BETWEEN COURTESAN AND WIFE: MENANDER'S *PERIKEIROMENE*

DAVID KONSTAN

I was proud of Helen. To me her profession seemed as honorable as that of any married woman—she made her living in the same way as they made theirs, except that she made a better living and had more rights over her body and soul. No man dared mistreat her . . . .[1]

All women are prostitutes of one kind or another. Because I was intelligent I preferred to be a free prostitute, rather than an enslaved wife.[2]

MENANDER'S PERIKEIROMENE, because it is fragmentary and has not benefited from the recent discoveries that have substantially augmented the *Aspis*, *Samia*, and other of Menander's comedies, has been largely neglected in modern criticism.[3]

The scene is, in all likelihood, Corinth,[4] although one cannot rule out entirely some other location: not necessarily Athens, as has been suggested,[5] but a city, perhaps near to Corinth, where marriage between a male citizen of Corinth and a free woman of the city in which the dramatic action takes place is not absolutely excluded.[6] Glykera, the "shorn girl" of the title, has been living as a concubine or παλλακή with Polemon, a mercenary soldier.

[1]Agnes Smedley, *Daughter of Earth* (New York 1976) 136.

[2]Nawal al-Saadawi, *Woman at Point Zero*, tr. Sherif Hetata (London 1983) 91.

[3]My main guide to the play has been A. W. Gomme and F. H. Sandbach, *Menander: A Commentary* (Oxford 1973), hereafter abbreviated as GS. Earlier reconstructions of the plot are reviewed in GS, and will only occasionally be referred to explicitly in the notes below. For a more recent reconstruction, with bibliography, see A. Blanchard, *Essai sur la composition des comédies de Ménandre* (Paris 1983) 349–362, hereafter cited as Blanchard. The text cited throughout this paper is F. H. Sandbach, ed., *Menandri reliquiae selectae* (Oxford 1972). Sandbach's numeration differs from earlier editions of the *Pk.*, but it seemed cumbersome to cite double figures for each reference.

[4]GS *ad* 125, p. 470; A. Körte, "Menandros (9)," *RE* 15 (1932) 743–744.

[5]Most forcefully by E. Schwartz, "Zu Menanders Perikeiromene," *Hermes* 64 (1929) 1–15, at 1–3, repr. in *Gesammelte Schriften* 2 (Berlin 1956) 190–206.

[6]One possibility, mentioned simply for the sake of illustration, is Sicyon, the scene of Plautus' *Cistellaria*, and perhaps also that of its Menandrian model, the *Synaristosai*. O. Fredershausen, "Weitere Studien über das Recht bei Plautus und Terenz," *Hermes* 47 (1912) 199–249, at 205–207, argues that marriages with a noncitizen in comedy occur only in cities other than Athens. See also D. Konstan, *Roman Comedy* (Ithaca, N.Y. 1983) 105–106, and E. Fantham, "Sex, Status, and Survival in Hellenistic Athens: A Study of Women in New Comedy," *Phoenix* 29 (1975) 44–74, at 58–59, a passage which, along with others in this valuable article, ought to have been cited in my book.

In a house next door, or next door but one,[7] dwells her brother Moschion, who is being raised as the son of Myrrhine and her husband, a prosperous citizen couple. He is ignorant of his foundling status, and of his relationship to Glykera. His sister, however, was raised by the old woman who discovered Moschion and her when abandoned as infants; this woman passed Glykera off as her own daughter (130–131) when she gave her over into the possession of the soldier.[8] Glykera had been informed by the old woman, previous to her death, that she was a foundling and sister to Moschion, but she has been keeping this information secret in order to spare Moschion the painful knowledge of his true status (147–150), and continues to do so, later in the play, in deference to the wishes of Myrrhine as well (790–791).[9] Her embrace with Moschion, which is the occasion for Polemon's jealous response of cutting off her hair, probably preceded the action of the play.[10] Polemon subsequently abandons his home for the company of friends.

After the delayed prologue, Glykera arranges to take refuge with Myrrhine. Daos, a slave of Moschion's, pretends that Glykera's move was inspired by an interest in the young man, and that he himself abetted the move by persuading Myrrhine to comply with the irregular arrangement (271–275). Sosias, a slave of Polemon's, discovers the departure of Glykera (366–367), and confronts Daos threateningly with accusations of kidnapping and adultery (375–377, 370, 390). Glykera's maid, Doris, explains the real reasons for Glykera's flight, and Sosias, in a lost segment of the play, departs to tell Polemon the news.

[7]Two houses on stage: Schwartz (above, n. 5) 14; three houses: C. Robert, "Bemerkungen zur Perikeiromene des Menander," *Hermes* 44 (1909) 260–303, at 274; Körte (above, n. 4) 743.

[8]The old woman was probably of noncitizen status (possibly a metic, if the action occurred at Athens); it seems unlikely that a citizen woman would be represented in comedy as giving away her daughter on such terms, though it may have been tolerable ἔξω τοῦ δράματος; cf. also J.-P. Vernant, "Marriage," in *Myth and Society in Ancient Greece*, tr. J. Lloyd (Sussex 1980) 46–47, citing a passage in Isaeus (3.39) to show "that a girl could be installed with a man as a concubine, παλλακή, by the member of her family who had authority over her."

[9]Glykera perhaps explained her relationship with Moschion to Myrrhine at the time when she took refuge with her; cf. Blanchard 355.

[10]I have been persuaded by W. Geoffrey Arnott that this is more likely than that the embrace was enacted on stage (cf. GS 467–468). It occurred on the previous evening, and GS themselves adopt the hypothesis that the action of the play was confined to a single day (468). A scene from the *Pk.* on a wall painting at Ephesus, showing three figures, one of them with head covered, may bear upon this question. S. Charitonidis, L. Kahil, and R. Ginouvès, *Les mosaïques de la maison du Ménandre à Mytilène* (Bern 1970, *Antike Kunst*, Beiheft 6) 100, following F. Eichler and H. Vetters, suppose that it pertains to the final act of the play; W. Jobst, "Griechische Wandinschriften aus dem Hanghaus II in Ephesos," *WienStud* 85 (1972) 235–245, at 238–240, identifies the figures (from left to right) as Glykera, Pataikos, and Doris, and the scene as the recognition (755 ff.). Cf. V. M. Strocka, *Die Wandmalerei der Hanghäuser in Ephesos* (Vienna 1977) 48, 55–56, and pl. 66. Arnott proposes that Glykera is concealing her hair, with Polemon and a third figure (possibly Doris) looking on, and infers that the play began either with or immediately after the shearing.

When Polemon appears in Act III, his friend, Pataikos, discourages him from physically attacking Myrrhine's house (the plan advised by Sosias) since he has no legal grounds for such violence. Later, in conversation with Pataikos, Glykera refuses to be reconciled with Polemon, and begs him to retrieve some precious objects for her (including keepsakes from her real parents) from Polemon's house (742–744). Pataikos recognizes the tokens, which prove that Glykera is his own daughter, whom he had exposed upon the death of his wife and the wreck of his fortunes (803–809).[11] In the final act, Polemon, informed of the new state of affairs, returns, and Pataikos, after congratulating Glykera for agreeing at last to be reconciled (1006), formally betroths her to Polemon (1013–15), with the warning that he must moderate his behavior. Our text ends with a reference to arrangements for a marriage for Moschion as well.[12]

On the basis of this bare outline, we may recognize certain affinities between the plot of the *Perikeiromene* and the story forms characteristic of New Comedy in general. Foundlings or other individuals whose real status is unrecognized discover their proper citizen identity by means of an *anagnorisis* or recognition scene, as in the *Andria* or *Cistellaria*, to take familiar examples based on Menandrian originals.[13] This in turn enables a legitimate union in wedlock, eliminating the obstacle that had divided the lovers. Broadly speaking, the obstacle of status may be seen as one variety of the formula of separation and reunion that informs every one of Menander's comedies.[14] The handling of these two elements—the reunion and the recognition—is elegant in the *Perikeiromene* in that the separation between Glykera and Polemon is the cause by which the birth tokens are produced and identified by Pataikos: just as the tension between the lovers appears to be leading to a decisive rupture, with the removal of Glykera's belongings from Polemon's house, those same belongings prove to be the means by which her citizen status is revealed and reconciliation with Polemon accomplished.[15]

[11]GS *ad* 550, pp. 511–513; the details have been variously reconstructed.

[12]Possibly with a daughter of Myrrhine's husband; so Robert (above, n. 7) 300–301, Schwartz (above, n. 5) 14; G. A. Gerhard, "Zu Menanders Perikeiromene," *Philologus* 69 (1910) 10–34, at 34, n. 78, defends the view that Philinus, mentioned at 1026, is not related to Myrrhine.

[13]Cf. Fantham (above, n. 6) 56–59 for analysis; also A. Hähnle, ΓΝΩΡΙΣΜΑΤΑ (diss., Tübingen 1929).

[14]See T. B. L. Webster, *An Introduction to Menander* (New York 1974) 21–22; C. R. Post, "The Dramatic Art of Menander," *HSCP* 24 (1913) 111–145, at 112; Konstan (above, n. 6) 26–29.

[15]See GS *ad* 708 ff., p. 514. W. Geoffrey Arnott has pointed out to me that there is perhaps a similar elegance in the *Misoumenos*, where the sword that played a part in the rupture may also have been instrumental in the recognition; cf. also GS p. 441.

And yet, the cleverness of this juncture does not entirely conceal a certain inconsequentiality. For the breach between Polemon and Glykera was not caused by her want of citizen status, as in the comedies mentioned above.[16] Polemon has neither the wish nor the need to alter the basis of his association with Glykera. The breach is rather a result of Polemon's fit of jealousy and his humiliating treatment of Glykera. While the revelation of her true identity solves the problem of her relationship with Moschion, and opens the way to Glykera's marriage with Polemon, it does not, in itself, do anything to heal the rift between them. To be sure, Polemon is terribly contrite, but Glykera is unwilling to pardon him on these grounds. It is only after, and apparently on account of, the lucky outcome of her restored status as a citizen that she consents to being reconciled (1006–08, 1023).[17]

The integration of the two strands or complications of the narrative, namely, that of the quarrel between Polemon and Glykera, and that of the misapprehension of Glykera's and Moschion's true status and relationship, is thus to a certain extent factitious. Even if, on the level of entailment between discrete events, Glykera's estrangement from Polemon leads to the discovery of her identity through the exhibition of her birth tokens, that discovery does not resolve the problem out of which the separation arose, while Polemon's grief and regret, which might have been represented as influencing Glykera to be reconciled, fail to move her. Rephrasing the question in terms of Menander's strategies of composition, we may put it this way: why did Menander fuse the problem of unrecognized citizen status with the story of a lover's quarrel to which that problem is apparently irrelevant?

We may put this question in a clearer perspective by comparing the structure of the *Perikeiromene* with another comedy in which the cause of the separation between the lovers takes the form of a deliberate rejection of one by the other. In Terence's *Hecyra*, based on a Greek original by Apollodorus who composed in the generation after Menander, Pamphilus rejects his wife after the early birth of a child proves her to have conceived before their wedding. Pamphilus accepts her again only when it is revealed that it was he himself who had violated her. The revelation of identity, which does not in this case entail an alteration in civic status but which does affect, according to the conventions of New Comedy, the woman's eligibility for

[16]S. Humphreys, "*Oikos* and *Polis*," in *The Family, Women and Death: Comparative Studies* (London 1983) 8, ventures a general proposition which is broadly accurate: "New Comedy provides further evidence for the opposition in Athenian minds between natural affections and legal rules;" the *Pk.*, however, must be recognized as at least a partial exception.

[17]Blanchard's suggestion (359; cf. 361) that Glykera will not pardon Polemon so long as the problem of Moschion's identity remains unresolved, because she fears new excesses of rage and jealousy on his part, is not, in my view, supported by the text.

marriage, directly eliminates the obstacle, as Pamphilus sees it, to the union.[18]

We have, to be sure, only parts of Menander's *Perikeiromene*, and it is possible that some closer connection between the recognition and Glykera's willingness to pardon Polemon's offence was adumbrated in a lost scene. But it is difficult to see how the main structure of the plot could have been much affected. The basis for the separation remains Polemon's assault upon Glykera. Had she forgiven him this, and had the recognition of her identity come, accordingly, after reconciliation, we might have read their marriage as the symbol and reward of Polemon's repentance and Glykera's generous or loving disposition. But it is clear from our text that the pardon followed the discovery that Glykera is Pataikos' daughter, and this is precisely what makes her gesture seem arbitrary, unless it is, as Pataikos hints, explicable as a display of truly Greek magnanimity on the part of one who is favored by good fortune (1007–08).

Before undertaking, however, to patch up the unity or consistency of the *Perikeiromene* on the basis of Greek conceptions of justice or responsibility—a matter to which we shall return—it is best to examine the possible grounds of the thematic tension as it appears in the text, without deciding in advance either that the two strands must yield a perfectly harmonious design, or that their irreducible distinctness as parallel rather than intersecting motives is necessarily the sign of an artistic flaw. This duality may rather be the expression in the text of social or ideological contradictions which Menander reproduced in his representation of Athenian social life, without submitting them to systematic criticism. To identify the contradictions that may manifest themselves in a text in this indirect or symptomatic way, through an apparent gap in the logic of the action, it is necessary to look at the fine texture of the work.[19] Here we shall discover—to anticipate our

[18]On the *Hecyra*, see Konstan (above, n. 6) 130–141; on the *Hecyra* and Menander's *Epitrepontes*, which apparently inspired Apollodorus' composition, see K. Stavenhagen, "Menanders Epitrepontes und Apollodors Hekyra," *Hermes* 45 (1910) 564–582, esp. 580, and Fantham (above, n. 6) 66–71.

[19]On the symptomatic reading ("lecture symptomale") of a text, see L. Althusser and E. Balibar, *Reading Capital*, tr. B. Brewster (London 1970) 16; P. Macherey, *A Theory of Literary Production*, tr. G. Wall (London 1978) 94–95; S. B. Smith, *Reading Althusser: An Essay on Structural Marxism* (Ithaca, N.Y. 1984) 73, 75–82. This approach is characterized by the supposition that inconsistencies in a narrative are not necessarily to be understood as an aesthetic failure (as though flawless unity were an essential aspect of any well-composed plot), nor are they necessarily to be ascribed to a conflation of sources or models. Rather, some moments of tension within a text are treated as symptoms of a latent content, much in the way that dreams are understood in the Freudian tradition as conditioned by conflicts that motivate but are not explicitly present in the recollected version. E. Laclau, *Politics and Ideology in Marxist Theory* (London 1977) 102–103, writes: "In periods of stability, when the social formation tends to reproduce its relations following traditional channels and succeeds in neutralizing its contradictions by *displacements*, this is when the dominant bloc in the formation is able to absorb most

conclusions—why Glykera's rejection of Polemon after his insult to her, and indeed her very freedom or capacity to reject him, operate on a distinct plane from the matter of citizenship and marriage. The convincing dramatization of a proud and independent woman, in this case one who has taken on a permanent relationship as a παλλακή, is necessarily far removed from the conventional portrayal of a young girl eligible for a citizen marriage, where such independence would no longer be an available mode of action in the context of Greek social conventions. At the source of the narrative inconcinnity, on this reading, is a contradiction in the status of women in Menander's Athens, one which finds expression in the *Perikeiromene* through the simultaneous motivation to represent the proud autonomy of the concubine and yet to subject that autonomy to the respectable form of a citizen marriage. This contradiction is, at the same time, the source of the play's power.

We may begin by observing an apparent confusion in the description of Polemon's relation to Glykera, which, though it is, of course, concubinage, comes close to being represented—indeed, on the part of Polemon, is frankly acknowledged—as a proper marriage.[20] When, shortly after the prologue, Doris complains that unfortunate is the woman who takes a professional soldier as her man (ἄνδρα, 186), there is, as Gomme suggested, good reason to understand the word in the sense of "husband."[21] Sandbach notes further the absence of any special ceremonies validating marriages, or of their registration in a public record. Polemon's and Glykera's "marriage" would of course be invalid in the sense that any children issuing from the union would not have the rights of citizens, but there were no special formal requirements or practices to mark a difference between validly married couples and those living together on a permanent basis but without the possibility of transmitting citizen privileges to their offspring.[22]

The same attitude characterizes Sosias' conception of Moschion as a μοιχός

---

of the contradictions and its ideological discourse tends to rest more on the purely implicit mechanisms of its unity;" this could, I think, stand as a description of the effect of popular or mass literary genres. See also, in a different vein, P. Szondi, *Die Theorie des bürgerlichen Trauerspiels im 18. Jahrhundert: Der Kaufmann, der Hausvater und der Hofmeister*, ed. G. Mattenklott (Frankfurt-am-Main 1973) 90 on the sentimental character of George Lillo's *The London Merchant*: "Empfindsamkeit ist der Ausdruck der Tabuierung jedes Konflikts zwischen den Angehörigen einer Familie." A mood, or more specifically, melancholy, is here the symptom of the renunciation of familial conflict.

[20]Cf. S. M. Goldberg, *The Making of Menander's Comedy* (London 1980) 53: "Polemon is essentially a distraught husband;" true, if we understand "essentially" in the colloquial sense, i.e., "to all appearances."

[21]GS *ad* 186, p. 477; *ibid.* on the meaning of στρατιώτης as professional soldier, as opposed to a citizen on military campaign for his polis.

[22]See Vernant (above, n. 8) 47, and (on the relation between marriage and the household ideology in classical Athens) 45–51; also Fantham (above, n. 6) 47–50.

or adulterer (357, 370, 390). When he learns that Glykera has moved into the house of Myrrhine, he accuses Daos and his master (the verbs at 375–377 are plural) of forcibly detaining a free woman against the will of her κύριος, or legal guardian. Sandbach (*ad loc.*) inquires: "Was the 'husband' of a παλλακή in fact her κύριος?" There is no evidence that he was, as Sandbach observes.[23] The point is that Sosias, in part no doubt to magnify the enormity of Daos' and Moschion's behavior, as he understands it, in part also because he shares his master's conception of Polemon's relation with Glykera, speaks of Glykera as though she were a legal wife. It is doubtless as "wife" that we must understand γυναῖκα in verse 376 (cf. also *Mis.* 307, with GS *ad loc.*). The same idea informs Sosias' subsequent effort to intimidate Daos with the prospect of legal action: for it is with a view to the courts that Sosias demands a confession from Daos that he and Moschion are actually in possession of the girl ("You admit—tell me—that you have her?" 383–384), repeated, with mention of a witness, in verse 385. It is only after he has established the justice of his position—again, according to his understanding of the case—that Sosias threatens to attack Moschion's house physically.[24] In response to Daos' abuse, Sosias indignantly reminds him that they are living in a city (πόλιν οἰκοῦντες, 394–395), where laws, he implies, obtain. Here Daos appears momentarily disconcerted: at all events, he declares that they do not have the girl (395), which, if it is not an outright evasion, perhaps looks to the fact that she voluntarily moved in with Myrrhine, and so she is neither being held against her will, nor is she, strictly, in the possession of Moschion. With this, Daos withdraws.

Returning with Polemon in Act III, Sosias is, as we have said, eager for battle, but is dismissed by Pataikos (480), who counsels Polemon that he has no case. Pataikos acknowledges that the situation would be different if Glykera were Polemon's lawful wife (γαμετὴν γυναῖκα, 487), as Polemon and his household enjoy pretending (cf. 486).[25] Polemon objects that he for his part considers Glykera his wedded wife (ἐγὼ γαμετὴν νενόμικα ταύτην,

[23]In the *Sikyonios*, the owner of a (putative) slave woman is informally called her κύριος; see lines 191 (very badly preserved), 194, 240; at 207 he is called her δεσπότης. GS *ad Sik.* 193–195, pp. 652–653, speak of the master as a "de facto" κύριος. If it was in fact possible to describe the possessor of a noncitizen woman in this way, it is nevertheless the case that such a description is not pertinent to the *Pk.*, and it is carefully eschewed.

[24]GS *ad* 384–385, p. 498.

[25]Contrast the ironic use of the expression γαμετὴν ἑταίραν at *Samia* 130; on the behavior of Alcesimarchus in the *Cistellaria*, who, in defiance of his father's prohibition promises marriage to Selenium, see Fantham (above, n. 6) 58–59. In a new fragment of the *Mis.*, *POxy* 3371 A, ed. E. G. Turner, in *Oxyrhynchus Papyri* 48 (1981) 1–21, Thrasonides, who has given his former slave Krateia her freedom (38–39), announces that he considered her a wife (γυναῖκα νομίσας, 40). A mutilated line (45) seems to contain the words οὐδὲ κυρία, which Turner tentatively translates: "[Even if she were legally her own mistress . . .]." Cf. also Goldberg (above, n. 20) 50–51; A. Barigazzi, "Menandro: L'inizio del *Misumenos*," *Prometheus* 11 (1985) 97–125.

489; ἐγώ is emphatic), to which Pataikos logically replies: "Who, then, is it who gave her to you?" (τίς δ' ἔσθ' ὁ δούς, 490). "Who?" exclaims Polemon; "She herself" (αὐτή). "Great," says Pataikos; "She liked you then, no doubt; now she doesn't" (490–491). The point is: if Glykera was free to give herself to Polemon, she is free to break the tie when it no longer pleases her. At no time was she bound in a legal marriage, which would have required that a proper guardian or κύριος had authorized the union. An informal, or self-arranged, relation, such as Polemon had enjoyed with Glykera, depends upon sentiment, not law or custom.[26] Since Polemon had, as Pataikos said, mistreated Glykera, she is free to withdraw from the liaison.

Polemon, who is slow to appreciate his powerlessness, momentarily seeks to dodge the issue by pretending innocence, and alleging that Pataikos' charge of ill-treatment has wounded him beyond all else (493–494). Pataikos is not, however, distracted from the problem at hand: what Polemon is doing now is mad (496). He has nowhere to turn, for Glykera is her own mistress (ἑαυτῆς ἐστ' ἐκείνη κυρία, 497). All that is left for Polemon to try is persuasion, if he still loves her.

We may pause here to consider the implications of Pataikos' argument. In describing Glykera as mistress of herself, he does not mean to suggest that she has the legal rights or status that pertain to an Athenian who is, in the Roman phrase, *in sua potestate*.[27] As Gomme and Sandbach remark, "she would be completely without standing in a court of law, since she had no man to represent her" (*ad* 497, p. 507). There is no question here of her having given herself to Polemon with full legal authority, which would have meant, among other things (and *per impossibile*), that she would have been able to transfer power over herself to Polemon, who, as her husband, would have become her κύριος.[28] Pataikos' expression, striking as it is, means simply that Glykera is independent, without a κύριος at all.[29] It is precisely

[26]See Vernant (above, n. 8) 46, on κυρι εία in marriage, and the contrast with the παλλακή, who "installed herself on her own responsibility." The old woman who "gave" (130) Glykera to the soldier was not in a position to contract a binding relationship. Cf. A. R. W. Harrison, *The Law of Athens* 1 (Oxford 1968) 14–15 (on the power of a male to give a woman to another male as concubine), and contrast 19, 21, and 108–109 on the inability of an Athenian woman to enter into a contract or to "engage her own hand in marriage" (108). See also Isaeus 10.10, cited by Harrison at 73, n. 3.

[27]Compare the ἐπίκληρος wife in the *Plokion*, fr. 334 Körte-Thierfelder, in which a husband describes his wife as κυρία of all their joint possessions. Cf. also Plautus *Asinaria* 87, where Demaenetus asserts that he sold his *imperium* (= κυρι εία?) for his wife's dowry. On the *dotata* as the Roman translation of ἐπίκληρος, see Fantham (above, n. 6) 73, n. 60.

[28]GS *ad* 487, pp. 505–506.

[29]In theory, Moschion might be considered the κύριος of Glykera, though the possibility is not raised in the text; as an adopted son of Myrrhine, Moschion's relationship with his former family might be felt to be suspended, cf. Humphreys (above, n. 16) 65. Humphreys writes (64): "The concubine, having fewer rights than the wife, might well be, literally, more attached. A similar desire for a more total attachment of the wife to her husband is suggested by Xeno-

this independence that makes Polemon's treatment of her the decisive issue in their association.[30]

This is the sense in which Glykera may be said to be free (cf. ἐλευθέραν, 375). It is not that she has the free status of a citizen, as Sosias had implied;[31] that is a freedom which, for a woman, depends upon the authority of another (cf. τοῦ κυρίου in 376). Glykera's freedom is rather the reverse of this status notion: it is the capacity to act independently and without obstacle—a freedom she lacks, for example, in respect to her brother, toward whom it was not possible for her to behave freely so long as she was obliged to keep her relation with him secret (οὐκ ἐλευθέρως ποεῖν ἔξεστιν αὐτῇ, 161–162). I am suggesting that Menander portrayed Glykera's independence precisely in contrast with the kind of free status that legal marriage would have represented, under which Polemon would have had the right at law to claim Glykera back from a neighbor who had given her refuge. For to leave Polemon, as Gomme and Sandbach observe, "against his will, she would have had to be transferred to the guardianship of a male relative with the knowledge of the archon basileus" (*ad* 487, p. 506).[32] Glykera's ability to leave Polemon explodes his pretensions to a legal marriage. That he had construed his relationship with her in such a manner contributes to the tension and pathos of the scene, no doubt, but, more than that, it structures the opposition between Glykera's personal independence as a παλλακή and the dependent condition of a legally wedded Athenian woman.

Polemon, in the scene we have been examining, ventures a last legal

---

phon's advice (*Oeconomicus* 7.4 ff.) to marry a young girl and educate her yourself to run the household as you wish it to be run." I cannot agree with Humphreys that this "attachment" represents a desire for "a closer communion;" rather, it indicates the desire for a total domination, and in this respect is at quite the opposite pole from a romantic or sentimental relation with an independent παλλακή.

[30]Cf. Fantham (above, n. 6) 51: "In one sense the *hetaera* was the only woman in Greek society who enjoyed a freedom comparable to that of a man," a principle that may be extended here to include a παλλακή such as Glykera; in general, on the role of ξέναι at Athens, see Fantham, 49–51. It should be stressed that there is no question here of frivolousness on Glykera's part. She abandons Polemon, but with cause. Polemon's behavior was, as Pataikos says, οὐ κατὰ τρόπον (492).

[31]On "free" in the sense of "citizen," see Fantham (above, n. 6) 53, n. 26, and 57, n. 33; cf. also *Dyskolos* 290–291, and Terence *Eunuchus* 558–559 (*civem* = ἐλευθέραν?). In an earlier age, ἐλεύθεροι seems more specifically to have distinguished metics or quasimetics; see Vernant (above, n. 8) 50. More generally on the political history of the term ἐλεύθερος, see Kurt Raaflaub, "Democracy, Oligarchy, and the Concept of the 'Free Citizen' in Late Fifth-Century Athens," *Political Theory* 11 (1983) 517–544; and, "Freiheit in Athen und Rom: Ein Beispiel divergierender politischer Begriffsentwicklung in der Antike," *Historische Zeitschrift* 238 (1984) 529–567.

[32]On the procedure, GS *ad Epitr.* 641 cite A. R. W. Harrison (above, n. 26) 40–44, 55–56. The passage in *Epitr.* indicates that witnesses might be summoned as well; cf. also D. M. MacDowell, *The Law in Classical Athens* (Ithaca, N.Y. 1978) 238, on the need for witnesses in a summons to trial.

gambit, pretending that Moschion has wronged him insofar as he has corrupted Glykera (498–499). Pataikos replies that Polemon is in a position to lodge a complaint concerning Moschion's conduct, but that he will certainly lose his case if he tries force, for the offence in question does not allow for private revenge (τιμωρίαν, 503), as adultery would, but only for complaint (ἔγκλημα)—presumably, an informal complaint, since, as Gomme and Sandbach note, "no form of action for enticing away a παλλακή is known, and it is improbable that any existed at Athens" (*ad* 499–503, p. 507).[33]

Polemon, at last convinced of his helplessness, is desperate to the point of contemplating suicide. Sosias' earlier description of the intensity of Polemon's suffering (172–174) is visibly confirmed, and one may suppose that it aroused the sympathy of the audience, as it did Sosias' (356–360).[34] The sincerity of Polemon's regret, and of his love for Glykera, is not in doubt. It is, rather, represented as being so profound as to induce the expectation that he may be forgiven when Pataikos, at his earnest request, agrees to intercede for him with Glykera (506–513). We are informed that Pataikos knows her well (508), and can, therefore, speak freely with her. What is more, Polemon concedes his error (ἠδίκηχ', 514), and promises to behave honorably in the future (515). Finally, the contrast with Moschion's fatuous and triumphant air when he comes upon the scene, preening as though Polemon had departed in fear of him (526–529), may also have disposed the audience to empathize with the genuine emotion of Polemon.[35]

If any such expectations were nourished in this scene, or in what followed it in the original play, they are disappointed when Glykera herself appears in the fourth act. The papyrus resumes in the middle of her speech to Pataikos, after his attempt to mediate the quarrel in behalf of Polemon. Glykera begins—or rather, our text begins—with an indignant rejection of the notion that she might have sought a liaison with Moschion.[36] She remains, however, entirely firm in her rejection of Polemon. The text is very poorly

[33]On the rights of a man, under Solonic law, to take action against adultery of a παλλακή who was taken for the purpose of having "free children" (ἐπ' ἐλευθέροις παισίν), see Vernant (above, n. 8) 48; it is to be doubted that this law was in effect in the time of Menander, cf. MacDowell (above, n. 32) 89–90.

[34]Cf. Goldberg (above, n. 20) 48–49, on the force of Polemon's outburst at 506–507.

[35]A. Barigazzi, "Il giuramento di Glicera nella Periciromene di Menandro e la preparazione del riconoscimento," *Prometheus* 5 (1979) 43–44, argues that Pataikos' efforts to persuade Glykera were represented in the lacuna after v. 550, although he failed to make an impression upon her noble sentiments; this does not strike me as an especially plausible reconstruction. Goldberg (above, n. 20) 46 (cf. 49–50) suggests that Moschion assumes "many of the characteristics of the comic soldier," while Polemon "becomes the sympathetic, romantic hero." On the characterization of Polemon, see also W. G. Arnott, *Menander* 1 (Harvard 1979) xxxiii–xxxiv.

[36]Marriage is not possible, and Glykera rejects the role of hetaera. Cf. GS *ad* 305, p. 485, on Daos' reference to Glykera at her bath as the sign of a hetaera; also line 340, where Daos distinguishes Glykera from an αὐλητρίς or πορνίδιον. Of course, Glykera cannot tell Pataikos the real reason why a union with Moschion would be impossible; cf. Blanchard 359–360.

preserved here, but Glykera clearly lets it be understood that she will not submit to Polemon's ὕβρις (723), and that she regards his behavior as having been impious (ἀνόσι[ον], 724). To Pataikos' appeal for a more all-sided view of the case, Glykera replies that she best knows her own concerns (ἐγὼδα τἄμ' ἄριστα, 749; again, ἐγώ is emphatic), and she persists in demanding the return of her personal effects from Polemon's house. A last effort by Pataikos to implore her reconsideration falls on deaf ears (752–753), and her possessions, including, of course, the birth tokens, are brought forth, to be recognized, in due course, by Pataikos (824). Moschion discovers that he is Glykera's brother and Pataikos' son, and here again the papyrus is interrupted.

While the focus of the scene shifts from the matter of reconciliation between Polemon and Glykera to that of the recognition of her identity, Glykera's rejection of Pataikos' appeals in Polemon's behalf seems well established. Her firmness looks like the mark of her strong character and deep sense of injury.[37] Gomme and Sandbach comment on the scene in which she first appears: "Many modern writers testify to the vivid impression made by Glykera," and they add: "it is remarkable that it rests mainly on the following 18 mutilated lines" (*ad* 708 ff., p. 514). Indeed, in these few lines (though she will have more to say in the course of the recognition scene itself), we may agree with the judgment of Gomme and Sandbach that "her indignation at being misjudged and still more at the treatment received from Polemon, which she regards as unforgiveable, are excellently portrayed" (*ibid.*). Nevertheless, such a course will prevent the happy conclusion of the comedy unless some means are found to circumvent it. Sympathy for Polemon may well dispose an audience favorably toward a final resolution of the quarrel, but that resolution will not be a function of Glykera's personal magnanimity or graciousness. Her independence requires that she not compromise on the insult she has suffered, and she is accordingly immune to sentimentality.

In the final act, Polemon, having learned Glykera's and Moschion's new situation, is overcome with shame and remorse, and at Doris' advice prepares a sacrifice in honor of Glykera's good luck, the better to impress her and Pataikos with his honest intentions.[38] Pataikos emerges from the house commending Glykera for her willingness to be reconciled (πάνυ σου φιλῶ τὸ "νῦν διαλλαχθήσομαι," 1006), the more so in that she shows a generosity which is the sign, he says, of the true Greek character (1008).[39] Pataikos proceeds with rather startling suddenness to pronounce the regular formula

[37]The suggestion of Blanchard (360), that Glykera's citizen status will justify her having resisted Polemon's violence, seems quite alien to the argument of the text.

[38]Cf. GS *ad* 999, p. 529; Körte (above, n. 4) 747 remarks that this scene anticipates that Glykera will forgive Polemon.

[39]T. B. L. Webster, *Studies in Menander* (Manchester 1950) 21–25, interprets this sentiment as an indication of Menander's hellenic humanism.

for giving a daughter in marriage (1013–14), and to stipulate the size of the dowry (1015), which Polemon accepts with alacrity. Pataikos adds that Polemon's irrational behavior was the source or cause of a good outcome (1021–22), and that it is on this account (διὰ τοῦτο) that he has received pardon (1023).

Precisely why forgiveness should follow upon the lucky event has been discussed by scholars who have sought to explain, by reference to the theories of Aristotle or other Greek notions, the logic of Glykera's change of heart. William Fortenbaugh explains it best: "forgiveness is justified solely on the grounds that Polemon's act has been a source of blessings. This justification is to be taken at face value. The blessings resulting from Polemon's act simply nullify any possible moral indignation Glykera may have felt and at the same time remove from the spectator any serious concern with fine distinctions between misfortunes, errors, and injustices."[40] To Fortenbaugh's analysis I would add only that Menander's decision to neglect Aristotelian or other grounds of forgiveness in favor of a "carefree pardon" (Fortenbaugh 442) indicates his indifference to overcoming the division between Glykera and Polemon on grounds pertinent to their quarrel, whether the grounds be sentimental or philosophical. While such a resolution was available to Menander, he did not elect to adopt it.

In the last scene of the play as we have it, there is, as Gomme and Sandbach have convincingly demonstrated and contrary to the opinions of most previous editors, no speaking part for Glykera.[41] Gomme and Sandbach argue first of all that such a part would require, uniquely in the surviving drama of Menander, a fourth actor for its performance (*ad* 1006 ff., pp. 529–530).[42] They support the plausibility of their view, which requires that

[40]W. W. Fortenbaugh, "Menander's *Perikeiromene*: Misfortune, Vehemence, and Polemon," *Phoenix* 28 (1974) 430–443, at 441 (references to line numbers omitted); cf. R. L. Hunter, *The New Comedy of Greece and Rome* (Cambridge 1985) 174, n. 22. Major contributions to the discussion, all of which, to my mind, overemphasize the technical aspects of the issue, are M. Tierney, "Aristotle and Menander," *Proc. Royal Irish Acad.* 43 (1936) 241–254, at 248; Webster (above, n. 39) 7, 204–205; and, "*Woman Hates Soldier*: A Structural Approach to New Comedy," *GRBS* 14 (1973) 287–299, at 291; Adelmo Barigazzi, *La formazione spirituale di Menandro* (Turin 1965) 135–160 (cf. 228); R. Schottlaender, "Menanders Bedeutung für seine und unsere Zeit," in W. Hofmann and H. Kuch, eds., *Die gesellschaftliche Bedeutung des antiken Dramas für seine und für unsere Zeit* (Berlin 1973) 185–187 (Schottlaender's suggestion, 191, that Pataikos effects the reconciliation between Polemon and Glykera seems wide of the mark). Central to the discussion is fr. 359 Körte-Thierfelder, which distinguishes between an ἀτύχημα and an ἀδίκημα. Blanchard endorses Fortenbaugh's interpretation (350–351).

[41]Most recently, G. M. Browne, "The End of Menander's *Perikeiromene*," *BICS* 21 (1974) 43–54, tentatively assigns 1021–1022a, 1023 to Glykera (50), while noting that the marginal note in the papyrus naming Glykera has been added by a second hand (*ad* v. 46 = 1021 Sandbach, 48).

[42]Cf. also F. H. Sandbach, "Menander and the Three-Actor Rule," in Jean Bingen, Guy Cambier, and Georges Nachtergael, eds., *Le monde grec: pensée, littérature, histoire, documents: hommages à Claire Préaux* (Brussels 1975) 197–204.

they ignore the assignment of parts by a second hand in the margins of the papyrus, by an appeal to dramatic considerations as well: "it is conceivable that [Glykera] kept a modest silence and, like a respectable Greek girl, let her father speak for her. That he was not misrepresenting her sentiments would be known from 1006." It is of course conventional in New Comedy that citizen maidens speak publicly, if at all, only under exceptional conditions: an example is Knemon's daughter in the *Dyskolos*, whose appearance alone in public, where she is engaged in conversation by a strange man, is regarded by her half-brother as a scandalous testimony to the moral collapse caused by her father's misanthropy. What is striking about Glykera's silence in the conclusion to the *Perikeiromene* is the contrast with the forthright speech and sure sense of her own interests and capabilities that had been hers till now. Her deferential silence, if indeed she maintained it throughout the final act of the play, appears as the sign of her new citizen status, and the marriage that it brings. The role of Athenian wife thus deprives her of the very traits that have, as Gomme and Sandbach remarked, made "a vivid impression" upon modern readers and critics of the play. As Nicole Loraux writes of the marriage of Athenian women generally: "Once they have crossed the threshold of marriage, the husband becomes the provider and the wife earns the right to be quiet."[43] Glykera's change in status, imposing as it does a silence that is the sign of dutiful obedience, cancels the independence she had enjoyed as a παλλακή.

Certainly, the marriage to which Glykera consents (1006), and her father entrusts her, is one in which Polemon will have learned, and learned well, the lesson of his jealous rage. He magnanimously refuses to blame Glykera for her actions (1019–20, as restored), and implores her only to be reconciled. This will be a marriage with a history, and one may imagine, if one wishes, that this history will abide as a reminder of Glykera's dignity and her resentment of unjustified abuse.[44] Pataikos' admonition to Polemon on

[43]"Une fois franchi le seuil du mariage, le mari devient le nourricier et la femme y gagne le droit de se taire," N. Loraux, *Les enfants d' Athéna* (Paris 1984) 177. Cf. Humphreys (above, n. 16) 16: "The rules of modesty for unmarried girls were particularly strict, but even a married woman would never appear at a dinner party or entertain strangers in her husband's absence;" also M. M. Henry, *Menander's Courtesans and the Greek Comic Tradition* (Frankfurt-am-Main 1985) 76: "Silence befits a bride; Glykera is no longer ἑαυτῆς κυρία. She has undergone several metamorphoses from citizen by birth, to foundling, concubine, *de facto* wife, imagined hetaira, to citizen once again."

[44]Dario del Corno, ed. and tr., *Menandro: Le commedie* 1 (Milan 1966) 308, sees the *Pk.* as a drama of self-discovery on the principle of πάθει μάθος: "Polemone conosce la profundità irrevocabile del suo amore, Glicera la forza e il valore di un sentimento, che supera e trascende l'atto isolato." I am doubtful that moral development, as opposed to the overcoming of ignorance, is thematic in ancient comedy. Cf. G. Lukács, *The Theory of the Novel*, tr. A. Bostock (Cambridge, Mass. 1975) 108; L. Bersani, *A Future for Astyanax: Character and Desire in Literature* (Boston 1976) 54–55: "In Molière, the obstacles to the good lovers' marriages are simply pushed aside by happy strokes of fate. The young people's union is not the result of any growth of moral consciousness: *they* have generally been in love from the very start."

this score underlines the message, and Polemon's contrition will presumably have taught him self-control. Fortenbaugh, noting that such a change of character is not Aristotelian, remarks: "We are not meant to scrutinize Pataikos' injunction in terms of a consistent theory of human personality."[45]

Nevertheless, it is Pataikos, the father, who extracts Polemon's promise of good conduct, and Pataikos who issues the warning. This is natural, insofar as, henceforward, it will fall to Pataikos to receive Glykera back under his authority or κυριεία in the event that further troubles should threaten the marriage. For Glykera is no longer ἑαυτῆς κυρία, her own mistress, and she cannot act, or speak, in her own right and with her former freedom.

The *Perikeiromene* as we have it gives no evidence for any constraint upon Glykera's decision, but by the conventions of New Comedy, at least, Glykera had no choice but to marry Polemon, once her citizenship was established, if, at all events, she was ever to marry at all. For the genre had it that a young woman must either be a virgin upon marriage, or else have known carnally only the man who will be her husband. To this rule there appear to be no exceptions.[46] Insofar as citizenship and marriage are normally co-entailed in New Comedy, the discovery of Glykera's true identity means marriage, and more specifically, under the circumstances of the play, marriage to Polemon. Not that Menander would necessarily have us believe that Glykera herself views her marriage in this light. It is enough, perhaps, that Menander felt the connection between citizenship and marriage to be sufficiently close that Glykera's forgiveness might plausibly be predicated upon the discovery of her true status. Thus, the two themes of his comedy—the *anagnorisis* and the resolution of the quarrel—might be connected by no greater tie of logic or necessity than that good fortune in the matter of birth should excite good will in the relationship.

But the almost naive confidence in the connection between the themes, manifested in the postponement of the reconciliation until the question of Glykera's status is resolved, may be read as the sign of the elision, in the play, of the problem of Glykera's submission to her new role as wife and citizen, without a voice and without autonomy. Having granted it to Glykera to say that she knew best her own interests or concerns (749), Menander reduces her to the silent dependency of an Athenian wife by nothing more than the commonplace device of a recognition. But the peculiarity remains that, whereas in other comedies in the genre this device is precisely the means by which the status barrier to the relationship between

[45]Fortenbaugh (above, n. 40) 443. On the role of the lover-soldier in New Comedy, see, most recently, G. Wartenberg, "Der miles gloriosus in der griechisch-hellenistischen Komödie," in Hofmann and Kuch (above, n. 40) 197–205, with bibliography; W. Hofmann and G. Wartenberg, *Der Bramarbas in der antiken Komödie* (Berlin 1973), esp. 35–39 on the *Pk.*; Arnott (above, n. 35) xxxiii.

lovers is surmounted, here it is only accidentally the cause of Glykera's subjective consent to being reconciled with Polemon.[47]

New Comedy did not celebrate the voluntary bond between man and woman, as if they thus inhabited a domain separate from and independent of society. No character in Menander would say, with the father in Diderot's *Père de famille*: "Une belle femme, un homme de bien, sont les deux êtres les plus touchants de la nature."[48] Marriage, in ancient comedy, together with the personal sentiments that entered into it, was finally an affair of the city. Through the mechanism of the plot, this civic contract displaces the free sentimental association between Polemon and Glykera. Private life is not ideologically available to the genre as a separate sphere in which social

[46]See W. S. Anderson, "Love Plots in Menander and his Roman Adapters," *Ramus* 13 (1984) 124–134, at 124–126; Fantham (above, n. 6) 57. Of course, it was permissible for a widow to remarry, as in Terence's *Adelphoe*.

[47]Other comedies of Menander are based on plots more or less similar to that of *Pk*. Closest of all is *Mis*., in which a soldier, Thrasonides, is rejected by a former slave girl, Krateia, to whom he has given her freedom (see Turner, above, n. 25); a recognition scene relatively early in the play reunites Krateia with her father. Thus, the recognition occurs well before the resolution of the tension between soldier and concubine. The cause of the girl's hostility to the soldier is not entirely clear from the fragments (Choricius and Plutarch suggest that it should be attributed to the soldier's ἀλαζονεία; see GS *ad* fr. 1); it is possible that the girl suspected the soldier of having killed her brother. It is impossible to determine what role, if any, the question of the independence of a παλλακή played in this comedy. See Goldberg (above, n. 20) 56 on the difference in effect produced by the placement of the *anagnorisis*, and for a comparison of the two plays, 46–47.

The *Sik*. presents us with a soldier in possession of a girl who has been kidnapped (as opposed to captured in the *Mis*. and exposed in the *Pk*.); her citizenship is revealed, reuniting her with her father; a rival named Moschion is removed when he is revealed as the brother, this time of the soldier, Stratophanes, whose Athenian citizenship is also demonstrated in the course of the play. From early in the play, the soldier appears eager to restore the girl to her father (238–239). It is not clear whether the girl, Philoumene, had a speaking part, and the issue here would seem to be not so much a question of her status as that of the tension between a citizen's rights to marriage and the sentimental bond formed through the rearing of a woman from childhood on (246–257; Humphrey's observation, quoted in n. 29 above, would appear to be rather more pertinent to the situation in the *Sik*. than to that in the *Pk*.). At the end of the play there is an emphatic reference to the preservation of Philoumene's virginity (372); a woman named Malthake, possibly a hetaera, has a speaking part, and stands in contrast to Philoumene (fr. 11 Sandbach; but cf. Habrotonon in *Pk*. 482–485).

Webster (above, n. 39, 18) suggests that Menander's *Rhapizomene* and *Empimpramene* may have been similar in plot; see also 21 on the *Epitr*., and Goldberg (above, n. 20) 51.

[48]Act V, sc. 12, cited in Szondi (above, n. 19) 116; cf. 122–123, and Szondi's analysis on 144: "Indem er im *Fils naturel* und im *Père de famille* die Bühnenrealität auf die Intimität der Familie reduziert . . . macht Diderot die *tragédie domestique et bourgeoise* zur Darstellung und Verteidigung der bürgerlichempfindsamen Kleinfamilie als realer Utopie;" see also 89 on the insistence in bourgeois drama that a daughter choose freely to submit to the wishes of her father. This sentimental idea of freedom allows an overt representation of the tension between feelings and duty in which duty triumphs, rather than being forced into a synthesis with desire, as happens typically in ancient New Comedy.

contradictions may be imaged and dissolved.[49] Thus, the tension in the *Perikeiromene* is not solved, but merely absorbed or cancelled under the unquestioned hegemony of civic forms.

While the focus of the *Perikeiromene* is, I have argued, on the status of Glykera, and the implications for the representation of her autonomy, there is also the suggestion of a more general transformation of roles mediated by the plot, such that all the figures who stand in a more or less marginal relation to the city-state society are subsumed or normalized within it. The classical Athenian conception of the marriage transaction involves three parties: a man who gives the bride in marriage, a man who receives her, and the bride herself. The giver, whether he is the father, brother, or a near male relative of the bride, is her κύριος; the receiver, upon utterance of the performative connubial formula, and conveyance of the woman to his own house, becomes her κύριος. The woman is without κυριεία or authority over anything in this exhange, including herself. In the initial conditions, so to speak, of the *Perikeiromene*, the signs indicating the presence or absence of κυριεία among the three parties appear to be reversed: Glykera is mistress of herself; Polemon, although he lives with her as her husband, is without authority over her; and there is no man to give Glykera in marriage—neither her father nor her brother is in a position to assume the responsibility of κυριεία in respect to her. The effect of the recognition scene will be to restore the proper values to each member of the triad. Pataikos assumes his role as father, with the power to bestow his daughter in marriage; Polemon will assume the role of husband, with κυριεία over Glykera; and Glykera is correspondingly deprived of authority over herself. The social normalization of Glykera's role, always considered within the context of the city-state ideology, is part of a transformation involving all three agents in the marriage exchange.

What is more, each of the agents at the beginning of the play, when the normal signs of authority are inverted, is marked by a function that is in some sense beyond or outside the conventional ideal of the household-based society of the ancient city-state. In the case of Glykera, the mark is her apparent non-citizen status, combined with her role as concubine, which prevents her from entering into the system of social reproduction defined by the οἶκος. Polemon, for his part, is marked as a mercenary soldier, who operates not in the citizen army of his own community, but as a hired officer in the service of foreign powers. Whether or not he was in fact a citizen of the city in which the dramatic action of the *Perikeiromene* was located, his connection with the local society is volatile. Thus, he is bidden to forget he

[49]On the question of private versus public sphere in Greek ideology, see the suggestive analysis in Hannah Arendt, *The Human Condition* (Chicago 1958) ch. 2, "The Public and the Private Realm," 22–78; P. Rahe, "The Primacy of Politics in Classical Greece," *AHR* 89 (1984) 265–293.

is a soldier (1016) as the condition for entering into the civic relation of marriage.

Finally, Pataikos too is normalized as a father and head of household, securing his line and the bonds of kinship between οἶκοι by engaging both his children in marriage. T. B. L. Webster has observed that "Menander apparently disapproved of wealthy bachelors," citing Micio in Terence's *Adelphoe* and Megadorus in Plautus' *Aulularia* along with Pataikos of the *Perikeiromene*.[50] There may, however, be another respect in which Pataikos is reincorporated into the closed world of the city-state, as it is idealized in New Comedy. Pataikos, as we have seen, exposed his children when he lost his fortunes at sea (808–809). Consider, in this connection, the following remarks by Sally Humphreys on the nature of the classical Athenian economy:[51]

> The οἶκος tradition of economic activity was one of careful supervision and management, self-sufficiency, production for private consumption, mortgaging land if necessary to raise money for liturgies, for loans to friends or for family expenses such as dowries and funerals . . . But interaction between the market and the *oikos* as a production unit was always impeded by the reluctance of *oikos*-heads to involve themselves in market transactions . . . Land and slaves belonged to the *ousia*—"being," the identity of the *oikos*. Money and goods exchanged in the market were *chremata*—"things," transitory possessions. Transactions in the *oikos* sphere were part of a lasting pattern of social relationships—kinship, affinity, friendship. Market transactions were contractual and ephemeral . . . [C]itizens should maintain their political integrity and their status difference [from metics or slaves] by keeping to the traditional pattern of the landed *oikos*.

There is no evidence in our text of the *Perikeiromene* that Pataikos' current income is derived from land rather than from the kind of mercantile investments that had cost him his fortune at the time when his children were born.[52] I would suggest, however, that Pataikos' earlier involvement with the high-risk economy of foreign trade serves as a sign of his problematic relation to the city-state society, in the way that Glykera and Polemon are marked by their roles as concubine and mercenary soldier.[53]

[50]Webster (above, n. 39) 17; on Megadorus, cf. also Konstan (above, n. 6) 41–46.

[51]Humphreys (above, n. 16) 10–13; on wealth as property within one's control, cf. Aristotle *Rhetorica* 1361a13–23. Such, at all events, was the ideal; in reality, figures like Pataikos may well have been motivated by an entrepreneurial spirit not unlike that of early European capitalism; see W. E. Thompson, "The Athenian Entrepreneur," *L'Antiquité classique* 51 (1982) 51–85, esp. 74–78.

[52]Del Corno (above, n. 44) 305, n. 23, observes, in connection with Pataikos' loss of his fortune, that ἥκουσα in 808 perhaps indicates that the news of the shipwreck was false, since Pataikos is later in a position to provide a rich dowry for his daughter; alternatively, he adds, one may suppose that Pataikos subsequently acquired a new fortune.

[53]Moschion's position too, of course, is regularized by the new state of affairs; he will become a proper head of household.

With the normalization of the οἶκος structure, Glykera's independence as concubine is dissolved into the silent role of wife. Through the device of misapprehension, however—the *Agnoia* who acts as the prologue to the play—Menander projected, I believe, the image of a condition in-between, where a woman who was really a citizen and potentially a wife might assert the freedom and autonomy that her true status would ultimately abolish.[54]

Department of Classics
Brown University
Providence, RI 02912

[54]I wish to thank Marilyn Arthur, Barbara Harlow, Michael Roberts, Walter Stockert, and Elizabeth Traube, and also the anonymous referees of this journal for their comments on earlier versions of this paper.