

# THE FATHER-SON RELATIONSHIP AND THE ENDING OF MENANDER'S *SAMIA*

JOHN N. GRANT

THIS ARTICLE ADDRESSES TWO ASPECTS of Menander's *Samia* which have generated discussion and some disagreement since the Bodmer codex added considerably to our knowledge of the play. The first concerns how the final act fits into the structure of the play as a whole. The second is the dramatist's portrayal of the father-son relationship: does Menander give a favourable or unfavourable impression of the bond between Demeas and his adopted son Moschion? Since the father-son relationship is a major theme of the play, and since Demeas and Moschion are the principal characters, the two topics here addressed are connected. One purpose of this essay is to point out one feature, unnoticed, to my knowledge, or at least not publicized, of the final act which strengthens its connections with the rest of the play: the exploitation of a motif which occurs elsewhere in the play—the reversal of the father-son relationship with respect to Demeas and Moschion. This motif naturally pertains to the second aspect mentioned above.

When the chorus enters for the final *entr'acte* at the end of the fourth act, the complications which have arisen in the play to prevent what all the characters desire—the marriage of Moschion and Plangon, the daughter of Demeas' neighbour Nikeratos—have been resolved. Preparations for the wedding are now under way and Chrysis, the *pallake* of Demeas, whom he had expelled from his household because of his mistaken belief that she had seduced Moschion and had borne a child as the result of that union, has been restored to her former position. Demeas has realized that he erred in his judgment of Moschion and has apologized for misjudging him: οὐδὲν ἀδικοῦς, Μοσχίων· ἐγὼ δέ σε / ὑπονοῶν τοιαῦτα (537–538). What, then, remains for the final act?<sup>1</sup>

The following works will be referred to by author's names alone: W. S. Anderson, "The Ending of the *Samia* and Other Menandrian Comedies," *Studi classici in onore di Quintino Cataudella* 2 (Catania 1972) 155–179; H.-D. Blume, *Menanders 'Samia'. Eine Interpretation* (Darmstadt 1974); S. M. Goldberg, *The Making of Menander's Comedy* (London 1980); A. W. Gomme and F. H. Sandbach, *Menander. A commentary* (Oxford 1973); N. Holzberg, *Menander: Untersuchungen zur dramatischen Technik* (Nürnberg 1974); J.-M. Jacques, *Ménandre. La Samienne* (Paris 1971); H. J. Mette, "Moschion ὁ κόσμος," *Hermes* 97 (1969) 432–439. The line references to the text of Menander are based on Sandbach's OCT.

<sup>1</sup>If more of Menander's work had survived, the apparently premature conclusion at the end of Act IV would probably not be in the least surprising. Even on the basis of what has survived, it seems that frequently the plot may have been worked out before the final entrance of the chorus and that the last act was primarily a celebration of the re-established harmony of the society of the comedy. See Anderson; Gomme and Sandbach 369; T. B. L. Webster, *An introduction to*

The audience would certainly have been awaiting the return of the bridegroom. Moschion has gone off to the agora at 539 and is as yet unaware that all is now ready for the wedding to take place. We might reasonably expect Moschion to enter and to express with some impatience his hopes that all the problems have been resolved.<sup>2</sup> This could have been followed by a meeting with Demeas in which he heard of all that had happened—of Chrysis' return to Demeas and of the completion of the arrangements for the wedding. Then the reconciliation between father and son, which had been cut short in Act IV by the arrival of Nikeratos at 538, immediately after Demeas' apology (quoted above), might take place at greater length before the final celebration scene.

What actually happens is that in an entrance monologue Moschion says that the more he has thought of how Demeas has misjudged him by believing him to be the father of a child by Chrysis, the more angry he has become. He decides to pretend to leave for Karia or Bactria and take up military service. This will frighten Demeas and teach him a lesson. Moschion's slave, Parmenon, then enters and is sent inside by his young master to bring out a sword and cloak. He returns empty-handed, however, and tells Moschion about the wedding arrangements which are busily being made. His master, he says, seems to be behind the times and to be ignorant of what has happened. His despair is all for nothing (670 ff.). Moschion's reaction is to abuse Parmenon verbally and physically and to send him in again. In his absence Moschion's resolution wavers and he wonders if Demeas will make no attempt to prevent his leaving. If so, Moschion's plan will come to nought and he will be a laughing stock when he has to give up the pretence and return (682–686). Parmenon finally brings out the sword and cloak, but with them he also brings the news that no one inside saw him collecting these items. Moschion's dilemma is solved by the arrival on stage of his father. Demeas takes the apparent preparations for departure at face value and delivers a short speech, serious in tone and content (694–712). He admits that he was wrong to suspect Moschion. At the same time, however, Demeas puts forward his own case. He adopted Moschion and reared him

---

*Menander* (Manchester 1973) 78 f.; L. Nicastrì, "Sul problema del V atto in Menandro," *Vichiana* 7 (1978) 168–178, who stresses more than others the links between the ending of Menandrian plays and the traditional farcical and celebratory atmosphere of Old Comedy.

Notwithstanding our incomplete knowledge of the dramatist and his work, however, the views which have been commonly expressed about the final act of the *Samia* are a testimony to Menander's mastery of the genre and to his inventiveness in producing fresh variations on traditional motifs or *topoi*. The content of this act has been seen, sometimes by the same scholar, on the one hand to be unexpected, on the other to form an integral part of the play. N. Holzberg, for example, says one expects the final act to begin with the celebration of the wedding (131), but later writes: "Der fünfte Akt der Σαμία . . . schliesst organisch an die bisherige Handlung" (133).

<sup>2</sup>So, for example, Blume 245 f.

from an early age. If Moschion has had a comfortable mode of life (and the audience knows that he has), he owes it to Demeas. Moschion should therefore put up with actions of Demeas which cause him pain. Moreover, despite the mistake which he made, Demeas did everything he could to protect Moschion and to look after his interests by keeping the "facts" to himself. Moschion, on the other hand, by his intended action, will publicize Demeas' error. Demeas urges Moschion not to think of this one day of their lives together, but to remember all that went before. Demeas will say no more except that it is virtuous for a son to comply readily with his father's wishes, while οὐ καλῶς ἔχει / πατρὶ μόλις πιθέσθαι (711–712).

Before Moschion can answer, Nikeratos enters. He immediately thinks that Moschion is deserting his daughter. The misunderstanding is quickly cleared away and Demeas bids Nikeratos bring out Plangon. In his short absence all that Moschion has time to say is: "If you had done this right away, you would not have been put to the trouble of your philosophizing just now" (εἰ τοῦτ' ἐποίεις εὐθὺς, οὐκ ἂν πράγματα / εἶχες, ὦ πάτερ, φιλοσοφῶν ἄρτι, 724–725). Nikeratos enters with Plangon and utters the marriage formula, to which Moschion responds: ἔχω, / λαμβάνω, στέργω (728–729). The wedding procession is then summoned and the play ends with a call for applause and an appeal to Νίκη.

In an article which was all the more attractive because of a frank disavowal of wishing or being able to reduce the structure of Menander's comedies to a simple formula, Anderson discussed a feature of the ending of the surviving plays of Menander and of Roman comedies based on Menandrian originals. When Menander devoted the fifth act of his plays primarily to effecting the integration or re-integration of the comic society, this was achieved sometimes by the mocking or humiliation of a character who was in some way still a blocking character even in the fifth act when the plot was to all intents and purposes complete. Knemon in the *Dyskolos* is forced at the very end of the play to join the wedding celebration as a result of the physical maltreatment which he receives at the hands of Sikon and Getas. Similarly, though not by physical means, Smikrines in the *Epitrepontes* is ridiculed and humiliated by Onesimos. Anderson pointed out similarities between the *Dyskolos* and the *Samia* and the treatment of Knemon and Moschion in the two plays. Although Moschion is the initiator of potentially humiliating action directed at Demeas, and Knemon is the victim of such conduct, the end result is the same in both plays. Both Knemon and Moschion are the comic butts.

If anyone has been responsible for the complications which threatened to disrupt the relationship between Demeas and Moschion and to endanger the marriage of Moschion and Plangon, it is Moschion himself.<sup>3</sup> In his initial

<sup>3</sup>I find it difficult to accept that Demeas can be accused of "hasty, ill-founded suspicions" which cause him to break off his relationship with Chrysis: so Goldberg 92. Demeas certainly

meeting with Demeas in Act II Moschion missed two opportunities to tell his father about his relationship with Plangon, first when Demeas expressed his displeasure with Chrysis for rearing what he thought was his own child by her (130 ff.), and secondly when Demeas raised the prospect of Moschion's marriage with Plangon (145 ff.). His failure to reveal the truth in Act IV is more pardonable. There he thinks that Demeas already knows the full truth, when his father reveals his knowledge of Moschion's paternity of the child. It is only after the tirades of Nikeratos (495 ff., 506 ff.) that Moschion realizes that Demeas still believes the mother of the child to be Chrysis (see especially 521–522). Anderson is surely right to claim that in Act V Moschion can in no way “leap to self-righteous anger against his father and hold him guilty” (157–158). One might add that the characterization of Moschion makes his pretended plan to join the army comic and preposterous. Moschion has in the earlier part of the play shown all the characteristics of the *adulescens timidus*, and this trait is obvious here too, when he wonders if his father will make no effort to detain him (685–686). In a neat example of dramatic irony Menander makes Moschion think he will be γελοῖος if this happens, when in fact he is γελοῖος at the moment of speaking. Moschion is the comic victim of his own ploy.<sup>4</sup>

Anderson sees another feature common to the *Dyskolos* and the *Samia*. Not only is the fifth act in both plays used to achieve the social integration of all the characters, but the prerequisite, so to speak, for the achievement of this integration is also the same. The characterization of both Knemon and Moschion is as yet incomplete and must be filled out before the final harmony of the comic society can be achieved: Knemon “must be humanized and recognize the interdependence of men,” while Moschion “must face his guilt squarely” (164). But since there is little indication in the act that Moschion does this, Anderson is less convincing on this point. Integration is achieved, but it is a hollow achievement, and of a superficial kind, which seems to be explained more by the need for a “happy ending” than by any repentance or change in the character or attitude of Moschion.<sup>5</sup>

It is equally difficult to accept unreservedly the views of those who explain the coherence of the final act with the rest of the play in terms of the need for a reconciliation between father and son.<sup>6</sup> No one can deny the

---

acts throughout the play with haste, but the conclusion which Demeas comes to seems a reasonable one in the light of what he knows at this point.

<sup>4</sup>Blume has good comments on the humour which arises from the incongruity of Moschion's alleged intention and the kind of character he is (251 f.). The tone of his speech also adds to the comic effect. See also Gomme-Sandbach 618 (on 616 ff.).

<sup>5</sup>I am also sceptical of any real filling out of the characterization of Knemon at the end of the *Dyskolos*.

<sup>6</sup>So Jacques xxvii; Holzberg 133: “Selbst wenn auch hier mit dem Ende des vierten Aktes alle Irrtümer und Hindernisse aus dem Weg geräumt sind und damit die Handlung ihr eigentliches Ziel erreicht hat, so ist doch noch eine versöhnliche Aussprache zwischen Vater und Sohn, den beiden Trägern der Handlung, vonnöten.”

dramatic need for a more extended scene of reconciliation between Demeas and Moschion, since the potential reconciliation scene in Act IV was cut short by the arrival of Nikeratos at line 539. But what is one to do with the uncomfortable fact that yet again in Act V Nikeratos interrupts and prevents any attempt on the part of Moschion to respond to his father? Demeas and Moschion are not left alone on stage long enough for any reconciliation to take place.<sup>7</sup> If, as Jacques claimed, the act provides the opportunity for “une ultime explication” (xxxvii), it can hardly be said that what actually happens “rétablit entre eux un climat de sérénité totale et d’absolue confiance” (xlvi). Moschion’s sole response at 724–725 is graceless and seems to dismiss his father’s words at 694–712 as irrelevant sermonizing.<sup>8</sup>

The “problem” of the final act will be put aside for the moment in order to look at the father-son relationship in the rest of the play. The majority view is that the *Samia*, like the *Adelphoi B* (in the minds of some), presents a model relationship to which fathers and sons would not be ashamed to aspire.<sup>9</sup> In the opposing camp Stoessl’s view that despite the happy ending

<sup>7</sup>If the events in the play were real and not the product of a dramatist’s imagination, it might be reasonable to say “Nichts könnte für Moschion zum gegenwärtigen Zeitpunkt peinlicher sein als das Erscheinen des künftigen Schwiegervaters” (Blume 277) or “He [Moschion] is saved by the sudden appearance of Nikeratos, which relieves him from the necessity of an immediate reply” (Gomme-Sandbach 628). But it is more important to ask why Menander has deliberately chosen not to allow a reconciliation of the two men to take place.

<sup>8</sup>Attempts have been made to explain away what Moschion says. David Bain, *Menander. Samia* (Warminster 1983) 129, states that Moschion’s “reaction takes the form of a joke. In case his behaviour appears excessively flippant and heartless it should be pointed out that the address *o pater* is an affectionate one.” Cf. Gomme-Sandbach 629: “Moschion tries, illogically but perhaps not altogether seriously, to put some blame on his father.” If Moschion had gone on to say something like “but I’ve been wrong too in some respects. Let’s learn from this,” the tone of Moschion’s words might seem less grudging. Lines 724–725 also troubled Blume: “Das ist etwas schlicht und ein billiger Lacheffekt und nicht ganz in Einklang zu bringen mit dem Charakter des Jungen, wie ihn Menander bisher gezeichnet. Offenbar gestattet er sich in Schlusszenen eine grössere Lockerheit” (280).

<sup>9</sup>Hugh Lloyd-Jones, “Menander’s *Samia* in the Light of the New Evidence,” *YCS* 22 (1972) 119–144, talks about the sympathetic study of the relations between adoptive father and adopted son. “Each,” he says (143), “is devoted to the other and the devotion of each triumphantly surmounts every test to which it is exposed by the farcical concatenation of events.”

Jacques’ view may be seen from the quotation at the end of the preceding paragraph, and elsewhere he talks of “la profondeur et l’originalité de l’affection unissant père et fils” (xxxiii) and of “une amitié paternelle et filiale renforcée par cette communauté de tempérament et de caractère qui a créé entre eux des liens plus étroits que ceux de sang” (xxxv). Anderson refers to “complete family integrity” (160), Blume thinks that the audience leaves with the feeling of satisfaction “dass alles endlich nach Wunsch verlaufen ist” (285), while E. Masaracchia, “Il quinto atto della *Samia* menandrea,” *Helikon* 18–19 (1978–1979) 258–275, whose interpretation places more emphasis on the growth and maturing of Moschion as a theme of the comedy, believes that the play ends “in un’atmosfera gioiosa e serena.” “Come non applaudire ad una conclusione così concretamente rassicurante?” she asks (274).

More restrained, Mette states that “der fünfte Akt dient nur dem einen Ziel die Basis des Vertrauens zwischen Sohn und Vater wiederherzustellen” (439).

the play is basically bitter and sarcastic, a view thought by Lloyd-Jones to be absurd, seems overstated.<sup>10</sup> More balanced is Del Corno's verdict: "al di là dell'ottimismo della conclusione, il motivo della dialettica tra le generazioni si risolve nello sconcolato riconoscimento dell'incomprensione che divide pure un padre e un figlio che si amano." He describes the moment when Demeas asks forgiveness for Moschion as "una delle situazioni umanamente ed *amaramente* [my italics] paradossali di Menandro."<sup>11</sup>

The audience is introduced to the relationship between father and son at the very beginning of the play. The long opening monologue of Moschion serves as much to characterize that relationship as to cast light on the kind of person Moschion is. The young man tells of the comfortable life style which he has enjoyed through the generosity of his adoptive father. Moschion has not been unappreciative: ἀστείαν δ' ὅμως / τούτων χάριν τιν' ἀπέδιδουν· ἦν κόσμος (17–18). In expressing these sentiments Moschion clearly marks himself out as an unusual son in Greek comedy,<sup>12</sup> although what he says might represent the behaviour of an ideal son in the eyes of Greek society. When talking of friendship between unequal individuals, Aristotle refers specifically to φιλία between father and son. The obligations of a son to a father far outweigh the claims of a son on his parent (*EN* 1158b20 ff.), and indeed no one can ever render his parent the honour he deserves (*EN* 1163b15 ff.).<sup>13</sup> In comedy, however, the failure of a son to behave in such a way is grist for its mill.<sup>14</sup> While Moschion's words at vv. 17–18 have attracted attention, and rightly so, an earlier passage in his monologue, which has aroused little comment, is equally important. At vv. 7–8 Moschion says that, although he well remembers the material comforts he enjoyed as a child, he will pass over them. The reason for doing so is given in v. 9: [εὐεργέ]ται γὰρ ταῦτά μ' οὐ φρονούντά πω. Moschion speaks here not in terms of the father-son relationship, in which a son's debt of gratitude to his father has nothing to do with his awareness of the benefits at the time he enjoyed them, but in terms of a relationship between friends. Aristotle names as one of the requirements for real friendship the need for friends to be aware of each other's goodwill.<sup>15</sup> This condition is close to what underlies

<sup>10</sup>F. Stoessl, "Die neue Menanderpublikationen der Bibliotheca Bodmeriana in Genf," *RhM* 112 (1969) 208; Lloyd-Jones (above, n. 9) 144, n. 6.

<sup>11</sup>D. Del Corno, "Il nuovo Menandro: 'Lo scudo' e 'La donna di Samo'," *Atene e Roma* 15 (1970) 77, 76.

<sup>12</sup>See, especially, Mette *passim*; Jacques xxx–xxxi.

<sup>13</sup>*EN* 1158b20 ff.: ταῦτά μὲν δὴ οὔτε γίνεται ἐκατέρω παρὰ θατέρου οὔτε δεῖ ζητεῖν· ὅταν δὲ γονεῦσι μὲν τέκνα ἀπονέμῃ ἃ δεῖ τοῖς γεννήσασσι, γονεῖς δὲ [υἱέσιν] ἃ δεῖ τοῖς τέκνοις . . . ; 1163b15 ff.: τὸ δυνατόν γὰρ ἡ φιλία ἐπιζητεῖ, οὐ τὸ κατ' ἀξίαν· οὐδὲ γὰρ ἔστιν ἐν πᾶσι, καθάπερ ἐν ταῖς πρὸς τοὺς θεοὺς τιμαῖς καὶ τοὺς γονεῖς· οὐδεὶς γὰρ τὴν ἀξίαν ποτ' ἂν ἀποδοίη.

<sup>14</sup>See, for example, F. Wehrli, *Motivstudien zur griechischen Komödie* (Zürich 1936) 70 ff.

<sup>15</sup>*EN* 1155b33–1156a5: εὐνοίαν γὰρ ἐν ἀντιπεπονηθόσι φιλίαν εἶναι. ἡ προσθετόν μὴ λαμβάνουσιν; πολλοὶ γὰρ εἰσιν εὖνοι οἷς οὐχ ἑωράκασιν, ὑπολαμβάνουσι δὲ ἐπιεικεῖς

Moschion's thinking at this point in the monologue. As a child he could not have been truly aware of all the things that his father did for him. Therefore, they are less important than the benefits he received from Demeas when he was old enough to appreciate them.

The role of friend rather than son is also suggested by Moschion later in the monologue. He tells (21 ff.) of how Demeas fell in love with a Samian woman. Moschion realized that unless Demeas won her, he would run the risk of losing her to younger rivals. Although, unfortunately, the next few lines are fragmentary, it seems likely, however, that Moschion helped his father in some way to bring his desires to fruition.<sup>16</sup> One of the frequent "duties" of a young man's friend was to help him in his love affairs. In the *Dyskolos* Sostratos called in the aid of Chaireas to win the daughter of Knemon καὶ φίλον καὶ πρακτικὸν / κρίνας μάλιστα (*Dysk.* 55–56). Chaireas then parades at 56 ff. how he helps out his friends when they are in love.<sup>17</sup> In the *Bacchides* Pistoclerus is entrusted by his friend Mnesilochus with the task of tracing the latter's lover, one of the sisters who give the Roman play its name (cf. 385 ff., 475–476, 540 ff.). One thinks also of Eutychus in *Mercator*, who offers his services to Charinus as his *amicus* and *sodalis* (cf. 475 ff., 500, 995).<sup>18</sup>

While Moschion here looks upon Demeas as a friend as much as a father, he even speaks of him as a father might speak of a son. When he describes Demeas' love for Chrysis as a πράγμ' ἴσως ἀνθρώπινον (22), he reminds one of Micio in the *Adelphoe* when he lectures Aeschinus about his rape of Pamphila: *iam id peccatum primum sane magnum, at humanum tamen* (687). At 27 Moschion goes even further and ascribes to his father a sense of shame on *his* account: τοῦτο (δὲ) ποῆσαι δι' ἐμ' ἴσως αἰσχύνεται. Here we have the reverse of a common situation in New Comedy where a young man is affected by *pudor patris* or is expected to be so.<sup>19</sup> The relationship which

---

εἶναι ἢ χρησίμους· τοῦτο δὲ τὸ αὐτὸ καὶ ἐκείνων τις πάθει πρὸς τοῦτον. εὖνοι μὲν οὖν οὔτοι φαίνονται ἀλλήλοις· φίλους δὲ πῶς ἂν τις εἴποι λανθάνοντας ὥς ἔχουσιν ἑαυτοῖς; δεῖ ἄρα εὐνοεῖν ἀλλήλους καὶ βούλεσθαι τὰ γαθὰ μὴ λανθάνοντας δι' ἐν τι τῶν εἰρημένων.

<sup>16</sup>See Mette 436; Jacques 4, n. 7; Stoessl (above, n. 10) 196.

<sup>17</sup>Chaireas is described as a παράσιτος in the list of characters, and has some of the characteristics of that stock figure, but he should be thought of as a friend, if not a true one, of Sostratos: see Gomme-Sandbach 131; W. G. Arnott, *Menander* 1 (Camb., Mass. 1979) 183, n. 1.

<sup>18</sup>Note Charinus' words to his friend Pamphilus at Ter. *An.* 319 *ad te advenio spem salutem auxilium consilium expetens*. Charinus has a problem, since he is in love with the girl whom Pamphilus seems about to marry. In *Eunuchus* Chaerea wants to make use of the arrival of his friend Antipho to plan to get the girl whom he has just raped: *et de istac simul, quo pacto porro possim / potiri, consilium volo capere una tecum* (613–614). Cf. also *Ad.* 708 (quoted at the end of the article).

<sup>19</sup>Cf., e.g., Ter. *An.* 262, *Ad.* 683, *Ph.* 233, *Heaut.* 260, Men. fr. 598 K.-Th. Goldberg (94) suggests that "Moschion is simply projecting his own sense of shame onto Demeas." Even if that is correct, the point made here about how Moschion views his relationship with his father is not affected. The reversal of roles is noted by Bain (above, n. 8) *ad loc.*; Blume 14.

the content of Moschion's opening monologue indicates is certainly an unusual one for a father and son and perhaps the very fact that it is the son who initially informs the audience about the relationship reinforces the feeling that roles have been exchanged. In other plays where the father-son relationship is an important theme it is the father who has the first word: Simo in *Andria*, Menedemus in *Heauton Timorumenos*, Micio in *Adelphoe*, and (as noted by Goldberg [93]) Strepsiades in *Nubes*.<sup>20</sup>

In the rest of the first act Moschion shows the more typical traits of an *adulescens* and a *filius*. He feels a sense of shame when he thinks of his father (αἰσχύνομαι τὸν πατέρα, 67), he admits to fear and cowardice when he knows that he will soon face Demeas (δειλὸς ἤδη γίνομαι / ὡς πλησίον τὸ πρᾶγμα γέγνε, 65–66) and deserves the description of ἀνδρόγυνε (69) from Parmenon. He seems to threaten, not very seriously, one supposes, to hang himself (οὐκ ἀπάγξομαι ταχύ; 91).<sup>21</sup> At the end of the scene he goes off to seek solitude to practise what he must say to Demeas (94–95).<sup>22</sup> It is this fusion of the typical and atypical which renders Moschion such an interesting character. And the same is true for Demeas.<sup>23</sup>

If Moschion's initial monologue takes up a considerable portion of Act I, in the central act it is Demeas who dominates the stage in two important monologues. In the first (206–282) he tells of how he has learned that the child is not his but Moschion's; in the second (325–356) he persuades himself that Moschion has been the innocent victim of Chrysis ("my Helen," he calls her at 336–337). He cannot believe that Moschion, τὸν εἰς ἅπαντας κόσμιον καὶ σώφρονα / τοὺς ἄλλοτρίους (344–345), could have betrayed his father by deliberately seducing Chrysis. He decides to give up his concubine and conceal what he thinks has happened for the sake of his son. To justify the expulsion of Chrysis he will use the pretext of her having raised the child (350–355; cf. 133–134). Now since in New Comedy a common situation is for a son to give up his lover to please his father,<sup>24</sup> here then is a piquant reversal of the norm.

<sup>20</sup>It is surprising that the audience is informed about a rape by the young man who has committed the deed. In other plays where a recent rape is part of the hypothesis the informant seems to have been a divine or quasi-divine figure: so, probably, in Menander's *Andria*, *Adelphoi B*, *Georgos*, *Epitrepontes*, and the Greek model of *Aulularia*. Does this suggest, at least initially, that Moschion is more mature than the usual *adulescens*?

<sup>21</sup>Suicide, by one means or another, is not infrequently contemplated or hinted at by distraught young men in New Comedy. Cf. Men. *Pk.* 505, Plautus *Asin.* 605 f., *Cas.* 307 f., *Merc.* 472, Ter. *Ph.* 686. See also Donatus' comment on *Ad.* 275, but cf. John N. Grant, "Notes on Donatus' commentary on *Adelphoe*," *GRBS* 12 (1971) 201 ff.

<sup>22</sup>For lovers seeking solace in solitude cf. Prop. 1.18, Vergil *E.* 2 (Corydon), *E.* 10 (Gallus). For the idea of practising a speech in solitude commentators refer to Ter. *An.* 406 f., where Simo, a *senex*, is thought to have done this.

<sup>23</sup>On this Jacques makes some excellent points (xxxvii ff.).

<sup>24</sup>So, in the *Andria*, Pamphilus is being forced to give up Glycerium and marry (cf. 262 ff.). Cf. also *Heaut.* 1054 ff.



The reversal of roles is brought out not just by the situation in which Demeas is placed and by his decision to put his son before his own feelings for Chrysis but also by a formal aspect of the second monologue. John Blundell identified ten occasions in Menander where a speaker addresses himself in the second person.<sup>25</sup> In seven of these the speaker is a young man, and the self-address usually occurs at a point where his love affair is going badly and he is distressed or anxious. The three exceptions all occur in the *Samia*. The slave Parmenon rebukes himself for having run away when he has done nothing wrong (653–654). The speaker in the other two examples is Demeas, and both occur in Act III:

τί, Δημέα, βοᾷς;  
τί βοᾷς, ἀνόητε; κάτεχε σαυτόν, καρτέρει (326–327)

Δημέα, νῦν ἄνδρα χρῆ  
εἶναί σ'· ἐπιλαθοῦ τοῦ πόθου, πέπαισ' ἐρών,  
καὶ τἀτύχημα μέν τὸ γεγονός κρύφθ' ὅσον  
ἐνεσσι διὰ τὸν ὕν . . . (349–352)

Although Demeas is a *senex*, he is a *senex* in love, and is faced with the prospect of giving up Chrysis. His use of self-address is in this context therefore not inappropriate. But since the major theme of the play is not so much the love affairs of either Demeas or Moschion but the relationship between the two men, there is added significance. It has been noted that Demeas' decision to give up Chrysis for the sake of his son is a reversal of the norm. The self-apostrophe emphasizes further how in some respects father and son have exchanged roles.

This theme of reversal, I suggest, is sustained in the final act. Commentators have noted how Menander has used here in a fresh way the common *topos* of an unlucky lover leaving home to join the army.<sup>26</sup> In the *Samia* Moschion only pretends to do so to punish Demeas. But the very fact of Moschion's playing a trick on Demeas is also important. The two Menandrian plays whose theme is very similar to that of the *Samia* are *Adelphoi B* and *Heauton Timorumenos*. It is not without relevance that in both of these comedies a father plays a trick on his son. In Terence's *Adelphoe* Micio, without the knowledge of his son Aeschinus, has learned the facts about his relationship with the girl next door—about the rape and the child which has just been born from that union. Although Micio took pride in the close bond between him and Aeschinus (cf. 52 ff.), Aeschinus has kept all this secret from his father. Micio decides therefore to practise a deceit on his son: *quor non ludo hunc aliquantisper? melius est, / quandoquidem hoc numquam mihi ipse voluit credere* (639–640). Micio pretends that the nearest

<sup>25</sup>John Blundell, *Menander and the Monologue* (Göttingen 1980) 65 ff.

<sup>26</sup>Cf. Ter. *Heaut.* 117, Plautus *Trin.* 597 ff.

male relative has arrived to claim the girl whom Aeschinus has raped and now hopes to marry (650 ff.). After reducing the young man to tears (679) Micio drops the pretence and tells Aeschinus that the marriage he is hoping for can now take place (696 ff.). In the *Heauton Timorumenos* Chremes, one of the fathers in the play, learns that the courtesan who he thought was the lover of his neighbour's son is actually the girlfriend of his own son Clitipho. Like Micio, he plays a trick on his son. He pretends that he is going to disinherit him by giving all his property as his daughter's dowry (940-942). Thereby he hopes to reduce Clitipho, *qui nunc luxuria et lascivia diffluit* (945), to a state of not knowing where to turn. The deceit succeeds. The young man comes to his senses and agrees to give up the *meretrix* and marry (1055 ff.).

This motif of repaying one deceit by another is not of course confined to conflicts between father and son. In the *Eunuchus*, for example, Chaerea, who rapes a young girl while posing as a eunuch, is made to squirm (850 ff.) before Thais, the "owner" of the girl, and the slave Parmeno, Chaerea's accomplice in the rape, is tricked by Thais' slave into believing that the life of his master is in danger by his being apprehended as a *moechus* (941 ff.). And in the *Adelphoe* itself Demea makes his brother Micio pay for having breached their agreement not to concern themselves with the other's son (129 ff.) by pretending to adopt Micio's liberality (at Micio's expense) at the end of the play.<sup>27</sup> When this has been said, however, I believe it is significant that in those three plays where the father-son relationship comes under scrutiny the father is the deceiver in the *Adelphoe* and *Heauton Timorumenos*, while in the *Samia*, where in other respects Moschion and Demeas have exchanged roles, it is the son who is the trickster. But in the *Samia* the trickster is the victim of his own deceit.<sup>28</sup>

The action of the final act of the *Samia* is focused on the attempt to achieve some kind of reconciliation between father and son. It has already been said that in fact the reconciliation of Demeas and Moschion is not effected in a convincing manner. Moschion's only response to Demeas' case smacks of surliness rather than of repentance and forgiveness. The two men seem to be as far apart as at the beginning of the play. The gulf between Moschion and Demeas is demonstrated not only by the unusual nature of their relationship but also by how they are characterized and by how each contributes to the complications of the plot.

Moschion is marked by a tendency to indulge in thoughts and words which are not, however, translated into action. The length of the opening

<sup>27</sup>One thinks also of how Herakles plays a trick on Admetos at the end of the *Alcestis* because the king lied to him about the reason for the mourning in his house (cf. *Alc.* 1012 f.).

<sup>28</sup>Anderson (172 f.) and, somewhat hesitantly, Webster (above, n. 1, 79, n. 24) see the "humiliation" of Clitipho as an example of how sometimes the final act concerns itself with achieving social integrity. Neither connects this with the father-son motif.

monologue may itself be seen as evidence of this fondness for words. More striking, however, is the use of verbs such as λογίζομαι (4), διεξελθών (6), διελογιζόμεν (24), and the phrase καὶ γὰρ ἅμα τὰ πράγματα / ἡμῶν δίδειμι πάντ' (19–20). The futile deception which he practises in the final act arises from brooding and thinking over what has happened: ὡς δὲ μᾶλλον ἔνους γίνομαι / καὶ λαμβάνω λογισμὸν . . . (619–620). At 95, as has been said, he goes off to practise in solitude what he will say to Demeas, but when he returns, he seems to have spent most of his time daydreaming about what would happen at the actual wedding ceremony (122 ff.). When he meets his father, he fails to reveal to him the facts about his relationship with Plangon, although he expatiates on how the terms γνήσιος and νόθος should be defined. Paradoxically, then, despite his fondness for cogitation and words, he fails to take the action that would have forestalled the complications which arise. Parmenon has urged upon him the need to be a man and tell his father about the marriage he desires (63–65): ἀλλ' ὅπως ἔσει / ἀνδρείος εὐθύς τ' ἐμβαλεῖς / περὶ τοῦ γάμου / λόγον. But he admits to already feeling afraid as the time for action (τὸ πρᾶγμα) draws near (65–66).

Demeas too, like Moschion, creates some of the complications in the plot by concealment and silence. But while for Moschion ἡ ἀνδρεία lies in *revealing* to Demeas the *truth* about the child and his relationship with Plangon, for Demeas ἡ ἀνδρεία lies in putting aside his feelings for Chrysis and *concealing*, for the sake of his son (349 ff., quoted above), what he *thinks* to be the truth. When Chrysis asks why he is expelling her, he does indeed come close to divulging his real reason (371–372, 374) but stops short of doing so. Unlike Moschion, then, Demeas stands by his resolve, but his silence has the same result as Moschion's—misunderstanding and confusion.

In other respects Demeas is quite different from his son. While Moschion procrastinates and has a bland temperament, Demeas is irascible and impetuous. He is quick to make up his mind and is as quick to act upon his decision. His desire that the wedding take place that very day and the way he overrides his neighbour's astonished reaction is one example (172 ff.). His immediate inclination to remove Chrysis from his house because she has raised the child which he at this point thinks is his (133–134) is another. He acts swiftly himself (note τρέχω, 154; ὑπερεσπουδακῶς, 219) and brooks no delay on the part of others. He rebukes a servant for dilatoriness at 105 (ἀπόπληχθ', ἔστηκας ἐμβλέπων ἐμοί;) and impresses upon Parmenon the need for haste when he sends him off to the agora (καὶ ταχέως· ἤδη λέγω, 193; παῖ, διατρίβεις. οὐ δραμεῖ; 202). The comment which he makes when his neighbour goes in to tell his wife about the arrangements for the wedding is revealing: δεῖ δὲ μὴ δοῦναι λόγον / μηδὲ χρόνον ἤ[μ]ας (201–202). Although he is talking about the relations between man and woman, what he says is true of his own dealings with everyone else. He has arranged his son's marriage without any prior consultation with him, and on two vital occasions in the play he does not allow someone to speak when, if he had done

so, he would have learned the truth about the parents of the child. At 151–152 Moschion seems to be on the verge of revealing the facts about his relationship with Plangon.<sup>29</sup>

[πῶς ἄν, πηθόμενος μηδὲ ἐν τοῦ πράγματος,  
ἐσπουδακότα μ' αἰσθοιο συλλάβοις τέ μοι;

In his haste to speak with his neighbour about the wedding, however, Demeas cuts off Moschion before he can say any more; καταν[οῶ] / τὸ πρᾶγμα, Μοσχίων, ὃ λέγεις (153–154) he says, unaware of how little he understands the situation. Demeas later confronts Parmenon with his knowledge that Moschion is the father of the child (319 ff.). Parmenon admits that this is so and then appears to be about to add something which would make it clear that Plangon and not Chrysis is the mother (ἔστι, δέσποτ', ἀλλὰ λανθάνειν—). But Demeas flares up in anger and calls for a whip with which to beat the slave (τί “λανθάνειν”; ἱμάντα παιδῶν τις δότω . . .). The opportunity for the truth to be revealed is again lost.

The play has probed the relationship between a father and son who have quite different temperaments but who are genuinely fond of each other and have the other's interests at heart.<sup>30</sup> In the end, however, it is exposed as one which has not worked. The absence of any real reconciliation at the end of the play is one indication of this; Demeas has finally spoken with frankness to Moschion about their relationship (694 ff.), but Moschion does not reciprocate. The problems have arisen from the reluctance of both to take each other into their confidence. Each has kept from the other information which, had it been given, might have prevented the complications which occur. Demeas did so by choice, Moschion through timidity. Even at the end of the play when the problems and misunderstandings have been cleared away Moschion seems unable to meet Demeas halfway and to make his own contribution towards establishing a new kind of relationship.

The unsatisfactory nature of the relationship is brought out, then, by the different, almost opposite temperaments of father and son and by how each in his own way has created the difficulties which have arisen. But, as has been pointed out earlier, it is brought out also by the way in which the roles of father and son are in part reversed and in part confused, since Moschion sees himself as Demeas' friend as much as his son. Relevant to this point are some words spoken by Aeschinus in the *Adelphoe*, where the relationship between adoptive father and son is also shown to be imperfect. When Micio has readily given his blessing to the young man's marriage and has indeed made all the arrangements for the wedding to take place, Aeschinus says at 707–709:

<sup>29</sup>The exact meaning of these words is uncertain, but I find Stoessl's interpretation, which I follow here, the most attractive. See Gomme-Sandbach 560 on these lines.

<sup>30</sup>Cf. Lloyd-Jones (above, n. 9) 143 f.; Bain (above, n. 8) xviii: “the *Samia* is par excellence a play about basically ‘nice’ people.”

*hoc est patrem esse aut hoc est filium esse?  
 si frater aut sodalis esset, qui mage morem gereret?  
 hic non amandus, hicine non gestandus in sinust?*

Here Aeschinus expresses the ideas that are presented less explicitly in the *Samia*. The reversal of roles of father and son is indicated in 707, in the metaphor *gestandus in sinust*, which suggests the image of a parent holding a child, and perhaps too in the use of *morem gerere* in 708, although here it is applied to Micio's acting more like a brother or a *friend* than like a son.<sup>31</sup> In these words Aeschinus is praising Micio. They should not be taken, however, to indicate that the relationship between Micio and Aeschinus is an ideal or desirable one.<sup>32</sup> Micio, like Moschion in the *Samia*, attempts to transform the relationship between father and son into one between friends (cf. *Ad.* 67), where the partners in such a relationship are less unequal. Menander's view in both plays seems to be that a relationship in which the inherent disparity between father and son is ignored is an unsuccessful one, however much the partners are concerned with each other's welfare.<sup>33</sup>

DEPARTMENT OF CLASSICS,  
 UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO,  
 TORONTO M5S 1A1

<sup>31</sup>The phrase *morem gerere* often expressed in early Latin the obedience of a wife or son to a husband or father respectively: cf., e.g., Plautus *Amph.* 1004. Terence exploits this at *Eun.* 188, when Phaedria says *mos gerundust Thaidi*, and at *Ad.* 214 *adulescenti morem gestum oportuit*, where the pimp plays on the notion of sexual compliance which the phrase sometimes conveys. At *Ad.* 708 the context makes the appearance of *morem gerere* particularly pointed. On *morem gerere* and related words see Gordon Williams, "Some Aspects of Roman Marriage Ceremonies," *JRS* 48 (1958) 16–29, esp. 28–29.

<sup>32</sup>As they are taken by O. Rieth, *Die Kunst Menanders in den 'Adelphen' des Terenz* (Hildesheim 1964) 94. The scholarly literature on the interpretation of the *Adelphoe* and its Greek original is immense. For some of the bibliography see R. H. Martin, ed., *Terence. Adelphoe* (Cambridge 1976) 22, n. 2, to which may be added C. Lord, "Aristotle, Menander, and the 'Adelphoe' of Terence," *TAPA* 107 (1977) 183–202; N. A. Greenberg, "Success and failure in the 'Adelphoe'," *CW* 73 (1979–1980) 221–236. Few accept the one-sided view adopted by Rieth in what, nevertheless, is a stimulating study of the play(s).

<sup>33</sup>It is probable that Menander made Moschion the adopted son of Demeas in order to make more plausible the unusual kind of relationship which he wanted to represent. This is close to the view expressed by Eva Keuls, "The *Samia* of Menander. An Interpretation of its Plot and Theme," *ZPE* 10 (1973) 1–20; see esp. 20. A similar consideration may account for the same relationship between Micio and Aeschinus in the *Adelphoe*. In that play, however, the adoption by Micio of his nephew allows Demea to be concerned about how Aeschinus has been reared without his incurring to the same extent as Chremes in *Heauton Timorumenos* the charge of *περιεργία*. It also makes possible the abandonment of Micio by Aeschinus in favour of Demea at the end of the play (995–996), if the Terentian play follows its Greek model at this point.

Gomme-Sandbach (544) suggest that the fact that Moschion is adopted makes "Demeas' indulgent treatment of Moschion . . . and his actions in the play more creditable." Blume takes a similar line, thinking that the absence of blood relationship highlights the loyalty of Moschion and the trust of Demeas (140). Thierfelder (reported by Blume [140, n. 108]) suggested that the adoption was invented by Menander to avoid raising the idea of a natural son defiling his father's bed.