MENANDER'S SLAVES: THEIR NAMES, ROLES, AND MASKS

W. THOMAS MacCARY
University of Minnesota

There have been many studies made of Menander's slaves, but, without exception, these have confounded Plautus' and Terence's adaptations with the fragments of the originals as a basis for criticism.[1] This approach prevents answers to the two most interesting questions which could arise from such a study: are Menander's slaves like Plautus' slaves and do they show consistency of name and attributes, i.e. is Daos always clever and Parmeno always faithful? Plautus and Terence are known to have changed the names of their Greek characters more often than not, while there is at least some semblance of consistency in Menander. Ancient commentators on comic slaves' names and activities cannot be interpreted with certainty as referring to Menander's slaves in particular or Greek and Roman slaves in general. Thus, when Galen says that "Davus and Getas believe that they have not acquitted themselves well unless they have thrice deceived their master" (*De nat. fac.* 2.67 K), one does not know whether he is thinking of Menander's *Dis Exapaton*, Terence's *Heauton* and *Adelphoe*, or all

[1] This is true, of course, in varying degrees. Legrande (*Daos = Annales de L'Université de Lyons* 2.22 [1910]) does not distinguish between Greek and Roman slaves at all, nor does Langer (*De servi persona apud Menandrum*, Diss. Bonn 1919). Gomme ("Menander," *Essays in Greek History and Literature* [Oxford 1937] 249–95) goes only so far as to note the element of exaggeration in Plautus. Fraenkel, of course, changed the nature of Plautine studies with his *Plautinisches im Plautus* (Berlin 1922), and the departures in the slave roles he found from Menander in particular and Greek New Comedy in general have been noted by subsequent writers on Plautus but generally ignored by those primarily interested in Menander. T. B. L. Webster (*Studies in Menander* [Manchester 1950] hereafter cited simply as **Webster**) is an exception; I am greatly indebted to Professor Webster's work in reconstructing fragmentary plays and in assigning masks. He has been kind enough to read this paper and offer helpful suggestions for its improvement. In citations from Menander, **K = Körte**

of Greek and Roman comedy. Propertius (*astutos Getas*: 4.5.44), Ovid (*fallax servus*: *Amores* 1.15.17), and Apuleius (*servulus callidus: Florida* 16) raise a similar question of reference, though Apuleius is speaking specifically of Philemon. Such is also the case with Donatus' note on Terence, *Adelphoe* 1.1:

> nomina personarum, in comoediis dumtaxat, habere debent rationem et etymologicum. etenim absurdum est comicum, cum apte argumenta contingat, vel nomen personae incongruum dare vel officium, quod sit a nomine diversum. hinc servus fidelis Parmeno, infidelis Syrus vel Geta, miles Thraso vel Polemon, iuvenis Pamphilus, matrona Myrrhina et puer vel ab odore Storax vel a ludo et gesticulatione Scirtus et item similia.

What is needed is a survey of the slave parts represented by the fragments of Menander—there are over forty—and an attempt to answer questions of dramatic function, attitude, and consistency of characterization without relying upon external, misleading comparisons.[2]

The importance of the *Perinthia* fragment (*POxy.* 855) for an appreciation of Menander's slaves is such that a detailed discussion of suggested reconstructions is in order. Körte's observations are found in his introduction to the play (Menander: *Reliquiae* I, lii–iv) and in notes to the text (pp. 131–33), while Webster's analysis appears in his *Studies in Menander*, 77–83. Both see the burning of Daos in the *Perinthia* as parallel to the binding of Davus in the *Andria* of Terence (860 ff.), and the arguments of the two plays running parallel throughout. This seems safe enough, since Donatus' note on Terence's observation that the plays are similar—*qui utramvis recte norit ambas noverit* (*Andria* 10)—need not be taken as contradictory; Donatus explains that there is close verbal similarity, actual repetition of lines, in Menander's two plays at only three points:

> prima scaena Perinthiae fere isdem verbis quibus Andria scripta est. cetera dissimillia sunt exceptis duobus locis, altero ad versus XI, altero ad XX, qui in utraque fabula positi sunt.

One understands *verba* with *cetera* and sees Donatus in complete

[2] Stace, *Greece and Rome* 15 (1968) 64–78, has cataloged the Plautine slaves according to their deceptive abilities.

agreement with Terence's further criticism of his material (*Andria* 11–12):

> ita non sunt dissimili argumento sed tamen
> dissimili oratione sunt factae ac stilo.

Donatus even seems less convinced of the substantial difference between the two plays than Terence pretends to be: "ne Menandrum culpare videatur, hoc adiunxit, quod laudis est."

What one sees in Terence's *Andria* is a meddling slave rather than a clever one; Davus' plans are so complex and so dependent upon subtle suspicion that they completely miscarry and he is punished by Simo not for what damage he has done but for his stupid interference. He is bound simply to get him out of the way. The *Perinthia* fragment, however, suggests a different kind of character, a different situation: conflagration is no petty punishment. Körte and Webster both assume that the preparations for burning Daos are interrupted in some manner, but they differ on just how this was accomplished. Körte, in his introduction to the play, imagines that the *anagnôrisis* scene immediately follows the fragmentary scene: "quibus ex angustiis Davum paucis versibus intermissis adventu hospitis Perinthii libertum esse manifestum est." In his note on line 21 of the papyrus, *[ΣΩΣ]ΙΑΣ. [ἀρτί]ως ἀφίκετο*, however, he assumes the arrival of a slave with news which will save Daos: "Sosia(?) nuntium afferre videtur, quo Davi res mutetur." Webster rightly points out that no one can arrive to save Daos as long as there are three speakers on Stage—Tibeios. Pyrrhias, and Getas are mute—least of all Sosias, who is one of those speakers, as the character notation six lines previous to the first decipherable line of the papyrus indicates. What one has here is a scene between the master and slave of one household, Laches and Daos, overheard and commented upon by a slave from another household, Sosias. Sosias is, then, the equivalent in the *Perinthia* of the character Terence calls Byrrhia in the *Andria*. This is just another instance of the confusion arising from Terence's habit of changing the names of Menander's characters; here he has given an alternate form of one of Menander's characters' names—Byrrhia for Pyrrhias—to another character. (It seems likely that Menander used the same set of names for the same set of characters in the *Andria* and *Perinthia*.) For Sosias

as a slave in the house of secondary importance and eavesdropping on interviews in the house of primary importance, see the *Perikeiromene*. For a similar scene of eavesdropping see Terence, *Andria* 412–31.

Would Terence have hesitated to use the same dramatic device twice in the same play? What dramatic function does eavesdropping have in the Terence and Menander scenes?

In the Terence scene Byrrhia (who is Sosias in Menander) overhears Simo's instructions for Pamphilus to marry Chremes' daughter; Charinus is then alerted and the misunderstanding between him and Pamphilus develops; Webster compares the *Bacchides*. This scene obviously occurred in Menander's *Andria*, probably in his *Perinthia*. The *Perinthia* eavesdropping scene in the papyrus is strictly one of revenge; Sosias' comments should be reconstructed, with Webster, to read something like, "Yes, for he has recently come with a rush (to complete destruction) and is surrounded (by fire)." Menander developed antagonism between Daos and Sosias in the *Perikeiromene*. There Sosias is the slave of Polemon, who sends him to eavesdrop on the situation at Myrrhine's house, where Glykera has fled for refuge. Daos attempts to arrange a seduction of Glykera for Moschion, but, of course, fails. The slaves exchange abuse (164–216 Körte).

If Sosias in the *Perinthia* is like Sosias in the *Perikeiromene*, a scurrilous and vengeful eavesdropper, then what is Daos in the *Perinthia* like? His action in the play is clear, and his attitude, at least towards his master, is discernible in his remark that "to trick a useless and vacuous master is no great thing" (fr. 1 Körte), a remark which is reported to Laches and referred to by him in the burning scene (13–14). Thus Laches, as well as Sosias, enjoys his revenge upon Daos, who, far from performing "no great thing" in tricking his master, succeeds in tricking no one. Is not, then, the punishment by fire out of all proportion to his crime? Friedrich has the answer in his comparison of this scene in the *Perinthia* to *Altarfluchten* in the *Ion*, *Heracles*, and *Alexander* of Euripides, and the *Rudens* of Diphilus and Plautus.[3] Burning is not a punishment in Menander, but an attempt to dislodge the slave from the altar to which he has fled for sanctuary. The mere threat of fire is sufficient to remove Daos from this sanctuary, whence

[3] *Euripides und Diphilos* (Munich 1953) 159.

he is escorted into Laches' house and probably not heard from again.

Webster speaks of the "harder" lines in the *Perinthia* as compared with Menander's *Andria*, taking Terence as a clear reflection of the latter play. He dates the *Perinthia* early (319–317) and the *Andria* late (304 or soon after), and speaks of a "chronological sequence of decreasing fooling" (pp. 103–8). Friedrich, too, sees a development from the *Perinthia* to the *Andria* and points out a refinement in the character of Daos: he has become self-questioning in the *Andria* (Terence 209 ff., 380, 604) and incapable of engineering a truly clever deception.[4] There certainly is a difference between the Daos of Menander's *Perinthia* and the Davus of Terence's *Andria*, and if one can accept Terence's Davus as closely resembling the Daos of Menander's *Andria*, then Menander would seem to have lost interest in the boastful slave of his earlier play by the time he came to write the later play. It is this loss of interest which accounts for the difference in characterization, rather than an attempt at refinement; boasting and revenge were dropped as motifs in the *Andria*, and thereby was Daos' rôle foreshortened. One must not be too insistent on a continuity of development in Menander's characterization, especially when one has to argue from a Terentian adaptation in which the traits added to a character need not necessarily be either a refinement or even Menandrean. Menander's Moschion in the early *Samia* is much more elaborated and defined than the Moschion of the later *Perikeiromene*, while the Smikrines of the earlier *Aspis* is a caricature compared to the Smikrines of the late *Epitrepontes*.[5] The criterion of "decreasing fooling" is also to be applied with caution, since there is as much trickery and raillery in the *Eunouchos* (without the *Kolax* scenes) as in the *Samia* or the *Dyskolos*. The problem is centered in the fact that little late Menander survives and that all opinion on his production after 304, with the exception of the *Epitrepontes*, is based on Terence. Though Terence is taken as a clear reflection of Menander with greater safety than Plautus, there still exists the probability of significant Terentian changes, not so much in plot as in characterization.

One is inclined, in fact, to take Caesar's labeling of Terence—*o*

[4] Friedrich (above, note 3) 159–61.

[5] I have established the consistency of these and other characters in two forthcoming papers, "Menander's Old Men" and "Menander's Young Men."

dimidiate Menander—as an indication of the Roman's diminished capacity for recreating the richness of his Greek originals. One cannot read a play by Terence without feeling the loss of Menander's subtlety of characterization: in Menander characters behave unjustly or ridiculously because of understandable and unfortunate circumstances; Terence's characters are so unrelievedly good and true.

The time has not yet come for a final analysis of Menander's development, and probably never will. It does, however, now seem safe to build upon a few basic premises. Webster's "decreasing fooling" and Friedrich's "refinement of character" are good if they are tempered with an appreciation of how Menander constantly reworked the same characters and the same situations to arrive at fresh dramatic effects. The Daos of the *Andria* is not the Daos of the *Perinthia*, simply because Menander is not as concerned in the later play with the boast-revenge motif of the earlier. Daos appears in eight other plays, and an examination of his rôle in these will increase one's understanding of his character.

In the *Aspis* Daos emerges as Menander's most attractive slave; at the opening of the play he arrives from Asia Minor where he has been campaigning with Kleostratos, whom he now believes dead. Rather than take advantage of an opportunity for freedom and wealth, he returns to Greece with the spoils which Kleostratos had gathered, so as to turn them over to his sister, who will then have a dowry. When Kleostratos' greedy old uncle Smikrines tries to marry the girl himself, it is Daos who comes up with the plot to stop him; Chairestratos, Kleostratos' younger uncle, must be reported dead so that Smikrines will try to marry his, much richer, daughter. The plan seems to be working well when the Bodmer Papyrus breaks off, and one can easily reconstruct the *komos-gamos* ending with help from the prologue speech of Tyche. What is most striking about Daos, besides the nobility of his mission and the cleverness with which he carries off the deception of Smikrines, is his reticence; he never boasts of his sacrifice or ingenuity nor does he abuse Smikrines. His three scenes with the old miser (Kasser, *Papyrus Bodmer* XXVI [Geneva 1969] 1–96, 164–249, 391–468) are models of disapproving deference, the finest "put-on" in ancient comedy. What he manages to do is bring out all the worst aspects of Smikrines' obsession with money and

insensitivity to human love and suffering, while refusing to disagree openly with the rationale behind them.

In the *Aspis*, then, one finds a Daos who is at once both clever and conciliatory, noble and servile, disapproving and polite. His intrigue is in the family's interest and was probably successful, though it is possible that it had begun to misfire about the time the resurrected Kleostratos appears on the scene to save the day (line 491). At any rate, the intrigue itself, like that of Daos in the *Andria* and *Perinthia*, was unnecessary: Smikrines could not possibly have married Kleostratos' sister on that very day. Daos in the *Aspis*, unlike Daos in the *Perinthia*, shows no trace of a *gloriosus* attitude; this is Daos' play, just as the *Samia* is Moschion's and the *Dyskolos* Knemon's.

In the *Perikeiromene* Daos is Moschion's slave, and his attempt to gain for his master the favors of Glykera has been discussed above. He is a busybody constantly on the alert for an opportunity to do some mischief which will win him freedom; in this he is the exact antithesis of Daos in the *Aspis*, who, though bemoaning the loss of his hopes for freedom in his master's death, is even faithful to his dead master—compare *Aspis* 1 ff. with *Perikeiromene* 77 ff. He is not altogether unattractive, though his idea of seducing Glykera while she is in Moschion's adoptive mother's care seems slightly excessive even under Menandrean conventions. His plan, is, of course, unsuccessful.

Daos in the *Dyskolos* is the faithful slave of Gorgias, and, through eavesdropping, he misconstrues Sostratos' intentions towards Knemon's daughter. He is surly and rude to all but his rustic master and quick to think the worst of any city folk. That his information is incorrect—though serving as it does to bring Gorgias into contact with Sostratos—makes him comparable to the Daoi in other plays, whose schemes are ineffective.

In the *Eunouchos* he plays the part which Terence assigns to Parmeno.[6] It is he who suggests to his young master the ruse of masquerading as a eunuch, and this, of course, is totally successful. One wonders whether the whining remorse of the Terentian character (see especially 923 ff.) is based on Menander, just as one wonders about the similar trait of the Terentian Davus in the *Andria*. This plot to rape Pamphila

[6] Persius, *Satires* 5.161 and scholia *ad loc.*

is, like Daos' plot in the *Aspis*, unnecessary; had Chairea simply waited one day, until the efforts of Thais (Chrysis in Menander) to identify the girl carried through, he could have married her without first compromising her and himself.

In the *Kolax* Daos belongs to Pheidias, and his only extant speeches are full of disdain for parasites; but if one follows Webster's reconstruction (pp. 74 ff.), Daos must have helped Pheidias in his attempt to rescue a girl from a pimp, a girl whom the soldier Bias has made arrangements to purchase. Though Pheidias seems to owe his capture of the girl primarily to Gnatho, Daos might have helped; on the other hand, Daos' speeches suggest that he was trying to discourage Pheidias from having anything to do with Gnatho and perhaps with the girl herself. Should one see Daos here as a pedagogue,[7] who is looking after Pheidias in his father's absence? Probably not; much better to think of him here, as elsewhere, in the rôle of the blunderingly helpful henchman of a young master. At any rate, the whole plot to save the girl from Bias is rendered unnecessary by her recognition as free-born.

One of Menander's most interesting departures from the standard love-confusions in middle-class households is his creation of Daos in the *Heros*, a slave in love. He is a parody of the *adulescens amans*, who is perhaps better attested in Plautus and Terence, but who must have been a mainstay of non-Menandrean New Comedy. (Menander's only extant developed character of this type is Sostratos in the *Dyskolos*.) He has a surly but sympathetic audience for his love-lament in Getas, who probably fills here the rôle which Daos normally did for the Pheidiases and Moschions he attended. It is against all evidence to suppose that he pursued his love with the same vigor as did Chalinus and Olympio in the *Casina*. Daos in love is like Daos in intrigue, ambitious but ineffectual.

In the *Georgos* Daos delivers a long messenger-speech to someone in town; he has come from the country with news of Gorgias' having saved Kleainetos' life. The situation is, of course, terribly similar to that in the *Dyskolos*. Kleainetos is, like Knemon, the old man living alone in the country, depending only on himself, until disaster strikes.

[7] See below, note 23.

Gorgias, like Gorgias in the *Dyskolos*, is afraid a young man from town will desert his sister, having wronged her.[8] Is Myrrhine Kleainetos' deserted wife, as she is in the *Dyskolos*? To whom does Daos belong? He is familiar with the affairs of Myrrhine's household but seems to have been to the country to make preparations for Moschion's marriage to his half-sister, and thus seems to be a member of that household. If there was an intrigue against Moschion's father so as to delay his marriage to his half-sister, as Webster (p. 50) assumes, then Daos must have had a part in this. Again the intrigue would have been unnecessary, since Hedeia is recognized as the daughter of Kleainetos and therefore acceptable as a bride for Moschion. From the fragments Daos would appear to have had, in the *Georgos*, more in common with the Daos of the *Aspis* than with the Daos of the *Dyskolos*, for he is sympathetic and not surly; of course all three of these slaves have as their main characteristic an interest in their families' affairs which is affecting.

Daos in the *Epitrepontes* is the surliest and least attractive of all Menander's characters of this name. He is, in his attempt to keep the foundling's tokens, a servile equivalent of the Smikrines who arbitrates against him. Like all his namesakes who attempt evil, he is unsuccessful; had he kept the tokens no recognition would have been possible, which is, of course, the hypothetical argument which Syriskos uses against him. The names of both these characters are cast in doubt by the Mytilene mosaic. It depicts the arbitration scene (B is inscribed above) and labels the characters Syros, Smikrines, and Anthrakeus. On Syros, see below; Anthrakeus is obviously not a proper name, so the dispute as to whether Syriskos is correct can continue.[9]

In summary, one can say about the ten Menandrean slaves named Daos that, though either unsuccessful (if their plans are evil) or unnecessary (if good), they all have leading rôles in their plays. They probably wore the same mask, Pollux no. 22 or 27, "leading slave with roll of red hair" or "leading slave with wavy hair." No. 22 is more likely since it is described as resembling the "leading old man" mask and

[8] The young man is probably Moschion, since he has raped a free-born girl and later marries her. See above, note 5.

[9] See W. G. Arnott, *CQ* 18 (1968) 228.

all the Daoi seem to be older slaves, and since the hair is red, which was thought to be a sign of *πανουργία*.[10] His name would match this characteristic, suggesting "firebrand."[11]

The other slaves in Menander who play leading rôles are Parmeno in the *Samia*, *Plokion*, *Hypobolimaios*, *Theophoroumene*, and *Kekruphalos*, and Onesimos in the *Epitrepontes*. In the *Samia* Parmeno belongs to Demeas, in whose absence he has been party to a deception which he maintains after his master returns: Demeas' adopted son Moschion has raped a neighbor's daughter and Demeas' mistress Chrysis claims the child as her own. When Demeas seeks out Parmeno to confirm or deny suspicions which have arisen through an overheard conversation—he thinks the child is Chrysis' by Moschion—Parmeno lies. Demeas gives a full description of Parmeno's character at this point (83–85 K):

> *τοῦτον μὲν οὐδέν, ὡς ἐγῷμαι, λανθάνει,*
> *τάχ' οἶδε πᾶν πραττόμενον ἔργον· ἐστὶ γὰρ*
> *περίεργος, εἴ τις ἄλλος.*

Whereas Daos in most of his appearances is clearly *πανοῦργος*—one dismisses the Terentian adaptations which reduce him to a meddler—Parmeno here is *περίεργος*, i.e. curious. He knows all that goes on in the house but there is no indication that he has engineered the deception; on the contrary, he scolds himself for fearing reprisal, though innocent (296 ff. K = *PBodmer* 25.641–42). He lies not to trick his master but to save his family from needless trouble. He is, in short, the faithful retainer that one finds in all periods and in all kinds of comedy.

Webster (p. 99) argues for a double plot in the *Plokion*, but this would be unparalleled in Menander; there are plays which end in double marriages (*Dyskolos*, *Perikeiromene*, etc.), but invariably one of these romances is a last-minute development; never are two affairs treated simultaneously and with equal attention unless one is with a courtesan, one with a marriageable girl. Thus there is probably not a recognition at the end of the play, since Menander's plays of recognition (*Heros*, *Georgos*, etc.) have that element as essential to the main plot, whereas the main plot of the *Plokion* is obviously the marriage

[10] Aristotle, *Physiognomica* 812A.

[11] The whole burning scene in the *Perinthia* could be seen as an elaborate pun.

of a poor man's daughter with a rich woman's son. The rich woman's husband speaks the famous lines on heiresses quoted by Aulus Gellius (2.23 = 333 K) and compared by him to their rendition in Caecilius' *Plokion*. The poor man has lived on a farm most of his life but has now come to the city and subjected himself to ridicule, so his slave Parmeno announces (336 K). Parmeno is obviously a faithful slave sympathetic to his master's plight. What this plight consists of is uncertain, but it would seem that his daughter has been raped by the rich woman's son, who is now to be married to a kinswoman (345 K). The only possible resolution to such a dilemma is similar to that which Webster proposes for the end of the *Kitharistes*:[12] the son admits that he has raped the girl and is convinced by his father that he should marry her. One should take the reference to a "pretty servant girl" in the heiress speech as an indication that the husband is a *senex libidinosus* as well as a man who shares the feelings of Megadorus in the *Aulularia*. His son, like Lyconides in the *Aulularia*, has either been too cowardly to own up to his crime, or has been ignorant of the girl's identity, in which latter case the necklace would have been the key. At any rate, Parmeno's part is clear: he is anxious to see justice done for his old master's family, but does not intrigue to accomplish this.

In the *Hypobolimaios* one has a situation similar to that in Terence's *Adelphoe*: there are two sons, one a rustic in love with a slave girl; the other lives in town and has raped a maiden. Parmeno is addressed by the father on the subject of fortune (416 K), a speech similar to the sentiments expressed by Parmeno himself in the *Plokion*. It is doubtful that the old man would speak in such a manner to someone he did not trust, so Parmeno cannot be the slave who tricks him, if indeed he is tricked by a slave.[13] There is a difficult woman in the play (418, 422 K) and much talk of fortune and money (417, 419, 420, 424 K); could the mother who saw Moschion at the Panathenaea (428 K) be this woman, and does she make difficulties for the old man? Perhaps it is she who has "cleaned him out" (427 K). Parmeno is probably instrumental in setting things straight without intrigue.

[12] Webster 53: "Moschion confessed that he had raped the daughter of Phanias and was then persuaded to send for his father." The father was the difficult figure in the *Kitharistes*, the mother in the *Plokion*.

[13] See Webster, 100 ff., on 427 K: *γέρων ἀπεμέμυκτ' ἄθλιος, λέμφος*.

Parmeno's presence in the *Theophoroumene* is attested by a mosaic from Mytilene.[14] He stands between Lysias and Kleinias, two young men. This scene from the second act (B is inscribed above) gives no information on the speeches in the title-scene from the first, a portion of which is preserved (Körte I, pp. 101 ff.), so one is still uncertain as to whether the harsh language regarding the inspired girl, which is addressed to Lysias, is Parmeno's.[15] Webster (p. 51) thinks it is a slave's language, and one could imagine Parmeno, if, in the *Theophoroumene*, he plays the rôle of the faithful retainer as he does in other plays, speaking unkindly of a woman whom he sees as a threat to his master's security. Exactly who Kraton is—he delivers the long speech on the injustice of good men fairing badly (Körte I, pp. 102–3)—cannot be determined; his name suggests that he might be a soldier, but Webster (p. 52) quotes Plutarch to the effect that he is the "old man in comedy," and his speech certainly would seem more in character for a *senex* than for a *miles*. He also appears in the *Androgynos*, but no indication of type is given; he is addressed there on the subject of friendship (48, 49 K). If Kraton were a soldier, then one would have a situation parallel to that in the *Misoumenos:* a young man (Kleinias in both plays) is in love with a courtesan (Krateia in the *Misoumenos*); but she is pursued by a soldier (Thrasonides in the *Misoumenos*); in the *Misoumenos* Krateia is recognized by Demeas as his daughter and therefore Kleinias' sister, so Thrasonides must have redeemed himself, as does Polemon in the *Perikeiromene*, and retained his mistress; so Kleinias would suffer the fate of Moschion in the *Perikeiromene* and be married off to someone's convenient daughter.[16] At any rate Parmeno in the *Theophoroumene* would have been loyal to both father and son and engineered no intrigue.

In the *Kekryphalos* the same assumptions seem safe: Parmeno is with Moschion in a scene which leads to the recognition of a girl by her mother (951 K).

There is, then, a definite difference between the Parmenones and the Daoi in the extant fragments: Daos intrigues to no avail while Parmeno simply stands by and listens to moralizing speeches or gives

[14] Daux, *BCH* (1967) 474, has bibliographical notes on each of the mosaics.

[15] On this scene see E. Handley, "Menander and Plautus—An Inaugural Lecture Delivered at University College, London, 5 February 1965," note 4.

[16] See E. G. Turner, *BICS* Suppl. 17 (1965).

them. His name, of course, implies this, coming from παραμένω, as does the name of Onesimos, coming from ὀνίνημι. Onesimos appears in but one play, the *Epitrepontes*, but his rôle is such that one can use him as an example of the faithful retainer type. It is Habrotonon who brings about the recognition of the child, which leads to reconciliation between Charisios and Pamphile. Onesimos can only lament the fact that Habrotonon will win her freedom and he, through "lack of foresight," will remain a slave forever (340 ff. K). He later leads the attack upon Smikrines which ends the play, and this attack consists of the same sort of theological and moral enquiries which characterize Kraton's speech in the *Theophoroumene* (Körte I, pp. 102 ff.): the gods take no account of human behavior and good behavior is not rewarded with good fortune (726 ff. K). It is probable that Onesimos was successful in returning Smikrines to the family group, just as Getas was with Knemon in the *Dyskolos*. Onesimos is better developed than any other slave of his type; he explains his reluctance to become involved in any matter concerning his master as a result of previous experience in such endeavors: it was he who had informed Charisios of his wife's pregnancy (243 K) and thereby incurred his wrath. He warms up to the enterprise after Habrotonon has outlined the action (534 ff. K), but would desert her if anything went wrong (395 ff. K). As primarily interested in the family's welfare—also, of course, in his own freedom—Onesimos is aware of, but not actually a participant in, the intrigue which removes the main barrier between Charisios and Pamphile—confusion over the baby's parentage—and instrumental in removing, or at least changing, the second barrier—Smikrines' antagonism towards Charisios, a result of his miserliness. Parmeno in the *Plokion* serves the same purpose, and probably has a similar rôle in the *Hypobolimaios*.

One is inclined to assign the ἡγεμὼν ἐπίσειστος (Pollux no. 27) slave mask to the Parmenones and Onesimos; it has red hair, like the ἡγεμών "with a roll of hair" (Pollux no. 22), which is suggested for the Daoi. Of course this second mask could have been reserved for plays in which there were two large slave parts, but this seems unlikely, since the extant fragments suggest no play except those in which one "leading" slave dominates several minor ones.[17]

[17] Handley suggests that both Getas and Pyrrhias in the *Dyskolos* wore the ἡγεμών "with a roll of red hair" (*Dyskolos*, pp. 35–36), but Getas is obviously subservient to

Among the minor slave characters one can distinguish two main groups: those who have significant speaking parts and those who serve simply as porters or are mentioned without ever appearing. In the first group belong Getas in the *Dyskolos*, *Heros*, and *Misoumenos*; Pyrrhias in the *Dyskolos* and *Sikyonios*; Sosias in the *Perikeiromene* and *Perinthia*; Simias and Syriskos in the *Epitrepontes*; and Lydos in the *Dis Exapaton*. In the second group are Tibeios in the *Heros* and *Perinthia*; Donax in the *Dyskolos* and *Sikyonios*; Dromon in the *Sikyonios*; and Syros in the *Dyskolos*. Questionable appearances are by Pyrrhias in the *Perinthia*; Sosias in the *Arrephoros* and *Kolax*; Sangarios in the *Heros*; Tibeios in the *Thettale*, *Messenia*, and *Misogynes*; and, most notably, Syros in the *Georgos*, *Messenia*, and *Dis Exapaton*.

Getas is a fountain of abuse in the *Dyskolos*, but it is Sikon the cook who turns him on and off. Together the two of them are responsible for forcing Knemon to join the *komos-gamos* ending of the play. He belongs to Kallipides and is a common household servant, probably young, as opposed to an old and respected retainer. He does, however, command Sostratos' respect for ingenuity.[18] In the *Heros* it is Getas who listens to Daos' love lament, seemingly with sympathy, though this has been disputed.[19] The question of his attitude toward Daos cannot be answered without first knowing to whom he belongs, and that is impossible to discover from the fragments. It is more than possible that he is purely protactic (cf. Chaireas in the *Dyskolos*). In the *Misoumenos* Getas belongs to Thrasonides and reports to him a conversation between Demeas and Krateia.[20] Getas' rôle in the *Perinthia* cannot be determined; he is mentioned in connection with the preparations for burning Daos, but it is not certain he ever appears on stage. In his three certain appearances he is sulky, though not unsympathetic. In both the *Heros* and the *Misoumenos* he must listen to love laments.

Sikon in baiting Knemon and not of the same stature in his household as Daos in his. Thus, if ἡγεμών means anything, either socially or dramatically, a mask by that name should not be given to Getas. See below on Getas and Pyrrhias.

[18] Sostratos says of him: ἔχει ‹τι› διάπυρον καὶ πραγμάτων ἔμπειρός ἐστι παντοδαπῶν (183).

[19] See Webster 26 ff.

[20] Turner (above, note 16) 11.

Pyrrhias appears twice as a running slave, and in each case that is his only appearance. In the *Sikyonios* he announces to Stratophanes the death of his adoptive mother and in the *Dyskolos* he reports on Knemon's irrascible behavior. In the *Perinthia* he brings wood for burning Daos, if the reconstruction of his name in Körte, lines 1 and 8, can be accepted. For him, on the basis of his performance in the *Dyskolos* and the suggestion of his name, one is inclined to assign Pollux' mask no. 24, since it is described as *οὖλος* with red hair and a squint; curly hair and squinting eyes are signs of cowardice, according to Aristotle.[21]

Sosias in the *Perikeiromene* is the rather unattractive slave of Polemon who says unkind things about Glykera and is prone to violence. In the *Perinthia* he seems to be enjoying the violent punishment of Daos. In both cases his primary function is eavesdropping. In the *Arrephoros* he is called insane by another slave and in the *Kolax* he is addressed by a cook. His name would seem to be related to *σώζω*, but it does not particularly relate to his rôles.

Simias is clearly the tutor of Chairestratos in the *Epitrepontes*, as is Lydos of Moschos is the *Dis Exapaton*.[22] These are the only pedagogues represented in the fragments; they probably wore the *πάππος* mask, Pollux' no. 21.[23]

Syriskos appears only in the *Epitrepontes* and his name is in doubt there.[24] He is the noble charcoal-burner who champions the rights of the foundling.[25] His name seems to be a diminutive of Syros.

Webster has reconstructed an important part for Sangarios in the

[21] *Physiognomica* 812B, 807B.

[22] Handley (above, note 15) 8 and *passim*.

[23] Daos calls himself the pedagogue of Kleostratos in the *Aspis* (14 Kasser); does he mean that this was his task before Kleostratos went to war or that he considered himself as such even on the battlefield (cf. Phoenix, *Iliad* 4.443 ff.)? In either case this function is not his in the action of the play.

[24] See above on Daos in the *Epitrepontes*.

[25] Zini (*Il linguaggio dei personaggi nelle commedie di Menandro* 23 ff.) maintains that Syriskos' presentation of his case is in language inappropriate to a slave and that therefore he comes off as a pretentious fool. There might be an element of tragic and philosophical parody in his speech, just as there is in the attack of Onesimos upon Smikrines mentioned above. Nevertheless the characters, both Smikrines and Onesimos, remain sympathetic, and one smiles with them rather than laughs at them. The whole question of Menander's use of slaves for mouthing platitudes calls for further discussion. Most of his traceable tragic quotations, for instance, are found in slaves' speeches.

Heros, a character given in the *dramatis personae*. His name suggests country of origin, as do several other slave names in Menander.

In minor rôles one finds Tibeios as a porter in the *Perinthia*, mentioned in the *Misogynes* (281 K), and addressed by someone on the subject of cheerfulness in the *Thettale* (194 K); his presence in the *Messenia* is proved by a Mytilene mosaic, and he is mentioned as the dead overseer who raised Gorgias and Plangon in the *Heros*. His name denotes his origin. Donax is a porter in the *Dyskolos* (959) and in the *Sikyonios* (lines 385-86 Kassel). His name suggests rusticity. Dromon has taken care of Philoumene in the *Sikyonios*, and is at hand when Theron brings about her recognition by Kichesias (343 ff. Kassel). He is Moschion's slave in Mette's *Fabula Incerta* IV,[26] but that this is Menander can be seriously doubted. His name suggests that he should be a "running slave," but the evidence of the fragments is insufficient to confirm or deny this function.

The most significant problem is with Syros. He is a porter in the *Georgos* (39–40 K) and the *Dyskolos* (959). His name appears where one would have expected Daos' in the Mytilene mosaic showing the arbitration scene from the *Epitrepontes*, and in another showing a scene from the *Messenia*. He has a part in the *Dis Exapaton*, presumably the part Plautus assigns to Chrysalus in the *Bacchides*, but the lines in which he is mentioned, or which he himself speaks, have not been published; only an attempt at reconstruction in translation is given by Handley in his London Inaugural Lecture. Handley has promised further study of the *Dis Exapaton*, and one must wait for this before discussing the rôle of Syros in the play. It can be said now that the *Dis Exapaton* fragments already published have provided one surprise in Menandrean nomenclature: Moschos appears in the rôle of Plautus' Pistoclerus. This name is not found elsewhere in Menander, though the diminutive Moschion is given characters in twelve plays. Any indication in the fragments of the nature of the slave's rôle will, of course, be the most important evidence for Plautus' workmanship since Fraenkel's *Plautinisches im Plautus*.

This survey of Menander's slaves leads one to several tentative conclusions. Most important, perhaps, is the fact that there is no

[26] Mette, *Lustrum* 10 (1965) 16, 22–23, 34, 89–90, 100–1, 186–91.

indication in the published fragments of any Menandrean play of a slave's part of the scope which characterizes Plautus' masterpieces, the *Pseudolus* and *Bacchides*. Evidence to the contrary might be forthcoming in the *Dis Exapaton*, but one cannot but suspect that the slave's part there will have more in common with the rôles of Daos in the *Aspis*, the *Eunouchos*, and the *Perinthia* than with the rôles of Chrysalus and Pseudolus in their plays, i.e. that the Menandrean slave will be anxious for his freedom, afraid of his master, operating within the social and moral order of the play, perhaps surly but never overbearing, unsuccessful in his intrigue, or, if successful, working toward the solution of difficulties which are finally solved in some other manner. The Plautine slave of the *gloriosus* type—of which there are six: Chrysalus, Pseudolus, Tranio, Epidicus, Leonidas, and Libanus—is, on the contrary, condescending towards his master, successful in his intrigue insofar as the immediate goal is concerned, and, most significant, completely outside the social and moral order of the play: he gives the impression that he intrigues for the sheer satisfaction of displaying his superiority over his social betters.[27] If more secure chronologies for Menander and Plautus were possible, there is every reason to believe that Menander's cleverest slaves would appear in his earliest plays while Plautus' most heroic slaves would appear in his latest. One would then have the fascinating development of the comic hero in classical comedy as beginning in Aristophanes,[28] declining through Middle Comedy and early Menander, disappearing in late Menander, and coming to dominate the genre once more in Plautus. Terence, of course, suppresses the type altogether.

The second point to be emphasized is the seemingly consistent characterization of slaves in Menander according to name. Daoi do not behave like Parmenones; characters named Pyrrhias and Sosias and Getas play secondary parts. Tibeios, Syros, Donax, and Dromo tend to be minor characters, porters, or mutes. The names of the slaves probably have significance only in the context of Menander's drama: Daos is particularly appropriate in the *Perinthia*, but seemingly nowhere else; Parmeno and Onesimos always behave as their names suggest they

[27] For a close consideration of these characters see W. T. MacCary, *Servus Gloriosus: A Study of Military Imagery in Plautus*, DA 2000-A (Nov. 1969).

[28] See C. Whitman, *Aristophanes and the Comic Hero* (Cambridge, Mass. 1964).

should; Sosias seems to have nothing to do with salvation, nor Dromo with running, nor Donax with a shepherd's pipe; the ethnic names—Getas, Sangarios, Syros, Syskos, Tibeios, Lydos—are not rendered appropriate by emphasis in characterization upon any national trait (cf. the Phrygian slave in Euripides' *Orestes*). Within the corpus of Menander's drama, however, one can watch with fascination and compare the development of different aspects of a named character in different plays.

As for their masks, nothing can be proved on the basis of description within the plays, and representations in ancient art are either lacking in the color necessary for identification or are insufficiently detailed. What one is left with is the obvious fact that Daoi and Parmenones tend to be leading slaves and there are two masks in Pollux' list for leading slaves. Furthermore, five slaves is the maximum for any one play (*Dyskolos* and *Perinthia*) and Pollux lists five masks for slaves. It would then seem likely that masks were not assigned haphazardly but were used as an aid to identification; although Menander is generally careful with entrances and exits—"Here comes Pyrrhias," "Getas, you go inside"—identification of a mask with a type that had a traditional name would have been a great mnemonic device and struck down a barrier for ancient audiences which discourages so many modern readers of Menander, i.e. the difficulty of who belongs to whom and what one can expect him to do.

One need not, in considering the suggestion that Menander used the same characters with the same names and masks for play after play, think less of the poet for doing so. Daos is not the same in the *Aspis* as he is in the *Perinthia*; superficially the two characters are quite similar, but the ways in which they are developed and the attitudes they are given differ vastly, and it is this difference which is the essence of Menander's genius for characterization. Not being bothered with establishing credentials—a middle-aged slave, anxious for freedom but not unfaithful to his master, capable of devising plans for deception but not of carrying them through—Menander could go on to the subtler aspects of character: Why does he feel about his master the way he does? What are his ideas on love, money, and friendship? In making this great leap towards intimacy Menander created characters unparalleled for their depth and their capacity to arouse sympathy in the audience. His slaves are some of the best of these.