 1940, 108 assumes that these words are spoken by the husband to the priestess at the end of the play: they explain the reason for the husband having deserted the priestess.

2. Note the likeness of 371 K and Ribbeck X; *Fab. Incert.*, 20 and Ribbeck III.
who prefers social distinction to marriage (Ribbeck X; 371K, cf. on Arrhephoros above). His first attempts at keeping away from the hetaira seem to be unavailing (Ribbeck VII) but perhaps her greed finally breaks him (372-373K, cf. Thais and Truculentus); and the play ends with wedding bells (Ribbeck XII).

APPENDIX ON TRUCULENTUS.

The Truculentus has been claimed for Menander and, in particular, Schoell (Analecta Plautina, 15 f.) has made an elaborate case for the Sikyonios, because the soldier in both is called Stratophanes: 442K must however refer to a soldier who has recently become rich (like Bias in the Kolax) and of this there is no trace in the Truculentus, nor are Schoell's explanations of any of the fragments, except the very general 443, 446K, convincing. The general parallels with Menander's hetaira plays are noted above under Thais, Demiourgos, Paidion. The following detailed parallels may be mentioned: Truc. 286 with 610K (Schoell); 342 f. with 114K; 352 f. with Eun. 81 f. (particularly 354 with Eun. 84, 372 with Andr. 959, 386 with Eun. 100); 433 with 381K (but cf. also Anaxilas 21K, Antiphanes 212K); 559 with 580K; 824 with 498K (note that 499K belongs to a similar context of confession); 831 with 627K (Schoell). In an early scene (which we must assume to make sense of 86 f.; Plautus has perhaps preserved some of it at 130) the baby was borrowed as in the Samia and the Titthe (unless these two should be identified); the scene in which Diniarchus and Phronesium discuss the baby (384 f.) has the same kind of irony as the Arbitration scene in the Epitrepontes (there the grandfather, here the father is ignorant of the baby's identity); the scene between Cyamus, Phronesium and Stratophanes (551 f.) is like a similar scene in the Eunuch (454 f.); Strabax' intervention on Phronesium and Stratophanes (925 f.) makes a situation which recurs in the Misoumenos and Karchedonios; Stratophanes' final attempt to get a share of Phronesium (962 f.) suggests Thraso's similar attempt at the end of the Eunuch (1054 f.). If the original was by Menander, Phanion and perhaps Demiourgos (cf. Truc. 825) are possible titles; in the Thais there is no place for the rustic Strabax; in the Paidion
the young man's father appeared; in the Parakatatheke the 'deposit' (or 'ward'? ) must have been more important than Truculentus' arrabo (689). On the other hand it may be argued that the tone is not Menander: there is a complete absence of sympathy and no statement of positive values, the style is harder and more antithetic, the self-characterisation in the monologues is more direct and artless than in Menander. I do not therefore feel certain that the original was by Menander, but the likenesses are sufficient to justify using it to fill out the rather scrappy picture given by the fragments of Menander's hetaira plays.