

Elaine Fantham
Roman Readings

Beiträge zur Altertumskunde

Herausgegeben von
Michael Erler, Dorothee Gall,
Ludwig Koenen, Clemens Zintzen

Band 277

De Gruyter

Elaine Fantham

Roman Readings

Roman response to Greek literature
from Plautus to Statius and Quintilian

De Gruyter

ISBN 978-3-11-022933-2
e-ISBN 978-3-11-022934-9
ISSN 1616-0452

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Fantham, Elaine.

Roman readings : Roman response to Greek literature from Plautus to
Statius and Quintilian / by Elaine Fantham.

p. cm.

Includes bibliographical references.

ISBN 978-3-11-022933-2 (hardcover : alk. paper)

1. Latin literature – History and criticism. 2. Rhetoric, Ancient.

I. Title.

PA6011.F36 2010

870.9–dc22

2010011248

Bibliografische Information der Deutschen Nationalbibliothek

Die Deutsche Nationalbibliothek verzeichnet diese Publikation in der Deutschen
Nationalbibliografie; detaillierte bibliografische Daten sind im Internet
über <http://dnb.d-nb.de> abrufbar.

© 2011 Walter de Gruyter GmbH & Co. KG, Berlin/New York

Druck: Hubert & Co. GmbH & Co. KG, Göttingen
∞ Gedruckt auf säurefreiem Papier

Printed in Germany

www.degruyter.com

Content

Introduction	VII
--------------------	-----

I Comedy and Sexuality

1. Act 4 of the <i>Menaechmi</i> : Plautus and His Original	3
2. The Madman and the Doctor	15
3. Philemon's <i>Thesauros</i> as a Dramatization of Peripatetic Ethics	32
4. <i>Heautontimoroumenos</i> and <i>Adelphoe</i> : A Study of Fatherhood in Terence and Menander	51
5. Sex, Status and Survival in Hellenistic Athens: A Study of Women in New Comedy	79
6. <i>Stuprum</i> : Public Attitudes and Penalties for Sexual Offences in Republican Rome	115
7a. <i>Domina</i> -tricks, or How to Construct a Good Whore from a Bad One	144
7b. Women of the Demi-Monde and Sisterly Solidarity in the <i>Cistellaria</i>	157
7c. Maidens in Other-Land, or Broads Abroad: Plautus' <i>Poenulae</i>	176
8. Terence and the Familiarization of Comedy	195
9. Roman Experience of Menander in the Late Republic and Early Empire	215
10. Mime: The Missing Link in Roman Literary History	228

II Rhetoric and Literary culture

11. Imitation and Evolution: The Discussion of Rhetorical Imitation in Cicero <i>De oratore</i> 2.87–97 and Some Related Problems in Ciceronian Theory	243
12. Imitation and Decline: Rhetorical Theory and Practice in the First Century AD	265
13. Orator and/et Actor	285
14. Disowning and Dysfunction in the Declamatory Family	302
15. Quintilian on the Uses and Methods of Declamation	320

16. The Concept of Nature and Human Nature in Quintilian's Psychology and Theory of Instruction	331
17. The Synchronistic Chapter of Gellius (<i>N.A.</i> 17.21) and Some Aspects of Roman Chronology and Cultural History Between 60 and 50 BCE	343

III Ovid's Narrative Poem, the *Fasti*

18. Sexual Comedy in Ovid's <i>Fasti</i> : Sources and Motivation . . .	359
19. The role of Evander in Ovid's <i>Fasti</i>	393
20. Ceres, Liber and Flora: Georgic and Anti-Georgic Elements in Ovid's <i>Fasti</i>	409
21. The <i>Fasti</i> as a Source for Women's Participation in Roman Cult	430

IV Passion and Civil War in Roman Tragedy and Epic: Seneca, Lucan and Statius

22. Andromache's Child in Euripides and Seneca	457
23. Statius' Achilles, and His Trojan Model	475
24. Incest and Fratricide in Seneca's <i>Phoenissae</i>	482
25. Caesar and the Mutiny: Lucan's Reshaping of the Historical Tradition in <i>De Bello Civili</i> 5.237–373	502
26. <i>Religio</i> ... <i>dira loci</i> : Two Passages in Lucan <i>De Bello Civili</i> 3 and Their Relation to Virgil's Rome and Latium	519
27. The Angry Poet and the Angry Gods: Problems of Theodicy in Lucan's Epic of Defeat	535
28. <i>Discordia fratrum</i> : Aspects of Lucan's Conception of Civil War	559
29. Statius' <i>Thebaid</i> and the Genesis of Hatred	577
30. The Perils of Prophecy: Statius' Amphiaraus and His Literary Antecedents	607
31. <i>Chironis exemplum</i> : On Teachers and Surrogate Fathers in <i>Achilleid</i> and <i>Silvae</i>	624

Introduction

It is more than 40 years since my first publication, and I have come to realize that while some of my papers served only for a given occasion, others still have some merit of originality, or cover material that has not been developed since. Reviewing this body of work I thought it best to select approximately thirty papers with some internal coherence for reprinting, while providing basic references for readers interested in pursuing another 10–15 related studies. Some papers have already been reprinted in collections and these will simply be listed, starting with “The *Curculio* of Plautus: an Illustration of Plautine Methods in Adaptation,” *Classical Quarterly* 15 (1965) 84–100: this is available in both English and German, having been reprinted by Eckard Lefèvre in his collection *Wege der Forschung CCXXXVI, Plautus und Terenz* (1971). I would like to acknowledge here the pleasure and stimulus I have enjoyed from subsequent collaboration with Prof. Lefèvre and the generations of his pupils in successive conferences and collections on Roman comedy.

1. Comedy and Sexuality

If we want to follow the Roman experience of Greek comedy starting around 210 BCE, we must first face the sheer diversity of the Roman dramatic scripts that have come down to us. For Plautus it will be enough to contrast three plays on which I have written. While there seems no reason to include my 1965 paper on *Curculio* here, a summary will illustrate my approach in attempting a reconstruction of the Greek original that Plautus freely adapted: given the extent of his reworking, it would seem inappropriate to speak about his model. *Curculio* is only half the length of many Plautine comedies, but it contains the recognition of its heroine as a citizen available for marriage, a concealed identity of which the audience had the right to expect advance notice. Our Latin text lacks a prologue and offers no evidence that there ever was one; the whole play of under 750 lines bears obvious signs of compression. (The same is true of Plautus’ *Epidicus*, and I refer readers to my

parallel treatment, “Plautus in miniature; compression and distortion in the *Epidicus*,” *Papers of the Liverpool Latin Seminar III* (1981) noting, however that my friend Sander Goldberg actually argued in *TAPA* 108 (1978) that Plautus dreamed up this complicated plot without reference to any Greek original!) *Curculio* starts as a typical love intrigue, in which the impecunious lover has sent his unscrupulous parasite from Epidaurus to raise money from a friend in Caria so that he can set his girl-friend free. This might be called a diaspora play, set not in democratic Athens, but in the Hellenistic age of mercenary warfare, full of soldier’s boasting of far away places. Far from being authentically Greek, the play’s most conspicuous scenes both depend on ethnic contrast. The bombastic parasite returns, ordering out of his way a whole array of unlikely *Greek* officials—commanders, tyrants, market magistrates, village and parish officers, and denouncing pretentious *Greek* intellectuals loaded with books and strolling in their foreign cloaks; later the Master of the wardrobe introduces himself and offers a survey of the *Roman* forum, itemizing the lowlifes that hang around each of its landmarks. By coincidence the parasite spent an evening in Caria drinking with a soldier (unmentioned to this point) and learning of the man’s interest in his master’s girlfriend, stole his signet ring. This soldier has actually agreed to buy the girl and needs to collect her. In a series of short (30 line) sketches with the drunken old custodian, with the sick Pimp supplicating Aesculapius for a cure, and with the banker, the parasite first gets the soldier’s deposit and then the girl as his property. But when the violent soldier arrives to claim his girl the whole intrigue is sent into reverse because the girl recognizes the ring on the parasite’s finger as her father’s signet ring. In a few quick-fire lines we discover that she is freeborn with an identifiable father (602), and what is more the soldier confirms that the ring belonged to his own father: the two are brother and sister. A play that began with a sentimental affair has turned into a situation ripe for, even requiring, marriage; yet the only hints of this happy-ever-after outcome were incidental comments naming the girl as a virgin (612–3) and her later claim that the pimp had preserved her chastity (698). There is an instant change of ethos, as a hedonistic love-affair has turned into a joining of two families in marriage, and a furious soldier-rival has been converted into a doting brother. A flippant comedy of intrigue and disguise has ended as a bourgeois drama, but it never rises to virtuous sentiment, remaining crudely mechanical in its jokes and contrivances.

Contrast *Menaechmi*, also a diaspora play set outside the old Athenian *politeia*: The scene is Epidamnus in Epirus and the chief personnel are Syracusan. The play is brilliantly organized with advance information that the Syracusan brother is searching the seas for his lost twin, and throughout the first four acts the two brothers enter and exit narrowly missing each other as the visiting twin is mis-identified by the local twin's wife, mistress, servants and in laws. The two papers on *Menaechmi* published here were written thirty years apart: in the study of Act III (*Classical Philology* 63 (1968) 175–83) my purpose was to detect Plautus' own humorous expansions in the Epidamnian Menaechmus' confrontation with his wife and parasite: in contrast "Madness and Medication," the original English text of my (Italian) lecture for the *Lectiones Plautinae Sarsinates*, focuses on the most truly Greek aspect of the episode; the paratragedy when the visiting Menaechmus pretends "madness" to escape from his brother's wife, and the parodic scene of his interview with the pretentious doctor. While the visiting bachelor Menaechmus is a free spirit, his local brother is henpecked and hagridden, and their humorous potential is as divergent as their personalities. It is the only comedy we have in which divorce is welcomed as a happy-ending.

In contrast again, Plautus adapted his *Trinummus* ("The Three-bit Trickster") from the *Thesauros* (Treasure) of Philemon, an altogether more leisured and sententious comedy which might well have disappointed audiences hoping for an intrigue of trickery and disguise. This comedy is called after a trickster, but is set in a sedate civic Athens and loaded with moralizing; to start with, it has four old men (and two would be enough) and opens with a long exchange of unwarranted reproaches from Senex A to Senex B who has bought his absent friend's house to save it from being sold by the man's spendthrift son Lesbonicus. This is followed by a prolonged scene of moral self-congratulation by the Good Young Man, and his request to Senex C, his father, for permission to marry Lesbonicus' unseen sister without a dowry, leading to a slow-moving encounter in which Senex C asks the spendthrift's permission and is almost refused. Apart from the rich metrical setting there is little so far to win over the Roman crowd. What compensates for this sedate action is the loyal and earthy slave Stasimus, working to save his master from himself, and a late-born plot to send a trickster with faked letters to give the young man access to money for the dowry. And this does indeed become funny when the returning absent father (Senex D) meets the trickster who claims that he sent him, and demands his money back.

The heavily moralizing emphasis of this play ties in with a genuine Aristotelian *aporia*. If two young gentlemen are friends how can one do the other a necessary kindness without damaging the other's honour? This play touches on two aspects of Hellenistic ethics; the conflict of competing moral ambitions, which I discussed in "Philemon's *Thesaurus* as a Dramatization of Peripatetic Ethics," *Hermes* 105 (1977) 406–201, and the wider issue of father-son relationships, which will become almost an obsession with Terence, as I illustrate from the contrasting pairs of fathers in two Terentian comedies, "*Hautontimoroumenos* and *Adelphoe*: a study in Fatherhood in Terence and Menander," *Latomus* 30 (1971) 970–98. It remains an issue among scholars whether we should read the denouement of *Adelphoe* with Demea's generosity at Micio's expense as Menandrian, or an adjustment by Terence in favour of the more severe approach to fatherhood.

What happened to Roman theatre between Plautus and Terence? There was another successful dramatist, Caecilius, whose plays were closer to Plautus, to judge from the excerpts from his version of Menander's *Plokion* preserved by Gellius (N.A. 2.23) than to either the Attic comedies which he adapted or to his successor Terence. I am convinced that the strange output of Terence is the product of his stranger circumstances. Suetonius tells us he was born at Carthage and grew up in the household of Terentius Lucanus, but the date of birth (185, altered by some editors to 195) would make this slave of Carthaginian origin (*Afer*) too young to have been a prisoner of war. A number of stories show Terence on intimate terms with young Roman nobles. How could this be? I think we need to imagine the Roman household as the context of education in this generation. Who would teach the sons of the house, and teach them Greek? Terence was no Greek, but once Lucanus hired a Greek schoolteacher to train his son(s) in both languages, it would be natural to enliven the schoolroom by providing other students—their cousins or young boys in the slave household needing to be trained as accountants and secretaries. Home-bred slaves were the safest employees, especially if, as must have often happened, the home-bred slave's mother was a concubine of the Master or his son. If Terence was so close to the master's family, he would share their education and probably apply it by working as an assistant teacher within a year of completing his training. The same young man would learn Greek, then teach it, then compose exercises for his pupils, then perhaps use the Greek he had learned to compose

speeches and scenes, like the young son in *Phormio* who goes off to practice a speech in defence of his brother's unauthorized marriage.

Thus comedy and education would be internally connected, as they continued to be in later centuries. And these sixteen-year-old classmates would be well placed to collaborate in Latin versions of Greek comedy. It would explain the correct family atmosphere of Terence's plays, and the dutiful respect of the young sons, respect shown even for father figures who are usually mistaken in their assessment of everyone around them, and especially of their women, whether wives or mothers in law (Sostrata in *Hecyra*) or mistresses. The enigma of Terence's origin and background, and the ultra-elitism of his values led to my presentation of this hypothesis in "Terence and the Familiarization (I should probably have said *domestication*) of Comedy," 21–32 in *Ramus* 33 (2004).

Working on Terence, with his often similar sentimental plots, convinced me that there was an inherent relationship between the legal status of these fictional young women (recognized as citizens, or struggling to obtain recognition) and the dramatic intrigues in which they were involved. Interest in the position of women was a recent and far from universal phenomenon in the 1970's but it led me to write "Sex, Status and Survival in Hellenistic Athens; a study of women in New Comedy," to provide a framework for students working on comedy, and show how a woman's lack of citizenship determined her options in life: only a known father could guarantee her the security of bourgeois marriage instead of struggling to live by her wits. I am happy that the intersection of comedy and private law has since been illuminated by Adele Scafuro's excellent study of family arbitration in comedy and the courts in *The Forensic Stage*.

There has always been a seepage of motifs and techniques between formal Palliata comedy and the popular stage of improvised mime and Atellane. Submerged threads connect comic situations in different generations and media, and two papers, "The Earliest Comic Theatre at Rome: Atellan farce, comedy and mime as antecedents of the *Commedia dell'Arte*," 23–32 in *The Science of Buffoonery*, ed. D. Pietropaolo, Toronto 1989 (not included in this collection) and "Mime; the Missing link in Roman Literary History," *Classical World* 82–83 (1989) 155–68, represent my attempt to provide background continuity. A similar interest in the continuity of Roman acquaintance with New Comedy led me to trace the role played by *Comoedi* in training young speakers in elocution, and their use of Menandrian speeches from otherwise lost

plays (attested by Quintilian), and again the performance of Menandrian scenes as after-dinner entertainment in elite homes like that of Atticus or Pliny the Younger: all of these aspects feed into the persistence of Menander's texts in upper-class Roman culture: hence "Roman Experience of Menander in the Late Republic and early Empire," *TAPA* 114 (1984) 299–309.

At the same time I had joined a collaborative enterprise to provide a combined source book and social history of women (*Women in the Classical world: Image and Text*, OUP New York 1994). Switching from literary interpretation to historical record, I assembled the somewhat scanty evidence for attitudes to sexual offences against citizens in the second century BCE, and the extent to which Romans differentiated between the heinousness of violating a protected female, and assaulting or seducing a well-born citizen male: I believe the attitudes of our Roman reporters confirm the verdicts of the admittedly limited case studies available for this early period: they are reviewed in the short paper "*Stuprum*: Public Attitudes and Penalties for Sexual Offences in Republican Rome," *Classical Views* 10 (1992) 267–91.

The only women who have any degree of autonomy in Classical comedy (or social life) are the outlaws, the non-citizen or fatherless girls who must make their way by their charms. They are also almost the only fully rounded and lively women on the comic stage after Aristophanes; hence three separate studies I have made on *Meretrices* / courtesans. Taking Plautus' black-comedy *Truculentus* (successful in his day but neglected in the nineteenth century syllabus) I examined the range of trickery applied by Phronesium to her assorted lovers—the ex-favourite Diniarchus who lends her his illegitimate child (but will have to end the play married to its offstage mother), the rich country lout who names the play, and her naïve soldier lover to whom she displays the virility of "his" newborn son. Then I compared her trickery with the accusations aimed at the honest Thais in Terence's version of Menander's *Eunuchus*, and Thais' reluctant manipulation of her peniless civilian lover to protect her "sister" from the crude soldier ("*Domiina*-tricks, or how to construct a good whore out of a bad one").

"Maidens in Otherland or Broads abroad" examines the scenario in *Poenulus*, where the two freeborn sisters (captured and lost in Calydon) are on the brink of professional activity: while young *Hetaerae* speak freely in comedy, virgin daughters do not, but these young women exhibit both the vanity of their potential profession and the self-respect of their origin. The study of *Cistellaria* "Women of the demi-monde and

sisterly solidarity in the *Cistellaria*,” singles out two exceptional features; the sense of collective loyalty evinced by the old mother (“Lena”) in the face of proud matrons, and the anomaly that Selenium has been promised marriage by her lover before he or she can know that she is citizen-born and eligible. I wrote the three papers for collections published by Vogt Spira and other pupils of Lefèvre, and plan another related paper to come, on courtesans’ control of men and their finances.

2. Rhetoric and Literary culture

Comedy and Rhetoric are both performance arts, and we know from both Cicero and Quintilian that Roman orators obtained some of their training from *Comoedi*. My earliest work on rhetoric sprang from offering a graduate course on Cicero’s *De Oratore*. Although the book had to wait for my retirement there was time for articles (starting with “Ciceronian *conciliare* and Aristotelian *Ethos*,” *Phoenix* 27 (1973) 262–75, not reprinted here). I turned to Cicero’s representation of how natural talent was enhanced by training in performance and delivery—the indefinable essence of *decere*, itself the chief element of the eloquence, and to the issue of style. *Imitatio* had been a fourth ingredient, along with *natura* (*physis*), *exercitatio* (*melete*, also translated as *studium* or *diligentia*) and *doctrina* (*episteme*) in the system of Isocrates and the Roman rhetorician who composed *ad Herennium*. Moving from the actual imitation of Cicero’s teachers by their pupil Sulpicius Rufus, Cicero argued that Greek oratorical styles evolved from teacher to pupil, through a blending of their separate styles which Cicero believed his own generation also practiced. Thus Sulpicius’ shift of model from Antonius to Crassus is seen as parallel to the divergent evolution of Isocrates’ pupils Ephorus and Theopompus. Naturally in my two-phase study of Roman methods and principles of *Imitatio* Greek rhetorical theory is more prominent in the first study “Imitation and Evolution: the discussion of rhetorical imitation in Cicero *De Oratore* 2.87–97,” *Classical Philology* 73 (1978) 1–16, than in “Imitation and Decline: rhetorical theory and practice in the first century after Christ” whose starting point is a generation that already has Roman models to enhance or reject (*Classical Philology* 73 (1978) 102–116).

But the decade 60–50 BCE was also a time of broadening intellectual; curiosity and exploration of both Greek and Roman cultural history; this is the time when Varro and younger chronographers like

Nepos and Atticus were constructing a framework of time and place for the record of Greek poetry and prose—even as Cicero himself seems to have incorporated his historical account of Greek literature into a now damaged part of his *De Re Publica*. I have grouped in the papers on rhetoric “The synchronistic chapter of Gellius (NA 17.21)” from *Liverpool Classical Monthly*, an attempt to retrieve the chronological framework of Greek and Roman literature set up in Nepos’ lost *Chronica*, a no doubt less skilled forerunner of Atticus’ *Liber Annalis*.

Not reprinted here are “*Varietas and Satietas, De Oratore* 3.96–103 and the limits of *ornatus*,” *Rhetorica* 6 (1988) 275–290) “Occasions and Contexts of Roman Public oratory, from *Roman Eloquence*, ed. W. J. Dominik, London: Routledge 1997; “Meeting the People; the orator and the republican *contio* at Rome,” 95–112 in *Papers in Rhetoric III*, ed. L. Calboli Montefusco, and my exploration of Pliny’s double editorial procedure in revising his *Panegyricus* to make it simultaneously more literary and more ostensibly oral in parading the political formulae of Trajan’s glorious election to the consulate: “Two levels of orality in the genesis of Pliny’s *Panegyricus*,” 221–237, in *Signs of Orality*, ed. E. Anne Mackay, Leiden 1999.

During the nineties I was working on *Roman Literary Culture from Cicero to Apuleius*, Baltimore 1996, and preoccupied with the marginal forms of education and quasi-literary activities that fostered what we regard as more central texts. What was the social and socializing role of the declamatory school, and how did this strange new performance practice relate to the apparently lost art of domestic comedy? There seems to have been no continuity between earlier types of exercise (such as the accusations of Odysseus or Orestes as outlined in *Rhetorica ad Herennium*) and the dysfunctional family dramas of the elder Seneca’s youth. Rather we must look to overwhelming non-literary factors, to the outbreak of civil war, with young Quintus Cicero’s disloyal denunciation of his father and uncle, for a symptom of how families were turning sour under the pressure of debt and political blackmail. This was my thinking behind the specialized topic of the repudiated son: “Disowning and Dysfunction in the Declamatory Family,” *Materiali e Discussioni* 53 (2004), whereas the Quintilian paper “Quintilian on Declamation: themes and Problems,” 270–280 in *Hispania Terris omnibus felicior* (ed. P. Urso, Rome: L’Erma di Bretschneider, 2002) aims to offset the point of view of the Elder Seneca in his generation with Quintilian’s more academic concern to treat the phenomenon of declamation, which he clearly thought a distraction from systematic training, with fairness

and independent judgement, and use it as a rigorous tool of legal and logical training.

In studying Quintilian's educational theory I was impressed by his scrupulous attempt to determine the elusive relationship between Nature (as a Stoic concept of providential control) and human nature as a psychological force applied in rhetorical training. How did Quintilian—an eminently sensible teacher who did not take things at face-value—relate his instruction to nature, human and universal? This led me to write "The concept of Nature and Human Nature in Quintilian's Psychology and theory of Instruction," *Rhetorica* 13 (1995) 125–136; once again we have to disentangle Roman attitudes to nature and art, and the role played by imitation.

3. Ovid's Narrative Poem, the *Fasti*

I came to Ovid's *Fasti* from comedy, and an interest in Roman recognition of women's (limited) sexual autonomy. Roman comedy depends on sexuality for its appeal, tempting a lusty audience with the prospect of vicarious gratification, and yet as I came to realize, it always exercised a code rather like the FBI's "crime does not pay," in denying sexual success to adulterers. Thus the married Menaechmus cannot even enjoy the rendezvous he has prearranged (with the gown stolen from his wife as payment) with the courtesan Erotium, but his bachelor brother wanders on stage and is invited for an intimate visit. This is not a taboo on what the Romans defined as adultery (limited to seducing a married woman), since infidelity by a wife does not even feature in comedy except in the false intrigue of *Miles Gloriosus*: nor is it because a comic Lothario is married that he is denied success; indeed in society he had a perfect right to sleep with any socially unregulated person. Often the reinforcing factor in comic and elegiac intrigue is the age or unattractiveness of the would-be lover. So too, although Ovid the lover of *Amores* chases other men's wives or women, Ovid, the poet of the *Fasti* delights in the frustration of certain over-sexed gods; not that they or their targets are married, but because they are old and/or lecherous. My first paper on *Fasti*, "Sexual comedy in Ovid's *Fasti*: sources and motivation," *HSCP* 79 (1983) 185–216, sprang from this limited interest in the obvious similarities of several Ovidian narratives of sexual frustration: Faunus' assault upon Omphale (or rather Hercules cross-dressed), two variations of a tale in which Priapus tries to rape a sleeping nymph or the

goddess Vesta and is foiled by the untimely braying of Silenus' donkey, and finally Anna Perenna's frustration of Mars' attempt on the virgin Minerva by substituting her own aged body under the blanket—the same false-bride trick used to foil the lecherous Lysidamus of Plautus' *Casina*. There was also the undoubted attraction of the purely non-verbal mime settings, and the likelihood that Ovid was in fact taking over traditional Roman (panto-) mime.

Serious Roman poetry changed radically with Catullus, notably his translation of the vow of Berenice's lock from Callimachus' *Aitia*. From this time poets adapted the courtier language and values of Alexandria, and even Virgil's *Eclogues* allude freely to the astronomer Conon and invoke Apollo to justify their turning away from *reges et proelia* to a more fitting, lean and elegant poetry. There was already an abundance of contemporary studies of Augustan Callimacheanism from Wimmel's *Kallimachos in Rom* to the scholarship of Richard Thomas, and I was interested in the *Fasti* not for its powerful adaptation of Callimachean divine interlocutors (on which see John F. Miller, "Ovid's divine Interlocutors in the *Fasti*," *Studies Deroux III*, 1983, 156–192, also "The *Fasti* and Hellenistic Didactic," *Arethusa* 25, 1992, 11–31) but for its reaction against Hellenizing features of Virgil, Propertius and Horace (the cult of Olympic victors in e.g. Hor. *Odes* 1.1 (cf. e.g. 4.3 *illum non labor Isthmicus / clarabit pugilem, non equus impiger / curru ducet Achaico / victorem*), in the proem to *Georgics* III, and in the programmatic opening poems of Propertius' third book of elegies. By the time of the Secular Games in 17 BCE the *Aeneid* had transformed Rome's origins into the world of Aeneas, shaped by its destiny to be the empire of his descendant. Scholars had come to realize how much Ovid was "Virgil's Best Reader" (I quote J. J. O'Hara's powerful paper on Ovidian rewriting of Virgilian etymologies, from *Classical Journal* 91 (1996) 255–76) and wrote his work around but not against, Virgil's epic and religious poetry; Ovid embraced the imaginative power of *Aeneid* VIII, but he singled out and developed Virgil's hints of an earlier Italic world: *haec nemora indigenae fauni nymphaeque tenebant / gensque virum truncis et duro robore nata* (8.315–6) to build up in *Fasti* a site of Rome inhabited from its beginning by Janus (his most eloquent divine interlocutor) and Saturn, a world to which not Aeneas but Evander came in flight from primitive Arcadia. Ovid filled the shores of Latium with friendly rivers and families of prophetic and protective nymphs, and represented Rome's earliest history as a sequence of refugee colonizers from east to west; Hercules and his Argive followers (*Fasti* 1 and 5 (*the Argei*)) also in *Fasti*

6, Diomedes, Odysseus, Halaesus, Antenor, even Solymus, companion of Aeneas and founder of Sulmona: they would be followed by gods, by Cybele (*Fasti* 4) and Aesculapius (*Met.* 15). The world of the *Fasti* was also home to a new calendar of Augustan ceremonial, and a vigorous religious life especially for women. Hence papers on Evander as a counterweight to Aeneas (*Arethusa* 25, 1992), in a joint panel on "Reconstituting Ovid's *Fasti*," and a discussion of "Women's cults in Ovid's *Fasti*," now printed here, as part of G. Herbert-Brown's Bimillennial collection *Essays on Ovid's Fasti* (Oxford 2002). The paper "Ceres, Liber and Flora; Georgic and anti-Georgic elements in Ovid's *Fasti*," *PCPS* 39 (1992), like Eleanor Leach's pioneering study of Ovid's (subversive) reworking of *Georgics* in *Ars Amatoria* ("Georgic Imagery in the *Ars Amatoria*," *TAPA* 95 (1964) 142–154) examines Ovid's combative reaction against Virgil's proper reverence for Ceres and Liber in his exaltation of the pollination goddess, associated with hedonism and the uninhibited sexuality of the mimes at the spring festival of the *Floralia*. It is, after all, Flora whom Ovid begs to grant her his grace, using language close to Callimachus' request to the muses to smear their perfume on his poems: *floreat ut toto carmen Nasonis in aevo / sparge precor donis pectora nostra tuis* (*Fasti* 5.277–8).

Because my focus on *Fasti* was divided between the Cambridge commentary on book 4 and reviews of innovative and controversial monographs by Barchiesi, Herbert-Brown and Newlands, I have no separate studies to include here, and have omitted even the contextualizing discussion of Ovid's rededication to Germanicus and abortive second edition ("Ovid, Germanicus and the *Fasti*," first published in *Papers of the Liverpool Latin Seminar V* (1985) 243–282, since republished in *Oxford Readings in Ovid*, ed. Peter Knox).

Papers on *Fasti* not reprinted here include a review article on Barchiesi's *Il Poeta e il Principe* and Geraldine Herbert-Brown's historically oriented study *Ovid and the Fasti* which appeared in *Classical Philology* 91 (1995) 367–378, and the M. N. Tod Memorial Lecture "Rewriting and rereading the *Fasti*," printed in *Antichthon* 29 (1995) and in a separate gathering of several Tod Lectures.¹

1 I have not reprinted here a number of papers that arose from my teaching of Ovid's *Metamorphoses*, but mention them for the record. First "Ovid's Ceyx and Alcyone: the metamorphosis of a myth," *Phoenix* 33 (1979) 330–345, provoked by Ovid's mysterious invention of Morpheus' specialist team of dream imitators, and a complementary paper on other shape-shifters in *Metamorphoses*, "Sunt quibus in plures ius est transire figuras," *Classical World* 87 (1993) 23–36.

4. Passion and Civil War in Roman Tragedy and Epic: Seneca, Lucan and Statius

Seneca did not write epic, but he was influenced by it, especially by Ovid's Trojan narrative in *Metamorphoses* 13, and in turn exercised his own influence upon later epic. Two of my earlier publications are included here because they trace the influence of Greek tragedy from Euripides' *Andromache*, where the captive Andromache fights to save the child Molossus she has borne to Neoptolemus, just as she fought in vain to defend Astyanax. I tried to convey this overlap between the two episodes in "Andromache's Child in Euripides and Seneca," 267–80 in *Essays Presented to D. J. Conacher* (Calgary 1986). But work on Seneca's *Trojan Women* and its two Euripidean models (*Troades*, *Hecabe*) had also led me to examine the same type of scene in Statius' *Achilleid* ("Statius' Achilles and his Trojan model," *Classical Quarterly* 29 (1979) 457–620) where Thetis' protective action echoes Andromache's desperate attempt to save Astyanax in her highly developed confrontation with Ulysses that forms the central crisis of Seneca's *Troades*. We have here two Greek and two Roman versions of one highly pathetic situation.

Civil war began at Thebes, and the earliest full-scale Latin representation of Greek familial and civil conflict is Seneca's unfinished tragedy *Phoenissae*, almost certainly composed just before the enforced deaths of Seneca and Lucan, and after Lucan set out to write his (unfinished) epic of Roman civil war. This text ought to be a key to Roman understanding of the passions or anger and jealousy that lead to hatred between brothers in the family and rivals in a closed political society. Instead I found it profoundly disappointing. Examining this text, with no overlap of action or roles between its two groups of scenes, in "Incest and fratricide in Seneca's *Phoenissae*" (*'Seneca tragicus': Ramus Essays in Senecan drama*, Victoria, Australia 1983) I could see why Seneca had left his drama unfinished. The opening scenes of over three hundred lines show only the self-recrimination of the exiled Oedipus, and his inability

Keeping in mind the limited range of dramatic roles available to women, I examined women as mourners in two papers: "The Role of Lament in the growth and death of Roman Epic," 221–235 in *Epic Traditions in the Contemporary World*, ed. M. H. Beissinger, Berkeley 1999, and "Mater Dolorosa," a study of Ovid's grieving mothers from Clymene to Hecuba and Aurora in *Hermathena* 77–78 (2003–2004).

to shape any constructive action out of his daughter Antigone's faithful support. Only when the focus changes to Jocasta with the second group of scenes is there scope for any kind of action. Miraculously transported onto the battlefield she vainly attempts to dissuade Polynices and his invading army from attacking his own city: echoing the famous parallel scene from Euripides' *Phoenissae*, she argues with him over the potential of exile for hope as well as despair, but leaves the issue unresolved for a far shorter and more futile attempt to win over Eteocles. It adds to the sense of futility that there is no direct contact between the brothers, although they appear to share the same scene with their mother. Opelt suggested that Seneca would have ended with a messenger narrative of the brothers' mutual murder and their mother's suicide. We can only say that Seneca did not see his way to drive the tragedy on to its end. The only new element comes in a series of hints that Seneca saw the precedent of incest as a threat as renewable like the reiteration of kin-murder, and my paper explored this and other related texts as evidence for fear of woman as an incitement to evil.

The fratricidal Theban war would provide Statius with a fertile source of dramatic narrative, as would the lesser Theban paradigm of the Spartoi sown by Cadmus. In Ovid's two versions of the Spartoi, the survivors of the Theban dragon's teeth resist Cadmus' attempt to restore peace, and themselves beget further murderous generations, whereas Medea's dragon men turn on each other and self-destruct. As I show in *Discordia Fratrum* forthcoming in a collection of *Civil War* papers (Oxford 2010) Lucan finds no room for this precedent in his *Civil War* except the paradoxical loving-fratricide of the desperate Caesarian Volteius and his men

Sic semine Cadmi
Emicuit Dircaea cohors ceciditque suorum
Volneribus, dirum Thebanis fratribus omen;
Phasidos et campus insomni dente create
Terrigenae missa magicis e cantibus ira
Cognato tantos inplerunt sanguine sulcos. (4.549–55)

If we look to Lucan's *Civil War* for a reflection of either Homeric epic or any other literary inheritance from Greek epic or tragedy this quickly proves misleading. When the known world is torn apart by matching forces, and combat is polarized as the hatred of rival commanders, or the massed and anonymous conflict of armies, there is little opportunity for grounding the narrative in myth or history, or for conscious opposition of Greek and Roman traditions. It is perhaps significant that two

Greek communities offer models of loyalty: the Massilians of book 3, who offer shelter and arbitration between the warring commanders, and the people of Mytilene on Lesbos who give shelter to Pompey's Cornelia (book 8) and are prepared to risk their community for him even after Pharsalus. Caesar himself will go (unhistorically) to Troy, and learn nothing from the ruins he tramples except the disappearance of the heroic past.

Yet Lucan's civil war has a greater dimension than the personal conflicts of the leaders and the Achillean anger of Caesar. From the beginning Lucan puts in parallel the shattering of Rome's empire and of the universe itself (1.79–80 *totaque discors/ machina divolsi turbabit foedera mundi*). He sees beyond the vicious selfishness of Roman leaders and Roman people (1.158–159 *hae ducibus causae: suberant sed publica belli / semina quae populos semper mersere potentes*.) This polarization persists as Romans fear and lament the outbreak of war, and is fully expressed in the only episode of total civil war in Lucan's poem; the horrified reminiscences of massacre and corpse violation by the old Survivor of Marius' assault and Sulla's tyranny. These hundred lines come as near to the Roman image of civil war as the dreadful carnage depicted by Tacitus in the "year of the Four Emperors" which Lucan would not live to see. Lucan creates his contrast of good and evil out of the quiet nocturnal consultation of Brutus and Cato. Both speakers use the Cosmos as their model for the wise man's soul, but where Brutus advocates disgusted abstention, Cato argues for an obligation to participate, but participate as a martyr, a model of *devotio* to draw away the missiles of both warring armies (2.306–319). This second book sees no actual confrontation (beyond the personal interview of Caesar and Domitius (2.528–595). Only with Pompey's flight from Brundisium as he sails on the open sea at the opening of book 3 is the war free to spread, as it will spread through Gaul (book 3) and Spain (book 4) and Illyria and Africa (book 4) to Epirus and Thessaly (books 5 and 6, book 7) and the Aegean, to Libya (book 9) and Egypt (9.1004–1108, until the text breaks off). Each of these changes of setting is associated with its own microclimate of storms and floods.

Through his unrelenting circumnavigation of the Mediterranean Caesar is accompanied by the disruption of earth and sea and sky: typical is the cloudburst that follows frozen winter in the Spanish campaign:

timbers from the untouched barbarian grove for his new fleet. It is also characteristic of Lucan to delight in Caesar's engineering: the harbour moles at Brundisium (2.660–679), the long rampart of investment at Massilia (3.381–387, 394–398) and his ambitious plans to expand his area of control in Epirus (6.32–43) hyperbolically compared with Babylon or the valley around Tigris and Orontes.

In any episode where Caesar speaks, he will dominate by sheer force of passion, but the power of his anger at e.g. 2.493 (*calida proclamat ab ira*) is matched by that of the undistinguished Domitius (2.521 *premit ille graves interritus iras*) and even the supposedly self-controlled Stoic Cato (9.509 *concitus ira*). Anger is characteristic of Caesar and part of his power, but anger is also fundamental to Lucan's own creativity. Romans were ambivalent about this manly passion, recognizing its contribution to authority, and Cicero and Seneca both, while denouncing anger as a destructive and distorting passion in *Tusculans* 4 and the three books of *De Ira*, clearly understand its role as a tool in the world of power. Lucan himself both acknowledges divine anger against Rome (2.86–88 and 4.805–9) and voices increasing anger with the gods (and their surrogate Fortune) over the death of the honourable Pompey. Lucan's stance allows for Rome's suffering in the civil war to be the consequences of an earlier sin (cf. the death of Remus, 1.82–97) but cannot forgive the gods for the outcome. It was in hope of defining Lucan's ideology and refuting the myth of Lucan's omission of the gods that I composed "The Angry Poet and the Angry Gods: Problems of Theodicy in Lucan's Epic of Defeat," reprinted here from *Ancient Anger*, Yale Classical Studies, Vol. 31, ed. S. M. Braund and G. R. Most, Cambridge 2003.

Lucan's ten books coincide in content with Caesar's own *Civil War*, and scholars such as Michel Rambaud and more recently Jamie Masters (*Lucan and the Poetry of Civil War*, Cambridge 1992) have argued that Lucan used Caesar as his model: The incentive to pay attention to the text which has survived is enormous, but the case for dependence on Livy's eight lost Civil War books (based only on the existing *Periochae*, remains strong. Moving from the two years covered by Lucan's empire-wide narrative to Statius' saga of the Theban expedition is almost like comparing apples and oranges: there is so vast a difference between Lucan's near-contemporary melodrama and Statius' essentially Homeric conflict articulated by its multiple leaders and multiple layers of supernatural causation, between Lucan's geographical and scientific curiosity and the dazzling local myths and sites of Statius *Thebaid* (es-

pecially in the Teichoskopia of 7.259 ff.). Yet I probably derived much of my enjoyment of Statius from his affinities with Lucan and the drastic scenes of evil triumphant relished by both authors. I have reprinted here a paper that aimed to disentangle the different levels of causality invoked by Statius, starting with the poet's own analysis of the brothers' emotions: "Envy and fear the begetter of hate': Statius' *Thebaid* and the genesis of hatred," 185–212 from *The Passions in Roman Thought and Literature*, ed. S. M. Braund and C. J. Gill (Cambridge 1997). The poet has begun his action with the blind Oedipus' curse on his sons, in the savage daylight of his spirit with the Furies already in his heart: *saeva dies animi, scelerumque in pectore Dirae* (1.51).

Tisiphone is the emotion in Oedipus' heart, but she is also the fiend outside him, addressed as if he were her votary, and a physical presence, stationed at Cocytus waiting to emerge in the upper world and give the signal that galvanizes the landscape from Sparta to Thessaly (like Allecto in *Aeneid* VII). It is her presence perched on Cadmus' citadel that infects the palace (there are echoes here of Seneca's *Thyestes*) and fills the brothers with emotions, madness and envy and fear leading to the love of domination and *sociisque comes Discordia regnis* (125–30); now Statius turns directly to the brothers and the price they have paid to occupy Oedipus' throne. From here the poet passes through the protests of a citizen chorus to the higher level of Jupiter, independently summoning his council of gods in anger at the sins of mankind; like the petulant autocrat of *Metamorphoses*, he is weary of his unruly subjects as he reports Oedipus' murder and incest which he has atoned for by his rejection of daylight (236–8). But now, as if Jupiter was unaware of Tisiphone's actions, he confirms that he will himself fulfil Oedipus' curse and destroy his race, using Adrastus' forthcoming marriage union to punish both Thebes and Argos; Adrastus (like Phaedra or Hippolytus) is an innocent tool of divine revenge but Jupiter's long memory can make a pretext of his ancestor Tantalus' offences. It has taken so much divine motivation to bring Polynices and the fugitive murderer Tydeus through the nocturnal storms to Adrastus' unoffending porch.

I have recapitulated here the many motivations of this civil war that will reach so far beyond the original tormented family. The epic defies the readers' control, and it seems right even in this introduction to attempt a mapping of its interwoven threads, as it is constantly drawn forward by different agents, and re-set in new directions by gods above and below, though the lesser Olympians (Mars, Venus, Bacchus) are more inhibited (and less convincing) than the Furies. Statius has calculated a

slow build-up for the Argive expedition through Tydeus' failed embassy and the deferral of the drought at Lerna and tragic death of the child Opheltes with its separate closure in the book-length ceremonial games of book 6. A morally important element in this narrative is provided by the seer Amphiaraus, whose victimization by fate prompted me to write "Amphiaraus or the perils of prophecy," in *Flavian Poetry*, ed. R. Nauta, H.-J. Van Dam and J. Smolenaars, (Leiden: Brill, 2005.) In Amphiaraus Statius has formed a fully Roman augur fully understanding the ominous message of the bird flights (3.546–551 and 566–572). In his resistance to the evil of warfare Amphiaraus plays the role of Latinus, until his refusal to admit the omens is denounced and overridden by a jeering Capaneus. It is Amphiaraus who will be first to die once Tisiphone has renewed battle frenzy in both camps and the battle is joined (7.690–823). It is his descent into Hades that provokes Dis himself to send out Tisiphone to produce a new level of abomination that will amaze her fellow Furies and start a program which readers can recognize as the cannibal death of Tydeus and Creon's refusal of burial to the dead, and of Capaneus as a vehicle of Dis' revenge on Jupiter as he tries to storm Olympus with thunderbolts (8.65–77). After books 8–10 have covered the deaths of Tydeus, Hippomedon, Parthenopaeus, and Capaneus, and Theban Menoeceus has sacrificed his life for Thebes in vain, comes the climactic book 11. Just as Jupiter in *Aeneid* XII had to summon up a new level of evil spirit, the Dirae attendant on his throne, to bring down Turnus, so now Tisiphone appeals for the help of Megæra to conduct her war and together they brood as outriders over the chariots of the brothers. But first the Furies must incite all the human agents, adding Creon bereaved by the sacrifice of his son, while on the side of mercy Jocasta and Antigone desperately intervene, resolved to deter the brothers from their duel, but find their human piety outweighed by the savage incitements of the Erinyes (11.382–402). When the Olympian wargods (Virtus, Bellona, Mars and Gorgon-bearing Athena) withdraw from the horror of this human hatred, the Stygian sisters dominate the field and the natural arena around the brothers, deserted by both gods and men, is filled with an audience of Theban ghosts. Adrastus too cannot endure and deserts his son-in-law, while the pale and pathetic spirit of Pietas makes the last attempt to resist the Furies. Scorned by Tisiphone she veils her eyes and flees to protest at the knees of Jupiter himself (11.496). The interweaving of world and underworld will end only with the mutual murder of the brothers whose dead souls will now pollute Hades itself. The poet makes a

vain appeal for this to be an end, and it seems a sign of an ending that Oedipus himself returns to the city. Led by Antigone to the corpses, he tries to touch their faces, and confesses to his first return of piety (605; Piety herself had fled at 496). After the ferocious clashing of hatred and repudiation of humanity the epic has returned to its point of departure.

Statius showed himself capable of more realistic, even humorous poetry, in his unfinished *Achilleid*, which has recently provoked a flowering of critical analysis, and in his personal *Silvae*. I hope to continue to interpret his poetry, but have brought this collection to a close with a simpler piece “*Chironis exemplum*: on teachers and surrogate fathers in *Achilleid* and *Silvae*,” 59–70 from *Hermathena* 1999. (I have omitted another short paper which takes into account the mature Achilles’ reminiscences of Chiron’s syllabus for heroes, “Chiron, the Best of Teachers,” 111–122 in *Literature, Art, History: Studies in Classical Antiquity in honour of W. J. Henderson*, ed. A. F. Basson and W. J. Dominik.) Chiron united the roles of parent and teacher, which Statius experienced as a devoted son (*Silvae* 5.3) and would-be adoptive father (5.5) and can serve as an archetype for both the values of poetry and of loving education for so many students of the Classics.

The author gratefully acknowledges the generous subsidy provided from the David Magie Fund by the Department of Classics, Princeton University. She would also like to thank most warmly Christine Ehle, her expert copy editor, and the students who came to her aid, Ana Troisi and Francesca Patterson of Kings College London, and Megan Campbell and Laura Mawhinnie of the University of Toronto.

Books Published

1. *Comparative Studies in Republican Latin Imagery*: Phoenix, Suppl. 10, Toronto: University of Toronto Press 1972.
2. *Seneca's Troades: a Literary Introduction, Text, Translation and Commentary*, Princeton: Princeton University Press 1982.
reviewed Griffin, *TLS* Nov 1983, Kennedy, *CW* Nov 1983, Calder III, *AJP* 1983, Douglas, *CR* 35.1 (1985), Billerbeck, *Phoenix* 38 (1984), review article: Fitch, *Classical Views* 29 (1985) 435–453.
3. *Greek Tragedy and its Legacy: Essays presented to D. J. Conacher*, Calgary: Calgary University Press 1986. Co-edited with M. Cropp, S. J. Scully.
4. *Erasmus: Literary and Educational Writings*. (Collected Works of Erasmus, Vol. 29). Co-edited with Erika Rummel, Toronto 1989; Essay “Erasmus and the Latin Classics,” annotated translation of *Lingua*.
5. *A Commentary on Lucan 'De Bello Civili Book 2'*, Cambridge Greek and Latin Classics, Cambridge 1992.
6. *Women in the Classical World: Image and Text*. Co-authored with Helena Foley, N. B. Kampen, S. J. Pomeroy, H. A. Shapiro, Oxford, New York: Oxford University Press 1994, Paperback 1995.
7. *Roman Literary Culture from Cicero to Apuleius*, Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press 1996, Paperback 1998, in German translation, Stuttgart: Metzler 1998.
8. *A Commentary on Ovid 'Fasti book 4'*, Cambridge Greek and Latin Classics, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 1998.
9. Editor and contributor: *Caesar Against Liberty? Perspectives on His Autocracy, Papers of Langford Latin Seminar 11*, FSU Tallahassee, Cambridge: Cairns 2003.
10. *An Introduction to Ovid's 'Metamorphoses'*, Oxford Approaches to Classical Literature, 2004.
11. *The Roman World of Cicero's 'De Oratore'*, Oxford: Oxford University Press 2004.
12. *Julia Augusti: the Emperor's Daughter*, Routledge 2006.
13. *Latin poets and Italian Gods* (The 2004 Robson Lectures.) Toronto: University of Toronto Press 2009.
14. *Seneca: Selected Letters*. (Oxford World Classics.) Oxford: Oxford University Press 2010.

I apologize to readers both for omitting papers they may have wanted to read, and for any perversities or weaknesses of argument in the papers that I have included.

I

Comedy and Sexuality

1. Act 4 of the *Menaechmi*: Plautus and His Original

The *Menaechmi* is perhaps the most satisfying among all the plays of Plautus in the balance and symmetry of its structure. There is not only the symmetry of alternation between the resident, Epidamnian Menaechmus, and his brother, the Stranger from Syracuse—that is, a balanced grouping of scenes for each hero in turn—but there is symmetry on a smaller scale; for example, the Sicilian Menaechmus in Act 2, scene 2, first accuses the cook Cylindrus of madness and offers to pay for an expiatory sacrifice, but soon it is Cylindrus' turn to suggest that Menaechmus must be mad and needs to make expiation. Later in the arbitration scene, Act 5, scene 2, where the old man is summoned by his daughter to rebuke her husband Menaechmus (it is in fact the other Menaechmus who is involved in this scene), he addresses himself in turn with equal sympathy and the same phraseology first to the wife (777) then to the supposed husband (810). The same symmetry is achieved in the final recognition scene by giving the slave Messenio the quite unnecessary function of negotiator and interpreter between his master and the other Menaechmus, dividing his attention more or less alternately between them.

Naturally the credit for this neat and well-balanced structure must go in the first place to the author of the Greek original, whether the Sicilian Posidippus or an unknown. The Greek play must have been mechanically superb. Yet some credit is also due to Plautus for respecting and preserving this symmetry. For all his vitality, and the exuberant verbal humour and ornament which he has undoubtedly added to the original, Plautus seems to have kept the structure and proportions of the play without distortion. No Plautine scholar has had reason to suggest that the *Menaechmi* contains any modifications of the Greek plot or any additional scenes, however short. Within the scenes, too, Plautus generally seems to have abstained from digressions or enlargements of favourite roles, such as that of parasite or slave, at the expense of a balanced structure.

There is however, one scene whose construction in our texts appears awkward and misshapen. In an article in *Rheinisches Museum* 37 (1882) 531–47, investigating textual problems arising in the *Menaechmi*, O. Ribbeck gave special attention to Act 4, scene 2—the confrontation of the Epidamnian Menaechmus by his treacherous parasite and vengeful wife. Ribbeck's treatment of this scene is based on Ritschl's text; it is in many respects too drastic, proposing wholesale transpositions of lines and reallocations of speeches, and rejecting (R) 617 to 624 (611 to 619 in our texts) as a post-Plautine interpolation. Indeed the text he proposes (*op. cit.*, 543) makes the scene barely recognizable as the one that Leo and Lindsay were able to accept without significant alteration of the traditional text. At the same time Ribbeck dealt only with the first part of the dialogue (604–35), but the later dialogue, while it is simpler to follow, seems to contain a great deal of Plautine innovation which Ribbeck was not concerned to identify. As far as I know there has been no separate discussion of the scene since Ribbeck's article, and I should like to make a fresh attempt to analyse it.

In order to distinguish the results of Plautus' treatment, it will not be sufficient to consider the negative question of lines which on grounds of content or technique could not have occurred in the original. Where a scene appears to have been as freely handled as this one, attempts to reach a reconstruction of the original by a process of purification and subtraction must be open to many doubts. I have preferred to adopt a more positive approach to Plautus' workmanship. A comparative study of features common to similar scenes of other plays suggests that Plautus contributes more than mere wisecracks and digressions to his originals; I hope to illustrate from this parallel material how the whole cast of the dialogue in large sections of this scene has been shaped independently by Plautus. Once such a picture of Plautine elements has been established, it will complement the general reconstruction of the scene in the Greek original which I shall try to deduce from the requirements of the action.

First, let us put the scene in its context. In the first act, the Epidamnian Menaechmus leaves his house after a quarrel with his wife; unknown to her he has taken one of her mantles to give to his mistress, Erotium. He promises the parasite Peniculus that they will share a feast at Erotium's house, and together they visit her and arrange a feast for later that day. Patron and parasite go off to the market place, leaving the mantle behind. Act 2 introduces the twin Menaechmus from Syracuse, who is mistaken by both Erotium and her cook for

his brother and welcomed in to enjoy the feast. But his behaviour in Act 3 brings retribution for his married brother; for as the Syracusan Menaechmus emerges triumphant from the party, the parasite, who has lost his patron in the crowd, takes him for his married brother and accuses him of enjoying the feast without him. When Menaechmus naturally does not recognize him and denies the charge, Peniculus in revenge goes to tell his patron's wife the whole story of the stolen mantle. The result is that in Act 4 the wife, infuriated, and backed by the parasite, comes into the street to tackle her errant husband at the very moment when he is at last returning from the market place after a frustrating delay.

Scene 2 brings the moment of confrontation, the climax when the reproachful wife, by openly accusing Menaechmus of the theft, forces him to make a confession and agree to restore the stolen goods; until they are returned, his own home is barred to him. In the short final scene (3) his attempt to recover the mantle from Erotium (who has already given it to his brother to have alterations made) makes his downfall complete. The anger of his wife and her barred doors are balanced by his mistress' fury: banned from both households through his brother's fault, Menaechmus is now *exclusissimus* (698).

There are several occasions in Plautus where an unfaithful husband is exposed and confronted by his angry wife: such scenes occur in the *Asinaria* (5.2), *Casina* (3.3), and *Mercator* (4.3 and 4), but the nearest to *Menaechmi*, Act 4, scene 2, in plot and in treatment is the finale of the *Asinaria* (5.2). Here too the parasite informs on a husband (not his own patron) and leads the wife to the scene of the crime. The beginning of this scene, although more detailed, is very close to *Menaechmi*, Act 4, scene 1. Both start in mid-dialogue, with the wife's indignation at what she has already been told. There are obvious verbal coincidences: *Men.* 562: "manufesto faxo iam opprimes: sequere hac modo" = *As.* 876: "sequere hac me modo, iam faxo ipsum hominem manufesto opprimas"; *Men.* 570: "ex insidiis aucupa" = *As.* 881: "aucupemus ex insidiis clanculum quam rem gerant" (in which *aucupari* is a purely Roman metaphor); there are also less obvious similarities. Compare *Men.* 568–69: "quid ego nunc cum illoc agam? / :: idem quod semper: male habeas ..." with *As.* 869–70: "ne <ego> illum ecastor miserum habebo. : : ego istuc scio, / ita fore illi dum quidem cum illo nupta eris."

Apart from the use of *aucupari*, and possibly *Men.* 568–69, there is nothing in *Menaechmi*, Act 4, scene 1, which need suggest any Plautine deviation from the original. On the other hand the theme of the stolen

palla, essential in the *Menaechmi*, occurs incidentally at *As.* 884–85, “egon ut non domo uxori meae / surrupiam in deliciis pallam quam habet, atque ad te deferam,” and forms a climax to the wife’s accusations at 929. This might suggest a Plautine reminiscence, imported from the *Menaechmi*, but is as likely to be a classic form of marital infidelity occurring independently in the Greek original of the *Asinaria*.

Scene 2 opens with Menaechmus’ song of frustration. He has been delayed by a client whom he had to defend in a lawsuit. The song falls into three parts: a general criticism of the folly of patrons and villainy of clients (571–87); a detailed account of his recent experiences with this particular client (588–95); and a short tailpiece summarising his misfortunes and hopes. The subject matter, depending on the patron–client relationship, and displaying many special features of Roman law, is as Plautine as the polymetry. Here the *Casina* (3.3) provides a simpler treatment of the same theme. E. Fraenkel, in *Elementi Plautini* (Florence 1960 152–53), has traced the theme of the lover delayed on the way to a vital rendezvous through *Casina*, Act 3, scene 3, and Terence’s *Eunuchus*, Act 2, scene 3, to Diphilus and Menander, and uses the much shorter *Casina* monologue to illustrate what is likely to have stood in the *Menaechmi* original.

Casina 563–73 gives only three lines to generalisation, four to the speaker’s own misfortune, and four to a proposed reform of the social system—a pattern which we meet elsewhere in Plautus, and (with a little modification) in an earlier scene of the *Menaechmi* itself, the monologue of Peniculus, frustrated of his appointment with dinner in Act 3, scene 3. These parallels led Fraenkel to suggest that the whole of Menaechmus’ monologue was developed from a few lines in the Greek play; he shows that whereas 570–95 represent a large free-ranging expansion, with new Roman material, the simplicity of 595a–601 and their affinity with *Casina* 566–69 suggest a direct paraphrase of the original.

Yet the large scale of this Plautine expansion causes no dramatic absurdity. The eavesdroppers must be silent for some thirty lines instead of at most a dozen in the original, but they can either be represented as unable to hear—since Menaechmus has a considerable length of stage to cross before reaching the nearer house—or allowed to hear the whole song: there is nothing in the first two sections to provoke them to interrupt or challenge him. It is sufficient for the action of the scene that

Menaechmus' wife should hear the incriminating admissions of 598–601.¹

At 602, wife and parasite exchange comment unheard by Menaechmus, who is making for the house of Erotium, beyond his own, and near the harbour end of the stage. Line 603, “hinc intro abeam, ubi mi bene sit,” makes it clear that he has reached her house: the eavesdroppers in the doorway of his own home (or possibly an *angiportum*²) must have to call him back. The first outcry of his wife (604), “ne illam ecastor faenerato apstulisti,” goes unanswered. Menaechmus has either not heard, or decided not to hear, the reference to the mantle (*illam* = *palla quam dedi*, 600). The threat itself is a type found in the *Asinaria* (5.2) at 896–97 “ne tu istuc cum malo magno tuo / dixisti in me,” 902, “ne illa escastor faenerato funditat,” and again at 909, or more briefly at *Cas.* 576, “audivi ecastor cum malo magno tuo,” and is clearly a cliché in such scenes. However the strong coincidence of the word *faenerato* (occurring only in these two related scenes) suggests that Plautus was inspired by his own work, as well as the text of the original. If anything, *As.* 902, *faenerato funditat*, with its alliteration and the appropriately spendthrift verb, is more successful than *Men.* 604 but it would be dangerous to use such a question of taste in support of any argument for the priority of either play.

When the wife renews her abuse (605) Menaechmus turns around to answer her, but without any formal greeting; like Demaenetus in *Asinaria*, Act 5, scene 2, he is too overwhelmed by shock. Her indignant *men rogas?* is answered by a more flippant *uin hunc rogem?*, a form of joke which recurs at 640: “me rogas? :: pol haud rogem te, si sciam.” The retort is hardly good enough to justify such repetition and is one of several motifs duplicated in this scene. If Menaechmus' flippancy is slightly surprising in itself, it is equally incongruous with the type of wheedling which would justify 607, *aufer hinc palpationes*; this comes unprepared and is itself unanswered—a difficulty which could easily be overcome in action but perhaps is a sign of careless writing. Line 607 is in fact an anticipation of 626–28, “ME. dic, mea uxor

1 Even the references to his mistress and the proposed party need not be regarded as incriminating, since Menaechmus had already threatened in Act 1, scene 1, 124 ff., to hold this party, and since it is clearly the theft of the mantle which obsesses his wife throughout Act 4 (cf. 560–61) and is the climax of her accusations in Act 5, scene 2 (803–4).

2 An *angiportum* seems to be implied by Messenio's comment in 1056–57.

quid tibi aegre est? PE. bellus blanditur tibi. / ME. potin ut mihi molestus ne sis? num te appello? MA. aufer manum. / PE. sic datur," where the feigned caress is properly introduced and meets with a proper rebuff, brought out by *sic datur*, "that's the way to treat him." This is a pattern we can illustrate from *Cas.* 228–30: "blande haec mihi mala res appellanda est. / uxor mea meaque amoenitas, quid tu agis? : : abi atque apstine manum. / : : heia, mea Iuno, non decet esse te tam tristem tuo Iovi." A further motivation for the Plautine anticipation at 607 may be the word *palpationes*, here only in Plautus, but suggested by the occurrence of the comic word *palpator* earlier in this same play (260; cf. *Rud.* 126).

Lines 609–10 present a more serious problem, the climax of the whole scene is the moment when the wife finally declares the theft of the mantle to Menaechmus' face. This moment of confrontation clearly comes at 642–45, marked by a speech of special dignity and rhetoric from the wife. Surely if the mantle is mentioned prematurely, the denunciation is an absurd anticlimax. There is no sign that Menaechmus hears his wife's outcry at 604, but in 609–10, "MA. pallam—ME. pallam? MA. quidam pallam—PE. quid paues? / ME. nil equidem pauco. PE. nisi unum: palla pallorem incutit," Menaechmus must not only hear but tremble. The clue to these lines lies in the wordplay of 610, *palla pallorem incutit*, a Latin pun not possible in the original. For the sake of this pun, Plautus anticipates the grand moment of denunciation and then has to drop the subject. He does this, as so often, by repeating an earlier phrase, *perge tu* (607), and resuming in 611, *perge in uirum*.³ But 611 does not only borrow an earlier phrase, "at tu ne clam me comesses prandium" is another anticipation. When this next appears, at 628, "properato absente me comesse prandium," it is very naturally answered by Menaechmus with indignant protest. It should have provoked the protest at 611, but it is ignored. Plautus has merely used the motif in advance as a means of leaving an awkward subject.

ME. non taces? PE. non hercle uero taceo. nutat, ne loquar.

ME. non hercle egoquidem usquam quicquam nuto neque nicto tibi.

MA. ne ego ecastor mulier misera. ME. qui tu misera es? Mi expedi.

PE. nihil hoc confidentius: quin quae uides ea pernegat.

ME. per Iouem deosque omnis adiuro, uxor, (satin hoc est tibi?) / me isti non nutasse.

PE. credit iam tibi de "isti": illuc redi.

3 Cf. Fraenkel, *op. cit.*, 105 ff., 137.

ME. quo ego redeam? PE. equidem ad phrygionem censeo; et pallam refer.
 ME. quae istaec palla est? PE. taceo iam, quando haec rem non meminit
 suam (612–19).

This is a closely connected section weaving together two themes: the grimaces of Menaechmus at the parasite and (again) the stolen mantle.

Line 614 has distressed many scholars because it seems unrelated to its context, and Kiessling's proposal to transpose 614 after 619 as an introduction to the new theme of 620, *num quis seruorum deliquit*, is very attractive. But 614 would be an interruption after 619, as it is now; it is an example of what can happen in Plautus when one party in a three-man scene has been driven out of the dialogue by the bickering of the other two. A similar interruption occurs in *Mercator*, Act 4, scene 4: the wife, neglected for seven lines in the altercation between husband and cook, has to recall her presence with the cry, *heu miserae mihi* (770), and is again ignored for fourteen lines. Nor is this confined to women. In *Curculio*, Act 5, scene 2, Phaedromus, distracted from the serious action by the bickering of the girl and the parasite and having been ignored for seven lines, bursts out in 608, *enim uero irascor!*, is answered, and again ousted from the dialogue by a new disturbance. So here Plautus restores the wife to the conversation with an exclamation of distress, but allows her to fade away as new jokes suggest themselves.

It is Menaechmus' oath in 616 which diverts the dialogue away from her. This is an oath of the greatest conceivable force, used in an incredibly trivial context and repeated verbatim in this same scene at 655. But in 655 Menaechmus has a serious offence to cover up, and his perjury (equal on both occasions) is justified by his extremity. There, such an oath is in place, as it is in *Merc.* 760: "CO. nempе uxor rurist tua, quam dudum dixeras / te odisse aequе atque anguis ... :: ita me amabit Iuppiter, / uxor, ut ego illud numquam dixi" (760–63). At 616 it merely serves to introduce the wordplay which enables Peniculus to return to the question of the stolen mantle. This wordplay is on *isti* = *istic*, "over there,"⁴ and *illuc redi*, "get back there," used in two senses—physically of returning to the embroiderer's, and verbally of returning to the point, the previous point in the dialogue (610–11). Such a pun would not be possible in Greek, and interrupts the main conflict, leaving the wife speechless for three lines. Menaechmus' bold query, *quae istaec palla est* (619), does not square with his sup-

4 For *isti* = adverbial *istic* here; cf. *Ep.* 721, and e.g., *Cap.* 60 (with Lindsay's note), 94, 278, etc., where *illi* is used for *illic*.

posed terror in 610, and the whole passage fades into futility, leaving 620 to introduce a new theme. These features of 616–19 lend some plausibility to Kiessling's proposal, for the lines are most unlikely to have occurred in the original in any form, whereas our dialogue would pass neatly from 614 to 620 and would have been quite possible in the Greek play.

The new topic in 620, trouble with the servants, is one which features briefly in *Mercator*, Act 4, scene 3, 716, *num quid delinquent rustici?*, and 718, *quid autem urbani deliquerunt?*, a natural theme in either a Greek or Roman context. But the refrain with variations, *nugas agis ... nugas agis ... nugas agis ... nunc tu non nugas agis ... em rusum nunc nugas agis*, is a favourite device in Plautus. The refrain *surge amator, i domum* in the *Asinaria* finale (921–25) is without variations, but we may compare *Mo.* 975–79, *aiio ... aiio ... aiio ... non aiio ... neque istuc aiio*, or the supreme example in *Rud.* 1270–78, in which eleven replies of *censeo* (with comment) are followed by two frustrating negatives.

From 625 to 637 the dialogue runs easily. Menaechmus' attempts at blandishment are rejected; the parasite maliciously urges on the wife and taunts his former patron. His reference to the feast in 629–30 naturally drives Menaechmus into genuine denial. It is part of the comedy of the scene that he should be accused both of offences he has committed and those he has not. The false accusations give him confidence to deny those that are true and contribute to deny those that are true and contribute to the accumulation of bewilderment which he is to suffer from now on until the resolution of the plot in the finale. The pattern of his denials, “neque edepol ego prandi neque hodie huc intro tetuli pedem. / :: tun negas? :: nego hercle uero” (630–31) and “quin ut dudum diuorti aps te, redeo nunc demum domum” (635), recalls a passage in the central confrontation scene of the *Amphitruo*: “tun me heri aduenisse dicis? :: tun te abiisse hodie hinc negas? / nego enim vero, et me aduenire nunc primum aio ad te domum ... neque edepol dedi neque dixi” (758–62). Again, the similarity is natural in the context, and need not imply any Plautine reminiscence of his own earlier work.

With 637, *omnia hercle uxori dixi*, Peniculus has reached his trump card, but he has to play it twice; indeed the ensuing passage contains a much more serious repetition:

PE. omnia hercle uxori dixi. ME. quid dixisti? PE. nescio, eam ipso roga. ME. quid hoc est, uxor? quidnam hic narravit tibi? quid id est? quid taces? quin dicis quid sit? MA. quasi tu nescias. palla mihi est domo surrupta. ME. palla surrupta est tibi? (639a) MA. me rogas? ME. pol haud rogem te, si

sciam. PE. o hominem malum, ut dissimulat! non potes celare: rem nouit probe. omnia hercle ego edictaui. ME. quid id est? MA. quando nil pudet neque uis tua voluntate ipse profiteri, audi atque ades. et quid tristis <sim> et quid hic mihi dixerit, faxo scias. palla mihi est domo surrupta. ME. palla surruptast mihi? [637–45]

Peniculus' remark in 637 and Menaechmus' feigned questions do bring on a crisis at 639a (the wife declares the theft of the mantle), but it collapses in the feeble witticisms of 640, "me rogas? : : pol haud rogem te si sciam," which are so reminiscent of 606, and Peniculus has to renew the attack (642). Again Menaechmus is blandly innocent, and his wife is goaded into her virtuoso speech—in a tragic tone marked by the doublets "*audi atque ades* (643) et *quid tristis sim et quid hic mihi dixerit*," and culminating in the identical phrase, "*palla mi est domo surrupta*."

What has happened? Lindsay's suggestion (639a in app. crit.) that 639a is a substitute verse designed to eliminate 640–45 must fail, since 639a could not conceivably be followed by 646. On the face of it 637–41 serve no purpose; the passage is mere patchwork. Not only in 637, *omnia hercle uxori dixi*, repeated in 642, but the parasite gets the same type of answer from Menaechmus, *quid dixisti* (637) = *quid id est* (642). Lines 638–40 recall 606, and 626, "dic mea uxor quid tibi aegre est"; (639) *quasi tu nescias* and (640–41) "o hominem malum, / ut dissimulate" repeat the themes of 608–9, "te scire oportet : : scit, sed dissimulat malus." But this patchwork can be parcelled, and *Mo.* 548–52 features the very same repetition as 637–42:

numquid dixisti de illo quod dixi tibi?
 : : dixi hercle uero omnia : : ei misero mihi metuo ne techinae meae perpetuo perierint.
 : : quid tute tecum? : : nihil enim, sed dic mihi dixtine quaeso? : : dixi inquam ordine omnia.

Here the motive for the repetition would seem to be line 550: the favourite idea of the slave's *techinae (doli)*, a Greek word used as only Plautus would use it, in glorification of slave cunning. *Dixi omni* must be repeated to renew the dialogue, and it is a phrase which in most contexts could naturally be repeated for emphasis. On the other hand 639a, "*palla mihi est domo surrupta*," is unpardonable when it forestalls the proper climax of 645. Leo excises it as an interpolation, designed to fill a lacuna arising after 638.⁵ Whatever the cause, the line is surely not Plautine.

5 On the lacuna, cf. Ribbeck, *op. cit.*, 540. Without 639a *quasi tu nescias* and *me*

Plautus' love of the immediate joke often causes inconsequences of dialogue and repetitions at the expense of the action; but there is no humour at any level to be derived from 639a, and its effect on what follows is disastrous. Without 639a, our scene is repetitious, but reasonably effective until 645. But Menaechmus does not respond to the gravity of the situation, and the level returns to near farce. Echoing his wife's *mihi ... surrupta*, he provides Peniculus with the excuse for a witticism; "if it had been stolen from you it would not be safe (at the embroiderer's)".⁶ Menaechmus turns away from him, and with the resumptive *sed tu quid ais* returns to his wife, giving her a cue for her second denunciation (the third in the text of our MSS).

This phrase, *sed ... quid ais*, is frequently used by Plautus to return to the main course of a dialogue after one of his digressions. A typical instance is *Merc.* 487–92. Eutychus and Charinus want to buy a slave girl. The question is one of money. *Unde erit?* (487) is answered by a Plautine mythological extravagance, "Anchillem orabo aurum ut mihi det Hector qui expensus fuit," and further jokes; then Eutychus returns to the subject, "iam tace; / sed quid ais? unde erit argentum quod des?" Other, larger digressions are resumed with *sed quid ais* at *Am.* 620, *Cas.* 252, *Ep.* 29. Here then the dialogue has wandered; it is no further advanced at 648, and Menaechmus' reply *quis eam surrupuit?* would have been better following 645 immediately. Even now Menaechmus equivocates, and his feeble parryings from 648–53 are only designed to provoke the wordplay "tu tu istic inquam :: vin adferri noctuam / quae 'tu tu' usque dicat tibi? nam nos iam defessi sumus." This splendid pun can only have arisen in Latin—no owl ever cried *sou sou*—and points to the probability that at least from 651, *quis is Menaechmust?*, the material is Plautine innovation. Thus the lines between the wife's grand denunciation in 645 and Menaechmus' passionate oath are largely Plautine expansion. Where little more was required than the equivalent

rogas have to form one speech. But *me rogas?*, *rogasne?*, etc., are never preceded by any phrase in Plautus except an indirect question, and *quasi tu nescias* itself follows the phrase which it qualifies in the two similar instances at *Cas.* 333, *Cist.* 480. There is the further difficulty that "pol hau rogem te si sciam" does not answer *me rogas*, but is a fair retort to *quasi tu nescias*. This is a point in favour of assuming the unusual turn of phrase, and taking "quasi tu nescias me rogas!" as one speech without benefit of lacuna.

6 I take it that the point of Peniculus' jibe is that he saw Menaechmus (the Syracusan) take the mantle to the embroiderer's, and knows it is not yet in Erotium's hands, but can be safely recovered. See Leo, app. crit. on 646.

of “*palla surruptast tibi? quis eam surripuit :: tu :: quis arguit? :: ego-met :: et ego, atque huic amicae detulisti Erotio,*” Plautus has turned the confrontation into anticlimax by delaying Menaechmus’ surrender.

From 655, the scene runs a smooth and uninterrupted course. The solemn oath which Menaechmus has already used so trivially at 616 is appropriate and dramatic here,⁷ and made richer by the feeble pretext that he only lent the mantle. He suffers a curtain lecture (658–60) and is warned that he will not be received at home without the mantle. Peniculus also gets a fit return for his double dealing: when he asks the wife for his reward, she turns him away with an empty promise instead of a full meal; and he leaves the stage and the play, conscious that he has lost his position in that household forever. Menaechmus stays behind, still confident of better treatment from Erotium, but scene 3 rapidly destroys his hopes, and then end of the act is the nadir of his fortunes.

It may be advisable after this discursive analysis to recapitulate what seems to have been Plautus’ technique in creating this scene. Our story of the comparative material suggests that 601–26 form an independent, if undistinguished, Plautine creation, freely adapting ideas that occurred later during the action of the original and introducing humorous material of his own. Certain elements—the parasite’s support of the wife and contradiction of Menaechmus, Menaechmus’ falsely innocent questions, even his assumption (620 ff.) that it is the household which has offended his wife—are likely to have occurred in the Greek play. So also are Menaechmus’ attempts at blandishment and his rebuff (626–28). The parasite’s accusations over the feast consumed by the Syracusan Menaechmus and Menaechmus’ denials are essential, as is Peniculus’ declaration that he has told the wife all and that Menaechmus can gain nothing by concealment (640–42). This must have led to a grand denunciation (of 642–45), followed by a brief attempt at denial by Menaechmus and his final absurd perjury and capitulation (655 ff.) to the wife’s verdict dismissing the parasite and excluding her husband. It is not possible to estimate what embellishments the Greek play provided around this basic narrative, but we have seen some aspects of the Plautine treatment: anticipation of material at 607, 611, 616; intru-

7 Leo is surely assuming the ethos of Menander rather than of Plautus, in regarding 655–56 as interpolated because Menaechmus’ oath would be ungentlemanly and his wife’s retort would seem foolish. The humour of 657 depends on the solemnity of the preceding oath, and it could hardly follow *egon dedi* without some intervening qualification by Menaechmus.

sive wordplay at 609–10, 617–19, 645–47, 651–54; the refrain motif from 620–25.

Most of these identifiable Plautine features, while detracting from the main action with digressions and anticipations of the desirable climax, add considerably to the immediate comedy. Peniculus in particular, the least respectable of the characters, gains most from the Plautine innovations; the wife on the other hand is thrust into the background, except at the actual climax where she must be allowed to hold the stage (642–45 and 658–60) and in the two passages (620–25 and 649–54) where Plautus has provided her with humorous material. Thus the free and expanded treatment in the first part of the scene and in the interlude between the wife's challenge and Menaechmus' surrender, together with the greater prominence allowed to a subsidiary character, provides a natural explanation of the lack of continuity and balance for which this scene is conspicuous.⁸

8 I am greatly indebted for Professor G. W. Williams for his many valuable suggestions which helped me to set this narrow problem in a wider context.

2. The Madman and the Doctor

Part I Which is the mad man?

It is in the nature of identity comedies that much of their humour comes at the expense of straight characters when they suffer cognitive dissonance, that is, they are unable to decipher conflicting phenomena. Baffled by apparent contradictions or duplications they may be accused of being crazy by others who have not shared their experience. So in Plautus three comedies of switched identity, two of them relatively serious, use the motif of insanity to reconcile appearance with facts. It may be no coincidence that none of these plays, *Amphitryo*, *Captivi* and *Menaechmi*, is a standard family-based comedy set in bourgeois Athens, and none of them is motivated by a comic trickster in the usual sense.

In *Amphitryo*, certainly, Mercury has warned the audience that he and his father Jupiter are impersonating the humans Sosia and his master Amphitryo: only Sosia meets his double, leaving Amphitryo to be confused and finally panicked by discovering that a Doppelgänger has been enjoying his bed and board: his situation is very much that of the resident *Menaechmus* in our play, except for his indifference or hostility to his wife.

In *Captivi* the impersonation is more subtle. It is not a visible, physical, impersonation but a social identity which the two captives from Elis have exchanged so that the master Philocrates may escape home without paying a ransom, while his slave Tyndarus bravely stays captive in his place. The crisis comes when the new master Hegio finds another Elean gentleman, Aristophontes, who knows Philocrates, and brings him to meet his supposed friend: neither Tyndarus nor Aristophontes is deceived about identities, but Tyndarus' only hope is to maintain his false identity by alleging that Aristophontes is demented; initially he even succeeds in convincing Hegio, but as we shall see later, Aristophontes is too sincere and too thorough in unmasking the slave for Hegio to remain deceived: this "mad scene" is unlike like the mad-scene of *Menaechmi* because the schemer does not have to feign his own madness, but that of his adversary. Both plays contain elements

in common with *Menaechmi* and we shall return to them for comparative purposes.

Real madness has no place on the comic stage, and accusations of madness have only a limited potential for humour. With *Menaechmi*, however, the comedy derives not from impersonation, but from actual visual doubles; the prologue informs the audience that the well-informed bachelor twin has come to Epidamnus in search of his lost brother, when he inadvertently stumbles into his brother's double life. First the playwright sets up the world of the married Menaechmus, whose marital home occupies one side of the stage, while that of his mistress Erotium occupies the other. His double life involves him, and will involve his brother, with representatives of both his legitimate and his surreptitious life: the wife from whose home he exits as the action begins, and her aged father brought from offstage in Act 3, and his mistress's cook Cylindrus and maid. But the real trouble will only start for the brothers when a third element in the resident's life, his parasite, believes he has been cheated of a meal at Erotium's place, and informs on the resident to his wife. As for the bachelor Menaechmus, he has only one associate, his good slave Messenio, who will disappear early in the action without really meeting any of the local figures until the play is ready for its denouement.

The motif of madness, however, develops from the early scene when the bachelor is mistaken for his brother by the "other woman", Erotium's, cook and urged to go in to her. The scene is built around a symmetry between the first half when the bachelor Menaechmus thinks this stranger must be crazy to tell him he is expected, and talk about his parasite: yet he knows his name, Menaechmus, so he offers the fellow the price of a piglet to sacrifice for his sanity

responde mi,
adulescens, quibus hic pretiis porci veneunt
sacres sinceri :: nummis :: nummum a me accipe,
iube te piari de mea pecunia,
nam equidem insanum esse te certo scio
qui mihi molestus homini ignoto, quisquis es. (287–93)

But when Menaechmus claims he was never in Epidamnus before, affirms he does not live next door and curses whoever it is who does live there, the cook declares aside that he must be mad to curse himself:

Atque audin, Menaechme :: quid uis? :: si me consulas
nummum illum quem mihi dudum pollicitus dare –

nam tu quidem hercle certo non sanu's satis
 Menaechme, qui nunc ipse maledicas tibi –
 iubeas, si sapias porculum adferri tibi. (310–314)

The motif is more productive when Erotium herself accost the visiting Menaechmus and invites him in: his dinner is ready just as he ordered it, so he should come right in and recline with her. She does not stop when he asks her who on earth she is, and he again assumes she must be crazy; *certo haec mulier aut insana aut ebria est*, Messenio (373).

Messenio even tries to question her: where did she meet Menaechmus? But although he still thinks she must be crazy when she declares that he brought her his wife's gown as a gift, she is calling him by his correct name—the name he shares with his unknown brother—so he decides to humour her and enjoy what she has to offer. She in turn is confused by his talking about the ship he came in, but nothing is gained when she identifies him by his birthplace and patronymic: they are correct. Overriding Messenio's anxieties he dismisses him and goes in to enjoy his brother's paid up pleasures. As he emerges replete with food and sex from her house he is first greeted by his brother's parasite, who has arrived too late for the promised meal and is now determined to get his revenge (469–73): after repeating the dialogue pattern of the encounter with Cylindrus Menaechmus accuses him too of insanity:

tuum parasitum non nouisti? :: non tibi
 sanum est adulescens sinciput <ut> intellego ... (505–6)
 neque ego hercle uxorem habeo, neque ego Erotio
 dedi nec pallam surripui; satin sanus es? ... (509–10)
 tun me indutum fuisse pallam praedicas?
 :: ego hercle uero. :: non tu abis quo dignus es
 aut te piari iube homo insanissime. (515–17)

It looks as though the routine will be repeated when Erotium's maid appears to give him some jewelry to have remodelled. But this time he plays along and graciously accepts the bracelet. The bachelor Menaechmus deliberately discards his dinner wreath on the left and leaves (right) to look for Messenio, having turned three of these four encounters to a profit.

While the visiting Menaechmus goes offstage to look for his slave Messenio, everything he has done comes back to haunt his married brother. The parasite has denounced him to his wife, and Erotium is disappointed of the gown, so the resident Menaechmus finds himself *exclusissimus* (698), kicked out of both his home and his mistress's place. Inevitably, when the visiting Menaechmus returns still clutching the stolen

gown, his brother's wife treats him as her offending husband, and answers his denials by summoning her father to ask for a divorce. Once again he protests that he knows neither of them: if he has ever set foot in her house where she lives, may he be the most wretched of all wretched men. Predictably again he is accused of insanity for denying that he ever lived in his own home

sanun es, qui istuc exoptes aut neges te unquam pedem
in eas aedes intulis<se> ubi habitas, insanissime?

Like the others the old man assumes Menaechmus is just joking, but this time the charge triggers a new dramatic twist. As the matron points to his discoloured and glittering eyes Menaechmus gets the idea of faking madness to drive them away—a ploy unique in Roman comedy.

Matrona: Uiden tu illic oculos uirere? ut uiridis exoritur colos
ex temporibus atque fronte, ut oculi scintillant, uide!

Menaechmus II:

quid mihi meliust quam, quando illi me insanire praedicant,
ego med adsimulem insanire, ut illos a me apsterream? (831–2)

Matrona: ut pandiculans oscitatur! quid nunc faciam, mi pater?
Senex: concede huc mea nata, ab istoc quam potest longissime.

Menaechmus: Euhoe atque euhoe Bromie, quo me in siluam uenatum
uocas? (835)

audio, sed non abire possum a his regionibus,
ita illa me ab laeua rabiosa femina adseruat canes.
poste autem ilinc hircus +alus+, qui saepe aetate in sua
perdidit civem innocentem falso testimonio.

... Ecce Apollo mihi ex oraclo imperat
ut ego illis oculos exuram lampadi[bu]s ardentibus ... (840–41)

..... Enim haereo
ni occupo aliquid mihi consilium, hi domum me ad se auferent.
pugnis me uotas in huius ore quicquam parcere,
nei a meis oculis apscedat in malam magnam crucem.
faciam quod iubes, Apollo ... (846–50)

hau male illanc amoui; <amoueam> nunc hunc impurissimum,
barbatum, tremulum Tithonum, qui cluet Cygno patre Titanum MSS,
Priscian

ita mihi imperas ut ego huius membra atque ossa atque artua
comminuam illo scipione quem ipse habet ... (853–6)

Faciam quod iubes; securim capiam ancipitem atque hunc senem
osse fini dedolabo assulatim uiscera ... (858–9)

old goat, he has spent his life ruining citizens with perjured evidence. In fact *Menaechmi* is a play with a high incidence of socio-political allusions: Peniculus was delayed by being caught up in an assembly; Menaechmus I was delayed by having to speak on behalf of a client (this could indeed be Roman). We might compare Lysidamus' grievance at the time wasted in serving as sponsor (*aduocatus*) for a friend in *Casina* 563–73. The slur of giving false witness recalls the citizen witnesses of *Poenulus* (Alexis' *Karchedonios*).

Now Menaechmus switches to Apolline possession: first he claims that Apollo's oracle is ordering him to burn out the woman's eyes with blazing torches; but when the father-in-law announces that he will leave to fetch strong slaves to carry Menaechmus off, it is not clear how Menaechmus hopes to avert the risk of seizure: he probably redirects his threatened assault against her father (taking *huius* in *huius ore* as masculine), perhaps cutting off the old fellow from his hoped for exit to his house. From describing Apollo's command in third person (840 *imperat*) Menaechmus now addresses himself (848) to the god. Both the old man and his daughter are equally frightened, and the ploy by which she hurries off-stage urging him to keep watch over Menaechmus (851 *adserua istunc mi pater*) will be repeated with variations at 954 *adserua tu istunc, medice*. Because she has fled, it seems the old man's opportunity to go and fetch slaves has evaporated, but Menaechmus continues to threaten him, and we should imagine the old man retreating as Menaechmus advances. It is unlikely that Menaechmus actually lays hands on him although he pretends the god is telling him not to spare his fists on the old man in case he get away—to damnation. Once the wife has fled (851–2), he concentrates on the old fellow in an absurd mix of epic and comic language: at 837 in keeping with Bacchic confusion of human and animal life, he had been a (stinking) he-goat; at 854 Menaechmus turns to epic diction and allusion. With Leo and Questa I would read this as an allusion to the helpless decrepitude of Tithonus: it is immaterial that Tithonus was a Trojan prince, not begotten of any of the known warriors called Cycnus; the name Cycnus simply evokes Tithonus' hoary gray hair at e.g. *Homeric Hymn to Aphrodite* 228–30. The visiting Menaechmus' mythological lore is as random as were his earlier retorts to the wife that he knew her father as little as Calchas or Porthaon (745, 748)—it will be useful to compare the language of Tyndarus' mythological allusions when he repudiates Aristophontes in *Captiui* 562–3. Menaechmus' threats may be followed by gestures, but certainly not actual violence, as he pretends to listen to

Apollo ordering him to beat the old man to a pulp (notice the multiple elision of *membr(a) atqu(e) oss(a) atqu(e) artua/comminu(am) illo scipione*) with his own stick: he must seem to assault the old fellow, but make sure that the other performer can duck out of his reach.

I mentioned Tyndarus in *Captivi*: it is time to recall just how he tries to discredit the Elean Aristophontes when this old friend of Philocrates is brought to meet him: he claims Aristophontes was known to be crazy back home in Elis: he chased his father and mother with spears, and suffered fits (548–9). As Aristophontes is naturally indignant Tyndarus treats his anger as a sign of growing madness: see how he is glaring (*inimico uoltu*) and his frenzy is swelling up (*gliscit rabies*)! Still masquerading as Philocrates Tyndarus now declares in a climax of invention that this man is no more his old friend than the madmen Alcmaeon and Orestes and Lycurgus: *et quidem Alcumeus et Orestes et Lycurgus postea / una opera mihi sunt sodales qua iste* (562–3): then returns to imagining the man's physical symptoms, his burning eyes, (just as the matron imagined them in *Menaechmi*) and the discoloured blotches that are appearing all over his body, proof that he is being upset by black bile (594–6). In a later reprise of tragic allusions he even compares Aristophontes to Ajax (615).

Although, like Tyndarus, Menaechmus is clearly running out of ideas, (*enim haereo*, 846) he keeps up the serial instructions from the god; now he will snatch up a two-headed axe (note the assonance of *securim capi(am) ancipitem*) and batter the old fellow's inwards down to the bone in smithereens: word accent and ictus coincide to mimic the blows falling in each foot, with hiatus at the diaeresis; *ósse fíni dédólábo ássulátim úiscera*. (Can this be an echo of Clytemnestra?) As a climax he pretends (862) that the god has told him to yoke horses and mount his chariot to trample down the decrepit, smelly, toothless old creature. The language and meter heightens with the anaphora and tricolon crescendo and multiple resolutions of 865, *iá(m) adstit(i) in cúrrum, iám lora téneo //*, *iám stimúlus in manust*, and in 866–7 the trochaic verse becomes increasingly infected with dactylic rhythms; *ágite e/quí faci/tóte /sónitus //* *úngul/ár(um) app/áreat: cúrsu /céleri / fácit(e) inf/léxa //* *sít pe/dúm pern/icitas*. Of course Menaechmus *has* no chariot, and if he is charging across the stage like a man on a hobbyhorse he must somehow stop himself, or be stopped, as Achilles is stopped by Athena in *Iliad* I and Herakles by a rock in Euripides' *Herakles Mainomenos*: when he imagines being jerked by his hair from the chariot (like Troilos, or just like a professional charioteer?) it would seem he pretends to be un-

seated from behind. No editor interprets this as an actual assault from the rear; either Menaechmus actually loses control and trips or he deliberately throws himself down, faking a fit (cf. *illi derepente tantus morbus incidit*) in order to bring the scene to an end. His last words as he falls maintain the fiction of acting under divine orders—the supposed attacker is “overthrowing or countermanding your command and decree, O Apollo.”

It is enough to convince the old man, who leaves the madman prone on the ground as he goes to fetch a doctor.

Where did this scene come from? As feigned madness it has no parallel; as madness it echoes a number of famous cases. To recognize and enjoy paratragedy Plautus’ audience must have been familiar with tragedy itself, so we turn to the tragic madmen listed by Tyndarus: Orestes and Lycurgus are classic examples of victims of Apollo and Bacchus, just as Orestes and Pentheus, with whom Virgil compares the demented Dido in *Aeneid* 4.468–73. Alcmaeon is a less obvious model, and may for that very reason be a pointer towards the Roman tragedy *Alcmeo* of Ennius. Obviously we do not know the date of *Menaechmi* and cannot even prove that Ennius put his drama on stage before Plautus’ death in 184; Ennius lived and wrote tragedies for another fifteen years. But the hallucination scene of Alcmaeon was famous, and is cited repeatedly by Cicero. Here as quoted in *De Oratore* 3.217, *aliud metus, demissum et haesitans et abiectum* is Alcmeon’s voice of fear, low-pitched and tremulous with terror:

multis sum modis circumuentus, morbo exilio atque inopia,
tum pauor sapientiam omnem exanimato expectorat
alter (mater?) terribilem minatur uitae cruciatum et necem
quae nemo est tam firmo ingenio et tanta confidentia
quin refugiat timido sanguen atque exalbescat metu.

(16–20, fr. XIV Jocelyn)

I am encircled and trapped in many ways by sickness, exile, and poverty; then terror drives all wisdom from my panicked breast. The other one / my mother threatens a dreadful living torment and death: no man is so strong of spirit and firm of confidence that his blood does not drain from him in fright at these things, and he grows white with fear.

(This passage seems to be a favourite with Cicero who has already quoted it earlier in *De Oratore* 3.154 and will return to it in *Fin.* 4.62 and 5.31, also *Tusc.* 4.19.) In the *Academica*, when Cicero is discussing the role of the mind in distinguishing vision from delusion he returns to Alcmaeon, contrasting these words of the despairing but sane Alc-

maeon with his hallucinations, cast in monody. Cicero's interlocutor has claimed at *Acad.* 2.52 that when madmen begin to rave they say that something unreal seems to be happening, and when they are restored to normal they utter those words of Alcmaeon: "my heart in no way agrees with the sight of my eyes:"

sed mihi neutiquam cor consentit cum oculorum aspectu (*Joc.* 21)

Cicero himself corrects this claim at *Acad.* 2.88. 'You said that the things seen by men asleep or drunken or mad were weaker than things seen by men awake, sober and sane? How can this be so? When Ennius woke up he did not say he had seen Homer, but that it seemed as if he had. But Alcmeon declares "my heart in no way agrees," etc. (2.89) What about madmen? Doesn't your own example of Alcmeon once his madness has been roused, speak like this:'

unde haec flamma oritur? ("Where has this flame sprung from?") (*Joc.* 22), and later:

"+ incede incede + adsunt, me expetunt: ("come, come, they are at hand, they are attacking me") (*Joc.* 23)

What about when he begs the maiden's help? Do you doubt that he thinks he sees these things?

fer mi auxilium, pestem abige a me,
flammiiferam hanc uim quae me excruciat,
caeruleae incinctae igni incedunt,
circumstant cum ardentibus taedis ... (*Joc.* 24–27)
intendit crinitus Apollo
arcum auratum luna innixus
Dianam facem iacit a laeua ... (*Joc.* 28–30 ; = fr XV)

Bring me aid, drive this plague from me, this firebearing force that torments me; they come blue-gray and girdled with fire, they stand around me with burning torches. Long-tressed Apollo stretches his gilded bow leaning on its crescent, while Diana hurls a torch from the left.

"How could Alcmaeon," says Cicero, "be any more convinced of these things if they were real than he was because they seemed to be. Clearly his heart and eyes are in agreement." Alcmaeon's hallucinations share with Menaechmus' opening lines the torches and the blocking of stage action, setting Diana, like the bitch-wife, on the left.

But Menaechmus' recurring visions are too varied to be traced to this single source.

If Plautus were simply adapting a feigned mad-scene from a Greek comic dramatist who relished spoofing Greek tragedy, such as the rather sensational Diphilus, it is difficult to imagine that the Greek scene would be so miscellaneous. As Ekkehard Stärk points out in his *Die Menaechmi des Plautus und kein griechisches Original*, such a potpourri of gods is alien to the Greek theatre; each madman should have only one divine persecutor (p.107). There is another problem. Menaechmus' fake hallucinations, like Alcmaeon's real hallucinations, are put before us on stage. If we review the mad scenes that have come down to us from Greek tragedy, leaving aside the *Bacchae*, since Pentheus' madness is prurient rather than violent in the way needed here, we note that Sophocles does not introduce Ajax until he has recovered from his mad violence: but Euripides does offer treatment of madness in two plays about Orestes and one about Heracles. In none of these plays does the hero's dementia set in on stage. When Orestes' intermittent madness sent by the Erinyes is described by the shepherd messenger in *Iphigenia in Tauris*, and by Electra in Euripides' *Orestes*, they quote excerpts from his deranged speech, but he is not shown maddened on stage. Nor is the maddened Heracles, whose actions come far nearer to the pretended violence of Menaechmus. It is a messenger who describes and quotes the hero's hallucinated offstage attacks on his wife and children, preceded by his delusion that he is mounting his chariot to travel to Argos for a victorious attack on Eurystheus and his family. Heracles himself does not return to the stage until he is brought in collapsed and exhausted. But exactly this "delusion," that he is mounting his chariot, is shared by Menaechmus, and takes the same form.

865 iam adstiti in currum, iam lora teneo, iam stimulus in manust (Leo's text)

Eur. *Her.* 947–49 ἐκ τοῦδε βαίνων ἄμαρτ' οὐκ ἔχω ἔχειν
ἔφασκε δίφρου τ' εἰσέβαινεν ἄντυγα
κᾶθεινε, κέντρῳ δῆθεν ὥς θείων χερσί

Next, mounting a chariot, which he did not have, he declared he had it and stepped to the rim of the plate and struck as if he had a goad in his hand

Where the details of Heracles' madness differ most from *Menaechmus'* counterfeit is in the constant changing of imagined setting, as he sets out for the Isthmus, wrestles and holds a victory feast, then goes onward to Mycenae to kill Eurystheus. And this is where we must draw on yet another Plautine comedy for parallel material. In *Mercator* Charinus, deprived, as he thinks, of his beloved who may have been shipped over-

seas, utters a ritual farewell to his family home, then puts on a performance before his friend Eutychus of his supposed departure into exile in quest of the beloved. Is he deluded? Or indulging in fantasy? Scholars differ, but his more or less instant recovery suggests it is mere controllable fantasy. Here then is the content of his fantasy: from 852–63 he is his own groom and attendant, resolved to search for her over river and mountain, winter and summer, night and day; rebuffing Eutychus' offer to accompany him he claims to be in haste to leave before sunset. Eutychus plays along (874–80) but as if Charinus were now on shipboard; "the wind is favourable from this direction, change your course, I see a great storm coming but there is sunshine on the left, the gods order you to turn this way!" After a lot of by-play, when Charinus hears that the girl-friend is safe in his friend's house, he is almost ready to give up his travels, but when denied instant access to the girl resumes his fantasy at 921, snatching up the (imaginary) travelling cloak and discarding his town cloak to the (imaginary) slave. Now he has his (imaginary) sword (*machaera*) in hand and his oil flask; he is ready to set off again and curses his own delay (929–30) sending the (imaginary) slave into the house,

iam in currum escendi, iam lora in manus cepi meas (931)

Now I have mounted the chariot, now I have taken the reins in my hands.

Charinus has not given up yet; instead he describes himself reaching Cyprus, then going on to Chalcis, where he sees a guest friend from Zacynthus who tells him that his girl-friend is right here in Athens, so he embarks on shipboard and sets out straight away; now he is home again, returned from exile. At this point finally the threads of fantasy are fused with fact as he greets Eutychus as if he had been long away. Eutychus can only comment *Hic homo insanust!* "The fellow is crazy."

And are we supposed to believe Charinus is actually crazy, deranged? What mattered was not the psychological state of the character, but the actor's opportunity for flamboyant theatrical mimicry. In this respect Stark is right, *not* in denying a Greek model from which Plautus deviated, but in stressing Plautus' own theatrical initiative, and his positive motivation for these often inconsistent stage extravaganzas.

But is it sufficient to assume only one step between Greek tragedy and Plautine paratragedy? Why have I given so much attention to a scene outside *Menaechmi*, in a play derived from the playwright Philemon? Because the convergence of the chariot motif in *Mercator* and

Menaechmi with the messenger narrative from *Herakles* suggests to me that two stages of adaptation underlie this scene of ours. First a Greek comic playwright—let us say Philemon—adapted the narrative of Heracles' madness to the feigned madness of comedy, then Plautus made his version of the scene in *Mercator* (this is generally believed to have been an early play given the lack of cantica and its apparent faithfulness to Greek structure). Later, composing *Menaechmi*, he incorporated the chariot motif into the composite mad-scene along with reminiscences of Ennius' *Alcmaeon* and other Latin plays which no longer survive, in a kind of extravagant *contaminatio* of divine dementias.

But couldn't Plautus have drawn his scene directly from the *Heraclēs*? I see two or three obstacles. Firstly, there is no evidence that any Roman adapted the play of Heracles' madness before Seneca, although we have the celebrated Assteas vase from Paestum as evidence that his madness was staged in south Italy. Indeed the myth of his madness seems not to occur in Latin literature before the first century of the common era. It would seem out of the question that Plautus should actually search out a Greek tragic script to inspire his para-tragedy. Secondly Greek tragedy does not seem to have staged scenes of mad violence, but kept them off-stage, mediating them through messenger narratives. The only staged mad-scene I know of before Seneca is precisely the *Alcumeo* of Ennius. Was Roman drama already accustomed to present delusion and violence on stage in its first generation? This is where the allusions of *Captivi* seem to offer strong proof that the Roman audience already knew Alcmaeon and Orestes and Lycurgus (just as Virgil could assume his readers knew *demens* ... *Pentheus*, ... *aut Agamemnonius scaenis agitatus Orestes*, *Aen.* 4.469, 471).

We know nothing of Greek tragedies about Alcmaeon, Aeschylus and Sophocles' *Epigonoī*, or Sophocles' *Alkmeon*, or Euripides' two plays based on Alcmeon's wanderings after his matricide. (Agathon too wrote an *Alkmeon*, and the comic Antiphanes quotes Alcmaeon as a familiar hero of tragedy.) So there is nothing to suggest that any Greek tragedy had a scene corresponding to Alcmaeon's on-stage attack of madness. Whatever stood at this point in the original Greek comedy, I think we must assume Plautus' audience had developed a taste for mad-scenes from their experience of the Roman tragic stage; if not from *Alcumeo*, then from other tragedies now lost.

Part II The Doctor Scenes 5.3 and 5.5,
882–898 and 909–956

It is regrettable that so much of the scholarship spent on the “Doctor scene(s)” of *Menaechmi* has concerned itself with arguing either that Plautus has contaminated this scene into the action of the play from another Greek source, or that Plautus has invented the scene whole cloth. I consider that E. Woytek (“Zur Herkunft der Arztszene in den *Menaechmi* des Plautus,” *W. St.* 16 (1982) 165–82) has done more than enough to prove the futility of Steidle’s analytical objections to the nexus of scenes (“Zur Komposition von Plautus’ *Menaechmi*,” *Rh. M.* 114 (1971) 247–61), but I would also like to use Woytek’s arguments against Stark, who argues from the other end of the spectrum, that not only the scene but the whole play is Plautus’ own independent creation. Steidle and before him Gaiser (*ANRW* 1.2.1061) approached this question in terms of dramaturgy, using both a prioristic principles of structural symmetry and specific issues of entrance and exit to argue that Plautus’ Greek model moved from the old man’s threat to abduct Menaechmus with his slaves at 846 to the actual abduction at 990 f. Stark’s approach is to point, as I shall myself, to the Roman ingredients in the dialogue of the doctor first with the old man then with Menaechmus (but now the local resident Menachmus) as evidence that Plautus invented the scene. Following Woytek I believe that the play from its first conception needed a climax that would take the local Menaechmus from his domestic and erotic crises into public danger and the risk of confinement beyond his home territory: the doctor, a stranger to Menaechmus, is needed to generate this climax from which his brother’s faithful Messenio will rescue him. As to Plautus’ invention, I have never doubted it, but I beg to differ from Stark in arguing that Plautus created not the actual encounter with the doctor, but its Latin humour, substituting jokes that his Roman audience would understand for what was probably a parade of technical medical jargon.

The issue of medical scenes in Greek comedy offers a more general problem. We now have the doctor scene in Menander’s *Aspis*, but despite the existence of four lost Middle and New Comedies entitled *Iatros*, ascribed to Antiphanes, Aristophon, Philemon and Theophilos, there are only one or at most two fragments suggesting doctor interviews: Arnott’s very full commentary on Alexis fr. 142 can cite only one other fragment which may be from Epicharmus, as Turner cau-

tiously allows. To find semi-parodic doctor-speak, I can suggest only that we resort to Plato's Eryximachus in *Symposium*. And his diction and level of argument is certainly not one that could keep a Roman audience amused. Doctors in some ways resemble cooks, in that they have a technical apparatus which could be used to entertain, and we know, thanks to Athenaeus' many quotations that many playwrights of middle comedy did parade boastful cooks and their gastronomic lore: so did Plautus in staging the boastful cook in *Pseudolus*. But our lack of evidence for doctors in comedy may not simply be the result of Athenaeus' indifference to doctors. They differ from cooks, I would suggest, on the basis of *Aspis* and the Plautine title *Parasitus Medicus*, in that while Greek comedy featured real cooks, it may not have made fun of real doctors: instead many, if not most, "doctors" in comedy will have been impostors contributing to an intrigue.

It is also relevant that doctors were a recent innovation at Rome and foreigners an object of mistrust. Cassius Hemina (ap. Pliny *N. H.* 29.12–13) reports that the first physician to come to Rome was the Peloponnesian Archagathus, in 219 BCE who was given citizenship and a surgery at public expense; he seems to have been a surgeon, and a drastic one. Cato, who composed his own notebook (*commentarii*, 29.15) of household remedies warned his son against Greeks, against their writings but even more against their doctors. *Iurarunt inter se barbaros necare omnes medicina, et hoc ipsum mercede faciunt ut fides is sit et facile disperdant.* ("They have sworn a common oath to kill all barbarians with their medicine, and even this they do for a fee, to win credit and ruin men more easily.") Things had not changed much since Cato; two-hundred years later Pliny sees medicine as a sinister art which no Roman is willing to practice, with a mystique that gives prestige only to treatises written in Greek (29.17). Doctors are supremely suspect.

So let us pick up Plautus' comedy with the return of the old man at 881, complaining in noticeably heavy iambic senarii at the time he has to waste, first seated (in the doctor's clinic?) waiting for his return from a call, then in escorting back this fellow who walks like an ant (*formicinarum gradum*) and boasts of setting the broken limbs of Aesculapius (who is at least mortal) and Apollo himself. When the doctor speaks he starts by asking a most unmedical question: *num larvatus aut cerritus?* "Is the patient possessed by Ghouls or by Ceres?" (this was Sosia's suggestion – when Alcumena contradicted Amphitryo's expectations at *Amph.* 775–7 *quaeso etiam quin tu istanc iubes / pro cerritam circumferri ... nam haec quidem certe larvarum plenast!*) But then the doctor passes

from mental to physical illness, suggesting that the patient is suffering from lethargy or dropsy.

Now it will be part of my procedure to show that most of the material in this scene stems from popular Italian folk-medicine; thus both lethargy and dropsy occur in Catullus, (17.24 and 99.14) and Cicero's intimate letters: lethargy is an issue in Horace's *Sermones*: *fidis offendar medicis, irascar amicis / cur me funesto properent arcere ueterno* (*Epist.* 1.8.9–10), just as the choice of wine and medication by hellebore occur at *Sat.* 2.3.82 *danda est ellebori multo pars maxima auaris*, and 2.4.26–9 *leni praecordia mulso prolueris melius. si dura morabitur aluus, / mitulus et uiles pellent obstantia conchae / et lapathi brevis herba, sed alba non sine Coo*.

I have no suggestion for amending the doctor's next statement, apparently that he will take such great care that he utter sighs (*suspirabo*) more than six hundred times a day; it seems obvious that the verb needs replacing by a physical form of cure, like drawing blood. (Possibly *suscitabo*?) At least the old man recommends observation, the medical practice of *parateresis*.

From the local Menaechmus' soliloquy they learn only that he is most unhappy: but the doctor's first question *quor apertas brachium?* points to a gesture—perhaps he has raised his arm to heaven in despair?—and somewhat surprisingly claims that this gesture is very harmful to his sickness—a sickness which he had not yet diagnosed, but again with *quidni sentiam?* he seems to affirm expertise; this will take a whole field of hellebore. Why does Menaechmus challenge his first diagnostic question whether he drinks white wine or black? It is clear from Pliny's *Natural History* that investigation of drinking habits was expected as a preliminary to prescribing a cure for many illnesses (cf. 14.58, for medical advice on wine; 14.73, the recommendations of Erasistratus, 14.76 for a whole pamphlet on the choice of wines addressed to Ptolemy by Apollodorus, and Pliny's own recipe for invalids at 14.100). We learn from Pliny (14.80) that wine had four colours *albus*, *fuluus*, *sanguineus* and *niger*: but if it was normal to call wine *albus*, as Catius does in Horace (cited above), what we call red wine was always called *niger*, not *ater*; hence Menaechmus' jest about eating crimson, scarlet, or golden bread (luxury colours, incidentally the colours of Virgil's golden age rams). Scaly birds and winged fish are on an altogether different level of fantasy (916–18). *Deliramenta loquitur*, says the old man, as Amphitryon does in an early phase of the “Mad” scene with Alcumena (*Amph.* 696).

Like most ignorant people even now, the old man wants a “quick fix”, with something for the patient to drink (*aliquid potionis*) but the doctor is determined to go through his routine interrogation, and puts simple questions: Do his eyes turn hard on him? Do his innards growl? Does he get a good night’s sleep? These questions may have stood in Plautus’ model play, but they allow rude commonsense answers—“Do you think I am a lobster?” “Well, they don’t growl when I’m full but they growl when I’m hungry, and yes, I sleep right through the night if I’ve paid my creditors.” It is certainly possible that this exchange replaces something more technical and fanciful in the Greek play.

Now Menaechmus is provoked to anger, and as in the false mad-scene of *Captivi*, (592 *enimvero nequeo contineri*) the sane man’s rising anger is treated as a sign of madness setting in (916 *nunc homo insanire occipit*). When the old man accuses him of the words and behaviour of his twin brother, of calling his wife a mad bitch and threatening to ride him down with yoked chariot horses, this reinforces Menaechmus’ fury and he replies with a heap of absurd charges: “I know that you stole the sacred crown/garland from Jupiter and were imprisoned for it; that when you were released you were beaten on the *furca*, and I know you thrashed your father and sold your mother—*satin haec pro sano maledicta maledictis respondeo?*” (“Are these retorts to your insults good enough for a sane man?”) Here too we are dealing with Plautine commonplaces; for stealing Jupiter’s crown, compare the more explicit accusation of *Trin.* 85 *nam nunc si ego te surripuisse suspicer / Iovis coronam de capite ex Capitolio / qui in columine astat summo*. If it were not for *Trinummus* we might not understand that the suggestion is not just sacrilegious: it is all but impossible as a physical feat. This passage seems to build on the *Trinummus*: but the imprisonment and slave punishment are a new enhancement of the fantasy. And beating his father and selling his mother? This too is Plautine, part of the exchange of *maledicta* between young Calidorus and Ballio which begins at *Pseudolus* 355; *adsiste altrinsecus atque onera hunc maledictis*: after Calidorus has used up the social insults—*uerbero*, *bustirape*, *furcifer*, *sociofraude*, *parricida*, *sacrilege*, *periure* and *legirupa*, and several more ordinary accusations, we come to *uerberauisti patrem atque matrem*, answered cheerfully and in the same spirit as Menaechmus by “yes, and what’s more, I killed them, to save having to feed them!” *atque occidi quoque, potius quam cibum praehiberem* (367–8). In his lectures on *Pseudolus* Eduard Fraenkel used to remind us that Old Comedy at least delighted in such accumulated accusations;

both the slanging match between the Just and Unjust Arguments in *Clouds* 908 f., and Pheidippides' later abuse of his father at 1327 f., rise to the equivalent insult: *patraloias kai metraloias*. This at least, could as well be Greek as Italian. The old man is panicking, and it only remains for the doctor to wind up the interview; "have him brought to me," he says, repeating the hellebore motif, "I'll take care of him with a twenty day diet of hellebore." Ignoring Menaechmus' threats at 951, which are mere variations of 943 (*pendentem* recalls the *furca*, *fodiam stimulis* the notion of *caesum uirgis*) the doctor tells the old man to fetch attendants to drag him to the clinic, while the father-in-law in turn tells the doctor to keep an eye on him, but neither man wants to be left with the lunatic, and both leave at 956. Certainly the action has advanced no further than we expected when the father-in-law first volunteered to fetch attendants to carry Menaechmus home at 845, 847, but we have gained two things: whereas at 845 f. the visiting twin would have been dragged into his brother's home, the doctor has brought the situation out of the family and household into the public domain, making sure that either of the twins will have a chance to be rescued.

The last repercussions of the confusion come when the local Menaechmus, still lurking in the porch in hope of admission to his home at nightfall, apparently does not hear Messenio's soliloquy (966–989), nor is Messenio noticed by the old man, who does, however, spot his prey Menaechmus (990–996) and orders his attendants to seize his son-in-law. It remains for Messenio to rescue the man he believes is his master, and ask for his freedom as reward. Equally baffled by the unknown slave's behaviour and his family's accusations, the local Menaechmus makes one last attempt (1039–47) to reconcile the latest behaviour of a total stranger with the equally strange behaviour of his father-in-law and the doctor: *socer et medicus me insanum esse aiebant; quid sit mira sunt. / haec nihilo esse mihi uidentur setius quam somnia* (1046–7). He leaves the stage only once more, attempting this time to be admitted to Erotium's house, and is again thrown out; but this time his rescuer and his twin are both at hand and the action is finally resolved.

3. Philemon's *Thesaurus* as a Dramatization of Peripatetic Ethics

There is much to suggest that Menander's contemporary and rival Philemon was a dramatist of ideas, who won his many victories less because of his undeniable stage-craftsmanship than for the ethical appeal of his plays. The heavy moralising of the fragments need not be representative; we can blame this on Stobaeus' predilections:¹ more significant is the evidence of "Demetrius" *On Style* and Apuleius² that Philemon's plays were favourite reading; Demetrius tells us that because of their continuous, even, style they were read rather than performed in his time; Apuleius depicts Philemon himself reading a new play to a public gathering on the eve of his death. Apuleius praises Philemon for his *ioca non infra soccum, seria non usque ad cothurnum*; it may well have been the *seria* of his plays which won him the vote of respectable bourgeois judges over the more elusive psychology and subtler portrayal of human relations by his great rival.³

-
- 1 This point is answered by Jachmann, *Plautinisches und Attisches*, Berlin 1931, in the excellent appraisal of Philemon which opens his chapter on the *Trinummus* (225–228). Jachmann draws attention to fr. 94 and 213, for affinities with thought in the *Trinummus*. We might add 140–141, 164, 168, and 176 as evidence for Philemon's concern with benefactions; besides 94, 23 illustrates his rather inartistic explorations of moral paradoxes.
 - 2 Demetrius, Περὶ ἑρμηνείας 193, γραφικὴ δὲ λέξις ἢ εὐανάγνωστος. αὕτη δ' ἐστὶν ἡ συνηρτημένη καὶ οἷον ἡσφαλισμένη τοῖς συνδέσμοις. διὰ τοῦτο ... Φιλήμονα δὲ ἀναγινώσκουσιν. Apuleius Florida 16.63–64 credits Philemon with wit, well-turned intrigues, lucid recognition scenes, characters appropriate to the action, and, on the level of thought, *sententias uitae congruentes, ioca non infra soccum, seria non usque ad cothurnum*. Among the character types attributed to him the *patruus obiurgator*, the scolding uncle, confirms his taste for moralising in drama.
 - 3 The best discussion of Philemon in English is Webster, *Studies in Later Greek Comedy*, Manchester 1970, 125–151. Although his criticisms in the main echo Jachmann's assessment, he points some useful contrasts with Menander, drawing attention to the flatness of form in Philemon, his near repetition of words, his moralising (141), his elaboration of characters' sentiments beyond the requirements of the occasion, and failure to create dramatic situations which justify such self-analysis. His moralising "may be said to proclaim one

Of the three Plautine adaptations⁴ of Philemon, *Trinummus*, adapted from the *Thesauros*, stands apart. It is a peculiar play; the love affairs of the prodigal Lesbonicus, alleged cause of the dramatic crisis, are never specified, and instantly forgotten when his marriage is imposed in the resolution of the finale; the cast consists of four old men, all virtuous, two young men, (one “born middle-aged”) and one loyal slave; even their names, to suggest the Tropos of their owners.⁵ There is a dearth of comic roles, and the longest scenes of the play are all discussions of morality on a scale unparalleled in comedy except for Plautus' *Captivi*.⁶

real value, the value of friendship, but otherwise ... does not go beyond the polite commonplaces of Athenian society ... the speeches probably have more *êthos* and more *dianoia* than Middle Comedy” (150–151). In *Trinummus* while dialogue continues to represent these commonplace values, I believe Philemon reveals their inadequacy through the action; the situation, not the sentiments is the medium of his critical judgement. Webster's claim that Philemon's work is essentially comedy of caricature and extemporisation (151) seems to me false both to *Trinummus/Thesauros* and, if we follow his attribution, *Captivi/Aitolos*.

- 4 *Mercator* and *Trinummus* identify their originals in the prologues (*Merc.* 9, *Trin.* 18–19). The identification of *Mostellaria* with Philemon's *Phasma* was originally made by Leo in *Hermes* 18 (1883) 559, on the basis of *Mo.* 1149 and affinities with the two certainly attributed plays. See most recently Fuchs, *Mus. Helv.* 6, 106, n. 5.
- 5 Callicles means “of fair fame”, Lysiteles, “the profitable one”, Megaronides, “high in virtue”, and Stasimus, “Standfast”. K. Schmidt, “Griechische Eigennamen bei Plautus,” *Hermes* 37 (1902) 173–211, 353–390, shows that Callicles and Charmides are attested both in other comedies and in inscriptions; Stasimus, here only in comedy, occurs in several inscriptions; there is epigraphic evidence for Philto, not found elsewhere in comedy, and apparently without significance. Lysiteles, also attested epigraphically, is obviously significant; Schmidt quotes the epithet λυσιτελής applied to the good friend in e.g. Xen. *Mem.* 2.6.5. On Megaronides and Lesbonicus, named, not attested elsewhere, Schmidt argues for significant naming, associating Lesbonicus with the comic tradition of Lesbian profligacy (cf. λεσβίζειν, λεσβιάζειν) p. 372; Megaronides he sees as related to names like Meg-Aristos, and comments “der Name paßt vorzüglich auf unsern Alten” (374).
- 6 Compare Wilamowitz' trenchant criticism in: Menander, *Das Schiedsgericht*, Berlin 1925, p. 165, “Im Trinummus hat Philemon den Versuch gemacht, ernster, tiefer, Menandrischer zu werden, was unbefriedigend ausgefallen ist. Denn in ihm langweilt man sich selbst bei Plautus”, with his accompanying footnote comparing the *Captivi*.

With notable exception of Leo,⁷ scholars of this century have been substantially in agreement that Plautus, though he changed the title of the *Thesauros* to advertise the scene of the imposter, and slightly expanded the role of the slave, has retained the plot structure and articulation of scenes unchanged.⁸ Suspicion cast on the prologue by Wilamowitz, repeated by Jachmann, Körte⁹ and many others, was reaffirmed by Abel in his careful study of the Plautine prologues: yet I am still persuaded, with Leo and Webster,¹⁰ that the allegory of *Luxuria* as mother

7 *Geschichte der Römischen Literatur*, 1.116–117, Berlin 1913; compare Körte, *RE* XIX.2142, Jachmann *op. cit.* (n. 1), 244.

8 Fraenkel, *Elementi Plautini in Plauto*, Firenze 1960, notes the transformation of a brief monologue into Lysiteles' great canticum at 223 f. (53, 133), the expansion of Stasimus' comment at 538–555 (111) and the interpolation of a slave-monologue at 1008 f. (146–149).

9 Wilamowitz *op. cit.* (n. 6), 148; Jachmann, *op. cit.* (n. 1), 229–243, Körte, *RE* XIX.2143, K.-H. Abel, *Die Plautus-Prologe*, Diss. Frankfurt 1955, 19–25. Körte summarises the arguments against the Greek origin of the prologue; there are two main counts; the play has no anagnorisis or other problem requiring a prologue to inform the audience; the prologue we have does not even report the dramatic situation, but refers the audience to the opening dialogue of Megaronides and Callicles for the exposition.

10 Leo, *Plautinische Forschungen*, Berlin 1912, 202; Webster, *op. cit.* (n. 3), 140. Leo argued that *Trin.* 8–9 (*Plautus nomen Luxuriae indidit / tum hanc mihi gnatam esse voluit Inopiam*) merely reported the Latin names given to the Greek abstractions *Trouphê* and *Aporia*. His arguments and those of Webster, based on the appearance of Hera and Lyssa in Euripides' *Heracles* and of *Penia* in Aristophanes' *Plutos*, are reiterated by G. Hertel, *Die Allegorie von Reichtum und Armut*, Nürnberg 1969, 45–48. While it is likely, as Stoessl suggested (*RE* XXIII.2 s. v. Prologos 2401) that Philemon gave a more positive role to *Trouphê* and *Aporia* than survives in the Plautine prologue, he may have been content with a mere tableau; it is more likely that Philemon devised the personification than that Plautus should either have borrowed or invented the conception. I would add to the usual arguments four points: the increasing proportion of New Comedies now known to have had prologues; the use of such personifications in popular moral theory from Prodicus' *Heracles* at the cross-roads, as reported by Xenophon, to Cleanthes, who used a scenario of Pleasure, attended by the Virtues to show the folly of Epicureanism (Cicero, *De fin.* 2.21.69); the appearance of *Tryphe* personified, usually as a courtesan, in later Hellenistic art (vide G. Downey, *TAPA* 69 (1938) 260, 262) and the possible source of Philemon's scenario in an image of Menander, *Dysk.* 208–211 ὦ κάκιστ' ἀπολουμένη / Πενία, τί σ' ἡμεῖς τηλικούτ' ἐφεύρομεν; / τί τοσοῦτον ἡμῖν ἐνδελεχῶς οὕτω χρόνον / ἔνδον κάθησαι καὶ συνοικεῖς; Wilamowitz has suggested that Philemon was imitating Menander in this play; could he not have converted the verbal image of poverty as a concubine, into a stage-tableau?

of *Inopia*, is Philemon's conception, perhaps truncated, but not introduced by Plautus. The issue is indirectly important for the consideration of the ethical theme or themes of the play, because the prologue as we have it commits the playwright to a Lesbonicus ruined by *Luxuria*; if we acknowledge the prologue as essentially Philemon's, we must accept the profligacy of Lesbonicus as part of his original Greek *persona*.

As it is, the contradictions of his personality remain the most disputed aspect of the play. Thus while allusions in the body of the play led Leo to believe that Lesbonicus had in the *Thesauros* a love affair like that of Philolaches in *Mostellaria/Phasma*, and that Plautus—contrary to his usual practice—had suppressed this feature, Jachmann¹¹ saw the love-affairs as a general characteristic given to Lesbonicus by Philemon for the purpose of plot and character-contrast, but which Philemon failed to integrate into a credible personality. Wehrli,¹² writing in terms of tradition and innovation in plot-motifs, traced the contrasted pair Lysiteles/Lesbonicus back to the σώφρων and καταπύγων of Aristophanes, but gave no further scrutiny to Lesbonicus' role. Most recently Lehmann¹³ has taken the opposite approach, seeing the young man, not as a diluted version of the Aristophanic lecher, but as the pure ἄσωτος, in the sense defined by Aristotle at *E.N.* 1121 a 13 “der edle Verschwender im Sinne des Aristoteles, der immer gibt und nicht nehmen will”. He stresses the evidence in the play that Lesbonicus' impoverishment is due to misplaced generosity; for Lehmann the interest of the play lies in the Aristotelian meaning of ἐλευθεριότης, and he interprets the central acts as reflecting in successive dialogues the behaviour of the ἐλευθέριος contrasted with the two extreme types of ἀνελεύθερος and ἄσωτος. This thesis leads him to see the allusions to Lysiteles' love-affairs in the body of the play as Plautine distortion, beyond the intent of Philemon's characterization.¹⁴ It need hardly be said that such as inter-

11 *Geschichte der Römischen Literatur* 1.117 n. 2, criticized by Jachmann *op. cit.*, 242–243. Jachmann adds “Wirklich seiend ist diese Figur nicht, zu voller und runder Gestaltung, zu wahrhaftem Leben ist sie nicht geschaffen. So bleibt denn in dieser Hinsicht auch die Gestalt des Lesbonicus unanschaulich.”

12 F. Wehrli, *Motivstudien zur Griechischen Komödie*, Leipzig/Zürich 1936, 49, 99.

13 E. R. Lehmann, “Der Verschwender und der Geizige: Zur Typologie der Griechisch-Römischen Komödie,” *Gymnasium* 67 (1960) 73–90.

14 Lehmann argues from an aprioristic assumption that the Romans, thinking in terms of *frugalitas* and *parsimonia* rather than the subtler ideal of ἐλευθεριότης (*liberalitas*) could not understand the conception of ἄσωτία as excessive generosity; the dramatist therefore in adapting the play for the Roman audience had

pretation is not compatible with acceptance of the Greek origin of the prologue.

At first sight this problem of character interpretation might seem to have no bearing on the main theme of the *Thesauros*, the requirements and testing of friendship. Ribbeck¹⁵ recognized friendship as the theme of the play, and attributed New Comedy not only to its dramatic antecedents in Euripides' Orestes plays, but also to the influence of Aristotle and Peripatetic philosophy. Writing of Middle Comedy he says "in ihrer letzten Zeit entwickelte Aristoteles die Theorie der *philia* (Eth. Nicom. VIII, IX), und Menander und Philemon lasen Theophrasts Schrift wie sie erschien".¹⁶ The opening of *Trinummus* is one of his illustrations of such dramatised ethics.

Leo's hint at the philosophical stimulus to such dramatic themes was taken up by Zucker, "Die Freundschaftsbewährung in der Neuen Komödie,"¹⁷ who devoted half of his extensive discussion to the treatment of friendship in *Trinummus/Thesauros*, and its relationship to Aristotelian theory represented by books 8 and 9 of the *Nicomachean Ethics*. It is his valuable contribution to have pointed out the recurrence in New Comedy of what he calls "Die Kasuistik der Freundschaftsbetätigung in konkreten Situationen dramatisiert,"¹⁸ and examined this play as a representation of friendship put-to-the-test. But Zucker's aim of covering all varieties of *philia* took his focus away from *Thesauros* before he had fully explored the problems of the play, or its close affinity with Aristotelian precepts and aporetic.

In returning to his theme I would like to extend his discussion in four ways:

I. By a closer scrutiny of Act I in relation both to Aristotle and to the major crisis of Act 3. This will make clearer the conscious parallelism of

to import *luxuria*, substituting a vice which his audience could recognize (pp. 80–81). But if the emphasis on *frugalitas* in Lysiteles' canticum or his father's speeches, is Roman, it does not follow that the opposite vice, *luxuria* played no part in the characterization of the original. (See below, for a wider interpretation of the ἄσωτος, recognized by Aristotle and perfectly appropriate to the figure of Lesbonicus as we have it in Plautus.)

15 *Geschichte der Römischen Dichtung* 1.103 f.

16 *Plautinische Forschungen* 128.

17 *Berichte der Phil.-Hist. Klasse der Sächsischen Akademie der Wissenschaften*, 98/1, Leipzig 1950, 3–38.

18 p. 7.

the two dramatic confrontations, Megaronides/Callicles and Lysiteles/Lesbonicus.

II. By a re-examination of Act 3 scene 2, illustrating the popular attitudes which underly the morality practiced by Lysiteles and respected by Lesbonicus, and relating them to Aristotle's discussion of friendship, generosity, and the pursuit of honour. I will argue that the conflict in this scene between material generosity and the demands of honour upon the recipient is clearly foreshadowed, and only partly resolved in Aristotle's discussion of *eouergesia* in *E.N.* book 9.

III. By re-considering Lesbonicus' role. Is this a credible character? Why does Philemon give him the attributes of both a wastrel and a man of honour? Is his *persona* intelligible in terms of Aristotelian psychology? To what extent is this, as Zucker has suggested, the reason for the breakdown of the action in Act 3 scene 2, rather than a fundamental inadequacy in popular morality, based as it is on the pursuit of honour in various forms?

IV. By demonstrating the symmetry with which the play is constructed around affirmations of friendship and moral obligations. It will be argued that the architecture of the play is related to its moral issues rather than the modest and ineffectual intrigue of the old men.

It is tempting to raise a final question: is the ethical theme borrowed from philosophy to make interesting drama, or as an end in itself? If there is social criticism in Act 3, was the plot designed to produce it, or is it a by-product of the dramatic action?

The play presents different aspects of three friendships, all between honourable men; that of Callicles and the absent Charmides is, as it were, offstage—a matter of the pre-dramatic situation—but itself a provocation for the issue of friendship between Callicles and Megaronides. The other friendship central to the play is that of the young men Lysiteles and Lesbonicus.¹⁹

In Act 1 Megaronides' friendship for Callicles obliges him to reproach Callicles with his apparent betrayal of his absent friend. Megaronides opens the dialogue on his own terms of friendship: he is

19 Aristotle divides friendship according to several classifications: into the three categories of friendship for advantage, pleasure, or for the sake of virtue itself, the only true kind of friendship (1156 a 10 f.): into friendship as between equals, or between superior and inferior (1158 b 10) and into the social categories of friendships between young men (1156 a 31) and between old men (1156 a 24–26, cf. 1158 a 1–6), the friendships of good men or gentlemen (*ἀγαθοί, ἐπικτεῖς*) and vulgarians (*φραῦλοι*, 1157 b 2, *ἀγοραῖοι*, 1158 a 21).

Callicles' friend and wellwisher, if Callicles is the kind of man he wants him to be, if not, his indignant enemy.²⁰ Callicles' moral fault (*culpa* 78, 81) has forced him to speak his reproaches. "Rightly" says Callicles, "you are my truest friend. If you know I have committed a blunder or wrong,²¹ and fail to accuse me, you yourself should be reproached" (94–96). Zucker²² recognized in this an acting out of the Aristotelian precepts concerning moral failings in friends, but oddly failed to pinpoint the situation here enacted; the equivalent in Aristotle is *E.N.* 1165 a 36 ἔχει δ' ἀπορίαν καὶ περὶ τοῦ διαλύεσθαι τὰς φιλίας and specifically the formula of solution at b 19–20 ἐπανόρθωσιν δ' ἔχουσι μᾶλλον βοηθητέον εἰς τὸ ἥθος ἢ τὴν οὐσίαν, ὅσῳ βέλτιον καὶ τῆς φιλίας οἰκείότερον ... ἀλλοιωθέντα οὖν ἀδυνατῶν ἀνασῶσαι ἀφίσταται. If our friends are capable of reform or recovery,²³ we must help them towards moral even more than towards financial recovery. Only if the friend is changed for the worse and cannot be saved does one stand aloof, since if one's friend's is πονηρός one should not love him and must not grow to resemble him (15–18). The other keynote of the scene, Latin *fides*, comes with Callicles' self-defence; welcoming the well-intentioned criticism, as is recommended in the peripatetic tradition²⁴ he vindicates himself: he is

20 *Trin.* 46–47 *tui beneuolentis, si ita es ut ego te uolo / sin aliter es, inimici atque irati tibi.*

21 *si quid scis me fecissi inscite aut improbe.* The Latin combines a pragmatic word with a moral one; the assimilation of morality with commonsense is characteristic of Aristotelian thought. Probably the original employed a combination of ἀμαρτάνειν and ἀδικεῖν (they are interchangeable in e.g. *Men. Pap. Didot.* cf. 6 ἐκεῖνος εἰ μὲν μείζον ἡδίκηκέ τι, 8, *ei d'eis em' hēmartēken*, and 13, τοῦτο τί μ' ἀδικεῖ, λέγε (Körte's punctuation). Or again *me fecisse inscite*, suggest an adjectival form like *Epitr.* 1099: ποῶν / μηδὲν ἄτοπον μηδ' ἀμαθές, 1100: νῦν τρόπος ποεῖ / ἀμαθές τι;

22 *op. cit.* (n. 17) 11–13.

23 The word ἐπανόρθωσις "the act of correcting" is Aristotelian. In Plato the verb ἐπανορθοῦν is common of practical, intellectual or moral adjustments or corrections to arguments (*Prot.* 340 a and d, *Gorg.* 461 d, *Symp.* 180 d) calculations (*Theaet.* 143 a; 167 e, cf. ἐπανόρθωμα 183 a) life-styles (*Rep.* 425 e) and laws or social structure (regularly in *Laws*). Aristotle introduces it in the mathematical account of justice as τὸ ἐπανορθωτικόν *E.N.* 1132 a 13, and equates ἐπανόρθωμα with δικαίωμα 1153 a 13, and τὸ κατὰ νόμον 1137 b 17. But as the reference to property in 1165 b 19 suggests, the concept is intrinsically practical, and only moral by the analogy of virtue with pragmatism which is used persuasively in this and other passages.

24 For the need to terminate a friendship on moral grounds compare Cicero *Laelius* 76–77; the need for moral correction, 88–90; f. 88 *nam et monendi amici*

bound by a promise, has kept it with honour, and is free of blame (117, 124, 142; cf. 192). As Epitropos he has acted with what in Greek tradition would surely be δικαιοσύνη;²⁵ but this needs no philosophical pedigree. If in telling Megaronides the secret of the treasure, he breaks his promise to save his reputation, we should I think see it not as a significant violation of *fides*²⁶ but as a perquisite for dramatic action. No revelation: no play!

Megaronides undertook the necessary correction of his friend and had to threaten termination of the friendship, because of a misunderstanding; the crisis was a false problem, though dramatically fruitful. In contrast when Philemon moves from the friendship of the old in Act 1 to that of the young men in Acts 2 and 3 there is real need for moral correction, or rather aid to recovery, both moral and economic. The dramatic context of Lysiteles' proposal returns us to the Act 1 crisis and risk of termination, but this time complicated with the further problems arising from εὐεργεσία; the equilibrium of kindness and honour between friends.

Something should be said first about the popular tradition behind such acts of generosity; at issue in Acts 2 and 3 is the traditional obligation of the Greek gentleman to give money to friends in need. The technical term is ἐπαρκεῖν "to help out". Aristotle's recognition in *E.N.* 1163 a 33 that it is the role of the good friend to help out his

saepe sunt et obiurgandi, et haec accipienda amice cum benevole fiunt. Although the basis of the *Laelius* is Stoic, much Peripatetic theory seems to have been transmitted; Gellius 1.3.10 f recognized in *Lael.* 36 and 61 the argument of Theophrastus' first book *On Friendship*; it is likely that 76–77 and 88–90 also go back through Panaetius to Theophrastus, although it should be noted that Theophrastus seems to have differed from Aristotle *E.N.* 1165 b 15–16 on the obligation to terminate a friendship with a bad man. See F.-A. Steinmetz, *Die Freundschaftslehre des Panaetius*, Wiesbaden 1967, 66, 106, 134 (differentiating between Aristotle and Theophrastus) and 149. Zucker (p. 13) quotes *Laelius* 88 without reservations as Theophrastean.

25 Δικαιοσύνη is conventionally defined as keeping trusts and returning what is not ours by Cephalus, in *Rep.* 331; Socrates' reply quotes the case of returning a sword to a friend who has lost his wits, as a restitution which his not just—the paradeigma reflected in *Trin.* 129: *dedistin hoc facto ei gladium qui se occideret.* See now K. J. Dover, *Greek Popular Morality*, Oxford 1974, 170–171.

26 This criticism is made by Stein, "Morality in Plautus' *Trinummus*," *CB* 47, (1970) 7, 8.