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Chapter 1

Introduction

1.1 The Story

A shepherd finds a baby on a hillside, hands it over to a friend for safekeeping; a third man recognizes a ring which was exposed with the baby as that lost by his master recently. The master is confronted with this awkward truth: a baby has been found identifiable by his lost ring; ergo, the baby is his, fruit of a nocturnal adventure during a religious ritual. Suddenly the man is sympathetic to his estranged wife, who, he has discovered, also became pregnant by a stranger before marrying him. He rages at his previous intolerance; what she suffered before their marriage – rape and an unwanted pregnancy – he has inflicted on another woman. Then it emerges that the girl whom he had got pregnant that fateful night without his ever seeing her face is none other than his wife; the baby which she bore and exposed, and which was rescued by the shepherd, is none other than his son by his wife. All’s well that ends well!

This is – briefly – the plot of Menander’s *Epitrepontes*. A seemingly disastrous and tragic situation is made to ‘come out right’ in the end. The baby finds his way back to his rightful parents; the estranged married couple make up and reunite; stressful episodes in both their lives – the woman’s rape and pregnancy, the man’s nocturnal adventure followed by realization that he has fathered an illegitimate child – emerge miraculously as fortunate, not tragic. Thus the plot may be said to move in an anti-tragic direction. Whilst fifth-century tragedy showed the gradual, or sudden, unravelling of an individual’s or family’s stability through fateful acts, realizations or events, Menander’s comedy – like a film running backwards – shows unhappiness turn to happiness, as if spilled milk were shown pouring back up into an overturned jug.

Think of Oedipus: exposed on Kithairon as a baby, rescued from death by a shepherd, raised by foster parents – only to kill his father in ignorance one day while travelling, coincidentally, on the same path, to go on to marry his own mother in Thebes – still in ignorance of his identity, then, tragically, as heroic king of Thebes
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gradually to realize who he was and what he had done on the path to glory. From proud monarch to blind outcast, the Sophoclean play traces the story of downfall like a series of steps into the agonizing, irredeemable past. Not so Menander's new comedy. His exposed baby returns by the purest of good luck to its rightful parents; here the father does not put out his eyes in rage and fury at his blind folly; on the contrary, he is made, finally, to realize his incredible good fortune in – coincidentally – marrying the very girl he had got pregnant on the night of the Tauropolia. Here husband and wife are reunited in proud parenthood, not separated finally and hatefully like Oedipus and Iokaste in Sophocles' play.

This comparison serves to show how very similar the materials are with which Sophocles fashioned a mythical tragedy and Menander a 'realistic' comedy. Menander even reminds his audience of that fact in the middle of the arbitration scene after which the play is named. One of the arbitrants, Syriskos, the charcoal-burner, says to Smikrines, the arbitrator: 'you know your tragedy. Think of Neleus and Pelias. An old goatherd found them as babies. If he hadn't given them the tokens which were with them, they would never have discovered their real identity and become kings' (paraphrase of 325-33). The reference appears to be to a lost play of Sophocles, Tyro. The words spoken by Syriskos work on at least two levels. From his point of view they form a cogent argument supporting his claim on the tokens which were found with the baby by the shepherd Daos. But from Menander's point of view they show his awareness that his plot is cast on lines familiar to his audience through tragedy. The case is complicated further by the fact that his overall design of the arbitration scene – an elderly man adjudicates the fate of his own grandson (unknown to him) when two servants refer their dispute over the baby's tokens to his arbitration – resembles quite closely the arbitration theme of another lost tragedy, the Alope by Euripides.1 Did Menander expect his audience to recognize the Alope when they watched the arbitration scene in Epitrepontes? And, if Menander wanted them to make the connection, why did he wrong-foot them with the allusion to a quite different tragedy, that of Pelias and Neleus?2 Of one thing we can be sure: in playing on tragedy in this manner he was hardly testing his audience's knowledge, nor was he asking them to judge the fidelity of his play to tragic antecedents. The game seems to be of a different order.

1.2 Menander and tragedy

Menander has been seen as the ancestor of not only 'high' forms of later European comedy such as the Commedia dell'Arte and, in France, Molière and Marivaux,3 in which mistaken identity, recognitions and reunions play a large part, but also of

---

1 For details see commentary.  
forms as low as modern ‘soaps’. That is, the endless parade of troubled relationships, conflict between the generations, love-affairs, illegitimate babies, breakups and reconciliations which are the stuff of many modern TV soaps, are really quite like Menandorean plots. Let us take an example of a successful and skilful comedy series, *Friends*, for the light that may shed on the relationship of comedy to serious genres of film and play. For we are, in fact, dealing here with a form of intertextuality, or more accurately, intertheatricality, to coin a word. When Menander plays on tragedy, and when *Friends* alludes to other films or TV shows, the phenomenon is essentially the same: the comedy exploits an audience’s familiarity with earlier drama to raise a laugh or give an amusing ‘take’ on the scene.

A relevant example for the present purpose of illuminating Menander’s allusions to tragedy comes in series 2, episode 2 of *Friends*. Joey has the job of selling ‘Bijon for Men’ after-shave to men in a department store. To do that he is equipped with a hand-spray which he offers to spray on the wrist of customers as a sample of the scent. One day a rival appears: a man dressed in cowboy-costume touting a competitor’s scent ‘Ombre’. Quickly the rivalry between the two slips into the cinematographic genre of rivalry between two gunslingers in a Western. The two men’s sprays become their revolvers. Their walk, dress and speech imitate Western clichés. The final ‘duel’ (which ends farcically in the ‘Ombre Man’ squirting his aerosol into the face of a customer, nearly blinding him) is a spoof of similar duel scenes in e.g. ‘High Noon’. In this scene *Friends* plays on conventions of a serious genre to raise laughs in one comic scene in this episode. The touch is light, not too intrusive. For these things are easily overdone. Once the amusement of recognition (‘ah yes, just like a Western’) has been fully realized for a particular scene, further elaboration or extenuation would only weaken the joke. Similarly in Menander: the tragic touches are short in duration, just enough to alert the audience to the target genre and to heighten the humour of the present scene. But rapidly the allusion is dropped and Menander passes to another source of humour, or, later in the play, to a quite different tragic ‘butt’.

Another interesting example of genre play comes in the same episode. Rachel is intensely jealous of Ross’s new girl-friend Julie; now her best friend Monika befriends Julie, goes shopping with her and even has lunch with her. In a spoof of ‘jealousy scenes’ between lovers in serious romantic drama, Rachel discovers
the lunch check in Monika’s pocket indicating that she had lunch with someone. Gradually she extracts the truth from Monika about her shopping-lunch trip with Julie. The dialogue is modelled on easily recognizable (indeed clichéd) jealousy-and-discovery scenes in serious love stories. The point is that the screenplay of Friends derives its humour from (at least) two levels: first there is the situation itself, modelled more or less on possible scenes from ‘real life’; then there is the level of intertextuality: dialogue and dramaturgy shift from simple mimesis of ‘reality’ and engage with a whole tradition of comparable scenes in serious genres, to humorous effect.

A final example from episode 5 of series 2: here Phoebe challenges the scientist Ross’s belief in evolution. Using a number of means, Phoebe finally extracts from Ross the admission that there is room for doubt about the veracity of evolution as a theory. At this point the script exploits genre play. Ross’s ‘crisis of faith’ is modelled on comparable crises of conscience in serious drama when the hero is forced into a decision which conflicts with his/her most deeply held convictions and beliefs: ‘How will you live with yourself now?’ asks Phoebe melodramatically. Ross has been teased in this episode not only as the rather ‘straight’ scientist for his unbending adherence to scientific principles, but also with playful reference to ‘good men’ in serious drama wrestling with their consciences.

Returning to Menander, we find that his plays are similarly not only about what they say they are (e.g. a broken marriage in Epitrepontes); they also flag their kinship with other drama in the process. Even more than in the modern world with its hundreds of available TV channels and its plethora of cinemas and theatres, ancient Athens had, essentially, one stage: that of Dionysos, on which plays were staged at two major festivals, the Dionysia and Lenaia. Of course one should not ignore stagings of plays in rural Attic demes, but it remains true that theatre for the Athenians was centralized and concentrated on a few events. The serious genre was tragedy: the fourth century saw many new plays produced as well as restagings of earlier plays, especially Euripides. It cannot be an exaggeration to say that tragedy, both contemporary and ‘classical’, was the dominant cultural form in Menander’s time. Comedy had, from the beginning, been light relief after the heavy fare of tragedy. Aristophanes siezed on tragedy as a butt of parodic fun and played constantly with tragic diction when he wanted his characters to appear pompous or to mark an action as para-tragic. One has to grasp this cultural dominance of the tragic mode to understand Menander’s plays. The Athenians were acculturated to seeing life through mythical spectacles, and to assimilating the issues of their everyday lives to tragic patterns.

---

5 For a compilation of the evidence for the restaging of fifth-century tragedies in the fourth see Katsouris (1974).
6 Cusset (2003, 212) makes the point that Aristophanes parodies contemporary tragedies and can show living playwrights on his stage, whereas Menander usually refers to the ‘classic canon’ of tragedies, and is thus more distanced in time.
Menander's plays, too, derive much of their flair from this cultural symbiosis with tragedy. Although his characters inhabit the everyday world of contemporary Athens, their plights have mythical – that is, tragic – overtones. Knemon, the old grouch in *Dyskolos* who falls down the well and cannot get out, makes his grand speech of repentance in the fourth act in the unmistakable manner of a tragic hero: he is wheeled on stage, incapacitated by his fall, in the manner of Hippolytos after his disastrous accident. Demeas in *Samia* feels he has been cuckolded by his own son in a manner reminiscent of Theseus in the same play by Euripides. We have already seen how the fate of the exposed child in *Epitrepontes* parallels various mythical antecedents. But it is not only in structural elements of plot that one sees Menander playing on tragedy. Direct quotations from tragedies are by no means rare; it is simply assumed that all players from rich fathers to cheeky slaves know their tragedy. Tragedy, as shared cultural experience, forms a kind of meta-language for Athenians on and off stage to underpin their arguments or to hint at meanings to other characters.

Some, indeed, talk of ‘metatheatricality’ in this connection. In other words, Menander, by reminding his audience at strategic points that they are watching a play, not reality in strange garb, is encouraging them to step outside the world of the play to engage in reflection on its literary ancestors and indeed on the very institution of theatre. I think we have to be careful with this critical term. Two considerations need to be borne in mind. First, there is the fact that ‘normal’ Athenians used comparisons with myth in their everyday speech. We see that in the orators, where arguments must persuade and the speaker must not appear phoney: a villain can be castigated as an Aigisthos or an Oedipus there because the jurors knew what was meant and could relate to the image thus evoked. So when characters in Menander refer to well-known tragedies and tragic figures they are doing no more than the Athenian man-in-the-street was wont to do. In fact it seems likely to me that this habit of speech was part of the act: a reference to some tragedy ‘which we all know’ was a trick by which Menander could make his speaker appear just like a member of the audience. Second, there is a danger in using the term ‘metatheatricality’

---

7 Important treatments of this aspect of Menander are Hunter (1985, 114-136), Hurst (1990), with further references.
8 See especially Gutzwiller (2000, 102): ‘the term metatheatricality refers to theater that self-consciously calls attention to itself as theater, often for the purpose of playing with the distinction between the fiction of the play and the reality of performance’.
9 Andokides 1.129; similarly the step-mother in Antiphon 1.17 is called a ‘Klytaimestra’.
10 This aspect is recognized by both Hunter (1985, 135) and Gutzwiller (2000, 105): ‘In other instances, characters actually refer to dramatic staging or use technical critical terminology, as known through Peripatetic literary theory, to refer to the constitutive parts of plays. Such comments are realistic, or “probable” in the Aristotelian sense, because it is likely that Greeks of the fourth century regularly interpreted their own lives through the paradigm of myth, best known in dramatized form, and used theatrical metaphors to refer to everyday events. It is because of the probability of such comments that dramatic pretense is preserved. At the same time, however, audience members may experience a character’s comparison of the dramatic situation to tragedy as humorously ironic because
that this implies a deliberate break with the ‘dramatic illusion’ of the rest of the play. In other words, that a play normally creates a world of its own, then touches of metatheatricality break this and lure the audience down a different path of reflection altogether. Let us not forget, as Wiles (1991) points out, that an audience is always aware it is watching a play. However engrossing the story, humans can tell theatrical mimesis from other modes. That is the force of Coleridge’s ‘willing suspension of disbelief’: an audience allows itself to believe in the play, but that does not close its mind to other, concurrent modes such as parody, political satire, historical or literary allusion. These are all possible branch-lines of the main dramatic track.

The important point in evaluating Menander’s allusions to tragedy seems to me the recognition of such play as a possible, temporary comic mode; not one which should swamp a play, nor one permanently indulged in, but one condiment in the sauce, as it were. The examples from Friends above have shown what I mean. Parodies of high drama add an additional dimension and source of humour to scenes in the series. But this parodic mode cannot be sustained: it is only funny as a temporary mirror held up to the series itself.

Similarly in Menander: the sections of overt ‘tragic mode’ are recognizable as self-contained units: a comic mode which the script marks with clear linguistic signs (metre, diction or explicit mention of tragedy) and which permits another comic ‘angle’ on the proceedings. A major example occurs in the Aspis when the slave Daos quotes from a series of tragedies to express his woe that Chairestratos is (purportedly) dying; the mock-tragic mode contributes to the effect of hoax which Daos is playing on Smikrines (lines 399-418).11 In Epitrepontes we have two good examples of this type of play. As already mentioned, Syriskos in the arbitration scene reminds everyone (primarily Smikrines) that what is at stake – the recognition of an exposed infant by tokens – is ‘just like in tragedies’. If the audience did not get the implicit parallel with Alope, then at least they could not miss Syriskos’ explicit comparison of the present situation with that of Pelias and Neleus in another play. This produces a jokey effect: not only can the audience smile knowingly when they recognize Syriskos’ high-faluting rhetoric in lines 232-36, they will also smile inwardly when they pick up the clever parallels with various tragedies. This is not so much ‘meta-theatre’ in my opinion, but one of Menander’s multiple comic modes.12

The second instance comes at the end of the play when Onesimos teases Smikrines, the only character still to be in the dark about the identity of the infant (lines

---

12 Cf. Hunter (1985, 135): ‘The reference to tragedies within a scene modelled on a tragic forerunner shows us Menander lightly toying with the motifs of his plot. It is here a very pleasing effect, as it acknowledges the dramatic debt without in fact parodying the tragic model.’ Fine discussion in Hurst (1990, 111-12).
1123-26).  

Onesimos first quotes a line of tragedy as a hint about what has happened between Pamphile and Charisios, then, when Smikrines says ‘eh?’, follows it up with ‘I’ll quote the whole speech from *Auge* if you still don’t cotton on!’ Once again, Menander has entered mock-tragic mode. Onesimos uses an allusion to a play by Euripides to confound a Smikrines groping to understand what is going on. The playful use of tragedy again contributes to the dramatic action, this time baiting a somewhat obnoxious character at the end of the play. If the audience knew the story of *Auge*, so much the better; if not, they would still understand the quotation from the play itself and share Onesimos’ joy in baiting Smikrines from a position of superior knowledge. This is not parody *on* tragedy; rather, it is the playful use of tragedy to heighten the comic effect. 

We should not, then, read Menander’s plays as a kind of *roman à clef* in which the game consists of identifying the consistent tragic sub-text. Rather, the play with tragedy is one arrow in the artist’s quiver, or, to repeat the former image, spice in the soup. This view facilitates understanding how, in one play, Menander may allude to a variety of tragedies and tragic motifs. In *Epitrepontes* there is explicit mention of at least two different tragedies, and in the commentary the reader will find comparisons with numerous tragic models. For, as I said, Menander can slip in and out of ‘tragic mode’ at will; each instance is not connected with the previous or next instance. The important thing is the comic effect of the moment. 

André Hurst finds in a thoughtful consideration of Menander’s on-going debate with tragedy in the extant plays that the playwright was, perhaps more than most, ‘fascinated by tragedy’. This fascination expresses itself, according to Hurst, in three sorts of references, or points of comparison with tragedy. On the one hand there are the passages I have just been discussing of paratragic diction and overt references to tragedy as a genre or to individual plays. On the other, there are a host of structural elements which Menander’s plays share with tragedy, particularly Euripides. Hurst detects a serious purpose behind this pervasive, tongue-in-cheek engagement with tragedy: on the one hand tragedy provides an authoritative model to which characters in his plays can appeal when they seek a higher cultural authority. On the other hand the tragic manner is often associated in Menander’s plays with moments when characters lose touch with reality or common-sense. Thus both Demeas and Nikeratos in *Samia* become ‘tragic’ when suffering from delusion. Similarly in *Epitrepontes* Onesimos uses a quote from Euripides’ *Auge* to bait
I
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Smikrines, to pull wool over his eyes and tease him with his failure to grasp the true situation. And in the earlier Epitrepontes passage, when Syriskos compares the fate of this baby with similar foundling children in tragedy, he makes the comparison only to draw attention to the difference between Daos’ actions and the finders of Pelias and Neleus in tragedy: Daos is behaving like a real-life slave by wishing to keep the tokens through greed, whereas the myth of tragedy depends on the slave’s altruistic treatment of the foundling children and their tokens. According to Hurst, Menander constantly reminds his audience that his comedy is a mirror of ‘reality’, ‘real life’, whereas tragedy exists on a higher, more ideal, plane with less connection to reality. Menander, in Hurst’s view, is an advocate of his chosen genre; his play with tragedy involves an essential ambiguity: on the one hand admiration for the dominant theatrical genre, and focus of Aristotle’s Poetics; on the other, a declaration: real people are not like that; my plays are about reality.

1.3 The lost prologue

It is a major irritant in reading Epitrepontes that the prologue – for surely the play had one – is lost without a trace. It cannot have been the first scene of the play as that position was taken by introductory dialogue between Karion, Onesimos and Chairestratos. Most have assumed a delayed prologue of the type found in Aspis, Heros, Perikeiromene, spoken by an omniscient deity. For, according to the apparent convention of New Comedy, the audience learned the crucial facts concerning the incipient drama before the characters themselves. The key fact in Epitrepontes is the parentage of the infant; no character was in a position to know that before the recognitions and revelations which begin in the third act. If the audience were

---

17 His essay takes as its starting-point the quotation from Antiphanes’ Poiesis in Athenaios 222a-23a (fr. 189 KA), in which the poet points to the far greater difficulty of writing comedies than tragedy: tragedians merely have to mention Oedipus and the whole audience knows the story; the writer of comedy has to invent everything: the characters, background to the play, the action, disaster and turning-point (ονόματα καινά, τα διωκημένα / πρότερον, τα νυν παρόντα, την καταστροφήν, / την εισβολήν).

18 The remark attributed to the ancient critic Aristophanes of Byzantium is almost too well known to require citation: ‘Ah, Menander and Life: which of you imitated which?’ Test. 83 KA (Syrian comment. in Hermog. II 23 Rabe).

19 See the long discussion in Martina (1997, 29-41).

20 Photiades (1958, 109-110) talks of two types of Menanderian prologues: one, the ‘personal’ type, with which one of the characters opens the play; two, the ‘delayed’ type, spoken after the first scene, often by a divinity or deified abstraction. Apart from Tyche (Aspis) and Agnoia (Perik.), we hear of Elenchos (fr. 717 K.-Th. = PCG VI 2, fr. 507), associated with Aletheia and Parrhesia in Lucian, Pseudol. 4.

21 If Onesimos spoke the prologue, as suggested by Majnarić (1960, 42), he can only have informed the audience about Pamphile’s illegitimate baby; he cannot have known that Charisios was its father. That fact only begins to emerge in act three, when Onesimos and Habrotonon put two and two together in the matter of the rape at the Tauropolia. But at that point neither knows that the mother of the baby is Pamphile herself. I do not think it possible that Onesimos spoke the prologue.
in the privileged position of knowing from the beginning that the baby was in fact Charisios', by Pamphile, whom he had raped, then they must have received that information from an omniscient source, not a character in the play. So who spoke the prologue? A fairly common proposal is that Tyche, 'Lady Luck', spoke the prologue as in Aspis. Luck certainly plays a large part in the development of the plot: first the coincidence of Charisios marrying the very girl he happened to have raped at the Tauropolia; then the chance meeting of Syriskos and Daos with Smikrines, who decides the fate of his grandson without knowing it; then the chance recognition of Charisios' ring by Onesimos who happens to meet Syriskos while he is examining the tokens; then the chance meeting of Habrotonon and Pamphile. This is to mention only the main points which depend on luck. In line 807 Pamphile refers to Tyche as instrumental in her fate; in line 1108 Onesimos says that tautomaton, 'chance', has halted Smikrines in his destructive path.

Despite all these chance elements in the play, I rather doubt that chance can be said to be the dominant or most striking feature of the play's architecture. In Aspis it is clear that the chance mistaking of one shield for another launches the entire series of dramatic developments, but that cannot be said of Epitrepontes. True, Charisios married the girl whom he had earlier raped incognito by chance, but the chance element here is not so striking, nor so original, as the chance snatching up of the wrong shield in hectic preparation for battle. I do not rule out Tyche as the prologue speaker of Epitrepontes but I am not convinced. If I were to hazard a guess I might propose Reconciliation, Diallagē, as a suitable lady personification to capture the spirit of the play.24 There are several references to the reconciliation between Charisios and Pamphile in the course of the play.25

Whoever it was, he or she spoke the prologue after Karion and Onesimos had conducted their preliminary exchange, in which the changed circumstances of Onesimos' master Charisios were discussed, as well as the preparations for the meal. P.Oxy. 4936 shows that Chairestratos took part in this conversation hardly surprisingly, as the meal was to take place in his house, and that was the destination of both Karion and, presumably, Onesimos. When the Petersburg parchment admits us to the action again, we find Smikrines grumbling outside Charisios' house, overheard by Chairestratos who is probably standing at his doorstep. The prologue, if there

---

22 See Stockert (1997, 8-9). Other suggestions: Dike (Corno, 1970, 103); Dike or Eros (Martina, 1997, 39); Elenchos or Eleos (Holzberg, 1974, 62 n. 223); Peithō (Cusset, 2003, 171 n. 44) and (Ireland, 1992). By a fanciful touch Murray (1945) made Kallisto speak the delayed prologue: she was the heroine of Brauronian myth, but there is no guarantee that she had any connection with the Tauropolia at Halai Araphenides.

23 Vogt-Spira (1992, 169) points out that Habrotonon's plan plays a major part in the recognitions of Epitrepontes, thus reducing the part played by Tyche; he conceded, however: 'Gleichwohl spielt auch in diesem Stück der Zufall eine Rolle: Er wird jedoch von der dramatischen Ökonomie an andere Stelle verschoben, indem er weniger im Sinne einer causa efficiens eingesetzt ist, als vielmehr die Voraussetzungen bereitstellt, um das Handeln der Protagonisten zu entfalten'; cf. ibid. 173. 24 Who was also personified by Aristophanes in Ach. 989.

25 Lines 425 (see note on this line), 592 (probably), 1109, 1121-22.
was one, must have come between these two scenes. But did Chairestratos leave the stage with Karion and Onesimos when they reached his house? He must have, or he would have heard the prologue.

1.4 Staging

Menander lived approximately half a century from 342/1 to 290 BC, and began producing plays before he was twenty. We do not know when *Epitrepontes* was performed within the span of, say, 320 to 290 BC, as there is no substantial evidence, either internal or external, to go by. The ancient hypothesis of the play (see p. 38) contains a positive judgement of the play’s merit, which may reflect its success in the competition for Comedy at the Dionysia or Lenaia in Athens. Some have felt that the intricate plot and psychological subtlety suggest a play of Menander’s mature years, but is *Dyskolos*, the earliest extant play, so simple and lacking in psychological finesse? There are no tetrameters in the extant portions of *Epitrepontes*, unlike in e.g. *Dyskolos* or *Samia*, but whether this reflects a gradual simplification of Menander’s metrical preferences is at least open to doubt.

At two points in the commentary I speculate whether we can detect contemporary allusions to circumstances in Athens in Menander’s language. The metaphorical use of the term *phrourarchos* in line 1094 may reflect the presence of a foreign garrison in Attica during these years ensuring that Athens did not secede from the ruling power. Two particular garrisons seem relevant, as I explain in the note on that line: the Macedonian garrison at Mounychia from 322-307 BC, and the garrison of Demetrios Poliorcetes on the Athenian Mouseion established in 295; if Onesimos in the play is alluding to the latter in his jibe at Smikrines (and I think it is possible), we would have a late terminus post quem for the play. In line 691 I wonder, secondly, whether the term *μετοικέω* in combination with citizen status as *παραγεγραμμένος*, literally ‘added at the side of the registry’ might reflect a particular case (or cases) of naturalization known to us from historical records. It must be emphasized in this connection, however, that the words used by Menander are quite general and certainly do not constitute specific historical allusions in the manner of Old Comedy. But no man or writer exists in a historical vacuum, and the same will have held true of Menander. Since one needs the hand-hold of a date when reading literature, ancient and otherwise, one might do best to consider that *Epitrepontes* was performed some time in the nineties of the third century BC. If my specula-

---

26 For a good discussion of the available evidence see Arnott (1979a, xiii-xix).
27 As a further speculation one might mention the fact that Demetrios was ‘reconciled’ with Athens in 295; if my idea that reconciliation is the keynote of the play and that Diallagé spoke the prologue happens to be correct, we might obtain a political nuance for the play’s domestic theme, such as Lape (2004) advocates generally for Menandrean plots.
28 Lowe (2007, 73): ‘... *Epitrepontes* probably belongs in the 290s’: but I do not see any reasons given for this guess.
tion about historical echoes happens to be right, \textit{Epitrepontes}, we may hazard, was performed at the Dionysia or Lenaia of 294 or 293 BC. That would make it one of Menander's last works.

It was first performed, most likely, in the Theatre of Dionysos in Athens, at the Dionysia or Lenaia theatre festival. The audience will have been confronted with a raised stage whose set (in Greek \textit{skēnē}) depicted a section of Attic street with the fronts of (at least) two houses painted on an imitation wall made of wood. To judge by Dioskourides' mosaic depiction of a scene from \textit{Theophorōmenē} this street was pretty bare, although the pair of house entrances must have been structurally significant enough to allow a character to 'cower' or hide in a doorway to avoid being seen on occasion. The two houses in our play are those of Charisios and his neighbour and friend Chairestratos. They live in a deme of Athens, not the city itself. Since the festival called Tauropolia, which is so important for the background to the play, took place at Halai Araphenides on the east coast of Attica, some have thought this deme might have been the location of the play. Others object that it was a long walk from Halai to Athens and Smikrines, for one, walks this distance several times in the course of the play. The fact that Syriskos is a charcoal burner who conveys the takings from this trade to his master Chairestatos in act two is probably not sufficient to locate the play in Acharnai, a deme famous for its charcoal-burning.\textsuperscript{29}

It is, in fact, largely irrelevant, in which country deme \textit{Epitrepontes} is to be imagined staged.

The actors acted on their raised stage, whilst the chorus of inebriated young men appeared four times to sing (?), dance and cavort in the orchestra.\textsuperscript{30} Although the prologue of a Menandrean play was frequently spoken by a god or personified abstraction such as 'Lady Luck', or 'Ignorance', the actor playing this figure probably spoke from stage level, not from the top of the stage building.\textsuperscript{31}

All the visible action of the play takes place, according to the custom in ancient theatre, on the street outside these two houses. There is interplay with interior action in that sometimes a character reports what has just happened, or is happening, indoors. Nor is it rare for a character, on entering, to throw a few remarks over his/her shoulder to someone indoors. Otherwise, the characters come and go by entering and exiting from the visible doorways, or by walking along the street to the right or left of the stage. Traditionally, exit left was toward the country, right to the city. So Syriskos and Daos will have appeared early in the second act from the country side, Smikrines will have made several journeys between this street and town. The interesting arbitration scene in the second act involves a chance encounter between Smikrines heading from the scene into town and the two servants Syriskos and Daos appearing from the country. In \textit{Epitrepontes} the threshold between inside and out-

\textsuperscript{29} Cf. Gomme-Sandbach 290.


\textsuperscript{31} In tragedy the \textit{deus/dea ex machina} spoke from the elevated position of the \textit{theologeion}. 
side is very important. Charisios overhears the conversation between Smikrines and Pamphile by standing just inside Chairestratos' front door, which is ajar. Similarly Onesimos in act four seems to cower at the entrance of Charisios’ house while Charisios fumes outside Chairestratos’ door. At one point Habrotonon bridges the action indoors with that visible to the audience outdoors when she rushes outside early in act three for a breath of fresh air, as it were, from the strain of the situation indoors where Charisios is trying to drown his sorrows by partying.

Once Smikrines refers to the ‘vivid gesturing’ of old Sophrone (παθαινομένη line 1127). Although she had a non-speaking part, clearly that part involved excited gesticulation. In the same scene Smikrines is said to be ‘dragging’ Sophrone along (ἀρπασμα line 1082), presumably against her wishes, at least at a speed which she cannot manage herself. Since there are no stage directions in our texts we have to imagine the acting in most instances. We know when someone is holding the famous baby (Syriskos’ wife in act two, Habrotonon in act four), and some vignettes – for example the counting of the tokens in act three – are readily imaginable: Syriskos takes each item from a leather purse and hands it, after inspection and description, to his wife who receives it in the fold of her dress. The Mytilene mosaic depicting the arbitration in act two shows us little more than that which was obvious from the text anyway: Smikrines standing between Daos and Syriskos, with wife and baby, while they conduct their dispute. Smikrines does, however, have his hand on the arm of Daos holding the purse of tokens: there may have been considerable toing-and-froing in the disputed exchange. Other scenes require little imagination to envisage their staging: the recognition of Pamphile by Habrotonon in act four must have been a highly charged moment in the play, with Pamphile turning sadly to enter her house, to be halted abruptly by Habrotonon’s exclamation of recognition: ‘wait a moment!’ The dramaturgy of the whole play seems to have depended on a contrast between the relatively static inner drama played out in the houses and reported on by characters who step outside, and the agitated comings and goings of Smikrines, who, like an overwrought pendulum, oscillates between the scene and town. His arrivals are anticipated with nervousness by Chairestratos and Charisios, his departures are brought about by tricks (Onesimos) or rebuttal (Pamphile). In this way Menander may have established a static, but anxious, pole in his dramaturgy and a mobile, disruptive force now present, now absent. In the section (below) on language, I show how the register of Menander’s language reflects a similar cardiograph, as it were, of the emotional temperature of the dialogue as it fluctuates.

1.4.1 Scene-play

A Menandean play is divided into five acts with four intervening choral dances. Presumably the aesthetic impact of the choral dance, whose performers are regularly described as drunken young men one would not like to encounter alone on a dark night, contrasted strongly with the nuanced dialogue of the play. Menander goes to
considerable lengths to maintain the flow of action over these choral interludes.\textsuperscript{32} Frequently he ends an act with a piece of unfinished business which is then picked up again at, or near, the beginning of the next act; or a character exits at the end of one act with a declaration of intent, leaving the audience to anticipate the result of the action in the next. Similarly the ‘entr’acte’ is used by Menander for off-stage action; the audience may imagine some anticipated action happening while the chorus is dancing. Thus in \textit{Epitrepontes} Smikrines exits at the end of act one declaring that he will first interview Pamphile before planning his approach to Charisios; he reappears at the beginning of act two, although we do not know with what result as the relevant lines are lost. At the end of act two Onesimos goes off declaring his intention of confronting Charisios with his lost ring; at the beginning of the next act we learn that he in fact flunked the task through nerves. At the end of act three Smikrines declares his intention of taking Pamphile from her marital home and act four sees the two arguing bitterly over his proposal. Between acts four and five we may imagine a kind of reunion celebration between Charisios and Pamphile.

But the real art of Menander’s dramaturgy appears in his construction of scenes within acts.\textsuperscript{33} There tend to be three distinct scenes in each act, sometimes with a clear break between scenes, sometimes without.\textsuperscript{34} A scene which begins abruptly such as the arbitration scene in act two of \textit{Epitrepontes} does so for dramatic purpose: new characters burst in on the stage, creating the sense of a sudden new development in the action. More common, however, is Menander’s clever use of linked transitions between scenes; by that I mean that one character stays on stage at the end of a scene to provide a link with the next.\textsuperscript{35} Or, a new character enters while a scene is in mid flow to pick up the thread in a new, connected, scene. Each scene normally has one key character who is the focus of the action. A scene changes when this focal character cedes to another. One might surmise that the three scene structure, with a key actor in each scene, is linked to the three actor convention of New Comedy. Let us see how all this works in the play.

In act one the first scene centres on Karion, the cook, who bustles on stage

\textsuperscript{32} See Handley (1987, 303-9) and Zagagi (1994, 76-82).

\textsuperscript{33} By ‘scene’ I do not mean our modern ‘scene’, which usually refers to a ‘change of scene’ i.e. place. In Menander the place is always the same. Therefore I want ‘scene’ to refer to a meaningful unit of action with clearly delineated contributory participants.

\textsuperscript{34} What Handley (1987, 307) refers to as ‘the “clean break” effect of an empty stage. Martina (1997, vol. II 1, 39-48) chooses a completely different analysis of scenes. He assigns a new scene whenever a new speaker enters. This gives him, for example, seven scenes in act two, and nine in act three. Perhaps what he is talking about is ‘units’ of text, cf. Handley (1987, 305). Some early editions of \textit{Epitrepontes} divided the text into scenes, e.g. van Leeuwen J.F. (1908) and de Falco (1946), but they each count at least four scenes in act three.

\textsuperscript{35} Similar to the concept used by Handley (1987, 307) of ‘overlapping action’. Because of the subtlety of some scene-changes in Menander Handley wrote at the end of this paper (310): ‘Hence I doubt, for Menander, the utility of one or another of our inherited concepts of “scene”’. It seems to me that, on the contrary, in \textit{Epitrepontes} at least, we can see Menander cleverly exploiting a three-scene convention.
with Onesimos, asking questions about the household where he is to cook that day. If we are to believe Primmer (1986), the nosey and big-headed character of Karion, as described by Themistios (for details, see commentary), was developed in this opening scene. But midway through the scene, as a new papyrus shows us, Chairestratos enters, to engage in three-way conversation with the other two. It is a probable conjecture (for deficient lines) that Chairestratos announces at the end of this scene his intention of keeping a look-out for Smikrines that day, in case the old man comes along to break up the party. All three actors must leave stage to clear the way for the speaker of the delayed prologue. Then, in the third scene, Smikrines does indeed appear, intent on confronting his wayward son-in-law. Chairestratos observes his movements and adds a parte comments in this scene, until he is joined by Habrotonon. Their flirtation at this point initiates a subsidiary strand of the plot which will hold spectators’ interest to the end. All three characters exit with declarations of intent: Smikrines to plan his confrontation with Charisios, Chairestratos and Habrotonon to warn Charisios of the proximity of his father-in-law.

The first scene of act two is, unfortunately, badly preserved, despite new papyrus discoveries. Smikrines is likely to have been the key character, although Onesimos will have played an important part, too. Smikrines is still on stage – although already on his way ‘to town’ on a wild goose chase (probably suggested to him by Onesimos) - when Syriskos and Daos appear, arguing about the tokens, for the second scene, the arbitration. Thus Smikrines is the ‘link figure’ between the first two scenes. After the arbitration Smikrines does finally leave for town, leaving Syriskos with his wife on stage. The third scene – examining the tokens – focuses on Syriskos, who is interrupted by Onesimos. Onesimos recognizes as his master’s the ring which Syriskos is examining with his wife. So Syriskos is the link figure between scenes two and three.

In act three Onesimos holds centre-stage in the first scene; here, action is complicated by double threads. On the one hand Onesimos and Syriskos engage in further debate about the ring; on the other, Habrotonon intrudes on the scene, at first a parte, then as interlocutor of Onesimos once Syriskos has gone. This thread of the action is the link between scenes one and two of this act. It develops into the major dialogue between Habrotonon and Onesimos in the second scene, dominated by Habrotonon’s clever initiative. Onesimos provides the link with the third scene when he stays on stage following Habrotonon’s departure, to witness Smikrines’ return from town. He quickly exits then, however, as he is scared of being seen by Smikrines. So the third scene involves new characters; first Smikrines talks to an irate Karion, whose entry is motivated by the consternation in Chairestratos’ house following Habrotonon’s (offstage) bombshell. Then Smikrines talks to Chairestratos himself. Smikrines is clearly the focus of this scene, and also the link with the first scene of act four, as he announces his intention of removing his daughter from her marital home at the end of act three.

Act four begins with the argument between Smikrines and Pamphile, staged as
the continuation of their altercation indoors during the entr'acte. Pamphile is surely the focus of the scene as she stands up heroically to the pressure put on her by Smikrines to leave Charisios. She is also the link with the second scene, as she stays, mournfully, on stage after her father’s departure, where she is recognized by Habrotonon in the first recognition scene. There is no link figure between the second and third scene of this act. This is to highlight the drama of Charisios’ appearance in the fourth act. The women go off, Onesimos appears to tell the audience of the pandemonium inside Chairestratos’ house. This ‘messenger speech’ has tragic ancestors: it paves the way for the appearance of the stricken Charisios, who is the focus of this third and last scene.

It is common for the main action of a Menandrean play to be completed by the end of the fourth act, and Epitrepontes follows the pattern. So how was Menander to create a satisfying finale? He picked up two loose threads of the previous action. These threads are tied to the two characters who are not yet ‘in the know’ about Pamphile’s baby. The first scene (probably) shows Chairestratos brooding over Habrotonon’s unavailability. This secondary love-interest of the play links the first with the last act. The second scene begins again in the abrupt style. Smikrines bursts on stage, dragging the old nurse Sophrone with him; this time he really is going to take Pamphile home with him. Onesimos holds centre stage for this second scene, which involves the baiting of Smikrines. The scene is completed when Smikrines finally gathers the truth, at which point Chairestratos enters, to share, no doubt, in the dénouement. I conjecture that the third scene (linked to the second by Chairestratos) involved a happy ending with Chairestratos and Habrotonon, but the lines are lost.

This survey of the scene-play in Epitrepontes shows the care which Menander took in constructing the play. It is this ‘arrangement of the plot’ which the anecdote in Plutarch shows to have been the decisive step in Menandrean composition. The economy and symmetry of plot construction in Epitrepontes is truly impressive.

---

36 De gloria Athen. Mor. 347E = Kassel & Austin (1983-2001, Test. 70): Λέγεται δὲ καὶ Μενάνδρῳ τῶν συνήθων τις εἶπεν Ἐγγύς οὖν, Μένανδρε, τὰ Διονύσια καὶ σὺ τὴν κωμωδίαν οὐ πεποίηκας; τὸν δὲ ἀποκρίνασθαι Ὄη τοὺς θεούς, ἐγὼ γένα τὴν κωμωδίαν ὃ καὶ ἄνοιγμα γὰρ ἠ διάθεσις, δότο τῇ συνήθει ἐπάσαι. ‘The story goes that one of Menander’s friends said to him: “Menander, the Dionysia will soon be upon us and you haven’t written your comedy yet?” To which he is said to have replied: “I have written the comedy, by Jove! I’ve worked out the plot. All I have to do is write out the verses to go with it.” Cf. Blume (1998, 10), Wilamowitz (1925, 119).

37 This is not the place for a full-scale comparison with scene-play in other plays by Menander, a work which awaits to be done. Let one small example suffice here: in the third act of Samia the first scene consists of Demeas’ soliloquy; the second encompasses the entry of Parmenon with the cook and the interview of Parmenon with Demeas; in the third Demeas ejects Chrysis from his house. Demeas is present on stage throughout the act (except when he briefly enters his house to fetch Chrysis in 360, and at the end, leaving Chrysis alone), giving it continuity. He is the focus of three phases of action: by himself before the house, with Parmenon before the door, with Chrysis by the door. Although the transitions between scenes are fluid and natural, the tripartite structure is manifest.
1.4.2 Distribution of parts

Since, as most scholars believe, Menander operated with only three main actors, he had to allow time for individual actors to change their *prosōpon* between scenes. In act one, scene one, he had to take one of the three men offstage in time to allow the actor to don the mask of the prologue-speaker; another of the three will have put on Smikrines’ mask for scene three; presumably the same actor played Chairestratos in scenes one and three.

If act two, scene one, began with a monologue spoken by Onesimos, he had to exit and change into (probably) Daos’ mask before the arbitration scene, to reappear in scene three as Onesimos again. In the present state of our text he had at least the fifteen lines of Smikrines’ speech in P.Oxy. 4641 to do so, but probably more.

In act three either the actor playing Syriskos in scene one or Habrotonon in scene two has to exit and change into Smikrines’ mask in time for scene three; the latter alternative preserves the speaking voice of Smikrines (see table below); the actor had the twenty-five lines of Onesimos’ monologue to do so. In fact the occurrence of the monologue here, well integrated though it is in the flow of thought, may reflect the necessity of leaving time for a change of mask.

In act four Onesimos, when he appears in scene three, cannot be played by either ‘Habrotonon’ or ‘Pamphile’ as they both exit just before his appearance. He might be played by ‘Smikrines’ from scene one, but that would involve a change of voice (see table below); so it is better to assume that Smikrines changes into Habrotonon’s mask after scene one (he has a few lines spoken by Pamphile to do so) and that Pamphile changes into Charisios’ mask for scene three; she has the duration of Onesimos’ monologue to do so. Perhaps the effect was deliberate, that man and wife should speak with one voice!

Three characters constitute act five: Chairestratos (probably), Onesimos and Smikrines. If Habrotonon actually appeared again in scene three someone of Smikrines, Onesimos and Chairestratos had to exit before she appeared. All three are still present on stage where our text breaks off. In the fragmentary state in which act five presents itself to us today we can still draw further conclusions about Sophrone, who accompanies Smikrines in scene two. She cannot have been played by either of the two actors who play scene one as the scene change is too abrupt. In scene two we have two speaking parts (Smikrines and Onesimos) as well as Sophrone

---

38 For discussion see e.g. Blume (1998, 64-69); after consideration of *Dysk.*., with the apparent necessity there of one role being shared between actors, Blume maintains that the case for strict adherence to the three-actor convention in Menander is not proven; he acknowledges, however, that the plays could – with some gymnastics – be performed by three actors. For various calculations of the division of parts between three actors in *Dysk.* see his n. 64. Wiles (1991), for example, does not believe Menander’s productions were limited to three actors.

39 In the lacunose state of the text we cannot ascertain exactly how many.

40 Perhaps, as in the previous act, the monologue here was ‘forced’ on Menander by the three-actor rule; but to say that is only to show Menander’s mastery of dramatic technique, as the speech is anything but redundant, and meshes with the ensuing scene perfectly.
on stage until Chairestratos appears in line 1133; nothing indicates that Sophrone has exited by then. Therefore, unless Menander broke the three actor rule here, we can conclude that Sophrone was not played by one of the three ‘leads’; as a ‘mute character’ she may still have uttered one or several words (for details see commentary). So, assuming that Menander tried to keep the voices of his characters consistent as far as possible, we reach the following scheme:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>act one</th>
<th>actor a</th>
<th>actor b</th>
<th>actor c</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>prologue</td>
<td>Chairestratos</td>
<td>Onesimos</td>
<td>Karion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Habrotonon</td>
<td>Smikrines</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>act two</td>
<td>Syriskos</td>
<td>Onesimos</td>
<td>Smikrines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Daos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>act three</td>
<td>Syriskos</td>
<td>Onesimos</td>
<td>Habrotonon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>act four</td>
<td>Chairestratos</td>
<td>Karion</td>
<td>Smikrines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pamphile</td>
<td>Onesimos</td>
<td>Smikrines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>act five</td>
<td>Chairestratos</td>
<td>Onesimos</td>
<td>Smikrines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is interesting that only Smikrines and Onesimos appear in all five acts; they have by far the largest parts. The two central figures in the drama – Pamphile and Charisios – have quite small speaking parts in comparison. That does not diminish their significance; it points up Menander’s foregrounding technique. Blume (1998, 66-68) argues that surely a play would be more satisfactory if the same actors played the same parts throughout the play, especially as the fourth century saw the rise of ‘star’ actors with almost more prestige than the playwright himself. The scheme above allows for consistency of voice for each role with two exceptions: that of Karion whose appearances in acts one and three require different actors; and the few lines spoken by Habrotonon in act one must be given to a different actor from that in her major appearances in acts three and four. May we excuse these changes in acting voice by the fact that an act intervenes in each case, giving the audience time to ‘forget’ the original voice?

1.4.3 Masks

We are not able to assign particular masks from the catalogue in Pollux, *Onomastikon* IV.143-54, to characters in the play. Smikrines clearly wore an old man’s mask (ήγεμών πρεσβύτης?). Charisios and Chairestratos wore two different young men’s masks (μέλας νεανίσκος and ούλος νεανίσκος?). Onesimos may be considered the ‘lead slave’ (ήγεμών θεράπων?); Syriskos and Daos wore other slave

---

41 Martina (1997, vol. II 1, 49-50) cuts the Gordian knot here by assuming – without discussion – that Menander used four main actors.
42 The hundred-page excursus in Martina (1997, vol. II 1, 115-222 ‘Maschere e attori’) does little to clear these issues for *Epitrepontes*. 
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masks. Pamphile's mask of a young bride (ψευδοκόρη?) will have differed noticeably from Habrotonon's hetaira mask (παλλακή?). Sophrone will have worn an old woman's mask. Even if we could assign certain masks to the prosōpa of the play, we would not have gained much insight into the intended characters. As the work of Poe (1996) has shown, the list in Pollux is by no means the key to all the Hellenistic New Comedy masks which have turned up through excavation; not even the relatively homogeneous series which has been recovered in Lipari matches closely the categories in Pollux. So the idea that New Comedy operated with a fixed symbolic language of facial attributes given to a limited palette of masks is not true. And, as (Blume, 1998, 124) points out, no mask could show the changing moods of an Onesimos in this play; nor any standard 'Smikrines' mask the subtleties of Smikrines in Epitrepontes (Brown, 1987, 197). So the masks of recurrent characters in Menander, even if they evoked certain expectations of the character in the audience, were limited in the amount of information they could convey about the character in this particular play. The characterisation in the text is necessarily far more detailed and subtle than any prosōpographia could ever be. The most that we can say is that Menander's audience would have immediately recognized the basic age, sex, social status and, in some cases, occupation of the characters as they appeared from their mask and costume. I expect the playwright had individual masks made for his play which, whilst being based on long tradition, nevertheless had an individuality suited to the play. Why go to such lengths to denote individuality in the text if the masks were stereotyped? Were the services of the skeuopoios so expensive that economies of simplification or mass-production were forced on the playwright in this essential branch of his art? I doubt it.

1.4.4 Language

Comedy works through situation, speech, timing. What people say (and do), in what situation, and in what manner, can make people laugh. Of the reasonably well preserved plays of Menander we know the situation, we can read (most of) the

\(^{44}\) Poe (1996, 311): 'If even the Lipari terra-cottas fit Pollux' catalogue so imperfectly, we should consider the possibility that it is not the monuments that are unreliable but the catalogue itself.' Cf. Blume (1998, 71): 'Die Lipari-Masken legen übereinstimmung die Vermutung nahe, dass es einen größeren Variantenreichtum gegeben hat als (Poe in) Pollux nahelegt'; Brown (1987, 185).
\(^{45}\) The theory has been worked out particularly by Wiles (1991). A too rigid adherence to this theory has been questioned by Poe (1996): '...it ought to be obvious from the text alone (sc. of Pollux) of the mask catalogue that some of the physical features that are mentioned most frequently, notably hair-style, hair-color, and beard could have had nothing to do with the personality of the dramatic character to whom an individual mask was assigned or with his situation' (315).
\(^{47}\) Cf. Poe (1996, 324). One thinks of the Princeton relief (obj. nr. y1951-1; cover picture of this book) showing Menander 'communing' with a set of masks, as if reflecting on the characters in his next composition.
speeches, but what is hopelessly lost is the way in which the speeches were delivered, the timing, and the acting itself. Nevertheless, with attention to the language used by characters in the plays and by comparison with other works of Attic poetry and prose, we can hazard a fair guess at some of the more conspicuous manners of speech used by Menander. It is Menander’s subtle and flexible language which receives Plutarch’s highest praise in his *Comparison of Aristophanes and Menander*.

There Plutarch remarks that Menander’s diction is an ideal synthesis suited to all characters and types. He uses special effects sparingly like a musician who sometimes ‘pulls out all the stops’ but rapidly returns to normal level. Menander ‘mixes his diction’ to suit all ages and types. He possesses consummate δεξιότης λόγου, ‘verbal skill’ and tackles all subjects μετὰ πειθοῦς ἀφύκτου, ‘with winning persuasiveness’. Similarly Dio Chrysostomus attests Menander’s superior skill in imitating all types of characters and comic situations compared with Old Comedy.

These two critical positions in antiquity – Menander’s ‘ethical’ skill and his sparing, but telling, use of special verbal effects – may be examined briefly with reference to *Epitrepontes*.

As Menander teases tragedy for its high-faluting style and the horrifying im-passes into which it leads its heroes and heroines, so he mimics the speech patterns of his figures, who represent everyday Athenians, by subtle parody. The mannerisms of orators, philosophers, irritable older men, devastated young men, women of pleasure and respectable women are all the subject of Menander’s ethopoiia in *Epitrepontes*. This characteristic is also highlighted by the ancient hypothesis of the play (O28, see p. 38).

The arbitration scene is a skit on legal wrangles as the Athenians knew and loved

---

48 P. 853 = Test. no. 103 Kassel-Austin. Cf. Lowe (2007, 69): ‘The innovative distillation of everyday Attic speech patterns, and the subtlety with which he uses this to delineate the speech and thought patterns of individual characters, were two of the qualities most admired by Menander’s ancient enthusiasts’.

49 Plutarch, *Compar. Aristophanis et Menandri compendium* 853E4: ή δὲ Μενάνδρου φράσις οὕτω συνέζεται καὶ συμπέπνευκε κεκραμένη πρὸς ἑαυτὴν, ὥστε διὰ πολλῶν ἀγομένη παθῶν καὶ ἤθων καὶ προσώποις ἐφαρμόττουσα παντοδαποῖς μία τε φαίνεσθαι καὶ τὴν ὁμοιότητα τηρεῖν ἐν τοῖς κοινοῖς καὶ συνήθεις καὶ ὑπὸ τῆς χρείας ὀνόμασιν, ‘Menander’s diction is so polished, and consists of such a harmonious mixture, that, while depicting many different emotions and character traits, and being adapted to a variety of character types, it nevertheless achieves unity and preserves consistency through common, typical and ordinary language’. Pace Sandbach (1970, 113), however, I find it clear that Plutarch means to emphasize the variety within unity of Menander’s diction.

50 Ibid. ἐὰν δὲ τινος ἄρα τρατείας εἰς τὸ πράγμα καὶ ψόφου δέησι, καθάπερ αὐλοῦ πάντητον ἀναστάτης ταχὺ πάλιν καὶ πιθανος ἑπέβαλε καὶ κατέστησε τὴν φωνήν εἰς τὸ οίκεῖον, ‘If talk of marvels and noise is required by the action, like an aulos-player he can pull out all the stops and then quickly and plausibly revert to normal diction’.

51 Dio Chrys. (AD 40- after 112) or. 68.6 Arn. = Test. 102 Kassel-Austin: ἢ τε γὰρ τοῦ Μενάνδρου μέλησις ἀπαντος ἦρως καὶ χάριτος πᾶσαν ὑπερβέβληκε τὴν ἰδιότητα τῶν παλαιῶν κοιμικῶν.

52 This aspect of Menander’s language has been investigated penetratingly by Sandbach (1970) and Arnott (1995); the latter suggests that Menander may have followed Alexis’ lead in this attribute of style.
them.\textsuperscript{53} Aristophanes had written a play around the subject of Athenian litigiousness (\textit{Wasps}), and the fourth century, Menander’s century, was the era of the orators and philosophers. Smikrines himself comments on the comic aspect of two slaves engaging in ‘litigation’ (228-29). Syriskos’ opening speech (230-36) sets the tone of glib rhetoric in a slave’s mouth. Daos can only exclaim: ‘It’s no mean orator I’ve run up against. Why did I give him a share?’ (236-37). It is easy for us reading the ensuing debate between the two slaves to forget their incongruous social status. Their speeches read, with subtle differences discussed in the commentary, like fair oratory. The humour no doubt lay in the contrast between these two shabbily dressed and perhaps grubby servants pleading like professionals. The mere juxtaposition of oratory with the lower class serves to take oratory down a peg. The audience will have smiled to hear the rounded phrases flowing from the plebs.\textsuperscript{54} Perhaps the effect is comparable, though more subtle, to the Pyramus and Thisbe inset in \textit{A Midsummer Night’s Dream}.

The philosophers are the source of blatant verbal fun in the fifth act, when the slave Onesimos instructs Smikrines in moral philosophy. Picking up an oath by Smikrines, Onesimos tells him that it is not the gods who oversee right and wrong in human relations: they would be too busy keeping an eye on the world’s population. No, it is each person’s character, \textit{tropos}, implanted in his chest by the gods, which serves as the moral instance approving or disapproving of human actions. And now, says Onesimos to Smikrines, your \textit{tropos} strongly disapproves of what you’re doing (1084-1101). The humour of a slave adopting the high tone of moral rationalism is combined in this scene with references to the supreme artistic genre of tragedy (as we have seen).\textsuperscript{55} Onesimos throws in a quotation from Euripidean tragedy to belittle Smikrines further. As we know from Plato, philosophers were fond of quoting high poetry when arguing a point. Regardless of whether the quotation was entirely appropriate, the mere ability to cite Pindar, Homer, or tragedy, established one’s intellectual credentials. I expect Onesimos put on a suitably condescending tone and manner when instructing Smikrines about his \textit{tropos}.

The central figure of the play, Charisios himself, is characterized as someone who has received the best sort of education in the philosophical schools, as Gaiser (1967) has well recognized. In his great ‘confession speech’ he says that he had considered himself a paragon of virtue, able to distinguish wrong from right, blameless (908-10). But his \textit{daimonion}, perhaps ‘guiding spirit’ in life, has taught him a

\textsuperscript{53} Cf. Quintilian \textit{Inst.} X 1.69 = Test. 101 Kassel-Austin.

\textsuperscript{54} An example used by Sandbach (1970, 125): in line 324 Syriskos says the foundling child, when mature, will \textit{θηράν λέοντας, ὀπλα βαστάζειν, τρέχειν ἐν ἁγώσπι}. Sandbach comments \textit{βαστάζειν} is a verb as absent from Attic prose as lions from fourth-century Greece. Syros (sic) is striking out a rhetorical phrase, which must appear slightly comic in the mouth of a slave, and the unusual scansion \textit{δικα} adds to the comic flavour’.

\textsuperscript{55} In this connection Sandbach (1970, 134-35) points to the pseudo-scientific language used by Onesimos: abstract nouns in -\textit{μος}, compound adjectives in -\textit{τικός}. It seems Menander wanted to characterize Onesimos as the upstart slave with more than a smattering of learning.
lesson and made him look an abject fool. I think we feel genuine sympathy with Charisios’ despair in this scene, but we should not ignore Menander’s characterization. He has brought Charisios to this low point in order to ridicule him: Charisios is no Oedipus likely to strike fear and pity in the hearts of the audience. He is the stuck-up young man (υψηλός τις 693) who has been taught a well-deserved lesson. The reference to his daimonion will have pointed up the unflattering comparison to the famous philosopher with the speaking daimonion: Socrates.

Many reading the play have been taken with Habrotonon, the musician callgirl whose clever ruse and compassion for the baby makes things turn out all right. Her voice must have been striking, even in male imitation. Her repeated exclamations of τάλαν, ‘dear me!’ , her endearing ως κομψόν (466), ‘what a sweetie!’, on seeing the baby which has been brought in, no doubt imitated a type of woman familiar on Athenian streets (see p. 172). When she rehearses before Onesimos the things which she will say to Charisios’ face, we are given a sample of her ability to flatter and seduce a man: ‘shameless, you were (that night), and how masterful!’ (527-28). She characterizes her own style of talking here: ‘I’ll say all those flattering commonplaces’ (άκκιοϋμαι 526). Habrotonon may have been the ‘whore with the heart of gold’ in this play, but I believe Menander gave her the voice as well as mask and dress of the hetaira. This may have included a touch of the vulgar and a huffiness about her profession, as when she says to Onesimos: ‘I didn’t know what men were like then’, to which he scoffs: ‘not half!’ (478-79).

Menander has lavished care on the curmudgeon Smikrines’ voice, too. His tone is niggardly, impatient and he frequently uses hyperbole to express his exasperation with his son-in-law’s behaviour. He harps on Charisios’ spending habits in a way which may have struck a chord in the ear of many penny-pinching Athenians. His first remarks about Charisios’ reckless expenditure on wine and women set the tone (127-37), as do his repeated references to the dowry he gave Pamphile on her marriage, and which he fears Charisios is wasting (134, 153, 688, 1065, 1079). He uses variants of the expletive οιμώζω, literally ‘groan’, colloquially ‘be damned’ or ‘be sorry’, frequently (see p. 130). But he is not nearly as repugnant as his namesake in Aspis, whose greed and heartlessness make him comically monstrous. In fact

---

55 Cf. the comment of Sandbach (1970, 126) on a listener’s probable reaction to Syriskos’ speech in the arbitration: ‘he can therefore simultaneously be amused and moved by the language. It is a mistake to suppose that an audience’s reaction must always be either one thing or another... even so they (sc. the audience) can at the same moment find a character ridiculous and sympathetic, so that they can both laugh at him and still to some extent share his emotions.’

56 Sandbach (1970, 131) also points to her repeated use of the exclamation ο θεοί. ‘I think it must be intended as a characteristic of her talk, but we do not know whether at the end of the fourth century this use would suggest any particular sort of character or milieu’.

57 The decent, upright and courageous speech of Pamphile in her anguished discussion with her father is also recognizable, but the text is fragmentary and points of style therefore difficult to make out.

58 Sandbach (1970, 122) observes similarly that Knemon in Dysk. uses the insult κακός, uniquely, three times in the play; but Sandbach is right that Menander was sparing with such touches: ‘he did not sow with the sack for his effects’.
one grows rather fond of Smikrines’ rhetorical excesses, and feels some sympathy perhaps for the older man’s irritation with Charisios, particularly when one knows that Pamphile’s great sin is a chimera. One imagines the actor playing Smikrines gesticulating frequently with his arms, speaking in a loud, hectoring voice, always in a hurry, his blood-pressure and pulse rate dangerously high. His rough treatment of the elderly serving woman Sophrone in the fifth act is a good example. She probably says nothing while he rants and threatens to ‘crack her skull’ (1062), to ‘dunk her in that pond until she’s dead’ (1073) if she goes on objecting to his precipitate actions (1064 προπετώς).

Theophrastus does not include speech patterns in his character-sketches of odd Athenians; he concentrates on the typical manners and behaviour patterns which reveal character. In Menander’s plays we not only see people acting true to character but also hear the nuances of Attic Greek which suit these characters. This is presumably what Plutarch meant when he said that Menander’s diction manages to preserve its unity while accommodating a variety of individual speech patterns revealing character.

The other point in Plutarch’s appreciation of Menander’s diction is well borne out by the play, too: his ability to raise the emotional temperature of his language when the moment requires it, and to return easily to normal. Sandbach (1970, 124ff.) takes the words which I have paraphrased as ‘raised emotional temperature’ (τερατεία and ψόφος) to denote ‘elevated or poetic language’, which Sandbach locates chiefly in those passages which remind one of tragedy or cite tragedy directly (I have discussed these in the previous section). That is to equate the τέρατα, ‘wonders’, in the noun τερατεία with the myths of tragedy. But I do not think this is right, or is, at least, too limited in scope. τέρατα are, literally, signs and monsters; the basic meaning of τερατεία must be ‘talk of such signs and monsters’, that is, a discourse which stands out from the norm as remarkable or – to use our metaphor – prodigious. Plutarch is, I think, referring to points in Menander’s plays where increased emotional tension is reflected in language heightened by remarkable diction and syntax. ψόφος may imply raised voices in a literal sense, or, metaphorically, a raised emotional volume in the actors’ delivery.

When Habrotonon bursts on stage in act three she begins dramatically by calling backwards into the house she has just left: ‘Let me be, I beg you, don’t give me trouble!’ (430-31) Then, in two short monologues, she gives vent to the hurt and indignation she feels having been hired by Charisios, then scorned. Using the rare verb χλευάζω, ‘jeer, scoff’, she says she has made a mockery of herself by entering Charisios’ service, expecting love, only to be rebuffed by him completely. She says, hyperbolically: ‘He hates me with a supernatural hatred’ (433 θειον μίσος), and uses two striking figures to describe her unexpected chastity: (1) ‘As far as that’s concerned (sc. the services Charisios has paid good money for) I could

---

60 See above n. 49.  
61 See above n. 50.
carry Athena’s basket’, meaning that she is as chaste as one of the girl kanēphoroi, basket-carriers, who featured in the Panathenaic procession. (2) ‘I’ve been “pure in body”’ (440 ἀγνή γάμων), as the saying goes, three days already.’ Menander concludes this agitated entrance by returning to the dialogue between Onesimos and Syriskos, which Habrotonon overhears. She falls silent for quite natural reasons, as their exchange catches her interest. As Plutarch says, Menander has raised the intensity of his language to match the emotional state of a character, then easily and quickly modulated it back to normal.

Later in the same act we have another interesting instance. Habrotonon has, with Onesimos, worked out a plan to induce Charisios to admit that he is the father of the child which has been found with his ring to identify it. Onesimos comments at the end of their scene together: ‘what you omit to mention is that you’ll be freed’ (538-39). He believes that Habrotonon’s ruse will gain her her freedom, as Charisios will think that she has borne his child. Habrotonon exits with a short prayer to Peitho, Persuasion, lending a brief note of solemnity before she proceeds to put her plan into action. Onesimos is left alone on stage and he is clearly devastated by the thought that Habrotonon has outwitted him: he had had the ring; now she has it and has devised a plan with it which will make her a free woman. He laments to himself in another emotional speech, beginning: ‘But I’ll remain a slave all my days, a little snot-nose, cripple, too thick to think of things like that!’ (560-62) The asyndetic string of insults sounds like lashes of the tongue.62 He tries to comfort himself with the thought that, if Habrotonon succeeds in her plan, she might return the favour to him, only to draw up short with the realization: ‘What a fool I am, a wretch (κακοδαίμων), to think I’ll get a favour from a woman! I just hope nothing bad happens to me!’ (563-66) Following this outburst, Onesimos quickly turns to a different subject: that of Pamphile’s position, once Habrotonon has tricked Charisios into thinking she has mothered a child of his. Again, Menander has raised, then lowered, the emotional volume of his language in a plausible and natural manner.

The most impressive example of speech reflecting distress through its charged words and syntax is Charisios’ great ‘confession speech’ (908-932), which, together with the debate between his wife Pamphile and her father in the same fourth act, comprises the heart and climax of the play. For an analysis of the constituent elements of this emotive speech the reader is referred to the commentary. Here one might mention that the emotional temperature is lowered again by Menander through the intervention of Onesimos, who has been listening to Charisios’ outburst in the background. Charisios catches sight of him suddenly – to his chagrin – and the play can return to the normal register of dialogue.

1.4.5 Metre

The metre of the entire (extant) play is the comic iambic trimeter. There are no tetrameters as in Dysk. or Sam., no extraneous metres such as the hexameters in Theophoroumene, no indications of musical accompaniment to lines more sung than spoken (as in Dysk. after line 879). Since the trimeters of Menander have been excellently treated in other works, I give here only a brief introduction to the subject for those unfamiliar with the comic trimeter.

Two iambics (--) combine to form an iambic measure (metron), which is repeated three times in a trimeter:

\[\text{\textbf{--\textbf{--}} \textbf{--\textbf{--}} \textbf{--\textbf{--}}}\]

As will be seen, the first position of each metron is anceps (short or long) and the final position is long, even when a prosodic short syllable occupies the position ('brevis in longo').

The comic trimeter differs from the tragic in being freer with 'resolved positions', that is, when a double-short takes the place of a long, anceps or short. All positions in the comic trimeter can be resolved in this fashion except the last two. A fuller symbolic representation is, then:

\[\text{\textbf{--\textbf{--}} \textbf{--\textbf{--}} \textbf{--\textbf{--}}}\]

Comic trimeters are, however, rarely a riot of double-short positions. Resolution of two consecutive positions is as good as non-existent. And the so-called 'proceleusmaticus', meaning four short syllables comprising one iambic foot (\textbf{---} for --) does not seem to occur in Menander, although it does occasionally in Aristophanes. In practice we very commonly find one or two double-shorts in a line of Menander, more rarely three and exceptionally four.

This comparative freedom of resolution means that rhythmic patterns quite alien – one would think – from the iambic alternation of short-long are admissible. Spondees (--) are possible when a long anceps stands before an unresolved long. Anapaests (\textbf{--\textbf{--}}) are possible when an anceps or a short is replaced by a double-short. One anapaest can follow another, producing what is, strictly speaking, an anapaestic monometer. Even a dactyl (\textbf{--\textbf{--}}) is possible when a resolved long follows a long anceps. Resolution after a short leads to the so-called tribrach (three successive short syllables). In this apparent anarchy of rhythm the only secure anchor is the last two positions, which are, unfailingly, iambic.

One would like, indeed, to know how these lines were spoken by the actors. Much as one tries to assimilate the truth that Greek metre was quantitive rather than

---

64 See esp. Handley (1965, 56-73), G.-S. 36-39; more specialized studies: White (1909); Rubenbauer (1912).
65 See Handley (1965, 57); Newiger (1961).
66 For a count in Epitrepontes see Martina (1997, III (Prolegomeni) 312-321). Verse 1064 is a rare instance of four resolutions in one line.
accentual, one feels that a rhythm with rises and falls (what used to be called *arsis* and *thesis*, German ‘Hebung’ und ‘Senkung’) must have asserted itself, however subtly. Certainly the modern reader of Menander will find it easier if he maintains a kind of mental iambic rhythm as hand-hold through the plethora of double-shorts and other ‘anomalies’.

Let us take some examples. Some lines consist of regular iambics. Line 127, for example, spoken by Smikrines, runs:

\[
\text{άνθρωπος οίνον, αυτό τούτ' ἐκπλήττομαι}
\]

In line 130 we find a resolved short in the second iamb:

\[
\text{εὶ καὶ βιάζεται κοτύλην τις τούβολ[ου.}
\]

The pattern becomes more complicated in e.g. 133, with three resolutions. This leads to an anapaest in the first foot, a tribrach in the second and fourth feet:

\[
\text{τὸν ἔρωτα. τί δὲ μοι τούτο; πάλιν οἴμω[ζέτω.}
\]

There is a positive flurry of resolved positions in line 1064, perhaps underlining the impetuous tone of the speaker (Smikrines):

\[
\text{προπετῶς ἀπάγω τὴν θυγατέρ', ἱερόσυλε γραῦ;}
\]

The comic trimeter does not fall so conspicuously into two halves, divided by a strong caesura after the fifth or the seventh position, as in the tragic trimeter. Frequently there is, technically, caesura in fifth or seventh position, but sometimes not.67

This information is probably sufficient for the reader to ‘scan’ the lines of *Epitrepontes*. The editor is faced with more technical problems, in particular the prosodic treatment of double-short positions resulting from resolution. Menander has a marked tendency not to allow a so-called ‘split anapaest’, that is, word-break between the two short syllables of an anapaest or between the double-short and the long syllable. One can call this phenomenon a ‘bridge’: word end is not tolerated after one or both of the shorts in an anapaest. It would appear that the poet and his audience expected an anapaest to be, as it were, a sound-bite, a unit of sound and sense, and a word-break between the elements apparently destroyed this unity. In fact the rule is not absolute. Various small words combine with others to form a sense unit; here word-break is allowed within the anapaest. Nor is the rule absolute; it has been calculated that Menander’s verse admits a split anapaest on average every 700 lines.68

---

67 See Handley (1965, 57).
68 For detailed exposition see Handley (1965, 63-66); Arnott (1957). Similar considerations apply to ‘divided resolutions’, that is, when a resolved long is divided between words.
The most interesting question is whether there was an aesthetic ‘value’ to such variations of metre. Did a double-short in a certain position add anything to the comic effect of a line, or to the ethos of a speaker or his/her mood at the moment? Certainly we can recognize the para-tragic tone of certain lines by their adherence to tragic norms in the trimeter (see above section 1.2). If that is the case, the converse might also be true: the further the rhythm departed from the tragic norm, the more comic or potentially comic a line might be. Or it might be that the greater flexibility of the comic trimeter was intended to resemble the language as really spoken by average people, in contrast to the high-faluting tragic style. Handley’s conclusion regarding the aesthetic effect of metrical variation is largely negative: we notice the tone of a certain passage by context rather than by its metre, even if, on occasion, the metre seems to match this perceived tone (1965, 59).

It was suggested above that a line such as 1064 with its many resolutions might serve to underline the agitation of the speaker’s mood. Certainly the syntax in this speech of Smikrines with its abrupt switches and broken structure seems to point to an agitated state of mind (see e.g. 1070-73 with commentary). Metrical effects are never prolonged or sustained, however, in a speech by Menander. A line which impresses by its metrical licence is often followed by a regular iambic trimeter or an unremarkable sequence of trimeters. Similarly, there do not seem to be inherent distinctions between slaves and the free in the number of resolutions they speak with on average. Individuals are not characterized by a propensity to resolutions; nor are individual scenes distinguished by a greater frequency of certain metrical features. Where we can discern distinctions (in other plays) is in metre itself: the longer tetrameter tends to be used for hectic or climactic scenes. The longer, perhaps faster, lines cannot fail to be noticed by the listener. But in a play without metrical variety such as *Epitrepontes* it seems the intention is rather to assimilate the verse of stage with spoken Attic idiom. Double shorts are a sure way of breaking the monotony of regular iambs and of marking the genre’s distance from tragedy. Conversely, those who try to supplement gaps in Menander soon realize that his apparently free rhythm is in fact anything but free. It gives the impression of freedom until one tries to imitate it. In short, Menander’s rhythms maintain a delicate balance between formality and freedom.

### 1.5 Legal background

At times when reading *Epitrepontes* we would like to know what the legal background to the characters’ actions or words was in historical Athens. For some of the scenes in the play reflect legal or quasi-legal institutions of Athenian society. There is the arbitration scene itself, modelled on the institution of private arbitration between disputants. Then there is the question of the dissolution of Pamphile’s marriage to Charisios, which the father of Pamphile, Smikrines, wishes. In considering the relations of play to society, however, one rapidly runs up against the problem
that documentary evidence outside the play is sometimes lacking, or insufficient to permit a reliable historical reconstruction. Frequently one finds experts in this area relying on Menander’s plays to reconstruct the historical institutions, so the argument rapidly becomes circular. The paper by Taubenschlag (1959) focuses on the legal status of the infant, whether free or enslaved, and on the property rights of the disputants of the arbitrants; his contribution is perhaps overly influenced by conditions under Roman law. With these provisos in mind, it is still worth considering what we know of the relevant institutions.

1.5.1 The marriage and the dowry

Pamphile married Charisios presumably according to the normal procedure of *enguē* (roughly ‘betrothal’) followed by *ekdosis*, ‘handing over’ of the bride by her legal guardian (*kyrios*), in this case her father Smikrines, to her future husband. In difficult lines Smikrines seems at one point to insinuate that Charisios is acting as if his marriage was in some way unofficial and he had married a ‘foreigner’s daughter’ and not the daughter of a true-blooded Athenian (691-92). If the lines are correctly restored and interpreted they offer confirmation of the official and normal status of the marriage between Charisios and Pamphile. At one point Smikrines seems to refer to the marriage ceremony, when he ‘sent’ (ἐ’πεμψα) his daughter to her future husband, accompanied by witnesses including (we guess) Chairestratos (line 661). The ‘handing over’ of the bride by her father to his son-in-law was accompanied, normally but not inevitably, by the provision of a dowry. This could be either money or property or a combination of the two. In the case of Charisios’ wedding, Smikrines provided a particularly large dowry of four talents of silver; Casson (1976) has argued that this places Smikrines in the category of the super-rich of Athens. As various authorities point out, one point of the dowry system was to give the bride some security in her marriage (Todd, 1993, 216). Not only did it provide her with financial backing, it also discouraged her husband from divorcing her on a whim, as in that case he was obliged to return the dowry to the girl’s *kyrios*.70

When Charisios discovered (as he thought) that Pamphile had already been unfaithful to him before they married, he no longer wanted her as his wife. The normal procedure in such a case was for the husband to dismiss his wife, dispatch her back to her father’s house (*apopempsis* or *ekpempsis*). Charisios conspicuously does not do this, but rather moves out of his house and takes up residence in his friend’s house next door; he becomes *apokoitos* (136), ‘not in his own bed’. Capps (1910, 31) has suggested that this move was to encourage Pamphile to leave him of her own free will (*apoleipsis*). This might have saved them both embarrassment, and –

69 Nor do the many misspellings and misprints inspire confidence in his arguments. He also regularly takes Wilamowitz’s conjectures as the basis for his observations. 70 Or pay interest on the capital at the rate of eighteen percent per year (Blundell, 1995, 114-16).
who knows? – perhaps freed Charisios from the obligation of returning the dowry. But Pamphile does not do this; she remains on her own in Charisios’ house, holding out against her father’s pressure to leave Charisios. Now Harrison (1998, 30-32) thought that Smikrines could remove his daughter from her broken marriage by force (aphairesis), but this very play by Menander is his chief witness. And indeed, Smikrines says in lines 658-60 that he would be within his rights to remove Pamphile from Charisios’ house. Pamphile protests, however, that he should not use force, but rather persuasion, if he wishes her to leave Charisios; only a tyrant, she says, uses force; a father uses persuasion (713-14). Most authorities leave the issue open whether a father was within his legal rights to exercise aphairesis at will. It has to be said that the evidence from the play itself seems to indicate that Smikrines could, under the circumstances, dissolve the marriage of his daughter. One thing is made abundantly clear by Smikrines: he wants his dowry back now that Charisios has chosen to move out. A procedure known as dikē proikos existed to sue a husband who refused to return the dowry after divorce; Smikrines does not overtly threaten legal action against Charisios to retrieve the dowry. If a restoration of the text in line 687 is correct, however, he does indicate that there is a ‘necessity’ for Charisios to return the dowry (ὁπερ [γε δ]εί) now that the marriage is in the opinion of Smikrines de facto annulled. If a woman divorced, she could marry again: a possibility which Pamphile seems to consider theoretically – only to reject it – in lines 824-26.

A complication is introduced into the couple’s circumstances by ‘Habrotonon’s baby’, i.e., the baby she pretends to have had by Charisios. Onesimos jumps to the conclusion that if Habrotonon confronts Charisios with her baby and the ring which he lost while engendering the baby, Habrotonon will gain her freedom (538-40). Why so? Presumably, as Harrison (1998, 70 n. 2) says, because Charisios, if forced by the ring to acknowledge fatherhood of the child, would wish to legitimize a child born out of wedlock; to do this he would have to buy Habrotonon’s freedom and then admit the child into his household. Of course, he could hardly marry Habrotonon and have the child registered as an Athenian citizen, as Habrotonon presumably did not qualify as the daughter of Athenian citizens. At best she could be his pallakē and her child his nothos.73 So Charisios’ acknowledgement of the child as his by Habrotonon would lead to an awkward ménage-à-trois with Charisios still

71 Likewise Taubenschlag (1959, 630-32) who states categorically that Attic fathers had this right.
72 Lewis (1982), Todd (1993, 214), Maffi (2005, 255), Scafuro (1997, 306-9). It seems that aphairesis, if a legal right of the father at all, was not possible after the wife had borne a child to the husband (Cantarella, 2005, 247). Perhaps that lent a touch of irony to Menander’s plot: Smikrines thought Pamphile had not had a baby by Charisios, and pressed for aphairesis, but in fact she had had a child by him, as yet unbeknown to anyone in the play. Scafuro (1997, 307-8) points out that aphairesis is a coinage of modern scholars, without ancient authority.
73 For the status of nothoi see Harrison (1998, 61-68) and Patterson (2005, 280-83) with further literature. Harrison (1998, 68-70) argues, if a married couple already had gnēsioi offspring, the husband would not be allowed to legitimize bastard children except by false declaration; however, he suggests tentatively that such legitimation might be possible if no gnēsioi already existed, as was the case – purportedly – at that stage of the play in Epitrepontes.
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married to Pamphile but cohabiting with Habrotonon plus child. It is precisely this
distasteful prospect which Smikrines holds up before Pamphile to dissuade her from
sticking loyally by Charisios’ side even after the discovery of ‘Habrotonon’s baby’.
In describing this undesirable domestic setup Smikrines draws a stark contrast be­tween Pamphile, the lawful wife, and her more successful rival, a pornē, or prosti­tute (793-4). This may be just Smikrines’ rude word for pallakē, or ‘concubine’,
but it certainly rules out Harrison’s idea (1998, 70 n. 2) that Charisios might free
Habrotonon, marry her and legitimize the child by a false declaration as to her, and
the child’s, status with regard to citizenship.74

1.5.2 The arbitration

Syriskos and Daos decide, spontaneously, that their dispute over the tokens left with
the exposed baby can only be settled by arbitration. Smikrines happens to be passing
and the two slaves ask this wealthy gentleman to arbitrate in their dispute. He looks
disdainfully at their rustic garb and would rather not oblige, one feels, but Syriskos
persuades him with an appeal to the obligation of every man to ensure justice is done
in all walks of life. Smikrines asks them whether they will abide by his judgement;
the two agree. Then they speak in turn, first Daos who had found the baby and wants
to retain the tokens; then Syriskos, who has agreed to look after the baby, but claims
the tokens as property of the child, and the only means to establish its identity in
later life. Smikrines listens to their pleas, and then rules in favour of Syriskos at the
end.

This scene, which Menander has embellished beyond the immediate require­ments of the plot, relates to the Athenian institution of private arbitration as a means
of resolving private disputes.75 Arbitration was also an official process, adminis­tered by officials known as diaitētau (Todd, 1993, 128-9); Demosthenes 21, Against
Meidias (83-93), contains an interesting case of public arbitration between the ora­tor and his enemy Meidias mediated by the unfortunate Straton; Meidias managed
to claim that Straton’s judgement was procedurely faulty and he had him stripped
of his citizen rights. But private arbitration was a possible course for individuals
quarrelling over a relatively minor matter; they would agree on one or more arbitra­tors (diaitētau) chosen from their circle of acquaintances who would listen to their
dispute and give his/their private judgement of it.76 By the end of the fifth century

74 Note Cantarella (2005, 246), who writes: ‘What made the difference between the cohabitation of a
man and a concubine (usually indicated by the verb suneinai: “to be together”) and the cohabitation
of two married persons (indicated as sunoikein, “to share the participation in the household”) was the
sequence eggye-ekdosis. A woman was a wife (gynē, damar) and not a concubine {pallake
only if
the beginning of her cohabitation with a man (celebrated by an ektos) had been preceded, no matter
when, by an eggye.

75 For the general structure see Scafuro (1997) and Taubenschlag (1959, 637-39).
76 For a discussion of the procedure and its distinction from ‘reconciliation’ see Scafuro (1997, 117-
141).
private arbitration had some legal status and could be referred to in subsequent litigation. Demosthenes 33, *Against Apatourios* (14-19) relates an interesting case of private arbitration in which the disputants referred their quarrel to three chosen arbitrators. But the proceedings went awry when one disputant saw that two of the three arbitrators were likely to give judgement against him, and began obstructive tactics. As MacDowell (1978, 205-6) says, private arbitration as a procedure suffered from the difficulty of finding an impartial arbitrator to whose judgement both parties agreed to submit. We see Smikrines in *Epitrepontes* laying this down as a condition of his taking the time to hear out the two disputants: they must agree to abide by his judgement (237-38).

Scafuro (1997, 160) points out that the scene in *Epitrepontes* differs clearly in one respect from real-life arbitrations: Syriskos and Daos choose Smikrines because he happens to be there; they do not know him beforehand. In reality disputants chose someone (or several individuals) they both knew and (at least initially!) trusted. But I wonder whether there is not another major discrepancy between the play and real-life arbitration: slaves could, presumably, hardly refer their quarrels to adjudication by a disinterested citizen who was not their master. Slaves were the property of their masters; therefore anything they owned, or claimed ownership of, belonged to their masters. They were not free to negotiate ownership of anything in their ‘possession’ with anyone. Smikrines does, indeed, point out the absurdity of men dressed as they are (in clothes marking their humble status) engaging in litigation (228-29). When Syriskos replies ‘but nevertheless...’, that is presumably Menander’s way of asking acceptance for the discrepancy. It seems to me part of the general discrepancy in New Comedy between slaves’ ability to act and speak like ‘normal people’ and their real life inferiority.

---

77 See MacDowell (1978, 204); Todd (1993, 124); Scafuro (1997, 125), however, disputes the earlier view that private arbitration necessarily had any legally binding quality in the fourth century. Her position is: *non liquet.*

78 Scafuro (1997, 134) says: ‘A private arbitrator, then, should have a friend’s knowledge of the two disputants and be well-disposed to each... Indeed, what might be called an “ideology of friendship” not only guides the relationship between arbitrator and disputant, it also pervades many of the decisions and terms of compromise reported in the orators’. Disputants might, for example, each choose one friend as arbitrator and agree on a third individual to prevent a ‘hung’ decision. For figures on the constitution of arbitration panels see Scafuro (1997, 131 n. 40).

79 Scafuro (1997, 154 n. 2) only touches on this question. She thinks that, since private arbitration was not legally binding (in her view), ‘there is no reason why slaves might not find a third party to mediate a dispute’. I think this is to ignore the genre of comedy, where slaves are allowed to behave like human beings, to humorous effect.

80 Nünlist (2003b) believes that the background to the arbitration scene was the threat by Syriskos to Daos to refer the dispute to his master Chairestratos with words such as: ‘we’ll see what my master thinks of your refusal to hand over the tokens!’ Although nothing in the text supports this conjecture it is at least consistent with the reality of Syriskos’ position.

81 Taubenschlag (1959, 625-26 and n. 12) thinks slaves had quasi-property rights (‘in gewisser Richtung vermögensfähig’) but his sources are all either from comedy or in one instance from Theophr. *Char.* 30.9; the point is, surely, that slaves could ‘sort-of’ own things if they found them; that is, they
If Smikrines is a stranger to Syriskos and Daos, he is – as it happens – hardly a disinterested passer-by. As becomes clear in the course of the play, and as was clear already, presumably, to the audience, who had listened to the play’s prologue, he was the unwitting grandfather of Pamphile’s exposed baby and hence in act two arbitrator of his grandson’s destiny. This position coincides with the role played by King Kerkyon in the arbitration scene in Euripides’ Alope, as will be discussed in greater detail in the commentary (p. 143). So Menander was building his arbitration scene around (at least) two models: (1) literary antecedents such as Euripides’ Alope, which were themselves, no doubt, influenced by real-life practices, and (2) the institution of private arbitration as known to Menander and his audience.

Private arbitration in fourth-century Athens, one feels, is unlikely to have been an occasion for displays of rhetoric. Heated argument, doubtless, but hardly polished oratory. In fact that may well have been an attraction of private arbitration compared with litigation in the courts: no need to pay for the services of a logographos in preparing one’s set speech for court. I expect neighbours disputing a boundary, say, before another local acting as arbitrator, discussed their positions informally with dialogue and question and answer, and not as a formal agōn. But in Epitrepontes both slaves deploy their rhetorical skills as best they can, Syriskos pretty impressively. So here, too, Menander may have departed from real life to increase the entertainment value of his arbitration scene. It is conducted in the spirit of a lawsuit: each speaker has a certain time to plead his case in rhetorical monologue; then judgement is given. The models are forensic actions on the one hand and literary (mainly Euripidean) agōnes on the other.

1.6 Sources

Before the discovery of the Cairo codex in 1905 (first publication 1907) Epitrepontes was known only from a handful of citations in later authors; it was only after the discovery of the Cairo codex that the passages of text on the Petersburg parchment could be assigned to Epitrepontes. Since 1907, however, a number of papyri have contributed, in some cases significantly, in others minimally, to knowledge of the text. In particular, the fragments of the Michigan papyrus (M) have considerably extended our knowledge of the end of act three and the beginning of act four, as well as slightly adding to the end of our known text. The Michigan fragments still await final publication but the preliminary texts provided by Koenen (2002), Austin (2001) and Arnott (2004) provide a good basis to work on. Below I give a list of the...
available sources, together with details of their first publication.


The text of Epitreponotes (and the other plays which C partially contains) was the subject of intensive study in the early decades of the twentieth century. The first editor, Gustave Lefebvre, published a preliminary text in 1907, assisted by Maurice Croiset who in 1908 published an edition of the fragments of Epitreponotes.
1.6 Sources

1918), Wilamowitz (1925, reprint 1974), the detailed notes on the papyrus published by Guéraud (1927), and finally Jensen (1929). The spate of activity abated after the twenties of last century, no doubt with reason, as it appeared unlikely that further visits to Cairo would add significantly to knowledge of the Menander codex. The photographic edition of C, however, should be mentioned, as it provided scholars in the later decades of the century with a tool with which to check the results of the pioneers (Koenen, 1978). I have used original prints from Koenen's negatives to go over this terrain, too.\(^83\) Since the quality of these black and white photographs is quite good, and since the original photos published by Lefebvre can be compared (they are not as good), the modern scholar, working with scanned and enlarged images on his computer screen, is quite well placed to go back a hundred years and compare the readings of Koerte, Sudhaus, Jensen and others with what he can see. For this reason I have felt free to query earlier readings of C where the photographs do not seem to justify confidence in them. This has led to a more liberal use of dotted letters and other indications of uncertainty, particularly at line beginnings and ends where the papyrus tends to become rubbed or tattered, than in most modern editions. In a way I agree with Sandbach that the reader would prefer not to be distracted by too many brackets and dots, particularly where a supplement is very likely. But the work of Guéraud (1927) in particular confirms my opinion that it is (still) wrong to claim that any particular reading is more certain than it really is. Only in one or two places do I tentatively claim an improved reading of what can be seen in C; usually the modifications involve indications of the need for greater caution about what has been read.

Guéraud found fault with Sudhaus for building too much on tiny particles of ink or dark spots on the papyrus. And there is the bizarre case of J.M. Edmonds’ last volume of *Fragments of Attic Comedy* (1961) in which the executors of his estate published, as an appendix, the readings of C which Edmonds falsely claimed had revealed themselves to him by infra-red photography.\(^84\) It is close to a miracle that so much of Menander’s lost plays has returned to the world after nearly two millennia. The fragmentary nature of what has returned presents a new challenge – and a new temptation – to fill the gaps in what we have. These gaps – small or large – have an almost siren-song effect on the scholar. One has to tie oneself to the mast of reason, and perhaps Menandrean humour, not to succumb too readily to their allure. As Arnott has said about editing Menander, there is an *ars nesciendi*, too. Let us hope that more text is discovered in the future.\(^85\)

Some of the principles I have used in printing the main text are as follows. I have used medial and end-sigma in the main text, lunate sigma in reporting read-

---

\(^83\) Kindly made available to me by Colin Austin.

\(^84\) I once spent two days worrying about the possibility that there might be *something* true about these readings of the ‘paraphrast’. For a critique of Edmonds cf. Marzullo (1961), who took another infrared picture of a page of the *Cairensis* and found no confirmation of Edmonds’ alleged readings.

\(^85\) Cobet (1876, 293) said that an ‘obscura quaedam fama’ had come to his ears that ‘some books’ containing plays by Menander lay hidden somewhere on Mt. Athos!
ings of papyri, as that is the only way to leave open the question whether a ‘stray’ sigma marked word end or not. In addition to square brackets [ ] to indicate supplements, I have used grey rather than black print to indicate conjectural readings. This is to make doubly sure the reader does not mistake conjecture for (reasonably secure) transmission. I only print paragraphoi in the main text where the sources are fragmentary and changes of speaker more than doubtful. In the apparatus I report variant readings where different papyri disagree, identify the modern author of supplements or corrections adopted in the text and give a selection of other possible supplements. Where the constitution of the text is particularly difficult – notably where the Michigan papyrus combines with sundry other fragments – I give detailed papyrological readings of the available sources in a separate section. The purpose of this is to simplify the apparatus at these critical sections of text, and to provide evidence for the constitution of the text presented. I hope the miniature masks printed in the margin with arrows below them will vividly mark exits and entries for the benefit of the reader. The editions principally cited in the apparatus and commentary are the following (unless otherwise stated):

Arnott = Arnott (2004)
Austin = see individual articles referred to in the apparatus or commentary
Bodin = Bodin (1908)
Bodin-Mazon = Bodin & Mazon (1908)
Capps = Capps (1910), Capps (1908), Capps (1909)
Cobet = Cobet (1876)
Coppola = Coppola (1st edition 1927, 2nd 1938)
Croenert = Croenert (1907, 1908), Croenert (1911)
Croiset = Croiset (1908)
Del Corno = Corno (1966)
Falco = de Falco (1946)
GH = Bernard P. Grenfell and Arthur S. Hunt in the relevant volume of The Oxyrhynchus Papyri
Gronewald = Gronewald (1986b)
G.-S. = Gomme & Sandbach (1973)
Guéraud = Guéraud (1927)
Headlam = Headlam (1908)
Hense = Hense (1908)
Herwerden = van Herwerden (1908)
Hunt = Hunt (1914)
Hutloff = Hutloff (1913)
Jensen = Jensen (1927)
Jernstedt = Jernstedt (1891)
K.-G. = Koenen & Gagos (Aug. 20, 2002)
Koerte = Koerte (1910)
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K.-Th. = Koerte & Thierfelder (1953-1955)
Lefebvre = Lefebvre (1907) or Lefebvre (1911)
Legrand = Legrand (1907, 1908)
Leo = Leo (1907), Leo (1908)
Martina = Martina (1997)
Nünlist = see individual articles referred to in the commentary
Parsons = see the volumes of *Papyri Oxyrhynchi* referred to in the commentary
Robert = Robert (1912.23), Robert (1908)
Sandbach = Sandbach (1990)
Sudhaus = Sudhaus (1914)
Turner = see the volumes of *Papyri Oxyrhynchi* referred to in the commentary
van Leeuwen = van Leeuwen J.F. (1908), van Leeuwen J.F. (1918)
Vollgraff = Vollgraff (1911)
von Arnim = von Arnim (1907)
Furley = this edition
Wilamowitz = von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff (1925, reprint 1974)
Chapter 2

Text

The cast

In order of appearance:

- Karion, the cook, *mageiros*
- Onesimos, household slave of Charisios
- Chairestratos, friend of Charisios
- Habrotonon, harp-girl, *psaltria* and *hetaira*
- Smikrines, father-in-law of Charisios
- Daos, slave, a herdsman
- Syriskos, slave of Chairestratos, a charcoal-burner
- Pamphile, wife of Charisios, daughter of Smikrines
- Charisios, young man
- Sophrone, old woman, nurse of Pamphile

The scene is a rural deme of Attica, probably not far from Athens, with two house doors opening onto a street: one belongs to Charisios, the other to his friend Chairestratos.
Hypothesis

O28 = P.Oxy. 4020

'Επι]
'Επιτρε[ποντες
Οὕχ ὁ τ[ρόφι-
μός σφ[i, πρόσ
θεών, [ 5

tὸ δράμα τῶν ἄφιστων.  
περιγέγραψεν γὰρ δηλώσει  
ἡθὼν ἀπάγων [ἐχόν δω[λούς  
dύο, τὸν μὲν σωφ[ρόνως τὸν  
δὲ αἰσχυνομένως δικάζοντα.  
γ]αμετὴν κοσμίως ἐχώσαν  
ἐταίραν ἄφελος, γ]έροντα  
φιλάργυρον λογισμ[ῶν ἔχοντα:  
θ]εράποντα δικας[ολογούντα  
[—unknown number of lines missing—] 15

Act One

The play opens with two slaves conversing. The cook, Karion, addresses Onesimos, Charisios’ servant:

fr. 1 K.-Th.

(KARIΩN)

οὐχ ὁ τρόφιμός σου πρὸς θεῶν, Ὄνησιμε,
ὁ νῦν ἔχων (τὴν) Ἀβρότονον τὴν ψάλτριαν
ἐγήμεν ἐναγχός;

(ΟΝΗΣΙΜΟΣ)

πάνυ μὲν οὖν [ 

fr. 2a and b K.-Th.

(Kα.)

φιλῶ σ’, Ὅνησιμε·
καὶ σὺ περίεργος εἰ...
...οὐδέν (ἐστι) γὰρ
γλυκύτερον ἢ πάντη εἰδέναι

P.Oxy. 4936

In the following fragment, which Handley places between fr. 1 and the beginning of the Petersburg parchment, we have scraps of conversation between Karion the cook, Chairestratos and Onesimos. Column i contains line ends, column ii line beginnings, including notae personae and paragraphoi. Column length appears to have been thirty-five lines. For both columns I give a combination of Handley’s diplomatic text (where only single letters can be discerned) and his restored text (where whole words can be plausibly restored). All the suggested supplements given in the apparatus stem from Handley’s textual commentary. For ‘Handley’, then, one can read ‘Handley in comm.’.

Column i

(minimal traces of 4 lines)

[... σιον 5
 ] τα τα φ ..., 
traces [ 
] .. ἐεε 
traces [ 
] .. [..]φ ... 10
] ..., φ[ 
], συν[ ..., ] ..., [ 
] γενομεν[ - 
] ..., ςι
ις δλήν
καλτ[ _ ] κόρη _
σφόδρ' οϊσθ' δτι
. ιν οὐδέπω
κρεάδιον
Χαρισιο[-
]
φ . [ ] σι:
όν[ै]ματ[ο]ς
. εις φρε[ν]
σιον
στε ... [ 
σηρ[ ... ]ν
.-αμα σύ
δετου[
]. Ε[ ] μ[

5 Χαρ(ε)ισιον dubitanter Handley 15 e.g. [ημέραν, οικίαν, πόλιν] Handley χαι[ε]ις Furley 16 καλής κόρης vel -ή[ν] vel -η[ι] vel -η[ι] Handley oγ. s.l. vel correcturam vel notam personae intell. Handley 19 e.g. οίκονομείς vel -μ εις ίσα Handley: ο[με]είς/ή[με]ις possis χαρεισιο[ Π 26 ]χεις vel ]τεις leg. Handley et suppl. e.g. άφειστή φρένων: φρονών possis 27 e.g. έμοι δοκειν vel τεκείν Handley 28 Χαρίσιον fortasse Handley 30 e.g. διπερ [έμοι]ο vel τ[τ]ο περ[ι]ο Handley 32 e.g. τ[τ]άμα σύ Handley

Column ii

[με . . ]
λεγ . . . [ 
Καρ. . . . . . [ 
χα . . [ 
ν . . . . . [ 
. . πακο . . . [ 
Καρ. . . . . . [ 
. . . . [ 
ετήρκε' εγωι] Χαι. πέφυκα[ 
υ . . [ 
Ου. . . . . . . [ 
. . . . . . . . . . [ 
. . . . . . . . . . [ 
. . . . . . . . . . [ 
. . . . . . . . . . [ 
Between the end of this fragment and the beginning of the next scene must have come the lost prologue. Someone – probably a deified abstraction (Diallage, ‘Reconciliation’?) – told the audience what lay behind the rift in Charisios’ and Pamphile’s marriage: a baby conceived before their marriage, considered illegitimate and exposed before Charisios’ return from his business trip, but in fact his very own child by Pamphile.

Before the Petersburg fragment commences we may place, conjecturally, two further fragments. For their attribution to Epitrepones see commentary.

Fr. 10 K.-Th.

Stobaeus, Ecl. 4.29.58 Hense. Μενάνδρου Ἐπιτρέποντος
έλευθέρωι τὸ καταγελάσθαι (μὲν) πολὺ αἰσχιών ἦστι· τὸ δὲ ὀδυνᾶσθ’ ἀνθρώπινον.

1. (μὲν) Heringa: (γὰρ) Hense  2. αἰσχιών codd.: αἰσχιστὸν Heringa.

Fr. 613a K.-Th. = fr. 837 KA

Stobaeus, Ecl. 4.29.59 Hense. Τοῦ αὐτοῦ·

οὐχ ἐλευθέρου φέρειν

νενόμικα κωινωνοῦσαν ἡδονὴν ὑβρεὶ.

The Petersburg fragment begins in the middle of a speech by Smikrines as he paces angrily up and down outside Charisios’ door.

[ΣΜΙΚΡΙΝΗΣ]

ΣΜΙΚΡΙΝΗΣ

ΔΙΚΑΙΟΝ ΤΙ ΤΩΙ ΠΕΙΝΩΝΤΙ (ΠΡΟΣ) ΠΤΙΣΑΝΗΝ ΠΟΤΕ.

[?ΑΒΡΟΤΟΝΟΝ]

Χαρίστεσε σε προσμένει, Χαρίσεστράτη.
τίς οδ’ ἐστι δή, γλυκύταιβί';

(Χα.) τῷ τῆς [νύμφης πι]στήρ.
δρμῖ βλέπων ώς ἄθλιος τις φιλόσοφος
ἀκριβολογεῖθ.

(Σμ.) ὁ τρισακχαρίδες[μων φάλ]τριαν
[σαγ γυναῖκα [ ]οις]

[— gap of 1 line —]

[145] 150 Τ O25

....][]

προσε[]
ἀλ’ η[]
ἀποδοὺς δὲ[]

Αβρ. τήν προίχα γ . [ ]

ο γ’ ἔρω.

Σμ. [π]ερι τῶ[ν] . . [ ]

ἀγχου[ . ] . κεῖτον[]

Αβρ. .].[ ]

τῆς νυ[κ]τῶς.

χι[...] . . [ . . . . Α]βρότων.

(Χα[.] αρ.) ἀλλ’ οὐκ ἐκάλο[υν [ ]]

(Σμ.) οὔτως ἀγαθόν τί σοι γένοιτο, μή λέγε

(Αβρ.) οὔτως άγαθόν τί σοι γένοιτο, μή λέγε

(Χα[.] αρ.) οὐκ εἴσ[ε]ιμι δ’ οὐκ εἴσω σαμώς τε πυθόμενος

(Σμ.) εἰσ[ε]ιμι δ’ οὐκ εἴσω σαμώς τε πυθόμενος

άπαντα τῇ[α]τα τῆς θυγ[α]ρίας βουλεύσομαι

δντινα τρόπον πρὸς τοῦτον ἢ δὴ προσβάλω.

44

TEXT

ɒ25  (?Ἀβρ.)  ϕάσσω[ν] ἀυτωί τούτον ἡχοντ' ἐνθάδε;
(Χαί.)  ϕάσσω[ν] μεν. ὦν κύναδος· οἴχον ποεῖ
ἀνάστα[τον].

(?Ἀβρ.)  πολλάς ἐβουλόμην ἄμα.
(Χαί.)  πολλάς;

(?Ἀβρ.)  μίαν μὲν τὴν ἐφεξῆς.
(Χαί.)  τὴν ἐμὴν;

(?Ἀβρ.)  τὴν σῇν γ'. ιὼμεν δεύρο πρὸς Χαρίσιον.
(Χαί.)  ἱωμεν· ὡς καὶ μεσακυλίων ὁχλός
εἰς τὸν τόπον τις ἔρχθῃ· ὑποβεβρεγμέν[ων

[ΧΟΡΟ]|Τ

Act Two

(?Ov.)  ἐπὶ[ ±10 ] πάντα τανθ[165]
oἴμ[εν] ενος
καὶ τοτ[170]
ὁ δεσπό[της]
ὁ γέρω[ν]
oὐδὲ λό[γ]—

— gap of several lines —

O25 fr. 3

(?Ov.)  . . . ευ . . . ἦ[175]
. . ζει . . σα[]
. . ου . α . ἦ[
πα]ρατρύμου[5]
. ὕφας ἀνατ[]
τὸ γὰρ ττ[ε]ρας[
ἄ]πλλάγηθι .[
ἄ]γαθὰ γένοιτο[ο]
χάθει[ν] ἀναστ[]
χλίνην ἐμοὶ[
ἀ]πόλεσεν .[

— gap of several lines —

Jernstedt  173 oἴμ[εν] εἰναι Jernstedt  177 λό[γ]— Furley post hunc v. initia octo
versuum quae habet P in folio IIIr inser. Hutloff; num Epitrepontibus attribuenda dubium
est
ἀγαθὸν γένο[ιτο
ελάλει δέ μοι Χ[
αὐτὸν ἐθέλει[  
ὑμᾶς ἐνοχλε[
οὐδὲν δέομαι[
οὐ] τῷ τιχόντι[  
± 4 ] τος εἴπ[ε  
± 4 ] γυναίκ[  
± 4 ] ἀπο[  
± 4 ] δακω[  


Then, conjecturally, unplaced fragments of O14

See Weinstein (1971b); Austin (1973, no. 135).

V
]εἰσομαι
]εἰσθαι χ[
] . ει παλαι
] . . . λ[

VI
]ξ[
ἀπὸ]χοιτος εξ ὅτου . . [  
]ελ . . [ .. ] . τ'] εξ[  
]ων εμο:] τι φησι με[  

VII
[ .. ] . . [  
et]ηρ' ὅλως  
ἐ]βούλετο[  
] . πεπείσμη[ . [  

VIII
. . . λεθ[  
] . ἀναξ[  

....
IX
] . . [ ]αυτη[ . . [ X ]εθηυω[ . . [ [Ωδε . [ 

Οπον


[− gap of not more than three lines −]

(Συ.) θεύγεις τὸ δίκαιον.
(Δα.) συχοφαντεῖς, δυστυχές.
(Συ.) οὔ δεί σὲ ἔχειν τὰ μὴ σὶ'.
(Δα.) ἐπιτρεπτέόν τινι ἐστι περὶ τούτων.
(Συ.) βούλομαι' χρινόμεθα.
(Δα.) τίς οὖν;
(Συ.) ἐμοὶ μὲν πάς ἰκανός. δίκαια δὲ πάσχω· τί γὰρ σοι μετεδίδουν;
(Συ.) τοῦτον λαβέιν
(Δα.) βούλει χριτήν;
(Συ.) ἄγαθὴ τύχη.
(Δα.) πρὸς τῶν θεῶν,
(Συ.) βέλτιστα, μικρὸν ἄν σχολάσας ἡμῖν χρόνον;
(Συ.) ὑμίν; περὶ τίνος;
(Συ.) ἀντιλέγομεν πράγμα τι.
(Συ.) τί οὖν ἐμοὶ μέλει;
(Συ.) κρίθην τούτου τινά
(Σμ.) ζητοῦμεν ὦσιν· εἰ δὴ σὲ μηδὲν κυλύει,
(Συ.) διάλυσον ήμας.
(Σμ.) ώ κάκιστ' ἀπολούμενοι,
(Συ.) δίκας λέγοντες περιπατεῖτε, διφθέρας
(Σμ.) τί οὖν ἐμοί μέλει;
(Συ.) κρίτην τούτου τινά
(Σμ.) τίνος;
(Σμ.) ἀντιλέγομεν πραγμά τι.
(Σμ.) τοῦτον λαβεῖν
(Δα.) πρὸς τῶν θεῶν,
(Σμ.) ἄγαθεν τό δίκαιον.
(Δα.) συχοφαντεῖς, δυστυχές.
(Σμ.)

οίς ἂν δικάσω; Πάντως.

(Σμ.) ἀξοῦσομαι· τί γὰρ
τὸ μὲ κωλύσω· σοὶ πρῶτερος ὁ σωπῶν λέγε.

Δα. μικρὸν γ’ ἢνοδον, οὐ τὰ πρὸς τοῦτον μόνον
πραχθένθ’ ἵν’ ἢ σοι καὶ σαφῆ τὰ πράγματα.
ἐν τοῖς δασεῖ τοῖς πλησίον τῶν χωρίων
τούτων ἐποίμασιν· τριακοστὴν ἔσως,
βελτίστατε, ταῦτην ἠμέραν ἀυτὸς μόνος
κάκκειμένον παιδάριον εὐρον· νήπιον
ἐξον δέραια καὶ τοιούτοί τινα
κόσμον.

(Σμ.) περὶ τοῦτων ἑστὶν.

Δα. οὐχ ἐκ λέγειν.

(Σμ.) ἐὰν λαλῆς μεταξὺ, τῇ βακτηρίᾳ
καθίζομαι σου.

(Σμ.) καὶ δικαίως.

(Σμ.) λέγε.

(Δα.) λέγω.

ἀνειλόμην, ἀπήλθον οἶκαθ’ αὐτ’ ἔχων,
τρέφειν ἔμελλον. ταῦτ’ ἐδοξεξ μοι τότε·
ἐν νυκτὶ βουλὴν δ’, ὧπερ ἀπασί γίνεται,
διέβους ἐμαυτῶι διελογιζόμην. “ἐμοὶ
τί παιδοτροφίας καὶ κακῶν; πόθεν δ’ ἔγω
τοσαύτ’ ἀναλώσως; τί φροντίδωι ἐμοὶ;”
τοιούτοι τις ἣν. ἐποίμασιν πάλιν
ἐδεῖθ’ εἶν αὐτός· ἔστι δ’ ἀνθρακεύς
περί τούτων ἄνθρωπος με
καὶ δικαίως.
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Σμ. ἐδέου (σὺ γ');

(Δα.) οὕ', Σύρισκ'; ὀλὴν τὴν ἡμέραν κατέτρυψε. λιπαροῦντι καὶ πεῖθοντι με ὑπεσχόμην. ἔδωκ', ἀπηλθεὶς μυρίᾳ εὐχόμενος ἀγαθὰ· λαμβάνων μου κατεφίλει τὰς χεῖρας.

(Σμ.) ἐπὸς εἰς ταύτῃ;
(Συ.) ἐπὸσων.
(Δα.) ἀπηλλάγη.

μετὰ τῆς γυναικός περιτυχών μοι νῦν ἄφνω τὰ τότε συνεκτεθέντα τοῦτωι - μικρὰ δὲ ἡν ταύτα καὶ λήρας τις, οὐθὲν - ἄξιοι ἀπολαμβάνειν καὶ δεινά πάσχειν φήσ', ἐτί οὐκ ἀποδίδουμ', αὐτὸς δ' ἔχειν ταυτ' ἄξιοι. ἔγω δὲ γ' αὐτὸν φημὶ δεῖν ἔχειν χάριν οὐ μετέλαβεν δεόμενος· εἰ μὴ πάντα δὲ τοῦτοι δίδωμ', οὐχ ἐξετασθήναι με δεὶ. εἰ καὶ βαδίζων εὑρεῖν ἄμ' ἐμοὶ ταύτα καθήν εἶναι ἔτη καὶ λαμβάνον· συγκεκριμένοι δὲ πάντα ἐγὼ δὲν καὶ πάντα ταὐτ' ἄν ἔχειν γέγονεν μοι εὐρέων· οὐ παρὼν τοῦτ' ἄπαντεν ἔχειν εἰς τειχεῖα με δεῖν· ἐμὲ δ' οὐδὲ ἔϊν· τὸ πέρας· διδωκαί σοι τι τῶν ἐμὸν ἔγω· εἰ τοῦτ' ἀ' [περίστατο] ἐς τοίς; καὶ γίνετο· ἐξει. εἰ δ' οὐκ ἀφέσκει, μετανοεῖς δ', ἀπόδος πάλιν καὶ μηδὲν ἀδίκησε[ι] μηδ' ἐλαττοῦν. πάντα δὲ, τὰ μὲν παρ' ἐκόντως τὰ δὲ κατασχύσαντά με, οὐ δεὶ σ' ἔχειν. εἰρήνη δὲν τό γ' ἐμὸν λόγον.

(Συ.) εἰρήκειν;

[Σμ.] οὐχ ἡκοῦσας; εἰρήκειν.

Συ. καλῶς.

οὐκοῦν ἔγω μετὰ ταύτα. μόνος εὑρ' οὕτοςι τὸ παιδίον, καὶ πάντα ταὐτ' ἄ ν[ν] ν λέγει 295 ὅρθος λέγει, καὶ γέγονεν οὕτως, ὧ πάτερ. οὐκ ἀντιλέγει. δεόμενος, ἰκετεύον μεγὼ ἐλαβόν παρ' αὐτοῦ τοῦτ' ἰ[δ][η][η] γὰρ λέγει.

ποιμήν τις ἔξηγεγελέ μοι, πρὸς ὅν ὀύτοσι εἶλάησε, τῶν τοῦτω συνεργών, ἀμα τινὰ χόσμον συνεφεύρεν ἀυτῷ· ἐπὶ τοῦτον, πάτερ, ἀυτὸς πάρεστιν ὀύτοσί. - [τὸ] πα[δί][ν]ός μοι, γύναι. - τὰ δὲρα καὶ γνωρίσματα ὀυτὸς σ’ ἀπαίτει, Δα’· ἐαυτῷ ψησὶ γὰρ ταύτι ἐπιπεδήθηκαί χόσμον, οὐ σοὶ διατροφήν.
κάγὼ συναπαίτω κύριος γεγενημένος τοῦτον· σὺ δ’ ἐπόησάς με δοὺς. νῦν γνωστέον, βέλτιστό, σοι ταύτι ἐστίν, ὡς ἔμοι δοκεῖ, τὰ χρυσά’ ὅ ταῦθ’· ὁ τι ποτ’ ἐστὶ· πότερα δεὶ κατὰ τὴν δόσιν τῆς μητρός, ἤτις ἦν ποτε, τῶι παιδίωι τηρείσθιν, ἔως ἂν ἐκτραφῆι, ἦ τὸν λελαοποδυτῆροτ’ ἄυτὸν ταύτ’ ἔχειν, εἰ πρῶτος εὑρείς τάλλοτρα. τί οὖν τότε, ὅτι ἐλάμβανον τοῦτ’, οὐχ ἄπιστους ταύτα σε; οὗπω παρ’ ἐμοὶ τοῦτ’ ἕν· ὑπὲρ τοῦτον λέγων ἥκω δὲ καὶ νῦν, οὐχ ἐμαυτοῦ σ’ οὐδὲ ἐν ἰδιον ἀπαιτῶν. κοινὸς Ἰερμῆς; μηδὲ ἐν εὐμυρίᾳ’, ὅπου πρόσεστι σῶμ’ ἀδικουμένον οὐχ] εὐρείας τοῦτ’ ἐστιν ἀλλ’ ἀφαίρεσις. 


εἰ δ’ ἐκλαβὼν ἑκείνα Δάων ἄπειδο
αὐτῶι (γ') Ἰνα χερδάνειε δραχμάς δώδεκα,
ἀγνώτες ἀν τὸν πάντα διετέλουν χρόνον
οἱ τηλιχούτοι καὶ τοιούτοι τοῖ γένει.
οὔ δὴ καλὸς ἐξει [τὸ] μὲν σῶμι ἐκτρέφειν
ἐμὲ τοῦτο, [τῇ]ν [δὲ] τοῦδε τῆς σωτηρίας
ἐλίποια λαβόντα Δάσον ἀφανίσαι, πάτερ.
γαμοῦν ἀδελφὴν τις δία γνωρίσματα
ἐπέσεκε, μητέρι ἐντυχὼν ἐρρύσατο,
ἐσωσι' ἀδελφόν. ὄντι ἐπισφαλῆ φύσει
tὸν βίον ἀπάντων τῇ προνοίᾳ δεῖ, πάτερ,
τηρεῖν, πρὸ πολλοῦ ταῦθ' ὀρῶντ' εὖ ὃν ἔνι.
“ἀλλ' ἀπόδος, εἰ μή", φησ', "ἀρέσκει". τοῦτο γὰρ
ἰσχυρὸν ὀίεταί τι πρὸς τὸ πράγμ' ἐχειν.
οὐκετι δίκαιον, εἰ τι τῶν τοῦτου σε δει
ἀποδιδόναι, καὶ τοῦτο πρὸς ζητείς λαβεῖν,
ἐν' ἀσφαλέστερον πονηρεύσηι πάλιν,
eἰ νῦν τι τῶν τοῦτου σέσωκεν ἢ Τύχη.
εἰρήκα. χρίνον ὅτι δίκαιον νενόμικας.

(Σμ.) ἄλλα εὐχρήτ' ἐστι' πάντα τὰ συνεκκείμενα
tοῦ παιδίου 'στι. τοῦτο γινώσκω.
(Δα.) καλὸς:
τὸ παιδίον δ';
(Σμ.) οὐ γνώσομ' εἰναί, μὰ Δὰ[α, σοῦ
τοῦ νῦν ἄδικοντος, τοῦ βοηθοῦντος δὲ καὶ
ἐπεξιόντος τῶν ἄδικων μέλλοντι σοὶ.
(Σμ.) πόλλα' ἄγαθά σοι γένοιο.
(Δα.) δεινή γ' ἢ [κρίσις,
νὴ τὸν Δᾶν τὸν Σωτῆρα: πάνθ' εὐφών ἔγνυ
ἄπαντα περισσαῖς'. ὃ δ' οὐχ εὐφών ἔξοι.
οὐκοῦν ἀποδίδως;
(Σμ.) φησί.
(Δα.) δεινή γ' ἢ κρίσις,
ἡ μηθὲν ἀγαθὸν μοι γένοιο.
(Σμ.) φέρε ταχῦ.
(Δα.) ὁ Ἰακώβεις, ὁ πέπονθα.
(Συ.)

τὴν πήραν χάλα
καὶ δεῖξον· ἐν ταὐτῇ περιφέρεισ γὰρ. βρα[χ]ὺ
πρόσμεινον, ἱκετεύω σ', ἵν' ἀποδοί.

(Δά.)

τί γὰρ ἐγὼ
ἐπέτρεψα τούτωι;

(Συ.)

δός ποτ', ἐργαστήριον.

(Δά.)

αἱ σχρά γ' ἢ πέπονθα.

(Συ.)

πάν[τ'] ἔχεις;

(Συ.)

οἶμαι γε δή,

εἰ μὴ τι καταπέπωξε τὴν δίκην ἐμοῦ
λέγοντος, ὡς ἡλίσκετ'.

(Συ.)

οὐχ ἂν [ὁ]ῷμην.

(Συ.)

ἀλλ' εὐτύχει, βέλτιστε. τοιοῦ[τοῦ]ς ἔδ[ει]
θὰτ[τον] δικάζειν πάντας.

(Δά.)


ὁ Ἡράχλεις, οὐ γέγονε δε[ινότερα χρήσις].

Συ.

πονηρὸς ἡςθας.

(Δά.)

ω πό[νηρ', ὡς σύ] νῦν
τούτωι υφάσιες αὐτ[ά] ...
ACT TWO

οὐχ ᾧν διαγνοῖς: Κλεόστρατος δὲ τίς ἐστὶν ὁ ποίησας, ὡς λέγει τὰ γράμματα.

(Οὐ.) ἐπὶ θείουν.

[Σὺ.] ἢν. σὺ δὲ ἐι τίς;

(Οὐ.) [ο]ὐτός ἐστὶ —

(Σὺ.) τίς;

(Οὐ.) οὐ δὲ ἀκτύλιος —

(Σὺ.) ὁ ποίες; οὐ γὰρ μανθάνω.

(Οὐ.) [τοῦ] δεσπότου τοῦμον Χαρ[υ]σίου.

(Σὺ.) χολάἰς;

(Οὐ.) οὐ ἀπώλεσεν.

(Σὺ.) τὸν δακτύλιον θές, ἢθλιε, τὸ γα ᾗ μέτερον.

Οὐ. σοι θῶ; πόθεν δ' αὐτὸν λαβὼν

(Σὺ.) έχεις;

(Οὐ.) Ἀπόλλων καὶ θεοῖ, δεινοῦ κακοῦ.

(Σὺ.) οὐί οὐκ ἔστιν χρήματ' ἐστὶν έστιν όρφ[α]νοῦ παιδός; ὁ προσελθὼν εὐθὺς ἀρπάζειν βλέπει. τὸν δακτύλιον θές, φημι.

(Οὐ.) προσπαίζεις ἐμοί;

(Σὺ.) τοῦ δεσπ[ῶ]του 'στι, νη τὸν Ἀπόλλω καὶ θεούς. 400

(Οὐ.) ἀποσφαγείην πρὸτερον ἀν δήπουθεν ήτοι τοῦ τί καθυφείμην. αἄραρε, δικάσομαι ἀπάσι καθ'/ ενα. π[αιδίο] 'στίν, οὐκ έμά. —

(Σὺ.) ή μοι δός, ἢ έγώ σοι παρέχω σών.

(Οὐ.) βούλομαι αὐτ[ὸς] [φυλάττειν.]

(Σὺ.) οὐδέ εἰς τούτον διαφέρει·

(Οὐ.) εἰς ταὐτό [γ]υρ παράγομεν, ὡς ἐμοὶ δοξεὶ, δεύρ' ἀμφότεροι.
(Ου.) νυνὶ μὲν οὖν συνάγουσι καὶ
οὐκ ἔστιν εὐχαριστῷ τὸ μηνὺειν ίσως
αὐτῶι περὶ τοῦτων, αὕριον δὲ.

(Συ.) καταμενῶ,
αὕριον ὃτωι βούλεσθ' ἐπιτρέπετει ἐνὶ λόγῳ
ἐτοιμὸς. οὐδὲ νῦν κακῶς ἀπῆλλαχα.
πάντων δ' ἀμελήσανθ', ὡς ἔοικε, δεὶ δικαῖς
μελετᾶν διὰ τοῦτο πάντα νυνὶ σῶζεται.

ΧΟΡΟΤ

**Act Three**

Οὐν. τὸν δακτύλιον ὁμηρχα πλεῖν ἢ πεντάχις
tῶι δεσπότῃ δεῖξαι προσελθών, καὶ σφόδρα
δὲν ἔγγυς ἢ[δη] καὶ πρὸς αὐτῶι παντελῶς
ἀναδύομαι. καὶ τῶι προτέρων μοι μεταμέλει
μηνυμάτων λέγει γὰρ ἐπεισιώς πυκνά
“ὡς τὸν φράσαντα ταῦτα μοι κακὸν κακ[ῶς
ὁ Ζεὺς ἀπολέσαι.” μὴ μὲ δὴ διαλλαγ[ε]ίς
πρὸς τὴν γυναῖκα τὸν φράσαντα ταῦτα καὶ
συνειδότ' ἀφανίσηι λαβών. καλῶς [ποῦκ
ἐτερόν τι πρὸς τοῦτοις κυκάν δ' [βούλομαι.]
χάνταυθα κακὸν ἐνεστὶν ἐπεισιώς μ[έγα.

Αβρ. ἑατέ μ’ ἱκετεύω σε καὶ μή μοι κακὰ
παρέχειτ’. ἐμαυτὴν, ὡς ἔοικεν, ἀθ[ ι[α
λέληθα χλευάζουσ’ ἐράσθαι προσ[εδ[όκω[ν]
θειον δὲ μυσεῖ μίσος ἀνθρωπὸς μὲ τι.
οὐκέτι μ’ ἐξί γὰρ οὔδε κατακείσθαι, τάλαν,
παρ’ αὐτῶι, ἄλλα χωρίς.

Οὐν. ἀλλ’ ἀποδῶν πάλιν
παρ’ οὗ παρέλαβον ἀρτίως; ἄτοπον.

Αβρ. τάλας
οὔτος. τί τοσούτοιν ἀργύριον ἀπολλύει;
ἐπεὶ τὸ γ’ ἐπὶ τοῦτο τῷ τῆς θερ’ φέρειν
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κανουν έμοιγ’ οίν τε νῦν ἕστιν, τάλανν
ἀγνή γάμον γάρ, φασίν, ἠμέραν τρίτην
Ὡς κάθημαι.

(Ου.)
πῶς ἄν οὖν, πρὸς τῶν θεῶν,
pῶς ἄν, ἵκετεύω—

Συ.
ποῦ ’στ[ιν, ὅν ζητῶν ἐγὼ
περιέρχομ’ ἐνδον; οὗτος, [ἀπόδο]ς, ὦγαθὲ,
tὸν δακτύλιον ἢ δείξον ὦι, μέ[λ]εις ποτέ.
χρισμεθ’ εἰλθεῖν δεῖ μὲ ποι.

Ου.
τοιουτοί

(Ου.)
ἐστιν τὸ πράγμ’, ἄνθρωπε—τοῦ μὲν δεσπότου
ἐστ’, οὐδ’ ἀκριβῶς, οὗτοι Χαρισίου,
άκνω δὲ δείξει—πατέρα γὰρ τοῦ παιδίου
αὐτῶν ποῦ σχεδόν τι τοῦτον προσφέρων
μεθ’ οὗ συνεξέχειτο.

(Συ.)
pῶς, ἄβελτερε;

(Ου.)
Ταυροπολίους ἀπώλεσεν τούτον ποτε
παννυχίδος οὔτις καὶ γυναῖκών. κατὰ λόγον
ἐστὶν βιασμόν τοὺς τούτον εἶναι παρθένοψιν.
ὥ δ’ ἐτεκε τοῦτο καξέθηκε δηλαδή.
eἰ μὲν τὶς οὖν εὐρὸν εκεῖνην προσφέροι
τούτον, σαφὲς ἄν τι δεικνύς τοίχον
νυνὶ δ’ ὑπόνοιαν καὶ ταραχὴν ἔχει.

(Συ.)

(Ου.)

(Συ.)
sκόπει

(Ου.)

(Ου.)

(Αβρ.)

(Αβρ.)

(Ου.)

(Ου.)

καὶ τοιουτοί

τὸν δακτύλιον ἐπόντα τούμορο δεσπότου.

(Αβρ.) αὖ, δόσμορ' εἴτ' εἰ τρόφιμος ὄντως ἔστι σου,

(Ον.) τὴν μητέρ' οὐδεὶς οἶδεν.

(Αβρ.) ἀπέβαλεν δὲ, φῆς,

(Ον.) Ταυροπολίοις αὐτῶν;

(Αβρ.) παροινών γ', ὡς ἐμοὶ
tὸ παιδάρι[ο]γ εἴψ' ἄκολουθος.

(Ον.) δηλαδὴ
eἰς τὰς [γ']μναίκας παννυχίζουσας μόνος
ἐνε[πεσε]· κάμο γάρ παρούσης ἔγενετο
tοιοῦτον ἔτερον.

(Αβρ.) σοῦ παρούσης;

(Ον.) πέρυσι, ναί,

(Αβρ.) μά τὴν Ἀφροδίτην.

(Ον.) τὴν δὲ παιδ' ἃ γ' ἦταν ἡν

(Αβρ.) πυθοίμην αὖ παρ' αἷς γάρ ἦν

(Ον.) πατρὸς τίνος

(Αβρ.) οὐδὲν οἶδα* πλὴν ἰδοὺς γα

(Ον.) καὶ τοῦτον [εἶχ]·

(Αβρ.) εἰς ἵσως, ἀλλ' οὐκ ἐμοὶ

έδειξέν οὐ γὰρ ψεύσομαι.

(Ον.)

τί χρή ποιεῖν

εμὲ νῦν;

(Αβρ.)

όρα σὺ τοῦτ’· ἐὰν δὲ νὸν ἔχης ἔμοι τε πειθῇ, τοῦτο πρὸς τὸν δεσπότην
φανερὸν ποίησις εἰ γὰρ ἐστ’ ἐλευθέρας παιδός, τί τοῦτον λανθάνειν δεῖ τὸ γεγονός;

Ον.

πρότερον ἔκειν ἥτις ἔστι, Ἀβρότονον, εὑρόμεν. ἐπὶ τοῦτοι δεῖ ἔμοιγ’ οὐ νῦν [δ]ράμει;

(Αβρ.)

οὐκ ἂν δυναμήν, τὸν ἀδικοῦντα πρὶν σαφῶς τίς ἐστιν εἰδέναι. φροσυμαί τοῦτ’ ἐγὼ,

μάθην τι μηνύσει πρὸς ἐκείνας ὡς λέγω. τίς οἶδεν εἰ καὶ τοῦτον ἐνέχυρον λαβὼν

(Ον.)

τί τοὺς πότοις τοιαύτα γίνεσθαι φιλεῖ.

πρὶν εἰδέναι δὲ τὸν ἀδικοῦντ’ οὐ βούλομαι ζητεῖν ἔκειν οὐδὲ μηνύειν ἐγὼ

τοιοῦτον οὐδέν.

(Ον.)


(Αβρ.)

θέασ’, Ὀνήσιμε, ἃν συναρέσηι σοι τοῦμον ἐνθύμημ’ ἀρα. ἐμὸν ποίησαμεῖ τὸ πρᾶγμα τοῦτ’ ἐγὼ,

(Ον.)

τότε τις παρ’ αὐτῶν ἀπέβαλεν

(Αβρ.)

κατιδών μ’ ἔχουσαν ἀνακρίνει πόθεν εἶληφα. φήσω “Ταυροπολίοις παρθένοις

(Ον.)

λέγ’ ὃ λέγεις: ἄρτι γὰρ νῦ.

καθιδῶν μ’ ἔχουσαν ἀνακρίνει πόθεν εἰς ταυροπολίας παρθένοις τα τ’ εκείνηι γενόμενα πάντ’ ἐμὰ ποιμένη′ τὰ πλείστα δ’ αὐτῶν οἶδ’ ἐγὼ.

(Ον.)

ἀριστά γ’ ἀνθρώπων.

(Αβρ.) εάν δ' οίκείον ἦ 
αὐτῶι τὸ πράγμα', (οὖκ) εὐθὺς ἢζει φερόμενος 
ἐπὶ τὸν ἔλεγχον καὶ μεθύων γε νῦν ἐρεῖ 
πρότερος ἀπαντᾶ καὶ προπετῶς; ἄ δ' ἄν λέγη 
προσομολογήσω τοῦ διαμαρτεῖν μηδὲ ἐν 
προτέρα λέγουσ'.

(Ov.) ὑπέρευγε, νὴ τὸν "Ἡλιον.

(Αβρ.) τὰ κοινὰ ταύτι δ' ἀκχιοῦμαι τῶι λόγῳ 
τοῦ μὴ διαμαρτεῖν: "ὡς ἁναίδης ἡθα καὶ 
ἰταμός τις".

(Ov.) εὐγέ.

(Αβρ.) "κατέβαλες δὲ μ' ὡς σφόδρα. 
καὶ τὰ κοινὰ ταύτι δ' ἀκχιοῦμαι τῶι λόγῳ 
τοῦ μὴ διαμαρτεῖν: "ὡς ἁναίδης ἡθα καὶ 
ἰταμός τις".

(Ov.) Ἡράκλεις.

(Αβρ.) τὸ πέρας δὲ πάντων, "παιδίον τοιὺν" ἐρῶ 
"ὅτι γεγονός σοι", καὶ τὸ νῦν εὐριμένον 
δὲ λέω.

(Ov.) πανούργως καὶ κακοήθως, Αβρότονον.

(Αβρ.) ἄλλα δὲ ἐξετασθήτι ταύτα καὶ φανή: πατήρ 
δὲν οὐτος αὐτοῦ, τὴν κόρην ζητήσομεν 
κατὰ σχολὴν.

(Ov.) εκείνο δ' οὐ λέγεις, δτι 
ἐλευθέρα γίνηι συ: τοῦ γὰρ παιδίου 
μητέρα σε νομίσας λύσει εὐθὺς δηλαδή.

(Αβρ.) οὐκ οίδα βουλοίμην δ' αν.

(Ov.) οὐ γάρ οίσθα συ;

(Αβρ.) νῇ τῷ θεῶ, π[ά]ντων γ' ἐμαυτὴ σ' αἰτιον 
ἡνῆσμαι τοῖσων.

(Ov.) εάν δὲ μηκέτι 
ζητήσει εἴναιν ἐξεπίτηδες, ἄλλα' ἐδι 
παρακρουσαμένη με, πὸς τὸ τοιοῦθ' ἐξει;

(Αβρ.) τάλαν,

τίνος ἐνεκεν; παιδὼν ἐπιθυμεῖν σοι δοκῶ;

εὐνεήσα μόνον γεγορίμην, ὦ θεοὶ.

τούτον λάβοι, μισθόν ἐκ τούτων.

(Αβρ.) οὔχοὖν συγ[αρ]έσχει σοι;

(Ον.) συγφρέσχει διαφόρως.

ἀν γὰρ κακοπεθεῖσθαι, μαχοῦμαι ὧν τότε:

Δυνῆσομαι γάρ, ἐν δὲ τῶι παρόντι νῦν

Ἰδώμεν εἰ τούτ’ ἐστιν.

(Αβρ.) οὔχοὖν συνδοχεῖ;

(Ον.) μάλιστα.

(Αβρ.) τὸν δακτύλιον ἀποδίδου ταχύ.

(Ον.) λάμβανε.

(Αβρ.) φίλῃ Πειθοί, παροῦσα σύμμαχος

πότει καταρθοῦν τοὺς λόγους οὐς ἂν λέγω.

(Ον.) τοπαστικὸν τὸ γύναιον. ὡς ἡμισθῆν’ ὃτι

κατά τόν ἐρωτ’ οὐκ ἔστ’ ἐλευθερίας τυχὼν

ἀλλος δ’ ἀλύει, τὴν ἐτέραν νομίζεται

ἄλλον. ἄλλ’ ἐγὼ τὸν πάντα δουλεύω σχόνον,

λέμψος, ἀπόπληκτος, οὐδαμῶς προσημεῖος

τά τοιαῦτα. παρὰ ταύτης δ’ ἱσος τι λήφομαι,

ἀν ἐπιτύχῃ: καὶ γὰρ δικαιον. ὡς κενά

καὶ διαλογιζόμου’ ὁ κακοδαίμων, προσδοκῶν

χάριν κοίμεσθαν παρὰ γυναικός μὴ μόνον

κακὸν τι προσαλάβουι. νῦν ἐπισφαλὴ

τά πράγματ’ ἐστί τα περὶ τὴν ἐκεχτημένην

ταχέας ἐὰν γὰρ εὐρεθῇ πατρὸς κόρῃ ἡ

ἐλευθέρου μήτηρ τοῦ τούν παιδὶ;

(Γεγονοὺς’, ἔκεινην λήφηται ταύτην [ἰσωσ

ἐνδούς κελεύσας αὐτὸν] ἀπολείπεται. ὅ[μως

καὶ νῦν χαριέντως ἐξενευκέναι δορ[κὼ

τοῦ μὴ δι’ ἐμ[οὺ] ταύτι κυκάσθαι. χαρι[εῖ](

τὸ πολλὰ πράττειν ἄν δὲ τὶς λάβηι μ’ ἐτ[ι]

περιεργασμένον ἢ λαλήσαντ’ ἐκτεμεῖν

διδῶμ’ ἐμαυτοῦ (τὰς γνάθους, ἀλλ’ οὕτως)


Lefebvre 564 usque ad v. 566 = Stob. eel. 4.22.151 = fr. 564K., additis καὶ κάλλιστ’

ἐξεί: ὥσ ἐν γυναικὶ φύεται πιστὴ χάρις 567 -68 Lefebvre 569 Koerte 570

δ’ ἵσος Sudhaus: ὑπεύχες von Arnim: [δ’ ἐγὼ] Jensen 571 εὐθὺς κελεύσας e.g. Furley

(κελεύσας Robert): ἐκοινωνία τὸν οἴκον; Jensen olim, Coppola: ἐπείζεται την Κορτε, τῶι

καὶ von Arnim: ἐπείξεται τῆν δι’ ἐμ[οὺ] ἀπολείπετεν ὅ[μως Sudhaus: ἐπείξεται θ’ ἡ

γὰρ ἐνδούς ἀπολείπετεν; [ἵλος Post (1941) (ἐπείξεται Jensen): τῶι ἐς ἐς ἐς ἐς


γὰρ ἐνδούς ἀπολείπετεν; [ἵλος Post (1941) (ἐπείξεται Jensen): τῶι ἐς ἐς ἐς ἐς

καὶ νῦν Arnott 572 Lefebvre, Guéraud 573 τῶι Wilamowitz χαρέ[τω Lefebvre 574 Lefebvre: μ’

τὸ Wilamowitz 576 τὰς γνάθους Furley: τουοὗδι ]ιντας C: τὸ δὲν’ Kassel: τὰς γονάς


575

(Σμ.)
εξη [ ἡ πόλις] [άσωτ[ ] ὅλη γά[p άιδει τὸ καχόν] εὐθὺς [ ] [δη] σαφῶς [ ] πίνειν[ ] [ιω]ν τοῦνομ[α] ψ[αλτρίας] ζην αὐτό [ ] [ης έφη] πλέον ἡμ[ερῶν] αὐτόν διαλλ[ ] [ἐνον.] οὔμοι τάλ[ας] κοινωνο[ ] [η] προσήλθ[ ] [εγώ] ὁτε τὴν[ ] [το]ύτο τε πυνθα[πάτησε με] φιλαρ[γυρ-] [τ]οι τρόπωι ἐνα [ ] [άπλοὺν] [. . . . .] καὶ ψάλτρια[ ] [πότοι συνεχεῖς.] χύβοι τυχόν [ ] [λα] χαιρέτω. [πολλῶν [ ] [ων] ἐκτησάμην] [φαινο] [η] μοι μόνη [γ]ν είναι στά[σιν] (Σμ.)

(Σμ.)
οὐδεὶς [. . . .] ἔτερος ὑμίν. [ποικίλον]

ACT THREE

(Καρ.) ἀριστον ἀριστῶσιν.

δ᾽ θρισάθλιος
ἐγὼ κατὰ πολλά. νῦν μὲν οὖν οὐχ οἶδ᾽ ὡς
d[α]σχεδάγ[νυντ' ἐ]χτός· ἀλλ᾽ ἔαν πάλιν
π[ ][μαγείρου [τ]ής τύχηι
.. γ[ ] . ε . άλει . [ . . ] . . , χαριας.

Σμ. ]ς τινὸς

.................................

.................................

.................................

χα[ ]
μὲνογ

Σμ. Χα[ρισίωι παῖς γέγονεν ἐκ τῆς ψαλ[τράς;]
Καρ. νῦ[ν] ἀριστ[ῶσι καὶ
με[θύουσι]

(Σμ.) ]άρα γε

[?Καρ.] ε]χουσι δή

(?Σμ.) σ[ ]

(?Καρ.) πέ[μπεν ἵνα]

[?Χαι.] νὴ τὸν Ἑλιον

μυκροῦ γ[ ]

πρώην αρ[ ]

ἐπάνωθ[εν]

ἐγὼγ' ἀπολ[ ]

ο[ ]

Σμ. ἐπείτα δ[ ]

θυγατέρ' .

(Χατ.) λαβὸντι ἀ[ ]

ε[Ξ]λείτ' Jensen 615 vel ἐστιν ὃς G.-S. 621 suppl. Sandbach, Χα[ρισισά...ψαλ]τράς
tοῦ μετώπου Arnott 635 ἀπολ[οίμην vel ἀπόλ[ωλα possess 638 θυγατέρα al. 639
tετοκεχ C sine apostroph. : τέτοκ' ἐξ Χαρισίου Robert
παρακαλ[ ]

_διαχ[l]ονι[π]_

(Σμ.)

Χαρ[ις-]

to . [ 625

ύμων ἐτὰρώς οὕτος οὕδ' ἡμιχύνητο 645

παιδάρι[ν] ἐχ πόρνης [ 645

προσω[ . . . . ] . . . [ 645

εὐληψ[ ] [ 645

tics

par . . [ 645

ενη[ 650

]θα .

] . etai

] . βίου

tο]?] δυστυχο[ξ].

(?)Χαι.[ 650

]γ] δυστυχ[ξ].

Τ O27

(Σμ.)

τοῦτο[ν, μα] τ[ρ]γν Διό[νυσο]ς. άλλ' ἵσως ἐγώ 655

πολυπραγμον[ο] [πλε[ί]ῳ τε πράττῳ τῶν ἐμῶν,

κατὰ λόγον ἐξ' ἄ[π]ειν]αὶ τὴν θυγατέρα

λαβόντα. τοῦτο μὲ'ν π]ο[ῆς καὶ σχεδόν

dedουμενόν μοι τυγχάνει. μαρτύρομαι

ύμας δ' ὀμ[ός Χ]αριστρατ[ 660

μεθ' ἀν . [ ±6 €πεμψα . [ 660

θυγατέρα τ[ν σήν λ]αμβάνε[ . [ 660

άναξι' ἡμόν [ ± 9 ] . . . [ 660

(Σμ.)

. . .

(?)Χαι.

Τ L

(Σμ.)

θυγατέρα τ[ν σήν λ]αμβάνε[ . [ 660

άναξι' ἡμόν [ ± 9 ] . . . [ 660

(Σμ.)

μηδὲ λέγε. τ[ . . . . λ]εγον π[ 665

καὶ περιβόητ[ν πάσσον ἀνδρώποις (ποῶν)

(Σμ.)

αὐτόν, ἄχρατ[ς καὶ τοῦτο δ' τὸ λεγόμενον

Hibernate, πότ᾽ ἐκ τὸν εὐφρατ[ 665

[ —c. seven lines missing —] 665

(Σμ.)

αὐτός τοὺς θεούς

(Σμ.)

e.g. Austin 665 -668 = fr.com.adesp. 78 ΚΑ (Niinlist, 1999a). 665


(Σμ.)

mη νυν δόκει e.g. Austin: σοῦ θ' ἄμ[. (Σμ.) ούχ εἰμι δοκεί e.g. Handley 664

(Σμ.)

ημ[ . . . . . . ]λε [ 665

(Σμ.)

μη νυν δόκει e.g. Austin: σοῦ θ' ἄμ[. (Σμ.) ούχ εἰμι δοκεί e.g. Handley 664

(Σμ.)

ημ[ . . . . . . ]λε [ 665

(Σμ.)

μη νυν δόκει e.g. Austin: σοῦ θ' ἄμ[. (Σμ.) ούχ εἰμι δοκεί e.g. Handley 664

(Σμ.)

ημ[ . . . . . . ]λε [ 665

(Σμ.)

μη νυν δόκει e.g. Austin: σοῦ θ' ἄμ[. (Σμ.) ούχ εἰμι δοκεί e.g. Handley 664

(Σμ.)

ημ[ . . . . . . ]λε [ 665

(Σμ.)

μη νυν δόκει e.g. Austin: σοῦ θ' ἄμ[. (Σμ.) ούχ εἰμι δοκεί e.g. Handley 664

(Σμ.)

ημ[ . . . . . . ]λε [ 665

(Σμ.)

μη νυν δόκει e.g. Austin: σοῦ θ' ἄμ[. (Σμ.) ούχ εἰμι δοκεί e.g. Handley 664

(Σμ.)

ημ[ . . . . . . ]λε [ 665

(Σμ.)

μη νυν δόκει e.g. Austin: σοῦ θ' ἄμ[. (Σμ.) ούχ εἰμι δοκεί e.g. Handley 664

(Σμ.)

ημ[ . . . . . . ]λε [ 665
[Σμ.]
μισεί τὸν ἵδιν λεγόμενον τοῦτον βίον;
ἐπινε μετὰ τὴν δ(ε)ίνος, εἰχεν ἐσπέρας
τῇ ἐν δ(ε)ίν', [ἐ]μελλε δ' αὕριον τῇ δεῖν τ' ἐχει[ν].
πολλὰς πεπόν[η]κεν ὥσ[ι]ς ἀναστάτους
οὔτος ὅ [β]ίος, [πό]λεις [θ'] ὀλας ἀπολόλεκεν
αὐτῶν [κ]αθ' ἐκαστῆν προῖκα.

(Χαι.)
μὴπω, Σμ[ικρίνη].

Σμ.
οὐδ' ἄν, μὰ τὴν Δήμητρα, δέχατον ἡμέρας Διοκλήτιου
μέρος καταμε[ι]ν' ὥσ τὸν βίον
καταφθαρεῖ τ' ἐν ματρυλ(ε)ίῳ βιώσεθ', ἡμᾶς δ' οὐδὲ γινώσκειν δοκών
αὐτήν μὲν έξε[ι], τήν δ' έπ[ει]σάξει λαβών.

(Χαι.)
νῦν ἂν άτέρπαται τούμον, ὡς ἐμοὶ δρέξει.
[ἐμοὺς με]λητέον δὲ καὶ πορευ[τέ]ρν

ΧΟ Π [ΟΤ]

---

Act Four

Σμ.  οὐχ ὁδὴ τοῦτο[ν τῶν κακῶν ἄλλην λύσιν ἄλλ' ἀπείναι δε[ί, Παμφίλη τοις ἐμφροσύν μ' ἐστὶν ἄρετὴ τὸν ἄτοπον φεύγειν ἄει.

[ΔΗΜΙΑΔΗ]

πά[(]πα, τί (δὲ) τοῦτ' ἔστ' 

(Σμ.)  [ταῦτ' ὅνου 

σχιά: σχολὴ γὰρ ἐ[ ............................................. ]


(Σμ.)  πάλαι προτε[ιν]νω σοι 

✧ M

(Πα.)  ύπέρ (δ') ἐμ[ο]ῦ τοῦθ' [ 

[— gap of 2 lines —]

Τ C

ἀλλ' εἰ με σωίζων τοῦτο μὴ πείσας ἐμέ, οὐκέτι πατήρ κρίνοι' ἂν ἄλλα δεσπότης.

(Σμ.)  λόγου δὲ δείται τὰῦτα καὶ συμπείσεως;


±4]. ἄμε[λ]ώς ήδέως, σὺ δ'[ ο]ῦ σφόδρα

|χουσ' ἐκθέτης ἕτ' ἄν

(Σμ.)  δια[χόνωι τοῦτον . [ 

(Πα.)  γ' ἔχουσιν' ἀπαν[ ] 

[ — gap of about 24 lines —]

τὴν πολυτέλειαν. Θεσμοφόρια δίς τίθει,
Σκίρα δίς τον όλεθρόν του βίου καταμάνθανε. ούχον απόλλων ούτος ὁμολογομένως;

σχόπει τὸ σὸν δή: φησὶ δέιν εἰς Πειραιά αὐτὸν βαδίσαντα: καθεδείτ' ἐκείν' ἐλήθ᾽ ὁ περὶ τούτους οἴδαν, περιμενεῖς πανγὺς οὐκείπος· οὐκ ὁ σκόπει τὸ σόν δή. φησὶ δ' εἰς Πειραιὰ

(Σμ.) γυναικ' ἐπίβολον

— gap of about 26 lines —

Τ Μ, O23, O24

Γυναῖκ' ἐπιβάλει σε λυμανεῖταί τ'...

(Πα.) δ' πάτερ, ἐμὴν γνώμην λέγειν πεπλαγμένην τῷ πάτερ


795 = fr. 7


801 άκοντος K.-G. 800 Gronewald
... ...]ς se peithesata[i θ'] ὁ μᾶλλον ἐπα[ 805
ἐπεὶ δὲ τοῦτο, πάπ(π)α, λυπηρὸν δοξεῖ, κόρας διὰ μηδὲν ἡδισχυριαν Τύχην εἰκη δ' ἀμαρτούσας εἴωμεν. δεύτερο[ν,]
...
] παρὰ τοῦτο γ' αἰτίων τουτο[ 810
ἀλλ' οὐ]δέν ἀισχρὸν ἐν ἀλλογως ἐχ[
ἀφι]βές οἱ πολλοὶ |
[ι]α]σι καὶ λέγουσιν ὡς[
ἀτυχόν ἐπιτροποθε π[ 815
φ[ο]γεὶν δὲ δεῖ τοῦτον [με;
ἐ[ι] μὲν γάρ εἰπάς ἄρνωις[ 820
. [. ]ῃκας, ἀπολειθ' οὔ[τος
dια τοῦτο. πότερον ή[λ]θ[ο][ν εὐτυχοῦντι μὲν συνευτυχήςουσ', ἄν δ' ἄτυχήσῃ μηκέτι αὐτῶι προίδω; μὰ τὸν [Δι']
χοουνονός ή[λ]θον το[ν] βίου, τὰ δ' εἰ τυχόν ἐπιταιχεν; οὔσω τοῦτ[ 825
δο' οἰκλας οἰχοῦνθ' ὅπ[ 830
προσέχοντι ἐκείνη λα[ 835
ἀλλ' εἰ μὲν ἔτερον μ' εἰ[ς γάμον δώσεις ἐφ' ὧν μηδὲν ὀδυνηρῶν μήδε λυπηρῶν παθεῖν
καλὸς ἔχει μοι τοῦτ[ 821
εἰ δ' ἐστ[τ] ἄδηλον τοῦτ[ο
tαὐτ' εἰς τοιαθ' ἡξου[ṣια 826
ἀλλ' ἐχθαλεί με; τῷ Χα[p]σι[ 831
αἰ(σ)θεστ' εὐνοῦν οὐσ[αν
tιμῶν ἐκείνην ε . [ 832
... ὁν' ἄταν γάρ προς[ 833
δ'ραί τὸ χεῖρον ῥαδιῶς [ 838
[η]μιάς ἐκείνη διαβ[τεί; 840
[. . ] θεν δ[ι]αβ[τ]ῇ[ 839

[— gap of 17 or 18 lines perhaps containing fr. 8 —]
éξετύφην μὲν οὖν κλαίουσα' ὀδὼς.

ἐν 'Επιτρέπουσιν.

(Ἀβρ.) [τὸ παιδίον
έξεμ' ἔχουσα' κλαμμυρίζεται, τάλαν,
pάλαι γάρ· οὔχ οὖθ' ὃ τι κακόν πέπονθε μοι.

(Πα.) τίς ἄν θεῶν τάλαμαν ἐλεηθεῖε με;
Ἀβρ. ὃ φιλτατόν [παιδάριον], ὄψει μητῆρα; καὶ [γὰρ]
(Πα.) πορεύσομαι.
(Ἀβρ.) μιχρόν, γύναι, πρόσμεινον.
(Πα.) ἐμὲ καλεῖς;
(Ἀβρ.) ἐγώ.

έναν][τίον βλ[έ][π'.

[Πα.] [ἂν] μὲ γνώσκεις, γύναι;
(Ἀβρ.) αὕτη στιν ἦν ἑόρ[α]κα: χαίρε, φιλτάτη.
(Πα.) τί[ς δ' εἰ] σὺ;
[A(Ἀβρ.)] [χείρα δεύρο μοι τὴν σὴν δίδου.
λέγε μοι, γλυκεία, πέρυσιν ἠλθες ἐπὶ θέαν
tοῖς Ταυροπολίοις ε[]
(Πα.) γύναι, πόθεν ἔχεις, εἰπέ μοι, τὸ παιδί[ον
λ]αβούσ';
(Ἀβρ.) ὃραις τι, φιλτάτη, σοι γνώριμον
(Πα.) οὐκ ἔτεκες αὐτὴ τοῦτο;
(Ἀβρ.) προσεποιησάμην,

(Πα.) τί πείσομαι; Handley per litt. 863 ἔν ταραντίνωι καλὼν] Jensen 866 Lefebvre 869 post εὐρήκα interpunxit Wilamowitz
(Πα.) τίνος δ' ἐστὶν πατρός; 870
(Αβρ.) Χαρισίου.
(Πα.) τοῦτ' οἷσθ' ἀχριβῶς, φυλτάτη;
(Αβρ.) εὖ ο[ἰ] δ' ἥ[γωγ]': ἀλλ' οὐ σὲ τὴν νύμφην ὀρῶ
tὴν ἐνδον οὐσαγ;
(Πα.) ναιχ.
(Αβρ.) μαχαρία γύναι,
θεῶν τις ὑμᾶς ἠλέησε. — τὴν θύραν
tὸν γείτονων τις ἐφώφηκεν ἐξίων.
eἰσῳ λαβοῦσά μ' ὡς σεαυτήν εἰσαγε,
ἲνα καὶ τὰ λοιπὰ πάντα μου τύθη σαφῶς.
(Αβρ.) εδ ο[ἰδ'] ε[γωγ'] αλλ' οὐ σὲ τὴν νύμφην ὀρῶ
tὴν ἐνδον οὐσαν;
(Πα.) ναιχί.
(Αβρ.) μακαρία γυναῖ,
θεών τις ύμας ἠλέησε. — τὴν θύραν
tων γείτονων τις ἐφώφηκεν ἐξίων.
eἰσῳ λαβοῦσά μ' ὡς σεαυτήν εἰσαγε,
ἲνα καὶ τὰ λοιπὰ πάντα μου τύθη σαφῶς.
(Πα.) τούτ' οἷσθ' ακριβῶς, φιλτάτη;
(Αβρ.) εὐ ο[ἰ] δ' ἥ[γωγ]': ἀλλ' οὐ σὲ τὴν νύμφην ὀρῶ
tὴν ἐνδον οὐσαγ;
(Πα.) ναιχ.
(Αβρ.) μαχαρία γύναι,
θεῶν τις ὑμᾶς ἠλέησε. — τὴν θύραν
tὸν γείτονων τις ἐφώφηκεν ἐξίων.
eἰσῳ λαβοῦσά μ' ὡς σεαυτήν εἰσαγε,
ἲνα καὶ τὰ λοιπὰ πάντα μου τύθη σαφῶς.
(Πα.) τούτ' οἷσθ' ακριβῶς, φιλτάτη;
(Αβρ.) εὐ ο[ἰ] δ' ἥ[γωγ]': ἀλλ' οὐ σὲ τὴν νύμφην ὀρῶ
tὴν ἐνδον οὐσαγ;
(Πα.) ναιχ.
(Αβρ.) μαχαρία γύναι,
τὸν διαβαλόντα, τυχόν ἀποκτείνει[ε]ν ἄν.
dιόπερ ὑπεκδέδυκα δεύρ’ ἔξω λάθραι.
καὶ ποί τράπωμαι γ’; εἰς τί βουλὴς; οὕχουμαι.
ἀπόδωλα τὴν θύραν τέπληξεν ἐξιών·
ζέω σώτερ, εἴπερ ἐστὶ δυνατὸν, σῶιζε με.

ΧΑΡΙΣΙΟΣ

ἔγω τις ἀναμάρτητος, εἰς δόξαν βλέπων
καὶ τὸ καλὸν ὅ τι πότ’ ἐστὶ καὶ ταῖσχρόν σκοπῶν,
ἀκέραυος, ἀνεπιπληκτος αὐτὸς τῶν βλω—
ἐν μοι κέχρηται καὶ προσηκόντως πάνυ
tὸ δαιμόνιον—ἐντάυθ’ ἐδείξε’ ἀνθρώπος ὄν.
“ὁ τρισκακαδαμίον, μεγάλα φυσάς καὶ λαλεῖς,
ἀκούοις γυναικὸς ἀτύχημ’ οὐ φέρεις,
ἀυτὸν δὲ δεῖξο α’ εἰς οὕς ἐπταῖκότα,
καὶ χρήσετ’ αὐτῇ σοι τότ’ ἡπίως, σοῦ δὲ
tαύτῃν ἀτυχήμες ἐπιδειχθῆσει θ’ ἁμα
ἀτυχῆς γεγονός καὶ σκαίος ἀγνώμων τ’ ἀνήρ.”

ΤΟ4

ἔγω τις ἀναμάρτητος, εἰς δόξαν βλέπων
καὶ τὸ καλὸν ὅ τι πότ’ ἐστὶ καὶ ταῖσχρόν σκοπῶν,
ἀκέραυος, ἀνεπιπληκτος αὐτὸς τῶν βλω—
ἐν μοι κέχρηται καὶ προσηκόντως πάνυ
tὸ δαιμόνιον—ἐντάυθ’ ἐδείξε’ ἀνθρώπος ὄν.
“ὁ τρισκακαδαμίον, μεγάλα φυσάς καὶ λαλεῖς,
ἀκούοις γυναικὸς ἀτύχημ’ οὐ φέρεις,
ἀυτὸν δὲ δεῖξο α’ εἰς οὕς ἐπταῖκότα,
καὶ χρήσετ’ αὐτῇ σοι τότ’ ἡπίως, σοῦ δὲ
tαύτῃν ἀτυχήμες ἐπιδειχθῆσει θ’ ἁμα
ἀτυχῆς γεγονός καὶ σκαίος ἀγνώμων τ’ ἀνήρ.”


905 act Four
910 τον διαβαλόντα, τυχόν άποκτείνει[ε]ν αν.
διόπερ ὑπεκδέδυκα δεύρ’ ἔξω λάθραι.
καὶ ποί τράπωμαι γ’; εἰς τί βουλής; οὕχουμαι.
ἀπόδωλα τὴν θύραν τέπληξεν ἐξιών·
ζεὺ σῶτερ, εἴπερ ἐστὶ δυνατὸν, σῶιζε με.

ΧΑΡΙΣΙΟΣ

ἔγω τις ἀναμάρτητος, εἰς δόξαν βλέπων
καὶ τὸ καλὸν ὅ τι πότ’ ἐστὶ καὶ ταῖσχρόν σκοπῶν,
ἀκέραυος, ἀνεπιπληκτος αὐτὸς τῶν βλω—
ἐν μοι κέχρηται καὶ προσηκόντως πάνυ
tὸ δαιμόνιον—ἐντάυθ’ ἐδείξε’ ἀνθρώπος ὄν.
“ὁ τρισκακαδαμίον, μεγάλα φυσάς καὶ λαλεῖς,
ἀκούοις γυναικὸς ἀτύχημ’ οὐ φέρεις,
ἀυτὸν δὲ δεῖξο α’ εἰς οὕς ἐπταῖκότα,
καὶ χρήσετ’ αὐτῇ σοι τότ’ ἡπίως, σοῦ δὲ
tαύτῃν ἀτυχήμες ἐπιδειχθῆσει θ’ ἁμα
ἀτυχῆς γεγονός καὶ σκαίος ἀγνώμων τ’ ἀνήρ.”


920 οἰμο[ι] γ’ εἴπεν οἷς σοῦ διεγόμου τότε
πρὸς] τὸν πατέρα, κοινωνὸς ἥκειν τοῦ βίου,
ἔπειτα δ’]οὺ δείξω σ’ εἰς δμοι’ ἐπταίκότα,
καὶ χρήσετ’ αὐτή σοι τότ’ ἡπίως, σύ δὲ

ΤΟ4

δμοια γ’ εϊπεν οίς σύ διενόου τότε
πρός] τὸν πατέρα, κοινωνός ήκειν τοΰ βίου,
ζεὺ σῶτερ, είπερ έστι δυνατὸν, σωίζε με.

ΧΑΡΙΣΙΟΣ

ἔγω τις ἀναμάρτητος, εἰς δόξαν βλέπων
καὶ τὸ καλὸν ὅ τι πότ’ ἐστὶ καὶ ταῖσχρόν σκοπῶν,
ἀκέραυος, ἀνεπιπληκτος αὐτὸς τῶν βλω—
ἐν μοι κέχρηται καὶ προσηκόντως πάνυ
tὸ δαιμόνιον—ἐντάυθ’ ἐδείξε’ ἀνθρώπος ὄν.
“ὁ τρισκακαδαμίον, μεγάλα φυσάς καὶ λαλεῖς,
ἀκούοις γυναικὸς ἀτύχημ’ οὐ φέρεις,
ἀυτὸν δὲ δεῖξο α’ εἰς οὕς ἐπταῖκότα,
καὶ χρήσετ’ αὐτῇ σοι τότ’ ἡπίως, σοῦ δὲ
tαύτῃν ἀτυχήμες ἐπιδειχθῆσει θ’ ἁμα
ἀτυχῆς γεγονός καὶ σκαίος ἀγνώμων τ’ ἀνήρ.”


930 τί δε μοι πατρός;
έρω διαρρήδην “έμοί συ, Σμικρίνη,
mή πάρεχε πράγματ’ οὐκ απολείπει μ’ ε γυνή,
tί συνταράττεις καί βιάζηι Παμφίλην;” —
τι[ ι’ α]υ βλέπω γω;

Ον.

πάνυ κακῶς ἔχω σφόδρα,
μή μ’ ἐγκαταλίπηις.

Ον.

(Χαρ.) οὔτος ἑπαρομεύ[νος]
ἔστηκας, ἱερόσυλε, μου;

[Ον.] [μ]ὰ τοὺς θεοῦς;

[Χαρ.] α[ . . . . ] λαθεῖν

[Ον.] ποτ . . . . οὐθ[

[Χαρ.] ἐγὼ σε λανθάνειν πον[

βροντῶντα.

(Χαρ.) δια . ε[

(Αβρ.) ἀλλ᾽ οὐθὲν ὕφθησε[ι]

(Χαρ.) τίς εἰσ . . . . αὐ . εἰς . [

(Αβρ.) οὐκ αἰσ[θά]γης;

(Χαρ.) τίς εἰσ . . . . αὐ . εἰς . [

(Αβρ.) οὐχ ἂν εἰ[μὸν τὸ π]α[ιδίον]

(Χαρ.) οὐκ ἂν σό[ν; 945

(Αβρ.) βούλει μ᾽ ἀπ[]

(Χαρ.) ἀλλ᾽ ἔξαπτ[ίνης]

(?) ἐμ᾽ ἐπρ[πε]

(?) ε[ . . . ] εἰς[

(Χαρ.) τί φῆς, Ὁν[ήσιμ᾽], ἐξεπειράθη[τε] μου;

(Ον.) αὐ[τή] μ᾽ ἔπεισε, νὴ τὸν Ἀπόλλων [καὶ θε]ούς.

(Χαρ.) καὶ σὺ μὲ περισπαῖς, ἱερόσυλε;

(Αβρ.) μὴ μάχου,

γλυκύτατε, τῆς γαμετῆς γυναικὸς ἐστὶ σου
touti] γ[αρ, οὐκ ἀλλότριον.

(Χαρ.) εἰ γὰρ ὄψειν.

(Αβρ.) νὴ τὴν] φύλην Δήμητρα.

(Χαρ.) τίνα λόγον λέγεις;

(Αβρ.) τίνα; τὸν] ἄληθῆ.

(Χαρ.) Παμφιλῆς τὸ παιδίον;

(Αβρ.) οὐκ ἡν] τὸ παιδίον;

(Χαρ.) καὶ σὸν γ᾽ ὁμοίως.

(Χαρ.) Παμφιλῆς;

Act Four

Άβρότο]νον, ίκε[τ]εύω σε, μ[ή] μ' ἀναπτέρου
[— (gap of 10-13 lines) —]

(Αβρ.)
πός ἐγώ, τάλαν,
πρ}ν πάντ᾿ εἰδέναι

(Χαρ.)
ὁρθὸς λέγεις.
ο μοι:
... ἔρε
δύμως
το[ύ]το δή
βούλομαι
ματα.

[ΧΟΡΟΥ]

Act Five

[?Χαι.]... έμενον
tα]ύτη],[,]ος[ 980
]

Χ[α]ρ[εστρ]α', ήδη το μετά τα[ΰτ]α σκεπτ[ον,
διαμ]μενεῖς ὅν Χαρισιῶν φ[λος
ο[δός ποτ' ἡσθα πιστός. οὐ γάρ ἐσ[τι που
έταιριδιον τούτον συμ[ενεὶς τοῦ]χον
ποιον; ήδη τέτοιον· ὅ νοος
καὶ πρώτον αὐτήν κατά μόνα[ς
τόν φιλτα[τ]ον καὶ τόν γλυκύτατα[ν]
[— gap of approximately ten lines —]

.... ]ιστρ
.... ], χαλ[
εἰ τὸ χαλδόν . [
όσπερ λύκ[ος

άπελήλυθ[ 1005
άποστ[ 1005
φίλο[ 1005
dιαι[ 1005
ού χρι[ 1005
καιν[ 1005
δόσα μ. [ 1005
ὴν μο. [ 1005
ἐνδον πρ[ 1005
ἐνοχεν: ου[ 1005
. . . . ]οσπ[ 1005

[— gap of max. 4 lines —]

ἐπ' αὐτό[ 1020
δοντως . β[ 1020
ἀλλ' ἔξαπατ[ 1020

Ον. 1020
ἀπέσωσε συ . [ 1020
ἐγὼ δ[ἐ] προς[ 1020
. . αν 1020

[— gap of between 10-14 lines —]

]ἐλα . [ 1035
τ]ουτ[ . . . . [ . . ] . 1035
τ]ης . αι . . . . ει . 1035
] . ου χαχά 1035
] . ο . . . [ . 1035
]Α]βρότονον 1035
] . ωι 1035
]τε[ 1035
]γ[ 1035
]αν . . . σου 1035
] . . . . . . . . . . 1035
]ουτε 1035
to]ύτ' ἀλλα συ 1035
] . ζ τουτ[ο]νι 1035
] . [ 1035

[— gap of max. 4 lines —]

1005 ἀποστ[ερεῖν Sudhaus 1008 οὔ χρι[νομα leg. suppl. Sudhaus, vel οὔχορ[δα Guéraud 1019 [A]βρότονον Lefebvre, Guéraud 1021 οὐλ|λαβοσεξ Sudhaus
σώφρονα: τοιαυτησί γάρ ούχ ἀπέσχετ’ ἃν ἐκείνος, εὕ τούτ’ οἶδ· ἐγὼ δ’ ἀφέξομαι.

Σμ. ἂν μὴ κατὰξω τὴν κεφαλὴν σου, Σωφρόνη, κάκιστ’ ἀπολομίην. νουθετήσεις καὶ σὺ με; προπετῶς ἀπάγω τὴν θυγατέρ’, ιερόσυλε γραφή; ἄλλα περὶ τὸν ἄρπαγεῖν τὴν προῖκα μου τὸν χρηστὸν αὐτῆς ἄνδρα καὶ λόγους λέγω περὶ τὸν ἐμαυτοῦ; ταῦτα συμπείθεσις με σὺ;

σώφρονα* τοιαυτησί γάρ ούχ άπέσχετ’ ἃν ἐκείνος, εὕ τούτ’ οἶδ· ἐγὼ δ’ ἀφέξομαι.

Σμ. ἂν μὴ κατὰξω τὴν κεφαλὴν σου, Σωφρόνη, κάκιστ’ ἀπολομίην. νουθετήσεις καὶ σὺ με; προπετῶς ἀπάγω τὴν θυγατέρ’, ιερόσυλε γραφή; ἄλλα περὶ τὸν ἄρπαγεῖν τὴν προῖκα μου τὸν χρηστὸν αὐτῆς ἄνδρα καὶ λόγους λέγω περὶ τὸν ἐμαυτοῦ; ταῦτα συμπείθεσις με σὺ;

σώφρονα* τοιαυτησί γάρ ούχ άπέσχετ’ ἃν ἐκείνος, εὕ τούτ’ οἶδ· ἐγὼ δ’ ἀφέξομαι.
(Σμ.) λέγεις δὲ τί;
(Ον.) σαφῶς διδάξω σ'. εἰσὶν αἱ πάσαι πόλεις,
όμοιον εἰπέτω, χλαία: τρισμύριοι
οίκοιοι' ἐκάστην. καθ' ἕνα τούτων οἱ θεοὶ
ἐκάστον ἐπιτρίβουσιν ἢ σώζουσιν;

(Σμ.) πῶς;
(Ον.) λέγεις γὰρ ἐπίπονον τῷ' αὐτοῦς ζῆν [βίον.
οὐκ ἀρα φροντίζουσιν ἡμῶν [οί] [θεοί,
φήσεις; ἐκάστοι τὸν τρόπον συγ[ώδισαν
φούραρον' οὗτος ἔνδε[λ]ήξ[ής ἐγκείμενος
ἐπέτριψεν, ἂν αὐτῶι κακῶς χρη[σώμεθα,
ἐτερον δ' ἐσώσεν. οὗτος θεός ἡμῶν θεός
ο τ' αἴτως καὶ τοῦ καλῶς καὶ τοῦ κακῶς
πράττειν ἐκάστῳ: τοῦτον θάνατον ζωῆς
μηδὲν ἄτοπον μηδ' ἀμαθές, ἵνα πράττητις καλῶς.

(Σμ.) πώς;
(Ον.) λέγεις γάρ επίπονόν τιν' αὐτοῦς ζῆν ἢ [βίον.

(Σμ.) συντρίβει σε.
(Σμ.) τῆς παρρησίας.
(Ον.) ἄλλ' ἀπαγαγεῖν παρ' ἀνδρός αὐτοῦ θυγατέρα
ἀγαθόν σὺ κρίνεις, Σμικρίνη;
(Σμ.) λέγει δὲ τίς
tούτ' ἀγαθόν; ἄλλα νῦν ἀναγχαίον.
(Ον.) θεός;
(Σμ.) τὸ κακὸν ἀναγχαίον λογίζεθ' οὔ[τ]οσι.
(Ον.) τούτων τις ἄλλος, οὐχ ὁ τρόπος, ἀπολλύει;
καὶ νῦν μὲν ὃρμῶν' ἐπὶ πονηρὸν πράγμα 
στεφάνων ἀποσέσωκε, καὶ καταλαμβάνεις
dιαλλαγάς λύσεις τ' ἐκείνος τῶν κακῶν.

(Σμ.) θυγατριδοῦν, μαστιγία;
(Ον.) παντόκροτος καὶ σὺ, νοῦν ἔχειν δοχῶν.

παρ' άνδρός [οί] Σμικρίνη, μαστιγία;
οὔτως ἐπίγαμον παλὶ' ἐπίγαμον; τοιγαροῦν
tέρασιν ὅμοια πεντάμηνα παυδία
ἐκτρέφομεν.

1091 Lefebvre 1092 von Arnim 1093 suppl. Sudhaus 1094 fin. Furley, vel
Wilamowitz: ἐνδο[ν]
Wilamowitz: ἐνδο[ν]
1096 Sandbach 1095 suppl. Wilamowitz 1102 σαυτοῦ C, corr. Leo: σαυτοῦ
1105 οὐ[τ]οσι Lefebvre 1106 αφιεο ex αφιεεο C: άφιεσο Lefebvre 1116 πεντάμηνα
(Σμ.) ούχ οἶδ' ὦ τι λέγεις.
(Ον.) ἥ γραύς δὲ γε οἴδ', ὡς ἐγώμαι: τότε γὰρ οὕμος δεσπότης τοῖς Ταυροπολίοις—

(Σμ.) Σωφρόνη,
(Ον.) ταύτην λαβὼν
χορῶν ἀποσπασθεὶσαν—
(Σμ.) αἰσθάνει γε;
(Ον.) νὴ;

νυνὶ δ' ἀναγνωρισμὸς αὐτοῖς γέγονε καὶ ἀπαντὲν ἀγαθά.

(Σμ.) τί φησιν, ἱερόσυλε γραύ;
(Ον.) “ἡ φύσις ἐβούλεθ', ἤ γνώμων οὐδὲν μέλεν: γυνὴ δ' ἐπ' αὐτῶί τῶιδ' ἐφώ.”
(Σμ.) τί;
(Ον.) μῶρος εἰ;

τραγικὴν ἐρῶ σοι ὅρπιν ἐξ Αὐγῆς ἀλην ἄν μὴ ποτ' ἀἰσθη, Σμερνή.

(Σμ.) σῷ μοι χολὴν
[χ]ινεῖς παθαινομένη σὺ γὰρ σφόδρ’ οἶοθ' ὧ τι ὀὕτοις λέγει νῦν.
(Ον.) οἴδεν, οἴ[θ'], εὖ ἵσθ' ὧτι ἥ γραύ']ς προτέρα συνήχε.

(Σμ.) πάνδεινον λέγεις.
(Ον.) ο[θ'] γέγο[θ'] γεν εὐτύχησα μετέκον οὐδὲ ἐν.
(Σμ.) εἰ τροῦτ' ἀλήθες ἔσθ' ὧ λέγεις, τὸ παιδίον ἐκ τ[ῆς γ]αμετής γυν[αἰκὸς α]ν Χαρίσιωι γ'ένοιτο.

Χαι. ταύτην η[ ±5-6 Άβρότ]ονον.
(Σμ.?)[ ±5-6 ]
(Σμ. ?) [ἀψωφητός ἐστ' ἄνθρωπος
(Χαλ. ?) [. . . . . . ] ἀπασι, Σμικρ[ήνη,

( traces of six more lines)
Unplaced Fragments

P. Berol. 21142

See Austin (1973, no. 138) = PCG vol. VIII, com. adesp. 1121. The name Charisios in line 5 is the only reason for attributing the fragment to Epitrep. Handley (2009) suggests that the coarse banter of πίνειν...βινεῖν suits the opening conversation between Karion and Onesimos.

col. ii

είς ἐτερα ν[   
μὴ στι πει[   
Χαρισίωι πρ[   
ἄλλα λέλυτα[ι   
πίνειν μ[   
βινεῖν ε . [   
οὔθεὶς. -κελ[ευ   
προστάξατ . [   
ἀγαπα κολα[   
ἐπισταλη . [   
εἴρη . ]   
. [   

Unplaced fragments of M (P. Mich.)

4733 fr. 1

K.-G. suggest that the fragment belongs around 603-631.

] . . . χα[   
]ον: Καρ[ι(ων)   
]. εβεν[   
]. αφ . . [   
λ]ευχο[ν   
]ον λ[ια[ν   
]π[   

4733 fr. 4

K.-G. suggest that the fragment belongs to Smikrines’ speech to Pamphile in the fourth act.

][ . . . [   
ψάλτρια τ .
4733 fr. 6

K.-G. assign the fragment for physical reasons to column XIX (= lines 676ff.).

4801g, fr. 1

K.-G. point out that lines 2 and 3 of this fragment are either very short or mark the beginning of a new act; but the words preserved do not seem to match any beginning of an act in Epitrep. In fact it is very unlikely that two successive lines would be so short as not to appear at all in positions 2 and 3. One might speculate that the line endings (which are clearly metrical) come from a metrical hypothesis of the play; the vivid προς θεών in line 10 does not appear to suit that idea. Or one might try fitting the line endings of 4ff. at the beginning of act 2, in combination with the extant line beginnings in P. On the assumption that dotted theta at the end of P is, in fact, omikron, one might postulate, without much confidence:

έπι[σταμαί μὲν] πάντα τὰ νόερ' εὖ πράσα[α]

but νόερος is unattested in comedy. If the final letter of P were epsilon (not theta) one might try:

έπι[σχοπῶ 'γω] πάντα τ' ἀνερευνῶ [but Nünlist (per litt.) says that the omega of ἀνερευνῶ does not suit the traces.

{o . . [}
Unplaced Fragments

4 Perhaps ὤ]πέρευ.
11 E.g. καὶ[λώς K.-G.
12 Perhaps μα[χο[-. K.-G. suggest χο[λή[ν or σχο[λή[ν but omit the omikron after chi in their transcription.

fr. 4800B26/B17F

6 Since M has abbreviations of speaker names in mid-line K.-G. surmise that chi after dikolon may indicate that Charisios or Chairestratos begins to speak.

fr. 4807c

Miscellaneous unplaced fragments

3 K.-Th.

Photius Berol. 83.2 ἀλύειν τὸ μηδὲν πράττειν. Μένανδρος Ἐπιτρέπουσιν.

(Οὐ,) τι δ' οὖ ποιεῖς ἄριστον; ὡ δ' ἀλύει πάλαι κατακείμενος.
4 K.-Th.

Erotianus 41.18 Nachmanson. ἦστιν ἑχίνος χύτρας εἰδος μεγαλοστόμου καὶ μεγάλης. μέμνηται τῆς λέξεως Μένανδρος ἐν Ἐπιτρέπουσιν.

5 K.-Th.

Athenaeus 119e. Μένανδρος Ἐπιτρέπουσιν:

(Kα.) ἐπέπασα
ἐπὶ τὸ τάριχος ἀλας, ἐὰν οὕτω τύχηι.

9 K.-Th.

Orion, Anthol. VII.9 Haffner. ἐκ τοῦ Γεοργοῦ· οὐθὲν πέπονθας δεινόν, ἂν μὴ προσποιήσῃ.

?P.Oxy. 3969

In 1992 E.W. Handley published a scrap of new comedy tentatively ascribed to Menander; the fragment contains a Smikrines and there is talk of a daughter (fr. 1) and giving something. At the end of fr. 1 someone bids Smikrines fairwell. Conceivably, the fragment belongs to Epitrepontes although Handley points to other characters called Smikrines in Aspis, possibly Sikyonios and the Greek original of Plautus’ Aulularia. In fr. 4 χαιρε[ could be Chairestratos.
Chapter 3

Composite Readings

The purpose of this section is twofold. On the one hand it aims to unburden the apparatus at points in the text where multiple papyri permit a reconstruction of continuous text; on the other it aims to facilitate understanding of this reconstruction for the reader. He or she can see for himself which letters come from which papyri, where they overlap, where there are still gaps etc. It should be emphasized that the readings given below do not constitute a re-edition of the papyri. They do not supplant or replace the authoritative publication of these papyri in any way. Nevertheless, I have checked the originals of the papyri wherever possible, and good photographs wherever not, and have tried to form my own judgement as to which letters can be read. For this reason readers will find minor discrepancies between some of the readings given below and those printed in the papyrological editions. Where there are discrepancies these represent places, of course, where readings are difficult and doubtful. At such points certainty does not exist, and we must all be cautious. I have tried to steer a course between respect for the original publications and a certain independence of judgement. One can make serious mistakes by adopting others’ readings without checking them oneself, as the slightest error in the original publication – for example, a misplaced or missing square bracket – if reproduced, perpetuates the illusion of a certain reading where there is none. Finally, I hope setting out the fragments like this will allow others to share the fun of reconstructing Menander from a diversity of traces on papyrus. Establishing a text at such points is like walking on the smallest of stepping stones through a worryingly deep river.

I use different colours to distinguish different papyri contributing to the text of a given passage; I use lunate sigma instead of the conventional two sigma shapes used in the main text (which make reading somewhat easier).

1 I am grateful to René Nünlist for checking my readings of the Michigan fragments, which are based on photographs kindly made available by L. Koenen; thanks to Nünlist also for a photograph of the last fragments (lines 1128-44).
3.1 Lines 150-164 etc.

Sources: O25 = P.Oxy. 4021, fr. 1 and 2; Membr. Petrop.

[Text transcription]

151 Or προε[ Bathrellou. If epsilon, perhaps e.g. προεχ- or προσε[λθ-.  
152 μαλ’ ή[δέωc Bathrellou, but the alpha does not match this scribe’s usual alpha.  
153-δους possible.  
155 Previous suggestions involve ὁ γέρων or, because of ink above and to the right of γ (apostole), γ’ ἐρόν (Parsons). For the ‘false apostrophe’, however, Austin compares (per litt.) fr. 3 l. 8 γ’ ἐνοιτ[. The letter after omega is, however, anything but clear. Perhaps it is not even a letter, but a mark showing the end of someone’s speech, as in 160. Since the apostole is clear, I tentatively suggest δ γ’ ἐρό.  
155 Parsons suggests ἐροτῶ or ἐρῶ τῶ[ν. Bathrellou plausibly read ἐρ̄. Austin
suggests e.g. (per litt.) ἐράτω [πορνιδίου καὶ πινέτω / ἀσχοῦς ἐκατόν.

156 Parsons suggests ἄχοο (referring to wine-bibbing), ἄγχοο (’not suited to the style?’) or ἄγχοο (’but elsewhere ἀπάγχεσθαι’). Bathrellou picks up the first suggestion (ἀσχοῦς) and reads the next word as ἐκατόν (’a hundred wine flasks’). It is difficult, however, to circumvent ἄγχοο palaeographically. The second letter can be read as sigma only at a considerable stretch. After the gap, there is a trace of a middle horizontal, which might be epsilon. Then I am relatively confident we have the ligature epsilon-iota, which is characteristic of this scribe, then, probably, tau, of which only the cross bar can be seen. A plausible supplement eludes me, unless ἄγχοο, ‘near’, is considered acceptable in comic diction: e.g. ἄγχοο δ’ ἔκειτο ν[. Or: ἄγχοον’ ἔκει τόν [.


158 letter traces above γ of οὐκ ξων or ηων.

160 After πο νυ looks most likely, supporting Austin’s δ (δ’) εἶπον. After (?)νυ there are further unintelligible ink marks (change of speaker? - Parsons).

161 There seems to be dikolon after delta, but hardly to mark a change of speaker.

162 I read θαντα, followed perhaps by τ.

163 I read τοῦτο.

3.2 Lines 657-670

Sources: C = P.Cair. 43227; lines 657-667 O27 = P.Oxy. 4023; L = Frag. Laurentianum

3.2 Lines 657-670

Sources: C = P.Cair. 43227; lines 657-667 O27 = P.Oxy. 4023; L = Frag. Laurentianum
3.3 Lines 676-710

Sources: C = P.Cair. 43227; M = P.Mich. 4733 fr. 1; 4807 frr. g 1,2 and 3; 4801 j; L = Frag. Laurentianum

666 λέγων vel γ[ Parsons O27
ους

ους

αυ

ουδ' αν [ 685

ουχ αν μα την Δημητρα δεκατον ημε[ 690

μερος τι[ 695

υψηλος ουν τις [ . . . . ] ουχ οιμωξεται

ξεται

καταφθαρεις τ' ε[ 700

κατ[ . . . ] αρει[ ] ε ματρυλλω τον βιο[ 705

μετα της καλης [ ] αικος ην επεισαιγει

κατα της καλης [ ] αικος ην επεισαιγει

βωσεθ' ημας [ ] δε γινωσκων δοκων:

βω[ ] ημας [ ] δε γειν [. . ] εκειν δο[

ζαζι λαβων

Composite Readings

\[\begin{align*}
\text{[Z]υι^x} & \text{ οωκ οιδα τουτω[} \\
\text{αλλ απιεναι δ . [} \\
\text{μι εκτιν αρετη τατοπον φευγειν αει (fr. 179c Κ.-Σ.)} \\
\text{μι εκτιν αρετη [} \\
\text{[ΠΑ]^μ} & \text{ παπα, τι τουτ εκτιν} \\
\text{αι ει . γεινη χυρο[} \\
\text{οκιας σχολ . γαρ ε[} \\
\text{ταμοψιβς[ολα δει]} \\
\text{παλαι πρ . τει[} \\
\text{.... υπερ ειμ[ . ]γνουθβ[} \\
\end{align*}\]

676 last letter not iota, perhaps lambda or mu (Nünlist).
690 After μερος in C apparently not a kappa, more like a tau.
704 Monost. 339: το άτοπον cod.: τον άτοπον Or.
709 On the reading προτει[ Nünlist writes: ‘omikron and iota are very uncertain. The former could also be two letters’.

3.4 786-835

Sources: M = P.Mich. 4733 fr. 2; 4801 fr. a; P.Oxy. 3532 frr. 3; P.Oxy. 3533.

\[\begin{align*}
\text{[ . . . . ]κα επιβρ[} \\
\text{[ . . . . ] . αλει σε λυ[μανειται} \\
\text{[ . . . . ]ητ ενεγκαι[} \\
\text{[ . . . . ]σαδ[} \\
\end{align*}\]
3.4 786-835

{ [. . . . ] , ε βιωσεται[
    ] . . . . . . . οχ[

{ [. . . . ] τούτο αυ [ ] . ραμυθ[] . . ντο . [ ] αυτή παραμυθίων ποτε

{ [. . . . ] χυθρωπαζ[
    ] . νουθε[ . . . ] ζα[
    ] . παζουσα νουθετουσ' αει

{ [. . . . ] της εχους[
    ] οτ . . . . . Χ[
    ] ουσα σχη . . . . ζισακε καθ[

] θα παραλυ[σει]

] χ . . επον παμ[
] ραλυει σε· χαλεπον παμ[

] ερα γυναιξι[

] σφηνην μα[
] ναικι προς πορνην μαχι[

] πανουργηι[

    ] α οιδεν [ ] αισχρων παμ[
    ] ουργει, πλει[ . . ] ναι αισχρων παμ[

] [ ] κολακευει[

] γ, αιςχρω . [
] λακευει μαλλον, αιςχρω . [

] αλως νυν[

    ] γ, πυθ[
    ] γ, νυν ταυτα σοι την πυθ[

] γαι νομιζ σ[

    ] [ . . . ] . σμενα
] γομιζ', ακρει , ως εσομεν[

] ροθεμενηι[

    ] τοι λ[
    ] μενη του . . ταντι τω[

{ [. . . . ] δεν αχοντ][

    ] . . . . . θ[
    ] οντος ποησαις ουποτ' αγ
Composite Readings

[ΠΑμ]

805

810
3.4 786-835

{[ ... . . . δ]ε δει touton[ ]
   . [ . ]γεν δε δει tout . [ ]

{[ . . . ]γ]ες ειπας αρτιω[ ]
   ε[ . ]μεν γαρ ειπας αρτ . [ ]

{[ . . . ]ες απολειθ ου[ ]
   . [ . ]ηχας απολειθ ου[ ]

{[ . . . . ]π]οτερον η[λ]θ[ ]
   δια touto' ποτερον . [ ]

{[ . . . . ]τ]υχηους εαυ [ ]
   ευνευτυχηους αν[ ]

{[ . . . . ]προιδω ματ[ ]
   αυτωι προιδω μα tou[ ]

{[ . . . . ]ον]ος ηλθον το[υ ]
   κοινωνος ηλθον τ[ ]

{[ . . . . ]εν οιω tout[on ]
   επταίχεν οιω tout[ ]

{[ . . . . ]οικουνθ ύπ[ ]
   δυ οικιοις οικουντα γ[ ]

{[ ]ντ εξει . . λα[ ]
   προσεχοντ εξεινη . [ ]
   αλλ ει μεν ετερον μ ει[ ]
   μηδεν οδυνηρον μη[ ]
   καλως εχει μοι tout[ ]
   ει δ εε ταθελον tout[ ]
   ταυτ εις τουαυ ηξου[ ]
   αλλ εγβαλει με τωι χ . [ ]
   αιθησετ ευνουν ouc[ ]

   . . . . ον εξεινην ε . [ ]
   . . . . ων' εσθαι γαρ προς[ ]
   . . ]α το χειρον ραδιο . [ ]
   . ]μας εξεινη διαβ[ ]
   . ] . θεν . [. ]αθ[ ] . )λ [ ]

787 'the beta is very uncertain, as are Gronewald's supplements' (Nünlist).
789 ['καλ]ως is on the short side' (Nünlist).
800 The theta near line end in O23, if correctly read, points to a (mistaken) spelling here oυποθ' αν.
804 In M the first trace, an upright stroke, appears compatible with nu or iota. After omikron-nu the next letter can hardly by eta (K.-G.) as there is a top cross stroke compatible with tau or pi. After that a trace before tau might be iota: I read ] , οντ , τευ-. In O24 ]ρ-ι-οτ-α-μ[ are relatively clear, suggesting the supplement παρισταμένη (Turner). But in O23, whilst the rho may be discerned, the letter before that does not look like alpha. εύνοια παρισταμένη involves a split anapaest. Arnott’s ύπερισταμένη is a rare verb and receives no direct palaeographical support, although it avoids the split anapaest. The letter after -οι- in O24 looks like alpha, suggesting scriptio plena if ύπερ- really followed. There may be one or two letters in the gap in O24; if two, then one might consider εύνοιας παρισταμένης in absolute construction, although this places new requirements on the missing beginning of the line.

805 In O23 ]ε or ]ζ (small trace of horizontal; break in right side of arc). At end επα[ or επλ[.

806 O24 in. pi or perhaps tau-omikron (Nünlist) after upsilon. In O23 there is no trace of the bottom stroke of delta in first position, so lamda is more likely. The nu usually read after upsilon at left edge (δυν-) cannot be right, as the serif of the left vertical points the wrong way and there is no sign of a diagonal. I suggest λυπηρον instead of δυνατον. For the last four letter shapes compare δυνατον in line 825 of O23. O24 clearly shows υτρ (or, possibly υπ), then a gap, then omikron(?)-nu. So, on my reconstruction of the line, the gap must have contained nine letters, three more than the equivalent gap in the next line (six letters). I suggest that O24 had πάππα, τούτο instead of τούτο, πάππα, with six letters in the gap (five plus two halves: το]υτο [λυπηρον) as in the following line.

807 ‘there is a problem with spacing in this line. M almost certainly had a defective text (based on comparison with 023 and 24)’ (Nünlist).

808 O23 fin. εχ[ or ευ[.

810 ‘last letter could also be tau’ (Nünlist).

813 In O23 The visible left half of the first letter looks more like psi than phi. One might consider ψεγειν, but there is a cross-bar (as in pi) before gamma which seems to rule out epsilon. Nor does it seem to suit upsilon particularly well.

815 I read O23 this way. The first letter cannot, in my opinion, be omikron or alpha (δ μέν or α μέν) as a small crossbar is visible dividing the arc; epsilon seems to me the only possibility as theta does not produce a word. ετ, ευ, ες- all seem possibilities.

816 O23: the hook of the initial letter looks more like part of upsilon than alpha in this hand to me. ύφηκας, then, rather than άφηκας (Turner) or άνήκας vel sim. If ink has been rubbed off the first letter one might also consider the trace to be part of the arc of epsilon (έθηκας).

819 ‘O23 has ματογ’ (Nünlist).
822 O23 has οικουντα followed probably by upsilon. So, if M’s reading is right, we seem to have scriptio plena for οικουνθ’ υ’, although O23 elsewhere does not have scriptio plena (e.g. in 827).

823 M has what looks like two lamdas (e.g. α]λα[α) before the break, but if εκεινη before is right, λα (e.g. λα[μβαν-) looks a more likely reading.

829 ‘What Turner deciphered as alpha is in my view the apex-shaped serif of chi’ (Nünlist).

832 Or προχ[ Turner.

3.5 1128-44

C and P.Mich. 4801g fr. 1, 2 and 3

{[ ... ]} ε λεγει νυν: οιδ[ ... ] ευ ισθ’ οτι
{[ ... ]} ει νυν οιδεν οι[ ]

{[ ... ]} Περα συνηξε: πανδεινον λεγει[ ]
{[ ... ]} τερα συν[ ] ηε[ ±9 ] γεις

{[ ... ]} ευτυχημα μειζον ουδε εν
{[ ... ]} γε ... εν ευτυχ . η[ ±10 ] ε εν

{[ ... ]} ταληθες εθ’ ο λεγεις το παιδον
{[ ... ]} ει τ ... αληθες εθ’ ο[ ±11 ] διον

{[ ... ]} ΑΠΕ ταυτ[ ... ] η[ ±9 ] νον[ ]

{[ ... ]} ΑΠΕ νυν ... [ ±10 ] ουλ[ ]
{[ ... ]} ο[ ±9 ] ακ[ ]

{[ ... ]} γομαχηι: ε[ ... ] ακ[ ]

( traces of 5 more lines )

1128 M’s οιδεν seems to add an ending to C’s οιδ[ ], but it has to be admitted that omikron-iota are not certain readings. There is a horizontal ink stroke between the two letters which, in themselves, would suggest the reading epsilon-iota (ειδεν). One might take C’s οιδ[ ] as haplography for ειδενοιδ. But ειδεν fits the context less well, particularly as Smikrines had questioned Sophrone with οισθ’ in 1127, and the triple use of οιδα by Onesimos in his jesting response (οιδεν, οιδ’, ειδ ισθ’ οτι) would be spoilt by reading ειδεν. Moreover, what had Sophrone ‘seen’? Pamphile’s baby? That is indeed a possibility, but, on balance, I think we should give M’s οιδεν the benefit of the doubt.
1134 oevl, as in ieposvli-? iouv [K.-G., who suggest ἀφροζύν]η (sic).
1135 Perhaps [ε]φαξ[-, ‘[he/she] has seen’.
1136 -χης, -χες K.-G., but the letter after chi does not look like epsilon. After sigma traces which might be chi (Χ[αφεστράτωι or Χ[αφισίωi?), or zeta (Ζ[μικρίνη Nünlist).
Chapter 4

Translation

4.1 Hypothesis

Epi[
Epitre[pontes which begins:
‘Well, heavens, [Onesimos
didn’t your m[aster...’

The drama is among the b[est.
It excels through the [display of all character types, [having] two
[slaves], one [pleading] moder[ately, the other brashly,
a wife [behaving] properly,
an hetaera uprightly, an o[lder man fond of money, [always] calculating,
a slave speaking vind[ictively

... 5

4.2 Act One

Fr. 1

Karion

For Christ’s sake, Onesimos, didn’t your master
– who’s now hired the artiste, Habrotonon –
only just get married?

(Onesimos) That’s correct.
I like you, Onesimos
You’re a busybody…
…there’s nothing nicer
than to know all the facts…

[Probably Smikrines speaking]
For a decent person being laughed at’s
worse. Suffering, after all, ’s the common lot.

[Probably Smikrines speaking]
A free man’s not obliged, I think,
to tolerate indulgence plus offensiveness.

[The Petersburg parchment begins]

...the wine he [bought]! That’s what amazes me.
I’m not talking about the excessive drunkenness.
But it’s bordering on the incredible to think
he insists on drinking himself into the ground
with wine for fifteen quid a glass.

Just
what I was waiting for. This’ll put the cat
among the pigeons.

What’s it to me? To hell with him!
He collared a dowry of four whole silver talents
but doesn’t consider himself attached to his wife.
He’s flown the nest. Twelve whole drachmi a day’s
the price he’s paying the pimp!

Twelve indeed.
He’s well informed on the detail of the matter.

Enough to feed a man for a month and a week.

That’s cutting it thin. Two obols a day
used to be enough to feed a beggar on watery soup.

(Charisios is waiting for you, Chairestratos.)
Who’s this then, sweety?

(Chai.) The father of the bride.
He’s looking sour like a down-at-heel philosopher strapped for cash.

(Sm.) The scoundrel [has] a mistress [...] [abandoning] his wife [...] [— six lines missing —] [...] give [it] back [...] Habr. The dowry [...] what I’ll say.
Sm. About that — — — by night.
Chai. Well [...] Habro[tonon]
Habr. But didn’t [they] call [...] (Chai.) [...] but — no offence intended! — don’t keep saying what I said.
(Chair.) Give me a break! You’ll be sorry!
(Sm. [still talking to himself] I’ll go inside now. And, having ascertained the details of my daughter’s situation, I’ll think how best to come to terms with this fellow. [exit]
(?)Habr. Should we tell Charisios he’s here?
(Chair.) We should indeed. What a rat! He’ll wreck the family.
(?)Habr. And others, too, I wouldn’t mind.
(Chair.) Others?
(Habr.) Let’s say, the neighbours’...
(Chair.) You mean mine?
(?)Habr. You’ve caught on. Now let’s join Charisios.
(Chair.) Yes, let’s, because I can see a riotous crowd of drunken youths and they’re heading our way. Better not to tangle with them, I think. [exeunt]

[Choral Interlude]

4.3 Act Two

(Onesimos) [to himself] ] all hum[an] things [
Translation

thinking
[...]
the master
the old man
nor word

[—±41 fragmentary lines including: —]

[Onov]

(Smikrines) [to himself]
...my daughter...
...as the expression goes...
...persuade, persist...
...not from his point of view...
...has [ruined] thousands...
...a pretty pickle, if it’s necessary...
...saying ‘I’m beyond the pale...
...I’m drunk, I’ve got a hangover...
...I’ll tell him...
...put him to the test, since now...
...no one tells him;...
...works. To be strong is [surely good
but a healthy man who’s lazy’s much worse off
than an invalid. He eats twice as much
—and to no effect! Well, I’ll see [him later.

(Daos)
[bursting in]
Wait! Oh, what an afternoon...!

(Syriskos)
[running from Daos]
So long! You can wait here by yourself!
It’s each man for himself as far as I’m concerned.

(Da.) That’s not fair!
Syr. No
...to my master’s...
...He lives here...
...lives...

[After 1-2 lines the Cairo codex begins]

(Syriskos) [in the middle of an argument]
You’re avoiding justice.

(Daos) And you’re a lousy blackmailer!
You can’t have what’s not yours.
We need a referee
to adjudicate.

I agree. We’ll go to arbitration.

But who?

Anyone’s OK with me. I’m in
the right. Oh, why did I go shares with you?

How about him

as referee?

OK with me.

Excuse me, sir. Could you spare us a moment of your time?

You? What for?

We can’t agree on a matter.

What’s that to me?

We’re looking for
an impartial arbitrator. Unless you’re busy,
settle our dispute.

Miserable oafs!
In your rags, hanging around engaged in legal
quibbles!

Nevertheless. The matter is simple,
easily explained. Please, do us the favour!
Don’t ignore us, for mercy’s sake! At all times
and in all places justice must prevail;
it’s a common principle in everyone’s life
that the chance passer-by must have a care
for this ideal.

I’ve tangled with a proper orator!
O why did I go shares?

Will you abide, though,
by what I decide?

Of course!

I’ll listen, then. Why
not? You – who’s said nothing yet – speak first.

I’ll have to go back a bit, not just
tell what’s come between us, so you’ll understand.
I was shepherding my flocks in the rough pasture
close by here, it must be, what, about a month
ago today, on my own, when – what do you know?
– I came on a baby boy, exposed he was, a mite,
with a necklace on, and some other stuff
like that.

(Sy.)               That's what this is about.
Da.                  He's interrupting!
(Sm.)               If you butt in like that, you'll feel
my stick on your back.
(Sy.)               All right.
(Sm.)               Speak!
(Da.)               I will.

Well, I picked him up and took him home with me,
I thought I'd bring him up. I thought that then.
But in the night, as generally happens, I had
second thoughts and began to wonder. Why should I
give myself the hassle of parenthood? Where was I
to get all the money? Why make life difficult?
That's how I felt. Well, I went out shepherding
next day and along he comes – a charcoal-burner –
to the same place looking for wood to chop
for charcoal. We weren't strangers to each other.
We got talking. He saw I was upset by something
and said, 'What's up, Daos?' And I said, 'Yeah, what?
It's my own fault.' And I explained the thing to him,
my discovery, my decision. Straightaway, before
I'd finished, he blurted out, 'Good on you,
Daos, good on you', he kept saying, over and over,
'Give me the child. It's in your interest.
You'll be free that way. My wife, you see,'
he said, 'just gave birth but the baby died.'
That's the lady who has the baby now.

[Smikrines turns to Syriskos]
Sm. Did you ask?
(Da.)               Well, Syriskos?— The whole day
he pestered me, wore me down with asking,
till I said yes. I parted with the kid. He went away
thanking me a thousand times. He kissed my hands
when he got it.
(Sm.)               Well, did you?
(Sy.)               Yes.
(Da.)               Off he went.

Then, bumping into me one day with his wife,
he asks for what went with the child – trinkets,
that's all, not worth talking about – he claims
they're his and now is kicking up a fuss because I won't part with them. I say they belong to me. In my view, he should be grateful now for what he got on asking. And if I won't give everything to him, he can't take me to task for that. If he'd been walking with me when I found it, it'd be 'finders, sharers', he'd have taken his bit, and I mine. But I found it by myself. You weren't there and yet you claim it all, while I get nothing. What's more, I gave you from my private property. If that's to your liking, keep it now; if not, you've changed your mind, give it back and don't rob me or complain. That you get everything, whether with or without my consent, is simply not right. Now I've had my say.

(Sy.) Has he finished?

(Sm.) Yes. Didn't you hear?

Sy. OK.

So now it's my turn. He found the child by himself. And everything he said just now is true. It happened just like that, sir. I don't deny it. I asked, I pleaded, and I took the child from off his hands. He told the truth. Then a shepherd let me know — one this man had chatted to, a workmate of his — that he'd found some valuables with the boy. And that, sir, is why I brought the child—

[turning to his wife] hand him over, will you, dear? — this child is here to claim the bracelets, Daos, and the tokens back. He says they were meant for his benefit, not your greed. And I, since I've become his guardian, support his claim. Your gift made me that.

[to Smikrines] Up to you now, friend, as far as I can see, to judge whether these gold trinkets — whatever they are — ought best, since the mother gave them — whoever she might be — be kept for the child, till he's grown up, or whether the thief should keep them just because he found lost property first. You ask why, when I took the child, I didn't ask you for the things? That wasn't an option then. But now on his behalf
I’ve come to lodge a claim – on not a single thing of my own. ‘Finders keepers?’ Don’t ‘find’ anything, if someone gets robbed in the process. That’s not discovery, that’s daylight robbery! Look at it this way, sir. Like as not this child’s above us socially and, if he’s raised by workers, he’ll feel out of place, and when he’s fully grown he’ll want to try the leisured class’s ways, hunting lions, swinging a javelin, athletic competitions. You’ve watched tragedy, I’m sure, and remember all the stories. How an old man, goatherd he was, found Neleus and Pelias, twins; he had on what I have now, a goatskin. When he discovered they were his superiors, he told them all, how he found them, took them in. And he gave them a little bag of tokens, too, which enabled them to ascertain their roots, and, from goatherds, they ended up becoming kings. If Daos robbed them of the things, and sold them, simply so he’d make a few quid profit, they’d have gone unrecognized their whole lives, such important people, of such grand stock. So it’s not right that I should get the child to raise, while all hope of its ever being saved is lost, dashed, thanks to Daos here, you see. Marriage to one’s sister’s been prevented by such tokens, or a son to his own mother. They’ve saved a brother’s life. Being so insecure, it’s everyone’s responsibility to guard life with forethought, taking all possible measures. ‘Give it back,’ he says, ‘if you’re not satisfied.’ He thinks that’s his trumpcard in the argument. It’s not right, if you’re obliged to render up an item of the child’s, to claim him back, too, so you can cheat more confidently in the future, now Chance has rescued something of the baby’s. That’s my case. Now judge as you think fit.

(Sm.) An easy matter. The things found with the child all belong to the child. That’s my decision.

(Da.) Fine.

How about the child?

(Sm.) Hell, I’ll hardly rule it’s yours
when you’re the offending party. It belongs to him who helped it and prevented you from injuring it.

(Sy.) Admirable, splendid fellow!

(Da.) A terrible judgement, I swear by God Almighty! I found everything, and now I’ve nothing. The non-finder takes all. And now I should deliver?

(Sm.) Exactly

(Da.) A terrible ruling!

Not an ‘admirable fellow’ at all.

(Sy.) Get on with it!

(Da.) Lord, the injustice of it!

(Sy.) Open your purse now, show what’s in it. They’re in there, aren’t they? Sir, please, stay a moment, till he’s done.

(Da.) Why, o why, did I let him judge?

(Sm.) Get on with it, scum!

[Da.] The injustice of it!

(Sm.) Got everything?

(Sy.) I think so, unless he swallowed something during my speech, when he saw he was losing.

(Sm.) Most unlikely.

(Sy.) Anyway, thanks, my friend. People like you ought to judge cases more often.

(Da.) The injustice of it!

I swear to God, there was never a more biased judgement.

Sy. You were the villain.

[Da.] Villain yourself, mind you keep the property safe for him.

I’ll be watching you, be sure of that, without respite.

(Sy.) Shut up and get lost!

[to his wife] Now, dear, take these and bring them in to Chairestratos indoors. We’ll stay here for the rest of the day, and tomorrow we’ll go out to work, having delivered our earnings. First, though, let’s count these one by one. Got a bag? Put them in your pocket.

[enter Onesimos, to himself:] You’ve never seen a more lethargic cook! This time yesterday
they were drinking already.

(Sy.) [examining the articles] Now this looks like a pretty brittle little cock. Here, take it.  
On. This is solid stone. It’s an axe.

(Sy.) And what’s that?

On. A signet ring, embossed in gold, on an iron band. The seal’s a bull, or goat maybe. Hard to tell. One Kleostratos made it, that’s what the letters on it read.

(Sy.) Here. Who are you?

(On.) This is... Who?

(Sy.) ... the ring!

(On.) What ring? I don’t understand.

(Sy.) Charisios, my master’s ring!

(On.) Are you crazy?

(Sy.) The one he lost.

(On.) Give it here, pest, it’s ours!

(Sy.) Apollo and the gods, this is a disaster! I wonder, can one keep the property of an orphan? A passer-by immediately grabs it.

(On.) You must be joking. It’s my master’s, by Apollo and the gods.

(Sy.) I’ll be hanged, I swear, before I give in to this bloke. That settles it, I’ll litigate against all comers. It’s the child’s, not mine.

[resuming his examination] And this is a necklace. Take it. And a purple wrap. Take them in. Well, what do you have to say?

(On.) Me?

(Sy.) The ring belongs to Charisios. He lost it once, when drunk, he said.

(On.) I prefer to keep it myself.

(Sy.) Makes no difference to me,
since we’re both heading, as it seems, towards the same address.

(On.) They’ve got guests. Probably not the right moment to tell him anything about this business. Tomorrow will do. [exit]

(Sy.) I’ll wait. Tomorrow I’ll willingly submit the case to anyone for arbitration. I didn’t do so badly last time. Apparently the thing to do is litigate regardless who against. That was my salvation now.

[Choral Interlude]

4.4 Act Three

On. Five times or more I was on the verge of showing the ring to Master. I’d already got within a whisker of him, on the very brink, then chickened out with qualms about my earlier revelations. He’s always going on about ‘that wretch who told me this. May he die a god-awful death.’ I’m worried he’ll make up with his wife and want to remove the culprit —me— who’s in the know, for good. Well [done] me for wanting to stir up more trouble! The business then is plenty bad enough.

Habr. [talking as she leaves Chairestratos’ house]
Can’t you please leave me in peace and not give me a hard time? Clearly I was deluding myself, poor fool, into thinking I was going to be loved. The man loathes me with a supernatural dislike. He won’t even let me lie beside him any more, poor me, but apart.

On. [to himself] Should I give him back what I just received? Ridiculous!

Habr. [to herself] Poor him, too! I wonder why he wastes so much money? As far as he’s concerned, I could serve as basket-carrier for the virgin goddess. I’ve been ‘pure in body’, as the saying goes, three days already.
(On.) How on earth, for God’s sake, how, I ask you—
(Sy.) Where is he, who I’ve been looking for all round inside? Hey, you! Give it back, mate,—the ring—or tell me who you’ll give it to. Let’s settle this. I must be off.

(On.) Look,

the situation’s this. I’m quite certain it’s my master’s—Charisios’s, that is, but I hesitate to show him. It makes him as good as father of the child, if I present the ring found with it.

(Sy.) Why’s that, you rogue?

(On.) He lost it at the Tauropolia once when the women met at night. What more likely than that this marks a virgin’s rape?
She had the baby and exposed it with the ring. If one could find her and then produce it, the case would be as good as solved. As it is, all’s guess-work and confusion.

(Sy.) Make that your business. If you mean that as a threat, wanting me to work the ring, then give you a share of whatever, forget it. There’s no way I’ll go shares with you.

(On.) Nor’m I asking.

Sy. OK, then.

I’m off on my errands. I have to go into town now to see what’s to be done in this matter. [exit]

(Habr.) That child inside, Onesimos, the one his wife’s breast-feeding – this coalman found him?

(On.) ’s what he says.

(Habr.) My o my, what a dear!

(On.) Together with this signet-ring belonging to my master.

(Habr.) You’re in for it! If he’s actually your lord and you look on while he’s brought up a slave, you’re done for, and deservedly!

(On.) As I say, no-one knows who’s the mother.

(Habr.) But he lost it, you say, during the Tauropolia?
(On.) Through being drunk, according to the boy who went there with him.

Habr. He must have fallen in, on his own, with the women celebrating all night long. I was there and something like that happened.

(On.) You were there?

(Habr.) Yeah, last year, at the Tauropolia. I was playing guitar for the girls, and celebrating along with them. In those days I’d yet to learn what a man is.

[On.] Sure!

[Habr.] I swear by Aphrodite!

(On.) And the girl—any idea who she was?

(Habr.) I could find out. The women I was with—they’re friends of hers.

(On.) Or have you heard who’s daughter she is?

(Habr.) No idea. But if I saw her, I’d recognize her. She was pretty, I tell you, and well off, apparently.

On. Perhaps she’s the one.

(Habr.) Who knows? She was out with us that night when suddenly she comes running, crying her eyes out, clawing at her hair. She had on a pretty dress of thin Sicilian cotton—a sight for sore eyes—which was ruined. The whole thing in tatters.

(On.) She had the ring?

(Habr.) No idea. But if I saw her, I’d recognize her. She was pretty, I tell you, and well off, apparently.

(On.) Perhaps, but she didn’t show it to me. I’ll only tell the truth.

(On.) So what should I do now?

(Habr.) Up to you. But if you’re sensible and listen to me, you’ll bring this business to your master’s notice. If the baby’s mother’s free-born, what’s to stop him knowing about it?

(On.) I suggest we first, Habrotonon, identify the mother. Won’t you run and find that out for me?

(Habr.) I can’t until we’ve first identified the male culprit. What bothers me is telling the women I mentioned a tale I can’t back up.
Who knows, another among the people present then may have got the ring from him as a pledge, then lost it. Perhaps he used it playing dice as a betting stake, or had a wager about something, took off the ring and lost it. A thousand things like that can happen when men drink together. Before I find the man responsible I don’t want to look for her, or let on about this matter in any way.

On. What you say’s convincing.

But what to do, though?

Habr. Consider, Onesimos, whether an idea I’ve had appeals to you. I’ll pretend I was the girl involved. I’ll take the ring with me and go inside and confront him.

(On.) Go on. I think I get you.

(Habr.) When he sees me with it he’ll ask me where I got it. I’ll say ‘At the Tauropolia, when I was still a girl,’ and I’ll act as if it all happened to me. I’m familiar with most of it.

(On.) More than most!

(Habr.) And if the business strikes a chord with him, won’t he come running to convict himself, and, with the drink, tell all without my prompting? And as he talks I’ll nod in agreement so as not to slip up by talking first.

(On.) I swear, you’re a genius!

(Habr.) I’ll go along with all these commonplaces to avoid slipping up. ‘You were awful,’ I’ll say, ‘a brute.’

(On.) Quite right!

(Habr.) ‘You tumbled me so roughly. The clothes I ruined. I was so upset!’ Before this conversation I’ll get the baby, cry tearfully and coddle it and keep asking where the woman found it.

On. Jesus Christ!

(Habr.) To cap it all I’ll say, ‘and you’re the father of a baby boy!’ I’ll show the child they found.
4.4 Act Three

(On.) Cunning, Habrotonon, fiendishly cunning!

(Habr.) If he’s found out like that and proves himself the father, we’ll look for the young mother at our leisure.

(On.) What you haven’t mentioned is that you’ll be freed. If he’s convinced you’re the child’s mother, he’ll free you straightaway.

(Habr.) I’m not sure. I’d like that, though.

(On.) Sure you’re sure. And what’s in this for me, Habrotonon?

(Habr.) God, yes! I’ll always know I’ve you to thank for this whole business.

(On.) But what if you deliberately stop looking for the girl, drop that plan, and trick me in the process? What then?

(Habr.) My dear, whatever for? You think I want to be a mother? All I want, I swear to God, is freedom. I hope that’ll be my reward for this.

On. I hope, too.

(Habr.) Don’t you like my plan?

(On.) O yes, extremely! And if you try anything funny, I’ll get my own back. I could, you know. But for the present moment let’s see how this goes.

(Habr.) So don’t you like it?

(On.) Yes, indeed!

(Habr.) So give me the ring this minute.

(On.) Here!

(Habr.) Dear Persuasiveness, stand by me now and lend my words the necessary conviction! [exit]

(On. [alone]) What an operator she is! When she realized sex is not enough to earn her freedom, —she’s wasting her energy— she thought she’d try plan B. As for me—I’m damned to slavery for good, snotface, cringing cur, incapable of planning things like that. But perhaps she’ll reward me if she succeeds. It’d be only fair. Stop deluding yourself with idle thoughts, fool, imagining you’ll get something from a woman! Consider yourself lucky if you don’t suffer! Now the situation’s
touch-and-go for the mistress of the house. Because, if the girl who’s mother to the child is found to be the daughter of a free-born man, no doubt he’ll marry her, [and tell] his present wife to leave [at once. Oh well,] I think I got out of that quite elegantly by not being the mischief-maker. I’m done with meddling. If anyone catches me interfering any more or gossipping maliciously, I submit to cutting out my – gob! But who’s this approaching? It’s Smikrines on his way home from town again, looking steamed up once more. Perhaps he’s stumbled on the truth from someone. I’d better remove m[yself… from the scene […]

[— about 27 mutilated lines—]

…no-one else will [serve] you.

(Sm.) A lavish

lunch they’re having.

(Kar.) Well, I’m a poor devil in many respects. You wouldn’t believe it, now they’ve wandered off outside. If ever again any of you happens [to need] a cook like me [you know] where you can bloody-well stick it!

[— about 40 mutilated lines—]

(Sm.) This man indeed, by Dionysos. But perhaps I’m interfering, meddling in other people’s affairs, whilst I could simply be off, taking my daughter with me. I will indeed do that. I’ve as good as decided to take that course. I call you to witness, Chairestratos, I swear…

with whom[…] I sent [her]  

[Chair.] If you take your daughter [back] [you’ll be treating] us unworthily […]

(Sm.) […] don’t say […] and he’s made himself the talk of the town with his profligate ways, and, as the saying goes, by lowering himself in a humiliating affair
with a common prostitute!

[--- 11 lines missing---]

[Sm.] And he dislikes this so-called easy life?
So he was drinking with one girl, in the evening
he had another, next day it was to be yet another.
Such carrying on has ruined many a household,
why, it’s brought whole cities to their knees...

[--- 2 lines missing---]

But [she] didn’t persuade him. So, let him,
as he must, return the dowry.

(Chair.) Not so fast, Smikrines.

(Sm.) Nor, I swear by Demeter, would my daughter
be inclined to stay another hour in his house
—unless, of course, he’s married into a family
of immigrants with no rights!

Chair. He doesn’t think that.

(Sm.) To hell with him and his high-faluting airs!
He’s run through his fortune in a whore-house;
he’ll set up house now with the lovely lady
he’s engaged, and, pretending not to know us,
he’ll keep his wife and take another, too.
[Not if I can help it!] I’ll soon see to him.

(Chair.) [to himself]
That’s really blown it as far as I’m concerned.
Well, I suppose I’d better get on with what
I’ve been instructed to. I’m on my way.

[Choral Interlude]

4.5 Act Four

(Sm.) I know no [other solution to] this [fix].
You must leave him, Pamphile. It’s always wise
for respectable people to avoid the dissolute.

(Pamphile)
Father, what [advantage is there if]
you remain my guardian for good [...]?

(Sm.) Stuff

and nonsense! There’s [no] time [...] Pa.

Delicate matters [always] require [much thought.]

Sm. I’ve been telling you all along [...] Pa.

[If you’re saying this] in my interest [...] 710

[— 2 lines missing—]

Pa. But if you ‘rescue’ me by force, not words, you won’t deserve the name of father, but of tyrant.

(Sm.) Does this matter need persuasive words? 715

Isn’t it already blatant? The truth, Pamphile, cries out aloud. But if I must engage in rhetoric, then so be it. I’ve three propositions for you. He can no more be saved in this than you.

[— 29 lines missing—]

...the expense! Reckon the Thesmophoria twice, the Skira twice! Consider his wasteful lifestyle. Doesn’t he face indubitable personal ruin? Consider your position: He says he’s business at the harbour. Once there, he’ll stay. You’ll be miserable, wait up all night, go without supper. He’s out partying with her ... 750

[— about 30 lines missing—]

(Sm.) A woman infiltrator [...] who’ll tell tales about you, damage your reputation [...] to endure [...] while in comfort] she’ll have a good life, and you a bad. That [will be] an incitement to her; 790

by being always cross, permanently criticizing, playing the wife, she’ll gradually draw level until she’s ousted you. It’s hard, Pamphile, for a free-born woman to compete with a whore. She knows more tricks, has more experience, shrinks from nothing, out-flatters, stoops to sordid things. So take it now as gospel from the Delphic oracle that what I say’ll prove true to the letter. So if you preface everything you say with this,
you’ll not do anything against my will.

(F.)

Father, I can dissemble and choose my words on anything to suit what you think proper, [or speak] my mind. I’m [capable] of being sensible [...] and the good-will is certainly there [...]

[...] to persuade you, which is more [appropriate.

Since the subject seems too painful, father, [of girls] who fall victim to Fate, and err [by accident], let’s leave that aside. Secondly, [...] the fault on his side [...]

But there’s nothing shameful among few [...] the majority precisely [...] they know and say [...]

bad luck can follow previous [good luck...]

should I leave him? [...] As to what you said just now [...]

 [...] he [won’t] be ruined [...] by this. Did I join him [only to share in his good fortune, and if his fortune changes should I drop him? I swear [...] I came as partner in his life, so what if bad luck trips him up? I’ll put up with it [...] if he divides himself between two homes [...] paying attention to that [woman ...]

And if you give me to another [man as wife as long as I don’t suffer pain or humiliation that’s all right by me [...]

But if that is not clear [...] these things, when I arrive at that point [...] Will she throw me out? [Oh no,] she’ll see my good will toward Ch[arisios...]

honouring her [...] for when [...] one sees the bad side easily [...] Will she denigrate me [...]?

[...] cast aspersions [...]

Fr. 8 K.-Th.

(?Pa.)

My eyes were all inflamed from crying.
[enter Habrotonon with the baby]

Habr. I'll go outside with [it]. Poor thing's been crying for ages. I've no idea what can be the matter.

[enter Pamphile]

(Pa.) Will a god have mercy on me in my grief?
Habr. Dearest child, will you meet your mother?
(Pa.) ... I must go.

(Habr.) Wait a minute, madam.
(Pa.) You mean me?
(Habr.) Yes.

Look me in the eye.

[Pa.] Do we know each other, woman?
(Habr.) This is the girl I saw! Hello, my dearest!
(Pa.) But who are you?

[Harbr.] Here, give me your hand!
Tell me, sweetie, were you at the Tauropolia last year [...]?
(Pa.) Tell me, woman, where you got the child you're holding.
(Habr.) Dearie, is there something familiar about his appearance? Don't be shy, madam.
(Pa.) You're not his real mother?
(Habr.) I was just acting, not to offend the real mother, but so as to discover her identity at leisure. And I've succeeded! You're the girl I saw that night!
(Pa.) But who's the father?
(Habr.) Charisios.
(Pa.) Dearest woman, do you know for sure?
(Habr.) I do indeed. But aren't you the young bride I've seen indoors?
(Pa.) Indeed I am!
(Habr.) You're the lucky one!

A god has had mercy on you.—The door next door's just opened: one of the neighbours going out.

Won't you take me home with you indoors so that I can fill you in on points of detail? [exeunt]

[enter Onesimos]

On. He's mad. I swear by Apollo. Raving mad.
Stark raving mad. I swear he's gone completely crazy.
I mean my master. Charisios. Manic depression
has him in its grip, or something similar.
What else can have happened, can someone tell me?
He was standing by the halldoor inside just now,
craning his neck out, oh, for ages [. . .
The father of the bride was going on about
this thing to her, as well he might, while he
was turning all colours of the rainbow!
‘My darling, only an angel could speak such words!’
he wailed, and hit his own head hard.
Then again, after an interval, ‘With a wife like her,
what a pitiful fool I’ve been!’ And finally,
when he’d heard all and gone indoors again,
the screaming started, howls and mad cries.
‘I’m the devil,’ he cried over and over again.
‘I’m guilty of the same crime,’ he wailed,
‘I fathered a bastard child, and then refused
to show so much as a mite of understanding
to my wife in the same predicament. Savage,
heartless man I am!’ Bitterly he chastises himself
and looks around with agonized, bloodshot eyes.
I’m scared stiff personally, dry-mouthed with fear.
If he sees me in his present state of mind
— I denounced her— he may well kill me.
That’s why I’ve popped outside here secretly.
And where can I turn? What course adopt? I’m finished,
done for! He’s banged open the door. He’s coming out.
God, have mercy! If there’s a way, save me!

[enter Charisios]
Char. Blameless me, concerned about my reputation,
finely distinguishing right from wrong,
faultless, irreproachable in my private life—
serves me right!— a higher power has taught me
a well-earned lesson, proving me all too human.
‘O consummate wretch, with your airs and phrases,
you couldn’t abide an involuntary lapse in your wife,
but I’ll show you stumbling into identical trouble,
and she’ll treat you kindly then, whilst you
do her dishonour! You’ll be convicted on both counts:
deserving of bad luck and foolish, empty-headed.’
The contrast between what she said to her father
and my position!— how she’d come as partner for life
and shouldn’t run away when some chance mishap
struck. But you, you great pompous ass...

[--- 4 mutilated lines---]

...but her father
will treat her [harshly]. Well, what's he to me?
I'll speak forthrightly. 'Smikrines, don't give me
a hard time. My wife's not leaving me.
Why are you pестering, pressuring Pamphile—?'

[catching sight of Onesimos]
What are you doing here?

On. I'm in a terrible fix!
Woe is me!
[aside, to Habrotonon] Don't abandon me, my friend,
is all I ask!

[Char.] You? You've been standing here
eaves-dropping, good-for-nothing?

[On.] God's honour, no,
I came out this minute.

[--- 13 mutilated lines in which
Charisios learns that Habrotonon
is not the baby's mother---]

(Char.) What's this, Onesimos, blackmailing [me], were you?

(On.) She persuaded me, I swear by Apollo [..]

(Char.) And you're the trouble-maker, rogue?

(Habr.) Don't be angry,
darling. The child is yours by your lawfully-wedded
wife, and not another's.

(Char.) Would that were true!

(Habr.) By sweet Demeter, it is.

(Char.) What?—the truth.

(Habr.) Pamphile's the baby's mother?

It was mine, I thought.

(Habr.) And so it is!

(Char.) And Pamphile's?

Habrotonon, I implore you, don't raise my hopes.

[---about 20 mutilated lines before the end of the act---]

[Choral Interlude]
4.6 Act Five

[—3 mutilated lines—]

(?Chair.) [to himself]
Now, Chairestratos, consider the following:
how you can remain as true a friend to Charisios
as you once were. The girl concerned’s no
common whore nor run-of-the-mill [amusement.]
In no time she’s produced a child: her mindset’s
free. Damn! Don’t look [. . .]
First [talk] to her alone [. . .]
then the nearest and dearest [. . .]

[—about 70 mutilated lines—]

(?Char.) . . . sensible. If she was like that, I know
he wouldn’t have refrained. But I will refrain.

[enter Smikrines]
Sm. If I don’t smash your head in, Sophrone,
may I end horribly! Will you lecture me as well?
I’m taking my daughter ‘ rashly’, am I, wretched woman?
that marvellous husband of hers, and waste my breath
arguing about what’s mine, that’s your proposal?
Prompt action’s preferable. I warn you, you’ll regret it
if I you babble any more. Me submit to Sophrone?
‘Persuade her, when you see her’, is it? You know
what I’d like to do with Sophrone when I go home?
You saw that pond we passed on our way? I’ll spend
tonight dunking you in it till you’re dead!
That’ll teach you to be at loggerheads with me
and stand in my way! We must knock at this door.
It seems to be locked. Servants, door-boy!
Open up, someone! Servants, don’t you hear me?

[enter Onesimos]
On. Now who’s knocking at the door. Ah, Smikrines,
the hard-hearted, come to fetch his dowry and
his daughter.

(Sy.) It’s me indeed, pleb!
(On.) Quite right,
too. The zeal belonging to a man of reason, great intelligence, and Herculean drive!
I’m impressed.

[Sm.]  I swear by all the gods and powers—
[On.]  Do you think the gods enjoy such leisure
as to enable them to portion out both good and bad,
on a daily, individual basis, Smikrines?

(Sm.)  What?
(On.)  I’ll try and explain. There are about—what?
—a thousand cities. Each with a population
of about thirty thousand. Can the gods be bothered
to persecute or save each single citizen?

(Sm.)  How?
Their life would be one long grind, by your account.

(On.)  So the gods don’t take thought for us,
you think? They’ve implanted in each of us a watchdog
character. This [keeps] an ever-vigilant [eye on us]
and plays up if we act contrary to its interest,
and vice versa. This is the divinity inside us
which governs all, both good and bad behaviour
in an individual. Appease this by doing nothing
unseemly or unwise, and you will reap the benefit.

(Sm.)  And is my ‘character’, rogue, now up to
no good?

(On.)  It’s ruining you.

(Sm.)  The cheek of it!
(On.)  Do you consider it something good, Smikrines,
to take one’s daughter from her husband?

(Sm.)  Who says it’s good? It’s just necessary.

(On.)  You see?
This man makes wrong out to be necessary.
What’s leading him to ruin if not his character?
Now, even as you’re bent on an unlovely act,
chance has come to the rescue, and you’ve found
redemption and release from your current troubles.
But don’t let me catch you ever again, Smikrines,
acting thus impetuously. Now drop your accusations,
let them be and go inside and meet your grandson,
talk to him.

(Sm.)  What ‘grandson’, rascal?
(On.)  You, too, were stupid, thinking yourself clever.
Was that the way to look after a girl? You realize we’ve a miraculous four-month-premature baby in the family?

(Sm.) I don’t know what you’re on about! But she does,

(On.) I reckon—the old lady.

[turning to Sophrone] It was at the Tauropolia that my master—

(Sm.) Sophrone— caught the girl alone, separated from the dancers.

(Sm.) you understand?

(On.) Oh yes.

Now they’ve recognized each other and all’s ended happily.

(Sm.) What’s he on about, old hag?

(On.) ‘Nature led where morals fear to tread. Such is woman’s lot’.

(Sm.) What?

(On.) Are you thick? I’ll recite the whole of Auge’s tragic speech, if you still don’t catch on, Smikrines.

(Sm.) [to Sophrone] You’re getting me riled with your gesticulation. You know perfectly well what he’s on about.

(On.) She knows, I know. And you should know the old dear caught on first.

(Sm.) A scandal!

(On.) In fact no greater blessing has ever occurred.

[Sm.] Well, if what you say is true, the child would be Charisios’s by none other than his wife!

[Chair.] This woman [. . . Habroto]non.

(Sm.) [. . .]

[Chair.] Now [. . .] you devil [. . .]

[ . . . . . . . ]

[. . . ] quarrelling, Smikrines, [. . .

(Sm.?) The man’s intolerable [. . .

(Chair.?) [. . .] for all, Smikrines [. . .

[—traces of six more lines—]
4.7 Miscellaneous unplaced fragments

3 K.-Th.

[?Onesimos to Karion]
Why won’t you make lunch? He’s been carrying on a while on his couch.

5 K.-Th.

(Karion) I’ve poured oil on the fire (lit. ‘salt on the salted fish’) if things go that way!

9 K.-Th.

You’ve suffered nothing bad if you don’t act that way.
Chapter 5

Commentary

5.1 Hypothesis


The papyrus fragment contains the beginning of lines naming and describing *Epitrepontes*. The information given – title, (repeated or) alternative title, first line, critical judgement, description of ἑθῆ of the characters – may come from a copy of the play or from a collection of summaries such as that by Sellios in the first c. AD (Blume, 1998, 31). It is not exactly comparable in format to other fragments from Menandrean *hypotheseis* (P.Oxy. X 1235 and XXXI 2534; PIFAO 337, see Boyaval (1970, 5-7) and Austin (2001, 10-11)); the main elements missing are a summary of plot and a didascalic notice, but these may have followed in the text. The text tells us nothing new about the play; in fact supplements tend to derive from our knowledge of the play. It does, however, confirm the position of fr. 1 as the first lines of the play.

1-2 are written in a large, rather ungainly, script, whereby the letters of 1 are about twice as big as in 2. If Ἐπι[ is read correctly in 1 we seem to have either a repetition of the title in lines 1 and 2, or possibly an alternative title such as Ἐπιτροπή ἡ in 1 (Parsons). A play Ἐπιτροπή is attested for Diphilos, an Ἐπίτροπος for Alexis. Corbato (1965, 68-69) suggested that Ἀλαείς (cf. *PCG* vol. VI.2, p. 53: Ἀλαείς test. ii) was the alternative name for *Epitrepontes* as the play’s action follows from an event at the Tauropolia festival at Halai Araphenides on the E. coast of Attica (see p. 174). This looks less likely after the publication of this fragment of the hypothesis.

2 Parallels lead us to expect Ἐπিপρέ[ποντες ὄν ἀρχή* cf. e.g. P.Oxy. 1235 col. i.14; col. iii.103. But this gives us a very long line compared with the next two. Parsons wondered whether one might envisage two small columns of quoted text under 2, thus filling the horizontal space, but doubts the likelihood of such an arrangement. Moreover the relative length of 3, οὐχ ὅ τ[ρόφι-, rules out the possibility of two
neatly symmetrical columns aligned under 2. Parsons concludes that οὖν ἀρχὴ was omitted.

5 One would expect Ὄνησις after θεών but there is a small gap without ink after nu. If Parsons’ ‘two-column’ theory were right (see previous note), Ὅνησις-/με (vel. sim.) might have been written in the right-hand column.


8 [έχον]. Cf. P.Oxy. 1235.97 [έχει δὲ πρ.; PIFAO 337.3 [τὸ δράμα ἔχει] / καὶ πρεσβύτας χρήστος [ (Turner), see Koenen (1970, 284). As Parsons (1994a, 29) points out, the line is longer than the others.

9-15 The list of prosōpa with characteristics can be paralleled by PIFAO 337.3-5. There ‘old men with good characters’ (πρεσβύτας χρήστοις) and (probably) an hetaira who is ‘bold’ but not ‘wicked’ ([θρασ]εῖαν μὲν οὐ πονηρὰν δ[έ) are mentioned.

10 αἰσχυνομένως should mean ‘shamefully’ (cf. Parsons) in clear contrast to σωφρόνως, but in its only other occurrence in Dion. Hal. Ant. Rom. 7.50 it is paired with σωφρόνως giving a sense like ‘respectfully’ – which cannot be right in the hypothesis here. On the other hand, can Daos be said to speak ‘shamefully’ in the arbitration scene? Certainly he loses the debating contest and Smikrines chides him as having displayed bad character. One wonders why the writer did not simply say αἰσχρῶς if he meant that Daos’ position in the debate revealed his base character.

12 ἀφελῶς, ‘frankly’, ‘openly’, opp. to ‘deceitfully’. Habrotonon is frank enough in her conversation with Onesimos in act three and when talking to Pamphile in act four; but she deceives Charisios (offstage) by pretending to have borne the baby to him.

13 λογισμ[όν έχοντα] (Parsons), finds some echoes in the text. In line 140 Chairestratos comments on Smikrines’ estimate of the amount Charisios is spending daily: εὖ λελόγισται; in 1081 Smikrines is described as λογιστικοῦ, ‘calculating’, and again in 1105 Onesimos says that Smikrines ‘calculates’ (λογιζομένου) that a bad thing can be necessary. The literal meaning of λογιζομένου, ‘reckon up’, ‘keep an account’ (cf. Dem. 18.113), has a mildly metaphorical meaning applied to character, like our ‘calculating’. Cf. Dem. 21.38, where an impetuous character is said to have ‘acted without thinking’ (ἀγίνομεν τὸν λογισμὸν). But Smikrines also ‘keeps tabs’ in a literal sense: he knows exactly how much Charisios is spending on wine and on Habrotonon (127 and 136-37) and, above all, he is concerned that Charisios is running through the generous dowry he gave his daughter through profligate living, instead of returning the money to Smikrines now Charisios has, effectively, separated from Pamphile. Men. fr. 191 ([Imbr]oi) attributes two aspects to λογισμὸς: the management of affairs (διαθέσθαι πράγματα) and ‘reckoning up’ (λογίσομαι); in
this fragment each person is said to be like a general or politician in the deployment of this managing, reckoning, faculty. And indeed, Smikrines in this play is not only concerned about money, he tries to manage his daughter’s affairs although he is no longer her kuri os (cf. line 706).

14 δικαιολογούντα (Kassel). This would refer to Onesimos’ haranguing of Smikrines in the fifth act (1078-1131; esp. 1107-11). Similarly Prometheus ‘harangues’ Hermes and Hephaistos when they nail him to the Kaukasos in Lucian’s Prometheus (188 ήδέως αν δικαιολογησαίμην). One might, alternatively, consider δικαιολογούντα, ‘punish’, ‘take to task’, as a supplement, as it produces a shorter line (19 letters), more compatible with the other lines; and Onesimos does take Smikrines to task in this scene.

The hypothesis may have named the scene of the play, as tragic hypotheses sometimes do. Some have argued that the scene of the rape – Halai Araphenides on the E. coast of Attica, some eighteen miles from Athens – must also have been the scene of the play; cf. Mette (1962a). But there is no reason why Pamphile and Charisios should not separately have travelled to Halai to attend the Tauropolia festival there. Menander may have chosen the festival of Artemis there as suitable backdrop for the nocturnal rape scene, rather than because Charisios and Chairestratos should be imagined living there. Cf. Sandbach (1986, 157). Since Smikrines walks to town and back several times in the course of the play, and Syriskos, too, announces his intention of going to town on an errand and then returning, I think we should imagine the setting of the play as a rural deme close to Athens.

5.2 Act One

5.2.1 Scene 1: Before the party

Fr. 1 may now confidently be identified as the opening lines of the play as the papyrus hypothesis of Epitrepontes (text: p. 38 with comm.) quotes the play’s first line. The opening lines convey three vital pieces of information: (1) Onesimos is the central character’s (τρόφιμος) man; (2) his master has taken in a mistress with musical gifts, although (3) he recently married. ► (Καρίων). The cook’s name may be conjectured here as the speaker’s inquisitiveness regarding the state of Charisios’ affairs matches what Themistios (or. XXI 262c) has to say about the nosey and gossipy character of a mageiros called Karion in comedy (ὅ μάγειρος ὁ κωμωδικός); that Themistios is talking about Epitrep. is made more or less certain by his (mis-) quoting a known fragment of the play (fr. 2b K.-Th.) in the same context: οὐχ ἔστι, γὰρ, φασὶ, γλυκέρωτερον ἡ πάντ’ εἰδέναι, ‘there’s nothing sweeter, so they say, than knowing all’. Themistios says that this Karion not only irritated the guests at the meal by ‘altering (ἐξαλλάττων) the seasonings’ but also proved himself a gossip and scandal-monger who ferreted out the dark secrets of Charisios’ household
A passage in Athenaeus (XIV 659b) says that the cook in Menander’s Epitrepontes was conspicuously jokey (σκωπτικός) but we do not have much evidence of that in the extant lines spoken by Karion in this play. Fr. 1 in combination with the new fragment from Oxyrhynchus and these two testimonia give us an idea of the opening scene of the play: joking repartee between Onesimos and Karion which conveys to the audience essential details of Charisios’ new ménage. They are joined by Chairestratos in the course of the scene. We find a similar structure – introductory backchat between slaves followed by (hypothetical) prologue – in e.g. Heros; the name Ἡρως θεός comes third in that play’s cast list, which is also a pointer to a prologue (spoken by the deified Heros) following the opening scene. The cook’s name here, Karion, ‘Carian’, is a ‘slave’s name’ in comedy reflecting barbarian status, cf. Krieter-Spiro (1997, 28). For detailed discussion of the Themistios passage cf. Primmer (1986).

1 προς θεών, a similar opening oath to that in Dis Exapatôn: προς των θεών, μετράκτων (P.Oxy. 1235.1). To begin a play thus emphatically conveys an impression of (1) immediacy, (2) all that has gone before, leading to the speaker’s excitement. Primmer (1986, 130) takes it as evidence of Karion’s pressingly inquisitive character.

2. ψάλτρια, ‘harp-girl’. The word, a feminine form of ψάλτης (Men. fr. 367 KA), comes from ψάλλω ‘pluck’ or ‘twang’ the strings of a musical instrument such as the lyre (or a bow in archery). One might think that a psaltria played specifically a psalterion, ‘harp’, but the word may mean generally ‘hetaira who played a stringed instrument’ (e.g. a lyre or kithara, see below for the case of Thisbe), as opposed to e.g. an auletris, an hetaira who played the aulos; cf. Men. fr. 319 K.-Th. = 224 KA (from Methē), line 4: αὐλητρίδας... καί ψαλτρίας. [Arist.] Ath.Pol. 50.2 mentions psaltriae beside auletrides and kitharistriai as expensive women entertainers. Plays entitled Psaltria are recorded for Dromon (PCG V pp. 124-25) and Euboulos (PCG V p. 259); otherwise there are not many psaltriai in extant comedy. An Athenian hetaira called Thisbe in Helioud. Aith. 2.8.2-5 excels as a psaltria; she sells ‘herself and her skills’ at men’s symposia and outdoes a rival hetaira Arsinoe whose slow play on the aulos cannot match Thisbe’s slick kithara recital (ἐπίτροχον ψάλλουσα καὶ γλαφυρόν τῇ κιθάρᾳ προσάιδουσα). For illustrations of female harpists in an erotic context see Herbig (1929, esp. figures 7, 9, 10). One notes the ability of Sallust’s Sempronia figure in Coni. Catil. 25 psallere et saltare elegantius quam necesse est probae, or Horace’s friend Chloe, dulcis docta modos et citharae sciens (Ode 3.9). Or one might recall other musically talented courtesans such as Lamia, who excelled as auletris (Plut. Demetr. 16.3; cf. Wheatley (2003)).

The name Habrotonon means literally ‘wormwood’, a sweet-smelling plant, and hence suitable as a name for a sweet-smelling lady of pleasure. Post (1948, 204) identifies the wood habrotonon as ‘southernwood’ and says that it was used for spicing wine; he suggests ‘Winespice’ as a translation of the name. Nevertheless one feels that the constituent elements of the word bear connotations beyond that
of the botanical name: ἀβρο- and τόνος combine to produce an impression of ‘soft thrill’, well suited to a prostitute. Another ‘lady of pleasure’ named Habrotonon is addressed, with sexual innuendo, in Perik. 482-84. Brown (1990, 249) says that Habrotonon is not called explicitly an hetaira in the play, ‘but musiciennes regularly provided sexual services for their customers, and Habrotonon clearly expected to do so in this case’. In fact her status as hetaira is made clear enough. In line 136 Smikrines says that Charisios has been paying a pornoboskos, ‘pimp’, for the services of one of his girls, Habrotonon, no doubt; in lines 431-37 she says herself that Charisios is paying her for love; Smikrines refers to her disparagingly in 646 as a πόρνη, and in 985 there is reference to an ἐταφίδιον, meaning Habrotonon.

Figure 5.1: Rf cup by Onesimos with lyre-playing hetaira (kitharistria) beside symposiast. London E44

2-3 νῦν ἔχων... ἔγνημ' ἕναγχος. The two verbs with their temporal adverbs sum up the tension of the entire play: Charisios now has Habrotonon as his hired mistress although he only married recently. The commentator on Aristotle (iv. 5 p. xxii) who quotes this fragment uses it to illustrate the fact that love rapidly fades; the quotation is hardly apposite as Charisios has not ‘fallen out of love’ with Pamphile, nor have his affections shifted to Habrotonon. He has taken up with her in a fit of pique, having listened to Onesimos’ gossip.
fr. 2

περιεργος, ‘meddling’, ‘interfering’; cf. Arnott (1996a, 422) on Alexis fr. 145.1. Onesimos meddles in this play by ‘telling on’ Pamphile to Charisios, as he ruefully recalls in 422-27. Syriskos immediately suspects him of scheming with Charisios’ ring when it turns up (458), and Onesimos admonishes himself in 573-75 not to get up to further meddling tricks. However, when the danger has passed and Onesimos has escaped his master’s ire, he promptly reverts to character in the last act by leading Smikrines a merry dance. Cf. Mette (1962b) on periergia as a stock attribute of slaves in comedy.

P.Oxy. 4936

Ed. pr. (Handley, 2009) places this fragment, which contains 34 line endings of one column and 35 line beginnings of the next, in the first act between fr. 1 and the beginning of the Petersburg parchment. Col. ii has marginal speaker names: (?)Karion (the cook), Chairestratos and Onesimos. The name Charisios occurs once relatively securely (col. i.22) and at least twice conjecturally (col. i.5 and 28). As we seem to have three speakers already in this scene, the talk must be of Charisios, rather than include him. Since the play began with a preliminary conversation between Karion and Onesimos, in which the latter told the former something of the goings-on in his master’s household, this fragment is likely to come from a later stage of the same scene, which Chairestratos has joined. In line 17 the ‘pretty girl’ is likely to have been Habrotonon who is mentioned already in fr. 1. The three probably go on to discuss details of the banquet which is to take place in Chairestratos’ house later that day: there is mention in line 31 of Thasian wine and in 22 of meat; perhaps πινω. In 25 there is talk of ‘shutting’ – probably Chairestratos’ door. The Petersburg fragment with Smikrines making a first irate approach to his son-in-law’s front door must represent a later scene, and the end of that is also the end of the act. So, if there was a prologue in this play – and surely there must have been – it came after the first scene with discussion of the banquet and Charisios’ present situation and before the Petersburg scene. Now, Chairestratos listens – presumably from his front door – to Smikrines’ rantings, so he must have exited with Onesimos and Karion after the first scene, and reappeared for the Smikrines scene (I think at line 131, closely followed by Habrotonon). For questions concerning the content and speaker of the lost prologue see Introduction pp. 8ff.

As Handley says, the new fragment, if correctly placed, makes it certain that act one of Epitrep. was longer than the 170 odd lines assigned it by Gomme & Sandbach (1973). Let us do the sums. With Handley’s new fragment we arrive at a total of 126 extant (but fragmentary) lines, including sundry book fragments as arranged in the text. It is clear, however, that the scenes represented by these lines are not complete; a number of introductory or complementary lines are missing from the visible action. If one guessed that the missing lines numbered at least thirty, one
arrives at 156 as the new total. That leaves, on present counting, only some fifteen lines for the prologue, which is clearly too short by around thirty-five. Handley points to the 249 lines of Aspis' opening act; the first act of Epitrep, presumably was also in the low two-hundreds. Although that much is clear, there is no way of guessing the exact number of missing lines, so, until more text miraculously appears, it seems more practicable and user-friendly to retain the Sandbach numbering. I follow the same course at the beginning of act two, where, similarly, new discoveries of papyri have made it next to impossible that C can only begin at 218 (on the old counting).

The theory of Primmer (1986, 134) that a scene in which Charisios himself appeared followed the prologue is made even less likely by the discovery of this new papyrus. When the Petersburg parchment begins, Smikrines, the bride's father, is grumbling to himself as he approaches Charisios' house to complain about the husband's profligate behaviour; his grumbles are overheard by Chairestratos who keeps in the background.

**Column i**

16 καλη κόρη . The 'pretty girl' is, presumably, Habrotonon, rather than Pamphile, who can no longer be described as a κόρη. The ink traces above these words have been tentatively read by Handley as ου , possibly followed by an eta. He suggests that they may be either a correction written above the line, or a mid-line *nota personae*, Ονη (sc. Onesimos).

17 σφόδρ' οίσθ' ότι at line end also in line 1127 of this play.

21 κρεαίδιον (the reading is doubtful) 'a joint of meat', cf. Aristoph. *Plut.* 227f.; the plural κρεαίδια occurs in a cook scene in *Pseudherakles* 409.13 KA; for the spelling with long alpha and iota subscript see Arnott on Alexis, *Atthis* fr. 27.5 KA. The mention of meat here, combined with the wine mentioned in column ii, lines 29 and 31, makes the sympotic context clear. The servants seem to be discussing the wining and dining to be held in Chairestratos' house that day.

22 Handley reads χαρειαο but the surface of the papyrus is damaged and sand seems to obscure part of initial chi (making it look like kappa). Nevertheless the decipherment as Χαρισιο is convincing.

29 ]cie. Presumably not vocative of Charisios, as he is not present (unless reported speech). ἀνόσιε would be a suitably rude word for the slaves.

**Column ii**

3 and 8 'What seems to distinguish the abbreviation of Karion's name from that of Chairestratos, given the damage here and in 6, is essentially the way in which the final stroke of alpha rises to form a loop for rho instead of curving down to represent iota' (Handley).

8 It is interesting that Chairestratos joins in the discussion of Karion and Onesimos about preparations for the party at this stage of the play. He reappears with
Habrotonon towards the end of the first act. See the previous note regarding the reading of the abbreviated names in the left margin of the column. Handley points to the ‘high tone’ of the word, suggesting that it may be a ‘retort to the firmness of εϊρηκα from the cook’. Or it may be deliberately high-faluting, in the paratragic manner. First and second person sing, and pl. are possible, third person pl. (‘[men] are born...’) is ruled out by metre.

10-18 A longer speech, it seems, by Onesimos, as there are no paragraphoi or marginal speaker names: ‘this looks like Onesimos suggesting a course of action’ (Handley).

15 έν γειτόνων, ‘next door’, cf. Perik. 147; fr. 657 KA. From Onesimos’ point of view when he speaks these lines ‘next door’ is probably Charisios’ house (normally his own, too), as the party being discussed, and Charisios’ whereabouts, are at present located in Chairestratos’ house. But, as the context of Onesimos’ remark is unclear, the logic may be reversed and ‘next door’ refers here to Chairestratos’ house.

17 Either short ἄν, ‘at all events’, ‘whatever happens’, or long: ‘if this happens’.

24-25 τιτρον might suggest that Chairestratos is to be on the look-out for Smikrines, κλείσω that Onesimos will shut the street door of the house where the party is taking place’ (Handley, who compares Plautus, Mostellaria 400ff.).

26 περίμειν- is, I think, marginally preferable to ed. pr. περιμεν-, cf. line 1065 of this play. Assuming Onesimos alternates with Chairestratos in this exchange, Chairestratos should say this word. But since, as Handley says, he is the one who should ‘hang around’ (sc. to keep a look-out for Smikrines) the imperative is awkward. ‘Perhaps the word echoes an imperative at 25 end: “Wait, you say?”’, as at adesp. 1017 KA 60f.’ (Handley).

29 Θασι- and 31. For (high quality) Thasian wine see Sandbach on Kolax 48 and Arnott on Alexis, Tokistes fr. 232.4. If this expensive wine is to be served at today’s symposion we may recognize here a link with Smikrines’ exclamation about Charisios’ expensive tastes in wine (lines 127-30).

30 If Handley’s interpretation is correct – σοι πείθαι, ‘I agree with what you say’ – the words probably mark Chairestratos’ exit, leaving Onesimos with Karion, who, if this is right, must speak lines 31-32. The implied threat in 33 – ἄν εχι Χαλήις, ‘if you go on talking...’ – also accords better with Karion as addressee. As Handley says, the cook’s garrulity is a stock theme in comedy (cf. Sam. 283-85).

32 οἵ τι χαίρων, ‘it won’t do you (or him) any good...’ For the expression cf. Aristoph. Frgs 843 ἀλλ’ οἵ τι χαίρων αὖτ’ ἐρεῖς.

33 If ἄν εχι Χαλήις is right, it recurs in line 1069 of the play (spoken by Smikrines to Sophrone; cf. line 248). The words constitute a kind of threat, like English ‘if you don’t shut up...!’
5.2 Act One

5.2.2 Scene 2: The delayed prologue

This scene is wholly missing; see Introduction pp. 8f.

5.2.3 Scene 3: Smikrines at the gates

When the Petersburg parchment begins, Smikrines is to be imagined standing outside Charisios' house, or perhaps walking to and fro outside it, rehearsing his complaints about his son-in-law's behaviour. As lines 161-63 show, he plans first to get full details of the situation from his daughter (in Charisios' house) before approaching Charisios directly (in Chairestratos' house).

frr. 10 and 613a K.-Th.

Fr. 10 (Epitrep.) K.-Th. is cited by Stobaios 4.29.58 Hense under the lemma Μεν-άνδρου Ἐπιτρέποντος in the major manuscripts, whereby S seems to abbreviate to με. The name of the play should probably be emended to Ἐπιτρέπουσιν or Ἐπιτρέποντων. The case of fr. 613a (= 837 KA) is more dubious. The mss. of Stobaios quote it immediately after fr. 10, under the lemma τοῦ αὐτοῦ or, in the case of S, με again. Hense (1909, 358) argued, on the strength of the manuscript evidence of Stobaios, that this fragment, too, should be assigned to Epitrep., most plausibly to Smikrines. However, in his 1909 edition of Stobaios he cautions that the beginning of fr. 613a οὐκ ελευθέρου might point, by coincidence with ἔλευθέρωι in fr. 10, to its origin in an alphabetical collection of Menandrean sayings. This would not, however, explain the lemma in S, and I prefer to believe that fr. 613a, too, came from Epitrep.

It seems to me that both quotations would suit opening lines spoken by Smikrines well, as they would announce his position with regard to the impasse in his daughter's marriage: Fr. 10 runs: 'For a free man being ridiculed is the ugliest thing; being pained [by this] is only human'. The words would apply to the situation as perceived by Smikrines: Charisios is making a fool of him by separating from Pamphile and running through the lavish dowry on wine and women. And 613a 'But I am convinced a true citizen of Athens should not tolerate it when pleasure joins forces with hybris'. This would reinforce the same point in a more abstract manner: Charisios' behaviour is, in the eyes of Smikrines, a combination of pleasure-seeking and insolent offence [sc. to Smikrines]. Wilamowitz assigned fr. 613a to the last scene of the play. As a matter of pure conjecture I also wonder about fr. 613 K.-Th. (= 836 KA) from the same context in Stobaios; its sentiment, too, would suit a huffy Smikrines at the beginning of the play.

127-28 By commenting on Charisios' excessive expenditure on wine - not to speak of his continual drunkenness - Smikrines characterizes both Charisios (his profligacy) and himself (he minds more about the depletion of the dowry than Charisios' debauchery); Σ on Hom. Od. 7.225 cites Smikrines in Epitrep. as someone who
Commentary

προτάσσει τῶν ψυλλάτων τὴν κτήσιν, 'gives preference to property over his nearest and dearest'. The characteristic will appear most clearly in the great debate between father and daughter when Smikrines urges Pamphile, against her will, to consider her marriage to Charisios null and void. The figure of the 'miser' appears in three of Theophrastus' Characters: 10 'Mikrologia', 22 'Analeutheria', 30 'Aischrokerdeia'. In 'Aischrokerdeia' the stingy man is characterized by, among other things, serving too little bread at a dinner-party and by diluting wine with water. Smikrines here is objecting to the opposite tendency in his son-in-law Charisios: spending too much of Smikrines' money, as the old man perceives it – on carousing. The general tendency to object to displays of luxury emerges at Dem. 21.133, where the orator mocks Meidias for going to war decked out in finery. ► ἁνθρωπος οίνον. A verb such as 'buy' must have preceded these words: 'the man [buys incredibly expensive] wine!'

The medical writer Caelius Aurelianus, de morbis acutis 3.15 (= fr. 440KA) says that an irate old man in Menander ascribes hydrophobia to alcoholics, that is, people who drink wine to excess: non posse bibere eos, qui vinum usque ad vexationem potant. This last expression is quite similar to Smikrines' εἰ καὶ βιάζεται... πίνειν ἑαυτὸν, as Hutloff (1913, 21) saw. However, nothing in the extant lines says anything about hydrophobia, or rabies, with which it was connected in antiquity. Smikrines might have referred sardonically to Charisios' apparent abhorrence of water, however, before the surviving lines.

128 ὑπέρ (δέ). With (Cobet's) inserted δέ to restore metre we hear Smikrines saying: 'it's not because of his drunkenness I say this... ' (sc. but rather the expense of his excessive drinking). Others have suggested inserting μή before μεθύσκεθ', giving the sense 'for the sake of his not-drinking', i.e. 'to stop him drinking', but this thought is, on the whole, distracting. Menander wants to point up Smikrines' money-mindedness at this early juncture; whether or not he disapproves of Charisios' drinking is largely irrelevant. ὑπέρ has also been questioned, as its common meaning 'for the sake of' is not quite right here. Cobet, for example, suggested replacing it with περὶ, the common preposition for talking 'about' something. But there is a nuance of meaning here, which favours ὑπέρ: Smikrines is not just talking 'about' the drinking; he says he does not mention the consumption of wine 'because of', that is, 'concerning the question' of the drinking (but because of the expense). And for this ὑπέρ is just right (cf. LSJ s.v. III); cf. fr. 412 KA ὑπέρ μὲν οἶνου μηδὲ γρῦ, τιτδη, λέγε. For a near-contemporary use of ὑπέρ = 'because of' cf. Hypereides Ag. Diondas p. 2.25 Carey et al. (2008).

129 ἀπιστίαι. For the passive sense of ἀπιστία, 'incredibility', cf. Isokr. 17.48 (G.-S. ad loc.).

131 εἰ καὶ βιάζεται... πίνειν ἑαυτὸν, 'if he forces himself to drink wine which he buys for an obol a cup'. For Smikrines Charisios' folly is twofold: (1) buying such expensive wine (Austin (2006, 3) 'something like fifteen quid a glass'); (2) going
5.2 Act One

so far as to *drink* it (*xai*). Fraenkel (1937) suggests that Charisios does not enjoy the wine, as he does not enjoy Habrotonon; that is why he has to ‘force himself’ to drink even this expensive wine. But there is no indication that Smikrines believes Charisios is falling into gloom despite his carousing. A section of the Michigan papyrus now shows rather that he is convinced that Charisios is living it up after shamefully abandoning his daughter (680ff.). For the expression with infinitive cf. Dysk. 371 τι *κακοπαθεῖν σαυτόν βιάζει*; ► ἐγ[ώ]: ἔτ[ι van Leeuwen.

131ff. Chairestratos enters, presumably from his house, and comments upon Smikrines’ angry mutterings as he fumes outside his son-in-law’s front-door. By a convention of ancient comedy, one character on stage (Smikrines) fails to notice another (Chairestratos), although the latter’s remarks have to be audible throughout the theatre. His opening words τοῦτ’ ἐγὼ / προσέμενον, ‘I was waiting for this’, may pick up περίμεν[ν- in line 26 of P.Oxy. 4936, where (?)Onesimos told (?)Chairestratos to ‘wait around’.

132-33 ἐμπεσόν διασκεδαί / τὸν ἔρωτα, the combination of words suggests the sudden attack by a predator on a cluster (or nest) of its prey, causing it to scatter in alarm; cf. English ‘that’ll put the cat among the pigeons!’ In comedy Gronewald (1995, 28) compares Aristoph. *Frogs* 900ff., where the chorus anticipate Aeschylus’ violent scattering of Euripides’ word-formations (ἐμπεσόντα συσκεδαν). For the image of violent scattering one thinks also of Homeric passages such as the two eagles swooping on the gathering of people in Ithaka causing consternation (*Od.* 2.146-55), or the hungry lion ravening round the livestock of a farm (*Od.* 6.130-34). Moreover, Eros is often depicted as a small, winged, boy or youth, likely to be frightened off by an aggressor. Bion’s witty poem (Hopkinson (1988, XX)) shows, first, a boy taking swipes at Eros who hops like a bird from branch to branch of a tree, eluding him; then, when the boy has matured, Eros hunting him. Sisti (1985, 241) sees in διασκεδαί an inversion of the imagery commonly associated with love itself: love sweeps people off their feet like a storm wind (cf. Sappho fr. 47 Voigt ἐμπέτων), whereas here Smikrines is depicted as the storm wind scattering love. ► τὸν ἔρωτα. But which ‘love’? At this point we do not know – unless earlier lost lines told us – whether Chairestratos’ interest in Habrotonon has become apparent. If he is still firmly ‘on Charisios’ side’, then the love he believes Smikrines’ appearance may upset is likely to be that between Charisios and Habrotonon; but if his feelings for Habrotonon already influence his words, then the love may be the marital love (which still exists, despite the rift) between Charisios and Pamphile. Cf. Sisti ibid.

133 τι δέ μοι τοῦτο κτλ. The papyrus has a dot and a small space before τι; this can, but need not necessarily, be interpreted as indicating a change of speaker (from Chairestratos to Smikrines). Hutloff (1913, 9, cf. 20) argued that the words should be given to Smikrines; Arnott (1968b, 226-27) prefers to give them to Chairestratos, taking τοῦτο as referring to ἔρως in the same line – the love, in Arnott’s opinion, between Charisios and his wife. But the argument cannot stand. The words spoken by
Chairestratos in line 131-33 are his first after appearing from his house and registering Smikrines’ approach. In that case it is illogical for him to say about Smikrines: πάλιν οίμωζέτω, ‘[I say] again: let him go to hell!’ The ‘again’ is wrong. Moreover (see next note), οιμώζω seems to be a favourite word of Smikrines. I prefer, with the majority of editors, to give the words from τί to Smikrines (see next note for their sense). The space after έρωτα may be compared with that after δίδωσι in 137, again, presumably, to indicate change of speaker.

133 οίμωζέτω, lit. ‘let him groan’, a conventional phrase (cf. Aristoph. Plut. 111) equivalent to ‘I wish him ill’, coll. ‘he can go to hell/get lost’; cf. Georg. 29; Sam. 427 οίμωζεται / σκωλύς ὄν. A good instance comes in Georg. 57 when the old farmer Kleainetos has injured his foot but none of his work force is prepared to help: οίμωζεν μαχράν / ἔλεγον ἀπαντες, ‘they all told him to go to hell’; Perik. 370-1 οίμωζεν φράσασ’ ἡμῖν μακρά καὶ μεγάλα. Smikrines is fond of the expression, cf. 160, 693, and 1068, possibly an instance of Menandrean characterization through favourite expressions; cf. Sandbach (1970, 122) and G.-S. p. 300. But no sooner has Smikrines said this than another irritant occurs to him, the dowry which he has wasted on his profligate son-in-law, and he begins his mutterings again. The dowry is a theme which Smikrines harps on in the course of the play; when he later discovers (as he thinks) that Charisios has had an illegitimate child by Habrotonon, he demands his dowry back (688, perhaps as early as 153), as a dissatisfied investor might demand his money back.

134 προίκα... τάλαντα τέτταρ’. A very large dowry, testifying to Smikrines’ wealth, but not a record in extant Greek comedy: cf. Plokion fr. 296.11 KA (ten talents) and note, too, P.Ross.Georg. I.10.3-4 (from Köneizomenai) where there is mention of τάλαντα πένθ’ ἀμα / [...]χόσμον, which may well describe a dowry (although Zereteli & Krüger (1925, 67) supplement τρία] τάλαντα, πένθ’ ἄμα / μνᾶς εἰς στολήν καὶ] κόσμον). Incidentally, I looked for this fragment in the Kekelidze Institute of Manuscripts in Tbilisi, but it seems to be lost.

The figures given in Roman adaptations of Greek New Comedy are sometimes higher, too; cf. Webster (1974, 25f.). Casson (1976, 53-59) has argued that the dowry of four talents places Smikrines among Athenian ‘millionaires’. Chairestratos in Asp. gives his niece a two talent dowry, to be matched, presumably, by that given to his own daughter; that would bring his expenditure on dowries from an estate worth 60 talents (line 350) to four talents. Casson’s conclusion is worth quoting: ‘We now know that it is precisely the “millionaires” who figure most prominently in his plays. We see reflected there the ancient equivalent of the society of Molière’s Misanthrope or Oscar Wilde’s Importance of Being Earnest, not the comfortable suburbanites of American television comedy’ (p. 58-59).

135 οἰκετήν. For the husband as ‘servant’ of his wife cf. Alexis fr. 150, with Arnott’s comment, where this quasi-servile position is linked with the dowry. By marrying a dowried woman a man effectively enslaves himself because any disso-
lution of the marriage necessitates repaying the dowry; therefore a husband has to watch his step, and not just spend the dowry (he might have to repay it). Smikrines’ point is that Charisios appears to be running through the large dowry he had given with Pamphile by wasteful carousing, instead of considering himself duty-bound to his wife (οἰκέτης). In Smikrines’ eyes the large dowry has failed to obtain that security for his daughter for which it was intended.

136 ἀπόκοιτος, ‘sleeping out’, i.e. away from his wife, said of Zeus at Lucian DDeor 10.2; cf. com. adesp. 1084.6 KA (Menander?); it emerges at 164 (and probably in lost earlier lines) that Charisios is sleeping at Chairestratos’ house and keeping Habrotonon there. The word recurs in Ο14 fr. VI.2 from this play. ► πορνοβοσκῶι δώδεκα / τής ημέρας, twelve drachmi a day, Smikrines insinuates, is an exorbitant amount, and indeed that appears to be the case when we compare the ten drachmi which Demosthenes, 4.28, says is sufficient to feed a foot-soldier for a whole month of active service. Smikrines himself says the sum is enough to feed a man for well over a month (although Chairestratos scoffs at that calculation). According to [Arist.] Ath.Pol. 50.2 a law forbade charges for female entertainers (auletrides, psaltriae, kitharistriae) in excess of two drachmi a day; Krieter-Spiro (1997, 45-46) seeks to explain the apparent discrepancy by (a) the ‘overheads’ which a porno-boskos had and (b) passages in Plautus’ Asin. (230, 752) implying a charge of six drachmi a day for an hetaira. Probably we should allow for a considerable range of prices for prostitutes according to their background, status, refinement and the agency for which they worked. Later in the play, when Chairestratos is (probably) considering how he can take over Habrotonon from Charisios he admits to himself that she is no ‘common prostitute’ (984-85). In Sam. 392-97 Demeas points out the difference between the lifestyles of the common prostitute and the ‘kept lady’. For Charisios’ ‘playboy’ lifestyle which Smikrines is castigating here cf. Aristoph. Wealth 244, where a spendthrift is characterized as wasting money on women and dice (πόρναισι καὶ κύβοσι; cf. lines 504-7 and 601 of Epitrep. for gaming as another aspect of Charisios’ behaviour).

140-41 An example of Menander’s brilliant economy of language (if the textual restorations can be relied upon: see next note). Chairestratos’ rejoinder to Smikrines’ comment that Charisios spends as much in one day on his mistress as others need to keep them for a month and six days, contains in one short line (141) three points indicating the stinginess of Smikrines’ calculation: ‘yes, enough for a starving man (πεινώντι) for a cup of gruel (πτισάνην) once upon a time (ποτέ)!’ I.e. Smikrines’ calculation (λελόγισται) is quite inadequate by any ordinary standards. The ancient hypothesis to the play (P.Oxy. 4020) refers to this penny-pinching habit in Smikrines (12-13 γ[έροντα / φιλάργυρον λογισμ[όν έ'χοντα Parsons). Note the speaker in Lys. 7.12 who admits that he had a reputation for being δεινόν καὶ ακριβή καὶ ούδέν εἰκεί καὶ ἀλογίστως ποιήσαι, ‘an awful penny-pinter, not one to do anything without careful reckoning’. ► πτισ[άνη]ν, cf. Aristoph. fr. 165; 428 KA; Alexis fr. 146.2-3 τρύβλιον πτισάνης, a ‘cup of gruel’, with Arnott’s note.
141 A problematic line in several respects. First, there is a clear dikolon after 140, indicating that the copyist of C, at least, thought Smikrines spoke 141. Jensen (1929), for example, retains this. Second, Wilamowitz' supplement ιξανό]υ τι makes sense, but the space after tau looks to me (in Capps' photograph) too big for a mere iota (as Cobet (1876) saw: he allowed space for two letters). Third, προς or γεις has been inserted by editors before πτισ[άνη]ν, itself a doubtful conjecture, to make the verse scan. Finally, I, for one, cannot read Hutloff's ποτε at line end, although most editors have concurred. So, with all these provisos, and with grave doubts, I leave the line in its 'received' form. Perhaps the possibility of άρκο[υ]ντα at line beginning is worth mentioning, as this scribe writes the first upright of alpha nearly vertically sometimes.

142 A third character enters (from Chairestratos' house) to tell Chairestratos that his friend Charisios is waiting for him inside. Before the discovery of O25 it was uncertain who appeared to call in Chairestratos. Wilamowitz believed it was the cook's assistant Simias. Although O25 only has an abbreviated form of Habrotonon's name in 154, any assumption other than that she speaks 142 and the following remarks to Chairestratos is implausible.

143 γλυκύταθ'. Although Habrotonon has been employed by Charisios, the term may express endearment to Chairestratos at this early stage. See note on 166. Bain (1984, 36-37) lists γλυκύς as a word used predominantly by women in Menander, cf. in this play 862, 953 and 989 (perhaps a quote of what Habrotonon had said, cf. Webster (1960, 102), but note 888 γλυκύτατη said by Charisios of Pamphile). Bain's remarks lend support to the attribution of the present line to Habrotonon.

144-46 The distribution of words between speakers is not certain. Earlier editors took 144 and early 145 as a question spoken by Simias, the supposed friend of Chairestratos. They then gave the latter half of 145 to Chairestratos as answer. But since the discovery of O25 it is more or less certain that Habrotonon, not Simias, shares in the exchange with Chairestratos; the latter cannot refer to Habrotonon in 145 as ψάλτριαν so Smikrines becomes the likely speaker of these words. Given that, it seems best to give 144 and early 145 to Chairestratos as the continuation of his answer to Habrotonon's question 'Who's this?' I print Austin's ingenious supplement for these lines.

150-64. For palaeographic comments on these difficult lines of O25 see the section in 'Composite Readings'. The general sense seems to be that Chairestratos and Habrotonon exchange comments about Smikrines' appearance and intentions. In the course of this Smikrines makes some more grumbling remarks to himself. The exchange between Chairestratos and Habroton is a parte.

155-57 Here Smikrines seems to be going on about Charisios' (imagined) excesses by night (157 τῆς γυ[ρ]ι[ξ]τ[ό]ς).
5.2 Act One

156 άγχος κτλ. For readings and possible supplements see composite readings.

159 οὕτως άγαθόν κτλ., common in comedy, cf. 264-65 οὕτω τί σοι / άγαθόν γένοιτο Δάς, which Syriskos says repeatedly (265 παρ' ἕκαστον) when excitedly listening to Daos' account of finding the exposed child. The meaning is similar to 'bless you!'. When Syriskos gets his way in this passage he goes off 'wishing a thousand blessings' on Daos, his benefactor (272-73 μυρία / εὐχόμενος άγαθά). A parallel type of expression is οὕτως ὁναίο... + imperative, 'may you profit from...', e.g. Lucian, Hermotim. 775 οὕτως ὁναίο, διακόνησαί μοι τί (Selene speaking). A kind of opposite of the expression occurs in line 362 of this play: μηθέν άγαθόν μοι γένοιτο, 'I'll be damned!' In Latin cf. e.g. Plaut. Poen. 208 O multa tibi di dent bona.

160 Arnott (2000, 154), who argues for the supplement "αεί ποτ' " , believes Habrotonon is referring to Smikrines' constant harping on Charisios' faults: '[you're] always... [sc. doing some bad thing or other]'. But she can hardly be addressing Smikrines either directly or indirectly ('bless you', in previous line), as the theatrical interest of the scene lies in Smikrines acting on his own, whilst Chairestratos, and then Habrotonon, observe his arrival and overhear his mutterings. In later work Arnott (2004) retained the reading but shifted his ground as to whom Habrotonon was addressing (Chairestratos now): 'Don’t keep on saying “for ever”'. Arnott believes Habrotonon is criticizing Chairestratos for using this phrase repeatedly to her. It is less clear, however, why Chairestratos should say 'for ever' to her over and over again. Nor has the reading itself gone unchallenged. Austin (2006, 6) says that 'the papyrus clearly has αείπον followed by an upwards sloping dash. We can reasonably postulate that in uncial script a delta has dropped out after alpha and read ἂ (δ') εἶπον.' His reconstruction gives the sense (Habrotonon:) ‘...Keep quiet. But what I said... ’ (Chairestratos, aside, to Smikrines:) ‘Oh, go to hell. You’ll pay for this, you will’. This is, indeed, possible, although μή λέγε used in an absolute sense ‘don’t talk’, particularly after the long formula οὕτως άγαθόν κτλ. is unconvincing. If we insert (γ') instead of (δ') in the next line and let 160 run on without a sense break at least we get a better sentence: ‘don’t say what I said!’

O25 has some letters above ούκ, indicating a change of speaker. At the same time, there is paragraphos after this line. The first interlinear letter might be χ, suggesting that Chairestratos spoke the words, but to whom might he address them? Presumably not to Habrotonon, whom he surely wants to flatter, not insult; and he is not conducting a conversation with Smikrines, so the words (2nd person sing.) can hardly be direct address. Since the idiom οἰμώξει (vel sim.) is characteristic of Smikrines in this play (see above p. 130), we might consider giving the half-line to Smikrines; he would then be saying, irritably, in front of Charisios’ door (he knows he’s not at home) ‘won’t you go to the devil?’, before announcing his intention of getting the ‘low-down’ from his daughter before approaching Charisios directly. But the direct address (οἰμώξει) is awkward in his mouth, too, as he knows Charisios
Commentary

is not at home. Probably we had better honour the trace of speaker’s name in the papyrus and give the words to Chairestratos.


164-65 Here Chairestratos and Habrotonon announce their intention to warn Charisios of Smikrines’ approach; thus the audience will know – when act two begins, that important information has been given during the entr’acte: residents and guests chez Chairestratos have been warned to expect a hostile visit from Smikrines shortly, as soon as he has left Pamphile.

164 χίναδος, ‘cur’, (originally, apparently, a Sicilian word for ‘fox’), with connotations of cunning, and used disparagingly; cf. Andok. 1.99; Dem. 18.162; ibid. 242; Dinarchos in Demosth. 40.3. Hutloff (1913, 26 n. 1) refers to the description of a cinaedus in Petronius Sat. 21.23, an undesirable who causes commotion in the house.

166 άνάστατον, ‘destroyed’, ‘ruined’, usually of communities after enemy action; cf. Kol. 87, where ‘flatterers’ (χόλακες) are said to have been solely responsible for the ruin of cities (ὅσας άναστάτους / πόλεις ἐφώρακας). Here the word is used in a mildly metaphorical sense of a private household ruined by infidelity.

166 πολλὰς ἐβουλόμην αμα. The point of Habrotonon’s remark seems to be: she would profit from the disruption of many households just as she is profiting now from Charisios’ separation from his wife Pamphile. When Chairestratos then questions her meaning, she suggests she would particularly appreciate it if his household was disrupted (167-68 τὴν ἐμὴν; - τὴν σήν γ’.). She seems to be putting out her ‘feelers’ to Chairestratos, since Charisios has paid for her services but shown no inclination to enjoy them (430-41). These lines mark the beginning of the secondary ‘love-interest’ in the play between Habrotonon and Chairestratos, on which see Koerte (1944) (although much of his argument is based on premisses which new papyrus discoveries have invalidated), and Arnott (2004, 274-75). In particular Koerte points to Choricius of Gaza 32.73 Foerster-Richtsteig in which it is said that, among Menander’s characters, Chairestratos has ‘prepared us... to love a harp-girl’ (ἡμᾶς παρεσκεόασε... Χαιρέστρατος δὲ ψαλτρίας ἐρᾶν). Similarly in Mis. Kleinias has a girl-friend, whose pursuit provides side-entertainment beside the main love-affair between Thrasonides and Krateia (see esp. lines 270-74). In a general sense prostitutes are averse to marriages, particularly happy ones; cf. the courtesan Bacchis’ remark in Terence, Hecyra: ‘etsi hoc meretrices aliae nolunt; neque enim est in rem nostram / ut quisquam amator nuptiis laetatur’ (834-35). Nünlist (2003a, 61 n. 6) suggests a different interpretation of the present passage: he says that Habrotonon would like Smikrines to ‘shake up’ Chairestratos’ house in order to ‘[force] Charisios out of his lethargy, who after all shows no interest in the girl he hired for good money’. In other words, rather than enticing Chairestratos with these words, Habrotonon would be remaining dutiful to Charisios; Ireland (1992,
65) takes a similar view.

167 τὴν ἑρέξιδον, the next-door house, i.e. Chairestratos’. By another convention of comedy, the two households involved in the drama are either neighbours or near-neighbours. The arrangement is, in fact, somewhat abstract. The two visible house-fronts merely ‘stand for’ two separate households; their juxtaposition is a simplification required by limited stage space.

169-71 These three lines contain the relatively stereotypical announcement in Menander of the first choral interlude; no texts (if there were any) of these song-dances survive; the performance was clearly komastic, as the reference to ‘drunken young men one shouldn’t get in the way of’ points to the exuberant inebriation associated with the kōmos. Cf. Dysk. 230-31 (Πανιστάς ὑποβεβρεγμένους), Asp. 247-48 (ὦχλον ἀνθρώπων μεθυόντων), Perik. 261 (μεθύοντα μειφάκια); this manner of choral sideshow appears already in Alexis fr. 112 KA (Kouris): ἐπικώμων ἀνθρώπων πλῆθος. Antiphanes fr. 91 KA (Dodonis) Ἰώνων ἄνθρωπος ἡμεραθής ὀχλος (thanks to L. Reyno for the last references). As Zagagi (1994, 76) says, there is no intrinsic connection between Menander’s plot and the antics of the chorus. Dramatically, it seems that the chorus was reduced in New Comedy to a musical interlude which interrupted the action four times with music and dancing reminiscent of the Dionysiac kōmos. Zagagi shows that Menander was careful to lessen the degree of interruption in the plot by ‘bridging’ choral interludes with leads at the end of one act taken up at the beginning of the next. Here, Chairestratos and Habrotonon announce their intention of warning Charisios of Smikrines’ approach just before the chorus enters, and it seems almost certain from O25 and O26 that the next act begins with a report of (i) what had happened inside Chairestratos’ house, and (ii) the first encounter with Smikrines. In other words, Menander retained the convention of the Dionysiac chorus in comedy but stitched over its intrusions into a ‘naturalistic’ development of plot. Furthermore, one notes that the intrusion of a drunken group at this point meshes with the plot in that a party is planned, or is already in progress, in Chairestratos’ house. To a certain extent one might see the chorus’ cavorting as evocative of the indoor scene.

170 ὑποβεβρεγμένων, lit. ‘soaked’ = ‘tipsy’, cf. Dysk. 230-31 Πανιστάς... ὑποβεβρεγμένους; Alexis, fr. 277 KA Θασίας οἰναρίως καὶ Λεσβίως τῆς ἡμέρας τὸ λοιπὸν ὑποβρέχει μέρος καὶ νωγαλίζει, ‘he quaffs and chomps the remainder of the day away with Thasian and Lesbian wines’.

171 ο[[κ] μ[ή] κτλ. The formula is almost equivalent to a stage direction exit/exeunt. In earlier writers the theme is more developed, less formulaic: the speaker in Alexis fr. 112 KA, e.g., says ‘I wouldn’t want to bump into you lot by night...I’d need wings to escape molestation’.
5.3 Act Two

5.3.1 Scene 1: Smikrines deceived

Act one ended with, first, the departure of Smikrines into Charisios’ house to question his daughter on her domestic situation. At this point he already knew (somehow) that he would not find Charisios at home. Second, the departure of Habrotonon and Chairestratos into the latter’s house to inform Charisios that his father-in-law was dangerously close. Now act two begins after the choral interlude with what looks like a monologue by Onesimos. P contains line-beginnings of six lines with no paragraphoi indicating changes of speaker. If we could reconstruct the sense of the following lines, we would probably find that Onesimos had been instructed by Charisios or Chairestratos to intercept and divert Smikrines in some way.

Then, according to Nünlist’s probable attribution, come more fragmentary line-openings in O25 fr. 3; let us assume, without certainty, that these lines were also spoken by Onesimos. After this comes P.Oxy. 4641 (Onov) which contains the beginning of the arbitration scene, when Syriskos and Daos make their first appearance, disputing the ownership of the tokens found with the exposed baby (line 16).

But who spoke lines 1-15 of this fragment? As the first editor, Nünlist, says, there are no unequivocal signs; Onesimos and Smikrines seem the most likely candidates. Nünlist favours Smikrines, arguing that Menander usually wraps up ‘loose ends’ from the ends of previous acts (Handley & Hurst, 1990, 132 n. 17; 140 n. 29); hence it is unlikely that Smikrines went off in act one announcing his intention of confronting Charisios after speaking with his daughter, and then did not reappear early in act two to ‘update’ the audience, so to speak, on this plan. And there is another strong reason for assuming that Smikrines makes an appearance early in act two. After the arbitration scene he departs on unstated business at line 371; then, in act three, he returns from town, as Onesimos says, apparently in an agitated state, having learnt ‘the truth’; at that point Onesimos wishes to steer clear of the riled Smikrines and hides before he arrives (576-81); as others have pointed out (Gomme & Sandbach, 1973, 302), this reaction of Onesimos enables us to guess that he had pointed Smikrines in the wrong direction earlier in the play; it looks as if he had encountered Smikrines, perhaps outside Chairestratos’ house, and told him some story which led him to head ‘for town’ (cf. line 597 ἡπάτησέ με); for such a deliberate diversion we may compare Plaut. Bacch. 989f., where Chrysalus sends the irate Cleomachus off on a wild goose chase after Mnesilochus (in fact he’s inside the door they are standing beside). Since acts two and three of Epitrep. are substantially complete from the beginning of the arbitration scene, we are virtually forced to place this encounter before the arbitration scene, at the beginning of act two. I guess that the unplaced fragments V-VIII of O14 are to be assigned to this encounter between Smikrines and Onesimos outside Chairestratos’ doorstep. The word ἄναξ in fr. d might be Onesimos’ respectful address of Smikrines, ‘buttering him up’ so as to
avoid suspicion of the lie he is telling; [άπότεχος in fr. b, a reference to Charisios’ absence from home, might also fit this hypothetical exchange. If my restoration of a form of Smikrines’ name in fr. c is correct, it would lend support to this conjecture.

Let us then, with Nünlist, assume that Smikrines spoke lines 1-15 of P.Oxy. 4641; they fall after the presumed encounter between Onesimos and Smikrines, and just before the arbitration. In line 15 Smikrines announces an intention to ‘see’ someone (Charisios in town, presumably); then Syriskos and Daos burst in on the scene with the word ‘stop!’ There follows a brief altercation between the two, which we can follow from the end of P.Oxy. 4641 to the beginning of C with a break of only very few lines. Then in line 223 comes the appeal to Smikrines to arbitrate in their dispute. Presumably Smikrines had not left the stage during the introductory altercation between the two slaves; he, too, no doubt, had been arrested by the cry ‘stop!’ and the heated exchange between the two (Blume, 1998, 106). So, between lines 16 of P.Oxy. 4641 and line 223 of act two we should imagine Smikrines standing at the right side of the stage with Syriskos and Daos bursting in from the left; their opening altercation will have taken place as they make their way from left to centre stage.

173 οἵμου[ενος. Unless the scribe of P wrote οἵμου- by mistake for οἵμ-, the form cannot have been 1st p.s. (οἵμου[εθα is possible). The participle is likely, but not certain.

175 ὁ δἐσπότης. Assuming Onesimos is the speaker, this can only be Charisios.

176 ὁ γέρων. And this, in context, can only be Smikrines.

177 λόγ-. A form of λόγος, presumably.

[178ff.] Hutloff (1913, 16) placed some line-beginnings preserved on a piece of P here, but they yield no sense, and no connection can be established with proven Epitrepontes. Jensen (1929) doubts their belonging to the play and subsequent editors seem to have quietly forgotten about them. Here they are: νε[ει / ἔως ἐλα[ / ἔδειτο χ[ / ἀπωθεν [ / τούτωι τι[ / κατὰ τὸ ἄ[ / . . . . . . ξοφ[ / . . . . . . ψ.

O25 fr. 3

For the placing of this hitherto unplaced fragment see Nünlist (2003a). In his view the lines are spoken by Onesimos after entering from Chairestratos’ house after the entr’acte. Before this Chairestratos and Habrotonon had decided to warn Charisios of the impending approach of Smikrines. They may have encouraged Charisios to rouse himself from his drunken stupor and either evade Smikrines or prepare to face him; Onesimos would then be giving a short account of this scene inside Chairestratos’ house.

2 χυ[ζει, ‘provoke’, ‘tease’, ‘irk’, or, with connotations of sexual attraction, ‘tickle the fancy’, might be a suitable word in Onesimos’ mouth; cf. Sam. 330; Perinth. 16.
4 παρατριβόμαι. Austin ap. Nünlist supplements παρατριβόμαι which Nünlist (2003a, 61 in comm.) glosses 'I am exhausted', explaining: 'Onesimos expressing his frustration with Charisios' strange behavior'. But the ending of the supplement is not certain and might equally be a form of the participle παρατριβόμενος. Although the meaning of παρατριβόμαι (passive) 'to be worn out' [sc. by travel] is documented once in a late papyrus (P.Oxy. 1668.24, iii AD, a private letter), middle παρατριβόμαι, 'clash against', 'fall out with' (LSJ II), as used by Polybios (e.g. 27.15.6), might suit here. Onesimos might be reporting on the 'clash' between Smikrines and Charisios which he, presumably, averted by sending Smikrines on a wild goose chase into town (above p. 136).

6 τό γάρ πέρας Parsons, Nünlist, cf., in this play, O25 fr. 3.3, and lines 287, 533, 891: 'to cut a long story short' Handley (1965) on Dysk.

7 ἀπαλλάγηθι. Since this is a monologue (no paragraphoi) the word must be quoted speech. This suggests that the following line-beginnings are also parts of quoted speech (lines 8-11), a sequence ended by ἐλάλει δέ μοι, where Onesimos(?) continues in narrative mode. He is, presumably, quoting fragments of speech from a conversation not witnessed by the audience. To judge by references to sleeping and dining couches (9-10) one might guess that the sympotic scene inside Chairestratos' house is meant. Onesimos' speech at the beginning of act two seems to have contained a lively account of the goings-on and exchanges in and around Chairestratos' house during the entr'acte.

8 and 12. Here we have parts and a variant of the common expression πολλὰ ἀγαθὰ σοι γένοιτο, 'good on you!', 'bless you!'; see note on lines 159 and 1070-73.

9-10 κάθευδ' ἀναστ[άς Austin], 'get up and sleep it off...!' Cf. Perik. 469 κάθευδ' ἀπελθόν, where Pataikos tries to get rid of the drunken Polemon (Parsons). Nünlist (2003a, 61 in comm.) records Austin's suggestion: "κάθευδ' ἀναστ[άς [κλίνην ἐμοί [παράδος]". Niinlist (2003a) redeciphered this line to read κλίνην ἐμο[ι where the first editor, P. Parsons, had read ἐκποδών, τὴν σήν δέ νυν / κλίνην ἐμοι [παράδος]. Assuming itacism (ει for iota, cf. line 4), he reads κλίνην, interpreted as a couch used at a symposion: 'Within the Epitrepontes this can only be the carousal which is taking place in Chairestratos' house in order to console the supposedly cuckolded husband Charisios'. He believes the new reading supports a supplement in the previous line: κάθευδ' ἀναστ[άς, '... the addressee (sc. Charisios) is to get up from his kline and sleep it off elsewhere' (see previous note).

10 Nünlist (2003a) redeciphered this line to read χλ[ει]νην ἐμο [ where the first editor, P. Parsons, had read θ[ει]ν Ἐ[ω [. Assuming itacism (ει for iota, cf. line 4), he reads χλίνην, interpreted as a couch used at a symposium: 'Within the Epitrepontes this can only be the carousal which is taking place in Chairestratos' house in order to console the supposedly cuckolded husband Charisios'. He believes the new reading supports a supplement in the previous line: χάθευδ' ἀναστ[άς, '... the addressee (sc. Charisios) is to get up from his kline and sleep it off elsewhere' (see previous note).

13 Χ[αιρέστρατος or Χ[αρίσιος Nünlist (2003a, 61 in comm.). Not much of the chi is visible.

15 ὑμᾶς ἐνοχλε[ί. Quoted speech again unless Onesimos is addressing the audience directly (unlikely). Perhaps Charisios said to Chairestratos 'I don't want to bother you' (e.g. υμᾶς ἐνοχλε[ίν ου βούλομαι).
16 Cf. *Perik.* 180, οὐδὲ ἐν δεόμενος.

19 γυναῖκ*. Pamphile, perhaps, if Charisios’ speech is being reported.


**O14 = P.Oxy. 2829**

Not much can be made of these six small fragments. In VI 2 ἀποξοίτος, ‘away from bed (= home)’, echoes Smikrines’ description of Charisios in line 136. This might lead us to think that Smikrines is the speaker here.

**Onov = P.Oxy. 4641**

Ed. pr. René Nünnlist identifies this probably third-century papyrus fragment as belonging to *Epitrep.* by overlap with a known book fragment of the play (fr. 6) in lines 13-15. Its position in the play is, as he says, fairly securely established by the speaker-name Syrisk[os] above line 19 and by the dialogue of lines 16-23, which appears to mark the beginning of the famous arbitration scene. On the attribution of lines 1-15 to Smikrines rather than Onesimos see introductory remarks on act two (above). Lines 1-15 contain little of clear import. The daughter referred to in 1 is presumably Pamphile herself; the quoted self-description in lines 7-8, ‘I’m out of control... drunk, hung over...’ would seem to apply to Charisios’ drunken behaviour now that he has left Pamphile; in line 10 the speaker announces his intention to ‘put someone to the test’ – Charisios, again, no doubt. And the moralizing gnōmē in 13-15 about the evils of idleness seems to suit Smikrines’ insistence on decency and scorn of immorality. For an inspired, but hypothetical, reconstruction of the sense of these lines see Austin (2006).

Then, in line 15, the speaker announces that he wishes to see someone; if Smikrines is indeed the speaker, this should refer to his intention of speaking to someone in town, perhaps Charisios himself. New speakers enter, their dialogue initiated by an urgent command ‘wait!’ Since the command is in the plural and we know from the ensuing arbitration scene that Syriskos is accompanied by his wife and their adopted child, it seems that Daoa says ‘wait!’ to Syriskos and family. In the middle of line 19 change of speaker is indicated by interlinear Συρικσ, so the previous speaker must be Daoa. Lines mid-16 to 18 then are to be given to Syriskos. Incidentally, the indication of speaker in line 19 seems to confirm the charcoal-burner’s name in this form as opposed to Syros. Now Nünnlist believes that Daoa is saying ‘wait!’ to Syriskos as he wishes to stop him from breaking off their encounter. He surmises that Syriskos had threatened to refer the matter of their dispute – the ownership of the tokens found with the infant – to his master Chairestratos, and Daoa wishes to stop him. In other words, the two slaves appear for the first time in mid-argument;
Commentary

Syriskos and wife (holding baby) appear first, as they are on their way to Chairestratos’ house; Daos follows, but speaks first. For this arrangement Nünlist (2003b, 27) refers to Ter. Ad. 155ff. For the threat by one slave to another to ‘tell’ on him to his master one could also compare Plaut. Rud. 958-61. For the silent, but no doubt conspicuous, presence of the baby in the whole of this scene cf. Heap (2002-3, 98-108).

2 τό] δὴ λεγόμενον, introduces a saying, e.g. Phasma 42; fr. 689 K.-Th. (= 460 KA) τό δὴ λεγόμενον θάττον ἢ βάδην.

3 Cf. Sam. 356 δαξών δ’ ἀνάσχοι, καρτέρησον εὐγενῶς. The first editor suggests the supplement μυθεν] σε πείση, καρτέρησ[ον.

5 πεπόρκηε μωρίου[ς seems to chime now with 683-84.

6 [καλ]όν γε τό χαχόν. For the ironical sense of καλός in Nünlist’s supplement cf. Dem. 9.65 καλήν γ’... χάριν... .

7-8 ἄσωτός εἰμ’... μεθόω, χραταπαλό. There is similar asyndeton in Chaireas’ description of his ‘predatory’ behaviour when assisting a friend to snatch an hetaira (Dysk. 60: μεθόω, κατακάω, λόγον ὀλως οὐκ ἀνέχομαι). ► For Handley’s supplement οὔτω έστιν cf. Men. Andria fr. 48 KA οὔτως αὐτός ἐστιν.

7 Cf. line 584 of this play ἄσωτ[ι, said by Smikrines, quite probably about Charisios. Men. fr. 544.2 KA: ἐγὼ δ’ ἀνόητος, εὐτελής ύπερβολῆ, ἢ ὁ (δ’) ἄσωτός ἐστι, πολυτελής, θρασύς σφόδρα, places ἄσωτος semantically close to words like ἄβελτερος, ‘impossible’, ‘incorrigible’, ‘capable of anything’. Aristotle EN 1119b31: τοὺς γάρ ἀχρατεῖς καὶ εἰς ἀκολούθιαν δαπανηροὺς ἀσώτους καλοῦμεν, διὸ καὶ φαυλότατοι δοκοῦσιν εἶναι. Alexis wrote a play called Ἀσωτοδιδάσκαλος which, to judge from the extant fragment, had a character who taught people to scorn philosophy and live it up; wealth does not survive death; the dead man only possesses ‘what he had eaten and drunk’.

8 A superlative adverb, perhaps, at line beginning, e.g. μύλιστα, τάχιστα, κάχιστα.


11-12 ε[ / ε]ργάζετ’ Nünlist (2004, 97) puts these words in inverted commas, without comment: the letters are then what ‘no one says to him’. For ἐργάζομαι, ‘work’, cf. Georg. 47.

12-15 Smikrines concludes his description of Charisios’ wasteful behaviour with a gnōme: ‘the idle healthy man is worse off than a man with fever, because he eats twice as much with nothing to show for it’. In other words, the idle healthy man wastes the food he eats, whilst Charisios is wasting his own and Smikrines’ substance in drunken idleness. Smikrines likes to deploy such pieces of popular wisdom in his tirades against his son-in-law; cf. e.g. 680, 683-84, 793-94.

15 ἰδεῖν βουλήσομ’. For such a declaration of intent prior to exiting see Asp. 93
5.3 ACT TWO

εἰτ’ ἐντυχεῖν βουλήσομαι τι Δᾶε σοι (cf. ibid. 142); Eur. Med. 259 τοσοῦτον οὐν σου τυγχάνειν βουλήσομαι (Medea to the chorus); a papyrus fr. of id. Stheneboia line 27 (ed. pr. Rabe RhM 63, 1908, p. 147) has ἀλλ’ εἰς ἀγρόν γὰρ ἐξέναι βουλήσομαι, where ἐξέναι is unmetrical; whether this justifies the emendation to ἐξιὼν βουλεύσομαι (Wilamowitz and others, cf. Kannicht in TGF 5.2 fr. 661.27) is another matter. Antiphon 6.8 βουλήσομαι ἀπολογήσασθαι. The future of βούλομαι seems to be idiomatic in such expressions of intent, like our ‘I’ll be wanting [to see you]…’ or ‘I look forward to seeing [him]…’; strictly, it is the seeing which lies in the future, the wanting now. On the Aspis passage Beroutsos (2005, 45 ad v. 93) notes: ‘the future looks forward to the realization of the wish’.

19-23 Austin (per litt.) supplements e.g.:

(Συ.)  οὐ μ’ ἄ[ποστρέφεις.
      ἐγὼ δὲ πρὸς τὸν δεσπότην [τραπήσομαι 20
      τὸν ἐμὸν. κατοικεί δ’ ἐνθα[δ’ι Χαιρέστρατος.
      ἀλλ’ εἰσ[ω]μεν. οἱ κενοὺς άε’ι λόγους
      [λέγοντες οὐχ εἰσ’ ἄξιοι κοινωνίας.]

22 in. Nünlist, cett. Austin (vel οἱ κενοὺς ἡμίν λόγους / βέβαδοντες οὐχ εἰσ’ ἄξιοι προσρήσεως.).

5.3.2 Scene 2: The arbitration

P.Oxy 4641.16 Enter Syriskos, presumably with his wife holding the baby, and Daos; they enter from the ‘country side’ (left) as Syriskos announces his intention (in 378-80) of staying in town with Chairestratos for the rest of the day and returning to work in the hills the following morning. The entry of both men with at least two κόφα προσδόπα marks the beginning of the arbitration scene. When the audience has grasped the significance of the scene, they will be able to imagine a Syriskos who has come with his ‘family’ to his master’s house on regular business (he is to pay him recent earnings, line 379-80; cf. the bailiff Collybiscus’ visit to town in Plaut. Poen. 170), and met up with Daos on his way and engaged in argument with him over the tokens found with the baby. Taubenschlag (1959, 625) makes the point that Daos is an ordinary δούλος whilst Syriskos belongs to the class of δοῦλοι χωρίς οἰκοδόμοι; he lives with a wife – and, now, an adoptive child – in a hut in the woods, calling sometimes on his master to render up earnings.

16 [π]ροσμείνατ’. For ‘calling back’ scenes in which a character about to leave the stage is called back by someone wishing to deal with him/her, see e.g. 858 of this play (Habrotonon to Pamphile), Plaut. Pseud. 245 (Pseudolus to Ballio). In the latter Plautine passage the pimp Ballio reacts with impatience comparable to that of the addressee here: quid hoc est? quis est qui moram mi occupato / molestam optulit?

16 ὁ δειλῆς μετα[. The first question is whether we have genitive of δειλῆ, ‘af-
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ternoon’, or (fem.) of δειλός, ‘cowardly’ or ‘miserable’. An expression in Sam. 429 ὁ μαχρᾶς δείλης, ‘oh, what a long afternoon!’, suggests the former. Previous supplements have reflected a belief that Daos must be expressing annoyance at the unexpected course events that afternoon have taken. He has bumped into Syriskos returning to town with wife and foundling child; Syriskos is demanding the tokens which Daos found with the child. According to Nünlist he has threatened to tell his master Chairestratos about the matter in order to enlist his support. Handley suggests ὁ δείλης μετα[τρόπου, Austin μετα[πιπτούσης κακῶς. But one could imagine an indignant exclamation with δειλής, too: for example, ὁ δείλης μετα[νολας, ‘what a cowardly change of heart!’, or ὁ δείλης μετα[στάσεως πάνυ, ‘what an absolutely cowardly withdrawal!’ μετάστασις can also mean ‘exit’ of the chorus on the stage, according to Pollux 4.108, which would suit Syriskos’ intended movement well.

17 ἔρρωσο, ‘good-bye’ in the sense of ‘get lost!’; cf. Dem. 21.39 ἐφροσθαῖ πολλὰ τοῖς νόμοις εἶπόν. ► τὸ κατὰ σέ πρόδο[μειον μόνος, ‘you stay there by yourself’. τὸ κατὰ σέ picks up Daos’ word προσμείνατ’, but it may also anticipate what Daos later says about himself, how he suddenly baulked at the thought of having a family to look after and chose not to adopt the child he had found (252-55).

19 οὐ μα[,] probably, but not necessarily, an exclamation; Nünlist (2003b, 27) suggests οὐ μ’ ἀποστρέφεις; Handley (per litt.) οὐ μά[την λέγω. ► Interlinear συρις* above οὐ μα[ is strong support for the slave’s name as Syriskos, as given in 270, rather than Syros as in the Mytilene mosaic (fig. 1 on p. i). Syros was a common slave’s name in comedy, however, see Plaut. Bacch. 649 non mihi isti placent Parmenones, Syri etc..

C (Caerensis) begins

218-22 The division of parts in these opening lines of C has been much discussed. C has dikolon after τὸ δίκαιον in line 218 and at the end of the line (followed by paragraphos). If one observes the remaining dikola in C down to the first remark which can be clearly attributed to one of the two speakers (Daos must say τί γάρ σοι μετεδίδουν; in line 222) one reaches some odd discrepancies. Daos must then be the first speaker, but surely it is he who is ‘fleeing from justice’; and some, especially Weinstein (1971a, 136), have argued that the first half of 219 must be spoken by Syriskos, not Daos. Then again, if we give, with Weinstein, the first half of 219 to Syriskos and observe the remaining dikola in C, this throws out the sequence of speakers down to the fixed point of Daos’ remark in 222. So what to do? Weinstein herself advocates reading the kolon between βούλομαι and κρινώμεθα in C as a dikolon, indicating change of speaker from Syriskos to Daos. Against this three objections can be raised: O14 does not even have a high stop here and Weinstein’s argument about ‘double iota’ here (i.e. βούλομαι followed by dikolon looking like an iota) is far-fetched; secondly, κρινώμεθα does not come naturally from the mouth of one who had already said: ἐπιτρεπτέον τινί: that is to double
the proposal. And, last, the rapid succession of speakers entailed by this proposal is strained. Her parallel from Plato, *Crat.* 414e, is not a good one as it involves a repetition of a form of \( \beta \omega \lambda \omega \mu \alpha \), which flows more easily. In a detailed discussion Zanetto (1990, 143-47) sides with Weinstein about the first half of 219, but proposes, to save the sequel, that C does not in fact have dikolon after \( \tau \alpha \ \mu \eta \ \sigma ' \) (he reads \textit{CAEPIITPEITPEON}). If that were true, we could give the rest of the line and half of the next to Syriskos, which would make sense. But examination of Koenen’s photograph of C confirms the reading by earlier editors of apostrophe after sigma followed by dikolon. If that were not enough, there is the paragraphos in both C and 014 below 219 to indicate change of speaker either at line end or in mid-line. I think, with the majority of editors, that we must ignore the dikolon at the end of 218 and give to Daos the remark \( \omega ' \\delta \varepsilon ' \ \varepsilon ' \ \varepsilon ' \ \varepsilon ' \ \tau \alpha \ \mu \eta \ \sigma ' \), which also makes sense: he is saying to Syriskos: ‘you have no just claim on these things’; cf. lines 286 and 290-92 where he says similar things.

218 \( \sigma \nu \omega \rho \alpha \nu \tau \varepsilon \zeta \), cf. Sam. 578, Perik. 378: an insult equivalent to ‘blackmailer’, cf. Fisher (1976, 36). \( \sigma \nu \omega \rho \alpha \nu \tau \varepsilon \zeta \zeta \), ‘unfounded accusation’ = ‘abuse, calumny’, cf. Dem. 18.95; \( \sigma \nu \omega \rho \alpha \nu \tau \varepsilon \zeta \zeta \) ibid. 113; Hyperides \textit{Against Diondas} p. 8.1 and 24 Carey. ▶ \( \delta \upsilon \tau \upsilon \chi \varepsilon \zeta \zeta \). The epsilon of a vocative ending looks likely to me in C although all editors seem to write \( -\eta \varsigma \), which also finds support in \textit{Heros} fr. 7 K.-Th. \( \omega ' \ \delta \upsilon \tau \upsilon \chi \varepsilon \zeta \zeta \), \( ' \ \mu \eta ' \ \beta \varepsilon \delta \varepsilon \varepsilon \). But the latter is not a ‘true’ vocative, meaning rather ‘oh [you are] a wretch, if you won’t budge’, whereas Daos’ retort to Syriskos does contain a true vocative, ‘that’s blackmail, wretch!’

219 \( \tau \alpha \ \mu \eta ' \). (Συρ.) \( \varepsilon \pi \tau \rho \varepsilon \tau \varepsilon \varepsilon \nu \). Braun (2000) has an interesting note on the elision of \( \sigma \zeta \alpha \) before a change of speaker. He compares examples in Italian and French dramatic poetry and cites Racine’s \textit{Phèdre} in performance to show that syllables in hiatus are not usually elided before a change of speaker. This means that ‘Daos’ in this passage would have enunciated \( \sigma \zeta \alpha \), before ‘Syriskos’ said \( \varepsilon \pi \tau \rho \varepsilon \tau \varepsilon \varepsilon \nu \), although G.-S. had considered this unlikely.

219 \( \varepsilon \pi \tau \rho \varepsilon \tau \varepsilon \varepsilon \nu \ \tau \nu \nu \). The verbal adjective introduces the scene after which the play was named. Scafuro (1997, 120-21) writes: ‘The verb \textit{epitrepein}, with or without \textit{diaita} (“arbitration”) as object, means “to refer a dispute to arbitration”, whether the procedure envisioned is reconciliation or arbitration in the strict sense.’ It has long been recognized that the structure of this scene coincides to a considerable degree with a Euripidean precedent, a scene in the lost \textit{Alope}: Katsouris (1975, 148-56), Cohoon (1914); for detailed, if not always convincing, discussion see Cusset (2003, 168-83). Our knowledge of the plot of this play depends largely on an account of the myth of Alope given by Hyginus, \textit{Fab.} 187 Marshall, which many have taken as a summary of Euripides’ play. If so, the play contained a prominent arbitration scene: a shepherd found a baby exposed in regal garb. He took in the baby; a fellow shepherd asked to have the baby. The first handed it over, but kept the garments. The second demanded the garments too, as token of the baby’s identity (\textit{insignia in-}
The ensuing quarrel (iurignum) was arbitrated by King Kerkyon himself; he recognized the tokens (insignia) as pieces torn from his own daughter Alope's dress: ea esse ex veste scissa filiae suae; thus he discovered that his virgin – as he thought – daughter, had given birth to a child (it was Poseidon's). As we shall see at later points in Epitrep., details of Hyginus' narrative may provide a clue to the interpretation of details of Menander's staging of Epitrepontes.

If we read on in Hyginus, however, the stories diverge. On recognizing the baby as his daughter's, Kerkyon ordered her execution and the baby's (second!) exposure. It was saved from death a second time and grew up as Hippothoos. Later, Theseus killed Kerkyon and restored the kingdom to Hippothoos; Poseidon changed Alope's body into a fountain. If all this was in, or foretold in, Euripides' play, we can only usefully make a partial comparison with Menander's Epitrepontes. Smikrines does not recognize the baby's tokens after the arbitration; neither is the daughter executed nor the baby exposed a second time. But these differences do not preclude audience recognition of Menander's tragic precedent here; on the contrary, as Lennartz (1999) has argued (see below ad 365), they may have heightened an alert audience's enjoyment of the comic arbitration by creating an expectation that Smikrines would recognize the tokens of his daughter; after all, they must have known the story from the prologue.

Plautus' Rudens, too – a play based on a Greek original by Diphilos – contains an arbitration scene which is quite similar to that in Epitrep.: two servants, Trachalio and Gripus, cannot agree on how to proceed in their dispute over a chest found at sea; cf. Katsouris (1975, 150-56), Goldberg (1980, 67-68); after much to-ing and fro-ing Trachalio says: verba facimus, it dies. / vide sis, cuius arbitratu nos vis facere. And, as in Epitrep., the person chosen as arbitrator (Daemones) has an as yet unknown connection with the object under dispute. For an examination of both these scenes of arbitration in comedy with respect to the historical processes of arbitration in Greece and Rome see Scafuro (1997, 154-92).

There is an ambiguity in ἐπιτρεπτέον τῶι here: in the first instance it is the slaves' dispute which is to be 'referred' to an adjudicator, but the welfare of the baby itself is also being placed in Smikrines' hands, as he decides who keeps the tokens, vital to the identification of the child's parents. Perhaps we should recall that a child's 'guardians' were called ἐπίτροποι; they were 'entrusted' (ἐπιτρέπω) with the well-being of a child until he reached majority (see Dem. 21.78). Thus the arbitration scene is anything but incidental to the main plot.

222 τούτον, Smikrines. According to my reconstruction of Smikrines' movements in this act, he never left the stage when Syriskos and Daos entered, in mid-argument, at P.Oxy. 4641.16; probably he lingered a few moments at the right side of the stage to see what the dispute was about. When Syriskos and Daos cast around for a suitable passerby as arbitrator, they spotted him. Scafuro (1997, 160) points out that the choice of an unknown bystander as arbitrator is unparalleled in historical fourth-century cases of arbitration; there a friend or acquaintance of one (preferably
both?) party was usually chosen.

226 τι οὖν ἐμοὶ μέλει; If only Smikrines knew! The audience must have known from the delayed explanatory prologue. But if he had known, the entire plot would have been short-circuited. The dramatic irony is continued in 227 when Syriskos says they are seeking an ‘impartial’ adjudicator (κριτὴν ἱσον).

227 Neither C’s εἰδεσε nor O14’s εἰδητι is quite right: the former is unmetrical, the latter lacks σε which is needed for clarity. I adopt the usual remedy of writing δή for δέ, although a passage in Plato (Prot. 310a2-3), εἰ μη σε τι κωλύει, shows that a reading based on O14 with μη τι, ‘not something’, rather than μηδέν, ‘nothing’, is at least possible (see app.). Likewise, Heliodorus, Aith. 2.21.6, writes εἰ μη σε τι προφυγαίτερον ἀποσχολεῖ in a similar context of a chance encounter.

228 διά κάκιστοι ἀπολούμενοι, a formula of abuse in Menander, ‘abject wretches’: cf. Dysk. 208, 403.

229 δύκας λέγοντες περιπατεῖτε, ‘you go around disputing’; cf. fr. 274 KA (Paidion) Εὐφέστα... περιπατεῖ / λέγων ἀλεξιφάρμακα. ► The διφθέρα, ‘skin’ (probably of a goat), is the traditional garb of the farm labourer (cf. Dysk. 415 and this play 328) and thus incongruous for litigants in town; cf. Goossens (1946), who recalls Theognis 1.55f. οἳ πρόσθ’ οὐτε δύκας ἡδεσαν οὐτε νόμους / ἀλλ’ άμφι πλευρήσι δορᾶς αἰγῶν κατέτριβον, to show the antithesis between ‘lawsuits’ and ‘skins’. At the same time the remark here characterizes Smikrines as a snob, contemptuous of the rights of the low born. These farmhands should be out in the fields working, in his opinion, not wasting their and his time in Athens quarrelling. Another aspect of Smikrines’ snobbery emerges in 691-92 where he recoils in horror at the thought that Charisios’ behaviour constitutes a snub toward him such as only metics deserve. Likewise περιπατεῖτε, ‘stroll round’, denotes a comportment unsuited to menial slaves; philosophers ‘strolled’ while disputing a learned issue.

231 πάτερ, familiar and ingratiating. At Dysk. 494 the cook Sikón says that when he wants to ingratiate himself with an older man in order to borrow some implement from him, he calls him πατέρα καὶ πάππα[ν]; similarly he addresses an old woman as μητέρ’. 232-36 The gnōmē spoken by Syriskos corresponds to contemporary rhetorical practice in introducing a moral generalization as basis or starting-point for a following argument; e.g. Dem. 18.95 (καὶ γὰρ ἄνδρα ἔδοικεν κτλ.), ibid. 97 (πέρας γὰρ ἀπασιν κτλ.). Syriskos’ introductory speech establishes his credentials as an orator, as Daos ruefully acknowledges in 236. As marks of the ‘high style’ here note the enjambment 232-33 and 234-35, the grand abstractions καιρός, δίκαιον, μέρος, πρόνοια, κοινόν, the generalizations characteristic of the public speaker (ἐν παντὶ καιρῶι, ἀπανταχοῦ, πάντων), and impressive compound forms ἐπικρατεῖν, παρατυγχάνοντα. Gorgias in Dysk. 271ff. begins a speech similarly with a gnome. The lines here are quoted in Orion, Anthol. VI.4, under the rubric Περὶ δίκης καὶ δικαίωσύνης; interestingly, the first line is quoted in an unmetrical form beginning
μη καταφρόνησης θεών... The anthologizer clearly thought, or wished to imply, that the gods vindicated the just. The sentiment in 234-35 here, that it is everyone’s duty to uphold the principle of justice for the common good, is a major theme of Dem. 21, *Against Meidias*, esp. 219-22.

232-33 ἐν πάντι / καυρῶν recurs as a phrase in fr. 377.2 KA.

234 τὸν παρατυγχάνοντα. Generally ‘anyone who happens by’, but in context Smikrines who has ‘happened by’ at the moment of their dispute. τοῦτον τοῦ μέρους / ἔχειν πρόνοιαν. A very general expression: ‘to have concern about this interest’, but with a direct point to Smikrines here: he should involve himself as arbitrator in the slaves’ dispute as an instance of the common human concern for justice.

235 ἔχειν πρόνοιαν. Some punctuate after this, making the following clause (κοινόν ἐστι...) a separate sentence, but the sense is perhaps better if one lets the construction run on: ‘it is a matter of common concern for everyone that the passer-by etc.’

236 Daos answers in kind with a high-faluting compound (συμπέπλεγμαι) and ironical litotes μετρίωι ρήτορι, ‘no mean speaker’; cf. fr. 379 KA σκαιόν οὐ μετρίως, ‘no small fool’; *Perik.* 512 (Πω.) δύνασαι δὲ δηπουθὲν λέγειν, Πάτακε. / (Πα.) μετρίως, ‘you can talk, of course, Pataikos.’ ‘Reasonably well’. Pentheus in Eur. *Ba.* 800 comments in similar vein on Dionysos’ skill in arguing: ἀπόρωι γε τῶιδε συμπεπλέκεθαι ξένωι. συμπλέκομαι, ‘tangle with’, was used of wrestlers ‘grappling’ with each other, then of opponents engaging in contest generally (LSJ s.v.). Photius p. 412.8 records a use of the simple verb πέπλεκται in an unnamed drama = ηττηται, ‘to be defeated’ (= fr. 565 KA).

237-38 ἐμμενείτ’ / οίς αν δικάσω; Smikrines wants to know whether the contestants will abide by his ruling; cf. Dem. 41 *Against Spoudias* 14 (οὐχ οἶος ἐμμένειν οίς εκείνοι γνοίεν). Scafuro (1997, 125) states that rulings in private arbitration in fourth-century Athens were not legally binding; this in contradistinction to official arbitration. So Smikrines’ concern that he will not be wasting his time appears justified in view of historical reality.

239 τοξωλυνομε C, τοξω[ ]ιογ[ ] O14. C’s reading involves two consecutive resolutions (+–ω–ω), which should probably be considered intolerable (Handley, 1965, 70-71). Two solutions suggest themselves: one may simply omit με (Lefebvre), or correct to τὸ μὲ κωλυον (Eitrem, edd. pl.). It is hard to decide between the two courses.

242 ἐν τῶι δασεί. Earlier editors preferred δασεί, ‘thicket’, ‘copse’, but this became less likely with the discovery of the Bodmer codex of *Dysk*. where we find (line 120) τὸ δασό, ‘the rough ground’ below a hill. Sheep or goats grazed in the ‘rough’, that is, pasture unsuited for crops. It is interesting that the earlier reading has disappeared from modern editions, Martina’s included, although the parallel from *Dysk* is hardly
proof of δασεΐ in Epitrep. One might argue that ‘thicket’ is more likely than ‘rough ground’, if Pamphile had really wanted the baby to die (he would be less visible)—and vice versa.

249-352 The Debate

Although both parties argue their case with good control of language and logic, a basic difference emerges; Daos is only concerned about his own welfare and gain, whilst Syriskos pretends that he is pleading on behalf of the child, not for himself or his wife. Daos says that, having rescued the baby, he spent the night worrying whether he could afford either the expense or the trouble involved in the baby’s up-keep (252-55). His subsequent argument that he found both child and tokens alone and is therefore surely entitled at least to a share is convincing enough if the things found were only objects; as it is, a child’s life and future is at stake, and Daos shows not the slightest concern for those (Heap, 2002-3, 101-2). Syriskos, on the other hand, argues the case from the baby’s point of view; if he is robbed of the tokens, how will he ever discover his identity in future? He may be of royal lineage; without the tokens to establish his identity he may be condemned to a lifelong existence as manual labourer. Syriskos produces the child in person and says that he, not Syriskos or his wife, is claiming the tokens as his property. When we consider that Smikrines is unwittingly deciding the fate of his own grandson, it makes sense that the baby’s future is the real issue behind this debate (see note on 219). On the other hand, Smikrines’ decision in favour of Syriskos is only indirectly the cause of the recognitions which follow in the play. Chance plays a part, too, as Onesimos has to spot Charisios’ ring (one of the baby’s tokens) when Syriskos takes it from the pouch. It is, however, a central irony of the play that Smikrines is actively working to dissolve his daughter’s marriage the whole time, but his involvement in the arbitration results in the recognitions which save his daughter’s marriage and the legitimacy of the baby. For further remarks on the two speeches see Goldberg (1980, 66-67); Cohoon (1914); Ireland (1992, 67-68).

The view that Syriskos stands on firmer legal ground in this debate is supported by Klingenberg (1984, 183). He disputes the view of Kränzlein (1963, 107) that the debate would lose all interest if the two parties did not both have plausible claims on the tokens. Klingenberg argues that the humour in the scene derives from the way in which Daos seeks to depict what is basically ‘embezzlement’ (ἀφαίρεσις) as legal ‘ownership’; he compares Daos’ position to an old Yiddish joke (‘ostjüdischer Witz’): a Jew prosecutes a Tartar who has robbed him of his horse. The Tartar responds by saying he found the horse. The Jew narrates how the Tartar came upon him, beat him up and rode off on his horse. ‘Yes’, answers the Tartar, ‘I found both – the Jew and the horse. But I had no use for the Jew’.

The scene is no doubt based loosely on the Attic institution of arbitration (διαιταν) by which less serious private suits might be settled out of court; see Scag-
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furo (1997, 117-40 and 154-61), MacDowell (1978, 206-11), MacDowell (1990, 303-25), Omitowoju (2002, 160-62). There a διαιτητής was appointed by lot to adjudicate between disputing parties and to make his ruling (δίαιτα) known to the forty tribal judges.

249 καὶ δικαίως makes more sense in Daos’ mouth than in Syriskos’, even if he is subsequently instructed to speak by Smikrines (λέγε); G-S, however, have good parallels for the admission of guilt by an offending party, and give the words to Syriskos.

252-53 ἐν νυκτί βουλήν... / διδους. A proverbial expression (listed by e.g. Zeno-bius, Gregorius Paroemiographus) for ‘thinking over at leisure’ or ‘sleeping on it’; cf. Plut. Them. νυκτί φωνήν, νυκτί βουλήν, νυκτί τὴν νίκην δίδου. But night is also the time for worrying over problems: see Penelope’s quandary and prayers to Artemis in Od. 20.61ff.; Phaidra’s nocturnal brooding (Eur. Hipp. 375-76).


257 So Syriskos is a charcoal-burner. The Mytilene mosaic depicting the arbitration scene of Epitrep. (see fig. 1 on p. 1) shows Smikrines flanked on the left by a character called Syros, on the right by a character identified as Anthrakeus, with a small figure to his left (his wife, carrying the baby). The figure on Smikrines’ right is clearly the Syriskos of our play, so the artist has confused Daos and Syriskos; the inversion of names may be a simple slip of memory by the artist, or it may be another instance of that mirror-reversal of images which we find also in the Synaristosai scene, and partially in that from Theophorumene, in the House of Menander in Chorapha, Mytilene, when compared with the earlier emblemata in Pompeii showing the same scenes by Dioskourides; see Arnott (1996b, 54-56); Dunbabin (2001, 216-18, 303); Easterling & Hall (2002, 172); Green (1985); for a dating of the Menander mosaics to around AD 300 see Berczelly (1988).

The mosaic shows above all how the arbitration scene was staged: Smikrines stood between the arbitrants, as befitted his role as mediator. The charcoal-burner was accompanied by his wife with the baby, whilst his opponent, Daos, is carrying a handbag slung from his neck and shoulder, no doubt to indicate the bag with tokens (363 πήρα). So the participants in the debate hold the objects which they have before Smikrines’ ‘sentence’ is passed. But Smikrines already has his hand on the arm of Daos clutching the bag to him, so it looks as if he is about to relieve Daos of the tokens and ensure they are handed over to Syriskos. Berczelly (1988, 124) comments on the curiously frontal stance of all three participants in the arbitration. The first editors of the mosaics (Charitonidis et al., 1970) explained this with reference to the necessity for actors to face the audience when speaking, but Berczelly sees here in addition the influence of a later style of representation, that which is typical of early Christian book illustrations. Incidentally, he also interprets the presence of Sokrates, flanked by Simmias and Kebs, among the Menander mosaics as evidence
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of the pagan, or, as later ages said, humanist beliefs of the owner of the villa, as opposed to Christian (where Jesus flanked by disciples would be the appropriate icon).

A charcoal-burner was a familiar figure in Athenian life and literature (Aristoph. Ach. e.g. 664ff.). His job was to cut suitable sticks in the woods of Attica, par-burn them in special charcoal ovens, then transport the product to the city for use as fuel. Andokides fr. 4 Blass-Fuhr (schol. Aristoph. Ach. 477) refers to the unusual sight of charcoal-burners (ἀνθράκευτάς) in Athens occasioned by the exodus from the country during the early years of the Archidamian War. Clearly these men usually kept to the hills, except, no doubt, to bring their produce to market, or, as in the case of Syriskos in this play, to hand over takings from the trade to their owner.

261 σύννους, ‘pensive’, ‘troubled’, cf. com. adesp. 1027.1-2 KA ... τί σύννους κατὰ μόνας σαυτώι λαλεῖς / δοκεῖς τε παρέχειν ἔμφασιν λυπουμένου; where the sense is made clear: you are σύννους when alone (κατὰ μόνας), turning things over in your mind (σαυτώι λαλεῖς), and giving a generally troubled impression (ἔμφασιν λυπουμένου). In the present passage the sense is also clarified by σκυθρωπόν, ‘with troubled (or irritated) brow’. Cusset (2003, 175) points to the occurrence of σκυθρωπός in fr. 105a K. of Euripides’ Alope, but recognizes that the context is unknown. It is interesting to find σύννους and σκυθρωπός contrasted in Isokr. 1 (Ad Demonicum) 15.4: the author says that the latter makes a person look αὐθάδης, ‘stubborn’ or ‘surly’, whilst the former makes him look φρόνιμος, ‘thoughtful’. Clearly σύννους could have a positive connotation, ‘pensive’, in the sense of giving a matter careful thought, weighing options sensibly.

262 περίεργος, ‘over-zealous’, ‘a busy-body’, ‘meddling’, with περί- implying, as often in compounds, an excess of some quality; cf. Sam. 300; fr. 2 of this play and below p. 124.

264 πρ'ιν εἴπειν πάντ', ‘before I’d said everything’. Innocent sounding words, but in fact subtle justification on Daos’ part that he had failed to inform Syriskos about the tokens on this first occasion (see note on line 313f.).

267-68 Conveniently for both the baby and Syriskos, his wife has just lost a child, making her a suitable foster-mother for the foundling. Menander obviously has no qualms about such convenient coincidences (the same situation occurs in Sam. 54ff. where Chrysis loses one child and rears another); they are simply necessary for the smooth-running of his plots and not intrinsically impossible. Nor should we even begin to wonder how the child had fared in Daos’ hands without a suitable foster-mother, although Theophrastus’ ‘Ahedia’ (Char. 20.5) contains a father who feeds an unweaned baby by prechewing food for it himself. Generally, of course, the phenomenon of foster-mother or wet-nurse will have been more familiar in antiquity than nowadays, when anyone can buy ‘formula’; cf. Eur. Alk. 638; Moschion is the foster-child of Demeas in Menander’s Samia and we also hear of the nurse who raised him (lines 236-37).

270 C has dikolon at the end of line 269 (after παιδίον), paragraphos under 269
and, written in the margin, σμικ. It looks very much as if the writer of these marks thought Smikrines said ἐδέου, Σύρισκος; But this, as Gomme & Sandbach (1973, ad loc.) say, is virtually ruled out because Smikrines cannot and should not know Syriskos’ name at this juncture. The two men seeking arbitration are strangers to him and Daos has not mentioned Syriskos’ name in the course of his speech. In addition, the line as transmitted by C is two positions short (⊔⊔). Various solutions to this nexus of difficulties have been proposed (Arnott, 1968b, 227-29). (i) My proposal makes Daos ‘prompt’ Syriskos who may be baulking at answering Smikrines’ question ‘Did you ask?’ Daos follows up with: ‘Well, didn’t you, Syriskos?’ On this reading we can retain the vocative Σύρισκος, which is appropriate when coming from Daos. And the assumed omission by the scribe is quite readily explained as a sort of haplography when writing ΕΔΕΟΤΟΤΓΟΤΟΤΡΙΟΚ’. (ii) The proposal by Capps (1944, 178) – Sm. ἐδέου; Da. Σύρισκος! Sy. ἦγωγ’. Da. ὄλην τὴν ἡμέραν – is along similar lines, but seems to me to involve a rather abrupt exclamation from Daos, and a weak and conjectural response from Syriskos himself. (iii) Zanetto (1990, 151-52) suggests that the first part of ΣΥΡΙΣΚΕ originated from an interlinear sigla CYP which was then copied into the line itself; the letters ΙΚ came from a misreading of an original phrase said by Syriskos. Zanetto suggests Σμικ. ἐδέου; Συρ. (περὶ ὅν εὑρήσας χ’) (Δα.) ὄλην τὴν ἡμέραν but this does not give good sense. (iv) The ingenious suggestion by Arnott (1968b, 229) deserves consideration: ΣΜΙΚ/ ἐδέου σῷ γ’; (Δα.) ἵχ(ετεύων) ὄλην τὴν ἡμέραν / xατέτρωψα, where the scribe, according to Arnott, saw ΣΥΡΙΣΚΕ and read it as ΣΥΡΙΣΚΕ, jettisoning the following ΤΕΥΩΝ because it no longer made sense. (v) The majority of editors have decided that marginal ΣΜΙΚ in C must simply be a mistake and have given the first two words to Daos. They have then supplemented an answer by Syriskos; Hense’s (Ἑγώγ’) is perhaps best. Handley (per litt.) wonders whether Daos may not have simply gone on without waiting for Syriskos’ reply, e.g. ὄλην (μὲν οὖν) τὴν ἡμέραν.

271 λιπαροῦντι, ‘insisting’, cf. Aristoph. Ach. 450-52 ὃ θύμ’... νῦν δὴ γενούν / γλίσχρος, προσαιτών, λιπαρῶν; Machon fr. 356 Gow λιπαρῶν καὶ προσκείμενος; Pherekrates fr. 146 KA; Telekleides fr. 40 KA.

274 C has dikolon after χειρας, indicating change of speaker. Since Smikrines intervened (according to C) in line 270, and since the question ἐπόεις ταὐτ’; comes somewhat more naturally from a new speaker, I follow C’s division of the line between speakers. In the threefold antilabe this involves it is interesting to see how Menander uses a kind of alliteration or assonance to connect the short parts: ἐπ- ἐπ- ἀπ-. This emphasizes the staccato effect.


277 ληρος, ‘a trifle’, ‘not worth mentioning’, cf. Aristoph. Lys. 860; Frogs 809 and 1005; Thesm. 880 (ληροῦντι ληρον); Plut. 517 (ληρον ληρεῖς).
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284 κοινὸς Ἐρμῆς, lit. ‘joint Hermes’, with sense ‘shared lucky find’; cf. Arist. Rh. 1401a21; Theophr. Char. 30.9; cf. Taubenschlag (1959, 633-35). As the god of luck and especially travellers’ luck, Hermes’ name came to stand for a stroke of luck, such as finding something valuable; such a find could be called a ἔρμαιον. Michael Apostolius, Collectio paroemiarum Centuria, gives two explanations of the proverb κοινὸς Ἐρμῆς: (1) 7.94.1: Ἐρμαιον κοινὸν καὶ Ἐρμῆς κοινός· ἐπὶ τῶν εὐφοντῶν τι κέρδος ἀπροσδόκητον καὶ κοινὸν πουρησάμενον; (2) 10.1.1: Κοινὸς Ἐρμῆς· οἶον, κοινὸν τὸ εὑρεμα· κλεπτήσατος γὰρ ὁ Ἐρμῆς κατέδειξε κοινὰ ἐνα τὰ φόρεσα; the first applies better to the situation in Epitrep. The combination of thieving and finding is well illustrated by the Hom. Hymn to Hermes, in which Hermes ‘finds’ a tortoise which gives up its shell for the first lyre, and fire-sticks which enable him to kindle fire for the first time; he also steals big-brother Apollo’s cattle and hides them in a cave.

ἐλα[βέ η. Slings (1990) rightly objects to the double ἀν in the normally accepted supplement of this line as being untypical of fourth-century usage. His suggestion, however (ἐλα[βέ τι), gives the sense ‘some part of it’ (τὸ μέν τι), which is not quite right, as τὸ μέν in context should refer to the baby, hardly a ‘part’ of the whole find. ποι, by contrast, is suitably vague. Daos means ‘he might have got that, I suppose (ποι), and I this’. Austin had arrived at this solution independently. In Austin (2006) he supplies parallels for ποι combined with ἀν: Soph. OT 1116; Plato, Apol. p. 38b; I add id. Prot. 312d ἔποιμεν ἀν ποι· αὐτῶι.

286 I read C’s line end as οὐδ’εν. The last visible letter cannot, it seems to me, be an epsilon. Presumably the writer elided οὐδεν, not realizing that that made the line unmetrical.

287 δεδώκα. Gronewald (1987, 13) makes out a good case for δ’· δεδώκα (Daos does not intend the finality of the gift implied by the perfect tense), but there is no visible apostrophe after delta, and τὸ πέρας does occur without δέ (as Gronewald acknowledges), so I leave the perfect here.

289 εἰ δ’ οὖξ ἀρέσκει. A rare use of οὖ in a conditional clause, conspicuous particularly since Menander could easily have written εἰ μὴ δ’ αocrin. G.-S. (312) explain: ‘οὖξ ἀρέσκει is felt as one word (‘unpleasing’) and οὐ retained after εἰ, as sometimes εἰ οὖ φημι, οὐξ ἔδωκα etc.’ Cf. Kühner & Gerth (1966, Part Two, vol. 2, 189-90) with examples.

290 ἐλαττοῦ. Literally ‘have less than one’s due’, presumably with the sense ‘don’t act as if you have less than your due’ (Arnot: ‘don’t feel thwarted’). But one might take the sense as ‘don’t do me an injustice and don’t have less than your due’, i.e. Syrskos should be content with just the child and not (1) demand the tokens (2) keep less than his due (the baby, which Daos had given him).

290-91 πάντα δέ. . . κατισχύσαντά με. Feneron (1974, 83) points to the rhyme of the line-endings near the end of Daos’ speech (‘Daos’ pompous epilogos’), considering it an indication that he is ‘self-conscious about their style’. The construction
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of κατισχύσαντα with σε in the next line is not immediately apparent, embedded as it is between τά δέ and με.

292 εϊρηκα κτλ. A formal marker that a speaker has finished his speech, cf. Prometheus’ long defence speech in Lucian, Prom., which he winds up with εϊρηκα (202).

293 ικιδι was read in the left margin of 026 by ed. pr. Austin interprets the last letters as ίδί[αι, ‘aside’, ‘to himself’, but actually Smikrines is saying this directly to Syriskos if we have the sequence of speakers right.

301-3. Syriskos pleads the baby’s case as it is not able to speak for itself. At the same time the baby is a kind of hostage underpinning the justice of Syriskos’ claim on the jewelry. Babies as hostages on stage were familiar to the Athenian audience from several plays by Euripides: in the Telephos the exiled king Telephos presses his claim by threatening to kill the baby Orestes, whom he holds in his hands; the scene is parodied by Aristophanes in the Acharnians. In the Andromache Menelaos tries to force Andromache from her defensive hiketeia on Thetis’ altar by producing her baby girl by Neoptolemos and threatening to kill him. Defendants in the law-courts also, apparently, produced their infant children when they pleaded for mercy from the jury; in Dem. 21.187 the orator says that, unlike Meidias, the vile offender, he has no babies to produce for the tear-jerking effect (MacDowell, 1990, 321). See further Post (1939) and Scafuro (1997, 159). Heap (2002-3, 112-13), building on Post’s article (1939), points out that the baby in Epitrep., like that in Sam., has an important, if passive, role throughout the play. In particular, she points to the role of the baby as ‘touchstone’ for the character of the various individuals who come into contact with it: the unfeeling and selfish Daos, Syriskos who at least claims to be acting on behalf of the baby, Habrotonon who also takes a kindly interest in the baby’s welfare, although she uses the baby as instrument in her ploy to identify Charisios as its father, and hence, perhaps, to gain her own freedom.

305 διατροφήν, cf. 139 of this play, ‘sustenance’. δια- conveys the idea of sustaining a person for a certain duration of time. Cf. Halieis fr. 18 KA διατροφήν πτωχώι.

307-13 Note the clever slant Syriskos gives to his argument here; on the one hand, in his favour, he points to the ‘mother’s will’ and the plight of the innocent baby whose rights should be protected until he comes of age; on the other, the defendant has ‘robbed’ (λελωποδυτηκότ’) the baby of his property, taken what is not his (τάλλότρια); the idea is to make Smikrines’ choice easier for him (νύν γνωστέον βέλτιστέ σοι) without straining credibility.

309 δ τι ποτ’ ἐστι. C has ταυθ’ατι which is normally corrected to δ τι (Richards). It seems that the writer of C hesitated between a form agreeing in number with ταυθ’ and the usual expression δτι ποτ’ ἐστι. A reading ἀττα seems ruled out by the fact that it produces an anapaest split after the first syllable which is part of a word which began in the previous foot (ἀττα ποτ’ ἐστι = —||ν—). This appears inadmissible in Menander, cf. G.-S. 38. Richards’ emendation seems the best solution, perhaps helped by punctuation as here to separate ταυθ’ and πότερα somewhat from δ τι.

313f. Syriskos anticipates an objection (προκατάληψις): why had he not demanded the tokens when he took over the baby? Most editors take the following expression οὐπω παρ’ ἐμοί τοῦτ’ ἔχω (315) as meaning that he had not the right to claim them as he was not yet kyrios of the child (cf. 306). But, as Donzelli (1989, 317-21) points out, he had just explained that he did not know about the tokens when he received the baby; he heard about them later from a herdsman-friend of Daos’ (299-301). Unless Menander has forgotten, or chosen to ignore, this detail so quickly, Syriskos’ words here must reflect his own account. Moreover, in 264 Daos had already said that Syriskos asked for the baby initially before he had even heard Daos out – a detail which surely dovetails with this point. Accordingly, Donzelli takes οὐπω παρ’ ἐμοί τοῦτ’ ἔχω, ‘that was not yet in my power’, not in a legal sense, but as a matter of fact: Syriskos could not demand the tokens then because he did not know about them (cf. Karnezis (1979, 120-22)). This slightly extends the familiar sense of παρ’ ἐμοί as ‘in my judgement’, or ‘in my hands’ (LSJ s.v. B II2 and 3). Syriskos seems to mean ‘that was not yet in my ken’, or ‘in my range of cognizance’. Leo’s emendation of the line should be rejected, although it produces smoother sense, because of (1) the two textual changes required and (2) the illogicality pointed out by Donzelli. However, I find the corollary of her interpretation – that υπέρ τοῦτου λέγων does not mean ‘speaking on his behalf’ but ‘speaking of this matter’ – unnecessary; we can combine the sense quite satisfactorily without that assumption: ‘Why then, when I assumed possession of the child, did I not demand these things [sc. the tokens] from you? That was not possible for me then. But now I’m here to speak on his behalf…’ For the delayed δέ in 316 which this interpretation and punctuation requires cf. Plato Prot. 310e αὐτὰ ταῦτα καὶ νῦν ἥκω παρὰ σὲ, ἵνα υπὲρ ἐμοῦ διαλεχθῆσθι αὐτῶι.

315-18 Syriskos’ strongest argument; his claim is not in his own interest but in that of the child; he is merely representing the child’s best interests (see below on 353-54). He places his position in stark contrast to Daos’ self-interest. Moreover he cleverly turns Daos’ reference to ‘shared luck’ (χοινός Ἐρμῆς) against him by pointing out that the principle of ‘treasure-trove’ does not apply when the owner is known, and stands to lose by the appropriation of his property by others. Syriskos manages to combine an appearance of not acting in self-interest with altruism; he is only protecting the helpless child’s interests.
315-16 λέγων / ἠκω, ‘I come speaking’ = ‘I’m here as speaker’; cf. fr. 366 KA ἠκω λαβεῖν βουλόμενος.

316 The insertion of (ο) by Sudhaus has the advantage of removing hiatus between ἐμαυτοῦ and ο_UNS , and receives somewhat shaky support from O14. But it is not strictly necessary and slightly interrupts the emphatic denial by Syriskos οῦκ ἐμαυτοῦ οὐδὲ ἐν / τίνον. Moreover, we had σε in 314, so it does not need to be repeated for the sense. One might consider (γ’) instead.

318 εὐρισχ’. The imperative is a little difficult, but the suggested emendation by Kelly (1970), μη λέγε / εὑρεσίν, hardly recommends itself as it involves too drastic surgery in two lines and introduces an undesirable repetition (εὑρεσίν...εὑρεσίς). I think the imperative μηδέ ἐν / εὐρισχ’ should be taken as a ‘conative’ use of the present stem: ‘don’t try to find’ = ‘don’t even think about finding...’.

318 σώμα ἀδικοῦμενον, where σώμα = ‘person’ (LSJ s.v. II.2) like ‘body’ in legal parlance.

319 εὑρεσίς...ἀφαίρεσις, Syriskos demonstrates his rhetorical prowess with this elegant jingle (παρονομασία), worthy of the rhetorician Gorgias. Taubenschlag (1959, 633 n. 44) compares this accusation of theft with Plaut. Rud. 956-58 where Trachalio accuses Gripus of theft (furtum, furem) on finding the chest.

320-25 Another winning strategy of Syriskos: humility. He admits that the child’s parentage is likely to be above his station in life, that of a manual worker. Therefore it is imperative that the means of establishing the child’s identity – the tokens – remain with the foster-parents. Instead of disqualifying him for the role of foster-parent, Syriskos turns his low station in life into an argument supporting his claim on the tokens.

323-25 The typical activities of a young aristocrat seem to combine the Greek with the Persian; participation in athletic competitions and learning to fight are Greek enough, but the reference to lion-hunting recalls Xenophon’s Kyropaideia (e.g. 1.4.7). The important point, of course, is that activities such as hunting, athletics, military prowess are a mark of that ‘freedom’ (ἐλεύθερον τι πονεῖν 323) which money brings. A natural occupation of the rich man’s son Sostratos in Dysk. is hunting (42) on the very land which poor farmers – such as Gorgias (Knemon himself is not really poor) – have to hack and till to eke out a subsistence livelihood. ► ὁπλα scanned with long first syllable, in the tragic manner (cf. 325), cf. τέχννυν in the recognition scene of Mis. 615 Arnott.

323 αἰξάς, ‘turn eagerly to’, see LSJ s.v. I.2. Leo’s supplement receives good support from Clem. Alex. Strom. 1.23.153 Stählin/Früchtel εἰς δὲ τὴν αὐτῶν (L αὐτοῦ Früchtel: ἄνδρον Hiller) φύσιν ἀξίζας (ἀξίς λ: ἡξίς Hiller) (sc. Moses) and the torn edge of C makes two missing letters most probable. As G.-S. say, ἀξίζας is ‘no everyday word’. But that suits Syriskos’ high-faluting style here, where he compares the baby’s putative descent with figures of tragedy. As an alternative, I won-
325ff. Syriskos backs up his case by reference to tragic themes. When he reminds Smikrines that the material is surely familiar to him, there are metatheatrical implications: (1) that he, Syriskos, a charcoal-burning slave, knows his tragedy (2) that the audience is equally conversant with his allusions. The remark reminds us of the speaker’s position: the plays referred to had been performed on the same stage as that on which Syriskos speaks. In fact, however, it is not necessary either for Smikrines, the audience or us to know the play to which Syriskos is referring: given a vague awareness that Pelias and Neleus were mythical characters, Syriskos’ account is sufficient to instruct his listeners as to its relevance. Omitowoju (2002, 161-62) argues that Syriskos’ references to tragedy here do not locate the matter of the dispute in the world of myth, but rather point up for the audience the contrast between myth and ‘reality’ (albeit stage reality). In fact we can take the matter further: references to myth were common in such real-life situations in Athens as court-cases; many forensic speeches contain mythological references to underpin an argument. For example Demosthenes (21.149) casts aspersions on Meidias’ legitimacy by saying that a secret surrounds his birth ὡσπερ ἐν τραγῳδίαι; for more instances see Scafuro (1997, 158 and n. 11). And we can be sure that everyday life and conversation frequently involved comparisons with mythical personages and events, as these were paradigms for the Greeks. Hence, when Syriskos here compares the child’s predicament in this dispute with mythical exposed babies, he is doing what an average Athenian commonly did. This reinforces the implied reality of the staged dispute: the characters on stage talk ‘just like’ Athenians involved in a real dispute. Similarly in fr. 602.8 KA (from an unknown play) a servant apparently addresses his master (line 1 τρόφιμε) in ‘tragic’ tones: Ἰνα σοι (καί) τραγικώτερον λαλώ. For the question of popular knowledge of tragedy see Green & Handley (2001, 371) and section 1.2 of the introduction.

325-27 Gronewald (1995, 28) suggests punctuating these lines differently to avoid awkward ἔχεινος in 326: he suggests punctuating with a comma after πάντα and starting a new sentence with ἔχεινος. But I doubt whether the slight anakolouthon in Νηλέα τινά / [Π]ελίαν τ’ ἔχεινος requires this change in the conventional punctuation. Against it one could also argue that Νηλέα τινά / [Π]ελίαν τ’ do not follow elegantly after κατέχεις πάντα, ‘you know everything’, or indeed τραγῳδούς in the previous line, as Neleus and Pelias are certainly not τραγῳδοι. Gronewald is, however, right, I think, to say that τινά in 326 does not imply that Neleus is not well known. It has more the sense of ‘for example’ or ‘it might be’ (cf. Dover on Aristoph. Frogs 911f.), and introduces a casual or off-hand note to Syriskos’ speech (‘der Eindruck einer gewissen Beiläufigkeit und Nonchalance’).
326-37 The apparent simplicity of Syriskos’ exposition conceals rhetorical sophistication. A single word (ἐκείνους) suffices to invoke the tragic stage (‘those characters...’). The casual reference to the goatherd’s skin cloak (διφθέραν) – like Syriskos’ own – effortlessly links the mythological case to the case in hand. Similarly, the action of the goatherd in tragedy (330) exactly parallels Syriskos’ behaviour now. And, to clinch the case, Syriskos imagines how Neleus and Pelias would have fared if a Daos had found them then and kept the tokens for himself; they never would have become the kings their high birth destined them to be. Petty self interest then (ἀπέδοτο... αύτωι (γ’) ἵνα κερδάνει δραχμάς δώδεκα) would have ruined kings’ fortunes. In short, we see a sophisticated meshing of themes by Syriskos here: the mythological with the actual.

326/7 Neleus and Pelias were the two children of Tyro by Poseidon, exposed as infants and raised to adulthood by a maid. Pelias became king of Iolkos in Thessaly, Neleus of Pylos in Messenia. For the frs. of two plays by Sophocles entitled Tyro see Radt frs. 648-69a. Arist. Poet. 1454b25 mentions the ‘cradle’ (σκάφη or ‘boat’) which effected the recognition scene in the Tyro (presumably of Sophocles); this must refer to the cradle in which the baby twins Pelias and Neleus were set afloat upon the waters (like Romulus and Remus) by their mother. Aristotle contrasts this token of recognition with περιδέραια, ‘trinkets’ used in other plays for the same purpose. One might conclude, therefore, that Syriskos is not referring to this play by Sophocles; G.-S. ad loc., however, disputes this conclusion. Apart from Sophocles’ play Euripides’ first play, Peliades, may well have alluded to the family history of Pelias.

333 Cassius Dio (60.29.3) quotes a version of this line as βασιλείς έγένοντο χοί πριν δντες αίπολοι; its adaptation as a ‘one-liner’ gives it a more general gnomic quality (χοί πριν for οί τότ’ δντες). The legal process according to which an exposed child might gain recognition as the legitimate child of citizen parents was known as άφαιρεΐσθαι εις ελευθερίαν, cf. Harrison (1998, 71).

334 εί δ’ έκλαβων. ειδεκελαβων C was corrected by Lefebvre to εί δέ γε but that is an ugly sequence of particles, and the verb εκλαμβάνω can have the correct sense of ‘sieze and carry away’ (LSJ s.v. II e.g. Isocr. 1.2.194); the correction of Bodin-Mazon recommends itself.

335 αύτωι (γ’) ἵνα. C’s reading needs (γ’) to avoid hiatus. Otherwise Croenert’s emendation, αυτός ἵνα, gives good sense.

341-43 γαμών αδελφήν, like Moschion in Perik. who wants to marry his sister Glykera but is deterred when her identity (and his) is established by tokens. In Plautus, Curculio, Therapontigonus discovers the girl he loves to be his sister. ► 342 μητέρ’ έντυχών, like Ion in Eur. Ion, who was saved and reinstated in his true status as heir to the Athenian throne when his mother, Kreousa, recognized tokens. ► 343 ἔσωσ’ αδελφόν like Iphigeneia in Eur. IT who saves her brother Orestes from sacrifice when his identity is revealed (by means of the letter which Iphigeneia gives
to Pylades to take back to Argos to ‘Orestes’). The lines are further indirect evidence for the omnipresence of Euripides behind Menander’s thought.

343-45 the gnōmē concluding this section of the argument. Syriskos’ mastery of the rhetorical gnōmē has already been demonstrated in lines 232-36, where the key word πρόνοια, ‘forethought’, first occurred. ► πρὸ πολλοῦ ταῦθ’ ὁρῶν’ ἐξ ὃν ἐνι, lit. ‘examining those things well in advance from which it is possible (sc. to take forethought for future security). For ἐξ ὃν cf. Heliodorus, Aith. 2.18.2 ἐξ ὃν ὁ καχρὸς ἐδίδου, ‘as far as the situation allowed’. ἐνι is a non-verbal form of ἐνεστὶ, ‘it is within the realm of the possible’ (cf. coll. German ‘es ist drin’); cf. Dem. 18.198 οὐχ ἐνι τοῦτον εὖνου εἶναι τῇ πατρίδι.

346-51 Refutation of Daos’ last trump card: if Syriskos doesn’t like the present status quo, then he should return the child (instead of demanding the tokens). Syriskos responds with a rather convoluted argument: ‘if you’re supposed to surrender property belonging to it (the baby) [sc. but you refuse], it’s not right that you demand it (the baby) back’. This is elaborated by secondary digs intended to bias Smikrines’ judgement in his favour. (1) Daos wants the child back, according to Syriskos, so that he can continue with his ‘crooked ways more safely on a future occasion’ (350 ἵν’ ἀσφαλέστερον πονηρεύση πάλιν); i.e. if Syriskos returns the child to Daos, there will be no further claimant to the trinkets; (2) ‘chance’ (351 Τύχη) has seen to it that the tokens survive, that is, not Daos’ good offices. For a similar argument, involving three parts to a conditional clause pointing out the injustice of an opponent’s case, see Dem. 18.201 τίσι δ’ ὁφθαλμοῖς πρὸς Διὸς ἐωρῶμεν ἃν τοὺς εἰς τὴν πόλιν ἄνθρώπους ἀφενομένους εἰ (1) τὰ μὲν πράγματ’ εἰς ὅπερ γενέσθαι ἔχειν ἡγεμόν, δὲ καὶ κύριος ἡμέτερος ἡμῖν ἠπάντων, (2) τὸν δ’ ὑπὲρ τοῦ μὴ γενέσθαι ταῦτ’ ἐγών ἕτοροι χωρὶς ἡμῶν ἠσαν πεποιημένοι, (3) τὸν δ’ υπὲρ τὸν μὴ γενέσθαι ταῦτ’ ἐγών ἕτοροι χωρὶς ἡμῶν ἠσαν πεποιημένοι, (3) (gen. absol. instead of conditional clause) καὶ ταῦτα μηδεπώποτε τῆς πόλεως ἐν τοῖς ἐμπρόσθεν χρόνοις ἀσφαλείαν ἀδιόθεν μᾶλλον ἡ τὸν υπὲρ τὸν χαλῶν χάθυνον ἡρημένης: ‘How could we have faced people coming to Athens [i.e. my opponent’s position would have led to an unbearable situation], if (1) Philip had been elected to the position of leader and master of all (as things have in fact turned out) and (2) others had fought the battle against precisely this happening without us, and this when (3) Athens never in the past put ignominious safety before peril in the interest of the good’.

346 φήσ’. Lefebvre’s correction of C’s φηαν is necessary metrically to avoid ‘split anapaest’. One might also write φής, ‘you say’. The next line is then explanation to Smikrines (‘he thinks…’); then in 348 he addresses Daos again directly.

348 σουκτικῶς Corr. Sudhaus, recently advocated afresh by Arnott (1977, 16-17). But how necessary is the emendation? If we scan C’s reading ‘normally’ we get |−|−|−|−, in other words, a split anapaest in position 1 C. This has been thought inadmissible and Koerte proposed scanning the words −−−−−−− with correction of −−−. The correction is certainly unusual, however, and most editors
have preferred Sudhaus' emendation οὐκέτι. Sandbach objects that then Syriskos would be accepting some of Daos' case and only objecting to this further point. Arnott (ibid.) answers this by saying that οὐκέτι actually sharpens Syriskos' case: 'that is no longer a just claim... [sc. to demand the baby back if Daos is not happy parting with the trinkets]'. Arnott adds that traces in 014 indicate that the first τ in line 348 was probably the fifth letter and not the sixth. Lloyd (1987) supports Arnott's position, adding that οὐκέτι here means 'the further point', not 'no longer', as in Eur. Suppl. 432, Or. 1498 and Menander himself in Sik. 270-71: 'Syros is thus saying that it is unjust for the baby to be separated from the trinkets, and that it is also (and perhaps surprisingly) unjust for Daos to have both the baby and the trinkets'. I add a passage of Plato, Men. 73a4, where Menon says in reply to a point made by Socrates: έμοιγέ πως δοκεϊ, ώ Σώκρατε, τούτο ούκέτι δμοιον είναι τοις ἀλλοις τούτοις; this does not mean 'this does not seem the same any more', but 'this further point (as Lloyd says) does not seem the same...' 349 πρός. The adverbial use of πρός, 'in addition', is somewhat unusual, but occurs in poetry (Euripides) and prose (Plato, Aristotle, Demosthenes) 'frequently at the end of a second clause ' (as here): see LSJ s.v. D. The verb προσζητέω (Arnott) is rare and late, and should not be written here, I think.

353-54 Smikrines announces his judgement without any hesitation; one has the impression he is in a hurry to be on his way. Little does he know that that judgement indirectly settles the fate of his own grandson. Klingenberg (1984, 181) says that Smikrines' judgement is in accordance with Attic 'Fundrecht' as arguments about property rights were always a question of who had the better claim; here, according to Klingenberg, the baby had the better claim to the tokens found with him than Daos. Hence Smikrines judges (quite properly) that the tokens belong to the baby, who is in Syriskos' hands. Klingenberg's argument is that Attic law had no concept of the 'ownerless object' ('res nullius'); by exposing the child neither the child's parents nor indeed its grandfather Smikrines had, according to Klingenberg, forfeited property rights because they had not explicitly made over the child to someone else ('Die pure Entäußerung ohne Zuwendung stellt keine Zweckverfügung dar' p. 181). 353 εὐχριτ', cf. Perik. 353 εὐχρι[νή Wilamowitz, ? εὐχριτα Sandbach in app.

357 τ(άδ') άδικεΐν. Most print C's τάδικεϊν, following Wilamowitz in taking this as an unusual crasis of τώι άδικεϊν, where τώι goes with μέλλοντι σοι later; cf. G.-S. p. 318, who compare τάνδρι for τώι άνδρι. But is τώι άδικεϊν μέλλοντι σοι Greek? It is at least extraordinary word-order. I adopt Bodin-Mazon's remedy ('you, who were about to commit this injustice') as the assumed error is a simple haplography. One might try retaining τάδικεϊν and taking it as τού άδικεϊν where έπεξιέναι has the not infrequent construction with dative of the person prosecuted and genitive of the charge. But this leaves μέλλοντι without infinitive complement, which is awkward. The crasis τού ἀ- → τά- itself would not be unheard of; cf. Antiphon 5.46 τάληθος and τάνδρός in Philodemos (Croenert, 1911, 2400).
5.3 Act Two

359 and 363 Oaths reflect a character’s emotional state. Here Daos curses by Zeus Sōtēr and Herakles, two divinities associated with perilous endeavour e.g. Xen. *Anab.* 4.8.25. For oaths as a means of characterization in Menander cf. Arnott (1975, 17 with n. 30).

359 Σωτήρα·. It seems better to divide thus rather than Σωτήρ’· ἀπανθ’ (edd.) as C regularly marks elision, but does not here.

360 ε[λοι, ‘he should take’, or ‘let him take’. This seems to me preferable to Wilamowitz’ ε[χει, as the ruling has been made but Syriskos does not yet have what is coming to him. For ε[λοι = ‘let him take’, cf. Eur. *Rhes.* 257, Opp. *Hal.* 5.99. If, however, alpha is to be read, Lefebvre’s ἄφει is a possibility.

363 ἄ πέπονθα. I think (with LSJ and against G.-S. 318) that ἄ is exclamatory. The relative pronoun is regularly used thus. Metrically the words involve a split anapaest in position 2 A (+ -«), but the relative pronoun may be thought to form a unit with the following word.

364 The dikolon in C after γάρ is probably meant to indicate that Syriskos turns from addressing Daos to Smikrines, rather than that someone new speaks; cf. Jensen (1929, xii).

365 πρόσμεινον. Syriskos asks Smikrines to stay a moment longer until Daos ‘coughs up’ the valuables. In the following lines Daos reluctantly undoes the tie of the purse (πήρα) in which he carries the tokens and empties them out, presumably into Syriskos’ hand, while Smikrines stands disdainfully by. Lennartz (1999) sees significance in the fact that first Smikrines wants to leave immediately after the arbitration, but Syriskos begs him to stay until Daos has handed over the tokens. Pursuing the line of reasoning adopted by Stockert (1997) (one of the tokens, the piece of purple cloth, was designed to remind the audience of Euripides’ *Alope* at the critical moment of recognition), Lennartz argues that this scene, too, depends on the audience’s familiarity with Euripides’ *Alope* (see above p. 143). Hyginus, *fab.* 187.4, tells us that King Kerkyon had recognized the baby Hippothoon’s tokens, which had been its undoing; now, Lennartz argues, Smikrines’ presence on stage when the tokens are handed over by Daos will raise the audience’s expectations that Smikrines will recognize the tokens and the plot take a dramatic turn for the worse (as he will deduce that the baby was really an illegitimate child of his daughter). Hence this stage ‘retardation’ of Smikrines’ departure introduces an element of suspense. Nothing in the text marks a near-recognition of the tokens by Smikrines, but we do not know how the scene was staged. Smikrines may well have supervised the exchange with an elaborate display of vigilance. Lennartz argues for one-to-one metatheatricality with Euripides’ *Alope* here, but the effect might have been more general: would Smikrines recognize the tokens belonging to his daughter – a fact known to the audience – as they passed under his nose? Cf. Introduction pp. 5ff.

366 ἔργαστήριον, lit. ‘workshop’, here in pejorative sense, roughly ‘dolt’. Wilamowitz ad loc. understands ‘Insasse eines Zuchthauses für Sklaven’, but there is
no reason to see all ἐργαστήρια as houses of correction; they were plain ‘sweat­shops’. But several passages in Demosthenes show ἐργαστήριον, qualified by a gen­itive plural denoting people, in the sense ‘gang’, ‘mob’: Against Pantainetos 39.8 τὸ ἐργαστήριον τῶν συνεστώτων, Against Boiots 1.2.4 and 2.9.8 ἐργαστήριον συκοφαντῶν; Against Zenothemis 10 ἐργαστήρια μοχθηρῶν ἀνθρώπων συνεστή­κότων. Perhaps we may understand this meaning here, ‘rabble’, ‘riff-raff’ or like our ‘scum’. An ἐργαστήριον was a place where a gang of workmen worked; by metonymy the term came to be applied to the work-force itself; if I am right, Smikrines is addressing one member of such a work-force like this. Cf. carcer as a term of abuse in Roman Comedy.

368 καταπέπωκε. καταπίνω often means ‘swallow’, e.g. Plato, Euthyphr. 6a2 (of Kronos’ children).

369 C has ζυγ/ – Syr[iskos], it would seem – in the right margin. There is dikolon after ἡλικεττ’, none at line end, paragraphos under the line. It would seem that the author of this marginal note thought Syriskos spoke the words after ἡλικεττ’. But that cannot be right. Most editors give ὅξ χείρων to Daos, whereby Sandbach’s interpretation (“I would not have thought it”) makes the remark apply to the injustice of Smikrines’ judgement, not to Syriskos’ sarcastic remark that he now has all the tokens, unless Daos has swallowed some in the meantime. If the words belong to Daos, they could mean simply ‘I don’t think!’; dismissing Syriskos’ absurd suggestion. Arnott (1968b, 229-30) gives the words to Smikrines — ‘I shouldn’t have thought he swallowed anything’. Some support for Arnott’s interpretation — which I accept — comes from Syriskos’ following remark—to Smikrines, which makes slightly more sense if he had just spoken.

371 Smikrines exits to return in 576 from town in a state of agitation, according to Onesimos, having learned new and disturbing information about his son-in-law’s carryings-on. Syriskos and Daos are left for a few lines together on stage; Daos leaves after uttering a threat that he will keep a close eye on Syriskos to see that he really does keep the valuables for the baby.

371 θατ[τον] cf. LSJ s.v. ταχύς Cl2, ‘sooner’ = ‘rather’, e.g. Od. 2.307 θᾶσσον ἀν κλύοιμι; Soph. Phil. 631; Dem. de fals. legatione 254.2 θάττον γὰρ ἀν τοῦ αἴματος ή λόγου μεταδοῦνα τιν; Eroticus Sp. 55.6 θάττον βουλήσσειν πείραν σου λαμβάνειν. θάττον in Menander usually means ‘quickish’, i.e. ‘promptly’, ‘straight­away’, a meaning common already in epic (e.g. Od. 72). ► [ἄδικοι πράγματος], exclamatory genitive, cf. Sik. 346. The construction is colloquial: Stevens (1976, p. 61-62).

373 οὐ πόνηρ’ cf. fr. 477 KA.

374 Von Arnim’s supplement (cf. 311) assumes, quite acceptably, scriptio plena αὐτ[α in C. Certainly this sense is required.
5.3 Act Two

5.3.3 Scene 3: Examining the tokens

376-82 Syriskos, left alone on stage with his wife and the baby, takes time to examine the tokens. Menander was faced here with the problem of describing to the audience in a tolerably natural manner objects too small for them to see. The presence of the wife is useful here again, as it allows the goods to change hands from Syriskos to her, with a comment on each object handed over. Not only the audience can witness this tableau; Onesimos, when he enters in 382, too, who promptly recognizes one of the tokens as his master’s lost ring. Taking stock of objects on the comic stage was a motif familiar already from Aristophanes, e.g. Plut. 804ff.; Eccl. 728ff. In Perik. 755ff. Glykera itemizes the tokens given to her and her brother when they were exposed as babies. A famous Euripidean precedent is the scene in Ion (1411ff.) in which Kreousa, in order to prove her motherhood, lists the tokens she had deposited with Ion as a baby.

376-78 Iversen (2001) argues that these lines indicate that Syriskos intends to use the tokens to pay his master Chairestratos what he owes him from the charcoal-burning business; instead of paying Chairestratos the normal ἀποφορά, Iversen says, Syriskos cunningly wants to use the tokens he has just earned through arbitration; εἰσφέρειν in 376, he says, means ‘contribute’ and is related to technical terms for ‘tribute’. If this is right, a new slant is given to Syriskos’ character; from the selfless champion of the baby he becomes a sly rogue only pretending to act in the baby’s interest. He cites Honigmann (1950, 20) in support of his view. But the idea does not convince me: (1) lines 376-78 mean simply ‘wife, take these into Chairestratos’ house’; they do not mean ‘wife, hand these over to Chairestratos in payment’. (2) Syriskos counts out the tokens after this statement; if he had meant to use them instead of a cash payment, he would have needed to know their cash value first. (3) Why should he contest the ring’s ownership so bitterly with Onesimos, if he had no other interest in it than mercenary? Iversen’s idea is clever, and certainly gives an interesting twist to Syriskos’ character, but I think it is unnecessary; also, we do not need two shifty servants; that would detract from the amusement provided by Onesimos.

380 ἀποφοράν, the revenue from a trade which a slave living and working outside the master’s estate had to deliver up to his owner; cf. fr. 326 KA. Aeschines, in Timarchum 97.6, records slaves working in the leather industry who earned two obols each a day for their owner, whilst their overseer brought in three obols a day. In Andok. 1.38 Diokleides describes an alternative procedure to that followed by Syriskos here; he says that he owned a slave in the mines of Laureion and had to go there to collect his revenue (ἀποφορά). Here the charcoal-burner Syriskos had come to town to hand over to Chairestratos the takings of his trade.

381-82 κοιτίδα. κοιτής is diminutive of κοίτη, ‘box’ (probably wooden cf. IG I2 276 κοίτη ύπόξυλος κατάχρωσος), and should mean some small container suitable
for the valuables. Edd. usually supplement κιστίδ' in Perik. 756 as container for Glykera's tokens, but perhaps κοιτίδ' (van Leeuwen) would be preferable. Presumably Syriskos' wife indicates by a gesture that she does not have such a box or case on her, as Syriskos then says, by way of substitute, 'put them in your pocket, then'. The προκόλπιον was technically a fold of cloth over the chest/breast, forming a kind of pouch or pocket in which things could be carried (cf. Theophr. Char. 7 and 22). Menander, Hen. fr. 155.1 KA, runs ἀλλὰ θεός οὖδεις εἰς τὸ προκόλπιον ψέρει / ἄργυριον, ἀλλ' ἔδωκεν εὐνοῦς γενόμενος / πόρον, 'god doesn't put money in your pocket...'. 'Counting into the pouch' seems a conventional procedure: Eros puts his astragaloi into a fold of his mother Aphrodite's dress: μητρός ἔός πάντας ἀρίθμησας βάλε κόλπωι, AR 3.155. For a man's prokolpion see G.-S. 320.

καθ' εν, 'one by one', 'individually', frequently in Men. e.g. in this play lines 403, 792, 1089; Asp. 75 and 199.

382 Enter Onesimos from Chairestratos' house. His first words are a general complaint to anyone who cares to listen that the cook is slow and the meal not nearly ready. His appearance has no real motivation, but it is essential for the first 'recognition scene', that of Charisios' ring by Onesimos. At the same time, his appearance towards the end of act two and entry into the house to communicate the news to Charisios links the end of this act neatly with the beginning of the next, when Onesimos reappears to report on the success or failure of his plan; this is a typical strategy of Menander, see Handley (1970).

385 στιφρός: στιφρόν Αττικοί, στριφνόν Έλληνες Moeris. Lexikon Oxyr. 1803 στιφρόν: δ' οί πολλοί στριφνόν, citing instances in Aristoph. Geras, Men. Synar. fr. 343 KA; the alternative spellings look like a reflection at least of that metathesis common in Attic inscriptions leading to spellings such as κάτροπτον for κάτοπτρον, see M.N. Tod, JHS 50, 1930, 34. — With ἀλεκτρυών here Wilamowitz takes στιφρός as 'mager' (thin), but I do not see why it should not mean 'hard'. After all, the cock is presumably of a hard material (clay?), hence harder than a real bird. There is no indication in the text that Syriskos bites the objects, as people used to do to test gold coin, but his remarks show that throughout he is trying to ascertain the material of which the tokens are made; 'hard', in my opinion, makes more sense in this context than 'thin'. True, there are jokes about skinny sacrificial animals (e.g. Sam. 399 with G.-S. ad loc.), and this cock might be taken as a token of sacrifice, but the joke would be far-fetched; it was a miniature cock anyway; its thinness would hardly be a noticeable feature.

386 The next object is a miniature axe described as διάλιθον, 'set with [precious] stones' (LSJ); cf. fr. 395 KA ἐπιχύσεις διάλιθοι. Joannes Zonaras, Epitome historiarum, Büttner-Wobst Page 165, line 11, mentions κόσμιοι γυναικῶν διάλιθοι τε καὶ περιμάργαροι, 'women's jewelry set with sparkling jewels'. Wilamowitz compares the golden securicula ancipes, 'two edged little axe' in Plaut. Rud. 1158 which is one of the tokens by which Palaestra recognizes her mother Daedalis.
387 Onesimos, watching the inventory-taking with interest, spots the ring before Syriskos says anything; clearly he had picked it up and was about to hand it to his wife.

387-88 υπόχρυσος δακτύλιος... αυτός σίδηρους. The ring is said to be made of iron itself but to be ‘golden’ in some sense (υπόχρυσος, LSJ III ‘gleaming with gold’). Immediately one thinks of ‘gold-plated’, but how could Syriskos tell that the ring was iron under the gold (unless it was very worn)? Wilamowitz thinks the gold is ‘beneath’ something (ύπο-) in the sense that the cut gemstone is set in gold, but that does not solve the problem of the iron which Syriskos immediately recognizes. Koerte (1929) discusses epigraphic evidence of words definitely meaning ‘gold-plated’ (ἐπίχρυσος, κατάχρυσος, περίχρυσος) and concludes that ‘correct’ usage in the present passage of Epitreponotes would be ἐπίχρυσος. Nevertheless he refrains from emendation, pointing to somewhat later epigraphic evidence for the use of ύποχρυσόω (ὑποκεχρυσωμένος and ύποχρυσός – once – = ‘gold-plated’). His conclusion is that Menander is using ύποχρυσός here in this later, and, strictly, incorrect meaning ‘mit etwas Gold versehen’, ‘vergoldet’. Nevertheless the objection to ‘gold-plated’ remains: how could Syriskos immediately see that? A passage in Pliny the Elder (Nat. Hist. 33.6.25) may help us further: he refers to the practice of some men of making their signet-rings with a gold hoop (outside) but of a light material inside in case the ring falls, damaging the seal itself: alii bratteas infercire leviore materia propter casum tutius gemmarum sollicitudini putant. In other words the actual ring consists of two layers of metal, something lighter inside, gold outside, with the seal set in the gold foil. A construction like this seems to suit our passage, as Syriskos can immediately recognize the layers. Barbara Borg (in conversation 23.6.04) points out that ύποχρυσός may indeed mean ‘gold underneath’ in the sense that the seal may have been of a transparent material such as rock crystal, set in gold; the gold would then shine through (ὑπόχρυσος, ‘under-gold’) the gem stone. This position is compatible with the explanation based on Pliny: the inner band of the ring was iron, then came a thin gold band in which the – perhaps transparent – carved gem-stone was set.

Hdt. 7.69 refers to the cutting (γλύφω) of signet-rings (σφρηγίδας), so the seal (γλύμμα) must have been a cut gem rather than stamped or moulded in the metal. This form of signet-ring was presumably what is known as ‘intaglio’, i.e. the motif is carved as an indentation in the gem-stone, which, when used as a seal, produces the reverse form. Borg further suggests that the two animal forms mentioned – goat or bull – are iconographically so distinct that Onesimos would normally have no difficulty telling them apart; Menander must have intended some further point by juxtaposing such different images; the ring belonged to Charisios: is his character symbolized by these two animals? At this stage it is not clear whether he is a billy-goat, responsible for raping an unknown girl at a nocturnal party, then dispossessing his wife and taking up with a hetaira, or whether he is really made of sterner stuff, a bull, staunch and true. The Macedonian soldier in Plaut. Pseud. 56, for example,
has an image of himself carved into his signet ring; he leaves this as a token with the pimp. And the soldier’s ring in Plaut. Curi. 424 has a seal showing a warrior ‘slicing an elephant in two with a knife’ (clupeatus elephantum ubi machaera dissicit), an act of bravado presumably intended to reflect on the strength of the ring’s owner.

389 I prefer διαγνοίης O26 to C’s διαγνοίην. For one thing, it is the more common expression (‘hard to tell’); secondly it is a prompt for Onesimos’ ‘show me’ (391). Kleostratos, not known as a sculptor, recurs as a character in Asp. Kλεόστρατός τις, ‘one Kleostratos’, indicates that to Syriskos at least the name was not familiar.

390 τὰ γράμματα, perhaps on the inside of the ring, as with modern wedding rings; G.-S. 322 cite G.M.A. Richter, Catalogue of Engraved Gems, p. xxxii, for the (relatively rare) occurrences of the engraver’s name on a ring.

391 Ἡν, ‘here!’, does not necessarily imply that Syriskos hands the ring to Onesimos; he may just hold it out for him to see. But by 394 at the latest Onesimos has taken it from him. In 402 Syriskos says he ‘surrendered’, ‘handed over’ the ring to Onesimos. The line contains threefold antilabe, a quick-fire exchange perhaps underlining the stage-action in which the ring changes hands. The scribe of O26 seems to have written Ον[ησ] above σύ δ’ indicating that he thought Onesimos asked the question – a confusion.

Onesimos does not answer Syriskos’ question ‘who are you?’. Instead he begins ‘This is...’, and Syriskos’ next question ‘what?’ addresses Onesimos’ half-finished sentence, rather than repeating his question who the intruder is. We may think it odd that the two men do not know each other – they are slaves of friends and neighbours – but for the play it is better that they do not. For one thing the juxtaposition of two households on the comic stage is more symbolic than literal; second, Syriskos may have been a rare visitor to town.

393 χολάις; ‘are you crazy?’ perhaps better as a rhetorical question than an exclamation ‘you’re mad!’. χολάω, lit. ‘be full of bile’, = ‘be mad’, ‘off one’s head’, cf. Sam. 416; Straton Phoinikides fr. 1.7 (PCG VII), cf. (Page, 1950, no. 57).

395 O26 divided the line like this as there is a high point after ἡμετερον and on omikron (i.e. ο[νης] above the following sigma. C on the other hand has no indication of change of speaker at this point – nor, however, dikolon at the end of 394. It is perhaps an indication of Syriskos’ character that he already considers the ring ‘his’, although moments before it had been in Daos’ hands and even now – as he himself argued so eloquently – belongs to the baby rather than himself.

396 Ἀπόλλων καί θεοί. For the form of oath (a single named deity + generalising ‘gods’) see fr. 730 K.-Th. (= 546 KA) ἀλλ’ Ἡρακλείδαι καί θεοί; Dem. 18.285 ὤ Ζεὺς καί θεός; 21.73 πρός Δίως καί θεόν.

Above Ἀπόλλων O26 seems to have the letters ποική. Parsons records Rea’s suggestion to read the suprascript letters as an abbreviation for ποική Σύρισκος. Syriskos is not a shepherd, however, but a charcoal-burner; the Mytilene mosaic makes a similar mistake. There, the not-charcoal-burner (i.e. Daos) is called Syros.
Parsons then suggests that other superscript traces in this papyrus might ‘very doubtfully’ be interpreted as follows: 392 ποιοί, 393 πτ, 394 ποιοί. Nünnlist (1999b) supports this theory with particular reference to the same mistaken identity of Syriskos in the Mytilene mosaic: ‘Die Erklärung von J. Rea ist also höchstwahrscheinlich richtig’.

397 ο[ίόν] τε ‘can one...?’ Both papyri leave it uncertain whether gamma or tau followed [ο]ίον. Parsons (p. 39) thinks tau is more likely in O26 ‘to judge from the position of the upright’. Austin’s suggestion (per litt.) turns the whole sentence into a rhetorical question, which Syriskos explains in the following sentence (ό προσ- ελθῶν κτλ.). Alternatively one might consider οίόν γε, ‘what a business it is...!’, cf. Aristoph. Lys. 884 οίόν τὸ τεχεῖν and Thesm. 2.1 οίόν γε ποῦ 'ιστιν αἱ σοφαί ξυνοσαί with Biraud (1991, 147 n.3); Plato, Euthyphr. 15e5 οίον ποιεῖς. After a relatively humorless sequence of lines in which the main event is Onesimos’ recognition of the ring, Syriskos’ exasperated comment – ‘I wonder, can one keep an orphan’s things? The first chance passer-by has an eye to nabbing them!’ – draws a smile. First he had had to ‘litigate’ against Daos for the tokens; now the first passer-by has grabbed a ring and refuses to give it back. On the difficulty of keeping gains once they’ve been made cf. Dem. 1.23 διόπερ πολλάξις δοξεῖ τὸ φυλάξει τάγαθα τοῦ κτησανθαί χαλεπώτερον είναι.

398 C has dikolon after βλέπει, which can only be right in the sense of marking a change of addressee in Syriskos’ speech: first himself, then Daos again. ► ἀρπάζειν βλέπει lit. ‘look to plunder’, i.e. ‘intent on plunder’. The phrase recurs in Mis. 801 Arnott ἀρπάζει σβλέπουν; Alexis fr. 102.1 KA ἀρπαίηθαι μόνον / βλέποντες, on which Arnott (1996a, 271) comments that the usage of βλέπω with infinitive may be a colloquial idiom, as it is confined to comedy (cf. Aristoph. Ach. 376; Wasps 847).

399-400 προσπαίζεις ἐμοί; like ‘are you kidding me?’, or ‘you must be joking!’ cf. Xen. Mem. 3.1.4; Antiphanes fr. 138 KA μαλακὰς αὐθόδεσ [sc. ἀμυγδάλας], δι’ ἄς μέλιτι προσπαίζειν βία. Similarly Demes says to Moschion in Sam. 138-39 σοῦ μέν / παίζεις. Note the way Onesimos here picks up Syriskos’ oath (‘by Apollo and the gods!’) in order to confirm his determination not to do as Syriskos says.

401-02 ‘I’d sooner die than yield an inch to this fellow!’ The potential construction of the optative with ἂν becomes here nearly a wish ‘may I die before...!’ For ἄποσφάττω, ‘butcher’, ‘bump off’, cf. Aristoph. Thesm. 750 and 753; Men. Perik. 281.

402 τούτῳ τι... τιμήμιν C. Von Arnim’s καθυφείμην is a good supplement, but the ink marks after tau are anything but clear. Probably we have a miniscule iota followed very closely by part of kappa, but the reading of these two letters does not inspire confidence. Lefebvre’s [τ]ι [πο]θ’ ύφειμην leads to a split resolution in position 1 D, not an impossibility. For καθυφείματι τινι, ‘concede’, ‘give in to’ someone, cf. Xen. Hell. 2.4.23. The active καθυφίημι (and middle in the same sense
Commentary

Dem. 3.8) is almost a technical term in Demosthenes, ‘surrender treacherously’, κ. ἀγώνα, ‘conduct [a case] collusively, compromise it’ (LSJ I). The legal connotations of the verb well suit Syriskos’ context here, having fought off one contender by arbitration and now facing the next (cf. δικάσομαι in this line). ▶ τούτωι.

Gronewald (1995, 29), believing τούτωι (‘this man’, Onesimos is not addressing Syriskos directly) and έμά in the next line (not έμός) to be problematic, suggests a revised reading τούτων τι; but the trace of nu which he sees in the photo of C could also be the top of iota adscript, and does not confirm the conjecture τούτων, in my opinion. Nor are the other perceived difficulties sufficient to warrant emendation.


403 χρθ᾽ ἐνα, see on I. 381. The rest of the line represents an extreme compression of his main line of argument in the arbitration scene; the tokens belong to the child, not Syriskos or anyone else.

404 The last two items, a στρεπτόν, ‘necklace’ or ‘collar’ of twisted metal, and a πορφυρά πτέρυξ, ‘purple top’, that is, a fold (lit. ‘wing’) of purple cloth presumably intended as a garment or wrap for the baby. The neuter form στρεπτόν (masc. is more common) occurs in IG 22 1388.28; a gold strepton from the Artemision in Delos. Necklaces in the plural (δέραια) were first mentioned in this play in line 246. For the πτέρυξ Wilamowitz cites Pollux Onom. 7.62 πτέρυξ τὸ ήμισυ τοῦ χιτωνίσκου and a papyrus from Ghoran (42, O. Schröder, com. nov. fr. S. 25; now = Men. Sik. 280) πτέρυξ χιτωνίσκου γυναικείου διπλή; the πτέρυξ also features among the women’s clothes dedicated to Artemis Brauronia on the Athenian Acropolis, see Linders (1972, p. 18 on IG ΠΙI 1524, line 234). This is the garment, or piece of purple cloth, which the baby may be wearing in the recognition scene in lines 865-66, enabling Pamphile to recognize the child immediately by its appearance. See Stockert (1997). It may indeed be the whole, or part of, the garment worn by Pamphile on the night she was raped by Charisios, see below on line 489.

408-18 The agreement ‘to differ’ over ownership of the ring until the matter can be decided by arbitration finds a parallel in politics: Athens and Thebes agreed in 366 BC that the disputed township of Oropos (on the border of Attica) should remain in Theban hands until the matter could be decided by arbitration (Xen. Hell. 8.4.1 μέχρι δίκης). Demosthenes is said to have been inspired to a career as rhetor by listening to Kallistratos speaking on the Oropos issue (Plut. Dem. 5).

411 παράγομεν, ‘go in’ as often in Menander: e.g. 405 of this play; Asp. 91, Perik. 525; Arnott (1996a, on Alexis fr. 177.12) suggests that the sense ‘go in’, common in comedy but rare elsewhere, may have been a colloquialism, perhaps deriving from military usage (cf. Xen. Kyr. 5.4.44). Syriskos assumes that Onesimos is heading in the same direction as himself presumably because he had seen him coming out of Chairestratos’ house.
412 συνάγουσι, intr. ‘assembling’ sc. to dine, cf. Empimpramene fr. 146 K.-Th. (= 123 KA) with its context in Athen. VIII 365c ἔλεγον δὲ συνάγειν τὸ μετ’ ἀλλήλων πίνειν.

415-16 To Onesimos’ objection that now’s not the moment to approach Charisios with the ring, as he’s drinking with friends, Syriskos replies that he is quite content to wait until the next day, then to submit the matter to arbitration by anyone. This position, combined with the following remark (‘one has to litigate against them all’), is perhaps an objection to the theory of Nünlist (2003b, 27-28) that, at the beginning of the arbitration scene, Syriskos had wanted to refer the dispute to his master Chairestratos, as he himself had no power to litigate. Now that both servants are going inside to their respective masters, this would be an ideal opportunity to refer the further dispute over the ring to the masters.

417-18 Syriskos rounds off the act with a gnome. The last two letters of δίκας are unclear, but μελετάω in the sense ‘practise, pursue’ regularly takes an accusative object so the reading is likely. ➤ τουτ’ ι. G.-S.’s defence of C’s reading (‘due to this’) against Croiset’s correction τούτου is just about convincing.

5.4 Act Three

5.4.1 Scene 1: the servants meet

Onesimos opens act three with a short monologue (419-29) narrating the state of play subsequent to his departure at the end of act two. He had told Syriskos that it was not an opportune moment to approach Charisios with the ring while he was entertaining friends, but it seems that this is what he repeatedly tried to do. He describes how he had constantly been on the brink of showing his master the ring, but his nerve failed him each time, knowing his master was still angry with him about the previous revelations (sc. about Pamphile’s child). Typically, it is the psychology of his characters which interests Menander: Onesimos is itching to show his master the ring, but anxious that the reaction will be anger at him; Charisios, on the other hand, is portrayed through Onesimos’ description as a man deeply troubled by the news of his wife’s (presumed) infidelity, and trying to drown his sorrows with alcohol. The humour – and it is of the nature of a wry smile rather than hearty laughter – derives from the audience’s knowledge that Charisios’ troubles are, in fact, illusory and from the spectacle of Onesimos, the busybody, caught in a quandary: should he reveal his interesting new discovery (the ring) and therefore incur further wrath from Charisios?

There has been considerable debate as to whether act three marks the beginning of a new day or a later point in the same day. G.-S. and Sandbach (1986, 156-58) argue that a new day has dawned. In summary: (1) Onesimos in act two had said that the party was a bad time to bother Charisios with the ring (412-14),
but now, at the beginning of act three he says he had approached Charisios with the ring several times; (2) Syriskos in act two had said he would meet Onesimos on the following day and decide the matter of the ring (414-16); in act three he appears, having been looking round for Onesimos indoors; (3) in act three Habrotonon says Charisios has not slept with her for ‘three’ days (440); Onesimos says in act two that the party had begun earlier on the previous day (383-84), so, if Habrotonon makes her remark on the second day of the play’s action, that would fit (day one: party before the play; day two: events of acts one and two; day three: act three and following); (4) Smikrines walks between Chairestratos’ house (in a rural deme) and ‘town’ several times during the play; one day would not be enough for these journeys. In addition to these internal considerations G.-S. point to exceptions to the general rule that comedy took a day and no more. To their evidence one might add the fragmentary hypothesis of an unnamed Menandrean play (PIFAO 337.6 = Δημιουργός test. iv in Kassel & Austin (1983-2001, vol. VI2)), which says that the action of the play took two days ([καὶ περιέχει τ]οῦτο δύειν ημερῶν χρόνον]; cf. Arnott (1988).

But there are counter-arguments, which Arnott (1987) and, earlier, Arnott (1977, 17-18) has cogently set out. (1) Menander is usually scrupulously clear in his depiction of the passing of stage time; exceptions to the ‘one day’ duration of comedy are, in fact, few (Heauton Timorumenos by Terence following Menandrean original), and these are always clearly signposted. (2) Onesimos’ declared intention of putting off the presentation of the ring to Charisios till ‘tomorrow’ is mere procrastination designed to get Syriskos off his back; Arnott collects passages in Greek and Roman comedy to show that stage references to actions ‘tomorrow’ always refer to things scheduled for the day after the play’s action; Primmer (1986, 137) adds that Onesimos only says there may ‘perhaps’ (ἰσως) be no chance that day to approach Charisios, not that he will definitely only broach the matter the next day (412-14). (3a) When Habrotonon appears in act three (430) a party appears to be going on inside (cf. line 522, where Charisios is said to be already ‘drunk’ – which can only be after dinner); if this is day two of the action, Menander has elided a whole day between the beginning of lunch on one day and after lunch on the following day; that would be an extraordinary disposition of time. (3b) When the play begins, Karion, the cook, is visiting Chairestratos’ house for the first time; he has to ask Onesimos whether the information he has heard about Charisios is correct. That would not be the case if he had cooked for the ménage on the previous day. Onesimos’ remark about Karion’s slowness (382) also confirms that this cook is doing duty for the first time; so when Karion emerges in act three (line 610) should we believe that this is the second time he has served the household? That seems unlikely, particularly if he was really slow in preparing the meal on the first day. (4) As for Smikrines’ movements, we do not know the distance between the rural deme where Charisios and Chairestratos have their houses and the town of Athens; it may have been less than Sandbach supposes. Moreover, the depiction of off-stage time (Smikrines’ walks) is
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not subject to the same rules of realism as on-stage time. (5) In line 436 Onesimos asks himself whether he should return the ring to Syriskos from whom he has ‘only just’ (άρτίως) received it; this word does not well fit with reception on the previous day. (6) A further argument may be found in Syriskos’ movements: see note on line 462.

In conclusion, I side with Arnott in this debate and assume that act three begins after the company assembled in Chairestratos’ house has had its lunch (610 άρ ιστόν); the meal was, however, somewhat later in the day than one would expect. In the course of this elapsed time Onesimos made several abortive attempts to show the ring to Charisios, and Smikrines made his way to town, discovered something, and started making his way back, to reappear in line 576. Although Zagagi (1994, 81) follows Sandbach in the debate about the time-scale of Epitrep., her remark about the dramatic purpose of the break between acts two and three is still worth quoting: ‘What we have here is a unique example in New Comedy of a break between acts serving exclusively as an aid to characterization. Assuming that the morrow has come with Act III, the way Menander avoids exploiting the interlude for dramatic purposes other than to emphasize the hesitant behaviour of his character [sc. Onesimos’] is quite striking.’

422 ἀναδύομαι, ‘shrink from’, ‘hesitate’; cf. Od. 9.377; Dem., De Chersoneso 50.4 and 77.5; Epistulæ 1.15.1.

423ff. Charisios goes around muttering under his breath; his distress at discovering (as he thinks) his wife’s infidelity vents itself on the carrier of the news, Onesimos. Aristophanes, Plut. 1110, ή γλώττα τώι κήρυκι τούτωι τούτων τέμνεται, ‘for the bringer of this news the tongue is cut’, is a punning reference to the practice of giving the animal’s tongue at sacrifice to the officiating herald; cf. Kadletz (1981). Karion means here that the messenger’s tongue should be cut out for bringing such bad news.

424 “ώς τόν κτλ.”. One might also punctuate ως· “τόν κτλ.”.

424-25 κακόν κακώς... άπόλεσαι, the repetition of κακός (adj. + adv.) is standard in such curses; for the sense one can supply the participle κακόν [sc. οντα]. In Menander, Dysk. 221-22; Asp. 238; Sik. fr. 11.5 Sandbach (P.Oxy. 1238); Latin e.g. Plaut. Pseud. 13 misere miser sum; Lucr. DRN 3.898 misero misere. The repetition is a bit like English ‘die the death’.

425-26 μή με δή... άφανίσηι, ‘[I’m afraid] he’ll kill me... ’ The construction is the type of originally dependent clause (after a verb of fearing) becoming independent. 425 διαλλαγ[εις, ‘reconciled’. C’s reading is preferable to O26 κατα[λλαγε’ις. διαλλάττομαι seems to recur in line 592 of this play and is used several times with this sense in other plays: Perik. 1006, 1020 (reconciliation between Polemon and Glykera); Sam. 82; fr. 469 KA.

427 συνειδότ’, ‘in the know’. Onesimos admits he knew all about Pamphile’s preg-
nancy and the supposedly illegitimate baby which she exposed. The word does not necessarily imply that he was her accomplice, merely that he knew what was going on and could later ‘tell on her’ to his master. LSJ s.v. ‘know something about a person, esp. as a potential witness for or against him’.

427-28 Jensen (1929) believed he could read the traces of \( \delta \pi [\varepsilon] \sigma [\chi \omicron \mu \nu] \) at the end of 428; Wilamowitz, accepting this as datum, supplied \( [\pi o \omicron \nu] \) at the end of 427; cf. Perik. 989; Dem. 18.231 \( \delta \mu e i z \ \kappa a l \delta z \ \pi o i o \nu \tau e s \ \tau o u s \ \kappa a r p o u s \ \kappa e x \omicron \mu i s \theta e \). In fact nothing is readable in C after \( \kappa u x \alpha \nu \), whilst in O26 \( \kappa u x \alpha \nu o c \) is readable, with a fraction of doubt about the final sigma. On the basis of this Arnott (2000, 155) conjectured \( \pi o \omega / \ldots \delta \zeta \beta o u \lambda o u s i s \). This entails taking \( \kappa a l \delta z \ \pi o \omega \) ironically: ‘well done! (I don’t think)’. For a similar irony (coming from Charisios) see line 919, where \( \delta \mu o i a \ \gamma e \) must mean the opposite: ‘the same (I don’t think!)’ On this reading \( \chi a n \tau a \delta \theta a \), ‘there, too’, in 429 must refer to Onesimos’ initial disclosure to Charisios of Pamphile’s illegitimate baby. As a non-ironical end to the line I considered \( \delta \zeta [\nu \nu \ \dot{o} \kappa n \dot{o}] \), ‘I do well...to hesitate’. Arnott’s irony is perhaps a little more spirited and the rhyme \( \pi o \omega \ldots \dot{o} \kappa n \dot{o} \) not so welcome. Against Austin’s conjecture for 427-28 (endorsed by Ferrari (1998, 49)) one might point out that \( \omicron \sigma o n \ \tau \acute{a} \chi o s \) is used when something should be done ‘as soon as possible’, ‘post-haste’, not when something should not be done as in this case. It does not make good sense to say ‘why stir up more trouble (= one should not stir up more trouble) as soon as possible?’

428 \( \kappa u x \alpha \nu \), ‘stir up’ here, as in 573 (\( \kappa u x \alpha \sigma \theta a i \)), used metaphorically of trouble; literally one ‘stirred up’ or ‘mixed’ liquid food, such as the Eleusinian \( \kappa u x \varepsilon o v \) or Kirke’s potion (Od. 10.235). We find a similar metaphorical sense in Dem. 18.111 [\( \lambda \gamma o u s \)] \( \delta i a x u x \alpha \omicron \nu \).

429 \( \chi a n \tau a \delta \theta a \), ‘in that matter’, see note on 427-28. ► \( \mu [\acute{e} \gamma a \] \), a likely supplement although, as Guéraud says, the visible speck of ink before the break could be more or less any letter. For \( \mu [\acute{e} \gamma a \ x x \alpha \nu o c \) cf. Dysk. 877 with Handley’s comment on p. 145; Perik. 399.

430ff. Enter Habrotonon from Chairestratos’ house. There begins a short scene in which two threads of conversation continue independently of each other; Onesimos goes on wondering how he should proceed with the ring; Habrotonon addresses remarks to (unseen) people inside Chairestratos’ house. When Syriskos appears and confronts Onesimos, Habrotonon presumably begins to listen to their conversation; then, after Syriskos has announced his departure for town in 463, she chimes in with a question to Onesimos. These two – Onesimos and Habrotonon – belong to Charisios’ ‘inner-circle’; they are in a position to discuss his domestic affairs. During this scene, then, the audience’s attention is first divided between Onesimos’ cogitations and the re-appearance of Habrotonon, in which she describes her unsatisfactory relations with Charisios, then it focuses exclusively on the main story-line, the identity of the baby. For the theatrical trick of having someone come on stage while still ad-
dressing remarks to people inside see Zagagi (2004) and on this scene specifically Bain (1977, 138-39). Zagagi points out that the device adds realism to a scene in which characters on stage conduct separate conversations for a while before noticing each other. If Habrotonon is still concentrating on action within Chairestratos’ house and turns her face (mask) in the direction of that door while uttering her first remarks, it is more plausible that she does not notice Onesimos at first. Moreover, as in the cinematographic technique of cross-fade (or ‘dissolve’), the device bridges a transition in the action which would otherwise be abrupt and unmotivated. Her opening words contain, as often in Menander (in this play e.g. 1060-62), a verbal ‘link’ with the last line(s) of the previous scene (κακά – κακόν).

430 Most commentators take Habrotonon’s cries of protest – ‘leave me in peace, don’t give me hassle!’ – as an indication that guests at Chairestratos’ party were molesting her since Charisios had hired her but did not want her as mistress. But I wonder. She addresses a single person – ἰκετεύω σε – with her plea not to maltreat her, and her subsequent remarks explain how Charisios loathes her with extraordinary force and stops her even lying beside him on his couch. I think she may enter here for ‘a breath of fresh air’ as it were, having been humiliated by Charisios. She had tried to lie down beside him, as befitted a hired call-girl, but he had pushed her away brusquely; he may even have hurt her in his drunken state. Accordingly, I take her opening remark as addressed to Charisios, expressing her dismay at his rude and, probably, physical rejection of her. Her entry is, in fact, occasioned by his rejection of her. For εἶα, ‘leave alone’, ‘leave in peace’, cf. Her. 55.

432 χλευάζουσ’, ‘make a mockery/fool of’; cf. Epikrates fr. 10.31 KA δενως ὑγιαθησαν χλευάζεσθαι τ’ ἐβόησαν; Demosthenes, De Halonnesso 7.2: ὅταν δὲ λέγητο περὶ τούτων ὡς εὐθείᾳ διαδικάσασθαι, οὐδὲν ἀλλ’ ἢ χλευάζει ὑμᾶς; cf. De falsa legatione 23.7; in Cononem 4.9. There is also χλευασμός, ‘mockery’, e.g. Dem. 18.85 αἰσχύνην τῇ πόλει συμβάσαν ἢ χλευασμόν ἤ γέλωτα. Here Habrotonon says she has made a fool of herself by deluding herself into thinking Charisios wanted her, when he didn’t. Her mentality clearly differs from that of a common prostitute who might not care whether her patron actually wanted her as long as he paid; Habrotonon felt hurt that Charisios did not desire her. When we think of e.g. Demeas’ passion for Chrysis in Sam., or the historical case of Perikles and Aspasia, we see the difference between this type of ancient relationship and modern prostitution. ► προσ[εδόκων], already conjectured by Capps, now confirmed by O26.

433 θείων μίσος, lit. ‘godly hatred’, or, as we say, ‘ungodly hatred’; cf. Hdt. 2.66.2 (G.-S.); Eur. fr. 841 Kannicht τόδ’ ἦνα θείων ἀνθρώπως κακόν, / ὅταν τὶς εἰδη τάγαθον, χρήται δὲ μή. Perhaps, too, there is play on the more common expression θείων μένος as in e.g. A.R. 2.613. τέρων is used similarly of the ‘supernaturally large’ wave which spews out the deadly bull onto land in Eur. Hipp. 1206. In Aesch. Ag. 1411 Klytaimestra is addressed as a μίσος ὃπριμον, a ‘hugely loathsome thing’,
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where ἀβριμὸς has the connotation ‘larger than life’, or ‘supernatural’.

434 κατακείσθαι, ‘lie down’ next to Charisios, that is, on his κλίνη at a symposium. For delayed γάρ cf. Alexis fr. 37.1 KA. ◀ τάλαν, ‘oh dear!’ (G.-S.), an interjection used in comedy exclusively by women, and, as Dedoussi (1964, 5) says, typically by lower class women (but there are few upper class, free Athenian ladies in New Comedy). According to her the word ‘expresses a feminine reaction towards a situation or event, which implies tender sympathy with reproof or mockery’; specifically here: an ‘interjection of tenderness with pity for herself’. Cf. Bain (1984, 33-35, here 33): ‘If there is one word that characterizes women in Menander it is τάλαν’. On p. 33 he describes ‘the use of the vocative form τάλαν or ὁ τάλαν in a kind of exclamatory function, reflecting either self-pity or sympathy towards someone else. Whether τάλαν is to be regarded as an exclamatory expression which happens to have a fossilized vocative form... or whether we are sometimes entitled to treat it as a true vocative is open to question.’ He glosses the present instance (exclamatory): ‘[the] poor thing!’ For forms of τάλας in women’s speech in Aristophanes (e.g. Myrrhine in Lys. 910, 914) cf. Sommerstein (1995, 68-70). Habrotonon uses this or another form of τάλας conspicuously often (at least eight times) in this play, such that e.g. Goldberg (1980, 63) calls it a ‘mannerism’ in her diction. ‘Deary me!’, although slightly old-fashioned, might catch the sense in English; or one might add ‘poor’ as an epithet to the object or subject, as appropriate (here: ‘poor me!’). For characteristic speech in the depiction of Habrotonon cf. Leurini (1998).

436 ἄτοπον, lit. ‘out of place’, then ‘odd’, ‘strange’, ‘peculiar’; v. common in Menander e.g. Dysk. 288, 417.

437 τοσοῦτον ἀργύριον: Smikrines told us that Charisios was spending twelve drachmi a day on Habrotonon (136-37); in line 694 Smikrines says that Charisios is throwing his fortune away in the whore-house (a rhetorical exaggeration), and in 749-50 he points out to Pamphile the enormous expenditure Charisios is running up by keeping two women. But Habrotonon’s tone is sympathetic by comparison with Smikrines’ disgust at his son-in-law’s profligacy.

438-39 To ‘carry the goddess’s basket’ meant to take part in a religious procession – typically at Athena’s Panathenaic festival – as a παρθένος κανηφόρος. It was a role reserved for daughters of ‘good breeding’, and to have been a Kanephoros was both a status symbol and confirmation of impeccable citizen status; the women’s chorus in Aristophanes Lys. 646 list service as a κανηφόρος παῖς among the ritual duties they despatched as girls growing up in Athens (cf. 1193; Eccl. 732). Thucydides relates the presumably well-known incident involving Harmodios’ sister. In order to slight Harmodios (προπηλάκιζει), as he had refused his amatory advances, Hipparchos sent for his sister as a basket-bearer in the Panathenaic procession; when she arrived he rejected her as ‘unworthy’ (διὰ τοῦ μὴ ἄξιαν ἔξω ἔκρυψε; Thuc. 6.56.1). What Habrotonon means here, then, is not only that Charisios has not slept with her, but also that her status has become as pure as a kanēphoros; no longer a ‘call-girl’,
now she’s reverted to a virginal condition. Incidentally, the image helps prepare us for Habrotonon’s ruse in this act, in which she declares her intention of pretending to Charisios that she was the virgin he seduced that night at the Tauropolia.

439 ἔστιν, τάλαν. Early editors of C read ἔτονταλαν, but the omega was misread, in my opinion, for γν.

440-1 The inserted φασίν, ‘[as] they say’, indicates that Habrotonon is quoting a familiar expression (cf. Perik. 291; Sam. 503), and, indeed, ἀγνὴ γάμων is cited as a proverbial expression applied to ‘the virtuous woman’ (ἐπὶ τῶν σωφρόνων γυναικῶν), and, in an ironical sense, not-so-virtuous women (τῶν μη σωφρόνων), by two paroemiographers, Diogenianus and Michael Apostolius; see Leutsch & Schneidewin (1839, reprint 1965, vol. 1, Centuria 2, section 46, line 1 and vol. 2, Centuria 1, section 15, line 1). Diogenianus then says that the expression τὸ κάνουν τῆς θεοῦ φέρει is ‘equivalent’, as αἱ γάρ ἀγναί ἔφερον. D.H. Antiqu. Rom. 1.21.2, line 6, contains a passage which combines this phrase with the ritual status desired of a κανηφόρος παῖς in religious ritual. Describing the cult of Hera at Phalerion, he says, ὁ τῆς Ἁρας νεώς ἐν Φαλερίωι κατεσκευασμένος ὡς ἐν Ἀργεί, ἔνθα καὶ τῶν θυηπολιῶν ὁ τρόπος ὁμοιός ἦν καὶ γυναῖκες ἱεραῖς θεραπεύουσαι τὸ τέμενος ἣ τε λεγομένη κανηφόρος ἀγνὴ γάμων παῖς καταρχομένη τῶν θυμάτων χοροὶ τε παρθένων ὑμνούσων τὴν θεόν ὡδαίς πατρίοις. (cf. ibid. 1.43.1 line 7). Elsewhere we find the expression ἀγνὸς γάμων in Plato Laws 840d; ἀ. λέχους Eur. Hipp. 1003. The expression does not, then, mean ‘unmarried’, but ‘virginal’, although the two things – the Greeks hoped – were synonymous. Aristoph. Lys. 912 suggests that women entering the Acropolis generally had to be sexually pure (ἀγνὴ).

441 κάθημαι, ‘sit around’, the choice of verb is significant in comparison with κατακεῖσθαι, ‘lie down’, in 434. Sitting is not the position Habrotonon expected to be in.

441-42 Onesimos’ unfinished ‘how on earth...’ is to be completed by the thought ‘am I to broach this matter with Charisios?’.

442 Enter Syriskos from Chairestratos’ house; he looks round for Onesimos, spots him and immediately claims the ring.

443 The transposition of C’s οὐτοσευθὸν by Wilamowitz has found general favour. G.-S. retain Sudhaus’ reading of C’s word order, explaining that ἔνδον is equivalent to mulieri (cf. 465): Onesimos should hand the ring over to Syriskos’ wife who is indoors. But why should Syriskos suggest that circuitous route instead of merely demanding Onesimos hands the ring back to him. For ► οὔτος cf. 934-35 οὔτος... ἱερόσυλε, ‘you there!’. Alternatively, one might try οὔτος ἔνδον; ‘...running around like this inside?’, but the following ἀπόδος is then abrupt, and the confusion of omikron for omega is not elsewhere clearly attested in C. Epsilon is written erroneously once for eta (line 227) and in line 422 C has πρότερον where O26 has προτέρων; but the latter may be a variant rather than the intended reading in C. For a manuscript confusion of οὔτος and οὔτως cf. Antiphon 5.44.2.
ποτέ gives force to the imperative in the previous line (G.-S. with examples); German 'gib mal!' reflects the idiom exactly.

πατέρα γάρ τοῦ παιδίου / αὐτόν ποῦ σχεδόν. The remark is surprising because, up till now, Onesimos has only revealed that he knew Charisios had lost the ring one night when out drinking (393-94 and 406-7); he had said nothing about a sexual adventure on Charisios' part. To Syriskos' understandable bafflement (450), he proceeds to explain his train of thought (451-54): the ring had been found with the baby now resident in Chairestratos' household in the care of Syriskos' wife (450). His master had lost it at the Tauropolia festival when women had been out and about by night (451-52). Ergo, Charisios had raped a girl that night and she had exposed the baby with Charisios' ring as token of its anonymous father (452-54). Onesimos' line of reasoning helps steer the audience's mind in the direction desired by Menander. The missing link is, of course, the identity of the baby's mother — as Onesimos points out (455-56).

Amott (1977, 20) suggests dividing the line differently, giving πώς only to Syriskos, and beginning Onesimos' next speech with αβέλτερε. But I am not convinced by his argument that Syriskos is otherwise polite to Onesimos and therefore is unlikely to call him αβέλτερε; Syriskos has been aggressively assertive toward Onesimos already at the end of the previous act. Moreover, αβέλτερε would be a singularly abrupt opening by Onesimos to a Syriskos who can hardly be accused of obtuseness (Arnott) for not understanding what Onesimos' previous remark meant.

The ring changed hands in the opposite direction to that in Ter. Hec.; there the ravaged girl, Philumena, lost her ring as well as her virginity to the anonymous attacker. It turned up later on the finger of the man's courtesan, Bacchis, to effect a similar recognition to that here: the attacker-by-night turned out to have been none other than the victim's own husband-to-be. The Hecyra was based on a Greek original by Apollodoros; Capps (1910, 42) suggests that Apollodoros must have been influenced by Epitrepontes.

Ταυροπολίων, 'at the Tauropolia' sc. festival of Artemis Tauropolos. In a well known passage Euripides has Athena instruct Orestes to found a cult in honour of Artemis Tauropolos at Halai on the Attic coast by Karystia. Her festival is to involve a man's throat being nicked by a knife so as to draw blood; the rite is to compensate symbolically for the blood of Orestes which she has not received in Tauris (IT 1446-61). And an inscription (Staupouloupollos, 1932) from the mid-fourth c. BC confirms that a festival called Tauropolia took place at Halai Araphenides, a deme on the coast adjacent to Brauron; lines 14-15 of this inscription, a decree honouring one Philoxenos for his services as choregos at the Pyrrhic dance in Halai, say that a herald is to announce Philoxenos' award 'at the competition (or festival) of the Tauropolia' (Ταυροπολίων τῷ ἀγώνι). A second, similar, honorary decree for two
people (their names are missing) who have served Halai well stipulates that the stele announcing the honours is to be erected in the sanctuary of Artemis Tauropolé (sic) in Halai (Ταυροπόλις Kotzias (1925-26, text and p. 176)). Hesych. has the entry ταυροπόλια: ἄ εἰς ἐφορτήν ἄγουσαν Ἀρτέμιδι, whose bad grammar – ἄ εἰς is incomprehensible – prompted Deubner (1932, 208) to emend to Ἀλείς (sic), ‘Haliens’ – but both inscriptions from Halai clearly give the name of the demesmen as Ἀλείς or Ἀλαιῆς. The entry in Hesych. should probably be emended to Ἀλαεῖς κτλ. (like the name of a play by Menander, see below).

Strabo 9.1.22 mentions a temple of Artemis Tauropolos at a locality which has had to be supplemented (Ἀλαί Ἄραφηνίδες) in addition to the neighboring temple of Artemis Brauronia at Brauron (Mette, 1962a, 383). This, as Nilsson (1955, Ι485) says, tells against the identification by some modern scholars of the cults of Tauropolos and Brauronia. There appear to have been two localities with two neighboring cults of Artemis. Now whilst there is abundant evidence for women’s and girls’ pannychides at Brauron during worship of Artemis Brauronia (Sourvinou-Inwood, 1988), the cult records for the Tauropolia at Halai Araphenides are more scarce. A valuable reference in Callimachus, HArtemis 173, however, mentions Halai Araphenides as one of the places where Artemis dances with her school of nymphs; ‘may my oxen not be ploughing then’, says Callimachus, ‘when the Sun looks down on that spectacle, as he will be reluctant to move on’ (170-82). This recherché conceit is a way of expressing the beauty of Artemis’ choral dances here, likely to hold the Sun’s attention for a long time. We may assume that the mythical precedent (Artemis and nymphs) reflects cult reality, and that Charisios’ eye, like the Sun’s, may have been caught by the dancing girls. One notes, of course, the difference that the nymphs in Callimachus dance in daylight, whilst Charisios infiltrated a women’s pannychis.

Furthermore, Kahl (1977, 96) wonders whether the cult at Halai did not have similar women’s rites in honour of Artemis-Iphigeneia to those at Brauron; she points to a small sanctuary at Halai which might have been a herōon of Iphigeneia (as at Brauron) and to the fragments of krateriskoi found at Halai, a vase form typical of the Brauronian Arkteia celebration. In short, the evidence for the importance of Artemis Tauropolos’ cult at Halai in the fourth century BC for both men and women is growing. Wilamowitz points to the odd reference in Aristoph. Peace 873, to men going drunk to the festival at Brauron (sc. of Artemis), but that leads us back to the question of the degree of linkage, or similarity, between the goddess’s cult at Brauron and Halai. See further Graf (1979) and Kahl (1977). Accepting the initiatory character of Artemis’ cult at Halai Heap (2002-3, 104) points out that ‘the choice of this as a background for the rape in Epitrepontes would suit the themes of virginity and motherhood in the play’. Menander is said to have written a play called Halaeis, whose action took place at Halai Araphenides; no fragments survive (Koerte & Thierfelder, 1953-1955, II p. 19).
festival'"; cf. Phasma 95 πανυχίδος οὔσης καὶ χορών, 'during nocturnal dance celebrations'. For the occasion here see previous note. That a festival provided the occasion for Charisios' rape (βιασμός) of Pamphile is something of a literary cliché; Satyros, Life of Euripides (P.Oxy. 1176 fr. 39, col. 7.8-10) says βιασμοί παρθένων are a stock theme of New Comedy following the model of Euripides (ibid. 20-22: πρὸς ἔχρων ἡγαγεν Εὐριπίδης). The Suda lexicon credits the poet of Middle Comedy Anaxandrides, however, for introducing love affairs and the rape of virgins into comedy (Lowe, 2007, 63). Apart from the instances in Menander himself (Sam. 38-48: Adonia, cf. Phasma loc. cit.; Kith. 94-95 festival of Artemis Ephesia), several plays of Euripides seem, indeed, to have revolved around a "pannychis-rape" with ensuing pregnancy and exposure of the child: (i) in Ion Xouthos assumed a nocturnal liaison with a female participant at the Delphic Phanai celebration on Mt Parnassos had led to an illegitimate child – Ion, as Xouthos thinks (550-54); (ii) Auge in the (lost) play of that name was raped by Herakles at a pannychis of Athena in Arkadia and bore Telephos; the fragmentary hypothesis of this play indicates that Auge was dancing in the goddess's chorus at the time (cf. Kannicht (2004, no. 14); see further below p. 253); (iii) Alope fell victim to Poseidon (circumstances unknown) and bore Hippothoos (cf. Kannicht (2004, no. 8) and above p. 143). The comparison with Euripides, however, only takes us so far. As Omitowoju (2002, 185-86) says, Euripides shows the suffering mortal women (e.g. Kreousa in Ion) endure when they are raped by a god (and they never marry the god at the end of the play!). By contrast, Menander does not allow his rape victims to give voice to their outrage when violated by a man, and they usually marry the rapist quite happily at the end of the play. The point Satyros was making, surely, was that rape and exposure of the resulting baby followed by recognition later, were plot elements which New Comedy derived in particular from Euripides.

Other instances: Hdt. 6.138 narrates how 'Pelasgians' ambushed Athenian women while they were celebrating the festival of Artemis at Brauron (Halai's neighbour on the E. coast of Attica). For girls' dances in honour of Artemis as a likely place for a man to find a bride see HHApfr. 117-21, where Aphrodite claims Hermes had snatched her from a chorus of nymphs dancing for Artemis; he had been one of many male onlookers.

452 κατὰ λόγον, 'logically', 'it stands to reason'. Cf. fr. 683 KA: οὐδὲν κατὰ λόγον γίνεθ' ὃν ποιεῖ Τύχη; fr. 224.6 KA; fr. 843 KA.

453 βιασμόν sounds like our 'rape' (without consent of the victim) but Omitowoju (2002, 172) points out that the word sometimes means 'sexual activity...without the consent of the kurios of the woman'. However, in view of the torn rags (490) in which the girl returned to the main group, it sounds – as Omitowoju says – as if physical violence is meant. Her subsequent discussion of the significance of the rape scene itself (2002, 174f.) suffers, however, from her confusing two things kept separate in the play until the end: (i) the rape of an unknown girl by Charisios at the Tauropolia and (ii) the illegitimate child born to Pamphile perhaps (but not
explicitly stated) as a result of rape. Moreover, she discusses (176-77) the possible
reasons why Charisios failed to recognize Pamphile later (and vice versa) without
reference to the obvious dramatic device that it was dark! Sandbach (1970, 134-
35) points out that βιασμός is one of three rare words in -μός used by Onesimos
(βρυχηθμός and τιλμός in 893). This perhaps give a sort of pseudo-high-faluting
tone to his speech.

455-57 Onesimos means that the ring alone without the mother merely puts Chari­sios on the spot – and therefore Onesimos, as informant, again – whereas if one
could first find the mother, then one would have a definite case. The words – over­
heard by Habrotonon – set her mind ticking, obviously, as that is the course on
which she embarks: to confront Charisios with the ring, pretending she is the baby’s
mother. Menander cleverly paves the way for this development in the plot.

457-61 have been misunderstood, in my opinion, by commentators. G.-S. 331:
‘Here it would seem that Syriskos warns Onesimos not to try to blackmail him into
buying the ring back by a threat to keep it and refuse arbitration’; Wilamowitz (76):
‘Onesimos hat eine Geschichte erzählt, um seine Weigerung zu begründen, da mag
άνασείειν “aufschütteln, zur Abwehr vorbringen” sein können, aber eher erwartet
man “Winkelzüge machen”, oder “wenn du zurückziehst”. Aber ich sehe nicht, wie
man so etwas herausbringen kann’. The point, in my opinion, is this: Syriskos thinks
Onesimos is suggesting using the ring as a form of blackmail (άνασείεις, ‘threaten’) against
Charisios. Onesimos wants Syriskos to take the ring, find the woman, then
blackmail Charisios and give Onesimos a share of the takings; to which Syriskos
says flatly: ‘no shares with me, mate!’ (461). In other words, Onesimos is insinuat­
ing that Syriskos should be the one (τις) to ‘present Charisios with clear evidence’
(456). In Plaut. Rud. 954ff. we see one servant, Trachalio, attempting to get another,
Gripus, to go shares with him when the latter nets a chest from the sea and decides
to keep the contents for himself. Trachalio threatens to ‘tell the master’ if Gripus
does not agree to halve the proceeds with him. Although the exact geometry of the
situation is not the same as in Epitrep., the passage is a good illustration of one slave
trying to get a share in another’s racket. Vogt-Spiva (1992, 177) makes the point that
Onesimos’ desire to give the ring back to Syriskos here (because he shrinks from
showing it to Charisios) creates an interesting tension: if Onesimos does give the
ring back to Syriskos as part of a blackmail plot, the discovery of the child’s parent­
age is once more endangered.

► άνασείες, ‘threaten’, or ‘stir up trouble’. Literally ‘shake up’, ‘brandish’,
we find άνασείω or άνάσεισις (Thuc. 4.126.5) applied in a threatening sense with
concrete objects (weapons, hands, aegis, sacred garments), once metaphorically of
a prosecution (εἰςαγγελίαν, Dem. in Aristogeit. 25.47); and once in a political con­
text ‘stir up’, ‘incite’ (Diodoros 18.10.1 τῶν δημοκόπων άνασεοντων τὰ πλήθη);
cf. Harpocr. s.v. άνασείας: ἀπειλησάμενος. Pollux ix.155 gives as synonyms:
ἐκπλήττειν, θορυβεῖν, ἀπείλειν, ταράττειν, δείττεσθαι, άνασείν, έκφοβεῖν,
which demarcates a clear ‘Wortfeld’. For the absolute sense ‘threaten’, which seems
to be required here, we find a parallel in Galen De sanitate tuenda Koch vol. 5.4.2, where ‘sparring’ without actually boxing is called ἀνασείειν ἀπλώς. Similarly, in e.g. Diod. Sic. 14.10.3 we find ἀνασείω without an object of the thing shaken, but with an accusative of the person threatened: τοὺς Συρακοσίους ἀνασείων. Alexis fr. 3 KA μὴ πίσετε μοι / τὸν Μισγόλαν, is probably similar (Arnott, 1996a, 63). Antiphon 6.43 shows clearly the sense of the simple verb σείω when one Philokrates is said to have ‘shaken up and threatened’ officials before their euthunai in order, presumably, to get cash: Φιλοχράτης... ἔτερους τῶν ὑπευθύνων ἐσείε καὶ ἐσυχοφάντει; cf. Gagarin (1997, ad loc.) with parallels. So we may assume the sense ‘shake up’ or ‘rattle’ here, in order to blackmail. When Syriskos says ‘if you’re threatening...’, he does not name the person threatened, but one could easily supply a person in the accusative (Charisios, in my opinion). Note that this reading of Syriskos’ understanding of Onesimos’ thoughts chimes with the structure of the ensuing plot between Habrotonon and Onesimos; with the aid of the ring Habrotonon may secure her freedom; but will Onesimos somehow get some recompense for his part? (542). ▶ ἀπολαβεῖν, ‘take back’, cf. Alexis fr. 212.1 KA. 460 ληρεῖς, ‘you’re talking foolishly’, cf. Heros 12; Alexis fr. 25.1 KA τί ταῦτα ληρεῖς, φληγαρσὶν ἄνω κάτω κτλ.; Demosth. 5.10 νομίζω τὸν λέγοντα ληρεῖν; 9.20 ἄν ληρεῖν καὶ τετυφώσθαι δοκῶ. By itself ληρεῖς is often equivalent to ‘rubbish!’ e.g. Aristoph. Thesm. 1080; Birds 572.

461 μερισμός, ‘part, share’. The mention of a ‘share’ in any possible gains tallies with my reading of Syriskos’ words here (he suspects Onesimos wants to involve him in a blackmail scheme), but is hard to square with any reading of these lines which involves Onesimos handing the ring back to Syriskos for a payment (that would not be a ‘share’, but a ‘price’). In other words, Onesimos cannot be trying to blackmail Syriskos (thus G.-S.); how could he, anyway? ▶ ταῦτα ἡ is an elliptical expression = ‘that’s that, then’; cf. Aristoph. Ach. 815. What is elided may be deduced from expressions such as ταῦτα ἡποὺ μανθάνω (Asp. 443). The Emperor Joseph II in Milos Forman’s film Amadeus (1984) had an amusing way of rounding off an exchange with ‘There it is’; that seems to me to catch Syriskos’ tone here.

462 Syriskos’ declared intention of walking into ‘town’ to return later is perhaps another argument against the two-day theory of the action in Epitrep.: for Syriskos had agreed with his wife (379-80) that they would return to work in the woods on the day after they arrived (day one of the action); if this was day two, he should be back in the country. ▶ διαδραμών, ‘run an errand’, cf. Dysk. 557.

5.4.2 Scene 2: Habrotonon’s ruse

465-66 Actually Syriskos had not found the baby; had he claimed to have found it once inside Chairestratos’ house? One thing is clear from Habrotonon’s words,
however: he had not claimed the child was his wife’s own baby; Habrotonon seems to know that Syriskos’ wife had lost a baby recently (she could breast-feed) and that the one she was feeding was a foundling.

466 ὡς κομψόν, ‘what a little dear!’ Probably Habrotonon is referring to the baby itself (which she has just seen being fed indoors) but she might be referring to the fact that Syriskos found it and gave it to his wife to nurse. Elsewhere in Menander we find Sostratos, the young lover, described as κομψός by the cook in Dysk. 414; in fr. 777 KA, it is said that there can be no κομψῶς στρατιώτης, ‘refined’ or ‘gentlemanly’ soldier. Alexis fr. 103.21, calls a prostitute’s mouth κομψός, ‘pretty’. Otherwise in comedy κομψός can mean ‘clever, subtle, smart’ vel sim.: Perik. 108, 298; fr. 265.2 K.-Th. (= 225 KA); Alexis fr. 9.1 KA, a ‘charming’ habit; similarly in Plato, Euthyrph. 11d, where Sokrates refers jokingly to his ability to demolish another’s argument: τούτο μοι τής τέχνης ἐστι κομψῶτατον. In Eupolis’ Kolakes fr. 172 KA the chorus call themselves κομψός, but a baby can hardly be that; Habrotonon is using the word here in a manner analogous to ‘nice’, which originally meant ‘fine, accurate, subtle’, but came to be used generally as a term of approval expressing admiration; there are many such words in English: ‘cool’, ‘great’, ‘super’, ‘neat’. Particularly the last (in American usage) may well match Habrotonon’s use of κομψός here. Hesych. glosses κομψούς simply as καλούς. A line of Antiphanes’ Philetairos (214 KA) is quoted as κομψός γε μικρός κρωμακίσκος ούτοσι / γαλαθηνός, which seems to mean ‘here’s a sweet little suckling piggy’ where κομψός is applied to a small creature to indicate how sweet or ‘cute’ it is, as, apparently, in Habrotonon’s remark. And Demeas’ remark to Nikeratos in Sam. 614 κομψός εί is ‘there’s a good chap!’ rather than ‘bright, clever’. Note the way Habrotonon opens her ploy with two ‘receptive’ exclamations: this one (‘what a dear!’) and then, three lines later on hearing of Charisios’ bad luck, ‘God! You poor devil!’. These responses serve to acquaint Habrotonon with the situation, such that she can act on it. For τάλας see note on 434.

468 αἰ, δύσμορ’, addressed to Onesimos, as one sees from the vocative: ‘God! You’re in trouble!’ In this and the following lines Habrotonon wants to point out what a fix Onesimos has got himself into, in order to ‘soften him up’ for cooperation with her plan. We find αἰ τάλας in Mis. 177. Δύσμορος, ‘wretched’, ‘unfortunate’ is quite common in Menander: e.g. Sam. 69, 255, 370. Bain (1984, 35-6) says that both αἰ and δύσμορος are words said only by women in Menander. Perhaps they have a slightly archaic ring to them; on p. 28 of his article Bain begins by quoting Plato, Crat. 418b-c, on the conservatism of female speech: αἱ γυναῖκες αἰπερ μάλιστα τήν ἄρχασθαν φωνὴν σωζουσι. Τρόφιμος, here = ‘charge’. There is an apparent contradiction in that Charisios was called Onesimos’ tropimos in line 1; now he is the father of this baby tropimos and has himself become Onesimos’ despotes (467). The explanation does not, however, lie in a possible ambiguity of the word tropimos itself (on the one hand
'active' = 'nurturing' sc. of Onesimos; on the other hand passive 'nurtured', sc. by Onesimos) as Shipp (1977, 9) correctly says: 'Actually the two applications are essentially one. The erilis filius [sc. of Roman comedy] is δ τρφωμος not as nurturing the slave, but as having been the slave’s nursling in his babyhood. The term sticks even when the child is grown up...’ For another baby trophimos cf. Sik. 8, where the daughter of the house, still a babe-in-arms, is called τρφωμη. In Plaut. Pseud. 1269 we find erus minor to distinguish Calidorus, the ‘young master’ of Pseudolus, from his father Simo; cf. ibid. 1283 nunc ab ero ad erum meum mairem venio. In other words erus here is a generic term, ‘the master’s family’, and can be applied to the descending generations of males in a slave-owning household. Note the word-play τρφωμος...τρφωμενον, which serves to underline the identity of baby and τρφωμος. For the passive sense of τρφωμος, ‘looked after by’ cf. Eur. Ion 683-84. Habrotonon means: if the child is really Onesimos’ charge (because he is Charisios’ child), and Charisios learns that his natural child is being raised as a slave, then the master will have every right to punish the slave who had kept the identity of the child secret. For the formulation ειτ...κοκ αν δικαίως άποθάνοις;, cf. Sam. 552 δικαίως άποθάνουμ’ αν; fr. 508.1 KA ειτ’ ου δικαίως...; Dem. 18.101 καλ τις ουχ αν άπεκτευνε με δικαίως, ει κτλ.; id. 210 δικαίως μενταν άπεθανον. 473 παροινον, ‘under the influence, drunk’; a common phenomenon in antiquity with its institutionalized heavy drinking (symposion and komos), and standard excuse in cases of riotous or vandalous behaviour; e.g. Sam. 339-41; Antiphon 3.1.6; 3.3.2; Lysias 1.45; Plato, Euthyphr. 4c5; [Plut.], Vit. dec. orat. 834C7 (άχολαστον οντα νυκτορ κωμάσαντα). Good examples of rape when παροινον: Xouthos in Eur. Ion 553; cf. Ter. Adel. 470 persuasit nox, amor, vinum, adulescentia. Pictorial representations of satyrs sneaking up on, or carrying off, nymphs reflect the same phenomenon as satyrs are always under the influence of Dionysos and nymphs are their traditional prey. 475 ενεπεσε is the generally accepted supplement but ενέβαλε would also be conceivable. 476 πέρυσι, about ten months ago, in fact (nine months pregnancy plus the month referred to by Daos in 243). Assuming that Pamphile married Charisios in the Attic month Gamelion (it is merely an assumption), when she was not yet visibly pregnant, the Taupopolia must have been a festival celebrated in autumn (our October, say). Then the baby would have been born in summer (that fits with Daos’ grazing and Syriskos’ charcoal-burning), when Charisios was away from home. The Philoxenos decree from Halai (see n. on l. 451) which mentions the Taupopolia, says that Philoxenos’ victory at the Pyrrhic dance is to receive official celebration at the Taupopolia, later in the year. But this relative date does not help with an absolute dating of the Taupopolia. 477 εψαλλον, ‘I played the harp’, as befitting a ψαλτρια, see note on l. 2. If we take Habrotonon at her word, she was already an accomplished musician when still a
virginal girl, celebrating the Tauropolia for Artemis with other girls of her age. This indicates that she received her musical training while still a girl, presumably because she was not free-born, and therefore not destined for marriage to an Athenian citizen. Note that the previous reference to a women’s pannychis has now turned to a chorus of girls (κόραις). This at least fits with Callimachus’ description of Artemis’ choruses at Halai (above n. on l. 451). Since Artemis was no musician, myth told of Apollo playing the lyre for girls’ choruses (HHApoll. 201); in theoretic records we quite often come upon the names of musicians who played at cult celebrations (the 2nd-c. BC Pythais inscriptions are good examples) but the musicians are almost invariably men. There are exceptions: Helen of Sparta is said to have excelled in ‘playing the beat’ on the lyre at a festival of Artemis or Athena (Theocr. 22.35-36); Sappho and her circle were nothing if not musicians and singers. For other historical musician-companions see above p. 122.

478 αὐτῇ [συνέπαιζον]. Various combinations of readings have been proposed for these words (see app.). I think it makes best sense if Habrotonon insists to Onesimos here that she, too (despite her present status as a call-girl), took part in the girls’ rites at the Tauropolia not only by playing her instrument for their dances, but also by dancing with them as an active participant. After making this point she adds by way of explanation that then she ‘didn’t know what a man was either (like them)’; in other words, she was still a virgin (cf. lines 517-18). Cf. Guéraud (1927, 136), who carefully measured the gap after αὐτ- and concluded that the space exactly suited eta, but was too small for alpha-iota. The OCT reading αυτη necessitates an emendation of C’s -παιζον to 3rd p.s., and suffers, in my opinion, from the fact that the pronoun αὐτη, ‘this girl’, is too abrupt, as we do not yet know who Habrotonon is talking about. For ► παίξειν in a ceremonial context cf. Dover (1993, 57-59).

479 οὐπω γάρ is inserted parenthetically, leading to ‘delayed γάρ’; cf. line 1071 of this play and fr. 351.2 KA. If placed at the beginning of the sentence (οὐπω γάρ ὁδ’ ἔγω Χτλ.) the word order becomes more natural. For a good example of γάρ postponed to the second line of a sentence see Adelphoi fr. 17 KA. ► καὶ μᾶλα. C indicates no change of speaker before or after these words; editors have given them to Onesimos as a scoffing ‘not half!’ in response to Habrotonon’s claim to innocence at that age. The sense of the expression elsewhere in Menander seems to have depended on context and tone of voice: in Perik. 294 it is affirmative, ‘indeed!’, but in ibid. 349 the tone seems to be ironic, ‘oh, sure!’, meaning ‘not likely!’ I concur with editors who give the words to Onesimos, but one might defend C’s punctuation by seeing Habrotonon responding to a doubtful shake of the head by Onesimos with: ‘No, really! By Aphrodite [sc. I didn’t know what men were like]!’

480 μᾶ τὴν Αφροδίτην. μᾶ is affirmation of a denial, as in e.g. 355, 689.

484-85 εὔπρεπῆς, πλουσίαν, foregrounding of an as-yet unseen character; the girl was ‘pretty’ and ‘rich’. The audience, no doubt, knew from the delayed prologue in act one just who Pamphile was, and how she had come by her baby, so this
mini-description by Habrotonon underlines her suitability now as Charisios’ bride. Cusset (2003, 170) points out that Alope is said in Hyginus to be *formosissima*, but was her beauty Euripidean? See above p. 143 for Hyginus’ summary of the story. The form of oath ► *δ̣ θεοί* is relatively rare (elsewhere in *Perik.* 807, 827); Habrotonon uses it again when continuing her description of Pamphile in 489, and again in 548; it sounds colloquial, like our ‘oh boy!’ or ‘Jesus!’; cf. Alexis fr. 168.7, where it accompanies an expression of pleasure in certain foods (*ἡδομέν’ θεοί*). Bain (1984, 41) observes that this form of oath is confined to women in Menander (mostly Habrotonon in this play) – as opposed to *δο πολυτιμητοι θεοι*, a male oath – but is said by men in earlier comedy (Kratinos, Aristophanes).

485 *αὕτη στις τυχόν*; Perhaps better as a question, prompting Habrotonon’s *οὐκ οίδ’* in the following line.

486-90 Habrotonon’s narrative ekphrasis continues; the details she picks out are few, but so telling that Menander conveys an entire personal tragedy in three deft strokes: we already know from the previous lines that it was night, and that a man had intruded into the women’s *pannychis*. Then this one girl rejoins the others ‘crying’ (*κλάουσα*), tearing at her hair (*τίλλουσ’ εαυτής τάς τρίχας*), her skimpy dress in rags (488-90). A similar nocturnal encounter is told from the man’s point of view in *Sam.* 41-46.

486 ἑπλανήθη, ‘she wandered’, that is, by herself, unaccompanied, while the other women did the same; cf. *Phasma* 99 μόνη πλανηθείσ’ ἡ τάλαν (suppl. Austin) (vel πλανηθείση, τάλαν Sandbach), where a comparable nighttime rape during a festival seems to be being discussed. Ritual ‘wandering’ is familiar from various cults with their associated myths; Demeter ‘wandered’ the earth in search of Kore (by night: *HHDemeter* 48, *στρωφατ’*), a wandering which was imitated by initiates into the Eleusinian Mysteries; Euripides describes a comparable ‘wandering’ of the Mountain Mother (*Hel.* 1301ff.; cf. Porph. *de abstin.* 4.19ff., quoting from a chorus of Eur. *Cretans*), a theme which recurs in the Epidaurian Hymn to the Mother of the Gods, see Furley & Bremer (2001, no. 6.2). The torchlit ritual on Parnassos called Phanai was the backdrop for a comparable literary rape: Xouthos admits in *Eur. Ion* 550-53 that he had ‘mingled’ with Dionysos’ bacchants on a previous visit to Delphi. The vases known as krateriskoi from Brauron show girls and young women running through the night carrying torches; they may well be engaged in ritual *πλανασθαι*; see fig. 5.2 on p. 183, with Kahil (1977). Similar krateriskoi have also been found in excavations at Halai, but I have not seen publication of them yet.


488-89 *καλὸν τὰνω / καὶ λειπτόν... ταραντίνων*. The description as a whole is reminiscent of the seductive Kirke in *Od.* 10.543-44 who puts on a shining gown λεπτόν καὶ χαρίεν when she gets out of bed having told Odysseus how to sail to the Underworld. The ► ταραντίνων specifically is described by Photios as a light di-
aphanous cloak (λεπτόν καὶ διαφανὲς ἱμάτιον, cf. Hesych. s.v. ἱμάτιον γυναικεῖον λεπτόν, χρωσσοῦς (sic) ἐχον ἐκ τοῦ ἕνδος μέρους). The name denotes an origin in Tarentum. The tarantinon was a garment frequently dedicated by women to Artemis Brauronia, as documented by the Brauronion inscriptions, see Linders (1972, e.g. 1518 lines 49 and 86; 1524 line 149); for the dedication of garments by women in Artemis Brauronia’s cult see Eur. IT 1464-65, Deubner (1932, 207f.). So if Pamphile was wearing a tarantinon at the Tauropolia it might have been destined to be dedicated to Artemis after the rite, if Charisios had not ruined it. For the possible parallel between Brauronian and Halaian rites for Artemis see above p. 174. Pho- tios goes on to say that the tarantinon was ‘not all purple, as some have assumed’ (οὕτως οὐ πάντως πορφυροῦν, ὡς τινες ὑπέλαβον οὕτως Νικόστρατος); since one of the tokens left with Pamphile’s baby was a fold of purple cloth (404 with note), it seems likely that it was the whole, or part, of this very tarantinon, i.e. a piece of the garment worn on that fateful night, which might help to jog the anonymous lover’s memory (always remembering that the rape took place at night).

490 ἀπολωλεκυΓ in the sense ‘ruined’ rather than ‘lost’, as it was still hanging from her in rags (490 ράκος). One notes the restrained eroticism (pace Omitowoju (2002, 175 and 176)) of the description: first the girl is described generally by ‘God, she was lovely!’ (484); then her dress, before the act, is said to be particularly fine and clinging (488-89); in the next line it is torn from her, revealing everything. Note
the similarly revealing attire of a woman in fr. 653 K.-Th. (= 471 KA): διαφανές / χιτωνάριον ἔχουσα.

493 εὰν δὲ ν(ο)ῦν ἕχης, ‘if you’ve got any sense’, a standard expression, cf. e.g. Alexis fr. 229.2.

496 τὸ γε[γονός. After το C has sigma, upsilon, then the lower tail of a diagonal which would suit e.g. chi, mu, lambda, possibly nu. Above sigma-upsilon the scribe has written γε; since the papyrus is broken after these letters we do not know whether any further letters followed gamma-epsilon. Leo’s supplement τὸ γε[γονός has won widespread favour as the expression is common in Menander and makes good sense here. True, it leaves ἔλευθέρα[ς] / παιδός without construction but one can easily supply τὸ παιδίον from the previous context. As early editors guessed, C, [ in C may represent an erroneous reading such as συμβεβηκός (cf. line 922) which the scribe subsequently corrected to γεγονός. Wilamowitz considered reading τὸ συμβάν at an earlier position in the line but that involves considerable juggling of the present word order to satisfy metre. His suggestion that τὸ γεγονός refers to the baby, ‘that which has been born’, which can then be taken with ἔλευθέρα[ς] / παιδός, ‘from a free girl’, is not really necessary, and involves a shift in the regular meaning of τὸ γεγονός, ‘what happened’. It has to be said that a scribe who could write τὸ συμβέβηκὼς at the end of the line can have had no ear for metre at all. At one stage I considered the remedy τὸ γε συμ[όν; referring to the child: ‘that [sc. child] which is with him anyway’. This might be satisfactory palaeographically, but the sense is somewhat strained: the child is not really ‘with’ Charisios; it is residing at present in the house of his friend Chairestratos, and will presumably leave the following day again with its foster parents.

498 ἐμοι ὅν οὐ νῦν δραμεῖ; ‘won’t you run for me now?’ i.e. to discover the identity of the mother. A complex restoration. Koerte already saw that the iota of ἐμοι might be an upsilon. In fact the scribe seems to have intended iota, then added a slanting bar top right in hindsight. In my opinion, this was his way of inserting gamma between ἐμοὺγιου when he noticed he had omitted it. The next point concerns οὐ. This has been taken hitherto as C. However, there is a small hole in the papyrus interrupting the right arc of omikron, making it look like sigma. Finally, the two last letter traces were deciphered in early decades of work on C as either -εν- or -ψα-. Working on the latter assumption I suggest οὐ δραμεῖ at line end, as in Sam. 202, παί, διατρίβεις. οὐ δραμεῖ; Habrotonon had already suggested in 481 that she might find out who was the mother, and in 508-9 she returns to the idea. The supplement also leads in well to 501 in which Habrotonon says that she is reluctant to approach ‘those women’ (sc. the participants at the Tauropolia) without a watertight case.

Of other solutions Sudhaus’ assumption that a word such as σύνεργος to follow γεγονός was cut short by Habrotonon interrupting is hardly convincing; why should Habrotonon cut Onesimos off in mid-speech at this point? Sandbach’s ἐμοὶ
νῦν συγγενοῦ, 'join forces with me' gives good sense apart from the possible in-nuendo of συγγίγνεσθαι, '(physically) come together'; cf. Arnott (1968b, 230-31). Moreover, as Sandbach admits, the use of συγγίγνομαι in this sense seems to be tragic.

Moreover, as Sandbach admits, the use of συγγίγνομαι in this sense seems to be tragic.

501 ἐξείνας ἀς λέγω: the women Habrotonon celebrated with at the Tauropolia; she had mentioned them in lines 474 and 482. They, if anyone, would know who the accosted girl was.

502-7 Habrotonon speculates on how else the ring might have come into the girl’s hands; assuming it was Charisios’ ring – Habrotonon has Onesimos’ word for that – the girl might still have taken it from someone else on that fateful night; Charisios might have parted with his ring before the rape for any number of reasons. Here Habrotonon reveals her familiarity with the typical goings-on at men’s gatherings; a decent Athenian woman should not know what went on at men’s symposia, except indirectly. She mentions three concrete possibilities:

(i) Charisios might have given the ring away as an ἐνέχυρον, ‘pledge’, ‘security’ (Etym. Mag.: τὸ εἰς ἀσφάλειαν ἀντάλλαγμα) for a loan, or wager, for example; cf. Aristoph. Plut. 451; Hermippos fr. 29.1 KA; Antiphanes fr. 75 KA.

(ii) Charisios might have used the ring as ‘guarantee of payment’ (εἰς συμβολὰς / ύπόθημ’), and lost it through defaulting on the payment, presumably; cf. Plaut. Cure. 356 suum anulum opposivit. G.-S. say that ύπόθημα seems to be a variant for υποθήκη, ‘pledge’, attested elsewhere only in SIG² 976.13-14 (2nd c. BC); but the variant spelling υπόθεμα, ‘security’, is relatively common in inscriptions (LSJ s.v. II). And we find ύποτιθέσθαι with the specific meaning ‘put down as a deposit or stake’ (LSJ s.v. VII), e.g. Hdt. 2.136; Dem. 27.25. For εἰς συμβολὰς G.-S. suggest either ‘as a contribution to the jackpot’ or ‘as a subscription to a dinner or party’ (cf. Ter. Eun. 539ff.). For the latter we need to consider the expression, well attested in comedy, δείπνον ἀπὸ συμβολῶν. Arnott (1996a, 86-87) writes: ‘it was a form of entertainment especially popular among wealthier young Athenian bachelors. One of a group of friends undertook to organise a dinner and the wine for drinking afterwards, and the others engaged to pay their shares of the cost usually after the dinner... Tokens such as rings were sometimes deposited with the organiser in advance as security’. So here we seem to be faced with two alternatives: either Charisios may have lost the ring while dicing (thus Taubenschlag (1959, 636 and n. 53) ‘als Garantie für den Einsatz beim Spiel’), or he may have tendered the ring as ‘deposit’ for a shared meal, then lost it by defaulting on the payment or due to some other confusion.

(iii) Finally, Charisios might have taken off the ring (περιέλετο, Gronewald) in the course of a private negotiation with someone (συντιθέμενος περί τινος), then had to forfeit it (ἐίτ’ ἔδωκεν), perhaps to pay a debt or otherwise recompense the other person. Editors had long puzzled over the sense of passive περιέλετο but Gronewald has removed this difficulty with his improved reading of C as περιέλετο, ‘took off’ (sc. his finger), with parallels in Hdt. 3.41 and Plato, Rep. 359e.
On the general point, Herodas Mim. 3.5-6 describes a son who has ruined the family by gambling in the παίστρα, ‘gambling den’ (ibid. 11) and Wealth in Aristoph. Plut. 242-43 tells how a certain type could squander a fortune on ‘women and dice’ (πόρναισι καὶ κύβοισι); in Plaut. Bacch. 71, dice (talos) are a feature of the life of pleasure with a meretrix which Pistoclerus rejects. Xenophon Oik. 1.20 castigates trivial pursuits such as gambling and low society which appear to be pleasures, but are in fact a bane. Then, as now, gambling was clearly a good way of losing one’s money and property. Probably G.-S. are right in saying that the ring would not have been pledged for its cash value; the value of a signet-ring in ancient comedy was more commonly as token of its owner’s identity or good faith, cf. Plaut. Bacch. 327-30. Generally, Habrotonon’s imaginative reconstruction of the ring’s putative history looks like a comic trope of a literary theme; one is reminded of other famous rings – Polykrates’ ring (Hdt. 3.41) or Theseus’ ring (Bacchylides 17) – which completed fantastic journeys before being restored to their owners. 502-4 λαβὼν...τις...έτερος, the spaced nominatives tie a complex sentence together. 507 ἐν τοῖς πότοις, lit. ‘at drinking bouts’ = ‘while carousing’; for the expression cf. Aesch. De fals. leg. 47.5; for the danger of compromising oneself at such drinking parties cf. Isokr. Ad Demonicum 32.1 μάλιστα μὲν εὐλαβέας τάς ἐν τοῖς πότοις συνουσίας· ἐὰν δὲ ποτέ σοι συμπέσῃ καιρός, ἐξανίστασο πρὸ μέθης. 511 τί ποῆση τις; ‘what is one to do?’: unusual 3rd p.s. deliberative subjunctive with τις instead of ‘Τ’ (G.-S.); cf. Antiphon 1.4 πρὸς τίνας οὖν ἠλθητι τις βοηθοὺς, with Barigazzi’s note (1970).

The ruse

Habrotonon decides to trick Charisios into admitting his ‘guilt’ by pretending to be that very girl whom he had got pregnant on the night of the Tauruspolia. The ‘ruse’ or ‘intrigue’ is a favourite device of Menander for adding interest to the plot. In Asp. the servant Daos decides to trick the grasping old Smikrines by pretending that an even richer epikleros is available for marriage; in so doing he hopes to distract Smikrines from marrying the girl who had been promised to Chaireas (Beroutsos, 2005, 12). In Dysk. the ruse consists of pretending to Knemon, the old misanthropist, that the ‘city slicker’ who wants to marry his daughter is a sunburnt rustic, i.e. a suitable match for his daughter. In Sam. Moschion and Chrysis decide to deceive Demeas into thinking that the baby in his household is Chrysis’, not Plangon’s; cf. Jaekel (1984, 8) for Euripidean instances of the ruse as background to the plot here. As Daos in Asp. comments, ‘he who sees and assumes only what suits him will be a bad judge of the truth’ (325-26 ὁ βούλεται γὰρ μόνον ὅρων καὶ προσδοκῶν / ἀλόγιστος ἔσται τῆς ἀληθείας κριτής). According to this, deception works by presenting to someone what is amenable to them (but false); or, to put it psychologi-
cally, a person’s disposition may predispose him/her to view events in a certain way – a predisposition which can be exploited by others to their advantage. Quite a nice example of a real-life ruse is found in Antiphon’s first speech on a murder charge: a wronged woman dupes a concubine (pallake) into administering poison both to the concubine’s lover who is wronging her and to the woman’s own husband (whom she wants to do away with, according to the prosecutor). She tells the pallake that the substance she is to administer is a love philtre which will win both men back to their women. In fact it is a deadly poison: the pallake is taken in by the ruse because she wants her lover back.

Gutzwiller (2000, 118-21) discusses this and other ruses in Menander with respect to metatheatre. By this she means that the initiator of a ruse (here Habrotonon) acts like the playwright himself in creating a new identity for himself/herself and playing it out in a small play-within-the-play. This, in Gutzwiller’s opinion, draws the audience’s attention to the conditions of a play’s construction, thus partially breaking the ‘dramatic illusion’ (metatheatre). Whilst her discussion is full of shrewd observations, I think the conclusion we should draw from them is different. Rather than distract from the ‘dramatic illusion’ of the play’s world, a ruse, in my opinion, cements it all the more solidly. When a character (here Habrotonon) assumes a fictive identity or role she is acting like a real-life deceiver; this serves to reinforce her identity in the play (Habrotonon, psaltria, hetaira to Charisios) rather than call it into question. The audience are familiar with the mechanism whereby a person assumes a feigned identity to trick someone; that person’s real identity is the yardstick for the identity fraud. Hence an actor playing a role in a play who takes on a false identity establishes his role in the play as the yardstick for the deception. This mechanism, in my opinion, tends to eliminate the audience’s consciousness of the actor-behind-the-mask and reinforce their belief in the actor’s ‘real’ role (prosōpon).

511 θέασα', an alternative to ἄρα or σκότει, cf. Aristoph. Ach. 366, Knights 997 ἱδοū θέασαι, Thesm. 280 θέασας; Wasp 1170 ἵδου. θεώ τὸ σχῆμα, καί σκέψαι κτλ.; Call. HDem. 3 θασείσθε, βέβηλοι.

512 ἐνθύμημα', a rare word in comedy (otherwise only Anaxandrides fr. 55.2 KA), almost technical in tone, ‘idea’, ‘strategem’; it is the standard word in rhetorical treatises for ‘idea’ in writing as opposed to ‘language’ (ὄνομα, λέξις), very common in e.g. Alkidamas, Dionysius Hal., Menander Rhetor. Wilamowitz ad loc. says the sense was introduced by Isokrates and adopted by Aristotle. Thus, Habrotonon’s choice of word for her ruse reflects the technical language of rhetoric: Menander’s ἐνθύμημα for advancing the plot here becomes her idea. ► ἄρα, common in conditional clauses of the form εἰ μὴ ἄρα or εἰ ἄρα, adding the nuance ‘perhaps’, ‘as it might be’; ἄρα is sometimes separated from εἰ, as here (cf. LSJ s.v. B 6). G.-S.’ parallel (from Aristoph. fr. 150, Gerytades), is hardly apposite as it involves ὡς... οίρα, where ἄρα has its common inferential sense ‘as it turns out’. Plato, Crat. 400a ἐκὸν ἄρα καί σοι ἄρεστη (Wil.). Habrotonon presents her idea cautiously: ‘you see, Onesimos, whether or not my plan appeals to you too’.
513 ἐμὸν ποῆσομαι, ‘I’ll make it mine’, i.e. ‘pretend it happened to me’. The
idiom is repeated in 518-19 πάντ’ ἐμὰ ποουμένη. One notes the middle voice, as in
προσποιοῦμαι, ‘pretend’.

515 λέγ’ δ’ λέγεις: ἔρτι γὰρ / νοῶ, ‘say what you mean. It’s just dawning on me.’
A ‘prompt’ in dialogue where a speaker speaks for the audience: that’s what they’d
like to know. For the double meaning of λέγω, ‘say’ and ‘mean’, cf. Karch. 14 ὅτι
λέγεις λέγε; Alexis fr. 129.19 KA δ’ λέγεις οὐ λέγεις; Plato, Rep. 336d3, λέγε
ὁτι δὲν λέγης. ▶ ἔρτι with present tense means ‘to be just doing something’ at
a given moment, e.g. Aristoph. Birds 922 οὐκ ἔρτι θύω; so Onesimos means ‘I’m
just beginning to catch on’; cf. Aristoph. Frogs 598 ἀλλὰ καυτὸς τυγχάνω ταῦτ’ /
ἔρτι συννοώμενος. Editors wonder what it is exactly that Onesimos is beginning
to understand; that is unnecessary. The important point is that his mind has been
set working (as has that of the audience) on hearing that Habrotonon will confront
Charisios with his lost ring.

516ff. ἀνακρίνει. Habrotonon begins an imagined dialogue with Charisios. The
scene she imagines is thus a mini-play within the play. She will slip into a role (the
raped virgin), ceasing to be Habrotonon the psaltria in Charisios’ eyes. Interest­
ingly, this piece of role-playing serves to confirm Habrotonon’s ‘real’ persona on
the stage rather than weaken the dramatic illusion (see above p. 187). Moreover, the
imagined scene anticipates what will happen shortly off-stage (Habrotonon’s con­
frontation of Charisios) triggering Charisios’ crisis of confidence in act four. And
this anticipation heightens the audience’s interest in Charisios’ reaction. Nor should
we forget that we have still met neither Charisios nor Pamphile, the focus of interest
in the play. This imagined conversation, then, between Habrotonon and Charisios is
another of those theatrical sign-posts leading up to the stage dénouement: Charisios’
appearance as a broken man.

518 τά τ’ (τατ’ C). Wilamowitz corrected to τά κεῖνη to avoid the inconcinnity
involved in taking both participles (οὔσα and ποουμένη) as coordinate. But, with
Sudhaus, I do not think the inconcinnity is that great if we place Habrotonon’ first
remark in inverted commas (what she will say) and take the second as tacked-on
explanation to Onesimos. Against Wilamowitz’ conjecture one has to ask: if the
correct reading was τά κεῖνη why should a scribe have written τατ’εκεῖνη?

519-20 τά πλεῖστα... ἄριστα. Habrotonon means she knows most of what hap­
pened to the raped girl (as she was there, had witnessed her distress); but Onesimos
chimes in with double-entendre: ‘of course you do: better than anyone!’ (because
she’s a hetaira). His tone matches that of καὶ μᾶλα in 479. It is Habrotonon’s fate
in this play to be constantly reminded of her status; her behaviour is remarkably
philanthropic, but that does not stop others poking fun at her as a sex-object. G.-S.
doubt the double-entendre here, taking Onesimos’ words to mean ‘first-rate’!

520 οἰκεῖον, lit. ‘belonging to his house’, or ‘his own’ (cf. Dysk. 330), hence ‘to do
with him’ (G.-S.). The word has a juridical sense like English ‘party to’ something;
cf. Antiphon 1.13 ήδεσαν γάρ οίκείον σφίσι τό κακόν ἀναφανησόμενον, 'they knew that it would emerge that they were party to the crime'; cf. id. 4.4.5 οίκείον τό ἀμάρτημα.

521 C's reading πραγμευθυο leaves the line a syllable short. Arnott (1968b, 231) restores metre by transposing the δ' from the previous line, a solution approved by Sandbach with 'due reserve'; it entails an uncomfortably delayed connecting particle (seventh position) and an unusual opening εάν οίκείον without connecting particle (a connecting particle almost always follows εάν). Delayed δέ has been defended by Arnott, loc. cit., above p. 153 and Handley (1965, 131 on line 10); see further KA on Alexis 278.3 (6th position) and on com. adesp. 1000.33 (7th position = Pap. Didot). Another remedy was proposed by Sudhaus: (μέν) inserted after εύθυς, corresponding to δέ' ἀν λέγη: in 523. However, there is something pedantic and therefore superfluous about μέν here. Austin per litt. suggests (οὐκ) εὐθύς ἦξει... καί έρει; turning the whole sentence into a question, as in Eur. Andr. 1066-68 οὐχ ὅσον τάχος / χωρίστησαι τις... καί... λέξει...; With the slight reservation that μεθύων γε νῦν might be thought to interrupt the smooth flow of such a double question, I adopt Austin's suggestion.

521-22 ἦξει φερόμενος ἐπί τὸν ἐλεγχον, cf. Lycurg. in Leokr. 59 ἦξει δι' ἴσως ἐπ' ἐκεῖνον τὸν λόγον φερόμενος and, perhaps, Perik. 278 (G.-S.). The sense is 'won't he come at a run?', '...without delay?'. With ἐπί τὸν ἐλεγχον, 'to the proof', cf. Lys. in Diogitonem 12.3 ἦξίουν δὲ τούτον εἰς ἐλεγχον έναν περὶ τῶν χρημάτων. A normal expression for 'submit to proof' is εἰς ἐλεγχον καθιστάναι or καθίστασθαι.

523 πρότερος καί προπετώς, 'of his own accord and eagerly', mild paronomasia with προ-. For πρότερος, 'of [one's] own accord', cf. Dysk. 10 προσηγόρευκε πρότερος δ' οὔδένα.

524 τοῦ διαμαρτεῖν μὴ δὲ ἐν, 'so as not to slip up in any way'. The genitive of infinitive + article without any preposition (ἐνεκα, χάριν etc.) to express purpose is common enough, e.g. in Thucydides.

525 ὑπέρευγε, 'super', cf. Asp. 412, Perik. 982 ὑπέρευλις λέγεις, a distinctly fourth-century word: Plato, Theaet. 185d; Dem. 18.10; cf. Plaut. Rud. 164 euge euge, perbene. ► νὴ τὸν Ἡλιον: oaths 'by the Sun' are relatively common in 4th-c. comedy: in this play 631, Archedikos fr. 3.4 KA, Alexis fr. 248.1 KA, Men. Mis. 686 Arnott, but unknown in tragedy.

526 τὰ κοινά ταύτι, 'commonplaces', or 'typical things', cf. Sam. 242 καὶ ταύτα δὴ τὰ κοινά... εἰποῦσα, followed as here by a string of expressions typical of the given situation.

526 ἀκκίουμαι, 'I'll play up to him'. The sense of ἀκκιζομαι emerges from Choriocius 29.2.60 Foerster-Richtsteig οἶον ἀκκιζομένη καὶ βλέποντας ἀσέλγες τε καὶ ὑποῦλον καὶ πως ὑποκρινομένην ἑράν, οἷα δὴ τῶν ἐταιρῶν τὰ σοφίσματα
προσποιουμένων ἔραν, ὡς ἀνα πλέον τοὺς ἑραστὰς ἐπιφλέξωσι, where ἀκχιζομένην describes the fawning, flattering behaviour of a prostitute trying to stir a man's desire; cf. Alkiphoron Epistulae 3.5.2 Schepers [sc. a woman to her young lover] θρύπτεται καὶ συνεχῶς ἀκχιζεται; Philippides fr. 5.2 KA τὰ μὲν οὖν γύναια τάλλ' ἄκκιζοντα ('fought shy'). What Habroton means comes out clearly in the following sequence of remarks: 'what a brute you were!', 'how you bowled me over!', 'the beautiful dress I ruined!' She will play the helpless innocent, but in a coy, provocative manner. τὰ κοινά ταῦτα are, then, the things women in such a situation commonly say, clichés or standard ploys ('platitudes' Balme (2002)).

528 ἱταμός, 'go-getting' (from ἴναι), i.e. 'impulsive', 'macho'; cf. Mis. 802 Arnott; Perik. 713 ἱταμός; Alexis fr. 110.3, and, in an amatory context, fr. 236.5.

529 ἱμάτια οί'. Habrotonon has already described the fine tarantinon the girl was wearing (489), but the general word ἱμάτια is more suited to the clichéed style she is cultivating here.

530-32 To add authenticity to her claim Habrotonon adds that, before confronting Charisios, she’ll go to Syriskos’ wife (532 τὴν ἔχουσαν), take the baby in her arms and pretend, with tears and kisses, to be reunited with her lost child. As the following lines show, she will then confront Charisios with the sight of the baby in her arms. In a similar way Chrysis in Sam. pretends to be the mother of Moschion’s child. Onesimos is full of admiration for the audacity of Habrotonon’s plan: ἡράξκεις.

533-34 The coup de grâce in Habrotonon’s ruse (τὸ πέρας δὲ πάντων): she will confront Charisios with ring and baby, saying: ‘and you’re the father of a child!’ But notice how Habrotonon stops short of saying ‘here’s the baby I bore to you.’ For τὸ πέρας see note on p. 138.

534 ἐστὶ involves a split resolution but auxiliary ἐστὶ belongs closely with the participle. Early editors considered η a possibility for the trace of a letter, but [ἡδ]η ('here’s your baby already') gives neither ideal sense nor grammar (participle without copula).

535 κακοηθώς, ‘wicked’, cf. l. 551 κακοηθεύσηι, ‘behave wickedly’, and Dem. 18.11, with word-play and paronomasia: κακοηθής δ' ὄν, Αἰσχίνη, τοῦτο παντελῶς εὕψεις ὑψήθης; adv. ibid. 78 κακοηθῶς πολιτεύεσθαι (Philip’s letter to the Athenians); ibid. 108 βάσκανον δέ καὶ πικρόν καὶ κακοηθῆς οὐδέν ἐστι πολίτευμα ἑμὸν. In comedy the sense ‘underhand’, ‘fiendish’ is already present in Aristoph. Thesm. 422. In Theop. fr. 1.17 Sandbach the κακοηθής is said to achieve much more than the upright person in the present generation, being outdone only by the flatterer and the sycophant. Fr. 588 K.-Th. (= 811 KA) runs: ‘an hetaira never has the good (τὸ καλῶς) at heart, as τὸ κακοηθῆς has conditioned her behaviour’. Post (1934, 26) says that Onesimos is correct to assume that Habrotonon is proposing to act ‘ill-naturedly’, as her claim to have borne a child to Charisios, if believed, will gain her freedom (cf. line 539). But Post forgets that Habrotonon’s motive in
assuming a false identity is, in fact, altruistic — to find the real mother. She herself says (547) that she has no desire to become a mother. Note how nearly all Onesimos’ comments are adverbs: Habrotonon says she will do something and Onesimos exclaims ‘well or schemingly well [done]’.

538-49 A complication occurs to Onesimos; if Charisios falls for Habrotonon’s ruse, he will assume she is the mother of the child and will liberate her post-haste so as to avoid scandal (moreover, he has taken up with her anyway). And then Habrotonon would have no reason to search for the baby’s real mother. Onesimos would have involved Habrotonon in his scheming only to find that he had helped her to her freedom whilst leaving himself empty-handed. But when he puts this to Habrotonon (544-46), she sighs (τάλαν) and protests that she has no interest in becoming a mother. But she would not mind obtaining her freedom. We do not learn in the extant portions of Epitrep. whether or not Habrotonon does obtain her freedom. As an illustration of how a slave might obtain his or her freedom through doing some good turn for the master one may compare Plaut. Rud. 1217ff., where Trachalio wins his freedom by enabling Daemones to identify his long-lost daughter; cf. id. Poen. 133-34; ibid. 909-10. ‘Freedom’ was one of the coins of exchange in New Comedy, and clearly a focus of interest for the audience, which included slaves.

541 γάρ, ‘you really don’t know?’ For γάρ in an echoed question, cf. Denniston GP 77-78: ‘[sc. the tone is] surprised and incredulous, often ironical, and implies that the speaker throws doubt on the grounds of the previous speaker’s words’ (77).

542 ἀλλ’ [ή] χάρις τίς, ‘what’s in it for me?’, picked up in 565, when Onesimos calls himself a fool to expect χάρις from a woman. Gronewald (1987, 14) argues for this reading over Wilamowitz’ [ή] χάρις τίς, since, as Sandbach says, ‘ἀλλ’ ἦ is normally used in surprised or incredulous questions that answer some statement (Denniston, GP 27), and that is not true here’. Jensen said that the space was not large enough for οὐ, which Lefebvre had suggested. Gronewald compares e.g. Plato Krit. 14ε τίς ἥ ὄφελλα and, for the word-order, Eur. IT 1168 ἥ δ’ αἰτία τίς; Like Onesimos, Trachalio in Plaut. Rud. hopes for a reward for his good offices: Atque ut gratum mi beneficium factis experiar. (1221)

543 νή τω θεώ, ‘by the two goddesses!’ (Demeter and Kore), a favourite expletive of women, see Aristoph. Lys. passim; Thesm. 594 is an amusing hybrid in the mouth of a man disguised as a woman; in Eccl. 155ff. a woman disguised as a man can give away her sex by using the wrong oath. This oath recurs in Men. in Georg. 24 (Philinna), Dysk. 878 (Simike, an old woman). The goddesses were worshipped primarily at the women’s festival Thesmophoria. For characterization by choice of oath in Menander see p. 159,

546 παρακρουσαμένη, ‘tricking’. In the active παρακρούω means ‘strike aside’, in the sense ‘knock off balance’, or ‘wrong-foot’ somebody, an expression deriving from wrestling (Et. Mag.); a character in Phrynichos fr. 61 KA addresses Hermes: ὁ ρίλταθ’ Ἑρμη, καὶ (σὺ) φυλάσσον μὴ πεσών / σαυτόν παρακρούσῃς, which
appears to mean ‘dearest Hermes, be careful you don’t trip yourself up/knock yourself over and fall...!’ In the middle voice the sense is ‘trick’, ‘deceive’ or ‘mislead’ (LSJ); cf. Dem. 18.276 ὃτις μὴ παραχρούσωμαι μηδ’ ἐξαπατήσω; in Aristokr. 88.6 βούληται κακομοιρείν καὶ παραχρούσθαι; Dinarchos, in Demosth. 110.5 Δημοσθένης ἐξαπατήσαι βουλόμενος καὶ παραχρούσμενος κτλ..

550-56 συναφέσχει... συνδοξεί... φιλή Πειθοί. An almost ceremonial conclusion to Habrotonon’s ruse. First συναφέσχει (twice) picks up the same verb used to introduce the ruse (512); then Habrotonon makes doubly sure Onesimos agrees (συνδοξεί;); finally she utters a short prayer to Peitho, goddess of persuasion, for success in her planned deception. Then, exit. For double confirmation of agreement to a plan cf. Plaut. Poen. 180 and 188 (consilium placet... placet consilium). For a similar appeal to Peitho at a stage exit see Aesch. Suppl. 522-23: ἐγὼ δὲ ταῦτα πορσυνῶν ἐλεύσομαι: / πειθώ δ’ ἐποίησο καὶ τύχη πρακτήριος. The women in Aristophanes’ Lys. 203-4 pray: Δέσποινα Πειθοί καὶ κύλιξ φιλοτησία, / τα σφάγια δέξαι ταῖς γυναιξίν εὐμενῆς. The power of Peitho is often dwelt upon in fifth-century drama: e.g. Eur. Hek. 816 πειθῶ δὲ τὴν τύραννον ἀνθρώπους μόνην; in a fragment of Eu-polis’ Demoi (102 KA) ‘persuasiveness’ is said to ‘sit on the lips’ of an excellent rhetor (Perikles): πειθὼ τις ἐπεκάθιζεν ἐπὶ τοῖς χείλεσιν (Πειθώ Welcker (1844, vol. 1, 316)). Cf. Buxton (1982). Although a character in Eur. fr. 170.1 Nauck says Peitho has ‘no temple but the word; her altar resides in human nature’ (οὐκ έ'στι Πειθοὺς ιερόν αλλο πλήν λόγος, / καί βωμός αὐτῆς ἐστ’ ἐν ἀνθρώπου φύσει), it seems in fact that there was an official cult of Peitho in Athens from the end of the fifth century BC and certainly in the fourth, when orators mention state sacrifices to her; see Stafford (2007, 79). She was worshipped in close association with Aphrodite Pandemos in Athens (Paus. 1.22.3). One notes also that Peitho and the Charites give Pandora her attractive jewelry before she embarks on her mission of deceiving men by her beauty (Hes. Erga 73-74). Perhaps it is not simply that Habrotonon here wants her ruse of words to fool Charisios; she is also playing the role of the mother of his child in an erotic intrigue. On the subject of women’s deceitful speech in drama generally see Hawley (1995, ch. 4-6).

Habrotonon’s prayer here, though short, contains typical elements. The invocation contains one term of endearment φιλή; cf. fr. 247 KA ὃ δ νυλτάτη Γῆ μήτερ. The prayer itself consists of a threefold request: παροῦσα σύμμαχος πόει, ‘be with me, help me, see that...’. Then the precise action requested is stated ‘...the words I utter work’. Longer prayers embellish the invocation and elaborate the deity’s powers before finishing with the request. For a similar ‘prayer-interjection’ see Sam. 444-46, where Demeas utters a quick prayer to Apollo as he passes his pillar-image outside his front door; and Dysk. 572-73, where Sostratos ‘signs off’ a scene in which he avows to further his suit of Knemon’s daughter with a bow to Pan, the god of the local shrine. Heap (2002-3, 98) suggests that Peitho spoke the delayed prologue of Epitrepontes; if that were true, Habrotonon’s prayer would chime with the audience’s knowledge of this goddess’s role in steering the plot.
Onesimos’ monologue

Left alone, Onesimos indulges in introspection. This picks up his self-doubting speech at the beginning of the act, where he described his hesitation about showing the ring to Charisios (Blundell, 1980, 28-32). Now he broods on his own incompetence and lack of success compared with what he perceives as Habrotonon’s quick-wittedness. And, it has to be said, there is some reason for his dejection. He has not fared well in this affair of his master’s marital crisis. First he had reported to Charisios that Pamphile had been delivered of an illegitimate child in his absence: that had earned him his master’s rage as the bearer of bad news (423-35). Then he had seen his master’s lost ring by chance, when Syriskos was examining it, and managed to get his hands on it. Syriskos had refused to play along with Onesimos in some scheme to use the ring to blackmail someone, probably Charisios himself (457-61). And now Habrotonon has taken the ring from him to use in a scheme which may secure her her freedom, but which leaves him empty-handed. He has failed to exploit his chances, and woefully dwells on this realization in the following lines. Onesimos is the scheming slave manqué in this play; cf. Krieter-Spiro (1997, 240). Once more we see how Menander customizes stock themes of comedy to achieve his own effects. The audience can only smile at this snivelling servant whose best-laid plans come to nothing. At the same time one notes a kind of structural parallel between the man-servant and master here. When Charisios finally appears, it is in a crisis of despair and self-doubt; but the audience has been prepared for this spectacle by repeatedly witnessing the man-servant’s moods and vaccinations. The ‘young man’ of comedy often had a close relationship with his servant; as Chrysalus says in Plautus Bacch. 645, he ‘drinks and eats and loves’ together with his young master Mnesilochus.

Onesimos’ introspection lasts until 566; then his mind turns to developments in the plot. Pamphile’s position is precarious if the mother of the baby is found; like as not, Charisios will reject Pamphile and take the other woman to wife (570-1); it occurs to Onesimos that he’s done well not to be involved with this further twist in the story. In other words, he experiences here a swing of mood; before he had envied Habrotonon her enterprising spirit which may win her her freedom; now he considers himself ‘well out of it’, and swears not to meddle in future (573-76). How well Menander has captured here that psychological process whereby a person talks himself out of gloom by looking on the bright side. Similarly in Sam. 324ff., Demeas talks himself out of his fury with his son and takes a more positive view of events. Here in Epitrep. the buoyant, if shallow, nature of Onesimos’ personality is brought out well.

557 τοπαστικόν, literally ‘divinatory’, ‘good at guessing’, from τοπάζω, ‘guess’ (e.g. Aristoph. Wasps 71); here ‘inventive’, ‘quick-witted’, as Onesimos observes that Habrotonon has quickly changed her tack on acquiring new information about Charisios. Jaekel (1984, 17) compares with Aesch. Ag. 1368-69, where τοπάζειν
is contrasted with σάφ' εἰδέναι. Photios gives s.v. τοπάζειν οίον στοχάζεσθαι· ἐνθυμεῖσθαι· ὑπονοεῖν, to which Hesych. adds εἰκάζειν. The word is hap. leg. but comparable to formations such as σχολαστικός (σχολάζω), μοναστικός (μονάζω); Aristophanes, *Wasps* 1209, seems to have a similar comic formation in ξυνουσιαστικός. Sandbach (1970, 134) points to the other adjectives in -τικός used by Onesimos (προνοητικός, ταρακτικός, λογιστικός) as examples of his pretentious vocabulary; cf. Krieter-Spiro (1997, 239). Here, Habrotonon has seen her chance (by the kind of intuition implied by τοπάζω) and means to take it. Onesimos contrasts this with his own inability to intuit the future, ούδαμώς προνοητικός τὰ τοιαύτα (561). Onesimos is fond of such ‘academic’ generalizations on character, cf. 1081 (of Smikrides) λογιστικοῦ γάρ ἄνδρός.

γύναιον. Not necessarily derogative (Aristoph. *Wasps* 610), but certainly less formal than γυνή; slightly slangy, perhaps, like Lat. *muliercula* (e.g. Plaut. *Rud.* 52): cf. *Dysk.* 568 (said by a slave Getas); in Menander otherwise only in *Mis.* 162/562 Arnott; Formation comparable to θηρίου > θήρ, παιδίου > παῖς.

557 ἡσθηθ' not ‘when she noticed’ (which would require the aorist, not perfect), but ‘because she has realized’, ‘now that she (has observed and) is aware that...’ as G.-S. explain with respect to the question whether the perfect in the fourth century BC was becoming equivalent to the aorist (they reject the suggestion).

559 άλλως άλύει, ‘she’s wasting her energy’; cf. fr. 3 of this play, probably said of Charisios (see p. 79). άλλως in 5th-c. dramatic texts often means ‘be distraught’, ‘distrressed’, with the associated aspect of nervous, undirected movement e.g. of a bird flapping its wings futilely when caught in bird-lime: Eur. *Cycl.* 433-34 ὀσπέρ πρὸς ἰξώι τῇ κύλικι λελημένον / πτέρυγας άλύει; in id. Hipp. 1182 Hippolytos decides to stop ‘fretting and obey [his] father’s words’, τί ταύτ' ἄλυο; πειστέον πατρός λόγοις. Arnott (1996a, 344) on Alexis fr. 121.13 KA (οἱ μὲν εὐποροῦμεν, οἱ δ' ἄλυμεν) compares this ‘stronger’ sense of ἄλυο (‘a range of senses linked by the disconcerting effect of strong emotion, frenzy and pain’; cf. Zenodorus Περι συνηθείας 257.12, who defines ἄλυειν· ἐπὶ τοῦ μετὰ λύπης περιπάτου, ‘troubled walking to and fro’) with a later ‘weaker’ sense in prose of the imperial period ‘I am idle, roam about’. Sisti (1985, 239-40) adds that ἄλυο in the medical writers can indicate ‘melancholy, despair’ without necessarily implying agitation (Chantryne, 1968, s.v.), a mood which he thinks suits that of Charisios in the play (cf. fr. 3). Arnott concludes that the two instances of the verb in *Epitrep.* are closer to the earlier, stronger sense. So perhaps we can take Onesimos’ meaning here as roughly equivalent to ‘she’s hitting her head against a brick wall’. We saw before that Habrotonon was upset by her failure to arouse Charisios’ desire (432-33); now she has realized that her efforts in this direction are a waste of time.

561 For a similar string of adjectives, see Charisios’ speech of self-hatred 908-10 ἐγώ τις ἀναμάρτητος... ἀκέραιος, ἀνεπίπληκτος; fr. 804.12 KA (unknown play); a Latin example: Plaut. *Rud.* 409, timidas egentes uvidas ejectas examinatas. Alto-
5.4 Act Three

gether, asyndetic strings are a feature of Menander's style; see note on p. 23, and e.g. fr. 313 KA λύτη, φόβος, φροντίς, πέρας ἐστιν οὐδὲ ἐν. They have the effect of piling on abuse, or other types of heated emotion. ► λέμφος, lit. ‘snot’, here = ‘snivelling’; cf. fr. 383 KA (Hypobolimaios) γέρων ἀπεμέμυκτ’ (‘has been cheated’ LSJ) ἄθλιος, λέμφος. ► ἀπόπληκτος, ‘lame’, ‘paralytic’; cf. Handley (1965, on v. 312): ἀπόπληκτος is both literal, as here, of someone paralysed, mentally deranged or struck dumb; and also figurative, as in 839, of someone who behaves as stupidly as if we were so afflicted. We have the figurative meaning here, cf. Perik. 496; Plato Com. fr. 138 KA: νῦν δὲ δρώσιν οὐδὲν, / ἀλλ' ὀσπέρ ἀπόπληκτοι στάθη ἔστω τε ὑψονται; Dem. 21.143 οὐχ οὔτως εἰμι ἄφρων οὐδ' ἀπόπληκτος. Onesimos depicts himself as the opposite of his ideal: snivelling, helpless, dull-witted, as opposed to quick-witted and quick to act – qualities he perceives in Habrotonon at present.

564-66 These lines are quoted (with some adaptation to context) by Stobaios 4.22g.-151 Wachsmuth/Hense; immediately after he quotes an anonymous line of tragedy: οὐκ ἐν γυναικὶ ψωται πιστή χάρις. For a similar sentiment cf. Alexis fr. 150 (with Arnott’s commentary for further passages) where the speaker (presumably a married man) says women are much harder task-masters than men.

565-66 μὴ μόνον... προσλάβοιμι ‘I only hope I don’t suffer some disadvantage’. A negated wish with μόνον indicating that it will be ‘enough’ if the wish comes true, compared to the previous over-optimistic thought (‘the woman will do me a favour’).

566-67 εἰποσαλῆ / τὰ τράχματ’ ἐστίν. These words prompted earlier restorations of line 172.

567 κεκτημέ[νην, ‘mistress’, i.e. Pamphile; cf. Glykera in Perik. 754, who is not the wedded wife of Polemon but his concubine, given to him in quasi-marriage by her mother; Her. 37. A scholion on Lucian, Dial. meretr. 9.1 says that κεκτημένη was a more common term for ‘mistress’ in Attic than δεσπόινα; and Philemon is said to have been exceptional in using χυρᾶ (fr. 190 KA, inc. fab.). Onesimos realizes here that Pamphile’s position is precarious because if Charisios identifies the child’s mother as a desirable and eligible spouse, he may marry her and divorce Pamphile. χόρη in 568, the as-yet unidentified ‘girl’, contrasts with κεκτημένη, ‘mistress of the household’ and hence married.

568 ταχέως εάν γάρ κτλ. The position and sense of ταχέως in particular have given difficulty. The position of γάρ seems to indicate that the sentence really begins ἐὰν γάρ...; then one should take ταχέως with εὑρεθήμ. ‘if she is found soon/quickly...’, and this interpretation is favoured by G.-S.: ‘Perhaps this could be explained as meaning that if such a discovery were postponed, Charisios might in the meantime have become reconciled to Pamphile, who would thus be in less danger of repudiation’ (341). They seem, however, not entirely convinced by this suggestion, as they offer the further thought that ταχέως may be a corruption of τελέως (Capps),
to be taken with the previous sentence (see *PCPS* 1969, 46). However, interpretation of ταχέως ἐὰν γὰρ εὑρεθη ἑτερ ναι is facilitated by a nuance of ταχέως, ‘readily’, ‘promptly’, quite common in the orators, and in combination with ἐὰν: e.g. Lycurg. in *Leocrateum* 71.2 ἦ ποὺ ταχέως ἐὰν ἀγνοησθεί τις ἐκεῖνον τῶν ἄνδρων τοιούτων ἐργον, ‘nobody, surely, would have readily tolerated…’; (?)Andok. in *Alcib.* 27.1 ἦ ποὺ ταχέως ἐὰν ἐπέτρεψεν…. In other words, we do not have to take ταχέως here strictly of time, but rather with reference to the ease with which a suitable girl could be found. The sense of the whole sentence is: ‘if a girl is readily found who is both the daughter of a free man and the mother of the baby…’. ► χόρ[η], without article (‘a girl’), is subject of εὑρεθη, which should be construed twice (once with genitive of origin, πατρός ἐλευθέρου, then with complement μήτηρ) with the participle γεγονοῦντι. Conceivably, one might also take ταχέως with the verb of the main clause λήψεται, ‘he’ll promptly take…’ (thus Ferrari (1998, 50)) but the possibility seems remote. I can read no letters of ► γεγογγυ’ with any confidence and wonder whether an alternative such as εἰκυ’ (‘a girl…who appears to be the mother’, ‘…suits the role of mother’) might not be better (too short?).

570-71 ἐκεῖνην λήψεται… / ἀπολείπειν. The sense must be something like ‘he’ll take that girl [to wife] and abandon this one (i.e. Pamphile), but the missing words are elusive. Earlier readings of the tantalizingly illegible C at this point were doubted by Guéraud, who could make nothing of the first half of 571. Arnott (1978, 11-12) stresses that ἀπολείπω is normally used of a wife leaving her husband, not vice versa; cf. Cunningham (2003, 1689) (= fr. 523 KA), who says that men ‘expel’ (ἀποτέμπω) unwanted wives, whilst women ‘leave’ (ἀπολείπω) unloved husbands according to Attic usage; cf. line 930 of this play. Accordingly Arnott supplements: …ἐκεῖνην λήψεταί, ταύτην [ἢ ἀφείς] / ἐπεύξεται τὸν ἐνδον ἀπολείπειν ὡς ἐπιχλον, translating the second line ‘he’ll hope to leave behind him all the trouble that he has in there (with a gesture to Chairestratos’ house and a reference to the parties and commotions there.’ Handley’s supplement (based on an earlier restoration by Post) retains ἀπολείπειν with object ‘the woman inside’ (= his wife, Pamphile). My e.g. reconstruction envisages Charisios ‘letting Pamphile go’, when he discovers the mother of his child. εὐθύς at least satisfies the opinion of earlier editors that upsilon was most likely in fourth position.

572 χαριέντως ἐκνευκέναι δο[κώ. Literally ‘it seems I’ve elegantly swum clear’ or, to use the same metaphor in English: ‘…I’ve got out of that swimmingly’. To ‘swim clear’ (sc. of danger) presumably derives from the experience of swimming clear of a wrecked or sinking ship to safety on land, as e.g. Odysseus succeeds in doing from his broken raft; for the metaphorical sense of escaping from a ‘sea of troubles’, see Eur. *Hipp.* 470 and 823 with Barrett’s note. G-S. prefer to derive the form from ἐκνεύω, ‘dodge’, ‘side-step’, a metaphor from hand-to-hand fighting.

573 κυκάσθαι, cf. 428.

574 μ’ Ἔτι, or μέ τι? I think the former is marginally preferable because Onesimos
vows to stop meddling *henceforth*; but Wilamowitz has a point that \( \lambda \alpha \lambda \varepsilon \sigma \alpha \varepsilon \alpha \nu \) really needs an object (\( \tau i \)). There is a hole in the papyrus where one would expect apostrophe after \( \mu \).

575 περιεργασάμενον, ‘meddling’, ‘interfering’, see above p. 124. \( \lambda \alpha \lambda \varepsilon \sigma \alpha \varepsilon \alpha \nu \). \( \lambda \alpha \lambda \varepsilon \) can have a pejorative sense, ‘talk rubbish’, ‘gossip’, ‘prattle’, beyond neutral ‘chat’; cf. Perik. 347 Arnott; Sam. 255 cf. 261; G.-S. 567 on Sam. 241.

575-76 \( \varepsilon \kappa \tau \varepsilon \mu \varepsilon \varepsilon \nu \) /... (\( \tau \alpha \varsigma \gamma \nu \alpha \theta \alpha \nu \varsigma \)): There are three things wrong with C’s clear reading τουκοδ[ ]ντακάλλ’ουτος. First, the line is one syllable too long if one makes the obvious restoration τούς όδόντας. Second, the verb \( \varepsilon \kappa \tau \varepsilon \mu \varepsilon \nu \) does not suit ‘teeth’. One does not usually ‘cut out’ teeth; one knocks them out. Third, the punishment which Onesimos proposes should suit the crime: being a busy-body and a tell-tale. In other words, the mutilation proposed (jokingly) should stop him talking in the future. The loss of teeth is certainly a hindrance to speech, but not the most obvious muffler. I suggest that Menander wrote \( \tau \alpha \varsigma \gamma \nu \alpha \theta \alpha \nu \varsigma \) ‘jaws’, ‘cheeks’, or ‘face’, whose excision would certainly prevent speech, and that τούς όδόντας originated as a gloss. With \( \tau \alpha \varsigma \gamma \nu \alpha \theta \alpha \nu \varsigma \) the line as a whole is metrically correct with \( \alpha \lambda \lambda \)’. The actor might have drawn out the pronunciation of the first two letters of \( \gamma \nu \alpha \theta \alpha \nu \varsigma \) to lead the audience to expect \( \tau \alpha \varsigma \gamma \nu \alpha \theta \alpha \nu \varsigma \varsigma \) ‘genitals’ (see Arnott’s suggestion below). \( \varepsilon \kappa \tau \varepsilon \mu \varepsilon \varepsilon \nu \) is, after all, the usual verb for castration, with or without an object denoting the genitals; e.g. Plato *Euthyphr.* 6a3. For possible connotations of \( \gamma \nu \alpha \theta \alpha \nu \) it is a pity we do not know the context of Menander fr. 611 KA (from an unidentified play) which reads \( \omega \tau \gamma \nu \alpha \theta \alpha \nu \varepsilon \chi \vou \vsi \). In comedy one usually hears of cheeks and jaws being ‘hit’ or ‘beaten’ but other violations occur: in Aristophanes *Frogs* 424 we hear of someone ‘lacerating his cheeks’ \( \sigma \pi \rho \acute{\alpha} \acute{\tau} \tau \acute{\epsilon} \tau \acute{\epsilon} \mu \varepsilon \iota \nu \tau \alpha \varsigma \gamma \nu \alpha \theta \alpha \nu \varsigma \); in id. fr. 903.1 the cheeks or face are ‘thrashed’ (\( \alpha \lambda \alpha \alpha \alpha \)ν). For the sense ‘face’ cf. id. *Wasps* 1088, *Lys.* 360. I assume Onesimos was using \( \gamma \nu \alpha \theta \alpha \nu \varsigma \) here in a colloquial sense = ‘chops’, ‘gob’.

Of course, other remedies have been proposed. One can retain \( \delta \delta \acute{\omicron} \nu \tau \varsigma \) and shorten the line by omitting \( \alpha \lambda \lambda \)’ or changing \( \omicron \upsilon \mu \sigma \omicron \iota \omicron \) to \( \delta \iota \) (Austin per litt.). Or one can emend \( \delta \delta \acute{\omicron} \nu \tau \varsigma \) in a variety of ways. Austin’s proposal, that original \( \tau \iota \varphi \eta \mu \)’; was displaced in transmission by a feeble stop-gap \( \delta \delta \acute{\omicron} \nu \tau \varsigma \) which sought to restore decency after vulgar \( \varepsilon \kappa \tau \varepsilon \mu \varepsilon \varepsilon \nu \), is a possibility. Arnott’s (1965) suggestion also deserves mention. He reads \( \gamma \upsilon \omega \upsilon \rho \sigma \delta \rho \sigma \tau \varsigma \varsigma \) \( \tau \alpha \varsigma \gamma \nu \alpha \theta \alpha \nu \varsigma \) C and suggests that the original reading was \( \tau \alpha \varsigma \gamma \nu \alpha \varsigma \) ‘genitals’: ‘is it not also possible that \( \gamma \upsilon \omicron \varsigma \) was corrupted from a blurred \( \gamma \nu \omicron \varsigma \), at a time when the interpolated τούς όδόντας had not yet driven τάς γονάς completely out of the text?’

576-82 Onesimos sees Smikrines approaching from the right; he judges – from his agitated gait and manner, no doubt – that he has discovered some uncomfortable truth and is ‘fighting mad’ again as a result. He decides to avoid meeting Smikrines. If the supplement \( \alpha \lambda [\eta \beta \varepsilon \iota \varsigma \varsigma \) in 579 is correct, and in combination with Onesimos’ desire to avoid meeting Smikrines now, these lines appear to point clearly toward
an earlier meeting between Onesimos and Smikrines in which the slave told a lie to Smikrines to throw him off the scent; now he fears that Smikrines has ‘discovered the truth from someone’ and has come storming back. Webster (1960, 37) first drew the conclusion that act two must have included an early encounter between the two of this nature; see above p. 136, cf. Nünlist (2004, 99).

579 For the plural of αληθεια without apparent semantic distinction from the singular, cf. Sam. 525, Theoph. 25 K.-Th., and fr. 775.2 K.-Th. (= 655 KA): the fact that it appears occasionally in prose (see LSJ s.v.) and in the dative ‘truly’ in both long and short forms, ταῖς αληθείαις (αισι), Asp. 372, Theoph. 25, suggests that the idiom may be an old one.

581 λαλεῖν looks a plausible supplement. Onesimos wants to avoid a ‘talk’ with Smikrines in his present mood.

582 [δει]. Early editors seem to have been able to read these letters; I bracket them because they are no longer visible: a piece of papyrus seems to have broken off after με.

5.4.3 Scene 3: Smikrines on the rampage

583-697 Enter Smikrines, who remains on stage almost until the end of the act. He is another of the ‘comet figures’ circling round, and dramatizing, the centre of gravity in the play, the relationship between Charisios and Pamphile. We have seen Onesimos and Habrotonon approaching the couple from another angle in the first half of the act. Lines 583-602 seem to be a monologue by Smikrines in which he recapitulates his view of the proceedings and tells what he has discovered: lines 588-602 contain words which probably apply to Charisios’ life-style as perceived by Smikrines: his ‘drinking’ (588), the ‘harp girl’ (589 and 600), his rift with his wife (592 if a form of διαλλαττομαι can be assumed), his betting (601, but this might be a reference to the famous ring). Smikrines is fuming at his son-in-law’s good-for-nothing lifestyle; as is abundantly clear throughout, Smikrines is as upset by Charisios’ running through the dowry as he is by the young man’s neglect of his daughter. In 603 it appears that the cook Karion enters and the following lines to 631 show Smikrines and the cook conversing outside Chairestratos’ house. The cook’s entry is motivated by his frustration that all the guests have disappeared now his meal is finally ready (611-12); he has come to call them in. In 631 a new dialogue begins between Smikrines and Chairestratos; his identity is indicated by Smikrines’ calling him ‘Charisios’ friend’ (645), by the relatively secure reading Χαιρέστρατος[ in 662 and by the indication of speaker in 692 (always remembering that these speaker names in C are not original).

The main topic discussed by Smikrines and Chairestratos is the illegitimate child which Smikrines now believes Charisios has had by a ‘prostitute’ (πόρνη 646). Smikrines must have heard this from Karion as it was only those present in Chaire-
stratos’ house that day who were in a position to have witnessed (or heard about) Habrotonon’s confrontation of Charisios with baby and ring. Smikrines could not have discovered this ‘truth’ in town, as no one could have known about it by then (pace G.-S.). As we have seen (p. 121), Themistios (Or. 21.261c) says that Karion in this play discovered the ‘intimate secrets’ of the house and retold them with exaggeration; the reference is likely to have been to this scene in which Karion ‘spilled the beans’ about Charisios’ (alleged) child by Habrotonon to Smikrines; cf. Primmer (1986, 138-39). The sequence would then be: Smikrines discovered in town that Onesimos had sent him there on a wild goose chase. The ‘truth’ referred to is probably Charisios’ whereabouts. Now he comes storming back to the neighborhood and promptly hears from Chairestratos’ cook Karion the still more shattering news: Charisios already has a bastard child by the *psaltria.*

584-85 Robert’s insertion of fr. 882 Kock here has generally found favour with editors (Wil., G.-S. in comm., Martina), but clearly rests on slender evidence. For the hyperbole cf. Dem. 21.80 ὅλη γὰρ ἡ πόλις τὴν ἀντιδοσιν... ἡσθέτο.

589 ψαλτρίας. Here, and again in 600, Smikrines presumably makes reference to Charisios’ relationship with Habrotonon; in 621 he probably combines Charisios’ name (Χα...) with the derogatory (because anonymous) reference to Habrotonon (ψαλτρίας); perhaps this is one of the ‘truths’ (579) he has discovered about Charisios while in town.

590 ἐφη, perhaps a reference to the source of Smikrines’ new knowledge; someone ‘told’ him these facts.

591 πλέον ἡ[πρόν], ‘more than [x] days’, probably a reference to the alleged length of Charisios’ liaison with Habrotonon in Chairestratos’ house.

594 κοινωνο[ (short last syllable). The word is quite a theme of this play: 820 (Pamphile), picked up by Charisios in 920. The point is, marriage entails a commitment to sharing (κοινωνέω) luck and misfortunes.

601 Robert’s placing of fr. 659 K.-Th. (= 423 KA) πότοι συνεχεῖς, κύβοι here rests only on a one-word overlap, but the sense suits Smikrines’ (presumed) tirade well enough.

602 πολλὰ χαιρετῶ. Jensen wondered whether a trimeter quoted in Diogenianus 7.9 (= adesp. 554 Kock) might not come from here: οὐκ ἔστι’ ἐμὸν τὸ πράγμα: πολλὰ χαιρετῶ, an attribution accepted in PCG VIII p. 509. Smikrines might be concluding that Charisios’ child with Habrotonon no longer concerned him as his daughter must certainly divorce Charisios now.

603-29. For a conjectural reconstruction of the sense of these lines see Primmer (1986, 139-41).

609-10 Smikrines comments, probably, on the ‘elaborate’ (ποικίλον) character of the midday meal which Karion is late in preparing (382), and before which the guests have now scattered in all directions (611-12).
610 τρισάθλιος, 'thrice miserable', a common hyperbole, e.g. *Mis.* 816 Arnott.

611 οὐχ οἶδ' ὅπως, lit. 'I don’t know how' = 'somehow' cf. *Dysk.* 485; *Perik.* 306 ὁ ὅπως τὴν ὁ τε.

612 δ[α]σχεδάν[ν]υντ', 'disperse'. In *Od.* 1.274 the disguised Athena advises Telemachus to order the perpetually feasting suitors to 'disperse to their homes' (ἐπὶ σφέτερα σκίδνασθαι).

614 [β]αλείτ' [εί]ς μακαρίαν (Wilamowitz): ἐς μακαρίαν 'is a substitute for ἐς κόρακας or ἐς ὀλεθρον in imprecations' according to G.-S., cf. Aristoph. *Knights* 1151, Antiphanes fr. 239 KA (ἐς μακαρίαν τὸ λουτρόν), Plato *Hipp. Maj.* 293a. μακαρία is equivalent to 'hell' (place where the dead go) according to a scholion on the *Knights* passage. The supplement is anything but secure, however. There is a letter trace before αλει which does not look compatible with beta, and C clearly has καριαυ̠ at line end. The letters before that do not look like μα-. Perhaps a joke about the cook’s name Karion? Before that, Jensen’s ἐ[ξ]ολείτ' looks more plausible.

621 Χαρισίωι παίς γέγονεν ἐκ τῆς ψαλτρίας; (Sandbach) is plausible; cf. Primmer (1986, 140).

630 ] ημιας. Wilamowitz corrected to Σιμίας (the usual Attic spelling of the name) and posited an assistant of this name to Karion. The character is not referred to elsewhere in the play, unless ]μιας on the hair side of O27, line 6, should be supplemented Σιμίας (cf. Arnott (1979a, 385); Sisti (1991, 15)). He was certainly a kophon prosdpon. Is any other reading possible? One might consider Μαμίας, cf. Aristoph. *Lys.* 897, but the letter before first μ does not look like alpha. Handley (per litt.) suggests ]σι μιας at line end, with an assimilation of -σι to σιμ; e.g. οὐδὲ δέσποιν' οἰκίας, ὃ Ὅρακλεις, μι' ἐστίν, ὃς φασιν, μιας; cf. fr. 698.2 (unknown play) at line end: ἡ φύσις μία. However, an assistant to the cook Karion is not an unlikely proposition in itself and at least provides an addressee for Karion’s parting remark; Primmer (1986, 140) reconstructs this as Ὡ Ὅρακλεις, ἡκουσί· ποῦ 'στιν] Σιμίας; In *Asp.* 222 the cook has an assistant, Spinther, whom he addresses as his παιδάριον; cf. Krieter-Spiro (1997, 23-25).

633 πρώην αρ[. Kuiper (1929, 164-65) made a valiant attempt to restore this line from a Venetian scholion on Aristoph. *Birds* 1258, as: πρώην ἄρ[αξ ἐπάταξ' ὡ δ' ἡρχος] τάς ὀφρύς, but this rests on all too flimsy legs. The scholion appears to quote from Menander πρώην ἄρης ἐπάταξα, corrected by White to πρώην ἄρας ἐπάταξα. By ingenious, but tortuous, reasoning Kuiper changes this to πρώην ἄρ[αξ ἐπάταξ'ε, the reading being dependent on a conjecture by Blaydes for εύραξ πατάξ in Aristophanes.

633-34 Arnott (1978, 12) observes that, if anyone, Habrotonon should have 'her eyebrows raised' at this point since 'if she were the mother of Charisios’ baby, as Chairestratos thinks at this point, she would now have every reason to be arrogant.' He supplements e.g. πρώην ἄρ’ [–κ–ν, νῦν δὲ] τάς ὀφρύς / ἐπάνωθ[ε]ν ἔξει τοῦ
μετώπου. For raised eyebrows as a sign of haughtiness cf. Men. fr. 37 KA (Andria); Alexis fr. 16.1-2 KA. But ‘to raise one’s eyebrows’ can also be a sign of despair or misery, as fr. 634.2-3 (= 857 KA) shows: εάν / ἀναστάσας τις τὰς ὀφρὺς οἷμοι λαλήης, and I think Chairestratos is more likely to be talking about his own distress here. E.g. ἀναστάσας might have followed ἔπανοθ[εν]. Since raised or lowered eyebrows are, according to Pollux, defining characteristics of masks, one wonders whether the remark that Habrotonon (or anyone else) had raised eyebrows has any significance for the mask worn by that person: probably not. For discussion of the (multiple) significance of raised brows of masks see Poe (1996, 320-21).

639 τέτοκε, probably a reference to Charisios’ bastard child of which Smikrines has now gained cognizance, unless the suggestion of Paoli (1952, 284) is correct, that we restore [παιδίον γάρ οὐδέπω] / τέτοκεν, applied to Pamphile; since she has not yet born a child to Charisios, Smikrines would be saying, she can leave him without further ado.

645 ὑμῶν ἔταιρος, Charisios, presumably. The commonly printed supplement of the second half of this line, οὐδ’ ἦσχυνετο (e.g. Sandbach) cannot, in my opinion, be right. The letter before σχ cannot be η, α, υ, ruling out a form of αἰσχύνομαι, and the χ is more than dubious.

646 Here, surely, we have a definite reference to the child Smikrines believes Charisios has had by a prostitute.

653-54 Surely a change of speaker between these lines, as the repetition of the word δυστυχής marks the second speaker picking up – and rebutting – the other’s point.

655 C has either a kolon or dikolon before ἀλλ’. If I am right to give 654 to Chairestratos (see previous note), then the whole of 655 must be given to Smikrines; the punctuation in C would then denote a change of direction in his speech: first addressing Chairestratos, then returning to his own – more or less private – ruminations.

655 ἀλλ’ ἵσως ἐγὼ / κτλ. ἀλλ’ ἵσως is a common opener in rhetoric by which a speaker anticipates an opponent’s argument (‘no doubt [he’ll claim]’, prokatalepsis), here used ironically (‘no doubt – I don’t think –’), as in Dem. in Aristogit. 2.19.1. Smikrines means he is well within his rights to remove his daughter from Charisios’ household.

655-61 The sequence of thought reveals much of Smikrines’ character. First he says he is ‘within his rights’ (κατὰ λόγον ἐξόν) to act as he intends; then he announces his intention of acting in a certain way (τούτῳ μὲν πόρομαι), then repeats the declaration with nearly whole-hearted conviction (σχεδόν / δεδομένον μοι τυγχάνει). Finally he calls Chairestratos to witness his declaration, as one of those present when the marriage was joined. There is more bluster in Smikrines’ speech than real conviction. Moreover, his remarks reveal his desire to act according to Attic convention. Above all he is concerned for his family’s standing (cf. lines 691-92 with notes). And here he finds himself in a quandary. On the one hand the state of
his daughter's marriage is bringing his family into disrepute; on the other, divorce is an ugly business. Smikrines is shown here trying to convince himself to take the fateful step.

657-58 Harrison (1998, 31) believes Smikrines' words are conclusive evidence that a father was entitled to dissolve his daughter's marriage (paternal *aphairesis*). The fact that Pamphile later (713-14) says that he must persuade her to leave Charisios or else appear a tyrant, shows, he says, that 'she is simply underlining the difference between a moral and legal right, as against her father, who is suggesting that his undoubted legal right is also moral'. Maffi (2005, 255) questions the father's legal right to remove his daughter from a marriage.

659-60 Delayed δ': 'And I call you to witness, Chairestratos, and swear...'  
661 μεθ' ών[...έπεμψα, a reference to Pamphile's wedding, at which Smikrines 'despatched' (έπεμψα or a compound of it) her, accompanied (μεθ' ών) by Chairestratos, perhaps, as best man (πάροχος or παράνυμφος), to her new home with Charisios. Now Smikrines calls Chairestratos to witness his present intention to annul the wedding.

662 Chairestratos appears to protest that if Smikrines removes his daughter from Charisios' house, the action will be unworthy of Charisios and his associates, including Chairestratos (ημών).

663 must have been divided between Chairestratos and then Smikrines as the latter's first words in 664 are incomplete as they stand.

664-68 Smikrines launches into another tirade against Charisios' alleged debauchery. He objects both to the public scandal Charisios has caused by his behaviour (*περιβόητον κτλ.*), and to his perceived weakness of character in succumbing to lust for a low woman; both aspects are linked in Smikrines' mind: Charisios' immoral actions *and* the ill-repute they bring on his house, and hence Smikrines' own. Smikrines has a tendency to exaggerate in decrying Charisios: his behaviour now is said to 'outrage everyone' (*περιβόητον πάσιν ἀνθρώποις*), when in fact it must have constituted a minor scandal in the neighborhood at most; his immorality reaches a 'proverbial' level (*τούτο τὸ λεγόμενον*); the girl he has taken up with is not only a 'little slut' (*πορνιδίωι cf. fr. 410 KA*), but also 'thrice-wretched' (*τρισαθλίωι*) - hardly an apt description of the attractive and gifted Habrotonon. One might say that in his sustained hyperbole Smikrines 'splutters' with indignation. Lines 667-70 are transmitted as fr. com. adesp. 78 KA (with ὁ Κράτες instead of ἀκρατής). Poseidonio, fr. 441f Theiler, alludes to them in his discussion of ἐγκρατής and ἀκρατής: ὁ δὲ τῶι ἀκολάστωι καὶ ἀλόγωι τῆς ψυχῆς ἐπόμενον περιφέρων καὶ ὑπηρετοῦν τὸ κρέαττον ἦττων ἐκατοῦ καὶ ἀκρατής λέγεται, 'he who lets his better nature follow, and submit to, the undisciplined and irrational [movements] of the soul is said to be "beneath himself and without self-control"'.

665 *περιβόητον*, that which causes an 'outrage' (*περιβοάω*) by outrageous behaviour,
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cf. fr. 296.2-3 KA, where the act of ejecting a once-desired woman from one’s house when she causes offence is called μέγα / καὶ περιβόητον ἔργον. Similarly the behaviour of Calidorus in Plaut. *Pseud.* 418, is said by his father to have the effect: *ita nunc per urbem solus sermoni omnibust.* Menander’s characters are concerned about their reputation ‘about town’; in *Sam.* 510-13 Nikeratos says he would be the talk of the town for his resolute action if he had been in Demeas’ position.

666-67 ἀκρατὴς καὶ... ἤπτων ἐνυτοῦ (see also note on 664-68). Probably we should take ἀκρατὴς as well as ἤπτων with ἐνυτοῦ. ἐνυτοῦ χρατεῖν, ‘to be in command of one’s faculties’, was an expression in itself (e.g. Antiphon 5.26). The verb ἀκρατεύομαι is attested for Menander (fr. 591 KA).


680-88 A second tirade on the same subject: immorality and its ill effects on society. Smikrines starts with a rhetorical question (‘He hates this lifestyle...?’), like the ironical ἀλλ’ ἱσως with which he opened his first tirade. Then follows another typical exaggeration, this time of the number and frequency of Charisios’ affairs; he gives the impression that Charisios has a different woman every night. Then Smikrines widens the implications of such debauchery: it is the undoing of families (οἰκίας) and entire cities (πόλεις θαλας); perhaps Smikrines is thinking here of the early chapters of Herodotus’ *Histories* where ‘la femme’ is seen as the root cause of several legendary wars. The following two lines no doubt continued in this vein, but they have not yet been plausibly reconstructed. Smikrines concludes with the matter which concerns himself personally: since Charisios has broken the terms of the marriage contract, he should at least return the dowry.

681 τής δὲινος M. In view of line 755 (‘he’s out drinking with...’) M’s reading is probably preferable to C’s τοῦ δεινός, ‘with some man’.

683 [άναστάτ]ους is suggested by 165-66 οἰκίαν ποεῖ / [άναστα]τον. If both supplements are correct there would be some irony: in the first passage Chairestratos says that Smikrines will ‘be the undoing’ of a family; in the latter passage Smikrines accuses Charisios of doing that on a large scale by his whoring.

684 See the passages adduced by Austin (2001, 12-13), also Soph. *Ant.* 673-74 πῶτη
(sc. anarchy) πόλεις ὀλλυσιν, ἥδ' ἀναστάτους / οἴκους τίθησιν (Nünlist per litt.).

685 ἑρός, perhaps a reference to the enmities between individuals and families which adultery or infidelity causes.

686 εὐφρόνη. The supplement envisages a sense such as ‘he breaks the marriage vows every night’. Arnott (2004, 274) thinks εὐφρόνη is an unlikely word for Smikrines to use in this context, as it is ‘normally a word of high poetry’, but see Aristoph. Eccl. 952-53 ξύνευνος / τὴν εὐφρόνην ὅπως ἐσει.

687 γε δὲ (Austin), ‘as he must’, is perhaps preferable to other supplements.

688 ἀποδίδω τὴν προίκα. We should recall that a husband who wished to dissolve his marriage (he ‘ejected’, ἀπο- or ἔκπεμπειν, the wife from his home) was obliged to return the dowry to the woman’s father (Cantarella, 2005, 247). Chari- sios’ case was a little different, however. He had moved out of the house, becoming ἀποκοκτόνος, ‘sleeping out’, perhaps in the hope that Pamphile would divorce him, with her father’s support, as Capps (1910, introduction) suggests.

688 Arnott (2004, 272) suggests that this interjection by Chairestratos (and the other in line 692) is of the nature of an ‘aside’; neither here nor in 692 does Smikrines respond directly to it. Smikrines might be so incensed by his son-in-law’s behaviour that he does not respond to Chairestratos’ (fully audible) remark (like Getas in the fourth act of Mis.). Against this it must be pointed out Smikrines addresses Chairestratos directly in line 662 and, if the supplement of 664 (τὴν σήν λαμάν) is correct, Chairestratos says ‘your’ to Smikrines there. For Arnott’s suggestion to be acceptable, one would have to imagine a Smikrines who works himself into such a temper that he can no longer respond to Chairestratos’ rejoinders. ► μήπω, ‘not yet’ may pick up Smikrines’ words (‘he should return the dowry’) or it may be an instance of the idiom we find at Dem. 21.90 (MacDowell, 1990, ad loc.) where a form such as λέγωμεν should be understood: ‘let us not talk of this yet’ = ‘more of that later’ (MacDowell for ἀλλὰ μήπω τοῦτο).

689 οὐδ' ἀν, μὰ τὴν Δήμητρα recurs at Dysk. 570 where Getas avows that the women will not give him so much as a grain of salt from the coming feast. Here the oath μὰ τὴν Δήμητρα seems particularly appropriate in a context involving marriage and fidelity. Demeter (with Kore) was closely associated with the family life of Athenian women citizens. In the Dysk. passage it is used to underline a characteristic in women perceived by Getas.

689-90 δέκατον ἡμέρας / μέρος, equivalent to our ‘hour’. More loosely cf. fr. 362 KA (Hymnis) λαλήσας ἡμέρας σμικρόν μέρος. A ‘tenth part’ generally equals ‘one tenth’ (e.g. of the Athenian populace = a phyle cf. Dem. 21.126).

690 καταμέινε (Gronewald) is perhaps marginally preferable to Arnott’s καταμε[/vo] / (γ'), unless the gap is thought too small for the three letters required (νε). Arnott’s supplement requires the insertion of (γ) to avoid hiatus, as the letter traces before eta do not seem to permit gamma. One might consider construing the
sentence as an unreal condition (‘my daughter wouldn’t have stayed an hour...’),
but that would require an augmented form of καταμένω, entailing an emendation
κατέμεν[
. Martina actually prints καταμο[νή]ν (without comment), leaving the sen-
tence without a verb, unless we are prepared to ignore the evidence of the Florence
parchment for the end of the line ἐνταῦθ' έτι and supplement a form of e.g. εἶναι
there.

691 εἶ μή. If we accept κεκήδευκ' in the following line, this clause cannot continue
the construction begun with οὐδ' ἄν, as the optative (or, conceivably, indicative
imperfect/aorist) would be required in the (postponed) protasis of the conditional
period (‘my daughter wouldn’t stay...if he hadn’t joined in marriage’); rather, it
must be appended by Smikrines as a sarcastic afterthought: ‘unless (I don’t think)
he’s married into our family as immigrants added to the registry’; cf. Mis. 170 εἶ
μή τι κακόν ήμας ποεΐς, ‘...unless you mean some harm to us’: Perik. 358 εἶ
μή γε παντάπασαι αὐτόν ἥλεονυ. LSI s.v. εἶ VII 2a quote a similarly ironical
example: Xen. Mem. 1.2.8 εἶ μή ἃρα ἢ τῆς ἀρετῆς ἐπιμέλεια διαφθορὰ ἐστίν.
Smikrines means: his daughter wouldn’t stay a minute longer in Charisios’ house
under the present intolerable circumstances, unless, that is, their family had no rights
in Athens as metics and she must be grateful to Charisios for so much as tolerating
her presence in this embarrassing situation. Smikrines’ tone is that of indignant
mit uns verschwägert, mit Leuten nämlich, die kein Bürgerrecht haben und zunichte
sind, d.h. in der Situation jeglichen Selbstrespekt verloren haben’. For the sensitive-
ness of the issue of ‘true Athenian status’ in Menander’s plots generally see Davies
(1977-78, 113-14).

Arnott (2000, 157) corrects ► ημη in C to ἦ μήν, the oath formula, but
Smikrines is here hardly avowing something solemnly. Note, however, Sam. 312
where Parmenon begins ἦ μήποτ' after a string of oaths by various gods (Dionysos,
Apollo, Zeus and Asklepios). He was beginning to say something like ‘I swear
I didn’t...’ before Demeas cuts him off short. If we read, with C, here ἦ μή and
punctuate after ἐτι in 690 with full stop or colon, we could take 691-92 as an avowal:
‘It’s no family of metics he’s married into, you know!’

► μετουκήσας[ας] παραγεγραμμένοις. Although the papyrus is damaged, the
extant letters hardly permit a different supplement. μετουκήσας, aor. participle of
μετουκέω with ἦμιν in the following line, might be taken as equivalent to the noun
μέτοικος, a metic, or ‘immigrant’. It might, conceivably, have a weaker sense,
like μετουκοδομέω in Dysk. 446, ‘move house’, but since metoikos is t. t. in Attic,
and παραγεγραμμένοις implies something less than ἐγγεγραμμένοις, ‘entered
in the registry’, Smikrines’ use of μετουκήσας must imply a sneer: ‘immigrants’.
παραγράφω means literally ‘write beside’; παραγεγραμμένοι νόμοι in Dem. 18.111
are the laws ‘written beside’ a disputed decree (cf. 23.7, 63 and 215; 32.1; 37.34;
Aischin. 3.200). Every Athenian citizen had to be registered in a deme with the
approval of the members of that deme (Ath. Pol. 42; Karch. 34: τοὺς δημότας
νόμιζε ποιείν ἐγγράφην, cf. Sam. 10: ἐν[ἐγγράφην]. παραγράφωμαι as opposed to ἐγγράφωμαι, then, might represent a type of secondary registration in a deme for metics (‘append to the register’ as opposed to ‘register’). One notes, however, the expression παρεγγράφου, ‘[people] illegitimately enrolled’, used to disfranchise 4760 persons in 445/4 BC (Davies, 1977-78, 111 and n. 45); if our text here read παρεγγραμμένοις we could confidently translate ‘unlawfully registered’ (with the metrical disadvantage of creating a ‘split anapaest’ between μετοικήσασι and παρεγγεγραμμένοις). As it is, one might take the whole expression as ‘foreigners added to the registry’, with the connotation that their citizen status was secondary (παρα-) compared to native born Athenians. Arnott (2000, 157) advocates a still more negative interpretation: ‘written-off (sc. powerless) metics’. In later work (2004, 289 n. 13) he goes further, taking παραγράφω as equivalent to παρεγγράφο, ‘inscribe illegally’, cf. Dem. 39.31, ἐγὼ σ’ ἀξίω, ἢ πατρός ἄλλου σεαυτόν παραγράφειν, ἢ τούνομον ἔχειν ὁ ἱερός ἑδοχε σο, where παραγγάρω seems to imply ‘fraudulent’ registration (as opposed to ἐγγράφω, legitimate registration). Hesych. glosses παραγράφεται (s.v.) as εκβάλλεται, Photios, Lex. s.v. as ἔξουθενεῖ (= ἔξουθενῶ, ‘count as nothing’ LSJ) both without sources.

At any rate it seems clear that Smikrines is referring in a snobbish manner to people in Athens who are not ‘true blue’, but have arrived in Athens from abroad (μετοικήσασι) and somehow had themselves enrolled on the citizen list. He is surely referring to the process of ‘naturalization’ of foreigners awarded Athenian citizenship for their good services. The subject has been studied in minute detail by Osborne (1981-1983). Although such honorary decrees by the Athenian dēmos were nothing new, Habicht (1995, 77-78) notes a proliferation following the ‘freeing’ of Athens from Macedonian dominion by Demetrios Poliorcetes in 307 BC. Many foreigners were granted honours, including citizenship, in Athens for their good services to Athens and Demetrios. If my speculation on the significance of the word φρούραρχος in line 1094 has any validity (that it reflects the establishment of Demetrios’ garrison on the Athenian Mouseion in 295 BC), one pricks up one’s ears at one particular case of honorary citizenship around this time. Following Demetrios’ return to Athens in 295 and his ‘reconciliation’ (Plut. Dem. 34.5 διηλλάσσετο) with the citizenry, who had seceded from his rule, it seems that the comic poet Diodoros of Sinope was awarded citizenship; his bronze statue, together with the honorary decree, was to be exhibited in the Theatre of Dionysos; see Habicht (1995, 96) with Osborne (1981-1983, D 69). This event might well have impinged on Menander’s consciousness as a native Athenian and rival comic poet. It is pure speculation, of course, but I wonder whether Smikrines’ remark here may not be another pointer to composition of Epitrepontes in the historical context of Demetrios’ reconciliation with Athens in 295 BC. ► χειρήσεις’, ‘is related by marriage’, cf. Dysk. 903.

692 οὐδ’ ἔχεινος οὔτει. Chairestratos replies that Charisios does not believe that either, i.e. that he has married into a family without full citizen rights. οὔτει in the
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sense ‘think so’ is common, e.g. Dem. 21.220 ἐγὼ μὲν οὐχ οἶμαι.

693-98 A final burst of indignant rhetoric from Smikrones before he disappears into Charisios’ house to reappear, in mid-conversation with his daughter, at the beginning of act four. The salvo involves two rhetorical questions, more hyperbole (a rich man like Charisios would never in fact stoop to frequenting a matruleion), sarcasm (‘that fair lady’, a description of the despised Habrotonon), indignation (‘he’ll act as if he didn’t know us’) and paradox (‘he’ll have one woman and bring along another’). But where exactly does Smikrones’ speech end? Some have detected a faint dikolon in C after 696, indicating that he exits there and Chairestratos speaks 697 as an echoing question; cf. Koenen (2002, 12-13): ‘dann ist es genau diese Selbstfrage nach dem Abgang des Smikrones, die es ihm klar macht, dass er keine Chance mehr hat, Habrotonon für sich zu gewinnen’. Some points tell against this, however. Most importantly the δ’ in 696, itself only indistinctly discernible, indicates parataxis: ‘and, pretending not even to know us,...’ The clause is not complete with δοκῶν. Second, the end of 698...αὐτὸν δηλαδή looks like a closing formula in which Smikrones announces his intention of confronting ‘him’ (Charisios presumably). On this reading Smikrones exits after 698 and Chairestratos comments ‘now the game’s up’ (νῦν ἀναττέτραπται). Against this position one might object that 697, if spoken by Smikrones, involves the repetition of ἐπέσαγω. But the repetition may suit his indignation.

693 ὑψηλός, literally ‘high’, then ‘high-and-mighty’, or ‘haughty’, as Hippolytos is said to be in Eur. Hipp. 730. Charisios applies the description to himself in 922. The nuance is the same as when we say something is ‘beneath’ someone, or that he is ‘above’ something. The point of Smikrones’ remark is that Charisios has (in his eyes) been acting ‘high and mighty’ towards his wife, whom he suspects of immorality, but his own life-style is nothing but carousing and debauchery. ► οὐχ οἰμῶξεται, ‘won’t he [live to] regret it?’ = ‘he’ll rue it’, ‘he’ll be sorry’, see note on line 160.

694 τ’ ἐ(ν). Koenen (2002, 8-9) argues that both C (τ’ἐ[ν]) and manuscripts ABC of Harpokration s.v. ματρυλεῖον (καταφθαρείσθε ἐν) support the retention of τε and Sandbach’s supplement ἐ(ν). He also takes Smikrones’ reference to a brothel (ματρυλεῖον) as referring (in indignant exaggeration) to Chairestratos’ house before him. M has the unmetrical spelling ματρυλλιοίω, which C may share ...]ιω; the error comes, perhaps, from the alternative spellings of the word ματρυλεῖον and ματρυλλεῖον (ps.-Zonaras, Lex. Tittmann s.v.; cf. Eustat. Comm. ad Homeri Iliad. vol. 1, p. 599.27 ματρυλλεῖον τὸ πορνεῖον). Ματρυλλεῖον is nowhere attested as a possible spelling; it may be an instance of itacism, however = ματρυλλεῖον. This line of Epitrep. is quoted in a number of writers with the spelling ματρυλεῖον (Dinarchus Or. 48 fr. 5.7; Harpokration p. 200). ► A ματρυλεῖον was a place to go and drink and have sex (Pollux, Onom. 7.201 πορνεία οἰκήματα ματρυλεῖα); why then ματρ-, as if the prostitutes were ‘mothers’? Photius, Lex. has an interesting
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explanation: s.v. ματρυλείον τόπος ἐν ὃι γράφεις μαστροποὶ διατρίβουσιν ἑταῖρας ἐξουσιά ἀλλὰ δέχονται τοὺς βουλομένους ἐκάλουν δὲ αὐτὰς μαστρύσας εὐφήμως, and according to the Etym. Mag. s.v. ματρυλείον, Doriens euphemistically called μαστροποὶ (the female equivalent of a πορνοβοσκός), ματέρες. So a ματρυλείον was in fact a μαστρυλείον, or ‘whore-monger’s den’. Similarly, the lupanar (e.g. Plaut. Bacch. 454), ‘brothel’, was a ‘house of lupae’. There is a vivid portrait of a mastropos’ modus operandi in Herodas, Mint. 1. For the debauched lifestyle which Smikrines imputes to Charisios, cf. Aristoph. Birds 284-86, where Kallias is said to be losing his feathers (= wealth) to sycophants and prostitutes.

695 ἐπεισάγει. Paoli (1952, 282-83) discusses the sense of εἰσάγω here (‘introduce into the home/family’), but that was before the discovery of the Michigan papyrus.

696 ἡμᾶς δ’ οὐδέ γινώσκει (-ων C) δοκών. This is ambiguous. Koenen (2002, 13) reads accusative-with-infinitive after δοκών ‘und glaubt er nicht, dass wir es nicht einmal merken?’ But I prefer ‘and, acting as if he doesn’t know us’ (ἡμᾶς object); cf. 932, where Charisios considers the line he should take with Smikrines: τῇ σ’ αὐ βλέπω ’γώ;, ‘why should I take any notice of you?’ For the expression cf. Plato, Euthyphr. 5c Μέλητος οὖτος οὐτος σὲ μὲν οὐδὲ δοξεί οὐράν.

698 A similar line to Perik. 369, it would seem: ἢ δ’ οἶχεθ’ ὡς τὸν γείτον’ εὐθὺς δηλαδή, but there spoken in comment on someone else’s movements. If Smikrines speaks 698 he is announcing his own intention to confront Charisios – an encounter anticipated by Charisios in 928ff. Others may be right, however, to give 697-98 (or only 698) to Chairestratos.

699 [νῦν ἀν]ατέτραπται τοῦμόν ὡς ἐμοὶ δοξεῖ. Cf. Sam. 548 (Dem.) πάντα πράγματ’ ἀνατέτραπται, τέλος ἐξεί, ‘everything’s turned on its head, the game’s up’; Demeas says this when Nikeratos finally realizes that the baby is his daughter’s, not Chrysis’, as he’d thought previously. Cf. Mis. 796 Arnott τὰ πρόσθε γενότερ’ ἀνατρέψειν ἀνατρέψω / τὸ ζην. Dem. 18.143 ἁπάντα ἀνατρέψει τὰ τῶν Ἑλλήνων. The pf. pass. of ἀνατρέπω indicates the total overturning of a person’s situation. The origin of the expression may be nautical, ‘capsize’, cf. Dem. 9.69 τὸ σκάφος ... ὡς ... μηδὲς ἀνατρέψει. But what has Smikrines said that convinces Chairestratos that his prospects are nil? Clearly, that Smikrines has firmly announced his intention of removing his daughter from Charisios’ household to prevent the situation he indignantly describes in lines 694-98 – Charisios living blithely with two women in contempt of Smikrines – from coming true. And if Smikrines removes Pamphile, Charisios, left without a wife, would be more likely to cling to Habrotonon. Hence Chairestratos concludes ruefully that Smikrines’ intended course of action is his own undoing.

701 This ‘errand’ which Chairestratos has been sent on (πρὸς ἦν] ἑτάχχηθαι [ν] ἐπὶ[τ]α ἑπεκλ[εια], ἑστὶ μοι.) is not otherwise referred to in the play. Koenen (2002, 11-12) suggests that Charisios had sent Chairestratos on an errand in connection with purchasing Habrotonon from her owner; on hearing from Habrotonon that he was
5.5 Act Four

5.5.1 Scene 1: Father and daughter

The act begins with a long and heated argument between Smikrines and Pamphile (702-[at least]835). He had come this time with the firm intention of taking her from Charisios' house, back to his own presumably, but he meets with spirited and reasoned opposition from Pamphile. The two have started their argument indoors, but the audible part is (has to be) conducted outside Charisios' front-door. We learn later in act four (883-84) that Charisios has overheard this conversation by standing just inside Chairestratos' front-door, with the door ajar. The open door and possibly some sounds of consternation from Charisios may have been noticeable to the audience, but whether they could actually see who was listening behind the door is open to doubt (see n. on 884). At 835 our sources desert us while Pamphile is still in mid-speech, defending her resolution to stay with Charisios through thick and thin. Then after a gap of 18 lines, the action recommences with an entry by Habrotonon, carrying the squawling baby. For a few lines Pamphile is on stage outside her door and Habrotonon outside Chairestratos' front-door without the two seeing each other. Pamphile asks herself first 'what god will pity me?', indicating her distress, then says 'I'll be on my way', meaning that she intends to go back indoors. At that point Habrotonon calls her back, however, and the main recognition scene takes place, when Habrotonon recognizes Pamphile as the girl who had been raped at the Tauropolia in the previous year. Smikrines cannot be present during this recognition scene; he is kept in ignorance of the truth until the fifth act. So in the gap between 835 and 853 he must have left the stage, having told Pamphile in no uncertain terms where her duty lay. Charisios had presumably also stopped eavesdropping on their conversation when the father-in-law removed himself. Pamphile was alone on stage, feeling destitute, when Habrotonon appeared with the baby. Menander took matters to the brink. Pamphile felt deserted by her husband and her father, who, presumably, had given her an ultimatum to leave her husband. Then the downward trend of the action is turned around by the fortuitous meeting of Charisios' two women.

Relations between fathers and daughters are rarely thematized, or even visible, in Greek literature (Porter, 2000, 160). However, there is an interesting parallel to this scene at the beginning of the fourth act of *Perik*. Here Pataikos, not yet iden-
tified as Glykera’s father, tries to persuade Glykera to stay with Polemon, who has
done her physical violence. She argues against him in the same spirited manner as
Pamphile here, though to opposite purpose: she is determined that the wrong done
her is fatal to the relationship; Pamphile is determined to remain true to her husband
through thick and thin.

The so-called Didot *rhesis* contains the answer of a daughter to a father who
wants to take her from a husband who has met with financial disaster; before the
discovery of P.Oxy. 3532 and 3533 some believed that we had here Pamphile’s
answer to her father (Robertson, 1922). That is impossible, although the speech
has a distinctly Menandrian tone (Turner, 1983, 38). I wonder in fact whether it
is not a poetic exercise written in imitation of Menander, possibly even this pas­sage of *Epitrepontes*. No doubt the subject of marriage was a common source of
debate and tension between Greek fathers and daughters, as it was up to the *pa­ter familias* to arrange his daughter’s marriage to an eligible youth. The scene in
*Od. 6.56ff.*, in which Nausikaa asks permission of her father to do the laundry by the
sea, illustrates this. The girl does not ‘dare to mention marriage to her father;
but he understood all’ (66-67). But the dominant literary background to the *agôn*
here is undoubtedly Euripides. As Porter (2000, 161) writes: ‘The ties to Euripides
do not, of course, lie solely in the appearance on stage of a strong-willed female
character, or her participation in a lengthy agon; rather, they are revealed...in the
self-consciously rhetorical terms of the debate, in particular rhetorical techniques,
and in the domestic nature of the issues with which the argument deals’. In partic­
ular, he refers to the lost play *Melanippe the Wise*, which appears to have featured
an *agôn* between daughter and father (see below p. 220). The lost *Alope*, too, ap­
ppears to have contained an *agon* between father Kerkyon and daughter Alope which
began with Kerkyon announcing that children’s first duty is obedience to their fa­
ther (*TGF 5.1.8 fr. 110 Kannicht*; see above p. 143). Thirdly, we might mention the
debate between Iphigeneia and her parents in Eur. *IA*, 1211ff., which turns on what
one might call a disastrously misconceived marriage; Iphigeneia has been called to
Aulis by her father on the pretext of marrying Achilles, but in fact it is to her death
as sacrificial victim of Artemis. Other scenes in Euripides, too, set a precedent for
the ‘doughty daughter’ theme; Makaria goes bravely to her death in *Held. 474ff.*
after arguing the case for her self-sacrifice in a rhetorically adroit way; similarly
Polyxene in *Hek. 342ff.*. Pamphile’s command of rhetoric and her resolute pur­
pose in this scene remind one of such Euripidean heroines. The form of the debate
between Pamphile and her father owes a debt to the Euripidean *agôn*, too (Porter,
2000, 161); a quick-fire opening exchange of ‘hostilities’ gives way to set speeches
by both sides; both speakers indicate their awareness that they are now embarking
on *Rhetoric* (*Smikrines 717-18; Pamphile 801-2*).

702 One’s chosen supplement for this line might be influenced by the shape of
1109, in which Onesimos says to Smikrines that the unfortunate situation has been
changed by *διαλλαγάς λύσεις τ’*. Gronewald suggests *τῶν κακῶν ἄλλην λύσιν,*
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but one might question whether Pamphile’s departure would be any kind of λύσις for the present ills. Alternatively one might suggest τῶν κακῶν διαλλαγή. 703ff. ἀπέναι δε[ΐ. The implication is that Pamphile should leave Charisios and come back home to her father. This explains her response in 705-6 in which she complains that her father will be her guardian for ever, and anticipates 824-25 where Pamphile seems to be saying that she does not object in principle to a second marriage. This second marriage would have to take its point of departure from the parental home rather than that of Charisios. The situation when a woman remarries is clearly described by Athena in the Odyssey when, disguised as Mentes, she gives advice to the beleaguered Telemachus. He should dismiss the suitors, she says, and arrange for Penelope to return to her parental home if she wishes to remarry. A second marriage must be arranged in, and from, her own family (1.275-78). Cf. Erdmann (1934, ch. 5).

704 The verse is transmitted in monost. 464 Jäkel with τάτοπον (τό ἀτοπον cod.) instead of τῶν ἀτοπον. The ms. of Orion, Anthol. VII.7 Haffner, however, interestingly reads τῶν ἀτοπον, which editors (including Haffner) emend to τάτοπον. The lemma is ἐξ τῶν ἀποτρεπόντων, which should, no doubt, be emended to Ἐπιτρέποντων, and not Ἐκ τοῦ Ἕπωγον, as commonly stated (Handle & Hurst, 1990, 126f.). Koenen (2002, 15) points to 814 of this play (φ[υ]γείν δέ δεῖ τοῦτον [με; Τ should run away from him?) in support of the reading τῶν ἀτοπον (‘den Törichten’) here instead of τάτοπον (‘das Törichte’). As a gnōmé the reading with τάτοπον has greater generality, but in context here it makes more sense for Smikrines to tell his daughter to avoid an ‘impossible’ person. I should think the paroemiographers changed Menander’s verse to give a better aphorism. ► φεύγειν, ‘avoid’, ‘shun’, cf. Alexis fr. 219.3-4 KA δεῖν / φεύγειν ἀπάντων τὰς ύπερβολὰς αεί.

705 The daughter speaks for the first time. Both Alexis and Theopompos wrote plays entitled Pamphile, of which precious little survives. ► πάπ(π)α. The reading of the papyrus (παπα) is clear; K.-G. suggest emending to either παπαί, an exclamation of distress, or πά(π)α, ‘Daddy’. The latter entails supplementing the line with an extra syllable, as πάπαα scans —. On the basic question which is more suitable, a cry of distress or vocative ‘father’, we should bear in mind that clarification of the relation between the two speakers is desirable from the audience’s point of view. We do not know that Smikrines addressed the other speaker as ‘Pamphile’ in line 703. The remaining question, whether to honour M’s orthography (cf. Dysk. 194, 204, 648 where πάπαα is consistently written with one pi, ‘solita orthographia’, according to Handley (1965, 87)), or write πά(π)α, is more difficult. Nausikaa begins her famous speech to her father, in which she refers indirectly to her own marriage prospects, πάπαα φιλ. Cf. Bain (1984, 37-38) and Golden (1995, 21).

706 κύριός μου. A girl’s father was κύριος over her until he made her over legally to a husband (cf. Mis. 294); Pamphile’s point here is that Smikrines would resume the role of κύριος ad infinitum if she were to leave Charisios. For the expression cf.
212
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Sik. 255-56 τῆς παρθένου / μηθείς γενέσθω χύριος.

706-7 σκιά is a doubtful reading at the beginning of 707. But the supplement τάυτ’ ὄνομα σκιά, ‘that’s poppycock!’ is a likely exclamation from the testy Smikrines, paralleled by similarly abrupt proverbs at Mis. 303 ὃς ὅρησεν, ‘pig on a hill’ = very stubborn (or, with Kells, ὃς ὅρησεν, ‘pig to mule’); Mis. 295 ὄνομα λύρας ‘donkey [hears a] lyre’ = ‘falls on deaf ears’; fr. 296.8 KA ὄνομα ἐν πυθήχοις, ‘a donkey among monkeys’ (of an ugly woman). Lelli (2006, ch. 2) comments on the frequency of animal proverbs in Kratinos. Another line of interpretation might be suggested by the metaphorical sense of σκιά we find in e.g. fr. 743.4 K.-Th. (= 605 KA), φίλου σκιάν, ‘the shadow (= likeness) of a friend’, or Dem. 21.115 εἰ γ’ εἰς στιγμήν ἡ σκιάν τοῦτον ὄν κατασκεύαζεν κατ’ ἐμοῦ, ‘if he’d had a scrap or shadow of evidence for the charges he got up against me’ (MacDowell, 1990, 157). Smikrines might be saying something like ‘not a trace of that!’.

707 σχολή γάρ. If this is Smikrines’ response to Pamphile’s objection ‘will you always lord it over me?’, he might be going to say something like ‘I haven’t the time for that’. Or he may simply be expressing characteristic impatience: ‘there isn’t time for arguing’, which Pamphile’s response in the next line – ‘ambivalent matters require much thought’ – seems to suit. For the expression cf. Lucian Hermotimos 749 οὐ σχολή μοι περί τοῦτων διαλέγεσθαι σοι.

708 τάμψιλα, ‘ambivalent matters’; from a literal meaning ‘double-edged’ the word came to mean ‘disputed’, ‘controversial’, ‘ambivalent’, cf. Isokrates Panath. 12.240; Aeschines in Ktesiph. 162. For the supplement after δεῖται cf. Dem. 3.3 ὁ παρὰν καρδίας... πολλής φροντίδος καὶ βουλής δεῖται. We find a similar thought in Men. fr. 145 KA (Eunuchus) πάντα τὰ ζητούμενα / δεῖσθαι μερίμνης φασίν οἱ σοφώτεροι.

709 προτείνω. The supplement is not certain, but rings quite well in combination with πάλαι. προτείνω means, literally, ‘hold out’, ‘offer’, then, with abstract objects ‘proffer’, ‘offer as excuse/justification’. Dem. 19.255 e.g. has σὺ δὲ ἐκεῖ προτείνας καὶ ὑποσχόν, ‘there you made offers and promises...’.

710 The reading of Μ υπερεμ. οὐτοῦ is reasonably secure, making an unmetrical beginning of the line which needs a remedy such as ὑπέρ (ἢ). ► ἐμοῦ. Pamphile cannot say ἐμαυτοῦ about herself, as most editors supplement. I think she was asking Smikrines in this and the following two lines whether his position was on her behalf or his. One might supplement e.g. ὑπέρ (ἢ) ἐμοῦ τοῦθ’ ἡς προοῦν λόγους ποημ.[]. This chimes with her remark in 713-14 that he needs to persuade her of the correctness of his suggested course of action, not force her, otherwise he will be acting like a despot. ‘To speak for/on behalf of (ὑπέρ) someone’ cf. Dem. 9.63.

713-14 πατήρ... δεσπότης. Pamphile means that even if her father’s efforts to ‘save’ her from Charisios are well-intentioned, his influence amounts to despotism if Pamphile does not fall into line willingly. Her words reflect on the kind of relationship
which she wishes to have with her father. Put colloquially, she does not want him to boss her about. Wehrli (1970, 151) says interestingly that Menander developed the figure of the ‘kind father’ sympathetic to the young in contrast to the tyrannical ogre of tradition; he says this ‘humanized’ father-figure in Menander accords with the Peripatetic ideal of the benevolent paternalism of a free society which does not force citizens to comply. Now whilst that might hold true particularly of Demeas in *Sam.* it has to be said that Smikrines belongs more to the earlier type of ‘tyrant father’ wishing to exert absolute control of his relations and property. Nevertheless, the words used by Pamphile here may reflect consciousness on Menander’s part of the Peripatetic issue of ‘benevolent paternalism’ against ‘despotic state’. One notes Men. fr. 832 KA from an unnamed play in which it is said that the education of a child should proceed by persuasion (πείθοντα) rather than force (λυπούντα).

715-80 Smikrines’ *rhēsis*

Prompted by his daughter’s remark ‘you’d better persuade me!’ Smikrines sets about doing that, though not without initial grumbles (‘isn’t it obvious? It’s staring one in the face!’). As in a Euripidean *agôn* the actual speech, beginning at 719, is prefaced by an announcement to the effect ‘now I’m going to speak’. Smikrines says he has three main points (τρία δὲ σοι προῆσομαι). As the speech is lacunose it is difficult to make out these three points clearly. Line 719 baldly states his main case ‘neither he nor you can be saved [sc. in this situation]’. These two aspects – Charisios’ plight followed by Pamphile’s plight – are then taken up in order. Smikrines points out that Charisios will be ruined by his present lifestyle (to 751). Then he turns to Pamphile’s awkward position (752 σκόπει τό σόν δή up to c. 760). His third point may consist of the argument of lines 786ff., in which he describes the agonies of a *ménage à trois* in which Charisios, his mistress and Pamphile would cohabit, with the mistress enjoying all the advantages at Pamphile’s expense. The speech ends with a rhetorical flourish – ‘take what I’m saying as gospel from the Delphic oracle!’ For a similar analysis see Koenen (2002, 17), Arnott (2004, 277); for earlier proposals see Gomme & Sandbach (1973, 355). Prosser (1981) suggests, by a comparison with Euripides’ *Ion* (esp. lines 836-38) that Pamphile’s worst humiliation will be having to put up with Charisios’ bastard by Habrotonon in her household. That is the ‘third possibility’ in Smikrines’ tally. There is no textual evidence for this particular point, but Prosser can point to lines 920-22 in which Charisios quotes the vow Pamphile apparently made during her argument with her father to share his misfortunes, too. Porter (2000, 161-63) identifies the Euripidean cast of Smikrines’ ‘heated rhetoric’ with particular reference to the opening of Tyndareos’ speech in *Eur. Or.* 491ff.

715 λόγου δὲ δεῖται, lit. ‘does that need words?’ = ‘isn’t that self-explanatory?’; cf. Dem. 1.27 οὐδὲ λόγου προσδείν ἡγούμαι. C has a clear mark of elision after delta: δ’ἐδείτ, where the traces after tau could easily be omikron rather than alpha. But
the construction λόγου δ' ἐδέιτο ταύτα does not convince, and the reading leaves rather too much room for ταύτα. ► συμπείσεως, cf. the related verb συμπείθω, ‘win over’, Dysk. 790, 818, 837; Perik. 718 in a similar context. Note here the hendiadys: λόγου καὶ συμπείσεως = ‘words of persuasion’.

716 ἔξι σπλαθείαν, an inspired supplement by Jensen of scanty traces, ‘obvious’, cf. Arist. Rhet. 3.10, 1410b21: ἐπιπόλαια (sc. ἐνθυμήματα) γὰρ λέγομεν τὰ παντὶ δὴλα; cf. id. EN 1.5.4 (1095b24) ἐπιπολαίωτερον τοῦ ζητουμένου. The basic meaning of the word seems to be that which is prominent through being on top (ἐπιπολή) or on high; it approaches the sense ‘common’ (vulgāris) in passages such as Isokr. Antid. 190 παίδειας μὴ τῆς ἀπηρκιβωμένης ἀλλὰ τῆς ἐπιπολαίου καὶ πᾶσι νομής, and Dem. 61.56 τὰς ἐπιπολαίους ἡδονάς καὶ διατριβάς.

716-17 [α]ύτό... βοάι / φωνήν ἀφιέν. Arnott (2004, 277) collects good rhetorical parallels for this expression, ‘the facts speak for themselves’: e.g. Dem. 1.2 ὁ μὲν οὖν παρὼν καιρός... φωνήν ἀφιείς; 19.81 ἡ γάρ ἀλήθεια καὶ τα πεπραγμέν' αὐτά βοάι; add to these: Lukian Zeus Trag. 15, φωνήν ἀφιείς.

717 καμέ, ‘[for] me too [to speak]’, not only the facts themselves (716 αὐτό); thus Sandbach (Gomme & Sandbach, 1973, 355).

718 προθήσωμαι, ‘I will propose’. Προσθήσω in rhetoric means ‘put forward’, ‘advance’, ‘propose’ (a counsel etc.), e.g. Dem. 18.192 (βουλήν), but, like the literal meaning of ‘propose’, it also means ‘put before’, ‘begin with’, e.g. Dem. 61, Exordium 10.1; Arist. EN 1.3.8 τί προτιθέμεθα. Cf. the rhetorical prothesis, in which a speaker announces at the outset what he will do. In this sense the word chimes with one of Smikrines’ closing words, προθεμένη: if Pamphile ‘prefaces’ everything she says with what her father has proposed, she will not contravene his will. Thus Smikrines achieves rhetorical closure by returning to his opening note.

749S πολυτέλειαν... δίς τίθει, ‘[just imagine] the expense. Reckon twice...!’ Smikrines tells Pamphile to imagine the ruinous expenses Charisios will be faced with funding two women’s celebration of the Thesmophoria and Skira festivals; for the financial burden of keeping two women see Plautus, Poen. 226. Both the Thesmophoria and the Skira were women’s festivals, celebrated in the Attic months Pyanepsion and Skirophorion respectively. In a modern context Smikrines might have said “he’ll have to buy two sets of Christmas presents!” Isaio, Or. 3.80.2 speaks of the financial burden on a wealthy married man (Pyrhurs) to pay for a celebration of the Thesmophoria at his own home (θεσμοφόρια ἐστιάν) on behalf of his wife (ὑπὲρ τῆς γαμετῆς γυναῖκος) attended by unspecified other ‘women’ (thanks to L. Reyno for ref.). Family rites involved expense: fr. 796 K.-Th. (= 878 KA) speaks of the ruinous expense incurred by the married man always forced to celebrate some festival. Theophr. Char. 17 (‘Mempsimoria’) mentions the expense caused to a father by the birth of a child. Ibid. 30 (‘Aischrokerdia’) the miser gets friends to help pay for the marriage of his daughter. And Smikrines’ argument here is fully in character: it is not so much the immorality of Charisios’ perceived posi-
tion that upsets him, more the financial waste incurred. ► πολυτέλειαν: Aischines in Timarch. 42 says Timarchos wasted his inheritance away ὀφφορογίᾳ καὶ πολυτέλειαν δείπνων καὶ αὐλητρίσι καὶ ἑταῖραις καὶ κύβοις. ► τίθει, imper., 'reckon to account' (LSJ s.v. A II9), that is, 'imagine the cost'.

752-55 The situation envisaged by Smikrines (rhetorical diatypōsis (Porter, 2000, 162)) might be illustrated from 'real life' by Antiphon's first speech, in which two men go down to the Piraeus together to wine and dine, waited upon by one of the men’s pallakē (who involuntarily poisons them). In comedy G.-S. compare Plaut. Mercator (after Philenem) ὑξορ me expectat iamdudum essuriens domi. The Piraeus, like other harbour-towns such as Corinth, was famous for its prostitutes and brothels; cf. Aristoph. Peace 165 ἐν Πειραιεί παρὰ ταῖς πόρναις; Isaios, De Philoct. 19. Athenian men no doubt frequently 'went down' to the Piraeus for the entertainment offered there. Xenophon's Symposium, with its 'soft-porn' entertainment at the end, takes place in Kallias' house in the Piraeus. Smikrines paints a curiously modern picture of Pamphile as an 'abandoned wife', left alone while her husband goes off and plays. The description encapsulates the fuller version he had presented to Chairestratos earlier (680-86). In tragedy, 'jilted wives' such as Medea and Hermione (Euripides) or Deianira (Sophocles) tend to resort to extreme measures to punish their unfaithful husbands or attempt to win back their affection by charms and potions. The incident dealt with in Antiphon's first speech, just mentioned, also involves infidelity and jealousy. The two men carousing in the Piraeus are poisoned by the wife of one of the men who clearly wishes to take revenge on her unfaithful husband (she is nicknamed a 'Klytaimestra' by the prosecution; 1.17). There is an extraordinarily vindictive Athenian step-mother in Heliodorus’ Aithiopika called Demainete who is driven by jealousy to all manner of fiendish plotting. By contrast, it is a measure of Pamphile’s (and her creator’s) humanity that throughout this marriage crisis she stays calm and plays down the gravity of Charisios’ offence to her; no love-potions or murder-plots for her.

752 σκόπει τὸ σόν, a rhetorical turn of phrase, cf. Dem. 18.256 πρὸς τὴν σήν [sc. τῷ χείρῳ] σκόπει.

752-55 ψησί, καθεδεῖτ', περιμενεῖς, πίνει. The alternation of tenses between future and ‘vivid’ present is interesting (‘you’ll be waiting... while he’s drinking...’). ► καθεδεῖτ', ‘sit down’, with the negative connotation of idleness, ‘settle down’, cf. Dem. 9.75 εἰ δ' ὁ βούλεται ζητών καθεδεῖται.

754 παννυχίδ' ὀλην, 'you’ll wait up the whole night long'. I favour Guéraud's reading παννυχήδα here, although the first four letters πανν are anything but secure. I suggest ὀλην at line end instead of Guéraud's σω, to match Smikrines' tendency to exaggerate. Cf. Men. Arrhephorus/Auletris fr. 66.2-3 KA, ὀλην ἐπίνομεν / τὴν νύκτα. Moreover, we had σω already in the previous line. For παννυχίς in the sense of 'vigil' cf. Soph. El. 92. Arnott's πάλαν [τρέχειν nearly convinces, but leaves the subject of τρέχειν (Charisios) to be supplied (not impossible). Guéraud had said
that the first nu might be lamda-iota, but I do not agree: nu is more likely. Guéraud considered Wilamowitz’ πολύν impossible. If the present reconstruction is correct we have a situation reminiscent of that envisaged in Alkphrōn’s (no doubt fictive) letter of Menander to Glykera. The author of this envisages Menander enjoying himself in the Piraeus while Glykera is held up by a festival (the Haloa) in Athens (ep. 4.18). Conceivably, the author had the Epitrepontes passage here in mind when he designed his epistolary situation.

755 ἀδειπτον, ‘without supper’, a word Menander had used in his first produced play, Orge, see fr. 271 KA. In an unknown comedy he also used ἀνάφιστος (fr. 521 KA), literally ‘without breakfast’ (‘without dinner’ LSJ s.v.).

786-800 Smikrines’ third point (in my reconstruction) concerns Pamphile’s unfortunate position if she is forced to reside with Charisios and his mistress; that will lead to her humiliation by the other woman and eventually to her being ousted. As so often in Menander there are tragic overtones: Hermione in Euripides’ Andromache suffered the humiliation of her husband Neoptolemos fathering a child by the concubine instead of her; Kleopatra, Deianira and Medea all loathed the prospect of sharing their husband with his new girlfriend. Smikrines’ description of the mistress’s insidious unseating of the wife is a rhetorical tour-de-force. He sketches a progression from a situation in which the mistress first vies with the wife (παραμύθιον τότε), then rivals her status (792) and finally ousts her (793). This dynamic analysis is capped by the gnōmē, ‘it’s hard for a wife to compete with a man’s mistress’.

787 διακαλεῖ σε, ‘she’ll speak badly of you’, seems to be picked up by Pamphile in 834-35. ▶ λυμανεῖται, ‘she’ll ruin you’, cf. e.g. Dem. 9.36.


791 σκυθρωπάζουσα, νουθετούσα. As Turner (1983, 46) says, these words look ‘like an unwinning trait, and should therefore characterize Pamphile’; for the ‘cross’ wife cf. Eur. Med. 271 (σε τὴν σκυθρωπόν καὶ πόσαι θυμουμένην) and Hermione’s unlovely behaviour in Eur. Andr. However, in the present state of the text, it is difficult to see how the participles do not go with the subject of the next line, which must be the mistress. I suppose the mistress, gaining the man’s favour, could constantly frown her disapproval of the legitimate rival.

792 σκηνήμα, ‘look’, ‘expression’. Demosthenes (21.72) says that someone’s ‘expression’ (τοῖς σκηνήματι) can be a means, with the ‘look in one’s eye’ (τῶι βλέμματι) and the voice, to insult someone; cf. ibid. 195. ▶ έξίσακε: ‘the reading έξίσακε (perfect of έξισάζω, according to LSJ not previously recorded till Strabo) has been reached by elimination’ (Turner, 1983, 47). In Dysk. 768 we find έξισώ: έξισοῦν
ευτυχισμένη τινι / ευποροὺν πένητι. ► xαθ’ [ἐν], ‘one step at a time’, ‘gradually’. The phrase is a common one in Menander; in this play 381, 403; Perik. 823S πάντα [xαθ’ ἔν] εἱρήκα; cf. Dem. 2.24 xαθ’ ἔν’ αὐτῶν ἐν μέρει. The phrase can have a different meaning ‘in one go’, ‘all together’, e.g. Heliodorus, Aith. 2.17.3, but that meaning is not probable here.

793-94 χαλεπόν... μάχη. The expression is similar to that of fr. 637.2 K.-Th. (860 KA) πρὸς τὴν Τύχην γὰρ ζυγομαχεῖν οὐ ράδιων.

794-96 Smikrines says it is difficult for a wife to compete with a prostitute. The professional knows all the tricks which excite a man and knows no shame. In an interesting passage of Xenophon’s Oik. (10) Ischomachos describes how his wife appeared before him in high heels and make-up. He gently chided her saying: ‘would you want me to deceive you either about my financial situation or my physical being?’ He says that hired women practise deception through make-up, a deception which cannot work at home as the man is sure to catch the woman unmade-up sometime. He recommends his wife to cultivate her natural looks, to take exercise and to take an active part in the household chores; then, he says, his wife will appear more attractive than any servant, particularly as she grants her favours willingly while the other has to through servitude (ἐλλώς τε καὶ ὁπόταν τὸ ἐκούσαν χαριζόμενη προσηγαντικόν τοῦ ἁγιακώς ἔμενην ὑπηρετεῖν). In other words Ischomachos maintains the opposite of what Smikrines says here; in his opinion a wife’s natural looks and behaviour are preferable to all a whore’s tricks. For the attention lavished by hetairai on their appearance see Alexis fr. 103 KA with Arnott (1996a, 273-83), Plautus, Poen. 210ff., cf. Aristoph. Eccl. 929. Brown (1990, 258) points out that Smikrines’ depiction of the mistress’s behaviour here contrasts strongly with Habrotonon’s benevolent behaviour toward Pamphilê as revealed in the play. He believes the contrast contributes to the indirect characterization of Habrotonon in the play.

795-96 For a similar asyndetic string of verbal expressions describing a woman’s behaviour cf. fr. 219 KA (Kubernêtaï) γυνὴ κρατεῖ πάντων, ἐπιτάττει, μάχετ’ ἄει. / ἀπὸ πλειόνων ὀδυνάτ’.

797-98 τὴν Πυθ[ίαν] / [προειδε]ναὶ νόμιζ’, ‘believe the Pythia prophesied’; Smikrines uses one of his usual rhetorical flourishes to hammer home his point. A common rhetorical formulation is: ‘you don’t need a prophet to tell you that’ (e.g. Alexis fr. 160.7 καὶ τι μάντεως ἐδεί;). Smikrines converts this to: ‘consider that the highest prophet has told you that!’ For the authority of Delphi as a rhetorical topos see Plaut., Pseud. 480, quod scibo, Delphis tibi responsum dicitio. ► προειδε]ναί. Gronewald suggested [εἰρηχέ]ναι for the gap in 798; I am not sure the Pythia ever merely ‘says’ anything, nor that the construction with participle ἐσώμενα is satisfactory. πρόοψωδα satisfies both these conditions, but is one letter longer; with the exception of delta, however, these letters are relatively narrow in this hand. For πρόοψωδα, ‘prophesy’, of the Delphic Oracle cf. Thuc. 2.17; for the construction with

799 προθεμένη τοῦτο παντὶ τῷ λόγῳ. Pamphile should ‘preface’ all her remarks with this insight. Similarly, Dem. 21.108 περὶ πάντων ὃν ἂν ἀκούητε, τούθ’ ὑποθέντες ἀκούετε τῇ γνώμῃ, where Demosthenes uses ὑποτίθημι, Smikrines προτίθεμαι.

800 τοῦδ’ οὐδέν άκοντος. According to Gronewald’s supplement, Smikrines refers to himself as τοῦδε, like Pheres in Eur. Aik. 690 τοῦδ’ ἀνδρός, or the speaker of Antiphon’s sixth oration (§ 9): ἐξελέγξαι ἀδικοῦντα τόνδε τὸν ἀνδρα (referring to himself).

801-c. 850. Pamphile’s rhēsis

Pamphile’s answer to her father is reasoned and structured like a good orator’s. After Euripides’ many articulate women, this should not surprise us unduly (Porter, 2000, 160-65). True, Athenian women were not trained in rhetoric like their husbands, but the dramatic agón breaks down if one side is not as articulate as the other; moreover, we can be sure that, in real life, women at home would have honed their argumentative skills in constant debate with the menfolk. As Arnott (2004, 277) says: “By making her [Pamphile] so fluent and polished, Menander has abandoned the crudity of realism in order to create one of the finest defences of marital loyalty in ancient Greek”. It is only a pity that the speech is so mutilated; one would dearly like to follow Pamphile’s train more closely. As it is, one can make out some of the details of her argument, and guess otherwise at her general drift. For an inspired – if hypothetical – reconstruction of Pamphile’s speech see Austin (2008). For the resemblance of the so-called Didot rhēsis to Pamphile’s speech, see above p. 210.

Pamphile begins, in pointed contrast to her father’s impatient, hectoring tone, with a polite overture in which she defers to her father’s authority, whilst justifying her stance with reasoned words. In the body of her speech she counters Smikrines’ points one by one (808 δεύτερον, 815 εἰ μέν εἶπας ἀρτίως) and some of her remarks tie in with his by the repetition of key words (814 φυγείν δὲ δεὶ τούτον; — 704; 822 δ’ οἰκίας οἰκούνθ’ — 749-50; 834-35 διαβ— 787); cf. Porter (2000, 163). Later, Charisios, who is eavesdropping on this conversation behind Chairestratos’ front-door, will quote some of her expressions in self-recrimination. Thus is Pamphile’s admirable stance highlighted by Menander: first she gains our sympathy in debate with her materialistic father; then she becomes exemplary in Charisios’ eyes when he realizes how selfishly he has acted. The virtue which Menander gives Pamphile is her loyalty in adversity; she is no fair-weather sailor ready to abandon ship when the going gets rough. This is the virtue constantly ex-
tolled by Demosthenes in his political speeches against Macedonian ascendancy; Lape (2004) argues that Menander’s domestic stage is a political allegory, and it is at such points that one can indeed see democratic virtues highlighted by Menander’s comedy.

A striking feature of Pamphilé’s discourse is her use of opposites (άντινομία). Her words may be ‘artificial’ or ‘plain’ (801-3); she appears to contrast (like Sokrates) the opinion of the few with that of the many (810-11); she points to the ups and downs of life (818-821). This antithetical structure reflects her paradoxical situation: abandoned by her husband, who has taken up with another woman, she remains in his home defending the integrity of their marriage through thick and thin; under pressure from her father who urges her to cut her losses and leave Charisios, she defends what might appear to most a lost cause. At the same time, the oppositions she sets up reflect (no doubt) a state of inner torment in which she is torn between obedience to her father and an ideal of fidelity which is being jeopardized by Charisios’ behaviour (Porter, 2000, 165). This distress emerges clearly in fr. 8 and in the words she speaks in line 855. For Smikrines there is no ‘other side’; Pamphilé’s language shows her championing a position of endurance against the odds.

801 πεπλασμένη... [ή κάφ]ελή, ‘with artifice or in plain speech’; cf. Dysk. 764 ού πεπλασμένως γάρ ήθει πρός το πράγμα ἐλήλυθα / ἀλλ’ ἀπλώς, (Gorgias to Sostratos) ‘for you approached the matter not with disingenuous mien but simply’; for the concrete sense ‘fabricate’, cf. fr. 188.7 KA ὡργάνα πεπλασμένα. Although both words here are supplements, they are very good ones. In rhetoric the expression πεπλασμένος has negative connotations: ‘contrived, dissembling, disingenuous’, cf. Dem. 45.42; ibid. 68 πεπλασμένοις contrasted with τοῖς ἀπλῶς βαδίζουσι; Isaios De Cirone 13 associates λόγους πεπλασμένους with false witnesses; cf. Men. Mis. 765 Arnott τὸ κατάπλαστον τούτον μου, ‘that pretence of mine’. And fr. 586 K.-Th. (= 809 KA) runs: ‘one must fear women most when they feign something (περιπλάττομεν) in seemly (χρηστοῖς) words’. Plato, Tim. 26e4, contrasts πλασθέντα μῦθον with ἀληθινὸν λόγον. In view of this Pamphilé must intend the following contrast: ‘father, I can speak deceitfully, to please you, or straight.’ Arnott (2004, 279) misses the point when he translates πεπλασμένην ‘with style’ or ‘stylishly ornamental’ and construes the clause ὅτι ποθ’ ἦγεϊ συμφέρειν, ‘whatever you deem relevant’ (Arnott), with both ‘styles’ (in fact it only applies to the first option, πεπλασμένην); similarly Koenen (2002, 19) ‘der kunstvolle und affektierte Vortrag’. Pamphilé is not offering a choice of aesthetic styles for their own sake; she is asking whether she should dissemble or speak her mind. Demosthenes regularly offers his audience the same alternative: ‘shall I say what you want to hear, or shall I speak the truth?’ (e.g. 9.4). ▶ ἀφελή, ‘simple, plain’, cf. Aischines, in Timarchum 128 οὕτως ἐναργές εἶκε καὶ οὐ πεπλασμένον ὅ λέγω; Dem. Epistulae 4.11 ἄφελες καὶ παραφράσια μεστός; Isokr. Paneg. 11 draws a contrast between the ‘simple style’ (ἄφελες) appropriate to disputes over private agreements and epi-
Commentary

deictic oratory (έπιδεικτικῶς). I assume that in lines 803-6 Pamphile went on to explain why she chose the latter style, in the hope of bringing him round to her point of view.

802 ἔχω] (Gronewald) or perhaps ἔνι, cf. 346 of this play, Dysk. 699. ► δ' τι τοθ' ἥγετι συμφέρε[ν], ‘whatever you think advantageous’, a rhetorical commonplace, cf. Dem. 21.189 δ' τι ἄν συμφέρειν ύμιν ἥγηται and ibid. 190 δ' τι ἄν συμφέρειν ύμιν ἥγωμαι.

803 κα'ι γάρ φρονεῖν εἰς[. Accepting the sense, at least, of Gronewald’s supplement κα'ι γάρ φρονεῖν εἰς[μ' οὖ κακό] / [τῶν δέ] ἔνεστι μοι: / αὐτή δ' ἐμαυτής γνώμης εχω (Lys. 1124-25). Porter points out that both young women (Pamphile and Melanippe) ‘engage in αγώνες with their fathers. In each case, the issue at hand has been precipitated by the birth of an illegitimate baby...of whose existence the girl’s father is ignorant. Thus both women are compelled to present their case in such a way that their guilty secret will remain hidden.’ If accepted, we have yet another Euripidean foil underlying Menander’s comedy.

804 εύνοια παριστ-, a plausible reading of the combined traces on all three relevant papyri, involves a split anapaest, and is therefore suspect. The alternative proposed by Arnott, however (εύνοι' ὑπερισταμένη), and approved by Austin (2008), is difficult palaeographically and semantically. M and O24 both clearly have alpha after εύνοι-, so if ύπερ- is right, we have scriptio plena in both manuscripts. Moreover, υπερισταμαι is a rare verb, attested once in tragedy with the sense ‘standing over’ (= protecting) another. Were it not for γάρ in the previous line one might consider ή τ' εύνοια γάρ, which would match the traces well.

805 For K.-G.’s supplement ἐπά[γεται cf. fr. 357 (Hydria) γέροντα – τὸν θ' αὕτού κακών / ἐπαγόμενον λήθην, ‘inducing/procuring forgetfulness of his woes’, and fr. 791.4 KA ἐπάγεται at line end.

806 For palaeographical arguments in support of the new reading λυπηρόν in this line, see the notes on composite readings.

807-8 It seems in these lines that Pamphile is referring to the misfortune Fate can inflict on people. The participle ἀμαρτούσας requires a feminine object which, presumably, stood before it in this or the previous line. If Pamphile is referring to young women like herself who ‘fell’ through no fault of their own, we need a word such as κόρας or νύμφας (see note on 808). If, on the other hand, we think that Pamphile is referring to Habrotonon’s purported misfortune with Charisios, we might consider a supplement such as πόρνας (Austin, 2008). The matter is further complicated by the fact that we know that Smikrines knew about ‘Habrotonon’s baby’; we do not know whether he knew about Pamphile’s exposed child (probably not). Charisios, of course, did know about that. Onesimos told him, and that was the reason why he
left her. In the extant portion of Smikrines’ speech to Pamphile there is no mention of any baby. Therefore we do not know here to what, exactly, Pamphile is referring. On balance, I should think these lines were deliberately ambiguous: they might refer to Pamphile’s own case, or they might refer to Habrotonon’s alleged case. I suggest (after K.-G.) χόρας in 807 as a word which is perhaps sufficiently neutral to apply to both scenarios. Pamphile is only too ready to pass over this matter quickly (έψουεν), as it is embarrassing to her, too. For the suppression of painful truths cf. fr. 888 (from an unknown play): ἕα κεχρύψατι λαυθόνουσαν ἀτυχίαν.

808 Most editors supplement a feminine noun here with which ἀμαρτούσας agrees: K.-G. χόρας; Austin πόρνας. I prefer to place the object of ηδοκηρούαν in 807, χόρας, and supplement the beginning of 808 with εἴχῃ δ’, ‘but at random’, ‘haphazardly’, balancing διὰ μηδέν (Gronewald) in the previous line. ► ἔodynam, ‘let’s leave Fate [to her own devices]’, indicates a sensible desire not to ‘cry over spilt milk’. Those who believe Tyche spoke the delayed prologue of Epitrep. point to this mention of the goddess (cf. 351) (Turner, 1983, 48). ► ἀμαρτούσας, ‘making a mistake’, a euphemism for the ‘fallen’ virgin, as in Dysk. 290 (ἐξαμαρτεῖον).

809-13 Pamphile seems to be making some distinction between the opinion of the many and the few, presumably about herself or people in her situation. She is no doubt justifying herself in the face of common opinion. In Sik. 150-55, we find the view (expressed by an ‘oligarchic’ speaker – Smikrines?) that the truth in a dispute cannot be established when the defendant laments and pleads in front of a crowd but only in a small circle (ἐν ὀλίγωι [συνεδρίῳ] 155).

813 ἄτυχών ἐπιπρόσθε πτερός, looks like ‘suffering misfortune when he was [lucky /rich] before’. K.-G. supplement χρήστος φίλος in the previous line, but it is only a guess. For ἐπιπρόσθε cf. Asp. 42-43, οἱ βαρβαροὶ λόφον τινὰ / ἐπιπρόσθ’ ἔχοντες ἔμενον: the hill lay ‘before’ the Greek encampment.

814 φ[υ]γεῖν, likely in view of her father’s admonition to ‘flee the offensive person’ in 704, and Charisios’ thoughts in 921. But ψ[έ]γειν, ‘chide’, is also a possibility.

815-17 Pamphile seems to be responding to her father’s point that Charisios will be ruined by the course on which he has embarked (cf. 749-51). 815 ► ς[τ][μ]έν. As stated in the palaeographical commentary, epsilon looks most likely in first position. Pamphile is picking up a point made by her father, only to refute it, presumably, by her reasoning. The first letter of 816 is more than dubious (α[φ]ήκας Turner). One might even consider έ[θ]ήκας, in view of Smikrines’ earlier emphatic use of τίθει at the corresponding point in his speech.

817 For εις γάμον ἔλθεῖν τινι in this sense cf. Eur. IA 1044.

818 παρέχεται χηρόσοις’, ‘share in the good fortune of’, cf. Eur. Hipp. 1119. Pamphile’s meaning must be that she married not just for ‘the good times’ but as life-partner (κοινωνός: see note on 820) through thick and thin. ► ἀτυχήσηι. This is the verb Charisios uses about himself in 891.
Commentary

819 προίδω, 'look after', 'take thought for'. προοράσθαι with accusative (τὰς ὑμετέρας βουλήσεις) Dem. 21.61.

820 κοινωνός ἔλθον. 'I came as companion, partner...' Charisios echoes these overheard words of his wife in his impassioned rhesis (920). Cf. the conversation between Ischomachos and his wife (Xen. Oik. 10) in which Ischomachos describes himself first as χρημάτων κοινωνόν (i.e. husband and wife share their finances), then as τοῦ σώματος κοινωνός (i.e. physical intimacy); cf. Dem. 9.71 κοινωνούς τῶν κυνδύνων καὶ τῶν ἀναλωμάτων.

821 έπτακεν, 'he has stumbled', presumably a reference to Charisios' 'sin', which Pamphile must have heard about from her father; cf. 916, where Charisios refers to Pamphile's reaction to the news that he had sinned like her. Smikrines had learned of Charisios' child by Habrotonon in 646; the surviving lines of the opening of act IV make no explicit reference to this child, so we must assume that Smikrines had told his daughter about her husband's sins either in lost lines (756-86) or inside, before they come out at the beginning of act IV to continue the argument. One notes in M (fr. 4733.4), which K.-G. assign to Smikrines' speech, the mention of ψάλτρια (line 2). Perhaps it was here that Smikrines told Pamphile about the alleged child of Habrotonon. For ταῦτα cf. Dysk. 809; frs. 107.3 and 864 KA. ► οἰσω, 'I will bear', picking up Smikrines' ἐνέγκατα in 788.

822 δύ' οἰκίας οίκοΰνθ', 'while he lives in two houses'. Pamphile is probably referring to the two households Charisios will allegedly have to support if he lives both with Habrotonon and her baby whilst remaining officially Pamphile's husband. This would tie in with Smikrines' point about the double celebration of the Themophoria and Skira (749-50). But Charisios is living with Chairestratos (next door) at present; Pamphile might be referring to that.

823 έκείνῃ[ι, the rival, i.e. Habrotonon.

824 ἔτερόν μ' εἰ[ς. K.-G. supplement ἔτερόν μ' εἰ[ς γάμον δῶσεις], making Pamphile anticipate a second marriage arranged by her father. Would that not undermine Pamphile's loyal stance to Charisios unduly? Moreover, Charisios is the third-person subject in this section otherwise. Nülist (per litt.) also expresses scepticism about a possible second marriage here: 'My impression is that people are looking too closely at the so-called Didot rhesis, where, however, the general situation is different. Her husband is impoverished. That is why her father wants her to marry another man.' On the relationship between the Didot rhesis and Pamphile's speech see above p. 210.

832-33 οταν γὰρ προ[...] ὀρᾷ. I assume a sense like that in Eur. Ion 585-86: 'when one gets closer to something one can see the implications of it more clearly'.

After 835: one might consider placing Mon. 517 Jaekel, νῦμφη δ' ἔπρουκος οὔχ ἔχει παρθέσιαν, somewhere here; Pamphile might round off her speech with further justification of her parrhesia, 'outspekeness'.
5.5 A

Act Four

Fr. 8

έξετυφην. A scholion on Eur. Phoen. 1154 (τυφώς) explains τύφεσθαι as τό τούς ὀφθαλμούς συγκεχύσθαι with reference to a quote from Menander’s Philadelphoi: νη τὸν Δία τὸν μέγιστον, ἐκτυφήσομαι (fr. 439 K.-Th. = 397 KA). One hopes its author has not confused τύφεσθαι with τυφλοῦσθαι, ‘be blind’. τύφω means ‘burn’, and passive τύφομαι ‘burn’ or ‘smoulder’ so, if Pamphile spoke these lines, she might mean her eyes were red and sore from crying (κλαίουσ’).

5.5.2 Scene 2: The first recognition

Habrotonon emerges from Chairestratos’ house, carrying the squawling baby. At first she does not see Pamphile who is standing outside Charisios’ front-door, still mulling over what her father has said to her. In this first recognition scene, Habrotonon recognizes Pamphile as the girl she had seen that night at the Tauropolia; then Pamphile recognizes the baby by some or all of the tokens which she had left with it (865-66); she asks Habrotonon who the father is and learns that it is none other than her husband Charisios; Habrotonon ascertains by a question that Pamphile is Charisios’ wife, the young bride living next door to Chairestratos. These two, then, learn everything in this recognition scene. When Onesimos enters (875) from Chairestratos’ house, they disappear into Charisios’ house to discuss the details of the momentous discoveries they have just made. For Charisios’ moral peripeteia it is necessary that he is kept in the dark a while longer. It is interesting to see how the scene begins with nearly everyone crying (Pamphile, the baby and Habrotonon in distress) and ends with hand-holding (861) and recognition of benevolent gods (873-74).

853 and 855-56. Diction and metre are ‘tragic’, but not ‘para-tragic’. No comic effect is intended. The audience is meant to feel for Pamphile, and (to a lesser extent) for the motherless baby. Of course, the audience knows that ‘all’s well that ends well’; but that does not make the combined distress of Pamphile, Habrotonon and the baby here laughable.

853 ἔξειμ’ ἔχουσα. These cannot be Habrotonon’s first words as ἔχουσα must have an object (not supplied from subject of κλαυμυρίζεται); βρέφος, παιδίον e.g. must have preceded. Habrotonon’s appearance here with the baby picks up her declared intention in 530-32 of confronting Charisios with the baby in her arms. The audience will be reminded of her plan and of the drama which has taken place indoors since Habrotonon’s exit. Her opening words now are spoken to someone inside the house, presumably, as they are not addressed to the audience. A characteristic τάλαν, however, serves to remind the audience of the speaker’s ‘character-profile’ (see note on 434). ► κλαυμυρίζομαι (and its ‘brother’ κλαυθμυρίζομαι e.g. Lucian Hermotim. 23) is a rare word, hapax in comedy. The active means ‘make cry’, so the passive here may be chosen deliberately over e.g. κλαίει: ‘something’s mak-
ing it cry’. What that something is, Habrotonon professes not to know (next line),
but soon, when Onesimos enters, we will know what upheavals are happening in-
side, hardly conducive to a baby’s well-being. On stage, of course, the baby cannot
cry, but there is no reason why an imitation of a baby’s crying might not have been
heard indoors before Habrotonon appears.

855 and 857. Pamphile, standing distraught in front of Charisios’ front door, won-
ders what to do. Her husband has left her; her father urges dissolution of the mar-
riage; so far she has stood firm, but what now? She wishes a god would take pity on
her. In 857 πορεύσομαι, ‘I’ll be on my way’ or ‘I must go’, is presumably her reac-
tion to the intrusion of Habrotonon with the baby, and not her declaration of intent
to move out of Charisios’ house. In Perik. 183 Sostratos similarly says πορεύσομαι
when he wishes to move out of sight of Doris who has just appeared; cf. l. 700 of
this play and Dem. 21.222.

856 [παιδάριον], ὡςει κτλ.; Jensen first conjectured παιδίον, πότ’] to fill the gap
with minimal traces, then concluded later that this did not suit the visible traces,
suggesting παιδάριον instead. G.-S. say ὡςει μητέρα (not as question) is impossi-
ble, ‘for clearly Habrotonon is not yet, on any view, certain of Pamphile’s identity;
that certainty comes only at 860, when she has seen her face to face’. But as a
question ὡςει μητέρα; seems to me possible. Habrotonon leaves the house with
the baby because it has been crying; once outside she hears (and sees) Pamphile’s
first remark (in anguish). The sound – and, presumably, the sight – is enough to
make Habrotonon change her tune: ‘dearest child!’ she exclaims, ‘will you see your
mother?’ The future is comparable to Eur. Med. 1310 (with Mastronarde’s note).
In fact it seems to me that πότ’ ὡςει μητέρα;, ‘when will you see your mother [sc.
again]?’ is impossible when we recognise that it has already dawned on Habrotonon
that this is perhaps the young woman she is looking for. So, let us follow Jensen’s
conclusion about the faint ink traces.

858 ἐμέ. Jaekel (1984, 12): ‘andererseits glaubt man ein leises Zittern der Angst
aus der Auflösung der 4. Länge des Verses (ἐμέ) herauslesen zu können, als ängst-
liche Frage formuliert, doch bald durch das ἐγώ der Antwort Habrotonons wieder
beruhigt’. But the double-short is so common I doubt we should ‘psychologize’ it
here.

864 Rather than answering Habrotonon’s question (‘were you at the Tauropolia?’),
Pamphile asks Habrotonon where she got that baby; the question only makes sense
if an aspect of the baby’s appearance has caught her eye. Promptly Habrotonon
responds by asking ‘Does something about this baby look familiar to you, dear?’
Stockert (1997, 10-12) thinks the baby was wrapped in the πορφυρά πτέρυξ, pur-
ple wrap, which was an item of the gnōrismata examined by Syriskos in act two;
the audience had seen this cloth already and might recognize it simultaneously with
Pamphile; cf. G.-S. 359; he also notes that ‘a double pteryx of a woman’s dress’ was
the token by which the young Stratophanes was recognized in Sik. 280. Moreover,
in Euripides' _Alope_ it seems also to have been a piece of cloth which effected the father's recognition of his daughter's illegitimate baby (see p. 143). Whether this recognizable piece of cloth in _Epitrep._ was enough to remind the audience of the _Alope,_ on the other hand, and thus set their minds racing along metatheatrical tracks is another matter. Prosser (1981, 36) suggests that it was the famous ring that Pamphile recognized: Habrotonon had come out wearing Charisios' ring on her finger and Pamphile recognized that when they joined hands (861). But a ring is a small thing for an audience in the Theatre of Dionysos to recognize, and I think the purple cloth theory is more likely.

867 Again Pamphile answers Habrotonon's question ('Does something about this baby look familiar to you?') with another question: 'Is this not your baby, then?' The question reveals Pamphile's knowledge that Habrotonon had supposedly borne a child to Charisios; she must have learned that from her father in the previous scene.

Her answering a question with another question may indicate that Pamphile wishes to keep her distance from the stranger confronting her with a startling revelation, who is also her social inferior; before, when Habrotonon wanted to embrace her, she stopped her in her tracks with 'And who are you?' And the abrupt address γύναι at the beginning of 864 is cold compared to Habrotonon's repeated endearments (φιλτάτη, γλυκεία, φιλτάτη). It is only in 871, when she is beginning to believe her luck, that Pamphile calls Habrotonon φιλτάτη. G.-S. 359 doubt there is any element of social differentiation here, scoffing at Wilamowitz' suggestion: 'thus are Greeks turned into modern northern Europeans'. But when we recall Smikrines' snobbery about metics (691) or the speech 'Against Neaira', revealing entrenched Athenian suspicions about _hetairai_, Wilamowitz' view does not seem so far-fetched.

867-70 Habrotonon's explanation is more for the benefit of the audience, by way of résumé, than Pamphile, who is hardly interested in Habrotonon's ruse. In these few words she recapitulates what had happened in Chairestratos' house after she had left Onesimos. She had confronted Charisios with baby and ring; he had (presumably) acknowledged his sins on that night at the Tauropolia (the ring 'proved' the baby was his); the dinner party had been disrupted by the new development, Smikrines had found out from Karion that Charisios had had a baby with Habrotonon (who was pretending to be its mother); then Charisios had overheard the conversation between Smikrines and his daughter at his own front-door. Incidentally, one notices that Charisios was apparently in no position to say to Habrotonon: 'Wait a minute. You're not the girl I was with that night at the Tauropolia!' But then, of course, it was necessary for the whole plot that he did not recognize in his wife the girl he had got pregnant that night (nor she him). How unromantic that escapade at Halai Araphenides was!

874 θεών τις υμάς ἠλέησε. The remark picks up Pamphile's earlier lament ‘who among the gods will pity me?’ (855). Some detect here an allusion to the divine superstructure of the play which was probably introduced in the (maddeningly van-

875 ἐψόφηκεν; cf. Dysk. 204 with Handley (1965, 164). Habrotonon announces that Chairestratos’ front-door has ‘creaked’; the announcement is necessary because (1) that the door should actually creak loudly would be ludicrous; (2) the person must not emerge unannounced, as he/she might see the characters still on stage. Although convention allowed people to be present on stage simultaneously without seeing each other, there was nothing to stop them seeing each other and Menander can clearly not risk undermining the tension he has been building so carefully here by letting Onesimos get a preview of the main recognition scene. *Exeunt* Pamphile and Habrotonon into Charisios’ house. Bader (1971) has examined the evidence concerning the ψόφος of doors in New Comedy and concluded that it is the creak of a door opened inwards by someone exiting that is referred to: ‘since the door opened inwards, the emerging man can step forth only after he has fully swung it open; thus he is invisible to the person on the stage during the creaking (ψοφεΐ) and the moment immediately after the creaking (ἐψόφηκε). In view of this consideration, it is perfectly plausible that the announcing person first mentions the creaking and on doing this mostly does not yet know who the new person is’ (p. 44).

5.5.3 Scene 3: The main recognition scene

**Onesimos’ introductory rhēsis**

878ff. Onesimos introduces the moral peripeteia of the play. First he describes his master’s extraordinary behaviour indicating what Onesimos can only construe as madness, then Charisios appears himself, bearing out what Onesimos said; this technique (preparation for the appearance of a character suffering from emotional distress) is paralleled in Menander in *Mis.* 703ff. Arnott (Getas prepares for Thra-sonides’ appearance) and in Dysk. 81ff. (Pyrrhias for Knemon’s); and in tragedy; e.g. the nurse prepares for Phaidra’s first manic appearance in Eur. *Hipp.*, or Soph. *Phil,* where Philoktetes’ anguished pain-attack has been prepared for by earlier description; for further parallels see Porter (2000, 166-67). Blundell (1980, 34) points out that ‘the arrangement also means that when Charisios appears he does not have to explain about his eavesdropping. In fact there is no need for any narrative elements that would detract from the emotional intensity’.

Slaves, being in close attendance on their owners, are well placed to transmit to an audience the private woes of their masters or mistresses. Onesimos’ description of Charisios’ behaviour offstage has some of the features of a tragic messenger-speech (Porter, 2000, 166-67). (1) It has narrative form: first Charisios is at the door, groaning and expostulating as he hears Pamphile’s brave words to her father; then he retires indoors to brood on the consequences of what he has heard. (2) The visual and auditory symptoms of inner torment are described: the changing colours of Charisios’ face (886-87); his cries, groans and self-castigation (889-90); then the
‘roaring’ and ‘tearing of his hair’ and ‘repeated fits’ (893). (3) Charisios’ words are reported. (4) Charisios uses language suited to a tragic hero: ὀ μέλεος (891), ἀλιτήριος (894), ἔργον ἐξειργασμένος (895) all set the tragic tenor; cf. G.-S. 361. The overall effect of the narrative is to convey to the audience the picture of extreme emotional distress. This is the ‘comic’ version of a Herakles Mainomenos or Polymestor (in Eur. Hek.). I cannot follow Zagagi’s view here (1994, 88) that Charisios’ appearance in 908 contrasts with Onesimos’ build-up. She believes that ‘when Charisios appears on stage, he is perfectly calm...a pattern of behaviour diametrically opposed to what the spectator was led to expect after the preliminary remarks of Onesimos’. True, Charisios is calm enough to speak when he appears, but his desperate self-chastisement seems rather to corroborate Onesimos’ portrayal of him (if on a less manic level) than to contradict it. Blundell (1980, 33) comments on the flow of the speech: ‘After the short asyndetic clauses, oaths and varied repetitions at the beginning, the narrative has a straggling sentence structure with δε and τε the most frequent particles.’ For the importance of the eavesdropping motif in this and other plays by Menander see Parker (2001).

878-79 For similar polyptoton of μαίνομαι cf. Sam. 361-63 μαίνομενος...μαίνεθ’; Dysk. 82. The repetition conveys the speaker’s amazement at the other’s state (i.e. ‘he’s off his head. Crazy. Stark raving bonkers’). ► νῆ τὸν Άπόλλω, chosen not, perhaps, quite fortuitously. Apollo was the god of sickness and cure; in Soph. Aj. 331 Aias is said to be διαπεφοιβάσθαι κακοίς, to be glossed, perhaps, as ‘afflicted by Apolline madness through adversity’ (although Athena was ‘officially’ responsible for his fit of madness).

878 υπομαίνεθ’, ‘he’s off his head’. The first letter might also be alpha, giving ἀπομαίνεθ’. This verb occurs in Sam. 419 (παύσεθ’ οὗτος ἀπομανείς, said of the raving Demeas). But G.-S. are probably right to say ad loc. that the aorist participle rules out the sense ‘he will stop being quite mad’. ἀπομαίνομαι seems rather to have the sense ‘come to one’s senses’ although a passage of Lucian (DDeor. 12.1) attests the sense ‘go mad’ as well. υπομαίνομαι is only attested elsewhere as a medical terminus technicus = ‘be somewhat mad’ (Hipp. Vict. 1.35). The sense of initial ὑπο- seems to be ‘a bit’, ‘a touch’, as in e.g. Plato Prot. 312a, ὑπέφαινέν τι ἡμέρας, ‘dawn was just beginning to show’; cf. ibid. 334d ὑπόκωφος, ‘a bit deaf’. The sequence of verbs expressing madness then progressively augments the initial statement (see previous note).

879 μεμάνητ’, a rare perfect middle form for the more common μέμηνα, cf. Theocr. 10.31.

880-81 χολή μέλαινα, black bile literally, was thought to cause ‘melancholy’, a form of madness (Aristoph. Eccl. 251), when outweighing the other bodily humours; cf. Dysk. 89 (μελαγχολήν), Sam. 218, Phasma 57 Arnott (ὑπεμελαγχολήνις τι), Alexis fr. 214.1 KA. Excess χολή alone (cf. χολάω) could also cause a dangerous ‘turn’, see Aesp. 422 χολῆ, λύπη τις, ἔκστασις φρενῶν (said of the supposedly dying
brother of Smikrines); cf. Aristoph. Peace 67. Onesimos’ diagnosis is hardly a sign of learning; the theory of the humours had found its place in common parlance. The ‘unpleasant man’ in Theophrastus (Char. 20.6) reports at a dinner party that his bile had become blacker than Spartan zōmos after taking hellebore. At a modern dinner party the talk may well be of polysaturated or polyunsaturated fats, or ‘good’ and ‘bad’ cholesterol without the speakers really knowing what they are talking about.

883 Fin. α... [. Leo’s supplement ἄρτι[ως πολύν has been generally accepted but I doubt it. After alpha rho is highly dubious, then tau possible, but the next letter cannot, in my opinion, be iota. I wonder whether something along the lines of ἀπόρπυβετις τινα (or πολύν) / χρόνον might not be better.

884 διακόπτων, ‘eavesdropping’, literally ‘bending one’s neck through (sc. a door or window)’; cf. Aristoph. Eccl. 930, Peace 78. One wonders whether Charisios’ head was actually visible to the audience (i.e. he had poked it round the door) or whether the door was merely ajar and the audience might guess (from noises from within?) that someone was eavesdropping. The fact that Onesimos now tells them that Charisios had been listening in on the conversation seems to me an argument for the latter. The other words πρὸς ταῖς θύραις, ‘at the door’, and ἐνδόν, ‘inside’ (not ‘from inside’, ἐνδόθεν) seem to support this view. Moreover, Onesimos – from within – claims to have seen the changes in Charisios’ colour (887). Perhaps Charisios was a kind of ‘shadowy presence’ just inside the half-open door during the foregoing debate. In Dysk. 821 Gorgias says he has overheard the previous conversation ‘at the door’ (ἐξιών πρὸς τῇ θύραι), and here it is unlikely that the audience could have seen him listening. Handley (1965, 275) says: ‘He may have been seen peering out, but should not, one feels, do anything to lay stress on the eavesdropping and distract attention from the scene on stage’.

885 τοῦ πράγματος Croiset, is a likely supplement, but the traces in O4 can hardly be said to lend any support.

886 ἐλάλει, slangy ‘he went on about’, for the emotional and rhetorical agon between father and daughter. The word reflects the slave’s scorn for what seem to him the capers of the free.

887 ἥλλαττε χρώματ’, ‘he changed colours’, cf. Eur. Med. 1168 χροιάν ἀλλάξασα, describing the princess’s ghastly change of hue when infected by Medea’s poison. The scribe of O4 seems to have written τοχρωμανδρεο which a later hand, seeing οία, no doubt, in the previous line, corrected to τοχρωμ’ατ Αχνδρετ. One might consider το the middle ending (ήλλάττετο), but the active is supported by the Medea passage and Emped. 137 (μορφήν), so το must be deleted.

888 ὁ γλυκύτατη τῶν λόγων, an exclamatory genitive, ‘O sweetest of women for the words you speak!’ cf. Dysk. 189 (Knemon’s daughter speaking) οἶμοι τάλαίνα τῶν ἐγώ χακάν; Eur. Hek. 661 ὁ τάλαίνα σής κακογλώσσου βοής, Soph. El. 920 φεύ τής ἄνοιας; cf. Verdenius (1974, 37) with more examples. The construction
is connected with verbs of surprise or admiration taking the genitive, e.g. Thuc. 6.36 τούτους τῆς τόλμης θαυμάζω.

889 ἀνεπάταξε. The rare compound verb has caused difficulties. Wilamowitz ad loc. (p. 97) thinks ἀνα- is anaphoric with ἀνέκραγε, and suggests ‘das Ansetzen’ of hand to head, as in ἀνακροτεῖν τῷ χείρε (Aristoph. Wealth 739), whilst G.-S. (361) wonder whether the force of ἀνα- is ‘knocked his head backwards by a blow to the forehead’ (my italics). Headlam sought a way round the problem with θ’ ἀμ’ ἐπάταξε, ‘and struck his head all the while’. Handley (per litt.) suggests ἄν ἐπάταξε with iterative άν and aorist: ‘and would strike his head repeatedly’. Leo (1907, 324) had already considered – and (without reasoning) rejected – this reading. Against: (i) ἀνέκραγε is clearly to be taken without άν, thus introducing a doubtful distinction between the aspects of both verbs; (ii) Wilamowitz was surely right to see rhetorical anaphora in the two instances of ἀνα-; cf. Aristoph. Lys. 668, ἀνηβήσας πάλιν καναπτερώσας. Finally, Gronewald (1994, 72) has defended ἀνεπάταξε, pointing out that ἀνα- can be iterative or emphatic as in ἀνατινάσσω (Eur. Ba. 663). He cites as a parallel to the whole expression here Josephus AJ 17.7.1 (187): (Ἡρώδης) ἀνεβόησεν τε ἀνατυψάμενος τὴν κεφαλήν, pointing out that -τυψάμενος is the Hellenistic equivalent of Attic -παταξ-. For another instance of head-beating in despair cf. Her. 4: τί γάρ σὺ κόπτεις τὴν κεφαλήν οὕτω πυχνά; 891 ἡτύχηκα, in an absolute sense, ‘suffer misfortune’, cf. fr. 631.2 and 636 K.-Th. (= 854.2 and 859 KA). There is something to be said for Kalbfleisch’s ἡδίκηκα, defended by Koerte (1943) with reference to Plut. Amator. 769d, where an anonymous line from comedy is quoted: οἶαν ἄδικῳ γυναῖκ’ ὁ δυσδαίμων εγώ (= com. adesp. 736 KA). But the case is not quite strong enough to emend, and Charisios’ own word ἀτυχής in 918 is some support for ἡτύχηκα here. For a speaker’s self-pitying use of the perfect of ἀτυχέω, ‘how unfortunate I have been!’, cf. Asp. 287. C’s text can be rendered: ‘Having taken such a [woman to] wife how I, wretch, have erred!’.

We should not take ἡτύχηκα here with supplied object (‘her’) in the sense ‘I’ve lost her’ (Wilamowitz and others). For ἀτυχέω in Peripatetic thought as ‘involuntary error’ as opposed to ἀδικέω as deliberate injustice see Barigazzi (1961). He also discusses related words such as ἀτύχημα and ἀτυχής in the play, concluding, too, that Kalbfleisch’s suggested emendation is not appropriate.

893 βρυχήθμως... συχνή, ‘a roaring, tearing of hair, repeated fits’. βρυχήθμως is used elsewhere of a lion’s roar, surf’s thunder; of a person’s mad roaring (βρυχήθμως θηριώδει) in Gregory’s Life of Gregory Thaumaturgus (MPG 46. vol. 46, page 904). When Medea in the Argonautika is distraught with worry having helped Jason against her father’s will she tears her hair and ‘groans in wretched despair’ (4.19 γοερήι βρυχήσατ’ ἀνίηι); βρυχάομαι denotes animal-like roars, wails or groans of anguish. At Sik. 221 we find βρυχώμενος and a scholion on Nicander Alex. 221 implies that Menander also used the verb βραχανάσθαι, but of a child’s wailing (fr. 668 KA).
cf. Asp. 422 (the brother who has had a nasty ‘turn’) χολή, λύπη τις, ἔκστασις φρένων. To experience ἔκστασις is to be ‘beside oneself’ with emotion, cf. Asp. 306-8 μελαγγολω... / οὐχ εἰμί ἐν ἐμαυτῷ... / ὁ καλὸς ἄδελφός εἰς τοσαύτην ἔκστασιν / ἡδὸν καθίστησιν με τῇ πονηρίᾳ. A frag. of Encheiridion 136 K.-Th. uses ἔκστασις by itself to denote ‘shock’: πάντα δὲ / τὰ μηδὲ προσδοκώμεν’ ἔκστασιν φέρει. The ‘repeated fits’ suffered by Charisios are like those suffered by Orestes in Eur. IT 307 (μανίας πίτυλος).

894 ἐγώ ἀλιτήριος, ‘it’s me who’s the culprit’, i.e. not Pamphile; cf. fr. 608 KA οἷς δ' ἀλαζών ἔστιν ἀλιτήριος. Charisios left Pamphile thinking she had given birth to an illegitimate child; he had felt ‘in the right’ as he explains shortly in his rhesis (908-10). But now he has discovered (1) that he had fathered such a child by Habrotonon (as he thinks) and (2) Pamphile had stood by him despite this, whilst he had taken the opposite line with her. Strictly speaking, Charisios might excuse himself by saying that at the time he abandoned Pamphile for her sin, he did not know he was guilty of the same offence; but that excuse is extraneous to Menander’s purpose here. ἀλιτήριος is a strong word, bringing in the question of theodicy. An aliterios is someone who has transgressed the moral code endorsed by gods, thereby incurring divine wrath (ἀλιτεία) (Hatch, 1908, 157-62). Charisios will explain shortly how ‘the divine’ (τὸ δαιμόνιον) decided he needed to be taught a lesson in view of his hybris toward Pamphile. In Perik. 986 Polemon rebukes himself in a similar way for his jealous rage against Glykera: δ' δ' ἀλάστωρ ἐγώ, ‘I am the transgressor’. Litigants in Athenian courts liked nothing better than to accuse their opponents of being ‘god-hated’, ‘enemy of god’ etc., e.g. Andokides 1.130-31 with Lysias 6.52 Against Andokides, cf. Furley (1996, 113-14); id. 13.79 Against Agoratos; Dem. 21.126 (MacDowell, 1990, ad loc.); as a term of abuse in comedy: Aristoph. Knights 445; Menander fr. 746.3 K.-Th. (= 608 KA); Straton fr. 1.49 KA.

898 βαρβαρος, ‘barbaric’; Charisios repeats the word in self-condemnation in line 924. As a term of abuse cf. Men. fr. 312 KA (Progamôn); Dem. 21.150 where the orator says it is τὸ τῆς φύσεως βάρβαρον which makes Meidias commit hybris against him. As Jaekel (1984, 14-15) says, the word applied to Charisios here is the apogee of υψηλός before.

899 ἀνηλέης, from ἀν + έλεος, ‘without pity’. In Call. HDelos 106 Hera is said to have an ἀνηλέεξ ἦτορ, ‘feeling no pity’ (οὐδὲ... ὀξιτισας): exactly what Charisios accuses himself of here.

900 βλέπει θ' υφαιμον, lit. ‘he’s looking bloody’, i.e. ‘his eyes are bloodshot’ with rage and pain; cf. Mis. 722 Arnott βλέπει δὲ πύρ, ‘with eyes aflame’. For βλέπω with internal accusative adjective cf. Aristoph. Wealth 424 βλέπει μανιξόν καὶ τραχιόνα; Euphro 9.16 KA γλασμόν βλέπει. ἡρεθισμένος, as G.-S. 362 say: ‘in a state of agitation’ not ‘under provocation’. Charisios has been provoked by no one; he is in a state of consternation brought on by an unpleasant realization (like a minor Oedipus, see Introduction p. 1f.); cf. fr. 519 K.-Th. (= 742 KA) εἰ καὶ σφόδρθ'
άλγείς, μηθέν ἥρεθισμένος / πράξης προπετώς.

901 πέφρικ' εγώ κτλ., 'I'm trembling, dry-mouthed with fear', cf. Sam. 515 where Moschion says, possibly a little ironically, αὖός εἰμι καὶ πέτυχα τῶι κακῶι; in Perik. 352-53 Daos says after his heated exchange with his master ὑ__[v] δέει (K.F.W. Schmidt) / αὖός εἰμ'; Alexis fr. 163.1 σῶμα μὲν ἐμοὶ τὸ θνητὸν αὐὸν (αὐον Arnott) ἐγένετο. For φρίττω, lit. 'bristle [sc. with fear]', cf. Dem. 21.135 τίς οὐκ ἐφριξεν; It is perhaps coincidental that the combination αὖός εἰμ τῶι δέει...οἴχομαι. / ἀπόλλωλα (905-6) is like the formula found on several gold funerary lamellae, texts inscribed on gold leaf and placed beside the corpse to guide it on its journey to a happier lot in the underworld. Here the soul of the deceased is made to say δίψαι αὖός εγώ καὶ ἀπόλλυμαι vel sim.; see Graf & Johnston (2007, e.g. nos. 10 and 11). That Onesimos is here alluding to these esoteric texts seems unlikely, but he does conclude with an appeal to Zeus to save him in his present situation (907), just as the mystēs appeals to Persephone (usually) for salvation. With Menander’s love of subtle allusion we should perhaps not exclude the possibility of such overtones here.

902-3 μέ...τὸν διαβαλόντα, 'me, the one who told on [her]'; the understood object must be Pamphile, who gave birth to an illegitimate child during Charisios’ absence, cf. 422-24, where Onesimos expresses himself more fully.

904 ὑπεκδέδυκα, T have slipped out'. There is something surreptitious about the verb δύομαι, 'pop' or 'slip', suited to a servant’s desire to move cleverly but unobtrusively round the house to further his purposes; cf. 422 αναδύομαι. The effect is, of course, underlined by λάθραι at the end of the line.

905 The mock-tragic rhythm and style of this line (and 901) are evident. Onesimos speaks like a stricken tragic hero. We are not supposed to take this too seriously, although Charisios’ predicament and mood are serious enough. Gronewald’s conjecture for this line (1987, 14): καί(τ)οι τράπωμαί γ’ εις τί βουλής; is flawed, I think, by the new weight γε receives by changing the syntax thus. There is, in Gronewald’s sentence, no emphasis on τράπωμαί, only on εἰς τί βουλής and, for that, γε is misplaced.

906 τὴν θύραν πέπληθεν ἐξιῶν; cf. Sam. 300, 366, 555; Dysk. 188. As Handley (1965, 164 on l. 188) says, τὴν θύραν πέπληξε τις is a ‘conventional formula of someone coming out of a house’. But whence the verb πλήττω, ‘strike’? It definitely does not mean that a person knocked on the door from the inside to warn people outside of his imminent exit (Bader (1971, 34-46) and Beare (1955, App. G)). If one compares a passage of Homer (Od. 21.46ff.) in which Penelope is said to ‘strike the pins of the doors upwards’ when opening them (θυρέων δ’ ἀνέκοπτεν ὄχης), with reconstructions of such a doorlock, one sees that the typical action involved in opening a door – whether from the inside or with a key from the outside – was to knock the fastening pins which held the cross-bar upwards, so as to ‘release the catch’. These pins were later known as βάλανοι, giving rise to the name balanos-lock (see
A. Neuburger, *Die Technik des Altertums*, Leipzig 1919, 338-39). Presumably the noise of this knocking action became equivalent to opening the door itself. In other words, comic characters neither banged nor kicked on a door before going through it, but rather knocked the latch before opening the door and exiting. The sound of this knocking functioned as an indication of an imminent door-opening.

G.-S. 574 seek to explain the phrase by the haste with which someone went through a door, pushing or shoving it roughly; they admit, however, that the instances in Menander do not all involve haste or impatience. The view of Bader (1971, 46-48) that the noise referred to someone (in a hurry to exit) reaching for the door-handle and, in so doing, pushing the door against the frame, thus making a knocking sound (‘this will result in an audible bang’), seems to me most unlikely. Bader makes the mistake, it seems to me, of not distinguishing between ‘locking’ a door (by means of bolts or a lock) and keeping a door during the day, when it was not locked, ‘on the latch’. Bader’s idea that nothing held a door closed during daytime would have been most impractical if there had been any wind whatsoever. Note the closed front door of Charisios’ house in daytime in line 1076 of this play. Likewise, the view of Blomquist (1987), that πλήττω here means not ‘strike’ but rather ‘set in motion’ without implying any knocking or hitting sound, fails to convince me at least. Blomquist argues at length that stage doors opened inwards, and he rejects Bader’s idea of the initial knocking sound which might result from pulling the door toward one hurriedly. But why say πλήττω if the main idea is ‘draw the door open toward one’? Nor do I believe that sound was not the key factor in these passages of comedy, announcing someone’s imminent entry; the corollory ψοφώ shows the importance of some attention-catching noise to stage action.

907 Frightened by Charisios’ appearance, Onesimos seeks refuge; Sandbach in G.-S. 363 and 366 thinks he popped into Charisios’ house and reentered in 932, closely followed by Habrotonon. But he recalls Gomme’s objection that, if Onesimos had entered Charisios’ house, he would have learned the truth about the baby from Pamphile and Habrotonon (who are discussing precisely this point) and would not therefore say ‘oh dear, what a fix I’m in’ (932) on next seeing Charisios. I think (with earlier editors) that it is preferable to imagine Onesimos ducking into the entrance way of Charisios’ house and cowering behind a pillar while Charisios delivers his confession speech. Then, on being spotted by Charisios in line 932, he first exclaims (‘oh dear, now what?’), and calls to Habrotonon within to help him in his fix.
Charisios’ confession

The moral peripeteia of the play. Menander has been building up to this first – and only – appearance of Charisios throughout the play. So far we have only experienced aspects of his mood and behaviour through the reports of others. Onesimos, Smikrines, Habrotonon and Chairestratos have all contributed to the composite picture we have formed of the young man in our minds. In particular, as mentioned above, Onesimos’ introductory speech paves the way for this psychological dénouement now. A confessional speech of this type is at the heart of several surviving plays of Menander. Knemon realizes the folly of his ways in Dysk. (713ff.), Polemon acknowledges his wrong-doing to Glykera in Perik. (esp. 984-89); in Plaut. Bacch. (a play based on Menander’s Dis Exapatōn), Mnesilochus’ speech of self-recrimination is comparable (611-24); he lambasts himself for his stupidity and shamelessness in having first mistrusted his best friend Pistoclerus, believing him to have taken his girl, and, second, ruined his slave Chrysalus’ excellent ruse to diddle his father out of money much needed by Mnesilochus. The string of insults and taunts he directs at himself is very similar to that of Charisios here. The psychological and moral insight gained by a Menandrean ‘hero’ in the course of a play represents a major innovation in dramatic technique (Wiles, 1991, 3, 29). By the time a tragic hero had ‘stumbled’ in the fifth-century, it was usually too late to mend his ways; true, insight was gained (πάθει μάθος) before death or disaster, but only just before. Then Aristotle analyzed tragic hamartia as the key to classical Athenian tragedy; the suffering hero was in some way – what way Aristotle left tantalizingly open – at fault or in error, and responsible for his own demise. Menander, aware of the Aristotelian analysis (witness Knemon’s words: ἐν δ’ ἵσως ἡμαρτον (713)), gave drama a new direction by (1) allowing the central character to realize his own error and regret it; (2) making the realization the gateway to a new and happier future. As Barigazzi (1961, 49) says, the speech of Charisios’ personified ‘conscience’ (daimonion) is in effect a ‘plea for pardon’ (‘un’ esortazione al perdono’) through the insight that everyone, Charisios included, is fallible. After this salutary lesson, he can forgive, and be reconciled with, Pampphile. Cf. Goldberg (1980, 69-71).

But what exactly is the charge of which Charisios finds himself guilty? He chastizes himself for treating his wife cruelly, barbarically, for doing nothing more than what he has done himself, or rather, what he has inflicted on another woman (Habrotonon, as he thinks). He left Pampphile when Onesimos told him she had given birth to, and exposed, a child which (by simple time reckoning) she must have conceived before her marriage to Charisios. Then Habrotonon confronts him with the evidence of his peccadillo at the Tauropolia: a baby, no less, with the ring which he knew he had lost. The conclusion? —Habrotonon had been the pretty girl he had forced on that dark night. Then Charisios’ chagrin: he had rejected Pampphile for no greater reason than that with which Habrotonon has now confronted him: his guilt at recognizing his fatherhood of ‘Habrotonon’s baby’ is compounded by the real-
ization that he has condemned Pamphile to the shameful status of spurned wife for exactly the same misfortune (cf. Vogt-Spira (1992, 170-73)). It is, indeed, as Arnott says, the realization that he has acted inhumanly to his wife, that all his good intentions and high principles have been shown up as fraud and posturing, that plunges him into despair and disgust with himself. Cf. Konstan (1994, 223-24): ‘Because the reversal in the drama centers on Kharisios’ recognition that Pamphile’s misfortune is analogous to his own, and that this misfortune is precisely that of having been responsible for the birth of a nothos, it is reasonable to suppose that the problem corresponds to the solution, and that Kharisios left his wife not because she had been raped as such, but rather because she had produced a bastard child’. The suggestion by Gaiser (1967, 25f.) that Charisios prides himself on being a philosophos – a pride now dashed – supports this view.

Rhetorically, Charisios’ speech is the culmination of Onesimos’ prologue. The circumstances have already been described by Onesimos and the mood set; now the man appears in person and demonstrates what has been said about him. The speech begins with a string of words and expressions indicating self-loathing; Charisios had thought he held the moral high ground, had been scrupulously attentive to right and wrong – only to discover how misplaced his pride had been. The speech then gains rhetorical shape through the device of the ‘inner dialogue’. Charisios imagines his daimonion, or ‘god within’, confronting him with his odiousness and deflating his pretensions to moral superiority with withering scorn. The device had been masterfully employed by Plato in Socratic dialogues in which Socrates imagined the Laws of Athens (Kriton 50a6 ff.), or Justice, addressing a humble individual and showing him how petty human motives are in the divine or cosmic scheme. It is interesting how the device used by Menander here – ‘god’ has found out Charisios’ wicked heart and punished him for it – coincides with the religious mentality revealed by the late texts from Asia Minor known as the ‘confession inscriptions’ (second and third c. AD). Versnel (1991, 75, with n. 77) writes: ‘The reason for the erection of the stele is often a confession of guilt (όμολογέω or έξομολογέω), to which the author has been forced by the punishing intervention of the deity (κολάζω, κόλασις), often manifested by illness or accident.’ For the richness and depth of this speech by Charisios see further Arnott (1968a, 17).

908-10 ἀναμάρτητος, ἀκέραιος, ἀνεπίπληκτος, ‘without a fault’, ‘unsullied’, ‘beyond reproach’. The anaphoric string of negatives is broken by two participial phrases expressing positive attributes: ‘looking to my reputation’ and ‘meticulous with regard to right and wrong’. This aspect of Charisios’ character – pride – had been singled out by Smikrines, too (693): υψηλός ών (cf. 922). Charisios has indeed found reason to ‘groan’ now. ἀναμάρτητος, coming first, is given particular emphasis: Charisios had thought himself without that kind of fault (αμαρτία) which led to downfall. Wilamowitz (p. 99) (cf. Arnott (1968a, 17) and Sandbach (1970, 133)) thinks Menander was unconsciously recalling Eur. Or. 922 ἀκέραιος ἀνεπίπληκτος ἡσυχώς βίον – or perhaps indeed consciously: the theme of mad-
ness brought on by crime is relevant to Charisios’ view of himself. Another passage of Menander (Sik. 176ff.) also echoes Orestes. In view of what was said in the introduction about Charisios’ identity as a ‘fallen moralist’ (see p. 20), the tragic language also seems relevant: it emphasizes the puffed-up haughtiness of Charisios before the fall.

908-9 βλέπων... σχοπῶν. Feneron (1974, 84) draws attention to the half-rhyme here. His study of rhyme in Menander shows that it is expressive of a range of heightened emotions – rage, despair, eagerness etc. (the most conspicuous user of rhyme is Demeas in Sam.).

909 καί το καλόν... σχοπῶν. This line in particular seems to characterize Charisios as a ‘thinking man’, possibly one versed in philosophy; but, as Gaiser (1967, 25-26) says, Menander is pointing to a danger in a philosophical bent: it is all very well reflecting on good and evil, but if one fails lamentably when confronted with a real-life situation involving the judgement of good and evil in those nearest and dearest to one, then it is a bane.

912 το δαιμόνιον, ‘a god’. This had become something of a terminus technicus for the anonymous hand of god working behind the scenes to steer events. According to Thucydides, Perikles used the word in the plural when pondering on the causes of the plague (2.64 τα δαιμόνια, ‘things of divine origin’); Demosthenes wonders similarly whether it is not ‘god’ rendering the Athenians inert in the face of Philip’s advances (9.54 μη τι δαιμόνια τα πράγματι τα πράγματα τα ελαχόντες). In an unplaced fragment of Middle or New Comedy (Austin, 1973, no. 239.1 = P.Berol. 11771 = com. adesp. 1032 KA) το δαιμόνιον is said to remind those with eyes to see that life is a loan, not a gift, and can be called in at any moment. But the use of daimonion here to refer to the voice ‘of a conscience within’ of divine origin recalls most closely the daimonion of Socrates (Jaekel, 1984, 13); both Plato and Xenophon refer to this aspect of Socrates’ personality: he believed in an ‘inner voice’ which protested when Socrates or another embarked on a course contrary to its will. The expression το καλόν ότι πότε έστι καί ταίς χρόνοι σχοπῶν (909) is also Socratic: that is exactly what Socrates encouraged people to do in their lives. Note the juxtaposition of το δαιμόνιον with έδειξε’ άνθρωπος ών in this line: moral insight (German ‘Läuterung’) involves the recognition by an individual of his basic inferiority vis-à-vis divinity: a case of γνώθι σαυτόν, as the Delphic oracle taught. Perhaps we may recognize here also another echo of Euripides’ Auge – a play mentioned explicitly in line 1125 (see p. 253) – in which someone (Herakles?) acknowledges: πάσιν γαρ άνθρωποις, οὐχ ἡμίν μόνον, / ἡ καὶ παρατύχει ἡ χρόνοι δαιμόνιον / ἔσφηλε, κούδεις διὰ τέλους εὔδαιμονε (= TGF 5.1.14 fr. 273).

912, 915, 917 έδειξε’, δείξω, έπιδειχθήσει. The repetition of forms of δείκνυμι implies a juridical tone: Charisios will be revealed by a process analogous to trial as a moral miscreant; cf. Dem. 21.12 Μεδίας... αξιο τι δοῦναι τὴν ἐσχάτην δίκην ποιῶν δειχθήσεται.
The daimonion’s speech has a number of literary ancestors. In the first place, as already mentioned, there are the passages in Socratic dialogues in which personified abstractions take voice (prosopopoeia) and chide mortals for their wicked behaviour. But this pattern itself has its roots in the tragic deus/dea ex machinā, a form developed especially by Euripides. When human affairs have reached an impasse, a deity intervenes at the end of a play to pronounce judgement on the aberrant actors, apportion blame and direct the course of future events. A classic example is Artemis’ appearance in Hippolytos; the goddess explains the divine rationale of the tragedy, settles relations between Hippolytos and Theseus and gives instructions for rites which will commemorate the tragedy. The deus/dea ex machinā usually spoke from the roof of the stage building, emphasizing the superiority of the deity’s standpoint. Thus, when Charisios’ daimonion is imagined speaking to him here, we should picture a spirit standing over and admonishing him. The speech has a rounded structure; it begins with words of abuse, spells out the reason for the abuse in the middle section, then returns to abuse in the last line. The speech is placed in parallel to Charisios’ own thought pattern by the echo between ἔδειξ’ ἄνθρωπος ὧν (912) and ἐπιδειχθήσει... ἀγνώμων τ’ ἄνηρ (917-18).

It is not self-evident, however, where the daimonion’s speech begins and ends precisely. The suggestion (Koerte & Thierfelder, 1953-1955, vol. 1) that the speech began with ἄνθρωπος ὧν has the advantage of allowing ἔδειξ’ to remain 3rd p.s. (subj.: daimonion) but the disadvantage of requiring δείκνυμι to function as a plain verbum dicendi (which it normally does not). To avoid this difficulty Donzelli (1989, 322-24) suggested emending the line to τό δαιμόνιον· ἐντάυθ’ ἔδειξ’ “ἄνθρωπος ὧν”, but one wonders whether the legal terminus technicus ἐνδείκνυμι is really suitable in the daimonion’s mouth (pace Donzelli (1989, 324 n. 27)); and something of the difficulty of ἔδειξε = εἶπε remains. Most editors have chosen to make the speech begin in line 913 ὧ τρισκακόδαιμον κτλ., making ἔδειξ’ first person singular and Charisios the new subject: ‘there I showed I was just a man’. Although the change in subject is harsh, I see no better solution yet.

And where did the speech-within-a-speech end? The continued use of the second person singular pronoun in 919 and 922 might indicate that the daimonion continues speaking until e.g. the end of 924, ending on the resounding βάρβαρος. But there is a change between 918 and 919 in that the words spoken by the daimonion in 913-18 are prophetic (future tenses), whilst Charisios’ words following that are observations of past events, i.e. those available to mortals as well; moreover Charisios himself knows what Pamphile had said to her father in the previous scene; he does not need instruction from the daimonion about that (919). Accordingly, I think it best to close the quoted speech at the end of 918.

Perhaps we may conclude that, because there is a sliding, or hidden, transition from Charisios’ words to the daimonion’s and back again, that the effect is deliberate: it serves to emphasize the identity of Charisios’ thought-processes with the explicit criticism of the daimonion: after all, the daimonion is conceived as an inner
voice. What is more natural than that a person’s words should hardly be distinguishable from those of his/her inner voice?


914 ἀκούσιον ἀτύχημ’, an ‘involuntary misfortune’. ἀκούσιος is a legal term in Athenian homicide law (e.g. Antiphon 3.2.6; cf. MacDowell (1978, 114-15)), suitable in this context where Charisios is judging himself. Menander fr. 688 KA (unnamed play) emphasizes the distinction between an ἀτύχημα which happens διὰ τύχην and an ἀδίκημα which is a matter of choice (αἰρέσει). In Euripides’ Auge (see below p. 253) Herakles says to Auge (having raped her at a nocturnal festival of Athena): νῦν δ’ ὑπὸς ἐξέστησέ μ’· ομολογώ δέ σε / ἀδικείν, τό δ’ ἀδίκημ’ ἐγένετ’ οὕχ ἑκούσιον. This is the reverse side of the coin, as it were: Pamphile could hardly have avoided Charisios’ force (Charisios does not yet know it was himself who forced her).

915-17 Charisios realizes that he has abused his good and faithful wife; they have been involved in similar premarital affairs (as he thinks) yet he spurned her as a result while she treated him kindly. It is precisely this failure to ‘do as you would be done by’ which is highlighted in an interesting passage of Dem. 21.101 (Against Meidias, cf. ibid. 184; MacDowell (1990, ad loc.)). There Demosthenes says that all men reckon that their actions are a kind of investment (ἔρανος) in their own future; a good man expects to receive similar treatment from others in return, whilst a man who shows no pity to others should not expect pity from them. Charisios realizes that he has failed to observe this type of moral contract. Cf. Mis. 717-18 Arnott, where Getas expresses the view that it is right to reciprocate mercy: ἐλεεΐν ὀρθῶς εἴχει / τὸν ἀ[ν]τελεούνθ’. It is interesting that the argument in Epitrep. assumes equal rights for wife and husband. The concept of shared humanity between the sexes represents a major advance on the archaic idea of the fellowship of men governed by a code of honour, and women as passive recipients. One assumes, for example, that the audience of Aeschylus’ Eumenides did not boo and shoot when Apollo (658-61) and Athena (736-40) pointed out woman’s inferior place to man in the world’s design.

918 σκαλος καὶ ἀγνώμων, cf. fr. 641.1 KA; Dem. 18.120 οὕτω σκαώς εἰ καὶ ἀναστήτος, Αἰσχύνη κτλ., and, ibid. 289, where the orator admonishes Aischines ἵν’ εἰδήσ. . . σαυτὸν ἀγνώμονα καὶ συκοφάντην ὁντα καὶ μικρὸν. ▶ ἀγνώμων, ‘without perception’ = ‘senseless’, ‘brutish’; opp. to μετὰ λογισμοῦ πρᾶττειν fr. 641 KA; cf. Aischin. 3.244; Dem. 18.94 ἡγνωμονήσεων (of ‘offences’ committed). Theophrastus Peri Paideias ap. Stob. 2.31.124, had taught that paideia should
‘tame souls, taking away the beastly and uneducated element...’ (ἡμεροὺν τὰς ψυχάς, ἀφαιροῦσα τὸ θηριῶδες καὶ ἀγνωμον κτλ.); this is precisely Charisios’ confession: he had thought himself an educated and civilized man, but experience has now taught him the contrary (Gaiser, 1967, 34-35).

919 ὁμοία γ’ εἶπεν...τότε. Presumably Charisios means that Pamphile took a quite different line from that which he had intended taking when speaking to Smikrines about his daughter’s (perceived) breach of trust. He was going to say something like ‘I thought I was marrying a pure woman, but now that she has disappointed all my hopes, I see no other course than...’, whilst she said ‘I don’t care what he’s done; I’m sticking by him’. As G.-S. (p. 365) say, γε must be sarcastic: ‘similar, I don’t think...’. The comparison is sharpened by the fact that both sets of remarks were addressed to the same person, πρὸς τὸν πατέρα. As Zagagi (1994, 68) says, the conversation overheard between Smikrines and Pamphile has an opposite effect to that intended by Smikrines. He instructed Pamphile to leave Charisios; her refusal to do this resulted indirectly in a better understanding between the couple.

921 [ἐπειτὰ δ']. The point of this supplement is to make Charisios the intended speaker, not Pamphile. Charisios is recalling what he imagined saying to Smikrines that time when the father-in-law arrived to remove his daughter from the marriage. Other supplements make Pamphile the speaker, which seems to me less appropriate and also creates a dubious construction with the accusative αὐτήν if Pamphile is also the speaker (e.g. έφασκε κοῦ Wilamowitz). For ἐπειτὰ δὲ in logical argumentation cf. e.g. Antiphon 5.16.

924 βάρβαρος, cf. 898. Charisios presumably returns to this word of self-denigration.

925-27 The sense may be that Pamphile will, in the course of time, leave him (μέτεισι διὰ τέλους).

928 χαλεπώτατ’ Amott (originally Arnott (1978, 13)). An improved reading, in my opinion, on earlier ἔστατ’.

929-31 Charisios imagines how he will ward off Smikrines’ future attempts to remove his daughter. Before he would have explained to Smikrines how he could not stay with Pamphile after her misfortune; now he will change his tune, stand by her and tell the father where to get off. But Charisios does not inspire our admiration. This is only imagined conversation, a man bolstering his amour-propre by picturing himself saying certain things in a tricky situation. One feels that, faced with Smikrines in person, he might wilt. Menander always has his eye on the rhetorical aspects of a situation. Here Charisios imagines countering both possible lines of attack by his father-in-law: on him (929 έμο’ι συ) and on Pamphile (931).


930 ἀπολείπει. As Handley (1965, 133) says on Dysk. 22, ἀπολείπω is the technical
term for a wife leaving her husband; cf. fr. 523 KA (inc. fab.); Dem. 30.4; P.Oxy. 27.2464 col. ii; Harrison (1998, 40).

932 το! σ' φυρ βλέπω γ'ω; Charisios spots Onesimos cowering in the entrance of his own house. Others make these words the end of Charisios' imagined speech, i.e. (to Smikrines) 'why do I see you here again' (G.-S. p. 366). But note the interpolated 'here' in this translation, necessary to give the correct sense if Charisios is addressing Smikrines (who has turned up here again), unnecessary if Charisios has just spotted Onesimos: 'why – it's you again I see before me!' Moreover, the remark is in the wrong logical order if said to Smikrines: 'What are you doing here again?' should come before, not after the other expostulations. When Charisios spots him, Onesimos sighs 'oh dear, now I'm really for it!' (932-33) Before answering his master directly he calls in to Habrotonon to give him support. That is logical; it had been her plan to confront Charisios with baby and ring; Onesimos had only collaborated. Now he wants her to share in the master's blame. Other reconstructions seem to me unnecessarily complex (G.-S. p. 366).

933 και σος τούτοις, φίλη. Onesimos addresses this remark over his shoulder to Habrotonon inside; cf. Zagagi (2004). It is necessary to motivate her appearance in 940. φίλη seems less abrupt than Wilamowitz' γύναι, and at the same time appeals to the solidarity which the two had established in act three to implement the ruse. ► Arnott (1978, 13-14) objects that εγκαταλείπω in Menander and contemporary comedy 'is constructed solely with the accusative (in the sense of 'desert)'), but his supplement και σού δέομαι τούτοις, φίλη introduces a superfluous τούτο. The sense required by τούτοις, '[desert me] in this situation' does not seem strained to me; it links up naturally enough with their earlier collaboration in act 3 when they hatched the plot. Onesimos is saying here 'you can't desert me now!'.

935-38 Arnott (1978, 14-15) points out that C has no paragraphos under 936 and 937, indicating that Onesimos spoke all the words from μα τούς θεούς... to πάντ' ἐπαχρόσει. His reconstruction is worth quoting in full, although it remains conjectural:

[μ]α τούς θεούς,
ἀλλ' ἀρτίως ἐξήλθον. ἀ[μ]λα πος] λαβεῖν
ἐσταί σε'; ἐπα[ξε] ὡμίν το[σαύτα], νη Δ[ια]
πάντ' ἐπαχρόσει; (935-38)

According to this, 938-40 then contain Charisios' riposte: ἐγώ σὲ λανθάνειν πον[ηρόν ὄντα] κατ 'βροντόντα;

935 ἑρόσυλή μοι. One could divide ἑρόσυλη ἐμοῦ, but there is no emphasis on 'me' intended here.

942 The beginning of this line is commonly restored as τίς εἀ σφ; but I cannot believe that Charisios could say that to Habrotonon.
947 C's reading εξαπειράθη is reasonably clear, but a likely supplement proves elusive. One might consider έξαπίνης (Arnott, ει for [short] iota), but that is unparalleled in C. εξ followed by another word does not seem likely. Perhaps the alpha is wrong and we have here another form of ἐκπειράομαι as in 950.

950 ἐξεπειράθη[τέ μου:]. According to this supplement, Charisios is realizing angrily that he has been duped by Habrotonon and Onesimos in tandem. ἐκπειράομαι, 'test', 'make trial of', c. gen. pers. cf. Hdt. 3.135. Habrotonon's idea had indeed been to 'test' Charisios' reaction to ring and baby in order to ascertain his fatherhood. It is interesting in this and the following lines how a sequence of expressive verbs shows how Charisios has been the victim of circumstances, and, to a certain extent, intrigue; ἐκπειράομαι is followed by περισπαί (952) and ἀναπτέρου (957). Charisios' state of mind, or psyche, is the focus of this play.

952 περισπαί, lit. 'twist around' or 'twist off', seems to require a sense like 'trick' (G.-S. p. 368 'mislead') or possibly 'blackmail'. In line 360 Daos comments after the adjudication that, having found all, he is now 'robbed of' or 'tricked out of all' (ἀπάντα περιέσπασμ'), cf. Philippides fr. 23.1 KA (περισπάσειν κερμάτιον, like Engl. 'rip off'). When we recall that Syriskos had accused Onesimos of wanting to use the ring for extortion (458), we may suspect a similar meaning here: Charisios is accusing Onesimos of being in on some plot to blackmail him by confronting him with ring and baby. The pejorative ἰερόσυλε, 'thief', 'scoundrel', accords naturally with this. Charisios had already called Onesimos this in 935; it seems unlikely to me that he is addressing Habrotonon here.

953 γλυκύτατε. For the supplement cf. note on line 143 (p. 132).

954 Arnott (1978, 15) objects to [τέκνον] (Koerte) to describe the baby, as it is elsewhere called παιδίον or παιδάριον; τέκνον is common enough in Menander, but it usually means 'child' in the sense 'my child' and not 'baby'. Arnott suggests [ίδιον] spelled (to fill the gap) είδιον or ιδειον, but this is pleonastic with τής γαμέτης γυναικός εστί σού, and, as noticed above, such itacism is not characteristic of C. I wondered about γεγονός (all quite narrow letters apart from nu), but Wilamowitz' τούτι seems, on balance, the safest option.

957 Παμφίλης; Charisios repeats the question as it is the sticking point in his grasp of the facts. He had already thought the child was his – the ring proved that much – but that Pamphile is its mother (still) passes his comprehension.

958 ἀναπτέρου, 2nd p.s. imperative active, 'excite', 'raise my expectations', lit. 'set my wings at the ready [for flight]', cf. Eur. Or. 876 μον τι... ἁγγέλμ' ἀνεπτέρωκε Δαναϊδών πόλειν; In Aristoph. Lys. 668 (in anaphora with ἀνηβάω) the verb has the sense 'rejuvenate', 'revive'; here, too, Charisios means that Habrotonon should not revive his spirits with an empty claim.

958-68 Arnott (1979b, 55) calculates the gap in C here as 'between 10 and 13' lines, whereas previous editors said 'about 10'.
5.6 Act Five

5.6.1 Scene 1: Chairestratos reflects

If the restoration of Chairestratos’ name in 982 is correct, the opening lines are either spoken by someone to Chairestratos or by himself in self-address. In either case, Chairestratos has returned from the errand on which he departed at the end of act three. We must assume that he has had no opportunity to learn of the developments in the meantime, i.e. that both Pamphile and Charisios have discovered from Habrotonon that they are the parents of the foundling child, conceived, admittedly, some four months before their marriage. Since all the other characters – except Smikrines (and he cannot speak these lines) – are now ‘in the know’, it seems to me, with Webster originally (G.-S. p. 373), that the lines are best envisaged as Selbstgespräch; otherwise, one of their functions would have had to be to fill Chairestratos in on the exciting new developments, and they do not seem to do this.

I think we should imagine a Chairestratos returning to the scene to confront what for him is a major problem: how to succeed with Habrotonon while she is officially with Charisios? (Primmer, 1986, 124). We have seen how a possible reconstruction of the mutilated text at the end of act three shows Chairestratos despondent because he thinks Charisios is going to maintain a ménage à trois with Pamphile and Habrotonon; that would foil Chairestratos’ interests. The audience now knows that this is no longer an obstacle to Chairestratos’ desire for Habrotonon; they see him in an ironical light, pondering the choice between his friendship for Charisios and his desire for Habrotonon. A good parallel for a character in a quandary debating with himself is Dysk. 214ff. where Sostratos exhorts himself to persevere in his suit despite the daunting impediment of the girl’s father; other instances: Demeas in Sam. 326, 349; Moschion in Sik. 397ff. For discussion of earlier theories how these lines fitted the action of the play see G.-S. 370-73. Later in this first scene Onesimos appeared (name in margin at 1021; first appearance likely just before 1005) and probably filled him in on developments. Line 1021 ἀπέσωσε most probably refers to the ‘saving’ of the baby; in 1040 Habrotonon is mentioned, hardly addressed; ἀπεκχομένου in 1052 may refer to the joint plot of Habrotonon and Onesimos to get the truth from Charisios. In my opinion, then, this first scene served to demystify the last character but one (Chairestratos), leaving only Smikrines as focus of attention for the next scene.

982ff. τῷ μετὰ ταῖς ἑκάστης σκέψεις. The drift of Chairestratos’ thoughts, as far as they may be deduced from the remaining text, seems to be: ‘I must consider my next step: how to remain a true friend to Charisios. She’s no common whore; she’s already had a baby by him in a free-minded spirit. Forget her...!’ In other words, Chairestratos believes his desire for Habrotonon is incompatible with friendship with Charisios who – in Chairestratos’ still unenlightened state – has fathered a child on her at the Tauropolia.
984 Von Arnim's correction of C's οίσθα to ήσθα certainly improves sense, but one wonders why the writer made the mistake; perhaps the οί- at line beginning was responsible. οίσθα might, at a push, be maintained in construction with ών from the previous line; that would make ών apo koinou, cf. 565-66 ἐμπεσόν / οίδα; but there is nothing to be gained by retaining it.

984-85 'She's not just a cheap prostitute or your average tart'. The sentiment is like that in Perik. 340-1, where Daos says that Glykera has taken refuge in Myrrhine's house not like 'a flute-girl or some wretched little whore' (ὡς αὐτἡ[η]τρη[ίς] οὐδ' ὡς πορνίδιον τρισάθλιον).

985 παίγνιον (Sudhaus), cf. Anaxandrides fr. 9.3 KA. παιδίον (Herwerden) is also a possibility, cf. LSJ s.v. II; Krateia in Mis. 613 Arnott is called a paidion by her father in the sense 'my child'. In this play, however, we already have a παιδίον, the baby child itself.

986-87 'In haste she's already given birth to a child: her mind is free'. In this reconstruction of the lines, Chairestatos declares that Habrotonon has claimed her place at Charisios' side by giving birth - tout de suite - to his child, as if she were his legitimate wife. ► τέτοχ' cf. 439, where Chairestratos probably learns from, or discusses with, Smikrides the fact that Charisios has a child by Habrotonon. ► ὁ νοῦς (Jensen) or ἔρως (Schwartz) supplies a masculine noun with which ελεύθερος can agree, but it also introduces an abrupt change of subject. One might consider taking ελευθέρος in 987 as feminine (as in e.g. Aesch. Ag. 328), with Habrotonon still subject, but elsewhere in Menander ελευθέρος clearly has three terminations. Or one might emend ελευθέρος to either ελευθέρ(ι)ος (clearly an adjective with two terminations, see e.g. Her. 40) or ελευθέρως, but Jensen's supplement of 986 works without emendation, so seems preferable to other solutions. For this use of 'independent' ὁ νοῦς acting, as it were, of its own accord, cf. Aristoph. Wasps 93 ὁ νοῦς πέτεται; and for νοῦς = character of a certain sort cf. Od. 329 σοί δέ τις ἐν στήθεσιν ἀκῆλητος νόος ἐστίν.

1018-1023 Arnott (1979b) argued for the placing of this small piece of C (U1) after line 1014. His calculation of the gap after line 1014 (ten lines) means that a maximum of four lines stood between 1014 and 1018. The fragment appears in places to have a somewhat wider left margin (3cm) than usual (2.5cm), but Arnott argues persuasively that there are visible holes in the scrap at a distance of 2.5 cm from the line-beginnings, indicating where the margin originally ran.

1052-57 These line ends are on the other side of the fragment of C containing 1018-1023 and placed here by Arnott (1979b).

1060-61 Puzzling lines, as G.-S. p. 375 say. I feel that Chairestratos is still the most likely character to say 'I won't touch [her, i.e. Habrotonon]' (ἀφέξομαι), but I cannot think who ἐκείνος might be, unless Charisios (although he had kept his hands off Habrotonon, through pining for Pamphile). Presumably τοιαύτησι, 'a woman like her', is Habrotonon.
5.6.2 Scene 2: The chastisement of Smikrines

In *Dysk.*, Menander filled the fifth act with the chastisement of Knemon by cheeky slaves, even though he had already been made to see the error of his ways in act four and had delivered a suitably remorseful confession speech and conceded to the marriage of his daughter to Sostratos. Here, in my opinion, Menander manages the ‘chastisement’ theme better. Smikrines had been irritating everyone throughout the play by his insistence on receiving his ‘pound of flesh’ following Charisios’ ungentlemanly behaviour. Whilst others had been caught in the pangs of disappointed love, followed by chagrin (Charisios), or had kept steadfastly to their marriage vows through thick and thin (Pamphile), Smikrines had appeared interested only in the mundane question of the dowry going to waste and the compromised position of his daughter in the eyes of society. He had kept knocking on Charisios’ door to pursue the unhappy young couple and force the issue. Alone of all characters he has been left in the dark about the identity of the baby, leaving this magnificent scene at the close of the play, in which a mere slave, Onesimos, runs verbal rings round a floundering and perplexed Smikrines, caught between the scolding of an old woman, Sophrone, and the malicious teasing of a slave. It is a most satisfactory aftermath to a play of taut emotions and narrowly averted domestic grief. The only character not threatened directly by the emotional crisis in Charisios’ household in the main action of the play is left out on a limb at the end, made to look a fool.

Smikrines and Sophrone

When Smikrines bursts in on the scene, he is in mid-conversation with an elderly serving person, Sophrone. He appears to be rushing toward Charisios’ house with Sophrone (probably physically: see ἀρπασμ’ in line 1082) in tow. Whilst he rants, she does not actually say anything. The ‘dialogue’ consists of Smikrines’ indignant retorts to words he puts in the old woman’s mouth. There are good reasons for thinking Sophrone a *kōphon prosōpon* throughout this scene (see page p. 253 below). In this one-sided exchange it emerges that Sophrone is trying to restrain Smikrines who is hell-bent on forcing the divorce of Pamphile. One may wonder why Sophrone features in this scene at all. Would it not be sufficient for Smikrines to rant on his own, as he does in previous scenes? Soon he will have Onesimos as interlocutor, who proceeds to bait him. I think the explanation lies in Smikrines’ purpose. He is now determined that Pamphile should quit her husband and his house. For that purpose a maid to assist and escort Pamphile is desirable. As in the old days, when Pamphile was a girl living in her father’s house, Sophrone should resume her duties as servant to Pamphile. That she is reluctant to assist Smikrines in the course on which he has embarked shows both her fondness for Pamphile, and serves as foil to the precipitate action of Smikrines.

1062 Smikrines’ first remark is an oath (‘I’ll be damned if I don’t break your
Commentary

head, Sophrone’), exciting the audience’s curiosity as to why Smikrines is cross. Σωφρόνη may be one of those ‘linking’ word-plays (with σώφρονα in 1060) which help to bridge scenes; cf. Handley (1987, 307) with examples from Dysk. and Mis. Wilamowitz p. 108 recalls nurses named Sophrone in Eunuchus and Phormio, Arist. Arist.16. Cusset (2003, 171-73) discusses Sophrone’s role in the play (her knowledge of what Pamphile had suffered) with reference to the role of the nurse in a putative reconstruction of Euripides’ Alope (for the relevance of this see above p. 143).

1063 καί σὺ με; Deliberate word order giving emphasis: ‘What, you scold me?’

1064 προπετῶς ἀπάγω κτλ.; Antilepsis in rhetoric: a speaker picks up an opponent’s point in order to refute it: ‘what, I’m removing my daughter hastily [you say]?’ The refutation follows in the form of a rhetorical question: ‘should I wait until the rogue has run through the entire dowry?’ (expected answer: no!). ▶ προπετής has a negative connotation, ‘hastily’, ‘rashly’, like προπέτεια, ‘recklessness’ Dem. 19.251; Hyperides Against Diondas p. 8 line 8 (Carey et al., 2008).

1065-67 Smikrines’ indignant rhetoric is always entertaining: here three points underline the plain statement: (1) the enemy is said – with heavy sarcasm – to be a ‘worthy gentleman’ (χρηστόν ἄνδρα); (2) his spending habits are exaggerated coarsely: he ‘gobbles up’ (καταφαγεῖν) the dowry; (3) Smikrines has no need to defend himself as it’s only his property at stake anyway (λόγους λέγω subj. – περὶ τῶν ἐμαυτοῦ;).

1065-66 περιμέ(ί)νω (Croenert), far from being a ‘dubious aorist’ (G.-S.) is better in sense as a ‘complexive aorist’ suiting the aspect of καταφαγεῖν, ‘gobble up’. A present subjunctive here would imply ‘am I hanging round?’ ▶ λόγους λέγω, on the other hand has ‘durative aspect’: ‘should I be justifying myself?’

1066 τὸν χρηστὸν... ὀινδρα. For a similarly sarcastic use of χρηστός, ‘worthy’, cf. Halieis fr. 20 KA ὁ χρηστός ἡμίν μουχός.

1068 ὀξυλαβήσαι, ‘strike quickly’, ‘preempt’. Probably a military metaphor, cf. Xen. Hell. 7.4.27; Galen De parvae pilae exercitio vol. 5, p. 905.2 Wenkebach, where ὀξυλαβήσαι τὴν πρᾶξιν is said to be a virtue of good commanders. In Eustathius, Comm. ad Iliad. vol. 3, p. 45.4, ‘a direct approach’ in military strategy is contrasted with a ‘roundabout’ one: οὐ γὰρ προοιμίου νῦν ἄλλ’ ὀξυλαβεῖσα εἴδει τῶι καρπῶι. ▶ ὀἰμόωξει μαχρά, see above on 133 (p. 130).

1069 τί; Arnott (1978, 15-16) makes a strong case for Coppola’s punctuation by counting instances of λαλέω with internal or external object in Menander (very infrequent compared to instances without an object of what is said). Moreover, τί; introduces the following rhetorical question nicely, too. ▶ πρὸς Σωφρόνην: Wilamowitz emended to πρὸς Παμφίλην, thinking that χρίνομαι meant (med.) ‘decide a dispute’. But χρίνομαι pass., ‘be judged before’, makes good sense. For similar hypothetical cases of submitting to judgement (χρίνεσθαι) cf. Plato Gorg. 521e3; Hyperides Against Diondas p. 2.18 Carey et al. (2008).
1070-74 "μετάπειτον... ἵδης". I take this as quoted speech. Smikrines repeats Sophrone's (in his view) absurd suggestion – that he should persuade rather than coerce Pamphile – before rebutting it with threats and oaths (Bodin, 1908, 76). In effect, he says: 'Persuade her, should I?... I'll give you "persuade" by ducking you in that pond!' This interpretation makes better sense of γάρ in 1071, as it marks the second sentence as response to Sophrone’s objection (quoted by Smikrines, as Sophrone cannot speak herself). Read like this, the quoted remark of Sophrone matches Smikrines’ earlier expostulation (1064) προπέτως ἀπάγω τὴν θυγατέρα.; ‘what? It’s rash to take my daughter away?’, as these words too, are a quasi-quotation of an objection by Sophrone. G.-S. p. 376 and others take the first sentence (μετάπεικον... ἵδης) as an order by Smikrines to Sophrone: ‘Persuade Pamphile to change her mind, when you see her’. But this is illogical, as Smikrines is dragging Sophrone to Pamphile’s front door to assist in his coercion of her; there is no doubt when Sophrone will see Pamphile. The point of δταν ἵδης becomes clear if the words are envisaged as spoken by Sophrone; she is telling Smikrines to ‘persuade her when you see her’, i.e. some time in the future, not now in this precipitate manner. For similar quoted speech in agitated monologue see Polemon’s speech in Mis. 791ff. Arnott. ► μετάπειεις... ἀναγχάσω, ‘persuade... compel’. The same distinction between persuasion and compulsion had been made by Pamphile (713-14). Even if Smikrines was within his legal rights in removing Pamphile from a broken marriage (see Introduction, section 1.5) Sophrone, too, urges him to use persuasion rather than compulsion. For the antithesis compulsion/persuasion see further Dysk. 250ff., Perik. 497-503.

1070-73 The rapid and abrupt changes of subject in this sentence, combined with the expletive οὐτω τί μοι αγαθόν γένοιτο, and the exaggeration ‘I’ll duck you in the pond the whole night long’, further illustrate Smikrines’ indignation. He may also be a little breathless from rushing to Charisios’ house yet again, this time with Sophrone in tow. For the oddly positioned ► γάρ cf. line 479. Feneron (1974, 85) finds that the triple anapaestic opening of lines 1070-72 ‘emphasize(s) Smikrines’ angry, disjointed phrasing’.

1073 The threat of ducking ‘all night long’ reminds one of Alkibiades’ alleged threat to Eupolis to ‘duck him in the bitterest waters’ (off Sicily) in revenge for Eupolis’ having satirized Alkibiades in his play Baptai, see Σ Ael. Aristid. or. 3.8 L.-B., PCG V p. 332, test. iii.

1080-82 Fraenkel (1941) gave the whole speech from έγώγε to δαιμόνων to Smikrines (but retracted the following year (Fraenkel, 1942) on the last expression προς θεῶν καὶ δαματῶν). This can hardly be right: the exclamation in 1082 θαυμαστόν οἶνον must be someone else’s comment on Smikrines’ behaviour, not his own.

1080 τρισκατάρατε, ‘thrice-cursed’; cf. τρισκακοδαίμων in 145; Men. fr. 71 KA. κατάρατος is a standard term of abuse in the orators, e.g. Dem. 21.164; τρισκακατάρατος itself in Menander fr. 65 K.-Th. (= 71 KA) (from Arrhephoros or Auletris).
1082 ἄρπασμ', 'booty', 'plunder'; the nomen actionis, however, is ἄρπασμός, e.g. Plut. Quaest. conv. 644A3. So ἄρπασμα here should refer to something that someone has snatched, or removed as plunder; in Plato Laws 906d3, ἄρπάσματα are what wolves snatch from flocks; in Aeschines 3.222 ἄρπάγματα are monies 'embezzled' from the state. Given this, at least two interpretations recommend themselves. (1) With Wilamowitz and G.-S. (although the former thought Smikrines was speaking), the 'booty' refers to the dowry which Charisios has 'stolen' from Smikrines; so Onesimos would here be saying, with heavy irony: 'And the robbery is indeed remarkable!' (2) Post (1929, 209) suggests that ἄρπασμ' refers to the sight of Smikrines hauling Sophrone along with him, a kind of comic rape vignette; he would translate: 'For his haste befits a man of reason and extreme good sense; and his prize, Lord save us, what a stunner!' According to this Sophrone is the 'prize' or 'booty' (ἄρπασμα) Smikrines is dragging along with him. At any rate, it does not seem possible that ἄρπασμα refers here to the action of dragging Pamphile from her home.

Wilamowitz (p. 109), believing that there was dikolon after σπουδή, read δ' for Θ' and maintained that Smikrines spoke these words; but the dikolon is probably imaginary and the resulting combination of two forms of oath (Ἡράκλεις and πρὸς θεῶν καὶ δαιμόνων) in a single utterance is awkward.

1083 πρὸς θεῶν καὶ δαιμόνων. The words must come from Smikrines in order to 'trigger' Onesimos' rejoinder on divine intervention. C gives no indication of change of speaker, before or after the words. The position of Feneron (1974, 89), that the whole of 1080-86 may be given to Onesimos, is untenable.

1084-99. Onesimos picks up Smikrines' oath to rebut its implications in a mocking manner: why should Smikrines think gods care about such apparent miscarriages of justice? Their life would be a misery if they had to intervene in all the myriad disputes between men. His 'proof' of the non-involvement of gods in human morality reads like a parody of philosophical 'refutations' of traditional belief in the Olympians. It was a venerable tradition initiated, as far as we can see, by Xenophanes who suggested that cows, if they had hands, would fashion cow-shaped gods, continued by Plato (e.g. in the Euthyphro) and the Sophists and echoed in argumentative passages of poetry such as the Sisyphus fragment attributed by some to Kritias, by others to Euripides (Dihle, 1977). The reconstruction of a work Metarsiologica by Theophrastus has enabled scholars to point to the Peripatetic origin of this particular argument (Daiber, 1992); as Sedley (1998, 181) says, this was 'one of those rare topics on which Epicureans and Aristotelians could see eye to eye – the exclusion of direct divine causation from the sublunar world.' Onesimos' flippant remark about the gods' reluctance to involve themselves in the Herculean task of supervising all men's affairs certainly reminds one of the Epicurean gods relaxing in the intermundia. G.-S. quote Cicero (de nat. deorum 1.52) in this connection (... ne ille [sc. deus] est implicatus molestis negotiis et operosis). Lukian Zeus Trag. 37, too, in humorous vein seems to pick up Menander's theme here of the gods being too busy.
to concern themselves with human affairs. Note also Theophrastus’ rejoinder to a young man whom he saw praying to the gods for brains (νοῦν καὶ φρένας ἄγαθάς): ‘Brains don’t come to those who pray, but those who study’ (Fortenbaugh et al., 1992-2005, Part Two, no. 471).

A number of features of Onesimos’ tongue-in-cheek exposition remind one of philosophical debate: apart from the point just mentioned, note σαφώς διδάξω in 1087, where Onesimos sets himself up as teacher; his statistical proof (πίστις) in 1087-89; his anticipation of an opponent’s objection in 1092-93 (... φήσεις;); and especially his triumphant elenches in 1105: ‘See? This guy makes out that evil is necessary!’ See note on 1092-99 for Menander’s habit of putting tongue-in-cheek philosophy into the mouths of servants.

οἱ’ει — Σμικρίνη is quoted in Comm., in Aristot. 18.1.112, (including ἐκάστωι) in Philopon. De aetern. mundi 583 Ra.

1084 ἄγετον σχολήν, ‘lead a leisurely life’. ἄγω is the standard verb for ‘spend’ of time; e.g. Alexis fr. 230 KA ὁ βίος οὗμός εσπέραν ἄγετο, ‘it is the evening of my life’.

1088 ἀροιον εἰπεῖν, so-called ‘limiting’ infinitive (like ὡς συνελόντι εἰπεῖν): ‘roughly’, cf. Martina (1997, 1086) ‘per fare cifra tonda’; but Wilamowitz (whom Martina calls to witness) seems to be off-track: ‘es ist egal, wieviel wir sagen’. τρισμύριοι. G.-S. consider this would strike the audience, accustomed to a figure of ten thousand (citizen males) as average for a city-state, as a gross exaggeration. And, of course, Onesimos might tend to exaggerate as he wanted to emphasize the impossibility of the gods’ job in supervising so many individuals. Aristoph. Eccl. 1132 mentions ‘thirty thousand citizens’ of Athens; [Dem.] 25.51 (delivered c. 325) mentions ‘some twenty thousand’ (εἰσὶν ὡμοί δεσμυριοί) people who frequent the agora. Ktesikles (FGrHist 245 fr. 1) says that a census conducted by Demetrios of Phaleron counted ‘twenty-one thousand Athenians, ten thousand metic and four hundred thousand slaves’, figures discussed in detail by Hansen (1985, 29-36); he concludes (36) that the figure of 21,000 Athenians given by Ktesikles represents men liable for military service, corresponding to an actual male population of some 30,000. Even if this is true – and assuming that Onesimos means only men – Athens was surely perceived then as bigger than the average city. So Onesimos’ estimate is high, if not incredibly high, to Athenian ears. Whether women and slaves also had a tropos installed by the gods is, of course, an open question, and one which Onesimos could afford to disregard in his mockery of Smikrines, a rich and snobbish male citizen.

1090 and 1095 ἐπιτρίβουσιν, literally ‘rub’, ‘abrade’, coll. ‘trouble’, ‘give hassle to’, already in Aristoph. e.g. Lys. 888, Eccl. 1068; Men. fr. 878 KA ἐπιτρίβουσι δ’ ἡμᾶς οἱ θεοὶ. ἐπιτρίπτος is a term of abuse applied to ‘persons to whom one says ἐπιτριβεῖς’ (LSJ s.v. cf. Arnott (1996a, 295) on Alexis fr. 110.1).

1092-99 Onesimos teaches Smikrines that god has appointed an agent, τρόπος, resident in each of us to supervise our conduct. If we misbehave it punishes us, if we
treat it well it protects us. Cf. Epicharmus fr. 258 Kaibel, ὁ τρόπος ἀνθρώπους δαίμων ἄγαθός, ὁς δὲ καὶ κακός; Menander fr. 714 K.-Th. (= 500 KA) from an unnamed comedy, cited by Julian of Halicarnassus. In this the speaker says that a daimon was allotted to each of us at birth as ‘spiritual guide in life’ (μυσταγωγός τοῦ βίου). This daimon is essentially good; when we go astray and make a mess of our lives, it is wrong to blame one’s daimon; rather it is our ‘character’ (τρόποι 6) which is responsible. So in these two passages δαίμων in one and τρόπος in the other have comparable roles and represent ‘divine agency’ in life. Their importance is as guides in moral behaviour. Both seem to play a rather passive role. We offend them by misbehaviour; they make their discomfort felt. Thus it is our responsibility to behave in a way which accords with their (good) offices. Of course this popular philosophy is said in a tongue-in-cheek manner by Onesimos and may well have been in the unnamed comedy as well. For Onesimos goes on to say that Smikrines’ present behaviour – his heavy-handed removal of his daughter from her marriage – is an instance of his offending against his inner tropos. G.-S. p. 378 point to an inconsistency in Onesimos’ philosophy here, as he has confused, or rather combined, τρόπος, ‘character which brings him good or ill fortune’, with daimon, ‘guardian spirit which will reward good deeds, but punish offences’. And indeed there is inconsistency in saying that a man’s character (in conventional terminology tropos) leads him to some base action, which tropos (the agent within, according to Onesimos) then punishes him for. But such a ‘shift’ in the meaning of tropos might be seen merely as an aspect of Onesimos’ teasing: he is tying Smikrines up in verbal, or logical, knots. For subtle analysis of Onesimos’ questionable logic see Vogt-Spira (1992, 179-83); for the Peripatetic ‘flavour’ of Onesimos’ theory here, that character, not god, decides human behaviour, see Gaiser (1967, 26-30).

Popular philosophy in the mouths of slaves mocking or chiding their superiors is no exception in Menander; Handley (1968, 6) comments on the famous line ‘whom the gods love dies young’ (from Dis Exapatōn) that ‘the original use of the maxim, by a typically Menandrean stroke, was in the mouth of a slave mocking his elderly master’. An unplaced fragment (722 K.-Th. = com. adesp. 1027 KA) has a slave exhorting his despondent master: ‘take me as your advisor in adversity: a slave of sound character often proves wiser than his masters’ (lines 3-6). This slave sounds as if he really means to help his master; in the present passage Onesimos, of course, wants to mock Smikrines. Vogt-Spira (1992, 180) points to another kind of irony which Onesimos’ lecture may entail: the spectator may have been conscious of an ironical discrepancy between what the divinity had announced in the prologue (assuming that a deity such as Tyche spoke one) and what Onesimos says now: namely that the gods have no time to dispense good and evil on an individual, daily basis.

The concept of religious authority as a kind of secret police-force patrolling human affairs has antecedents in the fragment of Kritias (or Euripides) which describes how men invented gods in order to reduce crime (Sext. Emp. adv. Math.)
9.54 cf. Dihle, 1977); note esp. lines 38-39 of this text, δι’ οὕς καλῶς τε τῶι λόγωι κατώκισεν / τὸν δῆμον’ οὕτος κάν πρέποντι χαρῆωι, whose expression is quite like Onesimos’ formulation in 1093.

1093 Jaekel (1984, 19 n.21) compares with Epicharmos fr. 266 KA (see above on lines 1092-99). For τρόπος as the ‘seat’ of character governing an individual’s behaviour cf. Dem. 18.263 (of Aischines).

1094 φρουράρχον. Surely a loaded word in view of the political situation in Athens during the period of Menander’s productivity. In 322 BC the Athenians had made peace with Antipater on the condition they introduce an oligarchic form of government and accept a military garrison in Mounychia, controlling Athens’ gateway to the world, Piraeus (Green, 2003, 2). The first φρουράρχος of Mounychia appointed by the Macedonians was Menyllos (Diod. Sic. 18.18.5), succeeded by Nikanor on Antipater’s death in 319 (Green, 2003, 6). When, in 307 BC, Demetrios Poliorketes ‘freed’ Athens from the rule of Demetrios of Phaleron (who was ἐπιμελητής τῆς πόλεως), Dionysios was phrourarchos at Mounychia (Diod. Sic. 20.45.2; cf. 19.68.3 (314/3 BC)). In the period 317-307, then, the term phrourarchos would have meant to the Athenians the commander of the Macedonian garrison at Mounychia. Several years followed, first under the restored democracy (in name rather than reality), then under the tyranny of Lachares, who was deposed by Demetrios (again) in 295. The Athenians feared harsh reprisals when Demetrios recaptured the city, as it had seceded after the battle of Ipsos in 301, but Demetrios instead showed clemency. The Athenians voted to grant him the Piraeus and Mounychia; he himself established a garrison on the Mouseion on the South side of Athens so as to dissuade the Athenians from revolting again. Our sole source is Plutarch Demetrios 34.1-7, cf. Habicht (1995, 94): ὁ Δημήτριος αὐτὸς ἐφ’ ἑαυτού προσενέβαλε φρουράν εἰς τὸ Μουσείον, ὡς μὴ πάλιν ἀναχαίτισαν τὸν δῆμον ἁγχολογάς αὐτῶι πραγμάτων ἐτέρων παρασχεῖν. This garrison, with its commander, which existed until the secession of Athens from Demetrios’ rule in 287 BC (Habicht, 1995, 102), must have been particularly ‘near the bone’ for the Athenians. Could this be the reference point for Onesimos’ taunt? As Demetrios stationed himself on the Mouseion to prevent the Athenians from misbehaving, so god, in Onesimos’ theology, planted a phrourarchos in the heart of every person to stop them from misdemeanours? The combination is tempting, but insecure. If true, we would have a late date for Epitrepontes, post 295 BC, only a few years before Menander’s death. φρουράρχος recurs in Kolax 91, but in a general context.

► ἐνδε[λ]εχή[ς έγκείμενος, ‘continually threatening’, or ‘weighing on’. Guéraud (140) pronounced the reading ἐνδελεχητής ‘probable’ on the basis of the letter traces. The second epsilon is ambiguous and could be omikron, suggesting ἐνδο[ν. ἐνδελεχῶς occurs in fr. 412.3 KA, but the adverb is impossible palaeographically here. Sandbach then suggested (in app.) ἐπιτεταχμένος, but the second letter cannot be pi. More probably it is chi, possibly lamda. The trace of the next letter
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immediately suggests iota, but it is positioned rather far left for that, making eta a likely reading. Accepting ἔνδειχεν ἔγκειμενος, I suggest the participle ἔγκειμενος to fill the gap. This verb has the literal sense ‘lie in’, ‘inhabit’ (e.g. Euripides, Androm. 91, 784; Ion 181), but commonly means ‘press on’, ‘threaten’ like Latin instare (cf. Aristoph. Ach. 309 and Eccl. 956), and can stand in combination with an adjective, e.g. Dion. Hal. 6.62 βαρύς ἔγκειμενα (cf. LSJ s.v. II). Thus, according to this reconstruction, the tropos ‘inhabits’ the individual and weighs on him like a conscience. For the sense cf. Plut. Mor. 1090 D ὁ τοῦ μέλλοντος ἀεὶ φόβος ἔγκειμενος οὐχ ἔωι χαίρειν κτλ.

1099 μηδέν ἄτοπον. The phrase recalls Smikrines’ admonition to Pamphile always to shun the ‘offensive person’. Now it is Smikrines whose behaviour is out of order.

1102 αὐτοῦ. The correction of C’s cautos is necessary metrically. αὐτοῦ should then be taken with the understood subject τινα of the infinitive construction with ἀπαγαγεῖν: ‘one’s own daughter’. The impersonal phrasing of the question is picked up by Smikrines with λέγει δε τις.;

1106 ἀπολλέει. The reading at the end might also be -ωσι, but the upsilon of this ending is long.

1108 ταὐτόματον ἀποσέσωκε, ‘chance has saved you’, cf. Sam. 163-64 ταὐτόματον ἔστιν ὡς ἔοικε ποι θεός, / σοίζει τε πολλὰ τῶν ἀφόρατων πραγμάτων. τὸ αὐτόματον, ‘coincidence’, ‘pure chance’ (as well as τύχη) occurs, not surprisingly in view of the importance of chance occurrences in his plays, frequently in Menander; further examples: Perik. 151; Sam. 55; frs. 241, 420.3, 395.4 K.-Th. (= 211, 376.3, 349.4 KA). G.-S. suggest a distinction between Tyche (goddess of chance) and tautomaton, ‘mere chance’ without divinity, but one wonders whether the distinction is really valid. Vogt-Spira (1992, 27-34) argues plausibly that αὐτόματων in Menander is the more emphatic term – ‘pure chance (‘reiner Zufall’) – and cannot, unlike τύχη, be qualified by such attributes as ‘good’ and ‘bad’. Whilst τύχη may imply a power working (behind the scenes) toward some aim, αὐτόματον implies no such causality or final purpose (it lacks ‘das Moment einer höheren Sinnhaftigkeit’ p. 31). Here ταὐτόματον is ranged against τρόπος as the force majeure fortuitously blocking Smikrines’ destructive impulse. There is an interesting passage in Andokides’ speech De Mysteriis (113-14) in which the orator says that chance (τύχη) came to his rescue when he was about to commit an unfortunate error (like Smikrines here, according to Onesimos).

1108-9 διαλλαγάς λύσεις τε. Onesimos means that Charisios and Pamphile have become reconciled (διαλλαγὰ) having solved (λύσεις) the mystery of the illegitimate child. But the language has political or military overtones, chiming with the φρονίματος metaphor of 1094. Smikrines, according to Onesimos, was acting against the interests of his tropos, but chance has caused a reversal in the situation: ‘treaties and settlements’ have resolved the dispute between the warring factions before Smikrines can blunder into ill-judged intervention. Menander has transferred
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terms from political discourse to the domestic; cf. Lape (2004). For διαλλαγαί as a political term see e.g. Lysias, in Agor. 80.1; Andok. De pace 36.2; Dem. Olynth. 2.1.7. λύσεις commonly means ‘release’ of prisoners, but διαλύσεις is common for ‘settlement’ in all manner of disputes.

1110 ‘Don’t let me catch you acting rashly again...' Extraordinary words in the mouth of a slave to his master’s father-in-law. They are very similar to Pataikos’ much more appropriate warning to Polemon in Perik. not to act rashly again in future (1016-17). The construction (λέγω ὅπως μή with fut. indic.) is like that after verbs of caring, but the sense is final: ‘I’m saying this so I don’t catch you...’

1111 προπετῆ, ‘impulsively’, ‘precipitately’, cf. l. 523 of this play; Perik. 1017; Aesp. 290. The word comes from ‘fly’ (πέτομαι) rather than ‘fall’ (πίπτω). ► ἔγκλημα, ‘charges’, cf. Perik. 503, where Pataikos tells Polemon that his complaint amounts only to an ἔγκλημα, not an injury requiring τιμωρία. ἔγκλημα is also a word of international diplomacy (e.g. Dem. Olynth. 1.7.6; De corona 151.4); Onesimos continues in the same vein of ‘politicizing’ Smikrines’ quixotic errand (as in 1094 and 1109).

1112 ἀφεύσο (2nd p.s. pf. imperative of ἀφίεμαι) ‘have done with’, ‘be finished with’; cf. Handley (1965, 151 ad v. 111). The perfect aspect emphasizes that Smikrines should put his complaints behind him and begin a new phase. Cf. Sam. 350, 612. τέπωσο; Aristoph. Thesm. 1208 λέλυσο. ► τὸν θυγατριδοῦν. So it’s a boy. Literally ‘daughter’s child’, Onesimos is telling an astounded Smikrines that he is a proud grandfather. When Pamphile and Smikrines last spoke at the beginning of act four, Pamphile did not know that the baby she had exposed had been saved and found its way into Habrotonon’s hands. But Smikrines must have been aware of the root cause of the couple’s separation (Pamphile’s alleged loss of virginity before the wedding), or Charisios would never have experienced such pangs of remorse on overhearing the conversation; if she had kept quiet about her ‘guilt’ to her father whilst acknowledging Charisios’, he would rather have been confirmed in his self-righteous (ὑψηλός) attitude. Line 898 (relating, probably, to 807-8) tells us clearly enough that Pamphile had confessed her ‘sins’. But Smikrines knows only one living baby: that engendered by Charisios with Habrotonon. So his initial surprise (1113) comes from Onesimos’ calling a child in Charisios’ house his grandchild: how on earth, he will have thought, can he be the grandfather of Charisios’ bastard?

1113 μαστιγία, a common insult in comedy; voc. of μαστιγίας, German ‘Priigelknabe’, someone who deserves, and frequently gets, a beating. Note the line from Menander (‘the same poet’ as wrote line 333 of our play) quoted in Cassius Dio (60.29.3) (= fr. 441 KA): ἀφόρητος ἐστὶν εὐτυχῶν μαστιγίας.

1114 παχύδερμος. Our ‘thick-skinned’ gives the wrong picture. The meaning is ‘boneheaded’, a ‘numbskull’; cf. Lucian Timon 23. The opposite of παχύς, λεπτός can mean ‘refined’ in the sense of ‘clever’, e.g. Aristoph. Clouds 153 ὃς Ζεὺ βασιλεύ, τῆς λεπτότητος τῶν φρενῶν; cf. Frogs 1108; Alexis fr. 223.7-8
λόγοι λεπτοί. Onesimos means that Smikrines is ‘thick’ not to have noticed that his daughter of marriageable age had become pregnant. Since, as Onesimos goes on to say, the child in Charisios’ household is five months old, the bride must have been about four months pregnant when she married. One notes the husband in *PCG VIII* 1084 (?Menander) whose marriage has taken a disastrous turn in its fifth month; the fragment is, however, not long enough to know why the husband is suddenly estranged from his wife. Cf. Handley (2006). ► καί σύ, ‘you, too’, because Charisios had confessed to thick-headedness of a culpable kind before (918 – as Onesimos knew, and had reported to the audience). Wilamowitz thinks ‘you, too’ is a response to Smikrines’ insult to Onesimos (μαστιγία), G.-S. think it refers to ‘other people’ to whom Smikrines might have thought himself superior.

1115 ἐτήρεις, ‘guard’, ‘keep an eye on’. Martina’s charming parallels for the proverbial difficulty of keeping the *moichos* out of one’s bedroom are not really applicable to the case of the marriageable daughter. They were more at risk when they ventured outdoors for a festival, as Pamphile’s case shows. In *Dysk.* 222ff. Daos chides Knemon (to himself) for leaving his daughter unattended; promptly a young man (Sostratos) has approached her. ► παιδ’ ἐπίγαμον, ‘daughter of marriageable age’ cf. fr. 597.1 K.-Th. (= 820 KA) θυγάτηρ ἐπίγαμος; Dem. *Contra Boeot.* 2.5.1.

1116 τέρασιν δμοια, ‘miraculous’, lit. ‘equivalent to miracles’. Verdenius (1974, 42) is way off: ‘Not prodigies... but monstrousities... Onesimus tries to spite Smikrines by suggesting that Pamphile’s child is misshapen’. At this point Smikrines is not aware of any child of Pamphile at all. Onesimos’ joke is simply that a premature baby of only five months’ gestation is nothing short of miraculous (cf. the line of a song by the ‘Dubliners’: ‘a baby boy with his whiskers on sure I never did saw before’). ► παιδία, the ‘generalizing’ plural.

1119-20 I do not see why we should not retain C’s indications of speaker here. It marks Σωφρόνη and αἰσθάνει γε off with dicola and places a paragraphos below 1119, thus apparently giving these words to Smikrines. G.-S. say that αἰσθάνει γε in Smikrines’ mouth is meaningless, but that is not true. Onesimos had said ‘the old woman knows, I think’, and Smikrines turns to her saying ‘do you understand?’ Other editors give both lines complete to Onesimos, but that leads to an awkward vocative in Σωφρόνη after the third person οίδε. And the rhythm of Smikrines’ interjections from 1113 through to 1122 is maintained better with C’s attribution of parts. ► Ταυροπολίοις, see p. 174. ► ταύτην. The reference is clearly enough to παιδ’ ἐπίγαμον in 1115. ► χορῶν ἀποσπασθείσαν, like Aphrodite in *HHAphr.* 117-18, μ’ ἀνήρπαξε... ἐκ χοροῦ or the Mountain Mother’s daughter in Eur. *Hel.* 1312-13 τὰν ἀρπασθείσαν κυκλῶν / χορῶν ἔξω παρθένων... κούραν. ► νή. Sandbach (1967, 46) takes this as an affirmative, spoken by Onesimos, after Sophrone had nodded agreement to the question ‘do you understand?’ (in my opinion spoken by Smikrines); this is in accordance with Sandbach’s view that Sophrone had no speaking part in the scene (see ad 1123-24). He cites *Georg.* 41, *Dysk.* 510.
Karch. 33n, Sam. 385, in defence of affirmative νή (not ναι). He translates: ‘Yes indeed, and now etc.’


Although Smikrines had asked Sophrone what Onesimos meant, I think it is better, with Sandbach (1967, 44-46), to assign the quote from tragedy (= *TGF* 5.1.14 fr. 265a) to Onesimos and to keep Sophrone a *kōfōn prosoōpon* in the scene (and see further G.-S. ad loc.). Sandbach points out that it suits Onesimos’ character to goad Smikrines with the cheeky quote from Euripides, not Sophrone’s (‘a nurse with literary interests is unparalleled in comedy’). He also points to Onesimos’ use of rare words and intellectual vocabulary elsewhere in the play in support of his view that Onesimos is no run-of-the-mill slave, but one quite capable of quoting from tragedy (1970, 134-35). Moreover, the scene change at 1062 (enter Smikrines with Sophrone) would have necessitated an uncomfortably quick change of mask for the third actor (presumably the one playing Chairestratos who exited at 1061) if Sophrone had a speaking part; I do not think this is an insurmountable difficulty; the actor had the space of fifteen lines to change masks and reappear at the door as Onesimos. What really clinches matters, in my opinion, is the reappearance of Chairestratos in 1132, as evidenced by the Michigan papyrus, to join Smikrines and Onesimos; there is nothing to indicate that Sophrone had exited by that time. Therefore, assuming the three-actor rule, she was a mute player (Krieter-Spiro, 1997, 39); cf. the conversation between Thrasonides and Simiche in *Mis.* 790ff. (Arnott), in which Thrasonides appears to ‘quote’ Simiche’s remarks in order to answer them himself. Accordingly, when, in 1127, Smikrines says that Sophrone has angered him παθαινομένη, we should take this, with Sandbach, as ‘making a show of emotion’ rather than as ‘speaking emotionally’. The mute character Sophrone had clearly shown her joy on hearing Onesimos’ words, which reveal by implication that Pamphile had suffered a fate similar to that of Auge in Euripides’ tragedy.

But what is the point of the quote? Wilamowitz believed that this explicit quote of Euripides’ *Auge* by Onesimos pointed up the similarity in plot between this tragedy and *Epitrepontes* generally. For, according to a summary of the Auge story in Moses, *Progymnasmata* 3.3, Herakles had raped Auge while she was dancing at a *pannychis* of Athena (cf. *TGF* 5.1.14 fr. iia line 7), and given her a ring to remember him by. When Auge bore a child (Telephos) her father in anger ordered its exposure and her death by drowning. Herakles returned in the nick of time, recognized the ring and saved both mother and child; Auge went on to marry Teuthras, according to an Apolline oracle. So this quote from the play would serve in Onesimos’ mouth to remind Sophrone and Smikrines of Auge’s story and thus, indirectly, Pamphile’s.
Onesimos would be teasing Smikrines along the lines: ‘what, don’t you know the story of Auge? Are you stupid? Shall I recite the whole speech to you?’ Daos in *Aspis* teases the Smikrines there with quotes from tragedy in a very similar manner (407ff.).

However, Anderson (1982) has disputed Wilamowitz’ reconstruction. He points to the discrepancies between Moses’ version of the Auge story and that in Strabo 13.1.69; he doubts whether Moses’ version even derives from Euripides’ play. He gives precedence to the Strabo version, which differs quite significantly from the plot of *Epitrepontes*; in particular, there is no ring mentioned in Strabo’s account. Thus Anderson questions the sense of the quote from *Auge* here: it was surely not to remind Smikrines (and Menander’s audience generally) of the whole plot of the play. Rather, Onesimos’ words are ironical. By quoting Euripides’ *gnômê*, ‘nature willed it, who hath no regard for custom. A woman is born to precisely this’ (meaning: getting pregnant by a man), Onesimos, in Anderson’s view, is pointing up an ironical contrast between these cynical words and the pure and noble character of Pamphile as we got to know her: ‘For a man as stupid and narrow as Smikrines, it may be enough to assert that a woman’s function is to bear children, but the whole tendency of Menander’s sensitive plot has led us to the realization that Pamphila is a woman of complex and valuable personality, a significant compound of moral and physical qualities. It is not enough to dismiss the act of rape, with the subsequent pregnancy, as a deed of overriding nature. We, then, recognize the irony in the citation from *Auge*, its inappropriateness for the emotional and ethical circumstances that we have witnessed in the comedy’ (Anderson, 1982, 174).

But whilst Onesimos’ cheeky words certainly do not do justice to Pamphile, we should not lose sight of the primary purpose of the quote *in situ*, which is to convey to Sophrone and Smikrines by innuendo what has happened to Pamphile and her child. And for that to work, the listener must know the Auge story in a general sense and make the connection between Telephos’ exposure and rescue and that of Pamphile’s baby. Nor am I willing to concede to Anderson that the version of the Auge story in Moses’ *Progymnasmata* may have nothing to do with Euripides’ play (cf. Kannicht (2004, 333): ‘frustra oblocutus est Anderson’). The detail of the ring, for example, may simply have been omitted by Strabo for reasons of economy. When we think of the elaborate tokens produced in the recognition scene of *Ion* or the recognition by a chunk of cloth in *Alope* (see above p. 143), I do not think we can rule out recognition by ring as ‘un-Euripidean’.

Finally: who spoke the lines in Euripides’ play? Anderson maintains they are unsuited either to Herakles the rapist (‘a woman is born to this’ – what? surely not rape!) or Auge herself (similar objection, but from the reverse side). He proposes Athena as *dea ex machina* sorting things out at the end of the play, but grants that Reinhard’s suggestion (1974) that it was Auge’s nurse who spoke the words is also a strong possibility.

1124 ἐπ’ αὐτῶι τῶιδ’, ‘under precisely this condition’, ‘on just this basis’.
the dative gives the condition or rule according to which something exists or is done; e.g. fr. 740.6-7 K.-Th. (= 602 KA). Eur. Med. 928 runs γυνὴ δὲ θῆλυ κατὶ διαχρόνοις ἔφει (with Page’s (1938) parallels ad loc.), ‘a woman is a woman and born to tears’. ▶ τί; C marks change of speaker before τί (dikolon) and places paragraphos after the line. But Sandbach’s arrangement is possible. ▶ μωρός εϊ; Like Demeas in Sam. 589ff. when he pulls wool over Nikeratos’ eyes with ludicrous references to mythical precedent, Onesimos here teases Smikrines for not easily following his mocking allusion to a line from tragedy; on the passage from Sam. cf. Gutzwiller (2000, 111).

1126-27 σο... παθαινομένη must be said by Smikrines to Sophrone. For the sense see on 1123-24. Hsch. glosses παθαίνεσθαι as δεινοπαθείν. Plutarch Mor. 447ε uses the word to describe emotional displays by (1) orators (Mor. 447ε) and (2) musicians (Mor. 713α). The word gives us a rare clue on acting technique: Sophrone must have gesticulated with her arms and possibly with body movements to indicate her distress at being reminded of her mistress’ misfortune at the Tauropolia. G.-S. (383) think she expressed her delight, but that hardly accords with Hesychius’ δεινοπαθείν. I think it more likely that she has not yet taken in the significance of Onesimos’ words ‘all’s well that ends well’ in 1121-22, and is still showing woe on being reminded of Pamphile’s misfortune at the Tauropolia. For acting techniques in New Comedy see Handley (2002).

1128 The Michigan fragment effectively settles the debate as to the personal ending of C’s οἰδ[ and rules out the ingenious conjecture of Arnott (1968b, 232): οὐτο[ς λέγει νῦν Ὄιδί(ποις); M’s οἰδὲν also strengthens the case for believing Sophrone had a non-speaking part. Onesimos’ cheeky and gleeful remark – ‘She knows, I know, and you should know...’ – involves a kind of polyptoton with personal endings of οἴδα.

1129 πανσέλενον, ‘quite remarkable’, ‘unbelievable’; not ‘absolutely awful’, as Smikrines may be beginning to see the good side of Onesimos’ riddling information.

1130 εὐτύχημα, ‘piece of luck’, cf. fr. 187.3 KA.

1132-33 The truth apparently dawns on Smikrines at this point: the child appears, by some miracle, to be the offspring of Charisios and his lawfully wedded wife. It might be objected that Pamphile had become pregnant by Charisios before she married him, but the important point for Smikrines (and the child!) is that it became legitimate through the marriage. The reconstruction of 1132 is difficult. Nünnlist (per litt.) says that the space between γυνὴς χαρίζεις and η(...) is only big enough for five letters. It is difficult to see how five letters suffice for the four metrical positions required. K.-G.’s Ἡ χαρίζον / πάρεστι (7 letters in the gap) leaves the main clause without a verb (to be supplied by ἐστι) and the sense of ‘who lives with Charisios’ is what the whole play has been questioning. My conjecture counts eight letters but at least two of those are iota and the nu may have been written gamma before chi. Perhaps there is just space for this combination of letters in the gap. Otherwise we
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must assume that the scribe missed out a word when copying this line. ► 1133 
γ[ένοιτο (potential) ‘would become’; or ε[γένετο (unreal) ‘would have been’. The 
visible trace of M probably suits initial gamma better than the cross stroke of epsilon 
or pi (K.-G.).

5.6.3 Scene 3: Chairestratos’ relief (?)

1133-34 In both these lines the letters ]AIPE were read by K.-G. who took them 
as a mid-line nota personae for Chairestratos. The second instance in line 1134 is, 
in fact, more difficult to read than the first. The reconstruction of Chairestratos’ 
words in 1133 is difficult because we do not know what happened in the first scene 
of this act. It seems that Chairestratos stayed on stage until Smikrines burst in with 
Sophrone. Probably he exited then (but not certainly). How much new information 
he gathered in the lost section is not known to us, so the nature of his intrusion 
now on Smikrines’ conversation with Onesimos is difficult to gauge. ► ταύτην. 
There is a shadow of ink where eta should stand; it is at any rate sufficient to rule 
out omikron. ► ]ωνον. A small trace before first nu would fit omikron, making 
’Αφρότημων a likely, but not inevitable, supplement. It is uncertain whether any 
more text followed the last nu.

1134 ίερόσυλός συ. Lamda is more likely, in my opinion, than nu (K.-G. άφροσύ-
νη). ίερόσυλος, literally ‘temple-robber’, is a common insult in comic parlance; 
cf. line 935 of this play; Men. fr. 170 KA.

1136 ζυγομαχίας, ‘battle with’, cf. Dysk. 17; frr. 155.5, 860.2 KA. The eta of 
the ending looks more likely to me than epsilon (K.-G.), so we should imagine a 
construction requiring the subjunctive (perhaps after εάν). The letter after this word 
might be chi, suggesting a dative object after ζυγομαχέω such as Χαιρεστράχωι or 
Χαρισίωι; or if it is zeta, we might supplement the vocative of Smikrines (Σμικρίνη 
Nünlist).

1137 The line may have begun like fr. 441 KA άφόρητός ἐστιν εὐτυχῶν μαστιγίας, 
and been another huffy retort by Smikrines. Görler (1963, 146) doubts Menandean 
authorship of fr. 441.

5.7 Miscellaneous unplaced Fragments

5.7.1 Fr. 4

ἔχινος. According to Erotianus 41.18 Nachmanson, Menander used this word, 
meaning a large, wide-mouthed jar, in Epitrepontes. It might plausibly be placed 
in a context in which the cook Karion is talking about his trade, either in the first act 
or the third, where he comes out and exchanges words with Smikrines and, perhaps,
his assistant Simias. Or it might have been used figuratively, as the *echinos* was used at Athens to keep notes of evidence in case of appeal in legal disputes (LSJ s.v.).

### 5.7.2 Fr. 5

έπέπασα / τάριχος. Arnott (1979a) suggests that the expression ‘sprinkle salt on salted fish’ may be metaphorical, like ‘rub salt in the wound’; perhaps Onesimos said the lines to describe the effect of his new revelations on a Charisios already in commotion after the initial bombshell concerning Pamphile. Primmer (1986, 131-32) rejects the suggestion (‘hübsch, aber falsch’), on the grounds that Themistios Or. 21.262d seems to pick up the words ἢ οὐτω τῦχη, and hence that they must have been spoken, with literal meaning, by the cook Karion (who is Themistios’ butt). Primmer develops the theory that Karion boasted that his culinary art could cool the hot-headed and fire the dispirited, and that here he ‘added salt to salt fish’ to animate the depressed Charisios. However, his interpretation of ἢ οὐτω τῦχη as ‘iterative’ in the sense ‘jedesmal, wenn sich’s so ergab’ is certainly wrong, as that would require the optative; moreover, whether Themistios’ ἢ οὐτω τῦχη really echoes *Epitrep*. fr. 5 seems to me questionable at the least. The fragment seems to mean: ‘I’ve sprinkled salt on the salt fish if [things] turn out like that’; I agree with Arnott that ‘sprinkle salt on salt fish’ sounds proverbial.

### 5.7.3 Fr. 9

The manuscript of Orion attributes this fragment to Menander’s *Georgos* (actually ἐκ τοῦ Γεωργίου), but a marginal note reading ἐκ τῶν ἀποτρεπόντων has induced most editors of Menander to attribute the line to *Epitrep*. Haffner (2001, 214) says, however, that the marginal note refers to Orion VII.7 (= *Epitrep*. 704), not this fragment; therefore the attribution of 9 to *Epitrep*. is wrong. The fragment is quoted in a number of other sources, including the monostichoi (594 Jäkel), without attribution to a specific play. For a late (10th c.) and uncomprehending quotation of this verse in a letter see Christidis (1982-83).

### 5.7.4 P.Mich. 4733 fr. 1

For λέυκον Koenen-Gagos refer to the white costume of Smikrines in the Mytilene mosaic; but the reference could be to ‘whites of the eyes’ as in e.g. Alexis fr. 224.9 KA: τὰ λευκά τ’ ἀνοβάλλονθ’ ἀμα, ‘rolling the eyes’; cf. Arnott (1996a, ad loc.).
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<td>γλυκύτατα</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>γλυκύτατος</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>γλύμα</td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>γνάθος</td>
<td>197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>γνήσιος</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>γονή</td>
<td>197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>γράμμα</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>γύναι</td>
<td>225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>δαιμόνιον</td>
<td>235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>δάκτυλος</td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>δασύς</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>δέ for δή</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>δεῖ</td>
<td>198, 204, 211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>δέχωμεν</td>
<td>235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>δεῖλη</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>δειλός</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>δείνα</td>
<td>203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>δείπνον ἀπὸ συμβολῶν</td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>δέκατος</td>
<td>204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>δεόμαι</td>
<td>139, 150, 212, 213, 239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>δεσπότης</td>
<td>137, 212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>δηλαδή</td>
<td>208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Δημήτηρ</td>
<td>204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Δημιουργὸς</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>διαβάλλω</td>
<td>216, 231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>διαγιγνώσκω</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>διαιτητής</td>
<td>29, 148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>διακύπτω</td>
<td>228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>διάλυσις</td>
<td>162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>διαλλαγὴ</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>διαλλάττω</td>
<td>169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greek Word</td>
<td>Page Numbers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>διαμαρτάνω</td>
<td>189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>διαρρήν</td>
<td>238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>διασκεδάννυμι</td>
<td>129, 200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>διαφθέρα</td>
<td>145, 156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>διατρέχω</td>
<td>178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>διατροφή</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>δίδωμι</td>
<td>148, 151, 185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>δικάζομαι</td>
<td>166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>δικαίως</td>
<td>157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>δικαίος</td>
<td>129, 180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>δίκη</td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>δίς</td>
<td>214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>δοκέω</td>
<td>208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>δεδομένον</td>
<td>201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>δούλος χωρίς οίκων</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>δύσμορος</td>
<td>179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>δύστυχης</td>
<td>143, 201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>έαυτόν</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>έάω</td>
<td>171, 221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>έγγύη</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>έγκειμαι</td>
<td>249, 250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>έγκλημα</td>
<td>251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>εκέκτητα</td>
<td>221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>είμι</td>
<td>151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>έλαττόόμαι</td>
<td>189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>έλεγχος</td>
<td>189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>έλεεώ</td>
<td>225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>έλεύθερος</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>έμβάλω</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>έμενο</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>έμός</td>
<td>212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>έμόν ποήσομαι</td>
<td>188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>τούμον</td>
<td>208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>έμπιπτω</td>
<td>129, 180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>έναγχος</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ένδελεχής</td>
<td>249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ένδον</td>
<td>173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ένθυμη</td>
<td>187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ένι</td>
<td>157, 220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ένοχλέω</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ένταθα</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>έξαλλάττω</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>έξαπίνης</td>
<td>182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>έξεμι</td>
<td>223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>έξεστι</td>
<td>201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>έξόν</td>
<td>216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>έξόλλυμι</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>έπαιχρόομαι</td>
<td>239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>έπαισάγω</td>
<td>208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>έπειτα</td>
<td>238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>έπι</td>
<td>254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>έπίγαμος</td>
<td>252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>έπιδείκνυμι</td>
<td>235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>έπιμέλεια</td>
<td>208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>έπιπάττω</td>
<td>257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>έπιπόλαιος</td>
<td>214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>έπιπροσθε</td>
<td>221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>έπισφαλής</td>
<td>195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>έπιτρέπω</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Έπιτρέπων</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>έπιτρήβω</td>
<td>247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>έραω</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>έργάζομαι</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>έργαστήριον</td>
<td>159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>έρεθίζω</td>
<td>230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greek Word</td>
<td>Page Numbers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Έρμης</td>
<td>151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>έρχομαι</td>
<td>222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>έρως</td>
<td>129, 242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>έταιρος</td>
<td>201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>έτερος</td>
<td>186, 222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>έτι</td>
<td>196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ευθύς</td>
<td>189, 196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>εύχριτος</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>εύνοια</td>
<td>220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>εὐπρεπής</td>
<td>181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>εὔρεσις</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>εὐρίσκω</td>
<td>154, 195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>εὐφρόνη</td>
<td>204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>εφεξής</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>εὔχος</td>
<td>256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>εὖω</td>
<td>120, 190, 220, 223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ζυγομαχέω</td>
<td>256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ἑγέρω, 220</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ἑδύς</td>
<td>203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ἐκβλας, 189</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ἔμερα</td>
<td>199, 204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ἕμην</td>
<td>205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ἐν, 164</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ἐρακλῆς, 190</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ἐράκλεις, 246</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ἑτών, 203</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>θαυμαστός</td>
<td>245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>θεάομαι</td>
<td>187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>θεός, 22, 171</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>θεός</td>
<td>225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>θρίξ</td>
<td>182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>θυγατρίδος</td>
<td>251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>θύρα</td>
<td>228, 231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ίδια, 152</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ίερόσυλος</td>
<td>239, 256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ίκανος</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ίμάτιον</td>
<td>190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ίσως</td>
<td>190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>άλλ’ ίσως</td>
<td>201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ιταμός</td>
<td>190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>καθεύδω</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>κατάκειμαι</td>
<td>191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>κατάταξιμαι</td>
<td>215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>καθυφίημι</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>καρπός</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>κακοδαίμων</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>κακοήθης</td>
<td>190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>κακός</td>
<td>140, 220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>κακόν κακώς</td>
<td>169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>καλός</td>
<td>125, 140, 182, 235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>καλώς ποέω</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>κανηφόρος</td>
<td>172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>κατερέω</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>κατάκειμαι</td>
<td>172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>καταλλάττω</td>
<td>169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>καταμένω</td>
<td>204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>καταπίνω</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>κατεσθίω</td>
<td>244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>κατασχύω</td>
<td>151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>κενός</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>κηδεύω</td>
<td>206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>κίνας</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>κλαίω</td>
<td>182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>κλαυμυρίζομαι</td>
<td>223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>κλεῖσμα</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>κλίνη, 138</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>κνίζω</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>κοινός</td>
<td>146, 151, 189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>κοινωνός</td>
<td>199, 222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>κος, 161</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>κομψός</td>
<td>179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>κραιπαλάω</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>κρεάιδιον</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>κρίνω</td>
<td>244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>κρίνω, 125, 196</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>κριτικός</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>κρίσις, 125, 231</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greek Word</td>
<td>Page Numbers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>κτάομαι</td>
<td>287</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>κεκτημένη</td>
<td>195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>κύβος</td>
<td>199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>κυκάω</td>
<td>170, 196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>κύριος</td>
<td>211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>κωλύω</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>λάθραι</td>
<td>231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>λαλέω</td>
<td>126, 197, 198, 228, 244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>λαμβάνω</td>
<td>151, 186, 196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>λέγω</td>
<td>132, 185, 188, 126, 152, 247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>λεμφος</td>
<td>195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>λεπτός</td>
<td>182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>λευκός</td>
<td>257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ληρέω</td>
<td>178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>λήρος</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>λογίζομαι</td>
<td>120, 131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>λογισμός</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>λόγος</td>
<td>137, 213, 218, 228, 176, 201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>λόγους</td>
<td>244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>λυμαίνομαι</td>
<td>216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>λυπηρός</td>
<td>220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>λύσις</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>λωποδυτέω</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>μά</td>
<td>142, 181, 204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>μάγειρος</td>
<td>181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>μάνομαι</td>
<td>227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>μακάρια</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>μακρός</td>
<td>244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>μάλα</td>
<td>181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>μάγας</td>
<td>170, 237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>μεθύσκομαι</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>μεθύω</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>μέλας</td>
<td>227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>μέλει</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>μελετάω</td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>μερισμός</td>
<td>178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>μέρος</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>μεταπείθω</td>
<td>245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>μετάστασις</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>μεταοικέω</td>
<td>205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>μέτριος</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>μήπω</td>
<td>204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>μίσος</td>
<td>22, 171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>μόνον</td>
<td>195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>μύριοι</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>μύρος</td>
<td>255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>νή</td>
<td>189, 191, 227, 252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>νοέω</td>
<td>188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>νόθος</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>νομίζω</td>
<td>217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>νοθετέω</td>
<td>216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>νοῦς</td>
<td>242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>νοῦν ἔχης</td>
<td>184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>νόξ</td>
<td>132, 148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>νόθις</td>
<td>197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>νίκα</td>
<td>125, 182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>νἀ υν οἴδ’ ὅπως</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>νἴδα</td>
<td>242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>νίτθα</td>
<td>188, 220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>νίκηθης</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>νίκεω</td>
<td>222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>νίκη</td>
<td>203, 222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>νίκεω</td>
<td>21, 130, 133, 207, 244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>νίκος</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>νίκομαι</td>
<td>137, 160, 206, 247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>νίκος</td>
<td>165, 190, 245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>νίκος</td>
<td>215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>νίκος</td>
<td>238, 252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>νίκος</td>
<td>244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greek Word</td>
<td>Page(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>οἴλα</td>
<td>20, 154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>οἷς</td>
<td>251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ὀφάω</td>
<td>140, 157, 222, 224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>οὕδεν</td>
<td>151, 218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>οὐθεῖς</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>οὔχ</td>
<td>213</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

in protasis of condition, 151

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Greek Word</th>
<th>Page(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>oὐκέτι</td>
<td>157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>οὕπω</td>
<td>181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>οὔτος</td>
<td>166, 173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ταύτα δή</td>
<td>178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>οὔτως</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>οὔτως ἄγαθόν τι κτλ.</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>οὐράς</td>
<td>201</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

παθαίνομαι, 255

παίγνιον, 242

παιδαρίον, 224

παιδίον, 174, 242, 252

παίς, 252

πάλαι, 212

παλακχή, 28

Παμφίλη, 211

Παμφιλῆ, 240

πάνδεινος, 255

παννυχίς, 175, 215

πάππα, 211

παραγράφω, 205

παράγω, 166

παρακρούω, 191

παραστριμομαι, 138

παρατυγχάνω, 146

πάρειμι, 192

παρίσταμαι, 220

παριστηται, 180

πᾶς, 151

πάπσα, 159

πατήρ, 145, 174, 212

πάχυδερμος, 251
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INDEX OF GREEK WORDS

που, 151
πράγμα, 160, 189, 195, 228
πρίν, 149
προί, 130, 204
προκόλπιον, 162
πρόνοια, 146, 157
πρόοιδα, 217
προοράω, 222
προπετής, 244, 251
προπετώς, 22, 189, 244
πρός, 158
προαβάλλω, 134
προαδοκάω, 171
πρός θεόν, 122
προσλαμβάνω, 195
προσμένω, 129, 141, 142, 159
προσπαίζω, 165
προτείνω, 212
πρότερος, 189
προτίθημι, 214, 218
πρώην, 200
πτισάνη, 131
Πυθία, 217
ράκος, 183
ρήτωρ, 146
ρέρρωσο, 142
ρόδιναι, 29
ρόσιναι, 149
ρόσινοις, 149
ρόσινος, 169
ρόσινος, 29
ροθή, 125
ροθή, 174, 201
ροθήμα, 216
ροθήμα, 212, 247
ροθήμα, 154
Σωτήρ, 159
Σωφρόνη, 244
σαφρόνως, 120
σάλας
σάλαν, 172
σαφρονώς, 120
τάλας
τάραντεως, 182
τάραντεως, 257
τάττω, 208
Ταυροπόλια, 174, 252
ταχύς
θάττον, 160
ταχέως, 195
τέχνας, 240
τέχνας, 252
tερατεία, 22
tηρέω, 126, 252
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Greek Word</th>
<th>Page Numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>τίθημι</td>
<td>214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>τίκτω</td>
<td>201, 242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>τύλλω</td>
<td>182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>τοσούτος</td>
<td>242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>τοσπαστικός</td>
<td>193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>τό πέρας</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>τοσσούτος</td>
<td>172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>τρέφω</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>τρέχω</td>
<td>184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>τρισάθλιος</td>
<td>200, 203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>τρισκακόδαμον</td>
<td>237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>τρισκατάρατος</td>
<td>245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>τρισμύριος</td>
<td>247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>τρόπος</td>
<td>247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>τρόφιμος</td>
<td>179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>τυγχάνω</td>
<td>201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>τυχήν</td>
<td>182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>τύφω</td>
<td>223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>υπεκδύομαι</td>
<td>231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>υπέρ</td>
<td>128, 212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>υπέρευγε</td>
<td>189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>υπεριστάμαι</td>
<td>220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>υποβρέχω</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>υποβεβρεγμένος</td>
<td>229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>υπόθημα</td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>υπομαίνω</td>
<td>227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>υπόχρυσος</td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>υφαμος</td>
<td>230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>υψηλός</td>
<td>21, 207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ψέρομαι</td>
<td>189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ψεύγω</td>
<td>211, 221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>φημί</td>
<td>157, 199, 215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>φασίν</td>
<td>173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>φιλάργυρος</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>φίλος</td>
<td>192, 239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>φιλίτη</td>
<td>225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>φρίττω</td>
<td>231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>φρονεώ</td>
<td>220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>φροντίς</td>
<td>148, 212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>φρούραρχος</td>
<td>249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>φύομαι</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>φυσάω</td>
<td>237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>φωνή</td>
<td>214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>χαίρω</td>
<td>126, 199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>χαλεπός</td>
<td>217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>χαλεπώτατ'</td>
<td>238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>χαρίες</td>
<td>196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>χάρις</td>
<td>191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Χαρίσιος</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>χείρ</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>χλευάζω</td>
<td>22, 171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>χολάω</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>χολή</td>
<td>227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>χορός</td>
<td>252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>χρηστός</td>
<td>244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>χρώμα</td>
<td>228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ψάλλω</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ψάλτρια</td>
<td>122, 199, 200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>φοφέω</td>
<td>226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>φόρος</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>