

RICHARD F. THOMAS

MENANDER, *SAMIA* 380-3

aus: Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik 83 (1990) 215–218

© Dr. Rudolf Habelt GmbH, Bonn



### Menander, *Samia* 380-3

μή μοι λάλει.  
 ἔχεις τὰ σουτῆς πάντα· προετίθημί σοι  
 ἐγὼ θεραπαίνας, Χρυσί. ἐκ τῆς οἰκίας  
 ἄπιθι.

382 θεράπαιναν primum scripsit sed postea pluralem maluit Sudhaus : litteram c in codice Cairensi puncto subscripto deletam opinatus est Jensen, improbante Guéraud (recte, ut mihi uidetur ex imagine lucis ope confecta) χρυσι C : χρυσι B: Χρυσί Robert : χρυσί Lefebvre

One problem, one of the two acknowledged and reflected in the preceding apparatus, lies in the number of servants: "That Demeas should give Chrysis one servant is plausible; more than one is surprising, although no doubt possible, generosity. But it is improbable that, as some suppose, Demeas should exaggerate his gift;<sup>1</sup> the plural must be taken literally."<sup>2</sup> Hence Sudhaus' initial reading of θεράπαιναν, hence too the active imagination of Jensen.<sup>3</sup> But the preceding citation hardly settles the matter. The question that needs to be asked is this: "What is Demeas doing making any sort of settlement, be it reasonably or excessively generous, while in the throes of an emotional tantrum?"

The problem has its origin in the preceding sentence, ἔχεις τὰ σουτῆς πάντα, which I believe has been fundamentally and universally misunderstood. Here is the standard view: "τὰ σουτῆς: This will mean any clothes and jewellery that she had brought with her and gifts that she had received from Demeas. Clothes and jewellery belonging to a bride are often enumerated alongside her dowry, e.g. Dem. xvii.13, xli.27, and would be taken away by her if she were later divorced. Similarly Chrysis must take away her own possessions."<sup>4</sup> We are, then,

<sup>1</sup> So C. Austin, *Menandri Aspis et Samia* II (Berlin 1970) 74; J.-M. Jacques, *Ménandre. La Samienne* (Paris 1970) 25, n. 2; also see D. del Corno, "Alcuni aspetti del linguaggio di Menandro," *Studi classici e orientali* 24 (1975) 42-3. H.-D. Blume (*Menanders Samia. Eine Interpretation* [Darmstadt 1974] 146) sees a "komisches Element in der generalisierenden Übertreibung", but there is surely no place for comic elements at this moment in the play, and parallels from Plautus do little to convince.

<sup>2</sup> A.W. Gomme and F.H. Sandbach, *Menander. A Commentary* (Oxford 1973) 584.

<sup>3</sup> On the photograph, tiny dots appear beneath α of θεραπαίνας. Whether they are ink is less certain. In any case cancellation dots are normally not placed beneath letters (E. Turner, *Greek Manuscripts*, 2nd edition by P.J. Parsons, BICS Suppl. 46 [London 1984] 16), and, of course, a cancellation dot under α would make no sense (L. Koenen).

<sup>4</sup> Gomme and Sandbach (above, n. 2) 584. So the translation of D.M. Bain (*Menander, Samia* [Warminster 1983] 47): "You have all your possessions;" similarly E.G. Turner, *The Girl from Sa-*

expected to imagine Demeas, at the very height of his passion, making arrangements for the future comfort of the woman he believes has been having an affair with his own son. On the contrary, Demeas emphasizes her impoverished state both in the past (377-9) and, more telling, in the future when she will no longer benefit from his generosity (390-7). Moreover, there exists no marriage between Demeas and Chrysis. He merely has control over her (25 ἐγκρατήε) by virtue of the fact that she is living in his house. To talk of "divorce" settlements is unwarranted.

The solution is quite simple: ἔχεις τὰ σου πάντα means "You have/are holding everything that belongs to you" -- that is, the baby and nothing more. We know the baby is *not* hers, and sense the irony, but for Demeas the physical presence of the child, which emerged with Chrysis and the old woman a few lines earlier, is a source of torment. His obsession with the fact that she has, or is holding, the child is first expressed a few lines earlier: 372-3 ἔχεις τὸ παιδίον, τὴν γραῦν. And a few lines later he repeats himself -- not just ἔχεις, but now πάντα as well: 386-7 ἀλλὰ εὖ ἢ ὑὸν πεπόησαι· πάντ' ἔχεις. The vague<sup>5</sup> πάντα in 381 and 386 surely refers to the same thing, the παίδιον of 373.<sup>6</sup>

Now we can deal with the servants: "You have/are holding everything that belongs to you. I'm throwing in servants for you, Chrysis." They are presumably the two women whose words Demeas overheard and then related in his soliloquy at 242-61, the words which are the source of his misunderstanding. Nor does his inclusion of them amount to generosity, for he sees these two as accomplices in the betrayal; by "giving" them to Chrysis he will rid himself of the whole crew. As for the actual word θεράπεινα, Demeas has already applied it, or its diminutive, to each of these women. He refers to the younger of the two as a θεραπεινίδιον at 251 (and cf. 254 οὐ θεραπεύετε;). The other, the γραῦς of 373, is strictly speaking not a slave; she came as a foster-nurse with Moschion when Demeas adopted him and is now free (238 ἐλευθέρη δὲ νῦν). But before this she *was* one, as Demeas again noted: 237-8 γεγονυῖ' ἐμῇ ἢ θεράπειν'. His lapse as to her status in 382 is minor, given that she had been his θεράπεινα and also taking into account his desire to treat the two as a pair.<sup>7</sup>

---

*mos* (London 1972) 29, and K. and U. Treu *Menander, Herondas*, *Bibl. der Antike* (Berlin, Weimar 1980) 62. This seems to be the only way the words have been taken, and it is this reading (along with the hiatus produced by Χρυσί) that gave rise to Lefebvre's χρυσί' (also found in the Bodmer codex): "You have all your property. I add maids and gold." Bain, rather oddly, prints Χρυσί but translates χρυσί': "I give you as well servants, gold." In his notes he argues that a case could be made for either. I shall return to this issue shortly.

<sup>5</sup> Demeas seems to have trouble naming the "object".

<sup>6</sup> The repetition of πάντ' ἔχεις ἢ ἔχεις ... πάντα is noted by H.-D. Blume (above, n. 1, 145-6), but he reads the instance at 381 in the traditional way.

<sup>7</sup> He elsewhere shows some confusion about the status of the old woman, namely at 372-3, where he implies she is in some way in the possession (ἔχεις) of Chrysis. It might also be noted that θεραπεία and δουλεία are not interchangeable; the former refers to function as much as status. Clearly the old woman continues to "attend" Chrysis and "care for" the baby after her emancipation, and at 246-8 she seems to draw a parallel between her past nursing of the baby Moschion and her present care for his child; on this cf. Gomme and Sandbach (above, n. 2) ad *Sam.* 248.

I end with a possible objection, not, I think, insurmountable. In the new *Misumenos*, edited by E.G. Turner,<sup>8</sup> we find the soldier Thrasonides complaining of the bad treatment he is receiving from his captive Krateia, with whom he is in love. He on the other hand has treated her well: A38-40 τῆς οἰκίας | δέσποιν]αν ἀποδείξας, *θεραπαίνας, χρυσία, | ἱμάτια δο]ύς, γυναικὰ νομίνας*. We can now add this reference to those non-Menandrian ones, already collected by Gomme and Sandbach,<sup>9</sup> which list maidservants and gold (along with items of clothing), but must we conclude, with Turner (P. Oxy. XLVIII,16) that there are now "grave doubts" about "the acceptability of Robert's Χρυσί· ἐκ τῆς οἰκίας, with medial hiatus, at Men. *Sam.* 382"? That is, must we accept Lefebvre's χρυσί', supported by the Bodmer codex?<sup>10</sup> Although the matter cannot be resolved with absolute certainty, I think the answer is "no."

First, the hiatus. The paucity of parallels might seem to argue for χρυσί'. Instances at Herondas 1.84 (Γυλλί, ωνα[]) and 5.69 (μή, τατί, ἀλλά) have been emended away by some, but are defended by Volkmar Schmidt.<sup>11</sup> At Aristoph. *Ach.* 749 (Δικαιοπόλι, ἦ λῆις), although the vocative is found only in the Ravennas, it is accepted by all modern editors. Still, there would perhaps be grounds for rejecting Χρυσί were it not for Menander himself: at *Perik.* 983 we find Δωρί. ἀλλά.<sup>12</sup> So, Δικαιοπόλι, Δωρί, Χρυσί, Γυλλί, τατί, all vocatives in -ι, four of them proper names, which seem to have been accorded some sort of privileged status wherein they may occur in hiatus.<sup>13</sup>

Against χρυσί' is the fact that the Χρυσί is found four lines earlier (378) and will recur three and ten lines later (385, 392): "Demeas, who could not utter Chrysis' name while speaking of her, now when face to face keeps flinging it at her" (Gomme and Sandbach [above, n. 2] 585). In the midst of such a concatenation of the vocative Χρυσί, how could Menander expect his audience to hear χρυσί'?<sup>14</sup> Moreover, once we accept that πάντα τὰ αὐτῆς must refer to the

<sup>8</sup> Most recently at P. Oxy. XLVIII 3368-3371. See also "The Lost Beginning of Menander *Misoumenos*," *Proceedings of the British Academy* 63 (1977) 315-31.

<sup>9</sup> Above, n. 2, 585; i.e. Dem. 45.28; 59.46; Ter. *Men.* 120; *Heaut.* 252.

<sup>10</sup> On this, see above, n. 4.

<sup>11</sup> *Sprachliche Untersuchungen zu Herondas* (Berlin 1968) 94, 116-17. Gomme and Sandbach (above n. 2, 585) accept the instances from Herondas as parallels.

<sup>12</sup> Wilamowitz, although writing before the discovery of the Bodmer with its χρυσί' (but also apparently without knowledge of the supporting instances in Herondas), accepted the hiatus, chiefly on the basis of the Menandrian parallel: "Hiat hinter Χρυσί wird durch Δωρί *Per.* 405 [= 983] von Sudhaus richtig geschützt," *Sitzb. der königlich preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften* (1916) 70, n. 2 = *Kleine Schriften I* (Berlin 1935) 419, n. 4. I have not included in the text Theoc. 24.71 μάντι Εὐηρείδα (included by Schmidt, above, n. 11, 94), since it is further complicated by shortening of the following diphthong εῦ before η. However, unless it too be emended away (Gow prints it, giving further Homeric parallels, *ad loc.*), it does seem to supply further support.

<sup>13</sup> M.L. West (*Greek Metre* [Oxford 1982] 11; cf. also 15) sees vocatives in -ι as equivalent to the unelidibles τί, τι, ὅτι, περί, πρό, and ἄχρι and μέχρι before ἄν, all of which comedy will likewise allow before a word beginning with a vowel.

<sup>14</sup> And this would be the sole instance in the corpus of the elided plural.

baby, the generosity implied by  $\chi\rho\upsilon\acute{\iota}$  is even less appropriate. On balance, then, the vocative is to be preferred.<sup>15</sup>

Harvard University

Richard F. Thomas

---

<sup>15</sup> I wish to thank Professors A. Henrichs, H. Pelliccia and I. Ševčenko, and Sir Hugh Lloyd-Jones for comments on earlier drafts of this note.