

## Menander: Personal Address and Addressing the Audience

journal or publication title	東京大学西洋古典学研究室紀要
volume	8
page range	103-133
year	2013-12
URL	<a href="http://doi.org/10.15083/00078898">http://doi.org/10.15083/00078898</a>

# Menander: Personal Address and Addressing the Audience\*<sup>1</sup>

Adele C. Scafuro

## 1 Introduction

Studies of personal address have become increasingly visible in the field of Classics as a part of the larger methodological camp of Discourse Analysis. Classical scholars have long paid attention to personal address in Menander, even if, as we shall soon see, Menander is rather sparing in his use of it. Sandbach and Gomme, for example, were particularly sensitive to its nuanced appearances in their grand commentary published in 1973. This is evident, for example, in their comments on Act IV of *Epitrepontes*. At this point in the play (at lines 853-877), Pamphile is already onstage after a heart-rending discussion with her father; he wants her to divorce her husband Charisios. Unbeknownst to her father, Pamphile had been raped before she married (this happened before the play began); she had

---

\*<sup>1</sup> I am grateful to Prof. Y. Kasai for arranging my visit and the occasion for the presentation of this (now revised) paper at the University of Tokyo in March 2013; I am also grateful to the audience for its attentive responses, and especially to Profs. M. Kubo and M. Sakurai for their observations. Further thanks are due Oxford University Press for permission to repeat and expand, in sections 3 and 4 of this essay, a portion of chapter 10 'Menander' (pp.218-38) in *The Oxford Handbook of Greek and Roman Comedy*, eds. Michael Fontaine and Adele C. Scafuro (OUP) 2014. The text of Menander cited in this essay is Sandbach's 1990 OCT.

concealed her pregnancy and exposed the new-born infant. Her husband Charisios had only learned of the birth upon his return from a 5 month long business trip after the wedding; totally upset by the discovery, he had gone to live with his friend Chairestratos; he took solace in wine parties and in hiring the courtesan Habrotonon. That very same courtesan has come onstage now carrying an infant with tokens of recognition. She is acting on an inference that the infant's mother is Pamphile and that Charisios, her husband, is actually the father—that is, Charisios is the man who had raped Pamphile before marriage: he had been inebriated and the act was committed in the darkness of night; neither rapist nor victim knew the other. The dialogue that follows between the married woman and the courtesan is perhaps the most delicately nuanced in all of New Comedy—not a word about the rape falls in the course of the intense cross-questioning; nevertheless, it leads to the identification of mother, father, and infant. Here is Sandbach and Gomme's description:<sup>\*2</sup>

The forms of address in this scene deserve attention. Habrotonon begins (858) with γύναϊ, a usual polite form, 'madam'. In 859, Pamphile replies in the same form (but perhaps with a colder politeness). On recognizing Pamphile, Habrotonon breaks out with the warm φιλτάτη (860) and γλυκεῖα (862). Naturally Pamphile does not respond to this, although Wilamowitz may go too far when, ever careful of the proprieties, he thinks it impossible that she could give her hand to a girl 'whose calling she must recognize from her dress'; thus are Greeks turned into modern northern Europeans (cf.

---

<sup>\*2</sup> Gomme and Sandbach 1973: 359 apud 860.; see also Martina 1997 II2 on 860; Turner 1980 for Menander's technique of questioning and answering; Scafuro 1990: 150-51 for the curious questioning here. Polite addresses also cluster in the arbitration scene of *Epitrepontes* as well. Syriscus addresses Smikrines 6 times as πάτερ and he and Daos address him four times as βέλιστε.

Gomme, *JHS* 77 [1957], 255). At 864 we have the only place in Menander where the vocative γύνοι begins a sentence [and this is Pamphile addressing the courtesan]. The effect is abrupt and arresting. Pamphile to her astonishment has seen one at least of the γωροίσματα on the baby that Habrotonon is carrying. . . . Habrotonon replies with an eager φιλτάτη (865), but seeing that Pamphile is bewildered and needs reassurance, returns to the proper, formal ὦ γύνοι (866). Then Pamphile in her turn, in gratitude and appealing for confirmation of the good news, uses φιλτάτη (871). But Habrotonon is not encouraged thereby to any further liberties; her emotions more under control now, she reverts to γύνοι.

A profound story has been told by the use of the personal addresses in this scene, and scholars are indebted to Sandbach for calling our attention to it forty years ago.

Personal address in Menander has been studied more scientifically (though certainly ‘feelingly’ as well) by Eleanor Dickey in two publications: first in 1995 in an essay called, ‘Forms of Address and Conversational Language in Aristophanes and Menander’ and second in her wonderful book in 1996, *Greek Forms of Address from Herodotus to Lucian*. In the latter work, Dickey uses Aristophanes and Menander and an assortment of poets as comparanda to a long list of prose writers; she does not use these poets as the main objects of study; for this reason, I shall use the earlier essay, rather than her book, to provide essential data before I move on to my own more particular study of personal address, and later, audience address, in Menander.

Dickey’s aim in studying personal address in both Aristophanes and Menander was to discover ‘how close. . . [their language] is to conversational Attic, and which type of conversational language, if any, these

authors represent' (1995: 261). For her study, she singled out vocatives; this was a good choice, since extant plays of Aristophanes contain a total of 1168 addresses and Menander's plays provide 525.<sup>\*3</sup> She then examined four points of usage in the two poets and compared this usage with Plato and Xenophon and also with tragedy.

1. First she counted the frequency of unmodified names used as personal address; e.g., ὦ Σώκρατες in Plato—the plain and simple vocative with or without the particle ὦ. This is the most common type of address in Menander, that is, the addressee's name; it accounts for 40% of the addresses in Menander but only 12% in Aristophanes. This usage is relatively infrequent in Attic tragedy<sup>\*4</sup> but is extremely common in Plato and Xenophon: it accounts for 71% of 3,487 addresses in Plato and 60% of 1,092 addresses in Xenophon. On the basis of these statistics, Dickey concluded that Aristophanes is closer to the practice of tragedy and that Menander is closer to prose usage. Furthermore, she inferred that there was some form of conversational language in which unmodified personal names were the most common form of address (1995: 263).

2. Next, she tabulated the length of vocative phrases used as personal address: e.g., compare ὦ Σώκρατες in Plato with the following address in Aristophanes *Peace* 974-976: ὦ σεμνοτάτη βασιλεια θεά./ πότνι' Εἰρήνη./ δέσποινα χορῶν, δέσποινα γάμων. Dickey discovered that almost all Menander's addresses are like Plato's (whether by name or some

<sup>\*3</sup> For Menander, Dickey (1995: 263 n. 9) used all fragments assigned to known plays in Sandbach OCT 1972 (including emendations and supplements in that text) plus vocatives in the fragment of the *Misoumenos* published by Turner, *Proceedings of the British Academy* 1973 vol. 63: 315-31.

<sup>\*4</sup> Dickey 1996: 263 n. 11 here relies on T. Wendel, *Die Gesprächsanreden im griechischen Epos und Drama der Blütezeit* (Stuttgart 1929; Tübinger Beiträge zur Altertumswissenschaft 6) 56.

other term) and consist of a single word or a single word preceded by ὦ. Aristophanes, on the other hand, in one third of his personal addresses, uses more than one word and often, as in the example just cited, the address takes up several lines of verse. Again, Aristophanes' usage is closer to that of tragedy and Menander is closer to that of prose. And Dickey once again inferred that Menandrian and prose usage is closer to conversational Attic (1995: 264-65).

3. Thirdly, Dickey considered the overall variety of addresses: what words, she asked, did these authors use to address others, if one excludes personal name, ethnic name, and divine name?<sup>5</sup> She counted the number of *different* words used in address by each author (e.g. παῖ, πάτερ, φίλτατε) and also how many times each word occurs.<sup>6</sup> Menander's addresses contain 70 different words used on average 5 times each (the ten most common vocatives in Menander are, in declining order of frequency: παῖ, πάτερ, φίλτατε, βέλτιστε, ἄνδρες, ἄνθρωπε, δέσποτα, γυναῖ, μειράκιον, τάλαν—these are just 10 of 70 words). Aristophanes' addresses, however, contain 427 words used on average 2.9 times each. While the Aristophanic corpus contains about twice as many instances of personal address as one finds in Menander, nevertheless, the difference between 70 different words for Menander and 427 for Aristophanes is too great to be explained by the relative sizes of their corpora. Again, Dickey inferred that Menander's address system more closely followed conversational practice (1995: 265-66).

4. Finally, Dickey considered the consistency of address usage in individual dyads (i.e., in dialogue exchanges between two persons). She used American English as an example and I quote her here: 'One may on occa-

<sup>5</sup> Dickey also excluded paratragic addresses in tragedy.

<sup>6</sup> The masculine, feminine, and plural forms of each word (e.g., οὗτος, αὐτός, οὗτοι, αὐταί) are all counted as the same word.

sion use insults or terms of endearment as appropriate, but basically if, e.g., a girl addresses her mother as “Mum”, her teacher as “Mrs. Smith”, and a friend as “Jane”, she will use the same addresses for these three people each time she speaks to them, in a consistent and predictable way’ (1995: 266). Such consistency, Dickey tells us, is not found in all languages, but it is found in Greek prose. Thus, e.g. in Xenophon’s *Oeconomicus*, Ischomachus addresses his wife fifteen times, always using the same address, γύναϊ (‘wife’); in Plato’s *Republic*, Glaucon addresses Socrates 29 times, always with the vocative, Σώκρατες. Menander, as well, shows a high degree of consistency when characters address one another. In *Samia*, e.g., Moschion always addresses his father as πάτερ (128, 452, 467, 486, 520, 537, 725); his father usually replies Μοσχίων (154, 451, 459, 465 bis, 537, 694, 709, 720) but twice uses παῖ (129, 148), and once an insult (481). But not all characters are so consistent. Demeas in *Samia* uses four different terms to address the slave Parmeno: Παρμένων (189 bis, 295, 305), παῖ, (189, 202), οὔτος (312), μαστιγία (324). Usually when such variety of address appears, the dyad contains a slave, a cook, or person of similar (lower) status. Elsewhere, when variety of address appears between equals, as between Moschion and his father, it happens under the pressure of strong emotion. In Aristophanes, on the other hand, almost no consistency in address usage can be found. Once again, Dickey concluded that Menander, Plato, and Xenophon were imitating some form of conversational Attic (1995: 266-69).

It can be no surprise that in the end, Dickey concluded that both prose and Menander reflect actual tendencies of conversational language and more particularly the language of educated citizens. However, since Menander showed less consistency of address in dyads, especially in those dialogues in which slaves speak, Dickey posited that Menander might also represent the language of slaves. This last inference is bolstered by studies

(e.g. Bain 1984) that suggest that his characters also reflect elements of women's language.

Dickey's contribution is important, especially for indicating the regularity and consistency of personal address in Menander. In what follows, I would like to demonstrate first, how variation in Menander's personal address system serves important dramatic functions; and secondly, how Menander's addresses to the audience can be seen as extensions of personal address.

## 2 Personal address: variation and dramatic function: linguistic characterization and thematic expansion

I begin, then with personal address, but I set this in the larger context of Menander's linguistic characterizations.

Menander's language appears to be a mixture of (what we imagine to be) the everyday language of the (educated) man on the street artificially turned into, for the most part, iambic trimeters—with shorter or longer flights into a higher poetic register (with overlay of tragic and sometimes epic borrowings), and every now and then a plunking down into the gutter (all of which is found, e.g., in Demeas' monologue at *Samia* 325-56). Many *literati* of the Imperial Age (e.g., Quintilian, Plutarch, K-A test. 101, 103, 104) thought Menander a quintessential transmitter of pure Attic, an exemplar of persuasion for future orators, and a poet with the capacity to present a range of emotions and all sorts of characters. Not everyone, however, agreed on the first point, that Menander's scripts presented exemplary and pure Attic Greek: the second century CE Atticist Phrynichus (K-A test. 119) condemned Menander's language for numerous and ignorant 'counterfeits'. While his criticism has been interpreted as meaning that Menander admitted *koine* features into his scripts, his diagnosis was

disputed in the early part of the twentieth century and also in the latter part, when scholars with larger chunks of the author at their disposal showed, e.g., that Menander uses relatively few nouns ending in  $-\mu\acute{o}\varsigma$  or adjectives in  $-\acute{\omega}\delta\eta\varsigma$  and  $-\iota\kappa\acute{o}\varsigma$ —these are phenomena that are frequent in writers of *koine*.<sup>\*7</sup> On the other hand, Menander, might use some such words to color certain characters: e.g. Onesimos in *Epitrepontes*, as Sandbach (1970: 134-36) has shown, ‘stands alone among Menander’s persons in this tendency to use nouns in  $-\mu\acute{o}\varsigma$  and adjectives in  $-\tau\iota\kappa\acute{o}\varsigma$ .’ Yet Onesimos’ particular  $-\mu\acute{o}\varsigma$  words are quite uncommon and seem to depict, together with his facility for quoting swatches of tragedy, a slave who is a bit out of the ordinary in his skillful appropriation of language rather than one who picks up what he hears without discernment.<sup>\*8</sup>

Menander’s linguistic depictions of stage characters are sometimes subtle, sometimes not; characters, for example, may have penchants for using particular words (as Onesimos in *Epitrepontes*) or evince syntactical peculiarities that become associated with them.<sup>\*9</sup> The impostor doctor in *Aspis* with his false Doric dialect is the most sensational of Menander’s linguistic characterizations, but Knemon’s penchant for vituperative name-calling in *Dyskolos*, perhaps the most extensive for an Old Man in the corpus, is also remarkable.<sup>\*10</sup> His maligned subjects and addressees are sinners and criminals who appear rarely in the rest of the corpus: they are *anosioi*, *toichoruchoi*, (lit. ‘thieves who dig through walls’), *androphona thēria* (‘man-killing beasts’).<sup>\*11</sup> Other of Knemon’s vocative terms of abuse are

<sup>\*7</sup> For references, see Willi 2002: 21-22

<sup>\*8</sup> Gomme and Sandbach 1973: 321 on *στριφνός* at *Epitrepontes* 385 is instructive regarding the difficulty of identifying and interpreting *koine* in Menander’s texts.

<sup>\*9</sup> See Sandbach 1970 for numerous examples.

<sup>\*10</sup> Smikrines in *Epitrepontes* is a close second; see n.13 infra.

<sup>\*11</sup> *Anosioi*, ‘unholy’: 108-9 ‘*ἀνόσιε ἄνθρωπέ,*’ 469, 595 and used only once elsewhere in Menander’s corpus; *toichoruchoi*, lit. ‘thieves who dig through walls’: 588 and cf.

more widely used in Menander's corpus, though no one of the more fully preserved plays instances them as often as this one does: *mastigia* ('rogue in need of a whipping'), *athlie* ('wretch'), and *trisathlie* ('monstrously-wretched').<sup>\*12</sup> Knemon also curses frequently (432, 442, 600-01, 927-28) and threatens to kill his serving woman (931).<sup>\*13</sup> The grouchy old man is certainly not the only wielder of abusive speech in the play (we shall soon consider the language of *Sikon* the cook at 487-88); nonetheless his particular brand of name-calling, with its clustering of sinners and criminals, is suggestive of his self-righteous stand-alone morality that is more fully articulated elsewhere in the play (e.g., 442-55 and 742-47); his personal (abusive!) address system, accordingly, is his most distinctive linguistic trait. And it is all the more prominent as a polite—though sometimes ironic—addressing of characters occurs extensively throughout the play; this in turn may be due to the particular situation of the comedy: the divinity Pan will soon be celebrated by a genteel Athenian family and its slaves

---

447 (as subjects not vocatives) and only elsewhere in fragments; *androphona thēria*: 'homicidal beasts': 481 and not elsewhere.

\*12 *Mastigia* 471, used also by Sostratos at 140 and once each in *Epir.*, *Kolax*, *Perikeiromene*, *Samia*. *Athlie/oi* 702 and 955, used also by Getas at 880 and once each in *Epir.*, *Kolax*, and *Samia*. *Trisathlie*: 466, used also by *Sikon* at 423; elsewhere, by Smikrines in *Aspis* 414).

\*13 Knemon's name-calling is almost matched by the curmudgeonly Smikrines in *Epitrepontes* (1064, 1100, 1122; 1073; 366; 1080; 1113). Thrice his addressees are called *hierosyloi* (lit. 'temple robber' but apparently any kind of 'crook': 1064, 1100, 1122). In the first and third instance, Smikrines uses '*hierosyle grau*' of Sophrone whom he later threatens to drown and kill at night (1073); *hierosyle* is used as an abusive address twice elsewhere in *Epir.* (935, 952: see Martina 1997 I2: 521 on 952: it seems natural 'che fosse impiegato con una certa frequenza nella lingua corrente'), but only four times elsewhere in the Menandrian corpus (*Aspis* 227, *Dysk.* 640, *Samia* 678, *Perikeiromene* 366). Smikrines creatively calls Daos an *ergastērion* (lit. 'workshop,' here 'inmate of a forced labor sweatshop', 366), Omesimos *trikatarate* ('thrice-cursed', 1080) and *mastigia* (1113). For linguistic characterizations of other old men, esp. in *Samia*, see Grasso 1995: 235-39.

and assistants who meet and mingle with the ‘locals’ from Phyle.\*<sup>14</sup>

The first dialogue between Sostratos and Gorgias in Act II provides a splendid example of polite address. Here are two men, from disparate backgrounds: one, Sostratos, is rich while the other, Gorgias, the step-son of Knemon, is a hard-working farmer. As the scene begins, even before Gorgias meets Sostratos for the first time, he is at odds with him: Gorgias’ slave had seen Sostratos accost his half-sister; now Gorgias plans to warn the love-smitten Sostratos to stay away from her. Nonetheless, the two men maintain a balance of courtesy, and this is marked by the frequent exchange of personal address—7 times in the course of a 3-minute dialogue.\*<sup>15</sup> Gorgias begins the conversation at line 269 with the vocative, ‘Μειράκιον (young man),’ he says, ‘would you mind listening to some serious advice from me?’ He then continues, with somewhat stilted and pompous speech at first, but eventually he becomes quite candid: ‘You,’ he says to Sostratos, ‘have your mind set on seducing my sister!’ (289-91). The rich young man is shocked; he invokes Apollo’s name at line 293. Gorgias continues his warning, but Sostratos quickly interrupts with cour-

\*<sup>14</sup> Among the polite addresses in *Dyskolos*, we find βέλτιστε used 6 times (144, 319, 338, 342, 476, 503); μειράκιον 6 times, sometimes co-responsive with βέλτιστε (269, 299, 311, 342, 539, 729; Knemon himself uses μειράκιον once to address his son, and this occurs in the course of his ‘speech of redemption’); ὦ τᾶν ‘good sir’ is used twice (247 and 359); μακάριε twice (103 and 701); πᾶτερ as a term of respect for an older man, twice (107 and 171)—and this list excludes the terms for the members of a household (*pais, graus, pater, mēter, thugatrion*) who are also frequently addressed by different characters in the play. The explicit attention to language in this play suggests that Sostratos’ remark (201-02) on the use of a predominantly ‘male oath’ by Knemon’s daughter is just as much a critical comment on her inappropriate language as it is a compliment on her open manner (cf. Bain 1984: 40-1), ‘poised though she be, she is a country girl’ (ἐλευθερίως γέ πως ἄγροϊκός ἐστιν); on the girl’s language, see Traill 2008: 54-5.

\*<sup>15</sup> Thus μειράκιον, βέλτιστε, ὦ τᾶν: 269, 299, 311, 319, 338, 342, and 359; see Dickey 1996: 73-4 and 119-20.

teous restraint, using a vocative at the beginning of line 299, ‘Μειράκιον (young man), please let me say something!’ He confesses that he is in love with the girl, he wants to marry her—without a dowry; he’ll swear an oath to cherish her forever. He repeats the vocative address again in the middle of line 311, ‘If I’ve come here with evil intent, planning an intrigue behind your back, may this Pan, *μειράκιον* (young man), and the Nymphs together strike me senseless on the spot. . . .’ (309-13). The dialogue continues, from this point, in friendlier fashion ‘You’ve put things in a new light, you have me as a friend, too!’ says Gorgias and continues, ‘I’m no outsider, my dear sir (*βέλτιστε*), I’m the girl’s half-brother. . . .’ (318-19) Nevertheless, Gorgias is adamant: he can give no help to Sostratos’ courtship; the girl’s father, Knemon will be an impossible obstacle: ‘ὦ βέλτιστε (so, my friend)’ Gorgias says at line 338, ‘don’t give yourself trouble, it will be useless. Leave us to bear the burden, we’re his relatives, by gift of fortune!’ We have now arrived at a richly delicate moment of comedy: the passionate lover has been dealt a blow; his dream girl is quickly vanishing from his life; the girl’s half-brother has candidly told him he has no chance; nonetheless, Sostratos must enlist Gorgias’ aid; so he takes a desperate chance and at 341-342, he asks an intimate question and gets an intimate response and that intimacy is signaled, I submit, by an antilabic exchange of personal address—that is, a change of speakers within the same verse, with each addressing the other:

[Sostratos:] ‘By the gods, have you never been in love,

*μειράκιον* (*young man*)?’

[Gorgias:] ‘It’s not possible, *βέλτιστε* (*my friend*).’

[Sostratos:] ‘How so?’\*<sup>16</sup>

---

\*<sup>16</sup> (Σω) πρὸς τῶν θεῶν οὐπώποτ’ ἠράσθης τινός,  
μειράκιον; (Γο) οὐδ’ ἔξεστί μοι, βέλτιστε. (Σω) πῶς; (342)  
τίς ἔσθ’ ὁ κωλύων; (Γο) ὁ τῶν ὄντων κακῶν (343)

This is a telling moment that will lock the two men together even as Gorgias' reply makes clear how different the two are; nonetheless, they will work together in the remainder of the play.

Let us return now to the purveyor of abusive address in *Dyskolos*: Knemon. His penchant for name-calling is given attention right at the start, before he even sets foot on stage. It is hinted at in the prologue. There Pan depicts him as δύσκολος πρὸς ἅπαντας, οὐ χαίρων τ' ὄχλωι, 'peevish to everyone, never giving a friendly nod to the crowd', and then continues:

“ὄχλωι” λέγω; ζῶν οὗτος ἐπεικῶς χρόνον  
πολὺν λελάληκεν ἠδέως ἐν τῷ βίωι  
οὐδεν(ί), προσηγόρευκε πρότερος δ' οὐδένα. . . (10)  
‘Crowds’ do I say? He’s lived a good long time  
And never spoken willingly to anyone  
In his life, never been the first to greet a man.

This preliminary portraiture is made vivid in the first scene: Pyrrhias, a slave whom Sostratos had bidden to meet the old man, reports the experience in a series of short speeches (87-144) of five or ten lines which are now and again interrupted by his young master Sostratos and his friend Chaireas (87-144). The slave had gone to the farm, sighted the man, approached:

I was still a good  
Way from him, but I wanted to be a  
Friendly and tactful sort of fellow (ἐπιδέξιός), so  
I greeted him. “I’ve come,” I said, “on business,  
To see you, *sir* (πάτερ), on business, it’s to your  
Advantage.” Right away, “Ἄνόσιε ἄνθρωπέ (damned

*heathen*,” he said, “trespassing on my land? What’s your game?”  
 He picked up a lump of earth, which he threw  
 Smack in my face. (104-11, trans. Arnott 1979)

A small but vivid portion of the speech is delivered through quoted speech (107-10 and 112-15). Knemon’s first response has been to address his uninvited visitor as ‘*ἀνόσιε ἄνθρωπέ*’—and this after the slave’s concern to present himself *ἐπιδέξιός*, as a ‘tactful sort of fellow.’ Pyrrhios continues his narrative: the man beat him with a stake, shouting, at the top of his lungs, ‘Don’t you know the public road?’ (115); Knemon had then pursued him for fifteen stades, slinging clods of earth, stones, even pears, when nothing else remained. He sums up the old man’s character and offers advice to Sostratos:

*ἀνήμερόν τι πράγμα τελέως, ἀνόσιος*  
*γέρων. ἴκετεύω σ’, ἄπιτε.* (122-23)  
 What a savage brute, an absolutely damnable  
 Old heathen! Get out of here, *please!*  
 (trans. Arnott, mod.).

Pyrrhios has picked up Knemon’s language (*ἀνόσιος γέρων*), iterates the advice to leave this neck of the woods, but adds his own endearing ‘*please!*’ (*ἴκετεύω σ’*).

Indeed, courteous vs. abusive address and its reception play into a pervasive theme: hospitality (that great Greek virtue), and especially now, on the occasion of a sacrifice, a hospitality that is tested by the knocking on a neighbor’s door to borrow pots for the sacrifice to Pan and finding a welcome (or not), and by invitations to join in celebrating a wedding feast. Sikon, the cook who accompanies Sostratos’ mother to Pan’s shrine, makes the case for the utility of courteous address later in the play. Getas,

another slave in Sostratos' family, had tried to borrow a pot from Knemon, had miserably failed, and generated a great deal of annoyance by the very request: Knemon had left the stage, complaining of 'man-killing beasts' who come knocking on one's doors 'as if to a friend's house' (III 481-486). Sikon now reacts as he comes onstage, obviously having watched the preceding scene:

κάκιστ' ἀπόλοι'· ἐλοιδορεῖτό σοι; τυχὸν  
 ἦιτεις, σκατοφάγ'· ὥς οὐκ ἐπίστανταί τινες  
 ποιεῖν τὸ τοιοῦθ'· εὔρηκ' ἐγὼ τούτου τέχνην·  
 διακονῶ γὰρ μυρίοις ἐν τῇ πόλει (490)  
 τούτων τ' ἐνοχλῶ τοῖς γείτοσιν καὶ λαμβάνω  
 σκευή παρα πάντων. δεῖ γὰρ εἶναι κολακικὸν  
 τὸν δεόμενόν του. πρεσβύτερός τις τῇ θύρῃ  
 ὑπακίχο'· εὐθὺς πατέρα καὶ πάππα[ν λέγω.  
 γραῦς· μητέρ'. ἂν τῶν διὰ μέσου τ[ις ἦ γυνή. (495)  
 ἐκάλεσ' ἱερέαν. ἂν θεράπων[  
 βέλτιστον. ὑμεῖς δὲ κρεμαν.[  
 ὦ τῆς ἀμαθίας. παιδίον παι[  
 ἐγώ. πρόελθε, πατρίδιον· σὲ β[ούλομαι. (487-99)

Be damned to you! He told / you off? Perhaps you asked with the finesse / of a pig! Some folk don't know how to do a thing / like that. There's a technique to it that I've / discovered. I help millions in the town, / pestering their neighbors, borrowing pans from all / of them. A borrower must use soft soap. / Suppose an older man answers the door. [I call] / [him] 'Father' (πατέρα) straight away, or 'Dad' (πάππα[ν]. If it's / a hag, then 'Mother' (μητέρ'). If [a] middle-aged / [woman], I call her 'Madam' (ἱερέαν). If a [youngish (?)] slave, / 'good chap' (βέλτιστον). You people

though—[be (?)] hanged! / O what stupidity! [Claptrap like (?)]  
 ‘Boy! Slave! (παιδίον, παῖ)’ My approach / is, ‘Come on, dad  
 (πατρίδιον), [I want (?)] you! / (487-99, trans. Arnott)

Sikon addresses lines 497-499 to Getas, and as he concludes his speech, knocks on Knemon’s door to provide the proof of his technique (Arnott 1979: 261, 263). But the poor cook is hardly given a chance: Knemon calls for a leather strap to beat the man; Sikon asks to be released and (desperately) adds ‘βέλτιστε’ (‘good chap’) at 503, to no avail and apparently in violation of his own script—he has used the address that *he* reserves for slaves as part of ‘soft soap delivery’. Left alone onstage, Sikon sizes up the situation: ‘Yes, he’s ploughed me nicely! The importance of the tactful appeal (οἶόν ἐστ’ ἐπιδεδξιώς / αἰτεῖν)—by Zeus, how that does matter!’ 514-16. The cook has fared no better than Pyrrhias had in the opening scene, ‘wanting to be a friendly and tactful sort of fellow (ἐπιδεδξιός)’, 105-06 (Arnott 1979, mod.). Nonetheless, Sikon is shown here as a man who thinks about the way he uses language.\*<sup>17</sup>

Menander’s linguistic characterizations and especially his personal addresses, are carefully constructed and, in the instances discussed here, play into the larger themes of the comedy. Knemon’s abusive name-calling is part of the ‘address system’ of (in)hospitality, hinted at in the prologue, made explicit by Pyrrhias in the first act and theorized by Sikon in the third. Its ‘courteous side’ is shown elsewhere in the play, especially in the first dialogue between Sostratos and Gorgias in Act II. Courteous personal address, because of its connection to hospitality, and abusive address, be-

---

\*<sup>17</sup> Elsewhere Sikon appears as ‘a man of metaphors and colourful language’ (Gomme and Sandbach 1973: 282; also Sandbach 1970: 119-20); he is given a ‘linguistic climax’ in the last act when he describes (whether as enticement or torment for Knemon), in poetically-tinged language and metrically strict rhythm, the feasting that is taking place inside Pan’s shrine (946-53).

cause of its connection to inhospitality, become thematic in the play.

### 3 The monologue

Another kind of address differs from the types discussed so far: namely, audience address. Such addresses typically but not always are situated in monologues. A brief discussion of monologues will provide the context for audience address.

Menandrian plays abound with them—we find characterizing monologues, emotional monologues, expository monologues (including prologues), entrance monologues, ‘link monologues’ (which, as the tag suggests, ‘link’ scenes to one another), quasi-monologues (these are lengthy uninterrupted speeches by one character before an internal audience of cast members who remain silent, as in the case of Knemon’s ‘speech of redemption’ in *Dyskolos* Act IV, or they may be speeches that are interrupted just now and again with a line or two, as in the case of Daos’ speech before Smikrines in *Epitrepontes* Act II). Often monologues present moments in the comedy that are essentially unrealistic—for (a) who in real life, like Thrasonides in the opening of *Misoumenus*, walks down a street explaining where he is coming from and why he appears alone or (b) who, like Demeas in his opening monologue of Act III of *Samia*, stands before his house bemoaning to the world at large and to no one in particular that his mistress despises him or that she has been intimate with his son? Some of these monologists provide expository information—that is, information that enables the audience to understand the plot of the play or even, more simply, to let the audience know what happened offstage; this is the sort of information that Thrasonides supplies at the opening of *Misoumenus* and Demeas in the scene just alluded to in *Samia*. A monologist who supplies such information has traditionally been interpreted as directing his

speech toward the audience while the monologist who reflects on the dramatic situation ἐν ᾗθελι (i.e., in the persona of the dramatic character as Demeas does in a later monologue in *Samia* Act III) has been interpreted as engaging in an interior discussion, having a conversation with himself, a soliloquy; but surely in many instances no clear line demarcates the one kind from the other (Bain 1977:185-207; Blundell 1980: 63). I shall return to this point shortly.

Theatrical tradition fully embraced the convention of monologue; even so, Menander turned it into a new art form that enlivens the on-going drama; as Leo pithily put it in 1908 (and thus with a limited corpus at hand): ‘The characters of Demeas and Moshion in *Samia*, of Onesimos and Charisios in *Epitrepontes*, of Moshion in *Perikeiromene* are no more lively during the most excited dialogues than when they address themselves alone’ (89). Menandrian monologists certainly know how to take the audience into their confidence, to draw them into their dramas, not only because the events they report can be so crucial to the plot of the play, but also because they speak so vividly: they demand attention. Examples abound: (1) Onesimos, in remarkable language (*Epitrepontes* Act IV 878-907), relates Charisios’ response to overhearing Pamphile’s defense of her loyalty to her husband, quotes the words of his master in deep distress (see Gomme and Sandbach on 361 on 891), and thus prepares the audience for his manic entrance and delivery of his own redemptive monologue in the next scene; (2) there Charisios records the *daemonion*’s rebuke to him, quotes Pamphile’s response to her father’s request to leave him, and rehearses his own retort to Smikrines (908-32?). (3) The soldier Thrasonides, at the very opening of *Misoumenos*, stands outside his house and, bizarrely calling on Night and distressed that his mistress’ feelings have changed, sets the stage for the crisis in his house; (4) in Act IV of the same play, the soldier’s slave Getas enters (685), ambulates here and there

in deep conversation with himself, trying to figure out how in the world both the father of Thrasonides' mistress and she herself could refuse the soldier's request for marriage, and along the way, in fact, from the start, a neighbor follows him about (697: σ]υμπεριπατήσω καὐτός), trying to get his attention with questions and exasperated interjections until he finally succeeds (724)—but this only happens after Getas has provided a verbatim account: what Krateia's father said, what Thrasonides said, what Krateia did not say, what Getas would have done; all this is economically accomplished in fifty lines in one of the most comical scenes in the *oeuvre*; (5) this *coup de théâtre* is followed by the entrance of Thrasonides in the next scene (cf. Charisios' entrance after Onesimos' monologue in *Epitrepontes* IV): he now delivers what appears to be a melancholic monologue (757-815, Arnott's [1996b] text, with many partial verses—the scene is rather mutilated), delivered without interruption but as if he were questioning and responding to answers about his situation to another character onstage (potentially quite comical), and possibly ending with a plot to pretend suicide. Among other monologue highlights, it is difficult to omit (6) Demeas' address at the opening of *Samia* Act III (alluded to earlier) when he comes onstage like a shipwrecked man (his metaphor) and invites the audience to judge whether he's sane or mad, whether he's misconstrued the situation entirely, and then reports the busy scene of his son's wedding preparation and finally the conversation he overheard between Moshion's old nurse and maid by which he has deduced that the crying infant is Moshion's son by his mistress (206-82); and difficult to omit (7) his follow-up monologue, when later in the same act he is thoroughly convinced of his mistress' treachery and displays a remarkable range of emotions, lamenting his tragic universe (quoting Eur. *Oedipus*) and apostrophizing himself as an idiot: he must buck up, his son was not to blame, it was his mistress' fault—that Helen (324-56). And finally, a quick mention must be made of

(8) the ‘messenger’s speech’ in *Sikyonioid* Act IV (176-271), where, in the course of narrating the unfolding drama of a deme gathering where the fate of Philoumene is being determined, the speaker, with overarching allusions to the famous ‘messenger speech’ in Euripedes *Orestes* (866-956, reporting the Argive Assembly that determined the fates of Orestes and Electra), brilliantly re-creates the crowded scene, quoting numerous speakers: now the soldier’s slave Dromo, now the collective crowd, then the soldier’s rival for the girl’s affection, then an anonymous individual, the rival again, the collective crowd, the soldier, and so on (while speakers and change of speaker are sometimes difficult to identify, in 264-69, possibly seven different voices are heard); the role of this messenger was surely a demanding one to play.

These Menandrian monologists hardly appear as lone speakers who only address themselves; and while they sometimes do that (i.e., explicitly address themselves), they might also address the audience, apostrophize personifications (as in no. 3 above), report the speech of a personification (as in no. 2), or conversations with others and even dialogues in which they did not participate (nos. 4 and 6).<sup>\*18</sup> ‘Speech within speech’ is perhaps the stylistic device that most enlivens monologue—though the range of linguistic register (from tragic to comic) and the occasional stricter scansion (as in the messenger’s speech in *Sikyonioid*) also invite attention. Quoted speech is not limited to monologue; in the last section, for example, we saw Pyrrhias use ‘speech within speech’ as he narrated his meeting with Knemon in the opening scene of *Dyskolos*, and among the instances cited in this section, the ‘messenger’s speech’ is ‘quasi-monologue’—an uninterrupted long speech addressed to a character onstage. While its capacity to enliven (depending, of course, on the delivery of a good comic actor—

---

<sup>\*18</sup> For a complete catalogue and discussion of quoted speech in Menander, see Nünlist 2002.

but not the delivery of Quintilian's 'over the top' comic actor: 11.3.91) is perhaps obvious, and likewise its capacity to present scenes that could not be presented onstage for technical restrictions (three-actor rule, unity of place, masks), quoted speech served other functions as well, e.g., it served to introduce and characterize both the quoting character and the characters who were absent from the stage (Nünlist 2002: 253). Indeed, many of the 'quoted speeches' occur in *expository* monologues and these defy the traditional view that expository monologues can be easily distinguished from reflective or 'character- typifying' monologues. This is especially so in monologue no. 2, where Charisios not only gives information about what happened off-stage, but also deeply characterizes himself in the process; similarly, in monologue 4, we are given a fine idea of Getas' loyalty as he strolls back and forth onstage telling us what happened off-stage just a few moments ago; and in monologue no. 6, Demeas, while ostensibly informing the audience of how he discovered his son's alleged affair with his mistress, also gives us a very good idea of just what kind of man he is.

#### 4 Menander and his audience

Not only Menandrian monologists, but most Menandrian characters know how to take the audience into their confidence. In concluding this essay with observations on addresses to the audience, it will be useful to consider the *community* of Menander's theater. In the introduction to their commentary on Menander, Gomme and Sandbach drew attention to the proximity of the Greek audience to the actors; in contrast to much modern drama, 'the spectators were more immediately present at the events going forward in front of them, and the actor draws them in to participate. He informs them of what has happened off-stage, he confides in them, may even put questions to them, although he gives no opportunity for an

answer. This link between actor and audience is an inheritance from Old Comedy, and from Old Comedy is inherited, too, the traditional vocative in addressing the spectators: ἄνδρες.’ (p.14 with n.1). The vocative is the most explicit indication of audience address; it can reveal itself by the use of second person plural verbs and pronouns (e.g., *Dyskolos* 484, Knemon speaking, and often in parts ‘outside the play’, in prologues and endings: see Bain 1977: 186-7 for examples).<sup>\*19</sup> And sometimes, as Gomme and Sandbach point out (*ibid.*), in monologues where neither vocatives nor second person plurals appear, the audience is no less addressed. These observations raise many questions about the way monologues functioned in New Comedy. Here, only two interrelated questions can be posed: in cases where spectators are explicitly addressed as ἄνδρες, who is this audience and what are these addresses all about?

The monologists of the last section addressed the audience as ἄνδρες or ‘men’ six times: in *Epitir.* 887, *Samia* 269 and 329, and *Sikyonioid* 225, 240 [supplemented] and 269. The address to ἄνδρες appears on ten occasions elsewhere among the longer preserved plays (*Dysk.* 194, 659, 666, 921, 967; *Misoumenos* 994; *Samia* 447, 683, 734; *Sik.* 405).<sup>\*20</sup> These addresses

---

<sup>\*19</sup> At *Dysk.* 481-85, Knemon expresses his annoyance at the slave Getas as he scampers off stage: (Κν) ἀνδροφόνον θηρί· εὐθὺς ὥσπερ πρὸς φίλον/ κόπτουσιν. ἄν ἡμῶν προσιόντα τῆι θύρῃ/ λάβω τιν’, ἄν μὴ πᾶσι τοῖς ἐν τῷ τόπῳ/ παράδειγμα ποιήσω, νομίζεθ’ ἕνα τινὰ/ ὄρᾳν με τῶν πολλῶν. . . (485). ‘Man-killing beasts! They think it’s like a friend’s house/They come right up and knock! As for any man approaching our door-/Just let me catch him! If the whole region doesn’t find him/Made into an example, *consider* (νομίζεθ’) me a cipher when you see me.’

Only the audience of spectators can be the intended recipients of this speech—no one else is on stage, and the plural imperative ‘consider’ is addressed to them.

<sup>\*20</sup> Additionally, a mortal speaker addresses the audience twice as ἄνδρες in Pap. Didot II (= P.Louvre, Sandbach OCT p. 330, K-A fr. com. adesp. 1001, Arnott III [2000] Fab. Inc. 2) vv. 3 and 13; this may be a prologue and it may be Menander; see Bain 1977: 186 n.3.

to ἄνδρες can be categorized by a brief description of the speeches in which they appear:

–Three addresses to ἄνδρες are *outside the play* (that is, they appear at the play’s end, when their speakers call on the audience for applause: *Dysk.* 967, *Miosumenos* 994, *Samia* 734).<sup>\*21</sup>

–Four addresses to ἄνδρες are *internal addresses* (three in the messenger’s speech in *Sik.* and one at *Dysk.* 921); in each of these cases, the actor addresses men who are characters onstage—he is *not* calling upon the ‘men’ in the audience.

–Four instances of audience address occur in *expository* speeches that also vividly portray the character (‘*expository/characterizing*’: Sikon at *Dysk.* 659 and Sostratos at *Dysk.* 666; *Epir.* 887; *Samia* 269). In *Dyskolos*, the two characters describe what is happening off-stage to Knemon and so the addresses to ἄνδρες serve an expository purpose—the audience cannot see Knemon being hauled out of the well and so they are explicitly invited to listen to what happened; but the particular joy with which the slave and then Sostratos give the expository information characterizes those men as well. Hence I call these and such like speeches ‘expository/characterizing monologues.’

–The remaining five occur in *reflective* or *characterizing speeches* (*Dysk.* 194; *Sam.* 329, 447, 683; *Sik.* 405).

Explicit addresses to the audience are not plentiful; nonetheless, it is important to consider how to understand them, especially those embedded in the last two groups (that is, in the expository/characterizing speeches and in the reflective characterizing speeches). These are all monologues, in-

---

<sup>\*21</sup> Similarly, *Agnoia* (‘Misapprehension’) addresses the audience as θεαταί (spectators) as she says her farewell to the audience upon finishing her prologue speech in *Perikeiromene*; no one else, as the corpus now stands, addresses the audience thus.

cluding Sostratos' one-liner at *Dysk.* 194, and they all take the audience into the confidence of the speakers on rather serious matters—for these are speeches that go beyond the mere conveyance of information to the audience. Who do these speakers imagine themselves addressing? Is it, as Gomme and Sandbach thought, the ἄνδρες inherited from Old Comedy?

Before addressing this question even briefly, let us look at a snippet of one of the monologues: Demeas' address at the opening of *Samia* Act III. Here Demeas comes onstage to report what happened off-stage: he has overheard a conversation that has led him to infer that his adopted son Moshion has had an affair with his mistress and that she has borne him a son—well, perhaps he has not quite made the inference—no, perhaps he simply hasn't accepted the inference; but he is surely suspicious. He will address the 'audience' as he continues:

κἀγὼ προήμειν τοῦτον ὄνπερ ἐνθάδε  
τρόπον ἀρτίως ἐξῆλθον, ἡσυχῆ πάνυ,  
ὡς οὔτ' ἀκούσας οὐδὲν οὔτ' ἠισθημένος.  
αὐτὴν δ' ἔχουσαν αὐτὸ τὴν Σαμίαν ὄρω (265)  
ἔξω καθ' αὐτὴν καὶ διδοῦσαν τιθθίον  
ὥσθ' ὅτι μὲν αὐτῆς ἐστὶ τοῦτο γνῶριμον  
εἶναι, πατρὸς δ' ὅτου ποτ' ἐστίν, εἴτ' ἐμὸν  
εἴτ'—οὐ λέγω δ', ἄνδρες, πρὸς ὑμᾶς τοῦτ' ἐγώ,  
οὐχ ὑπονοῶ, τὸ πρᾶγμα δ' εἰς μέσον φέρω (270)  
ἅ τ' ἀκήκο' αὐτός, οὐκ ἀγανακτῶν οὐδέπω.  
σύνοιδα γὰρ τῶι μειρακίωι, νῆ τοὺς θεοὺς,  
καὶ κοσμίωι τὸν πρότερον ὄντι χρόνον ἀεὶ  
καὶ περὶ ἔμ' ὡς ἔνεστιν εὐσεβεστάτῳ.  
πάλιν δ', ἐπειδὴν τὴν λέγουσαν καταμάθω (275)  
τίτθην ἐκείνου πρῶτον οὔσαν, εἴτ' ἐμοῦ

λάθραι λέγουσαν, εἴτ' ἀποβλέψω πάλιν  
 εἰς τὴν ἀγαπῶσαν αὐτὸ καὶ βεβιασμένην  
 ἐμοῦ τρέφειν ἄκοντος, ἐξέστηχ' ὄλωσ.  
 ἀλλ' εἰς καλὸν γὰρ τουτονὶ προσιόνθ' ὀρῶ (280)  
 τὸν Παρμένοντ' ἐκ τῆς ἀγορᾶς ἐάτέον  
 αὐτὸν παραγαγεῖν ἐστι τούτους οὖς ἄγει.

[De.] . . . And I came forward in the way that I  
 Emerged just now, quite calmly, just as if  
 I'd neither heard nor spotted anything.  
 I saw my Samian partner out of doors,  
 The baby at her breast as I walked past.  
 It's definite then that the baby's hers.  
 But who the father is—whether it's me,  
 Or whether—*gentlemen, no, I won't tell*  
*You that!* I've no suspicions, but I bring  
 The facts and what I've heard out in the open. I'm  
 Not angry, yet! I really know my boy—  
 That he was always well-behaved in days  
 Gone by, and showed the greatest possible  
 Respect to me. Again, when I consider that  
 The talker was his former nurse, and spoke  
 Not knowing I was there, then when I look  
 Again at her love for the child, insisting it  
 Be raised, against my wishes—I'm completely  
 Incensed! But I see Parmenon—that's splendid!  
 Here he is, back from the market. I must let  
 Him take inside the people that he's brought.

(Menander *Samia* 262-82; trans. Arnott)

Who are these ἄνδρες, these ‘gentlemen’ (as Arnott translates the term) whom Demeas addresses? Can they possibly be the ἄνδρες addressed by the poets of Old Comedy?

Comparison with audience address in Aristophanes’ comedies is telling. While a great deal could be said here, I conclude with one observation and expand on that. The observation: Aristophanic addresses to the audience are different; they occur in speeches that are less personal than Menander’s; and while they certainly ‘take the audience in’, they hardly take the audience into their confidence. There are 28 allusions to current spectators (21 to θεαταί and 7 to θεώμενοι) and 6 vocative addresses to them (4 to θεαταί and 2 to θεώμενοι): in almost all instances, the ‘spectators’ are treated in their capacity as that, as ‘men at a show,’ who are often flattered as being smart (*Knights* 228, 1210, *Clouds* 521, 535, 890, *Peace* 43, *Frogs* 1110, 1118) or simply cajoled (*Acharn.* 442, *Wasps* 1527, *Peace* 962, 964, *Birds* 786, *Frogs* 1475, *Eccl.* 582, 583, 888, 1142, *Wealth* 798), occasionally insulted (*Clouds* 1096, *Wasps* 1014, 1016) or treated to information (i.e., expository passages: *Knights* 36, *Wasps* 54); sometimes they are mentioned neutrally, almost like ‘by-standers’ (*Wasps* 59, *Peace* 446, 543, 732, *Thesm.* 391; cf. Revermann 2006: 101-02). The lion’s share of Aristophanes’ addresses to ἄνδρες, on the other hand, are ‘internal,’ to members of the chorus (e.g., to the knights, to the wasps as judges) and to others onstage at the moment (39 out of 49 instances in the extant plays); there are two addresses to ἄνδρες in *parabases* (*Acharn.* 496, *Birds* 685; cf. λεῶ at *Wasps* 1015, *parabasis*): νῦν αὖτε, λεῶ, προσέχετε τὸν νοῦν, ‘now once again, people, give me your attention’), another in a song of similar tenor, (*Lys.* 1043-44)—and the ‘tenor’ is public,<sup>\*22</sup> and two

<sup>\*22</sup> ‘Public tenor’ also attaches to the vocative address to βροτοί (‘men’) at *Peace* 236 (thrice), 286, and *Birds* 687; also to the address to λεῶ at *Acharn.* 1000, *Wasps* 1015 (*parabasis*), *Peace* 298 and 551. Neither βροτοί nor λεῶ appear in Menander.

in expository and play-ending passages (*Birds* 30 and 1357). There is an occasional soliciting of the audience for assistance or acquiescence in an opinion (ἄνδρες κοπρολόγοι at *Peace* 9 and ἄνδρες ἥλικες at *Clouds* 1437). Only rarely does the speaker address the audience a bit more personally: *Peace* 13, 244, and 276; the first two are jokes (the second spoken aside) and the third is a melodramatic rhetorical question. These, of course, are only the most explicit addresses; there is no space here for discussion of second person plurals and implicit addresses, or a more convoluted discussion of the possible identification of internal audience with the one sitting in the theater; but even if added to the mix, the conclusions as drawn in the following sentences may be very much the same.

Aristophanic addresses to the audience, whether as ‘spectators’ (θεαταί and θεώμενοι) or ‘men’ (ἄνδρες) overlap but little with the audience addresses of Menandrian characters. The intimacies of confidences offered to the audience by Demeas in *Samia*, by Onesimos and Charisios in *Epitrepontes*, by Moshion in *Sikyonioi* are *nowhere* to be found in Aristophanes. It is a different world. While it is perilous to point to an absence in the Menandrian syntactical lexicon, no human character ever addresses the audience as θεαταί and none (so far) modifies ἄνδρες so that only a portion of the population is being called upon such as the ‘dung collectors’ and ‘gentlemen of my own age’ in *Peace* and *Clouds* respectively. And while it is also perilous to end an essay with conjecture, I hazard that the Menandrian ‘men’ who are addressed explicitly (and also implicitly: Bain 1977: 195-207) in both reflective and expository monologues (wherever the line is drawn) are addressed in their larger human capacity, not in their more prescribed roles as theater-goers, but as men with hearts and brains and souls, who may need to know, since the scene could not be staged (*Dysk.* 666-690), that Knemon fell into a well and that Gorgias jumped down and rescued him, but who are also immensely rewarded by know-

ing just exactly how Sostratos felt, as he stood at the lip of the well with Knemon's daughter as lone companion. Sostratos has taken the audience into his confidence. Yes, men with hearts, and brains, and soul, who may need to know, since the scene could not be staged, that Demeas in *Samia* is the victim of his own flawed syllogistic thinking—his mistress did not bear the infant whom she coddles in her arms; but the audience is also immensely enriched by hearing Demeas' humane response to his son's alleged misconduct: he is not angry, he is not suspicious—oh, but he is!

Menander's audience, the one that can be constructed from his characters' speech, appears to be a far more intimate one than Aristophanes', even if universalized—or perhaps *because* its members are universalized—as men with hearts and brains and souls. Talking to such men is perhaps not so very different from talking to oneself—or better: no different from talking to one's best friends. One's most personal observations are to be shared with friends. While the older comic poet certainly passed on his tricks of the trade, and while the actors of both poets were playing to the audience from the beginning of the performance straight through to the end, those audiences were quite different. The contemporary schools of philosophy (especially the Lyceum) and the symposia of elite intellectuals, by providing opportunities for dialogue on art, life, and love, may have had an equal if not greater role in the composition of Menander's plays, to say nothing of the composition of his audience. That audience, at least while sitting in Athens in the Lycurgan theatre, will have been larger than it had been in the late fifth century; a larger component of these spectators may now have been wealthy and some, specially schooled, may have been particularly sparked by Menander's portrayal of character and emotions and by philosophically-tinged jokes such as the play on a vitiated syllogism in

*Samia*.<sup>\*23</sup> It may be, in many cases, that this last group felt themselves to be the particular ἄνδρες addressed by Menander's characters; but there is no reason to exclude any (male) member of the audience at all; each is invited into the circle of friendship. As for women, if they were in the audience: surely they will have been pleased by the intimate admissions of the men—and if not really pleased, then content that they knew better.

Adele C. Scafuro  
Brown University  
Adele\_Scafuro@brown.edu

### Bibliographic note:

Studies of linguistic characterization (including personal and audience address) in its interaction with dramatic technique is a promising pathway for further study in Menander, especially as the number of published Menandrian papyri increases; it should be kept in mind that the assignment of verses to characters can be a tricky and fluctuating business (cf. Sandbach 1973: 554 on 98-101a and Arnott 2000: 32 on 96-105) and that a second person plural addressee can be interestingly ambiguous (internal or external audience?). Menander's linguistic characterizations, sometimes involving a distinction between men's and women's speech, is highlighted by Sandbach 1970 (brilliant), Katsouris 1975, Turner 1980 (on questions and answers), Bain 1984 (female speech), Brenk 1987 (young men, comparison with Euripides); and by Grasso in 1997 (on old people), catalogued by Arnott 1995 (who suggests that Alexis may have been a precursor); acutely analyzed by Sommerstein 2009/1995 (who contrasts male and fe-

---

<sup>\*23</sup> For Menander's portrayal of character and emotions, see Konstan 2014: and bibliography cited there; on the vitiated syllogism in *Samia*, see Scafuro 2003.

male speech in Aristophanes and Menander; see now Willi 2003: 157-97 on female speech in Aristophanes); given a big boost by Dickey in 1995 and 1996 (in which later work she uses Aristophanes and Menander and an assortment of poets as comparanda to a long list of prose writers: see Sommerstein 2009: 39, *addendum* to p. 29) as well as by Krieter-Spiro 1997: 201-53 (slaves, cooks, and hetaerae); and broadly sketched by Willi 2002: 29-30. Nünlist's important study of 'Speech within speech in Menander' (2002) follows in the wake of Osmun 1952; Bers 1997; and Handley 1969: 93; 1990: 135-38 and at the same time as Handley 2002: 178-82. Studies of the topics articulated here could be enriched by considerations of mask, costume, gesture, voicing, and staging.

## Bibliography

- Arnott, W.G. 1979, 1996b, 2000. *Menander*. Vols. I, II, III. Cambridge, Ma.
- 1995. 'Menander's manipulation of language for the individualization of character,' 147-64 in De Martino and Sommerstein (eds.).
- Bain, D. 1977. *Actors & Audience*. Oxford.
- 1984. 'Female Speech in Menander,' *Antichthon* 18: 24-42.
- Bers, V. 1997. *Speech in Speech: Studies in Incorporated Oratio Recta in Attic Drama and oratory*. Lanham, Md.
- Blundell, J. 1980. *Menander and the Monologue*. *Hypomnemata* 59. Göttingen.
- Brenk, F. E. 1987. 'Heteros tis eimi. On the language of Menander's young lovers,' *ICS* 12: 31-66.
- De Martino, F. and Sommerstein, A. H. (eds.) 1995. *Lo spettacolo delle voci. II*. Bari.

- Dickey, E. 1995. 'Forms of Address and Conversational Language in Aristophanes and Menander,' *Mnem.* 4<sup>th</sup> series 48: 257-271.
- 1996. *Greek Forms of Address from Herodotus to Lucian.* Oxford.
- Gomme, A.W. and Sandbach, F.H. 1973. *Menander. A Commentary.* Oxford.
- Grasso, L. 1997. 'Il linguaggio dei vecchi nelle commedie di menandeo (imprecazioni ed esclamazioni),' *Rudiae* 9: 231-43.
- Handley, E. W. 1969. 'Notes on the Theophroroumene of Menander,' *Bulletin Institute of Classical Studies* 16: 88-101.
- 1990. 'The Bodmer Menander and the Comic Fragments,' pp.123-48 in E. W. Handley and A. Hurst, eds., *Relire Ménandre.* Geneva.
- 2002. 'Acting, action and words in New Comedy,' pp.165-88, in P. Easterling and E. Hall, *Greek and Roman Actors.* Cambridge.
- Katsouris, A. G. 1975. *Linguistic and stylistic characterization. Tragedy and Menander.* Ioannina.
- Konstan, D. 2014. 'Crossing Conceptual Worlds: Greek Comedy and Philosophy,' pp.278-96 in M. Fontaine and A. Scafuro, *The Oxford Handbook of Greek and Roman Comedy.* Oxford.
- Krieter-Spiro, M. 1997. *Sklaven, Köche und Hetären : das Dienstepersonal bei Menander : Stellung, Rolle, Komik und Sprache.* Stuttgart.
- Leo, F. 1908. *Der Monolog im Drama: ein Beitrag zur griechisch-römanischen Poetik,* Berlin. (Reprinted 1970, Nendeln)
- Martina, A. 1997. *Menandri Epitrepontes. II2. Commento.* Rome.
- Nünlist, R. 2002. 'Speech within Speech in Menander,' 219-59 in A. Willi (ed.), 2002.
- Osmun, G. F. 1952. 'Dialogue in the Menandrian Monologue,' *TAPA* 83:

156-63.

- Petrides, A. and Papaioannou, S. 2010. (eds.) *New Perspectives on Post-classical Comedy*. Newcastle upon Tyne.
- Revermann, M. 2006. 'The Competence of Theatre Audiences in Fifth- and Fourth-Century Athens,' *JHS* 126: 99-124.
- Sandbach, F. H. 1970. 'Menander's manipulation of language for dramatic purposes,' in E. G. Turner (ed.) *Ménandre. Entretiens sur L' Antiquité Classique XVI*: 113-36.
- 1973. See Gomme, A.W. and Sandbach, F. H. 1973
- 1990. *Menandri Reliquiae Selectae* [Revised edn; first published 1972.] Oxford.
- Scafuro, A. C. 1990. 'Discourses of Sexual Violation in Mythic Accounts and Dramatic Versions of "The Girl's Tragedy,"' *differences, A Journal of Feminist Cultural Studies* 2: 126-59.
- 2003. 'When a Gesture was Misinterpreted: διδόναι τιθήιον in Menander's Samia,' pp.113-35 in J. Bakewell and J. Sickinger, *Gestures. Essays in Ancient History, Literature, and Philosophy presented to Alan L. Boegehold*. Oxbow..
- Sommerstein, A. H. 2009. 'The language of Athenian women,' pp.15-42 (with 'Addenda'), in *Talking about Laughter*. Oxford. First published in 1995, pp.61-85 in (eds.) F. De Martino and A. H. Sommerstein.
- Trail, A. 2008. *Women and the Comic Plot in Menander*. Cambridge.
- Turner, E. G. 1980. 'The Rhetoric of question and answer in Menander,' *Themes in Drama 2. Drama and Mimesis*: 1-23.
- Willi, A. 2002. (ed.) *The Language of Greek Comedy*. Oxford.
- 2003. *The Languages of Aristophanes*. Oxford.