Menander, *Samia* 380-3

μή μοι λάλει.

ἐξει τὰ ὠαυτῆς πάντα: προστίθημι κοι
ἐγὼ θεράπαινας. Χρυσί. ἐκ τῆς οἰκίας
ἀπῆλθε.

382 θεράπαιναν primum scripsit sed postea pluralem maluit Sudhaus: litteram in codice Cairensi puncto subscripto deletam opinatus est Jensen, improbante Guéraud (recte, ut mihi uidetur ex imagine lucis ope confecta) ἔχων C : ἔχων B: ἔχων Robert : ἔχων 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; the plural must be taken literally." Hence Sudhaus' initial reading of θεράπαιναν, hence too the active imagination of Jensen. 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, ἐξει τὰ ὠαυτῆς πάντα, which I believe has been fundamentally and universally misunderstood. Here is the standard view: "τὰ ὠαυτῆς. 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." We are, then,

---


3 On the photograph, tiny dots appear beneath ἐγὼ θεράπαινας. 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 ἐγώ would make no sense (L. Koenen).

4 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 ἐγκρατησής) 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 τὰν ζωτήν 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 | τὸν παιδίον, τὴν γυναῖ. And a few lines later he repeats himself -- not just ἔχεις, but now πάντα as well: 386-7 ἀλλὰ ὑὸν πεπόνησεν. πάντα ἔχεις. The vague5 πάντα in 381 and 386 surely refers to the same thing, the παιδίον of 373.6

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 θεράπαινα, Demeas has already applied it, or its diminutive, to each of these women. He refers to the younger of the two as a θεράπαινδιον at 251 (and cf. 254 οὐθέν θεραπεύμετε;) . The other, the γυναῖ 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 ἐλευθερεῖ δὲ νῦν). But before this she was one, as Demeas again noted: 237-8 γεγονοῦτις ἐμὴ | θεράπαινα'. His lapse as to her status in 382 is minor, given that she had been his θεράπαινα and also taking into account his desire to treat the two as a pair.7

---

5 Demeas seems to have trouble naming the 'object'.

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

7 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 θεράπαινα and δούλεια 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, 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 τῇς οἰκίας | δέκαποιν οὖν ἀποδείξας, θεραπαίνας, χρυσίας, | ἵματα δός, γυναῖκα νομίζας. We can now add this reference to those non-Menandrean ones, already collected by Gomme and Sandbach, 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. 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 χρυσ'. Instances at Herondas 1.84 (Γυλλί, οναξ) and 5.69 (μή, τατί, ἀλλάξα) have been emended away by some, but are defended by Volkmar Schmidt. At Aristoph. Ach. 749 (Δίκαιώπολι, ἦ λήις), 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. ἀλλάξα. So, Δικαιώπολι, 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.

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? Moreover, once we accept that πάντα τὰ ὑποτής must refer to the

---


9 Above, n. 2, 585; i.e. Dem. 45.28; 59.46; Ter. Men. 120; Heaut. 252.

10 On this, see above, n. 4.

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

12 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 Menandrean 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 μάντης Εὖρετά (included by Schmidt, above, n. 11, 94), since it is further complicated by shortening of the following diphthong eu 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.

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

14 And this would be the sole instance in the corpus of the elided plural.
baby, the generosity implied by χpucί’ is even less appropriate. On balance, then, the vocative is to be preferred.\textsuperscript{15}

\textsuperscript{15} 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.