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In this study the model of literary influence promulgated by Harold Bloom in *The Anxiety of Influence* (Oxford 1973) is used as a way of understanding the comedy of Menander in its local context. It is argued that Menander, like many a modern and ancient writer, was not innocently imitating Tragedy, but he was engaged in an *agon* or struggle for his poetic life, not with Old Comedy, but with the tragic canon that was still being performed on the stages of Attica. In particular, it is argued that Menander struggled for survival in the face of the great traditions that preceded him, and that part of this struggle included the subversion of Tragedy and tragic role-playing, especially Euripidean Tragedy as it was defined by Aristotle.

In the first chapter, the nature and significance of this view of Menander's relationship with Tragedy is outlined in contrast to other views of imitation and influence. Here the application of "Bloomian" theory to an ancient author is justified. It is shown that if we understand Euripides' influence on Menander in the traditional terms of imitation, then in Menander we are left with nothing but a kind of Euripidean Tragedy with a few comic additions thrown in. It is then demonstrated how the ancients, including Menander, were anxious to overcome their poetic precursors just as modern authors are.

In the second chapter all the surviving comic fragments through the time of Menander that refer to, burlesque, parody, or imitate Tragedy, with the exception of Aristophanes (because his references to Tragedy have already been catalogued and analyzed), are reviewed. Here evidence is found for a developing ideological *agon*. As
long as Tragedy was a living genre, Comedy maintained a parasitic or symbiotic relationship in that it depended on the living voice of Tragedy for its comic effects. There was a collision on the stage between Comedy and Tragedy: Tragedy was parodied or burlesqued and Comedy was another voice competing in the dialectic of the fifth-century polis for the attention of citizens. Then, as the great period of Tragedy ended and Aeschylus, Sophocles, and Euripides became canonical, that is, no longer the living voice of the contemporary stage but the bearers of traditional values, the relationship of Comedy to Tragedy began to change. For a time collisions between the genres continued: Comedy still parodied or burlesqued the three tragedians, but it also began to recognize and engage them as a canon from the past, not the living voice of the present. Finally in Menander, and presumably in New Comedy in general, the tragic staples were no longer parodied or burlesqued, but incorporated into Comedy in order for the poet to finally subvert them by imposing on events a sense of the "human comedy of the mundane" rather than a celebration of human greatness and human suffering.

Accepting the tragic staples, as defined by Aristotle, of pathos, anagnorisis, and peripeteia, in chapters three through six these ideas are explored in terms of specific plays. In the third chapter, Tyche and pathos in the Aspis are explored. Here it is argued that Menander rewrites these heroic and tragic concerns both as temporary misunderstandings in the larger course of life and as manageable elements in the petite dramas of life. In the fourth chapter, anagnorisis and peripeteia in the Epitrepones, Perikeiromene, and Sicyonius are evaluated. Here, the staples of Tragedy become devices for the self-interested rhetorical contests that engage the characters. In the Epitrepones it is shown that Smicrines' character is assimilated to the tragic mythical patterns (mythemes) of father-figures in Tragedy who persecute their unwed pregnant daughters and grandsons. As the presence of Tragedy in the play, he must be overcome and mocked by play's end. In the fifth chapter, Menander's interest in the consequences of tragic orgy and role-playing is
discussed as they are found in the *Samia*, where anger and tragic diction continually reinforce each other. Here it is shown that Menander subverts the tragic "performance" of anger. At the end of the play, the comic perspective imitates Niceratus' response to the tragic "paradigm" of Euripides' *Danãe* cited by Demeas to calm Niceratus: "What does the *Danãe* have to do with us?" In the sixth chapter, it is argued that the *Dyscolus* is Menander's response to the isolated, self-determined, unyielding type of the "heroic temper" represented by Cnemon, who, like other blocking-figures in Menander, is assimilated to tragic norms as the Comedy enacts its own ideological struggle. In the end Cnemon undergoes a *peripeteia* or *metabole* as he "falls" from misfortune to fortune. Cnemon, who represents the presence of Tragedy within the play, is overthrown, mocked, and forcibly brought back into society against his will for the good of himself and his *oikos*. In the process, Tragedy's dialectic, as represented by Cnemon, is undermined by the Comedy, which is represented by the clever slave and cook.

Finally, it is concluded that Menander exploited the image of Tragedy and tragic mythemes, but tried to mirror a more realistic world, one in which ordinary men and women could live with their ordinary problems. Menander's personal struggle for survival amongst a people who held great reverence for the traditions that preceded him is thus an instance of the survival of the human spirit in a society that perhaps viewed itself less heroic and less tragic.
For Suzanna.

οὐ μὲν γὰρ τοῦ γε κρείσσον καὶ ἄρειον,
ἡ δὲ ὀμοφρονέοντε νοήμασιν οίκον ἔχητον
ἀνδρα ἡδὲ γυνὴ πόλλ' ἄλγεα δυσμενέσσαι,
χάρματα δ' εὐμενέτησι· μάλιστα δὲ τ᾽ ἐκλυον αὐτοῖ.
- Odyssey 6.182-185.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

In this dissertation, the influence of Tragedy on Menander will be examined. To date, most, if not all, of the important studies of Menander have dealt with the broader issue of source-influence, including Tragedy. In fact, it would be fair to say that the scene of Menandrean criticism is source criticism, and has been since antiquity. The reasons for this are not difficult to ascertain. Critics realize that poets and their texts are influenced by earlier poets and their texts and that it is important to understand rightly this influence to more fully appreciate any author. Naturally, writers and their critics have always been interested in origins because origins are seen as a cause. Furthermore, interest in origins (αἰτία) is not something that is exclusive to literature. Humans possess an almost innate nostalgia for, perhaps one could even say preoccupation with, beginnings. The fixation of poets and critics with the past is really only one manifestation of a larger human obsession with fontes et origines -- an obsession which confers an almost universal prestige upon beginnings. The fact that humans feel "that is it is the first manifestation of a thing that is significant and valid, not its successive epiphanies" is, however, particularly problematic for poets, for it creates in them the conflicting emotions of reverence and anxiety towards their predecessors. Reverence, because it is the poets of the past that inspire one to want to be a poet in the present. Anxiety, because later poets cannot simply repeat the past if they

---

1This point will be elaborated below.
wish their own poetry to be revered. If we can identify and map a particular poet's struggle against tradition, that is, his precursors, to create something new, then we are in a better position to evaluate his work. Herein lies the greatest justification of this dissertation. Rather than the more traditional approach of emphasizing imitation, the influence of Tragedy upon Menander will be shown to be a literary *agon* between generations of poets in which Menander seeks to rationalize, correct, and subvert Tragedy, especially Euripidean Tragedy as it was defined by Aristotle and as it had come to be characterized, and to some degree "caricature-ized," in the fourth century. Where practicable, the argument will be expanded to include the New Comic tradition as a whole.

Before discussing the various theories of influence on Menander, it will be helpful to define the terms "rationalize," "correct," and "subvert," as well as the terms "parody" and "burlesque," all of which will occur regularly throughout this study. To rationalize is to devise rational, or plausible, explanations for events. When Herodotus alludes to the Argo by simply calling it a "warship" (μαχαιρί, Book 1.2), he has taken what he believes to be a kernel of truth from the myth of Jason and the Argonauts and corrected it so that it conforms more closely to reason and human experience, thus providing a more plausible story. In this same manner, it will be shown that Menander takes the myths of Tragedy and rationalizes them by bringing the unreal action of Tragedy down to the spectator's everyday world, thus providing amusement while correcting the earlier treatment of the myth. In Menander, gods and heroes are banished from the stage, except for the re-worked divine prologue that invites the audience to compare Menander's treatment to that of the tragedians. The activity of the gods is replaced by mundane human agents. Powerful kings are reduced to stodgy old niggards like Smicrines or Cnemon, losing their heroic status, but not their bad character. Gods who violate virgins are replaced by the boy next door, such as Moschion in the *Samia*. Menander's rationalization

---

3. This view of influence may be called, for convenience's sake, Bloomian influence. See below.
and reduction of Tragedy is, therefore, a correction, a substitution or emendation for what is considered inadequate or wrong. For a poet to correct an earlier poet or poem is equivalent to saying that the precursor poem or poet proceeded accurately up to a certain point, but should have gone in the direction that the new poet turns.\textsuperscript{4} When a correction is subtle and aimed at the values and ideology of the earlier poem, then it has a subversive quality. Subversion is, as the etymology of the word implies, stealthily coming from under something to overturn it. As shall be argued in the pages which follow, Menander appropriates the language, conventions, and situations of Tragedy -- usually those as defined by Aristotle -- in order to subvert tragic role-playing, values, and ideology. For instance, when Davus enters at the beginning of the \textit{Aspis} and delivers what is for him a serious tragic threnody for his departed master, he "performs" his suffering through the lens of Tragedy. In the course of the play, however, Davus and the audience come to find that his response was mistaken and his view of fate distorted. As the play enacts its own ideology in which Fate is replaced by Tyche, tragic language and conventions are shown to miss the mark (\textit{hamartia}) precisely because the characters are ignorant (\textit{agnoia}) of the comic truth, which is made plain (\textit{anagnorisis}) by play's end. Through the process of recognizing this truth, Tragedy is overturned into Comedy.

As will be shown in the next chapter, this relationship to Tragedy is, as far as we know, quite different from that which is found prior to Menander. Although it seems prudent not to assume that Menander was the first or only poet to engage in his sort of subversion, from what evidence there is, it seems that the comic poets before Menander usually either parodied or engaged in mythological/tragic burlesque. There are no universally accepted definitions of parody and burlesque,\textsuperscript{5} but for the purpose of this study


\textsuperscript{5}For these definitions, see Fred W. Householder, Jr., "\textit{ΠΑΡΩΛΙΑΣΙΑ}," \textit{CP} 39 (1944): 1 and the bibliography cited in chapter 2, where these terms are discussed at greater length.
a distinction will be made. Parody will be defined as a composition in which the characteristic turns of thought and phrase of a specific author or text are mimicked and made to appear ridiculous, especially by applying them to ludicrously incongruous subjects. Burlesque, on the other hand, will be defined as exciting laughter by a ludicrous contrast between the subject matter and the manner of treating it, as when a serious subject is treated ludicrously or a trifling one with solemnity. For this study, the big differences between these two, then, are that parody is found when the poet models his new passage on a specific text or author. Also parody usually requires that the poet apply the grave style and treatment of a specific author or passage to a trivial subject. Burlesque is when the poet models his text on a whole class of works and no particular author. As with parody, he may apply a serious subject to a ludicrous treatment, but unlike most parody, he can reverse this and apply a low treatment to a lofty subject. For instance, when Aristophanes takes a specific passage or scene from Euripides and inserts it into a play that has an entirely different subject matter so that there is a humorous disjunction between the original text and the new context, he is parodying Euripides. Unfortunately, no complete ancient comic burlesque survives, but we know they existed. Aristotle, at the end of chapter 13 of the Poetics, mentions a play in which the myth of Orestes and Aegisthus is given over to ludicrous levity and the two enemies walk off the stage as friends by the end of the play. According to the definitions in this study, this would probably have been a mythological/tragic burlesque of the entire myth, or subject, of Orestes and Aegisthus. Such a play may have contained parodies of specific scenes and passages from past tragic performances, but overall it probably would have dealt with the entire myth, and hence it would be burlesque. In Menander we rarely find parody or burlesque. Rather, he exploits tragic conventions at their face value, and the humor is not in their scenic use, but in the fact that the characters, whether consciously or unconsciously, mistakenly resort to

---

6For Menander's mythological burlesque the Achaeans, see below.
tragic dramatization of their emotions. In this way, Menander cleverly addresses "tragicness" without addressing a specific Tragedy, and thus more effectively generalizes his agon. With these definitions in mind, we may now turn to discussions of source-influence and Menander.

The material written about the sources of influence upon Menander falls into two distinct classes, the ancient and the modern. For the most part, the modern scholarship merely stresses or tries to prove one particular viewpoint espoused in antiquity. In reviewing the ancient testimonia about Menander's use of sources, one is struck by the agonal nature of the debate, which may be a reflection and an outgrowth of Menandorean New Comedy's struggle with its precursors. The conflicting ancient testimonia seem to indicate that scholars debated about not only who influenced Menander, or the New Comic tradition in general, but also the relative merit of the tradition itself and whether we are to understand this influence in terms of slavish imitation (i.e. plagiarism), reverent respect, or rivalry. Our evidence begins with the Greek biographer Satyrus (floruit 3rd c. B.C.), who made the following observation:

Conflicts (between men and women, fathers and sons, masters and slaves), reversals of fortune, rapes of maidsens, supposititious children, and recognitions through both rings and necklaces -- for these are surely the things that comprise the Newer Comedy -- were brought to the peak of perfection by Euripides.\footnote{Vita Euripidis, P. Oxy. 1176, fr. 39 [col. vii]: ἡγίστων ἄνδρι πρὸς γυναικα καὶ πατρὶ πρὸς υἱὸν καὶ βράπτοντι πρὸς δεσπότην, ἢ τὰ κατὰ τὰς περιπτεῖας, βιασμὸς παρθένων, ὑποβολῆς παιδίων, ἀναγνωρισμοῦ διὰ τὰ δικτυλίων καὶ διὰ δεβάζων ταῦτα γάρ ἵστι δήπου τὰ συνέχοντα τῆς νεωτέραν κωμῳδίαν, ἔπρος ἄκρων ἤγαγεν Εὐριπίδης. See Supplementum Euripideum, ed. H. von Armin, Bonn 1913, Bibl. Teubn. Kleine Texte 112, p. 5 vii 3; G. Arrighetti, Satiro: Vita di Euripide, in Studi classici e orientali 13 (Pisa, 1964) p. 59, 39 vii vv. 1-22. All translations are my own, unless otherwise indicated.}

The first thing to note about this statement is that Satyrus lumps the whole "Newer" Comic\footnote{More will be said about Satyrus' term, Newer Comedy, below. For now, his term will be used.} tradition together, and so, at least on the surface, Menander is not the only Newer Comic playwright to whom this quote applies. Furthermore, it is almost invariably taken
as evidence for Euripides' contribution to the formation of the New Comic tradition and Menander in particular, and to be sure this is implied, although it should be noted that it is not the intended point of the text. It is not so much aimed at identifying sources for New(er) Comedy's inspiration; rather Satyrus is making a value judgment about the comparative worth of the New(er) Comic and Euripidean treatment of these tragic and newer comic staples. That Satyrus is making a value judgment is corroborated by the form and words of the statement itself. It begins with a laundry list of items that Satyrus feels defines the New(er) Comedy so well he can add the word δηπου, which frequently adds a touch of irony in stating a case that seems certain and is virtually equivalent to "of course". This patently obvious statement is built up only to be followed by the unexpected name of Euripides at period end rather than the expected name of Menander. Satyrus' twist is so effective, in fact, it has prompted one scholar to emend the Εὑπειδης to Μενανδρος. In asserting that Euripides brought this list of themes to the peak of perfection, Satyrus is not only taking them away from Menander, but he is implying, quite polemically, that after Euripides their treatment went downhill. As such, this statement is more profitably read as evidence of an agon between partisans of the Euripidean treatment of these items and the New(er) Comedy's.

Before the other ancient testimonia on the sources of Menander's inspiration are discussed, a digression on the debate about the terms Old, Middle, and New Comedy, as it relates to the passage of Satyrus just quoted, seems justified. The controversy in modern times began in 1866 with W. Fielitz' treatise, De Atticorum Comoedia bipartita, in which he argued that the tripartition of Comedy was the invention of scholars who lived in the era

---

of Hadrian and that we should ignore the term Middle Comedy and only speak of an Old and Later (or Newer) Comedy. He notes that μέση κωμῳδία is not attested before Apuleius, who asserts that Philemon was a mediae comoediae scriptor, unless we date Platonius’ On the Differences Between Comedies and the anonymous author of On Comedy earlier than the Hadrianic age. At any rate, Platonius’ use of the word "autocrator" indicates that he belongs to the imperial period. Körte and Legrand provide discussions on the subject, and both opt for the three-fold division based on the qualities of a play, not its chronology. Fielitz’ thesis, however, may be supported by the passage of Satyrus quoted above, where he uses the phrase τὴν νεωτέραν κωμῳδίαν. An original two-fold division may also be supported by an earlier comment of Aristotle in his Nicomachean Ethics, where he says,

The jesting of the well-bred differs from that of the vulgar, and that of the educated from the uneducated. One may also see this from comedies -- the Old and the New. For in the former indecent language was funny, but in the latter innuendo is more so, and this is no small difference in regards to propriety. Here Aristotle contrasts Old and New Comedy with the phrase τῶν κωμῳδιῶν τῶν παλαιῶν καὶ τῶν καινῶν, making it clear that he divides Comedy into at least two distinct classes. Nothing in this passage, however, precludes the possibility of a third category, the Middle. It may just be that Middle Comedy is simply not relevant to

12Apuleius, Florida III,16.
15Philippe Legrand, Daos: Tableau de la comédie grecque pendant la période dite nouvelle, Annales de l'université de Lyon, nouvelle série II droit, Lettres, fascicule 28 (Paris: Librairie A. Fontemoing, 1910), 5: "Puis l'idée s'est fait jour, que, dans l'esprit même de l'inventeur, la distinction d'un moyen terme (κωμῳδία μέση) n'avait peut-être rien à voir avec la chronologie, et que la comédie moyenne était moyenne non dans l'ordre du temps, mais au point de vue de la qualité."
16Aristotle, EN 1128a 20-25: καὶ ἡ ἑλευθερία παιδία διαφέρει τῆς τοῦ ἀνδραποδώδους, καὶ παπαίδευμένου καὶ ἀπαίδευτου. ἰδοι δ' ἂν τις καὶ ἐκ τῶν κωμῳδιῶν τῶν παλαιῶν καὶ τῶν καινῶν· τοῖς μὲν γάρ ἢ γελοίῳ ἢ αἰσχρολογίᾳ, τοῖς δὲ μᾶλλον ἢ υπόνοιᾳ· διαφέρει δ' οὐ μικρόν ταύτα πρὸς εὐσχημοσύνην.
Aristotle's point here, but that seems unlikely. It seems more reasonable to conclude that either Aristotle's New Comedy is what later Hellenistic critics called Middle Comedy, because New Comedy had not yet been written, or that New Comedy was already being written and Middle Comedy never really existed. The former of these two views is more attractive, because the two types of Comedy that Aristotle refers to in his *Poetics* are consistent with what later critics termed Old and Middle Comedy. For instance, in the passage above he refers to Comedy that contains some "vulgarity," and in chapter three of the *Poetics* he specifically mentions Aristophanes. Clearly he is talking about Old Comedy. At the end of chapter 13 he says, "But this [contrasting outcomes for good and bad characters] is not the proper pleasure of Tragedy, but rather Comedy. For in that genre those who are enemies in the plot, such as Orestes and Aegisthus, walk off the stage in the end as friends, and no one is killed by anyone." Here we have a mythological/tragic burlesque, which is the type of Comedy that would later be thought to characterize the middle period. Nowhere in the *Poetics* do we have a reference to the type of Comedy later known as New.

The lengthiest ancient description of the terms Old, Middle, and New (or at least the first two terms) is found in Platonius' *On the Difference Between Comedies*, but it is problematic. It is worth quoting a substantial passage from that work.

The subject matter of Old Comedy was as follows: the censuring of generals and judges who made bad judgments, those who hoarded money through unjust means, and anyone who entered into a knavish lifestyle. Middle Comedy dispensed with such subject matter, and entered upon the ridiculing of poets' narratives. With impunity they were able to ridicule whatever Homer said or any poet of Tragedy. One can find dramas like these even in Old Comedy, the Old Comedies that is that in the end were produced after the oligarchy came into power. Indeed, the *Odysians* of Cratinus has censure for no individual, but it ridicules the *Odyssey* of Homer. Such is the subject matter throughout Middle Comedy. For they took up and ridiculed some of the myths (plots) in the older comedies on

---

the grounds that they were executed poorly, and they dispensed with *parabases* because they got rid of choruses since there were no longer *choregoi*. Nor indeed did they introduce masks like those used in Old Comedy. For in Old Comedy they fashioned masks specifically for those being satirized, so that even before the actors spoke anything, the man being satirized was plainly known from the likeness of his appearance. But in Middle Comedy and New Comedy they fashioned masks suitable for laughter, in fear of the Macedonians and the threat of them that hung over their heads, so that there not be any chance of resembling any face of some Macedonian ruler and any chance of the poet seeming to be purposely satirizing and thus suffer the penalty. Indeed, we see what sort the brows are on the masks of the Comedy of Menander and how the mouth is disfigured and is not like a real man's.\(^{18}\)

Unfortunately the text ends here at the point where Platonius may have gone on to better define New Comedy. What is clear, though, is that he defines Middle Comedy as having three characteristics that distinguish it from Old, each of which contains overgeneralizations or inaccurate statements. First there is the subject matter. Platonius says that Middle Comedy turned from censuring public figures to tragic and mythological burlesque and it was written after the oligarchy took control in Athens in 404 B.C. This is misleading. There were mythological/tragic burlesques in the earlier period (Old Comedy) and in the later period (New Comedy). Platonius' mention of the *Odysseis* of Cratinus,

\(^{18}\)Platonius, *Peri Diaphoras Komoidon*. [Kaibel, *CGF* vol. I, part 1, no. 1, 10-13]: ὑποθέσεις μὲν γὰρ τῆς παλαιᾶς κομῳδίας ἴσας αὐταί· τὸ στρατηγικὸς ἐπιτιμᾶ καὶ δικασταῖς οὐκ ὅρθος διδάσκοι καὶ χρήματα συλλέγοναι ἐξ ἄδικαις τις καὶ μοχθέρου ἐπησημενοῦς βιον. ἢ δὲ μέσῃ κομῳδίᾳ ἄρθηκε τὰς ταιούτας ὑποθέσεις, ἐπὶ δὲ τὸ σκώπτειν ἱστορίας ἤθελας τοιχαῖς ἠλθον. ἀνεύθυνον γὰρ τὸ τοιοῦτον οἶον διασώρειν ὁ Ὠμηρος εἰπότα τι θοδιε σή ἢ τὸν δείνα τῆς τραγῳδίας ποιητήν. τοιαύτα δὲ δράματα καὶ ἐν τῇ παλαιᾷ κομῳδίᾳ ἔστων εὕρετα, ἀπέρ τελευταίοιν ἐδιάθηκα λοιπὸν τῆς ὀλιγαρχίας κρατοῦσας· οἱ γοῦν Ὁδυσσεύς Κρατίνου οὔδενος ἐπιτιμᾶν ξεισάμοιν, διασώρευσάν δὲ τῆς Ὄδυσσεας τοῦ Ὁμηροῦ. τοιαύται γὰρ αἱ κατὰ τὴν μέσην κομῳδίαν ὑποθέσεις εἰσίν· μίθους γὰρ τινας τιθέντες ἐν ταῖς κομῳδίαις τοῖς παλαιοτέροις εἰρημένοις διέσυρον ὡς κακῶς ῥηθέντας, καὶ τὰς παραβάσεις παρατίθηναι διὰ τὸ τοὺς χοροὺς ἐπιλέιμα χορηγῶν οὐκ ὄντων. οὐ μὴν οὖδὲ τὰ προσωπεῖα ὁμοιοτρόπους τοῖς ἐν τῇ παλαιᾷ κομῳδίᾳ κατεσκευασμένοις εἰσῆγων· ἐν μὲν γὰρ τῇ παλαιᾷ κομῳδίᾳ ἐκατον τὰ προσωπεῖα τοῖς κομῳδοῦνοις, ἢ γὰρ πρὶν τι καὶ τοὺς ὑποκριτάς εἰπέν ἐκ κομῳδοῦμενος ἐκ τῆς ὁμοιότητος τῆς δίκαιος κατάδηλος ἢ· ἐν δὲ τῇ μέσῃ καὶ νέᾳ κομῳδίᾳ ἐπίτιθες τὰ προσωπεῖα πρὸς τὸ γελοιότερον ἐνδυμοίρυσαν, δεδοικότες τοὺς Μακεδόνας καὶ τοὺς ἐπιγραφήμενοις ἐξ ἔκεινων φόβους, ἢ γὰρ ἐκ τούτης τινος ὀμοϊότης προσώπων συμπέπει τινὶ Μακεδόνων ἄρχοντα καὶ δόξας ὁ ποιητὴς ἐκ προαιρέσεως κομῳδεῖν δίκαια ὑπόσχομαι. ὅρισμα γοῦν τὰς ὀρφιδί’ ἐν τοῖς προσώποις τῆς Μενάνδρου κομῳδίας ὁποῖας ἔχει καὶ ὄπως ἐξετραμμένον τὸ στόμα καὶ οὖδὲ κατ’ ἀνθρώπων φύσιν.
who may have been dead by 421 B.C., certainly well before 404 B.C., contradicts his own assertion that mythological burlesque was written after 404 B.C. Likewise, at least two of Aristophanes' plays were mythological/tragic burlesques, if we may judge from their titles, the *Aeolosicon* and *Amphiaraus*, the latter of which was produced in 414 B.C. before the oligarchy held sway. The five known titles of the plays of the fifth century playwright Deinolochus (from Syracuse or Acragas) all suggest burlesque. In fact, not only did some of the poets of Old Comedy turn from the ridicule of individuals to the writing of burlesque, but they even wrote character studies that anticipated the subjects of New Comedy, such as Phrynicus' *Hermit*, also produced in 414 B.C. Furthermore, mythological/tragic burlesque continued into the new period. The three major proponents of New Comedy, Philemon, Diphilus, and Menander, all staged mythological/tragic burlesques. We have only the suggestive titles and a few fragments from these travesties. Philemon wrote a *Myrmidones* and a *Palamedes*. From Diphilus we have nine titles suggestive of tragic burlesque, such as his *Danaides* and *Theseus*. Menander too wrote such burlesque. In 1947, a mosaic at Ulpia Oescus in Bulgaria dating to around 200 B.C. was unearthed depicting the theatrical scene of a soldier coming from the town gate on the left, a youth coming from the house door on the right, a seated woman, and a standing figure, without mask and wreathed. It also exhibits the following inscription:

19 Aristophanes at *Peace* 700 ff. (produced in 421) speaks of Cratinus as dead, but the passage and its interpretation are naturally controversial. At any rate, Cratinus is considered one of the greatest poets of Old Comedy, along with Aristophanes and Eupolis.

20 Hypothesis II to the *Birds*.

21 His *Medea* and his *Tragicomedy* for instance.

22 Although Sicily may not have been relevant to Platonius' discussion, the Anonymous includes the Sicilians in his work and lists Epicharmus from Syracuse as the first writer of Old Comedy.

23 Hypothesis I to Aristophanes' *Birds*.

24 Mosaic scenes from Menander's plays in houses are not uncommon, the most famous being those that make up the main decoration of a third century A.D. house at Mytilene. Others include those in houses at Ephesus and Pompeii.
MENANΔPOY: AXAIΩI, referring to a scene from Menander’s *Achaeans*, probably a tragic burlesque of the famous dispute between Agamemnon and Achilles in Book I, 121-313 of the *Iliad*. The soldier may be Agamemnon, the youth Achilles, the seated woman Breiseis, and the wreathed figure may be Menander himself. A vase from Demir-Kapija, which in antiquity was a part of northern Macedonia, contains a similar scene. On it is depicted Agamemnon seated on a throne holding a scepter, just like the mosaic from Ulpia Æscus. Underneath his named is written ΑΓΑΜΕΜΝΩΝ. In front of Agamemnon stands a soldier covering himself with his shield and appearing to move towards Agamemnon to attack. Underneath is written ΑΧ(ιελεύς). The mosaic and vase, if the latter was actually inspired by Menander’s *Achaeans*, have been corroborated by two later papyri finds. One of these is a list of Menander’s plays in alphabetical order with the entry ‘ΑΧΑΙΩΙ Ἐ. ΠΕΛΟΠΟΙ(ΝΗΣΙΟΙ). The other papyrus is actually a quote from the play that reads:

From Menander’s *Achaeans*  
But Chance  
wore down this poor and humble man  
in toils, so that he would raise his bright eyes  
when he obtained a change in fortune.

It is anyone’s guess as to the context of this quote and by whom it was spoken – it sounds rather melodramatic.

---


26This is Webster’s interpretation of the mosaic, *ibid.* Another interpretation has it as Agamemnon, Achilles, Patroclus, and the seated figure as Nestor or Phoenix [cf. Margarete Bieber, *The History of the Greek and Roman Theater* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1961), 89]. The interpretation of the maskless figure as Patroclus is especially problematic; it seems much more likely that this figure is not a character from the play.


29PSI XV (= Austin, *ibid* 113): ΜΕΝΑΝΔΡΟΥ ἔξις ἈΧΑΙΩΝ / ἀλλ’ ἐγίνυσα ὡ τύχη / τοῦτον πέντε καὶ ταπεινὸν ἐν πόνο[[s]] / ἵν’ ἀναφέρῃ τὰ λαμπρὰ μεταβολῆς τυχῶν.

30The reference to a μεταβολή is particularly noteworthy, for this is the word Aristotle uses for the veering around of fortune in a tragedy. The word is also found in the *Dyscolus*, where it is used in the context of Cnemon having fallen in the well. See Chapter 6 on the *Dyscolus*. 
What is clear is that Platonius' statement that Middle Comedy consists of mythological/tragic burlesque is entirely meaningless, unless we understand him to mean it is a type of play more prevalent in a specific period. Platonius' statement on subject matter is also misleading for another reason, namely that poets in the period after 404 B.C., but prior to Chaeronea, did not limit themselves to burlesque. The Ecclesiazusae, Plutus, and Cocalus of Aristophanes, as well as numerous other plays, such as Philaerus' Wine-drinker or Antiphanes' Boeotian Woman, all seem to contradict Platonius' simple scheme.

Platonius is also misleading in asserting that Middle Comedy did not criticize politicians. We know that political figures continued to be censured on the stage in the fourth century, although it is seems from the evidence we have that there was far less of this. Some of the more prominent political figures include Demosthenes, who is censured for his quibbling and theatrical diction. The wealth of the Diodochoi is criticized, including that of Seleucus, the Antigonids, and the Ptolemies. Apparently even Alexander the Great is warned to, "Cease puffing, Macedonian prince, quench the Gauls, lest you burn..." Platonius, therefore, exaggerates and presents as a defining difference characteristics best viewed in terms of degree.

Secondly, Platonius claims that choruses were eliminated as a result of crisis in the institution of the choregia. It is true that the chorus became far less important, and that

32 Kassel and Austin, PCG vol. II, Antiphanes fr. 288 (=Kock, CAF 296); Kassel and Austin, PCG vol. VII, Timocles fr. 41 (=Kock, CAF 38).
33 Kassel and Austin, PCG vol. II, Antiphanes, fr. 185 (=Kock, CAF 187); Kassel and Austin, PCG vol. II, Alexis, fr. 207 (=Kock, CAF 204). The latter mentions Seleucus' pet tiger -- apparently it was a lethargic beast.
34 Kassel and Austin, PCG vol. II, Alexis, fr. 116 (=Kock, CAF 111).
35 Ibid, fr. 246 (=Kock, CAF 244).
36 Kassel and Austin, PCG vol. V, Ephippus, fr. 5 (=Kock, CAF, fr. 5) [as quoted by Athenaeus VIII.346 F]: παντού φυσών, Μακεδόν άρχον / αύτίνου Κέλτων, μη προσκαυβής... Gilbert Norwood, Greek Comedy (Boston: John W. Luce & Co. Inc., 1932), 55, boldly emends the final word to προσκαυβής, and makes it even more provocative, i.e. "lest you be burned."
parabases disappeared, but there were still choruses. By the time of Menander they are reduced to a mere band of drunken revelers who take up time between acts, but they are designated as the chorus nonetheless. As far as the so-called crisis in the choregia is concerned, it appears that this liturgy continued to function quite well in the fourth century, much as it had in the fifth, until it was replaced with the agonothesia by Demetrius of Phalerum after 317 B.C. Again, Platonius' definitions are more rigid than the evidence allows.

Thirdly, he claims that the masks of Middle and New Comedy were distorted out of fear of some chance resemblance to a Macedonian official. This is possible in the case of New Comedy, but it is absurd in regard to Middle Comedy, as these ill-humored northerners did not provoke fear in the Athenians until after Chaeronea. Based on all these exceptions, Platonius' scheme is not very sound, and worse yet he contradicts himself.

A less rigid definition of these terms is provided by the Anonymous writer of On Comedy, who says of Middle Comedy that "The poets of Middle Comedy did not essay poetical style, but they employed common talk with rhetorical merit, so that a poetical character is rare in them. They are all concerned with plots." This definition is, however, so general as to be of little help. It could easily be applied to Menander. We might thus conclude about the debate over whether there was a Middle Comedy or not, as Gilbert Norwood has, that the whole question is trivial. If our opinion or understanding of any writer who belongs to one or the other alleged periods depended upon the correctness of the bipartition or the tripartition, that would be another matter. But of course it does not: our view of (let us say) Menander's indebtedness to Crates is not affected in the least by our deciding that there are two lines of demarcation, or one, between

38 Hereafter referred to as the Anonymous.
them. The whole dispute is about labels and nothing but labels. The really important point is, how do works of various periods differ? not the names of the periods.\textsuperscript{40}

No doubt the dispute over the exact labels can become trivial, and given the complex and varied history of Greek Comedy, any strict dogma is likely to be misleading. As this study will suggest, the labels are only useful in that they seem to characterize the different emphases of the times: Old Comedy has more tragic parody along with political censure; Middle has more mythological/tragic burlesque or travesty; New Comedy, or at least Menandrenan Comedy, is the subversion of tragic role-playing. Perhaps we can reconcile Satyrus to Aristotle by arguing that Aristotle knew of only an Old and a New Comedy, but Satyrus, who lived in the next century, knew of something that was even newer than what Aristotle called the New. Later critics then changed what Aristotle called New to Middle, and what Satyrus called Newer they changed to New. More important, however, is not the merit of the specific labels, but that there was labeling. This brings us back to the quote of Satyrus, where this digression began. Evidently Satyrus felt there was at least an Old and a Newer Comedy, and he takes it for granted that his audience would know to what he was referring. His use of the term \textit{νεωτέρον} in the attributive position suggests such a classification, and this may imply that he at least believed that the later group of comic poets was self-consciously trying to do something new with Comedy. The ramifications of this designation are, therefore, possibly as significant as the application of this term to the Neoterics (\textit{νεωτέροι}) at Rome, who followed Callimachus and, with the exception of Vergil, eschewed epic themes. In other words, Satyrus' labeling is significant because it may be indicative of an \textit{agon} between generations of poets over poetical aesthetics and ideology. Unfortunately, other than Menander's plays themselves, which of course contain no explicit prose statements that unequivocally show he was engaged in a

\footnote{\textsuperscript{40}Gilbert Norwood, \textit{Greek Comedy}, p. 37, note 1.}
polemic, we have almost no other corroborating evidence. We can, however, examine what Menander’s characters say about Tragedy. In addition, we can look at other ancient literary wars, where the evidence is more firm, to see if there are any elements present in Menander’s Comedy that justify interpreting it as a literary *agon*. For instance, one conspicuous parallel between Callimachus’ poetry and that of Menander is that neither wrote about “kings and heroes,”

as did their predecessors. Thus, while nowhere in the extant portions of Menander do we find an explicit statement, such as in Callimachus, that royal subjects will be avoided, nevertheless the fact that they are absent in Menander suggests that he was consciously swerving from his predecessors, just as Callimachus would do a few decades later.

We now leave this excursus and return to the main path. The war of partisans, which for us began with Satyrus, seems to have had another contestant. The biographer of Aristophanes makes the seemingly contrary assertion that:

He (Aristophanes) was the reason for the rivalry of the New Comic poets (I mean Philemon and Menander). For when there was a vote concerning the *choregia* so that they could not poke fun at anyone by name and the *choregoi* no longer supported paying for choruses, and when the resources for the comedies completely dried up because of these things, since the *raison d’être* of Comedy was ridiculing someone, Aristophanes wrote the *Cocalus*, and in it introduced a rape and recognition and all the other things that Menander rivaled. (And again, since support for choruses dried up, when he wrote his *Plutus*, with a view to having an interlude to change costumes, he wrote the word *chorou* ..., which we also see that the New Comic poets write in rivalry of Aristophanes.)

---

41Compare the opening of Callimachus’ *Aetia*.
42*The Life of Aristophanes*, Kassel and Austin, *PCG* III 2, testimonia 1, lines 46 ff: ἐγένετο δὲ καὶ αἷτιος ζηλοῦ τὸι νέοις κοιμικοῖς, λέγω δὲ Φιλήμον καὶ Μενάνδρος. υπηρίσκατος γὰρ γενομένου χορηγικοῦ, ὡστε μὴ ὀνομαστὶ κοιμιδεῖν τινα, ἐτὶ καὶ τὸν χορηγοῦν οὐκ ἀντεχόντων πρὸς τὸ χορηγεῖν, καὶ παντιάσαντι ἐκλεοπτικὰς τῆς ὑλῆς τῶν κοιμιδῶν διὰ τούτων αὐτῶν, αἷτιον γὰρ κοιμιδίας τὸ αὐτότερον τινάκης, ἔγραψε Κόκαλος, ἐν ὃ εἰσάγει φθοράν καὶ ἀναγνωρίσιον καὶ τάλλα πάντα, ἡ ἐξηλοσε Μενάνδρος. [πάλιν δὲ ἐκλεοπτότας καὶ τοῦ χορηγεῖν τὸν Πλούτον γράφας, εἰς τὸ διαναπαύεσθαι τὰ σκηνικὰ πρόσωπα καὶ μετασκευᾶσθαι ἐπιγραφὲς "χοροῦ" φθεγγόμενος ἐν ἑκείνοις. ἡ καὶ ὅρωμεν τούς νέους οὔτως ἐπιγράφοντας ζήλοις Ἀριστοφάνοις.]
As with the Satyrus passage above, this quote is usually thought to demonstrate the force of influence at work upon Menander, this time by Aristophanes. But this excerpt can also be read as evidence of a literary contest, especially when one considers the wording. The verb used here is ζηλόω, which has a range of meanings from "emulation" to "envy" that is hard to capture in English. It is here translated "rival," which perhaps best captures its range of semantic meanings in English. This verb has an analog in Latin, aemulari. In describing Terence's relationship to Menander, one scholar defines aemulatio in the following way: "Terence thought he could improve on Menander in Menander's own terms -- ethos and structure -- and this is the earliest known straightforward case in Roman literature of aemulatio, competition with Greeks on their own terms." 43 We could likewise say that Aristophanes' biographer here seems to argue that Menander competed with Aristophanes on Aristophanes' terms, i.e. parody of rapes and recognitions. This, however, cannot be the whole story, because Aristophanes was almost certainly parodying Tragedy, probably Euripidean Tragedy, when he introduced a rape and a recognition in his Cocalus. Surely this biographer is not arguing that Aristophanes was the first playwright to introduce these items -- an argument that is demonstrably false -- only perhaps the first comic playwright. At any rate, Menander did not parody Tragedy in the way that Aristophanes did, as anyone who reads him knows, but rather, as we shall see, he rationalized tragic mythemes and then subverted tragic role-playing. If anything, he implicitly corrected Aristophanes' parodical treatment by not following it. In fact, it may be possible to reconcile the quotes of Satyrus and the biographer of Aristophanes, if we argue that Aristophanes parodied Euripides' treatment of a rape and recognition, and that Menander, and perhaps other New Comic poets, sparred with both Euripides and Aristophanes by rationalizing rapes and recognitions. Presumably these two struggles

were different: Menander competed with Aristophanes in the manner of his handling of
tragic scenes and conventions, while both Aristophanes and Menander competed with
Euripides as ideologues.

Evidence of *agon* continues with Aristophanes of Byzantium, the great scholar and
head of the Library at Alexandria from about 194-180 B.C., who was a great admirer of
Menander, as can be gathered from his famous quote, "O Menander, O life, which of you
imitated which?"^44 This quote implies that those who preceded Menander did not portray
real life as well as Menander did. Or rather, because rapes and recognitions probably were
not standard events for the average Athenian, no one treated such mythical/tragic staples in
as lifelike a manner as Menander. Aristophanes' admiration for Menander is also revealed
in the fact that he ranked Menander second only to Homer.^45 Rankings, of course, suggest
a competition. Interestingly enough, Eusebius gives a long extract from book one of
Porphyrius' *Philological Lecture*, in which Eusebius claims that Porphyrius used
Aristophanes of Byzantium as evidence that Menander plagiarized other poets, saying:
"And Menander is full of this moral weakness (sc. plagiarism), which Aristophanes the
grammarians only gently said, because of his excessive love for him, in his work *Parallel
Passages in Menander and those from whom he Plagiarized*."^46 The title given us by
Porphyrius (as quoted by Eusebius) does not bespeak a gentle treatment and seems to
contradict Porphyrius' own statement that "Aristophanes excessively loved Menander." It

---

[hereafter Körte, Testimonia] [= Syrian commenting on Hermogenes' II 23]: ‘Αριστοφάνης ο
γραμματικός εύστοχοτάτα πεποίηκεν εἰς αὐτὸν ἐκεῖνο: "Ὄ Μένανδρε καὶ βίε, πότερος ἃρ
ὑμῶν πότερον ἀπεμιμήσατο;”

^45 IG XIV 1183, epigram inscribed on a Herm found at Rome dating no earlier than the second
century after Christ (= Körte, Testimonia 61e, with Kaibel's restorations): [οὐκ ἄλλως] ἔστησα κατ’
ὀρθαλλοῦς σε, Μένανδρ[ι]ε, / [γείτον] Ὀμηρεῖν, φιλτάτε μοι, κεφαλῆς, / [εἰ αὲ] γε δεύτερα
ἐταξε σοφός κρείνειν μετ’ ἐκείνων / [γραμματικὸς κλεινός πρόσθεν Ἀριστοφάνης.

^46 Porphyrius as quoted by Eusebius *Praeparatio Evangelica* X 3,12 (465d) (= Körte, Testimonia
51): καὶ Μένανδρος τῆς ἀρρηστίας ταύτῃς ἐπήλθη; ὥν ἤρεια μὲν ἠλεγξε διὰ τὸ ἄγαν
αὐτὸν φιλεῖν Ἀριστοφάνης ο γραμματικός ἐν ταῖς παραλλήλοις αὐτοῦ τε καὶ ἂρ' ὃν
ἐκλείψεν ἐκλογάς.
also does not comport with the testimony that Aristophanes placed Menander second only to Homer and claimed that he imitated life, not that he plagiarized other poets. It seems more likely, therefore, that Aristophanes wrote a work on Menander's sources under another title, but it was later twisted by one of Menander's detractors to reflect this critic's own sentiments about Menander. This disparager may have been Latinus, a literary critic of the early Roman imperial period, if we may trust what Eusebius reports Porphyrius to have said immediately after the quote above: "And Latinus, in his six-volume work entitled On Menander's Borrowings, exposed the majority of these plagiarisms." Eusebius then claims that Porphyrius went on further to comment upon the second century B.C. Roman comic playwright Caecilius -- himself an adapter of Menander's plays -- saying, "and Caecilius, as though he had made some great criminal arrest, says that Menander transcribed Antiphanes' whole play Oionistes from beginning to end into his Deisidaimon." We have no way of confirming or disproving this. One wonders how reliable Porphyrius' testimony is as quoted by Eusebius. As was stated above, the title of Aristophanes' work that is allegedly given by Porphyrius is not consistent with what other sources say and what Eusebius says that Porphyrius himself said about Aristophanes' opinion of Menander. The title of Latinus' work does not commit it to a negative treatment either; it may have simply been about Menander's employment of other poets and not a treatise claiming plagiarism. As far as Caecilius Statius' statement is concerned, it has no context and is, therefore, questionable. It could be rhetorical hyperbole in order to defend

---

47On the question of the title of this work by Aristophanes, see Heinz-Günther Nesselrath, Die attische Mittlere Komödie: Ihre Stellung in der antiken Literaturkritik und Literaturgeschichte, in Untersuchungen zur antiken Literatur und Geschichte 36 (Berlin and New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1990), 182.


his own use of Menander against some of his own detractors. As such it anticipates the kind of rhetoric we hear from Terence in the prologues to his plays in response to his nemesis, Lucius Lanuvinus. Compare the prologue to his _Andria_ where he says,

"Menander wrote an _Andria_ and a _Perinthia_, know one and you know both, for their plots are not unlike one another, though there are differences in dialogue and style."\(^{50}\) It may be that Porphyrius or Eusebius selectively read his sources in entirely negative terms to make his own point on plagiarism. Eusebius is particularly suspect, since here and elsewhere he seems intent upon showing how the Greeks were thievish by nature and in particular how their philosophy at best coincided with or derived from biblical doctrine.

Moving away from the critics who argue, or rather according to Eusebius argue, that Menander plagiarized his sources, we have the testimony of the greatest Roman literary critic Quintilian, a staunch supporter of Menander. He wrote "Menander especially admired Euripides, as he so often testifies, and he followed him, albeit in a different genre."\(^{51}\) We cannot be sure of exactly what Quintilian meant by "admired" and "followed," but it seems most reasonable to conclude that Quintilian meant that Menander imitated Euripides, and that he did not plagiarize him or engage in _aemulatio_, competition with Euripides on Euripides' own terms.

We may also add two other categories of influence: education and philosophy. For the former, the Anonymous author of _On Comedy_ asserted that "Menander spent a lot of time with Alexis by whom it seems he was taught."\(^{52}\) The _Suda_ went further and alleged

---

\(^{50}\) Terence, prologue to the _Andria_ 9-12: _Menander fecit Andriam et Perinthiam. I qui utramvis recte norit ambas novet: ita non sunt dissimili argumento sed tamen, dissimili oratione sunt factae ac stilo._

\(^{51}\) _Institutio Oratoria_ X, I. 69.(= Körte, Testimonia 38): _sc. Euripidem_ admiratus maxime est, ut saepe testatur, et secus, quamquam in opere diverso, _Menander_.

\(^{52}\) Anonymous _de Comoedia_ (= Körte, Testimonia 2): _Ménavdróσ...συνδιατρίμασ δε τά πολλά Ἀλεξίδι υπό τούτου δοκεῖ παιδευθῆναι._
that, "Alexis the comic poet from Thurii was the uncle of the comic poet Menander."\(^\text{53}\)

Diogenes Laertius, on the other hand, reported that "Theophrastus was, according to Pamphila in the 302nd book of her Miscellaneous Historical Notes, the teacher of Menander."\(^\text{54}\) Alciphron also claimed that Menander was the pupil of Theophrastus, but his assertion is contained in a pair of letters (4.18,19) whose contents seem to be a fanciful blend of fact and fiction. Assuming that Menander was Theophrastus' student, we can surmise that he was taught a great deal of peripatetic philosophy, which squares with Menander's seeming familiarity with Aristotle's Poetics. Strabo (14.638) also reported that Menander was a fellow ephebe of Epicurus, and some have found Epicurean attitudes in Menander's plays.

These sparse second-hand accounts, suggestive titles of lost works, and biographical snippets for centuries remained the best evidence we had about Menander because his work was lost in medieval times. In the twentieth century, Menanderean criticism has enjoyed a resurgence owing to a resurrection of a part of Menander's corpus with the disinterment of the Cairo codex from the sands of Egypt in 1905.\(^\text{55}\) The Aeëtean task of reconstituting this Apsyrtus-like corpus was aided in 1959 with the publication of the Bodmer codex, which included one virtually complete play the Dyscolus.\(^\text{56}\) This was followed by other discoveries and publications.\(^\text{57}\) Like their ancient counter-parts, modern

\(^\text{53}\) *Suda Lexicon (= Köte, Testimonia 5):* s.v. "Αλεξις Θεύριος κομικός ... γέγονε δὲ πάτρως Μενάνδρου κομικόν. Most scholars today believe the *Suda* errs when it states Menander's and Alexis' relationship was one of blood.

\(^\text{54}\) Diogenes Laertius 5.36 (= Köte, Testimonia 7): ὁ δὲ Θεόφραστος γέγονεν..., καθὰ φησὶ Παμφύλη ἐν τῷ τριακοστῷ δευτέρῳ τῶν Ὀποιμιμάτων, διδάσκαλος Μενάνδρου τοῦ κομικοῦ.

\(^\text{55}\) M. Gustave Lefebvre, *Fragments d'un manuscrit de Mnéandre* (Cairo: L'Institut français d'archéologie orientale, 1907). This publication included significant portions of the Epitrepontes, Perikeiromene, and Samia, as well as the beginning of Heros and some other minor items.


\(^\text{57}\) Large portions of the Misoumenos and the Sicyonius (-oi) were first published in 1965, and a hundred or so lines of the Dis Exapaton in 1968.
scholars have focused their attention on the sources of Menander’s inspiration and have explained Menander through the traditional prism of source-influence, or what the Germans call Quellenforschung. Not surprisingly, there are found among these modern scholars a spectrum of opinions about who or what exerted influence upon Menander and to what degree, and for the most part they derive from the ancient testimonia mentioned above.

Thus modern scholars generally agree that there were three major influences upon Menander. These are: Comedy (both Old, i.e. Aristophanes, and Middle, i.e. Alexis), Peripatetic Philosophy (Aristotle’s Poetics and Theophrastus’ Characters), and, following Satyrus and Quintilian, Tragedy -- particularly Euripidean Tragedy. Critics today mainly disagree about the extent to which these three sources exerted influence upon Menander and these differences in opinion provide the various hues of Menandrean criticism. Thus there are those who emphasize the Comic Tradition, such as Wehrli, who posits a ’Kontinuität’ between Old and New Comedy. Peripatetic Philosophy is best represented by Barigazzi, who concludes that the whole work of Menander is impregnated by peripatetic ethic-aesthetic principles whose influence on Menander led to the birth of New Comedy. Tragic influence has among its greatest proponents T.B.L. Webster and W.H. Friedrich. Webster emphasizes Menander’s use of tragic quotation and allusion, as well as his borrowing of tragic situations, recognitions, monologues, and the technique of characterization, but he argues that this relationship was one of respect where ”tragedy had become a classic to be quoted as a source of wisdom.” Friedrich concerns himself with

---

58Only one scholar, H.W. Prescott, so far as I know, adds a fourth influence, that being contemporary life. No doubt he had Aristophanes’ maxim in mind (see footnote 42 above). It seems unlikely, however, that foundlings, tokens of recognition, rapes... where the norm for most Athenian families at this time. See, however, Prescott’s series of articles, ”The Antecedents of Hellenistic Comedy,” in Classical Philology 12 (1917): 405 ff; 13 (1918): 113-137; 14 (1919): 108-135.
59Fritz Wehrli, Motivstudien zur Griechischen Komödie (Zürich and Leipzig: Max Niehans Verlag, 1936).
60A. Barigazzi: La Formazione Spirituale di Menandro (Turin: Bottega d’Erasmo, 1965).
61See Webster’s Studies in Menander, and Studies in Later Greek Comedy (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1971), 156.
plot-construction, as well as situation and characterization. Others admit tragic influence, but they prefer to see it as only part of a greater whole in which Menander uses a mixture of both tragic and comic modes or conventional elements peppered with Peripatetic thought. These include Handley, Goldberg, and most recently Zagagi. Sehrt and Katsouris discuss the question of the Euripidean influence on Menander in greatest detail. Sehrt's dissertation is divided into two major parts. In the first part he considered Menander's indebtedness to Euripides in regard to the following six categories: character-drawing, plot-construction, prologues, recognition scenes, love, and subsidiary characters such as nurses, slaves, and pedagogues. In the second part he detailed those cases where Menander seems to borrow Euripidean words, figures of speech, and proverbial expressions. Like the title of his dissertation, Sehrt left no doubt but that he believed that Menander found the inspiration of his art in Euripides, and that he deliberately tried to imitate him. Katsouris, too, in his numerous books and articles on Menander almost invariably stresses the imitative qualities of Menander's reliance on Tragedy, especially Euripidean Tragedy, and he frequently adduces direct dialogues with specific plays. In the more recent dissertation of D'Atri, she explores how Menander deliberately imitates "the anxious mood" that prevails in Euripidean Tragedy, and she rightly sees the comedy of Menander as a correction and subversion of Euripides' tragic outlook in that it

68 Sehrt also believes that the Peripatetic philosopher Theophrastus and his work *The Characters* influenced Menander.
69 She does not use these terms, but they are what her thesis argues.
is a form of laughter and a temporary victory over death in the dark, frightening, and anxiety-ridden world of Euripidean Tragedy. Of greater merit is R.L. Hunter’s chapter on Greek and Roman New Comedy and Tragedy, and articles by Hurst, Poole, and Łanowski, all of which argue that New Comedy, or Menander in particular, exploited (Hunter’s term) or commented upon (Łanowski’s phrase) Tragedy, particularly Euripidean Tragedy.

In this dissertation the question of source-influence will be taken up afresh, and building upon these shorter articles, it will be argued that in exploiting and commenting upon Tragedy, Menander seeks to rationalize, correct, and overturn it, especially Tragedy as defined by Aristotle. In any case, the traditional way of looking at that source-influence, which basically entails rummaging through extant Menander and finding phrases and techniques that are similar to past poets or allusions to contemporary thought and then assuming that they are reverent tips of the hat to these predecessors, will be corrected. This will be done by understanding influence partially in terms of what may best be described as "Bloomian" influence. Bloom regards poetic influence as a phenomenon analogous to what Freud called the family romance, and thus in terms far less naive and ideal than the traditional approach of source-criticism, which emphasizes reverent imitation. A poet, or even a tradition, Bloom believes, has one special father figure whom it at once admires and wrestles against. A later poet does not, therefore, deliberately imitate its precursor, rather in some ways it deliberately tries to be unlike its precursor in much the

---

same way that a teenage son tries to be different than his father. A later poet or tradition does this, because merely to imitate one's precursor would be the death blow to one's aspirations of individuality and immortality. In addition, the son has something new to say because what his "old man" could not see, because he lived in the past, the son can see and analyze.

As a prelude to the main body of this dissertation, a few comments on how Bloom’s modern critical theory will be applied in the present study seem warranted as a defense against the charges of making the evidence fit the theory or of being an anachronist. In regard to the first of these potential charges, no attempt will be made to neatly fit Menander into Bloom’s sixfold "revisionary ratios."\(^{76}\) Rather, some of Bloom’s terminology will be evoked because it provides a useful way to engage the œuvre of Menander, but it will in no way be thought to be all-embracing. In fact, in some ways, as this study will show, Bloom’s theory, while fruitful, is inadequate to describe Menander’s particular struggle. As was stated above, Bloom’s theory is modelled on the Freudian father-son family romance, and the struggle by the son is over identity. In this struggle, the more the son unconsciously tries to be unlike his father, the more he becomes just like him, or as the opening title of Bloom’s prologue puts it, "It was a great marvel that they were in the Father without knowing him."\(^{77}\) Where the father is, there the son shall be.

For Menander, on the other hand, it will be shown that while he primarily reacts against Euripidean Tragedy, he is consciously struggling against "tragicness" itself more than Euripides; and although this struggle shares some of the characteristics of the father-son struggle, especially in the fact that Euripides preceded Menander, in the end it is not so much about identity, but about who gets to speak to the polis. In this sense, then, the

\(^{76}\)These are the clinamen, tessera, kenosis, daemonization, askesis, and apophrades.

\(^{77}\)The title of the opening prologue in Bloom’s Anxiety, op. cit. p. 3.
struggle is more fraternal, that is, it is more akin to conflict between Polynices and Eteocles, than between Oedipus and Laius.

Regarding the second potential charge, that of being an anachronist, it should be pointed out that Bloom's theory is relevant to the Greek and Roman literary traditions. Bloom's first treatise on influence was formulated as a critical approach to post-Miltonic English and especially American poets, a milieu whose anxiety of influence, so Bloom argued, is more acute than all previous generations. This anxiety of belatedness finds its most ardent spokesman in Emerson, whose formulation of self-reliance serves as the mantra of all late-comers in the American tradition. One of the more eloquent poems steeped in American anxiety is Robert Frost's "The Road Not Taken."

Two roads diverged in a yellow wood  
And sorry I could not travel both  
And be one traveler, long I stood  
And looked down one as far as I could  
To where it bent in the undergrowth;

Then took the other, as just as fair,  
And having perhaps the better claim,  
Because it was grassy and wanted wear;  
Though for that, the passing there  
Had worn them really about the same,

And both that morning equally lay  
In leaves no step had trodden black.  
Oh, I kept the first for another day!  
Yet knowing how way leads on to way,  
I doubted if I should ever come back.

I shall be telling this with a sigh  
Somewhere ages and ages hence:  
Two roads diverged in a wood, and I --  
I took the one less traveled by,  
And that has made all the difference.

We will return to this poem in a moment. First, however, Bloom's thesis that the anxiety of American poets is greater than any other tradition, for instance, greater than that with which the Greeks and Romans labored under, needs some modification. In fact, Bloom himself offered a partial disavowal of his previous stance in his next book:
This affliction of belatedness, as I have begun to recognize, is a recurrent malaise of Western consciousness, and I would now recant my previous emphasis on the anxiety of influence as a Post-Enlightenment phenomenon. William Arrowsmith has observed, with a certain mordant splendor, that Euripides can be considered a misprision of Aeschylus, and Dr. Samuel Johnson with equally elegant gloom found Virgil to be deformed by his anxieties about Homer. Though I would now assert only a difference in degree, rather than in kind, for influence-anxieties from Milton on, this is nevertheless a true difference for reading, and for the pragmatics of interpretation. [my italics]

That Bloom’s theory can be applied to the earlier Greek and Roman literary traditions, as Arrowsmith has done, requires further elaboration. Every living generation of poets sees itself as the most belated, because in their lifetime they are. This anxiety of belatedness was no less acute in the Greeks and Romans. They did not consider themselves early born, and each struggled in his own way with his late status. Poets reveal their inner anxiety with their precursors most clearly in their desire to create something new and out of the ordinary. We find this desire for newness even in Homer, whom we now know to have stood at the end of a long oral tradition, although for all subsequent generations he represents the beginning of the western literary tradition. We can perhaps catch a glimpse of the Homeric bard’s anxiety for new material to satisfy his audience when Penelope chastises Phemius for his appropriation of the recent woes of the Trojan War rather than singing some older, more traditional theme. Telemachus defends Phemius and tells his mother Penelope, "People heap more praise on the song that is the latest (νεωτάτη) to reach their ears." At the end of the Odyssey, Phemius again needs a defense, but this time it is from being slaughtered by Odysseus. He pleads his own case with the words; "I beseech you, Odysseus, honor and spare me. It will rue you later, if you slay a bard who sings for both gods and men. For I am self-taught, and the god has

---

78 In order to avoid the onerous phrase "Homeric tradition," or some such circumlocution, I will use the simpler and more traditional attribution "Homer."

implanted in my thoughts all manner of song.” Thus at the critical juncture when Phemius must justify his continued existence, he appeals to his greatest asset: originality.

Even the traditional invocation of the Muse at the beginning of the Iliad and the Odyssey is no doubt, in part, a poet's ploy to vouchsafe the originality of his inspiration, because if the Muses are the source of one's inspiration, then no mortal is. We see this more clearly in Hesiod, whose lengthy preamble to the Theogony proper seems more intent upon emphasizing how the Muses inspired him personally, and no other, rather than avowing the truth of what he is singing. In fact, he himself asserts that the Muses know how to tell many lies that pass for the truth (διευθέσσα πολλὰ λέγειν ἑτύμοισιν ὀμοίων), which is probably a misprision of the Homeric tradition, for it echoes what is said about Odysseus when he is telling his "Cretan Lies" to Penelope: "He knew how to tell many lies that were like the truth" (Odyssey 19.203: ἵστε πεύεδεα πολλὰ λέγων ἑτύμοισιν ὀμοίων).82

Many examples could be cited from Greek Lyric poetry, but one from Pindar will suffice: "For so the Muse stood at my side when I discovered this new and sparkling mode of song." Again, the emphasis is on Pindar's own originality, which is guaranteed because the Muse, not some other mortal, showed him this. Aeschylus seems to have been more philosophical about his own anxieties of influence, if the anecdote he is reported to have said is genuine, that his tragedies were "morsels from the mighty dinners of

---

80 Odyssey 22.344-48: "γουνοθαμι ἀο ὥδε θεοὶ καὶ μα † ἑλέσαι / μοί ητο ἔροισεν ἄγχος ἔσεσαι, ἐν κεν άφων / πεφνης, ὦς τε θεοὶ καὶ άνθρωποις ἔδεω / αὐτοδίδακτος δὲ εὖ πλέον ἐνδυσίν ὀμᾶς / παντοῦ ἐνέφυεν"


83 Olympian 3.6-7: Μοῖσα δὲ οὕτω ποι παρὲ/στα μοι νεοσιγαλον εὑρόντι τρόπου
Dithyrambic poets were not immune to poetic anxiety either, as can be seen in Timotheus’ famous lines:

I don’t sing the old songs,  
because my new ones are better!  
Young Zeus holds sway,  
and Cronus’ reign was long ago.  
Time for the old Muse to retire!

Clearly Bloomian theory is applicable here. Timotheus has carefully constructed these lines so as to bring out the antithesis between old poetry, whatever that may be, and his new poetry. The contrast is made quite explicit by the word order. The first line ends with the old (τὰ παλαιά), and the next line begins with the new (καινά). Drawing upon the succession myth in Hesiod’s *Theogony*, Timotheus continues the contrast, suggesting quite polemically that his poetry is equivalent to the rule of the younger Zeus, who gave birth to the arts and civilization, while the old poetry is like that of the barbaric Cronus.

Bloom’s metaphor of the Freudian family romance could not be better expressed. The younger Zeus (Timotheus) seeks to supplant and be different than his father Cronus (Timotheus’ poetic predecessors). Such rhetoric anticipates that which we find in Callimachus (see below).

Arrowsmith’s Bloomian view of Euripides was already eloquently stated by Aristophanes in the *Frogs*, where we have a staged *agon* between Aeschylus and Euripides over who deserves the chair for best tragic poet in Hades. Aristophanes clearly interprets Euripides’ *oeuvre* as a conscious swerving from, and correction of, Aeschylus in the areas of diction, plot, and characterization.

---

84 Athenaeus VIII.347 E: οὐδ’ ἐπὶ νοῦν βαλλόμενος τὸ τοῦ καλοῦ καὶ λαμπροῦ Ἀισχύλου, ὡς τὰς αὐτῶς τραγῳδίας τεμάχη ἦναὶ ἔλεγεν τῶν ὸμήρου μεγάλων δείπνων.

85 Timotheus lived c. 450-360 B.C. according to the *Marmor Parium*, 76.

From the late fifth century epic writer Choerilus of Samos, we find a brief meditation on belatedness, where the poet longs for an idealized primitive past conducive to poetic originality:

Ah, blessed was the man skilled in song in those days and a servant of the Muses, when the meadow was yet unmown. But now when all has been allotted, and the arts have reached their limits, we are left behind in last place as in a race, nor is there a place whither to drive a newly yoked chariot, though you look everywhere. It is hard to imagine a chariot racer being any later than showing up to a race and finding no room even to enter his ride on the course. In fact, Aristotle mentions this passage as an example of an effective opening that an orator can use when he is about to embark upon a hackneyed (τεθρυλημένος) theme. It is not until Callimachus, whose imagery of driving his chariot on unworn paths anticipates Frost's imagery of taking a path less travelled, that we have a reasonably clear context for a poet's war on his precursors as the avowed starting point of his poetics. Callimachus uses Choerilus' imagery, but he rejects the idea that there are no new paths to be found:

For when I first placed a tablet upon my knees, Lycian Apollo said to me, "Bard, rear the sacrificial animal to be as fat as possible, but the Muse, good man, to be slender. This too I bid you, where carts do not pass, there tread, and do not drive your chariot in the tracks of others along a broad path, but along unworn passages, though your course be more narrow."

Frost's metaphor of taking the road less traveled is hauntingly similar to Callimachus' metaphor of driving his cart along untrodden paths. It is doubtful, although not impossible, that Frost had Callimachus in mind when he wrote his poem. He was well acquainted with Latin authors, and the Neoteric Catullus was his favorite, but it is more
likely that both arrived at their similar imagery through the same pressure to be unique. From the quotation of Bloom above, one gathers that he would argue that American poets have a higher degree of anxiety than those of earlier traditions. But the title of Callimachus' *magnus opus*, the *Aetia*, is a testament to his great obsession with origins, and his poetry is more anxiety-ridden than Frost's, if one may judge by the greater polemical tone he displays.\footnote{The opening of Callimachus' *Aetia* is too long to quote in full, but the parts that precede and follow are very bellicose towards the epic tradition after Homer.} Frost's poem, in contrast, is rather neutral because he regards both paths "as just as fair," and he is sorry that he "could not travel both / And be one traveler."

Callimachus' formulation became canonical with the poets of Rome in the generation of poets in the early and mid first century before Christ, and it carried on into the next century. Their anxiety of influence with their Greek models, I would argue, was comparable to that which we see in Post-Miltonic poets.\footnote{On the question of Roman poetry's relationship to its Greek predecessors, see G. Williams' *Tradition and Originality in Roman Poetry* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1968), especially chapter V.} As was mentioned above, these poets became known as the Neoterics or New(er) Poets, from the Greek νεωτέρος, the same word or root word we saw in the passages of Satyrus and Homer quoted above. Many of the second generation Neoterics at Rome began their program poems with a Callimachean *recesatio*, usually claiming how the god appeared to them and forbade them to write about epic themes, or in other words stale, hackneyed themes. These poetes include Vergil,\footnote{Eclogues VI.1ff.} Propertius,\footnote{Eclogues VI.1ff.} Horace,\footnote{Carmina 4.15.1-4.} and Ovid.\footnote{Amores 1.1ff.} Roman poets were not only anxious to avoid repeating worn-out traditions, they were also anxious not to be, or to even appear to be, excessively subservient to their Greek models. The best Roman poets and prose writers resisted strict translations of Greek models and took pride doing so. Cicero

---


\textit{Tradition and Originality in Roman Poetry} (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1968), especially chapter V.
says of this, "It will be unnecessary to translate word for word, as the uneducated translators are wont to do."\textsuperscript{95} Again, a measure of originality is sought for by Roman poets, as is demonstrated by the commonplace claim of many a Roman poet that he is the \textit{primus auctor} of something or other in Latin. It starts with Ennius, with his claim that he is the first Latin poet to make use of the hexameter (\textit{Annales} 213 ff.V.). It is variously followed by Lucretius, Laevius, Vergil (in both his \textit{Eclogues} and \textit{Georgics}), Horace, Propertius, Manilius, Ovid, and Phaedrus. The reaction resulting from anxiety of all of the great Roman poets toward their Greek models -- indeed the reaction of all great poets in any established tradition towards their precursors -- may be summed up by Horace himself:

\begin{quote}
Public material will become private, if you do not linger about the common and broad path, nor render word for word as a slavish translator, nor leap down into narrow imitation.\textsuperscript{96}
\end{quote}

This passage itself is an artful rendering of Callimachus' "where carts do not pass, tread, and do not drive your chariot in the tracks of others along a broad path, but along unworn passages, though your course be more narrow."

What all this demonstrates is that anxiety was just as alive and well in some poets of antiquity as it is in modern poets. It was even alive in Homer, the father figure of all western literature. The questions are, to what extent was anxiety present in Menandean New Comedy, who caused it, and how did Menander respond? It will be demonstrated in the pages that follow that it was present in Menander, although not as apparent as in Callimachus because of its subversive nature. And although we shall see that Euripides exercised the greatest influence on Menander (as Quintilian and some modern scholars have argued), Menander's struggle was not so much about anxiety and identity, as a strictly Bloomian view would require, rather it was more about representation and voice.

\textsuperscript{95}\textit{De Finibus} iii.15: nec tamen exprimi verbum e verbo necesse erit, ut interpretes indiserti solent.

\textsuperscript{96}\textit{Ars Poetica} 131-4: publica materies privati iuris erit, si / non circa vilem patuluumque moraberis orbem, / nec verbo verbum curabis reddere fidus / interpres, nec desilies imitator in arium.
CHAPTER 2

COMIC TREATMENT OF TRAGEDY BEFORE MENANDER

In determining the Menandrean New Comic tradition's relationship to Tragedy, we must first back up more than a century and consider earlier comedy, to ascertain whether there is anything different about the later treatment. We are hampered by the lack of context for almost all of the earlier evidence, except in the case of Aristophanes. From what evidence there is, however, it seems that the space between most of Menander's comedy and Tragedy differed greatly from the space which is found between comedy and Tragedy in the period that preceded him, and this may be indicative of an emerging ideological agon. Thus it will be useful to survey earlier comedy's treatment of Tragedy and surmise what we can about it.

In this study, there are nine different uses that comedians make of Tragedy or tragedians that have been identified in the extant plays and fragments of comedy prior to Menander. Since Aristophanes' plays provide us a context for his treatment of Tragedy, he is a useful starting point for analyzing comedy's relationship to Tragedy before Menander. An exhaustive list of the passages in Aristophanes that parody or mention Tragedy or the tragedians has already been compiled and will not be repeated here. It will only be noted that in Aristophanes we find the first seven modes of tragic allusions, most

---

1 I am indebted to K.J. Dover's review of Peter Rau's Paratragodia in Gnomon 40 (1968): 826-7 for some of these categories.
of which seem to be the same that we find in all of Aristophanes’ predecessors and contemporaries.

The first category is when a living tragedian is used as a character in a play, such as Euripides in the *Thesmophoriazusae*. This use of Tragedy is not found in Menander, and other than Aristophanes’ *Thesmophoriazusae*, no other extant examples of this use of Tragedy survive.

Secondly, in the course of the play Tragedy may simply be quoted without any specific intent other than recognizing the quote as such. Thus in the *Frogs*, when Aeacus beats Dionysus and Xanthias in turn to determine which is a god, after one such beating Dionysus shouts out in pain, “Poseidon!,” but he completes his cry of pain with a quote from Sophocles’ *Laocoön* "who dost lord over Aegeus’ promontories or in the depths of the green sea" in order to disguise his discomfort. There seems to be no real point to the allusion here, other than that we are amused that Dionysus cleverly masks his cry of pain with a quote from Dionysiac Tragedy. This use of Tragedy is also not found in the Menander that survives, and because the other comedians exist in mere fragments with little or no context, it cannot be determined whether their references to Tragedy fall under this category or another. This use of Tragedy is rare in Aristophanes, and it seems safe to assume that it was rare in the other comedians as well.

The third type of allusion to Tragedy that Aristophanes engages in is making a comment about a specific tragedian, usually a humorous or critical comment such as his mention of Sacas (Acestor) at *Birds* 31, but at times a positive remark. There are numerous examples of this in the periods prior to Menander, but none in the extant portions of Menander.

---

3 *Frogs*, 664 ff: Πόσειδον . . . ὃς Αἰγαίοι πρῶνοι ἡ γάλακτος μεθεὶς άλος ἐν βένθεσιν.
Fourthly, Aristophanes parodies Tragedy in three ways: (a) text parody, (b) topos-parody, and (c) visual parody. He engages in text parody when he reproduces a short or extended passage from some tragedian, verbatim or with some minor modifications, and inserts it into a situation incongruous with what the original author intended. In Euripides' *Telephus*, for example, Telephus pleads his case before the Greek leaders in the following way: "Do not begrudge me, leading gentlemen of the Greeks, if, although a beggar, I have dared to speak among the nobles."\(^4\) Aristophanes adapts this passage to Dicaeopolis before the assembly in the *Acharnians* with comic effect: "Do not begrudge me, gentlemen of the audience, if therefore, although a beggar, I intend to speak among the Athenians..."\(^5\)

Aristophanes also engages in topos-parody when he exploits tragic themes and motifs and inserts them into disparate situations. An example of this would be at *Acharnians* 47-51, where Amphitheus gives his pedigree: "For Amphitheus was the son of Demeter and Triptolemus, and the son of Triptolemus was Celeus, and Celeus married Phaenarete, my grandmother, and from her was born Lycinus, from whom I was born immortal."\(^6\) This sentiment is apparently not a specific text borrowed from any particular play, but is simply aimed at the general Euripidean technique of a genealogical prologue, for the Scholiast tells us that "he is ridiculing Euripides, who always takes pleasure in reporting lineages."\(^7\) We may compare this to the opening of the *Phoenician Women*, where Jocasta says "Cadmus came to this land, leaving behind the sea-girt land of Phoenicia -- he who wed the child of Cypris, Harmonia, and begot Polydorus, from whom they say Labdacus was born, and

---


\(^5\)Acharnians 497-9: μη μοι φθονήσῃ τ' ἄνδρες οἱ θεώμενοι / εἰ πτωχὸς ὦν ἐπείτ' ἐν Ἀθηναίοις λέγειν / μέλλω.

\(^6\) γάρ Ἀμφιθέας Δήμητρος ὄν / καὶ Τριπτολέμῳ τούτῳ δὲ Κελεός γίγνεται / γαμεῖ δὲ Κελεός Φαιναρέττιν τίθην ἔμην. / ἐξ ὥς Λυκίνος εγένετ' ἐκ τούτου δ' ἔγω / ἀδάνατος εἰμὶ.

\(^7\)αὐτῶν τὸν Εὐριπιδῆν, ὅει ὡδεος ἀπαγγέλλοντα τὰ γένη.
from Labdacus Laius. And I am known as the child of Menoeceus, and Creon is my brother by the same mother -- they call me Jocasta." An instance of visual parody of Tragedy would be the introduction of a beggar or a chorus of old men on stage in the manner of Euripides, or the wearing of tragic buskins as does Dionysus in the *Frogs*. These three types of parody are absent in the Menander which survives. Nevertheless, Menander does use tragic text, *topoi*, and visual similarities such as the *ekkyklema* in the *Dyscolus*, but he incorporates them into the play in such a way that initially they seem suitable to the plot. Later in the play, however, they are shown to be inappropriate, and hence tragic responses or dramatizations of life are undermined and made irrelevant in Menander, not parodied.

Fifthly, Aristophanes brings dead tragedians back from the grave, as in the *Frogs*, to offer advice to the city, criticize their colleagues' poetry, and promote the legacy of their own poetry. Again, other comedians of the fifth century do this, but nowhere in Menander's surviving plays do we find this use of Tragedy.

Sixthly, judging by the titles of a few of his plays, Aristophanes engaged in tragic/mythological burlesque, which is a ludicrous treatment of the *subject matter* of Tragedy. Examples of this would be his *Amphiaraus* and *Aeolosicon*. As we saw in the first chapter, all the major writers of New Comedy, probably including Menander, wrote mythological/tragic burlesque too, but only a few scraps of this survive. The distance between comedy and Tragedy in this category differs from that which is found in the plays.

---

8 Lines 5-11: Κάδμος ἡμικ ἠλθε γῆν / τῆνθε ἐκλιπὼν Φοίνικαν ἐναλίαν κόσμα / δίς παῖδα γήμας Κύπριδος Ἀρμονίαν ποτὲ / Πολυδωρον ἐξέφυσε, τοῦ δὲ Λάβδακου / φύναι λέγουσιν, ἐκ δὲ τούδε Λάιου / ἐγὼ δὲ παῖς μὲν κλήσομαι Μενοικέως, / -- Κρέοις τοί ἀδελφῶς / μητρός ὑπὶ μιᾶς ἐφι -- καλότατα δ' ἰοκάστην με'.

9 For the existence and use of the *ekkyklema* at *Dyscolus* 690 ff., compare the comments of A.W. Gomme and F.H. Sandbach, *Menander: A Commentary* [hereafter, Gomme and Sandbach, *Commentary*] (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1973), 239-240, line 690: "There can, of course, be no question of parody here; the scene which begins here has a colour less comic than that of any other part of the play, and there would therefore be no disharmony if it were introduced by a conventional device that properly belonged to tragedy." See also this study's chapter on the *Dyscolus*. 
of Menander that do survive. In a burlesque, such as the *Aeolosicon*, where a travesty starring the comic cook Sicon\(^{10}\) was probably superimposed on the Tragedy of Aeolus,\(^{11}\) the boundary between the tragic treatment of the myth and the comic treatment is so well-defined and clear, that the tragic view of humanity found in the original tragic treatment remains intact.

Seventhly, Aristophanes explicitly criticizes a tragedian via parody of his poetry. The most famous example of this is the λησθεν-scene in the *Frogs*. Again, this type of parody-criticism is wholly absent from the sizable portion of Menander that we possess.

Eighthly, Tragedy is sometimes treated as proverbial and something that is useful for the individual's conduct of life. Usually the audience is meant to recognize that in its context, the quotation is overly melodramatic. This use of Tragedy is more ideological and most like the use of Tragedy found in Menander, such as by Davus in the *Aspis*. There, however, Davus' quotes from Tragedy are meant to serve as a contrast to his earlier serious tragic "performance."\(^{12}\)

The ninth and final use of Tragedy is not found in Aristophanes. It consists of comparing the relative ease with which the tragedians are able to compose their plays against the greater difficulty of the comic poet. It is not found in Menander either.

Naturally all of these categories can and are used in various combinations at the same time.

With these nine categories of tragic allusion in mind, we now turn to the passages in which comedians other than Aristophanes and Menander appropriate or mention Tragedy or tragedians. The passages within each category will be given in roughly chronological order.

\(^{10}\)For a hypothesis about the general story line, see Kassel and Austin, *PCG* vol. III.2, 34, vii.


\(^{12}\)See chapter 3 on the *Aspis*. For the subversion of tragic "performances" and role-playing, see especially chapter 5 on the *Samia*.
Category 1: Tragedian as character in a play

Aristophanes' use of Euripides in the *Thesmophoriazusae* is an example of a living tragedian being used as a character in a play. Presumably some other comedians did this as well, but no other examples survive. The *Thesmophoriazusae* is not a criticism of Euripides. Rather Aristophanes creates a comic fantasy whereby the ingenious Euripides is pitted against the women of Athens who feel slandered by his staging unsavory female characters. Thus the stock jokes about Euripides' slipperiness and misogyny are combined into a comic revel. Here the tragedian's caricature of Euripides in a contrived plot provides amusement for the audience. Far from being critical, such a play indicates that Euripides was a conspicuous figure in the *polis* with an influential voice. Parody of this voice increased the stature of original, and on the whole, Euripides must have found it quite flattering to have practically an entire play devoted to parodies of his works.

Category 2: Quoted to be recognized as such

Without a context, it is impossible to determine whether other comedians besides Aristophanes quoted Tragedy with no apparent reason other than recognizing the quote as such. Although it is likely that some did, the quotes from tragedies without a context will be included under the text-parody section below, because it is likely that the majority of them were. It is important to note, however, that in the several plays of Menander that survive, this type of allusion to Tragedy never occurs. Quoting of Tragedy in this manner is not indicative of an ideological *agon*, but rather indicates that Tragedy was a popular coin in currency.

Category 3: Mention of a specific tragedian or tragic actor, personal praise or attack

Of the passages from comedies that praise or make an *ad hominem* attack upon a tragedian, as opposed to a specific passage in his poetry (see category seven below), we

---

13 Or a tragic actor.
begin with the comic poet Chionides. Athenaeus mentions that in a play named the *Beggars* (Ἰττῶξοῖ, which he tentatively assigns to Chionides, a lascivious tragedian named Gnesippus is mentioned. The lines read, "These things, I swear by Zeus, neither Gnesippus nor Cleomenes could have sweetened with their nine strings." Cratinus too lampoons Gnesippus in his *Herdsmen* (Βουκόλοι) as he criticizes an archon "who did not grant Sophocles' request for a chorus, but gave one to the son of Cleomachus [Gnesippus], whom I would not judge worthy of producing a play for me at the feast of Adonis." He also targets Gnesippus in his *Sissies* (Μαλθακοῖ), saying, "Who then heard of me being in love, Gnesippus? It really galls me! Personally, I think nothing is more foolish and vain." In his play the *Seasons* ('Ωραι), he again ridicules Gnesippus for employing effeminate choruses, saying, "Let also the son of Cleomachus, producer of tragedies, be gone and with him his chorus of coiffeurs who pluck their lewd melodies in Lydian fashion!" He takes a shot at Euripides and Aristophanes in a single jab by describing someone as an "overly subtle, maxim-chasing, Euripidaristophanizer!"

---

14 According to Aristotle (*Poetics* 1448a 33), Chionides was one of the earliest Attic comic poets, and the *Suda* states that he was the victor at the first City Dionysia for comic poets in 487 B.C.

15 Athenaeus XIV.638 D [Kassel and Austin, *PCG* vol. IV, Chionides, fr. 4]: ταύτ' ού μά Δια Γυνήσσιπτος ούδε Κλεομένης ἐν ἔνυπ' οὖν χορδαῖς κατεγλυκάνατο.

16 Aristophanes refers to Cratinus as an old man in the *Knights* (533), which was produced in 424 B.C., and in the *Peace* (700 ff.), which was produced in 421, he claims that he was dead, but this may be a joke. The last we hear from him is in 423, when he produced and defeated Aristophanes with his *Wine-Flask* (Τυφτινή). At any rate, if he were already an old man by 424, that would place his birth around 490 B.C.

17 Athenaeus XIV.638 F [Kassel and Austin, *PCG* vol. IV, Cratinus fr. 17]: δς ούκ ἔθεκ' αἰτῶντι Σοφοκλείς χορόν, τῷ Κλεομάχου δ', ὅν ούκ ἄν ἡξίουν ἐγώ / ἐμὸν διδάσκειν οὐδ' ἂν εἰς ᾿Αδωνία. This story is reiterrated by Hesychius, s.v. πυρπερέγχει.


19 Athenaeus XIV.638 F [Kassel and Austin, *PCG* vol. IV, Cratinus, fr. 276]: Τῶν δὲ καὶ τραγῳδίας / ὧ Κλεομάχου διδάσκαλος / + μετὰ τῶν + παρατυπηρῶν ἔχον χορόν / Λυδιστὶ τυλουσάν μέλη / ποιηρά. There is no doubt some word-play in μῆλη, which can also mean "limbs," particularly in view of παρατυπηρῶν, which literally means "hair-plucking slaves."

takes a swipe at Acestor’s undisciplined style of composition in his play *The Cleoboulinae* (Cleobouline was the daughter of the Lindian Cleoboulus, and notorious for her enigmatic hexameters\(^1\)) saying, "Acestor ought to take a beating, if he doesn’t compress his plays."\(^2\) This Acestor, according to the Scholiast at Aristophanes’ *Birds* 31, was a foreigner and tragic poet also known as Sacas. In the *Birds*, Aristophanes questions his judgment for wanting to become an Athenian citizen at a time when most Athenians wanted out of Athens. Cratinus also mentions, in a fragment from an unknown play, Philocles, who was Aeschylus’ nephew, saying "just as Philocles ruined his plot."\(^3\) Philocles is best known for having defeated Sophocles’ *Oedipus Tyrannus*\(^4\) at the City Dionysia, and was also the recipient of other comic barbs.\(^5\) The fifth century comedian Teleclides,\(^6\) who was a contemporary of Cratinus,\(^7\) mentions him in an opaque fragment from his play *the Hesiodians* (‘Ησιοδοι): "But the wretch † .... loathed † Philocles, but if he, with the mind of Aeschylus, ..."\(^8\)

Gnesippus’ lascivious verse is also censured by Eupolis, who was born in 445 B.C. and produced his first play in 429 B.C.\(^9\) There are various stories about his death, two of which point to the fact that he was dead before the close of the Peloponnesian War

---

\(^1\) Diogenes Laertius I 89.


\(^3\) Schol. Sophocles’ *Antigone* 404 [Kassel and Austin, *PCG* vol. IV, Cratinus fr. 323]: οὖν περ Φιλοκλής τὸν λόγον διέφθερεν.

\(^4\) The *Suda* s.v. and the argument of Sophocles’ *OT*.


\(^6\) He is listed under the poets of Old Comedy and is said to have written six plays. See Kassel and Austin, *PCG* vol. VII, Teleclides testimonium 2.

\(^7\) Wilhelm restores his name at *IG* II\(^2\) 2325, 54 just after Cratinus.


\(^9\) Anonymous, *de Comoedia* [Kaibel, *CGF* p. 8]: Ἐφισοὶς Ἀθηναῖς ἐδιδαξέν ἐπὶ ἄρχοντος Ἀπολλοδότου, ἐφ’ οὐ καὶ Φρύνιχος, γεγονός δυνάτος τῇ λέξει, καὶ ἐξίλυν Κρατίνου πολὺ τὸ λοιδορόν καὶ σκαῖρον ἐμφαίνει. γέγραπται δὲ αὐτῷ δράματα δ’.
in 404 B.C. The *Suda* attributes to him seventeen plays in all, the Anonymous fourteen; both of these figures are in keeping with a short life. He writes of Gnesippus in his *Helots* (Εἰλικτες), "To sing the songs of Stesichorus, of Alcman, and Simonides is passé, rather Gnesippus is the one to hear. He has invented evensongs for the lewd to lure out ladies with their *iambuca* and *triganon* in hand." Acestor, too, receives a jab in his *Flatterers* (Κόλακες). In this play a chorus of sycophants is giving a checklist of "dos" and "don'ts", and at the end they advise that at dinner "the flatterer, must immediately speak many delightful things, or be thrown out the door. I know that Acestor the fugitive suffered this, for he uttered a worn-out joke, and the slave led him out the door with his neck in stocks and handed him over to Oeneus."

The comic poet Strattis is found in a list of poets that is under the heading "The names and plays of the poets of Old Comedy," where it is claimed that he wrote seventeen plays. His most famous play was his *Manorestes* (Ἀνθρωπορέστης), which was produced sometime after Euripides' *Orestes* (408 B.C.) and sounds like it would have been a burlesque. He must have been writing well into the fourth century, because the scholiast to Aristophanes *Frogs* 146 asserts that "the *Atalantus* of Strattis was produced much later...."
than the *Frogs* (405 B.C.).\textsuperscript{34} A fragment from that play pans the acting of Hegelochus in Euripides' *Orestes*, saying "and of the other lyrics I didn't care for, but he murdered the very clever *Orestes* of Euripides when he hired Hegelochus the son of Cyntarus to speak the first words."\textsuperscript{35} This is a reference to line 279 of the *Orestes*, where instead of saying "From the sea-billows I again see a calm" he said, "From the sea-billows I again see a clam."\textsuperscript{36} Other known titles of Strattis' plays that suggest tragic burlesque are his *Medea*, *Philoctetes*, *Myrmidons*, and *Troelus*.

Euripides, who was Aristophanes' favorite target, was also the favorite of the comic poets who lived in the fourth century. One of these was Antiphanes, who, according to the anonymous author of *de Comoedia* (hereafter referred to simply as the Anonymous), produced his first play after the ninety-eighth Olympiad (388/84 B.C.).\textsuperscript{37} The Anonymous also claims that he, along with his son Stephanus, were the most noteworthy writers of Middle Comedy. In his play the *Carians* (Καρεῖς), some character says, "Don't you see that fem dancing with his arms? He is not ashamed, expounding on Heraclitus to everyone, the only one who has discovered the art of Theodectus, the one who composes Euripides' summaries."\textsuperscript{38} This last quote is indicative of Tragedy, particularly Euripidean Tragedy, becoming a privileged classic that warranted summaries.

---

\textsuperscript{34} Πολλῷ γάρ ύπερον τῶν θατράχων δεδιδακταὶ ὁ Ἀτάλαντος Στράττιδος. The *Suda* gives the title as *Atalante*.

\textsuperscript{35} Schol. (MTAB) Euripides' *Orestes* 279 [Kassel and Austin, *PCG* vol. VII, Strattis, fr. 1]: καὶ τῶν μὲν ἄλλων οὐκ ἐμέλησε μοι μελῶν, / Εὐριπίδου δὲ δράμα δεξιώτατον / δείκνυσιν ὁ Ὄρεστης, Ἡγελόχος τὸν Κυντάρου / μισθοσάμενος τὰ πρῶτα τῶν ἐπών λέγειν.

\textsuperscript{36} The pun on calm and clam (made by Arrowsmith in his translation of Aristophanes' *Clouds*) is an attempt at rendering the words *calm* (γαλήνα) and a weasel (γαλήνη) in the Greek. Line 279 of the *Orestes* reads ἐκ κυμάτων γάρ σοις αὐ γαλήνῃ ὄρῳ. Hegelochus said ἐκ κυμάτων γάρ σοις αὐ γαλήνῃ ὄρῳ. Compare *Frogs* 304, where this same *faux pas* is lampooned by Aristophanes.

\textsuperscript{37} Anonymous *de Comoedia* [Kaiibel, *CGF* p. 9 = Kassel and Austin, *PCG* vol. II, Antiphanes, testimoniun 2]: καὶ ἡράτοι δυσδάκται μετὰ τὴν ὁπ' Ὀλυμπιάδα.

There is another possible reference to Euripides in a fragment from Anaxandrides, whom the *Suda* claims was from Kameiros on Rhodes. He was victorious seven times at the City Dionysia, and three times at the Lenaea.\(^\text{39}\) The *Marmor Parium* states that his first victory was in 376 B.C. We know that he wrote a *Rustics* (*Αγροικοί*), and if we accept the restoration of his name at *IG XIV* 1098, line 8 under the title of that play, then that means he was active at least until 349 B.C. Many titles of his plays suggest tragic/mythological burlesque (*Αχιλλεύς, Έλευσ, Ηρακλῆς, Θησεύς, Νηρεύς, Νηρηδέας, Θησεύς, Πρωτεσθάνος*) and in particular his *Comictragedy* (Κωμικόδραμα). The reference to Euripides comes from his *Nereids*, which reads (A) "Hey Comus, give the pitcher to him and bring the *kymbion*."\(^\text{40}\) (B) "He will turn into a sort of Euripides today."\(^\text{41}\) Athenaeus then adds that "he is not speaking of the tragic poet, but someone else of the same name, who was either some drunkard or someone with a bad reputation, as Antiochus of Alexandria says in his work *On the Poets Ridiculed in Middle Comedy*. For bringing *kymbia* to an engagement and having the reputation of fighting implies both [i.e. that one is a both drunkard and of bad reputation]."

Athenaeus then goes on to mention the two other comic passages where a Euripides is mentioned in the context of *kymbia*. Both occur in Ephippus, who appears on a victor's list (*IG II*² 2325, 145) right before Antiphanes, and is said by the *Suda* to have been a poet of Middle Comedy. This places him around the second and third quarters of the fourth century. In the first fragment from his play the *Ephebes*, someone says, "Isn't Chaeremon

---

\(^{39}\)See the *Suda* and *IG II*² 2325, 142.  
\(^{40}\)According to *LSJ*, the *κυμβίον* is a small cup because it is the diminutive of *κύμβη*, which is also the name for a cup. *κύμβη*, however, also refers to the hollow of a vessel or simply means a boat, and one must wonder whether a *κύμβη* and a *κυμβίον* are not, in fact, rather large, particularly in light of the fact that *kymbia* are the choice cup for heavy drinkers.  
\(^{41}\)Athenaeus XI.482 C-D ([Kassel and Austin, *PCG* vol. II, Anaxandrides, fr. 33]: δὸς δὴ τὸν χοῦδά ἀυτὸν κυμέ, καὶ τὸ κυμβίον φέρων. / (B) Εὐριπίδης τις τὴν μέρον γενήσεται.}
bringing kylixes to dinner? Has not Euripides fought with kymbia?" It seems rather too coincidental that the names Euripides and Chaeremon, who was a tragedian active around the middle of the fourth century, should occur together. In fact, both the tragedians Euripides and Chaeremon are quoted close together by Davus in the "Doric doctor" scene of Menander's Aspis. The second passage of Ephippus comes from his play the Just Alike ("Oiioioi) or Obeliaphoroi (perhaps tribute payers of an obol tax), where someone says, "May I be obligated to memorize the plays of Dionysius and Demophon's words against Cotys, may Theodorus recite his pieces to me at dinner, may I live one door down from Laches, may I provide the kymbia when I entertain Euripides." The present tense of this passage gives one pause, but does not rule out the tragedian Euripides. Of the others mentioned in this passage, Dionysius the Elder, tyrant of Syracuse, is said to have affected Tragedy. Nothing is known about Demophon. Cotys is the renowned king of Thrace, not the goddess. Theodorus is the celebrated tragic actor in the age of Philip II. Who Laches is is not clear. The fact that two of the people on this list, Dionysius and Theodorus, have a clear connection with Tragedy again seems rather odd if this is not in fact the famous tragedian Euripides, but one cannot be sure. Implying that Euripides was a heavy-drinking brawler does not sound unlike a comedian.

Euripides is also mentioned in a fragment of Philemon, whom the Anonymous places among the most noteworthy poets of New Comedy. Philemon was from Syracuse (The Suda, Anonymous, and IG II² 1221), or Soli in Cilicia (Strabo 14.671). The sources

42 Athenaeus XI.482 BC [Kassel and Austin, PCG vol. V, Ephippus, fr. 9]: οὐ κύλικας ἐπὶ τὰ δείπνα Χαιρήμων φέρει; / οὐ κυμβίοις πεπολέμηκτ' Εὐριπίδης;
43 A. Meineke, Fragmenta Comicorum Graecorum (hereafter, Meineke, FCG) too feels that this must be the tragedian Chaeremon, which probably means it is the tragedian Euripides.
44 Athenaeus XI.482 D [Kassel and Austin, PCG vol. V, Ephippus, fr. 16]: Διονυσίου δὲ δράματ' ἐκμαθεῖν δέοι / καὶ Νημοφώντος ἀττ' ἐποίησαν εἰς Κότυν, / ῥήσεις τε κατὰ δείπνον Θεόδωρος μοι λέγοι, / Λάχητι τ' οἰκήσαι μι τὴν εξῆς δύραν, / κυμβία τε παρέχωμ' ἔστιτων Εὐριπίδης.
45 Aelian V.H. 13.18.
46 cf. Aristotle Pol. 7.17.

43
vary about his date of death and the exact number of years he lived (97, 99, or 101 years),
but they all agree that he was around a hundred when he died, and that he died sometime
between 267 and 263 B.C. This places his birth sometime between 368 and 360 B.C. At
any rate, he was an Athenian citizen by 307/6 (IG II² 3073), and according to the Marmor
Parium (B 7), his first victory at the City Dionysia was in 327. We also know that he won
three times at the Lenaea (IG II² 2325,161). He is said to have written 97 comedies
(Anonymous), of which over sixty titles survive. Of these known titles, only two imply
tragic/mythological burlesque (Μυρμιδόνες. Πολεμικές), and this along with the
evidence of Menander, suggests that burlesque had run its course and was becoming ever
less popular. In one of his plays whose title is not known, a character who seems to be
infatuated with Euripides\(^{47}\) says, "If in truth the dead had the power of perception, as some
say, I would have hanged myself to see Euripides."\(^{48}\) Again, this implies that Euripides
was reckoned a classic.

Finally Diphilus also makes mention of Euripides. The Anonymous tells us that he
produced his plays (numbering a hundred) around the same time as Menander, and that he,
along with Philemon and Menander, were the most noteworthy proponents of New
Comedy. It also says that he died in Smyrna.\(^{49}\) His family's burial stele is known, and
the lettering of his entry dates to about the beginning of the third century.\(^{50}\) He is recorded
at IG II² 2325,163 as having won three times at the Lenaea. About sixty titles of his plays
are known, with at least five suggesting tragic/mythological burlesque. Only Euripides,
however, is echoed or mentioned in the surviving fragments. In his Synoris (the name of a

\(^{47}\)Compare below the plays written by both Axionicus and Philippides entitled The Lover of
Euripides.

\(^{48}\)Vita Eurip. in Dindorfii Schol. Eurip. 7.10.13 [Kassel and Austin, PCG vol. VII, Philemo, fr.
118]: εἰ ταῖς Ἀλκετίαιασι οἱ τενχηκότες // αὐτησιν εἶχον. ἀνδρεῖς. ὡς φασίν τινες. //
ἀπεγφάμην ἀν ὡστ' ἱδεῖν Εὐριπίδην.

\(^{49}\)Anonymous de Comoedia [Kaibel, CGF pp. 9-10].

\(^{50}\)IG II² 10321: Δίον Διώδώρου / Σινωπείς. / Διφίλος Δίωνος / Σινωπείς. / ᾽Ηδύλη
/ Διώδωρος / Δίωνος / Σιμαχίδης.
hetaira), he has the following exchange between two courtesans, where one is tossing dice:

{A} "I wonder how I might toss a Euripides?" {B} "Euripides would never save a woman. Haven't you seen in his tragedies how he hates them?" This passage also indicates that Euripides plays were being restaged, and hence classics.

From the preceding survey, some patterns emerge. In the earlier periods, for the most part comic poets criticized contemporary tragedians such as Gnesippus and Acestor. These criticisms were not aimed at Tragedy, but rather a specific tragedian, and as such are indicative of the fact that Tragedy was seen as a living voice in the polis that mattered. As time moved forward, Euripides became the favored tragic poet to mention rather than criticize, but now he and Tragedy had become classic entertainment and were no longer a flourishing poetic.

Category 4: Parody: a) text, b) motif, convention, or topos, c) visual

Of all the categories in this study, the parody-group is the most prevalent in Aristophanes and other writers, and so for the purpose of analysis a clearer definition of this word is desirable. As we saw in the previous chapter, an exact definition of the παρόδον-terior-group53 of words in antiquity is lacking because it had a wide range of applications then just as it does today. One way of surmising the original use of the term

51 Athenaeus VI.247 A [Kassel and Austin, PCG vol. V, Diphilus, fr. 74, 3-5]: {B} πώς ἀν βάλλω; Εὐριπίδης; {A} οὐκ ἀν ποτὲ / Εὐριπίδης γυναῖκα σώσει. οὐχ ὅρας ἐν ταῖς τραγῳδίαις αὐτῶς ὡς στυγεῖ; Athenaeus explains how a roll of the dice was called a "Euripides," using this passage as his evidence.


53 By this I mean παρόδον and its kindred forms παροδέω, παροδία, παροδός, and παροδιτήτον.
παρωδή is to analyze its etymology. παρωδή is a compound word comprised of the preposition παρά and the noun ϕωδή. ϕωδή is the contracted form of αὐτῷ, meaning song, lay, or ode. It has particular associations with epic poetry, where most notably its verbal form, ἄειδεων (to sing or chant), appears as the second word in Homer’s Ιliad, and its noun form, ἄοιδος is used throughout Homer’s epics as the word for singers. παρά is a less straightforward word to define. It possesses meanings that push and pull in two different directions. At times it positively expresses such ideas as nearness and agreement, while at other times it negatively emphasizes the remaining differences and hence opposition. In other words, we might say that conceptually it expresses closeness, but sometimes that closeness isn’t close enough, or it is too close for comfort. When we combine παρά and ϕωδή we then come up with "near, but different than the (epic) song." With the παρατραγωδεω-group on analogy we have "near, but different than Tragedy."

Given the connection of ϕωδή with epic, it seems reasonable to conclude that the παρωδή-group of words was first applied to epic, and in fact the earliest extant instance of the word occurs in Aristotle and probably refers to epic parody, when he says, "Homer represented superior men, Cleophon men like us, and Hegemon the Thasian (who was the first to write parodies) and Nicochares (the author of the Delias) inferior men."54

Hegemon is mentioned by Athenaeus, who quotes Polemon as saying that "the first to enter the contests of the stage was Hegemon, and at Athens he won with other parodies, but especially noteworthy is his Gigantomachy."55 Assuming Hegemon's other plays were on epic themes similar to that of the battle of the giants, then it is safe to conclude that Aristotle's mention of Hegemon refers to his parody of epic. Aristotle's statement that

54 Poetics, 1448a 11-14: "Ομηρος μὲν βελτίους, Κλεοφόν δὲ όμοιοὺς. Ἡγήμων δὲ Θάσιος (ὁ τὰς παρωδίας ποιήσας πρῶτος καὶ Νικοχάρης ὁ τὴν Δειλιάδα χείρους.
55 Athenaeus XV.699 A: τούτων δὲ πρῶτος εἰσῆλθεν εἰς τοὺς ἄγωνας τοὺς θυμελικοὺς Ἡγήμων καὶ παρ᾽ Ἄθηναίοις ἐνίκησεν ἄλλας τε παρωδίας καὶ τῇ Γιγαντομαχίᾳ.
Hegemon was the first to write parodies is, however, misleading; he was not the first to write parody, but, if we may trust Polemon as quoted by Athenaeus, he was only the first to compete on stage with his parodies. This same passage of Athenaeus credits Hipponax as the inventor of parody, and quotes his famous conflation of passages from the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, "Tell me, Muse, of the son of Eurymedon, that sea-sized maelstrom, belly-dagger man, who eats with no decorum, and how by stoning that foul man will foully perish in accordance with the people’s will by the strand of the barren sea." The only extended example of this type of writing that is extant is the *Battle of Mice and Frogs*, which is actually closer to what is called a burlesque in this study. Thus the etymological argument combined with the evidence of Hipponax and Hegemon, who are both credited with firsts in parody that involve epic, seem to indicate that the term parody was first applied in relationship to epic poetry, and this relationship required the audience to notice similar and disparate elements with the original author’s text being parodied. Later, the meaning was extended to cover other forms of verse composition, most notably Tragedy, and ultimately it was extended by the rhetoricians to include prose. Perhaps some purists felt that the force of the παρωδή-group of words was too closely associated with epic, and hence a separate παρατραγωδεώ- group was created to accommodate Tragedy. At any rate, both the παρωδή-group and the παρατραγωδεώ-group were eventually applied by the ancients to describe certain tragic passages in comedy.

In my discussion of παρωδή and παρατραγωδεώ I have not yet dealt with the issue of their connection with humor. In other words, in antiquity did the terms παρωδή and παρατραγωδεώ suggest an attempt at humor as the word "parody" does today? 

---

ἐνεφό, ὅπως υφίσταντι κακοὶ, κακοὶ οἴτον τληται, / βουλῇ δημοσίᾳ παρά θείν, ἀλὸς 
ἀτρυγέςιον.

57 Webster's New Universal Unabridged Dictionary, 2nd edition defines parody as "literary or musical composition imitating the characteristic style of some other work or of a writer or composer, but treating a serious subject in a nonsensical manner in an attempt at humor or ridicule."
In looking at the evidence it seems safe to conclude that it usually did. For instance we have already seen the earliest extant usage of it in Aristotle being applied to Hegemon and his mock-epics that were performed at festivals, and these were certainly meant to be humorous. The quote of Hipponax above is also humorous. The *Suda* connects παρωδία with comedy by its very definition of the former: "Thus it is said when speech is transferred from Tragedy into comedy." The scholiast on Aristophanes' *Acharnians* 8 uses wording almost identical to that of the *Suda*. Hesychius' entry under παρωδούντες, which he defines as παρατραγωδούντες, implies virtually the same thing. In the case of παρωδία, the degree of humor is not always easy to gauge, and sometimes the idea in English may be better translated as "wit," "pun," or "irony." For instance, Hermogenes uses the phrase τὸ κατὰ παρωδίαν σχήμα -- which as Lelièvre correctly points out is not the same as παρωδία alone -- for substituting a word with some other word similar in sound for comic effect, which is what we would call a "pun." The only use of the παρωδή-group that does not necessarily imply humor is its specialized use by rhetoricians. In Hermogenes, the phrase κατὰ παρωδίαν refers to the rhetorical device of quoting part of a verse and then completing it with a prose paraphrase or creating a hybrid by introducing one's own material into the verse. Often the speaker aims at wit, but frequently there is no humorous intention -- an orator merely wishes to appropriate poetic material for his own serious purposes while flaunting his own learnedness. Further examples of the non-humorous use of παρωδία may be found in the *Thesaurus* (s.v. παρωδέω, etc.), and in Householder, who defines this use as, "verse quotation with partial paraphrase: loosely paraphrased quotation or reminiscence from prose or verse."

---

58 οὔτω λέγεται ὅταν ἐκ τραγωδίας μετευκρήθη ὁ λόγος εἰς κωμωδίαν
60 ΤΕΡΙ ΜΕΘΟΔΟΥ ΔΕΙΩΤΙΤΟΣ 30
Another issue which must be addressed is the idea of criticism of the original. When someone parodies another work or author does it signal criticism or not? The answer, of course, depends on the individual passage. Again, we lack a context for the majority of the authors, but some passing comments may be made about the evidence. For instance, Hipponax' and Hegemon's parodies of Homeric style were almost certainly not critical of Homer. Rather they used Homeric style to criticize some other subject matter, such as Hipponax' criticisms of the son of Eurymedon. In fact, it is safe to say that writers such as Hipponax and Hegemon were great admirers of Homer who exploited his style for their own purposes. Likewise, most of Aristophanes' parodies of Euripides in the Thesmophoriazusae and elsewhere are not merely critical of Euripides. In many ways parody upholds the original, for it is an admission that a particular poet has written or staged a memorable passage or scene, one to which the audience can connect. Parody is thus parasitic or symbiotic, and can frequently be a tip of the hat to the original. In fact, the scholiast to Plato's Apology who reports Carcinus' lines mentioned above, "overly subtle, maxim-chasing, Euripidaristophanizer!," adds that Aristophanes himself was the butt of jokes, because although he ridiculed Euripides, he imitated him. Thus parody owes a great debt to its model, and implicitly acknowledges that debt.

a). Text-Parody

For text-parody of Tragedy, we begin with Cratinus, who parodied a scene from Euripides' Stheneboea. Evidently there was a custom that when meat falls on the floor, it was thought to belong to the dead, and so when Stheneboea is dining and some meat falls on the floor, because she believes Bellerophon is dead, Athenaeus tells us she calls out that the meat is, "for the Corinthian stranger [Bellerophon]." Hesychius also relates that when

---

62 Scholiast on Plato Apology, 19c [Kassel and Austin, PCG vol. IV, Cratinus fr. 342]: 'Αριστοφάνης ὁ κωμωδιτοποιός...ἐκκειμανίεται δ' ἐπὶ τὸν σκόττεσσι μὲν Ἐυριπίδην, μιμεῖται δ' αὐτὸν. Κρατίνος τῇ δ’ εἰς κωμῳδὶς τὴν ὑπόλεπτολογομοί, γνωμοδικίκτης, ἐν αὐτῷ ἑρωτοκρατοῦσιν.

63 For Cratinus' dates, see above under category 3.

49
playing the game cottaöbus, participants would toss their latages (drops left over in the bottom of the cup) into a basin, and shout "for the Corinthian stranger," in imitation of Stheneboea. It is to the Stheneboea of Euripides that a fragment from an unknown play of Cratinus' must refer, when someone says, "when she drinks by the handle, names [lacuna], and hurls the latages for the Corinthian prick." There is only one more interesting comment that explicitly connects Cratinus with Tragedy. The Anonymous says, "He was very poetical, and he composed in the manner of Aeschylus." One must wonder whether the Anonymous has it wrong and that instead he parodied Aeschylean style. He was known to have written a play called the Archilochicans, which probably contained numerous parodies of Archilochus' forceful style.

The Old Comic poet Pherocrates also parodies Tragedy. The date of his first victory is unknown, but we know that he produced his Savages (*Αγριοι) in the archonship of Aristion (420 B.C.). From an unknown play one reads ζ ἐφυθόταυς βοτρύχοις κοιμῶν, which is probably a parody of words at Bacchae 235, where it is

---

64Hesychius (κ 3629 Κορινθιος ξένος): ἐπὶ τῶν τὰς λάταγας ῥιπτούντων. ἀπὸ τῆς παρ' Εὐριπίδη Σθενεβοιας τῷ Βελλεροφώντι ἀποχευούσης.

65Athenaeus Epitome XI 782 D [Kassel and Austin, PCG vol. IV, Cratinus, fr. 299, 3-4]: πίνουσον ἀπ' ἀγκύλης ἐπονομάζουσα <χ> / ὠς λάταγας τῷ Κορινθίῳ πέει. Kaibel comments on this fragment that "quaer cum Stheneboeac cotubo ludentem non sane fecerit Euripides, ad Cratini parodiampertinent."

66Kassel and Austin, PCG, Cratinus, fragments 118 and 246 may be parodies of unknown tragedies.

67Anonymous de Comoedia [Kaibel, CGF p. 7, no. 6]: γέγονε δὲ ποιητικῶτατος. κατασκευάζων εἰς τὸν Αἰσχύλου χαρακτήρα.

68Unfortunately the Anonymous' notice on him is muddled. It reads, "Pherocrates the Athenian was victorious in the theater(?) . Although he was Crates' actor, he rivaled him. Furthermore, he refrained from abuse, and gained a reputation for introducing new material; he was an inventor of plots." (de Comoedia [Kaibel, CGF p. 8, 8]: Φερεκράτης Ἀθηναῖος νικᾷ ἐπί θεάτρου. γενόμενος δὲ ὑποκριτῆς ἔξαλλος Κράτητα καὶ αὐ τοῦ μὲν λοιδορεῖν ἀπέστη, πράγματα δὲ εἰσηγούμενος καὶ θύσκειμε, γενόμενος εὔρητικός μύθων. There is a problem with the reading ἐπί θεάτρου. Dobree emends it to ἐπὶ Θεοῦδωρου, i.e. "in the archonship of Theodorus" (437 B.C.). Capps (AJP 28 (1907): 197 ff.) prefers ἐπὶ Πυθόδωρου (431 B.C.).

69Athenaeus V.218 D: ἐδίδαχθεν δὲ ὁ Αγριοι ἐπὶ Ἀριστικῶς ἄρχουσι.

70"O thou who dost plume thyself with golden peduncles!"
said of Dionysus that he has ξυνθοις βοστρύχοις ευσίμων κόμην.71 Presumably the context in which it was quoted was not suitable to the original and hence it was meant to be humorous.

Echoes of Sophocles appear in Eupolis.72 Sophocles' "for mortals, everything is deniable under oath"73 appears in altered form in the Cities, where a fragment reads "For the Athenians, what deed is not deniable under oath?"74 Another verse of Sophocles is parodied in his Prospaltians (Προσπάλτιοι -- a deme in the tribe of Acamantis). The papyrus is fragmentary, but reads, "Have you not seen by the streams whenever ... if anyone yields to arguments he is saved, but the resistant one is destroyed root and branch?,"75 which is a parody of Haemon's famous and, as we shall see, oft-parodied words to his father Creon in the Antigone, "Have you not seen by the winter-swollen streams the trees that yield save even their twigs, but the resistant perish root and branch?"76 With an echo of Aeschylus in his Maricas (Μαρίκας -- "a barbarian boy's nickname," according to Hesychius), Eupolis borrows from the first of the three great tragedians. This play was produced in 421 B.C. as an attack on the demagogue Hyperbolus, who is satirized under the guise of the barbarian name Maricas, just as Cleon is called the "Paphlagonian" in Aristophanes' Knights.77 Hyperbolus' hubris is evidently equated with Xerxes' and the Persian army's, for Eupolis parodies a line from Aeschylus'

71 "yellow locks of hair fragrant with perfume." No suitable English play on words seemed possible.
72 For his dates, see under category 3 above.
73 Antigone 388: βοστρύχοις οὐδέν εστι· ἀπωμοτον.
74 Photius (z) α 2758 [Kassel and Austin, PCG vol. V, Eupolis, fr. 234]: τι δ' ἔστι· Ἀθηναίοις πράγμα ἀπώμοτον;
75 Austin, CGFPR 97 [Kassel and Austin, PCG vol. V, Eupolis, fr. 260,23-25]: ὥρας παρά στρατην ὀταν ἓ...δε [ ] δὲ ἕκας οὖς ἐκαθορίζεται, ἂν δ' ἀντιτείνων αὐτότρεμοι οὐχὶ θεταί].
76 Antigone 712-714: ὥρας παρά στρατην: χειμάρροις ὦς / κλώνας ὦς ἐκαθορίζεται, / τὰ δ' ἀντιτείνουτ' αὐτότρεμον ἀπόλλυσαν. Antiphanes also parodies this line, see below [Kassel and Austin, PCG vol. II, Antiphanes, fr. 228].
77 Quintilian I, X, 18: Marcuius, qui est Hyperbolus, nihil se ex musicis scire nisi litteras conficietur. Cf. Knights, 188 ff.
Persae (65) that referred to that paragon of hubris: "The destroyer of cities, Maricas, has already made the crossing." Dinsdorf thought that a fragment from Eupolis' Cities, which reads "Hierocles, best lord of oracles," was a parody of Aeschylus' "Eteocles, bravest lord of the Cadmei," but this is not certain. In one of Eupolis' finest plays the Demes (Δήμος), we find the recurring comic motif of someone who is forlorn over Athens' plight bring back from the dead great figures from the past (see category five below). Who these figures were is a bit garbled by the ancient sources, but it seems none were tragedians. The Scholiast on Aristides says that, "Eupolis had Miltiades, Aristides, Gelon, and Pericles rise from the dead." The Scholiast at Acharnians 64 claims that, "Eupolis in his Demes brings on stage Pisistratus as king." Galen says that Nicias was also in the play and conversed with Pericles. Plutarch reports that the worthies were all statesmen, Pericles was among them, and that Myronides (or Pyronides) conversed with Pericles about his son who was still alive. One extant passage reads, "[when] the two of you, you and Solon, were governing..." Based upon this, Norwood conjectures that Solon should be read in the Scholiast on Aristides instead of Gelon, who has no obvious

---


79 Schol. vel. (Vf) et Tricl. (Lh) Aristophanes Peace 1046 [Kassel and Austin, PCG vol. V, Eupolis, fr. 231]: ἱερόκλεες, βέλτιστε χρησιμοδότων ἀναξε.

80 Seven Against Thebes 39: Ἕτεοκλεῖς, φέροντε Καδμείδων ἁναξε.

81 Scholiast to Aelius Aristides Or. III p. 672,5 [=Kassel and Austin, PCG vol. V, p. 342 Demoi testimonia *i]: Εὐπολίς ἐποίησεν ἀναστάντα τῶν Μιλτιάδην καὶ Ἀριστείδην καὶ Γέλωνα καὶ Περικλέα.

82 Εὐπολίς ἐν Δήμοις εἰσάγει τὸν Πεισιστράτου βασιλέα. I cannot agree with Norwood (Greek Comedy p.181, n.1) that the scholiast here, "means merely that Eupolis called P. a king." The verb εἰσάγει is a technical term of the stage and it is hard to believe that the Scholiast did not know how to use it.


84 In Pericles, XXIV.

85 Wilamowitz-Moellendorff [Hermes 54 (1919), 69] asserts that Μυρωνίδην is merely a "Byzantine conjecture" for Πυρωνίδην. By a strange coincidence, the first letter of the name is illegible in the two places it occurs on the Papyri.

86 Austin, CGFR 92, line 47 [Kassel and Austin, PCG vol. V, Eupolis, fr. 99, line 47]: ήρχετον σὺ καὶ Ὁλων.
connection to Athenian affairs, but perhaps this is just a nasty joke about someone's age.
If this quote isn't a joke, then it brings up another problem: one of Solon's contemporaries, or at least an early statesman, may have also been involved, but who that could have been is anybody's guess. At any rate, at some point it appears that Aristides protests to a sycophant[^7] and quotes Euripides, "Why don't you let the dead be dead?"[^8] The character of Aristides also makes use of another line from Euripides when he says, "Verily I swear by Marathon, by my battle, that no man shall grieve my heart and rejoice,"[^9] which is a parody of Medea's "Verily I swear by my mistress, whom I revere most of all and have chosen as my partner, Hecate, who has her home in the recess of my hearth, that no man shall grieve my heart and rejoice."[^9] In his Draft-Dodgers (Ἀστράτευτοι), there occurs a tantalizing fragment taken in part from Sophocles: "... lest I should ever rear in the house of Persephone a peacock like that which roises the sleepers."[^11] Sophocles' fragment reads, "the songs of the weaver's shuttle, which roises the sleepers."[^12]

Other old comic poets who parody Tragedy include Archippus, who was victorious at the City Dionysia in 415 B.C. (the Suda). Of the six known titles of plays by him, two

[^7]: Page (as quoted by Austin, CGFPR p.90, lines 78-120) says of this scene: "A Sycophant comes to Aristides for justice. His story is: He saw an Epidaurian in the street with barley-crumbs sticking to his beard. That suggested that he had been sacrilegiously drinking the Sacred Soup of the Eleusinian Mysteries. The Sycophant blackmailed him for a large sum. What happened next is obscure. But it seems clear enough that the Sycophant subsequently suffered some ill treatment at the hands of the Epidaurian, and appealed to Aristides for justice. But Aristides declined to take his part. Indeed he dealt with him severely; and warned the city that Justice was their most important virtue."

[^8]: Austin, CGFPR 92 [Kassel and Austin, PCG vol. V, Eupolis, fr. 99, line 102]: Ἀριστείδης ἐν τῷ Ἀττικῷ ἰσότατος ὦ ἢ ἦς τῆς τάφρας καὶ συντάξεως τῶν καὶ τῶν τελειώσεως τῶν τῆς Βηστίνης ἡμῶν. Προέρχεται ἂν ὑπήρξει τῷ Ἀριστείδῃ, τῷ ὑπὲρ Καρκασίου προστάτης τῶν τῆς Βηστίνης ἡμῶν, τῷ μέγας ἐν τῷ Ἀττικῷ ἰσότατος ὡς ὑπήρξει τῷ Ἀριστείδῃ, τῷ μέγας ἐν τῷ Ἀττικῷ ἰσότατος τῆς Βηστίνης ἡμῶν.


[^10]: Euripides, Medea 395-8: οὗ γὰρ μὲ τὴν δέσποιναν ἡ ἐγὼ αἶδο / μέλλωτα πάντων και ἐυνεργόν εἰλόμην, / ἐκάτην, μυχὸς ναίσουσαν ἐστίας ἐμῆς. / χαίρων τις αὐτῶν τοίμους ἀλλιγμεῖ κέαρ.


suggest mythological/tragic burlesque (Amphitryon and Marriage of Heracles). In a fragment from an unknown play we find written, "Persuasion had no altar or fire, neither among women nor in the nature of man." This seems to be an echo of a fragment of Euripides, which reads "There is no other temple of Persuasion except speech, and her altar is in mankind's nature."

Strattis parodies the prologue of Euripides' Hypsipyle  in his Phoenician Women (Φοινικαί Αήτες), with the following fragment, "I Dionysus, who with thyrsi...met through the wickedness of others, have come hung up like a fig upon a twig." In this same play he has the character Jocasta say, "I want to give both of you some wise advice; whenever you boil lentil-soup, don't pour in perfume," which is a parody of Euripides' own Phoenician Women where Jocasta says to her children, "I want to give both of you some wise advice; whenever some friend..."

In Antiphanes, there are several parodies that seem to be much like what we have seen in Old Comedy. In his Rustic ("Αγροκόσμος) he borrows some lines from an unknown play of Sophocles that are incongruous with the culinary context: (A): "And first of all I take the longed-for barley-cake, 'which life-giving Deo bestows as a beloved boon to mortals.' Then the 'tenderly stewed limbs of goats newly born with flesh wrapped in..."
green herbs." (B): "What are you saying?" (A): "I'm reciting from a tragedy of Sophocles." In another unknown play, Antiphanes parodies the same lines in Sophocles' *Antigone* that we saw above in Eupolis. This time the context is that of drinking wine: "I am talking about drinking. Have you not seen by the winter-swollen streams the trees that are ever night and day watered, how they grow tall and fair, but the ones that resist {as if with some thirst or desiccation} perish root and branch." Another fragment from an unknown play seems to be an echo of another line from Sophocles' *Antigone*, where Creon says to Tiresias, "Even very clever mortals fall a shameful fall, whenever they skillfully plead a specious case for the sake of profit." Antiphanes has, "How wretched those for whom for the sake of profit the shameful seems preferable to the good." In what appears to be from the opening lines of his *Aeolus*, Antiphanes probably parodies the opening of Euripides' play of the same name, saying "Macareus, smitten with passion for one of his siblings, for a time controlled his burden and repressed himself; but then he took wine for his general -- which alone leads out mortals' recklessness ahead of their prudence, and arising at night he achieved his desire." The

---

101 Athenaeus IX.396 B [Kassel and Austin, *PCG* vol. II, Antiphanes, fr. 1]: (A.) καὶ πρῶτα μὲν / ἀγων ποθεὶν ὑάζαν, ἥν φερέσθησι / Δημός βροταίς χάρισ δωρεῖται σιλήν. Ἐπείτα πινοῦν ταχερά μηκάδων μέλη, / χλόῃ καταμπέσουν σάρκα νεογενῆ. (B.) 'ί λέγεις; (A.) τραγῳδοῦν περαικὺ Σοφοκλέους. Nauck (TGF fr. 294) thought these lines were borrowed directly from Sophocles, but they may be some kind of comic conflation. Kock (CAF fr. 1) thinks that these lines must belong to the younger Sophocles, but I side with Nauck in assigning them to the elder poet. All of the identifiable comic quotes from the middle and new periods are from the three most famous tragedians, with the exception of a few of Davus' quotes in Menander's *Aspis*.

102 Athenaeus Epitome 1.22 F [Kassel and Austin, *PCG* vol. II, Antiphanes, fr. 228]: τὸ πίνειν φθείρε ἑγὼ. / ὅρας παρά ῥείθροις χειμάρροις δάσα / δένδραν αἳ τὴν νύκτα καὶ τὴν ἡμέραν / βρέχεται. μέγεθος καὶ κάλλος οἷά γίγνεται. / τὰ δὲ ἀντιτείνουσα ίσονελ δίμαν τινὰ / ἡ ἔρεσιν ἔχουν· αὐτόπρεμω ἀπόλλυται.

103 *Antigone* 1045-47: πίτπουσι δ', ὃ γεραιὲς Τειρεσία, βροτῶν / χοί πολλὰ δεινοί πτώματ' αἰχμῆ, ὅταν λόγους / αἰκόρας καλὸς λέγωσιν τοῦ κέρδους χάριν.

104 Athenaeus Epitome II.71 E [Kassel and Austin, *PCG* vol. II, Antiphanes, fr. 244, lines 1-2]: ως δυστυχεῖς, ἀδικοὶ τοῦ κέρδους χάριν / ἐπιτρέπομεν τάσιχρα φαιν' εἰς τῶν καλῶν.

argument to Euripides' *Aeolus* reads, "Macareus was smitten with a love for one of his sisters and raped her."\(^{106}\) In another fragment, the words of Heracles in Euripides' *Alcestis* "since we are mortal, our thoughts should be mortal too,"\(^{107}\) which are spoken to a servant so sullen with grief that he has neglected his duty to serve wine to his guest, are echoed in a fragment of Antiphanes from an unknown play: "If you are mortal, good sir, think also mortal thoughts."\(^{108}\) The original context suggests that Antiphanes applied it to a drinking situation in his own play for comic effect. In another fragment with a drinking context from Antiphanes' *The Wounded Man* (Τραυματίας), Euripides is parodied again: (A) "Let us not keep quaffing full cups, but let a bit of reason be drawn in, and a bit of song, and let some turns of thought pass by. Verily, sweet is a change of every task but one [lacuna] then hand to me the limb-strengthener (τὸν ἄρκεσίγυιον), as Euripides calls it." (B) "Euripides called it *that*?" (A) "Who else then?" (B) "Why, Philoxenus of course." (A) "There isn't a bit of difference, good sir. You correct me over a mere syllable?"\(^{109}\) The first part, "sweet is a change of every task" is a parody of *Orestes* 234.\(^{110}\) It isn't clear, however, whether Euripides' or Philoxenus' "limb-strengthener" is being parodied.\(^{111}\) Kock believes that the passage can be understood if Euripides had called wine τὸν ἄρκεσίγυιον or perhaps ἄρσιγυιον, and some other poet applied the epithet in


\(^{107}\) Euripides, *Alcestis* 799: ὄφθαλμος ὑμῶν θυμίατα καὶ φρονεῖν χρεών.


\(^{109}\) Athenaeus X.446 A [Kassel and Austin, *PCG* vol. II, Antiphanes, fr.205]: (A) μὴ μεστὰς ἁπὲς ἐλκομεν. ἀλλά καὶ λογισμὸς εἰς μέσον / παταξάτω τις. καὶ τι καὶ μελίακιον. / στροφὴ λόγων παρελθέτοι τις. ἤδι τοι / ἐτιν μεταβολὴ παντὸς ἔργου πλὴν ἐνὸς / ὁ παραδίδου δ' ἐξῆς ὑμοί / τὸν ἄρκονΤυον, ὡς ἕφασκ' Ἐυρίπιδης. / (B) Ἐυρίπιδης γὰρ τοῦτ' ἕφασκεν: (A) ἀλλὰ τις; / (B) Φιλόξενος δὴπουθεν. (A) οὔθεν διαφέρει. / ὁ τῶν ἐλέγχεις μ' ἕνεκα συλλαβῆς μίας.

\(^{110}\) At Euripides, *Orestes* line 234, Electra says, μεταβολὴ πάντων γλυκύ.

\(^{111}\) Nauck, *TGF* notes, "dubitari potest utrum Philoxeni (PMG 832) habeamus vocabulum an Euripidis."
a context so alien to Euripides' poem that it seemed worthy of Philoxenus.\footnote{Kock, CAF Antiphanes 207: "mihi Antipanes ita demum intellegi posse videitur, si Euripides re vera vinum, in cantico puto, tōn ἄρκεαλγυνον (fort. ἄρκεαλγυνον) dixit. id epitheton alter tam alienum ducit poesi Euripidea, ut Philoxeno potius dignum iudicet."} In another fragment from an unknown play of Antiphanes that reads, "Cypris resides in satiety, and Aphrodite is not present among mortals who do ill,"\footnote{Athenaeus Epitome 1.28 F [Kassel and Austin, PCG vol. II, Antiphanes, fr.238, lines 3-4]: ἐν πλησιμνη γὰρ Κύπρις, ἐν δὲ τὸις κακῶις / πράσασαυιν οὐκ ἐνεστὼν Ἀφροδίτη βροτοῖς.} we find an echo of Euripides' "Cypris resides in satiety, not among the hungry."\footnote{Euripides, Andromache 368: ἐν δὲ ἵσθι, ὅτου τις τυγχάναι χρείαν ἔχουν, / τοῦτ' ἐσθ' ἐκάστῳ μείζου ἢ Τροιαν ἐλεῖν.} Eubulus, according to the \textit{Suda}, "produced 104 plays and flourished around the 101st Olympiad (a. 376/2), lying between Middle Comedy and Old Comedy."\footnote{The Suda ε 3386: ἐδιδαξε δράματα ρή/. ἢν δὲ κατὰ τὴν ρα' ὀλυμπιάδα, μεθόριος τῆς μέσης κωμωδίας καὶ τῆς παλαιᾶς. \cf{Herodian I, 273, 31}} We have fifty-eight titles of his plays, half of which indicate mythological/tragic burlesque. In fact, ten or eleven titles of his plays are identical with those of Euripides (Ἀντιόπη, Αὐγή, Βελλεροφόντης, Δανάη, Ἰχών, Μήδεια, Μυσόι(?), ጡίδιτος, Οἰνόμας, and Φοῖνιξ), while another eight match the titles of other tragedians. Given Eubulus' affinity for Euripidean titles, it is not surprising to find many instances of Euripidean parody. In his play \textit{Amaltheia} (the name of the goat that suckled Zeus; her horn symbolizes the horn of plenty and Heracles is said to have stolen it and from it lived well\footnote{Euripides, Nauck TGF 895: ἐν πλησιμνῆι τοι Κύπρις. ἐν πεινὸντι δ' ὦ.} ), Heracles says of food, "Whether it be hotter or crispier or something in between, this is, for each man, more important than the capture of Troy."\footnote{Herodian I, 273, 31} This is a parody of Euripides' \textit{Andromache} 368, where Menelaus is threatening to kill Andromache's son unless she gives herself up, saying "But know well, whatever anyone happens to have need of, this is, for each man, more important than the capture of Troy.\footnote{Euripides, Andromache 368: εὖ δ' ἵσθι, ὅτου τις τυγχάναι χρείαν ἔχουν, / τοῦτ' ἐσθ' ἐκάστῳ μείζου ἢ Τροιαν ἐλεῖν.} " In his \textit{Auge}, Eubulus again
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\item Kock, CAF Antiphanes 207: "mihi Antipanes ita demum intellegi posse videitur, si Euripides re vera vinum, in cantico puto, τὸν ἄρκεαλγυνον (fort. ἄρκεαλγυνον) dixit. id epitheton alter tam alienum ducit poesi Euripidea, ut Philoxeno potius dignum iudicet."
\item Athenaeus Epitome I.28 F [Kassel and Austin, PCG vol. II, Antiphanes, fr.238, lines 3-4]: ἐν πλησιμνη γὰρ Κύπρις, ἐν δὲ τοῖς κακῶις / πράσασαυιν οὐκ ἐνεστὼν Ἀφροδίτη βροτοῖς.
\item Euripides, Nauck TGF 895: ἐν πλησιμνη τοι Κύπρις. ἐν πεινὸντι δ' οὐ.
\item The Suda ε 3386: ἐδιδαξε δράματα ρή/. ἢν δὲ κατὰ τὴν ρα' ὀλυμπιάδα, μεθόριος τῆς μέσης κωμωδίας καὶ τῆς παλαιᾶς.
\item cf. Herodian I, 273, 31
\item Athenaeus II.63 D [Kassel and Austin PCG vol. V, Eubulus, fr. 6]: θερμότερον ἢ κραυρότερον ἢ μέδος ἔχου / τοῦτ' ἐσθ' ἐκάστῳ μείζου ἢ Τροιαν ἐλεῖν.
\item Euripides, Andromache 368: εὖ δ' ἵσθι, ὅτου τις τυγχάναι χρείαν ἔχουν, / τοῦτ' ἐσθ' ἐκάστῳ μείζου ἢ Τροιαν ἐλεῖν.
\end{thebibliography}
borrows from Euripides with lines spoken by someone who is advising another person to hurry inside to get some food with the following words, "Hurry! Hurry! Lest like the wolf who once gaped but missed that too, you later bite yourself."

In his own *Medea*, Eubulus has an echo from Euripides' *Orestes*, with the following quote spoken of eels:

"Clothed in beets, Boeotian virgin of the Copaic Lake; for I demur at calling a goddess by name." In his *Nannion*, a character is speaking of the dangers of men who seek illicit affairs with other men's wives. In the course of listing these dangers he advises one to pay for a prostitute instead, saying, "Let him purchase his pleasure for a small coin, and not pursue furtive Pleasure -- the most ignominious of all maladies -- for the sake of pride, not desire. I for my part groan for ill-fated Greece..." The last sentence is a verse spoken verbatim by Menelaus in his dispute with Agamemnon at Euripides' *Iphigenia at Aulis* 370. The "furtive Pleasure" is an echo of a fragment from another play by Euripides. Finally, there is a fragment from Eubulus' *Orthannes*. Someone speaks of food, saying, "And likewise calamary and the maid of Phalerum, wedded with the entrails of lambs, leap and dance like a foal out from under the yoke." The last clause is a combination of Euripidean passages, most notably *Orestes* 45.

---

119 Athenaeus XIV.622 E [Kassel and Austin, *PCG* vol. V, Eubulus, fr.14 = Kock, *CAF*, Euboulos 15, 11-12]: ἔπειε’ ἔπειενε, μὴ ποθε’ ὡς λύκος χαυνῶν / καὶ τοῦθ’ ἀμαρτῶν ύπερον ἄκυρον ὤμου δραχμῆς †. There is a textual problem at the end, which Kock renders σαυτὸν δάκηνις after Aristophanes' *Wasps* 778; I follow his suggestion. Compare Euripides' *Phoenissae* 1280 (ἔπειε οὕσαν, θύγατηρ).

120 Athenaeus VII.300 B [Kassel and Austin, *PCG* vol. V, Eubulus, fr. 64]: Τοῦτοὶ ἠμμηχομένης θησαυρίου θησαυρίου / Καστάνιδος ὄνομαζεν γάρ αἰδούμαι θεάν. Compare to Euripides' *Orestes* 37, which is spoken of the Erinyes: ὄνομαζεν γάρ αἰδούμαι θεάς / Εὔμενής.

121 Athenaeus is not sure whether this passage is from Eubulus or another comic poet, Philippus.

122 Athenaeus XIII.568 F [Kassel and Austin, *PCG* vol. V, Eubulus, fr. 67. 7-10]: μικροῦ πριάσθαι κέρματος τὴν ἡδονήν, / καὶ μὴ λαθραίαν Κύπριν, αἰσχρότητα νόσον / πασών. διώκειν, ὑβρεῖος οὐ πόθῳ χάριν. / Ἐλλάδος ἔγογγε τῆς ταλαιπώρου στένο... Compare Euripides' fragment 82.7 (Austin, *NEPR*): λαθραίαν ἐμπολλωμένη Κύπριν.

123 Compare Euripides' *fragments* 82.7 (Austin, *NEPR*): λαθραίαν ἐμπολλωμένη Κύπριν.


125 Compare a fragment from Euripides (752,3 N = πηθδαί χορεύουν) and Electra's words at verse 45 of the *Orestes*: πηθδαί δρομαῖος πώλος ὡς ὑπὸ ζυγοῦ.
In a fragment from an unknown play, Anaxandrides\textsuperscript{126} may be contradicting Tecmessa's words in Sophocles' \textit{Ajax}, "Goodwill always begets goodwill,"\textsuperscript{127} saying instead, "In the opinion of many, goodwill does not beget goodwill,"\textsuperscript{128} but he may not have had this specific play in mind. His most famous piece of writing is from another unknown play, "The city willed it, and she takes no thought for laws,"\textsuperscript{129} which is a parody of Euripides' "Nature willed it, and she takes no thought for laws."\textsuperscript{130}

The \textit{Suda} tells us that the comic poet Alexis was born at Thurii, but apparently he spent most of his life in Athens. His earliest victory at the Lenaeus probably came in the 350s. He is recorded as sixth after Eubulus, fourth after Antiphanes in the victor's list (\textit{IG II}^2 2325,150). He won a victory at the City Dionysia in 347 (\textit{IG II}^2 2318, 278) and, according to the \textit{Suda}, composed some two hundred and forty-five plays. He is thought to have lived a long life and to have been active even through the first quarter of the third century B.C., which is in keeping with the large number of plays he is said to have written, of which about one-hundred and forty titles survive. As we saw in the last chapter, the \textit{Suda} claims he was Menander's paternal uncle, but this is unlikely as evinced by the fact that Menander's father was a \textit{diaитетes}, and hence a noble Athenian by birth. Rather it seems more likely that if there was a connection between Alexis and Menander, it was one of teacher/pupil, as the Anonymous says (\textit{Proleg. de com.} III, 45 10). About twelve of the known titles suggest tragic burlesque, and all of the surviving material that relates to Tragedy seems to be parodical. In his play \textit{Agonis} (the name of an \textit{hetaira}, so says the \textit{Suda}) or \textit{Hippiscus}, we find a parody of words spoken by a paranoid Orestes, "O Mother,

\textsuperscript{126}For his dates, see under category 3 above.
\textsuperscript{127}Sophocles, \textit{Ajax} 522: χάρις χάριν γάρ ἐστιν ἡ τικτοῦσ᾽ αἰτί.
\textsuperscript{128}Stobaeus II 46,5 [Kassel and Austin, \textit{PCG} vol. II, Anaxandrides, fr. 69]: οὐχὶ παρὰ πολλοῖς ἢ χάρις τίκτει χάριν.
\textsuperscript{129}Aristotle, \textit{Nichomachean Ethics} 7.11 1152\textsuperscript{a} 20 [Kassel and Austin, \textit{PCG} vol. II, Anaxandrides, fr. 66]: ἡ πόλις ἐφούλεθ', ἢ νόμων οὐδέν μέλει.
\textsuperscript{130}Euripides, Nauck, \textit{TGF} fr. 920: ἡ φύσις ἐφούλεθ', ἢ νόμων οὐδέν μέλει.
I beseech you, do not incite the bloodstained and snake-like maidens against me!"\textsuperscript{131}

Alexis has, "O mother, I beseech you, do not incite Misgolas against me!" For I don't play the cithara."\textsuperscript{132} This Misgolas was notorious for his fetish for cithara players and young boys.\textsuperscript{133} Another line from Euripides, this time from the \textit{Medea}, is parodied in Alexis' \textit{Night Festival or Hirelings} (\textit{Παννύχις Ἔριθοι}), where someone who has been in a brawl says, "Thereupon he threw a quart-sized canteen at me -- aged chattel of our house!"\textsuperscript{134} The Euripidean passage is spoken by the Tutor to Medea's old nurse at the beginning of the play, "Aged chattel of my mistress' house, why do you stand in solitude by the gates bemoaning your misfortune to yourself?"\textsuperscript{135} Alexis also echoes Sophocles twice. A fragment of his \textit{Cup-Maker} ('Εκτρωματοποιός) reads, "Ever fond of unguents is the entire race of Sardis,"\textsuperscript{136} which sounds like a fragment from some unknown play of Sophocles that says, "Ever fond of lucre is the entire race of barbarians,"\textsuperscript{137} or perhaps Creon's "The entire race of seers is fond of lucre" in the \textit{Antigone}.\textsuperscript{138} A couple of lines from his play the \textit{Thesprotians}, are replete with tragic bombast, but the source, if there was one, is not known: "O Hermes, escorter of the gods, O thou, allotment of Philippides, and thou, eyes of Night robed in black."\textsuperscript{139}

\textsuperscript{131}Euripides, \textit{Orestes} 255: οὐ μὴν ἱκτεύω σε, μὴ ἰσίει μοι / τὰς αἰματωποῖς καὶ δρακοντώδεις κόρας.

\textsuperscript{132}Athenaeus VIII.339 C [Kassel and Austin, \textit{PCG} vol. II, Alexis, fr. 3]: οὐ μὴν ἱκτεύω σε, μὴ ἰσίει μοι / τὸν Μισγόλαν· οὐ γὰρ κιθαρῳδὸς εἰμί ἕγω.

\textsuperscript{133}See Athenaeus VIII.339 B ff. for all the other references to Misgolas' fondness for cithara players and young boys.

\textsuperscript{134}Athenaeus XI.483 E [Kassel and Austin, \textit{PCG} vol. II, Alexis, fr. 181]: εἴτε τετρακότουλον ἐπεσοβίει κόδενα μοι, / παλαιόν οίκων κτήμα.

\textsuperscript{135}Euripides, \textit{Medea} 49 ff.: παλαιὸν οίκων κτήμα δεσποίνης ἐμῆς. / τι πρὸς πύλαις τίνα δ' ἄγουσ' ἐρμικάν / ἔστηκα, αὕτη θρεμένη σαυτή κακά;

\textsuperscript{136}Athenaeus XV.691 D [Kassel and Austin, \textit{PCG} vol. II, Alexis, fr. 67]: άει φιλόμυρον πάν τὸ Σάρδεσον γένοσ.

\textsuperscript{137}Sophocles fr. 587 R: φιλάργυρου μὲν πάν τὸ βάρβαρον γένος.

\textsuperscript{138}Sophocles, \textit{Antigone} 1055: τὸ μαντικὸν γὰρ πάν φιλάργυρου γένος.

\textsuperscript{139}Athenaeus XII.552 D [Kassel and Austin, \textit{PCG} vol. II, Alexis, fr. 93]: Ἐρμῆ θεών προτομίτη καὶ Φιλιππίδου / κληροῦξε, Νυκτὸς τ' ὀμία τῆς μελαμπτῆπλου. For the many tragic echoes in this passage, compare Aeschylus fr. 273\textsuperscript{8} R (χθόνιον τ' Ἡρμῆν πομπὸν φαλάνξα).
Philemon also has a number of fragments that parody Tragedy. One of his better known fragments, from his play the Soldier (Στρατιώτης), reveals a pompous cook parodying Euripides’ Medea: "...how a yearning has stolen over me to come forth to tell earth and sky how I prepared the morsel." The model for these lines is the nurse at the beginning of the Medea, who has just learned of Medea’s ill luck: "For I have swayed into such a state of grief that a yearning has stolen over me to come forth here to tell earth and sky of my mistresses’ misfortunes." In his Palamedes, he has a passage that reads, "For the reputation of justice alone, among both mortals and gods, ever continues immortal," which is probably from some unknown play of Euripides.

Cratinus the Younger, who was active in the fourth century, has a passage that echoes Aeschylus: it reads "It is better for the very prosperous to remain [at home?] and drink; Let battles and toil worry others." The Aeschylean fragment reads, "It is necessary for the very prosperous to remain at home."

Xenarchus, who seems to have been active during the fourth century, has a parody of Sophocles in a fragment from his Pentathlete that reads, "But I write a woman’s

Sophocles, OC 1548 (Ἑρμής ὁ ποιμής), and Euripides, IT 110 (οὐκτὸς δείκται λυγαίας μεθάμπτας δὲ Νῦξ).

For Philemon’s dates, see above under category 3.

Athenaeus VII.288 C [Kassel and Austin, PCG vol. VII, Philemo, fr. 82, lines 1-2]: ὡς ἵμερός μ’ ὑπήλθε γῆ τε κοῦρανῷ / λέξαι μολόντι τοῦφον ὡς ἐκεύομαι.

Euripides, Medea 56-58: ἐγὼ γὰρ ἐς τὸν ἐκβηθῆν αὐληθέουσιν, ὡσθ’ ἵμερός μ’ ὑπήλθε γῆ τε κοῦρανῷ / λέξαι μολόντι διόρο δεσποινής τύχας.

Stobaeus III.9.20 [Kassel and Austin, PCG vol. VII, Philemo, fr. 60]: τοῦ γὰρ δικαίου κάν νυκτοῦσα καὶ θείας ἰδίαν αὐτὸ δεῖξα διατελεῖ μόνου. Mieeneke and Kaibel believe this may be from Euripides’ Palamedes, and that Stobaeus has made the wrong attribution, but as Kock, CAF, Philemon fr. 57 says, "cum tot argumenta tragricorum coiirurnque communia sint, nullam video causam, cur de Philemonis Palamede dubitetur."

Cf. Nauck, TGF Euripides 637. It should be noted, however, that Aeschylus, Sophocles, and Astydamus junior also wrote tragedies of the same name.

Athenaeus XV.669 A [Kassel and Austin, PCG vol. IV, Cratinus junior, fr. 4]: πίνειν μένοτα τὸν καλὸς εὐδαιμονία / κρεῖττον’ μάχαι δ’ ἄλλοις καὶ πόνος μέλοι.


See Kassel and Austin, PCG vol. VII, p. 791.
oath in wine." The fragment by Sophocles says "I write the oaths of a woman in water." 

b. motif/convention/topos parody

The first instance of topos-parody is found in a fragment from an unknown play of Teleclides and smacks of tragic bombast (or what Kaibel describes as "tragica oratio"): "What is this shouting and veering (περιστασις) of the household?" In addition to the tragica oratio, it refers to the tragic topos of having someone come on stage to note the commotion from within the house, such as is found in Aeschylus' Agamemnon. Teleclides' use of περιστασις is particularly interesting, for this is the word that Theophrastus uses to define Tragedy: "Tragedy is the veering of heroic fortune." Thus the word περιστασις was applied to Tragedy as early as the fifth century.

In Menander, characters also rush out of the house shouting, such as Simice in the Dyscolus at the beginning of Act IV. Menander's Simice, however, is not parodying Tragedy, rather the audience is supposed to notice that her recourse to tragic role-playing in response to Cnemon's fall into the well is a temporary misunderstanding in the larger course of life.

Eupolís in his Cities (Πόλεις), has a chorus of old Athenian citizens say "How I barely can move; we are nothing but worn-out old men," which as Kock observes, is a...

---

148 Athenaeus X.441 E [Kassel and Austin, PCG vol. VII, Xenarchus, fr. 6]: ὁρκοὺ δ᾽ ἐγὼ γυναικὸς εἰς οἶνου γράφω.
149 Radt, TGF vol. IV, Sophocles, fr. 811: ὁρκοὺς ἐγὼ γυναικὸς εἰς ὕδωρ γράφω.
150 For Teleclides' dates, see above under category 3, footnote 26.
151 Phrynichus Ectage 353 περιστασις [Kassel and Austin, PCG vol. VII, Teleclides, fr. 37]: τίς ἢδε κραυγῇ καὶ δόμων περιστασις:
152 Diomedes, Ars grammatica III.8.125 [Kaiabel, CGF I, 57]: τραγῳδία ἐστὶν ἡρωικής τύχης περιστασις. For more on Theophrastus' definition, see the chapter on the Dyscolus.
153 For Eupolis' dates, see above under category 3.
154 Photius (b,2) α 1936 [Kassel and Austin, PCG vol. V, Eupolis, fr. 237]: ὡς μόλις ἀνήρρητοι οὐδέν ἐσμεν οἱ σατροὶ.
parody of Euripides' habit of introducing old men on stage who complain or comment on their old age, such as Cadmus and Tiresias in the Bacchae.155

The comic poet Callias also mentions Tragedy. He won first place at the City Dionysia in 446 B.C. (IG II² 2318, col. III, 78) and was active at least until 430 (Moretti, IGUR 216, 1-6). Athenaeus first mentions him in passing saying, "[Clearchus]156 records that Callias the Athenian composed a Tragedy of Letters, from which Euripides in his Medea and Sophocles in his Oedipus drew their lyrics and plots."157 Later, in a long passage, he expands upon this rather ludicrous theory:158

---

155Kock, CAF, Eupolis 221: "inridet Euripidem, qui saepissime senes in scaenam prodeuntis de senectuis molestis querentes fecit." For another parallel in Euripides, compare Heracles 314 (a chorus of old Theban men): νῦν δ’ οὐδὲν ἔσμεν. Aristophanes also pokes fun at this Euripidean trait at Acharnians 681, where the choral leader says of himself and the other old men of the chorus that they are treated as though οὐδὲν ἄντις.

156From Soli on Cyprus (c. 340 - 250 B.C.).

157Athenaeus VII.276 A [Kassel and Austin, PCG vol. IV, Callias, testimonium *7]: [Κλέαρχος] Καλλίαν ἱστορεῖ τὸν Ἀθηναίου γραμματικὴν συνθέναι τραγῳδίαν, ἂν ἂς ποιησά τὰ μέλη καὶ τὴν διάθεσιν Εὐριπίδην ἐν Μηθείᾳ καὶ Σοφοκλεᾷ τὸν Οἰδίπουν.

158Athenaeus X.453 C - 454 F [Kassel and Austin, PCG vol. IV, Callias, testimonium *7]: ὃ δὲ Ἀθηναίος Καλλίας (κρητομενὸν γὰρ ἐπὶ πρότερον περὶ αὐτοῦ) μικρὸν ἐμπροθέν γενόμενος τοῖς χρόνοις Στράτῳ ἐπιθέετο τὴν καλουμένην γραμματικὴν τραγῳδίαν οὕτω διατάξας, πρόλογος μὲν αὐτῆς ἦν τὸν στοιχεῖον, ὡς χρή λέγει διαρρύθμως κατὰ τὰς παραγράφας καὶ τὴν τελευτητὴν καταστροφικὰς ποιησμένος εἰς τάλαφα: "κ’ τὸ ἄλφα. ἢ βῆτα, γάμμα, δέλτα, θεοῦ γάρ εἰ. / ζῆτε', ἥτα, θῆτα, ἴστα, κάτπι, λάβδα, μυ. / νῦ. ἵστε, τὸν, πεί, ἀθ. τὸ σίγμα, ταῦ, τὸ > τ. > τ. > φεὶ, τὸ > χεὶ τῷ τῷ φεὶ εἰς τὸ ὁ. ὁ χορὸς δὲ γυναικῶν εἰ τῶν σύνδεσις πεισμένος αὐτῶ ἦν ξυμετρὸς ἀμα καὶ μεμελεποιημένος τῶν τῆς τριβήν: βῆτα ἄλφα βά, βῆτα εὶ βε, βῆτα ἡτα βη, βητα ἴστα βι, βητα οὐ βα, καὶ πάλιν ἐν ἀντιστρόφῳ τοῦ μέλος καὶ τοῦ μέτρου γάμμα ἄλφα, γάμμα εἰ, γάμμα ἡτα, γάμμα ἴστα, γάμμα οὐ, γάμμα ω, καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν λοίπων συλλαβῶν ὀμοίως ἐκάστων τὸ τε μέτρον καὶ τὸ μέλος ἐν ἀντιστρόφῳ ἔχουσι πάσαι ταῦται. ὡς τὸν Εὔρυπιδον μὴ μοῦνον ὑπονοοιχθήναι τῇ Μηθείᾳ εμπεθεῖν πεποιηκέναι πάσαν, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὸ μέλος αὐτὸ μετεννοχθάτα φανεροὶ εἶναι. τὸν δὲ Σοφοκλεὰ διεἰσεὶν φασιν ἀπότολμησαι τὸ ποίμι τῷ μέτρῳ τοῦτ᾽ ἀκόυσαι καὶ ποιήσαι ἐν τῷ Οἰδίποδι οὕτως: "ἔγω οὖτ' ἔμαυτόν οὔτε σ’ ἀλγυνζ. < τί > ταύτ᾽ / < ἄλλος > ἕλεγχες." διότι οἱ λοίποι τὰς ἀντιστρόφους ἀπὸ τοῦτον παρεξεκοντο πάντες, ὡς ὕσικνε, εἰς τὰς τραγῳδίας, καὶ μετὰ τὸν χορόν εἰσάγῃ πάλιν εἰς τῶν φωνημένων βρῶν οὕτως (ἤν δὲι κατὰ τὰς παραγραφάς ὀμοίως τοῖς πρόσθεν λέγουτα διαρεῖν, ἵνα τοῦ ποιησάντος ύπόκρισις αὐξητά κατὰ τὴν δύναμιν): "Α) ἄλφα μοῦν, ὡ γυναικὲς, εἰ τε δύτερον / λέγειν μοῦν χρῆ. (Χρ.) καὶ τρίτον μοῦν γ’ ἔρεις. / (Α) ἢτ’ ἀρα φήσω. (Χρ.) τὸ τε τέταρτον αὐ μοῦν / ἴστα, πέμπτον οὖ, τὸ δ’ ἔκτον οὖ μοῦν / λέγε. (Α) λοιαθίον γ’ λέγειν / δ’ φανω σοι / τὸς / τῶν ἐπτα φωνῶν, ἐπτα δ’ ἐν μέτρο σοῦν, / καὶ τοῦτο λέξασθαι. εἶτα δ’ αὐτὴ λάλει." δεδήλωσε δ’ καὶ διὰ τῶν λαμβέων γραμμα πρῶτος οὕτος ἀκολουθότερον μὲν κατὰ τὴν διάνοιαν, περιμεμένου δὲ τὸν τρόπον τοῦτον: "κυώ γάρ, ὧ γυναικὲς. ἀλλ’ αἰδοί, φίλαι, ἐν γράμμασι σφόν του νου’ ἐξερεβρέφους. / ὀρθή μακρὰ γραμμὴ ἀστίν’ ἐκ δ’ αὐτῆς
The Athenian Callias, of whom we inquired earlier, flourished a little before the time of Strattis and wrote the so-called *Tragedy of Letters*, arranging it in the following manner. The prologue is composed of the letters of the alphabet, and is to be spoken by dividing them according to the punctuation marks and bringing the dénouement back to the alpha in a tragic manner: "alpha, beta, gamma, delta, epsilon (the god's letter), zeta, eta, theta, iota, kappa, lambda, mu, nu, xi, ou, pei, rho, sigma, tau, u, next to phei the chei and then psei to o." The chorus of women is arranged by him in pairs of two and is set to meter along with lyric in the following manner: Beta alpha ba, beta ei be, beta eta be, beta iota bi, beta ou bo, beta u bu, beta o bo, and again in the antistrophe of lyric and meter, gamma alpha, gamma ei, gamma eta, gamma iota, gamma ou, gamma u, gamma o, and so on for each of the remaining syllables, all with the same meter and lyric in antistrophe.

Thus it may not only be suspected that Euripides composed the entire *Medea* based upon this, but it is also clear that the lyric itself was borrowed. And they say that Sophocles boldly divided his play by the meter when he heard this and did so in the *Oedipus* thusly: "έγώ οὔτε ἐμαυτον οὔτε σ' ἀλγνω. <τί> ταύτ'/< ἄλλος > ελέγχεις." And so all the others incorporated the antistrophic structure from him, so it seems, into their tragedies. After the chorus, he
introduced another speech using the vowels as follows (which when reading one must divide according to the punctuation marks just like in the preceding example, so that the delivery of the performer is preserved according to its force): (A) "You must say alpha by itself, ladies, and secondly ei by itself." (Chorus) "And the third vowel by itself you will say." (A) "Yes, I will say the eta." (Chorus) "Moreover, say the fourth alone, that is the iota, fifthly the ou, and sixthly the u alone." (A) "Lastly, I will sound out the ô for you to say, the seventh vowel, and then the seven in meter by themselves. And after you have said it out loud, then say it to yourself."

And he was the first to describe in iambics a letter of the alphabet rather crudely in expression, phrased as follows: "For I am pregnant, ladies. But with discretion, dears, I will tell to you two in letters the name of the babe. There is a long, straight stroke. In the middle of it a stroke stands by on each side turning upwards. [= Ψ] Next there is a circle with two short feet... [= Ω]" From this later on, one may suspect, the historian Maeandrius diverged a little from exact imitation in his exposition when he composed one of his Precepts in a manner more tiresome than that just mentioned. Euripides too seems to have composed the 'letter speech' in his Theseus from this. In this play there is an illiterate herdsman who clearly describes the name of Theseus as it is inscribed in the following manner: "Although I am not skilled in letters, I shall describe their shapes and distinct marks. There is a kind of circle measured off as though by a compass; this has a mark in the middle clear to see. The second letter first has two strokes, and these are separated by another one in their middle. The third letter is like some lock of hair twisted here and there, and the fourth again has one straight stroke, and propped up against it there are three cross-strokes. The fifth is not easily described; for there are two strokes standing apart, and these run together into one base. The last letter is like the third."

And Agathon the tragic poet did the same thing in his Telephus. For in that play, some illiterate describes the inscribed name of Theseus like this: "The first letter was a circle with a navel in its center. Then two straight bars yoked together, and the third was like a Scythian bow. Next alongside was a trident on its side; then upon one bar there were two upwards slanting strokes. And just like the third, so again was the last." And Theodectes of Phaselis introduces some illiterate rustic who clearly describes the name of Theseus: "The first letter was a circle with a navel at its center. Then two bars of quite equal length; and these were bound together by a perpendicular sideways bar. The third was like a twisted lock of hair. The next looked like a trident on its side, the fifth had two rods of equal length on top, and these came together on one base. The sixth was like a lock of hair which I described before."
Sophocles too wrote something similar to this in his satyr-play the *Amphiaraurus*, where he introduced someone who danced the letter forms.\(^{167}\)

It should be clear that the theory of the rather eccentric Clearchus claiming that Sophocles in his *Oedipus* and Euripides in his *Medea* borrowed from Callias seems highly improbable. It would be the only instance of tragedians borrowing from a comedian that is known. The verse of Sophocles' *Oedipus* quoted above that supposedly proves the borrowing does not prove anything, except that Clearchus was really grasping for straws, which is in keeping with what we know about the character of his other writings.\(^{168}\) But this does not mean that Athenaeus' information is useless. In fact, it is likely that Callias did write such a comedy, but he was parodying Euripides' *Theseus* when he wrote his play, and thus Clearchus has it backwards. Agathon and Theodectes are not really factors, since both are later, but their reworking of Euripides demonstrates that the Euripidean passage left a lasting impression and was the sort of tragic *topos* that a comedian would find hard to resist.

In Eubulus' *Antiope*,\(^{169}\) it appears that there is a parody of a tragic epilogue. In this fragment a character says,

> Zethus he bade to go and inhabit the sacred plain of Thebes, for at a better price they sold, so it seemed, bread there, and he was ravenous. And the very musical Amphion he bade to emigrate to famed Athens, where ever so easily the sons of the Cecropidae starve, gulping down air and feeding on hopes.\(^{170}\)

---

\(^{167}\)Radt, *TGF* vol. IV, fr. 121.


\(^{169}\)For his dates, see above under category 3a - text-parody.

\(^{170}\)Athenaeus *Epiome* II.47 B [Kassel and Austin, *PCG* vol. V, Eubulus fr. 9 = Kock, *CAF* Euboulos fr. 10]: ζηθίζον μὲν ἐλθὼν ἀγνοῦ ἐς Θήβῃς πέδου / οἰκεῖον κελεύει, κατ' ἅρα άξιωτέρας / πωλοῦσιν, ὡς ἐοικε, τοὺς ἄρτους ἑκεί: / ὁ δ' ὄξυπειος, τὸν δὲ μουσικῶτατον / κελεύας Ἀθήνας ἐκπεραῦν ἀμφίωνα / οὐ μᾶστ' ἀεὶ πεινώσι Κεκροπίδων κόροι / κάπτοσις αὖρας, ἐπίθεσις σιτουμενοί. At the beginning of line 4, Kassel and Austin have οὗ (the manuscript has ΟΕ), but I prefer the reading of Grotius, ὅ, which Kock also accepts.
It does not seem to be a parody of any single passage, rather it echoes several tragic passages, as it parodies the tragedians' habit of having a god or hero give orders to characters at the end of a play or prophesy. Examples of this would be Thetis in Euripides' *Andromache*, or Heracles at the end of Sophocles' *Philoctetes*.

There are two fragments of Phrynichus that suggest parody of Euripides' prologues. His debut was in 434 or 429. The last we hear of him is the year 405, when he produced his *Muses*. One fragment comes from the beginning of his play the *Hermit* (*Μονότροπος*) and reads, "My name is Hermit, and I live the life of Timon — unwed, unattached, quick-tempered, unapproachable, mirthless, speechless, self-opinionated." The other comes from his *Epialtes or Ephialtes*, but unfortunately is too garbled to make much sense of. It seems, like the *Hermit*, to begin with the formula "my name is..."

In another fragment from some unknown play of Philemon, what seems to be part of a prolix prologue spoken by Air (Ἀύρ) is probably intended to parody the Euripidean divine prologue:

---

171 For the phrase ἐλθὼν ἀγνόν ἐς Θήβης πέδου, cf. Sophocles' *OC* 415 (οἱ μολόντες ἐς Θήβης πέδου) and Euripides' *It* 972 (ἐς ἀγνὸν ἔλθαν αὐτὸς Ποῖδου πέδου; In Euripides' *Antiope* there is also a fragment (48,85 Kamb.) that reads πεδία τῇ Θήβῃ. For the phrase κλεινᾶς 'Ἀθήνας at the beginning of a verse, cf. Euripides' *Hipp. 1094, Ion* 590 and 1038. This use of ἐκτεραν also occurs in Aeschylus' *Prom. 713 (ἐκτεραν χθόνια).*

172 The Suda, s.v. Φρύνιχος: κομικὸς τῶν ἑπιδευτέρων τῆς ἀρχαίας κομικῆς. ἐδίδαξε γοῦν ἐπὶ τῆς πτω 'Ολυμπιαδος (435-432 B.C.).

173 *Anonymous de Comedia* [Kaibel, CGF II.10]: Εὐπόλος 'Ἀθηναῖος ἐδίδαξεν ἐπὶ ἄρχοντος 'Ἀπολλοδώρου, ἐφ' οὐ καὶ Φρύνιχος...

174 *Argumentum, Aristophanes’ Frogs*.

175 Photius (b, z) σ 375 [Kassel and Austin, *PCG* vol. VII, Phrynichus, fr. 19]: ὄνομα δὲ μοῦστι Μονότροπος / ζῶ δὲ Τιμώνος βίου / ἄγαμον, ἀξίγολον ἀξιόθυμον, ἀπόπροσδον. / ἀγέλαστον, ἀδιδέκτου, ἰδιογνώμων.

176 Scholiast (V) to Aristophanes’ *Wasps*, 1348a [Kassel and Austin, *PCG* vol. VII, Phrynichus, fr. 1]: τὸ δύο αὐτὸ τοῦ τούτ' ἤν ἐσοχθεν γυν' τε μή / ἔστω φιάλῆς ἀνδραγαθίας δυνακα, / ἐτί ἐμπάλης χριστάτα λε ἀπαλάλωμη τ. Kaibel says of it "loquiter in prologo, sicur Phrynichi Monotropus, Epialtes olim homo, tum post mortem Incubus factus... tragicorum prologos aut imitari aut ridere videtur comicus, velut Polydori orationem in Euripidis Hecuba."
I am the one whom no one ever noticed doing, nor ever will do, nor ever has done, any single thing bad nor good -- Air, whom some at times also call Zeus. And I, as is proper for a god, am everywhere -- in Athens, in Patras, in Sicily, in every city, in every house, in all of you. There is no place where there is no Air. And he who is present everywhere of necessity knows everything, because he is present everywhere.177

Kassel and Austin bracket off some of this quote, presumably because it is so repetitive, but like Kock, I prefer to keep it all, because it adds a long-winded "air" to the passage.

For the divine prologue in Euripides, we may compare, for instance, Aphrodite at the beginning of the *Hippolytus*, who begins, "Great is my power and I am not without fame among mortals and in heaven. I am called the goddess Cypris."178

c.) visual parody

Although no positive instance of visual parody outside of Aristophanes is known, no doubt it was an important component of the tragic/mythological burlesques. A fragment from Antiphanes' *Anteia* (the wife of Proetus, who tempted Bellerophon -- see *Iliad* 6.160) alludes to the importance of visual images: "Those garbed in the leathern jerkins, breeches, and the tiaras of Tragedy."179

d.) General remarks on parody

As with category 3 (the mention of Tragedy or tragedians), some definite trends seem to emerge from the evidence in category 4. First of all, outside of Aristophanes there are no certain parodies of other tragedians besides the big three, Aeschylus, Sophocles, and Euripides, and in Aristophanes these are also the three most prevalent. Euripides again

177Stobaeus, *Ecloge* I 1,32 and I, 10, 10 [Kassel and Austin, *PCG* vol. VII, Philoemo, fr. 95]: ὁ νῦν οὐδὲ ἐξ ἔλεγον οὐδὲ ἐν ποίῳ, / [οὐδὲ ἀν ποιήσων, οὐδὲ πεποιηκός πάλαι,] /οὔτε κακόν οὔτε γ’ ἐσθλόν, οὔτος εἰμ’ ἐγώ, / Ἄιρ, ὃν ἐν τις ὀνομάζει καὶ Δία, / ἐγώ δ’, ὃ θεοῦ ἀτιν ἐργον, εἰμὶ πανταχοῦ, / ἐνταῦθ’ ἐν Ἀθήναις, ἐν Πάτραις, ἐν Σικελίᾳ, / ἐν ταῖς πόλεις πάσαις, ἐν ταῖς οἰκίαις / πάσαις, ἐν ψυχὶ πάσιν οὐκ ἔστιν τόπος, / οὗ μὴ ἀτιν Ἄιρ, ὃ δὲ παρῶν ἀπανταχοῦ / πάντ’ ἐξ ἀνάγκης οἶδε [πανταχοῦ παρών].

178Lines 1-2: Πολλὴ μὲν ἐν βροτοῖς κοῦκ ἀνώνυμης, / θεὰ κέκλημαι Κύπρις, / οὐρανοῦ τ’ ἐσκ’

seems to be the favorite as time moves on, with 22 or 23 instances of parody outside of those found in Aristophanes. Next comes Sophocles with only seven or eight instances, followed by Aeschylus with three to five examples. A partial explanation for this no doubt lies in the fact that only large portions of the big three survive. More importantly, however, is that successful parody requires that the audience at least be aware that a tragic passage or topos is being parodied. Usually the more familiar they are with the exact passage, the funnier the parody. Then as now, the big three were better preserved and the most familiar, especially Euripides. This better explains why comedians almost exclusively targeted them. Of course, ideologues also tend to be more memorable, and Euripides had the greatest reputation of being an ideologue. The fact that no living tragedian of the fourth century can be shown to have been parodied and only one is mentioned (Chaeremon), also indicates that by the fourth century Tragedy was no longer a flourishing genre.

There is also a significant change in the figures who parody Tragedy. In the earlier period, Tragedy is used to lampoon living statesmen such as Hyperbolus, and it is used by dead statesmen, such as Pericles, who offer advice from the grave on how to run the polis. Again, this indicates that Tragedy was once considered an important voice in the polis. As time moved on, we have characters like cooks in Antiphanes who parody Tragedy. This suggests that Tragedy was no longer a political voice, but rather a source of entertainment. Comedy like this, however, continued to make Tragedy relevant, because parody is parasitic and depends upon its model for its comic effect.

**Category 5: Descending into Hades**

Descending into Hades, like attacking or parodying a tragedian or his poetry, also makes a tragic poet relevant, because it is an admission that the voice of Tragedy matters to the land of the living. In addition to Aristophanes' *Frogs*, there is ample evidence that other comic poets traveled to Hades to visit the tragedians. The first such poet was
possibly Phrynichus. His most famous extant fragment is from his play the *Muses*, and refers to Sophocles one year after his death: "Blessed was Sophocles, who died after so long a life, a happy man and clever, who wrote many beautiful tragedies and ended his life beautifully bearing no misfortune." Without a context it is hard to determine whether this is a serious sentiment or just mock-sincerity. Meineke argues that this comedy portrayed a poetic contest between poets with the Muses as judges, similar to that of Aristophanes' *Frogs*, only this time the contestants were perhaps Sophocles and Euripides. The only support he has for his hypothesis is contained in a fragment from the play that alludes to a trial: "See, take your ballot-pebble. Here is your voting-urn, this one for acquittal, and this here for condemnation." Meineke also suspects that another line from the play refers to the Muse of Euripides: "O saucy sow, O tramp, O street-walker." To this same play we may perhaps add another fragment: Diogenes Laertius tells us that Phrynichus said of Sophocles that like a good wine he was, "neither sickly sweet, nor doctored, but Pramnian." This last fragment, however, may belong to another play of his called the *Tragedians* (*Tragwòdia*). One fragment may be indicative of tragic bombast: "O gold-headed anchovy of the sea." The only other fragment from this play

180 For his dates, see under category 4b, parody of tragic topos.


182 Meineke, PCG vol. I, p. 157

183 Harpocration 165,6, s.v. κάδισκος [Kassel and Austin, PCG vol. VII, Phrynichus, fr. 33]: ἰδοὺ, δέχου τὴν ψήφον ὁ κάδισκος δὲ σοι / ὁ μὲν ἀπολύσων οὔτος, ὁ δὲ ἀπολλύσω δεῖ.

184 Pollux 7.203 [Kassel and Austin, PCG vol. VII, Phrynichus, fr. 34]: δὲ κατραίνα καὶ περιπόλας καὶ δρομάς.

185 Diogenes Laertius IV.20 [Kassel and Austin, PCG vol. VII, Phrynichus, fr.68]: οὐ γλύκις οὔδ’ ὑπόχυτος, ἀλλὰ Πράμνιος.

186 The Suda says the alternate title of this play was the *Freedmen* (*Ἀπελεύθεροι*); cf. Athenaeus III.115 B.

187 Athenaeus VII.287 B [Kassel and Austin, PCG vol. VII, Phrynichus, fr. 52 = Kock, CAF, Phrynichos, fr. 50]: ὁ χρυσόκεφαλος βειμβράδες θαλάσσαι. Kock notes, "si θαλάσσαι (non θαλασσί) Phrynichus scriptit, parodia statuenda est." We may also add that the form βειμβράδες, instead of the more typically Attic μεμβράδες, is also indicative of parody.

70
with a connection to Tragedy is one that mentions Lamprus, the illustrious music teacher of Sophocles, and may indicate the action took place in Hades: "...the lyres rang out threnodies, and in their midst Lamprus lay dying, a water-drinking man he, a whining arch-sophist, mummy of the Muses, nightmare of nightingales, hymn of Hell." 188

In Pherecrates' Crappies 189 (Κραταταλοί -- Hesychius says they are a worthless kind of fish, hence the pun), Pollux 190 says that he describes the monetary system of Hades, where some of the action evidently takes place. There one character (undoubtedly Jocasta) says, "How strange it is to be both mother and wife," 191 and we know that he has Aeschylus say, "Yes, I am the one who handed down to them the great art that I built." 192 Eustathius adds another line that Meineke suggests belongs to this play: "Their chorus wore filthy rags and bedclothes sacks." 193 Perhaps this is a reference to Euripides, who was taken to task by Aristophanes for having beggarly characters come on stage. Taken together, these two passages suggest that Aeschylus and someone else in Hades discussed early drama or Tragedy in a manner similar to Aristophanes' Frogs (and possibly Phrynicus' Muses). It is difficult to say whether this passage is -- or if both are spoken by Aeschylus, these passages are -- genuinely complimentary to Aeschylus or just boorish self-conceit. In Eupolis' Taxiarchs 194 (Ταξιάρχης), it seems that some of the action moves to Hades and involves the poet Sophocles. The scholiast at Aristophanes'

188 Athenaeus II.44 D [Kassel and Austin, PCG vol. VII, Phrynicus, fr.74]: < σ > λάρους θρήνειν, ἐν σοὶ Λάμπρους ἐναπέθηκαν / ἀνθρώπος < ὁν > ὑδατοτότης, μινυρός ύπερσωφιστής. / Μουσών σκελετός, ἀνθόδων ἡπιάλος, ὕμνος "Αἴδου. For more on Lamprus, see Plato Menex. 236a, Athenaeus 1.20 EF, Plutarch Mor. 1142b.
189 For his dates, see under category 4a, text-parody.
190 IX. 83.
191 Choerob. in Theodos. can., GrGr IV 1.307,17 Hilg. [Kassel and Austin, PCG vol. VII, Pherecrates fr. 96]: ὣς ἐπετῶν ἀτι ὑπερεχεῖν ἐναὶ καὶ γυνήν.
192 Schol., Aristophanes' Peace 748 [Kassel and Austin, PCG vol. VII, Pherecrates fr. 100]: ὡσ < γέ > αὐτοῖς παρέδωκα τέχνην μεγάλην ἐξοικοδομήσας.
193 Eustathius at Iliad 1369, 43; quoted from Pherecrates without identifying the title of the play [Kassel and Austin, PCG vol. VII, Pherecrates fr. 199]: ὁ χορὸς αὐτοῖς εἶχεν δάπιδας ὑππαράς καὶ στροματόδεσμα.
194 For his dates, see above in category 3.
Peace 347 says, "Dionysus in the Taxiarchs ... learns along with Phormion about the rules of command and engagement." Sophocles name appears twice in a papyrus of this play. The tragic poet was known to have been involved in the affairs of state as an imperial treasurer in 443/442 B.C. (IG I 3 269, line 36). He was elected general twice, one of these times in 440 B.C when he was a colleague of Pericles in the suppression of the Samian revolt, the other time with Nicias. He was also one of the πρόβουλοι appointed after the Sicilian disaster to deal with the crises. Thus it appears that Eupolis has Phormion and Dionysus go down to Hades to seek leadership advice, and one of the characters they speak to is Sophocles.

Plato produced his first play in the eighty-eighth Olympiad (428/7-425/4 B.C.). He was active until at least 385, and the fact that later scholars disagreed about whether to classify him as a poet of Old or Middle Comedy suggests he was still writing for some time after that date. One of his plays was called the Spartans or Poets (Λάκωνες ἢ Ποιηταί), in which it appears that some the action takes place in Hades.

---

195 Πολεμίου πάρα Φορμίων τούς στρατηγιῶν καὶ πολέμων ήμισ.  
196 Austin, CGFPR 98 [Kassel and Austin, PCG vol. V, Eupolis, fr. 268, lines 7-10]: [- -] τουτων Σοφοκλέους [- -] εις τιν εις φθορ[- -] / - -] ιμενται τα το άλλα [- -] / Σοφοκλέους ει[ τιν έκ] / Τηρέως Βοκ α[- -]  
197 Plutarch's Life of Pericles 8.  
198 Plutarch's Life of Nicias 15.  
199 Aristotle, Ars Rhetorica 3.18.  
200 As Kock, CAF Eupolis, fr. 98, says, "similiter Aristophanes in Ranis Bacchum ipsum ad inferos descendendem fecit ut tragicorum optimum Athenas reduceret."  
201 Cyril, Alex., Contra Iulianum, I 13 [Kassel and Austin, PCG vol. VII, Plato, testimonia 6]: όγδοημηκοστη όγδοη 'Ολυμπιάδι τον κομηδόν 'Αριστοφάνην. Εὐπολίων τε καὶ Πλάτωνα γενεάθαι φανών.  
203 On whether he was a poet of Old or Middle Comedy, note the Anonymous de Comoedia [Kaibel CGF pp. 13-14, col. II, lines 33-37]: γέγονε δὲ τὴν μὲν πρώτης κομηδίας Ἀριστοφάνης τινὲς δὲ τῆς δευτέρας Πλάτων. τῆς δὲ τρίτης Μανάνδρος. Also note The Scholiast on Dionysios Thrax [Kaibel CGF p. 15, lines 72-74]: τῆς δὲ μέσης καὶ αὐτῆς μὲν πολλοὶ γεγόνασιν, επισήμος δὲ Πλάτων τις. οὐχ δὲ φιλόσοφος ἄλλο ἐτέρος τοις ὁμόνοιοι, κάκεινον τὰ δράματα οὐ φαίνεται.  
204 For a discussion on the two titles see Kock, CAF I, top of page 619.
In the play there seems to be a symposium at which there was a discussion about rival poets or poetical schools, if we may judge by the title.\(^{205}\) Some dead poet appears and there is the following exchange: (A) "Verily, swear to me that you are not dead." (B): "I avow that my body is dead, but my spirit has risen just like Aesop's once did."\(^{206}\) That poets, and in particular tragic poets, were discussed is certain, for Harpocration tells us that, "Plato, in his Spartans, satirizes him (the tragic poet Sthenelus) for plagiarizing others' words."\(^{207}\) One extant line from this play reads "When I need an angular phrase, I stand by this man and I pry up the rocks,"\(^{208}\) and sounds like it may have been spoken by the weak Sthenelus. From whom he filched his phrases is unknown, but Norwood makes the attractive suggestion that it was Aeschylus, who was certainly a very forceful writer.\(^{209}\) Sthenelus appears again in Plato's Costumes (Σκευεί). This play lamented the decline of the theater, particularly the decline of Tragedy. In one of its passages, two characters are arguing over the merits of various poets. Somebody says, "Just you touch a hair of Morsimus, and I'll instantly stomp on your Sthenelus."\(^{210}\) In another passage from this play, the decline of choric dancing is mourned: "So that if anyone danced well, there was something to behold. Nowadays they don't do a thing, but like paraplegics they stand

---

\(^{205}\) Athenaeus XV.665 B [Kassel and Austin, PCG vol. VII, Plato, fr. 71] is a portion of this symposium.

\(^{206}\) Scholiast on Aristophanes' Birds 471 [Kassel and Austin, PCG vol. VII, Plato, fr. 70]: (A) καὶ μὴν διμοσῶν μοι μὴ τεθάναι. (B) τὸ σῶμα ἑγώ. / ψυχὴν δὲ ἐπανήκειν ὡστερ Αἰσχύλου ποτὲ.

\(^{207}\) P. 166, 3: ἐκαυμάζει δὲ αὐτὸν ὁ τοῦς Πλάτωνος Λάκωνος γράφας ὡς ἀλλότρια ἐπὶ αφετερίζομενον.


\(^{209}\) Norwood (Greek Comedy, p. 173, n. 1) notes that Aeschylus is addressed in the Clouds, 1399, as καῖνων ἐπὶ ᾑνων κινητά καὶ μοχλεύτα.

\(^{210}\) Scholiast to Aristophanes' Wasps, 1312, where Aristophanes himself ridicules Sthenelus [Kassel and Austin, PCG vol. VII, Plato, fr. 136]: ἂναι μόνον σὺ καὶ ἄκρω τοῦ Μοραίου. / ἵνα σου πατήσω τὸν Σθένελον μᾶλ' αὐτίκα.
motionless and howl." In another fragment from this play, it seems that Euripides' *Electra* is spoken of: "Euripides made her carry water. But for me pan(s) of coal... and new, if (s)he were to have an earthen pan of coals?" All these lines suggest that there was a debate in Hades just as in the *Frogs*. Finally, the scholiast to Euripides' *Hecuba* quotes from an unknown play of Plato an exchange between Hermes and some other character that sounds like it could have come straight from A.E. Housman's famous parody of Greek Tragedy: (A) "Ho! Who are you? Tell me at once! Why are you silent? Will you not speak?" (Hermes) "Hermes am I, endowed with the speech of Daedalus; here self-propelled I come on wooden feet." The tragic color is unmistakable, as Hermes' lines are in tragic meter with observance of Porson's law. Perhaps Hermes was acting in his role as *psychopompos*, and was escorting someone to Hades to consult the tragedians.

**Category 6: Burlesque**

No complete tragic/mythological burlesque survives, but based on the titles and comments by ancient critics, there were numerous examples, some of which have been mentioned above. The nearest to a burlesque that survives are the lengthy parodies of


212 Herodian Π καθόλ. προσωπ. fr. 31 [Kassel and Austin, *PCG* vol. VII, Plato, fr. 142]: Εὐριπίθης δὲ ἐποίησαν ὑδροφοροῦσαν ταύτην. / ἐμοὶ δὲ πυραυνακτιανεισσο...οὐτ / καὶ καίνον, εἰ πύραυλον ὀστράκινον ἔχοι: Electra carries water at line 55 ff. of Euripides' *Electra*.

213 A.E. Housman, "Fragment of a Greek Tragedy," *G&R* Ser. 2, 5 (1958): 14-19. The opening of Housman's "fragment" is quite similar in situation; here I give only the English. (Chorus): "O suitably-attired-in-leather-boots Head of a traveller, wherefore seeking whom Whence by what way how purposed art thou come To this well-nightingaled vicinity? My object in inquiring is to know. But if you happen to be deaf and dumb And do not understand a word I say, Then wave your hand, to signify as much." (Alcmaion): "I journeyed hither a Boeotian road." (Ch.): "Sailing on horseback, or with feet for oars?" (Alc.): "Plying with speed my partnership of legs."


215 Or someone impersonating Hermes.
Euripides' *Helen* and *Andromeda* in Aristophanes' *Thesmophoriazusae*. It is unlikely that Euripides himself found it unflattering to be the protagonist in an play almost entirely devoted to parody and burlesque of his plays. On the contrary, burlesque of Tragedy by comedy is a recognition of the popular entertainment value of Tragedy.

In addition to Attic burlesque, the genre flourished in Southern Italy and Sicily. As we will see below, Epicharmus (first third of the fifth century) provides the earliest instance of a comedian criticizing a tragedian's choice of words. During his lifetime, if the titles of his and other Sicilian and South Italian plays are any guide, mythological burlesque was quite common too. This kind of farce was probably imported from the Dorian Peloponnese. During Epicharmus' lifetime, however, Attic Tragedy reached the shore of Southern Italy and Sicily at the behest of Hieron I (478-467 B.C.), who invited Aeschylus to his court. At the end of the fifth century, Euripides was particularly popular there, if there is any truth to the story that Athenian captives from the unlucky Sicilian expedition could win their freedom by reciting lines from his dramas. Even if this story is somewhat apocryphal, by the end of the fifth century and especially in the fourth, numerous Attic tragic burlesque scenes began to grace the *phlyax*-vases of that region. Of all the tragedians, Euripides' plays are the most prevalent and this reflects his continued and dominant popularity there. What all this suggests is that gradually Sicilian *phlyakes* (or some sort of proto-*phlyakes*) evolved so that the subject of mythological burlesque was no longer the myths themselves, but rather the form of the mythical material which had been established by the well-known and popular Attic tragedies. Eventually this form of burlesque reached an even higher literary form in the hands of Rhinthon of Tarentum, who

---

was a contemporary of Ptolemy I (early 3rd c. B.C.). His plays were known as ἱλατροτραγῳδίαι, and later as *fabulae Rhintonicae*.

**Category 7: Attack of poetry**

The earliest known reference to a tragedian by a comic poet is that of Epicharmus' poking fun\(^{219}\) at Aeschylus' fondness for the word τιμηλοφεῖν -- to do honor to.\(^{220}\) As was mentioned above, Epicharmus was a Sicilian\(^{221}\) who was active in the first third of the fifth century at the court of Gelon (485-78) and Hieron (478-67/6).\(^{222}\) He would have come into contact with Aeschylus at the court of the latter, where Aeschylus was invited, in or shortly after 472.\(^{223}\) Aeschylus also returned to Sicily a second time after the production of his *Oresteia* in 458 B.C. Part of the humor may have involved the fact that Aeschylus was a foreigner, and hence it may be a jab at an Athenian regionalism.

Plato criticizes a bit of parechesis in a line of Euripides. The scholiast on the well-known line of Jason at Euripides' *Medea* 476, which reads ἔσσωσα σ', οὸς ἵσσαυν

\(^{219}\) Aristotle asserts that Epicharmus was "much earlier than Chionides and Magnes."

( *Poetics* 1448a 33-34: Ἐπίχαρμος ὁ ποιητὴς πολλῷ πρότερος οὖν Χιονίδου καὶ Μάγνητος), which means that he was probably already an established poet by the beginning of the fifth century. He was considered by some as the earliest comic playwright. The Anonymous tells us, "He was the first to gain mastery over comedy and its disparate elements by employing many arts. His *floruit* falls around the seventy-third Olympiad (488-85 B.C.); his poetry was full of maxims, original, and artistic. Forty of his plays survive, four of which are disputed" ( *de Comoedia* [Kaibel, *CGF* II, 4]): οὗτος πρώτος τὴν κομικὴν διερμίσατο πολλὰ προσφιλοτεχνήσας. χρόνοις δὲ γέγονε κατὰ τὴν οὐ ὀλυμπιάδα, τῇ δὲ ποίησις γνωμικός καὶ εὐρετικός καὶ φιλότεχνος. αφθηκέται δὲ αὐτοῦ δράματα μ', οὖν αντιλέγεται δ').

\(^{220}\) Scholiast on *Eumenides* 626 [Kaibel, *CGF*, Epicharmos, fr. 214]: τιμηλοφούμενον συνεχεῖ τὸ ὄνομα παρ’ Αἰσχύλος; διὸ σκόττει αὐτὸν Ἐπίχαρμος. In addition to its use at *Eumenides* 626, Aeschylus uses this word at *Agamemnon* 922, *Eumenides* 15, and 807.

\(^{221}\) We are not sure where he was born. Many cities laid claim to him: Syracuse (cf. Theocritus *Epigr.* 18; Diogenes Laertius, VIII, 78; the *Suda*; cf. *Marm. Par.* 71), Megara Hyblaea (The *Suda*; cf. Aristotle's *Poetics* 1448a, 33), Crastus in Sicily (The *Suda*), Samus (ibid), and Cos (Diogenes Laertius, loc. cit. and the *Suda*).

\(^{222}\) Marmor Parium 71 and Timaeus (apud Clem. Al., Strom., I, 64) say he was active under Hieron; The Anonymous (see footnote 176 above) puts his *floruit* in the seventy-second Olympiad, or 488-85 B.C., and hence under Gelon.

\(^{223}\) 476/5 is the date that Aetna was founded by Hieron; Aeschylus wrote a play, the *Aetnaeans*, in honor of the new city. At this time he also gave a repeat performance of his *Persae*, which was first produced in Athens in 472.
'Ελληνων δοσι, quotes a passage of Plato in his Festivals (Ἐορταὶ), which was evidently spoken to someone who employed attic pronunciation with the double tau rather than sigma: "Bless you, for you have saved us from the sigmas of Euripides."224 We find yet another comic poet comment on that sigma-infested line from Euripides’ Medea in a fragment from Eubulus’ Dionysius:225 "And to quote from Euripides, 'I saved you as so many possess knowledge of', and 'Maiden, if I should save you, will you repay me a favor?' and they laugh at my miseries in composing their sigmas, as though they were clever themselves."226

Attacking a tragedian's poetry, like attacking him personally or parodying him, is again indicative of that tragedian's poetry being a force in the polis, either as a political voice or a source of entertainment.

Category 8: Tragedy is proverbial or teaches lessons to the individual, or is a classic

We have already seen in the earlier comic periods how tragedians and Tragedy were thought to impart wisdom on the polis, most notably in the plays in Hades such as Aristophanes' Frogs. In the later period, however, we seem to undergo a shift, where tragedians are no longer sought in Hades to speak to the polis, rather they are now thought of as imparting wisdom to the individual. Usually, however, the comedian exploits the aphoristic nature of Tragedy and applies it to a lowly context. The Athenian comic poet Theopompus is the first poet we come to, other than Aristophanes, who quotes a tragedian

---

224 Scholiast (B) Euripides’ Medea, 476 [Kassel and Austin, PCG vol. VII, Plato, fr. 29]: ο – ο εύ γέ οοι < γένοιθ >, ἡμᾶς δτι / δοσισας εκ των σίγμα των Ἐυριτίδου. The phrase ευ οοι γένοιτο occurs at Euripides’ Alcæus 627.

225 For his dates, see above under category 3a - text-parody.

226 Schol. (B) to Euripides’ Medea 476 [Kassel and Austin, PCG vol. V, Eubulus, fr. 26]: Εὐριτίδου δ’ ἢ του τούτου την ἡμέραν / καὶ τοὺς ἡμῶν εὐγέλῳ πήματι / τὰ σίγμα πολλὲς ὄρνυτες, ὡς αὐτοί σοφοὶ. Compare these lines with Euripides' Andromeda (Nauck, TGF fr. 129), which reads ὡς παρθένῳ, εἰ σῶσαι ὦ, εἰσι μοι χάριν: 77
as though he were proverbial. He was active from roughly 410 to 370 B.C. Of the twenty known titles of his plays, nine suggest mythological/tragic burlesque. From one of these burlesques, his *Odysseus*, there is a fragment that quotes Euripides: "The saying of Euripides is best, not bad at all, that 'the really fortunate man dines on others' food.'" No doubt part of the fun of the quote was that it was applied in a situation incongruous with the original.

The Middle Comic poet Nicostratus, who is said to have been the son of Aristophanes (Schol. Areth. (B) Plato’s *Apology* 19 C; *Vita* line 56), is probably the Nicostratus mentioned in an inscription dating to the beginning of the fourth century (*IG* II² 3094 -- see Pickard-Cambridge *Festivals* p. 48) commemorating a victory in the deme of Icaria. In one of his fragments from an unknown play he quotes the same Euripidean line that Davus quotes in the “Doric doctor” scene in Menander’s *Aspis* 407 and which Phillipides quotes (Kassel and Austin, *PCG* fr. 18 - see below): "'There is no man who prospers o'er all.' Verily by Athena, dearest Euripides, did you succinctly define life in a single line.'

The comic poet Timocles wrote in the so-called middle comic period as well as the new comic period. He was victorious at the Lenaea sometime between 330 and 320 B.C. The last dateable reference in any of his fragments is his mention of the γυναικονόμου instituted sometime between 317 and 307 B.C. by Demetrius of Phalerum. He was thus a contemporary of Menander. In nearly half of his fragments he

---


229 *IG* II² 2325.158 [Kassel and Austin, *PCG* vol. VII, Timocles, testimonium 3]: Τιμοκλῆς.

makes personal references to contemporary individuals, including attacks on such prominent politicians as Demosthenes and Hyperides. Four out of the twenty-seven known titles suggest tragic/mythological burlesque (Heroes, Centaurus, Marathionians, and Orestautoclides). In his play the Women at the Dionysia (Διονυσιάζουσα), there is a long exposition about the many ways in which Tragedy is useful in the conduct of life:

My good sir, listen to whether I seem to say something to you. Mankind is a creature born for toils, and many are the sorrows his life brings with it. For this reason he has devised these diversions from his cares. For his mind takes leave of its own troubles and, coming under the spell of another's suffering, departs with joy and guidance to boot. First look at the tragedies, if you please, and how they benefit everyone. For when the poor man learns that Telephus is more beggarmore than himself, from then on he bears his own penury more easily. The sick man sees that Alcmaeon was also somewhat mad. Someone is blind -- so too the sons of Phinius. Someone's child has died -- Niobe provides comfort. Someone is lame -- he sees Philoctetes. Someone meets misfortune in old age -- he learns of Oeneus. For he takes it to heart that all his misfortunes "which are greater than anyone has suffered" have happened to others, and so he himself groans even less over his own calamities.

---

231 See Athenaeus VIII.341 E [Kassel and Austin, PCG vol. VII, Timocles, fr. 4].
232 Euripides wrote a Telephus. For the beggarliness of Euripides' characters, see Aristophanes' Acharnians 418 ff., where, as in this passage, Telephus, Oeneus, and Philoctetes are all mentioned -- Telephus the most beggarly of all.
233 No doubt the Alcmaeon of Euripides is alluded to here.
234 Both Aeschylus and Sophocles wrote a Phinius.
235 Sophocles wrote a Niobe.
236 Aeschylus, Sophocles, and Euripides wrote a Philoctetes.
237 Chaeremon wrote an Oeneus.
238 Athenaeus VI.223 B [Kassel and Austin, PCG vol. VII, Timocles, fr. 6]: ὁ τάν, ἀκουσον ἵν τι αὐτοί δοκῶ λέγειν. / ἀνθρώποις ἔστι ζῶν ἐπίπονον φύσει, / καὶ πολλὰ λυπήρ' ὁ βίος ἐν ἐαυτῷ φέρει. / παραμυχαὶς οὖν φροντίδων ἀνεύρετο / ταύτας: ὁ γὰρ νοῦς τῶν ἱδίων λήθην λάβων / πρὸς ἀλλήλων τε συμπαθήσεως πάθει, / μεθ' ἥδονης ἀπῆλθε παιδευθεῖς ἀμα. / τοὺς γάρ τραγῳδίων πρῶτον, εἰ διόλει, αἰκότει / ως ὄρφευς πάντας, ὁ μὲν ὧν γὰρ πένης / πτωχότητον αὐτοῦ καταμάθων τὸν Τήλεφον / γενόμενον ἤδη τὴν πεινᾶν ῥαῖν φέρει. / ὁ νοσάων τι μανικοῦ 'Αλκμέων' ἔσκηματο. / ὁφθαλμοῖς τις· εἰς Φινείδαι τυφλοί. / τεθνηκέ τω παῖς· ἡ Νιξβή κεκόπικε. / χώλος τις ἐστι· τὸν Φιλοκτίτην ὀρφ. / γέρων τις ἀτυχεῖ· κατέμαθεν τὸν Οἰνέα. / ἀπαντά γὰρ τὰ μείζον' ἢ πέπονθε τις / ἀτυχήματ' ἀλλ' ἐνεγκάθισεν· ἕννοιούμενος / τὰς αὐτὸς αὐτοῦ σωμφόρας ἕτον στένει.
Of all the mentions or uses of Tragedy in the Old, Middle, and New periods, this is the only one that looks like it may have the same subversive qualities as Menander's. Without a context it is hard to say, but we can imagine this passage in the same sort of context as the central scene of Menander's *Epitrepontes* or the scene between Demeas and Niceratus in the *Samia*. In both of these scenes, Tragedy is held up as a paradigm of life, but these tragic responses to life turn out to be foolish role-playing, which betrays a certain excessive importance attached to Tragedy.

In Diphilus' play the *Parasite*, the play's namesake quotes loosely from a Tragedy of Euripides saying, "To be sure many a thing was well spoken by gilded Euripides such as, 'Want prevails upon me and my wretched stomach.'" The original is from an unknown play and reads, "Want prevails upon me and my devastated stomach, from which all ills arise." Another passage comes from one of his unknown plays and reads, "Nothing is sure in the life of a mortal," which seems to be an echo of a proverbial Euripidean fragment, "Nothing is sure in the race of mortals."

Axionicus, who mentions Gryllis (one of Alexander's generals) and a certain Pythodelus, who is probably the archon of 336/5 B.C., wrote a play *The Lover of Euripides* (*Φιλευριπίτης*). One fragment, probably from the prologue, mentions the play's namesakes: "For both suffer such a passion for the lyrics of Euripides that everything else seems to them to be scannel pipes and a bunch of crap."

---

239 Athenaeus X.422 B (cf. Eustathius 1205,20) [Kassel and Austin, *PCG* vol. V, Diphilus, fr. 60]: εὐ γ' ὁ κατάχρους ἐπεὶ πόλλ' Ἐυριπίδης· ἑνεκ’ ἥχεια μ' ἕταλαίτωρός τε μου γαστήρ.

240 Clement of Alexandria *Stomateis* 6 [Nauck, *TGF* fr. 907]: νικά δὲ ἥχεια μ' ἕκακος τ' ὀλομενή / γαστήρ, ἄφ' ἦς δὴ πάντα γίνεται κακά.


243 Athenaeus IV.175 B [Kassel and Austin, *PCG* vol. IV Axionicus, fr. 3]: οὕτω γὰρ ἐπὶ τοῖς μέλει τοῖς Ἐυριπίδου / ἄμφω νοσοῦσιν, ὡστε τάλλ’ αὐτοῖς δοκεῖν / εἶναι μῆλη γιγγραντά καὶ κακὸν μέγα.
come to Philippides, who won a victory at the City Dionysia in 311 B.C. (*IG* Π² 2323a, 39) and was honored by the *Boule* and *Demos* in 283/2 B.C. (*IG* Π² 657, 8). He too wrote a play entitled *The Lover of Euripides*. There are no extant fragments from this play that mention or parody Euripides, but in his *Brotherly Love* (Φιλάδελφοι) he quotes a line from Euripides that we have already seen in Nicostratus and will see in Menander:

"Whenever some misfortune befalls you, master, remember Euripides, and you will feel better: 'There is no one who prospers o'er all.' And realize that you are just one of the commoners."  

Part of the fun of these "lover of Euripides" plays, then, must have been the fact that some rather dopey fellow thought that Euripides and Tragedy were useful for dealing with life, so that for everyone of life's struggles he had a quote from Euripides to soften the blow. But, of course, the comic poet's point is that such tragic posturing is really silly nonsense.

As with the other allusions to Tragedy, in this category Euripides is the favorite poet. The quotation of Tragedy as proverbial is also a further indication that Tragedy had become part of the collective cultural consciousness of the Athenian audience. But the quotation of Tragedy in a context in which the tragic sentiment itself appears to be ridiculous and outdated may be indicative of a literary and cultural *agon* in which the present poet asserts his own relevance by making the past poet look old fashioned and hackneyed.

**Category 9: Mention of, or Attack of Tragedy in general -- tragedians have it easier**

The earliest comedian that we know of who may have claimed that the tragic art is easier than the comic is Crates, who won his first victory in 450 B.C. Aristotle credits

---

244 Stobaeus IV.44,10 [Kassel and Austin, *PCG* vol. VII, Philippides, fr. 18]: ἐταν ἂτυχεῖν σοι συμπέσῃ τι, δέσποτα, / Εὐριπίδου μνήμητι, καὶ ρέων ἐσἠ / οὐκ ἔστιν ὅστις πάντες άνθρω περιευδαίμονει, εἶναι δ᾽ ὑπόλαβε καὶ σε τῶν πολλῶν ἑα.

him with being the "first poet at Athens to abandon the iambic concept and compose general stories and plots."246 In his comedy *Child's Play* (Παιδιάδοι) there is a tantalizing line that reads "This is sacrosanct for the tragedians, but for everyone else it's a different story."247 What is sacred for the tragedians but no one else is not clear. It may be a reference to the tragic poet's art, for the adjective σεμνός is ironically applied to the art of Tragedy by other writers. We may compare Plato's *Gorgias*, where Socrates calls Tragedy, "sacred (σεμνή)" and marvelous,"248 or Aristophanes *Frogs*, where Dionysus says of Aeschylus, "O foremost of the Greeks at building sacred phrases into towers,"249 or again later on when the chorus says "Better not to sit around jabbering with Socrates, casting aside music and leaving behind the serious matters of the tragic art, engaging in the idle dialogue of a crazy man with mere quibbles instead of with sacred words."250 Likewise, in the *Aspis* of Menander, Davus quotes a piece of Tragedy and identifies it with "Aeschylus of the sacred sentiments."251 In all these passages, Tragedy, or the words of Tragedy (especially Aeschylean Tragedy), are called σεμνά, but without a context the issue remains uncertain.

The following quote of Antiphanes from his *Poiesis* is the earliest certain instance of a comedian complaining that the tragedians have it easier:

The art of writing Tragedy is blessed in every way, firstly at least because its stories are well-known to the spectators, even before anyone speaks, so that it is only necessary for the poet to make an allusion. For if I only make mention of Oedipus, they also know all the rest: His Father was

---


249 Line 1004: ἀλλ' ὡ τῶν Ἐλλήνων πυργόσσας δήματα σεμνά... .


251 *Aspis* 414: Ἀισχύλος ὁ σεμνά.
Laius; his mother Jocasta; his daughters; some of his children; what he suffered; what he did. Should anyone again mention the name Alcmaeon, straight away the spectator lists even his children, and that in madness he killed his mother, and how in anger Adrastus straight-away will have come back and will go away [lacuna]
he persuaded when he was unable to speak further [lacuna]
and entirely among bankrupt plays, they raise the crane like a finger, and for the spectators it is sufficient. But for us this is not the case, but we must invent everything: new names, the previous events, the current state of affairs, the dénouement, the beginning. If some Chremes or Pheidon should neglect any single one of these things, he is booed off the stage. But anything is permitted Peleus and Teucer. 252

Antiphanes' discussion of Tragedy in these terms is different than anything we have seen thus far. Comedy is no longer a contemporary voice relying upon or vying with voice of Tragedy, but rather it is a struggle with an established canon from the past. His description of Tragedy as a "blessed poetry among all" on the surface sounds like a rather envious view of the privileged status of Tragedy, but we should guard against taking this passage at face value. It seems more reasonable to read Antiphanes' passage as a polemic against Tragedy, in which Antiphanes is really arguing (perhaps tongue-in-cheek) that the comic poet's art is more difficult, and therefore superior. One issue that arises from this passage is the question of whether the audience was familiar with the stories of Tragedy. Antiphanes takes it for granted, or at least he takes the rhetorical posture, that they were well-known. Some believe that the evidence of Aristotle, on the other hand, contradicts Antiphanes and indicates that the myths of Tragedy were not so familiar. In book nine of

the *Poetics*, Aristotle discusses the differences in the uses of names and plots by tragic and comic poets and concludes for tragic poets that, "Adhering to the traditional stories that are the subject of Tragedy is not to be sought at all costs, for this is silly, since the well-known material is well-known only to a few, but nevertheless it pleases all."\(^{253}\) One could argue that the audiences in Antiphanes' time were better educated, but this may be to misunderstand Aristotle's intent. As we shall see, other comedians also assume that the audience was familiar with the stories of Tragedy in general terms. Aristotle is probably not making the point that audiences were not familiar with past treatments of Tragedy, but rather that strict adherence is unnecessary because the audience only carries a general knowledge of these past treatments and it is advantageous for a playwright to alter the original myth in some way to speak to the present. In other words, the audience may not know the specific author and passage being imitated (or in the case of comedy, parodied), but they will know that a tragic style is being affected and they will enjoy that regardless of whether they can pinpoint the exact reference.

Philemon also has a fragment that seems to indicate that he wished the audience to realize that the comic art is more difficult: "Euripides says somewhere, he who alone can say..."\(^{254}\) Finally, in a fragment from Diphilus' *Olive-orchard Guardians* (Ἐλαϊωνηφροοιντες): 'O watcher and mistress of this most divinely favored site of hollowed Brauron and bow-wielding maiden daughter of Leto and Zeus.' This is how the tragedians speak -- they alone are at liberty to say and do anything."\(^{255}\) In all these

\(^{253}\) Aristotle *Poetics* 1451b 23-26: ὡσε τού πάντως εἶναι ζητητέου τῶν παραδεμένων μύθων, περὶ οὗ οἱ τραγῳδίαι εἰσίν, άντέχεσθαι, καὶ γὰρ γελοῖον τοῦτο ζητεῖν. ἐπεὶ καὶ τὰ γνώριμα ὁλίγοις γνώριμα ἔστιν, ἀλλ' ὁμοὶ εὑρήσασθε πάντας.


passages a comedian claims that Tragedy is easier to write, and this may be indicative of how Comedy's relationship to Tragedy had changed, because now Tragedy was seen as (or made to seem) a privileged poetic.

Summary of Findings

Having surveyed all the references to Tragedy or tragedians, let us now turn to analyzing the results. Since Aristophanes makes use of most of the categories above and provides a context for his use of Tragedy, he is the natural choice from where to begin. One fruitful way of describing Aristophanes' relationship to Tragedy is as a rivalry between poetic voices of the fifth-century Athenian polis. Contained within this argument is the conviction that fifth-century Tragedy was intimately involved with the ideology of the Athenian polis. Aristophanes parodies other poetic voices, such as lyric, but far and away his favorite source is Tragedy. This is probably due to the fact that Tragedy was the most popular, and therefore a very influential, "voice" in Aristophanes' day. One proof of this is that so many comedians, as we saw above, staged plays that brought tragedians back from the dead to offer advice to the city. These include Aristophanes' Frogs, Phrynicus' Muses, Eupolis' Demes and Taxiarchs, Pherecrates' Crappies, and Plato's Spartans or Poets.

As a competitor with Tragedy, however, we should not assume that Aristophanes and his contemporaries were completely critical of Tragedy, even Euripidean Tragedy, when they parodied it. In fact, theorists of parody have pointed out the complex relationship between the parodist and the object or author parodied. The parodist is

---

dependent upon his model, or in other words, owes a great debt to his model, whether he is critical or not. Despite Aristophanes' criticism of Tragedy, particularly Euripidean Tragedy, his ample quotes of Euripides throughout his work attest to the fact that Aristophanes was a great admirer of Euripidean verse, even in the *Frogs*. Thus the relationship of parodist to object or author parodied is as complex as the notion of παρά in the word παρόδος; the parodist is close to his model, with only a slight difference.

The notion that Aristophanes is close to Tragedy, but with a slight difference has further support in Aristophanes' own word to describe his comedy: τραγῳδία. There are eight instances of this word before 400 B.C., seven of which occur in Aristophanes.259 The root of the word comes from either τρυγάω, to gather a crop, or τρύζω, unfermented wine, or both. In fact, some scholars have argued that the word τραγῳδία is derived from these same root words, but as Pickard-Cambridge concludes "the word trygoidia (applied in classical times to Comedy) is very likely simply a parody-word based on the name tragoidia, which was certainly not derived from it, and was undoubtedly early."260 We need only cite again a passage from the *Acharnians*, where it occurs twice, to bolster this argument: "Do not begrudge me, gentlemen of the audience, if, therefore, although a beggar, I intend to speak among the Athenians about the city, as I make Tragedy. For

---


Tragedy too knows justice." As we saw above, this passage is a parody of Euripides' *Telephus* (Nauck, *TGF* fr. 703), and so the pun on tragedy is here unmistakable. The last sentence of this quote, "For Tragedy too knows justice," also has important implications, as Oliver Taplin has pointed out. The Greek reads τὸ γὰρ δίκαιον οἶδε καὶ τρυγοσφιξία. The position of καὶ in this sentence leads one to translate it as "too," or "also." It implies that there is some other obvious thing that "knows" justice besides Tragedy. The natural candidate in this context for this "other" is Tragedy. What Aristophanes seems to be saying, then, is that everyone knows that Tragedy knows justice, and he wants them to understand that Tragedy does too. But, as Taplin says, "The claim that tragedy τὸ δίκαιον οἶδε is not by any means to re-erect the dogma that it was written to inculcate moral lessons." Both Tragedy and Tragedy (Old Comedy) were important public voices competing in fifth-century Athens, where every important public decision was made by the *demos*, including who would be the victorious playwrights at the various festivals. Aristophanes did not compete head-to-head with Tragedy at the festivals for a prize, but in the arena of public voices he did compete with Tragedy in the shaping of the values, attitudes, and beliefs of the citizens. Aristophanes appropriated and (re)created the voice of Tragedy in his own plays and so made it his own voice. Like a skillful politician who latches on to an issue and then positions himself in the spotlight as the authoritative voice of reason for that issue, so too Aristophanes comically (re)created the voice of Tragedy in his Tragedy, and then positioned his own voice as that which the *polis* should listen to.

---

261* Acharnians* 497-9: μὴ μοι φθονήσῃ τ' ἄνδρες οἱ θεώμενοι / εἰ πτωχὸς ὄν ἔπειτ' ἐν Ἀθηναίοις λέγειν / μέλλων περὶ τῆς πόλεως, τρυγοσφιξίαν ποιεῖν. / τὸ γὰρ δίκαιον οἶδε καὶ τρυγοσφιξία.
262O. Taplin, "Tragedy and Tragedy," *op. cit.*
As we have seen, Aristophanes was not the only comedian to spar with Tragedy, but it seems that virtually all the comedians did. Thus both the tragedians and trugedians were concerned that their voice be heard, and this frequently meant exploring τὸ δίκαιον in the context of fifth-century Athenian civic involvement. This is why their subject matter usually revolves around a problem involving a transgression of fifth-century Athenian civic ideology. The tragedies were clothed in the heroes from epic, and so Tragedy competed with the privileged status of a poetic past. Old Comedy revolved around contemporary figures and voices that were influential. Both were public voices that competed with other voices of their own kind, and with each other, and this competing for public space was the basis and reason for tragic parody in Aristophanic Comedy. As long as Tragedy was a living genre, Comedy maintained a parasitic or symbiotic relationship with it in that it depended on Tragedy for its own comic effects and it competed with its public voice.

Although Tragedy's "historical moment" came to an end at the close of the fifth century, it continued to be a voice that comic poets had to reckon with in the fourth century. Accordingly, Comedy continued to parody and comment upon Tragedy. Now, however, the struggle was not with a living, flourishing poetic, but rather an emerging canon, and so the relationship between Comedy and Tragedy changed. The emphasis on parody, which we defined as the mimicking and applying to inappropriate subject matter the characteristic turns of thought and phrase of an author or work, gave way to a greater amount of burlesque, which is a spectacle that caricatures and renders ludicrous its subject matter. It is not that there was no burlesque earlier, nor any parody later, but it was a matter of degree. In the fourth century we begin to find a plethora of titles that were.

---


266 We can already see that Aeschylus, Sophocles, and especially Euripides were emerging as the tragic canon, because other than them, there is only one instance of another fourth century tragedian being mentioned (Chaeremon).
mythological, which by now meant tragic, burlesques. This indicates that Tragedy had become a treasure-trove of myth that could be raided for comic effect.

As time moved on, and the three great tragedians became canonical, as is evinced by Lycurgus erecting their three statues in the theater of Dionysus and ordering that an official copy of their works be made, the relationship between Comedy and Tragedy changed. Now that Tragedy was no longer a living voice of the contemporary stage, in many ways it became what epic had been earlier -- the most privileged poetic voice and the bearer of traditional values and ideology. Accordingly, Comedy's relationship to Tragedy also changed. Tragedy then was viewed as a paradigm or was treated as proverbial for the individual. Aphoristic quotes of Tragedy and entire plays like *The Lover of Euripides* are staged around this theme. Although we do not have contexts for these plays or the passages from them, we can postulate that they, like Menander, subverted those who used Tragedy as a role model for life. The fact that Euripides is parodied and burlesqued more than the other tragedians is, no doubt, a result of him being such an ideologue. Even Aristotle singles out Euripides in his discussion of Tragedy, saying:

> At first the poets picked stories at random, but now the finest tragedies are chosen from a few families, such as Alcmaeon, Oedipus, Orestes, Meleager, Thyestes, Telephus, and the others who either suffered or did terrible things. The best Tragedy in regards to poetic art possesses this arrangement. For this reason, those make the same mistake [mentioned above] who find fault with Euripides because he does this in his tragedies and ends many of his tragedies in misfortune. For this kind of ending is, as was said above, good. The greatest confirmation of this is that, of those plays staged and entered into competition, such plays like these seem to be the most tragic, if they are well-produced. *And Euripides, whatever his other faults of composition may be, at least seems to be the most tragic of poets.*

267 Aristotle, *Poetics* 13.17 (1453a): πρώτον μὲν γὰρ οἱ ποιηταὶ τοὺς τυχόντας μῦθους ἀπηρίθμουν, υἱὸν δὲ περὶ ὀλίγας οἰκίας αἱ κάλλισται τραγῳδίαι αὐτίκες, οἷον περὶ Ἀλκίμησιν καὶ Οἰδίπον καὶ Ὀμήρου καὶ Μελέαγρον καὶ Θέστατα καὶ Τῆλεφον καὶ ὀσίου ἄλλους συμβόηθηκεν ἢ παθεῖν δεινὰ ἢ ποιήσας. ὡς᾽ οὖν κατὰ τὴν τέχνην καλλιτεχνεία τραγῳδία ἐκ ταύτης τῆς συστάσεως ἦστε. διὸ καὶ οἱ Εὐριπίδη έγκαλοῦσης τὸ αὐτὸ ἀμαρτάνουσιν ὅτι τοῦτο δὲν ἐν ταῖς τραγῳδίαις καὶ αἴ πολλαὶ αὐτοῦ εἰς δυστυχίαν τελευτῶσι. τοῦτο γὰρ ἦστε ωσπερ εἴρηται ὁρθῶς σημεῖον δὲ μέγιστον ἐπὶ γὰρ τῶν σκηνῶν καὶ τῶν ἀγώνων τραγικότατας αἱ τοιαύτας φαίνεται, ἀν κατορθωθοῦσιν, καὶ ὁ Εὐριπίδης, εἰ καὶ τὰ ἄλλα μὴ εὖ οἴκονομεῖ, ἀλλὰ τραγικότατος γε τῶν ποιητῶν φαίνεται.
Thus Euripides became the "poster child" of Tragedy in the fourth century, especially those tragedies that end in misfortune, and this despite the paradoxical fact that he anticipated Menander in writing light escape-dramas, such as the prosatyrice Alcestis.

Having surveyed the nine comic uses of Tragedy prior to Menander, let us now turn to Menander and the tenth, which is the least comic of all -- subversion of tragic role-playing. In the chapters that follow we shall see that Menander appropriates the tragic staples, especially those found in Euripides' plays and those as defined by Aristotle, of pathos, anagnorisis, and perpeteia. These staples, however, are not parodied or burlesqued, rather they are elaborated and "performed" by characters who mistakenly view and dramatize their life through the lens of Tragedy. As the plays enact their own ideological struggle, those who cannot break the tragic pattern by the fifth act, that is the blocking figures, are humiliated and ridiculed.
CHAPTER 3:

THE ASPIS: A SUBVERSION OF TRAGIC PATHOS AND FATE

The first play of Menander that we turn to is his Aspis. A significant portion of the first three acts survives, and fragments from the fourth and fifth acts are extant as well. We have, therefore, a context for the passages from this play. As we shall see, the theme of the play centers around suffering at the hands of Tyche, the goddess of Chance whose cult was growing ever more popular in the Hellenistic world, especially at Athens during the last half of the fourth century when Menander was writing. More specifically, the play is about how events are governed by a benign Tyche, as opposed to the awful workings of a Fate (or the gods themselves) who cause terrible suffering so characteristic of the most memorable tragedies.

Tyche is not mentioned in Homer. Her earliest appearance is found in Hesiod's Theogony at line 360 in the long list of Oceanids, the daughters of Tethys and Oceanus. In Archilochus fragment 16, Tyche, like Moera, allots everything to mortals at birth. In Pindar she is actually the mightiest of the Moerac, daughter of Zeus Eleutherius and given

---


2 Pausanias (IV.30,4), who ascribed the Homeric Hymns to Homer, tells us that the earliest mention of her that he knows of in Greek literature is to be found in the Homeric Hymn to Demeter 420, where she again is said to be one of the daughters of Oceanus.

3 Pindar Hymn to Fortune fragment 41. See Pausanias VII.26,8.
the epithet Savior. Though ambivalent by nature, Tyche tends to be favorable. There are exceptions, most notably her usual role in Tragedy, where she is often invoked as good fortune, but in the end she turns out to be the cause, or at least she is blamed, for terrible suffering. Aristotle thought suffering so characteristic of Tragedy, that in his Poetics he states that in epic and Tragedy "there are these two components of the plot-structure, reversal (περιπέτεια) and recognition (ἀναγνώρισις); suffering (πάθος) is a third."

The locus classicus in Tragedy of a Tyche who causes pathos is found in the Oedipus Tyrannus of Sophocles. The root τυχ occurs 28 times in that play, with one instance seeming to stand explicitly for a divine power. That is when Oedipus says, "I consider myself to be the child of Tyche -- beneficent Tyche, nor shall I be dishonored" (Ἐγώ δ' ἐμαυτὸν παῖδα τῆς Τύχης νέμον / τῆς εὐ διδούσης, οὐκ ἀτιμασθήσομαι). What Oedipus so painfully discovers is that he is not a child of favorable Tyche, but a child of malignant Moera. The play is disturbing, because even though Oedipus scrupulously tries to avoid the fate of killing his father and sleeping with his mother, nevertheless he must suffer the harshest consequences for having made an innocent mistake (or ἀμαςτία to use Aristotle's term) about his own identity. As we shall see in the Aspis, Menander subverts this sort of tragic view of Fate and Tyche as agents of suffering that by his time, thanks in part to Aristotle, were thought to be characteristic of the finest and most memorable tragedies. In so doing, Menander's use of Tyche and suffering can be seen as part of growing cultural movement that increasingly saw (or tried

---

4Olympian 12.1-2: Αἰσχομαι, παί Ζηνός Ἐλευθερίου, / Ἱμέραν εὐρυσθενεί ἄμφιπόλει, ἄστειρα Τύχα.

5Compare Aeschylus Agamemnon 664, where she is savior and guide of the Achaeans, or compare Hesychius τύχη, εὐτυχία. Also compare her most usual epithet, ἀγαθή.

61452b 9-10: δύο μὲν οὖν τοῦ μῦθου μέρη ταύτ' ἐστι. περιπέτεια καὶ ἀναγνώρισις τρίτον δὲ πάθος. We will get to reversals and recognitions in the chapters which follow.

7In the Oedipus, it is not clear whether Tyche and Fate are one and the same. Perhaps Sophocles follows Pindar's geneology, making her one of the Moerae. For the various words and complex workings of Fate in Sophocles and tragedy in general, see R.P. Winnington-Ingram, "Fate in Sophocles," chap. in Sophocles: An Interpretation (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1980), 150-178.
to argue that) Tragedy's view of Fate and suffering was distorted and passé, and hence irrelevant. In this sense, then, Menander's use of Tyche can also be seen as one part of a larger cultural context in which Fate and even the gods themselves were viewed in more secular terms.

A rough outline of the plot of the play is as follows. An Athenian named Cleostratus has gone off to war to make money as a mercenary in Lycia. His father is dead, but his paternal uncles, Smicrines and Chaerestratus, are still alive and residing in Athens. He also has a sister (name unknown), whom he leaves behind under the charge of his uncle, Chaerestratus. In Lycia, Cleostratus' mercenary army is attacked by surprise, and in all the confusion one of his fellow soldiers grabs Cleostratus' shield and dies with it in his hand. Cleostratus' slave Davus, who had by chance set out for Rhodes just before the attack, heard the commotion, returned to the army, and with it took up a defensive position on a hilltop for three days. Eventually the mercenaries' position is no longer under siege, so they are ordered to bury their comrades as quickly as possible and move out. Among the fallen, who are bloated beyond recognition after three days of exposure in the sun, Davus finds a corpse clutching his master's shield (hence the title of the play), and mistakenly believes it to be the body of his dead master. Cleostratus is, in fact, not dead, but has been taken prisoner. Davus returns to Athens with Cleostratus' shield, money, and slaves to tell Smicrines and Chaerestratus of their nephew's tragedy. This news unleashes a struggle between Smicrines and Chaerestratus over the fate of their niece (Cleostratus' sister) and ultimately the whole inheritance. The older Smicrines wants to marry the girl and so possess the inheritance as well, but Chaerestratus wants to marry the girl to his stepson Chaereas, who is a more appropriate age-mate for the girl and has fallen in love with her. The play thus revolves around how to outsmart the greedy Smicrines so that Chaerestratus can wed the two lovers -- his step-son Chaereas and his niece.
The outcome of events is overseen by the ever-present deity Tyche, who speaks to us in a postponed prologue speech reminiscent of Euripides' divine prologue speeches. Unlike the Fate or the gods in Tragedy, or at least Tragedy as it had come to be thought of in Menander's day, Tyche in Menander does not cause suffering. In fact, in his Aspis Menander takes on the popular concept of dystyche in Tragedy and replaces it with eutyche. Furthermore the whole scope of what constitutes good or bad fortune has been reduced to the world of the average Athenian. An individual's Tyche does not revolve around the issues that were of concern to the heroes of Greek myth. Rather, Tyche for the average Athenian is whether or not we can marry someone we would wish, or whether we have the master we would wish, or whether we will get paid for a cooking job. The exact details of the play's outcome are unclear, because the end of the play is much too fragmentary from the point where Cleostratus returns. It is certain, however, that Smicrines is thwarted (cf. lines 143 ff) and Chaereas marries the girl. Chaerestratus has his own daughter who must be wed, and in some damaged lines it seems he says he wanted Cleostratus to marry her (lines 278-281), so in all likelihood we have a double wedding at the conclusion just as we have at the end of the Dyscolus. Thus a somewhat caricatured version of Tragedy, where we find that some men and women are fated to suffer, is challenged, and instead the play ends with the most comic of catastrophes -- marriage.

That the Aspis is a subversion of tragic suffering at the hands of Tyche requires that Tragedy, suffering, and Tyche have a prominent presence in the play. All, in fact, permeate this play in the portions that are preserved. The extant section of the opening of Menander's Aspis is very close to the beginning of the play, if not the actual first lines of
The play. It begins with 17 lines of unrelieved tragic diction spoken by the slave Davus.

The papyrus begins with Davus' solemn words:

1 [-----------------------------] ἡμέραν ἄγω
2 ὀ τρόφιμε, τὴν νῦν, οὐδὲ, διαλογιζομαι
3 παραπλήσι' ὧς τότε ἥλπησ' ἔξωρμόμενος.
4 ὁμηρεύ ἐνδοξοῦντα καὶ σωθέντα σε
5 ἀπὸ στρατείας ἐν βίῳ τ' εὐοχήμονι
6 ἡ δη τὸ λοιπὸν καταβίωσον τοις,
7 στρατηγὸν ἦ σύμβουλον ὄνομασμένον.

---
8 Sandbach, Gomme and Sandbach, Commentary, p. 63, does not believe that these are the first lines of the play because he feels the first exchange between Davus and Smicrines seems "unsuitable to the theory that Smikrines and Davus here first meet after a long absence (130), unless their curtness is a sign of Smikrines' lack of humanity, revealed by his very first words." I rather like his idea that Smicrines is here portrayed as being a bit uncaring. What is more, Menander has taken care in this passage to make clear the system of relationships around which this play is being built. He does this in a way that suggests that this is, in fact, the opening lines of the play. Thus Davus says in line 2, "O master," which tells the audience that he is a slave. A bit further on he makes his own status more explicit by saying "I your pedagogue," and he mentions the name of his master, Cleostratus. There is no reason for him to tell himself that he is his master's pedagogue, other than to let the audience know who he is, and the mention of his master's name is a bit gratuitous. Again, this suggests that these are the opening lines of the play. He then goes on to explain what has happened -- his master set out for war and has died, and only his shield remains. The play is named after the shield, and we would expect it to appear in the opening lines of the play. Finally, it is doubtful that Smicrines appears before the first lines we have with Davus, because in the postponed divine prologue, Tyche must explain who he is. Smicrines' mask would have told the audience everything they needed to know up to this point -- namely that he was a miserly, old man, so Menander would not necessarily have to provide us with more information. Furthermore, Smicrines first words include the apostrophe, "O Davus." Again this is a gratuitous address to Davus to let the audience know his name. Davus answers back with his own vocative, "Smicrines." If Smicrines and Davus had already met, this exchange of names would not be necessary. There may be a few more lines before the papyrus begins, and perhaps in those lines Davus tells us something about whom he is about to meet. In any case, the lines we have provide us with an economical, effective opening.

9 For the seeming violation of Porson's Bridge at line 10, see below.
10 The text used for all of the plays throughout this dissertation, unless otherwise stated, is the Oxford Classical Text of F.H. Sandbach, Menandri Reliquiae Selectae, rev. ed. with Appendix (New York: Oxford University Press, 1990).
I am spending this very day [in mourning?]
O master, nor do I reckon the balance
of things equal to my hopes when I set out.
For I was thinking then that you would have honor and would return safely
from war and live the rest of your years in modest grace and dignity,
holding the title of general or councilor,
and that your sister, for whose sake you then set out,
would be married to a groom worthy of yourself
upon your longed-for return,
and that for me there would be some respite from
my long labors in my later years in return for my goodwill.
But now you are gone, so unexpectedly snatched away,
and I your pedagogue, O Cleostratus,
have returned carrying this shield which did not
save you but which was often saved by you.
Yes, you were a great-spirited man,
if ever there was one.

As one can see from the scansion, all lines are in strict iambic trimeters, the meter of
tragic dialogue. None are without a penthemimeral or hepthemimeral caesura, and nowhere
is an iambus replaced by an anapaest. We do have eleven resolved feet, but as Sandbach
points out, there are passages of Tragedy that show a higher proportion of resolution, to
wit ten resolutions in only nine-and-a-half lines of Euripides *Iphigenia at Aulis* 1214 ff.¹¹
There is one seeming violation of Porson's Bridge at line 10 (ηκοντ' οικοδε), but upon
further examination we find that here we have a rare instance of the iambus being allowed
because there is an elision before the final trisyllabic word. The manuscripts show similar
elisions at Sophocles' *Ajax* 1101 (γειτ' οικοδεν, which the O.C.T. erroneously
emends¹² to γειτ' οικοδεν) and Sophocles' *Philoctetes* 22 (στματι' είτε έχει, which the
*Oxford Classical Text* simply gives as στματι' είτε έχει).¹³ Thus in this passage
Menander is not only presenting a tragic metrical scheme, but one that is recherché.

Verbal elements also lend a tragic flavor to the passage. The word κατακεφω at the
end of line nine is a word from Tragedy,¹⁴ and doesn't appear in general use until it is
found in inscriptions from the second century B.C.¹⁵ The use of χαριν (line 12) for
ένεκα is also mainly tragic.¹⁶ Its use here is particularly striking, as the phrase ενοικαζ
ένεκα is the standard form of the phrase found in inscriptions which confer public honors
to people. That Davus is thinking in terms of honors is confirmed by the fact that he had

---

¹¹F.H. Sandbach, "Menander’s Manipulation of Language for Dramatic Purposes," in *Entretiens
¹³Compare T.B.L. Webster's comments on line 22 (p. 69) in his commentary (Cambridge, 1970)
of the *Philoctetes*: "Here είτε έχει counts metrically as a single trisyllabic word. The rare exceptions to
this rule have, as here, elision before the trisyllabic word, e.g. Aj. 1101 γειτ' οικοδεν; probably elision
was felt to tie the words together so that the end of the line was heard as a pentasyllabic word which firmly
bound the third metron into the second."
¹⁴Compare Euripides, *Electra* 46.
¹⁵See Gomme and Sandbach, *Commentary*, p. 64, line 9.
¹⁶Ibid, p. 64, line 12
hoped that Cleostratus would return and be rewarded with a generalship or some councilor office, and that he himself would receive appropriate compensation for his loyalty. The participle εὐδο[ξο]ῦντα is also pervasive in honorary inscriptions from this period and again confirms that Davus is using language common to honorary context, but with a greater tragic flair. His apostrophizing of the dead Cleostratus with his words ὡ τρόφιμε is also reminiscent of Tragedy.

In addition to meter and diction, there is also a similarity to both the general situation and certain details of structure and incident that occur in tragedies. The whole opening is in fact designed to recall tragic pathos. Davus' delivery may be compared, for instance, to Electra's apostrophe of what she thinks are her brother's ashes in Sophocles' Electra 1126 ff. Electra says to the urn of ashes:

> O only remaining memorial of the soul of Orestes, the dearest of men to me, how differently I receive you home than what I had hoped for when I sent you forth. For now I hold nothingness in my two hands, but you, O child, were radiant when I sent you from home. Would that you had departed from life before I sent you to a foreign land after I had snatched you with these two hands and saved you from slaughter.

Similarities between the two situations include the addressing of someone who is thought to be dead, but is not. Blundell says of the monologue in the Aspis that, "Addressing the dead is fully in the tragic -- especially Sophoclean -- manner." Other similarities between the passages include both Davus and Electra making marked contrasts between their dearly

17Compare Wolfgang Schadewaldt, Monolog und Selbtsgespräch. Untersuchungen zur Formgeschichte der griechischen Tragödie (Berlin: Wiedmann, 1925), p. 29: "Wenn ein Erleben sich zur Leidenschaft steigert und den Menschen ganz erfüllt, vergisst er Zwecke, Haltung, Umwelt, alles, was ihn als geselliges Wesen bindet. Getragen von einem Pathos, lebt er ganz sich selbst und diesem Pathos. In Gegenwart anderer einsam, spricht er aus sich heraus oder in sich hinein."

18ὡ φιλατόν μνημείον ἀνθρώπων ἐμοί. / ψυχής Ὀρέστου λοιπόν, ὡς (ο) ἀπ’ ἔλπιδων /ούχ δι’ ἑξέπεμπτον εἰσεδεξάμην. / γιὰν γὰρ οὐδὲν οὔτα βαστάζω χεροῖν. / ὁμοίως δὲ σ’, ὡς παῖ, λαμπρῶν ἑξέπεμπτων ἐγώ. / ὡς ὀρελον πάροιδθεν ἐκλειπείν βίον. / πρὸς ὑμένα χεροῖν / κλέωσα ταύτεις κάνασασθαί φόνου...  
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departed and themselves. Both contrast between the past hopes and present realities. Both hold on to inanimate objects that are all that is left of the departed. One may compare another instance of this sort of "tragic threnody" in Euripides' *Troades* lines 673-683. There Hecuba grieves over her dead husband, Hector.

The faithful and forlorn servant, who appears on stage to deliver a prologue on the unfortunate state of his own and his master's condition, is also a tragic motif. We find this at the beginning of Euripides' *Medea*, where the Nurse appears. A band of captives accompanies Davus, which is another theme that occurs in Tragedy. We see it near the beginning of Euripides' *Hecuba*.

Calling attention to the shield of a fallen warrior borders on the melodramatic. In fact, were this whole passage to have survived without a context, it probably would have been considered tragic bathos. References to a warrior's shield occur in Euripides' *Troades*, where Talthybius brings in the dead body of Astyanax along with Hector's shield, and in a long speech he says of it, "...the terror of the Achaeans, this bronze-backed shield which this boy's father once slung around his side..." Shortly after Talthybius says this, Hecuba begins her response to this speech by referring to the shield: "Set the well-rounded shield of Hector on the ground, a painful, not dear, sight for me to behold." A little bit later she actually addresses the shield. "And you, once so fair in conquest and mother of a thousand routs, dear shield of Hector, receive this wreath. For

---

20I am in debt to A. Katsouris for much of the following material in his work, *Tragic Patterns in Menander* (Athens: The Hellenic Centre for Humanistic Studies, 1975), p. 105 ff. Having said that, I must point out that I think that Katsouris too readily argues that Menander had a specific tragedy in mind as he wrote this play. I think that most of what we find in the opening of the *Aspis* are a series of tragic motifs that are not based on any specific tragedy. It is the aura of Tragedy that Menander seeks to reproduce here, not a dialogue with a specific text. See my comments in my other chapters.

21Euripides, *Troades* 1136-7: ...φόβου τ' Ἀχαιῶν, χαλκόνωτον ἀστίδα / τῆν, ἢν πατὴρ τοῦ ἀμφί πλεύρ' ἐβάλλετο...

22*Troades* 1156-7: θεόθ' ἀμφίτορον ἀστίδ' ἐκτορος πέθω / λυπρόν θέαμα κοῦ φίλον λένασεν ἐμοί.
you are dead, although not dead, with this body, since it is better by far to honor you than
the arms of the clever, but evil, Odysseus."^23

After this initial tragic monologue by Davus, Smicrines speaks for the first time;
"What unexpected fortune, Davus!" (lines 18b-19a: τής ἀνελπίστου τύχης. / ὡς Δαί). Smicrines' emotional outburst24 contains a construction appropriate to Tragedy, the
genitive of cause used as an exclamation.25 The evocation of Tyche anticipates her
impending entrance, while at the same time it characterizes Smicrines, because the epithet
ἀνελπίστου is ambiguous in that it can be both positive and negative.26 For the greedy
Smicrines, who already has plans for Cleostratus' inheritance, Cleostratus' death really
represents a boon he could not have even hoped for. For Davus, who is perhaps already
suspicious of Smicrines' motives, it represents only despair and pain. Thus Davus replies
with a genitive of exclamation himself, clarifying that for him Tyche is tragic — δεινής
(19). But not only does the double meaning of ἀνελπίστου characterize Smicrines, more
importantly, it characterizes Tyche in a way that Smicrines and Davus do not foresee.
Tyche will work in unexpected ways throughout the play, in ways at variance with the
usual role of Fate or the gods in Tragedy. In the end she will be something that Smicrines
did not expect, and something Davus could not have hoped for.

The dialogue between Smicrines Davus continues. Smicrines asks, "How did he
die, in what manner?" (19-20: πώς δ' ἀπεκόλατε', ἡ τίνι / τρόπως). Gomme and
Sandbach note that "ἡ τίνι τρόπως appears to be an absolute equivalent of πώς; such

---

23Troilades 1221-5: αὕτ', ὡς ποτ' οὖσα καλλίνικε μαρίων / μήπορ τροπαίων. Ἡ ἔκτορος
φίλου αἀκος. / στεφανοῦ· θαυμῇ γάρ οὐθανώθα σὺν νεκρῷ· / ἔπει σὲ πολλῶ μᾶλλον ἡ τά
tου σοφοῦ / κακοῦ τ' Ὅδυσσέως δέξιον τιμῶν ὁπλα.
24Gomme and Sandbach, Commentary, p. 64,19 comment "ὡ strikes a note of simulated
emotion." We will continue to see the use of this construction as a signal for tragic speech.
26For the double meaning of ἀνελπίστου in this line, and how it characterizes Smicrines, see
that Menander uses it in the positive sense also at Sicyonius 128.
tautology is not infrequent in tragedy." Davus curtly reminds him that the path to death is easy for a soldier.

Smicrines persists, so Davus launches into a description about what happened that continues to blend the themes of Tragedy and Tyche together. He begins with the words, "There is a certain river in Lycia called the Xanthus..." Davus begins like a messenger in Tragedy. We may compare Aeschylus' Persae 447, νήσος τις ἡστὶ πρόσθε Σαλαμίνος τόπων and Sophocles' Trachiniae 237, ἀκτή τις ἡστὶ Εὔβοιας." D.B. Lombard notes other parallels between this speech and the common characteristics of Messenger Speeches in Euripides. He points out that generally in Euripidean Tragedy:

a.) The messenger addresses an actor or the chorus. If the latter is not the party concerned, he enquires where the addressee may be found. This address is mostly attended by passionate ejaculations which qualify the event which has taken place. b.) An anxious question of the addressee follows. c.) The messenger summarises the essential information. d.) The addressee now demands a full account of the event.

These characteristics obviously are similar to the exchange between Davus and Smicrines in the Aspis, including the part about the addressee emitting "passionate ejaculations."

Davus' tragic Messenger Speech continues, "...by which at that time we were faring well in a good number of battles. The natives had been routed and had left the plain. It would have been better, so it seems, to have not fared well in everything" (lines 24-28).

27Gomme and Sandbach, Commentary, p. 64.19.
28Gomme and Sandbach, Commentary, p. 65.
the root lend prominence to this theme, but the fact that the second instance is found in a gnomic phrase also highlights its importance. In the dialogue that follows between Davus and Smicrines over the fate of Cleostratus, the root appears one more time, in line 58:

"Fortunately there was a bit of a hill there, a strong position" (ἐὗτυξῶς δὲ τὶ / ἱοφίδιον ἦν ἑνταῦθ' ὀχυρών). Tyche, it seems, was even watching over Davus. As was alluded to above, throughout Davus' long description, Smicrines interjects several comments in tragic fashion, only in Smicrines' case the comments are designed to demonstrate his φιλαργυρία, miserly, and insensitive character. At length, Davus finally concludes his remarks about what happened to Cleostratus with the abrupt words, "You have heard everything from me" (ἀκήκοας μου πάντα). Austin notes that this sort of terse ending parallels many messenger speeches in Tragedy.

What we have then, is a speech that stylistically begins and ends like a messenger speech in Tragedy. These stylistic features serve as brackets, as it were, to the speech, which throughout is replete with tragic overtones. Davus himself, a few lines later, refers to his speech as a "wretched story" (ταξαίπωρον λόγον) -- again using a compound adjective appropriate to and common in Tragedy. Based upon the evidence of the Aspis so far, it would appear that Quintilian's assertion that Menander "followed" Euripides is justified, for in the Aspis we find a use of Tragedy not seen in Old Comedy -- paralleling and imitating it faithfully without a parodic spectacle.

At last when Davus and Smicrines leave the stage, the divine Tyche herself appears. Her function is threefold. First of all on a practical level she must fill in some details for the benefit of the audience. Secondly, she is the driving force behind the play's action, just

---

30 See Smicrines comments at lines 33, 48, 62.
31 C. Austin, Menandri Aspis et Samia, vol. II (commentary, 1970): He cites Sophocles' Ajax 480, πάντ' ἀκήκοας λόγον; Sophocles' Philoktetes 389, λόγος λέλεκται τὰς; Aeschylus' Agamemnon 582, πάντ' ἔχεις λόγον; Aeschylus' Eumenides 710.
32 Aeschylus uses ταξαίπωρον 5 times, Sophocles 10 times, and Euripides 39 times. Menander has it 8 times.
33 See chapter 1.
as Aphrodite is in Euripides' *Hippolytus*. Other extant plays of Menander that have a
divine figure who seems to be directing the action include Pan in the *Dyscolus* and Agnoia
in the *Perikeiromene*. Both Agnoia and Tyche are also the themes around which the actions
of their respective plays evolve. Thirdly, her prologue speech is designed to recall
Tragedy, especially Euripidean Tragedy. Divine prologue speeches are, of course, part-in-
parcel of Euripidean Tragedy. Of Menander's prologue speeches, Sandbach notes, "Both
divine and human prologue-speakers are to be found in Euripidean Tragedy and doubtless
served as a precedent for the writers of comedy." The big difference between Euripides'
and Menander's divine "prologue" speech in the *Aspis* is that the speech in the *Aspis* is
delayed. The delay affects the audience. Through the delayed prologue speech, the
audience experiences both an anagnorisis and a peripeteia that confirm their suspicions that
this is not Tragedy, but Comedy.

Tyche begins her speech as follows -- Arnott's translation is used because it
reflects the tragic mood: "If a real tragedy had struck these people, A goddess like me
couldn't come on next." As Arnott notes in his translation, Tyche refers to a well-known
convention of Greek Tragedy. Divinities could not enter the stage if there were a dead
person, because Greek divinities and their temples had to be kept free from the pollution
causd by contact with the dead. We can compare Artemis' words to the dying Hippolytus
at Euripides' *Hippolytus* 1437-39: "Farewell! For it is not lawful for me to look upon the
dead, nor pollute my eyes with your last gaspings for breath. For I see that you are already

---

34 Gomme and Sandbach, *Commentary*, p. 20. Cf. Handley's comments on divine prologues in
his *The Dyskolos of Menander*, Cambridge 1965, p. 127: "Menander and his contemporaries were working
with a long tradition behind them. Like many comic traditions, it was nourished by the continuous
influence of Tragedy, especially Euripidean tragedy; and as a divine prologue figure Pan includes among his
forbears in Attic drama not only Calligeneia in Aristophanes, but Aphrodite in Euripides' *Hippolytus*, and
the other divine prologue figures from the tragic stage."


36 Translating δυσχερῆς "tragedy" is appropriate here because we are explicitly told at lines 330-
331 that this is what Cleostratus' death is.

37 Lines 97-98: ἀλλ' εἰ μὲν ἡν τούτοις τι γεγονός δυσχερῆς, θεὸν οὐκ σαν οὐκ ἢν εἰκὸς ἀκολουθεῖν ἔμε.
near this evil."³⁸ Or again lines 22-23 of the Alcestis, where Apollo takes leave of Admetus' house because Alcestis is about to expire, saying: "But I, lest any pollution in the house touch me, take leave of the most beloved cover of these halls."³⁹ Tyche goes on to explain how Davus mistakenly identified the body of his master, using the language of Aristotle on Tragedy: "What with the shield lying among the corpses and with the lad all bloated, this fellow [Davus] made a mistake (διημαρτήκε)." Menander's acquaintance with Peripatetic teachings is well-documented, so his use of the root ἀμαρτία here and elsewhere probably is meant to resonate with echoes of Aristotle's Poetics,⁴⁰ except unlike ἀμαρτία in Tragedy, that in Comedy does not lead to disastrous results. More importantly, Tyche herself announces at the end of her speech in lines 147-8 that she is, "the mistress, umpire, and controller of all these things -- Tyche" (πάντων κυρία / τούτων βραβεύσαι καὶ διοικῆσαι, Τύχη). Her role can be compared to divine figures in the prologues of Euripides' plays, such as Aphrodite in the Hippolytus or Dionysus in the Bacchae. Tyche is therefore, the theme around which this play revolves, more specifically whether she is δυστυχίς, as in Tragedy, or εὐτυχίς.

In the scene that follows, we find the philargyrious Smicrines trapping Davus and telling him his intentions. With an echo from Tyche's speech, Smicrines pronounces that lawfully he is the "master of all" (lines 170-71: κατὰ τοὺς νόμους / κύριος ἀπάντων), including the young girl whom he now plans to marry himself. There is a bit of irony in Smicrines' pronouncement, because Tyche herself has already told us that Smicrines will be unmasked and that she is the πάντων κυρία. Such irony is not unlike what we find in Tragedy, for instance that which is found in the Oedipus. Davus tries to

³⁹ἴγω δὲ, μὴ μίσῃ μ' ἐν δόμοις κίχη. / λείπω μελάθρων τὸνδ᾽ Ὀἰτάτη τοῦταν στέγην.
⁴⁰For ἀμαρτία in Menander, see chapter 5 on the Samia and the bibliography cited there.
persuade him to behave more moderately, but Smicrines insists. Davus realizes that if
Smicrines does become the κύριος ἀπάντων, it will of necessity mean that he will
become Smicrines' slave -- a thought Davus abhors. When Smicrines at last leaves, Davus
is left alone on the stage and says, "O Tyche, what sort of master are you intending to hand
me over to after the one I had? What wrong have I ever done you?" (lines 213-15: ὄ
Τύχην, / ὧν με' ἄφρος δεσπότου παρεγγυᾶν / μέλλεισ. τι σ' ἡδίκημα
tηλικοῦτ' ἐγώ.: Davus is now moving beyond his master's tragedy, and contemplating
his own. But immediately after this forlorn pronouncement, just before the close of the
first act, Menander pulls out of his bag of tricks one of his favorite routines -- deflation of a
tragic situation. A comic cook, who was hired for the wedding between Chaereas and
Cleostratus' sister that was supposed to take place that day, enters and says:

When I finally ever do get a job, either someone dies
and I have to leave without my pay,
or one of the women in the house is secretly pregnant and gives birth
and then the party's suddenly over. But I'm sent off
and gone. What wretched luck!41

Of course, death defines Tragedy, and so do secret pregnancies, especially those of royal
virgins impregnated by the gods. Davus then tells him to get lost, and the cook responds,

What do you think I'm doing? [turning to his own assistant:]
Take the knives, little boy, and look sharp!
I came and took this job for three drachs
after ten days without work. I thought I had them in hand.
Some corpse comes from Lycia and steals the whole
lot by force! A tragedy like this happens to those
inside, and though you're dumb enough to rob a temple, when
you see the women crying and beating their breasts you only
steal an empty flask! Remember to seize an opportunity
like this! No Spark, but an Aristides have I --
an honest underling! I'll see to it that you get
no dinner. The waiter is probably staying for

41Lines 216-220: ἀν καὶ λάβω ποτ' ἔργων, ἢ τέθυηκε τις. / εἰτ' ἀποτρέχειν δεῖ μισθὸν
οὐκ ἔχοντα μέ, / ἢ τέτοκε τῶν ἐνδον κυώσα τις λάθραι. / εἰτ' οὐκέτι θύουσι' ἔξαπτινης. ἀλλ' οἶχομαι / ἀπίσων ἐγώ. τῆς διαποτίμας.
the funeral feast!42

The Waiter then comes out of the house and says (perhaps to women who are beating their breasts within), "If I don't get my drachma, I'll beat my breast myself and be no different than you!"43 The Waiter and Davus then exchange some insults.

At first glance this slapstick at the close of the first act may seem rather odd.

Gomme and Sandbach explain it as follows,

This is a lively scene, but at first sight it seems in no way to give new information, to forward the plot, or to be integrated into the structure. Its purpose seems merely that of introducing the cook, who has a traditional part in comedy.... But since Menander frequently constructs his plays that the final scene of an act introduces some element required for the progress of the plot in the next act, one looks for some kind of connection between this scene with the cook and the coming act. This may be found in the fact that it brings a vivid reminder that the wedding of Kleostratos’ sister was on the very point of taking place that day. This makes Smikrines’ conduct in stopping it more inhumane, and Chaireas’ disappointment, to be displayed in the next act, even more likely to arouse the audience’s sympathy."44

In addition to these lucid observations, it should be added that he is primarily brought on stage as the voice of Comedy to deflate the tragic situation. The Cook and Waiter, who are symbols of Comedy, overturn the tragic overtones that keep appearing in the play by engaging in tragic role-playing, calling attention to their own "tragedies," using tragic words and the same tragic grammatical construction that we have already seen (the genitive of cause), and applying them to their own "tragic" situation. Of the word δυσποτιμίας, Gomme and Sandbach themselves say, "In the main [it] belongs to tragedy,

---

42Lines 221-233: νῦν δὲ < οὐ > τί δοκῶ ποιεῖν; / λαβὲ τὰς μαχαίρας, παιδάριον, θάττον ποτε. / δραχμῆν τριῶν ἥλβον δί' ἡμερῶν δέκα / ἐργὸν λαβὼν ὡμὴν ἔχειν ταῦτας· νεκρός / ἐκδικήσας τὸν Λύκιαν / ταῦτας. τοιοῦτοις αὐτοῖς δι' ἔγχος / τούτοις τοιοῦτοις, τὸς ἐνδομένω, κλασομένως ὄργον / καὶ κοπτομένως γυναίκας ἐκφέρεις κεφήνη / τὴν λήκυθον; μέμησας καιρὸν παραλαβὼν / τοιοῦτον. οὐ Σπυρίδην. ὁ δὲ ἐκάθεν / ὑπηρέτησαν βίαν; ἐνακοίην ' ἀγάθον / ὑπηρέτησαν βίαν; ἐνακοίην. οὐ δὲ ταρταροὺς κατακεκοιμηθήκει / εἰς τὸ περιδείπτου τυχόν ἱσώς.


44Gomme and Sandbach, Commentary, p. 80.
its use by the cook of his bad luck probably has a touch of absurdity." Furthermore, the scene is well-integrated into the play, if we see that Menander intends for the audience to note the discrepancy not only between the Cook's (mis)appropriation of tragic language and dramatization of his emotions, but also Davus'. The Comedy appropriates Tragedy and tragic responses to life before our very eyes, and then invites us to contextualize them in the ordinary by privileging the comic. In fact, we find this same technique of deflation and undercutting in the opening scene between Davus and Smicrines. At every point that Davus' tragic tone begins to rise to a great pitch, Smicrines undercutts it with his greedy or sanctimonious remarks, such as at lines 33, 48, and 62. That Menander was fond of such a seesaw technique is perhaps supported by Plutarch's comments on his style: "But if the action should require any strange language and bluster, he opens, as it were, all the stops of his flute, but then quickly and plausibly closes them and brings the sound back to its natural quality."46

The Cook and the Waiter, then, are brought on stage as foils to the other tragedies in the play and to the very presence of Tragedy in the play. They are vivid reminders that the appropriation of Tragedy is misguided dramatic role-playing. In order to reinforce the themes of Tragedy and Tyche in the play, Davus says in the last two lines of Act I, "The workings of Tyche are unclear. Enjoy the time at hand!" (lines 248-9: τὸ τῆς Τύχης / ἀδηλος εὑφραίνειθ’ ὅν ξεστίν χρόνου). Austin notes that the sentiment comes from Heracles in Euripides' Alcestis 785 and 788, τὸ τῆς τύχης γὰρ ἀφανὲς...εὑφραίνε σαυτόν, πίνε.... It is difficult to say whether or not this is an allusion to the Alcestis. Elsewhere in this dissertation it is shown that Menander rarely if ever has a direct dialogue with another Tragedy. Davus' comments here, however, are absolutely programmatic. As

46 Translation by Harold North Fowler, with minor modifications. Plutarch, Moralia 853e: ἐὰν δὲ τίνως ἀρα τερατείας εἰς τὸ πρᾶγμα καὶ ψόφον δεῖπνη, καθάπερ αὐλοῦ πάντρητου ἀναστάσας ταχύ πάλιν καὶ πιθανῶς ἐπέβαλε καὶ κατέστησε τὴν φωνὴν εἰς τὸ οἰκεῖον.
the *servus callidus*, another potent symbol of Comedy, Davus, like the comical Heracles in the prosatryc Alcestis, must comically endure and preach the necessity of enjoying life while you can in the face of Tragedy. It signals that he will foil the Tragedy that is to unfold.

Act II opens with Smicrines and his younger brother, Chaerestratus, having basically the same conversation that Smicrines and Davus had earlier. Smicrines tells Chaerestratus that he intends to marry the girl and take control of the inheritance as is his right as the eldest surviving brother. Chaerestratus, like Davus, tells Smicrines he must behave more moderately. Chaerestratus even suggests that Smicrines take the rest of the inheritance, but let Chaereas marry the girl. In so doing, Menander makes it clear that Chaerestratus is not interested in money. Smicrines refuses, believing that if Chaereas and the girl have a child, then the child will have a legal claim to the inheritance. Smicrines then demands that a full accounting of the inheritance be made, so that he not be cheated. He leaves the stage and Chaerestratus says to Chaereas (the first two lines are damaged, but the sense is clear), "[I was intending that] you take this [girl] and he (Cleostratus) take my [daughter] and to leave you two in charge of my property. Sooner would I depart from this life than to see what I never expected." Chaerestratus' language is rather strong. He seems to be contemplating suicide like a tragic hero. His reference to the "unexpected" (μήπωτ᾿ ἡλπίοια) also echoes Davus' sentiments at line 3 of the play, as well as a theme found in many Euripidean epilogues -- the unexpected outcome that the gods bring about.

Chaereas then takes the stage alone and speaks to the dead Cleostratus (lines 284-298):

47The second Hypothesis to the Alcestis states that it was fourth in the set, after the Cressae, Alcmaeon in Psophis, and Telephus -- the position usually given to a satyr-play.


49Compare the endings of the Alcestis, Hippolytus, Andromache, Iphigeneia in Tauris, and Helen, all of which end with a formulaic reference to the unexpected (ἀξέλπτως).
Ah well. First of all, Cleostratus, perhaps it is reasonable to pity and weep your suffering, and then secondly my own. None of your relatives, surely, has suffered the fate I have. For I did not fall in love willingly with your sister, dearest of mankind to me. Nor did I do anything rash or unseemly or wrong. I asked permission to wed her legally from your uncle with whom you left her, and my mother by whom she is being raised. I was thinking that I had a somewhat blessed life, thought I had really reached the furthest limits, and now I expect I will be unable to see her hereafter. The law makes another her overseer, and judges my claim null and void from now on.  

In this speech of Chaereas we once again find more tragic overtones. Structurally and thematically the speech recalls that of Davus at the opening of the play. Both speeches are delivered as monologues. Both apostrophize the dead Cleostratus. Both mourn over their own fates and that of Cleostratus. Both compare past hopes with present realities in similar ways, including a verbal echo (in the opening scene Davus said δισίν γὰρ εὖδοξούντα καὶ συνεντα σὲ ἁπτῷ στρατείας ἐν βίωι, and Chaereas uses similar phrasing, saying δισίν δὲ μακάριος τις εἶναι τῷ βίωι). For the first time also, we see find use of the word πάθος. In lines 285 and 286, Chaereas says of Cleostratus that it is "reasonable to pity and weep your suffering, and then secondly my own." His words make it clear that he considers his and Cleostratus' sufferings to be similar. Later on in line 329 Davus will explicitly link πάθος in this play to Tragedy, and so here we would be justified in translating this word as tragic suffering. Furthermore, Chaereas' speech
contains five successive lines of tragic meter (lines 286-290), one of which contains the tragic-sounding phrase φιλτατ' άνθρωπων ἐμοί. This same phrase occurs at Aristophanes' *Clouds* 110, of which Dover says it exudes a "hint of paratragedy." The speech also continues the theme of tragic Tyche, for Chaereas use the verb ἡπόχρηκεν in line 287 to describe his fate.

What we have then is a series of characters who are all seemingly suffering some sort of Tragedy: Cleostratus, Davus, the Cook, the Waiter, Chaerestratus, and now Chaereas and the girl. All have erroneously appropriated the dramatic language of Tragedy, all need a different (comic) outlook on Tyche. Of course Smicrines is conspicuously absent from this list, but in the end Tyche will reverse the roles. No doubt even the Cook and Waiter are invited back at the end of the play to share in the good fortune of Chaereas' and Cleostratus' weddings, privileging the comic over the tragic.

The next scene opens with Davus imploring Chaerestratus to buck up. Slaves who encourage masters who are forlorn to the point of death are again reminiscent of Tragedy. The nurse in Euripides' *Hippolytus* comes readily to mind. That Chaerestratus is forlorn to the point of death is made clear by his remarks to Davus: "Davus my boy, I'm in a bad state. Black bile seethes in me over these affairs. By the gods, I'm not myself -- I've all but gone mad." Chaerestratus is dramatizing his "maddening" anger like so many figures in Tragedy. And a few lines later he says of the impending wedding of Smicrines and his niece, "I'll not live, by the gods, if I see this happen!" Chaerestratus needs a comic attitude adjustment. He is far too tragic in his response to life.

---


52 Lines 305-307: Δαί παῖ, κακῶς ἔχω. / μελαγχολῶ τοῖς πράγμασιν μᾶ τοὺς θεοὺς. / οὐ εἰμί ἐν ἐμαυτῷ, μαίνομαι δ' ἀκαρῆς πάνυ.

53 For the vocabulary of tragic madness, which is here used by Chaeresratus, see chapter 5 on the Samia.

54 Lines 314-15: οὐ μὴ βιῶ, μᾶ τοὺς θεοὺς. / εἴ τοῦτ' ἐπόξουσαι γενόμενον.
Chaerestratus' depression gives Davus an idea. He tells Chaerestratus (in some damaged lines) that the key to outsmarting Smicrines is to distract him from the girl with some prospect of a greater monetary reward. When Chaerestratus asks him what his plan is, Davus says to Chaerestratus and Chaereas, in the most significant lines of the play, "You two must act out another tragedy" (lines 329-330: δεῖ τραγῳδησαι πάθος / ἄλλοιον ύμῖς). The words πάθος ἄλλοιον with the verb τραγῳδησαι explicitly state that what has gone on before has been a tragic suffering too, and so for the first time Davus' words make clear what has been lurking in the background of this whole play. As was alluded to in the speech of Chaereas above, the use of the word πάθος here in close connection with the word τραγῳδησαι indicates that in this play suffering means tragic suffering, and it is almost certainly no coincidence that Aristotle defines suffering (πάθος) as one of the three basic components of Tragedy. The irony of it all is that Davus' words are more true than even he realizes, for both tragedies are ultimately "acts," albeit in different ways. The first act exploited tragic oration in ignorance, the second act will be one of tragic pretense. Thus it seems that Menander wishes us to see that "performing" Tragedy in one's own life is absurd. Davus counsels Chaerestratus to fake his death so that Smicrines will wish to marry his niece by Chaerestratus instead of his niece by Cleostratus. Thus depression, suffering, contemplation of suicide are not what make us heroes, but taking Tragedy and comically manipulating it rather than being manipulated by it. Davus is sure that Smicrines will prefer Chaerestratus' daughter over Cleostratus', because the estate of Chaerestratus is bigger than that of Cleostratus. Chaerestratus and Chaereas agree to the plan, which includes bringing in a sham doctor, Doric dialect and all, to certify that Chaerestratus is dead. As Act II comes to a close, the theme of Tyche once

55To repeat, Poetics 1452b 9-10: δύο μὲν οὖν τοῦ μύθου μέρη ταῦτ' ἐστὶ, περιπέτεια καὶ ἀναγνώρισις τρίτον δὲ πάθος.
56For Menander's criticism of those who "perform" or dramatize their emotions using tragic conventions, see chapter 5 on the Samia.
again appears, when Davus says to Chaerestratus, "Die, and good Luck!" (line 381: ἀπόθνησκ' ἀγαθῇ τύχη). The irony is rich and would not be lost on the audience. Even sudden death, the staple of the tragic stage, has been comically appropriated.

The next time we see Davus (D), he comes out of the Chaerestratus' house shouting so that Smicrines (S) can hear him,

(D) O ye gods, it is dreadful, by Helius, what has happened! I never would have thought that a person could sink into such tragic suffering so quickly! Some sort of violent thunderbolt has struck the house!\(^7\)

The tragic flavor is unmistakable. It begins with the situation itself. Davus "acts" like a tragic exanggelos who comes from the house to announce bad tidings. His first words are "a substitute for the hackneyed ω θεία of Tragedy."\(^8\) References to blighted houses are also legion in Tragedy. Again he repeats the word πάθος, to stress the tragic nature of Chaerestratus' feigned illness. When Smicrines asks him what he is talking about, Davus runs off a string of tragic aphorisms that are meant to intertwine the themes of suffering and Tyche that occur repeatedly throughout the play, and in some instances he underscores their sources:\(^9\)

---

\(^7\) Lines 399 ff.: οί δαίμονες, φοβερόν γε, νη τοῦ Ἡλίου. / τὸ συμβεβηκὸς: οὐκ ἂν ὠνήην ποτὲ / ἄνεργοστον εἰς τοσοῦτον οὕτωσι ταχύ / πάθος ἐμπεσειν. σκιπτός τις εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν / βαγδάτος ἐμπέπτοκε.

\(^8\) Gomme and Sandbach, Commentary, p. 95.

"No man whatsoe'er [prospers in all things]."60
Again most excellent. "Ye most [revered gods],
what an unexpected and [terrible?] affair!"61
Davus you damnable fiend, where's the rush?62
And this too perhaps,
"The affairs of mortals Chance, not Providence."63
Splendid. "God engenders blame in mortals,
whene'er he wishes to blight a house to its very foundations."64
Aeschylus the poet of holy words who--
Quoting maxims, you pathetic wretch?65
"Beyond belief, indescribable, dire."66
Will he never stop?67
"What is past belief among the sufferings of mortals?"68
So Carcinus says. "For in one day
god makes the prosperous flounder."69
All these were well-said, Smicrines.
What are you talking about?
Your brother -- O Zeus, how shall I say it? -- is all but
dead.
The one who just a moment ago was chatting with me?
What happened?
Bile, some sort of anguish, loss of sanity, choking.
Poseidon and ye gods, what a terrible tragedy!
"There's no word so dread to tell, no suffering --"70
You're killing me!

---

60 Aspis, line 407: from Euripides Stheneboea (Nauck, TGF, fr. 661) parodied by Aristophanes in the lekythos-scene of the Frogs, line 1217, as well as Nicostratus (Kassel and Austin, PCG fr. 29, and Phillipides PCG fr. 18.
61 Source unknown, but undoubtedly from some tragedy. For the restoration, Blume cites Fabula Incerta 56: οὐκ ἄνθρωπος ὁ θεός, ἀλλ' ἐκκυκλώμενος ἐξήγησις.
62 Line 410: Αἰτίες οὐκέτας, τούτων τρέχεις:
63 Ibid, line 411: from Chaeremon's Achilles Thersiactonus (Nauck, TGF, fr. 2), made famous by Theophrastus' use of it in his Callisthenes.
64 Ibid, lines 412-13: from Aeschylus' Niobe (Nauck, TGF, fr. 156). Attacked by both Plato (Rep. 380a) and Plutarch (Mor. 17b and 1065b) to exemplify poetry's poor theology.
65 Line 414: γεωμετρετέος, τρισάδεις;
66 Ibid, line 414: from some unknown source, doubtless tragic -- perhaps Carcinus (see next footnote).
67 Line 415: οὐδὲ παύσεται:
68 Ibid, line 416: from some unknown play by Carcinus. There were two Carcini who wrote tragedy, father and son. The younger lived in the fourth century and was the more famous and successful. He is said to have written 160 plays (Suda, s.v.) and won 11 times at Athens (probable restoration of IG ii2 2325,b9). He was also a favorite in the court of Dionysius II, the tyrant of Syracuse (Diod. Sic. 5.5.1). He is mentioned by Aristotle several times (Poet. 16, 17; Eth. Nic. 7.7; Rh. 2.23 and 3.16) and once by Plutarch (De Gler. Ath. 7). He, and not his father, is probably the Carcinus of this quote.
69 Ibid, lines 417-18: from an unknown source, although by its position it may be associated with Carcinus (see previous footnote).
70 Ibid, lines 424-25: from the opening of Euripides' Orestes.
"For mishaps unforeseen the gods ordained."\textsuperscript{71} The former Euripides, the later Chaeremon, not your everyday poets, they.

Has any doctor come?

Chaereas has gone to get one.

Whom?

This one, by [Zeus] so it seems. Good sir, do hurry!

"The sick are hard to soothe because of their helplessness."\textsuperscript{72}

Lines that interweave the themes of suffering and Tyche, include 411 (τύχη τὰ θυμήτων πράγματ' οὐκ εὔβουλία) and 417-18 (ἐν μιᾶ ημέραι / τὸν εὐτυχῆ τίθηι δυστυχῆ θεός. The first quote applies to all the characters, for they are all scheming with what they think are εὔβουλίαι, but in the end it is Tyche who is the master of all, a benign Tyche. The second quote is particularly important, for it sums up the ideological war of the play: the εὐτυχῆ of Menandorean Comedy versus the δυστυχῆ of Tragedy.

Smicrines understands, or rather believes, that something tragic has happened to Chaerestratus, and so in line 422 he asks "Suffering (πάθος) what?" When Davus describes this tragedy, Smicrines takes the bait and says in his next words "What a terrible tragedy!" (δενοῦ πάθος). Smicrines' second use of the genitive of cause as an exclamation also grammatically recalls the earlier uses,\textsuperscript{73} and so confirms that the earlier uses of this normally rare construction were meant to be understood as tragic utterances.

Davus then continues with the theme of suffering by quoting from the opening of Euripides' \textit{Orestes}, "There's no word so dread to tell, no suffering (πάθος)." Other key words in this section that echo words spoken earlier of Tragedy and fortune are κακόν,

\textsuperscript{71}Ibid, lines 425-26: from some unknown play by Chaeremon (Snell ascribes this quote to Euripides, frag. 944a, but see \textit{Commentary} by Gomme and Sandbach, pg. 98, lines 424-7).

\textsuperscript{72}Ibid, line 431: from Euripides' \textit{Orestes}, line 232.

\textsuperscript{73}Lines 18 and 248.
and Ἕλευσ. Again, it also reminds us of Aristotle, who, as was noted above, argued that suffering was one of the three main components of any good Tragedy.

Smicrines' initial reactions to Davus' tragic delivery are also important because they create an irony in that they are meant to mirror the "ideal" audience's response to the presence of Tragedy in the play: "Quoting maxims, you pathetic wretch?" When Davus persists, Smicrines actually turns to the audience at line 415 and says, "Will he never stop?" Finally in line 425 we have another ironical comic inversion, when Smicrines tells the tragic maxim-spouting Davus, "You're killing me!" The quoting of Tragedy kills the listener. Even the elderly Smicrines knows that Tragedy is nothing but outdated saws, and so we not only laugh at Smicrines' and Davus' performance of Tragedy, we also laugh at Tragedy itself.

The humorous Doric doctor scene follows, but the manuscript becomes increasingly difficult to make much sense of. A new fragment of the play, however, identified by Gaiser continues the theme of Tyche and Tragedy. Gaiser shows that the fragment belongs to the end of Act III where there is a considerable lacuna. In it, it seems that Davus ([D]) and Smicrines ([S]) are conversing:

[(D)] [You mean even if it seems] unjust to everyone, [the] word and law of a tyrant must be ob[eyed.]

[(S)] [Drop it!] What were you doing? Was the girl there?

[(D)] Weeping at her wretched fate [she kept crying "Father, Father!" And not letting [go] ["O] put your arms around me, father, [hold your child!"]

[(S)] [I am taking thought ] for my present fortune.

---


76 Arnott judges the lacuna to be between 178 and 214 lines, Sandbach believes it is about 205 lines.
[And you will not be tripped up] now, [since you are always]
a good judge in good fortune.\(^77\)

It appears that Smicrines has taken the bait. His mention of his "present fortune" (τὴν παροῦσαν μοι τῇ χη[ν]) recalls his first recorded lines of the play, where at the seeming death of Cleostratus he exclaimed "What an unexpected fortune!" The situations are parallel. The first "death" gave him the fortune of taking control of Cleostratus' estate, the second "death" that of Chaerestratus'. Davus' report of the girl's response to her father's feigned death also continues the pseudo-tragedy, first signaled by his use of the word μόρος. Mourners frequently cling to the dead corpses of their loved ones in Tragedy.\(^78\)

The use of [π]εριπλάκηθι, rare elsewhere, echoes a fragment of Euripides.\(^79\)

After this fragment, we have no way of knowing the extent to which the themes of Tragedy, Tyche, and suffering continue to play a role. At line 497, some form of the word εὐτυχις appears, and this suggests that at least the Tyche theme continues into Act IV.\(^80\)

Tragic coloring is definitely to be found in Cleostratus' remarks upon his unexpected return. When he first knocks on his uncle Chaerestratus' door, Davus does not recognize that it is him and tells him to go away because the master of the house is dead. Cleostratus immediately responds in the damaged line 502, οἴμοι δυ[σ- - -] and again in line 504, οἴμοι τάλας - ζω θεῖ... When Davus realizes that his master Cleostratus has returned, he

\(^77\)[Δ] [λέγεις: ἔναν καὶ πασί; ν ἔκδικος [θορκί.] / [ὁ λόγος τυράννου καὶ νόμος φυλακτεσ] / [Σ] [εα], τί ἤγεθα: ἥ κόρη δὲ καὶ προσ[ην:] / [Δ] [ὁδ]υρομενὴ δὲ πρὸς μόρον τὸν ἄθλιον] / [ἐμ]ιξεν "ἀι πάτερ, πάτερ" καὶ οὐ[κ ἀφεμενή] / [τὸ δὲ περιπλάκηθι μοι, πάτερ, τὸ τέκνου ἔχε.] / [Σ] [πρ]ός τὴν παροῦσαν μοι τῇ χη[ν] ἤμεν οὐκομοι/ [Δ] [κούκ, ἐν καλοὶ καλὸς κριθής γεγονός ἄει,] / [τὸ νῦν σφαλησθήση].

\(^78\)Compare the Medea 1204 ff., where Creon clings to his daughter's corpse and is also poisoned.

\(^79\)Nauck, TGF 930: οἴμοι, δράκων μοι γῆγεται τὸ ἡμιυρ - τέκνου, περιπλάκηθι τῷ λοιπῷ πατρί.

\(^80\)This line is spoken by Cleostratus upon his return. Handley restores it and the preceding line as follows: εἶ δ' αὖ διαιτήσεσθαι τοῦς πολεμίους ξηθ trị μοῦνον] / ὁ Δάος, εὐτυχι(-εστάτου πάντων τὸν ἀν] / νομίσαμι - ἐμαυτο[ν].

\(^81\)It is tempting to restore some form of δυστυχις.
says έξω σε, a recurring phrase in Tragedy for unexpected reunions. When Act V begins, however, it appears that the iambic trimeters give way to trochaic tetrameters and thus the Comedy has triumphed over the Tragedy, which is banished from the stage, just as it is at the end of the *Dyscolus*.

It should be clear that Menander's use of Tragedy is somewhat different than any we saw in the previous chapter, but as was noted before, the lack of context prevents us from drawing certain conclusions, except in the case of Aristophanes. In the latter we saw Comedy vying with the living voice of Tragedy, or burlesque of Tragedy. In the *Aspis*, on the other hand, when Davus first comes on the stage to announce the death of Cleostratus, Menander is closely imitating the characteristic staging of Tragedy. Davus is really (as far as he knows) suffering from a real tragedy. What is "comic," then, is not the scenic use of Tragedy, which would be parody, but its ideological and "performative" use. The language, conventions, and situations of Tragedy are appropriated and dramatized, especially those elements of Tragedy that are singled out by Aristotle as belonging to the finest tragedies such as *pathos*, but then they are dismissed as irrelevant or misguided responses to life. A more comic view of life replaces Tragedy, and is privileged in Tragedy's stead. Through all this, it seems that Menander appropriated the themes of Tragedy, like Tyche and suffering, and then dismissed them. It is as if he were saying, "Fifth century Tragedy had it all wrong. Real life is not being born fated to kill your father and sleep with your mother. I will tell you what a real Tragedy is -- being a cook or waiter who loses his pay. And in that sense, our real strength is not our ability to dramatize our sufferings as in a Tragedy, but our comic outlook and our ability to enjoy the time at hand."

More specifically in the *Aspis*, given that at the end of the play Smicrines must be unmasked and all the other characters rewarded, including probably the Cook and Waiter,

---

Menander challenges the tragic view of Fate or the workings of the gods, which condemn the hero to suffering before the play begins, such as Oedipus. His message seems to be that bad things happen, but they usually happen to those who deserve them like Smicrines. Character and fortune go hand in hand.\textsuperscript{83} Tyche in Menander, therefore, is not malignantly capricious as in Tragedy.\textsuperscript{84}

This analysis of Menander's view of character may be supported by a quote from Menander's \textit{Epitrepontes}. In that play the slave Onesimus asks another Smicrines whether the gods have time to concern themselves with each of our individual problems. Smicrines answers "no" because that would make their existence burdensome. Then Onesimus says,

\begin{quote}
But that does not mean they do not care for us. They have put a guardian in each one of us, namely our character. The character within us cares for us. If we use it badly, then it rewards someone else. This is our god, this is the reason each of us fares well or badly. Appease this god by doing nothing odd or stupid and you will fare well.\textsuperscript{85}
\end{quote}

Tyche and the gods in Menander are, based on this, something one can live with and manage, unlike Tragedy. Of course the idea that our character is our "daimon" is not new to Menander. The idea is as old as Heraclitus, who says "Character is man's daimon."

That we control our fate through our character must have appealed to the audience in Menander's day, for the Athenians then were under the control of the Macedonians and

\textsuperscript{83}For how Tyche in Menander seems to exercise her control through the characters and behavior of the plays' participants, see Vogt-Spira, \textit{Dramaturgie des Zufalls: Tyche und Handeln in der Komödie Menanders}, Zetemata: Monographien zur klassischen Altertumswissenschaft 88 (Munich: Verlag C.H. Beck, 1992).

\textsuperscript{84}Some scholars stress how in New Comedy Tyche is like that which we find in Tragedy. For instance, compare the comments on Tyche and New Comedy under Tyche in the \textit{Oxford Classical Dictionary} (3rd ed.): "The popular view of a capricious, malignant Tyche emerges from New Comedy." Nothing could be further from the truth. Assuming that Tyche was one of the Moerae, she was capricious and malignant in Tragedy long before New Comedy. In New Comedy, or at least in Menander, it is more probable that all the contextless passages that refer to a malignant Tyche are the result of characters' misunderstandings, as happens in the \textit{Aspis}.


\textsuperscript{86}Heraclitus fragment 119: ἦθος ἄνθρωπος δαίμον.
must have felt that some greater force was in control of their lives. Rather than ascribe this force to the gods, the Greeks began to think of it as a matter of Tyche. Demetrius of Phalerum's treatise *On Tyche*, written around 317 B.C., is informative. Demetrius was a contemporary of Menander and the Macedonian-backed ruler of Athens during most of Menander's career. In this treatise Demetrius writes:

> Yet somehow Tyche, who makes no guarantees for our life, but transforms everything in the way we do not expect and displays her power by surprises, is at the present moment, I think, showing all the world that, when she puts the Macedonians into the rich inheritance of the Persians, she has only lent them these good things until she changes her mind about them.87

The increasing popularity of the cult of Tyche in Athens and elsewhere in the Hellenistic world suggests that the traditional view of the gods or Fate as directing our fortunes was waning. The cult of Tyche was, as Nilsson so aptly put, "the last stage in the secularising of religion."88

Like so many popular movements of the fourth century, Euripides lead the way in the fifth. For in Euripides we find many plays that question the nature of the gods. We also find tragedies that have happy endings, or at least plays with a mixture of catastrophe and favorable fortune. Extant plays of Euripides that seem to have had a formative influence on New Comedy include the *Alcestis*, the *Iphigeneia in Tauris*, the *Helen*, the *Andromache*, the *Orestes*, and the *Ion*. Scholars have labored hard to find an adequate term to designate these plays, but judging from the prolific nomenclature, they have not been entirely successful.89 The plays themselves have been variously called romantic

---

87Felix Jacoby, *Die Fragmenten der griechischen Historiker* (Berlin: Weidmannsche Buchhandlung, 1929), IIb 228.39: ἀλλὰ πως ἢ πρὸς τὸν βίον ἡμῶν ἀνύθετος Τύχη καὶ πάντα παρὰ λογισμὸν τὸν ήμέτερον καινοποιοῦσα καὶ τὴν αὐτῆς δύναμιν ἐν τοῖς παρεδέξοις ἐνδείκνυσα καὶ νῦν, ὥσ ἐμοὶ δοκεῖ, δεικνύσαι πάσιν ἀνθρώποις, Μακεδόνας εἰς τὴν Περσῶν εὐθαμομιαν εἰσοικίασα, διὸ καὶ τούτοις ταῦτα τάγαθα κέχρηκεν, ἐὼς ἄλλοι θεοὶ ἄξιοι, ἐξ οὗτος δὲ ἀξίως θεοὶ ἀξίως
89For these plays, see Anne Pippin Burnett, *Catastrophe Survived. Euripides Plays of Mixed Reversal* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1971).
tragedy, romantic melodrama, tragicomedy, romances, romantic comedy, the happy ending plays, or the Tyche plays. Some have been called prosatyric plays, such as the Alcestis. By whatever name we wish to call them, their influence on Menander in both ancient and modern criticism has been primarily understood as "imitative-influence." Here lies the crux of the issue. If we argue that Menander merely imitated Euripides, then we are left with the rather uncomfortable conclusion that in the comedies of Menander we have a kind of Euripidean Tyche play "with a few comic additions." But what we have is far more subtle and subversive. The characters take on roles from Tragedy which are shown as misguided responses to life. Furthermore, rather than just imitate Euripides, he corrects and completes what was begun in Euripides, as though Euripides had failed to go far enough. This includes Euripides' attempts at "domestic affairs" in the context of myth, or what Aristophanes called οἰκεῖα πράγματα. Menander dispenses with the gods, fate, and heroes altogether and replaces them with Tyche and ordinary citizens. In a sense it is as if Menander were correcting Euripides because Euripides had tried to put "new wine" into "old wineskins." In this way Menander's plays can be seen as a repudiation of Tragedy and tragic role-playing in the face of suffering, and part of a larger cultural movement which saw the greater secularization of the gods, most notably in the cult of Tyche.

90See chapter 1.
92This is what Bloom calls a tessara, or completion and antithesis. A tessara "represents any later poet's attempt to persuade himself (and us) that the precursor's Word would be worn out if not redeemed as a newly fulfilled and enlarged Word of the ephebe" (Anxiety, p. 67).
93 Or rather a caricature of Tragedy as defined by Aristotle.
CHAPTER 4:

THE SUBVERSION OF TRAGIC RECOGNITION SCENES: THE
EPITREPONTES, PERIKEIROMENE, AND SICYONIUS

Electra discovering the lock of hair, the footprint, recognizing Orestes through
tokens, and the reversal of her despair through Orestes murdering their mother; Oedipus
learning about Laius — how he was fated to die by the hand of his son, that he pierced the
boy's feet and exposed him, that he was killed at the place where three roads meet by one
man not many, then recognizing himself as one who has committed parricide and incest;
and with that knowledge the complete reversal of his fortune through the death of his wife
and mother, the loss of his kingdom, and the loss of his eyesight. The letter of Iphigeneia
read aloud; Orestes recognizing that the priestess about to slay him is his sister Iphigeneia;
the exchange of proofs, and then the reuniting of brother and sister. These are the three
extant recognition scenes in Tragedy mentioned by Aristotle, each of them from one of the
tragic triumvirate, Aeschylus, Sophocles, and Euripides. In addition to these three, we
also have recognition/reversal scenes in Sophocles' Electra, and in the Electra, Ion, Helen,
Heracles, and Bacchae of Euripides, which brings the total to nine extant tragedies with
recognition/reversal scenes. Aristotle himself mentions nine other tragedies with
recognitions and reversals, and many more are known from other sources. Aristotle
thought recognitions and reversal so important to Tragedy, that in his Poetics he states that
in epic and Tragedy "there are these two components of the plot-structure, reversal
(περιπέτεια) and recognition (ἀναγνώρισις); suffering (πάθος) is a third."¹
We have already seen in the Aspis how Menander used the word πάθος to mean tragic
suffering. Recognitions and reversals also play a prominent role in Menandrean Comedy.
Of the longer surviving plays, we have recognition scenes in the Epitrepontes,
Perikeiromene, and Sicyonius that lead to reversals in fortune.²

Recognition scenes in New Comedy are usually considered to function in the
manner of the deus ex machina. As such they are simply understood as a dramatic device
to bring about the obligatory happy ending. On the recognition scene in Menander’s
Epitrepontes, one scholar states "Menander chooses to utilize the emotional potential more
characteristic of Tragedy, and his technical problem then becomes one of manipulating his
comic structure to support his seriousness."³ The recognition scene in the Epitrepontes,
then, is seen as a serious tragic refashioning, but as we shall see, the "serious" part of
Menander’s refashioning also includes the subversion of Tragedy in this play.
Specifically, Menander subverts the tragic mytheme of daughter and grandson who are
persecuted by a father figure who discovers her pregnancy through a recognition of tokens.

As with the Aspis, the Epitrepontes has missing parts, but the overall plot of the
play can be gathered from the surviving portions. The youthful Charisius had married
Pamphile, but after only five months of marriage she gave birth to a child who was the
product of a rape. Pamphile, with the help of her nurse Sophrone, secretly exposes the
child in order to salvage the marriage, but the nosy (περιπέτεια) Onesimus gets wind of
this and tells his master Charisius about Pamphile’s secret. Charisius curses Onesimus for

¹ 1452b 9-10: δύο μὲν οὖν τοῦ μύθου μέρη ταύτ’ ἐστίν, περιπέτεια καὶ ἀναγνώρισις
τρίτον δὲ πάθος.
² See my chapter on the Dyscolus for reversals.
³ S. Goldberg, The Making of Menander’s Comedy (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of
California Press), 71.
being the bearer of bad tidings, but still he cannot accept Pamphile's misfortune. Rather than return the dowry and Pamphile to her miserly father Smicrines, he moves out and takes up residence down by the Piraeus with a psaltira named Habrotonon. Almost certainly there was a divine prologue in which the god revealed that Charisius himself had raped Pamphile five months earlier at the Tauropoli. When the manuscript begins, it is near the end of Act I. There we find the parsimonious Smicrines more worried about how his new son-in-law is squandering his daughter's dowry on wine, women, and song rather than his daughter's feelings. He notes that Charisius is paying a pimp 12 drachmas a day -- enough to keep a man for a month and six days to boot! He is overheard by Chaerestratus, who accompanied by Habrotonon, goes to notify his friend Charisius about Smicrines' arrival. Meanwhile Smicrines goes to speak with Pamphile in order to ascertain how he might end this sham marriage so that Charisius cannot keep spending the dowry.

When Act II opens, there is a dialogue between a charcoal-burner named Syriscus and a shepherd named Davus. As we find out, Davus had discovered an exposed baby (Pamphile's child) and took the boy home. He then decided he could not raise the child, so he gave the boy to Syriscus without the tokens. Although it seems that Syriscus knows about the tokens when he first takes the child, he does not ask for them. Later, however, he comes back to demand them. The manuscript resumes with these two arguing over the tokens. Syriscus suggests that they refer their dispute to an arbitrator for judgment. Pamphile's father and the boy's grandfather, Smicrines, happens to be walking by at just this time, so Syriscus persuades him to arbitrate, thus the title of the play. They both agree

---

4It is certain that Charisius knows she was raped. His name is written in full in the manuscript before line 908, which strongly suggests these are his first lines of the play. In these seemingly first remarks of his, at line 914, he calls her rape an "unwilling misfortune" (ακούσου άτυχημα).

to abide by Smicrines' decision, whatever the outcome. Davus then begins. He tells Smicrines how he found the boy and took him in, but then later changed his mind. He then gave the boy to a begging Syriscus because Syriscus' wife had just lost a child and wanted one badly. He kept the tokens, however, because he was alone when he found the child.

Syriscus then counters Davus by arguing that it is not simply a matter of "finders, keepers," but that the tokens belong to the child, and as kyrios of the child he must see that the tokens stay with the boy. In his argument he mentions that Davus would forever throw away any chance that the boy might find his real parents for a measly 12 drachmas, which of course echoes Smicrines' earlier comment on how Charisius was squandering 12 drachmas a day on a prostitute. He even evokes Tragedy as a paradigm for how exposed children may be kings, but they need their birth tokens to prove it. More will be said about Syriscus' use of Tragedy below. Smicrines, contrary to the normal pattern in Tragedy, does not recognize the tokens as belonging to his daughter, but instead he merely decides in favor of Syriscus, and unknowingly sets off a chain of events that eventually leads to the identification of his own grandson.

Syriscus is the servant of Chaerestratus, who is the next door neighbor of Charisius. Syriscus has an arrangement with Chaerestratus to work independently and then turn in a portion of his earnings. Syriscus decides to go to Chaerestratus' house to make a payment. But before Syriscus can hand the payment over to Chaerestratus, Menander adds another twist by having the snoopy Onesimus approach Syriscus and his wife, who are at Chaerestratus' doorstep appraising their haul of trinkets, including a ring. Onesimus sees Syriscus with Charisius' ring that was lost several months ago at the Tauropolia, and he snatches it from Syriscus and demands to know where he found it. Syriscus once again plays the part of kyrios and protests that the ring belongs to the child.

---

6The tragic mytheme invariably has the father/grandfather recognize the tokens as coming from his daughter and then persecuting mother and child.
Onesimus refuses to give it back, so Syriscus agrees to let him have it as long as he gives it to Charisius by the next day, otherwise he expects Onesimus to give it back.

When Act III opens,7 we find Onesimus on stage at a complete loss as to what to do. Onesimus was told by another servant that his master was drunk at the Tauropolia last year, and that there he lost his ring. He rightly theorizes that in his drunken stupor, Charisius raped a girl at the festival and is now the father of this child. His nosiness over Pamphile's misfortune has already put him in hot water with Charisius. He is afraid that Charisius will reunite with Pamphile and then get rid of him because he knows Pamphile's secret. Thus he hesitates to show the ring to Charisius and make him the father of the baby, which would complicate things even more. Syriscus then returns and demands that Onesimus give him the ring or show it to Charisius. Onesimus explains to Syriscus his misgivings as to why he does not want to do that just yet. Syriscus runs off to town, presumably to seek some legal remedy.

Meanwhile Habrotonon overhears Onesimus tell Syriscus about how his master lost the ring at the Tauropolia last year and how he suspects he raped a girl there. Habrotonon was at the festival and remembers how that very thing happened to a young girl from a good Athenian family. The two believe that she must be the girl. Onesimus asks Habrotonon to go and find out who this girl was before he tells his master about the ring. Habrotonon, the bona meretrix, refuses, because she is afraid that she will ruin the young girl's reputation. Besides, they do not even know if Charisius was the one who raped the girl. Habrotonon suggests that Charisius could have given or lost the ring to someone else and this other person raped the girl. She must be convinced that Charisius is the father before she looks for the girl. The problem then becomes who to look for first, the father or the mother.

7There is a controversy over whether a night intervenes between Acts II and III. See articles cited below.
In order to solve this conundrum, Habrotonon suggests that she herself should pretend to be the mother of the child and show the ring to Charisius, who at present is partying away his sorrows. If he is the father, he will give himself away and then they will know for sure. Once they know that he is the father, then they can search for the mother. Onesimus agrees to this plan, and points out that Habrotonon will receive her freedom for this. He is also afraid that she will double-cross him and continue to pretend to be the mother. She assures him that she does not want to have a family. The rest of Act III is fragmentary. We can safely surmise that Habrotonon breaks in on Charisius' party and shows him the ring and that this causes quite a stir. Smicrines appears in some of the fragments, and it seems he (mis)learns of Habrotonon and the baby, which gives him all the more resolve to get Pamphile away from Charisius.

The next section of the play we possess is part of the fourth act. Here Smicrines, apparently armed with the knowledge that Charisius has fathered a child by another woman, tries to convince Pamphile to leave Charisius. He tells her that she will be no match for the charms of a professional courtesan. He says he will give her three reasons why she should leave: first, Pamphile will have to share her house with the hetaira, secondly, Charisius will go bankrupt trying to support two women, and the third reason is unfortunately lost. Prosser makes the attractive suggestion that the third possibility is that Pamphile would have to suffer the indignity of sharing her house with a baseborn son. If this is the case, then Pamphile's situation is very similar to that of Creusa in Euripides' Ion. Pamphile then, would be suffering her own Tragedy. Pamphile stands by her man and refuses to go with her father, of course not revealing to him that she believes herself to be the mother of a bastard. Smicrines leaves, and Pamphile is left alone wondering what she should do. While she is standing there, Habrotonon runs into her and recognizes her as the

girl who was raped last year at the Taupolgia. She shows Pamphile her child and tells her that Charisius is the father. The two go off stage where Habrotonon explains everything in detail.

Onesimus appears next and is still afraid that he is going to be sent away because he knows too much. Charisius then comes on stage and delivers a soliloquy on what a brute and hypocrite he has been towards Pamphile, as he overhead her kind comments to Smicrines just moments before. At first he does not notice that Onesimus is standing there, but then he spots him and curses him. The text becomes fragmentary, but it is clear that Habrotonon comes in and tells both of them that Charisius is the father of Pamphile's child. Charisius and Pamphile are thus united with their child. Here, as in all of the preserved plays, the solution to the primary problem is found by the end of the fourth act. The fifth act will see the resolution of some loose ends and the ridicule of the blocking figure.

Those loose ends include overthrowing Smicrines' designs of ending the marriage of Charisius and Pamphile. The honor of doing this falls to Onesimus, who in some well-preserved lines has fun revealing to Smicrines that he is a grandfather of a child conceived by Charisius and Pamphile some five months before their marriage. He even quotes Smicrines a bit of Euripides, to which we will return in a moment. Other loose ends include possibly the setting free of Onesimus and Habrotonon and almost certainly the uniting of Chaerestratus and Habrotonon in some way to complete the comedy.

There is another important loose end that requires attention. How are we to interpret Syriscus' use of tragic parallels. In fact, the question of explaining this refashioned recognition scene involving Syriscus is central to understanding the play within this play. Syriscus' behavior and rhetoric, therefore, require close scrutiny.

The traditional view of the central arbitration scene is that there is a sharp distinction made between the motives of Syriscus and Davus: Syriscus is genuinely concerned that the

---

9There is a debate about who quotes Euripides, Onesimus or Sophrone. See below.
baby keep its tokens, while Davus has solely his own interests in mind. A quote by Francis G. Allison sums up the prevailing view of these two characters: "The sterling goodness of Syriscus, the charcoalman, might convert coals into diamonds," while Davus "is the only villain in the play." But is such a saccharine view of Syriscus as an angel of benevolence justified? Only one scholar, Ernst Honigmann, has suggested otherwise, but his view has generally been overlooked. As we shall see, Honigmann’s position that Syriscus was, in fact, no more altruistic than Davus, only far more clever is justified, but his almost puritanical view of Syriscus' misappropriation of rhetoric needs modifying.

In viewing Syriscus' character, we begin with a passage in the play that has generated very little comment. After Syriscus has won the tokens from Davus, Smicrines exits and the two are left alone on stage, along with Syriscus' wife and the baby. With no reason to keep up any pretense, Davus nonetheless accuses Syriscus of being a fraud, saying, "You're the knave. You'd better guard these tokens for this child... know full well, I will keep an eye on you all the time!" Syriscus only responds, "Go to hell and get lost!" Davus exits, and then Syriscus, with tokens in hand, immediately turns to his wife and says:

οὐ δὲ ταυτί, γύναι, 376
λαβοῦσα πρὸς τὸν τρόφιμον ἐνθάδε’ εἰσαφερε


I had already written a draft of this chapter and independently arrived at the conclusion that Syriscus was just as self-interested as Davus, when I came across Honigmann’s little known or much ignored article entitled, "The Lost End of Menander’s Epitrepontes," in Mémoires de l’Académie Royale de Belgique, Classe des Lettres et des Sciences morales et politiques, Tome 46, fasc. 2 (Bruxelles, 1950): 3-43. Most of the article is fraught with undue speculation about the ending of the play (Körte, Menandri Reliquiae pars II, p. 278, only says of it “Exitum fabulae restituere ratione prosus non probabili conatus est E. Honigmann”), which probably explains why it has been ignored. Despite this defect, I was both pleased (and disappointed) to find that he anticipated most of my arguments about why Syriscus is no altruistic champion of the child. I should add, however, that it is my impression that he arrived at his conclusions from a different starting point than I did (i.e. he began with the ending of Euripides' Alope and the marginal gloss in Palladius -- whereas I began with the text itself).


Line 376: οἵμοις καὶ βάδισε.
Woman, take these here things
inside to master
Chaerestratus. For we are staying here.
Tomorrow we will set out for work
after we have paid our dues. But first
let's count them up one by one. Do you have some sort of a basket?
Put them in the fold of your dress.

We know from lines 407-8 that Syriscus is the servant (οἰκέτης) of Chaerestratus,
and so this passage makes clear that he has an arrangement with his master to turn in a
portion of the proceeds he makes from his profession as a charcoal-burner. What has been
overlooked, except for the brief mention by Honigmann,14 is that these lines strongly
suggest that Davus' suspicions are justified, because Syriscus intends to pay his dues to
Chaerestratus with the trinkets. These lines, therefore, warrant close analysis. The ταυτί
can either be singular or plural. The most natural way to take it is as a plural referring to
the tokens, and so it is ταυτί that are going to be taken "inside to master Chaerestratus."
Amott notes in passing that the ταυτί refers to the tokens: "At the end of the dispute
between Davus and Syriscus the latter tells his wife to take the trinkets found with the
exposed baby and deposit them in Chaerestratus' house."15 There are, however, some
other possibilities for what Syriscus is carrying besides the tokens that must be addressed.

Although a mosaic found at Mytilene16 depicting this scene is not very good
evidence for the staging of the original production of the play, it suggests another candidate

14op. cit. p. 20.
the comment of Eduard Schwartz, Hermes 50 (1915): 312, who writes: Nach dem Shiedsgericht bringt
Syriskos' Frau das Kind und die Erkennungszeichen, die dem Syriskos zugesprochen sind, in Chaerestratos'
Haus, das neben dem des Charisius liegt. Other than Honigmann, Amott, and Schwartz, I have found no
one else who comments on the ταυτί.
16For a good color photo, see Lily Kahil, "Remarques sur l'iconographie des pièces de Ménandre," in Ménandre, Entretiens Hardt 16 (1970): 231-251, plate 1 B. Davus (who is wrongly identified as
CYPOC -- cf. footnote 1) is shown as carrying a staff in his left hand and pouch with a long strap that is
for the ταυτή. It shows that the Ανθρακεύς is carrying a staff in his left hand as he speaks with Smicrines. His wife is shown carrying the baby. There is no plausible reason, however, why Syriscus would want his wife to give his staff to Chaerestratus, so it is ruled out. That leaves only the child, or some other thing(s) as possible candidates.

But there are insurmountable problems with identifying these ταυτή as the child or some other thing(s). It is true that at line 302 Syriscus asks his wife for the child in order to show him to Smicrines (τὸ παιδίου / δῶς μοι γόνατα). At line 307, however, there is a pause in his speech. He then resumes with the word νῦν. The most likely explanation for the pause is that here he hands the child back to his wife. Besides, it would be awkward for him to hold onto the child for almost fifty more lines of pleading. It is even more unlikely that he tells his wife to "take this [child] inside to master Chaerestratus," because she recently lost her own child and really wants to keep the child (see lines 266 ff.). So the child is ruled out as a possibility. That leaves us with some other thing(s), or the tokens.

If they are some other thing(s), then Syriscus must have had it or them in his hands the whole time (remember at 380-81 he asks his wife if she has some sort of a basket to put the tokens in and she must signal a "no" because they put the tokens in the fold of her garment). This would have been even more awkward to stage if the items were not small, especially at the point when he takes the baby from his wife for a brief moment during his speech, because then he would be holding on to at least two things at once while he was thrown across his body and over his right shoulder. No doubt this pouch contained the tokens. Smicrines (whose name appears as C MEI/KPIN/HC on the mosaic) is holding a long staff in his left hand and his right hand rests on Davus’ left forearm.

17 Arnott in his Loeb translation and Norma Miller in her Penguin translation both have Syriscus hand the baby back to his wife at this point.
18 For the seemingly common phenomenon (in Greek Literature, if not in actual ancient Greek society) of a woman desiring a baby after she has lost her own, compare Herodotus’ account of Cyrus (1.108 ff.). This is another reason why Syriscus would not want the real parents to be found, at least until the boy reached manhood.
19 If we give any credence to the Mytilene mosaic, then he would be holding at least three things: the baby, the staff, and this or these other thing(s).
pleading: the baby and this or these "other thing(s)." It would also be awkward for his wife if the ταυτί were some other thing(s), because she would eventually end up carrying at least three things at once: the baby, some other thing(s), and the tokens. This sounds like too much, unless the items were coins or some other small-sized method of payment, but then there is the question of dramatic economy. No purpose would be served by introducing some new thing(s) at this point in the play. Thus on the basis of staging (if the items were big) and dramatic economy (if the items were big or small), the tokens are the only items that seem plausible.

Now unlike the baby, it is certain that Syriscus has the tokens, because he is the one who takes them from Davus (lines 362 ff.). There is, then, no staging inconsistency when he turns to hand them to his wife. After he puts them in the fold of her garment, he says, "let's count them first." Here he uses the word ταυτά, and this confirms that beyond a reasonable doubt the earlier ταυτί was plural and referred to the tokens. Why are they counting them first? First before they go in, or first before they go in and hand them over to Chaerestratus? The position of the πρῶτ' after the ἄλλα suggests that it is both -- "Let's take these into Chaerestratus ... but first let's count them." A rather obvious explanation for why they are counting them at this point is that they wish to ascertain their value before they hand them over to Chaerestratus as a payment. It seems rather eager of them to count them now, for they could always count them later at their leisure if they were going to keep them. Arnott's interpretation (gleaned from the quote above) that the words πρῶς τόν τρόφιμον ἐνθάδ' εἰσφέρε / Χαιρέστρατον mean "to deposit in Chaerestratus' house" is not what the Greek says, if by deposit he means to put on deposit for later retrieval. εἰσφέρε never means "to deposit." The verb for "deposit" is some form of τίθημι. Here, as elsewhere, εἰσφέρε means "to contribute,"\(^{20}\) and it refers to the.

\(^{20}\) *LSJ* I.2: "contribute, pay the property-tax."
with which it is etymologically related. We should then translate these lines as "Take these here things [tokens] inside to master Chaerestratus as a contribution."

Once it is realized that Syriscus intends to pay off his master with the tokens, then his motives and behavior before and after these lines come into question, and upon close scrutiny he shows other signs of being just as self-interested as Davus, and even more duplicitous. What follows is an unmasking of Syriscus' rhetoric and character based upon the fact that he was not intending to keep the tokens for the baby, but rather he was going to use them to pay off his master. This reappraisal of Syriscus' character has implications for his use of Tragedy in this scene.

We can imagine that at the point where the manuscript begins Syriscus and Davus are shouting quite vigorously at each other. Syriscus speaks first, "You're running away from justice!" Davus retorts, "You're blackmailing me, wretch! You shouldn't have what's not yours!" It is quite possible that prior to this Syriscus had given Davus a good reason to say that he is being blackmailed, but we cannot be sure because that portion of the play has not survived. Syriscus, who is quite confident in his rhetorical abilities (cf. 401-3 and 414-18), suggests they turn the case over to an arbitrator. Davus agrees, at which point Syriscus' demeanor undergoes a complete transformation. He addresses the old Smicrines, who just happens to be passing by, as ΠΕΤΙΣΤΟΣ and politely asks him "Could

---

21Compare the phrase εἰςφορᾶς εἰςφέρειν (Antiphon, Tetr. 1.2.12.5; Isaeus, Or. 6.60.10; Lysias, Or. 7.31.3, 20.23.6 and 27.11.1. εἰςφέρειν is also a favorite word of Demosthenes for soliciting contributions for many and various causes.

22Honigmann too, op. cit. provides a similar reading of Syriscus' character, although he seems to feel that Syriscus is guilty of moral turpitude. Syriscus is duplicitous, but the Athenians would not have thought that such behavior constituted base morals.

23For a full analysis of Syriscus' and Davus' rhetoric, see J. Cohoon, "Rhetorical Studies in the Arbitration of Scene of Menander's Epitrepontes," TAPhA 45 (1914): 141-230, to which I am greatly indebted for much of my analysis. Although Cohoon repeatedly notes how shrewd Syriscus' rhetoric is, he never believes it to be a mask.

24Lines 218-19: (Syriscus) φεύγεις τὸ δίκαιον. (Davus) συκοφάντεις δυστυχής. / ού δεί σ' ἔχειν τὰ μὴ σά.
you spare us a bit of your time?"25 Clearly this is a *captatio benevolentiae*, and the sudden change in his disposition suggests that he is a clever manipulator. When Smicrines rebukes him angrily, he does not show resentment at Smicrines' vituperations, but persists with the even more respectful πάτερ (line 231). This is the first of many instances where Smicrines is called πάτερ. The irony, of course, is that Smicrines actually is the father figure from Tragedy, as will be elaborated below. Syriscus also adds the dignified sounding *sententia*, "In every season justice ought to prevail everywhere, and the bystander ought take thought of this -- it is something that touches the life of all."26 In the face of such deft rhetoric, Davus says in an aside "I've become entangled with a pretty fair lawyer! Why did I give him the child?"27 This aside alerts the audience that Syriscus' rhetorical flair is a mask.

Syriscus' initial pleading is effective, for Smicrines agrees to hear the case. Smicrines then asks Davus to speak first. He begins by giving Smicrines some details about the dispute so that Smicrines can understand clearly what the quarrel is about (240 ff.). He tells Smicrines about how he alone found an exposed child and with it some tokens, but at the first mention of the tokens Syriscus interrupts him and blurts out "It's about these!"28 It seems hard to believe that Menander simply wanted to portray Syriscus as the staunch defender of the child's tokens with this outburst. Rather it suggests that Syriscus is keenly interested in the monetary value of the tokens. Its inappropriateness is highlighted when Smicrines has to tell Syriscus that he will hit him with his stick if he does it again (248). Syriscus regains his composure and with a touch of irony deferentially

---

25 Line 224: βελτιστε. μικρὸν ἀν σχολάσας ἡμῖν χρόνον: Notice the courteous use of the optative with ἀν.
26 Line 232-36: ἐν παντὶ δὲ οἱ καὶ ὁ δίκαιον ἐπικρατεῖν ἀπαντάχοι. καὶ τὸν παρατυχάνοντα τοῦτο τοῦ μέρους ἐξειπρόνοιαν κοινὸν ἔστι τοῖς βίοις πάντων. Note that Aristotle states that maxims suit old age (*Rhetorica* 1395a, 2 ff.).
27 Lines 236-7: μετρίοι γε συμτείλεσμαι βήτροι. τί γάρ μετεδίδοιν:
responds "And rightly." Davus then proceeds with his artless and obviously self-interested argument, which is that he alone found the child so he alone is entitled to the tokens. Davus' speech, however, does have one virtue: it is honest; so honest, in fact, that Syriscus does not dispute any of its details (295). Some of those details reveal that Syriscus can really turn on the charm to get what he wants, and then quickly change his demeanor once he has it. For instance, Davus says that when Syriscus found out that Davus had a child, he repeatedly wished Davus well (and after each imprecation he asked for the child, 264-267). Right when he received the child he prayed for countless blessings for Davus and even kissed his hands (272-4). Apparently he even knew at that time that Davus had kept the tokens, because later he does not deny it, but says "Why then, when I was taking the child, did I not demand from you the tokens? Because then it was not yet in my power to speak on this child's behalf." Davus then relates how Syriscus' attitude changed once he knew that he had secured possession of the child, for he returned and demanded the tokens (275 ff.). Davus could have, like Syriscus, argued that he had the child's self-interest in mind and did not trust Syriscus to keep the tokens until the boy should reach manhood, but he was too unsophisticated to weave such a tale. The problem with Davus' speech, therefore, is that it is too honest. When Davus is done, he closes with the words "I rest my case." It is then Syriscus' turn to speak.

Rather than just begin, Syriscus first asks, "Has he finished?" Clearly he knows that Davus is done, so, far from this being an act of consideration after his first

29Line 249: καὶ δικαιόως.
30Lines 313-315: τι οὖν τὸτε, / ἄτ' ἐλάμβανον τοῦτ', οὐκ ἀπήιτουν ταῦτά σε; / οὗτος παρ' ἐμοί ἢν ύπερ τοῦτον λέγειν.
31Line 292: εἰρηκα τὸν γ' ἐμὸν λόγον.
32Line 293: εἰρήκευς;
33Davus also had indicated that he had only one more point at line 287 (τὸ πέρας'), and so Syriscus knows that he has finished.
interruption, it is an act of impertinence that implies that Davus' speech was inept. Smicrines is rightly annoyed and says, "Are you deaf? He's finished." Syriscus then responds with a polite "thank you" and proceeds with a tour de force of rhetorical tropes, the cumulative effect of which makes clear that Syriscus is a well-practiced sophist.

He begins by not denying Davus' charges (296 ff.). In so doing he mollifies Smicrines because he does not challenge Smicrines' impressions of Davus' speech, while at the same time he makes himself appear to be honest as well. In this way Smicrines' favor is gained in an indirect way at the beginning of his speech, which is what the Romans called insinuatio. While admitting the truth of Davus' words, however, he subtly corrects Davus' choice of words. Where Davus had spoken of Syriscus' pleading using the rather harsh words λιπαροῦτι καὶ πείθοντι (271), Syriscus uses the more benign δεόμενος, ἱκετεῦων (297). This rhetorical strategy in antiquity was known as ἐπιδιόρθωσις, correctio, or emendatio. Today it is known as "spin." He also continues to use the deferential addresses of πάτερ (296, 301, 320, 340) and βέλτιστε (308) to curry favor with Smicrines.

Once he has made some potentially damaging admissions, he must now find a tactful way to attack Davus. He begins cautiously in 299 by making an abrupt transition that introduces the object of his desire: "Some shepherd, whom he [Davus] spoke with and works with him, informed me that he also found jewelry with the baby." Sandbach comments (Gomme and Sandbach, Commentary, p. 312 at line 293) "With the excuse of having been forbidden to interrupt, Syriskos can pretend to make sure Davus has finished, the doubt implying a criticism of the speech. 'Can this be all he has to say?'

Line 293: oûk ἢκουες; εἴρηκεν.

35 Line 293: καλῶς. For the meaning of "thank you," see J.H. Quincy, JHS 86 (1966), p. 139.


37 Cohoon, op. cit. , p. 197-8.

38 Line 299-301: τοιμὴν τις ἐξήγγειλε μοι, πρὸς δὲν οὕτως / ἐλάλησε. τῶν τούτων συνέργων, ἀμα τινὰ / κόσμου συνερεῖν αὐτὸν.
Àpòstásēs|s has the effect of piquing Smicrines' interest in what is to follow. At this point Syriscus makes the most brilliant move of the whole speech. In order to produce pathos, he resorts to προσωποποιία. Assuming the mask of the child, he holds up the helpless infant before Smicrines, and pretends to speak the words the child would speak were he able (303 ff.), thus delaying a direct attack on Davus. In other words he attempts to remove himself as the principal in the case and assume the role of an advocate — a ploy which under the circumstances can easily be read as revealing the opposite. In fact, Syriscus knows that his motives may be too transparent, and so he claims that he is only acting as the κύριος of the child (306), looking after the child's interest and not his own (316). But such emphatic protestations only confirm his ulterior motives.

Now that Syriscus has gradually cast a pall of suspicion upon Davus, he then embarks upon a direct attack. He accuses Davus of being a λεκωτοδυτηκότ(α) (line 312), someone who steals clothes, particularly from bathers or travelers. This imposing word is solely designed to bias Smicrines' feelings because it exaggerates Davus' offense. For not only was great opprobrium attached to one who engaged in this activity, but according to Aristotle that person was subject to immediate arrest and, if he admitted guilt, even execution. Wilamowitz-Moellendorff rightly calls Syriscus' use of such hyperbole "Frechheit," or impudence. He then reverts back to the technique of ἔπειδορθωσις to cast his aspersions on Davus. Davus had said that he alone had found the baby and so there was no "common Hermes" (284), and hence he alone should keep the tokens. Syriscus scornfully repeats Davus' "common Hermes" (317), but corrects it: "It's not finding one bit, where it involves the wronging of someone. This isn't finding, but

---

41Aristotle notes that the sight of an unfortunate person tends to arouse pity, and pity is more likely to be felt by an elderly person such as Smicrines (Rhetorica 1386b 6 f.; 1386b 25 f.).
42Aristotle, Ath. Pol. 52.1 and Gomme and Sandbach, Commentary, p. 313.
43Menander Das Schiedsgerecht (Epitrepones), p. 64 at verse 95 (Also noted by Sandbach, Gomme and Sandbach Commentary p. 313).
filching!" His use of homoioteleuton in the phrase οὐχ εὑρέσις τούτ’ ἐστίν ἀλλ’ ἀφαίρεσις also reveals his rhetorical polish.

At this point Syriscus moves away from arguing that the trinkets belong to the child and endeavors to prove their value to the child. He does this by citing examples from Tragedy, and then cleverly insinuating that they are relevant to the current situation. He accomplishes this by pointing out that he himself is wearing a jerkin just like the peasants in the tragedies who raised heroes (328). Such a visual comparison is dramatic and appropriate for one who is play-acting. With the words ως εὑρεν. ως ἀνείλετο (330), he recalls Davus' same words (263), which again implies that the two situations are similar. The parallels he cites for the baby, however, are so absurd they cannot be taken seriously. No one in the audience would have believed that this child would one day be king in a Macedonian-controlled Athens, where there had been no kings for centuries. Nor would anyone think that he was the offspring of a god, or he would grow up to engage in doughty deeds like lion-hunting, or that the tokens would prevent him from violating such taboos as marrying his sister, or that he would be able to help rescue his mother or brother. Syriscus manages to bring these fanciful stories back to reality by saying, "If Davus had given up the tokens [of Neleus and Pelias] for a profit of twelve drachmas, they would have remained for all time ignorant of what sort of men they were by birth. It is not right that I rear the infant's body, and Davus take and bury this child's hope of escape.

---

44 Lines 317-319: κοινὸς Ἡμιῆς: μηδὲ ἐν / εὑρίσχα ' Ὑπον πρόεστι σῶμ' ἀδικομενου' / οὐχ εὑρεσις τούτ’ ἐστιν ἀλλ' ἀφαίρεσις.

45 Honigmann, op. cit., p. 20 points out that the comic poet Nausicrates is quoted by Athenaeus IX p. 399 EF (=Kassel and Austin, PCG VII fr. 2, p. 35) as saying in his Persis, "In Attica who has really ever seen lions, or any other beast like that? It isn't easy to even find a hare there!" (ἐν τῇ Ἀττικῇ τῆς εἶδε πάσωτε / λέοντας ἢ τοιοῦτον ἐτερον θηρίον / οὐ δαυποτε' εὑρειν οὐχὶ παθίου). Nausicrates, if the probable restoration of Köhler is correct at IG II2 2325, 148 (Ναυσικράτης III). was a contemporary of Antiphanes and Alexis and thus older than Menander. Compare also Herodotus' account (VII.126) of lions in Greece: "There are no lions anywhere in Europe east of the Nestus, or in the continent west of the Achelous; they exist only in the country between those rivers" (Penguin translation by Aubrey de Sélincourt).
It is a very effective antithesis between himself and Davus, but even as he appears to champion the cause of the child in opposition to Davus, his words reveal that he himself is counting the cost of rearing the infant. He even refers to the child as τὸ σῶμα, which is impersonal at best, and may even be significant because this word is frequently used of slaves.

Towards the conclusion of his speech he adds another sententia to sway the elderly Smicrines: "Because life by nature is precarious for all, one must guard it, father, with forethought, and well in advance look out for the means by which it is possible to do so." He then takes one last parting shot at Davus' motives, which can be seen as revealing what is in his own heart: "If you must give back any of this child's belongings, are you seeking to take back the child too, to commit your villainies more safely, if some of his things have now been preserved by Chance?" Of course this ignores that fact that Davus is no villain, for he sensibly realized that he could not nurse the baby and so gave him to someone who could. Nonetheless, it is an effective closure, for Syriscus avoids the assumption that Smicrines will decide in his favor, while at the same time arousing suspicion of Davus and equating himself with Tyche. Syriscus' words are truer than he knows, for Tyche prevents Smicrines from recognizing his own daughter's tokens, as is the normal tragic pattern, and Tyche rescues the baby from Syriscus by placing Onesimus at Chaerestratus' doorstep at just the right moment.

Syriscus' speech is, therefore, replete with rhetorical sophistry. A passage from the Sicyonius of Menander reflects Athenian attitudes toward this kind of pleading:
"You're gullible, a real sucker, pathetic fool, if you think the man who weeps and pleads to be speaking the truth. Nowadays this is well nigh proof that someone is up to no good." After a favorable verdict is rendered for Syriscus, in lines 367 and following Smicrines lingers to see that all is handed over to Syriscus, and he asks Syriscus, "Do you have everything?" (πάντ’ ἔχεις). Syriscus answers, being sure to tweak Davus, "Yes, I think so, unless he swallowed something while I was arguing my case and he was losing." It is clear that for Syriscus this was a contest of wits, and he gloats over his victory. After Smicrines leaves, Syriscus rubs Davus' nose in the verdict further saying, "With godspeed all judges should arbitrate like this." He adds another insult to Davus, "You were being a knave" (πουνηρὸς ἡθαν). Such cockiness alerts the audience to Syriscus' duplicity. Davus understands what the audience should have guessed by now, and, as we saw at the beginning of this excursus, he responds, "You're the knave. You'd better guard these tokens for this child... know full well, I will keep an eye on you all the time!" Nobody knows the heart of a swindler better than a swindler. Syriscus responds, "Go to hell and get lost!" Davus exits, and then, Syriscus, who has not even had time to count the tokens, turns to his wife and tells her to use the tokens to pay off Chaerestratus, as we saw above.

But signs of Syriscus' love of manipulating rhetoric and his duplicity do not end here. When Syriscus and his wife are standing on the doorstep counting the tokens before

---

49 Probably spoken by Smicrines to Blepes of Stratophanes (see Gomme and Sandbach Commentary p. 646 ff.) lines 150 ff.: ὅχλος εἰ φλευρῶν μεστός, ὥς πάντρη δύ, / δίκαια τοῦ κλάοντα προσδοκόντος λέγειν / καὶ τοῦ δεδομένον τοῦ δὲ μὴ δὲ εὖ ποεῖν / ὑγιὲς σχεδόν ταύτ’ ἐστι νῦν τεκμηρίου.


51 Compare Syriscus' aside at line 401-2.

52 Lines 370-1: τοιούτους ἐδεί / βάττον δικαίων πάντας.
they hand them over to Chaerestratus, the nosy Onesimus sees them counting them and he is curious. He approaches and sees that Syriscus has the ring of his master, Charisius. He snatches it from Syriscus, which prompts Syriscus to shout with overly dramatic indignation, "By Apollo and the gods, how terrible! What a job it is to preserve an orphaned child's possessions! Someone approaches and immediately looks to seize them!"\(^{53}\) Menander's audience would have enjoyed the humor of such mock indignation. When Onesimus persists in the claim that the tokens belong to his master, Syriscus shows once again\(^{54}\) that for him possession of the ring is nothing but a contest of wits. He says in an aside, "I would sooner have my throat slit no doubt than plead *nolo contendere* to this fellow. That settles it, I shall sue them all one by one!"\(^{55}\) Onesimus will not give the ring back, claiming that his master Charisius lost the ring when drunk (406). Syriscus then agrees to give Onesimus until the next day to show the ring to his master Charisius, and with great confidence in his own rhetorical abilities says, "I will wait. Tomorrow, in a word, I am prepared to turn the case over to any judge you and your master like."

Onesimus then leaves the stage, and when Syriscus is alone, in his litigation-loving manner, he only says with satisfaction, "I've not come off badly this time, either. Looks like I must ignore all else and practice law. Nowadays it's the only way to keep anything."\(^{57}\) No mention is made of the baby. Thus, when no one else is around, he removes his mask and reveals his self-interest.

\(^{53}\) Lines 396-398: "Ἀπολλόν καὶ θεόι, δεινοῦ κακοῦ. / [ὁ]ϊον ἄ̣τησις ἔχωσαι χρήματ' / ἐστὶν ὀρφανοῦ / παιδός. ὁ προσελθὼν εὔθυς ἀρπάζειν βλέπει.

\(^{54}\) Syriscus had gloated in his victory over Davus earlier at lines 368 ff. as I noted above.

\(^{55}\) Lines 401-3: ἀποσφαθεὶν πρότερον ἄν δῆπουθεν ἢ τούτωι τι καθυφεὶμην. ἀραρε, δικάσομαι / ἄπασι καθ’ ἔνα.

\(^{56}\) Lines 414-416: καταμενῶ, αὐριον ὠτοι βούλεσθ’ ἐπιτρέπειν ἐνι λόγῳ / ἔτοιμος.

\(^{57}\) Lines 416-18: οὐδὲ νῦν κακῶς ἀπῆλλαχα. / πάντων δ’ ἀμελήσανθ’, ὡς ἔοικε, δεὶ δίκας / μελετῶν διὰ τούτι πάντα νυνι αἰσιζεῖαι.
The next act opens and it is still the same day. Syriscus, however, does not keep his promise. Instead he demands that they settle their case immediately because he "must go somewhere." This is obviously a ploy designed to put pressure on Onesimus to act fast, or to test his resolve, for Syriscus had told his wife that they were going to be staying the night at their master's house and on the next day set out for work (378-9). So even if he really had to go somewhere, he knew he was coming back. In what follows, Syriscus' motives are made plain once again. For he had demonstrated earlier that he understood the potential significance of the tokens for the baby when he recited to Smicrines a litany of examples from Tragedy where the true parentage of a child was found through tokens (lines 325 ff.). Evidently he did not really believe that his tragic rantings were really relevant or anything other than rhetoric, because when Onesimus comes along and twice identifies the owner of the ring (lines 391 ff. and 445 ff.), he does not grasp, or does not want to grasp, the significance. Instead, Onesimus must tell him: "This ring belongs to my master Charisius, that I'm sure of, but I hesitate to show it to him. If I do, I practically make him the father of the child with whom it was found." Syriscus, who was so clever before, suddenly becomes dense and responds, "How?" (πῶς). Following Arnott, the

---

58 There is a controversy over whether a night intervenes between Acts II and III, and thus whether this play is longer than the usual one day. Sandbach, in his Commentary, follows the theory of van Lecuwen (note on his line 244 of his third edition) that a night intervenes between Act II and III. This theory was challenged by W.G. Arnott ("Four Notes on Menander's Epitrepontes," ZPE 24 (1977): 17-18). Sandbach wrote a rejoinder to this article defending his theory ("Two Notes on Menander (Epitrepontes and Samia)," LCM 11 (1986): 156-158). Arnott, "seeking to demolish" this theory, unleashed a battery of arguments in two articles, "The Time-Scale of Menander's Epitrepontes," ZPE 70 (1987): 19-31 and "An Addendum to the Time-Scale of Menander's Epitrepontes," ZPE 72 (1988): 26, that very convincingly show that no day intervenes. We now see the reason for the promised "tomorrow" that never comes -- it highlights Syriscus' crafty character.

59 Line 445: κρινώμεθ' ἐλθεῖν δὲ μὲ τοῦ

60 If we realize that Syriscus is a fraud, then this adds further support to Arnott's thesis (see footnote 58) that no day intervenes between acts II and III.

61 Lines 446-450: τοῦ μὲν δειπνῶτον / ἐστ', οἴδ' ἀκριβῶς, οὗτοι Χαρισίου, / ὁκνῶ δὲ δεῖξαι: πατέρα γὰρ τοῦ παῖδος / ἀυτὸν ποδοσχέδων τι τοῦτον προσφέρων / μεθ' οὖ δυσνεξίειτο.

62 W.G. Arnott, "Four Notes on Menander's Epitrepontes," ZPE 24 (1977) 20: "Yet it is not Onesimos but Syros who shows stupidity here. Onesimos says that if he shows to Charisios a ring
Dim wit! (dictions). It is more likely that Syriscus is playing dumb, than that Menander now transforms the shrewd Syriscus into a numskull. Onesimus then proceeds to tell him how Charisius lost the ring at the Tauropelia. Even when Onesimus tells Syriscus how the ring points to Charisius being the father, Syriscus does not care to help find the baby's real father. He only says to Onesimus, "That's your problem to look into!" For someone who seemed so eager to keep the tokens to help identify the baby's parents, he certainly shows a lack of concern when he has his first lead to solve the mystery. He is so motivated by self-interest, that it does not occur to him that Onesimus may be telling the truth. He only thinks that Onesimus is trying to pull a fast one on him, so he says, "If you are bluffing, hoping that I give you a little something to get back the ring, then you're a fool." In fact, now that he suspects he is speaking with what seems to him a fellow fraud, he drops all pretense of being the child's advocate, saying: "Going shares is not my style." He is clearly interested in the tokens for their monetary value, not their ability to help identify the foundling. We now also find the real reason for Syriscus' supposed "urgent errand" he mentioned moments ago. He says, "I'll be back, but I'm off to town now to learn the next

---

63 It could be argued that Menander is sacrificing consistency in character in order to avoid having Syriscus upstage Habrotonon, who is to enter soon, but I find this highly unlikely. Menander demonstrates a great concern for consistency in characterization down to the last minuta (cf. F.H. Sandbach's seminal article, "Menander's Manipulation of Character for Dramatic Purposes," in Ménandre, Entretiens Hardi 16 (1970): 113-143). We do, however, find that he allows an inconsistency in the prominence of roles, but this is due to the three actor-rule (cf. Chrysis in the Samian, who gives way to Demeas, Niceratus, and Moschion at the end of the play). It is entirely possible, therefore, that Syriscus fades from the play to never return, but I do not think it plausible that he becomes stupid before he leaves.

64 Line 457: σκότει αὐτὸς περὶ τούτων.

65 Line 458-60: εἰ δὲ ἀνασέεις, ἀπολαβεῖν / τὸν δακτύλιον μὲ βουλόμενος δοῦναι τε σοι / μικρὸν τι, ληπεῖς.

66 Lines 460-1: οὐκ ἔνεστιν οὐδὲ εἰς / παρ' ἐμοὶ μερισμὸς
move in the game." By breaking his promise to wait until the next day he was really only trying to avoid having to go to town to find out his legal options!

Having dispensed with the altruistic Syriscus, we must now reevaluate his use of Tragedy within the central arbitration scene. Syriscus' deceptive pleading has point of contact with Tragedy on three different levels: tragic diction, themes from Tragedy explicitly designated as such, and the arrangement of the dramatic action in the manner of Tragedy. For the first level, tragic diction, see the comments of Sandbach, Cahoon, and Katsouris. There they note that Syriscus' style continually rises to the pitch of Tragedy, but then subsides. Thus line 327 is tragic, but in line 328, where Syriscus speaks of himself, returns to the comic. Line 330 is tragic and noteworthy for the anaphora of ὡς. It is followed by the non-tragic anapaest of 331. Lines 332-334 are then tragic, followed by the untragic 335 and so forth. The word βλέψων (initial position in line 320) is found frequently in Euripidean ἀγονες, always the first word in the line as here in Menander. The words ἔργαταις (321), ἐρρύσατο (line 332), and ὀπλα βαστάζειν (line 324) are all poetic. Syriscus three times calls the tokens γνωρίσματα (lines 303, 331, and 341), thus recalling Aristotle's discussion of tragic recognitions. Syriscus' maxim about justice (lines 232-233), in keeping with Aristotle's discussion of maxims, also adds a noble and tragic flavor to Syricus' pleading, and is reminiscent of Hecuba's words spoken in a similar situation.

---

67 Lines 462-3: ἣξω διαδραμῶν — εἰς τοὺς γὰρ ἔρχομαι / νυνί — περὶ τοῦτον εἰσόμενος τι δεῖ ποιέων. Literally in the last part of this quote Syriscus says "to learn what I should do about these things." The translation "the next move in the (or this) game" is that of Amott (Loeb, p. 443) and Miller (Penguin, p. 92), and effectively captures the tone of his words.

68 Gomme and Sandbach, Commentary, p. 316 and
69 J.W. Cahoon, op. cit., p. 160
70 A. Katsouris, Tragic Patterns in Menander (Athens, 1975): 148
71 Aíceis 390 and 1121; Heraclidae 223; Suppliantes 284; Heracles 1227; Electra 567; Helen 1442; Iphigenia at Aulis 320 and 1238.
72 Rhetica 1395b 13 ff.
73 Hecuba 844-845: εἰθελοῦ γὰρ ἀνδρὸς τῇ δίκῃ τε ὑπηρετεῖν / καὶ τοὺς κακοὺς δρᾶν πανταχοῦ κακῶς ἀεὶ.
Nowhere is the play between Menander's New Comedy and Tragedy more obvious in this scene than in the second level of Menander's use of Tragedy -- the themes of Tragedy, some of which are explicitly designated as such. These themes also serve to isolate our attention on Smicrines, who stands as the father figure of Tragedy in the play. What are these themes? One scholar has called the arbitration scene "a serious travesty in all probability of a parallel scene in a lost play of Euripides, the Alope". This supposition is based upon the theory that Hyginus' Fabula 187 (Alope) is a summary of Euripides' treatment of the myth. Hyginus says:

Neptune raped Alope, who was the very beautiful daughter of Cercyon. She, in consequence of the rape, gave birth to an infant, and unbeknownst to her father gave it to her nurse to expose. When the boy had been exposed, a mare came and suckled him. A certain shepherd chased the mare and saw the infant and picked him up. When he had brought the child, who was wearing royal clothes, into his hut, a fellow shepherd asked him to give him the infant. He gave him the infant without the clothes. When a dispute arose among them, because the one who had received the boy was demanding the tokens of his birth, and the other one would not give them, the disputants went to king Cercyon and began to argue their case. The one who received the infant commenced to demand the tokens, which, when they were produced, Cercyon recognized as those that had been cut from his own daughter's clothes. Alope's nurse in fear gave proof to the king that the infant belonged to Alope, and he ordered his daughter to be arrested and killed, and the infant to be exposed again. The horse suckled the infant again, and again the shepherds found and picked up the boy, believing that he was to be reared by the will of the gods, and they fed and him and gave him the name Hippothous. When Theseus took a trip there from Troezen, he killed Cercyon. Hippothous then came to Theseus and demanded his ancestral kingdom, which Theseus gladly gave him, when he found out he was the son of Neptune, whence came his own stock. In addition, Neptune changed Alope's corpse into a spring, which is named after her.
From the actual fragments of Euripides' play we gather that Poseidon impregnated Alope, the daughter of king Cercyon, and deserted her (Nauck, TGF fr. 106-7). If Hyginus is to be followed, then Alope exposed the child, Hippothoon, or she had her loyal nurse (Nauck, TGF fr. 108) expose him. A herdsman finds the child wrapped in royal garments, which serve as birth tokens. Another herdsman asks for and receives the child, minus the garments. The two quarrel over the garments and take the matter to Cercyon, the grandfather of the child, to arbitrate. He recognizes the royal garments and interrogates the Nurse, who betrays her mistress while trying to maintain her loyalty (Nauck, TGF fr.108). Cercyon then rushes at Alope (Nauck, TGF fr.109-11, Nauck, TGF adesp. 510) to punish her. The rest is unclear. If Hyginus' description of the tale follows Euripides, then Cercyon has his daughter executed for her illicit pregnancy and he re-exposes Hippothoon. Poseidon then appears at the end of the play to transform Alope into a spring and to prophesy that Theseus will kill Cercyon and pass his kingdom onto Hippothoon.^^

If the above account fairly coincides with Euripides' Alope, then there are some obvious similarities and differences between the Alope and the Epitrepontes. Similarities include two self-interested pastoral figures arguing over a baby's tokens with one claiming they belong to the child in order to identify his parents, and the grandfather of the child unwittingly being chosen to arbitrate. More will be said below about the importance of the connection of Smicrines with the father of Tragedy, who is angered over a daughter's pregnancy. Another similarity is that nurses are involved. In the Epitrepontes we learn that Sophrone knew of the child and probably was the one who exposed it (lines 1117 ff.). Differences include the two types of tokens (clothing vs. ring), and the grandfather actually recognizing the tokens. It is unclear, then, whether Menander had the Alope specifically in

---

^F^sustulerunt, sentientes eum deorum numine educari, atque nutrierunt, nomenque ei imposuerunt Hippothoon. Theseus cum ea iter faceret a Troezene Cercyonem interfecit: Hippothous autem ad Theseum venit regnaque auta rogavit, cui Theseus libens dedit, cum sciret eum Neptuni filium esse, unde ipse genus ducebat. Alopes autem corpus Neptunus in fontem commutauit, qui ex nomine Alopes est cognominatus.

mind when he was writing the *Epitrepontes*, or whether he had only Tragedy generally in mind. We can at least be certain that Menander had more than just the *Alope* in mind when he wrote the *Epitrepontes*, for Syriscus says to Smicrines in his rhetorical *tour de force*:

> You have seen the tragedies, I’m sure, and you remember all of them. How a certain Neleus and Pelias were found by an old man, a goatherd, wearing the sort of jerkin I am now. And when he realized they were his betters, he tells them the story, how he found them, how he raised them; and he gave them the bag of tokens, with which they learned everything about themselves, each detail, and then they became kings who until that time were mere shepherds. Now if Davus had taken those tokens and sold them for a profit of twelve drachmas, they would have continued for all time to live in ignorance of how great a family they were from. It is not right for me to rear the child, this one here, and for Davus to take away his hope of rescue, sir. Someone through tokens avoided marrying his sister, another found and saved his mother, someone else saved his brother. 79

The specific story of Neleus and Pelias is alluded to here, not the *Alope*. The best-known treatment of this myth was staged by Sophocles, in his *Tyro*, but Carcinus (whom Davus quotes at *Aspis* 417) and Astydamas the Younger (a contemporary of Menander) also wrote tragedies by the same title. The basic outline of the Tyro myth can be reasonably reconstructed from other sources. From *Odyssey* book 11, 235 ff., we find that Tyro was the wife of Cretheus, but she was in love with the river-god Enipeus. Poseidon took

---

78 This passage proves beyond a reasonable doubt that Menander was interacting more with Tragedy, not Aristophanes’ *Cocalus*, when he wrote his scenes of rapes and recognitions. In fact, Menander frequently mentions Tragedy, but nowhere mentions Old Comedy, in his plays.

advantage of the situation and disguised himself as Enipeus and lay with her. The god's embrace was not ineffectual, and so she gave birth to the twins, Neleus and Pelias. Tyro then exposed the children and they were picked up by a horse-herder (ιττοφοφορβός, Apollodorus I.90). Meanwhile Tyro was abused by her step-mother Sidero. When her sons grew up, they were recognized by means of the cradle (σκάφη) in which they were exposed (Aristotle, *Poetics* 1454b25 -- this would be Sophocles' *Tyro*), at which time the twins pursued Sidero into a temple of Hera, where Pelias killed her at the altar. As one can see from the outline of the story above, Menander's *Epitrepontes* differs in at least one respect from Sophocles' *Tyro* -- the road to recognition begins with a ring in the *Epitrepontes*, not a cradle, unless Aristotle's σκάφη also includes its contents and part of those contents was a ring. Assuming that Apollodorus was also following Sophocles (which may not be the case), the *Tyro* is also different in that a ιττοφοφορβός finds the boys and not an αἰτρόκος. Of course another big difference in the *Tyro* may be that Tyro is already married to Cretheus and unfaithful, if Sophocles followed Homer. The text of Homer (*Odyssey* 11.235 ff.) suggests, however, that there is a confusion in the tradition on this last point. First the text of the *Odyssey* states that Tyro is married to Cretheus, but in love with the river Enipeus. But when Poseidon's seduction of her (line 245) is described, it says Poseidon "loosened her virginal girdle" (λύσε δὲ παρθενίνα ςώνην). *Parthenos* and its related forms mean "virgin" elsewhere in Homer, so we have a contradiction. Many editors, ancient and modern, have excised this line as spurious on the grounds that it is superfluous and the combination λύσε ςώνην does not appear elsewhere in Homer. It is also suspect because Zenodotus (fl. c. 280) was ignorant of the line. All of this suggests that the line was interpolated later, perhaps to make the myth more

---

80See Gomme and Sandbach, *Commentary*, p. 315.
82Compare OCT *apparatus criticus*.
consistent with a well known tragic treatment, such as Sophocles’ Tyro. Other inconsistencies between the myth and the Epitreponies include the fact that there are twins involved and an evil step-mother. An interesting potential parallel between the myth and the Epitreponies is suggested by a description of an epigram found in the Greek Anthology (3.9), which Welcker suggested alluded to the treatment of the myth in Sophocles. The epigram was inscribed by Attalus and Eumenes on the ninth column of the temple of Apollo at Cyzicus underneath a corresponding scene in relief. The anthologist describes the relief and quotes the epigram as follows:

On the ninth column is carved the scene of Pelias and Neleus, the sons of Poseidon, rescuing their own mother from bonds. For she had been bound by her father Salomeus because he was ruined by her seduction. And their stepmother Sidero supervised her torture: "Tyro, let the chains of Sidero no longer torment thee, cowering before this thy father Salomeus. For he shall no longer keep thee in chains, now that he sees Neleus and Pelias at hand to restrain him." Most notable is the fact in this version of the myth is that Salomeus persecutes his own daughter. No mention is made of a husband, and the fact that Salomeus is "ruined" (φθορά), the normal word said of fathers whose virgin daughters are raped, suggests that she was a virgin. He is one of many patriarchal figures in myth who punish, pursue, or even kill an unwed pregnant daughter. The Alope of Euripides alluded to above is one such example, and Euripides’ Auge, as we shall see below, is another.

Given that there are several tragedies alluded to, it seems safe to conclude that as a principle, Menander was playing with several tragedies at once and that in this scene he was not interested in a close correspondence between specific plays, but rather a general

---

84ἐν τῷ 8 Πελίας καὶ Νηλεῖς ἐνελάξενται. οἱ Ποσειδώνος παῖδες, ἐκ δεσμῶν τὴν ἑαυτῶν μητέρα ψυχεῖν, ἦν πρὸς ὅ πατὴρ μὲν Σαλμωνέως διά τὴν φθορὰν ἔδησεν ἡ δὲ μητρὶ αὐτῆς Σιδηρός τὰς βασάνους αὐτῇ ἐπέτεινεν. "μὴ Τυρῷ τρύχας σε ἐτείρημα Σιδηρός / Σαλμωνεῖ γενέτα τοῖς ὑποτητοποιοῦντι / οὐκέτι γὰρ δουλῶσαι ἐν ἑρκέσιν, ἐγγύθι λεύσασον / Νηλεῖς καὶ Πελῖας τοῦσδε καθέξουσίν σοι."
85LSJ 4: "seduction...rape" The social/cultural fact was that a virgin who was raped represented "ruin," financial and otherwise, to her father, who now could not easily wed her.
interplay between the two genres, or a specific aspect common to several tragedies. This is borne out by a close examination of Syriscus' words. He says, τεθέσας τραγῳδούς οδ' ὑπὲρ, καὶ ταῦτα κατέχεις πάντα, using the plural for tragedy, not the singular, and telling Smicrines he knows them all, thus implying that Syriscus is speaking of Tragedy in general terms. His next reference to the tragedy of Neleus and Pelias is more specific, but only a specific example to help with the general focus. He lists several other examples of recognition scenes as well: tokens prevented someone from marrying his sister, helped someone else find and save his mother, helped yet another save his brother. No tragedy of a brother or sister nearly marrying is known, but the motif appears in Menander's own Perikeiromene and Plautus' Epidicus. A mother is saved through a recognition in several well-known stories such as those of Tyro, Antiope, Melanippe, and Hypsipyle. A brother is saved through tokens in Euripides' Iphigeneia at Tauris. Of course Syriscus identifies himself as the shepherd-figure in the pattern (line 328), but he fails to appreciate the dangerous implications for the child: he is one of two greedy shepherds arguing over tokens, which inadvertently leads a daughter to be persecuted or killed by a father figure who recognizes them. Thus Syriscus' numerous addresses of Smicrines as πάτερ (lines 231, 301, 320, 340, 344), while ingratiating, also highlight Smicrines' role as the harsh father figure, and they are full of irony that would not be lost on the audience.

Later in the Epitrepontes, Onesimus also quotes a bit of tragedy to Smicrines, this time to reproach him for being too thick-headed to see what has happened, namely that his daughter was raped and impregnated by Charisius before her marriage to Charisius.

---

86 Some scholars like to believe that Menander is playfully alluding to his own Perikeiromene here, which takes as its theme a brother who is prevented from marrying his sister by a recognition brought about through tokens. Some tragedy, however, must have been the inspiration for the Perikeiromene as well, especially in light of the fact that Syriscus begins this section of his speech with τεθέσας τραγῳδούς; all the examples he cites, then, come from tragedy, including the tokens preventing someone from marrying his sister.
Onesimus\textsuperscript{87} says, "Nature willed it, and she pays no heed to laws; for this was woman born."\textsuperscript{88} Why are you such a moron? I'll quote you the whole tragic speech from the Auge if you still don't get it, Smicrines.\textsuperscript{89} The tragedy alluded to here is Euripides' Auge. Strabo gives us a summary of this play:

Euripides says that Auge, with her child Telephus, was put by Aleus, her father, into a chest and submerged in the sea when he detected her ruin by Heracles, but that by the providence of Athena the chest was carried across the sea and cast ashore at the mouth of the Caicus, and that Teuthras rescued the prisoners, and treated the mother as his wife and the child as his own son.\textsuperscript{90}

From the actual fragments of this play we learn that Auge is impregnated by a drunk Heracles (Nauck, TGF fr. 265). She must deal with her misfortune alone (or perhaps she is accompanied by a nurse) and is in desperate need for help (Nauck, TGF fr. 277). She angers her patron goddess, Athena, by giving birth to the baby Telephus in Athena's temple. Auge wryly notes that the slaughter of battle does not seem to bother Athena, but giving birth in her shrine does (Nauck, TGF fr. 266). This birth in the shrine apparently causes pollution for the city (Nauck, TGF fr. 267), which presumably results in the intervention of king Aleus, who upon discovering his daughter's guilt, probably through tokens, puts Auge and Telephus in the chest and submerges them in the sea. With the help of Athena, the woman and child are rescued by Teuthras. Unfortunately we do not know...

\textsuperscript{87}Körte follows the manuscript and assigns this quote to the old nurse Sophrone, but for reasons given by Gomme and Sandbach, Commentary, pg. 381, line 1120 ff., it is more likely they belong to Onesimus.

\textsuperscript{88}This quote was known from several sources before the discovery of the Epitreponies. One of these sources was Aelianus N.A. 4.54, who tells us that the quote is from Euripides. Based on this, Nauck was able to assign it to some unknown play of Euripides (fr. 920). The discovery of the Epitreponies in 1905 provided the particular play of Euripides, the Auge.

\textsuperscript{89}Epitreponies lines 1123-26: "ἡ φύσις ἐβουλέθ', ἡ νόσῳν οὐδὲν μέλειν / γυνὴ δ' ἐπ' αὐτῷ τόδε ἔρυς." τί μύρος εἴ / τραγικὴν ἐρῶ σοι ἰήσαι εἰς Αὔγης ἄλην / ἀν μή ποτ' αἰσθή.

Σιμικρίνη.

\textsuperscript{90}Strabo, Geography 13.1.69: Εὐριπίδης δ' ὑπὸ Ἀλέου φησὶ τοῦ τῆς Αὔγης πατρὸς εἰς λάρνακα τὴν Αὔγην καταστείλαν ἀμα τῷ παιδί Τηλέφω καταποντωθῆναι, φωράσαντος τὴν εἰς Ἡρακλέους φθοράν. Ἀδηνάς δὲ προνοια τὴν λάρνακα περαιωθεὶσαν ἐπεεῖν εἰς τὸ στόμα τοῦ Καῖκου, τὸν δὲ Τευθραντα ἀναλαβόντα τὰ σώματα τῇ μὲν ὡς γαμητῇ χρῆσασθαι τῷ δ' ὡς ἑαυτοῦ παιδί.
who spoke the lines quoted by Onesimus, or under what circumstances. It probably
doesn't matter, however, because what is important here is not a specific dialogue with the
Auge, but rather it is another example of a play where a father pursues his own daughter
for being impregnated out of wedlock.

Further support for the view that Menander was here interested in the general
interplay between the tragic father figure may be found in other tragedies with the same
theme. In addition to the Alope, Tyro, and Auge of Euripides, we also have a summary by
Moses Chorene of another tragedy involving Auge that Menander may have had in mind
when he wrote the Epitrepones. Moses says:

In a city of Arcadia, during ritual celebrations in honor of Athena, her
priestess Auge participated in the dancing, part of the evening rites, and
Heracles raped her. However, as witness to this misdeed he left her a ring.
She became pregnant and bore Telephus, whose name arose from
circumstances. When Auge's father discovered her disgrace, he became
furious and ordered that Telephus be cast out in an uninhabited spot (where
he was nursed by a doe), that Auge be drowned in the depths of the sea.
Meanwhile, Heracles came wandering back to this region. Reminded by the
ring of what he had done, he rescued his son and saved the mother from
imminent danger of death. In accordance with the prophecy of Apollo,
Teuthras took Auge for wife and Telephus as his son.

In 1875 Wilamowitz used this version to reconstruct Euripides' Auge, and in so doing he
assigned Strabo's version (quoted above) to Euripides' Telephus. When the Cairo
papyrus in 1905 yielded most of the Epitrepones as we know it today, it was taken as
confirmation that Moses' version was that of Euripides' Auge, given the fact that the plot of
the Epitrepones is very similar to the play that Moses summarizes, and given that
Menander quotes from the Auge. In 1935, however, shortly after Wilamowitz's death, a
new papyrus containing the first sixteen lines of the Telephus was published, and this new
find precluded Strabo's version from coming from the Telephus because of geographical

---

91 On the attribution of this line in Euripides' play, see William S. Anderson, "Euripides' Auge
and Menander's Epitrepones," GRBS 23 (1982): 165-177. I, however, believe that the line belongs to
Heracles rather than Athena, as Anderson argues.
92 Wilamowitz, Analecta Euripidea (Berlin 1875): 189.
That meant that Strabo's version must refer to Euripides' Auge because Strabo specifically says that he is summarizing a play by Euripides. Scholars then assumed that Strabo and Moses were both summarizing Euripides' Auge, and they did not bother to note the major inconsistencies between the two accounts, to wit, the fact that in one version Telephus is put in a chest with his mother, in the other he is cast out into the wild and raised by a doe. William Anderson, however, rightly points out that these two versions must come from two different plays. Moses does not tell us what play or author he is summarizing, but he cannot be referring to Euripides' Auge. It is possible that he may not even be summarizing a tragedy, but this seems unlikely. Moses's version, then, probably refers to another tragic treatment of the Auge/Telephus myth. Who the author of this tragedy was is unclear. The close correspondences between this story and that of the Epitrepones are too compelling, however, to be ignored. An innocent woman is raped at a night festival, and the assailant leaves behind his ring. The ring eventually leads to a recognition by the child's grandfather. To reiterate, what all this suggests is that Menander's usual technique is to incorporate several different tragedies at once, as he did in the Aspis.

The arbitration scene and Onesimus' quoting of Tragedy in the Epitrepones, then, are meant to highlight Smicrines as the father/grandfather figure of a tragic recognition scene. The parallel recognition scenes of the Alope, Tyro, and Auge are recalled to accentuate this as his role. The tragic parallels that Syriscus cites then, are germane to the situation, and the irony of it all is that they are both more and less pertinent than he realizes. This irony is particularly present when Syriscus says to Smicrines, "You've seen the

---

94 For one such reconciliation, see T.B.L. Webster, The Tragedies of Euripides (London 1967): 239.
tragedies, I'm sure, and you remember them all" (lines 325-326: τεθέασαι τραγωδίους, οἶδ' ὅτι, καὶ ταύτα κατέχεισ πάντα). κατέχεισ has two meanings here, one of which Syriscus does not realize. Smicrines not only remembers all of these tragedies, but he possesses and occupies all of them. He is the symbol of Tragedy in the play. He is the tragic father figure. Here Menander associates the blocking figure of his play with Tragedy, and then later towards the end of the play overthrows him, and the potential tragedy. On an ideological level, then, the blocking figure who is overthrown represents the final overthrow of Tragedy in the play. Furthermore, the most potent symbols of Comedy in the play, such as a clever slave or a cook, are given the honor of carrying out the final humiliation. The Dyscolus is instructive. There Sicon and Getas, cook and slave, abuse Cnemon, who represents the presence of Tragedy within the Dyscolus. In the Aspis, Davus outsmarts Smicrines, and perhaps Davus and the Cook, who is probably invited back at the end of the play for the double wedding as was argued in the last chapter, were given the honor of abusing the greedy Smicrines there as Getas and Sicon do in the Dyscolus. In the Epitrepontes, as far as we can tell the honor falls to Onesimus and Sophrone. After Onesimus discovers the real story, Onesimus has fun revealing the truth to Smicrines (lines 1080 ff.), because Smicrines is still trying to sabotage Pamphile's marriage to Charisius. Onesimus points out to Smicrines that he is blocking (καταλαμβάνεις) the Comedy at lines 1107-1109:

But now chance has spared you, though you be bent on a knavish deed, and you are blocking the reconciliation and the solution to those tragedies. But don't let me catch you, Smicrines, rushing headlong, I tell you. But drop your complaints now, and inside take and greet your grandson.  

96See my chapter on the Dyscolus, where I argue that Menander characterizes Cnemon as having a "heroic temper", like a Sophoclean hero. 
98καὶ νῦν μὲν ὀρμῶν ἐπὶ πονηρόν πράγμα σε / ταύτωματον ἀποσέσωκε, καὶ καταλαμβάνεις / διαλλαγὰς λύσεις τ' ἐκεῖνων τῶν κακῶν, / αὕτες δ' ὄπως μὴ λήμοιμαι σε.
When Smicrines realizes the implications of what Onesimus is saying, his anger is excited (line 1126) like a father figure in Tragedy, but unfortunately the manuscript breaks off for the last time. We can safely imagine that he tries to lunge at his daughter, and then Charisius, but he is thwarted, and his character, already mocked by Onesimus, is completely overthrown along with the potential Tragedy. Perhaps Onesimus' words just quoted, "Don't let me catch you, Smicrines, rushing headlong" foreshadow that Onesimus will play a further role in his humiliation after Smicrines ignores Onesimus' advice.

In addition to the tragic diction and tragic mythemes, the third level of the arbitration scene that touches upon Tragedy is the structure. It is modeled on the agon of Tragedy that is as much a part of that genre as the messenger speech, especially in Euripides. One sure way of detecting a Euripidean topos is to determine whether or not Aristophanes comments on it or parodies it. Not surprisingly, we find in Aristophanes references to Euripides' forensic skills. At Peace 534, Aristophanes calls Euripides the ποιητὴς ῥηματίζων δικανικῶν. At Acharnians 414 ff., Dicaeopolis asks the masterful Euripides if he can borrow a speech from one of his plays. The most famous example of all, of course, is his parody of a Euripidean agon in the Clouds with the contest between Dikaios Logos and Adikos Logos. Clearly Menander's treatment of the agon is much more subtle than Aristophanes'. Menander's agon, in fact, seems outwardly to be very similar to the form and function of the agon in tragedy, and it also appears to be better stitched into the fabric of the play.

Συμπόνη, / προπητὴ λέγω σοι· νῦν δὲ τῶν ἑγκλημάτων / ἀφείσο τούτων, τὸν δὲ λιγατριδοῦν λαβῶν / ἐνδον πρόσειπε.  
99Smicrines' χολή is aroused at line 1126. For the association of anger with Tragic responses, see Chapter 5 on the Samia.  
100On the tragic agon of the Epitrepones, see Katsouris, op. cit., p. 143 ff.  
101Acharnians 414 ff: ἀλλ' ἀντιβολῷ πρὸς τῶν γονάτων α' Εὐρίπιδη, / δός μοι ῥάκιον τι τοῦ παλαιοῦ δράματος. δει γάρ με λέξις τῷ χορῷ ρησιν μακράν.
On an ideological level, however, Menander's *agon* is noticeably different from Euripides' or Aristophanes' in that the *polis* does not figure in the debate. The *polis* is, in fact, far removed, as are the real issues of pain, suffering, and justice. It is unfortunate that we don't have the *Alope, Tyro, or Auge* to see how the *polis* figures into those plays, but based upon Sophocles' and Euripides' other plays, we can safely surmise that it did. We know that in all those plays the lowly workmen bring their case before the king, who governs the *polis*, and so it is likely that political considerations were involved. In other plays by Sophocles and Euripides, such as the *Oedipus Tyrannus, Antigone, Hippolytus*, and *Medea*, the results of the *agon* have political implications. In Menander, no communal aspect is present. The matter is entirely private, and the focus is on the individual characters, irrespective of the community at large. At one point Syriscus tries to make the *polis* relevant by suggesting that the infant may grow up to become a king someday, but the audience realizes that the rhetoric is so overblown that his words are merely a self-interested smoke screen. Thus, Tragedy here, as with Davus in the *Aspis*, is just another trope of life turned against blocking figures, whose character makes them antithetical to the comic spirit of the play, and hence like the presence of Tragedy within the play, worthy targets of scorn. That the *polis* is irrelevant to Menandrean comedy is also evinced by the role of the chorus, traditionally seen as the voice of the average member of the *polis* in Tragedy. In Menander the chorus is reduced to a mere band of drunken revelers that takes up space between acts and is to be avoided by the characters of the play, as Davus notes in the *Aspis* (lines 245 ff.) and Chaerestratus in the *Epitrepontes* (169 ff.). Menander's choral interludes were merely pieces of entertainment placed between acts that in no way offered a demotic perspective on the play's action.

With this in mind we can see that the recognition scene in the *Epitrepontes* not only subverts the Tragic figure in the play, but it also contests the old *polis*-centered values of Tragedy and focuses rather on private characters with private problems. Tragic
conventions are displayed as merely self-interested deceptive rhetorical tropes. It is, therefore, inappropriate to speak of Menander as a poet who "imitated" Euripides. His relationship to the great tragedian and Tragedy in general was of a far different nature. In the arbitration scene Menander uses the recognition scene, and especially the father figure of an unwed pregnant daughter, in order to set the worlds of Tragedy and Comedy side by side for us to compare and contrast. As André Hurst says:

Un point, cependant, fait dresser l'oreille et constitue une mise en parallèle de la tragédie et de la comédie. Les mots "vêtu d'une peau, tout comme moi" (328) amènent comédie et tragédie à se recouper exactement pour un bref instant: la figure du serviteur vêtu d'une peau oscille, sous les yeux du spectateur, entre l'univers tragique et l'univers comique. L'implication est claire: c'est ici le poète qui parle.\textsuperscript{102}

The poet speaks, and his aim is to undermine Tragedy as a source of private wisdom before an audience that was familiar with the "classics" because they were re-staged year in and year out. The unreal action of the solemn world of Tragedy was transformed and brought down to the spectators' everyday world. The traditional gods or Fate were banished from the stage and replaced by newer divinities such as Tyche or Agnoia. Heroes and their legendary tales of miracles, metamorphoses, or other supernatural expedients likewise disappeared and were replaced by real people. Maidens, who in Tragedy are seduced by a god, are instead violated by the boy next door. Kingly fathers are transformed into grumbling old niggards, losing their royal status but not their bad characters. The protagonists do not learn through suffering as in Tragedy (\(\pi\acute{\alpha}\theta\epsilon\iota\ \mu\omega\theta\epsilon\omega\nu\)), but rather they overcome life's troubles by appropriating a comic outlook. Those who do not are ceremoniously mocked and enraged.

In addition to the \textit{Epitrepontes}, we have recognition scenes preserved in the \textit{Perikeiromene} and the \textit{Sicyonius}.\textsuperscript{103} Their texts are too fragmentary to make certain

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{102}Ibid, p. 112.
\item \textsuperscript{103}There may also be a recognition scene in the \textit{Misoumenus} involving a sword, but the text is too fragmentary to be certain.
\end{itemize}
judgments, but what is preserved suggests Menander exploited and sought to subvert Tragedy in these plays as well.

The text of the *Perikeiromene* begins with Agnoia delivering a postponed divine prologue, like Tyche in the *Aspis*. From Agnoia (and the other preserved portions of the play) we learn that a man named Pataecus had lost his wife (who died while giving birth to twins) and his fortune in one day. He had someone expose the twins, and they were picked up by an old woman. The old woman kept the girl, Glyceria, but she gave the boy, Moschion, to a wealthy neighbor named Myrrha. When the old woman was about to die, she told Glyceria about her birth tokens and how she was related to Moschion, but Glyceria did not tell Moschion so he could enjoy his favored position in Myrrha's house. Evidently Myrrha does not tell Moschion he was a foundling either. The old woman also "gave" Glyceria to a soldier named Polemon. One night Moschion saw Glyceria, and not knowing that she was his sister, ran up to her and kissed her. She did not resist, because she knew that he was her brother.

In the meantime someone saw these two kiss, probably Polemon's slave Sosias, and he told Polemon. Polemon, who had just returned from some foreign campaign, cut off Glyceria's hair in a fit of jealous rage, hence the title of the play. Glyceria moved next door with Myrrha, which was also Moschion's house, to get away from Polemon.

All of this happens prior to Agnoia's prologue, which is where the extant text begins. After this we learn from the surviving portions of the play that Polemon believes that Glyceria has left him for Moschion. He sends Sosias to see what Glyceria is up to. The text breaks off for about seventy lines and resumes at the end of Act I. When Act II opens we find Moschion and his servant Davus talking. Davus hoodwinks Moschion into believing that he and his mother Myrrha have contrived to set up Moschion with Glyceria, and that Glyceria is interested in him. Davus goes in to announce that Moschion is coming to see Glyceria, but Myrrha quashes this idea. Moschion rightly suspects that Davus has
been lying. Davus manages to talk his way out of his lies. Moschion then goes into his house. Next Sosias enters and accosts Davus and demands to know if Glycera is in Myrrhina’s house. He threatens to assault the house, if they do not return Glycera. The text then breaks off. When it resumes, it is at the beginning of Act III. Sosias is trying to persuade Polemon to assault Myrrhina’s house, and Polemon is nearly convinced, but then is dissuaded by his older friend (comrade?), Pataecus. Instead, Polemon sends Pataecus to speak with Glycera to persuade Glycera to return to him. Before Pataecus goes, Polemon begs Pataecus to look at Glycera’s wardrobe to prove his lavish spending on her. As the two leave to inspect her wardrobe, a frustrated Moschion comes on stage lamenting his cold reception by his mother and Glycera. The text then breaks off. When it resumes in Act IV, Pataecus is on his embassy to Glycera, and Glycera is offended that they think she is having a liaison with Moschion. Her heart will not budge, and as "a woman shorn-ed" she refuses to forgive Polemon’s scornful act. She asks Pataecus to send someone into Polemon’s house to retrieve her birth tokens. The servant returns and Pataecus recognizes the tokens as those he had left with his children. Through some intense cross-questioning, Pataecus and Glycera realize they are father and daughter. Moschion overhears the conversation, and realizes that he is Pataecus’ son. He steps out and the three are thus united by the end of Act IV. When the text resumes in Act V, we learn that Pataecus has persuaded Glycera to forgive Polemon and so Pataecus gives her to Polemon with a dowry of three talents. The text breaks off with Pataecus saying he is going to speak with Philinus (Myrrhina’s husband?) about having Moschion wed Philinus’ daughter as well.

Thus the basic outline of the play is known. In the recognition scene of the Perikeiromene tragic diction once again appears, but it is even more pronounced than it was in the Epitrepontes. It is, in fact, the longest surviving stretch of unrelieved tragic diction in Menander (lines 779-823). It is even conducted in the manner of the tragic stichomythia, and is, therefore, sharply contrasted with the style of what precedes and what follows.
This tragic diction, including some Euripidean echoes, is thoroughly analyzed by Sandbach and need not be repeated here. Sandbach rightly points out that "the audience might be touched by the emotional level of a scene such as this, and yet not take it entirely seriously; feel with the characters, yet be amused by an incongruity between their poetic diction and their familiar everyday background. I am not convinced, as Gomme was, that there can be no question of parody." Elsewhere Sandbach notes of this scene, that "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..." Again, parody is a composition in which the characteristic turns of thought and phrase of an author are mimicked and made to appear ridiculous, especially by applying them to ludicrously inappropriate subjects. As Sandbach himself senses, Menander's treatment is not so "ludicrously inappropriate," and so we would be better off calling this subversion, or stealthily coming from under something only to overturn it. Perhaps if more of the play were preserved we could say more, but the fragmentary state does not permit.

The other recognition scene preserved in Menander occurs in the Sicyonius. This play is even more fragmentary than the Perikeiromene, but much of the plot is recoverable. The papyrus begins with a divine prologue. Only fifteen of these lines are well-preserved. In them we learn that some pirates (ληστές — cf. line 357) captured a girl (undoubtedly Philoumene), an old female servant, and a younger male servant (undoubtedly Dromon). In line 355 we learn that Philoumene is from the deme of Halae. There are two Attic demes with this name, both on the coast. Halae Araphenides was located near Brauron on the northeast coast of Attica, and Halae Aixonides lay between Phalerum and Sounion, the latter of which was the site of an abduction of the girl Pamphila.

---

104 Sandbach, Gomme and Sandbach Commentary, p. 520.
106 There is some confusion in the sources whether this play was called the Sicyonius or the plural, the Sicyonii. See Gomme and Sandbach, Commentary, p. 632 for why the singular is preferable.
in Terence’s *Eunuchus* (519 ff.), which was adapted from a Menandrian original. Philoumene was undoubtedly abducted from one of these coastal demes as well. The pirates left the old female servant behind, but took Philoumene and Dromon and put them up for sale on the market at Mylasa, a town in Caria in modern day Turkey. There a military officer\(^\text{107}\) referred to as the Sicyonius (line 13 -- probably Stratophanes) buys Philoumene and Dromon. The text then breaks off. It must have described how Stratophanes raised Philoumene as a free girl (see fragment 1, in which almost certainly the divine prologue figure spoke) and eventually brought her back to Athens (Eleusis) in hopes of restoring her to her father (see lines 235-6).

There are then two papyrus fragments, lines 52-61 and 62-109. They are assigned to the first half of the play, but whether they belong to Act I or II is unclear, probably Act II. The first scrap seems to contain a plan to get someone to perjure himself. Legrand made the suggestion\(^\text{108}\) that the falsified testimony concerns a girl’s status as a free-born citizen, and Barigazzi proposed that this suggestion was put forward by Moschion to Dromon (who is afraid that Stratophanes wants to make an untoward move on Philoumene). Moschion himself, however, wants to take Philoumene from Stratophanes and possess her.\(^\text{109}\) The next scrap seems to be a monologue where someone reports that they have found out that a girl claims to be of citizen status. This may be Moschion complaining that he has been double-crossed by Dromon, who along with Philoumene has now taken refuge at the altar.

\(^{107}\)The word I translate as "officer" in this passage is ἡγεμόν. Some have wished to make this a proper name, and so introduce two military men from Sicyon, and hence make the title of the play the Sicyonii. Sandbach adduces several reasons for rejecting this idea, and he makes mention of the repetition of the noun ἡγεμόν in line 14, but fails to note that it is modified by the adjective ἀρηπτός. This proves beyond doubt that ἡγεμόν is a noun, not a name. Why would someone call the Sicyonian a good Hegemon, unless there was some understanding that men named Hegemon are usually bad, which is utterly ridiculous?

\(^{108}\)BCH 30 (1906): 122.

The next fragment comes from Act III, where Stratophanes and his retainer Theron are conversing. Stratophanes' servant Pyrrhias then enters and tells him that his mother had just died and left him a note telling him he was not really her son or a Sicyonian, but was adopted from someone else. Pyrrhias hands Stratophanes the note his mother wrote, in which she tells Stratophanes of his family history, but this note is not read on stage as Act III comes to a close. Later, we learn that he was born an Athenian, and this will pave the way for him to marry Philoumene, who will also be proven an Athenian.

Act IV begins with two people talking, probably Blepes and Sm[icrines]. It is not certain who this Smicrines is and why Blepes tells him the story that follows. Sandbach argues that Smicrines is probably Stratophanes' father, and thus unknowingly a party to what Blepes is about to tell. Blepes recounts to a rather uninterested Smicrines an incident that he saw in town. He begins his story with what looks to be an echo of the opening remarks of the messenger in Euripides' Orestes. The allusion is appropriate, because in the Orestes we find a similar situation: the messenger tells Electra that she and her brother Orestes have been condemned to die by vote of the demos. Just like the messenger in the Orestes, Blepes says he was in town when he came upon a mob that was just gathering to decide the fate of a woman and a man (Philoumene and her servant Dromon) who took refuge at an altar claiming she was an Athenian citizen. A kangaroo court adjourns to hear the case. Moschion approaches Dromon and whispers something in his ear, at which the mob gets angry and wants to know who Moschion is and what he is whispering. Moschion tells the crowd that he has had some previous dealings with Dromon and wants to help, but he also blushes. The crowd then rightly suspects he is after the girl and hisses

---

110 The messenger in the Orestes 866 begins ἐτύγχανον μὲν ἄγροιεν πυλῶν ἔδωκ / βαίνον, while the papyrus in the Sicyonius has ἐτύγχανον μὲν οὐκ ἄγροιεν πυλῶν ἔδωκ / βαίνον, which Merkelbach restores as ἐτύγχανον μὲν οὐκ ἄγροιεν πυλῶν ἔδωκ / βαίνον.

111 Gomme and Sandbach, Commentary p. 651 note that "There is a parallel between this speech and that of Orestes in that both give an account of a debate before a popular assembly that decides the fate of a man and a woman."
at him. Next a manly fellow (ἀνδρικὸς - line 215) appears (probably Stratophanes) along with two other people (Theron and Pyrrhias). Stratophanes sees Philoumene and lets forth an emotional outburst. He explains how he had reared her since she was child and he hoped to restore her to her father. He tells the "court" to place her in the safekeeping of the priestess of Demeter's temple until her father is found. He also asks that no other suitor approach her until he has a chance to prove his own citizen status and ask her father for her hand. The mob agrees. This arrangement, however, does not please Moschion, who scoffs at this "melodramatic tragedy" (τραγωδία κενῆς - line 263) but he is silenced by the mob. Philoumene then leaves the altar and goes to the priestess of the temple.

The next scene begins with Moschion trying to arrest Stratophanes for being a kidnapper. The papyrus breaks off for about twenty lines. When it resumes someone (Stratophanes' real mother, who may be the wife of Smicrines?) is describing Stratophanes' birth tokens (a garment) and why he was sent away to the family at Sicyon. Stratophanes is, therefore, recognized as someone's son, probably Smicrines. We also learn that Moschion is Smicrines' other son, and hence Stratophanes' brother. Act IV then closes, once again immediately after the recognition is brought about.

Act V then opens with Theron trying to persuade a man (Cichesias) to perjure himself and say he is Cichesias, the father of Philoumene. The scene is very similar to Plautus' *Poenulus*, where Milphio wants someone to pose as the father of two girls who are in the hands of some slave-dealers. Milphio lights upon Hanno, who is in reality the two girls' father. When Hanno hears that Milphio wants him to pretend to be the father of two kidnapped girls, Hanno begins to weep and Milphio thinks he is just role-playing, and so praises his cunning. So too here, Cichesias begins to weep when he recalls his own daughter's fate, and Theron takes this for role-playing. Suddenly Cichesias' old servant Dromon appears and tells him that Philoumene is safe. Cichesias faints, but then recovers to hear the good news. Stratophanes then appears and meets his future father-in-law. He
also orders his slave Donax to transfer his goods to his newly-found family's house.

Moschion then appears and laments that his brother will marry Philoumene and that he will be stuck being the best man. What remains is too fragmentary to reconstruct, except that it is clear that torches and garlands are called for Stratophanes' and Philoumene's wedding. Whether there was a double wedding is unclear, but not unlikely.

Our analysis of the recognition scene in the *Sicyonius* is in some ways opposite to that of the *Perikeiromene*: In the *Perikeiromene* we have the complete recognition scene, but very little of the context surrounding that scene; in the *Sicyonius* we have more of the context surrounding the recognition scene, but not much of the scene itself. The portions of the scene that do survive, however, suggest that it was in many ways similar to that of the *Perikeiromene* -- that is, it was written in the style of Tragedy.\(^{112}\) The extant recognition scene begins at line 280 of our text. The preserved portions of the first seven lines, with the exception of no caesura in line 280, are in tragic meter, and, in what little remains of the next seventeen lines, there is nothing preserved that is not in tragic meter. Despite the scanty remains, our interpretation of this recognition scene is, paradoxically, perhaps better than that of the *Perikeiromene*, because of the preserved portion of the beginning of this Act.

To recall what has been said earlier in this same Act, a Blepes tells a Sm[icrines] about an incident he witnessed in town. He probably begins his speech with an echo of Euripides' *Orestes* that was a signal to the audience that here is a messenger speech such as you would find in Tragedy. In telling his news, Blepes eventually relates how Stratophanes appears and says to the mob:

'I too used to think that I was a Sicyonian.
But this man here is carrying
my mother's will and tokens of my birth.
And I think that I too, if I can
put any trust in this letter to prove it,

\(^{112}\)See Sandbach's comments, Gomme and Sandbach, *Commentary*, p. 660-1 at verse 280.
am your citizen. Do not take
away my hope, but if I too am
shown to be the girl's fellow citizen,
allow me to ask for the her hand
whom I rescued for her father.
And let none of my rivals
become kyrios of the girl
before her father appears.'
'Quite right and just,' 'right,'
'Take her to the priestess, take her.'
Then the pale-skinned fellow
suddenly leaps back up
and says, 'Do you really believe this stuff,
that this fellow has suddenly found a will
by which he is your fellow citizen, and with
this empty tragedy he will take the girl
away and keep his hands off her!'\footnote{\textsuperscript{113}}

The audience that witnessed these words would in a moment watch the recognition scene of Stratophanes, and they would remember them. Moschion gives voice to what Menander himself may be thinking and what Menander hopes that the audience will be thinking: this is "empty tragedy."\footnote{\textsuperscript{114}} It is impossible to say, but it is tempting to posit, that a similar sort of statement preceded or followed the recognition scene in the \textit{Perikeiromene} that too would have altered the audiences' view of that scene. At any rate, it is one thing for a poet to incorporate elements of another genre into his work, and it is quite another to have at the same time one of his characters call them "empty." This suggests that Menander was subverting the tragic recognition scene.

\footnotetext[113]{Lines 246-263: "Σικουώνιος τὸ πρότερον εἶναι προοδόκουν / κάγως: πάρεστι δ' οὖτοι μοι νῦν φέρον / μητρὸς διαθήκας καὶ γένους γνωρίσματα: / οἶμαι δὲ καύτος, εἰ τι 
τοὺς γεγραμμένους / τούτους τεκμαίρεσθαι με πιστεύσαι τε δεί, / εἶναι πολίτης ὑμέτερος. 
τὴν ἑπίδα / μήπω μ' ἀφελῆσθ', ἀλλ' ἄν φανώ τῆς παρθένου / κάγω πολίτης, ἥν ἔσωσα 
tῶι πατρί, / έσσατ' αἰτήσαι με τούτον καὶ λαβέων / τῶν ἀντιπραττόντων δ' ἐμοὶ τῆς 
παρθένου / μηθῆς γενέσθω κύριος πρὶν ἀν φανῇ / ἐκεῖνος." "ὁρθῶς καὶ δικαι', "ὁρθῶς", "ἄγε 
/ πρὸς τὴν ἱέρειαν, ἄγε λαβὼν." ὁ λεικόχρωος / ἐκεῖνος ἐξαφηθεῖς τε παραπταθήκα τῶ πάλιν / καὶ 
φησιν "ταύτι συμπέποικον, οὗ ὅμοιον / νῦν ἐξαπίθησις εἶλήθη διαθήκας ποθέν / ἐστὶ τε πολίτης 
ὑμέτερος, τραγῳδοῖα / κενὴ τ' ἀγώνινος τῆν κόρην ἀφῆσεται[ai]."

\footnotetext[114]{See Jerzy Lanowski, "KENH ΤΡΑΓΩΔΙΑ (Menander on Tragedy)," \textit{Eos} 55 (1965): 245-253.}
We may even be tempted to find in this reference to ἑρωδία κενῆ an unheimlich affirmation of one of Harold Bloom's revisionary ratios, kenosis (emptying) or repetition and discontinuity of one poet (or genre) from an earlier poet (or genre). If we must assign a particular antecedent to Menander in this case, then Euripides would be most appropriate, given that this scene in the Sicyonius has affinities with the Orestes. Briefly what Bloom postulates is that "Where the precursor was [= Euripides or Tragedy], there the ephebe [= Menander] shall be, but by the discontinuous mode of emptying the precursor of his divinity, while appearing to empty himself of his own. However plangent or even despairing the poem of kenosis, the ephebe takes care to fall soft, while the precursor falls hard." In other words, part of Menander's strategy in his use of tragic recognitions, as defined by Aristotle, was to initially exploit Tragedy at face value, rather than parody it, in order to empty it and make it fall hard, which is to subvert it, as he does in the Epitrepontes, and probably also in the Perikeiromene and Sicyonius.

CHAPTER 5

THE SAMIA: A SUBVERSION OF TRAGIC ANGER AND ROLE-PLAYING

The effect of anger was a theme that seems to have fascinated Menander, for it is a common motif in several of his plays. His first play, in fact, was entitled 'Opyhi. In this play the goddess Orge probably delivered a divine prologue speech, much like Agnoia in the Perikeiromene, and perhaps anger was the cause of separation between a man and his lover, as between Polemon and Glycera in the Perikeiromene. But only a few passages of the Orge are cited in our sources, and these are of no help for determining the plot. The Dyscolus takes as its subject a man's antisocial anger and the consequences of his misanthropy on himself and his family. The Heaton Timoroumenos explores the theme of a father's self-hatred. Anger also plays a major role in the Samia, especially that of a father towards a son, so much so that one scholar even suggests that in the Samia Menander "relies on the progressive inflaming of characters' tempers to organize, energize,

---

1 Or perhaps his first victory; Eusebius at Olymp. 114: Μένανδρος ὁ κωμικός πρῶτον δράμα διδάξει 'Οργήν ἐνίκησεν. As Kock notes (CAF III, p. 105), dubium est prōtōn utrum ad drāma an ad ēnikēsī pertineat. The Anonymous notes (XII) that Menander's first production was in the archonship of Diocles when he was yet an ephebe, but this is impossible, as there was no eponymous archon of this name in the relevant time period. Some have suggested either Anticles (325/4) or Philocles (322/1). For the problems on this chronology, see Arnott, Menander I (Loeb Classical Library no. 132) pp. xiv-xv.


3 Cf. Perikeiromene 163.

4 Kock, CGF fragments 363-369.


6 The relationship of father and son was of great consequence in Greek culture. One's own status and identity were ultimately derived from one's father, witness the use of the patronymic throughout all periods of Greek history. It is not surprising, then, to also find that poets probed this most significant of all relationships throughout all periods and genres of Greek Literature.
and unify the plot.\(^7\) But the anger in the *Samia* also has another function. It causes temporary madness and is portrayed in such a way as to recall the anger between father and son in Tragedy, for at every point that anger bubbles up in the play, tragic diction appears or mention of Tragedy is made. This tragic diction and these explicit references to Tragedy, then, are meant to make the audience compare and contrast the maddening anger in the *Samia* with that which erupts between father and son in such plays as Euripides’ *Hippolytus* and *Phoenix.*\(^8\) Like the *Hippolytus* and *Phoenix,* the *Samia* explores the consequences of a father’s rage when he believes that his son has betrayed him in the most sensitive of areas, that of his wife or lover. By evoking Tragedy, Menander places the tragic treatment of anger between father and son\(^9\) on stage so that the tragic dramatization or performance of one’s emotions is seen as misguided role-playing.

The idea that anger and mental derangement are sent by the gods to destroy a man or his house is promulgated in both epic\(^11\) and lyric,\(^12\) but it finds its most influential expression in fifth century Tragedy. In Sophocles’ *Antigone* the idea that the gods send

---


\(^8\) Old Comedy, too, frequently treated the theme of father and son (i.e. Aristophanes’ *Clouds, Wasps*), but as we shall see, Menander does not seem to have Old Comedy in mind when wrote the *Samia,* for it is tragedy that is alluded to throughout. See below.

\(^9\) For the similarities between Euripides’ *Hippolytus* and Menander’s *Samia,* see especially A. Katsouris, *Tragic Patterns in Menander* (Athens 1975), pp. 131-143 (and bibliography listed there) and Stephanie West, “Notes on the *Samia,*” *ZPE* 88 (1991): 11-23. Katsouris and West argue for a close interaction between the two texts, but the relationship is more one of general situation and includes more tragedies besides the *Hippolytus,* especially Euripides’ *Phoenix.* See my comments below.


\(^11\) Homer, μήνις, ἄτιτη

\(^12\) Cf. Theognis 403: οὐκέτι ἀνήρ, κέρδος δεξίμενος, ὅν τινα δαίμων / πρόφροιν εἰς μεγάλην ἀμπλακήν παράγει, / καὶ οἱ θεῖκε δοκεῖν, ἀ μὲν ἢ κακά, ταῦτ’ ἁγαθ’ εἶναι, / εὐμαρέως, ἀ δ’ ἂν ἢ χρήσιμα, ταῦτα κακά.
destructive delusion is presented as proverbial by the chorus of Theban elders at line 620-24: "With wisdom did he speak who rendered that famous saying, 'Evil seems to be good after awhile, to the man whose mind a god drives to delusion.'" The scholiast reinforces this passage by quoting some verses from some other unknown poet, who was probably a tragedian: "Whene'er god prepares ills for a man, he first harms the mind of him he counsels." James Duport in 1660 attributed this fragment to Euripides and rendered it in Latin as *Quem Juppiter vult perdere, dementat prius*. It is unclear, however, whether it belongs to Euripides or not. The fourth-century Athenian orator Lycurgus quotes from some unknown tragedy, saying much the same, which shows that the idea at least has a tragic pedigree:

For the gods do nothing before they lead aside the thoughts of knaves. Some of the ancient poets seem to have left behind as it were oracles to posterity when they wrote these iambics: 'Whene'er the anger of the gods harms a man, it first does this: it takes good sense from the heart and turns it to the worse opinion, so that he not recognize any of the errors he commits.'

Menander himself quotes in the *Aspis* a similar sentiment from Aeschylus' *Niobe*, "God engenders blame in mortals whene'er he wishes to destroy a house to its very foundations."
Thus maddening anger is a part of the heroic temper, and there are many tragedies that explore its unfortunate effect between father and son. Of the extant tragedies, we find this theme in the *Oedipus at Colonus*, where Oedipus' rage culminates in his cursing his son. This anger is alluded to several times leading up to the curse. Ismene tells him of the Delphic oracle that says that someday the Thebans will suffer "When they stand beside your grave, and feel your όργη." Creon lectures Oedipus on this character flaw, telling him "You gratify your όργη, which has always brought you dishonor." When Oedipus refuses to acknowledge his son Polynices, Polynices says, "Will you send me away dishonored without a word, nor tell me why you are full of μῆνις?" Polynices then delivers an ineffectual sermon to Oedipus on his wrath saying, "In the name of these two children and the sake of your soul, father, we all beseech and implore you to give up your heavy μῆνις towards me!" Oedipus at last relents and speaks, but curses both his sons to die in battle.

In another extant play, the *Antigone*, the anger of a father also causes the destruction of his son. When a messenger first tells Creon that someone has dared give burial rights to Polynices, the Chorus of elders believes this may be of god's doing, but Creon explodes immediately and he says to the Chorus, "Stop, before you fill me up with όργη!" Antigone is caught and Creon condemns her to death. Haemon then approaches his father and takes him to task for his rashness, saying, "Yield your wrath (θυμοῦ)!" He also says that his father has lost his wits: "If you weren't my father, I would call you..."
mad." Creon throws insults back at him, so Haemon leaves with one last parting shot at
his father's madness, "Find other friends to rave at!" The Chorus notes the anger
between father and son at Haemon's exit, saying "Lord, he has gone with the speed of

Tiresias then enters and describes the fighting between Creon and Haemon as
follows: "I heard the sound of birds I had never heard, screeching with an evil madness,
inarticulate, and noted they pursued one another with their talons, murderously."

Creon accuses Tiresias of money-grubbing, so Tiresias foretells the doom that awaits Creon's
house. As he departs he says, "Let this man vent his anger on younger men!" Creon
then loses his son and is cursed by his wife, who also kills herself.

Finally Euripides also explores the theme of the maddening anger of a father and its
destructive results. It is hypostasized in the Heracles Mainomenos, where Heracles in a fit
of madness enters his house and kills his children and his wife Megara. It is also found in
the already-alluded-to Hippolytus. As soon as Theseus reads Phaedra's tablet, he prays
that Poseidon kill Hippolytus because he believes Hippolytus has raped his wife. When
the Chorus asks him to reconsider, he only adds that he wants Hippolytus banished as
well. The Chorus then says, "Let go your destructive ὀγγή, lord Theseus, to better take
thought for your house." When Hippolytus appears, defends himself, and swears on
oath that he did not violate Phaedra, Theseus says, "Was he not born an enchanter and a
sorcerer? Does he think by his equanimity (εὐοργησίᾳ) that he will assuage my spirit
after dishonoring his father?" Theseus will not relent, but tells Hippolytus that he is

24Antigone 755: εἰ μὴ πατὴρ ἤθη, εἶπον ἄν α' οὐκ εὐ φρονεῖν.
25Antigone 765: τῶν φιλῶν μαίνη συνόν.
26Antigone 766: ἄνηρ, ἄνας, βεβηκέν εἰς ὀργῆς ταχύς.
27Antigone 1001-4: ἀγνωτ' ἀκούω φθόγγον ὀρνιθῶν, κακῷ / κλάζοντας οἷστρῳ καὶ
βεβαρβαρομένῳ / καὶ σπώντας ἐν χρησίν ἀλλήλους φονάις ἔγνων.
28Antigone 1088: τὸν δυοῦν οὖτος ἐς νεωτέρους ἄφη.
29Hippolytus 900-1: ὀργῆς δ' ἐξανείς κακῆς, ἄνας / Ἐθεσίου, τὸ λέοντος σοιάς
βούλευσαι δόμοις.
30Hippolytus 1038-40: ἄρ' οὐκ ἐπερδός καὶ γόνις πέρυξ ὀδε, / ὅς τὴν ἐμὴν πέποιθεν
εὐοργησίᾳ / ψυχῆν κρατῆσειν, τὸν τεκόντα ἀτιμᾶσαι:
banished. The Chorus then breaks into an ode, singing "We have seen, we have seen the brightest star of Athens driven into exile by a father’s ὀργή."

31 Theseus’ curses are not ineffectual, but when he learns from Artemis that Hippolytus is innocent he wishes Poseidon had never given him such curses. At this Hippolytus says, "But why? You would have killed me anyway, you were then so angry." 32 Father and son are then reconciled, but it is too late for Hippolytus.

In these passages we have seen some of the most common words to describe anger and madness in Tragedy. 33 In the fourth century, it seems that comic writers enjoyed caricaturizing Tragedy as being full of anger that resulted in insane antics. For instance, in Antiphanes’ famous fragment on the blessedness of Tragedy, we find that in his list of famous tragic incidents, the effect of madness and anger are singled out in two of his exempla: "Should anyone again mention the name Alcmaeon, straight away the spectator lists even his children, and that in madness he killed his mother, and how in anger Adrastus straight away will have come back and will go away [lacuna]..." 34 Likewise, in another comic fragment from the fourth century, Timocles 35 lists madness as one of the sufferings of life depicted in Tragedy that provide comfort to the spectator. As with Antiphanes, the madness of Alcmaeon is noted. Timocles says, "The sick man sees that Alcmaeon 36 was also somewhat mad." 37 We also find that tragic anger and its maddening effect are found throughout the Menander we possess, especially in the Samia. Various words denoting

---

31 Hippolytus 1122: φανερώτατον ἀστέρ’ Ἀθηνας / εἴδομεν εἴδομεν ἐκ πατρὸς ὀργάς / ἀλλὰν ἐπ’ αὐτὸν ἱέμενον.

32 Hippolytus 1413: τί δ’ ἕκτανες τὰν μ’, ὣς τότ’ ἡσθα ὀργασμένος.


35 Timocles was a contemporary of Menander. See chapter two.

36 No doubt the Alcmeon of Euripides is alluded to here.

37 Athenaeus VI.223 B [Kassel and Austin, PCG vol. VII, Timocles, fr. 6]: ὃ νοσῶν τι μανικόν Ἀλκμέων ἔσκέματο.
anger and madness are found throughout the play. The ὀργή-root is found at 83 (spoken of Demeas by Chrysis), 383 (spoken of Demeas by the Cook), 412 (spoken of Demeas by Niceratus), 463 (spoken of Demeas by Moschion), 683 (spoken of Demeas by Moschion), and 695 (spoken of Moschion by Demeas). There is also the verb χαλεπταίνεω at 79 (spoken of Demeas by Moschion), 491 (spoken of Niceratus by Moschion), and 549 (spoken of Niceratus by Demeas). The μυνία-root is found at *Samia* at line 217 (spoken by Demeas of himself), 361 and 363 (spoken by the cook of Demeas), and 419 (spoken by Niceratus of Demeas). One way madness was thought to occur was by an excess production of bile (χολή). This root occurs at lines 416, 447 (spoken by Niceratus of Demeas), and 563 (spoken by Demeas of Niceratus). The loss of νοος was another way of conceiving madness in Tragedy. The adjective άνοιγμα occurs at line 327 (spoken by Demeas of himself), 341 (spoken by Demeas of youth = Moschion), and 641 (spoken by Parmenon of himself). Frequently madness was thought of as one temporarily standing outside of oneself, described by the verb ἐξετασσεω. This verb occurs at line 279 (spoken by Demeas of himself) and line 620 (spoken by Moschion of himself). Madness often causes one to burst at the seams, and this idea is found in the verb διαφράγνυμι, which occurs at line 475 (spoken by Demeas of himself) and line 519 (spoken by Niceratus of himself). We can see from the passages cited above that the *Samia* is replete with words of anger and madness, and these are applied to all of the principals of

---

39 *Ibid*, pp. 47-53. Compare *Aspis* 422, where Chaerestratus is portrayed as going mad because of an excess production of bile, as well as *Dyscolus* 89, where it is spoken of Cnemon.
40 Padel, *ibid*, p. 15.
41 The phrase ἔχεις νοον occurs at 471 (spoken of Moschion by Demeas), 187, 605, and 611 (all spoken to Niceratus by Demeas).
42 Padel, *op. cit.*, pp. 120-21.
43 Compare *Aspis* 422, ἕκτασις φρενών
the play, Demeas, Niceratus, and Moschion. There is then a nexus of inflamed characters in the Samia, and each person's rage threatens to end in tragedy.44

The manuscript as preserved starts45 almost at the beginning of Act I with Moschion delivering a monologue which functions as a divine prologue. In the lines that are missing Moschion probably told how his father, Demeas, had adopted him as a child.46 He tells of his father's generosity and his own good behavior, except for one indiscretion, which he passes over for the moment. He then tells how his father had a Samian hetaira (Chrysis), but was ashamed and so kept the affair clandestine. Moschion, however, found out about it and persuaded his father to have the Samian move in so that his father would not have to worry about younger competitors. He then describes his own shame at something he had done while his father and the poorer next-door neighbor, Niceratus, were away on business to Pontus; he had impregnated Niceratus' daughter, Plangon. He has, however, promised the mother of Plangon that he will do the honorable thing and marry her daughter and keep the child47 upon the return of his father. The manuscript breaks off here, right at the point where Moschion describes how something lucky had happened, and

44 This nexus of characterization is also reinforced in other ways in the play besides the use of "anger" and "madness." Demeas is in love, Moschion is in love (81-2). Demeas is ashamed (23), Moschion is ashamed (47-8). Demeas chases Chrysis out and she takes refuge at Niceratus' house (360 ff), Niceratus chases Chrysis and she takes refuge back at Demeas' (575). Demeas alludes to tragic characters (337, 589), Niceratus does too (495). Niceratus says Demeas skatrophagei (426), likewise Demeas of Niceratus (550). Demeas fights with Niceratus (570), Moschion fights with Niceratus (719).

45 Perhaps 11 lines of Moschion's opening speech are missing, see Gomme and Sandbach Commentary, p. 544.

46 The evidence that Moschion was adopted rests upon the interpretation of lines 698-9, where Demeas says to Moschion: ei

47 Lines 53-4: υπερχωμη γαιμειν / [. . . . . ΔΣΟΑΣΑΟ ο πατηρ. / . . . / το ρατην γενομενον ελεγρ ο παλαιν. Surely Peter Brown (Papers of the Leeds International Latin Seminar 6 (1990) 265 n.73) and Stephanie West ("Notes on the Samia," ZPE 88 (1991): 11-23) are right when they argue (against Sandbach) that Chrysis intends to return the child to Moschion and Plangon after the marriage is effected, otherwise a citizen would be deprived of his rights. Too many people know the child was a citizen by birth to keep it a secret, including the child's grandmother.

173
it involves Chrysis (lines 55-56). The traditional view of these lines is that Moschion tells how Chrysis herself had given birth to a child not long ago but lost it, and so she agrees to pretend the baby is hers by Demeas and nurse it until which time Moschion and Plangon are wed. When the manuscript resumes, Moschion is having second thoughts about telling his father what he has done. Parmenon, his slave, chastises him for his cowardice. Moschion resigns himself to the fact that he must reveal his indiscretion. Chrysis is also on stage, and reiterates that she will raise the child and pretend she gave it birth. Moschion notes that Demeas will be furious (χαλεπανεί - 80) that she has kept a child, but Chrysis is confident that Demeas is in love with her and that he will relent. Besides, she could not bear to see the baby raised in an orphanage. The text breaks off for a bit, and when it resumes Moschion says he is going to a secluded spot to practice what he will tell his father. Next we have the arrival home of Demeas and Niceratus. We learn that while they were away, they both had agreed that Moschion and Plangon should wed. The text then breaks off, but nothing seems to stand in the way of the marriage at the end of Act I.

When the text resumes in Act II, Moschion and Demeas meet. In the interim, Demeas has learned that Chrysis has kept the child and he has decided to kick her out. Moschion persuades his father to let her stay and keep the child. Demeas relents and then brings up the subject of the marriage with Plangon. Moschion is eager to marry, and so he leaves for the city to prepare for his nuptials while Demeas goes to Niceratus to ask that the wedding take place that day. The text is a bit fragmentary, but it seems that at first

---

48 Demeas says that he saw Chrysis giving her breast to the baby (διδοὺσαν τίτοιον) at line 266. She is also said to be rearing it (τρέφειν) at line 78. Some scholars have argued for dramatic reasons that Chrysis did not actually nurse the baby, but only pretended to do so. The most thorough presentation of this argument is by Christine Dedoussi in "The future of Plangon's child in Menander's ‹Samia,' LCM 13 (1988): 39-42. Other scholars include T.B.L. Webster, AJP 94 (1973): 207; Heinz Hofmann, "A New Interpretation of Certain Aspects in Menander's ‹Samia,' Proceedings of the xiv International Congress of Papyrologists (London: Egypt Exploration Society, 1975), 167-175; N. Holzberg, Menander: Untersuchungen zur dramatischen Technik (Nürnberg, 1974), 33 n.102; K. Gaiser, "Die Akedeia Menanders,"GB 5 (1976): 111-14; A. Blanchard, Essai sur la composition des comédies de Ménandre (Paris, 1983), 130.
Niceratus wants to put the wedding on hold for a bit, but Demeas prevails upon the poorer Niceratus to make it that day. Niceratus agrees and goes to tell his wife. The text breaks off just before the close of Act II.

Unlike the Aspis, therefore, the opening two acts of the Samia contain no tragic language to speak of. It seems then, that Menander varies his technique of when to introduce tragic overtones into his plays, yet for all the plays with considerable remains, Tragedy always appears at some point. In the Aspis the initial tragic impression is slowly overturned. In the Samia on the other hand, all seems to be sailing along well, but this is just the calm before the tragic storm. As Demeas himself says when the text resumes in Act III:

"[Sometimes in the midst?] of a fair voyage
a storm suddenly comes out of nowhere [- -].
It shatters and capsizes those who moments before were running before the wind in fair weather.
Such a thing has just happened to me now." 49

Demeas then recounts an incident that occurred offstage in a manner that resembles a tragic messenger speech. He proceeds very calmly at first (ήσυχη τάνυ), and before he begins, he says to the audience "see whether I'm thinking straight or I am mad." 51 This is a programmatic self-reflection. Demeas knows he should not rush to judgment like a figure in Tragedy such as Theseus and curse his son, so he attempts to control his emotions. He says he is not angry -- not yet anyway (line 271, οὐκ ἂγανακτῶν οὐδέπτω), but as he proceeds to tell how he overheard Moschion's old nurse say that the child is Moschion's and not his own and he has more time to contemplate the implications

49 Lines 206-210: [ - - - - ]. ἐρώμου καλοῦ / κειμῶν ἀπροοδόκητος ἐξαίφνης [- -] / ἐκεῖνος τοὺς ἐν ἑωδίαι ποτὲ / θέουτας ἐξήραξε κάνεικαίτισεν. / τοιοῦτο γάρ καὶ τοιμάν ἔστιν. 50

50 Line 263.

51 Lines 216-17: σκέψασθε πότερον εὖ φρονῶν / ἢ μαίνοι. Compare Chrysothemis' lines to Electra before she begins her messenger speech at Sophocles' Electra 889-90: τρός νυν θεῶν ἄκουσον. ὡς μαθοῦσά μου / τὸ λοιπὸν ἢ φρονοῦσαν ἢ μέραν λέγεις.
of this, he begins to give way to his wrath and he says that he is utterly beside himself
(ἔξεστι σ' ὀλως⁵²). Parmenon then appears and Demeas questions him. Under threat of
torture Parmenon admits that Moschion is the father, but when he tries to explain why they
were keeping it a secret (line 320), Demeas' controlled madness gives way to a fit of tragic
fury and he calls for someone to bring him a whip. By giving way to a tragic rage, Demeas
chases Parmenon off the stage along with the truth. Demeas then says, "O citadel of
Cecrops' land, O outstretched aether, O -- why, Demeas, are you bellowing?"⁵³
Manuscript B has a gloss in the margin next to this: οἶδιτον ύποπόδου. Thus οὐ
πόλισμα Κεκροτίας χθονός, / οὐ ταναός αἰθήρ⁵⁴ appears to be a quote from
Euripides' Oedipus.⁵⁵ Demeas' utilization of tragic speech is a result of the tragic rage that
prevents him from listening to Parmenon long enough to hear the truth.⁵⁶ But he
immediately checks himself and says, "Why are you bellowing?" Demeas himself notices
the tragic breach in his language and his tragic role-playing, and this suggests that he is
speaking for the poet, Menander. He fights the tragic paradigm and calls such a tragic
outburst βοῶ, or bombast. The verb βοῶ occurs in four other places in this play, three
of which imply unreasonableness. It is first spoken by Chrysis to Parmenon at line 69, by Moschion to Demeas (who ends up shouting again against his own better judgment) at line 481, and by Demeas of Niceratus at 553, when Niceratus is caught up in a bit of his own tragic madness.

Elsewhere in Menander we find evidence that tragic speech was consciously thought of as a breach of normal language. In one fragment, a slave or freedman is trying to console his young master (τρόφιμε) in what Sandbach describes as "a fairly tedious piece of moralizing":

If you breathe the air according to the same laws we do, as is a commonly said (to prattle tragically to you), these affairs must be better endured and accounted for. This is the point of my words: you are human ...

Like Demeas in the Samia, the speaker of these lines recognizes that he has transgressed the bounds of ordinary language and entered upon tragic speech. To describe this breach of language he uses the verb λαλέω, which in this context must carry the connotation of "prattle." Aristophanes puts this word in the mouth of Aeschylus to describe Euripides' poetry in Aristophanes' Frogs. The speaker then checks himself, as does Demeas, and resumes normal language. Both Demeas and this character, then, are really the mouthpiece of Menander, who simultaneously has his character exploit Tragedy and then criticize it on the grounds that it is bombast or prattle. This is not simple imitation, therefore. For it is

---

57 At line 226 the verb is used of ordinary household noise.
58 See A. Hurst's comments, op. cit., p. 103.
59 Gomme and Sandbach, Commentary, p. 719.
60 Plutarch consol ad Apoll. 103 C (=Korte fragment 740; Kock fr. 531, lines 6-10): ei δ' έπι τοις αυτοίς νόμοις / ἐπ' οἷότερ ημεῖς ἔστασας τὸν ἀέρα / τὸν κοινὸν, ἔνα σοὶ καὶ τραγικότερον λαλώ / οἰστέον διεισον ταῦτα καὶ λογιστέον / τὸ δ' κεφάλαιον τῶν λόγων, αὐθεντας εἰ ...  
61 This is a favorite verb of Menander. At times it seems to denote useless talk, as it does here, but at other times it just seems to be talk in general. The context usually provides the necessary clues as to how to render it. For instance at Samia 255 and 261 a slave and the nurse herself call the nurse's unguarded talk λαλεῖ. At 380, as Demeas is kicking Chrysis out and she is defending herself, he says to her μη μοι λάλει, which clearly has a negative connotation.
62 Compare Frogs 1069: είτε αὖ λαλιάν ἐπιτηδεύσαι καὶ στωμιλίαν ἐδίδαξας...
one thing to borrow tragic tones, and quite another to borrow and then criticize. In Demeas' case, the tragic language is simultaneously meant to highlight his ignorance and the tragic rage that blinds him, as well as his own realization of the inappropriateness of the tragic dramatization of his emotions.

With the explicit rejection of tragic speech, Demeas regains some of his composure, and notes that he must control himself and endure.\(^\text{63}\) Again he knows that he should stay calm, and although the spirit is willing, the flesh is weak, for he then redirects his madness against Chrysis. He blames the whole affair on her and refers to her as his "Helen" (line 337).\(^\text{64}\) Helen was, of course, the most celebrated unfaithful lover in antiquity, and so this mythological reference poses a difficult problem as to whether Demeas refers to her tragic treatment or just the myth in general as seen in epic, proverbs, or the visual arts.\(^\text{65}\) Given that Demeas has just quoted from Tragedy and he will refer explicitly to the tragedians in the next scene, it seems a natural inference that he is referring to Helen's tragic treatment here. It is particularly likely when we consider that the myth of Helen has two versions. The commoner version has her as the unfaithful wife who goes with Paris to Troy, as in Euripides' *Trojan Women*. Elsewhere, Euripides and others\(^\text{66}\) follow a different version in which the Helen that went to Troy was a mere phantom, while the real Helen went to Egypt and was faithful. Menander here portrays Demeas as thinking in terms of her normal

---

\(^\text{63}\) Line 327: κάτεχε σαυτόν, καρτέρει.

\(^\text{64}\) Sandbach, Gomme and Sandbach *Commentary*, p. 578, notes that "Phaidra would have been in some respects a better mythological parallel..." This perhaps demonstrates that Menander did not expect the audience to have the *Hippolytus* firmly in mind, or at least he did not want them to have just the *Hippolytus* in mind.

\(^\text{65}\) For the problems encountered in determining whether a mythological allusion in Menander necessarily derives from a tragic treatment of the myth, see A. Hurst, *op. cit.*, pp. 106 ff. J-M Jacques in his commentary *Le Dyscolos* (Paris 1976), p. 15, n. 1, says of the mention of Perseus in line 153, "La référence à Persée, comme toutes les allusions mythologiques analogues, vient sans doute de la tragédie." See, however, Köte fragment 718 (= Kock 535), which says, "Well aren't they right to paint Prometheus pegged to the rocks...?" (ἐλι’ οù δικαιοις προπεπατταλεμένου / γράφουσι τον Προμηθέα προς ταῖς πέτραις...)

\(^\text{66}\) Hesiod claims she was a phantom (fragment 358, *Fragmenta Hesiodae*; eds. R. Merkelbach and M. L. West (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1967); Stesichorus too says she was a phantom (Plato, *Republic* 586c, Atheneaeus 14.620c).
mythic treatment (the *Trojan Women et passim*), but Menander himself perhaps was thinking in terms of the version made popular by Euripides' *Helen*, and so introduces some irony into Demeas' words. For just as Helen was falsely accused of impropriety in Euripides' *Helen*, so too is Chrysis in the *Samia*. It also foreshadows that Demeas will take her back, just as Menelaus took back Helen.

Demeas in his fit of tragic madness rushes into his house to kick Chrysis out, almost running over the Cook, who has just appeared on the stage (lines 357 ff.) in answer to his summons for the wedding preparations. The Cook does not yet know that Demeas is his employer, for he says of him "By Heracles, what is this, boy? Some old man has just run inside in a fit of madness," and two lines later he repeats the charge, "By Poseidon, I think he is mad." The collocation of Ηράκλεις...μείνομενος is particularly rich and apt, for in Euripides' *Heracles Mainomenos*, Heracles rushes into his house and kills his wife and children. The Cook obviously adds some levity to the situation, but as one of the more potent symbols of comedy, he also becomes the mouthpiece of the poet as a comic commentator on the inappropriateness of the tragic performance that is unfolding before his and the audience's eyes. For just as a commentator creates a split screen by simultaneously inviting the audience to view both himself and the events he is interpreting, so too does the Cook create a split action on the stage to invite the audience to compare his comic attitude towards events with Demeas' tragic outlook. It is as if the Cook were saying, "Look at that fool who dramatizes his anger by acting like Heracles in a Tragedy." Demeas cannot bear the presence of the Cook on stage, and thus the presence of comedy, and so at first sight he tells him to get out the way, then he asks whether or not the Cook has heard him and

---

67 Line 360-361: 'Ηράκλεις. Τι τούτο, παι; / μείνομενος εἰπεδραμήκεν εἰσά τις γέρων
68 Line 363: νὴ τὸν Ποσειδῶν. μαίνεθ'. ὡς εἰμι δοκεῖ
69 For the meaningful use of oaths in the *Samia*, see Martha H. de Kat Eliassen, "The Oaths in Menander's *Samia*," *SO* 50 (1975): 55-60. On page 59 she notes the association of Demeas' μείνομενος with Heracles'.
reiterates his desire for the Cook to leave, and finally he tells the Cook to go to hell.\textsuperscript{70} The Cook then recedes into the background and gives way to the tragedy. Demeas kicks Chrysis out and Chrysis calls such treatment δύσμορος (line 370), a rather tragic-sounding word. Demeas and Chrysis exchange some verbal blows, and the Cook steps forward again to add analysis: he uses the word ὀργή to describe Demeas' anger, saying, "The affair is some sort of wrath."\textsuperscript{71} The Cook is stating the obvious, but in so doing, Menander is making sure the audience gets the point: "The comedy (symbolized by the Cook) is commenting on the tragic ὀργή and the madness it causes." The Cook, the mouthpiece of comedy, tries to calm Demeas, but Demeas tells him he will hit him over the head if he interrupts him again (388). The Cook exits, and so the Tragedy has chased away the comedy for now. The Cook and the comedy, however, will return (cf. lines 673-674) for the wedding and prevail in the end. Demeas then tells Chrysis how her new life as hetaira will be long hours for little pay. Chrysis, too, tragically dramatizes her misfortune and responds with another rather tragic-sounding phrase, "Woe is me for my fate!"\textsuperscript{72}

At this point, Niceratus enters with a sheep for the wedding. He makes the usual wisecracks about the scrawniness of the sacrificial victim (399 ff.).\textsuperscript{73} His presence, like the Cook moments ago, acts as comic foil to the tragic color. He runs into Chrysis, who is crying on the stage. He asks her what happened (407) and she tells him. Niceratus is annoyed at Demeas' inauspicious behavior on the eve of the wedding. He too uses the root ὀργή to describe Demeas' behavior, saying "He was not angry right away?"\textsuperscript{74} He then refers to his anger with the verb χόλαξω, and explains it as a result of his trip to Pontus

\textsuperscript{70} Lines 359-360; 369, 370: ἐκ τοῦ μέσου / ἀναγε σεαυτόν..... οὔκουν ἀκούεις; ἀπιθ.... ἐς κόρακας ἥδη.

\textsuperscript{71} Line 383: τὸ πράγμα ὀργή τίς ὅτι.

\textsuperscript{72} Line 398: τάλαιν ἔγραψε τῆς ἐμῆς τύχης. Glycera uses this same tragic phrase for her own fate in the recognition scene in the Perikeiromene at line 810.

\textsuperscript{73} For the standard joke, compare Dyscolus 393 ff., Aristophanes' Birds 901, and Plautus' Aulularia 564.

\textsuperscript{74} Line 412-13: οὐκ ὀργίζετο εὐθὺς;
He also says, "This fellow's madness will cease when he takes account of what he is doing now," using the unusual verb ἀτομαίνομαι. Niceratus' calm and reasoned response at this point will stand in stark contrast to his own performance of tragic anger in a moment.

The next act begins with Niceratus telling Moschion of his father's odd behavior (434). Demeas then appears and says in an aside that he intends to go through with the wedding and suppress his χολή (447). Moschion then approaches him and takes him to task for not inviting Chrysis to the wedding. He pontificates to his father, saying "It is not always proper to be given over to ὄργη." He is like Haemon lecturing Creon in the Antigone or Hippolytus taking Theseus to task in the Hippolytus. Demeas tries to control his rage, but Moschion insists, so that Demeas says in an aside, "I will burst." He begins to raise his voice and shout so Moschion asks him, "Why are you shouting?" using the same words, τί βοῶς, that Demeas used earlier to check his tragic response. His shouting allows Niceratus to overhear the conversation, at which point Niceratus understands why Demeas is so wroth and, laying aside the mantle of reasonableness himself, he bellows, "O utterly horrid deed! O bed of Tereus and Oedipus and Thyestes and all the others! Their deeds, as many as we have seen on stage, pale in comparison!"

Moschion briefly interrupts his laundry list of notoriously incestuous characters from Tragedy and says only, "Me?" (497), at which Niceratus continues, "Are you so brazen,

---

75 Line 419-20: παύσεθ' οὗτος ἀτομαίνει / ὅταν λογισμόν ἐως ποιήσῃ λάβῃ. LSI only cites the verb at Lucian, Dial. Deor. XII.1, where it is not clear whether it means to "get rid of madness" or "go mad." R. Renehan, "Greek Lexigraphical Notes: Third Series," Glotta 48 (1970): 95 points out that at Aretaeus, SD I.6 (ἐνθεος ἐδε ἡ μάνια, κήν ἀτομαίνει εὐθυμοι, ἀκήδες ...) it means the former, but notes that it is the active form, which occurs nowhere else. Reiske emends it from ἀτομαίνειοι to ἀτομαίνωσιν. Here in the Samia it is a supplementary participle with παύσεθ' and can only mean "to go mad."

76 Lines 462-3: οὗ πάντα γαρ / ἐπιτρέπειν ὄργῇ προσήκει. Line 475: διαφραγμόμαι

77 Lines 495-97: οὗ πάνθειόν ἔργον / ὅ τὰ Τηρέως λέξῃ / Οἰδίποι τε καὶ Θεέστου καὶ τὰ τῶν ἄλλων, δοσ / γεγονόθ' ἡμῖν ἔστ' ἀκούσαι, μικρὰ ποιήσας. For the translation of ἀκούσαι as "seen," read on further.
do you have the effrontery to do such a deed? You should assume that rage of Amyntor, Demeas, and blind him!"  

As with Demeas' earlier reference to Helen, we are again faced with the problem of whether these are just general references to the myth, or their tragic treatment. One way that Menander makes it clear that Niceratus is alluding to Tragedy is by the elevated tone of Niceratus' words throughout this section. This elevated language begins at line 495 with "ο πάνθειον ἐργον: ὧ τὰ Τηρέως λέχη Οιδίπου τε καὶ Θεόστου. The word λέχη is certainly not pedestrian. His reinforcement of τούτ' ἐτόλμησας with the poetic τούτ' ἐτλησ also elevates the tone. The phrase ὅργην λαβεῖν may be compared to Euripides' Suppliants 1050 (ὅργην λάβωις). His use of ἡ[σχυνε] λέξε[τρον at line 507 is elevated far above the status of concubinage and may be compared to Euripides' Hippolytus 944 (ἡ[σχυνε] τάμια λέκτρα). The word συγκλιθεῖσα at line 508 is rare, and is only cited of lovers at Herodotus II.181 (Amasis and Laodice), and Euripides' Alcestis 1090, where Admetus vows he will never lie with another woman (οὐκ ἔστιν ἡτίς τοῦτος συγκλιθῆσεται). Finally Niceratus' use of μελάθροις τοῖς ἐμοῖς at line 517 for his own humble dwelling is absurd.

Furthermore, it should not trouble us that Niceratus in line 497 uses the verb ἄκουσαι of the myths instead of a visual verb, because such acoustic terminology is a hold-over from an age when poetry was primarily thought of in oral terms, hence I translate ἄκουσαί here as "to see on stage." We can compare Demeas' words to Niceratus' just a

---

79Lines 498-500: τούτ' ἐτόλμησας οὐ πρᾶξαι, τούτ' ἐτλῆς; Ἀμύντορος / ύπον ἔχρην ὅργην λαβεῖν σε. Δημέα, καὶ τουτον / ἐκτυφλός.

80Sandbach, Gomme and Sandbach Commentary, p. 598-9, does not believe that they are references to their tragic treatment for he says, "Niceratus does not speak as if his knowledge of these stories came from seeing them on stage." Austin on the other hand, Menandri Aspis et Samia II, p. 84 at line 497 writes, "ἄκουσαι: sc. in tragœdiis."

81Although Sandbach does not think that Niceratus is alluding to the tragic treatment of these myths, he himself notes that Niceratus' language is elevated to that of tragedy in his article, "Menander's Manipulation of Language for Dramatic Purposes," in Ménandre, Entretiens Hardi 16 (1970), pp. 131-32. I simply repeat his points.
bit further on, when he says, "Tell me Niceratus, haven't you seen the tragedians show how Zeus turned into gold, leaked through a roof and then debauched a girl who was locked up." Demeas also uses acoustic and verbal terminology (ἀκήκοας λεγόντων) rather than visual, but it is certain that he is referring to the tragic stage for he explicitly mentions the tragedians. His words also show beyond a reasonable doubt that he understood that Niceratus' earlier references to Tereus, Oedipus, Thyestes, and Amyntor came from the tragic stage, for he appeals to Niceratus' knowledge of Tragedy. Thus we have references to at least four tragedies here.

The first tragic subject that Niceratus alludes to is the story of Tereus. A *Tereus* was written by Philocles (mentioned by Aristophanes, *Birds* 281) and perhaps by Carcinus (fr. 4 Nauck), who lived in the early fourth century. It was also one of Sophocles' more popular plays, if we may judge by the fifty-seven extant lines of the play. A summary of the play is given by John Tzetzes in his commentary on Hesiod's *Works and Days*. From this we learn that Tereus raped his sister-in-law Philomela and cut out her tongue so that she could not identify him. Virtually an identical version is summarized in *Papyrus Oxyrhynchus* 42.3013, which is probably the Hypothesis of the play. Aristotle also mentions that the recognition in Sophocles' *Tereus* is brought about by "the voice of the shuttle." From Ovid we learn that Philomela weaves a tapestry to tell the lurid tale, which explains Aristotle's remark. Niceratus is thus equating Moschion with someone who rapes his sister-in-law.

The second of these tragic subjects, Oedipus, is well-known and was written on by several tragedians, the most notable, of course, being Sophocles. We have already seen

---

82 Lines 589-91: οὐχ ἀκήκοας λεγόντων, εἶπέ μοι, Νικηρατε, ἐτοι γραυχῶν ὡς γενόμενος χρυσὸς ὁ Ζεὺς ἐρρήν / διὰ τέγων καθειργμένην τε παιδ' ἐμοίχευσαν ποτέ;  
85 *Poetics* 1454b 36-7: καὶ ἐν τῷ Σοφοκλέους Τηρεῖ ἡ τῆς κερκίδος φωνή.
how Demeas quoted from Euripides’ version at lines 325 ff. Niceratus now compares Moschion to someone who sleeps with his mother and kills his father.

The myth of Thyestes was treated by several tragedians as well. Not much is known about Euripides’ version. Sophocles wrote two or three plays on the subject of Thyestes. The most well-known offense of Thyestes was his seduction of his brother’s wife, Aerope. In Sophocles’ *Thyestes at Sicyon*, however, Thyestes rapes a woman at a night festival who turns out to be his daughter Pelopia, who then gives birth to Aegisthus. Thus Niceratus also compares Moschion to one who seduces his brother’s wife and perhaps rapes his own daughter.

Finally at line 498, Niceratus says to Demeas that he ought to assume the “wrath of Amyntor and blind Moschion.” The reference is the myth of Phoenix. At *Iliad* 9.448 ff. Homer says that Phoenix was supplicated by his mother Alcimede to lie with his father Amyntor’s concubine so that the concubine would hate the old man. Homer makes no mention, however, of Phoenix’ blinding, so this at least proves that Menander was not referring to Homer’s treatment of the myth. Sophocles treated the myth of Amyntor in his *Phoenix* and/or his *Dolopes*, but only a few fragments under the title of the latter play survive. According to Homer, Phoenix was the ruler of the Dolopians in Phthia where he raised Achilles, and so some believe this play dealt with the rearing of Achilles. Others have thought the following remark in Apollodorus refers to Sophocles’ play:

*[Phoenix] was blinded by his father after his father’s concubine Phthia had falsely accused him of violating her. But Peleus brought him to Chiron, who healed his sight, and made him king of the Dolopians.*

86See T.B.L. Webster, *The Tragedies of Euripides*, p. 113 ff.
88F.G. Welcker in *Die griechische Tragédien mit Rucksicht auf den epischen Cyclus geordnet*, vol. I (Bonn 1938), pp. 140-45 argues that the *Dolopes* and the *Phoenix* of Sophocles are alternate titles of the same play.
89Apollodorus, *Library* 3.13.8: οὗτος ύπο τοῦ πατρὸς ἐτυφλώθη καταψευσαμένης φθοράν Φθίας τῆς τοῦ πατρὸς παλλακῆς. Πηλεύς δὲ αὐτὸν πρὸς Χείρωνα κομίσας, ὑπ’ ἐκείνου θεραπευθέντα τὰς ὄψεις βασιλέα κατέστησε Δολόπων.
It is more likely, however, that this passage of Apollodorus refers to Euripides' *Phoenix*. There are several extant fragments from this version. A somewhat corrupt, but still decipherable fragment says, "Children are a trouble to an old man. He pays (the penalty) who marries while no longer young. For a wife lords it over an elderly bridegroom."\(^90\) Another fragment from the play mentions a "woman not for legal wedlock."\(^91\) From these two fragments it seems reasonable to conclude that Alcimede was dead and played no role in Euripides' version and that Amyntor is justifying why he takes a young concubine instead of a wife at his age. The scholiast at *Iliad* 9.453 expressly says that Phoenix is "blameless in Euripides,"\(^92\) and so Niceratus' advice to Demeas is pregnant with irony.

Another fragment reads, "an old man is not pleasing for a young woman."\(^93\) It seems then, that just as in the *Hippolytus*, the wife/lover of the older man tries to seduce the son but is refused and then falsely accuses the son to the father. "Secrets are reasonably seized as evidence,"\(^94\) so Amyntor believes her. He then says, "Sooner would darkness descend over my eyes than I advise anyone to give a son authority."\(^95\) He possibly curses Phoenix, closely following the text of *Iliad* 9.455-6, "May you never lift onto your knees offspring of children."\(^96\) Phoenix defends himself by noting his character and the company he keeps (Nauck, *TGF* frgs. 810, 812; cf. Ennius IIR). Amyntor tells some of his slaves to blind Phoenix (Nauck, *TGF* frgs. 815, 816). If Apollodorus is to be followed, then in an


\(^{91}\) Hesychius 1 p. 149 (Nauck, *TGF* fr. 818): ἀμησίστευτος γυνῆ.

\(^{92}\) Εὐριπίδης δὲ ἀναμάρτητον εἰσάγει τὸν ἥρωα ἐν τῷ Φοίνικι.


\(^{95}\) Stob. *Flor.* 43.16 (= Nauck, *TGF* fr. 806): παραινέσαμι' ἀν παισὶ προσθείναι κράτη / πρὶν ἀν κατ' ὅσον τυγχάνῃ μὲ καὶ σκότος

\(^{96}\) Neque tuum unquam in gremium extollas liberorum ex te genus. This line comes from an unspecified play of Ennius (363R). It can be reasonably assigned to his *Phoenix*, which probably derived from Euripides. Compare *Iliad* 9.455: μὴ ποτὲ γούνασιν οἷσιν ἐφέσσεσθαι φίλου νίον / ἐξ ἐμέθεν γεγαώτα.
epilogue it is said that Phoenix is taken to Chiron where his eyesight is restored and he is made king of the Dolopians.

It should be sufficiently clear from the outline of the tragic treatment of the four myths that Niceratus mentions that, just as in the *Epitrepontes*, Menander alludes to several tragedies at once which contain a common theme, in this case sexual miscreants. This confirms once again that it was not Menander's intention to have a dialogue with just one tragedy, but rather with Tragedy in general. Thus while the *Hippolytus*, which we will return to below, was probably one of the tragedies that Menander had in mind when he wrote the *Samia*, it was not the only tragedy. If we had to argue for a particular tragedy, the *Phoenix* of Euripides would be the preferred choice, because the play is alluded to specifically by Niceratus, Phoenix is innocent just as Moschion is, and Amyntor is an older man with a younger concubine just like Demeas. But again, the fact that Menander alludes to four different tragedies suggests that he did not want his audience to think in terms of just one. This is also borne out by the fact that Niceratus not only refers by name to four tragic characters, but he also adds "and all the others" (496). Demeas, too, mentions to Niceratus the tragedians, plural, in the passage quoted above.

More importantly, Niceratus' reference to the "anger of Amyntor," 'Αμύντορος / νῦν ἔχρην ὀργήν λαβέιν σε. Δημέα, καὶ τοιτουι / ἔκτυφλωσαί, clearly indicates that Menander was specifically thinking of the tragic ὀργή of a father, and so he was relying on the progressive *tragic* inflaming of characters in order, as we shall see, to invite his audience to notice the absurdity of tragic role-playing. Especially noteworthy and programmatic are Niceratus' lines at 511 ff., saying that "Everyone would be sitting around from first light chatting about me, saying 'Niceratus is a real man, justly prosecuting for
murder."97 When a stunned Moschion asks, "For what murder?," Niceratus answers "I call it murder whenever anyone rebels and acts like this!"98 Tragic mania makes a slaughter out of a seduction, and were Niceratus to act so rashly he would certainly be on everyone’s lips -- like a figure from Tragedy.

The tragic madness continues in the scene that follows. After Niceratus goes inside, Moschion confesses his guilt to his father to clear up the misunderstanding. Niceratus then comes out of his house and says in tragic fashion, ὄ τάλας ἐγώ, τάλας (532).100 He tells Demeas and Moschion that he has just seen his daughter breast-feeding the baby (535, 540), which scares Moschion off the stage. Demeas tries to delay Niceratus, but he rushes back inside his house. Demeas comments, "When he [Niceratus] hears what happened, he will be angry, he will shout."101 Demeas then says of Niceratus, "By Heracles, how loudly he shouted! This was -- he's calling for fire! Says he will burn the baby! I'll see my grandchild roasted!"102 Once again the invocation of Heracles is fitting as someone in a fit of tragic mania rushes into his house to kill women and children. The roasting of children also calls to mind other tragedies, especially those that dealt with the Thyestes myth. We have already seen in the Epitrepontes how fathers in Tragedy persecute or kill daughters and their grandchildren who are born out of wedlock, and Niceratus "performs" like one of them. Niceratus appears again and says the women are all conspiring against him. He tells Demeas not to be surprised if he has to kill his wife with his own hand (560-1). He goes back inside and Demeas again reiterates how angry he is,
saying "He is atrabilious." Chrysis then appears with Niceratus not far behind. Demeas restrains Niceratus and tells her to go into his house. He then keeps Niceratus from going back into his own house to kill his wife (580). Demeas then tries to calm Niceratus first by calling Niceratus' perceptions into question (lines 541 ff.). When his sophistry won't work, he attempts to calm him down with another rhetorical trope -- he compares Niceratus to the father figure of Acrisius as depicted in Tragedy:

Demeas: Get ahold of yourself! Tell me, Niceratus, haven't you seen the tragedians show how Zeus became gold, flowed through a roof and once violated a girl who had been locked up?

Niceratus: So what?

Demeas: Perhaps we should expect anything to happen? Look and see if any of your roof leaks!

Niceratus: Most of it does, but what does that have to do with this?

Demeas: Sometimes Zeus becomes gold, sometimes water. Understand? This is his doing. How quickly we've found the solution!

Niceratus: Yeah, and you're leading me on like a lamb to the slaughter!

Demeas: By Apollo I am not! Surely you're not a bit inferior to Acrisius. If Zeus honored his daughter, then perhaps your daughter--

Niceratus: Woe is me! Moschion has cooked my goose!

Demeas tells Niceratus that he "must get ahold" of himself and stop acting like a father-figure in Tragedy. The specific tragedies that Demeas alludes to here are those that involve Danaë and her father Acrisius. Sophocles treated various phases of the legend in his Acrisius, Danaë, and Larisaei. The story goes that Acrisius was the father of Danaë

---

103 Line 563: οὔτσοι μελάγγολαί.
104 Lines 588-599: (Δήμος) καὶ σεαιτόν γὰ' ἀνάλαβε, / οὐκ ἀκήκοας λεγόντων, εἵπε μοι. Νὶκήρατε, / τὸν τραγῳδίων ὡς γενόμενος χρυσόν ὁ Ζεὺς ἔφυη / διὰ τέγους καθεργυμένην τε παίδ' ἐμοίχευσέν ποτέ; (Νίκη) εἶτα δὴ τί τούτο; (Δήμος) ἵσσα δεῖ πάντα προσδοκάν: ὁκότει, / τοῦ τέγους εἶ ὧν μέρος τι βεί. (Νίκη) τὸ πλεῖστον. ἀλλὰ τί / τούτο πρὸς ἔκειν ἔστι; (Δήμος) τότε μὲν γίνεθ' ὁ Ζεὺς χρυσόν, / τότε δὲ ὅτι ὁ ραῖρις· ἐκείνου τοῦργον ἔστιν. ὡς / ταχὺ / εὑρομεν. (Νίκη) καὶ θουκόλεις με. (Δήμος) μὰ τὸν Ἀπόλλωνα. 'γω μὲν οὐ. / ἀλλὰ χείρον οὐδὲ μικρὸν Ἀκρίσιον δῆμοτυβέν εἰ; / εἶ δ' ἐκείνην ἄξιοντε, τὴν γε σήν· (Νίκη) οἶμοι τάλας· / Μοσχίων ἐσκειλάκαν με.

105 Some scholars argue that the Acrisius is really the same as either the Danaë or the Larisaei, but with sixteen different references to the Acrisius and six apiece to the Danaë and the Larisaei, it seems more
and he received an oracle that he would be slain by his daughter's son. In order to avoid this, he shut her up in a brazen chamber, but she was still impregnated by Zeus, who placed her and the infant, Perseus, in a chest and put it to sea. The two were somehow rescued and later in life Perseus went on to accidentally kill Acrisius with a discus during an athletic contest at Larissa. If the Danaë dealt with the chest at sea, and the Larisaei with Acrisius' death at Larissa, then the Acrisius must have dealt with some earlier incidents of the legend. In the Antigone, Sophocles alludes to the myth of Danaë, saying "And Danaë in her beauty suffered to change the light of day for brass-bound halls...and was steward of the seed of golden rain."\(^{106}\)

Euripides too wrote a Danaë. Johannes Malahas gives a summary saying, "Euripides, the most skilled of poets, says of Danaë, in his arrangement of the same play, that she was shut in a chest and cast away, because she was violated by Zeus who had changed himself into gold."\(^{107}\) A seemingly genuine Hypothesis to the play states that Acrisius, who was the king of Argus, on account of some oracle locked up his daughter Danaë in maiden chambers and kept guard over her because she was beautiful. But Zeus fell in love with her and since he was not able to lie with her, turned into gold and flowed through the roof into her lap and made her pregnant. At the appointed time she gave birth to the child Perseus. When Acrisius learned of this he put them both in a chest, mother and child, and he bid them to be cast into the sea. When the Nymphs saw them they took pity on them and threw the chest into the nets of some fishermen from Seripha, and from there the mother and child were rescued alive, so he was named Perseus by someone. Cast of characters: Hermes, Danaë, Nurse, Acrisius, Messenger, Chorus, Athena."\(^{108}\)

\(^{106}\) Antigone 944-5; 950: ἡ δὲ καὶ Δάνας οὐράνιος φῶς / ἀλλὰξαί δέμας ἐν χαλκοδέταις αὐλαῖς... καὶ Ζηνὸς ταμιέσακε γονᾶς χρυσορώτους.

\(^{107}\) Johannes Malahas p. 34.19: περὶ ἡς ἐμυθολόγησεν Εὐρίπιδης ὁ σοφότατος ἐν τῇ αὐτῇ τοῦ αὐτοῦ δράματος ἐν κιβοτίῳ τινὶ βληθέαν καὶ ριφέαν τὴν Δανάην, ὡς φθαρέασαι ὑπὸ Δίος μεταβληθέντος εἰς χρυσὸν.

\(^{108}\) Codex Palatinus 287 (= Nauck p. 716): Ὑπόθεσις. Ἀκρίσιος "Ἀργοῦς ὄν χαλκεῖς κατὰ χρυσόν δὴ τινὰ τὴν παιδα Δανάην κατάκλεισαν ἐν τοῖς παρθένῳ ἐφύλαττε καλλιστὴν οὖςαν. ἐς ἔραθες οὗς ἦν ὄντως μίαθει αὐτή. χρυσὸς γενόμενος καὶ ρυείς διὰ τοῦ στέγου εἰς τὸν κόλπον τῆς παρθένου, ἐγκόμια ἐποίησεν. ἔξκοντος δὲ τοῦ χρύου βρέφος τὸν Περσέα ἀπέτεκε. τοῦτο μαθὼν Ἀκρίσιος εἰς κιβωτόν ἀμφοτέρους.
The Hypothesis shares some striking verbal echoes of what Demeas says, but given the fact that Demeas uses the plural "tragedians" it is evident that Menander is alluding to several treatments of the myth at once. Thus Tragedy is once again, as in the *Aspis* and *Epitrepontes*, a rhetorical ploy used to persuade others. Demeas' comparison, however, is particularly inept in that he says that Niceratus is not inferior to Acrisius. Acrisius was fated to be killed, and was killed, by his grandson in the tragedies. Niceratus realizes the comparison is inept and that he, like Acrisius, is "being led a lamb to slaughter." He is not fooled by Demeas' sophistry, but only says, "What does that have to do with this?" and "Moschion has cooked my goose!"

Finally at the close of Act IV Niceratus calms down and agrees to wed his daughter to Moschion. As in the *Epitrepontes*, *Perikeiromene*, and *Dyscolus*, the blocking figures seem to be under control by Act V. When Act V opens, however, we find that now Moschion is "beside himself" because his father suspected him of such an outrage. His words echo his father's feelings at line 279 (ἐξεστιν᾽ ὁλος), and just like his father and Niceratus, his words take on a tragic coloring when he is angry. He feigns resolve to join the foreign legion in order to teach his dad a lesson in trust, thus playing the role of an angry son in Tragedy. Parmenon, who had run away in the face of Demeas' rage in Act V.

---

109Compare Demeas' words at 590-91 (γενόμενος ὃ Ζεὺς ἔρρη / δίὰ τέγους καθεργιμένην τε παῖδ᾽ ἐμοίχευον ποτε;) with the Hypothesis (χρυσός γενόμενος καὶ μείζος διὰ τοῦ στέγους).

110Line 620-1: ἐξεστικα νῦν / τελέος ἔμαυτοῦ

111Comme and Sandbach Commentary, p. 618: "His speech is in an elevated tone, not because we are to take it seriously, but because Moschion takes himself very seriously. He opens with three colloquial lines, but as he warms to his wrongs he becomes purely rhetorical: observe the asyndeton ὁποίος τόθος χρόνος συνήθεια [624-5], the grand phrase ὃς ἐδουλούμην ἐγώ [625], the poetic word αἰχμάζων [Sandbach on the next page calls this "A brave word, belonging to epic and tragedy."] and the line ὃ τῆς ἐμῆς νῦν κύριος γνωμῆς Ἔρος [632], which might well come from a tragedy... From 623 to 629 every line keeps the metrical rules of tragedy."

112Compare lines 666-669, where it is clear that Moschion is merely play-acting.
III, now returns to the stage to seek out Demeas and explain his innocence, but Moschion sees him and orders him to go fetch his cloak and sword inside the house. Parmenon does so, and when he comes out, he tells Moschion that the wedding preparations are ready and they are all waiting for him inside. Moschion asks if anyone saw him bring the cloak and sword out and when Parmenon says no, this upsets Moschion, who is really only interested in giving his father a scare.

At this point in the play, then, Moschion becomes the principal blocking figure. Actually, Moschion has been the principal blocking figure throughout the entire play. When the play opens we find a guilty Moschion freely confessing his "error" to the audience, but too ashamed to tell his father Demeas. When Demeas first arrived, had Moschion told him the truth, the whole misunderstanding would have been avoided and the marriage would have taken place anyway, given that Demeas and Niceratus had already resolved that Moschion and Plangon wed (lines 113 ff.). Instead, the cowardly and untruthful Moschion waits until late into Act IV to reveal his misdeed, and then only does so, as he himself says, to avoid the greater guilt of being charged with fathering a child by Chrysis (line 526). But when he has finally admitted the truth to his father, he again lacks the fortitude to face Niceratus and admit his responsibility, so he flees instead (line 539). This leaves Chrysis and Plangon exposed to Niceratus' rage.

When Demeas appears, however, he does not play into Moschion's hand and beg him to return. He notes that Moschion is now angry (line 695: ὀργῇ) and tells his son that "I was ignorant, I made a mistake, I was angry" (line 703: ἡγυόμην, ἡμαρτὼν, ἐμάνην). The collocation of these three verbs is significant. Demeas' use of ἡμαρτὼν at this point in the play is in all probability an allusion to Aristotle's Poetics.\footnote{For \textit{hamartia} in Menander, see Sylwester Dworacki, "'Hamartia' in Menander," \textit{Eos} 65 (1977): 17-24.} It is tantamount to him saying, "I was ignorant, I was wrong, I was angry like a figure in
Tragedy, especially one as defined by Aristotle." In fact, the use of the verb ἁμαρτάνω and its related forms is prevalent throughout the play, and reinforces the presence of Tragedy. We find it first used in the opening lines of the preserved play, when Moschion admits "I made a mistake" (line 3: ἡμάρτησα γάρ). It is used again by Demeas at line 397 when he chastises Chrysis and tells her, "You will realize that you have made a mistake" (γνῶσει τίς οὖν ἡμάρτανες). The irony here is that Demeas is mistaken and behaving like a figure in a Tragedy. At line 622 Moschion takes umbrage at his father for "suspecting me of a mistake" (μ᾽ ὁ πατὴρ ὑπέλαβεν ἡμαρτηκέναι). At line 646 Parmenon notes that "Master wronged a free-born girl" (ὁ τρόφιμος ἐξήμαρττεν εἰς ἔλευθέραν / κόρην). We began with line 703, where Demeas admits he made a mistake, and then in the next line he uses the verb again when he asks Moschion to consider "how much I looked after your interests, when I was drawing the wrong conclusions about the others" (εἰς γε τοὺς ἄλλους ἁμαρτῶν σοῦ πρόνοιαν ἡλικίαν / ἔσχον). Not only is Demeas admitting that he acted tragically towards Moschion, but also Chrysis and the infant. He then goes on to use the noun a few lines later, saying to Moschion in lines 706-708: "Now you want to make public my mistake and call witnesses to testify to my stupidity" (ṃδὲ / τὴν ἐμὴν ἁμαρτίαν νῦν ἐκφέρεις καὶ μάρτυρας / ἐπὶ ἐμὲ τῆς ἐμῆς ἀνοίγας λαμβάνεις'). Demeas' repetition of the root three times in so short a space is no accident. Menander clearly wants us to think of Demeas as an Aristotelian character from Tragedy.

Niceratus then appears, is re-inflamed at the sight of Moschion leaving, and threatens to arrest Moschion if he tries to ditch his daughter. Moschion draws his sword on Niceratus, but Demeas intervenes. Moschion then quickly capitulates, and in an attempt

114 Gomme and Sandbach, Commentary p. 627 point out Oedipus' words to Creon at Oedipus at Colonus 968: τάδ' εἰς ἐμαυτὸν τοὺς ἐμοὺς θ' ἡμάρτανον.
to save face he says "Drop it! Your begging has me won me over!"\(^{115}\) As the principal blocking figure in the play, he too must be humiliated, just like Cnemon and Smicrines.\(^{116}\) Niceratus only mocks his words, saying "Begging?" (line 722: οὐ δεόμενοι). The two are separated, love conquers all (632 and 724),\(^{117}\) including the potential tragedy, and Moschion weds Plangon at the close of the play. Before they wed, however, Moschion tells his father that if he had just called for the bride right away "You wouldn’t have had to bother with sermonizing just now."\(^{118}\) Moschion says that Demeas' confession of being a tragic figure and his other words of advice were really unnecessary, just philosophical blather, and so the final repudiation of Tragedy is made complete.

In his work on politics as drama, the anthropologist Turner analyzed small kinship groups of the Ndembu in Africa. He noted that "The situation in a Ndembu village closely parallels that found in Greek drama where one witnesses the helplessness of the human individual before the Fates; but in this case the fates are the necessities of the social process."\(^{119}\) Turner made a connection between the dramatic stage and role-playing on the political public stage. He argued that political conflicts, like dramas, pass through ritual phases which are present, consciously or unconsciously, in the minds of the actors. He isolates four of these phases: breach, crisis, redress, reintegration or schism. These phases are strikingly similar to Tragedy and Menandrean comedy. In Tragedy, the final result is usually schism, in Menander, as far as we know, it is always reintegration. He further writes elsewhere that:

\(^{115}\) Lines 721-722: ἀφείσθω καταλελιπαρίστη / δεόμενοι μου.


\(^{117}\) Compare Chrysis' words of Demeas at line 81: ἐραὶ γάρ, ὡς βέλτιστοι, κάκεινος κακῶς. / ὡς ἔπτων ἦ σὺ.

\(^{118}\) Lines 724-725: οὕτω δὲ πράγματα / εἴχες, ὡς πάτερ. φιλοσοφῶν ἀρτι.
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What seems to happen is that when a major public dramatic process gets under way, people, whether consciously, preconsciously, or unconsciously, take on roles which carry with them, if not precisely recorded scripts, deeply engraved tendencies to act and speak in suprapersonal or "representative" ways appropriate to the role taken, and to prepare the way for a certain climax that approximates to the nature of the climax given in a certain central myth of the death or victory of a hero or heroes in which they have been indoctrinated or "socialized" or "enculturated." 120

In addition to the public and political arena, it should be noted that individuals in their private dealings also take on dramatic roles, and it is this concept of taking on dramatic roles from Tragedy in the private arena that Menander holds up to ridicule. Of course, Menander was probably not really concerned that people in the audience were actually taking on roles from Tragedy. He was merely engaged in a literary and cultural polemic, and the dramatic cross-fertilization of tragic role-playing in his Comedy allowed him to subvert Tragedy. In other words, Menander was no Plato, but he was a literary ideologue. In Plato, on the other hand, we find a philosophical polemic against traditional myths, the source of Tragedy, that argues that traditional mythemes negatively affect the behavior of ordinary citizens. In fact, the Athenian Stranger in Plato's Laws (886c) suggests that the familial conflicts contained in myths may be adversely affecting actual parent-child relations. 121

In the case of the Samia, the central traditional mytheme is that of the conflict between father and son over sexual potency and supremacy in the family, or the Freudian "family romance." This myth was deeply indoctrinated and enculturated into the Greek psyche. Witness the first father-son relationships in Greek myth. Cronus castrates his father Uranus, thus rendering him sexually impotent, as well as politically powerless.

121 Laws 886c 4 ff.: ἀ τοῖς ἀκούουσιν εἰ μὲν εἰς ἄλλο τι καλός ἢ μὴ καλός ἔχει, οὐ ρόδιον ἐπιτιμάν παλαιός οὔσιν, εἰς μέντοι γονέων τε θεραπείας καὶ τιμᾶς οὐκ ἀν ἐγγὺς ποτὲ ἐπαινῶν ἐπίσημη οὕτε ὡς ὄφελιμος οὕτε ὡς το παράταν δυτῶς εἰρηται.
within the family and the cosmos at large. The paranoid Cronus is supplanted by Zeus, who in his new dominant role becomes an "omnipotent" philanderer who avoids the fate of his father and grandfather by marrying Thetis to the mortal Peleus and swallowing his lover Metis. By swallowing Metis and giving birth to Athena from his head, he brings female co-conspiracy and cunning under his (male) control, witness Athena’s loyalty to the male in Aeschylus’ *Eumenides*. In the *Samia*, we find all these elements present, including female co-conspiracy at lines 556-557 and 558-559, where Niceratus complains that Chrysis, his wife, and his daughter are plotting against him.122

Lévi-Strauss, in his study of myth, argued that the common mythological theme (mytheme) of incest signifies "an overvaluation of kinship" and patricide (or fratricide) an "undervaluation of kinship."123 For Lévi-Strauss, myth is a kind of collective unconscious or collective pedagogy, a way of transmitting cultural anxieties across the generations. The particular anxiety and paradoxical message contained within the incest-patricide myth has been lucidly expressed by Leach: "If society is to go on, daughters must be disloyal to their parents and sons must destroy (replace) their fathers."124

In Menander’s day, the primary way these cultural anxieties were transmitted was through tragedies, which were restaged as "classics" every year at the City Dionysia. Sophocles masterfully plays upon this primitive father-son anxiety in the *Oedipus Tyrannus*, the play which Aristotle judged to be the finest specimen of Tragedy. Freud was certainly right that the play’s power and lasting impression derive from its exploitation of the father-son conflict so that the hearer reacts to "the secret meaning and content of the

---

122Δημέα, συνίσταται: ἐπὶ ἐμὲ καὶ πάντεινα ποιεῖ πράγμαθ’ ἢ Χρυσίς. // τὴν γυναῖκα μου πέπεικε μὴθὲν ὄμολογεῖν ἔλεγοι / μὴθὲ τὴν κόρην...


The myth of father and son at variance was also prevalent in other tragedies. We have already mentioned how Menander makes a specific reference to Euripides' *Phoenix*, where father mistakenly spars with son over sexual dominance in the house. Unfortunately we have only scraps from this play, and this makes it difficult to comment further. More useful is Euripides' *Hippolytus*, since it survives in its entirety. In it we find that the tension between father and son over sexual dominance is also central to the play's power and meaning. Barry Strauss has gone so far as to argue that fifth-century comedy and Tragedy, and in particular the *Hippolytus*, "puts the father-son conflict on center stage in front of the whole polis. By so emphasizing this conflict, Peloponnesian-War-era literature turns it into a central ideological metaphor, one with considerable political as well as sociological relevance." In particular he argues that fifth-century Athenian democracy was a system fraught with conflict between traditional and new ideas, and that part of the way the Athenians coped with this tension was to stage the conflict between father and son, who represented old and new. Thus in Aristophanes' *Clouds*, Strepsiades and Pheidippides symbolize traditional values versus new values and the polis' struggle to cope in a changing world. Likewise, the struggle between Theseus and Hippolytus in Euripides' *Hippolytus* symbolizes the same thing.

In the case of the *Hippolytus*, Strauss notes that the fifth-century Athenians elevated Theseus as a symbol of Attic unity and democracy. Various politicians vied with one another to exploit the myth of Theseus and associate themselves with him. Cimon is said to have "found" the bones of Theseus on the island of Scyrus around 475 B.C. and triumphantly returned them to Athens, where they were deposited in the hero shrine, the

---

127 Theseus is credited with creating the synoecism of Attica (Thucydides 2.15; cf. Plutarch *Theseus* 24).
Theseion, which was decorated with Theseus' various exploits.\textsuperscript{128} In the myth of Theseus, the father-son conflict is central. Theseus arrives in Athens to assert his identity and is almost killed by his father Aegeus and his mother-in-law Medea. He survives this threat, but then goes on to cause his father's death by forgetting to hoist the proper sail on his return from Crete. In Euripides' \textit{Hippolytus}, he curses his own son Hippolytus, whom he falsely believes to have raped his wife, and Hippolytus expires. This conflict between father and son, so Strauss argues, was emblematic of the struggle between the older and younger generations over control of policy within the polis.

In Menander on the other hand, we see that the madness that appears in the \textit{Samia} between father and son, although portrayed in the manner of tragedies like the \textit{Hippolytus} via vocabulary, situations, and explicit allusion, nevertheless overturns and contests the values found in Tragedy. His aim in the \textit{Samia} and elsewhere is to show the audience how the gods and heroes of Tragedy are unsuitable for the "modern" world. Instead of Hippolytus, Thyestes, Oedipus, Tereus, Phoenix, and "all the others" we have Moschion, Demeas, and Niceratus. Menander invites the comparison, for when Niceratus ticks off his tragic list, Moschion responds with the puzzled \textit{èycô}; (497). Rather than Theseus or Amyntor, we have Demeas. Instead of Phaedra or Phthia, we have Chrysis. Rather than Acrisius, we have Niceratus. Even Niceratus, the most extreme tragic ranter in the play, does not accept Demeas' tragic comparisons, asking "What does this have to do with anything?" (592). When Demeas persists in making his comparisons, Niceratus again asks, "What does that have to do with this?" (594). Menander is inviting the audience to notice that their life is not like that which is portrayed in Tragedy, and hence dramatizing one's anger in the manner of a tragic hero is foolish role-playing. That it is role-playing is particularly evident in Moschion, who admits he is only playing the part of the tragic angry

\textsuperscript{128}For Theseus' career, see Plutarch, \textit{Theseus} 36.3-4 and \textit{Cimon} 8.7; Thucydides 1.98.2; Pausanias 1.17.6, 3.37; Diodorus 11.60.2; \textit{FGrH} 328 F 18.
young man (line 634, τῷ λόγῳ μόνον). We may compare Smicrines' reaction to Davus' tragic allusions and role-playing in the Aspis. When Davus quotes incessantly from Tragedy, Smicrines says, "Damn you, are you quoting saws to me?" (413). Davus continues, so Smicrines asks the audience, "Will he never stop?" (415). When Davus persists, finally Smicrines says, "You're wearing my patience thin!" (425). Tragedy and tragic role-playing, then, are thought of as thoroughly passé, even by the elderly Smicrines.

It is such tragic role-playing between an angry father and son in Tragedy, and therefore implicitly the ideologies that governed them, that Menander reacts against and overthrows. In the Samia, Menander presents a performance of a naturalistic world that is invaded by the cross-generic dramatic performance of Tragedy. Such tragic role-playing and dramatization of one's emotion is seen as an absurd and an empty show that only threatens the successful comic resolution of the plot. As with the agon in the Epitrepontes, the polis in the Samia is irrelevant. The struggle between father and son is a private matter, not a symbol for rule in the city. Thus, such tragic role-playing is not only irrelevant, but the ideology behind it is also obsolete. Hence Tragedy itself is irrelevant to the lives of the citizens of the late fourth-century polis, where such conflicts as staged in fifth-century Tragedy are no longer meaningful paradigms for conducting city business. The Samia is, therefore, a comic repudiation of a tragic performance of anger between father and son, and hence is the Ἀμύστορος ὅργ' οὐκέτι.

\[129 \text{ Ἴ Θησέως ἦ Οἰδίπου...} \]
The dramatic portrayal of a single central character, whose actions and reversal of fortune are the axle around which a play revolves, is today known as the "tragic hero."

The literary theory behind the tragic hero has traditionally\(^1\) been thought of as deriving from a passage in Aristotle's *Poetics*, where he turns from discussing the treatment of good and bad characters in Tragedy and says,

> We are left with the character between these two. Such a man is one who does not excel in virtue or justice, and does not, because of evil and depravity, have a sudden veering \((\text{μέταβάλλων})\) to misfortune, but because of some fallibility \((\text{ἀμαρτιά})\). He is one of those who has a great reputation and prosperity, such as Oedipus and Thyestes and illustrious men from such families. It is imperative that a masterful plot have a single and not \((\text{καθὼς καί})\) double issue, and that there be a sudden veering \((\text{μεταβάλλειν})\) not from misfortune to fortune, but, to the contrary, from fortune to misfortune; and the cause must not be through depravity but some great fallibility \((\text{ἀμαρτιά})\), the man being such as I described, or better rather than worse.\(^2\)

It should be pointed out that just prior to this passage, Aristotle uses the plural to discuss the agents of Tragedy, but here in his central formation of the preferred type of tragic hero, he maintains the singular. No doubt some modern critics have gone too far in erecting the

---

\(^1\) Compare, however, John Jones, in his *On Aristotle and Greek Tragedy* (London 1962), 11-20, who argues (p. 13) that "we have imported the tragic hero into the *Poetics*, where the concept has no place."

\(^2\) *Poetics* 1453\(a\) 7-10: ο μεταβάλλειν ἀντιστροφὴν τούτων λοιπῶς. ἕστι δὲ τοιοῦτος ὁ μήτε ἁρετή διαφέρων καὶ δικαιοσύνης μήτε διὰ κακίας καὶ μοιχείας μεταβάλλειν εἰς τὴν δυστυχίαν ἀλλὰ ἀμαρτίαν τινὰ, τῶν ἐν μεγάλῃ δόξῃ δυτικῶν καὶ εὐτυχίας. οἷον Οἰδίπος καὶ Θυέστης καὶ οἱ ἐκ τῶν τοιούτων γενόσεως ἐπιφανεῖς ἄνδρες. ἀνάγκη ἢ τῶν καλῶν ἢ τῶν τοιούτων γενέσεως ἐπιφανείς ἄνδρες. ἀνάγκη ἢ τῶν καλῶν ἢ τῶν τοιούτων γενέσεως μᾶλλον ἢ μᾶλλον ἢ διπλῶν, ὡσπερ τινὲς φασὶ, καὶ μεταβάλλειν οὐκ εἰς εὐτυχίαν ἢ δυστυχίαν ἀλλὰ τοιαύτην ἢ δυστυχίαν ἢ μοιχείαν ἢ ἀμαρτίαν μεγάλην ὡς οἷον ἢ ἀμαρτίαν μᾶλλον ἢ κείρονος.
notion of the tragic hero based upon this passage, but those who would completely banish
the concept from Aristotle or Tragedy are equally tendentious.

At any rate, there is other evidence besides Aristotle. The closest we come to
finding an actual reference to the tragic hero in classical literary theory is in a statement by
Theophrastus, Aristotle's successor and Menander's teacher. It is quoted by the fourth-
century Roman grammarian Diomedes in book 3 of his Ars grammatica. Diomedes says,
"Tragoedia est heroicae fortunae in adversis comprehensio. a Theophrasto ita definita est:
τραγῳδία ἐστὶν ἡρωικὴς τύχης περίστασις." Aristotle twice uses this last word to
mean "the veering round of the wind" (Mete. 364b14, Pr. 942b27), and so Theophrastus' use of the word seems to be much the same thing as Aristotle's περιπέτεια and μεταβολή. The Etymologicum Magnum (764.1) has a similar definition of Tragedy:
τραγῳδία ἐστι βίων καὶ λόγων ἡρωικῶν μίμησις. So despite the fact that the modern notion of a "tragic hero" has a considerable amount of baggage attached to it, because of its long journey through Roman, Renaissance, and Neo-classical Tragedy, we still find the concept's underpinnings in fourth century discussions of Greek Tragedy, and fifth century Tragedy itself.

Returning to Aristotle, we should note that in speaking of the "masterful plot," he specifically refers to individuals (Oedipus, Thyestes) and their families. His reference to "illustrious families" anticipates some of his comments in the next chapter, where he says that "Whenever there is suffering among kinsmen, such as when brother kills brother (or

---

3Diogenes Laertius 5.36 (= K.T. Testimonia 7): ὃ δὲ Θεόφραστος γέγονεν..., καθά φησι Παμφιλῆ ἐν τῷ τριακοστῷ δευτέρῳ τῶν Ἔπομημάτων, διδάσκαλος Μενάνδρου τοῦ κομικοῦ.
4Ars grammatica III.8.125 (= G. Kaibel, Comicorum Graecorum Fragmenta I, 57).
6See Bernard Knox, The Heroic Temper: Studies in Sophoclean Tragedy (Berkeley 1966), who rightly locates the concept of the "tragic hero" in Greek Drama by arguing that it was the invention, or at least the focus, of Sophoclean drama and those that followed, including Euripides.
intends to do something similar) or son father, or mother son, or son mother, it is plots such as these that must be sought.7 After some other comments, he returns to this point and says, "Hence, as I said before, tragedies do not concern many families. Not through art, but chance, did poets seek and find how to achieve such effect in their plots; they were forced to turn to the families of those who suffered such things."8 Aristotle seems to be saying that the best tragedies focus on problems that occur between family members, and this is in part due to the nature of the Greek myths themselves, where the tragic events that occur between family members are detailed. Usually, however, one figure can be identified as playing a more significant role in the story, such as Oedipus or Thyestes. In Greek thought, however, individuals were thought of as belonging to a particular oikos, and so the fate of one affected that of the entire oikos. In other words, in Tragedy and myth an individual hero may play a pronounced role, but in Greek society no man or woman is thought of as an island; what the individual suffers, every filos of the oikos suffers. Thus while Oedipus plays the most pronounced role in the Theban tales as a whole, his entire oikos suffers, and for the purposes of Tragedy another member, such as Antigone, can become the focus. Thyestes is of course just one tragic member of the whole "House of Atreus." Greek myths focused on family relationships because family relationships were so important to Greek society and the cause of the greatest anxieties. The ancient concept of the "tragic hero" is then different than the modern, in the sense that

71453b19-22: ὅταν δὲ ἐν ταῖς φιλίαις ἐγγένεται τὰ πάθη, οἶκον ἢ ἀδελφὸς ἀδελφὸν ἢ υἱὸς ματέρα ἢ μητέρα υἱὸν ἢ υἱὸς μητέρα ἀποκτεῖνη ἢ μέλη ἢ τί ἄλλο τοιοῦτον δρᾶ, ταύτα ζητητέον.

The individual was always thought of in relation to his γένος and οἶκος. This may explain why Aristotle shifts between the singular (the individual) and the plural (the οἶκος).\(^9\)

In addition to a controversy over whether Aristotle supplies evidence for the concept of the "tragic hero" in Greek drama, there is also some disagreement over whether Aristotle's ἀμαρτία is similar to the modern concept of a character's "tragic flaw." Since the publication of Else's study of Aristotle's Poetics,\(^{10}\) it has been difficult for anyone to maintain that in this particular passage the word ἀμαρτία can mean anything other than "a mistake of identity." In particular Else argues that ἀμαρτία denotes a mistake or error in judgment about the identity of a φίλος.\(^{11}\) If Else is correct, then again we find that the central position of the οἶκος in Greek society is essential to understanding Aristotle's view of Tragedy. Aristotle notes that tragedies, especially the finest tragedies, frequently focus on the famous οἶκοι in which an individual of a particular οἶκος makes a ἀμαρτία in recognizing one of his φίλοι.

Turning now to Menander, it is this concept of the tragic hero, as defined by Theophrastus and the Etymologicum Magnum and implied by Aristotle, and the hero's tragic ἀμαρτία and μεταβολή which inform Menander's Dyscolus. Only Menander subverts the tragic norm; instead of an Oedipus, or Thyestes, or some such hero from so illustrious a family, we have the House of Cnemon and Cnemon's ἀμαρτία\(^{12}\) and μεταβολή. As Aristotle prescribes, the plot is single, and not double as some have

---


\(^{11}\)Else, ibid., p. 379, says, "Once the matter is put this way another concept springs to mind which is fitted to be the exact converse and complement of ἀμαρτία: i.e., recognition. Recognition is a change ἔξ ἀγνώστως ἐς γνώσιν; might not ἀμαρτία be the ἀγνώστως from which the change begins? Moreover tragic recognition, or the best tragic recognition, is a discovery of the identity of a 'dear' person, a blood-relative; it follows that the precedent ἀμαρτία would denote particularly a mistake or error or ignorance as to the identity of that person."

alleged. Cnemon, however, is worse than the man Aristotle describes, and he suffers a misfortune, but this misfortune turns out to be fortunate for the οἶκος, so in reality Cnemon "falls" from misfortune to fortune.

The play begins with a divine prologue speech reminiscent of Euripidean Tragedy, with some important differences, but the formal structure reinforces that we are to note the world of Tragedy. In fact, Pan seems more of a convention than a real divine presence in the play. Once he has introduced the action of the play, the rest of the events depend upon human agents. For instance, his prompting of Sostratus and Sostratus' love become indistinguishable as the play progresses. In this way Menander engages in a subtle rationalization of Tragedy that would have amused the audience in much the same way that one is amused by the rationalized myths that are found in Herodotus.

On a practical level, Pan provides us with the necessary Vorgeschichte to understand the plot. He invites us to imagine that we are in the Attic deme of Phyle, a

---

13 Armin Schäfer, *Menanders Dyskolos: Untersuchungen zur dramatischen Technik* (Beiträge zur klassischen Philologie 14, Meisenheim am Glan, 1965), was the first to point out the seeming double plot of the "love-interest" and the "misanthrope" in the Dyscolus. He was followed by G.W. Arnott ("Menander, qui vitae ostendit vitam...,” *G&R* 15 (1968): 1-17). This view was challenged by Michael Anderson, "Knemon's Hamartia,” *G&R* 17 (1990): 199-217, who argued that "the conflict between the two sides of the play is an imaginary one...and that the carefully integrated plot reflects a unity of theme in the comedy as a whole. Anderson, however, does not challenge the notion that if there are two plots, they are the "love interest" and the "misanthrope." As it shall be argued below, the theme of the play is Cnemon and the unhappy effects of his self-imposed isolation on himself and his family. If there is another seeming plot besides Cnemon, it is the theme of wealth that threatens a new plot at the beginning of Act V, and not Sostratus' "love interest." Sostratus' love-interest is only important in that it highlights Cnemon's antisocial behavior. Likewise wealth acts as another block to a marriage. But wealth, in the figure of Callippides, acts as a contrast to Cnemon. Thus there is no real double plot. Only different themes that highlight or serve as contrasts to Cnemon's behavior.

14 Compare Handley's comments (*The Dyskolos of Menander*, Cambridge, Mass. 1965, p. 127): "The ancestors of these [divine prologue] speeches in fifth-century comedy show that Menander and his contemporaries were working with a long tradition behind them. Like many comic traditions, it was nourished by the continuous influence of Tragedy, especially Euripidean tragedy."

15 Sander M. Goldberg, "The Style and Function of Menander's Dyskolos Prologue," *SO* 53 (1978): 57-68, uses the conclusions of Eduard Fraenkel's dissertation of 1912 on comic writers use of dramatic techniques found in tragedy and argues that in the prologue of the Dyscolus, Menander uses the device of the divine prologue (as paralleled in Euripides' Ion) as merely a device to present "a perspective from which the characters and events can be viewed, and from the distances he creates derive the irony, sympathy and humor that shape our response to the play" (p. 66). In addition to these aims, I would argue that Menander also intends that the audience begin comparing Menander's treatment of tragic characters to that of the tragedians, especially Euripides.
rustic area near the Cave of Pan on Mount Parnes (1-4). After the topographical particulars, he immediately turns to describing Cnemon's character, the principal of the play (5-12), and the only character of the prologue, other than Pan himself, that is named. He is a recluse and grumpy to all, even the god Pan. We then learn about the other characters, but none of them is named until later. Cnemon's estranged wife and her son (13-29, later named as Myr|rhine and Gorgias) farm a small plot of land along with one family servant (later named as Davus). The mother's character is not important for the play's action, so her character is not described. Her situation is important, however, so we are told that as a result of her estrangement, she is faring badly, along with her son (25-6). Gorgias' character is important, so we are told that he "has sense beyond his years" (28). Pan returns to Cnemon's character (30-34) to note again his rough existence and antisocial behavior. He lives "alone," which means he lives with no male heir, and has contact with only one old female servant (later named as Simice) and his daughter (unnamed throughout). This reclusive behavior is hurting his daughter's chances for marriage. The daughter's character is then described (34-39). She knows no nonsense and is pious towards the Nymphs and Pan, for which she will be rewarded. Finally, a young suitor (later to be named Sostratus) for the girl is mentioned. His character is important, so details are given about him: he idles about the city or hunts in the country and is the son of a wealthy farmer (later named as Callippides).

Thus all the principal members of the two families and themes of the play are economically introduced in the prologue, or as a very Aristotelian Pan puts it, "These are

---

16Themes in the prologue alluded to by Pan, such as wealthy vs. poor, words like ὀχλος, κακόν, and phrases like λελάληκεν ἡδέως are echoed throughout the play.
the main points." Only Sostratus' mother is not mentioned. The figures other than Cnemon, however, are only given brief thumbnail sketches and are not named, while Cnemon's solitary ways and surly demeanor and their unhappy effects on his family are recounted with great emphasis. This, and the fact that he is the only character other than Pan who is mentioned by name in the prologue (line 6), highlights his pronounced role in the play. In fact, Cnemon's character dominates the entire play just as it dominates the prologue and the lives of his immediate family. The entire prologue is, in fact, designed to pique the audience's interest in Cnemon, and once we have been set up, Menander keeps us in suspense. Sostratus and the parasite Chaereas enter. They discuss the best way to win the girl. Sostratus reveals to Chaireas that he has sent his servant Pyrrhias to ask the girl's kyrios for her hand. Suddenly the servus currens, Pyrrhias, rushes on stage in terror. It turns out that the girl's kyrios is Cnemon, and it seems that he has lived up to Pan's billing by chasing away Pyrrhias. Pyrrhias' first words to describe Cnemon are that he is "the child of Woe, or someone possessed, or a madman," "Οδύνης γὰρ ὑός ἢ...

17 Line 45: ταύτ’ ἐστὶ τὰ κεφάλαια. Compare Aristotle's injunction (Poetics 1455b): τοὺς τέ λόγους καὶ τοὺς πεποιημένους δεῖ καὶ αὐτὸν ποιούντα ἐκτίθεναι καθόλου, ἐφ’ οὗτος ἐπεισοδιοῦν καὶ παρατείνειν ...[long example from Euripides' Iphigeneia], μετὰ ταύτα δὲ ἢδη ὑποθέντα τὰ ὁνήματα ἐπεισοδιοῦν.

18 There has been a controversy as to whether Sostratus' mother has a speaking part in the play at the beginning of Act III ever since Ritchie [J.H. Quincey, W. Ritchie, et alii, Notes on the Dyskolos of Menander, Australian Humanities Research Council, Occasional Paper No. 2 (Adelaide 1959), 6] placed her there contrary to the manuscript. For a discussion and bibliography, see Gomme and Sandbach, Commentary pp. 200 ff. It has long been noted that Sostratus' mother does not appear in the cast of characters at the beginning of the play. The fact that Sostratus' mother is also not mentioned in the prologue, however, has not been noticed. This may add weight to those who would support the evidence of the manuscript and not assign her a speaking part. On the other hand, Getas and Sicon are not mentioned either, but they do have speaking parts, and the addition of the mother at the beginning of Act III makes much more sense.

19 Sandbach follows Post, review of Dyskolos, ed. by Hans Joachim Mett [AJP 82 (1961): 100] and Gallavotti [RFIC 91 (1963): 72-81] and argues that Pyrrhias is referring to himself as 'Οδύνης γὰρ ὑός ἢ ', but this makes no sense and requires an extra textual emendation, the άφι, unless we read ή as the first person singular -- a form that occurs nowhere else in Menander. Pyrrhias is still in pain, as lines 91-2 make clear, so why would he refer to himself as a "child of Pain" in the past tense? Besides, in the two other instances in the play where the root ô5uv~ is found, both are said of Cnemon. He is ô5uvôv menos (line 125) and one who ô5uvôs êpistôç (line 606). Cnemon both causes and suffers from some ô5uvôÇ. Thus I follow the text of Amott and Handley.
κακοδαιμόνες τις ἆνετά μέλαγχολῶν ἀνθρώπος. We have already seen in the *Samia* and other fourth century comedians, how anger was thought to be typical of the tragic heroic temper. In addition to anger, we have the word Ὅδυνης. It is the first word spoken of Cnemon by any character in the play other than Pan, and this, along with the fact that it is placed within a striking genealogical metaphor,\(^\text{20}\) suggests that it is important.\(^\text{21}\) As will be argued below, the metaphor is not only designed to build up Cnemon's misanthropic ways into mythological proportions before he enters, but it also may be meant to recall Aristotle's discussion of Tragedy and comedy in his *Poetics*.

In chapters 1-3 of the *Poetics*, Aristotle analyzes the distinctions that are necessary for the study of poetry. In chapter 4 he offers a compressed sketch of how poetry's particular cultural forms have evolved, and he maintains that there is a dichotomy between serious and humorous poetry. He then focuses on the developmental history of serious poetry (= Tragedy) until the end of chapter 4. At the beginning of chapter 5 he then turns to humorous poetry (= comedy) and says:

Comedy, as I said before, is an imitation of rather inferior characters, not, however, involving all manner of villainy, but merely the unseemly, one species of which is the comic. For the comic is some mistake (ἀμαρτήματα) and the unseemliness is neither painful (ἀνώδυνον) nor destructive. A quick example is the comic mask, which is somewhat unseemly and distorted, but does not cause pain (ἄνευ Ὅδυνης).\(^\text{22}\)

Later in chapter 11 of the *Poetics*, after defining the particular features of complex plots, namely περιπέτειαι and ἀναγνώρισις, Aristotle briefly states that there is a third element of a tragic plot structure -- πόθος or suffering. He adds, "And the suffering is a

---

\(^{20}\)For parallels and bibliography, see Handley's *Dyskulos*, pp. 144-5, and Gomme and Sandbach *Commentary*, pp. 148-9.

\(^{21}\)The Ὅδυνη-root is applied to Cnemon two more times in the play, once at line 125, and once at 606.

\(^{22}\) *Poetics* 1449a 32-37: 'Ἡ δὲ κωμῳδία ἐστὶν ὀστέρ εἶπομεν μίμησις χαυλο/τέρων μὲν, οὐ μὲντοι κατὰ πᾶσαν κακίαν, ἀλλὰ τοῦ / αἰσχρού ἐστι τὸ γελοῖον μόριον. τὸ γὰρ γελοῖον ἐστὶν ἀμάρ/τημα τι καὶ αἰσχος ἀνώδυνον καὶ οὐ φθαρτικόν, οἷον / εὖθυς τὸ γελοῖον πρόσωπον αἰσχρόν τι καὶ διεστραμμένον ἄνευ Ὅδυνης.
destructive or painful action, such as visible deaths, excessive pain, woundings, and the like." (πάθος δέ έστι πράξις φθαρτική ἢ ὀδυνηρά, οἷον οἱ τε ἐν τῷ φαινερῷ 
θάνατοι καὶ αἱ περιοδυναι καὶ τρώσεις καὶ ὅσα τοιαῦτα).

It is evident from these two passages that the πάθος in Tragedy, as defined as 
φθαρτική ἢ ὀδυνηρά, has a parallel in comedy, namely τὸ γελοῖον, and τὸ γελοῖον 
is a ἀμάρτημα τι καὶ αἰσχος ἀνώδυνον καὶ οὐ φθαρτικόν.23 There is also a parallel 
between the ἀμάρτημα of Tragedy and the ἀμάρτημα of comedy; that of Tragedy causes 
tὸ πάθος, that of comedy τὸ γελοῖον.24 Presumably Aristotle developed these parallels 
greater detail in his lost second book of the Poetics (if it existed) or his lost dialogue On 
Poets,25 and this was the source for later grammarians' definitions of Tragedy and comedy 
--- definitions which often26 elaborate a dichotomy between the two genres. For instance, 
in a passage that was partly quoted above, the grammarian Diomedes says,

Tragedy takes as its subject the fortune of heroes amidst adversities, thus it 
is defined by Theophrastus: 'tragedy is the veering around of a hero's 
fortune'...Comedy takes as its subject the fortune of private citizens without 
threat to their life, thus it is defined by the Greeks: 'comedy encompasses 
the affairs of private citizens without harm to them.' Comedy deals with the 
fortunes of villages, that is humble private dwellings, not, as in tragedies, 
public and royal abodes...Comedy differs from Tragedy, because in 
Tragedy heroes, leaders, and kings are introduced, while in comedy it is 
private citizens of low rank. The former has grief, exiles, slaughter, the 
latter love-affairs and the rapes of maidens. In the former, there is 
frequently and almost always sad endings amidst grief...27

23 Compare Else's comments (op. cit. p. 189): "The comic error is as much a part of Aristotle's 
thinking as the tragic error; it is in fact its counterpart." See also Michael Anderson's comments (op. cit., 
p. 212).

24 Compare the English phrase "comedy of errors."

25 On the question of whether later grammarians' definitions of tragedy and comedy derive from 
Aristotle's lost second book of the Poetics, or his dialogue On Poets, or the writings of Theophrastus, see 
A. Philip McMahon, "On the Second Book of Aristotle's Poetics and the Source of Theophrastus' 
Definition of Tragedy," HSCP 28 (1917): 1-46 and "Seven Questions on Aristotelian Definitions of 

26 For a detailed treatment of numerous passages that define tragedy and comedy together as 
opposites, see A. Philip McMahon, "Seven Questions on Aristotelian Definitions of Tragedy and Comedy," 

27 Diomedes, De Comoedia Graeca VIII-IX [= Kaibel, CGF pp. 57-58]: tragoeidia est heroicae 
fortunae in adversis comprehensio. a Theofrasto iva definita est: τραγῳδία εστὶν ἡρωικῆς τύχης 
περίστασις.... comoedia est privatae civilisque fortunae sine periculo [vitae] comprehensio, apud Graecos.
In all probability Diomedes' analysis of Tragedy and comedy, including his quote\textsuperscript{28} of Theophrastus, ultimately derives from Aristotle. The question then arises, did Menander exploit the perceived contrast between Tragedy and comedy in his plays as elaborated by Aristotle and Theophrastus? It is probably impossible to say with certainty, but the Dyscolus and the portions of his other surviving plays support such a view. Assuming that Menander is exploiting Aristotle, then his unusual reference to Cnemon as the 'Οδύνης ύδας has greater significance. Cnemon's behavior and its results are perhaps an amusing attempt to recall Aristotle's discussion of Tragedy and comedy, that is, he is causing a πάθος that is ὀδύνηρα. In other words he is a tragic figure, albeit a reduced and comical tragic figure.

Echoes of Aristotelian conceptions of Tragedy and comedy do not end here. Once Pyrrhias makes his entrance, the audience anticipates that Cnemon will follow immediately, but again is kept on a tether. Instead, Pyrrhias delivers a long messenger speech about his first encounter with the old grump. He tells at length of how he approached Cnemon, but Cnemon threw mud, rocks, and even pears (line 120) at him. He has also been chasing him now for 15 stadia (line 118). As in a tragedy, the "violence" is banished from the stage and only described by a messenger. Pyrrhias' description of Cnemon persuades Chaireas that now is not the right time to approach the irascible farmer, and so Chaireas exits (lines 129-34). The suspense of Cnemon's entrance builds more.

Finally at line 153, when one-sixth of the play has already been seen, Cnemon enters and his presence alone is enough to chase Pyrrhias off-stage (lines 143-44). At this point

\textit{ita definita: κομική ἐστιν ἰδιωτικῶν πραγμάτων ἀκίνδυνος περιοχή... in ea viculorum id est humilium domum fortunae comprehendantur, non ut in tragœdia publicarum regiarumque... comoedia a tragoedia differit, quod in tragœdia introducuntur heroes duces reges, in comoedia humiles atque privatae <personae>, in illa luctus exilia caedes, in hac mores, virginum raptus; deinde quod in illa frequener et paene semper laetis rebus exitus tristes...}

\textsuperscript{28}The singular "quote" is used, because it is unclear whether the definition of Comedy also belongs to Theophrastus (and ultimately Aristotle), because Diomedes only attributes it to "the Greeks" in general (apud Graecos). L.A. Post assumes that it is Theophrastian (TAPhA 69 (1938): p. 18).
Cnemon still does not speak, but rather Sostratus (and the audience) are given time examine the old grouch’s demeanor (his mask), and Sostratus’ first impression is that Cnemon does not appear to be "philanthropic" (φιλάνθρωπον). Sostratus' words echo Pan's sentiments at the beginning of the play, when he called Cnemon a ἀπάνθρωπος τις ἀνθρωπος οφόδρα (line 6). Perhaps it is a coincidence, but once again a character's initial impression of Cnemon has Aristotelian overtones, for the concept of φιλάνθρωπον occurs in Poetics 13, where Aristotle prescribes the ideal type of character for a tragedy:

First it is clear that (a) decent men should not be shown shifting from fortune to misfortune, for this is neither fearful nor pitiful, but morally repulsive. (b) Nor should the wicked be shown shifting from misfortune to fortune, for this is the least tragic of all and has none of the required characteristics — neither does it move human sympathy (φιλάνθρωπον), nor pity, nor fear. (c) Nor on the other hand should the thoroughly wicked fall from fortune to misfortune, for such a plot might arouse human sympathy (φιλάνθρωπον), but neither pity nor fear.

It may be possible then, that when Sostratus says that Cnemon οὐ πάνυ φιλάνθρωπον β[λέπειν μ]οι φαίνεται, Menander's φιλάνθρωπον has a double meaning; not only does Cnemon not have a "fellow-feeling for humanity," but he himself is not a character who moves human sympathy. Menander's use of φαίνεται may support this interpretation, for Aristotle uses this same verb in the passage quoted above, where it means "be shown [on stage]." If this is the case, then Menander's Cnemon falls under category (b) — a "wicked" man who falls from misfortune to fortune, and is, therefore,
the most untragic. On the other hand, to Cnemon, his fall to fortune seems like a punishment, especially his treatment at the hands of Sicon and Getas. Perhaps elsewhere in his lost writings on comedy, Aristotle noted how such a character is appropriate to comedy.

After all the buildup, Cnemon finally speaks, and his words reveal his misanthropic character (153-68). He alludes to the myth of Perseus, and wishes, like Perseus, that he had either wings to avoid pedestrians, or a Gorgon head with which he could turn everyone who bothered him into stone. If he had the latter of these two wishes, he says the whole place would be full of stone statues. There is a difficulty here in determining whether Cnemon is just alluding to the myth of Perseus in general, or his tragic treatment. It may be an allusion to Euripides' treatment of the myth in his Andromeda. The exact details of the plot are unclear, but it seems certain that in Euripides, Andromeda's father, Cepheus, resisted marrying her to Perseus because he was a baseborn bastard. As a result, Perseus may have threatened to use the Gorgon's head to petrify Cepheus and the other suitor, Phineus. If this is so, then there may be some irony at work here, because Cnemon, like Cepheus, is blocking his daughter's wedding. Of course, there are numerous examples of fathers who resist wedding their daughters to young heroes in myth and Tragedy, and Cnemon is certainly like one of them. We will return to this in a moment. After Cnemon's mention of the Gorgon head, he also tells us that he does not even work the part of his land that is near the public road so that he can avoid those who pass by. There is more irony in all this, for Cnemon is so obsessed with avoiding people

---

34For the problems encountered in determining whether a mythological allusion in Menander necessarily from a tragic treatment of the myth, see A. Hurst, op. cit., pp. 106 ff. J-M Jacques in his commentary Le Dyscolus (Paris 1976), p. 15, n. 1, says of the mention of Perseus in line 153, "La référence à Péseau, comme toutes les allusions mythologiques analogues, vient sans doute de la tragédie." See, however, Köyte fragment 718 (= Kock 535), which says, "Well aren't they right to paint Prometheus pegged to the rocks...?" (eít' ou δικαιώς προσπεπτάτταλειμένον / γράφωσι τον Προμηθέα προς ταῖς πέτραις...

that he is willing to be a bad farmer, because a good farmer uses every available piece of land, and stones are the one thing of which an Attic farmer does not need more. There is also irony in the fact that he is willing to lay aside his work and chase someone and throw his produce at them. Farming, it seems, is not one of Cnemon's priorities. He concludes his opening remarks with the rather tragic sounding "O plethoric multitude! Woe is me! Once again someone else is standing by our door!" Cnemon uses the genitive of exclamation (πολυπληθείας ὀξλοῦ) and the tragic οἴμοι. The closing words of Cnemon's first lines reveal to the audience that Cnemon sees himself as suffering a tragedy, and although the audience is to be amused that Cnemon would use such grandiloquent sentiments for his own petty situation, nevertheless they are also to note that Cnemon is portrayed as a tragic figure. After exchanging a few words with Sostratus, Cnemon once again gives voice to his tragic fate of meeting someone by his door, ὥς τάλας ἔγκο (line 176), and then exits.

Sostratus is then left alone on the stage. He ponders what to do next. He realizes that the situation demands action! He is determined to act decisively and... fetch his father's slave, Getas (lines 179-187). Thus Sostratus continues to be a bit a coward and a spoiled brat who seeks surrogates (Pyrrhias, Chaireas, and now Getas) to do his bidding. As he is set to leave the stage, he says "Many things can happen in one day." This sentiment, as we saw in the earlier chapter on the Aspis, has a tragic pedigree, and it is repeated at line 864. It invites the audience to compare the present play to a Tragedy.


38 For Menander's use of the genitive of exclamation to produce tragic effects, see my chapter on the Aspis.

39 Lines 187-188: πόλλα ἐν ἡμέραι μὴν / γένοιτ' ἄν.

40 See Gomme and Sandbach, Commentary, page 97.
But just as Sostratus is set to depart, suddenly the daughter of Cnemon (whom the manuscripts only name as κόρη) enters. She, like her father, applies a grand tragic utterance to a mundane situation, "Woe is me for my ills! What shall I do? Nurse was drawing water, and she dropped the bucket in the well!" We learn that she has had the misfortune of being told by Cnemon to make some hot water (line 193), but now has no bucket for the job. If Cnemon finds out, there will be hell to pay. Thus Cnemon's character continues to haunt those on stage, although he himself is absent. Sostratus gets the water for her, but someone approaches and the girl is then afraid that it is her father, Cnemon, and that he will catch her outside without a chaperon. Again she cries out, "Woe is me!" She takes the water from Sostratus, and then runs inside. It is not Cnemon, however, but Davus. He is the servant of Gorgias, who is the girl's half-brother. As Davus watches from the side, Sostratus bellows out "Woe is me for my evil fate!" But like Demeas in the Samia, he checks his tragic speech and says, "Stop your whining, Sostratus!" Once again, tragic speech and role-playing are described in unflattering terms. Davus sees the exchange and overhears Sostratus say to himself, "It will be all right." To which Davus, from his hidden position, responds, "What will be all right?" Sostratus continues, not realizing that he is being overheard, "Don't be afraid, do what you just intended. Go get Getas and explain the whole affair to him." Davus does not like Sostratus' elusive words and imagines the worst and says, "Whatever

41 Line 189: οἷοι τάλαινα τῶν ἐμῶν ἐγὼ κακῶν.
42 Greek girls stayed indoors unless accompanied by their kyrios, compare line 205. As in myth, an unattended girl was the target of unwanted advances.
43 Line 203: τάλαιν' ἐγώ.
44 Line 214: οἷοι, κακοδαιμονι. παυε θηνὼν. Σώστρατε.
46 Line 215: κατὰ τρόπον τί.
mischief is this?" He curses Cnemon for not properly watching over the girl (line 220), and heads off to tell Gorgias, the girl's half-brother. Act I then comes to an end.

When Act II opens, Gorgias is taking Davus to task for not accosting the young interloper (lines 233-246). Davus explains that he did not approach him because he was afraid the old grump would catch him near his door and hang him (lines 247-249). Gorgias points out that even if Cnemon behaves like an outsider to the family, that is no excuse for Davus (lines 240-246). Meanwhile, Sostratus has failed to find Getas, and so returns. Gorgias and Davus see him at Cnemon's doorstep contemplating what to do next. Sostratus is afraid to speak with Cnemon, but he decides to "knock on the door so that I end this debate." But he is saved by Gorgias, who asks, "Young man, would you mind listening to some rather serious advice?" Sostratus is relieved that someone has delayed him and is about to offer him some counsel, so he responds, "I'd be happy to! Go on." Gorgias' polite request warns the audience, and Sostratus, what sort of speech is to follow, and may be compared, for instance, to Euripides' Suppliant Women line 293, where Aethra asks Theseus, "May I say something, child, useful to both you and the city?" Thus, behind all of this exchange lies the formal pattern of a tragic agon, which is reinforced by the fact that thirteen out the first seventeen lines that Gorgias speaks maintain tragic diction.

Gorgias begins his pompous speech with an elaborate period of thirteen lines. The speech falls into three parts, each part interrupted by Sostratus, the first of which contains the proverbial fickleness of fortune:

I think that all men,
both the fortunate and the unfortunate, have a certain limit and change of fortune, and the affairs of the fortunate man continue to thrive so long as he is able to bear his fortune (τῦχη) without doing wrong. Should he ever get carried away with his affluence, then I think he takes a turn for the worse. On the other hand, the unfortunate, so long as they keep clear of crime despite their poverty and nobly endure their luck (δαίμων = Τῦχη), will in due course achieve a credit balance, and they can expect their stock to improve. What I am saying? You may be rich, but don't you bank on it, and don't you either look down on us who are poor! Always show onlookers that you deserve continued prosperity.

The fickleness of τῦχη and its designation as a δαίμων, although commonly found in various forms throughout Greek literature, comport with the "theology" of Tragedy. One conspicuous parallel is found in a fragment of Euripides:

A man who goes his way in good fortune (τῦχαις) ought not suppose that he will always have the same luck (δαίμων'). For the god (θεός) inexplicably -- if one should call him a god -- grows weary of associating so often with the same people forever. Mortals' prosperity is itself mortal; those who are proud and, based on the present, trust in the future, find the reproof of their fortune (τῦχης) in suffering.55

54 For δαίμων = Τῦχη, see Webster, Studies in Menander (Manchester, 1960), p. 196 ff.

Gorgias is preaching tragic truisms to Sostratus. Sostratus does not understand Gorgias’ sermon, which is rather inappropriate for the context, and so asks “Do you think I’m doing something out of place right now?” Gorgias responds by saying that Sostratus’ designs on the girl are dishonorable and worthy of capital punishment a thousand times over! Gorgias’ tragic response to life has made wooing a girl into a capital offense. Sostratus responds, “Apollo!,” while Gorgias continues with what Post aptly describes as a "gorgeously incoherent attempt at logic": "It is not right, indeed, that your leisure plague us who have none. Of all men, know that a poor man when wronged is most ill-tempered! At first he is pitied, but then he takes his bad treatment not as an injustice, but as an act of [hybris]."

The rustic Gorgias, like Syriscus in the Epitrepontes, has the ability to neatly toss off tragic-sounding "Gorganic" figures. His sage warnings remind one of Aristotle’s observation that "rustics are especially fond of quoting maxims (γνωμοτύποι)." Thus the audience would have been amused at the rustic who talks as if he were a figure in a tragic agon. But his rhetoric is out of place in a comedy and his logic incoherent, and this exposes Gorgias’ naïveté, against the more urbane experience of the Athenian audience.

Sostratus, who is a city slicker, realizes that he has just been lectured, and so he responds, "Young man, please listen to me for a moment too -- you’re prattling on (λαλών) without

---

57 Line 288: ἄτοπον δὲ σοι τι φαίνομαι νυνὶ ποιεῖν;
58 AJP 1959, p. 410.
59 Lines 293-296: οὐ δικαίον ἔστι γοῦν / τὴν οὖν σχολήν τοῖς ἀσχολουμένοις κακῶν / ἡμῶν γενέσθαι. τῶν δ’ ἀπάντων λαθ’ ὑτί / πτωχὸς ἁδικηθεὶς ἐστι διακολωτάτων, / πρῶτον μὲν ἐστ’ ἐλεινός, εἶτα λαμβάνει / οὐκ εἰς ἁδικίαν ὡσα πέπονθ’ ἀλλ’ εἰς οὐβριν’.
60 Ars Rhetorica 1395b6: οἱ γάρ ἄγροικοι μάλιστα γνωμοτύποι εἰσί.
knowing the facts!" Here tragic-sounding speech is equated with λαλιδα, just as it is in another fragment of Menander, which we saw earlier in the chapter on the Samia.

The tragic agon continues with Sostratus' rebuttal. Sostratus, however, takes a more Lysian approach. In simple prose he explains how his intentions are honorable (lines 301-314). Gorgias apologizes for speaking so strongly (lines 315-319). Sostratus, who is always looking for those who can help him, immediately enlists a reluctant Gorgias into his service. Gorgias explains that there is only one problem with Sostratus' intentions -- the girl's father, Cnemon. He goes on to describe in detail Cnemon's peevish ways, using words that echo Pan's sentiments in the prologue (lines 321-340). Thus Cnemon's surly character and its unfortunate effects on his family continue to be stressed. Cnemon is, like Smicrines in the Epitrepontes, a tragic blocking figure. We have already seen how he may be compared to Cepheus in Euripides' Andromeda. There are other examples of fathers in Tragedy who block their daughters from wedding, such as Oenomaus in Sophocles' and Euripides' plays of that title. In fact, in the myth of Perseus, which Cnemon alludes to above, Perseus' grandfather Acrisius locked up Danaë in a brazen chamber because he was afraid of an oracle that stated he would be killed by a son of Danaë. But Zeus, who was attracted to her beauty, came to her in a shower of gold and impregnated her, releasing once again the procreative power that Acrisius had attempted to restrain. Cnemon, then corresponds to the tragic father-figure in myth, and represents the repression of procreation, and just like Smicrines in the Epitrepontes and the other blocking figures in
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61Lines 299-301: μειράκιον, οὗτος εύτυχοις, βραχίες τί μου / ἄκουσιον [short interruption by Davus which is ignored by Sostratus] καὶ άν γ', ὁ λαλῶν πρὶν μαθεῖν. For Davus' interruption and the interpretation of these lines, see Gomme and Sandbach, Commentary, p. 184, line 301.

62Plutarch consol ad Apoll. 103 C (=Körte fragment 740; Kock fr. 531, lines 6-10): εἰ δ' ἐπὶ τοὺς αὐτοὺς νόμους / εφ' οὔστερ ἡμεῖς ἔπασας τὸν ἀέρα / τὸν κοίνον, ἵνα σοι καὶ τραγικότερον λαλῶ, / οἰστέον ἄμεινον ταύτα καὶ λογιστέον. / τὸ δὲ κεφάλαιον τῶν λόγων, ἀνθρώπως εἰ ... 

63Compare the chapter on the Samia, where Demeas alludes to the myth of Danaë, Acrisius, and Perseus.
Menander, he must be overthrown. Gorgias' warnings about Cnemon's character, however, do not dissuade the indefatigable Sostratus. Gorgias, Sostratus, and Davus then hatch a plot whereby Sostratus will cast aside his city cloak, assume the appearance of a farmer, and join Gorgias and Davus in the field in order to impress Cnemon. These three exit.

After Sostratus, Gorgias, and Davus have left, the cook Sicon and Sostratus' slave, Getas, enter carrying provisions for a sacrifice at Pan's shrine. After a few wisecracks about the scrawny sheep and the heavy load, their conversation turns to why they have arrived. We discover that Sostratus' mother has had an awful dream. In her dream she saw the god Pan putting chains on Sostratus, and then she saw Sostratus put on farmer's clothes and take up a mattock and dig on the neighbor's land (lines 407-418). In response to this dream, she sends out the family to sacrifice at Pan's shrine in order to avert the dream. Mothers' disturbing dreams about their sons and their making sacrifices to avert the dreams' realization have a long history in Tragedy. In Aeschylus' *Persae* 177 ff., the mother of Xerxes dreams that her son tries to yoke two women to his chariot, one representing Persia, the other Greece. The Persian one obeys, but the Greek fights back and makes Xerxes fall from his chariot. The dream portends her son Xerxes' downfall, and the chorus (lines 215 ff.) advise her to pour libations to the earth and the dead, especially her departed husband, Darius, in order to avert the dream. In the *Choephoroi* 527 ff., the mother of Orestes, Clytemnestra, has dreamt that she gave birth to snake, swathed it in baby's clothes, gave it her breast to feed, and that it drew blood with the milk. She sees that the dream portends Orestes' revenge, and so she sends the chorus out to pour libations to the Erinyes in order to avert the dream. In Sophocles' *Electra* 417, once again we find that Clytemnestra has had an awful dream. She sees Agamemnon coming back to life and his scepter sprouting foliage that spreads its shade over all of Mycenae. Again, this portends Orestes' arrival and her downfall, so she sends Chrysothemis to Agamemnon's
grave to assuage his spirit. In Euripides' *Hecuba* 68 ff., Hecuba has had a dream about her son Polydorus and her daughter Polyxena. She is afraid that both are in danger and prays to the gods of the underworld to avert the foreboding doom. In all these examples, a mother has a dream about her son that portends some doom, so she sends to make libations or she prays to avert the bad omen. Menander cleverly uses the dream motif to cast an aura of Tragedy about the play while amusing the audience, who will recognize a benevolent Pan behind the dream, that Cnemon's daughter represents the proverbial ball and chain of a wife, and that Sostratus is putting on a jerkin and swinging a mattock with Gorgias and Davus in order to win the girl. The dream also serves to motivate the arrival of Sostratus' family at Pan's shrine, who will both annoy Cnemon and pave the way for Sostratus' and Gorgias' weddings.

With Sostratus' family now at the shrine, Menander turns back to Cnemon and how his "heroic temper" affects everyone. Cnemon announces his intention to go out to the field (line 427 ff.), but the arrival of Sostratus' family prevents him from leaving because he would rather stay inside than cross paths with anyone. Getas and Sicon then each take turns at going up to the door to ask the old viper for a skillet. Cnemon is irascible and rude to both. Meanwhile Sostratus labors out in the sun along side Gorgias and Davus, keeping an eye out to see if Cnemon will approach (line 522 ff.). What Sostratus doesn't know, however, is that Cnemon will not come out while Sostratus' family sacrifices at the shrine of Pan. When Sostratus, Gorgias, and Davus realize that Cnemon will not be coming, they leave off work and Sostratus wanders over to the shrine of Pan. There he runs into Getas and discovers that his mother is making a sacrifice there. He runs off to get Gorgias and Davus to come and join them.
As soon as Sostratus is gone, Simice comes out of Cnemon's house yelling, "O tragedy! O tragedy! O tragedy!" We find out that she has tried to fish out of the well the bucket she had earlier dropped. She tied the mattock to an old piece of rope, but the rope broke and now she has dropped the mattock down the well too. Cnemon scolds her and orders her inside. He then says, "Woe is me! Woe is my isolation, woe like no other! With these words Cnemon reveals the subtext of the play -- the tragedy of his isolation, both for himself and his family. He may be compared to Philoctetes, who says to Neoptolemus and his men, "Pity me, I am wretched, alone, isolated, suffering with no friend" or again, "As a suppliant I beseech you, do not leave me alone, isolated amidst these ills." The isolated Cnemon then takes a hold of the rotten rope and tries to climb down the well himself to get the bucket and the mattock. Meanwhile Sostratus returns to the shrine of Pan with Gorgias and Davus, as Act III comes to a close.

When Act IV opens, Simice again runs on stage as though in a Tragedy, "Who will help? Woe is me! Who will help?" Sicon overhears and is irritated at the "house of Cnemon," and so says, "What a bizarre house!" Sicon, one of the voices of comedy in the play, notes that those who dramatize their emotions via tragic speech are "bizarre." We discover that Cnemon has fallen in the well. Menander, it seems, has taken Aristotle very literally, and had his tragic hero take a fall. Gorgias, and to a lesser degree Sostratus, help Cnemon from the well. Gorgias and his half-sister then roll Cnemon out on an
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64 Amott's translation of Line 574: ω δυστυχής, ω δυστυχής, ω δυστυχής.
66 Supplements of Winnington-Ingram, which Amott accepts.
67 Philoctetes lines 227-228: ἀλλ' οἰκτίσαντες ἄνδρα δύστυχον, μόνον. / ἔρημον ὡδὲ κάφιλον κακοῦμενν. and 470-471: ἱκέτης ἰκνοῦμι, μὴ λίπης μ' οὕτω μόνον. / ἔρημον ἐν κακοῖα τοῖοιδ... 
68 Line 620: τίς ἄν βοηθήσει: ω τάλαιν ἐγώ. / τίς ἄν βοηθήσει: 
69 Line 624: ω τῆς οἰκίας τῆς ἐκτόπου.
70 Aristotle uses the metaphor of a hero's fall (μεταπτιττω, συμπτιττω) two times in the Poetics: at 1453b2, 1453b15.
"like a stricken tragic hero." We may compare this scene to the ending of Euripides' *Hippolytus*, where Hippolytus is rolled out. Gorgias says to Cnemon, "This is the tragedy of isolation." Cnemon agrees, and says "Tragedies alone can teach us, it seems" While Gorgias quickly gets his mother, who is already at the shrine because Gorgias brought her there earlier, Cnemon asks his daughter to help him up. Here the manuscript has about five missing lines and three more badly damaged lines. When it picks up again, Gorgias has returned with his mother and Cnemon is offering an *apologia pro sua vita*:

nor perhaps [lacuna], nor could any of you change this in me, you'll agree. One mistake perhaps I made (ὁμαιρτον), I thought I was self-sufficient and needed no one. But now that I see how sudden and unexpected death can be, I find that I was nescient. One must always have -- and have handy -- an ally. But by Hephaestus, I had grown so cynical when I saw how everyone lived, and the manner in which they calculated for gain. I thought that no one would be kind to another. This got in my way. Only now has one man proved the contrary -- Gorgias, by his noble deed.  

Cnemon's acknowledgment of his ᾧμαρτία comes at the pivotal point in the play. Michael Anderson, who was noted above, has already called attention to the possible

70 Compare Cnemon's words at line 758: [εἰς ψυχήλετ' εἰσώ ῦ. For the use of the *ekkyklema* in this scene, see Gomme and Sandbach, *Commentary*, 239-240, lines 690-758.
71 E.W. Handley, *Dyskolos*, 249, line 690.
72 Amott's translation, Line 694: τοιούτον ἐστ' ἐρμία κακόν.
Aristotelian echo in Cnemon's use of the word ἠμαρτόν. To recapitulate, Aristotle says, "We are left with the character between these two. Such a man is one who is does not excel in virtue or justice, and does not, because of evil and depravity, suddenly change (μεταβαλλων) to misfortune, but because of some fallibility (ἀμαρτία)." Thus Cnemon's reference to his own ἀμαρτία at such an important juncture may be an allusion to Aristotle. Anderson fails to note, however, that Cnemon's ἀμαρτία is in keeping with Else's view of Aristotle: Cnemon's ἀμαρτία is a failure to recognize his φίλοι.

Anderson also fails to note that Cnemon literally has a change of fortune (μεταβαλλων). Gorgias alludes to Cnemon's μεταβολή when pledging his sister to Sostratus. Gorgias still has Cnemon's fall fresh in his mind when he says to Sostratus, "A man like this [you] will bear a change of fortune (μεταβολῆν τύχης) with poise," using Aristotle's term μεταβαλλων found in the passage with which this chapter began. The Dyscolus, is therefore, an Aristotelian Tragedy turned on its head. With the betrothal of Sostratus to Cnemon's daughter, the "Tragedy" seems to be over at the end of Act IV, just as in Menander's other extant plays.

In the next act, however, a new potential tragedy develops. Sostratus wants his wealthy father, Callippides, to betroth his sister, Callippides' daughter, to the poor Gorgias. Callippides, however, does not "wish to acquire two paupers-in-law at one go, one is quite enough for us." Rather than consider this scene a second plot that has developed, we should see how it is integrated into the play as a whole. Callippides, in effect, becomes another Cnemon. Cnemon's antisocial personality was the barrier to the union of families in the first four acts of the play and the cause of his own tragedy. At the beginning of the last act, wealth threatens to isolate Callippides and cause his own
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76Lines 769-770: καὶ γὰρ μεταβολὴν οὗτος τύχης / ἔγκρατώς.
77Lines 795-796: νῦμφην γὰρ ἁμα καὶ νυμφίον πρωχοῦς λαβεῖν / οὐ βούλομ'. ικανὸν δ' ἐστὶν ἠμῖν ἑτέρων.
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downfall. He too is in danger of becoming another Acrisius or Cepheus. Sostratus spells this out to his father in the following speech, which is meant to recall Gorgias’ earlier speech on the fortunate and the unfortunate, as well as the lesson that Cnemon has learned too late:

You babble on about money, an unstable substance. If you know that it will stay with you for ever, then guard it and don’t share it with anyone. But when you’re not its master (κύριος), when everything you have is not yours, but fortune’s (τύχης), why would you, father, begrudge a share of it to anyone? Fortune herself may snatch everything from you and bestow it to another who is perhaps less deserving. For which reason I say that you ought, as long as you are master (κύριος), use your money nobly, father, help everyone, make well-off as many as is within your power to do so. Such conduct never dies. And if you should ever happen to fall, it will yield the same in return for you. By far it is better to have a visible true friend than wealth that is hidden, which you have buried.\(^{78}\)

Fourteen out sixteen of these lines could stand in a Euripidean Tragedy, and this heightened diction, and the themes contained in it, recall the tone and themes of Gorgias’ speech, which argued that the fortunate man must be careful not to get carried away by his wealth nor look down on the poor man, otherwise he will have a change of fortune. Callippides is a wealthy farmer, and in the light of Gorgias’ claims earlier, he deserves to be only as long as he is not overly proud. Furthermore, Sostratus’ speech draws parallels between Callippides and Cnemon. Cnemon had learned that “One must always have -- and have handy -- an ally (ἐπικουρήσοντ’);” Sostratus tells his father to “be an ally to all

\(^{78}\)Handley’s text (because he, unlike the OCT, follows manuscript B rather than Stobaeus), lines 797-812: ἐπὶ χρημάτων λαλεῖς, ἀβεβαιοῦ πράγματος. / ἐπὶ μὲν γὰρ ὅσα ταῦτα παραμενοῦντά σοι / εἰς πάντα τὸν χρόνον, φύλαττε μηδειν / τοῦτον μεταδίδοις· ὥν δὲ μὴ σοῦ κύριος / εἰ, μηδὲ σαυτὸν τῆς τύχης δὲ πάντ' ἔχεις, / μὴ τί φθονοίς. ὥς πάτερ, τούτων τιν. / αὕτη γὰρ ἄλλως, τοῦχον ἀναξίω τινι, / ἀφελομένη σοῦ ταῦτα προσθῆκει πάλιν. / διότερ ἔγώ σε φημὶ δειν, ὅσον χρόνον / εἰ κύριος, χρησάθαι σε γενναίως. πάτερ. / αὐτῶν, ἐπικουρεῖν πᾶσιν, εὐπόρους ποιεῖν / ὥς ἄν δύνῃ πλείστους διὰ σαυτοῦ. τούτο γὰρ / ἀθάνατον ἔστι, κἂν ποτε πταῖσας τύχης. / ἐκείθεν ἐσται ταῦτο τοῦτο σοι πάλιν. / πολλοὶ δὲ κρείττον ἔστιν ἐμφανῆς φίλος / ἡ πλοῦτος ἀφανής, ὅν σὺ κατορύξας ἔχεις.
Cnemon has just fallen in a well; Sostratus reminds his father that "if you should ever fall (κἂν ποτε πταίσας τύχης)," then your generosity will repay you. Cnemon is no longer κύριος of his household, it has been handed over to Gorgias; Sostratus reminds his father that he is really not the κύριος of his fortune, and if he is not generous, Tyche will hand his wealth over to someone who is "perhaps less worthy (τυχών ἀναξίως τινί ")." Whether Menander means Sostratus to understand that he is talking about himself is unclear. On the whole, the speech does read like a veiled threat. Perhaps Menander wanted the audience to understand and be amused at the unintended self-reference. But the statement is apposite, for Sostratus has not yet demonstrated that he is a hardworking farmer like his father and thus deserving of his inheritance. Callippides is won over, and accedes to his son's wishes. The extent to which he compromises shows his reasonableness, against Cnemon's unreasonableness. As in the Samia, however, the potential bridegroom, Gorgias, feels slighted and will not assent to his own wedding (line 821 ff.). The manuscript is a bit damaged at this point, but it is clear that Sostratus and Callippides prevail upon Gorgias, and he too behaves reasonably and accepts the invitation to wed Callippides' daughter. With Gorgias' assent, all tragedies and potential tragedies have been averted.

With the Tragedy ended, however, Menander returns to Cnemon, who continues to display his antisocial behavior. Cnemon had undergone a tragic περιπέτεια or μεταβολή as a result of his isolation. His heroic temper had begun to crack, as is demonstrated by his switch from simple straightforward pronouncements to using cautious words like ἵσως (lines 711, 713) or optative constructions (line 711), but, in part, his heroic temper and alienation remains. As he himself says to his family "let me live, if I do live, as I wish." When asked about a match for his daughter, he says "Don't bother me,

---

79 Line 735: ἀλλ' ἐμὲ μὲν, ἦν ζωή, ξῆν ἔκθ' ὦς βούλομαι.
by the gods!" and "It's no longer a concern of mine!" He will not even go to her wedding, but asks only that he be rolled inside on the ekkyklema and left alone. In a tragedy, Cnemon's heroic stance would be left in tact, but Menander, it seems, must completely overthrow Cnemon, and therefore all tragic ideology. Cnemon must not simply be left alone in his isolation, he must be forced to join the wedding dance. Thus Getas and Sicon play their trick on him. Cnemon again responds to their presence as though in a tragedy, "Woe is me!" Finally Sicon gets tired of Cnemon's whining and lectures him in a partly damaged speech (lines 931-941). Cnemon responds with another tragic oμω (line 942), but at last accedes that "Perhaps (iδως) it is better to submit to the tortures at the party." Getas responds, "Hooray, we've won!" The Cook and clever slave, who symbolize Comedy, have triumphed over the tragic Cnemon, and like Cnemon, Tragedy itself has been beaten and forced to join the Comedy.

Thus Cnemon is a figure who has been assimilated to Aristotelian tragic norms throughout the play. He commits a hamartia by not recognizing his philoi, and suffers a metabole or peripeteia as a result. As Cnemon, the figure of Tragedy, is overthrown, the Comedy asserts itself and enacts its own ideology. Much of the pleasure and humor the audience derives from watching such a play lies in the fact that Menander reduces and rationalizes the tragic world. Instead of a grand hero like Cepheus or Acrisius, we have the rustic farmer Cnemon and the wealthy Callipides. Instead of contempt of a baseborn son or fear of an oracle, we have contempt of a city-slicker or contempt of the poor. Instead of heroic fall from fortune to misfortune via πάθη or κακά like suicides, blinding, or noisome wounds, Menander has reduced and domesticated the portrayal of human ills and
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80Line 750: μη ἐνόχλει, πρὸς τῶν θεῶν.
81Line 752: οὐδὲν ἐτι τοιοῦτον μοι μέλει.
82Line 919: ὁ δεισιτεχθεὶς ἐγώ.
83Lines 957-958: κρείττων / ιδως ύπομένειν ἐστι τάκει.
84Lines 958-959: κρατοῦκμεν. / ὁ καλλίνικοι.
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sufferings to a fall into a well. The everyday κακά in life resemble the Cnemons of the world and their experiences, not the mythical sufferings of Tragedy. As in the Epitrepontes and Samia, those who dramatize or role-play as though they were tragic characters are corrected, and those that represent Tragedy itself, such as Cnemon, are subverted and forcibly brought under control of the Comedy.
CHAPTER 7:

FROM EURIPIDES TO MENANDER

It is unfortunate that modern readers who approach Menander almost invariably read Menander against Aristophanes rather than Euripides. They are encouraged to do so by many critics or classroom surveys, which frequently approach Menander as a "successor" to Aristophanes,\(^1\) or someone who "transformed" comedy, and by this they mean Old Comedy.\(^2\) Given this emphasis, it is then not surprising that most modern readers are also almost invariably disappointed and find that Menander is a big post-Aristophanic letdown. It is the author's hope that the present study may combat this emphasis on reading Menander with Aristophanes primarily in mind, as the chapter title suggests. For in this study two arguments have been made. One, that Tragedy, as practiced by Euripides and defined by Aristotle, is the central element\(^3\) to understanding, and hence appreciating, Menander's art. Two, Menander did not seek to imitate Tragedy, especially Euripidean Tragedy, as some critics have argued; rather, he sought to rationalize and foil tragic role-playing and Tragedy itself. In this concluding chapter it seems fitting to summarize briefly the results supporting these two arguments and offer a possible

---

\(^1\)Note the title of the chapter on Menander in the *Cambridge History of Classical Literature: From Aristophanes to Menander.*


\(^3\)But of course not the only element.
explanation as to why Menander sought to exploit Euripidean Tragedy in the way that he did. Finally, some closing remarks will be made that offer a broader interpretation of his place within the cultural milieu of fourth-century Athens.

As the analysis of the plays demonstrated, Tragedy is abundantly present in Menander's better-preserved plays on many different levels, including Aristotelian plot-structures, Euripidean prologue speeches, meter, and mythemes. For the first of these, it was shown that all six of Menander's longer surviving plays resonate with Aristotle's discussion of Tragedy. Four out of the six have recognition and reversal scenes (*Epitrepontes*, *Perikeiromene*, *Sicyonius*, and *Dyscolus*). One of them incorporates tragic suffering (*Aspis*). Some utilize *hamartia* (*Samia*, *Dyscolus*, and probably the *Aspis*). The *Dyscolus* actually refers to Cnemon's tumble into the well as a *metabole*. All these ideas are central to Aristotle's analysis of Tragedy. Concerning recognitions and reversals, the present study has ignored the more fragmentary plays, but many of them also had recognition and reversal scenes. The Hypothesis to the *Heros* tells us that there is a recognition scene involving Gorgias and Plangon,\(^4\) who were, as is the case in many myths, born twins. The *Misoumenus* almost certainly had a recognition scene involving Thrasonides' sword, and the *Dactylius* must have had a scene involving a ring, to name but a few more. Menander's familiarity with Aristotelian recognition scenes is best summed up by Webster: "Menander's recognition scenes make such a good commentary on Aristotle's chapter in the *Poetics* that the conclusion is inevitable that Menander knew the Aristotelian classification, whether from Theophrastos' lectures or in some other way."\(^5\)

In addition to Aristotelian elements, the plays share many structural similarities with Tragedy, especially Euripidean Tragedy. Many of the plays have divine prologue speeches: Tyche in the *Aspis*, Pan in the *Dyscolus*, Agnoia in the *Perikeiromene*, and in

\(^4\)Line 11 of the Hypothesis: εὑρεν μὲν ὤ γέρον τοὺς ἑαυτοῦ γυρωμένας...

the fragmentary *Heros*, there appears a Guardian Spirit (*Ἡρως τεσσαρωσ*). The plays are also divided into five acts, which is a late Euripidean characteristic. We saw how some contained an *agon*, including the *Epitrepontes* and *Dyscolus*. Some contained messenger speeches, especially the *Aspis*, *Sicyonius*, and *Dyscolus*. The ancestors of all these elements are to be found in Tragedy, especially Euripidean Tragedy. We also saw how in the *Aspis*, Menander used Tyche as way to secularize and correct a caricatured version of Fate in Tragedy.

Long stretches of unrelieved tragic diction also occur in the well-preserved plays. The *Aspis* opens with seventeen lines of iambic trimeters that could pass for Euripides. In the *Sicyonius*, it was noted that the fragmentary recognition scene also preserves portions of twenty consecutive lines that adhere to the metrical rules of Tragedy. In the *Perikeiromene*, the recognition scene is accompanied by at least 50 straight lines of tragic verse; caesura and Porson's Law are observed, and with the possible exception of one line, anapaests are excluded from all but the first foot. Tragic patches occur throughout the other plays too. In the *Samia*, tragic meter and tragic anger went hand in hand. In fact, an astounding percentage (over 50 percent) of Menander's lines in the better-preserved plays conform to the meter of Tragedy: *Aspis* 61.5%, *Epitrepontes* 56%, *Perikeiromene* 61%, *Samia* 57%, and *Dyscolus* 53%. Simply put, this is no accident. Menander wanted his plays to reverberate with Tragedy throughout.

Furthermore, the plots of the well-preserved plays are built around tragic mythemes, or what Webster calls armature situations. We return to the quote of Satyrus, whence this study began:

Conflicts (between men and women, fathers and sons, masters and slaves), reversals of fortune, rapes of maidens, supposititious children,
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7 Ibid., p. 61.
8 Ibid., p. 57.
and recognitions through both rings and necklaces — for these are surely the things that comprise the Newer Comedy — were brought to the peak of perfection by Euripides.9

We may now better unpack Satyrus' words, which are the earliest critique of New Comedy that we possess. Satyrus claims that it is obvious (δήπου) that the mythemes of Euripidean Tragedy "comprise" (συνέχοντα) New Comedy, the latter of which undoubtedly refers to Menander. The participle συνέχοντα is important. It literally means to "hold together" or "to keep from falling to pieces."10 By this, he means that the mythemes of Euripidean Tragedy are the sinews that hold together and unite the plots of New Comedy. He does not attempt to explain or analyze how the two treatments of these elements differed, rather his biting remark is meant to elevate Euripides and vitiate New Comedy, especially Menander: Menander borrowed (or stole) from Euripides, but even then he failed to achieve Euripides' sublime heights. It is a nice piece of partisan rhetoric, because it implies that the New Comic poets, and Menander in particular, were not only mere imitators, but bad ones. It is a charge that would later be repeated against Menander by the Roman literary critic Latinus, who as we saw in the opening chapter wrote no less than six books on his alleged plagiarisms. But as we have seen, this is just a purposeful misreading, because Menander does not merely borrow or imitate these Euripidean mythemes, he transforms and then undermines their tragic treatment.

To review the plays themselves, we find that in some cases these tragic mythemes are explicitly designated as such by the characters within the plays, including characters in the arbitration of the Epitrepontes, in two scenes of the Samia, in the recognition scene in
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10LSJ 1 and 2.
the Sicyonius, and perhaps in the less well-preserved Heros. In the Epitrepontes, we saw how the recognition involving a child's grandfather is to be found in Euripides' Alope, Tyro, and Auge, and how Syriscus explicitly compares their present predicament to that of Tragedy. The recognition of brother and sister or parent and child, as in the Perikeiromene and Sicyonius, is found in the Electra plays, in Sophocles' Tyro, and in Euripides' Antiope and Alcmaeon in Corinth. In the Sicyonius, the recognition scene between parent and child is designated "empty Tragedy." The mytheme of a father or father figure falsely believing that his son or a guest has seduced his wife, as in the Samia, occurs in Euripides' Phoenix, Hippolytus, and Sthenoboea. In the Samia, Niceratus tells Demeas that Moschion is comparable to the most perverse sexual deviants in Tragedy and that he should "assume the wrath of Amyntor." The Father who secludes his daughter from all suitors, such as Cnemon in the Dyscolus, is found in the many tragedies treating the myths of Danaë and Hippodameia. In the Samia, Demeas specifically refers to the tragic treatment of the Danaë myth, saying to Niceratus, "Tell me, Niceratus, haven't you seen the tragedians show how Zeus became gold, flowed through a roof and once violated a girl who had been locked up?" If more of the ending of the Aspis had survived, it would not be surprising to find that it too was built around a tragic mytheme. Perhaps it is not too rash to posit a play such as Euripides' fragmentary Dictys. In that play, it seems that king Polydectes has designs on Danaë, and while Perseus is away, Polydectes' younger brother Dictys tries to protect her against the advances of his older brother, just as Chaerestratus tries to protect his niece against the overtures of Smicrines.

In addition to the mythemes found in the better-preserved plays, there is a scene in the Heros which may contain a parallel to Euripides' Auge. The play is too fragmentary to be certain, but during the course of the play a certain Myrrhine, who has been raped, speaks with a certain Laches. He questions her about the rape. In one damaged part at the

---

beginning of line 110 (Amott's Loeb), there appears the words 'Ἀλέας Ἀθένας [- -], or "Of Alea Athena..." The name Athena is not spelled in the normal Attic way, but in the Doric form favored in Tragedy. These words seem to coincide with the fragmentary opening of Euripides' Auge. In Euripides' Auge, the heroine may have recalled in the opening lines how she was raped by Heracles within the precinct of the temple of Athena Alea at Tegea. Körte suggested that Laches here asked Myrrhine whether her assailant respected the shrine of the Hero (the deity of the play) to which she clung, and she replied something like, "Did Heracles respect the temple of Athena Alea?," or she quoted from the opening of the tragedy to make her point. In either case, it is reasonably certain that Tragedy was explicitly invoked in this scene in order to make clear that Myrrhine's rape is a reworked mytheme of a rape by a god in Tragedy. Again, the fact that in the preserved portions of three of the six better-preserved plays there are one or more explicit invitations to the audience to compare what is taking place on stage to Tragedy and tragic treatments of the mytheme, suggests that it was central to Menander's art elsewhere too, as Satyrus points out.

Contrary to Satyrus' polemic, however, Menander's use of these tragic mythemes was not mere imitation, but rather he rationalizes them. Gods and royal virgins are replaced with the boy and girl next door. Stodgy old kings are transformed into parsimonious old niggards, losing their royal status but not their bad character. While reducing the social level of the characters, Menander undermines tragic role-playing and the visualizing of one's life through the lens of Tragedy. Thus in the Aspis, Davus' initial tragic monologue parallels his second "tragic act of suffering." The audience is supposed to compare and contrast Davus' two tragic performances, and realize that the first was even

---

12 For the opening of the Auge, see L. Koenen, "Hypothesis zur Auge des Euripides," ZPE 4 (1969): 7-18. He restores the opening lines as: [Ἀλέας Ἀθένας δὲ τὸν ύψιστον δῆμον].

13 See Amott's comments, Menander II, Loeb Classical Library 459 (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1996), 38-39; also see Webster, op. cit. p. 57, who regards Körte's interpretation as "certain."
sillier than the second. When Davus performs his tragic fiddle on Smicrines, the ideal audience's response to the presence of Tragedy within the play is meant to mirror that of Smicrines': "Damn you, Davus, are you quoting saws to me? (413)...Will he never stop?" (415)...You're wearing my patience thin!" (425). Smicrines is too dense, however, to realize that Davus' tragic role-playing is just a deceptive rhetorical trope in life. He is just like the other Smicrines in the Epitrepontes. In the latter play, Syriscus too puts on a tragic act, and even compares himself to the shepherds who save foundlings in tragedies, pointing out that he wears a jerkin just like they. In a line with two meanings, Syriscus also says to Smicrines that "You remember/comprise all of these tragedies." Again, Smicrines buys the rhetoric, and as the father figure who "comprises" the presence of Tragedy in the play, he is worthy of being deceived by Tragedy and mocked by Onesimus and Sophrone at the end of the play, who symbolize Comedy. In the Samia, all the principal male characters in the play are inflamed like figures in Tragedy. When Demeas begins to lose his cool and quote Tragedy, he checks himself and calls Tragedy "bombast." When Niceratus invites Demeas to "assume the rage of Amyntor" and blind his son Moschion as Amyntor blinded Phoenix, Menander's point is not the banal moral that we must not go around acting like Amyntor. Rather, his message is that tragic role-playing is irrelevant nonsense, and so is Tragedy itself. Towards the end of the play when Demeas invites Niceratus to compare himself to the father figure in tragedies, Niceratus' response is again meant to mirror the ideal audience's response: "But what does that have to do with us?" A little bit later, when Demeas confesses his tragic hamartia to Moschion, Moschion calls it unnecessary "sermonizing." In the recognition scene of the Sicyonius, Moschion calls the melodramatic action "empty tragedy."

In every extant case, therefore, where Tragedy is explicitly evoked in Menander, we can detect strongly negative view of Tragedy as irrelevant or empty. It seems safe to conjecture that in the only other fragment of Menander that contains an explicit reference to
Tragedy, where Tragedy is called "chatter," there is also this same subversion of Tragedy. Menander self-consciously and self-referentially presents a more naturalistic world that is invaded by a cross-generic dramatic performance. Tragic role-playing and tragic performances are then undermined as an "empty" show that merely threaten the successful comic resolution of the plot.

The reason why Euripides was the favorite target in Menander, just as he was in the other comedians of the fourth-century, is somewhat paradoxical, but not inexplicable. One reason, no doubt, lies in the fact that Euripides was such an ideological lightning rod at the end of the fifth-century. As Aristophanes makes so clear, his poetry came to symbolize everything that represented the dialectic of the late fifth-century polis. As time went on, his reputation only grew and he continued to be the favored tragedian of the comic poets to parody or burlesque. We will return to this point in a moment.

Another reason why he became symbolic of Tragedy may be found in Aristotle who writes:

At first the poets picked stories at random, but now the finest tragedies are chosen from a few families, such as Alcmaeon, Oedipus, Orestes, Meleager, Thyestes, Telephus, and the others who either suffered or did terrible things. The best tragedy in regards to poetic art possesses this arrangement. For this reason, those make the same mistake [mentioned above] who find fault with Euripides because he does this in his tragedies and ends many of his tragedies in misfortune. For this kind of ending is, as was said above, good. The greatest confirmation of this is that, of those plays staged and entered into competition, such plays like these seem to be the most tragic, if they are well-produced. And Euripides, whatever his other faults of composition may be, at least seems to be the most tragic of poets.14

---

14 Aristotle, Poetics 13,17 (1453b): πρῶτον μὲν γὰρ οἱ ποιηταὶ τοὺς τυχόντας μύθους ἀπηρίθμουσι, νῦν δὲ περὶ ὅλης οἰκίας αἱ καλλίσται τραγῳδίας συντίθενται, οἷον περὶ Ἀλκμέωια καὶ Οἰδίπου καὶ Ὀρέστη καὶ Μέλαγρου καὶ Θύεστη καὶ Τηλέφου καὶ ὀσίων ἄλλων συμβαθέντας ἢ παθεῖν δεινὰ ἢ ποιῆσαι. ή μὲν οὖν κατὰ τὴν τέχνην καλλίστη τραγῳδία ἐκ ταὐτῆς τῆς συστάσεως ἐστὶ. διὸ καὶ οἱ Εὐριπίδης ἐγκαλοῦντες τὸ αὐτὸ ἀμαρτάνουσιν ὅτι τοῦτο δρὰ ἐν ταῖς τραγῳδίαις καὶ αἱ πολλαὶ αὐτοῦ εἰς δυστυχίαν τελευταίαι. τοῦτο γὰρ ἐστὶν ὀστερὴ ἔριθαι ὀρθῶν σημείων δὲ μέγιστον ἐπὶ γὰρ τῶν σκηνῶν καὶ τῶν ἁγώνων τραγικῶταται αἱ τοιαῦτα φαινοῦνται, ἀν κατορθωθῶσιν, καὶ ὁ Εὐριπίδης, εἰ καὶ τὰ ἄλλα μὴ εὖ οἰκονομεὶ, ἀλλὰ τραγικῶτατός γε τῶν ποιητῶν φαίνεται.
Although Aristotle gives the palm to Sophocles' *Oedipus Tyrannus* as the single finest specimen of Tragedy, he, and presumably other fourth-century critics, concede that Euripides had become the poster boy or the essence of Tragedy in the fourth-century. The audience, too, must have felt that way, because of all the old tragedies that we know to have been restaged in the fourth-century, starting in 386 B.C. onwards,¹⁵ all were by Euripides.¹⁶ And although we have evidence for only three straight years (342/341, 341/340, and 340/339), what is impressive is that Euripides was chosen for all three. One would think that either Aeschylus or Sophocles would have been chosen at least once in a three-year period. Another indication that Euripides became synonymous with Tragedy in the fourth-century is that the majority of references to Tragedy by comedians of the fourth-century are references to Euripides, as chapter two demonstrated. There are even plays named after characters who were enamored with his poetry, to wit Axionicus and Philippides each wrote plays entitled *The Lover of Euripides*.

In addition to Aristotle's surprising designation of Euripides as the most tragic, Aristotle's discussion of Tragedy is remarkable for the fact that he, and presumably other contemporary critics, also moved beyond defining what Tragedy actually was to stipulating what Tragedy *ought* to be; namely it ought to be full of suffering and terrible deeds, and it ought to end in misfortune.¹⁷ As we saw earlier, Aristotle felt that suffering so defined Tragedy, that he claimed it was one of the three plot-structures of a Tragedy. He even

---

¹⁶See *IG II²* 2320.
¹⁷D.W. Lucas in commentary, *Poetics: Introduction, Commentary and Appendices* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1968), suggests that by τραγικότατος Aristote meant that "Euripides excels in arousing pity and fear," and he adds his own opinion that "Euripides is most tragic in the sense that he is the most heart-rending of the poets." He goes on to note that "Jebb, who was no great admirer of Euripides, attributed τραγικότατος here the meaning 'most sensational.'" What he fails to note, is that Euripides arouses the most pity and fear and is most heart-rending, according to Aristotle, precisely because he "ends so many of his tragedies in misfortune."
designates a Tragedy of Suffering as one of the species of Tragedy. Never mind that many fifth-century tragedies did not actually end in misfortune or were not full of suffering, and from our vantage point today, none more so than the plays of Euripides. Thus while Euripides and, as Aristotle implies, the other tragedians wrote some lighter escape-dramas, these "happy ending" plays were not considered the finest specimens of tragedies or representative of the essence of Tragedy.

Some of these other fourth-century critics include Theophrastus, the reputed teacher of Menander. He defined Tragedy the following way: τραγωδία ἐστὶν ἡρωικὴς τύχης περίστασις.19 We saw in the last chapter that Aristotle used this last word to mean "the veering round of the wind" (Mete. 364b14, Pr. 942b27), and so Theophrastus' use of the word περίστασις seems to mean much the same thing as Aristotle's περιπέτεια and μεταβολή.20 We may safely assume that Theophrastus also felt that the change from fortune to misfortune was most tragic. The fourth-century Roman grammarian Diomedes, who reports Theophrastus' definition, certainly thought Theophrastus felt that way, for he translates the Greek into Latin as Tragoedia est heroicae fortunae in adversis comprehensio. It is interesting to contrast Aristotle and Theophrastus with the only fifth-century definition of Tragedy that we possess. Gorgias of Leontinoi defined a tragedy as "a deception (apate) in which the deceiver is more just than the one who does not deceive, and the deceived is cleverer than the undeceived."21 It is

---

18Poetics 1455b2ff.: τραγωδίας δὲ εἰδὴ εἰσὶν τέσσαρα...ἡ μὲν πεπλεγμένη...ἡ δὲ παθητικὴ...ἡ ἡθικὴ...τὸ δὲ τέταρτον ὁμι...  
19Ars grammatica III.8.125 (= G. Kaibel, Comicorum Graecorum Fragmenta I, 57).  
inadequate, to be sure, but at least it has the decided virtue of covering plays such as Euripides’ Helen.

The fourth-century comedians also caricatured Tragedy as full of suffering, killing, and madness. It is even tempting to assert that when Aristotle alludes to those who “find fault with Euripides because he ... ends many of his tragedies in misfortune,” he is referring to the comedians. We recall Antiphanes’ discussion of Tragedy, the most blest of genres:

The art of writing Tragedy is blessed in every way, firstly at least because its stories are well-known by the spectators, even before anyone speaks, so that it is only necessary for the poet to make an allusion. For if I only make mention of Oedipus, they also know all the rest: His Father was Laius; his mother Jocasta; his daughters; some of his children; what he suffered; what he did. Should anyone again mention the name Alcmaeon, straight away the spectator lists even his children, and that in madness he killed his mother, and how in anger Adrastus straight-away will have come back and will go away [lacuna] 22

It is always easier to support one’s own argument, or in this case art, by stereotyping the competition. That is why Antiphanes mentions figures like Oedipus, Alcmaeon, and Adrastus. Antiphanes makes their sufferings, death, madness, and anger the epitome of Tragedy so he can more easily undermine it and elevate his own art. A fragment of Timocles reflects a similar view, and is interesting, in part, because just as in Antiphanes, it also lists Alcmaeon in its tragic hall of fame:

My good sir, listen to whether I seem to say something to you. Mankind is a creature born for toils, and many are the sorrows his life brings with it. For this reason he has devised these diversions from his cares. For his mind takes leave of its own troubles and, coming under the spell of another’s suffering,

---

22 Athenaeus at VI.222 A [Kassel and Austin, PCG vol. II, Antiphanes fr. 189]: μακάριόν εἰσιν ἡ τραγῳδία / ποίημα κατὰ πάντα, εἰ γε πρῶτον οἱ λόγοι / ὑπὸ τῶν θεάτων εἰσὶν ἐγκωφισαμένοι / πρὶν καὶ τίν’ εἰπεῖν  ἢ δῆσαι  ὑπομνησαί μόνον / δεὶ τῶν ποιητῶν. Οἰδίπους γὰρ + φῶς, / τὰλλα πάντας ίασίν ὁ πατήρ Λάιος, / μήτηρ Ἰοκάστη, δυγατέρες, παῖδες τίνες, / τί πεισθ’ οὔτος, τί πεποιηκεν. ἂν πάλιν / εἰπῃ τὶς Ἀλκιμέωνα, καὶ τὰ παιδία / πάντες εὐθὺς ἔφηρ’ , ὅτι μανεῖς ἀπέκτων / τὴν μητέρ’ ἀγανακτῶν δ’ Ἀδραστός εὐθέως / ἧξει πάλιν τ’ ἀπείχαι - ο’ - υ’ -/
departs with joy and guidance to boot. First look at the tragedies, if you please, and how they benefit everyone. For when the poor man learns that Telephus is more beggarly than himself, from then on he bears his own penury more easily. The sick man sees that Alcmaeon was also somewhat mad. Someone is blind -- so too the sons of Phinius. Someone's child has died -- Niobe provides comfort. Someone is lame -- he sees Philoctetes. Someone meets misfortune in old age -- he learns of Oeneus. For he takes it to heart that all his misfortunes "which are greater than anyone has suffered" have happened to others, and so he himself groans even less over his own calamities.

These seemingly earnest words are reported without any context, but instinct alone tells us that in the mouth of a comic poet they cannot be taken at face value. Tragedy is being defined as a world cluttered with the afflicted who can help us negotiate our own present troubles. Presumably the intent is similar to Menander’s. Exploit the popular perception that Tragedy is only about suffering heroes who are supposedly able to speak to our modern lives, only to turn the tables on Tragedy and make it irrelevant. We may compare Davus’ sorrowful prologue in the Aspis, and then his subsequent words to Chaerestratus and Chaereas, which proceed from the assumption that a tragic performance is a

23Euripides wrote a Telephus. For the beggarliness of Euripides' characters, see Aristophanes' Acharnians 418 ff., where, as in this passage, Telephus, Oeneus, and Philoctetes are all mentioned -- Telephus the most beggarly of all.

24No doubt the Alcmaeon of Euripides is alluded to here.

25Both Aeschylus and Sophocles wrote a Phinius.

26Sophocles wrote a Niobe.

27Aeschylus, Sophocles, and Euripides wrote a Philoctetes.

28Chaeremon wrote an Oeneus.


237
The dramatization of suffering: "You two must act out another tragedy of suffering" (lines 329-30: δεῖ τραγωδησαί πάθος / ἄλλοιον ψυχῆς).

The stipulation of Aristotle and other fourth-century critics, including comedians, that the finest tragedies contained suffering and ended in misfortune has been so authoritative that it has had a profound impact on what later generations have assumed about Greek Tragedy. In fact, the vast majority of modern students who are exposed for the first time to actual Greek tragedies like Euripides' *Iphigenia among the Taurians* or *Helen* invariably argue that these are not "real" tragedies. They expect horror, suffering, and the stage littered with dead bodies at play's end. But it is not just modern students. A quick division of the surviving plays of Euripides into plays that end in death or survival suggests that this was also the case in antiquity.\(^\text{30}\) Naturally, some may disagree with the following placement, but the results may still prove to be instructive. First all the plays are listed:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DEATH</th>
<th>SURVIVAL</th>
<th>DUPLEX OR UNCERTAIN</th>
<th>(PRO)SATYR</th>
<th>SPURIOUS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Medea</td>
<td>Heracleidae</td>
<td>Andromache</td>
<td>Cyclops (happy)</td>
<td>Rhesus (sad)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hippolytus</td>
<td>Supplices</td>
<td>Iphigenia in Aulis</td>
<td></td>
<td>Alcestis (happy)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hecuba</td>
<td>Electra</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heracles Furens</td>
<td>Iphigenia in Tauris</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Troades</td>
<td>Ion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phoenissae</td>
<td>Helen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iphigenia in Aulis</td>
<td>Orestes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bacchae</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the preceding survey, the *Andromache* is listed as *duplex*, because although Peleus laments the death of Neoptolemus at the end, the two heroines, Andromache and Hermione, both survive. The *Iphigenia at Aulis* is uncertain due to the fact that the ending of the play as we have it is considered spurious, given that Aelian's summary of the play *(Historia Animalium 7.39)* states that Artemis substituted a deer for Iphigenia.

\(^\text{30}\) The idea for this division was suggested to me on April 10, 1998 by David Lupher on the Classics List.
If we further divide the surviving plays of the Euripidean corpus into the two major categories, the "canonical" and the "alphabetic," the results are even more suggestive. The canonical plays (compiled by the third-century A.D.) yield the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DEATH</th>
<th>SURVIVAL</th>
<th>DUPLEX</th>
<th>PROSATYRIC</th>
<th>SPURIOUS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Medea</td>
<td>Orestes</td>
<td>Andromache</td>
<td>Alcestis</td>
<td>Rhesus (death)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hippolytus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hecuba</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Troades</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phoenissae</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bacchae</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The plays from the alphabetic collection provide a stark contrast:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DEATH</th>
<th>SURVIVAL</th>
<th>UNCERTAIN</th>
<th>SATYR</th>
<th>SPURIOUS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Heracles Furens</td>
<td>Iphigeneia in Aulis</td>
<td>Electra</td>
<td>Cyclops</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplices</td>
<td>Iphigeneia in Tauris</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ion</td>
<td>Helen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Now, the "alphabetical" reflects a "random sampling," whereas the "canonical" list is just what the name suggests: a school reading list compiled by schoolmasters who will have their own ideas about what is "tragic" and what is not. Presumably they were following a tradition that possibly had its roots all the way back to the fourth-century. The impression that one gets from the preceding survey is that the schoolmasters bent over backwards to stack the deck in such a way as to make Euripides conform to what Aristotle defined as the finest tragedy, i.e. one that is full of suffering and has an unhappy ending. We saw how the Andromache ends with the lament of Neoptolemus' death, so it does have an ending without survival in that sense. The second Hypothesis of the Alcestis tells us that it was staged in the fourth position in place of the satyr play, so presumably the schoolmasters wished to give their students one satyresque play. But even if they did not know that the Alcestis was prosatyric, the central character dies onstage, amidst bonafide laments, even if she does come back to life later on. The Orestes is the only canonical tragic play with a
happy ending, which is hastily brought about through the intercession of Apollo. Even more instructive is the fact that were it not for the random sampling of the alphabetic list, we would have no surviving satyr play. The propensity to canonize Euripidean plays with catastrophic endings may also explain the reason why the spurious Rhesus was let in under the name of Euripides.

The fact that by the fourth-century Euripides' plays of suffering became synonymous with Tragedy also explains why Menander could end his plays on a happy note, like many of Euripides' plays, and yet not seem Euripidean or tragic. Indeed, the happy endings of New Comedy are essentially different from the tragic happy ending in that the new comic endings are built around ignorance: the real peripeteia of New Comedy is the recognition (anagnorisis) that Tragedy is an illusion. For tragic endings, on the other hand, it is the outcome itself that is happy, not the realization that life is not a Tragedy. Quintilian's and other critics' contention, detailed in the opening chapter, that Menander simply "imitated" or "quoted tragedy as a source of wisdom" is, therefore, misleading. The traditional rivalry between the two major dramatic genres continued in Menander, only the methods and aims changed. Those who view Menander's exploitation of Euripidean Tragedy as expressions of appreciation are not unlike the early biographers who made arbitrary selections from dramatic texts to support their fictitious assumptions both biographical and doxographic.

The question now arises, why, except possibly in the Achaians or a few other lost plays, did Menander (and presumably other New Comic poets) engage Tragedy in the manner that he did, rather than in the way that Aristophanes did and what we know about the other comic poets? Why did he not make a tragic poet a character in his play, or quote Tragedy without intending anything other than recognizing the quote as such, or personally sneer at a tragedian, or parody Tragedy, or write burlesque of it, or bring a tragedian back from the grave? The inevitable answer must be that his aim was different, or that he
decided that a new approach was needed to meet the same objective. Part of the reason why his aim and methods were different must lie in the fact that the *polis* had changed.

Menander was born the son of Diopeithes of the deme of Cephisia when Sosigenes was archon in 342/341.\(^\text{31}\) The sources indicate his father was a well-connected Athenian, and this is borne out by the fact that Diopeithes appears in a catalogue of *diaitaetai*.\(^\text{32}\) Menander would have been about four years of age when Philip II defeated the Athenians and Thebans at Chaeronea, and thus Athens would have been under Macedonia's thumb for almost his entire life. While he was growing up, he would have witnessed leading democratic politicians, such as Demosthenes and Lycurgus, refuse to accept Chaeronea as the swan song of Athenian independence.\(^\text{33}\) In the decade immediately after Chaeronea, Lycurgus in particular would attend to a Periclean-esque building program that would have a profound impact on Menander. As public treasurer (337-325/324), Lycurgus carried out the alterations to the Theater of Dionysus. In addition to outfitting it in marble, as a part of the renovation he authorized the erection of bronze statues in honor of the tragic triumvirate, Aeschylus, Sophocles, and Euripides. He also authorized public funds for official copies to be made of all their plays (which were later "borrowed" by the Ptolemies, but never returned), from which the actors could not deviate.\(^\text{34}\) We have seen that the three great masters were restaged every year at the City Dionysia as early as 386, so Lycurgus only cast in bronze an existing model. Aristotle, too, looked back a century earlier for his ideal tragedies.

\(^{31}\text{IG XIV 1184 Μένανδρος Διοπείθους Κηρυσίευς ἐγεννηθὲ ἐπὶ ἄρχοντος Σωιαγένους...}\)

\(^{32}\text{Anonymous *On Comedy* (Kaibel, CGF I p. 9): Μένανδρος δὲ Διοπείθους υἱὸς Ἀθηναίος, λαμπρὸς καὶ βίορ καὶ γένει. His father appears as a *diaitētes* on IG II² 1926, 19 in the year 325/4, which means he was born in 385/4.}\)

\(^{33}\text{For the *Restorationspolitik* of this period, see U. Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *Aristoteles und Athen* vol. I (Berlin: Wiedmann, 1966), 351 ff.}\)

\(^{34}\text{Pseudo-Plutarch, *Lives of the Ten Orators* 841 F.}\)
It was in the midst of this official tragic enshrinement that Menander grew up and was educated. Tradition states that Menander was the pupil of Theophrastus. This is quite possible. Theophrastus was born on the island of Lesbos around 370 B.C., but came with Aristotle to Athens in 334 B.C., when Menander would have been about seven years old. We have seen how it is obvious that Menander was familiar with Aristotle's writings, to which perhaps Theophrastus exposed his young pupil, or perhaps even Aristotle himself lectured to Menander. At any rate, it seems likely that Menander was associated with the Lyceum in some capacity.

Menander served his first year of service as an ephebe when he was nineteen years of age in 323/322, the year Alexander the Great died. Alexander's death precipitated revolt among some mainland Greek states, including Athens, which culminated in the so-called Lamian or Hellenic War. Macedonian sympathizers or perceived sympathizers, which included Aristotle and many other intellectuals, fled the city. The Lyceum was particularly suspected of being partisan to the Macedonians, because it had strong Macedonian associations if for no other reason than that its leader, Aristotle, had been born way up north in Chalcidice, which Philip had incorporated into Macedonia, and he had been hired by Philip II to be Alexander's tutor. Once Aristotle left Athens for fear of the democrats, Theophrastus succeeded Aristotle as head of the Lyceum.

The Lamian revolt, however, was short-lived. In fact, in the next year, during Menander's second year of service as an ephebe in 322/321 (apparently a fellow-ephebe of Epicurus), Cleitus annihilated the Athenian fleet off the island of Amorgos. In this battle,
Athenian naval power "now sank for ever." Shortly after this, Antipater defeated the Greek allies at Crannon in Thessaly in the August of 322. Amorgos and Crannon were the final nails in Athens' political and military coffin. She would never again be a serious political or military player.

These defeats no doubt left a lasting impression on Menander, who would have been in the field during all this, for during the second year of compulsory military service, the ephebes were stationed at various fortified sites in the Attic *chora*. In fact, one of these fortresses is located at Phyle, near the cave of Pan on Mount Parnes. It leads from Chassia up Mount Parnes by a difficult pass to the west of Harma and the deme of Phyle, over the watershed into the Scourta plain, and thus is the most direct route to Thebes. The fort is one of several which were refurbished in 337/336 B.C. Demosthenes in his *On the Crown* 38, which was written in 330 B.C., also tells us that an ephebic garrison was stationed at Phyle. Of course, Phyle is the scene of Menander's *Dyscolus*, and it seems reasonable to assume that Menander's familiarity with the area was gained during his days as an ephebe five years before he wrote the *Dyscolus*.

After Amorgos and Crannon, Menander also would have witnessed the purge in Athens that followed. Antipater shipped off twelve thousand Athenian democratic rabble-rousers to Thrace and installed a Macedonian garrison in the Piraeus. Leading advocates of armed resistance, such as Hypereides, were hunted down, tortured before Antipater's eyes, and killed. Others such as Demosthenes escaped a similar fate only by committing

---

38 Édouard Will, *Cambridge Ancient History* VII, 32.
40 *IG* II² 244, line 244.
suicide.\textsuperscript{42} Theophrastus, in his \textit{Characters}, provides us with a glimpse of the precarious circumstances in Athens after Amorgos and Crannon, and the extent to which Macedonian politics dominated Athenian life. The Braggart (23), the most likely date of which is 320/319,\textsuperscript{43} relates how

he campaigned with Alexander, and how Alexander felt about him...and that he's got no less than three letters from Antipater summoning him to visit Macedonia, and that he has declined a grant to him for the duty-free export of timber, because he refuses to be prey to even one informer -- "The Macedonians should have been smarter than that!" And that during the food shortage his expenses in giving to destitute citizens amounted to more than five talents -- he just can't bring himself to say no.\textsuperscript{44}

It is clear that many Athenians, such as this trader, stood in fear of the pro- and anti-collaborationist currents that swirled around them. Wealthy Athenians like Menander, however, survived. Antipater, "conscious of where his best support lay, went easy on wealthy Athenians in the terms he dictated: they kept their lands and possessions."\textsuperscript{45} He also slashed voter rolls to a mere nine thousand by making citizenship contingent upon the possession of a minimum fortune of two thousand drachmas. It was also at this time that the \textit{theorikon} was probably abolished.\textsuperscript{46} Up until now, an ordinary laborer had been paid a wage so that all citizens could attend the theater, including the poorest. This must have drastically altered the make up of the audience.\textsuperscript{47} Coincidentally, it was in this same year

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{42}Ibid, p. 11.
\item \textsuperscript{43}See Peter Green, op. cit. p. 70 and bibliography cited there.
\item \textsuperscript{44}\textit{Characters} 23, translation by Jeffrey Rusten in the Loeb.
\item \textsuperscript{45}Peter Green, op. cit. p. 11.
\item \textsuperscript{46}For the history of the \textit{theorika}, see J. Buchanan, \textit{Theorika: A Study of Monetary Distributions to the Athenian Citizenry during the Fifth and Fourth Centuries B.C.} (Locust Valley, NY, 1962).
\end{itemize}
that Menander, while still serving as an ephebe,\textsuperscript{48} probably produced his first play, the \textit{Orge} and won his first victory with it, probably at the Lenaea.\textsuperscript{49}

As Menander’s poetic career proceeded, he would have witnessed more brutal political intrigues. After Antipater had wiped out the Greek rebellion and slashed voter’s rights, he installed an oligarchic government, led by the likes of Demades and the elderly aristocrat Phocion. Of course Antipater’s position outside Athens was far from secure -- he was engaged in a struggle with the other Alexandrian \textit{epigoni}, such as Perdiccas and Antigonus The One-Eyed. Athenian oligarchs like Demades, who had actually attempted to win many democratic concessions from Macedonia, felt compelled to hedge their bets on Antipater’s rivals. When Antipater and Cassander, however, uncovered evidence in 319 that Demades had intrigued with Perdiccas and seemed to have contacts with Antigonus, he was put to death along with his son. According to one account, Cassander personally murdered him with his own hands and hurled bloody insults at him to boot.\textsuperscript{50} Such brutality must certainly have been the subject of reflection in the Athenian Agora and gymnasia, as it was intended to be.

Shortly after Demades’ death, Menander would witness another short-lived Athenian bid for independence. When Antipater died in 319, on his deathbed he bequeathed his office of \textit{epimeletes} to Polyperchon rather than his son Cassander. Cassander did not appreciate this slap in the face, and immediately began organizing a coalition against Polyperchon. His first step in Athens was to install as commander of the garrison at the Piraeus his close and loyal friend Nicanor, who was Aristotle’s adopted son and provided yet another link between the Peripatetics and Macedonian rule. With

\textsuperscript{48}Anonymous \textit{On Comedy} [Körte, testimonia 2 = Kaibel, \textit{CGF} I p. 9] έδιδοξε Πρώτον ἐφησος διὰ ἐπὶ Διοκέτους ἄρχοντος. No Diocles was archon in this period, so the text has been emended to Philocles, who was archon in 322/1.

\textsuperscript{49}The sources are confused. On the evidence available, the archonship of Philocles in 322/1 seems the most likely date. See Körte and Thierfelder \textit{Menandri Quae Supersunt}, testimonia 23a-c. Also see Arnot’s discussion in his Loeb, pp. xiv-xv.

\textsuperscript{50}Quintilian 2.17.12, and \textit{Suda} s.v. Δημαδης.
Cassander lined up on the side of the aristocrats, Polyperchon shrewdly threw in his lot with the democrats.

Polyperchon made a proclamation stating that he would give amnesty to political exiles and return the constitution as it existed *ante bellum Lamium*. Theophrastus' Rumor-Monger in the *Characters* (8) again captures the mood in Athens. The Rumor-Monger relates how people told him "that Polyperchon and the king [Philip Arrhidaeus] were victorious in battle, and Cassander has been taken prisoner. And if you say to him, 'Do you believe it?' he will say he does, because it's the talk of the city..." Polyperchon's ploy was a direct appeal to the democrats and the disenfranchised to throw off the bondage of the oligarchy, and it worked. The pro-Macedonians were thrown out of office and strong democrats were elected in their place. Various oligarchic leaders, including the elder Phocion, were condemned to death or exiled. One of those who fled at this time was Demetrius of Phalerum, to whom we will return. Phocion himself in 317 was dragged back to Athens on a wagon through a hostile mob. Before the Assembly *in the theater*, a letter from Philip Arrhidaeus, which Polyperchon probably drafted himself, was read aloud that condemned Phocion and other oligarchic figures as traitors. The crowd shouted for Phocion's head on a platter, and they got their wish. He was forced to drink hemlock, and his body was cast out of Attica to the cheers of the hysteric crowd.

In the spring of 317, Cassander brought thirty-five ships and four thousand men into the Piraeus. Polyperchon meanwhile had suffered or was about to suffer severe defeats on land and sea. Cassander simply attacked Athens' perennial Achilles' heel by blockading the Piraeus and thus Athens' critical seaborne supplies. He also set about the reduction of the rest of Attica. This meant another round of starvation for the Athenians.

---

51 *Characters* 8. Translation by Jeffrey Rusten, Loeb.
52 See Plutarch, *Phocion*.
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Rather than face those prospects, by the summer of 317 Athenian envoys capitulated. Fortunately for the Athenians, Cassander was not interested in their destruction, but rather he wanted the throne of Macedonia. He needed to keep his rear protected, so he installed another pro-Macedonian government. He, like Antipater, left Athens in the charge of the wealthier aristocrats. He appointed Demetrius of Phalerum as epimeletes\(^5^4\) of the city. Demetrius, too, was a pupil of Theophrastus, a product of the Lyceum, and a prolific writer.\(^5^5\) Athens, it seemed, would have their own Platonic, or rather Peripatetic, philosopher-king after all.

It was the following spring, in Demetrius' first year of office, that Menander produced his *Dyscolus*. The didascalic notice prefixed to the Bodmer Codex tells us that it won first prize at the Lenaea.\(^5^6\) Given the political climate around him, it is not surprising that some find that the *Dyscolus* seems to be somewhat apolitical. The waves of deaths and exiles of oligarchic and democratic factions alike in recent months and years must have made public political talk almost unheard-of, and private talk dangerous. The constant jostling between the wealthy and the poor citizens of Athens, which was always a source of bitter and deadly contention, must have been exacerbated by the Macedonian presence which poisoned the *polis* even further. Phocion's death at the hands of a furious mob just months before testifies to the immense class divisions and resentments. One of the first things that Demetrius of Phalerum pushed through were sumptuary laws aimed at curbing excessive displays of wealth. These put an end to marvelous funerary and choregic monuments, some of which still grace the Street of Tombs, the Kerameikos, and the city of Athens today. He also instituted a board of overseers, the *gynaikonomoi*, to see to it that


\(^{55}\)Almost fifty titles of works by him are listed by Diogenes Laertius 5.80-81 on a wide variety of subjects from Homer to Tyche.

\(^{56}\)ἐδιδαξεν εἰς Αἴγυπτον ἐπὶ Δημογένους ἀρχουτ(ος) καὶ ἐνίκα.
women's expenditures on clothes, jewelry, servants, and carriages were modest. He even restricted breakfast and dinner parties of more than thirty guests. Clearly all these acts were promulgated to alleviate the appearance of class divisions. In the Dyscolus we do, in fact, find that these class divisions are gingerly addressed. We are told that Cnemon is a modest farmer who works the paltry rocks of Attica. His stepson Gorgias is barely scraping by. The wealthy Sostratus is the son of wealthy farmer, but he himself has become a pampered city-slicker. Gorgias says Cnemon will not marry his daughter to Sostratus unless he looks like a farmhand. Sostratus' father, Callippides, does not want to wed his daughter to Gorgias, because he does not want to acquire two paupers at one go. Sostratus lectures his father on the instability of wealth and how it is important to be generous and build friendships. In light of current events, Sostratus' comments on wealth and status would probably not have seemed merely another example of "moralizing asides thrown in to give these puffball plays extra weight." Certainly Menander is dancing around these important issues, and ultimately the jagged edges that protrude are quickly smoothed over by means of the comic ideology overtaking the tragic. But then, that is the point. The high-voltage civic and tribal conflicts that characterize fifth-century Tragedy's dialectic, while more sensational and interesting, also energized shocking behavior. What was needed, perhaps Menander thought, was a new message that undermined Tragedy's dialectic and advocated more of a concordia ordinum. Ultimately Cnemon's tragically heroic stance, and hence Tragedy's dialectic itself, had to be beaten into comic submission. Perhaps it is easy to scoff at a message that amounts to not much more than "Get along, and fulfill your responsibility to the oikos, or else be mocked," but the alternative from long experience seemed to be continued violence, or complete withdrawal from everything,

---

57 Philochorus apud Athenaeus 6.245 C.
58 Peter Green, op. cit. p. 67.
including family life. Menander's position was in many ways no different than Vergil's or Horace's, in that all had to engage their audience within political realities.

In 316/315, the year after the *Dyscolus* won at the Lenaea, the *Marmor Parium* states that Menander had his first victory.\(^{59}\) It is only possible to reconcile the conflicting testimonia if we assume that the *Marmor Parium* refers to his first victory at the City Dionysia, and that the *Orge* was victorious at the Lenaea, as was the *Dyscolus*. It was probably this same year that Demetrius abolished the *choregia* -- the liturgy that wealthier citizens undertook to outfit and train a chorus. It was replaced by the *agonothetes*, an officer who oversaw the production costs with monies from the state.\(^{60}\) It was another instance of private citizens no longer expressing civic pride or involvement in the *polis*.

Demetrius of Phalerum continued to rule Athens until 307, the year Antigonus moved against Cassander. Antigonus outfitted his son Demetrius, not yet known as Poliorcetes, with a fleet of 250 ships. Demetrius sailed into the Piraeus without warning, and captured the fortress at Munychia after a brief siege. He proclaimed that he was restoring the Athenians their ancestral form of government and promised food and timber.\(^{61}\) Demetrius of Phalerum was given safe conduct to Thebes, and then later migrated to Alexandria where he helped organize the Museum and Library. He received the Athenian equivalent of the *damnatio memoriae*. The Athenians immediately revoked all the decrees in his honor, and removed all his statues, save one on the Acropolis.\(^{62}\)

Theophrastus, like Aristotle before him, fled Athens in fear of the democrats' return to power. His premonitions were well-founded. Sophocles of Sunium immediately made

\(^{59}\) *Marmor Parium* B., ep. 14: ἄρχοντος Ἀθηναίοι Δημοκλείδου. ἐνίκα δὲ καὶ Μένανδρος ὁ κομιδοποιός Ἀθηναίων τὸτε πρῶτον.


\(^{61}\) Plurarch, *Demetrius* 10.

a proposal that banned the establishment of all new schools of philosophy without prior authorization of the Assembly. The law was clearly aimed at the Peripatetics, who had been firmly linked with Macedonian rule. Theophrastus himself was prosecuted (unsuccessfully) for impiety because he had declared Tyche the sovereign in all human affairs\(^{63}\) The evidence to support the charge was found in his work titled Callisthenes. Specifically he endorsed a passage in the tragic poet Chaeremon that we saw quoted by Menander in the Aspis: Τῦχη τὰ θυτῶν πράγματ', οὐκ εὐβουλία.\(^{64}\) We should also recall that Theophrastus' pupil Demetrius of Phalerum also wrote a treatise on Tyche, claiming that Tyche "transforms everything in the way we do not expect and displays her power by surprises." Clearly Tyche was a philosophical notion that the democrats found to be inconsistent with traditional religious notions. We saw how Menander's Aspis presents the same picture, and how it was a correction of the "traditional" view of Fate and the gods. Only Menander's view of Tyche is more optimistic.

It is not surprising to find that at this time it is reported that Menander was almost prosecuted too, because he was a friend of Demetrius of Phalerum. Probably the fact that he was a student of Theophrastus and that his plays seemed to propagate a similar view of Tyche played a role. Our source for this tells us that he was only spared through the intercession of Telesphorus, the cousin of Demetrius Poliorcetes.\(^{65}\) It is an open question, therefore, whether Menander's plays, in a sense, supported Demetrius of Phalerum's regime. They do reflect a tendency not to rock the boat. Menander, however, continued to write his plays for the Athenian stage after Demetrius was exiled, and this suggests that he was congenial with whoever was in power because he considered himself an artist above
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\(^{63}\)Diogenes Laertius 5.39, 51-58; Cicero Tusculan Dispositions 5.9.

\(^{64}\)Chaeremon, Nauck, TGF\(^2\) p. 782.

\(^{65}\)Diogenes Laertius 5.79: Μένανδρος ὁ κομικὸς παρ' ἀλίγου ἔλθε κριθῆναι δι' οὐδὲν ἄλλο ἡ ὁτι φίλος ἡν αὐτῷ. ἄλλ' αὐτὸν παρητήσατο Τελέσφορος ὁ ἀνεμίδος τοῦ Δημητρίου.
all else. The next firm date for a play of Menander is 302/301 B.C., when a papyrus states that Lachares prevented his *Imbrians* from being staged. Lachares in the next year or two declared himself tyrant, so it is difficult to know what to make of this. He was a friend of Cassander, who was pro-oligarchic earlier, but he was defeated by the seemingly more pro-democratic Demetrius Poliorcetes. At any rate, after 307 B.C. a period of considerable instability resulted, with several changes of government. Menander died in 292/291, apparently drowning in the Piraeus. In what must either be a nice twist of Tyche or a purposeful act, he was buried along the road leading from the Piraeus to the city near the cenotaph of Euripides.

The *polis*, therefore, certainly was a much different place in Menander's day, and this is reflected in Menander's plays. As an aspiring poet who hoped to achieve a name in Athenian dramatic history, he knew that his own art would be measured not only against his contemporary competitors, but more importantly by the standards of a long and illustrious tradition. His plays, if successful, would literally be staged in the shadows cast by the statues of the three great tragedians, whose plays would be re-performed along side his every year. Retrospective hagiolatry, however, does not engender originality in any art. The stress that Aristotle laid on *mimesis* perhaps deepened and widened an already existing artistic rut. Tragedies continued to be written, to be sure. In fact, we know the names of over a hundred fourth-century and Hellenistic tragedians, but their work was never praised by succeeding generations and survives in mere fragments, presumably because they simply repeated worn-out plots. A later group of seven tragedians at the court of Ptolemy Philadelphus (c. 285-246) that gained some recognition is typical of the period. They became known as the Pleiades, and their literary worth, in keeping with the shape of
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66Ovid, *Ibis* 591 ff. and the scholiast *ad loc.*
67Pausanias 1.2.2.
68See Bruno Snell, *Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta* vol. I (Götlingen, 1971), 189-312 and especially the list of names on pages vi-viii.
constellation they were named after, was questionable. A quick glance at the plays' titles of the most famous of the seven, Lychochon, look suspiciously familiar: Andromeda, Heracles, Suppliants, and Hippolytus.

Menander, however, and perhaps New Comedy in general, were different. Menander set about broaching, with restraint, those almost ironclad literary conventions governing fifth-century Tragedy, which stipulated among other things what type of language, vocabulary, actions, and plots were acceptable to stage. New Comedy is often criticized for having a remarkably narrow and formulaic range of plots: kidnappings, rapes, recognitions, and reversal of fortunes. As Satyrus points out, however, these are the conventional plots of Euripidean Tragedy. Menander took these conventions and pushed them further, trying to put on stage something that at least approached life as it was actually lived. In the process, his chosen dialogue with Tragedy was not rancor, personal sneer, parody, or burlesque. His chosen method was much more subtle. We saw in Chapter Two how prior to Menander, Comedy parodied or engaged in burlesque of Tragedy. So long as Tragedy was a living voice in the polis, Comedy maintained a parasitic or symbiotic relationship with Tragedy in that it depended upon the living voice of Tragedy for its comic effects. The attitudes of the parodists varied. Some sought to mock a particular tragedian, or a particular verse, but not Tragedy itself. Some merely parodied Tragedy to mock others. The end result of both of these attitudes was paradoxically the same: the original text was preserved. As Lutz Röhrich has pointed out in his work on parody, regardless of the parodist's intent, parody often is not only destructive, but also reconstructive:

Parodistische Veränderungen vorgegebenen Traditionsmaterials dürfen nicht nur negativ als Zersungenes oder Zersagtes angesehen werden. Sie

69 Compare Peter Green's comments on the Pleiades, Alexander to Actium (Berkeley: The University of California Press, 1990), p. 66. "...their fame seems to have been largely due to royal propaganda and sedulous self-promotion."
offenbaren zugleich auch einen Prozess sprachlicher Umbildung und Neubildung.\textsuperscript{70}

It is no coincidence, therefore, that one of the best sources for recovering the tradition of fifth-century Athenian high drama is to be found in many comic parodies and burlesques. Even the titles and fragments of such burlesques are often enough to give scholars some important clues about the original.

More importantly, the fact that a close parodying of a text preserves its original may suggest an important explanation for a peculiar trait of Menander's use of Tragedy. As was pointed out throughout this dissertation, Menander rarely, if ever, carries on a dialogue with a specific tragedy, rather he exploits specific tragic mythemes and structures found in several different tragedies at once. Thus in the \textit{Epitrepontes}, parallels of the recognition scene can be found in the numerous tragic treatments of the myths of Alope, Tyro, and Auge. Menander did not just have a specific recognition scene in mind, he had all of them in mind. In the \textit{Samia}, the anger between father and son is found in Sophocles' \textit{Antigone} and \textit{Oedipus at Colonus}, as well as in Euripides' \textit{Phoenix} and \textit{Hippolytus}. Menander is not a parodist of Tragedy, if for no other reason than the fact that he does not closely imitate any specific text, but rather a series of tragic mythemes or structures. Even in the messenger scene in the \textit{Sicyonius}, which has frequently been cited as the closest thing to a parody\textsuperscript{71} that exists in Menander, is so general in its subject matter and structure that most scholars who discuss the scene rightly refrain from calling it parody, strictly speaking.\textsuperscript{72} Hugh Lloyd-Jones' comments are representative:

Like the scene in the Argive assembly in the \textit{Orestes}, the scene now to be described is concerned with the fate of a man and a woman, and an


\textsuperscript{71}As was pointed out in chapter 4, it echoes Euripides' \textit{Orestes}. See bibliography cited there.

occasional touch of parody here recalls the *Orestes*. But it is going too far to say that this messenger speech is 'modelled' upon the one; rather it makes use of it in the same light, allusive manner in which the arbitration scene of Menander's *Epitrepontes* seems to have made use of the famous scene in which the fate of an exposed infant was decided, in a very different fashion, in the *Alope* of Euripides.\(^3\)

It is highly probably, therefore, that, although drawn in part from Euripides' play, the *Sicyonius* was also modeled on a whole series of such scenes which have not survived. In addition to parody, there is the question of quotations from Tragedy. Even when a specific tragedy is quoted, it is either quoted among several others, such as in the *Aspis*, or it is quoted because it comes from a play that provides another example of the tragic pattern that is being subverted. Onesimus' quote of Euripides' *Auge* in the *Epitrepontes* is an example of the latter.

What all this suggests is that Menander exploited several tragic scenes, structures, or quotes at once, because his target was not a specific play, rather it was Tragedy *qua* Tragedy. This is confirmed by Syriscus' words to Smicrines in the *Epitrepontes* and by Demeas' words to Niceratus in the *Samia*. In each of these cases, Tragedy was referred to in the plural. Menander does not just engage a specific tragedy, but all of Tragedy, which by his day primarily meant Euripides.

It is a completely different world from Aristophanes' comedy. For Aristophanes' *Frogs* may ultimately be reduced to the problem of what tragedian and what kind of Tragedy were needed by contemporary society to satisfy, so to speak, the didactic and dialectic objective. Aristophanes, therefore, summons Aeschylus back to earth and leaves Euripides behind. Other comedians summon back dead tragedians too. It was not a question of whether Tragedy was relevant or not, but which tragedian. Tragedy and Comedy participated in the same dialectic of the fifth-century *polis*. Menander, on the other hand, says of the tragedians "Enough already! Let sleeping dogs lie! We don't need their

---

\(^3\)Hugh Lloyd-Jones, "Menander's *Sikyonios*," *GRBS* 7 (1966): 141.
wisdom anymore, if it ever really was wisdom. We no longer share their outlook nor their problems. Times have changed, the polis has changed." Rather than parody or burlesque Tragedy, Menander transformed and elaborated tragic mythemes in order to impose on events a sense of the comédie humaine, rather than the celebration of human greatness and suffering. Accepting the tragic staples, as defined by Aristotle, of pathos, peripeteia, and anagnorisis, Menander tried to mirror a more realistic world, one in which ordinary men and women could live with their ordinary problems and find strength and pleasure.

The ideological treatment of the father-son theme is instructive. In both Euripides and Aristophanes it is a metaphor for conflict in the polis over old and new ideas, and who runs the show. And it is no coincidence, that in Aristophanes' one surviving play that explores the father and son theme, the Clouds, the father figure stands triumphant in the end, just as Theseus is left standing at the end of the Hippolytus. Aristophanes does not portray an overthrow of the tragic dialectic within the polis or the tragic view of life, he is a comic affirmation of it. Menander, on the other hand, not only banishes the polis from all consideration and focuses on private oikoi, his plays are also a ceremonial banishment and overthrow of Tragedy and the tragic dialectic. This new dialectic is symbolized by the bond, albeit uneasy, between father and son at play's end, such as in the Samia.

Now we can legitimately lament the fact that the fifth-century polis did not last, that was no longer what it once was. And as critics we may even hold it against Menander that his plays turned their back on the polis and became preoccupied with private health, wealth, and happiness, as they certainly did. But this is tantamount to condemning the entire Hellenistic Age, as some, in fact, do. Life, on the other hand, had to go on, and the men and women of the Hellenistic Age did what most everyone else would have done in their same shoes, and what most, in fact, did. Since it was a political and military fact that they

---

74 The most celebrated modern work on the Hellenistic Age, Peter Green's Alexander to Actium, reads like one continuous lament for the death of the Classical Age.
could no longer pursue liberty on the *polis* model, they choose either the pursuit of life and happiness, or complete withdrawal. Citizens, such as Demosthenes, who in effect demanded liberty or death, while admirable, all ended up dead martyrs in a doomed cause. Those who resisted the pursuit of wealth and happiness became even more detached from society. Witness the rise of such philosophers as Zeno, Diogenes, and Epicurus. All their most defining philosophical pursuits are cast in negative, disengaged terms: *aporia, alypia, akataplexia, ataraxia, apragmosyne, apathia*. One aspiration stated positively, *galenismos*, the tranquillity of the calm sea, is itself the absence of waves.\(^{75}\)

The life of Epicurus provides a particularly suitable *comparandum* with Menander, for they were exact contemporaries. He was born in 341 on the island of Samos,\(^{76}\) where his father was an Athenian cleruch.\(^{77}\) In 323/322 he left Samos to go to Athens to discharge his compulsory two years of ephebic service, alongside Menander. Shortly after he left Samos, his family and the other Athenians were expelled from the island by Perdiccas after the death of Alexander. His father Neocles lost his estate, and so Epicurus was reduced to poverty. It was an unfortunate twist of Tyche, one that many Greeks would experience at this time. After his ephebic duty was over, he first moved with his family to Colophon (321-311), then he went on his own to Mytilene on Lesbos (311/310), and finally to Lampsacus near the Hellespont (310-306). It was here that he met the wealthy Idomeneus, and received some financial backing. In 306 he moved to Athens, and spent the rest of his life there. Having been in Athens during the Lamian War and afterwards seen the death of men like Hypereides and Demosthenes, and having seen thousands of Athenians exiled to Thrace, and having experienced his own disenfranchisement on Samos, it is not surprising that he gravitated toward withdrawal and

\(^{75}\)See Peter Green, *op. cit.* pp. 55-56.
\(^{77}\)Compare *SIG*\(^3\) 312, which records the return of certain Samian refugees (321/0), and Diogenes Laertius 10.1.
apoliticism. One of his better known aphorisms reflects the practical lesson he learned: λάθε βιώσας -- "Keep a low profile." Plutarch devoted an essay self-righteously criticizing Epicurus for this, but then he was not a witness to the atrocities that Epicurus lived through. Amid wars, commercialism, materialism, Epicurus advocated peace of mind, withdrawal, the contemplative life. Not a far cry from medieval monasticism. In other words, he chose a path very different than Menander. Whose was more honorable? Both were escapist. Both were men who sought control of their lives in the face of events beyond their control. If we chide Menander for his literary and ideological agon with fifth-century Tragic ideology in the pursuit of fame and fortune, we should at least recognize the fact that his plays encourage involvement in the oikos, the only real "political" unit left the Athenians. Other intellectuals, like Epicurus, advocated withdrawal from almost all social intercourse.

In 1948, before the Bodmer Codex of Menander was published and thus the most significant portions of Greek New Comedy were known, Northrup Frye, using the plays of the successors of Menander and the other Greek New Comic poets, penned an essay titled, "The Argument of Comedy." In it, he reasoned, among other things, that "New Comedy unfolds from what may be described as a comic Oedipus situation." By that, he meant that the typical New Comic plot exploits the Oedipal mytheme of a young man vying with an older father figure to possess the bride of his choice. We saw how Menander employed this motif in the Samia. But Frye's words are also true in another sense. New Comedy, or at least Menandrean New Comedy, as has been argued in this study, unfolded in part from a literary and cultural Oedipus complex. That is to say that Menander, in

---

78Plutarch Moralia 1128B-1130E. Plutarch's essay was entitled "Is Lathe Biosas Good Advice?" (Εἰ καλὸς εἶρηται τὸ λάθε βιώσας).
80Ibid p. 58.
keeping with some aspects of the model of literary influence promulgated by Harold Bloom with which this study began, did not innocently imitate and revere his literary predecessor, rather he was engaged in an *agon* or struggle for his life. For Menander, the great tradition with which he wrestled the most was Tragedy, especially Euripidean Tragedy, not Old Comedy. This was the "argument of Menandrine New Comedy." Menander's struggle, however, was not so much an unconscious quest for identity in the face of a specific father figure, rather it was a struggle against "tragicness" and for representation and a voice in the new polis.

The success he gained in his struggle for life is evinced by the fact he was honored with a statue in the theater of Dionysus next to that Euripides. Pausanias remarks that of all the poets of comedy who had statues there, his was the only one of note. Even more impressive than his statue is his legacy. For Menander's comedy spoke to the more cosmopolitan Hellenistic world and profoundly influenced Roman drama. Plautus and Terence, the two greatest Roman playwrights, sought their models in the New Comic poets, especially Menander. Through his successors, Menander's art then passed into Europe and beyond: Shakespeare, Molière, Goldoni, Sheridan, Shaw, Wilde, Coward, Simon, and Ayckbourn to name but few. His new message for the new polis replaced Tragedy and resonated with Hellenistic audiences, so that it can be said with confidence, as did one of Menander's characters who surely spoke for the poet himself, that "The City Dionysia was a contest for tragic performances."

---

81 The base of this statue survives, with Menander's name inscribed upon it. See *IG II*² 3777.
83 Menander Fragment 873 K: τραγοφόπος ἦν ἄγων Διονύσια. This line is quoted by the scholiast to Aristophanes' *Acharnians* 202. It is hard to make sense of the quote as it stands. Dindorf suggests we read τραγοφόπον instead of τραγοφός, which Meineke accepts. Kock also suggests τραγοφόπος as a possibility, which Körte accepts as the preferred reading, as is this case here.
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