

The Samia

Autor(en): **Dedoussi, Christina**

Objektyp: **Article**

Zeitschrift: **Entretiens sur l'Antiquité classique**

Band (Jahr): **16 (1970)**

PDF erstellt am: **22.05.2024**

Persistenter Link: <https://doi.org/10.5169/seals-661108>

Nutzungsbedingungen

Die ETH-Bibliothek ist Anbieterin der digitalisierten Zeitschriften. Sie besitzt keine Urheberrechte an den Inhalten der Zeitschriften. Die Rechte liegen in der Regel bei den Herausgebern.

Die auf der Plattform e-periodica veröffentlichten Dokumente stehen für nicht-kommerzielle Zwecke in Lehre und Forschung sowie für die private Nutzung frei zur Verfügung. Einzelne Dateien oder Ausdrucke aus diesem Angebot können zusammen mit diesen Nutzungsbedingungen und den korrekten Herkunftsbezeichnungen weitergegeben werden.

Das Veröffentlichen von Bildern in Print- und Online-Publikationen ist nur mit vorheriger Genehmigung der Rechteinhaber erlaubt. Die systematische Speicherung von Teilen des elektronischen Angebots auf anderen Servern bedarf ebenfalls des schriftlichen Einverständnisses der Rechteinhaber.

Haftungsausschluss

Alle Angaben erfolgen ohne Gewähr für Vollständigkeit oder Richtigkeit. Es wird keine Haftung übernommen für Schäden durch die Verwendung von Informationen aus diesem Online-Angebot oder durch das Fehlen von Informationen. Dies gilt auch für Inhalte Dritter, die über dieses Angebot zugänglich sind.

V

CHRISTINA DEDOUSSI

The *Samia*

THE *SAMIA*

I am sorry that the very recent publication of the new text of the *Samia* did not leave me enough time to study it thoroughly. Therefore I am not ready to offer solutions to or suggestions about the various problems, which the new text and the play as a whole present, but I shall rather point out some of the problems, hoping that by discussing them your views and suggestions will throw light on them. These problems concern mainly the plot and the interpretation of the text as well as the analysis of the dramatic motivation of the characters.

There is also a problem which concerns not only the *Samia* but Menander in general. The new texts of Menander have shaken the foundations of the evidence, which was used before for the dating of his comedies. We need to establish a rough history of Menandrian comedy, extended over a period of about thirty years. His dated texts will help in establishing the evolution of Menander's comedy, but this evolution will help in arranging the long fragments in a kind of chronological order. The evidence which has, I think, lost its chronological meaning is the following: 1) The mention of real persons contemporary or older. 2) The use of other metre than the iambic trimeter. 3) The strong comic element (farcical scenes). 4) The traditional material connected with comic types. 5) The presence and the use of monologues. We have now to rely on the internal evidence: the play as a work of art, its plot and its characters express a certain stage in the evolution of their creator.

The only dated play, the *Dyskolos*, is an early play, but all agree that in this comedy the dramatic skill of a genius is already shown, as well as the ability to create individualistic characters. It could not be otherwise, because this is Menander. The prevailing opinion about the date of the

Samia was that it is an early play. In my edition of the play I dated it decisively after the *Dyskolos*, near the year 310 B.C. After reading the new text, not only I am of the same opinion, but I am also inclined to accept an even later date. The mature dramatist reveals himself with the plot and the characters of the play, their behaviors and their thoughts. The criteria of the dating have to be based on the play itself.

I thought it necessary to give these preliminaries in order to be a starting point, in case one wants to turn the discussion on the subject of the dating of the *Samia* and the position of this play in Menander's history as a dramatic poet.

We have a clear idea of the size of the *Samia*. The play appears to be about a hundred lines shorter than the *Dyskolos*, but this difference is reduced by half, considering that about 30% of the lines of the *Samia* are in trochaic tetrameters, while in the *Dyskolos* the proportion is about 16% (trochaic and iambic tetrameters). The trochaic tetrameters take more time in the performance of the play, because not only are they longer verses, but also because they are found in scenes where speech is combined with much actual movement on the stage.

The scene of this comedy is in Athens, there are two houses on the stage, one belongs to the rich Demeas, the other to the poor Nikeratos.

The play begins with a very long prologue spoken by Moschion, one of the characters of the play and not by a divine being or a personified abstraction. The beginning of the prologue is missing and we do not hear the motivation of Moschion's exit. When the text becomes intelligible, we hear that Moschion has committed a sin (ἁμάρτημα) and he is in a difficult situation. His previous life was happy, his father provided him the means to be a distinguished member of society. In return he had always behaved towards his father perfectly well. He was a decent and respectful son. His father fell in love with a Samian ἑταίρα, secretly in the

beginning, and he did nothing to take this woman in his possession, because he was ashamed in face of his son. But Moschion found out about it and thought that his father had to take the Samian woman in his possession, otherwise his young rivals could put him in a difficult situation. Here a gap stops the text. We are left with the impression that Moschion helped his father in a way to take this woman in his house as a concubine.

The Samian woman, whose name is Chrysis, was a poor foreigner, a professional *ἑταίρα*, who decided to live with the rich Demeas as his *παλλακή* (like Glycera of the *Perikeiromene*). Demeas calls her a free woman (v. 577). Therefore the words *τῆς ἑταίρας ἐγκρατῆς* (v. 25) must mean nothing more than 'securing the position of her exclusive lover' (this in fact he did by taking her into his house and entrusting her with its domestic management). And Nikeratos' words *παλλακὴν δ' ἂν αὔριον πρῶτος ἀνθρώπων ἐπώλουν* (v. 508 f.) express one of his 'tragic' exaggerations (see v. 513 and 560 f.). It does not seem to me probable that Demeas bought her from a *πορνοβοσκός* and that she was his property, or made free afterwards by him, because he would have mentioned it in the scene of her expulsion.

After the gap (v. 35) we hear about the mother of a girl, who was in good relations with his father's concubine (v. 36 *ἄβρ]αν?*). The women being neighbours and friends used to exchange visits. We understand that Moschion fell in love with the girl (the text here, v. 34, has an obscure expression: *συνθλάσας τὸ σημεῖον*). One day, almost a year ago, Moschion came back unexpectedly from his father's farm and found a party of women going on. The women were celebrating the Adonia (The word *περυσινά*, which M. Turner suggests fits well in the beginning of v. 39). Among the guests were, of course, the next door lady and her daughter. It was a merry and noisy party, he could not sleep and took part in it as a spectator. Then—he is ashamed

to continue, but what is the use?—the girl became pregnant. He did not deny his responsibilities; he went to her mother and promised her to marry the girl, when his father comes back from his voyage. In the gap after v. 29, he must have mentioned that his father as well as the girl's father were not in Athens and where they had gone. His child was born only a few days ago. He took it and brought it into his house. The text after v. 56 stops at a crucial point. The meaning of v. 55 f. is not clear and the conjecture of a supplement for the beginning of v. 56 is problematic. I do not think that any part of the verb *τίκτω* suits the context. The good luck for Moschion was the presence of Chrysis in his father's house, because she took up the baby and nobody learned, except the women of the two households, who was the mother of the baby. This arrangement was very convenient, because the real mother could easily visit Chrysis and feed her child. Chrysis offered a great service to Moschion, who must have felt very obliged to her. How did he finish the prologue? And did he leave the stage? We can only make conjectures. Equally unknown is also the beginning of Act I. When Moschion and Parmenon appear on the stage Chrysis is already there. The two are in the middle of an animated conversation. Parmenon announces the arrival of the two fathers (Demeas and Nikeratos) from the *Εὔξεινος Πόντος*. Now Moschion must speak to his father and ask his consent to marry the poor girl. But Moschion is not only a shy young man, but also a timid one. He simply cannot speak to his father. Parmenon gets angry with him and scolds him. Chrysis joins in the conversation and the three together decide what they are going to do about the baby. Chrysis will go on taking care of it. She will say to Demeas that the baby is his and her child. It was expected that this would make Demeas furious, but they were relying on his love for Chrysis. She is the opposite of Moschion, brave and ready to suffer

anything rather than separate the baby from its mother and give it to a poor nurse (v. 84 f.). We do not know how this scene ended. After the gap we find Moschion desperate and terrified. He decides to be alone in an isolated place and prepare a speech. He must find arguments to persuade his father and obtain his consent to marry the poor girl.

Demeas and Nikeratos with slaves carrying their luggage enter. We hear their impressions about the places they came from. This is a place for the dramatist to present Athens with a little traditional encomium (v. 100 f.). Nikeratos' simplicity is made clear with his remark ; the reply he gets from Demeas (v. 106 ff.) shows the humour of the latter. They turn the conversation to a subject they are familiar with : they have decided on a marriage between the son of Demeas and the daughter of Nikeratos, and agree to fix a day for the wedding. But the text stops again. In the gap act I ends and act II begins.

We can guess that act II began with Demeas coming out of his house, having just been told by Chrysis that the baby is his son. After the gap we find Moschion, who came back from the ἐρημία (v. 94). He is so absorbed that he does not notice his father. His rhetorical exercise did not actually take place, because when he was by himself instead of preparing his speech he was dreaming about the day of his wedding—a stupid thing to do at that moment (v. 126). Now he sees Demeas and understands from his appearance that there is something wrong. The ἐταίρα he lives with has born him a child, as if she was married to him. But he is going to send her away from his house (the feminine participle, conjectured to be ἀποφθαρεῖσα must be retained). Moschion is upset and in his embarrassment defends the illegitimate child, producing arguments, which are common-places (see Soph. fr. 84 and Eurip. fr. 168). The effect is comic, not because of the arguments themselves, but because of the special situation which produces them. The rest of

this conversation is unfortunately lost in the gap of the text. After the gap the subject of their conversation is Moschion's marriage. We know from v. 334 f. (τὸν φανέντ' αὐτῷ γάμον ἄσμενος ἀκούσας) that Demeas opened this conversation by telling Moschion that he had arranged a marriage for him with Nikeratos' daughter. Moschion was unexpectedly relieved, because he gained his cause without any effort. He agrees at once, but he shows an eagerness, which excites his father's curiosity. Moschion now at least must say something, but he simply is unable to do it. In his character we find the theme common to all lovers of comedy, lack of eloquence and persuasiveness, in an elaborate variation combined with timidity. He wishes his father could understand that he is in haste and help him without asking why. His wish is expressed with the optatives of v. 152, which I prefer to be plain optatives (without, of course, a question mark). The effect of Moschion's wish is successful. Demeas 'understands' (cf. v. 335 f. οὐκ ἔρῳν γάρ, ὥς ἐγὼ τότε ὥομην, ἔσπευδεν); he thinks Moschion is very much in love and being himself in the same situation he shows understanding. He decides to run immediately to Nikeratos and arrange the wedding for the same day. Moschion is so glad that he cannot restrain himself. Shall he go and fetch the girl after performing the preliminary rites of the wedding? I think that verses 156-157 suit Moschion better. But Demeas tells him to wait; They must first see Nikeratos. Moschion feeling guilty and being timid cannot face Nikeratos. He leaves his father alone to take care of the matter and enters the house.

The fragmentary text after the gap is problematic. Who are the speakers here? I agree with Mr. Sandbach that they are Demeas and Nikeratos. Demeas called Nikeratos to come out. It seems to me that Demeas is trying to persuade him that they had already fixed the same day as the day of the wedding, but Nikeratos strongly protests (vv. 170,

173). I cannot see what is the obstacle which makes Nikeratos think that 'it is impossible' (v. 176) to have the wedding on the same day. He says something about his friends (cf. also v. 403). Has he no time to announce the wedding to his friends and invite them? Demeas finally persuades Nikeratos, calls out Parmenon and sends him to the market for the traditional shopping and fetching of a cook. Parmenon cannot understand what has happened so quickly. He says that he is going in to take money. Nikeratos goes in to tell his wife about the wedding before he goes to the market. Demeas comments on Nikeratos, that he is going to have difficulties in persuading his wife to have the wedding on the same day. But I cannot see why. Parmenon shows reluctance to carry out quickly his master's orders. He probably wants first to get some information. The text stops again. Act II ends in a gap with the departure of Parmenon and Nikeratos for the market. Demeas goes in.

The three last acts of the play are almost complete. The old fragments of the Cairo Papyrus and the new ones of the Bodmer Papyrus offer us now a more or less smooth text. In the dramatic structure of the play the third Act contains the development of the action which leads to a failure and disappointment. Demeas opens the act with a long monologue, which is informative as well as dramatic. While he was busy with the preparations of the wedding he overheard that the father of the baby is Moschion. He comes out in a state of alarm. On his way out he sees his concubine suckling the baby. But he cannot even think that Moschion could be able to do such a deed. Parmenon enters with the cook and their traditional comic scene is a small interval. Demeas fails to extract the truth from Parmenon, who has to run away in order to avoid the anger of his infuriated master. Demeas controls himself and tries to face the situation with reasoning. Nevertheless his reasoning leads him to wrong conclusions. Taking into consideration

Moschion's age and former behaviour, he concluded that Moschion is not very guilty; on the contrary Chrysis, the former *ἑταίρα* and a person of low social level, is alone found responsible and guilty. He decides to throw her out of his house and get rid of her. The execution of his decision follows. It is very important for the dramatic development of the play that Demeas did not tell Chrysis the real reason of his behaviour, but at the same time it is also very well motivated. After this highly emotional scene, to which the presence of the Mageiros adds a comic touch, Nikeratos' appearance and his traditional jokes about the sheep are a change. He consoles Chrysis and takes her in his house.

Act IV, as it is now completed with the new text, is the great surprise in the new *Samia*—and it seems that all new Menandrian texts will contain some surprise. Being the climax of the play, this act has no parallel in Menander's surviving work. The various comic situations succeed each other quickly, 'making the act astonishingly dramatic', and the characters move from one emotional situation to the other, all of them playing equally important parts. The use of the traditional comic and tragic material shows clearly the 'new comedy' style of Menander.

Nikeratos comes out ready to go and speak to his friend. His house is upset, the women are crying. How is it possible now to have the wedding? Moschion comes from the agora. He is impatient and tired of waiting for the time of the wedding. Nikeratos tells him the latest news.

Demeas coming out of his house, where the women are crying, threatens them in order to stop and give a hand to the cook. The wedding must take place. He forces himself to swallow his grief and perform his duties properly. The other two men accost him and Moschion asks him to explain his behaviour to Chrysis. The following scenes spring from the inevitable misunderstanding, because neither Demeas nor Moschion can say openly in front of Nikeratos what

each of them implies as the 'truth' of the story. When at last Demeas full of indignation reveals his secret suspicion, which excites an explosion of Nikeratos' anger, Moschion finds himself in a desperate situation. Now it is impossible to tell the truth in front of the infuriated Nikeratos; but his silence is taken as a sign of his guilt. This misunderstanding gives Nikeratos time to compare this 'tragic' situation to the tragic myths of Tereus, Oedipus, Thyestes and to find them now less tragic. He imagines in crescendo a sequence of 'tragic' events, which he expects to follow Moschion's 'tragic' deed. He will never give his daughter to such a horrible person—gods forbid! He would rather accept the failure of having Diomnestos as a son-in-law—an *ὁμολογουμένη ἀτυχία*—than Moschion. It seems clear to me, although the text here is incomplete (v. 504 f.), that the name Diomnestos has a proverbial meaning (cf. the name Melitides in the *Aspis* 269); the difficulty is that Diomnestos appears for the first time in comedy, and his name is not recorded by the collectors of proverbs. Historic persons named Diomnestos, otherwise unimportant, are irrelevant, with one exception, which, I think, can throw some light on this obscure name. A certain Diomnestos is mentioned by Heraclides Ponticus in his work *Περὶ ἡδονῆς* (fr. 58 Wehrli) quoted by Athenaeus (XII 536 F). The story of Diomnestos, which Heraclides mentions speaking about Kallias, seems to be a popular tradition, fictitious perhaps to a certain degree, with a perpetually exciting subject: the discovery by chance of a buried treasure. We know that Kallias also was connected with the discovery of a buried treasure, hence his adjective *λακκόπλουτος* (v. *Suda* s.v.).

In Heraclides' story a certain Diomnestos from Eretria found a treasure in a room of his farm house, left there by the Persian general, who had encamped on Diomnestos' field, but was killed with all his army. In the first phase of

the story Diomnestos appears as a extremely lucky person. In the second phase the stories of two lucky men (Kallias and Diomnestos) are combined. When the King of Persia sent again an army to destroy Eretria (this is not historically true), the people of Eretria sent away their money. Among them Diomnestos' family sent the treasure to Athens and left it as a deposit to Hipponikos, son of Kallias. But all the inhabitants of Eretria were killed and the treasure of Diomnestos remained in Athens, in the hands of Hipponikos' descendants. Finally then the lucky Diomnestos turned out to be extremely unlucky; he lost not only his treasure but his life also.

The effect of Nikeratos' proverbial use of Diomnestos, as the name meaning great wealth gained and lost by chance, is comic, because it shows his financial concern in front of a 'tragic' situation. The poor Nikeratos realizes only for a moment that he is losing a rich son-in-law. When he goes in to expel Chrysis, Moschion seizes the opportunity to tell his father the truth at last. But now Nikeratos comes out playing a different tragic role; he is the father whose unmarried daughter has a child. Demeas is relieved, but Moschion is dying of fright and runs away, leaving Demeas again to face Nikeratos, who is not easy to handle, because his situation is really serious. He threatens and chases Chrysis, who takes refuge in Demeas' house. Demeas tries various ways: deceit, force, sincerity; till Nikeratos understands that Moschion is the father of his daughter's baby, but he is calmed down by Demeas, because he is assured that the wedding will follow at once. After regaining his humourous disposition Demeas wants to change the mood of the grieved Nikeratos with teasing and jokes. It is his turn to bring similar situations from the tragic myths, and compares Nikeratos to Akrisios, whose unmarried daughter Danae had given birth to a child. Traditional jokes about the parasites are combined.

The wedding, the centre of the action in the *Samia*, has reached the moment of its realization at the end of Act IV, but the end of the play has not come yet, because Moschion has self-respect and cannot bear the thought of his father's suspicions. Therefore he must do something to show the indignation of his wounded self and to punish his father. He would leave the house at once and go to Asia as a mercenary, if he could, but he is in love and his Plangon does not allow him to do any glorious deed. At least he can threaten his father.

Parmenon arrives in the nick of time after his running away. His comic monologue delays a little Moschion's action. Moschion orders him to go in and fetch a cloak and a sword, without giving him any explanation. As happened with Demeas in Act II, Parmenon asks to learn what is the matter and he is reluctant to carry out the order. But he goes in forced by Moschion, who waits imagining the success of his plan, although he admits his inability to persuade. Parmenon comes out without the cloak and the sword. In the house every-thing is ready for the wedding and they are waiting for Moschion. He tells Moschion to go in, because there is nothing to worry about. But Moschion insists and sends him again for the cloak and the sword. Fear and uncertainty about the result of his plan make Moschion irascible and rude and Parmenon gets angry with him. He brings Moschion the things he wanted, but Demeas does not appear yet. Nobody saw Parmenon carrying the sword and the cloak; this seems to ruin Moschion's plan. He is embarrassed till Demeas, after losing his patience, comes out to look for Moschion. Seeing him dressed as a traveller, Demeas understands the situation and with a moving speech begs Moschion to forgive him, forget what has happened that day, and stay. Moschion has succeeded and is completely satisfied, but his success does not last, because Nikeratos comes out. At the sight of Moschion

dressed up like a traveller Nikeratos misunderstands him, thinking that his future son-in-law wants to avoid the marriage. He gets angry and threatens to seize and bind him, practicing the rights given to him by the existing law. But Demeas intervenes, begs Moschion to give up the sword and the cloak, and sends Nikeratos to bring out the bride. At once Nikeratos brings the bride followed by her mother, and gives her officially to the bride-groom. From Demeas' house the loutrophoros and the flute player come and join the spectacular nuptial procession.

Demeas, on behalf of the poet, asks the audience to applaud and wishes the goddess Nike to give always her favour to his χοροί, using this word as synonymous to the words 'actors of his plays'. Although the χορός is separated from the drama, it remains an indispensable traditional element of the theatre.

DISCUSSION

M. Turner : Perhaps we may add to the summary of the action a short indication of the artistic methods employed by the dramatist to realize it. The subject of the play is a marriage between the households of two neighbours (a *Κηδεία*, as the alternative title has it), desired by all the parties to it, and of the obstacles that constantly arise to this marriage. They issue from a series of misunderstandings which are made to arise quite naturally out of each other. In this intricate action, full of ironical situations, surprises and paradoxes, Menander achieves a remarkable degree of suspense, and maintains the impetus right to the end of the play. He has also achieved his purpose with economy of characters. Nikeratos' wife and daughter do not appear on the stage till the final tableau.

The action is, in fact, made to grow out of the characters themselves and at the same time reveals them. Demeas misunderstands a situation because he wishes to believe the best of his adoptive son and wants to keep secret his worst suspicions ; Nikeratos because he is slow of comprehension and brusque ; Moschion because he lacks candour (he is a spoiled child) and has a cheerful readiness to hope for the best. There is an irony right from the start that a son should consent to his father taking a mistress and should help him to possess her ; and that in his first interview with his father he should plead the cause, in philosophical terms, of the claim of bastards to human sympathy when the baby in question is his own. Demeas attributes to the urgency of young love his son's instant agreement to the marriage with Plangon, and is therefore ready to fix " today " as the marriage day. When, concealed in the pantry, he has learned that Moschion is father of the child he had been led to believe was his own and also sees Chrysis nursing it, he jumps to the conclusion that Moschion has

made love to his own mistress Chrysis. The scene in which the slave Parmenon is questioned but escapes with evasive answers maintains the suspense. Again Demeas draws a wrong conclusion, and rationalizes it: Moschion's conduct he now believes to be due to his desire to escape from a temptress ("my own Helen"). On this is founded his decision to expel her from his household. This decision, as M. F. Wehrli has shown us, tears him in two, for he has a real affection for Chrysis and remembers when she first arrived ἐν συνδονίτῃ λιτῶ. The presence of the cook during this scene, as we have already discussed (pp. 31-33) both prolongs and softens the tension.

At the end of Act III Chrysis with her baby and attendants are shut out by Demeas but given refuge in his house by Nikeratos. The 120 new lines at the beginning of Act IV develop the embroilment, and none of the scholars who have tried to guess at the contents of this lacuna have come anywhere near to the truth, or suggested anything so amusing and imaginative: a scene which (as we can see with hindsight) is a natural enough extension of the earlier misunderstandings. Moschion and Nikeratos join forces; Demeas is resolved, if he can, to conceal his false suspicions. But Moschion's unexpected request that Chrysis should attend the wedding makes Demeas blurt out that he "knows" the baby to be Moschion's; and when the latter offers the defense, that his conduct is no worse than that of many others, Demeas bids him tell Nikeratos who is the baby's mother. In this ironical situation Moschion is confused, and it is Nikeratos' turn to jump to the same conclusion as Demeas. He compares Moschion to Phoenix: 'I should have sold any concubine of mine the next day and disowned my son; and all the barber's shops would have been full of people saying how manfully Nikeratos acted towards "a homicide".' He then remembers that he has betrothed his own daughter to this "murderer" and leaves the stage outraged. Alone with his father Moschion can confess the truth, and the rest of the act can be allowed full comic (not to say farcical) expression, as Nikeratos, entering and leaving like a top, finds his

daughter suckling the baby, and tries to seize it as hostage so as to extract the truth from his wife.

At length Demeas, his urbanity regained, calms Nikeratos down. But the emotional entanglement is not over. Moschion cannot bear to think of the suspicions his father had entertained. It is his turn to be torn in two. Shall he stay, as love for Plangon and oath require? Or go abroad to teach his father a lesson? It is hard to think of the weak-willed Moschion as a successful mercenary soldier. His father's sermon, apologies and entreaties fail to make him change his mind; Nikeratos' brusque orders to lower his sword do succeed. The invocation of the rigour of the law against a seducer of a free citizen woman is dropped, and at last in the final tableau the wedding can go forward.

M. Wehrli: Typologisch nimmt die *Samia* in der Behandlung des Verhältnisses zwischen (Pflege)vater und Jüngling eine so auffällige Sonderstellung ein, dass man chronologische Schlüsse zu ziehen versucht ist. Die auch in anderen Stücken Menanders vorliegende Umwandlung des Konfliktes in ein blosses Missverständnis ist hier mit der umfassendsten Umsicht vollzogen. Ein sachlich begründetes Zerwürfnis wäre durch Demeas Väterlichkeit wie durch Moschions fügsame Art ausgeschlossen; beide stimmen sogar, ohne es zunächst zu ahnen, in den Heiratsplänen für Moschion überein. Ja, der Argwohn des Alten wird gerade durch die reuevolle Verängstigung des Jünglings ausgelöst, der ihm seinen Fehltritt nicht einzugestehen wagt und darum das neugeborene Kind Chrysis unterschieben lässt. Ist diese lückenlose konsequente Motivierung der Handlung ein Beweis für späte Entstehung der *Samia*?

M. Ludwig: Die *Samia* hebt sich als ein einzigartiges Stück aus den übrigen bisher bekannten Komödien der Nea heraus. Ziel der Handlung ist wie sonst auch die Heirat des reichen jungen Mannes mit dem armen Mädchen. Aber weder stellt sich ihr ein Widersacher in Gestalt eines Rivalen oder eines abweisenden Vaters in den Weg, dessen Überwindung oder Ausschaltung das

Problem des Stückes wäre, noch muss eine vermeintliche Hetäre erst durch eine Anagnorisis heiratsfähig werden. Die beiden Haupttypen der Komödie sind damit vermieden. Die Väter haben —das gibt es sonst nirgends—bereits zu Anfang des Stückes (V. 114 ff.) entschieden, dass der junge Mann eben *dieses* Mädchen heiraten soll. Was kann jetzt noch dieser Heirat im Wege stehen? Der Mangel an Vertrauen und Aufrichtigkeit auf Seiten der im übrigen immer gut meinenden Personen verursacht die Verwicklungen der dramatischen Handlung. Die Art, wie hier das Übliche und Herkömmliche bewusst umgangen, ausgespart, ins Gegensätzliche verkehrt wird, scheint mir darauf zu weisen, dass die *Samia* zu den späteren Werken Menanders gehört. Typologisch gehört sie gewiss zu den voraussetzungsreichsten.

U.v. Wilamowitz, *Sitzber. Berlin* 1916, S. 73: « Die *Samia* war ein Jugenddrama Menanders ». Ein ähnliches Urteil wurde oft vertreten. In ihrem Kommentar sprach sich M^{lle} Dedoussi bereits für ein nicht allzu frühes Datum aus (*ebda* S. 14, nahe bei 310). Ich begrüße die zu Beginn ihres Vortrages gegebenen neuen Erwägungen. Die bisher für die Datierung benützten Kriterien scheinen mir in der Tat der Überprüfung bedürftig. Z.B. liegt der Annahme, eine Komödie, die Chairephon nennt, müsse 325-310 entstanden sein, nur eine grobe Schätzung T. B. L. Websters zugrunde (*Cl. Qu.* 1952, S. 22); es ist nicht ausgeschlossen, dass Menander sich auch später noch auf den berühmten Parasiten bezog.

Das Motiv, dass eine Hetäre das Baby eines bürgerlichen Mädchens bzw. einer bürgerlichen Frau für ihr eigenes ausgibt und mit dieser Unterschiebung den Lauf der Handlung entscheidend beeinflusst, hat die *Samia* mit den *Epitrepontes* gemein (etwas anders in *Truc.*). In der *Samia* geschieht sie mit, in den *Epitrepontes* ohne Wissen des Vaters. Bringt sie dort den Anstoss zur Lösung der Verwicklungen, so ist sie hier umgekehrt Anlass für die folgenden Verwirrungen.

M. Sandbach: The obstacles to the marriage that Moschion desires spring from his own actions. The whole of Acts II and

III is initiated by his fathering his own child on his father, not in itself an admirable procedure, although undertaken for a good purpose. He could have intended to reveal the truth when once safely married to Plangon, but there is no hint of this in the play. Then the minor delay of Act V is caused by his desire to punish his father for entertaining false suspicions of him, a project which, as Demeas effectively shows, disregards all the past kindness he had been shown and the attempt, which had gone along with the suspicions, to preserve his reputation.

M. Handley: Is there not this point to the opening situation: that Demeas' involvement with Chrysis and Moschion's involvement with Plangon are accompanied by a certain lack of trust or frankness on *both* sides between father and adopted son? Demeas fell in love "and understandably, perhaps, he concealed it, he was ashamed" (22 f.); Moschion in turn is "ashamed" to confront Demeas with his undertaking to marry the girl (67). The reversal of the expected father/son relationship brought about by Demeas' love affair reminds one of the end of the *Wasps* (where the treatment is much more ostentatiously comic), and of M. Wehrli's discussion of the motif (*Wasps* 1351 ff.; Wehrli, *Motivstudien* 24). The disappointing result of Demeas' efforts to be a model father recalls a number of points in the fuller study of fathers and sons in the *Second Adelphoi* as adapted by Terence. There, interestingly, the young man's sense of shame before his adoptive father is shown to have its positive as well as its negative side: *erubuit: salua res est* (643; cf. 683 f., 690 f. and context).

In looking at the play with the benefit of all the new accessions to its text, one is very much interested to see new points of design emerge. One example: Demeas' extended narrative of the wedding preparations at the beginning of Act III is appreciated in its own right when we come to it, as it has been before. But now that Act IV is present, and we find the same motif taken up at 440 ff., it becomes plain that the detail of the narrative is not simply scene-setting, or description for its own sake, but serves

to create a picture in which a significant change can very economically be shown: Demeas now forces the preparations along in spite of himself, and their continuity underlines the revolution in his feelings.

M. Turner: We may similarly note the reference to the use of τρυφή: ἐτρύφησα (v. 7) says Moschion, τρυφᾶν γάρ says Demeas to Chrysis (376). Moschion prides himself on being κόσμιος (v. 18—yet he wasn't!); his father remembers his being κόσμιος (vv. 273, 344).

I should like to ask different questions. What actually is Moschion doing as he enters to speak the prologue? Does he have some property to occupy his hands? How can he be seen ἄγειν πῶς σχολήν (20)?

Mlle Dedoussi: The prologue spoken by one of the characters of the play belongs to traditional drama as well as the prologue spoken by a divine being. But while the appearance of a deity has no other motivation than the need of the dramatist to introduce the audience to the plot of the drama, in the case of the appearance of a human being there must be some motivation. In the prologue of the *Mercator* we hear that the usual motivation of the appearance of a young man in a comedy was the need to express his love distress, and problems to the Night, the Gods, etc., in order to relieve his sorrow and ask for pity and help. Since in comedy the characters address the audience, especially in the monologues, it is expected the young man will address the audience, and this is what Moschion does in the *Samia* (v. 5); but he could begin the prologue with an invocation of some divinity. It is understood from v. 61 f. that Moschion left the stage at the end of the prologue, but the motivation of his exit is lost in the gap of the text.

M. Sandbach: A problem that has not been solved by the new text is why Menander made Moschion an *adopted* son. This had given rise to much unbridled speculation, now proved to be false. Have any of those here views on this subject?

Mlle Dedoussi: There was once a theory that Chrysis might have turned out to be Moschion's sister.

M. Sandbach: It is possible that an adopted son would not have the same claim on his father's affections as a son by birth? Demeas' indulgence of Moschion and care for his reputation would then be the more creditable, and he would have the greater reason for reproaching him for ingratitude (vv. 698-710).

Mlle Dedoussi: Why is it necessary to suppose that Chrysis has had a baby? The dramatist wanted to make Demeas certain that Chrysis was the mother of the baby, and the only possible way was to make him see her suckling it (vv. 256 ff.). This does not mean that she was in fact doing so, because Nikeratos also saw his daughter suckling the baby (v. 535 f. and 540 f.) and this shows, I think, clearly that the baby was fed by its real mother. Therefore there was no need for Chrysis to be able to suckle it herself. Demeas implies indirectly that he was mistaken, thinking that Chrysis was in fact suckling the baby, when he tries to persuade Nikeratos that Plangon was playing and not suckling it (v. 542).

Furthermore we can not combine, as a supplement of v. 56, with the adverbial expressions ἀπὸ ταῦτομάτου and καὶ μάλα a verb like ἔτικτεν (Austin tentatively) or τέτοκεν (metrically short). If the birth of a child to Demeas from his ἑταίρα, as a convenient lie, puts him in a most unpleasant situation (the same happens to Charisios of the *Epitrepontes*), why is it necessary to complicate the story, ἔξω τοῦ δράματος, by supposing that Chrysis in fact took the risk and gave birth to a child, who had to die, because there was no place for it in the plot?

M. Sandbach: There may have been some explanation after 118 of why Demeas wished to marry his son to a poor man's daughter. But I think it not out of the question that it was taken for granted that this was in character for him; he was the sort to assist a poor friend in this way. Generosity to poor

friends was a custom in Demeas' household, cf. τοῖς φίλοις τοῖς δεομένοις τὰ μέτρια ἐπαρκεῖν ἐδυνάμην (vv. 15-16) a line that may be there partly to prepare the way for this desire to arrange an unprofitable marriage.

Mlle Dedoussi: In vv. 113-115 we hear that the two men, Demeas and Nikeratos, who are friends and neighbours, had decided on a marriage between their children. The decision is ἐξω τοῦ δράματος and there is no need to ask why they so decided. It is clearly stated by the dramatist (vv. 13-16 and 381 f.) that Demeas is a generous rich man. It is unnecessary also to suppose that there must be a benefaction made by Nikeratos to Demeas (the word χάρις—v. 183—does not necessarily support this supposition).

M. Sandbach: Chrysis is a free woman and Demeas treats her as such (vv. 381-382, 577). But a distinction must always be made between the legal position and the practical position of the weaker members of society, among whom foreign women are emphatically to be reckoned. Nikeratos says (508) that he would have sold a *pallake* who had behaved as Chrysis is supposed to have done. There were legal processes for establishing the freedom of a free person who had been *de facto* enslaved (A. R. W. Harrison, *The Law of Athens*, 178-179), but a foreign woman could not benefit by them unless there was some citizen who had enough interest in her to institute them. Thus it is possible that Chrysis, once in Demeas' household, would have been for practical purposes in his power or under his control (25), although not of course his legal property, any more than Dromon and the girl were the legal property of the pirates who were ἐγκρατεῖς of them (*Sikyonios* 3).

M. Handley: Could I return once more to 440 ff. to raise another point of dramatic technique? Demeas' sudden exit from his house interrupts the conversation between Nikeratos and Moschion—at least it does so as far as the audience is concerned. I take it, as I believe M. Sandbach does, that Nikeratos speaks

again at 451, when he says σὺ πρότερος, Μοσχίων, πρόσελθέ μου (cf. *BICS* 16, 1969, at p. 105). It may not be determinable whether they are supposed to be talking or whispering to each other while Demeas is speaking, or whether further words were unnecessary; but they have in any case registered Demeas' presence and decided to act. This seems to involve a kind of simultaneous action on the stage. Could I ask whether there is anything comparable in Menander?

M. Sandbach: A passage occurs to me which, although very different from this, has the resemblance that while one character speaks, another conversation must be supposed to go on. At *Misoumenos* 210, Krateia comes out of Thrasonides' house, accompanied by an old woman, in my view her nurse, who is a *muta persona*. Demeas, who is already on stage, cries in surprise ὦ Ζεῦ, τίν' ὄψιν οὐδὲ προσδ[οκωμένην] ὄρω; whereupon Krateia says to the old woman τί βούλει, τηθία; τί μοι λαλεῖς; πατήρ ἐμός; ποῦ;. We must suppose that as Demeas spoke the old woman caught sight of him and broke the girl's train of thought with "look there's your father" or something of the kind.

There seems to be a similar trick at 229, where Getas, who has been speaking to Krateia, continues τί τοῦτο, καὶ σύ, γραιδίον [] καλεῖς (λαλεῖς looks much less likely). The old woman must once again be supposed to have said something while Getas was addressing Krateia, and presumably she said it to Demeas. Exempli gratia one might supplement καὶ σύ, γραιδίον, [γῦν δεσπότην] καλεῖς;. By calling Demeas δεσπότης the old woman confirms that he is Krateia's father. That Getas is convinced appears from his politely respectful continuation with the vocative βέλτιστε. In neither place is the old woman allowed to reply to the question addressed to her.

M^{me} Kabil: a) La description des fêtes d'Adonis, pendant lesquelles a eu lieu le viol, me paraît intéressante. Nous avons sur cette fête, qui comporte ici une *pannychis*, des témoignages archéologiques assez pittoresques (cf. N. Weil, *BCH* 90, 1966, pp. 664-

698 ; D. B. Thompson, *JEA* 50, 1964, pp. 147-163). Contrairement aux Dionysies, Tauropolies, etc., c'est une fête à l'intérieur (et non une procession hors de la ville) et cependant la jeune fille y a été mise à mal.

b) Le tableau final de la *Samienne* a pu être fort somptueux : d'après les dernières lignes du texte on peut imaginer l'arrivée de la procession nuptiale avec la joueuse de flûte, la porteuse de loutrophore, les femmes (dont l'épouse de Nicératos). Nous savons que Ménandre aimait ces représentations colorées et pittoresques (cf. le *Dyskolos* et la *Théophorouménè*).