Zeitschrift: Entretiens sur l'Antiquité classique
Herausgeber: Fondation Hardt pour l'étude de l'Antiquité classique
Band: 16 (1970)

Artikel: Menander's manipulation of language for dramatic purposes
Autor: Sandbach, F.H.
DOI: https://doi.org/10.5169/seals-661104

III

F. H. SANDBACH

Menander's Manipulation of Language for dramatic Purposes

MENANDER'S MANIPULATION OF LANGUAGE FOR DRAMATIC PURPOSES

This subject may have been suggested in order to give me as free a hand as possible, for it is one to which almost anything could be relevant. Trimeters and tetrameters cannot be written without the manipulation of language, and Menander wrote his for the stage, that is, for dramatic purposes. This paper cannot do more than begin the discussion of some arbitrarily selected topics.

A familiar passage of Plutarch may provide a start. In the extract preserved from his *Comparison of Aristophanes and Menander* he complains that Aristophanes for all his varied vocabulary cannot give a king dignity, an orator eloquence and so on, but " assigns his characters any words that come handy, as if by lot ; and you couldn't tell whether his speaker is a son or a father, a rustic, a god, an old woman or a hero. But Menander's diction is so polished, and has so coalesced by being mixed to a consistency (συμπέπνευκε κεκραμένη πρὸς ἑαυτήν), that while it passes through many emotions and types of character and is adapted to all kinds of personage, it appears to have unity and preserves its uniformity (ὁμοιότητα) as it employs common, familiar words in ordinary use . . . no workman ever made the same shoe for man and for woman, for youth and for old man and for family slave, nor the same mask or outer garment, but Menander so blended (ἔμειξε Herwerden: ἔδειξε) his diction that it fitted every nature, disposition, and time of life."

What exactly was Plutarch's meaning is, as often with him, not easy to determine. The final comparison may suggest that Menander had in some miraculous way compounded a style which was identical for all characters, so that one could not tell from the words and expressions used who the speaker was, but which was yet appropriate for

everybody. On the other hand the contrast with Aristophanes might imply that Plutarch believed Menander to differ from him in that Menandrean sons and fathers, gods and old women, were distinguishable in their vocabulary. This is not however a necessary interpretation. Plutarch's contrast may be merely this: Aristophanes had a huge vocabulary, from which he ought to have been able to find suitable differing styles, but did not; Menander, with his restricted vocabulary, found a single style that suited all characters.

I must confess that I find it easier to support the view that Menander distinguished his speakers by their language than to find clear evidence for a single style. Yet it is perhaps true that his various characters have a good deal in common in their talk, and are distinguished by excrescences from a common central territory; and that since he was a delicate artist, who avoided exaggeration, the range of difference is limited. 'Avoided exaggeration' is possibly not strong enough; rather he may not have fully reflected the range of differences that must have existed between the speech of individuals at Athens. Above all, it is scarcely credible that foreign slaves all spoke Greek as well as do those of the plays. The representation of life for which Menander was praised cannot then be a simple realism in language any more than in incident. It is a procedure that selects from life and modifies what it selects, but with a tact that leaves a result that seems lifelike.

Now can we recognise any features that are common to all his characters or nearly all? And that may constitute this single style of which Plutarch speaks? I hope it is a correct guess that they talk prose such as might have been heard in the streets of Athens. The fitting of this into metre, in particular iambics, is achieved with remarkably little violence to the natural order of words, which is departed from mainly to indicate emotion or confusion; and even this

departure is, as Wilamowitz noticed (*Schiedsgericht* p. 156), true to life. But this prose is not *all* that could be heard in the streets. Obviously indecent language is nearly excluded, and never admitted for its own sake ; at *Perikeiromene* 234 it characterises one whom we know to have had too much to drink, and at *Dyskolos* 892 one of whom we may suspect it ; less striking words are used by angry men at *Sikyonios* 266 and *Dyskolos* 462. Similarly there is little that can be called slang ; what may be termed literary decency is preserved. At the other end of the scale elevated or poetical vocabulary is sometimes used by some characters, in strict moderation and always for a purpose, but more readily, one may suspect, than it was used in real life. Of this more later.

But within this similarity of style there are marked differences between individual characters, of a kind that I do not see reproduced by Terence in his adaptations, although Professor Arnott has kindly shown me an article soon to be published in *Greece and Rome* in which he makes it clear that such differentiation is by no means completely absent. In Menander an extreme example is the pretended Doric doctor of *Aspis*. Apart from his dialectical forms—and whether his inconsistencies are deliberate or the work of copyists I see no way of deciding—his vocabulary is full of unusual words. Ἀναφρίζω, is known by LSJ only from Phrynichus; the compound ἀνερεύγομαι first occurs here, and the simple verb, for which the Attic form was ἐρυγγάνω, only in poetic and Hippocratic authors; for θάλπω, ' give false comfort ', cf. S. *El.* 888 and also A. *P.V.* 684. Φρενῖτις is a medical technical term for inflammation of the diaphragm (not of the ' brain ' as LSJ have it). Βιώσιμος 'likely to live' is known from Theophrastus *H.P.* ix.12.1 and several passages of Arrian, e.g. *Anab.* ii.4.8, ' the doctors did not think him βιώσιμος.' Πάμπαν, although a favourite word of Aristotle, is not found in comedy or the orators. But this man is an exceptional case,

valuable only to show that Menander was prepared to give a character a distinctive mode of speech.

The two young men in *Dyskolos* are clearly distinguished. Sostratos' speech is easy and flexible; one can rarely guess what is coming next, so that it seems to take shape as it is uttered. Gorgias talks like a book; his thought takes the antithetical form familiar in the orators, so that his sentences are determined before they begin. Almost as soon as he enters we have the symmetrical sentence (250 ff.)

> τοῦτον οὔθ' ὅτῳ τρόπῳ
> ἀναγκάσαι τις εἰς τὸ βέλτιον ῥέπειν
> οὔτ' ἂν μεταπείσαι νουθετῶν οἶδ' οὐδὲ εἷς,
> ἀλλ' ἐμποδὼν τῷ μὲν βιάσασθαι τὸν νόμον
> ἔχει μεθ' αὑτοὺ, τῷ δὲ πεῖσαι τὸν τρόπον.

The details of the text are uncertain (I use that of Lloyd-Jones and Jacques) but the general structure is clear. The passage contains an example of a construction surprisingly rare in Menander, οὔτε ... οὔτε used to join not words but clauses. Gorgias does this again at 823-826, again in combination with a μέν ... δέ opposition:

> ἐγώ σε Σώστρατ' εἶναι μὲν φίλον
> ὑπολαμβάνω σπουδαῖον ἀγαπῶ τ' ἐκτόπως,
> μείζω δ' ἐμαυτοῦ πράγματ' οὔτε βούλομαι
> οὔτ' ἂν δυναίμην μὰ Δία βουληθεὶς φέρειν.

Similarly he uses μήτε ... μήτε, each with its imperative clause, at 284-286. These three instances are half of the whole number we yet have in Menander: the others are frag. 335, a moralising and perhaps slightly ridiculous speech by a slave, *Dysk.* 743-745, intentionally impressive lines by Knemon, and almost certainly *Sik.* 176, the opening of the messenger's speech, modelled on Euripides' *Orestes* 866 ff. Menander must have felt that this construction belongs to

formal thought-out speech, not to normal conversation. Gorgias, I said, talks like a book. His hard life will have given him little practice in the art of talk, but plenty of time to acquire the habit of arranging his thoughts in antithetical form. Analysis of 271-287 would demonstrate at least seven antitheses, but I confine myself to noticing the wide separation of μέν (274) and δέ (280). This is unusual, and the only parallel for six intervening lines is in Moschion's speech at the beginning of *Samia* Act V. Here he tells the audience that he has quite lost control of himself, ἐξέστηκα νῦν τελέως ἐμαυτοῦ. It is an indication that this is nothing but the striking of an attitude that he immediately explains his position in a sentence ten lines long, organised round this μέν and δέ.

If a sort of footnote may here be allowed, there is a passage of *Sikyonios* where a μέν, probably followed by a δέ, shows how it is to be taken. Theron has been coaching an old man in a story he is to tell to impersonate Kichesias; he does not know that the old man *is* Kichesias. At 361 Dromon suddenly speaks:

ἡ μὲν τροφίμη 'στὶν ἀσφαλῶς τηρουμένη,

then some lines are lost. The question is whether Dromon has been present listening to the conversation unseen, as Kassel and Barigazzi believed, and here makes himself known, or whether he enters with these words. I do not believe that a loyal slave, seeing his master for the first time for at least ten years, would be calm enough to address him with such a μέν-clause, presumably with a δέ in mind. But a character entering the stage not infrequently uses μέν and δέ, appropriately, for he may be supposed to have been reflecting and to have arranged and organised his thoughts. Examples are *Aspis* 97, 164, *Dysk.* 259, 394, *Samia* 399, 616, *Perik.* 77. Similarly here Dromon, who was last heard of as he accompanied Philumene to her place of refuge with

the priestess, comes back ; and it may be guessed that he said to himself or to the audience, without immediately seeing the others ; ' my young mistress is in safe keeping, but now her father must be found.'

To return to Gorgias, another feature that distinguishes him from all other major characters in the play is that he uses no oaths but the plain, trite νὴ Δία and μὰ Δία (each twice). There is one exception : at 777 he exclaims, of the approaching Kallippides, Πόσειδον, ὀξυπείνως πως ἔχει . αὐτίκ' αὐτῶι ταῦτ' ἐροῦμεν, or so B. But was Foss perhaps right in assigning the first clause to Sostratos, not so much because of the impropriety he saw if Gorgias remarked on the appetite of his new friend's father, but because of the exclamation Πόσειδον. I also think that ' shall *we* tell him? ' is more likely in the mouth of Sostratos, who is always anxious to associate Gorgias in what is going on, than in that of Gorgias, who will in a moment suggest that Sostratos should talk to his father alone : λάλει τῶι πατρὶ κατὰ μόνας (781). But we are here entering a field where observations on the use of language may breed suspicions rather than dictate any departure from the tradition.

It is worth remark that Gorgias uses the word ἐθέλω, twice in the aorist (269, 767) and once in the future (854). These are the only instances in Menander of ἐθέλω (as opposed to θέλω), and they have no parallel in the fragments of Middle or New Comedy, except that ἠθέλησα occurs in paratragic surroundings in fragment 3 of Kriton, whom Pollux counts among οἱ νεώτεροι. The evidence of inscriptions shows that θέλω replaced ἐθέλω in Attica, but the word is not of very common occurrence and Meisterhans-Schwyzer quote nothing between about 300 B.C., their latest ἐθέλω, and 250 B.C., their earliest θέλω. Comedy suggests that ἐθέλω was obsolescent in the later 4th century. For that matter Menander had no liking for θέλω. In his plays it occurs only in the formula ἂν θεὸς θέλῃι (*Georgos* 45, fr. 39)

and in a quotation from Aeschylus. In the fragments there are three occurrences (45, 97, 499), none quite beyond doubt, but this is not the place for discussing them. The solid fact is that, apart from a possibly paratragic instance, Gorgias is in our remains of Middle and New Comedy the only person to use ἐθέλω. What is the reason for this? It is possible that in 317 B.C. Menander was himself still using the form ἐθέλω, although on the point of giving it up. There might be a parallel in the fact that seven times in *Dyskolos* he attaches πως to an adverb, e.g. πως ἐνθεαστικῶς, πως φυλακτικῶς: elsewhere he does this only once (fr. 153). If we possessed Ὀργή and Μέθη we might find more instances of ἐθέλω. But I should prefer to think, guess though it may be, that Gorgias uses ἐθέλω because it was an old-fashioned form that Menander felt to be appropriate to this youth who lived tucked away in the country remote from the modern fashions of the town.

Another pair of characters distinguished by their way of talk are Getas and Sikon. Getas' vocabulary and phraseology is almost entirely conventional. He uses half-a-dozen words not recorded elsewhere in Middle or New Comedy, but none of it is ' fine language '. Sikon's speech is picturesque, as was noted by Giannini (*Acme* xiii, 1960, 190); he deploys otherwise unknown metaphors, νεωλκῶν 399, βεβωλοκόπηκεν 515, σφαιρομαχοῦσι 518, and gives the proverbial expression ἐν φρέατι κυνὶ μάχεσθαι a literal turn. He is full of oaths, one every seven lines (Dohm, *Mageiros* 229), to varied gods (six besides Zeus). His peculiar vocabulary, unlike that of Getas, consists mainly of words found elsewhere in authors with some claims to style. The list is ἀδιήγητος, ἀθῶιος, ἀνάπηρος, ἀνιέναι τὰς ὀφρῦς, ἀποιμώζω, ἐπικωλύω, θαλλός, ἱεροπρεπής, κολακικός, χυτρόγαυλος. I omit the metaphors already mentioned. All this prepares the way for his climax in the last act, as he describes the scene of revelry in the cave, using poetic language and a simile that

has caused editors a lot of trouble (*perobscurum* says Lloyd-Jones). Handley rightly remarks that similar scenes are elsewhere reported in elevated language. It may be added that Menander has prepared for Sikon's poetic style here by earlier representing him as imaginative and unusual in his wording.

The distinction between Sikon and Getas may be relevant to the textual problem at 550. The metaphor ὄνος ἄγειν δοκῶ μοι τὴν ἑορτήν ascribed by many editors to Getas does not fit his usual down-to-earth style, which knows abuse and sarcasm, but not metaphor. This reinforces the other objections to the proposal of Barrett and others to read ὄνος for ολος, namely that confusion of λ and ν is not paralleled in B, and that Getas had already made a reference to donkeys at his entrance, τεττάρων γὰρ φορτίον ὄνων συνέδησαν αἱ κάκιστ' ἀπολούμεναι φέρειν γυναῖκές μοι. The reference is more appropriate there because a donkey is a proverbial beast of burden, as Getas then was, and not, what he here complains of being, a factotum. Ἄγω δοκῶ μοι τὴν ἑορτήν is sarcasm, typical of Getas: 'I'm keeping the holiday, I believe'. The association of ἑορτή with the idea of 'not working' is well illustrated in LSJ s.v. 2 and 3. ολος should be ὅλως, but whether to be taken with ἄγω τὴν ἑορτήν or with the preceding words is scarcely to be determined.

Nikeratos in *Samia* is a man of short sentences, often in asyndeton; if he manages to keep going for two whole lines, the sentence may be composed of small units, as 401-402. His style is well illustrated by 410-420:

> ἤκουσα καὐτὸς τῶν γυναικῶν, ὅτι τρέφεις
> ἀνελομένη παιδάριον. ἐμβροντησία.
> ἀλλ' ἐστ' ἐκεῖνος ἡδύς. οὐκ ὠργίζετο
> εὐθύς; διαλιπών δ'; ἀρτίως;

I follow the division of speeches on which B and C are agreed. Then Chrysis answers in a contrasted sentence of

three lines, after which Nikeratos goes on with his brevities, Δημέας χολᾶι, κτλ. There is one passage which provides a striking exception to this style, the great sentence 507-513 in which he declares what *he* would have done to a son or mistress who had treated him so. I believe this is deliberate. It is a measure of the strength of his indignation that it lends him an unusual power of sustained speech.

With some hesitation I now mention an idea that has not yet commended itself to any of my friends who have heard it. I should not suggest it at all if I were not one of those who believe Ritchie to have been right to give Sostratos' mother a speaking part. My suggestion is less bold.

When Demeas and Nikeratos first appear at 96, the former opens : ' Don't you already feel the change of place, and what a difference there is between things here and your troubles there?' Then there follow $3^1/_2$ lines of disconnected phrases, that jump from one thing to another and are certainly intended to be comic.

> Πόντος· παχεῖς γέροντες, ἰχθῦς ἄφθονοι,
> ἀηδία τις πραγμάτων. Βυζάντιον·
> ἀψίνθιον, πικρὰ πάντ'. Ἄπολλον. ταῦτα δὲ
> καθαρὰ πενήτων ἀγαθά.

This is in Nikeratos' style, not that of Demeas, who proceeds to the serious prayer, Ἀθῆναι φίλταται and so on. Apart from language, is it likely that the wealthy Demeas should recommend Athens as a place where poor men enjoy unadulterated good things? How does he know? It is of course true that some rich men will tell the poor how lucky they are, but it is a tasteless proceeding. Certainly by modern feelings it is better that Nikeratos should congratulate himself than that Demeas should tell him that Athens is a fine place for the poor.

It is a characteristic of many persons in real life that they have favourite tricks of speech, expressions of which

they are fond. Sometimes these may be significant of something in their character, but often enough it would be difficult to deduce anything about the person from them, any more than from the shape of his nose. Such favourite expressions, however, like the shape of his nose, form part of that complex which we recognise as an *individual* human being. To guard against misapprehension let me say that there may be some truth in physiognomy, but it is an uncertain art; similarly turns of speech may be significant of character, but they are difficult to interpret with certainty.

These individualising touches are to be found in some of Menander's personages. Thus it has been noticed that the vituperative vocative ἀνόσιε is used three times by Knemon (108, 469, 595) and never by anyone else. That does not mean that in the next play discovered there will not be some person who uses the word. A snub nose is not peculiar to Socrates, but it is part of what makes the individual Socrates. The phrase εἰπέ μοι is quite widely used in various plays, but no one is as fond of it as Demeas in *Samia*. Of 7 instances one is in the mouth of Moschion (677) and another (453) probably is, but at least 5 belong to Demeas: 482, 589, 690, and 692 are indubitable; 170 is not assigned by Austin to any speaker, but surely there can be no doubt. Demeas has undertaken to persuade Nikeratos to hurry on the marriage of his daughter to Moschion. The two old men meet at 169, as is shown by χαῖρε πολλὰ σύ. Then someone says μνημονεύεις, εἰπέ μοι, [ ]ν ἐθέμεθα ἡμέραν. Ἐγώ is the reply. In the next line we have τὴν τήμερον, and then a series of questions and objections: ποῦ; πότε; τρόπῳ τίνι; ἀλλ' ἔστ' ἀδύνατον. πρὶν εἰπεῖν τοῖς φίλοις; It is clear that Nikeratos is very naturally surprised and taken aback at the proposal to marry his daughter that very day, and so it will have been Demeas who introduced the subject by some such words as μνημονεύεις, εἰπέ μοι, [ὡς οὐχὶ πρότερο]ν ἐθέμεθ' ἡμέραν, 'you remember that we did

not previously fix a day?' In this εἰπέ μοι is otiose; there is no reason to press for an answer. Demeas uses the phrase because he has the habit. One may contrast the state of affairs in *Dyskolos*, where six instances are shared between five persons.

There are some other characters in whom such tricks of speech may be observed, but they are not many, and Menander did not sow with the sack for his effects. Accordingly the question may be asked whether in observing such things we are observing something that is there certainly, but is there by accident, so that it does not deserve attention? Is it not possible that these peculiarities in the language of individuals are due solely to chance? Now put in that simple way, this may not be a very useful question. Plays are written, not by chance, but by human beings ; human beings have a tendency to repeat words at a short distance unwittingly, often indeed to their own annoyance when they observe what they have done. Hence the useful question is whether the repetition of locutions is any more frequent than what would arise by the mechanical working of the human brain. But brains differ : we are concerned with the working of Menander's brain. And here we seem to meet an impenetrable wall, for we have no evidence, except in the plays themselves, of how his brain worked. I see no way past this difficulty, and what follows has no claim to be anything more than guesswork.

A single repetition of a word at a short distance seems most naturally explicable as the result of the tendency for a word once used to be used again ; it seems to be readily available to the mind. Thus when at *Epitrepontes* 247 Onesimos says ἐπιεικῶς πυκνά and at 253 (probably) ἐπιεικῶς μέγα, or at *Aspis* 24 Daos says ἐπιεικῶς μάχαις πολλαῖς and at 35 ἐπιεικῶς συχνά it would be rash to see any significance, although the word is not repeated elsewhere in what we have of either play. But when the repetitions of a word or phrase

by a single character are more numerous and well spaced out, it is harder to put them down to a mere mechanical trick of the mind. It seems more likely that the playwright's mind associated the word and the character. This association may, it is true, have been an unconscious one. Menander may have made a character repeat a word without realising what he was doing. But that does not imply that we should necessarily refuse to notice the repetition. Writers are not always aware of the processes of composition. Housman recorded that stanzas often came suddenly and fully formed into his head (*The Name and Nature of Poetry*, 49) ; we should not be justified in saying that the lines must have rhymed by accident. Unfortunately we do not know how far Menander was conscious of the details of his writing. Sophocles is reported to have said of Aeschylus καὶ γὰρ εἰ τὰ δέοντα ποιεῖ, ἀλλ' οὐκ εἰδώς γε. Perhaps the same could have been said of Menander. Whether he knew what he was doing or not, these tricks of speech are there and make their small contribution to the lifelikeness of their users.

I now turn to another subject, and shall discuss Menander's use of elevated or poetic language.

There are two possible extreme views. The first is that he used such diction seriously, because he wished to stir other emotions than that of amusement. According to this view the recognition scene in *Perikeiromene* is in stichomuthia to help the spectator to experience the pathos and the drama of what is going on. The other extreme is that poetic diction in domestic drama always has some element of absurdity. My own belief is that no generalisation will apply correctly to all the facts.

Let us start with a very simple case, the treatment of a syllable as long when it contains a short vowel preceding a mute and liquid. This means that the division between syllables was made to fall between the two consonants and not before them both, as regularly in comedy. Such scan-

sion, that is such a way of pronouncing, was used in tragedy. Whether it was ever used in Attic households in moments of emotion, how can we tell? But I think it not erroneous to call it tragic scansion.

Now when at *Misoumenos* 214 Demeas embraces his lost daughter with the words ἔχω σε, τέκνον, using this scansion, it is a sign of his emotion, and there can be no question but that the audience is to share that emotion without reservation or complication. But when at *Samia* 516 Nikeratos exclaims ἀλλ' ἐγὼ πρὸς τοῖσιν ἄλλοις τὴν τὰ δείν' εἰργασμένην εἰσεδεξάμην μελάθροις τοῖς ἐμοῖς, it is equally clear that the audience may observe, but will not share, his emotion. It is absurd that the poor Nikeratos should denote his house by the poetic word μέλαθρα, usually applied to the palaces of kings. Is not the absurdity heightened by the scansion of μελάθροις as a bacchiac? Even in tragedy the word is often scanned with a short second syllable. The long syllable, like the long form τοῖσιν in the previous line, is intended to indicate Nikeratos' emotion, but that is an emotion at which the audience will smile, knowing it to be based on ignorance of the facts. An intermediate case is *Epitrepontes* 148, where Syros imagines that the foundling when grown up will undertake θηρᾶν λέοντας, ὅπλα βαστάζειν, τρέχειν ἐν ἀγῶσι. Βαστάζειν is a verb as absent from Attic prose as lions from fourth-century Greece. Syros is striking out a rhetorical phrase, which must appear slightly comic in the mouth of a slave, and the unusual scansion ὅπλα adds to the comic flavour. Is there also perhaps an anti-climax achieved by starting with lion-hunting and ending with running at a sports-meeting, as is suggested by De Falco? At the same time Syros is not, like Nikeratos, a figure of fun. He may exaggerate his points, he may use figures of rhetoric that would be more at home in a court of law, where they are expected, than at an impromptu arbitration, where they stand out as rhetorical; but his case is basically a sound one

and his arguments essentially right. So that although the hearer may smile at the form of expression, he is not hostile to what is said ; 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. Just as they are not expected, above all by Menander, to find all characters *either* good *or* bad, or every action or mode of conduct either completely right or completely wrong ; or as they are at once present at the happenings on the stage, so that the man in the play may address them, take them into his confidence, perhaps even ask their help, and yet not present, for they cannot interfere in any way with the progress of events ; even so they 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.

These remarks may be thought both obvious and erected on an insufficient base, consisting of a handful of scansional oddities. But unusual diction is to be found in other fields besides that of scansion, and the principle that it can meet with what may be called a " multiple response " is one widely applicable and not to be lost sight of. But that said, one may still maintain that some passages require one predominant response, and others another.

The longest piece of poetic diction that survives is the recognition-scene of *Perikeiromene*, conducted in the artificial form of stichomuthia and composed according to the metrical rules of tragedy. It is therefore sharply contrasted with the style of the rest of the play, and has been felt by some critics to damage its unity. Yet this scene is not simply a tragic foreign body. To see it as such is to forget the presence of Moschion as an eaves-dropper, a figure who prevents one from taking it absolutely seriously. One may compare the scene in *Samia* where the attempts of the cook to interfere in Demeas' expulsion of Chrysis prevent that

episode from being one of unrelieved seriousness, passion and pathos. In *Perikeiromene* the stichomuthia begins in abrupt contrast to the very plain language of Moschion that immediately precedes. Again there is disharmony between it and Moschion's conversational line 357

τουτὶ μὲν ἔν μοι τῶν ἐμοὶ ζητουμένων

or again his colloquial ποῦ ποτ' εἰμὶ γῆς at 363. These are reminders that the dialogue is being conducted in artificial language and according to an artificial formula, and must, I think, prevent the spectators from taking it with unalloyed seriousness. When they hear the question

πῶς οὖν ἐχωρίσθητ' ἀπ' ἀλλήλων δίχα;

and recall the famous passage of Euripides on the separation of heaven and earth, ἐπεὶ δ' ἐχωρίσθησαν ἀλλήλων δίχα, they must smile at the impudence of transferring this phrase from cosmology to the separation of a pair of children. It is not to my mind improper to see in this scene an element of tragic parody or to find an intentional touch of absurdity in 355

μόνη δ' ἔκεισο; τοῦτο γὰρ σήμαινέ μοι.

or in Glykera's interruption at 375

τί γίνεταί ποθ'; ὡς τρέμω τάλαι[ν' ἐγώ.

When an early critic wrote ' the style rises in dignity to the level of tragedy, to correspond with the importance of the subject ' (T. W. Lumb, *New Chapters in Greek Literature* i. 82) or a recent one says ' il tono stilistico . . . denuncia e accentua il clima patetico e drammatico della vicenda ' (D. del Corno, *Menandro : Le Commedie*, 305), these judgements give only a half-truth. No doubt the dramatist wished to indicate the emotion and excitement of Pataikos and Glykera, but at the same time he was not writing a

tragedy, but a comedy : he wanted his audience to feel amusement at the characters' language as well as sympathy with their emotions. The capacity of the human being for a complicated multiple reponse makes this a feasible aim. Nevertheless I wonder whether Menander does not here demand rather a lot. To take a convention at its face value, for the purpose for which it was devised, and at the same time to know that fun is being made of it, is a difficult feat, and perhaps he was expecting a tour-de-force by his actors if they were to enable the audience to achieve it.

A ' parody of tragic style ' has also been seen in some damaged lines from the recognition scene of *Sikyonios*, published by Jouguet in 1906. When that phrase was written it was not known that much more of the play was composed in a style nearer that of serious poetry than had been met before in Menander. Having only mutilated lines from a mutilated play, it is dangerous to hazard an opinion ; but I doubt whether what remains of this passage is so far above the general level that we have adequate reason to speak of parody : it may rather be imitation, a piece of fine writing for a crucial incident in the plot.

There is, however, another passage in this play which at first sight at least appears to be tragic parody. At 169 the wrangle between Smikrines and the person I shall call 'the democrat' is abruptly terminated. Someone cries ὦ γεραιέ, μεῖνον ἐν παραστά[σιν and Smikrines replies μένω· τίνος δὲ τοῦτο θωύ[σσεις χάριν; (the supplement is certain). This reply is in language unknown to comedy and typical of tragedy, and it makes not unlikely the supplement of the previous line by the poetical word δόμων. Γεραιός is also found mainly in tragedy, where it is scanned, as here, as a tribrach in Sophocles, *O.C.* 200 and Euripides, *H.F.* 446. Unfortunately what follows is badly damaged, but the remains of the next three lines suggest that the elevated style may not have been maintained. 172 βουλόμεθ' ἀκοῦσαι τὰ περί τ[is

prosaic enough, and 174 might be e.g. εἰδώς γ' ἃ πυν[θάνει λέγοιμ' ἂν ταῦτ' ἐγώ. Neither πύνδαξ nor ἀπυνδάκωτος seem likely alternatives. If this is right, Smikrines' tragic language in 170 may be used because he wishes to make fun of the elevated diction of the other speaker. But what then is the reason for that diction? Here we are up against our imperfect understanding of the plot. Is the speaker someone who has no part to play except to report the events at the propylaea? Is he one who passes across the stage like a meteor in the manner of a messenger in tragedy? He seems to take it for granted that Smikrines will be interested in his tale, even before he has been encouraged to tell it: and he departs without waiting for comment or thanks, of which he receives no word. Perhaps Menander has here taken over the practice of serious drama and used it for his comedy. Then the tragic language of the messenger's entrance at 169 must be regarded as a signal of what is afoot. 'Here is a messenger, such as you know in tragedy.'

But if there is any element of parody here it is a very small one. The tale starts with a clear reference to the messenger's speech in Euripides' *Orestes*; but the phrases used are perfectly appropriate to their new position; there is no attempt to make fun of Euripides. Nor in all that follows is there any sign of parody of tragic language. The story is a serious one seriously told. But the language is not particularly poetic. One may notice ὠρεχθήσαμεν (196), the phrases κατεσβέσθη ἦχος (198) and perhaps εὔνοιαν εἵλκυσε (244), and the absence of articles in μητρὸς διαθήκας καὶ γένους γνωρίσματα (248). There are one or two unusual but prosaic words: μοιχώδης, ὑπόλειος and ἀντιτάττομαι. But the seriousness of the speech is marked not so much by its vocabulary as by the comparative strictness of its rhythms. For example, of 28 lines from 236 to 263 only six fail to satisfy the metrical rules of tragedy, or nine if one disallows the ending with a fourth paeon, uncommon in tragedy.

Before leaving this may I say that it does not appear quite certain that a new speaker enters at 169? If the democrat departs at 168, the scene between him and Smikrines is a strange fragment that seems to lead nowhere. But if we had the whole play it might be more intelligible. More serious, Smikrines seems to assume that the speaker of 169 will be able to inform him of what has passed in some particular circumstances, but there is nothing said to give rise to such a belief. If, however, the speaker of 169 is the democrat, as is maintained by A. Barigazzi, *SIFC* XXXVII (1965), 18, the audience may guess that Smikrines and he had been talking about these circumstances before they entered at 150.

I began by quoting from Plutarch, but omitted a sentence, because I do not understand it. However he says that when Menander has occasion for indulging in sounding language he quickly and convincingly closes down and restores his speech to the proper style.

What I am now concerned with is what Plutarch calls the convincing restoration of ordinary speech. It is, I believe, illustrated in *Perikeiromene*. The quasi-tragic stichomuthia starts abruptly, but at the end, from 380 onward, the level of speech subsides slowly to the normal. As far as can be seen from a mutilated text the metre remains tragic for a dozen lines, so far as caesura, Porson's Law, and resolved feet are concerned; but the vocabulary and phraseology become those of ordinary life. At the same time the lines are broken by change of speaker at varying points, in the style of comedy. At 392 the line probably ended with the untragic διαφανές τε χλανίδιον, certainly with a diminutive of some sort. Hence χρυσῆ τε μίτρα in 393 is suspicious; there seems to be no case for elevated speech or emotion at the end of this prosaic catalogue that begins at 390 with πορφυρ[ᾶ ζώνη τις ἦν. Herwerden's transposition μίτρα τε χρυσῆ should at least be in the apparatus criticus here.

I should also think it likely, although it can be no more than a guess, that 397 does *not* open with a tragic synizesis of ὦ θεοί, but that we have the first line of a scene in trochaic tetrameters, making a lively contrast with the one that has preceded. Unlike his sister, Moschion is not a figure to be taken seriously.

The exclamation ὦ θεοί is not used by Menander at random. Of five instances in all, no fewer than three are in the mouth of Habrotonon in a single scene of *Epitrepontes* (303,313,372). In the first two places she uses it almost casually, to emphasise an adjective, εὐπρεπής τις, ὦ θεοί, λεπτόν, ὦ θεοί, ταραντῖνον, and in all three it is parenthetic. 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. The other two instances are in this scene of *Perikeiromene*, where the phrase is both times used initially, to indicate surprise or dismay. The first (377) is in the mouth of Glykera. Recent editors give the second (397) to Pataikos, but are they right? The fact that the other four uses are all by women may give a slight initial probability to Körte's original view that it is Glykera who cries ὦ θεοί, τίς ἐστιν οὗτος;. The emotional reaction to Moschion's intervention may suit her better than her father, who elsewhere seems to maintain a high degree of calm. Of course she knows Moschion and he may not; but they are both equally surprised by the voice that interrupts their embrace, so that she can exclaim 'Who is this?' as well as he can.

To return to the question of adjusting an elevated or poetic passage to the normal level, there seems to be no example of the sort of thing Plutarch had in mind apart from the passage of *Perikeiromene* just discussed. *Sik.* 171 ff. is too uncertain for analysis. But there is a passage in *Samia* where the relation of poetic and ordinary language has some interest. I have already spoken of the absurdity of

Nikeratos' εἰσεδεξάμην μελάθροις (517). His elevated language begins at 495, ὦ τὰ Τηρέως λέχη Οἰδίπου τε καὶ Θυέστου. The poetic word λέχη may be thought not unnatural in these mythological surroundings; but he is set off on his poetic course: he reinforces τοῦτ' ἐτολμήσας with τοῦτ' ἔτλης, a verb little used in prose; then ὀργὴν λαβεῖν probably has tragic colour (Eur., *Suppl.*, 1050). But with εἶτ' ἐγώ σοι δῶ γυναῖκα τὴν ἐμαυτοῦ θυγατέρα; we are back to the simplest everyday words. At 506 he calls Demeas an ἀνδράποδον for putting up with an injury (cf. Pl., *Gorg.* 483*a*); the word is purely prosaic, but the following sentence returns to tragedy with ἤισχυνε λέκτρον and ἡ συγκλιθεῖσα (Eur., *Alc.* 1090). Next the barbers' shops in which people will sit and chatter from dawn bring us back to earth, from which we rebound with the description of Moschion's crime as a 'murder'. The passage provides a series of sudden alternations between the poetic and the colloquial, certainly intended to be comic; and there will shortly be yet another when Nikeratos rushes out of his house with the sounding couplet

> οἷον εἰσιδὼν θέαμα διὰ θυρῶν ἐπείγομαι
> ἐμμανὴς ἀπροσδοκήτωι καρδίαν πληγεὶς ἄχει.

but follows that up with

> τὴν θυγατέρα < > τὴν ἐμὴν τῶι παιδίωι
> τιτθίον διδοῦσαν ἔνδον κατέλαβον.

Nikeratos' poetic language is not blended into his ordinary style, but set in stark contrast with it, and so made to be primarily funny.

A related topic is the use of quotations from tragedy. Once again, no one explanation will suit them all. When Demeas at *Samia* 325 quotes ὦ πόλισμα Κεκροπίας χθονός, ὦ ταναὸς αἰθήρ, words assigned by B to Euripides' *Oedipus*, that is probably true to life. He cannot find words to express his seething indignation and has recourse to a phrase

that has stuck in his memory from a play. But when the messenger in *Sikyonios* opens his speech in a way that recalls the messenger's speech in Euripides' *Orestes*, and even quotes an almost complete line from it, one need not suppose that he is conscious of what he is doing, or that more than a minority of the audience knew; that minority would take pleasure in recognising the origin of the passage, but it has no dramatic significance. The same speech of *Orestes* provides a line for Charisios in *Epitrepontes* 590: ἀκέραιος, ἀνεπίπληκτον ἠσκηκὼς βίον comes out as ἀκέραιος, ἀνεπίπληκτος αὐτὸς τῶι βίωι. Here quotation is pointless and I imagine that Menander did not himself remember from where these words came into his mind.

There are two surviving plays in which quotations from tragedy are made as being applicable to the situation. In both places they are used by a slave, who knows that they will puzzle an old man. The more remarkable is *Aspis* 407 ff., where Daos cites Aeschylus, Chairemon, Karkinos, and Euripides, and all by name. (Handley's brilliant recognition of Χαιρημονος at the end of 427 enables one to say that.) This is a literary feat of which probably few slaves were capable, but Menander has made it a plausible one by representing Daos as once a *paidagogos*: he will have accompanied his young master to school, and have had the opportunity of picking up crumbs from his literary education. Moreover Daos has already hinted some acquaintance with tragedy, so that his ability to quote should occasion no surprise. His opening speech, with which the play begins, comes very close to the tragic style. Of 17 lines none lacks the penthemimeral or hepthemimeral caesura, and only one infringes Porson's Law; nowhere is an iambus replaced by an anapaest. There are 11 resolved feet, but passages of tragedy show a higher proportion, e.g. 10 in $9^1/_2$ lines of Eur. *I.A.* 1214 ff. The vocabulary, although it contains nothing that is specifically tragic, includes very little that is

not found in tragedy: παραπλήσιος, παραλόγως and διαλογίζομαι are perhaps all words that tragedy would eschew; the absence from the tragedians of ἀνάπαυσις (found in Mimnermus and Pindar) is probably an accident. But his ability to speak in an elevated style once established in a passage where his emotion makes it appropriate, Daos uses a straightforward workaday vocabulary for his account of the disaster in Lykia; and, although he tells the story well, there is little in the way of figures of speech, except the asyndeton of ἀκούω θόρυβον οἰμωγὴν δρόμον ὀδυρμόν and ἐπιρρεῖν ἱππεῖς, ὑπασπισταί, στρατιῶται. The other place where a slave quotes from tragedy is *Epitrepontes* 765. Here a line and a half is quoted from Euripides' *Auge*, and a threat is made to recite the whole speech. I have argued (*Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Society*, 1967, 44) that the speaker is not the old nurse Sophrone but the domestic slave Onesimos, and shall assume that to be true. Onesimos has not shown any familiarity with tragedy, but he has displayed a certain knowledge of out-of-the-way words, which makes it more credible that he should know such a speech by heart. His opening monologue in Act III uses μηνυμάτων in the sense 'informations laid', cited by LSJ only from Thucydides. Then he has three rare nouns in -μός: βιασμός (277), 'rape', a sense found in Satyrus, *Life of Euripides* fr. 39 vii; βρυχηθμός (573), 'roaring' (not 'gnashing of teeth', as LSJ), not known in any earlier author; and τιλμός (ibid.), which had been used by Aeschylus (*Suppl.* 839). A fourth, ἀναγνωρισμός (763), is not quite so rare: it occurs once in Aristotle, and Durham found five examples in the Christian era. He also has four adjectives in -τικός: τοπαστικός is a hapax (381), προνοητικός (385) comes a number of times in Xenophon, ταρακτικός (402) first outside Menander in Mnesitheos, a doctor of the third century B.C. The fourth, λογιστικός, is fairly common, but mainly in philosophical authors.

That these nouns in -μός and verbal adjectives in -τικός are unusual appears from a comparison with the language of other persons in the plays. Onesimos has four nouns in -μός; all other characters put together have five, of which one is the well-established word λογισμός (*Sam.* 620). Daos in *Aspis* uses ὀδυρμός (51), a word found 4 times in Euripides, and also in Plato; the same character has πνιγμός (423), an unremarkable word, occurring in Anaxandrides and at least 4 times in Aristotle. Syr(isk)os in *Epitr.* has μερισμός (285) and Knemon has ἐπηρεασμός (178) for the usual ἐπήρεια. Hence at *Sik.* 277 βάδιζ' εἰς ἐξέτα[σιν is much more likely than ἐξετα[σμόν. I should add that συγκλυσμός is found in frag. 656 and that grammarians cite with distaste the words ὀψωνιασμός (Pollux calls this παμπόνηρον, vi. 38) νουθετησμός and τηγανισμός, without comment κιγκλισμός and μυκτηρισμός, with approval ἀγαπησμός. Adjectives in -τικός are as rare. Counting their adverbs, four occur in *Dyskolos*: πρακτικός is used by Sostratos of Chaireas at 56, and by Chaireas himself in the comparative at 128, φυλακτικῶς by Pyrrhias at 95, ἐνθεαστικῶς by Pan at 44. Otherwise there is nothing but two or three instances in fragments: εὑρετικός (34), θεραπευτικός (333), πειστικός (407). Against this set Onesimos' four instances. He stands alone among Menander's persons in this tendency to use nouns in -μός and adjectives in -τικός. But it is typical of Menander that he does not overdo the tendency, he does not exaggerate it to the point of caricature. The listener is given the feeling, of which he may not even be consciously aware, that Onesimos is not quite in the ordinary run in his language. That makes a knowledge of tragedy more appropriate, more credible, when it comes. Incidentally I now note that in line 772, which I give to him, not to Sophrone, whom I believe to be a persona muta, the word εὐτύχημα was noted by Wilamowitz to be not at all common in the fourth century. The only other Menandrean instance is *Samia* 618, a speech

by Moschion which contains several other pieces of elevated or unusual diction.

Whether it is right or not to give Onesimos the quotation from Euripides, the investigation of his suitability does at least show him to be another of those characters to whom Menander has given individuality by some particular mode of speech. This is a field in which one may guess there are more observations to be made. But scope for them is limited by the mutilated state of several of those plays of which there are considerable remains. Not only is it desirable to have the whole of an actor's part to examine for its vocabulary, but it would also seem that discovery of what is significant is aided by finding contrasts between one character and another. Just as this is a method for elucidating their psychology, so it may illuminate their language. But the method of contrast must be insecure so long as we cannot compare a whole with a whole. In particular any conclusion that depends on noticing what a person does not say must be provisional until we possess the whole of his part. The discovery of a new scene may upset a negative generalisation. Nevertheless, handicapped as we are in this way and also, let us never forget, by our imperfect knowledge of the Greek spoken in fourth-century Athens, we may hope for further progress and an increased appreciation of Menander's plays.

DISCUSSION

M. Handley: Among many things to welcome in Mr. Sandbach's paper, I am much impressed by the ways in which he has extended his study of Menander's style beyond that of rare or poetic words to uses of common words and of sentence structure. Perhaps an example to mention in support would be Sostratos' speech at *Dysk.* 666-690, where I have myself thought that the speaker's mood—perhaps even something of his character—is reflected in the repetition of common qualifying phrases and in the informal structure (*Dyskolos of Menander* on 683 f.). In contrast, Gorgias' speech at 271-287 seems to give a good example of the stilted formality which Professor Sandbach finds characteristic of him; it is a further point, perhaps, that he opens with a *gnome* which he tries to work out (rustics are especially γνωμοτύποι according to Aristotle, *Rhet.* 1395 *a* 6), and that the working out brings what Post has called " a gorgeously incoherent attempt at logic " (AJP 1959, at p. 410). It seems that when we try to describe the language of Menander's characters, we are often drawn into considering what they say as well as how they say it.

M. Ludwig: Darf ich an die ausserordentlich aufschlussreichen und anregenden Beobachtungen von Herrn Sandbach eine Frage anschliessen, die sich mir aus seinem Vortrag ergeben hat: Für die Bestimmung der stilistischen Physiognomie eines Textes sind die Satzstrukturen ebenso wichtig wie der Wortschatz. M. Sandbach hat auch in dieser Hinsicht einige ausgezeichnete Beispiele gegeben. Freilich waren, so weit ich sehe, seine Beobachtungen zum menandrischen Wortschatz erheblich zahlreicher als die zur Syntax. Das ist nicht verwunderlich, da es leichter ist, einigermassen sichere Aussagen über die Atmosphäre eines Wortes zu machen. Wie könnte man in der Erfassung der « poetischen

Syntax» Menanders weiterkommen? Auf welche syntaktischen Bereiche sollte man zunächst die Aufmerksamkeit richten?

M. Sandbach: This is a very interesting, and I fear very difficult question. Subjects that might repay attention are

1. the use or absence of connective particles in continuous discourse;
2. the construction of sentences in prologues and in other narrative passages (are subordinate or coordinate clauses predominant ?);
3. hyperbaton. This last is so usual in verse that it may pass unnoticed in Menander and be more frequent than I have supposed.

These are merely first thoughts, and there may easily be more profitable subjects for enquiry.

M. Handley: One wonders how far metrical and rhythmic effects contribute to those of sentence structure. Naturally something can be done by analysis when the metre is unusually strict, and the elevated tone is also given by language. But in Menander's normal or less formal style it is much harder to be clear about the effect of his handling of the metrical pattern, and it would perhaps be good if more work could be done here.

The alternation of emotion seems to be well reflected in the changes of tone and verse rhythm in Demeas' speech in *Samia* 325 ff.

M. Turner: M. Sandbach's suggestion that *Samia* 98-101 Austin should be given to Nikeratos, though it is against the indications in the Bodmer papyrus, seems to me to carry conviction. It is a welcome example of what [Demetrius] Περὶ ἑρμηνείας calls διαλελυμένη λέξις being used to distinguish between a pair of characters. Demetrius lays stress on the suitability to the stage and inherently dramatic character of

this " disjointed style ". Asyndetic triplets (especially verbs) such as Demeas' ἠγνόησ', ἥμαρτον, ἐμάνην (*Samia* 703 Austin) are emphatic and evoke a crescendo to a climax: κινεῖ γὰρ ὑπόκρισιν ἡ λύσις. No wonder actors loved Menander, and left Philemon to be read in the study. But this very recognition of the fact that Menander knew how to write for actors may be one of the reasons for the ὁμοιότης of which Plutarch speaks. Certainly asyndetic cola are used by characters of varied social standing, and in moments of different emotional tension. It might be interesting to examine further examples. A case that immediately comes to mind is *Samia* 673-674 Austin, where the slave Parmenon's excitement in wishing to tell Moschion (what he thinks the latter does not know) that the marriage is on is given vent in asyndeta that are also contaminated by the high style:

ποοῦσι γάρ σοι τοὺς γάμους· κεράννυται,
θυμιᾶτ', ἐνῆρκτ', ἀνῆπται θύμαθ' Ἡφαίστου φλογί.

M. Wehrli: Es war ein glücklicher Gedanke, für die Behandlung der Sprache Menanders von der plutarchischen Feststellung auszugehen, dass jener im Gegensatz zu Aristophanes seine Sprache trotz der Einschränkung ihrer Scala doch den wechselnden Stimmungen und Personen anzupassen wusste. Und dass ihn die Kunst der Ethopoiie auch gegenüber seinem römischen Bearbeiter Terenz auszeichnet, ist in der Diskussion mit Recht in Erinnerung gerufen worden. Das Urteil des Plutarch steht mit der herrschenden stilkritischen Würdigung in Einklang, welche Menander in der Antike genoss. Wenn z.B. Quintilian (X 1, 69) seine Lebensnähe rühmt, so meint er die unaufdringliche, auf jede Rolle abgestimmte Differenzierung einer umgangssprachlichen Atthis. Mit dieser nimmt Menander offenbar auch unter seinen Zeitgenossen eine Sonderstellung ein. Wenn nämlich im Anschluss an Plutarchs Vergleich zwischen Aristophanes und Menander von einer Gesamtentwicklung der komischen Bühnensprache gesprochen werden darf, so führte diese durch den

Abbau poetischer Ausdrucksmittel zunächst bloss zu einem der gehobenen Alltagsprosa nahen Stil einförmigen Gepräges. Wie ausschliesslich die hier wirksamen Stiltendenzen auch für die Uniformität der terenzianischen Verse mit ihrem Ideal der Sprachreinheit (*Heautont.*, Prolog 46) massgebend gewesen seien, soll hier nicht zur Diskussion gestellt werden.

Einen Vorgang, welcher der Veränderung des komischen Sprechverses gleicht, stellt Aristoteles (*Rhet.* 1404 *b* 25) unter Hinweis auf Euripides für die Tragödie fest. Dass dieser die Tonhöhe derselben herabgestimmt habe, ist vor allem angesichts des aischyleischen Stiles evident, aber von der Umgangssprache bleibt der euripideische Sprechvers in seiner kunstvollen Gewähltheit doch weit entfernt, und der Mangel an Flexibilität macht ihn für ethopoetische Nuancierungen ungeeignet. Es zeigt sich damit, dass Menanders Sprachkunst auch von hier aus gesehen etwas Neues ist. Euripides hat die Tragödie zwar durch zahlreiche aus dem Alltag gewonnene Motive bereichert und damit den komischen Dichter angeregt, dafür aber den passenden Sprachstil zu schaffen blieb diesem vorbehalten.

M. Turner: Professor Sandbach has said that there is little in Menander which can be called " slang ". A word which may represent popular idiom and is still alive today is κατέδομαι, *Dysk.* 124, 468 (and perhaps *Phasma*). Patrick Leigh Fermor, *Roumeli* (London, 1966), p. 131 recalls how after the German conquest of Crete in 1942 « some greybeard would say ' Never fear, my child, with Christ and the Virgin's help we'll eat them!' »

M. Ludwig: Der Stil eines Textes resultiert nicht nur aus dem Vorkommen gewisser sprachlicher Erscheinungen, sondern auch aus der relativen Häufigkeit derselben. Der Vergleich der relativen Frequenzen einer sprachlichen Erscheinung in verschiedenen Texten Menanders einerseits und in menandrischen und nichtmenandrischen Texten andererseits dürfte zu einem wesentlich deutlicheren Bild führen. Welche Möglichkeiten sehen Sie für

solche Untersuchungen oder halten Sie diese augenblicklich noch für verfrüht?

M. Sandbach: I am inclined to think that such New Comedy texts as are certainly non-Menandrean are too short to make a comparison with Menander fruitful. To compare different Menandrean plays might bring some useful results, although it may be that we still have too few plays to allow of certain conclusions. If one was very lucky one might find evidence for the dating of plays. But I have a suspicion that different plays may have different levels of vocabulary to accord with their atmosphere. Thus the frequency of terms of vulgar abuse may be a sign not of date but of what sort of play is being written.

M. Handley: It seems hard in Menander to find much sign of "poetic" or other abnormal syntax. One small illustration might be given from his use of the definite article, where, outside set phases like ἐξ ἀγροῦ, or with names for members of the family (including τροφίμη, κεκτημένη and so on), one has a few instances of omission of the article in 'paratragic' or elevated style, as ἔρπ' ἀπ' οἴκων τῶνδε, fr. 679 *Koe.*, or ἀνῆπται θύμαθ', *Sam.* 674.

M. Turner: Certain words, which may be of traditional type, help to enlist the involvement of the audience in what is going on. Μοι δοκεῖ and its variants fulfil this function, and evoke a response "I think—don't you?" We should not restrict the audience's involvement to verses in which they are directly addressed.

M^me^ Kahil: Il est un type de recherche où l'étude de la langue devrait s'allier à celle des monuments, et que l'on pourrait peut-être envisager maintenant, à la lumière des nouveaux textes et des nouveaux documents figurés qui ont permis l'attribution de masques aux divers personnages des comédies de Ménandre (je songe en particulier aux études de T. B. L. Webster). Il s'agirait de rechercher si à tel ou tel caractère de comédie, qui porte un

masque déterminé, correspond un langage plus ou moins défini (par exemple langage de la pseudokorè, de la vieille entremetteuse, de tel ou tel jeune homme, de tel ou tel vieillard, etc.). Cela pourrait donner des résultats intéressants.

M. Turner: Menander writes occasionally a strong 'exit' line for an actor. One thinks of Knemon's ἐπηρεασμὸς τὸ κακὸν εἶναί μοι δοκεῖ, *Dysk.* 178 f., on which he disappears indoors. Analogous are the preparatory lines preceding the entry of a new actor, e.g. Sostratos' at *Dysk.* 151-152: δέδοικα... αὐτόν· τί γὰρ ἄν τις μὴ οὐχὶ τἀληθῆ λέγοι; Recently Professor T. B. L. Webster has called attention to the unsatisfactory nature of *Misoumenos*, *POxy* 2656, 269, if the line is divided between Thrasonides and Getas, and suggested (on the analogy of *Dysk.* 152) that in spite of the manuscript all 269 should be spoken by Thrasonides (without punctuation after πῶς). 'How should I wonder at the new situation?'

M. Questa: M. Sandbach ha mostrato la raffinatezza dei mezzi stilistici del poeta, che sa esprimere nel modo più adatto ogni situazione scenica.

Confrontato con Menandro, Terenzio può sembrare e probabilmente è (pur nell'abbondanza di πάθος che distingue ogni testo latino rispetto a quello greco da cui è 'tradotto') meno vario nell'uso dei mezzi linguistici (la presenza di stilemi comici tradizionali o 'plautini' in *Eunuchus* e *Phormio* non muta granchè il quadro).

Io vorrei chiedere a M. Wehrli e a M. Ludwig se essi credono deliberata e voluta questa maggiore uniformità di Terenzio (mi riferisco anche all'annunciato articolo di Arnott), oppure se essa dipende dalle possibilità insite nel 'codice' del latino e in particolare del latino dell'ambiente di Terenzio (per certi lati è la cultura latina a non avere certi 'mezzi espressivi': per es. Menandro può scrivere trimetri di stile tragico anche nella tecnica metrica e trarne effetti singolari, come alla fine della ἀναγνώρισις

della *Perikeiromene*, giusta quanto ha osservato Sandbach ; Terenzio *non* può farlo, perchè senario tragico e senario comico sono metricamente identici in latino, se si eccettua la problematica norma di Lange-Strzelecki : vedi quanto ho detto in *Maia* 1968, p. 382 n. 9).

M. Turner : I think Professor T. B. L. Webster has some excellent remarks on the exactness of Menander's language and the generalizing of Terence in *Bull. John Rylands Library* 45 (1962), p. 240. He adduces for instance, Ter. *Andria* 483 *Post deinde quod iussi dari bibere et quantum imperavi, date* spoken by Terence's midwife compared with Menander's (fr. 37 Koe.) καὶ τεττά-ρων / ὡῶν μετὰ τοῦτο, φιλτάτη, τὸ νεόττιον. Exact observation of detail is the life-blood of the comic style.

M. Handley : Once again, in the controversy over Terence's *tenuis oratio et scriptura leuis*, style and subject appear to be involved together. In the *Phormio* prologue (6 ff.), it is noticeable that he turns his critic's reproach into the form *quia nusquam insanum scripsit adulescentulum / ceruam uidere fugere et sectari canes / et eam plorare, orare ut subveniat sibi.*