

ON ANTINOOPOLIS PAPYRUS 55: FRAGMENTS OF NEW COMEDY

Fragments of a parchment codex of the fourth century, nine in number, have been edited by J. W. B. Barnes in Part II of the *Antinoopolis Papyri* ¹⁾ and identified as the remnants of a play belonging to New Comedy. Following the numbering of the editor they will be referred to as Antin. 55. A full description of the fragments, photographs, a transcription and text with notes and translation are supplied and furnish the indispensable basis for the study of this unusually interesting material. Several scholars have contributed suggestions; whenever they are mentioned without further reference it is to be assumed that Barnes has quoted them. Best preserved is fr. (a) with some seven practically intact lines both recto and verso. Fr. (b) contains the remnants of twenty verse endings recto and of the same number of verse openings verso. Fr. (c) has five lines with mutilated openings and endings both recto and verso. Fr. (d) contains the remains of eight lines on both sides, the beginning and end of each verse are missing; best preserved are the first five lines recto. Fr. (e), (f), (g), (h) and (i) are scraps.

The following is concerned principally with the interpretation and significance of fr. (a), and the remaining fragments will be taken into account in so far as they shed light on this. Barnes has tried to make out a case for ascribing the fragments to the *Misogynes* of Menander, but admits that the matter remains open to serious doubt. Turner ²⁾ has put his finger on a fundamental weakness of the editor's ascription: the proposed reconstruction of the plot does not leave room for the character of the "woman-hater" in keeping with the importance which it would be expected to have in a play of that title. It

1) Ed. with translations and notes by J. W. B. Barnes and H. Zilliacus, with four plates, London 1960 (Egypt Exploration Society, Graeco-Roman Memoirs No. 37).

2) Quoted by Barnes; also in *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library Manchester*, Vol. 42 No. 1 Sept. 1959 p. 242.

is not proposed to enter into a discussion of the matter³). The vital clue is missing: none of the fragments coincides with the quotations we possess. Under these circumstances it is essential that the authorship of the fragments be established first. It would be vain to try to trace the particular play to which they belong without having attempted to decide, on the basis of whatever sound evidence we can find, whether Menander or some other poet of the New Comedy is or is not the author of Antin. 55. The fragments themselves, subjected to an exact stylistic interpretation and brought into relation with the other remains of New Comedy, will put at our disposal the kind of evidence we need to enable us to determine the author. And after that we may attempt, with some chance of success, to identify the play. It is not immediately obvious that Menander is the author, in spite of a number of minor details, which recall the *Misoumenos* and the *Perikeiromene*. A "Thrason" (? "Thrasionides") is mentioned as a speaker fr. (b) verso v. 3, while the name "Moschion" occurs fr. (b) verso v. 14. Fr. (e) mentions the expected arrival of some group and refers to "young bloods": Webster suggests a house-storming scene (cf. *Perik.* v. 190 sqq.). Coincidences of this nature are what one expects in New Comedy; they do not give a clue to authorship. A more complicated impression results from the style of the fragments. They contain a certain element which one is inclined to regard as foreign to Menander, but stylistic affinities of a peculiarly subtle kind reveal themselves under close examination and compel us finally to yield Antin. 55 to Menander.

Fr. (a) recto col. ii — scarcely anything of col. i remains — v. 4—11 (of v. 1—3 little more than traces survives; the end of v. 1 is νεωτέρων) is given by the editor as follows:

[...]ε τοιούτ' ε...[] [.]. έμο.
 5 [.]. τως έσομ' ύμιν σ.[.....]ο.[.]ν έγω
αχρηστον

3) A plot is reconstructed on the basis of Alkiphron iii. 26, Men. Fr. 276—285 Körte *Misogynes* and Antin. 55. Such a method is not permissible. What Leo (Plautinische Forschungen, Berlin 1895 p. 127 sq.) has said concerning the worthlessness of Alkiphron and the others for the recovery of lost comedies remains valid. Such works as Kuiper, *De Verfoeide van Menander*, *Neophilologus* XVII 1932 p. 144—152 or Pack, *On the plot of Menander's Dyskolos*, *Classical Philology* XXX 1935 p. 151—160 possess value as a warning to all who may feel tempted to tread this treacherous ground.

- B ἄλλ' εἰ ταῦτα [σ]αυτ[ῶ]ι συμφέρειν
 ἤγεεῖ, πέραινε· τί γὰρ ἂν ἀντιλέγοιμί σοι;
 A εἶεν· μόνος δὴ γενόμενος νῦ[ν] πρὸς θεῶν
 λογισμὸν ὧν μέλλεις διοικε[ῖν] παραγ[μα]τῶν
 10 σαυτῶ[ι] δός, ἐν ὀλίγοις δὲ καὶ μὴ διὰ μ[α]κρῶν·
 τρόφι[μο]ς ἐρῶν, ἥς δῆποτ' οὐθὲν διαφ[έρει],

The papyrus erroneously has double point at the end of v. 6; it has been removed by the editor in agreement with Lloyd-Jones. These lines preserve a passage of transition from dialogue to monologue. Contrary to the opinion of the editor, who is inclined to assign all the fragments to a later stage in the comedy, the scene almost certainly belongs to an early part of the play, probably to the second half of the first act. This is made clear by the contents, which introduce the *desis* of the plot, and by the parallel situations from other plays which will be dealt with presently. The identification of the speaker of the monologue is not difficult: it is the resourceful slave who comes to the aid of the young master in love. Of this there can be no doubt because he employs the colloquial *τρόφιμος ἐρῶν*, an expression in which the substantive has the value of a proper name — exactly like our “Cook” (the usage is found *Dysk.* v. 553). The speaker who leaves as the slave’s monologue commences cannot be readily identified. One expects it to be the young master — this is the editor’s view —, for the plan to help the lover which is the theme of the ensuing monologue would most naturally follow a dialogue between the helpless lover and the wily slave. But the speaker’s parting words hardly favour this view. What can it matter to a young man in love whether something is to the advantage of his slave or not? The speaker would appear to be free-born or at least in a position of some authority in relation to the slave; the words *τί γὰρ ἂν ἀντιλέγοιμί σοι* seem to contain a polite concession and thus to point to the existence of a certain social inequality between the speaker and the slave who is addressed. He must, furthermore, be directly concerned with the lover’s plight. The latter’s father might possibly qualify for this rôle, if he were the tolerant kind like the Lamprias of Menander’s *Adelphoi* β (/Micio of Terence’s play). Again it could be a close friend of the lover, like Chaireas in Menander’s *Fabula Incerta*. It might even be the *paidagōgos*, who, as in the *Phasma*, can be intimately

concerned with the welfare of the young man in love⁴). On the evidence of ὑμῖν in v. 5 Handley has suggested that the speakers belong to different households. But since the slave is talking to someone who represents the lover's interests he cannot avoid using this form regardless of whether the two speakers belong to the same household or not (Getas employs it when speaking to his *trophimos* *Dysk.* v. 555). The context appears to require for the badly damaged v. 5 sq. the sense: "In this way I shall show myself to be a person of no trifling wit/counsel" (a participle is probable before ἐγώ). The other character, whoever it be, declares his readiness to leave matters fully in the hands of the slave and departs. πέραντε is similarly employed *Men.* Fr. 59 v. 5 (*Arrhēphoros/Auletris*) by a person to signalise that he now leaves off his attempt to advise another whom he has been trying in vain to persuade not to marry. The four opening lines of the following monologue begin with the characteristic εἶεν. Spoken simultaneously with the departure of the previous speaker, this is found too in a passage of New Comedy *Pap. Oxyr.* 11 v. 29 (Schroeder *Novae com. fragm.* p. 40 sqq.)⁵), which bears a striking resemblance to the present one. The long fragment belongs evidently to an early part of a play, because it begins with a dialogue of exposition between a slave, Daos, and his *trophimos*. A marriage has been arranged between the latter and the daughter of some well-to-do citizen. He has already received part of the dowry, but in the meantime has fallen in love with a foreign girl and now refuses to marry the rich man's daughter. The slave tries to impress on him the unpleasant legal consequences of his attitude (cf. v. 19 sq.); the young man however will not heed him, and when his adviser pessimistically declares that not even a god could save them he confidently asserts the contrary. At this point the *trophimos* makes his exit (v. 29), and Daos speaks a monologue, in the course of which he overcomes his former pusillanimity and decides on a plan of action to help the lover⁶). The link

4) Webster, *Studies in Menander*², Manchester 1960 p. 36 has suggested that Simias in the *Epitrepontes* may have been the *paidagōgos* of Chairestratos.

5) Discussed by Webster, *Studies in Later Greek Comedy*, Manchester 1953 p. 224 sq.

6) Regarding the value of this monologue for the appreciation of Plautine style in corresponding passages in Plautus see Fraenkel, *Elementi Plautini in Plauto*, Firenze 1960 p. 232 sq.

monologue opens in precisely the same manner as the one in Antin. 55 7):

εἶεν· καταλ[ιπὼν μ' ἀποίχεται.
ν]ῦν οὐ πεσόντα, Δᾶε, χρ[ή] σ' ἀπελπίσαι·

We encounter here a stylised formula of transition. The proposed restoration of v. 8 cannot be right. When a speaker who has just been addressing someone goes on to talk to himself employing in soliloquy the same second person forms, which he has used a moment before to communicate with an interlocutor, it is essential that he eliminate the danger of equivocation by clearly indicating the shift of application from the THOU without to the THOU within: he must use a vocative. Restoration does not present serious difficulty. Fr. (a) verso col. ii preserves a marginal notice of change of speaker: Dromon is the name. The same name occurs at the end of a fragmentary line fr. (b) recto v. 6. Dromon is a typical slave name of New Comedy, evidence of the popularity of the *servus currens* in Plautus's originals⁸⁾, a type brought to life again in the Greek by the Strobilos of Hibeh Pap. 5a (= Schroeder 2 fr. d = Philemon 87 A fr. 12 Edmonds)⁹⁾ and the Pyrrhias of *Dysk.* v. 81 sqq. There is a good chance that the scheming slave of Antin. 55 was Dromon and that the monologue belongs to him. Thus the following restoration of the opening line appears probable:

εἶεν· μόνος δὴ γενόμενος νυ[νί, Δ]ρόμων

Prof. Turner (London) has kindly pointed out to me that this

7) Blass's ἀπέρχεται, which Schroeder adopted, has been corrected by Edmonds.

8) See Rudolf Stark *Rh. M.* C 2 1957 p. 134 sq. with notes 10 and 11.

9) Edmond's treatment of v. 8 sqq. is an ugly blemish. He renders Ἄπολλον καὶ θεοί, τοῦ πνεύματος as "Lord Apollo, what a smell!" with the explanation (Fr. Att. Com., Vol. III a p. 55 note d): "betokening the presence of a deity". It means of course: "God! My breath!" (Sudhaus: spiritus me deficit!). The *servus currens* grips his breast panting, a regular feature of such scenes; cf. Men. *Dysk.* v. 96 sq. and Plautus *Casina* v. 636 sq. V. 11 οὐ δ' εἶ τίς; ὃ κράτιστε τῶν θεῶν (Leo's punctuation, followed by Schroeder), also spoken by Strobilos, becomes "Who, Great God, art Thou?" The vocative is in fact merely an exclamation, equivalent to ὦ Ζεῦ (cf. Men. *Perik.* v. 349, *Com. Flor.* v. 78); this description of Zeus belongs to an early stratum of Greek religious language, cf. Pindar *Ol.* XIV v. 14. Pap. Hibeh 5 preserves a scene which adheres to a typical pattern; see Fraenkel, *Elementi Plautini*, p. 212 sq.

reading — to judge from the photograph — actually appears to suit the traces better than that proposed by the editor.

The passage possesses considerable literary interest. It is the first original example to come to light of what was obviously a stereotyped form of transition from dialogue to monologue on the comic stage of Athens. Here the word *μόνος* is in effect a dramaturgic *terminus technicus*, used to indicate that the stage is clear of actors apart from the speaker. It does not describe a situation springing from plot or character¹⁰). It is a mere stage direction thrown in for lack of some better device to denote a transition: “now that you’re alone, Dromon, you can begin your monologue”. This is little better than a clumsy aside; it does violence to the dramatic illusion without achieving some compensating effect, such as comic emphasis or comic intimacy. At the same time this impression is reinforced by Dromon’s insistence v. 10 that his speech is to be brief and not longwinded. When Knemon, towards the end of his confession *Dysk.* v. 742, declares that he wishes to say a few words about himself the remark is quite in keeping with his natural taciturnity (cf. v. 9) and with his immediately preceding words. Again there is special point in the assurance of a prologue-speaker at the opening of his speech that he has no intention of behaving like a long-winded god (Pap. Argentor. 53 = Schroeder p. 45 = Edmonds Fr. Adespot. 103 A III A p. 316): the audience is expected to react appropriately to this *captatio benevolentiae*. But Dromon wishes to be brief because he has no time to waste and must straightway find means to help his young master. This specious motivation, though, merely has the effect of shedding a still more glaring light on the inadequacies of the monologue form.

10) Men. *Dysk.* v. 149 sq. Sostratos, moving aside before the oncoming Knemon, remarks ἀλλ’ Ἄρ[η β]ιοῦ / *μόνος* βαδιζῶν. Here the adjective has genuine descriptive force; only a madman yells when there is nobody about: οὐχ ὑγιαίνειν μοι δοκεῖ, Sostratos adds quite appropriately. In his portrayal of the *Misanthropos* Menander employs a motif, which Semonides applied to his picture of the woman descended from a dog Fr. 7 v. 14 sq.:

πάντη δὲ παπταίνουσα καὶ πλανωμένη
λέληκεν, ἦν καὶ μηδέν’ ἀνθρώπων ὄραϊ.

(Texts of Menander used are: *Dysk.* ed. H. Lloyd-Jones, Oxford 1960; *quae supersunt, pars prior*, Leipzig 1957 & *pars altera*, Leipzig 1953 ed. Körte/Thierfelder. Unimportant gaps in the papyri are not signalled in quotations).

Having explored the Greek material I have failed to discover a second example of this technical use of $\mu\acute{o}\nu\omicron\varsigma$. The proof that Dromon's opening words are a stereotyped formula is, however, furnished by Plautus. In the first act of the *Pseudolus* the wily slave is confronted with the plight of his young master, whose love-affair is thwarted by the inevitable *pornoboskos*. He undertakes to outwit and outmanoeuvre Ballio. A dialogue between slave and *filius erilis* ends v. 393 with the departure of the latter. Pseudolus, now alone, asks himself how he is to make good his promise. His monologue opens in precisely the same manner as that of Dromon: v. 394 sqq.

postquam illic hinc abiit, tu astas solus, Pseudole.
quid nunc acturu's postquam erili filio
largitu's dictis dapsilis? ubi sunt ea? etc.

The *jaculatio verborum* of the two slaves with which the *Epidicus* opens draws to a close when Epidicus calls on his fellow-slave to leave. With the words v. 80

numquam hominem quemquam conveni unde abierim
lubentius

Thesprio makes off, and Epidicus begins a monologue:

illic hinc abiit. solus nunc es. quo in loco haec res sit vides,
Epidice: nisi quid tibi in tete auxili est, apsumptus es.

Here some attempt is made to motivate what is but a standing formula; the demand that Thesprio go away has been complied with. Again, in the *Trinummus* v. 717 sqq. the device is employed, this time with wider application. The scene has been occupied by three characters; two make their exits together leaving the scheming slave alone:

abiit illequidem, ecquid audis, Lysiteles? ego te volo.
hic quoque hinc abiit. Stasime, restas solus. quid ego nunc
agam?

Each of these three passages has the speaker's name in the vocative¹¹), a powerful argument in favour of the proposed restoration of Antin. 55. It was maintained by W. Theiler¹²) that Plautus could not have been merely repeating a schematic device

11) Cf. Leo, *Der Monolog im Drama*, Berlin 1908 p. 102 (Abhl. königl. Gesell. der Wiss. zu Göttingen, philol.-hist. Klasse, neue Folge 11 Band X, Nro. 5).

12) *Hermes* LXXIII 1938 p. 277.

of his own invention and that these passages supplied a clue to the stylistic form of the Greek originals he used. Antin. 55 is documentary proof of the correctness of Theiler's assumption. Three other plays of Plautus have the formula under a somewhat different guise. One of the speakers in a dialogue having left the scene, the person who remains employs it to introduce a monologue in the first instead of in the second person: *Truculentus* v. 209 sqq., *Menaechmi* v. 957 sqq., *Artemo* fr. 1¹³).

There can be no doubt then that Antin. 55 contains a favourite dramatic device which was part of the equipment of Middle and New Comedy. Yet it is not adhered to in our extant Menander, in Terence¹⁴), or in those plays of Plautus which are based on Menander¹⁵). In the present connection it is important to emphasise a fundamental aspect of Middle and New Comedy. During a period that extended over one and a half centuries a multitude of dramatists wrote pieces, as it were to order, for particular festivals or theatres. The vast productivity of many of them and the speed with which they wrote plays — or let us say without hesitation "produced" — are well attested. It would be wrong to think of them, apart from a few, as poets in the true sense of the word; the great majority

13) *Ps.* v. 394, *Epid.* v. 80, *Truc.* 209 introduce Hough's Link-Monologue Type V (TAPhA 1939 p. 237 "... the material ... goes so far afield from the linking themes that comment on the previous conversation ceases to be a mere appendage to that conversation, but, enlarged and extended, becomes an entity ranking with other recognised units of dramatic action ... it may even advance the action, or at least the plot, by its own movement"). On *Epid.* v. 80 sqq. and *Truc.* v. 209 sqq. see too Prescott *CPh* XXXIV 1939 p. 8 sqq. *Menaech.* v. 957 sqq. belongs to Hough's Link-Monologue Type IV (*ibid.* p. 236 "Here themes suggested by the previous conversation are enlarged upon or material is introduced wholly unconnected with that which has preceded. The basic themes of the link-monologues are no longer the sole purpose of the speech"). On the artificial nature of link-monologues see Hough p. 233 and Prescott p. 4. *Trin.* v. 717 introduces an exit-monologue. It is impossible to determine to which of these classes Dromon's monologue belongs.

14) It is barely possible that Terence might have suppressed it as he suppressed the addressing of the audience directly, such an integral part of Menander's art (cf. Schadewaldt, *Monolog und Selbstgespräch*, Berlin 1926 p. 30 note 4 and Leo, *Monolog im Drama* p. 80), but the neglect of the device in the very considerable remains of Menander makes this altogether unlikely.

15) Webster, *Studies in Later Greek Comedy* p. 189 sqq. tries to show that the *Pseudolus* derives from a Menandrian original (*Katapseudomenos?*), but his arguments are not conclusive.

must have been mere literary practitioners. A tradition¹⁶) which gave rise to the false deduction that Alexis was the uncle of Menander does preserve this core of fact: the dramatists of Middle and New Comedy evidently worked together so closely that they formed a sort of writers' guild. This historical background is duly reflected in the surviving plays and fragments. Everywhere the power of traditional conventions asserts itself to a degree only possible wherever the poet's task has been usurped to a large extent by the team of industrious craftsmen. It is one such convention which Antin. 55 preserves; how deeply rooted it must have been in dramaturgic usage we can best judge from an illuminating passage of Plautus. A dialogue between the slaves Olympio and Chalinus opens the action of the *Casina*. Olympio begins v. 89 sqq.:

non mihi licere meam rem me solum, ut volo,
loqui atque cogitare sine ted arbitro?
quid tu, malum, me sequere?

"Why dont you let me soliloquise in peace?" Diphilos has seized on a worn stage mannerism: "now that you're (/I'm) alone, you (/I) can begin to soliloquise" and altered its context in order to achieve a certain surprise effect¹⁷). In Menander too a trace of the original device can be found in a transformed situation. Fr. 722 begins:

⟨δέσποτα⟩, τί σύννους κατὰ μόνας σαυτῷ λαλεῖς
δοκεῖς τε παρέχειν ἔμφασιν λυπουμένου;

It is reasonable to conclude, after the analogy of the *Casina*, that this passage stood at the opening of the first (or second) scene in a play. It introduced the exposition by means of a procedure, which is the direct opposite of that which Diphilos employs. Here a character who is preoccupied with his own thoughts, which he is supposed to be uttering aloud to himself, is suddenly confronted with someone who is curious to be told the other's worries¹⁸).

It is well known that the attitude of the more significant dramatists of New Comedy towards the conventions which

16) See Suda under *Alexis*; cf. *De Comoedia Graeca Anonymus* 17 (Kaibel) and RE I col. 1468.

17) Cf. also *Pseudolus* v. 908.

18) The same situation is portrayed *Epitr.* v. 84 sq., where Daos relates to the arbitrator how Syriskos met him on the morning after he had found the baby, and engaged him in conversation.

they inherited as part of their stock-in-trade could be critical or ironic¹⁹). Since the device with which the monologue of Dromon is introduced does not occur, in its original form at least, in our extant Menander or in the Latin comedies based on his plays, one might be tempted to believe that he purposely avoids it. It has been made abundantly clear that it was extremely common on the Attic stage. It is possible of course that its absence in Menander is due solely to the vagaries of transmission and that the poet used it as a matter of course in many of the hundred or more plays about which we know nothing or very little. For the *Dyskolos* must make us exceedingly cautious about insisting on what Menander can or cannot have written²⁰). Still we are bound to consider the available evidence with the utmost care before we abandon what appears to be a justifiable hesitation: can we assume that this poet began a monologue with the unbearably flat: "He's left. I'm alone. Now I must consider what is to be done". Ancient critics were careful to point out an essential quality of his drama: it was written to be acted. Accordingly he was a favourite with actors — in contrast to Philemon, who was read rather than acted (Demetrius *περὶ ἑρμην.* 193). Now when an actor stands facing the audience with the stage to himself, it is of no small importance that he seize the attention of the spectators from the beginning. The emphasis should fall squarely on the opening lines so as to create a dynamism, which will carry the actor through his

19) Basic for this matter is A. Thierfelder, *Die Motive der griechischen Komödie im Bewußtsein ihrer Dichter*, *Hermes* LXXI 1936 p. 320—337. Also F. Wehrli, *Motivstudien zur griechischen Komödie*, Zürich 1936.

20) I cannot refrain here from drawing attention to an unmistakably "Plautine" element in Menander. Knemon's accident is regarded by Sikon as the divine punishment, which the Nymphs have meted out to him for his sacrilegious ill-treatment of the cook v. 643 sq.:

νυ]γὶ μὲν αἱ Νύμφαι τετιμωρημέναι
εἶσ' ἀ]ὐτόν ὑπὲρ ἑμοῦ δικαίως.

The greater part of v. 639—665 is devoted to Sikon's hymn of triumph. In the final act, however, after Getas has put the question to him v. 891

τιμωρίαν [βοῦλ]ει λαβεῖν ὧν ἀρτίως ἔπασχεες;

he does not hesitate — except to protest against the insult to his dignity which is implied in the assertion that he suffered a rebuff — but sets about punishing the old man as though he had not appeared, after Knemon's fall, to celebrate that event as fitting retribution for the injury done to him. (On the significance of the *Dyskolos* for the interpretation of the *Stichus* see Fraenkel's remarks, *Elementi Plautini*, p. 443).

speech and enable him to control and modulate the reaction of his audience. As for what comes at the end, that is a matter of secondary importance; the formulaic τὴν θύραν πέπληχεν ἐξιόν (cf. Men. *Epitr.* v. 586) causes no offence because it comes after the principal impact of a speech is past²¹). Menander's monologues normally adhere to this pattern. The emphasis falls resoundingly on the opening: cf. *Epitr.* v. 381, *Perik.* v. 110, *Sam.* v. 110, *Dysk.* v. 179, 218, 481, 639. Davus's exit-monologue in the first act of the *Andria* occupies, within the dramatic economy of the piece, a position analogous to that of the monologues of Dromon, Pseudolus and the Daos of Pap. Oxyr. 11²²). The scheming slave has just been confronted with the complexities of the lover's plight; it is up to him to find a way out for his young master. His monologue begins, significantly, with selfapostrophe but without the standard formula found in the passages just mentioned; he comes to the point straight away v. 206:

enimvero, Dave, nil locist segnitiae neque socordiae etc.

The same principle dictated another development in Menandrian drama which the extant remains make tolerably clear²³). The traditional Euripidean prologue of an early play like the *Dyskolos* occupies the opening of the drama; later, as in the *Perikeiromene* and the *Hauton Penthôn* (? *Comodia Florentina*), the prologue comes after one or more opening scenes. An artistic will expresses itself here; at the beginning should stand an element containing such a degree of dramatic momentum as to be capable of arousing and sustaining the enthusiasm of actors and audience alike. With its traditional formalism the Euripidean prologue did not lend itself to such a purpose. The opening of the *Imbrians*, which was written 302/1, demonstrates

21) Even this convention was not always passively accepted. The bewitching aria of Phaedromus *Curculio* v. 147 sqq. (pessuli, heus pessuli, vos saluto lubens, etc.) represents to a certain extent a poet's reaction to a fossilised formula. The *paraklausithyron* (see Fraenkel, *ibid.* p. 99) stands in place of the traditional remark that someone has rattled the door, and jocosely alludes to the same.

22) Schroeder has pointed out the similarities of this and the *Andria* of Terence/Menander and shown that in spite of these it can belong neither to the *Andria* nor to the closely related *Perinthia*. He concludes that the dramatist was influenced by Menander's two plays.

23) The part played by Alexis in this development must remain obscure; fr. 108 from his *Kouris* belongs to an "internal" prologue (compare v. 1 sq. with Men. *Perik.* v. 7 sq.; see Leo, *Monolog im Drama* p. 45).

the brilliant effect with which dialogue might be used to begin the play (Fr. 212)²⁴). What may be the opening of a play, the so-called *Prologus adolescentis*, is preserved in the Papyrus Didotiana²⁵). This is no prologue in the traditional manner, but a regular monologue. For us it is of special interest because it begins with a form of the motif which we encounter in Dromon's monologue²⁶):

ἐρημία μὲν ἔστι, κοῦκ ἀκούσεται
οὐδεὶς παρών μου τῶν λόγων ὧν ἂν λέγω.

It is impossible to hear these lines and at the same time not to see with the mind's eye the actor first look behind him to confirm the absence of witnesses and then turn with a confiding gesture towards the audience. An atmosphere of mystery is made marvellously vivid, and a bond of infectious intimacy with the audience created. No more splendid introduction to what follows. The young man reveals his heart's secret in the form of a confession, twice addressing the audience directly as if to emphasise that he deems it uniquely worthy of his trust. Here the solitariness of the character commencing a monologue is linked with surpassing skill to ethos and dramatic situation²⁷).

24) Webster's suggestion (cited by Barnes p. 15) that *Misogynes* Fr. 280 ὦ χάρη, Γλυκέρα. ΓΑ. καὶ σὺ πόλλ'. Α. ὅση χρόνη/δρῶ σε is the opening of the play is exceedingly attractive. The *Imbrians* at any rate has precisely this form of opening.

25) Kock relegated it to the Adespota (104). Leo, *Monolog im Drama* p. 80 went so far as to deny that it belonged to New Comedy: „Man möchte das Fragment einer früheren Entwicklungsphase, der Übergangszeit aus der alten in die chorlose Komödie, zuschreiben; es spielt in naiver Weise mit der neugewonnenen Freiheit einsamer Rede und der alten des τραγηδός, frei mit dem Publikum zu verkehren.“ If there is anything naive about this monologue, that has a genuine artistic purpose: to portray the enthusiasm of the young Schwärmer. The decisive argument against Leo's assessment is furnished by *Eunuchus* v. 549 sqq., where Chaerea, wild with excitement after having seduced his sweetheart, introduces his confession with similar words:

numquis hic est? nemost. numquis hinc me sequitur? nemo homost.
iamne erumpere hoc licet mi gaudium? pro Iuppiter, etc., etc.

In the *Dyskolos* (v. 659 and 666) the audience is twice addressed within an even shorter space than in Pap. Didot. Rudolf Herzog, *Philologus* LXXXIX 1934 p. 185 sqq. found convincing reasons for ascribing the fragment to Menander, and was followed by Körte.

26) For ἐρημία in this context compare Plato *Phaon* fr. 173.

27) It is, in the words of Schadewaldt (*Monolog und Selbstgespräch*, p. 248 note 1), „poetisch wirksam“.

The poet has refashioned a theme which appears in Antin. 55 as a naive trick of the dramatist's trade.

But that is not all. In the light of the passages which have been dealt with it becomes possible to recover the dramatic meaning of three lines from Menander's *Stratiotai* (Fr. 380) which owe their preservation to an anthologist (Orion Antholog. I 17) who, tearing them from their context, sought to isolate and render autonomous a gnomic element that is, in reality, incidental to their true significance. The fragment can be assigned to a passage of transition from dialogue:

⟨ἀπ⟩ορῶν τι βούλευσαι κατὰ σαυτὸν γενόμενος
 τὸ συμφέρον γὰρ οὐχ ὁρᾶται τῷ βοᾶν,
 ἐν τῷ πρὸς αὐτὸν δ' ἀναλογισμῷ φαίνεται.

The speaker is not talking to an interlocutor but addresses himself. On the analogy of the previous examples one may safely assume that he has employed his own name in the vocative case in the immediately preceding line or two. It is certain that the three lines preserved are not the opening of the passage of transition to which they belong, for the contents of the second verse show that the speaker has just recovered from a momentary outburst of uncontrollable emotion which caused him to forget himself so far as to exclaim incoherently and violently. In the lines preserved by the anthologist the speaker finds his emotional equilibrium again, and the monologue proper can commence hereafter. The first word is corrupt. Kock's emendation of the MS ὁρῶν has been adopted by Körte, who rejects Nauck's ἐρῶν. Both attempts at correction were made without due awareness of the context of the fragment, which preserves a variant of the form of transition from dialogue to monologue which is encountered in the *Samia* v. 110 sqq. Demeas, getting no satisfaction from Parmenon, whom he believes to know all the secrets of his household, proceeds to use the lash on him, but the slave eludes him and makes off. Beside himself with rage, Demeas is no longer capable of coherent speech; with consummate art the inward collapse of control over the emotions is represented in the breath-taking rapidity with which the distraught master shifts his labile attention from this object to that, from the run-away slave to another who is a bystander, then from the citadel of Kekrops' land to the insubstantial aether, and finally — on the point of uttering yet another pathetic exclamation — to himself:

ποῖ σὺ; ποῖ, μαστιγία;
 λάβ' αὐτόν. ὦ πόλισμα Κεκροπίας χθονός,
 ὦ ταναὸς αἰθήρ, ὦ — τί, Δημέα, βοᾶις;
 τί βοᾶς, ἀνόητε; κάτεχε σαυτόν, καρτέρει.

Only now that he has, with a determined effort of the will, imposed restraint on his unruly emotions can the reflective part of the monologue commence. There is not the slightest doubt that a similar outburst immediately preceded the extant lines quoted from the *Stratitotai*. Otherwise the reference to "shouting" in v. 2 would remain quite pointless. Like Demeas, the speaker rallies himself following a fit of emotion which was an immediate and direct result of the particular circumstances surrounding the departure of the person with whom he had been speaking. He speaks a soothing word to himself. ἀπορῶν is therefore inappropriate. We should read:

Ἰααρῶν τι βούλευσαι κατὰ σαυτόν γενόμενος.

The elimination of the correct word is readily explained by the presence of ὄραται in the following line. καρτέρει in the equivalent passage of the *Samia* (v. 111) corresponds to Ἰααρῶν, and we have no choice but to rate the value of this correspondence very high indeed in view of the fact that the lines from the *Stratitotai* are composed entirely of elements peculiar to the passages of transition we are discussing. The details which Fr. 380 has in common with Antin. 55 are striking. The speaker in the *Stratitotai* sees it as his business to recognise the advantageous course of action; likewise the speaker of the monologue in Antin. 55 is regarded as competent to decide the most advantageous thing to do (v. 6 sq. ἀλλ' εἰ ταῦτα σαυτῶι συμφέρειν / ἤγχεῖ) — apparently because the lover himself cannot, just like Sostratos in the *Dyskolos* (cf. v. 76 sq. ἀλλ' οὐ ῥᾶδιον / ἐρῶντα συνιδεῖν ἔστι τί ποτε συμφέρει). Both speakers emphasise the need of calm, careful deliberation (with τῷ πρὸς αὐτόν δ' ἀναλογισμῶ compare λογισμὸν . . . / σαυτῶι δός). In κατὰ σαυτόν γενόμενος the influence of the formulaic μόνος γενόμενος is clearly visible, although in the *Stratitotai* Menander has not tolerated this rudiment in a position of dramatic emphasis. On the contrary, it comes in *diminuendo*, following the emotional outburst, with which the monologue — after the analogy of Demeas's speech — certainly opened. The evidence of the *Stratitotai* not only removes our more serious doubts regarding

give an explanation. In the photograph no trace of paragraphus under v. 5 is visible. The papyrus has double point in five places: v. 7 after *πάρεστιν*; v. 9 after *τούτο*; v. 10 after *κενοῦσιν*, and again at the end; v. 11 at the end. The semi-colon which the editor prints after **Ἀπολλων* v. 5 does not reflect the papyrus. For the restoration of v. 4 nothing conclusive can be expected from what remains. One expects an expression of surprise or bewilderment in the missing space of v. 5. Handley proposes *ἐ[π' ἀγαθῆι] τύχηι*, which would, according to the editor, fit the space. Though it is curious that a similar combination occurs Aristophanes *Wasps* v. 869:

ὦ Φοῖβ' **Ἀπολλων* Πύθι' ἐπ' ἀγαθῆι τύχηι,

this verse, introducing a prayer, cannot be regarded as parallel. The presence of the exclamation (by Apollo) beside the solemn formula would pose more questions than it would solve. Moreover, the formula commonly comes at the close of a passage of connected sense; and the present lines, as will be seen immediately, must stand at the opening of a scene. Another expression, which would fit the space, is *ἐάν οὕτω τύχη* (*Epitr.* fr. 5, Philemon fr. 16 *Babylonios*; cf. *Perik.* v. 91, *Kolax* v. 120, *Dysk.* v. 360 sq., Fr. 395 *Titthe*, Fr. 581), but it is just as difficult to imagine a suitable context for this as for Handley's proposal. At the end of v. 4 the papyrus does not have double point, and there is no justification for introducing a change of speaker here, as the editor does. The expression *ὦ δέσποτα*/**Ἀπολλων* is perfectly in order and receives support, for example, from Pherekrates fr. 87 *Krapataloi* (Edmonds I p. 238), where Agyeus is addressed in the same way. The enjambement: (*ὦ* +) vocative of epithet (or qualifying participle)/ + vocative of (personal) name, is a genuine feature of the iambic trimeter of comedy. Aristophanes has it three times: *Knights* v. 147 sq., v. 240 sq., *Frogs* v. 1160 sq., Nikostratos once: fr. 28 (Edmonds II p. 40), while it occurs four times in Menander's *Dyskolos* (v. 108 sq., 208 sq., 701 sq., 888 sq.), once in the other papyri of the poet, *Georgos* v. 42 sq., and twice in the fragments, *Aspis* Fr. 68 v. 1 sq., *Karine* Fr. 223. What was evidently comparatively rare in earlier comedy has become a common practice later, in accordance with that development towards a far greater freedom which appears most striking in the verse of Menander. What we encounter in Antin. 55 is a more emphatic form of **Ἀπολλων*, an exclamation extremely familiar to New Comedy

and no longer possessing a vital connection with the presence of the cult of Apollo Agyieus before every Athenian house. A passage from the *Pankratistes* of Alexis fr. 168 v. 3 sq. is an instructive example of the incongruity which was apt to result from the attempt to infuse life into such worn phrases. A husband, rebuking his wife, says:

Ἡράκλεις φίλε,
ἀγοράσματ' οὐ συμπόσιον εἶρηκας, γύναϊ.

On the one hand an attempt has been made to restore to the faded exclamation Ἡράκλεις the original value of an invocation by the addition of the word with which the Greek worshipper was wont to forge a link of intimacy between himself and the gods; on the other hand this same attempt has suffered a *reductio ad absurdum* by the intrusion of a verb in the second person addressed not to Herakles, but to the wife of the speaker (cf. *Dysk.* v. 74, *Heros* v. 55, *Fabula Incerta* v. 57, *Misoumenos* fr. 6, *Hyphobolimaios* Fr. 423).

The editor takes τί τοῦτο, παῖ; v. 5 to mean: "What is this object (I see), slave?" What follows he understands as the latter's reply: "Someone has set out a challenge on the altar, and there is a newly-kindled fire there". The first of two discoveries is supposed to be made here: a *proklesis* is found. But nothing in the text justifies this interpretation. The following "wait a minute!" (with this expression compare Men. Fr. 318 *Pallake* μικρὸν ἐπιμείνας προστρέχει / ἡγόρακά σοι περιστέρια <ταδί> λέγων) shows that nothing has been found as yet. Besides, if τί τοῦτο, παῖ; could have the sense the editor gives it, the supposed reply of the slave would not be suitable, for it would not identify an object the first speaker had seen, rather would it describe a situation or, since the editor accepts the alteration of γε to τε in v. 7 which Lloyd-Jones and Webster propose, two separate situations. The latter alteration should have been suspect from the start, since it would result in a text which ignored the simple fact that fire is the first thing the human eye sees. But τί τοῦτο, παῖ; is a stereotyped formula in New Comedy, and as such it has a dramatic function which is constant: it always stands at the opening of a scene. It does not occur in Aristophanes, though the expression τί δ' ἔστιν, ὦ παῖ; *Wasps* v. 1297 and *Thesm.* v. 582 — spoken in both passages by the chorus to a person who has just entered — may be the source whence it was to develop. There are six

drama. On entering, the *trophimos* and his slave make a discovery, which appears to influence the course of events decisively. Perceiving that a sacrifice has been made at the altar the young master concludes at once that someone has set out a *proklesis* there. His slave agrees that the newly-kindled fire, which he too sees on the altar, substantiates the other's deduction (for γε „where we should expect γούν or γάρ” see Denniston, *The Greek Particles*², Oxford 1954 p. 144 sqq.). That is the meaning of the text. But under what circumstances can the events which the text describes take place? How can someone who has but glanced at an altar conclude that a *proklesis* has been set out there? Only one explanation is possible. The altar must have been so intimately connected with the business of litigation that it could be instantly inferred from signs of a sacrifice that the characteristic formality of the *proklesis* had taken place there.

V. 8 sq. the young master catches sight of the actual object, whose presence on the altar he had deduced a moment before from the sight of a fire. With considerable skill the discovery is unfolded through the medium of the dialogue. Naturally the *trophimos* can see at once with his own eyes that it is a writing-tablet, but “what is this I see here? A writing-tablet!” would fall flat. That is why the slave must formally identify the find. The editor, adhering to the view that two objects are found, isolates the *grammateidion* from the *proklesis*³⁰). On the basis of the hypothetically reconstructed plot of the *Misogynes*, he regards the *grammateidion* as a love-letter or other communication, which passes from the maiden to her lover. But this view is hardly possible. *Proklesis* and *grammateidion* cannot stand in mere juxtaposition to one another. They must be intimately connected one with the other, for both are characteristic legal terms³¹). The words of the *trophimos* v. 5 sq. are inspired by the general appearance of the altar, where a sacrificial fire in-

30) Cf. Lipsius, *Das Attische Recht und Rechtsverfahren*, Leipzig 1915 p. 866 sq. Regarding the recording of the *proklesis* in a document see Lipsius *ibid.* p. 871.

31) For the latter cf. Theophr. *Char.* VI, 8 (aponoiā) ἰκανὸς δὲ καὶ δίκας τὰς μὲν φεύγειν, τὰς δὲ διώκειν, τὰς δὲ ἐξόμνησθαι, ταῖς δὲ παρῆναι, ἔχων ἐχτῖνον ἐν τῷ προκολλίῳ καὶ ὀρμαθῶς γραμματείδων ἐν ταῖς χερσίν. For the two terms in the same context cf. Demosth. *against Kallipp.* 14 p. 1240, 5 λαχῶν δὲ παρὰ μὲν τοῦ διαιτητοῦ ἀνείλετο τὸ γραμματεῖον, προδικαλέσατο δ' αὐτὸν ἐπιτρέψαι Λυσιστείδῃ, where *grammateion* is the indictment (see Lipsius *ibid.* p. 842 note 48).

dicates that a ceremony connected with litigation has just taken place. His remarks v. 8 sq. follow the moment he catches sight of the *grammateidion*. This document is logically the one whose presence on the altar he has just conjectured. The young master is beside himself with joyful surprise. With the ironic "that doesn't make any difference" in response to the master's "the gods rob me of my wits", the slave reveals himself as the descendant of the antique buffoon, of the *bômolochos* of Aristophanic comedy. His comment is enclosed on both sides by double point; there is no justification for ignoring this punctuation by connecting the words with the following, a change imposed by Maas's restoration of the last line:

ἐπεὶ] σε κρίνω τῶν φ[ί]λων εὐνο[ύ]στατ]ον.

Although there is double point at the end of this verse the editor takes the words of the young master to open a new development in the dialogue ("His master... begins to enlist the slave's cooperation") and punctuates accordingly. Aristophanes *Ploutos* v. 26 sq. and *Men. Georg.* v. 22 a dialogue between master (/mistress) and slave opens with a similar formula. But here the context makes it clear that the young master's words are inspired by what has just happened. As a result of the discovery his situation has obviously taken a turn for the better, and he acknowledges the important part played by the slave in bringing nearer a happy outcome. Similarly, in the *Knights* of Aristophanes v. 873—4:

κρίνω σ' ὅσων ἐγῴδα περὶ τὸν δῆμον ἀνδρ' ἄριστον
εὐνοῦστατόν τε τῇ πόλει καὶ τοῖσι δακτύλοισιν

addressed to the Sausage-seller by Demos, are inspired by the foregoing remarks of Agorakritos. In spite of the editor's misgivings, it is nothing strange that the *trophimos* should call his slave a friend at the moment of sudden joy when the cunning fellow's help appears to have proved a boon to his master. Indeed this trait agrees well with the traditional slave-master relationship of comedy; for the clever slave, ever bent on winning his master's favour, which may one day, he hopes, secure him his freedom, assumes the role of *kolax* in relation to his master. Part of a slave's speech from Menander (Fr. 566) states this attitude clearly:

ἔμοι πόλις ἐστὶ καὶ καταφυγὴ καὶ νόμος
καὶ τοῦ δικαίου τοῦ τ' ἀδίκου παντὸς κριτῆς
ὁ δεσπότης. πρὸς τοῦτον ἕνα δεῖ ζῆν ἐμέ.

The expression *πρός τινα ζῆν* (secundum, ad alicuius normam) is used to define the activity of the *kolax*: *Perik.* v. 122 sqq.

τὴν δὲ μητέρα

εἰσιόντ' εὐθὺς φιλεῖσαι δεῖ μ', ἀνακτῆσασθ' ὄλωσ,
εἰς τὸ κολακεύειν τραπέσθαι ζῆν τε πρὸς ταύτην ἀπλῶς·

and Aristotle *Eth. Nik.* 1124 b, 31 sqq. (μεγαλόψυχος) καὶ πρὸ-
ἄλλον μὴ δύνασθαι ζῆν ἀλλ' ἢ φίλον· δουλικὸν γάρ· διὸ κα-
πάντες οἱ κόλακες θητικοὶ καὶ οἱ ταπεινοὶ κδλακες. It is the
aim of the *kolax* to appear as a friend in the eyes of the person
whose favour may be to his eventual advantage: *Eth. Nik.*
1159 a, 12 sqq. οἱ πολλοὶ δὲ δοκοῦσι διὰ φιλοτιμίαν βούλεσθαι
φιλεῖσθαι μᾶλλον ἢ φιλεῖν· διὸ φιλοκόλακες οἱ πολλοί· ὑπερ-
εχόμενος γὰρ φίλος ὁ κόλαξ, ἢ προσποιεῖται τοιοῦτος καὶ μᾶλ-
λον φιλεῖν ἢ φιλεῖσθαι κτλ. The slave of fr. (a) verso — it
may be the Dromon of (a) recto — has played his rôle well:
the *kolax* is acknowledged as a friend. Even more effusive is
the language employed by the overjoyed lover, Plesidippus, in
addressing the slave to whom he owes so much: *Rudens* v. 1265
sq.

iterum mihi istaec omnia itera, mi anime, mi Trachalio,
mi liberte, mi patrone potius, immo mi pater³²).

A salient feature of the scene is the special mention of a
newly-kindled fire on the altar. The most natural inference
to be drawn from this is that a sacrifice has just taken place;
the offerings that were put in the flame are still burning (one
may recall by way of illustration the words of Knemon: *Dysk.*
v. 449 sqq. ὁ λιβανωτὸς εὐσεβὲς / καὶ] τὸ πόπανον· τοῦτ'
ἔλαβεν ὁ θεὸς ἐπὶ <τὸ> πῦρ / ἄπα]ν ἐπιτεθεέν³³) This is pre-
ferable to supposing, with the editor, that a sacrifice has been
prepared, for it would be difficult to motivate and reproduce
theatrically the interruption in the ceremony which that would
involve. Besides, the placing of the *grammateidion* on the altar
must have been the vital part of the ceremony, which was ac-

32) Here Plautus adheres to the original; the remainder of IV 8
from v. 1269 (introducing the play with "censeo") is the invention of Plau-
tus (see Jachmann, *Plautinisches und Attisches*, Berlin 1931 p. 40).

33) The expression "to bring flame to the altar" is synonymous with
"sacrificing"; cf. Plautus *Poenulus* v. 318 sqq. (... ante lucem ad aedem
Veneris venimus, / primae ut inferemus ignem in aram... / quae habent
nocturna ora, noctu sacrificatum ire occupant) *Mil. gl.* v. 411 sq., *Trucu-*
lentos v. 476, Alkiphron iv 13, 5, Archippos fr. 45 B Edmonds I p. 808.

accompanied purely as a matter of form by the gesture of sprinkling a little incense (for example) on a sacrificial flame; and since the most important stage in the ceremony, which took place before the arrival of the young master and his slave, is complete, it follows that the minor act must also be complete. Any doubts that might remain virtually disappear if two passages from tragedy be brought into relation with the present scene. As a prelude to the anagnorismos, the *paidagōgos* in Euripides' *Elektra* comes on the scene bringing with him a lamb and other gifts for the heroine. He relates how, while making his simple offerings at the grave of Agamemnon, he discovered there the signs of a recent sacrifice: v. 513 sqq.

πυρᾶς δ' ἐπ' αὐτῆς οἷν μελάγχμιον πόκῳ
σφάγιον ἐσεῖδον αἰμά τ' οὐ πάλαι χυθῆν
ξανθῆς τε χαιτῆς βοστρύχους κεκαρμένους.

The corresponding episode in Sophokles' *Elektra* v. 871—937 does not have the freshly-spilt blood — a detail evidently created by Euripides —; instead, the connection of Chrysothemis' discovery with the most recent past is brought out by the mention, first of freshly-spilt milk (v. 894 sq. ὄρω κολώνης ἐξ ἄκρας νεορρύτους / πηγᾶς γάλακτος), and then later of the newly-shorn lock of hair (v. 900 sq. ἐσχάτης δ' ὄρω / πυρᾶς γεώρη βόστρυχον τετμημένον). The relevance of these parallels becomes incontestable when it is recognised that the poet of Antin. 55 is in this scene deeply under the influence of tragedy and of Euripides in particular. The full extent of that influence will be seen presently.

We must now ask the question: to whom does the altar belong? It appears most unlikely that it is that of Apollo Agyieus which stands before the house and is often alluded to in Attic comedy³⁴). The idea that some one should place on a house-altar a copy of a *proklesis*, a document evidently intended to be read by members of the public, has little to recommend it. It may belong to Lykos, the *heros* of the Athenian law-courts, to whom Philokleon in the *Wasps* of Aristophanes shows such touching devotion. V. 818 he confides to Bdelykleon that only one thing is lacking to complete his bliss, and when asked what it is he replies: v. 819

θῆρῶν εἴ πως ἐκκομίσαις τὸ τοῦ Λύκου.

34) See Wilamowitz, *Schiedsgericht*, p. 67.

At the *heroon* of this daimon — there was one in front of every public building in which legal matters were settled — litigants and arbitrators engaged in all sorts of transactions and discussions relating to disputes³⁵). If we postulate a shrine of Lykos as part of the setting of the comedy to which Antin. 55 belongs, it becomes possible to elucidate the presence of a *proklesis* on an altar, for this daimon would gladly harbour at his cult-place a document intimately connected with one of those battles of the law-courts in which — according to *Wasps* v. 389 sqq. — he took such delight. Alternatively the altar might belong to the eponymous heroes of the Attic *phylai*. In the case of private as well as of public suits documents could be set out before the statues of these *heroes* in the market-place so that their contents might be brought to the public notice³⁶). That a document should be exposed to public scrutiny on or beside an altar is a common feature of ancient life. Plato *Leg.* 753 bc an altar has this function. The philosopher lays down an elaborate procedure to be followed in the election of new members to the class of the *archontes*³⁷). The election shall take place ἐν ἱερῷ ὅπερ ἂν ἡ πόλις ἡγήται τιμιώτατον. Each one of those qualified to participate in it shall deposit on the altar of the god a tablet on which he has written the name of the candidate he proposes, his father's name, that of his tribe and that of his deme (φέρειν δ' ἐπὶ τὸν τοῦ θεοῦ βωμὸν ἕκαστον εἰς πινάκιον γράψαντα τοῦνομα πατρόθεν καὶ φυλῆς καὶ δήμου ὁπόθεν ἂν δημοτεύηται); to this he shall append his own name together with the corresponding particulars in the same complete form. The tablets shall remain on the altar for a certain length of time exposed to public scrutiny. Whoever objects to the name on a particular tablet may remove it from the altar (ἀνελόντα) and set it out in the market-place. The further procedure leading to the final selection does not concern us. Clearly, the ceremony described by Plato represents, to a certain extent, a development from the simpler and more primitive practice of placing the *psephoi* on an altar as a preliminary to an elec-

35) See Lipsius, *ibid.* p. 174 sq.; also Gunning article *Lykos* (20) RE XIII col. 2398 sq. A good illustration of the intimate connection between legal action and religious gesture is furnished by Plato *Leg.* 936 E, a passage, which makes mention of a *proklesis*.

36) See Lipsius *ibid.* p. 820.

37) See Glenn R. Morrow, *Plato's Cretan City*, Princeton 1960 p. 159 sq. and 206 sq.

tion³⁸). But in Plato's ceremony the altar has an additional function: not only does it sanctify the election, it also does duty as a notice-board. Demosthenes *Neaira* LIX 76 an inscription with the text of a law is set up by an altar.

What part altar and *proklesis* may have had in the play must remain a secret. It is, however, nothing surprising that litigation should occupy a prominent place in the intrigue of a piece belonging to New Comedy, for the titles of several plays bear witness to the popularity of this theme: *Diadikazomenoi* (Dioxippos), *Enkalountes* (Diphilos), *Epidikazomenos* (Apollodoros of Karystos; Anaxippos; Diphilos; Philemon), *Dis Kategoroumenos* (Augeas), *Philodikastes* (Timokles). Grenfell and Hunt Amherst Papyri ii 13 (= Com. Adesp. Fr. 22 A Edmonds I p. 958 sqq.) contains the broken bits of a scene vitally connected with litigation. An element, which is characteristic of Old Comedy and is immortalised by Aristophanes in the *Wasps* and *Birds*, has survived and been adapted to the world of bourgeois drama. If it be accepted as plausible that the altar in Antin. 55 is that of Lykos a significant addition to our knowledge of New Comedy can be postulated. For in that case this *heros* most probably had a function within the piece corresponding to that of Pan in the *Dyskolos*. True, Arcturus speaks the prologue of Plautus's *Rudens*, while the sanctuary and altar belong to another deity. But the presence of a temple of Venus in a play set in Cyrenae is so obvious that it does not require an elaborate introduction. The shrine of a minor daimon, however, could not be incorporated into the setting of a play without explanation, and this explanation would most naturally be supplied by the divine occupant in person in the rôle of prologue speaker. The tutelary daimon of the Athenian law-courts can well be imagined as the expounder of a plot involving legal action. Furthermore, such an unusual figure as

38) The custom is familiar from Herodotos' anecdote concerning the choice of the best man in Greece at the conclusion of the Persian wars (VIII 123). At Athens this form of solemnisation was common: cf. Plut. *Per.* 32, Demosth. XVII 134, Plat. *Leg.* 12, p. 948 E. See Reisch RE I col. 1690. The altar was also a focal point in the ceremony of oath-taking. A particularly solemn form of oath was taken with a gesture in the direction of the altar or with the hand clasping an altar: cf. IG II/III 1237, 17, Aristot. *Ath. Pol.* 55, 5, and see Jean Rudhardt, *Notions fondamentales de la pensée religieuse et actes constitutifs du culte dans la Grèce classique*, Geneva 1958 p. 202 sq. and 284. (For the importance of the oath in Greek law Lykourgos against *Leokrates* § 79 is the *locus classicus*.)

prologue-speaker, far from arousing suspicion, would actually conform to the spirit and practice of New Comedy. One may recall Menander's *Heros*, Agnoia (*Perikeiromene*), the Lar Familiaris of the *Aulularia*, the Phobos of Com. Adesp. Fr. 154 Kock, all evidence of the popularity of out-of-the-way figures in the rôle of the prologue-speaker. Although the identification of a prologue-speaker must remain conjectural, it is reasonably safe to assume that the setting of the play was a *dikasterion* alongside of the two houses in which the opposing parties lived.

Though some of the difficulties posed by fr. (a) verso have been removed, uncertainties remain regarding the broader background. Only the plot could disclose the full meaning of the scene, but the plot is lost, and the attempt to recover it is better left, as it would tempt us to depart from the text of the fragments and to have recourse to the imagination. Let us be satisfied with the considerable gains which the fragments themselves yield, and not try vainly to wrest the poet's whole secret from a few broken pieces. And we have good reason to be satisfied, for in spite of uncertainties concerning matters of detail the value of fr. (a) verso as a contribution to our understanding of ancient drama cannot be doubted. It preserves a vivid example of a device, which is found not rarely in our extant material. The scene discloses the discovery of something that had been left behind by the persons who departed or moved into the background immediately before the arrival of those who were destined to make the discovery. It will be convenient here to list the examples of this procedure.

(1) At the grave of his murdered father Orestes in the *Choephoroi* makes an expiatory offering of a lock of hair. Then he and his companion move aside to escape observation as the chorus enters. Elektra prepares to pour libations on her father's grave. She discovers there signs of a recent offering and of her brother's presence. Recognition and reunion follow³⁹).

(2) In the *Eumenides* the scene shifts v. 235 sqq. from Delphi to Athens. Orestes prays v. 235—43 to the goddess of the city. Then his pursuers arrive. At first they do not see him, for he has retreated to the altar of Athena where he clings to

39) For the relation of the scene to the parts of Sophokles and Euripides which have been referred to above cf. Robert Böhme, *Hermes* LXXIII 1938 p. 202 sq.

the sacred cult-statue. But they nevertheless detect his presence at once: v. 244 sq.

εἶεν· τόδ' ἔστι τᾶνδρὸς ἐκφανὲς τέκμαρ,
ἔπου δὲ μῆγυτῆρος ἀφθέγκτου φραδαῖς.

The stench of the blood of a murdered mother tells them that Orestes is near at hand. After this the discovery of the fugitive is introduced v. 254 sqq. by the formal division of the chorus into two groups; the one gives exhortation to watch out and spy in all directions lest the matricide escape, while the other sets eyes on the outlaw and announces his presence.

(3) Odysseus and Diomedes *Rhesos* v. 565 make their first entrance as night-raiders at the camp of the Trojans. The deserted camp is recognised by Odysseus. His companion confirms that it must be the spot because it suits the description of Hektor's camp which Dolon had furnished. As in the scene at the grave of Agamemnon *Choephoroi* v. 164 sqq., *stichomythia* is employed — not consistently however — to infuse excitement and movement into the discovery. The signs which reveal to them the site recently evacuated by the enemy do not have to be stated explicitly; when Odysseus points to the deserted camp the imagination easily supplies a picture of smouldering fires.

(4) Davus in the *Andria* of Terence (/Menander) v. 721 comes out carrying the baby, which he proceeds to expose with the cooperation of Mysis. He then moves aside in order to create the impression that he is just on the point of entering. Chremes comes on and discovers the infant v. 741.

(5) In the *Cistellaria* of Plautus (/Menander Synaristosai) the servant girl, Halisca, accidentally drops the box containing the crepundia which she is to take into the house. The slave Lampadio, coming on, finds it v. 655 sqq.⁴⁰).

40) Halisca, having discovered her loss, reappears in a state of great distress and looks about her for the box; for the supposed connection of the latter scene with the *Ichneutai* of Sophokles see Webster, *Studies in Menander*, p. 163. The finding of exposed infants, crepundia, treasure, etc., a basic element of New Comedy, is otherwise not represented on the stage. For accounts of such happenings cf. *Aulularia* v. 701 sqq., *Rudens* v. 906 sqq., *Vidularia* v. 71 sqq., *Epitrep.* v. 64 sqq., *Perik.* v. 364 sqq., *Thesaurus* of Lucius Lanuvinus. Perhaps the editor in his interpretation of fr. (a) verso was influenced by the account of the latter play which is given by Donatus (10, 2 ad Ter. Eun. v. 9 sqq.): . . . adulescens, qui rem familiarem ad nequitiam prodegerat, servulum mittit ad patris monumentum, quod

In all these passages, a scene is linked to the foregoing by means of a bond, which consists of an object or trace left behind by a person who makes way before the approach of the finder or discoverer⁴¹). Formally, the discovery is disclosed by means of question and answer or comment and counter-comment⁴²); only the two examples from Roman comedy do not adhere to this pattern. The poet of Antin. 55 clearly stands in a tradition which developed from the dramaturgic practice of Attic tragedy. This can be seen more clearly still if we recall a device closely related to, but not quite identical with, that employed in the scene preserved by Antin. 55. A discovery is made of something whose presence has not previously been brought to the attention of the audience; the signs found have been left by someone who has not appeared on the stage, whose previous activity on the scene is merely evoked as a necessary fiction in the interest of the plot. Sophokles has this in the *Ichneutai* v. 94 sqq., where the chorus of Satyrs discovers the hoof-marks of the stolen kine. Here the discovery is introduced, as in the *Eumenides*, by the division of the chorus into two groups; the rapid exchange of surprised comments admirably reflects the inner agitation of the finders, who are formally a pair, in effect, though, a unit. Similarly the signs which Orestes and his companion spy before the temple in the *Iphigeneia en Taurois* bear witness to something which happened some time before their

senex sibi vivus magnis opibus apparaverat, ut id aperiret illaturus epulas, quas pater post annum decimum caverat inferri sibi. sed eum agrum, in quo monumentum erat, senex quidam avarus ab adolescente emerat. servus ad aperiendum monumentum auxilio usus senis, thesaurum cum epistula ibidem reperit. etc. The finding of the treasure was not shown on the stage. In a tragedy the presence of a tomb would be nothing unusual, but a comic poet could not have encumbered the scene with such a symbol of doom.

41) Quite different is the technique of discovery employed in scenes where one person spies on another. Objects, which advance the plot, are seen at the opening of a new scene by characters who remain for the moment unnoticed by those who hold the objects in their hands. Menander has two forms of this method. Chremes and Syrus at the end of the third act of the *Heauton Timorumenos* move to one side as Sostrata and the nurse appear; unobserved they see Sostrata examine the ring. The reverse takes place *Epitrep.* v. 206 sqq. Onesimos enters and sets eyes on Syriskos as he examines the ring and other *gnorismata* unaware of the presence of the intruder.

42) A similar method is used to disclose a landscape (Sophokles *Philoketes* v. 26) or view (the paintings in the temple at Delphi, Euripides *Ion* v. 184).

coming, not to events that had taken place before the eyes of the audience. The blood and hair on the altar and the spoil hanging from the roof of the temple enable them to recognise the place of their destination as soon as they enter (v. 69 sqq.). This is the passage which demonstrates most strikingly the debt the poet of *Antin.* 55 owes to the theatre of Euripides⁴³). On this account the dialogue between Orestes and Pylades v. 67—75 must be quoted.

- Ορ. ὄρα, φυλάσσου μή τις ἐν στίβῳ βροτῶν.
 Πυ. ὄρῶ, σκοποῦμαι δ' ὄμμα πανταχοῦ στρέφων.
 Ορ. Πυλάδη, δοκεῖ σοι μέλαθρα ταῦτ' εἶναι θεᾶς,
 ἐνθ' Ἄργόθεν ναῦν ποντίαν ἐστείλαμεν;
 Πυ. ἔμοιγ', Ὀρέστα· σοὶ δὲ συνδοκεῖν χρεῶν.
 Ορ. καὶ βωμός, Ἑλλήν οὖ καταστάζει φόνος;
 Πυ. ἐξ αἱμάτων γούν ξάνθ' ἔχει τριχώματα.
 Ορ. θριγκοῖς δ' ὑπ' αὐτοῖς σκῦλ' ὄρας ἠρηγμένα;
 Πυ. τῶν καθ' ἀνόντων γ' ἀκροθίνια ξένων.

Characteristic of scenes of discovery is the use of two speakers, whose remarks to one another enliven the revelation. Naturally Orestes can see as well as Pylades what is before the temple, and can draw the correct conclusions from what he sees; but the matter has to be communicated in the most dramatic manner possible, and the form chosen is essentially the same as that employed in *Antin.* 55. The relation in which Orestes stands to Pylades is analogous to that of the *trophimos* and his slave. The dramatic function of superior and dependant is the same in both scenes. Orestes, like the *trophimos*, is formally the first of the pair to set eyes on the scene; in a series of questions addressed to his companion he introduces the various stages of the discovery. Pylades confirms each detail in turn, just as the slave formally verifies his young master's impression and answers his excited questions. In both scenes a discovery is made at an altar. The general similarity of situation has resulted in a remarkable coincidence of expression. Orestes asks his companion v. 72: "And this is the altar where *Greek* blood *drips*?" Pylades can confirm this, for something he observes on the

43) For the influence which tragedy exerted on the stage-craft of the poets of New Comedy, cf. Leo, *Plautinische Forschungen*, p. 144 sqq., W. H. Friedrich, *Euripides und Diphilos*, München 1953 (Zetemata 5) p. 186, Webster, *Studies in Menander*, p. 162 sqq.

altar proves the deduction of Orestes to be right: "Yes, at any rate the colour of the hair embedded in the coagulated blood is fair". The *trophimos*, casting eyes on the altar (of Lykos?), concludes that a *proklesis* has been set out there, and his slave is able to verify this impression, because he too notices there something which makes the conclusion a plausible one; the words *καινόν γε πῦρ πάρεστιν* in the comic scene have a function corresponding to that of v. 73 *ἐξ αἰμάτων γούν ξάνθ' ἔχει τριχώματα* in the *Iphigeneia en Taurois*. This parallel at once supports and illustrates the explanation of v. 6 sq. which has been given above.

As a result of the comparison of Antin. 55 with Menander a light has been shed on stylistic affinities that lie so deep that one is forced to give up all reserve and declare frankly: these fragments are Menander. But the most important mark of the poet's style in Antin. 55 has not yet been disclosed. As the *mageiros* comes out in search of Parmenon *Samia* v. 142, he encounters Demeas, who, rushing wildly into the house, rudely shouts at him to move aside. Taken completely aback the *mageiros* exclaims that the man must be gone mad: v. 145 sqq.⁴⁴):

Ἡράκλεις, τί τοῦτο, παῖ;
 μαινόμενος εἰσδεδράμηκεν εἴσω τις γέρων,
 ἦ τί τὸ κακόν ποτ' ἔστι; τί δέ μοι τοῦτο, παῖ;
 νῆ τὸν Ποσειδῶ, μαινέθ', ὡς ἐμοὶ δοκεῖ.
 κέκραγε γούν παμμέγεθες.

This passage has the same basic structure as Antin. 55 fr. (a) verso v. 4—9. Analysis of the two in tabular form will best bring out their structural identity.

44) Körte puts the question mark before the vocatives at the end of v. 145 and v. 147. The cook has come out to fetch Parmenon but fails to find him. This is why Körte thinks that these vocatives, like those in v. 143 and v. 152, are directed beyond the immediate scene and thus stand in isolation from the surrounding context. But the cliché *τί τοῦτο, παῖ;* — with a clear function and a predetermined position in New Comedy — cannot be split in two. Alexis fr. 168, quoted above, is an excellent illustration of how an exclamatory vocative may stand at the head of a sentence, which ends with a true vocative. In v. 147 the proximity of the „ethic“ dative is against Körte's punctuation. It is psychologically plausible that the *mageiros* should suddenly address the slave as if he were present; he is at sea without the guidance of the person who hired him, and at a moment of intense bewilderment the wish engenders in him the illusion that Parmenon is actually beside him.

Antin. 55 fr. (a) verso v. 4—9
Exclamation (Apollo)

a. Formulaic τί τοῦτο, παῖ;
b. Surmise (a *proklesis* has been placed by someone on the altar). Use of τις, characteristic of conjectural statements.

c. Observation supporting the latter surmise (γε)

A. Double question re-echoing the formulaic a. (τουτι δε δη τι ποτ' εστι; . . . / . . . τι εστι τουτου;) ⁴⁵)

B. Asseveration (by slave) succeeding the surmise b. made by the *trophimos* (it is a writing-tablet)

Samia v. 145—149

Exclamation (Herakles)

a. Formulaic τί τοῦτο, παῖ;
b. Surmise (a madman has run inside). Use of τις, characteristic of conjectural statements.

A. Double question re-echoing the formulaic a. (ἦ τι το κακόν ποτ' εστι; τί δε μοι τουτου, παῖ;)

B. Asseveration succeeding the surmise b. that has just been made (it really is a madman)

c. Observation supporting the latter asseveration (γοῦν)

A single modification is found in the basic schema. Even the positions which the decisive words occupy in relation to one another within the verses correspond in either passage. The critical word of b., *μαινόμενος*, at the beginning of the verse *Samia* 146, is taken up two lines later by the critical word of B., *μαίνεθ'*, in the second half of the verse (*Samia* 148). Similarly *πρόκλησον*, the critical word of b. in Antin. 55, stands at the head of the verse (6) and is taken up three lines later (the different position of c. within the schema of the passages accounts for this variation) by *γραμματεῖδιον*, the critical word of B., in the second half of the verse (9).

The existence of such compositional schemata in Menander demands recognition. Their value as a seal of authenticity has

45) In a further detail fr. (a) verso v. 8 sq. carries the impress of Menander's individual style. Three clauses succeed one another in the order a, b, a. The last reverts literally to the content of the first; the interposed clause has the verb *βούλεσθαι*. Menander has this several times. Dysk. 512 sq. (Σικ.) *χαίρε πολλ'*. (Κν.) *οὐ βούλομαι / χαιρεῖν παρ' ὁμῶν οὐδενός*. (Σικ.) *μη χαίρε δή*, *ibid.* v. 750 sq., v. 954 sq., *Epitrep.* v. 365, *Perik.* v. 212 sqq.

remarkable that the last of these bears a unique title which happens to fit the equally unique dramatic situation of fr. (a) verso. A slave and his young master actively intervene after someone has made a *proklesis* which in all probability was directed against the *trophimos* as a measure aimed at securing his condemnation before a court of law (perhaps on a charge similar to that which was brought against the young master of Daos in Pap. Oxyr. 11: refusal or incapacity to return the dowry he received before he fell in love with another girl and refused to marry the first). The title of the play has been elucidated by Körte: Verbum προεγκαλεῖν alibi non traditum significat "alterius accusationem antevenire"⁴⁷). The chances

47) Only two short fragments survive from the play. Fr. 350 (Stob. ecl. IV 24, 21) contains a conventional complaint concerning the bitter troubles of parenthood. The other, Fr. 351, also preserved by Stobaios (ecl. IV 19, 17):

τὸ δὲ
κελευόμενον μὲν ἔστιν ἀσφαλέστατον
δοῦλῳ ποεῖν, ὧς φασιν.

can be related to the contents of one of the remnants of Antin. 55. An important element in the comedy was Dromon's undertaking to carry out a difficult task, which had been imposed on him by the person who had authority over him. The first six lines of fr. (d) recto (of the remaining v. 7—8 only inconsiderable traces survive) are given by the editor as follows:

[ἐπέτα]ξέ σοι τάχ' ὄν τιν' εὔρειν μ[ηχανήν]
[α]βτῶι· σὺ δ' ὀπέσχου τοῦτο· διὰ τίν' [α]τταν;] -
[πρῶ]τον μὲν, ἔστι κῦ[ριος σ]οῦ· δεῦ[τερον,]
[...]τος· <τὸ> τρίτον, ἔραϊ .[...]ος· ἐμη[
[σὺ γ'] οὐ δικαίως τοῖς ἔρω[μὲν]οῖς [τε και]
[σαυτῶ]ι βοηθεῖς ἅμα· πεπ[

Regarding the identity of the speaker, it seems possible that the person who entrusted the lover's affairs to the resourcefulness of Dromon in fr. (a) recto confronts the slave here again. For it would be most natural that the person who had encouraged Dromon to take action should also take him to task after he had appeared to give a poor account of himself. V. 3 sqq., giving the reasons why Dromon undertook to help his master, are badly mutilated and may not be free from corruption. κύριος v. 3 — the restoration is practically certain — is unusual of the relationship of master to slave, but cf. Antiphon 120 1—5 and Aristot. *Pol.* 2, 9, 4. χρηστός has been suggested as the second qualification of Dromon's young master, but, apart from the objection that it does not fit the space, it appears a somewhat colourless word here; moreover, its favourite application in comedy is ironical: "a good fellow!", "a fine thing!" One expects a word like κομψός, occasionally used of a master by a slave or inferior person with the sense "a sport, a jolly good fellow" (*Dysk.* v. 414). πιστός might be right if one

that Antin. 55 belongs to the Προεγκαλῶν and that the *Comœdia Florentina* belongs to the Αὐτὸν πενήτων are approximately equal; in both cases identification is based on the coincidence of an extraordinary situation and an extraordinary title. It remains finally to point out that Antin. 55 (Proenkālōn?) must belong to the poet's first period, for the present investigation has repeatedly exposed an intimate kinship with that style and manner which are most vividly represented for us by the *Samia* and the *Dyskolos*. The artistic shortcomings which were revealed in fr. (a) recto are satisfactorily explained by the circumstance that this too is an early play.

Dublin

Thomas Williams

were to suppose so close an identity of interests between Dromon and his young master that they would be almost in the position of friends. The jingle of πρώτον . . . δεύτερον . . . τρίτον within two verses is — though this may appear strange — quite compatible with the style of Menander. Fr. 142 *Empimpramene* has no less than five members of such a series within two verses; see also *Theophr.* fr. 1 v. 16 sq. and Fr. 209 v. 5 sqq. (*Thyrōros*). Yet another subtle mark of Menander's style is found in v. 1: the young master bade the slave quickly (τάχα) discover some means to help him, and the slave undertook to do this. Now the adverb which is employed here occurs in only one other passage of our extant Menander: *Samia* v. 84. There Demeas characterises his slave, Parmenon. Nothing seems to escape this fellow's notice, he quickly gets wind of everything taking place (τάχ' ὄλε πᾶν πραττόμενον ἔργον), since he is the greatest busy-body in the world. διὰ τίν' αἰτίαν at the end of the verse occurs Men. Fr. 773. Some of the remarks on fr. (d) recto now need to be modified since Latte (*Gnomon* 34 1962 p. 153 sq.) has seen that it belongs to Dromon's monologue.