Menander, Samia 380-3

μή μοι λάλει.

ἐχεῖν τὰς καυτὰς πάντας προστίθημι κοί

ἐγὼ θεράπαινας. Χρυσί. ἐκ τῆς οἰκίας

ἀπίθη.

382 θεράπαινας 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) χρυσὶ C: χρυσὶ B: Χρυσὶ Robert: χρυσὶ 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;1 the plural must be taken literally."2 Hence Sudhaus' initial reading of θεράπαινας, hence too the active imagination of Jensen.3 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, ἐχεῖν τὰς καυτὰς πάντας, which I believe has been fundamentally and universally misunderstood. Here is the standard view: "τὰς καυτὰς: 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."4 We are, then,
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 ἔγραστη) 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 τὸ σαυτής 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 ἂν παιδίον, τὴν γραψόν. And a few lines later he repeats himself -- not just ἔχεις, but now πάντα as well: 386-7 ἀλλὰ ἂν ὑπὸ πεπονησάτω πάντ᾽ ἔχεις. The vague 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 θεραπαινιδίον at 251 (and cf. 254 οὐ θεραπεύετε;) . The other, the γραψός 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 ἐλευθέρα δὲ νῦν). But before this she was one, as Demeas again noted: 237-8 γεγονούμ᾽ 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 ἂν 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: Α38-40 τῆς οἰκίας | δέκποιν | [ἄν ἀποδείξας, θεραπαίνας, χρυσίας, 1 ἰμάτια δο]δές, γυναῖκα νομίκες. 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 χρυσία, 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 χρυσί. Instances at Herondas 1.84 (Γυλλί, ονα) and 5.69 (μή, τατί, ἀλλάδω) have been emended away by some, but are defended by Volkmar Schmidt. At Aristoph. Ach. 749 (Δικαιώπολη, ἡ λῆκ), 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. ἀλλάδω. So, Δικαιώπολη, Δωρί, χρυσί, Γυλλί, τατί, all vocatives in -i, 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 ἐκυπτές must refer to the
baby, the generosity implied by χρυσί' is even less appropriate. On balance, then, the vocative is to be preferred.15

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.