WOMEN, METAPOETRY, AND COMIC RECEPTION IN TERENCE

A Dissertation

Presented to the Faculty of the Graduate School

of Cornell University

In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

by

Goran Vidović

February 2016

WOMEN, METAPOETRY, AND COMIC RECEPTION IN TERENCE

Goran Vidović, Ph.D.

Cornell University 2016

The focus of this study is self-reflexivity as a key to understanding Terence's dramaturgy and the poetics professed in his prologues. Building upon recent scholarship, I approach Terence's prologues not as biographical accounts but as fictional compositions with programmatic function. I explore the parallels between the prologues and the plots of his plays, interpreting the plots as metapoetic commentaries on playwriting as described in the prologues. Specifically, I argue that female characters in Terence's *Eunuchus* (Chapters 2-5) and *Self-Tormentor* (6-7) are metaphors for the plays and vice versa.

Pursuing the analogy of women and poetry is rewarding for several reasons. The position of women and control over them are of fundamental importance in Menander and Roman comedy. Woman as a metapoetic trope, abundantly attested in ancient literature, especially comedy, highlights the commodification of texts and articulates the poets' anxiety of ownership and availability of their work. The same concern emerges from Terence's prologues, mapping onto the themes of sexual exclusivity and anxiety about emotional reciprocity in the plays. Central to Terence's program is self-positioning vis-à-vis other poets.

I first consider a possibly unique case of the woman-as-play trope in Plautus' (most likely) last play, the *Casina*, proposing that he playfully commodified his "swan's song" by imagining its revival (Chapter 1).

In Chapter 2 I turn to Terence and interpret the *Eunuchus* prologue as "open-market" poetics, enacted in the play as sharing a *meretrix* (Ch. 3). An indication that the poetics are disingenuous is the emphasis on "privileged material:" the violation of a citizen virgin (Ch. 4),

framed in temporal paradoxes of initiative and imitation (Ch. 5), which ultimately secures Terence's poetic superiority by positioning the *Eunuchus* as a prehistory of the genre.

The key to the *Self-Tormentor* poetics is performative ("ontological") duplicity, between what is staged and what should be inferred (Ch. 6). This is manifested in the play through the character of Antiphila, designed to challenge the possibility of verifying a woman's emotions by appearance (Ch. 7). The last chapter analyzes how Menander and Plautus encoded the anxiety about female sincerity as deceptiveness, and especially duplicity, of performance.

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH

Goran Vidović was born in Belgrade, Serbia, where he completed an undergraduate program in Classics (University of Belgrade, 2006). He earned an MA degree in Medieval Studies at the Central European University in Budapest (2009). In 2010 he moved with his newly-wed wife Bojana to Ithaca, New York, where their two children, Milica and Maksim, were born.

Sve zajedno

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Like Terence, I am indebted to many. Unlike Terence, I acknowledge my debts without a tongue in cheek. I am grateful to my parents and brother for a loving and supportive upbringing. From my father, a teacher-philosopher-poet-playwright, from my mother, a lawyer, and my brother, a philologist, I have learned—I now realize—to love language, drama, poetry, and meticulous argumentation. My enduring passion for all things Greco-Roman I owe to the Department of Classics at Belgrade University, especially my Latin teachers Marjanca Pakiž and Vojin Nedeljković. The rigorous training I received at the Department of Medieval Studies at CEU proved to be invaluable for my future scholarly endeavors.

To the faculty, fellow-graduate students, undergraduate students, and staff of Cornell University's Department of Classics I am forever grateful for providing me with a complete, unforgettable graduate experience. Two of my doctoral committee members, Jeff Rusten and Fred Ahl, have particularly influenced my scholarly interests and approaches in many different, indeed often opposite ways—and it is only for the best. For the ultimate success in my doctoral studies I can easily blame Mike Fontaine, who has been an exemplary advisor even since before I joined the program. Because most of the time this dissertation has been "in progress," in the most risky meaning of the phrase, I have received less informal feedback than is perhaps desirable for a work of this level. Thus all of its shortcomings I proudly claim as my own.

None of this would have happened—or mattered—without the unyielding love and support of my dear wife Bojana and the salutary distractions of our beloved daughter Milica and son Maksim. This work is dedicated to the three of them.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

KA = Kassel, R., Austin, C. (1983-2001). *Poetae comici Graeci (PCG)*. Berlin—New York: W. de Gruyter.

LSJ = Liddell, H. G., Scott, R., Jones, H. S., McKenzie, R. (1996). *A Greek-English Lexicon*. 9th ed. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

OLD = Glare, P. G. W. (1982). *Oxford Latin dictionary*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

All abbreviations of Greek and Latin authors and works are according to LSJ and *OLD*, with the exception of Terence's *Heauton Timorumenos*: I use *HT*, instead of the conventional *Hau*. Unless specified otherwise, all translations are my own, and the texts used are: Kauer, Lindsay, and Skutsch (1958) for Terence; Leo (1895-1896) for Plautus; Wessner (1902-1908) for Donatus; Arnott (1979-2000) for Menander.

Introduction

> One of the facts that might come to light in this process [of literary criticism] is our tendency to insist, when we praise a poet, upon those aspects of his work in which he least resembles anyone else. In these aspects or parts of his work we pretend to find what is individual, what is the peculiar essence of the man. We dwell with satisfaction upon the poet's difference from his predecessors, especially his immediate predecessors; we endeavour to find something that can be isolated in order to be enjoyed. Whereas if we approach a poet without this prejudice we shall often find that not only the best, but the most individual parts of his work may be those in which the dead poets, his ancestors, assert their immortality most vigorously. ... Yet if the only form of tradition, of handing down, consisted in following the ways of the immediate generation before us in a blind or timid adherence to its successes, "tradition" should positively be discouraged. ... We have seen many such simple currents soon lost in the sand; and novelty is better than repetition. Tradition is a matter of much wider significance. It cannot be inherited, and if you want it you must obtain it by great labour. ... No poet, no artist of any art, has his complete meaning alone. His significance, his appreciation is the appreciation of his relation to the dead poets and artists. You cannot value him alone; you must set him, for contrast and comparison, among the dead. I mean this as a principle of aesthetic, not merely historical, criticism. The necessity that he shall conform, that he shall cohere, is not one-sided; what happens when a new work of art is created is something that happens simultaneously to all the works of art which preceded it. The existing monuments form an ideal order among themselves, which is modified by the introduction of the new (the really new) work of art among them. The existing order is complete before the new work arrives; for order to persist after the supervention of novelty, the whole existing order must be, if ever so slightly, altered; and so the relations, proportions, values of each work of art toward the whole are readjusted; and this is conformity between the old and the new. ... And the poet who is aware of this will be aware of great difficulties and responsibilities. In a peculiar sense he will be aware also that he must inevitably be judged by the standards of the past.
>
> — T. S. Eliot, "Tradition and Individual Talent" (1920)

Comedy was introduced in Rome in the 240s BCE through adaptations of Hellenistic New Comedy. Between the late 200s and 184, Plautus authored many such plays, of which twenty survive complete. In the 160s Terence composed his six. In such a situation it is perhaps understandable that Plautus becomes the norm and Terence is evaluated by Plautine criteria. But Terence himself would have been all too well aware of this.

In his classic 1974 formal survey of the corpus, John Wright (in)famously stated that Terence "writes, by and large, *as if* the comic tradition at Rome never existed. His deliberate

rejection of the tradition is no doubt the primary reason for the difficulties he experienced with the Roman audience."[1] Wright's conclusion is most recently revisited by George Franko, who rightly stresses that the key for understanding Terence is precisely the ambiguity of the "as if:"

> Terence's "deliberate rejection of the tradition" is better described as a thorough understanding, thoughtful critique, and successful variation within and beyond the tradition. Terence could not have written as he did without the tradition serving as a foil or "archive" relative to which he might position his productions. … Terentian characters orbit the tradition's stock types sometimes closely, sometimes not, but always derive their peculiar energy from their interplay with the genre's gravitational pull.[2]

Understanding the ambivalent nature of Terence's relation to his predecessors is especially significant when it informs literary-historical narratives and aesthetic evaluation. Sander Goldberg, in his *Understanding Terence*, the monograph that has been shaping Anglo-American scholarship on Terence for the last forty years, subscribes to the pessimistic Plauto-centric diagnosis:

> Terence's irony is clever and incisive, but it makes the comic devices seem contrived and unpleasant. His success in manipulating the old formulae to yield new results necessitated the end of both comic fantasy and comic exuberance. His genre could not endure this double loss, nor could it accept his substitution.[3]

Goldberg's post-apocalyptic obituary is a staple of literary criticism. A textbook example of an author who hit the last nail on the coffin of the genre he inherited is Euripides. One notices potential *post hoc ergo propter hoc* fallacy: after these latecomers there were no great

[1] Wright 1974: 151, emphasis mine.
[2] Franko 2013: 50.
[3] Goldberg 1986: 218. It is in fact still the only single-author literary study of Terence in English. Karakasis 2005 deals with style and language, Pezzini 2015 is linguistic. The overall approach of Sharrock 2009 is most germane to the present discussion, although her treatment of Plautus alongside caused some methodological drawbacks (cf. Germany 2011). Also useful is the collection of essays in Papaioannou 2014 and Germany's forthcoming monograph on the *Eunuchus* (I cite his 2008 Chicago dissertation). Edited volumes have meanwhile appeared regularly across the globe: Pociña et al. 2006; Kruschwitz et al. 2007; Augoustakis and Traill 2013. Non-Anglophone monographs have not contributed to changing the paradigm as much as one would want: Minarini 1987 addresses some sundry issues, Cupaiuolo 1991 offers many interesting observations but often underdeveloped; Minarini 1995 discusses Terentian metatheater (only two cases but in detail). Müller 1997 and Bagordo 2001 focus on language, Kruschwitz 2004 is a good introduction, Umbrico 2010 examines the perception of Terence, Cupaiuolo 2014 the reception. Lefèvre investigates Terence's relation to Greek originals in six monographs (1978, 1994, 1999, 2003, 2008, 2013).

representatives of the genre, so they must have contributed to its demise. While establishing their guilt is necessarily subjective, the ensuing critical assessment is even more so. One formulation, I believe, indicates the very problem: that Euripides (specifically in the *Helen*) "is not *simply* dancing on the grave of the genre he has outraged, *but* looking for a new mode of expression for another kind of thought."[4] Not only is the assumption that there is such a thing as "simply" killing a literary tradition without offering anything in return, but Euripides is ultimately appreciated for the same thing that Terence is blamed for. Undoubtedly one of the main reasons for this double standard is that Terence himself poses as a misfit in his prologues.[5]

1. And now for something completely different: the prologues

Terence's prologues were, as far as we know, unprecedented in Latin literature. In all of them he does more or less what he announced in the prologue to his first play, the *Andria*: instead of narrating the background of the plot, he is replying to accusations of some envious old poet (*An*. 6-7). The prologues end up as mini essays in literary criticism, providing ostensibly precious firsthand information about early Roman theater, about which we would otherwise know next to nothing: styles and tastes, audience expectations, criteria of selection and access to Greek originals, scripts and commissioning, actors and producers, professional climate, and so on. The once dominant scholarly tendency, still very much alive, is to take virtually at face value the coherent image of the poet that emerges: he had difficulties pleasing the audience; he was a misunderstood eccentric in constant feud with some senior opponent and other envious

[4] Burnett 1971: 85, emphasis mine.

[5] The image is supported by the suspect Suetonian biography (Suet. *Poet*. 11) for which see Beare 1942: 29: "Suetonius' life of Terence, the only dramatist whose works have come down to us complete, seems at first sight the most satisfying biography that we possess of any writer before the first century; but the stoutest faith in tradition cannot survive the discovery that the authorities from whom that life is derived do not agree with each other, and are in fact basing their arguments mainly on evidence which has descended to us—the text of the author—and which we can judge for ourselves." Cf. now Davis 2014.

individuals who criticize him for just about everything he does; he was repeatedly suspected of receiving help from his influential friends; once, he even unintentionally adapted an already adapted Greek play—which, to his surprise, turned out not to be allowed—and he did it so halfheartedly that his theft was obvious.

Perhaps understandably, the mere amount of sensational details and the urge to assemble them, distracted generations of Terentian scholars from questioning the reliability of the very platform that brings them. That the prologues are still taken as evidence is especially surprising since many precedents for them have long been on record. Friedrich Leo pointed out their similarities with Old Comedy parabases, and later studies demonstrate them in detail: debates about style, denouncing commonplaces, accusations of plagiarism, poetic rivalry, lamenting defeats, even the use of "our poet" by the speakers.[6] However we account for these parallels, the bare fact that parabases and Terence's prologues look alike—that is, as set pieces of highly stylized poetic self-presentation—means that Terence warrants the same caution that proved necessary in study of Aristophanes: "Classicists have been quick to plunder the parabases for (auto)biographical information about the poet, despite many indications that much of the authorial posturing in them was conventional and hyperbolic."[7] In fact, already during the first half of the 20th century William Beare kept advocating extreme skepticism in studying Terence's prologues, apparently to little notice. As he once protested, "Terence was not an honest man, but he was an artist. We do his creative talent less than justice if we take him at his word."[8]

[6] Leo 1912: 238-40; Arnott 1985; Ehrman 1985; cf. Hubbard 1991: 1, fn. 1; Dobrov 1995b. Papaioannou 2014: 27-9 lists most recent bibliography.
[7] Marks and Rosen 1999: 904. Papaioannou 2014: 27, 28: "Old Comedy emphasises self-reflexivity especially when the comic author himself appears in the play and delivers quasi-personal information. This information supposedly is historical and is utilised to create a fictionalised acting persona for the playwright. … In the pattern of Aristophanes' heroes, Terence's *prologus-persona* brings up a firm set of themes with marked consistency."
[8] Beare 1948: 82.

2. Poetics of failure: dressed-up with nowhere to go

The image of the poet in Terence's prologues is too neat to be true if only because it smacks of stock repertoire. This is all the more remarkable given one simple practical detail that is often neglected and which, I believe, cannot be emphasized enough: unlike in Aristophanes' Athens, there were no dramatic competitions in Terence's Rome. The variety of prologue scenarios highlights the absence of that one central avenue for strife between playwrights. In reproducing Aristophanic format of bantering antics, Terence is simulating the very environment where they should be taking place. His unnamed critics are shooting from every corner but never as direct rivals on and for center stage. Holt Parker is certainly heading in the right direction when he notes that Terence aims at publicity: "A little controversy goes a long way in the theater and artistic quarrels are good box office."[9] But the box office, I argue, is a metaphorical one.

The unparalleled, hence the single most defining, component of Terence's poetic persona is imagining polemics with *Roman* poets. His combativeness stands out spectacularly amidst the curiously pacifist history of Roman republican theater, as seen in both other playwrights and ancient testimonia. None of Terence's predecessor of whom we have sufficient record—Livius Andronicus, Naevius, Plautus, Ennius, Caecilius—is known for naming or alluding to earlier or contemporary fellow playwright.[10] There is only one possible exception, an allusion to Naevius' alleged imprisonment in Plautus' *Miles gloriosus* (211), which is not only non-polemical but would indeed prove that an extraordinary occasion was required.

[9] Parker 1996: 603. Cf. Sharrock 2009: 76: "Conflict is comic," with further discussion, 77-79.

[10] Ennius distinguishes himself as *dicti studiosus* from certain archaic poets, *Faunei vatesque* (*Ann*. 7.206-9 Skutsch); whether or not Naevius is meant (Barchiesi 2001: 130), the reference is in epic, not drama.

Every single one of Roman republican playwrights abides by a sort of a gentlemen's agreement.[11] Possible mentions of rivalries in lost texts would hardly suffice to constitute a broader trend, and there are even no biographical speculations about interpersonal feuds (apart from Suetonius' romantic *Life of Terence*, based on the prologues). Quite the opposite, there are two identical anecdotes about senior playwrights acting as a sort of a favorably inclined jury in passing the torch to the younger ones: Pacuvius the tragedian to Accius, and—even at the expense of actual chronology—Caecilius to Terence.[12] Thus, for whichever reason, in this personal aspect the early Roman theater history is a remarkable story of professional solidarity and authorized succession.

By stark contrast, Greek theater history is a story of polemics and competition even between poets from different eras, such as the deathmatch between Aeschylus and Euripides in Aristophanes' *Frogs*, or Plutarch's comparison of Aristophanes and Menander (and, in other genres, the *Certamen Homeri et Hesiodi*).[13] Meanwhile, the strong impression one gets from sources on Roman playwrights is of an inclusive camaraderie. Caesar memorably deplores Terence's lack of *vis comica* (Suet. *Poet*. 11.105) but does not compare him to anyone in particular—as much as modern critics instinctively supply Plautus. The canon of Roman comedians by Volcacius Sedigitus (*ap*. Gell. 15.24), speaks of a figurative contest (*palmam*) yet includes no less than ten authors, practically everyone there was except Livius Andronicus. Symptomatically, the ranking is jokingly glossed "inoffensively:" Plautus is second but "easily beats everyone below"—as if that is not obvious from the list itself (*Plautus secundus facile*

[11] Wright 1974: 111, with fn. 44, hears Plautus saying "This comedy outdoes anything ever seen on the stage" in the *Bacchides* (*stulti, stolidi, fatui, fungi, bardi, blenni, buccones, | solus ego omnis longe antideo,* 1088-9), interpreting it as "*aemulatio*… with Roman playwrights;" but the reference is not to authors, it is to *roles*.
[12] For Accius, Gell. 13.2. Suetonius' *Vita* (Suet. *Poet*. 11.27-32) reports that Terence read his *Andria* to old Caecilius at a dinner party, who liked it so much that he invited Terence to dine with him; but Caecilius died two years before the *Andria* was produced (Fontaine 2014: 550).
[13] For competitions as fundamental "meta-communicative frames" for texts in Greek literature, see Bierl 2011: 132.

exuperat ceteros); and Luscius is "easily" penultimate (*facile*). The half-sarcastic phrasing makes most sense if appreciative assessment is normally expected. Ennius' honorable mention at the last place "on account of his ancient standing" (*causa antiquitatis*) exemplifies the same inclusivity that we see elsewhere. Varro likewise uses the language of competition as he welcomes everyone according to their strengths and interests: "Caecilius takes the prize in plot composition, Terence in character portrayal, Plautus in language" (*in argumentis Caecilius poscit palmam, | in ethesin Terentius, in sermonibus Plautus*; *Men*. 399). Horace answers his own question of "who beats whom" (*uter utro sit prior*, *Ep*. 2.1.55) by allotting each playwright his own domain: Caecilius is the first in dignity, Terence in art (*vincere Caecilius gravitate, Terentius arte*, 2.1.59). One of Terence's responses to opponents indeed alludes to a sort of a mandatory inclusivity: "the victory palm is available to all those who practice the art of poetry" (*in medio omnibus | palmam esse positam qui artem tractent musicam*, *Ph*. 16-17); the prize is indeed left *undecided* (*in medio*: cf. e.g. Sal. *Cat*. 19.5; *OLD* 7).

The absence of polemics is in keeping with the situation where the title of "the man of the year" is not decided by the showdown between playwrights but administratively assigned. Plautus' *Pseudolus* was *chosen* for celebrating the completion of the temple to Magna Mater in 191 BCE. A detail from the *Eunuchus* prologue presupposes such a temporary monopoly. After the aediles similarly bought the play (*Eu*. 20), it is discovered to have been plagiarized, but the commission was not cancelled. The implication is not only that the plagiarism accusation is a joke: the prerequisite for the joke is that there were no rival alternatives to his play. Terence was at liberty to write whatever he wanted about this, and he chose to make it clear that it was so.[14] Lastly, the fact that he reports rumors of being supported by influential friends (*HT* 24, *Ad*. 15) not only of his own accord, but indeed proudly (*Ad*. 16-20), suggests that there was nothing

[14] I analyze this in detail in Chapter 2, and further elaborate through Chapters 3-5.

wrong about it. The sole point of insisting on it need not be that his good standing with the people up above is unique, but that now when it is his turn he actually *deserves* it.

Central to understanding Terence's self-fashioning project, therefore, is that his literary polemics is a stunt staged in a bubble. Indeed the lack of actual peer rivals may have precisely *prompted* him to keep simulating conspiracies.[15]

3. Fan factory

To be pragmatic about the exact course Terence takes, it is a fair question why he assumes the inferior position of a mediocre poet constantly under fire. As it happens, Dwora Gilula makes one completely logical observation but, in my view, so tellingly off the mark that she unwittingly explains the siege-narrative agenda: "The relentless and fierce attacks of adversaries and rival playwrights are in themselves a proof of Terence's talents and of his audience-appeal, as well as of the threat he posed others in the field. Nobody repeatedly attacks a loser, nor beats a dead horse."[16]

Another instance of Terence's disingenuous poetics is the account of two consecutive interrupted performances of the *Hecyra*, however one ventures to reconstruct the practicalities: the audience was stampeded over by those looking for boxers and tightrope walkers, and/or Terence's own spectators got bored and distracted by these more entertaining nearby shows,

[15] Terence's arch-nemesis is identified as Luscius Lanuvinus only much later in the compiled commentary of "Donatus," whose unreliability is well known (most recently, e.g., Moore 2012: 60 concludes that its sections on music are "product of late antique speculation"). Garton 1972 conducts the search for historical Luscius ("overly speculative:" Franko 2013: 51) and sees the prime obstacle himself, but continues the reconstruction nevertheless (41): "someone fond of Terence... had cared enough… to note down the identity of this vitupero ... and the jackdaw activities of Roman scholarship had kept hold of that annotation for four or five hundred years and then expiringly got it into the hands of Donatus, who relayed it to ourselves…" The standard discussion of Donatus is now Demetriou 2014.

[16] Gilula 1989: 96, fn. 4. Cf. Gutzwiller 2007: 61 on Callimachus, however one interprets the implications: "The continuance of disagreement about Callimachus' aesthetics long after his death demonstrates his lasting importance."

and/or Terence was sabotaged.[17] The poet's debacle is framed in the stock dichotomy illustrated by Ismene Lada-Richards with innumerable examples from antiquity to modernity: the narrative of a virtually cosmic conflict between highbrow literary drama and vulgar lowbrow entertainment.[18] Yet even though this is a demonstrably evergreen rhetorical strategy of aesthetic and cultural self-positioning—and despite the practical implausibilities of Terence's story detected by Erich Gruen[19]—it is still rarely considered that the failure of the *Hecyra* might be complete fabrication. Once again, I believe, the answer as to why would Terence fake his fiasco comes unintended. In his study of audience competence in fifth-century Athens, Martin Revermann reminds us that

> [i]n the history of art there have been numerous audiences who, for all we know, failed in part or even completely to gauge the extent to which an artist surpassed the contemporary paradigm and excelled in the craft. Shakespeare, Bach and Mozart immediately come to mind, and the list could be much extended. "Some day they will understand" is the anecdotal response attributed to the ailing Beethoven on his sick bed when informed of the uncomprehending reception with which one of his late string quartets was met. The Romantic notion of the unrecognized genius can even turn lack of appreciation during the artist's lifetime into something of a prerequisite for distinction. Van Gogh is a model case for such *post-mortem* iconization.[20]

[17] Audience was bored: Sandbach 1982; audience did not know what to expect from the confusing plot development and was off-put: Goldberg 1986: 159-69 (barely modified, Goldberg 2013: 16, 25). *Contra* e.g. Gilula 1981: 32: "But if one accepts this assumption, that the failure of the *Hecyra* was caused by internal flaws recognisable today, one must still explain why these flaws went unnoticed during *Hecyra*'s third, and successful performance." Spectators overrun by the neighboring audience: Parker 1996 ("whether by accident or sabotage," 601); Knorr 2013: 297-8: "the evidence seems to suggest not repeated failure but premeditated sabotage by hired claques that spread false rumors." This is also the view of Gilula, who again unintentionally provides Terence with the motive for fabrication (1981: 30): "If, as Terence hints, the disturbances were deliberately provoked, it would indicate that Terence was considered a talented and promising playwright, and therefore deemed a potentially dangerous rival. Had his plays, including *Hecyra*, been of inferior artistic quality, no outside 'help' would have been needed to hiss them off stage."

[18] Lada-Richards 2004.

[19] Gruen 1992: 2013, e.g., "the conjunction of plays with other forms of entertainment would normally not even arise" (213). "If the difficulties encountered by the *Hecyra* were at all representative of what might happen in the theater, why do we have no parallel instances elsewhere?" (214). For the unreliability of the didascalic notice, see Germany (2008: 150, fn. 28): "The two prologues purport to be from the second and third performances, and the A didascalia says the *Hecyra* was performed the first time without a prologue (5-6). This sounds suspiciously like an explanation for the missing prologue; in any case, we have no other mention of any Terence play being performed without a prologue. The same didascalia also tells us the Greek original was by Menander, where Donatus makes it clear that it was by Apollodorus."

[20] Revermann 2006: 99.

Michael Fontaine recently drives the point closer to home by discussing the cumulatively conspicuous correspondence between Terence's self-portrayal and the biographical tradition of Menander. Among other parallels, "[t]he ongoing quarrel with an older rival mirrors Menander's well-attested rivalry with Philemon, a comic poet twenty years his elder... This rivalry stemmed from the perceived difficulty Menander had in winning victories—only eight times in his career...—such that, by Martial's time, Menander's failure to please his public had become proverbial."[21] Fontaine contextualizes this as part of a widely practiced flattering labeling of Roman authors as Roman counterparts to the Greek. It is not only Cicero's impression that Terence is the Roman Menander (*conversum expressumque latina voce Menandrum*, *ap*. Suet. *Poet*. 11.99): this was the reputation Terence himself wants to publicize, much like Ennius self-anointed himself as the Roman Homer in the opening of his *Annales*.[22] Terence, therefore, is laying claims to Menandrian literary legacy.

But there might be an additional layer of his appropriation of Menander's image. Rivalry with Philemon and poor victory rate are not voiced by Menander, they are only ascribed to him by later sources. Complete absence of polemical self-reflexivity in Menander and New Comedy in general is probably not exclusively caused by, but certainly has something to do with, the development of "reading culture" in the 4th century. Matthew Wright considers the impact it had on comedy:

> It does seem significant that the collective sort of literary preference, as exemplified by the award of prizes at festivals, is rather lost sight of in later comedy. Apart from the perfunctory and formulaic tailpieces, containing requests for applause or prayers to Nike, that are found at the end of certain plays, there is no sign that the comedians were interested in the circumstances of the festival in which they were competing. This is in marked contrast to the work of earlier comedians, to whom the paraphernalia of the festivals and the outcome of the competitions were matters of explicit interest; indeed, for

[21] Fontaine 2014: 551, with references.
[22] Skutsch 1985: 148-150, with further references; Barchiesi 2001: 133.

> such playwrights the contests seem to have been influential in shaping their views on poetics in general.[23]

If one keeps in mind the widespread practice of comparing Greek poets at all costs mentioned above, Menander's rivalry with Philemon seems like hardly anything more than a product of imaginative speculation.[24] It is difficult to prove that Terence knew this, but given that his own prologues are practically designed for tabloids, he seems well acquainted with conventions of sensationalistic biography. If he did know, the implications are significant. In simulating Menander's perceived plight he is not imitating Menander, the person, but "Menander," the celebrity, assuming his *reputation* in biographers' imagination. Terence wants to be a *topic* of rumor and speculation so as to retroactively carve out a place for himself in literary history textbooks. His "poetics of loserdom," is a scripted self-fashioning game, a self-conscious metaphor for his actual secondariness, late arrival in history of comedy.[25]

For some reason, succession in the genre, we have seen, seems to be an endemically Roman notion. A fascinating indication of Terence's concern with chronological self-positioning is that his very first appearance in literary history is informed by the Alexandrian tradition of non-dramatic polemic.[26] Similarities between Callimachus' *Aetia* prologue and Terence's prologues have long been noticed, especially with the opening of the *Andria* prologue: "When the poet first set his mind on writing…" (*poeta quom primum animum ad scribendum adpulit,*

[23] Wright 2013: 611, with fn. 39; plays in question are e.g. Menander's *Dyskolos* 968–9, *Misoumenos* 465–6, *Sikyonios* 422–3, *Samia* 736–7, frg. 771, Posidippus' *Apokleiomene* frg. 6.
[24] Cf. e.g. Nervegna 2011: 108-9.
[25] The single most frequent form of controversy in Terence's prologues is between the old and the new, conservative and progressive (Papaioannou 2014: 43-50), a perennial dichotomy in literary criticism: "It seems to be one of the phenomena of literary history that tends to recur at certain intervals," D'Alton 1031: 266, with a detailed discussion of ancient debates, 266-353.
[26] Terence's "malevolent" opponents recall Envy, the programmatic foe of Callimachus. Terence's vocabulary: *malevolus*, *HT* 22; *iniuria advorsarium*, *Hec*. 22; *malevoli*, *Ad*. 15. For Callimachus, see a sample in Knox 2007 (*Iambi* 1, *Hymn to Apollo*, 2.105–12, *Aetia* prologue, epigrams). Nelson (forthcoming) discusses the influence of Old Comedy on the polemical aspect of Alexandrian poetics.

An. 1).[27] Remarkably, at this foundational moment of "*becoming* a poet"[28] Terence already imagines himself with an existing record of multiple plays: he is forced to reply to criticisms when writing his *prologues*, plural (*in prologis scribundis*, 5). Alternatively—or rather, I suggest, simultaneously—he announces that the future sequence of his prologues will be doing the same. The very fact that texts normally associated with temporary performance are being written down,[29] and that they already constitute a corpus, indicates a poetic program.

4. Metapoetic program

The first hint of metapoetic self-reflexivity in Terence appeared in the coda of Cynthia Dessen's 1995 essay on the *Eunuchus*. She notices thematic and lexical correspondences between the prologue and the play: Terence's theft of a play and violation of a virgin girl. Dessen provocatively suggests that Terence "transposes two major themes of the play, aggression and violation, to a literary context."[30] This remark will turn out to have been a watershed moment once Emily Gowers investigates analogies between all six prologues and plays.[31] For example, she proposes (I simplify somewhat): two marriages in the *Andria* mirror two Menandrian models

[27] Pohlenz 1956; Hunter 1985: 32; Papaioannou 2014: 47-8; Sharrock 2009: 78: "The technique of couching literary critical statements in terms of arguments between proponents of opposing schools is an old one, going back at least to the agon of Euripides and Aeschylus in Aristophanes' *Frogs*, and reaching its zenith with the Hellenistic poets. Most famously, Callimachus used, or possibly even invented, an argument between poetic practitioners as a vehicle to display his own wares and to introduce his great work. I suggest that Terence is writing in the tradition of such arguments, even directly alluding to the opening of the *Aetia* and other crucial programmatic passages such as the end of the *Hymn to Apollo*."

[28] Farrell 1991: 298, comparing *Aet*. with Plautus' Pseudolus (esp. *poeta fiam*, 404), not mentioning Terence.

[29] Terence refer to his plays as pieces of writings (*HT* 7; *Ph*. 2; *Hec*. 6; *Ad*. 25). In the *Eu*. prologue he differentiates between text and performance: rivalry is in writing plays (*scribendo*, 7; *scripsit*, 10), the *Eunuchus* is primarily a script which the aediles bought and the opponent requested for inspection (20-22, *inspiciundi*, 21). Terence consistently uses *facere* for earlier Roman adaptations he is accused of plagiarizing (*Eu*. 33; *Ad*. 7), as if to hint that his plays are a literary project. Gilula's observations are right on the mark (2007: 217): "But as much as they [sc. Terence's plays] please they are difficult to relate and to summarize. We rarely see Terence's comedies on stage, we read them and as much as we try not to, we treat them chiefly not as scripts but as literature. In the narration of their plots the reported events that took place before the beginning of the play and the closure are the prominent elements, whereas the actual stage action is relegated to secondary importance and usually barely mentioned" (cf. also Gilula 1991, discussed in Chapter 6.5). Papaioannou 2014: 50-58 outlines his textual orientation; cf. Kruschwitz 2001.

[30] Dessen 1995: 136; I discuss her interpretation in Chapter 4.1.

[31] Gowers 2004.

that Terence combined into this play;[32] the old prologue speaker in the *Self-Tormentor* (*HT*) foreshadows the problems of fatherhood in the play; the reportedly unpopular *Hecyra* is symbolized by the unpopular character of the mother in law, Sostrata; dietary language in the *Phormio* prologue announces the central role of the parasite-as-poet in the play;[33] and so on. Whether or not one agrees with individual results, the cumulative impression is arresting.[34] Gowers interprets the plays as playful autobiographical allegories:

> [T]he plays can be read in sequence as constructing a particular image of Terence the playwright, while conversely the prologues can be read between the lines as mirroring the plays they present but apparently sideline. … Terence's aggrieved rhetorical persona—misunderstood, unacknowledged, confused with other people, the victim of ignorant stereotyping—finds soulmates in the aggrieved personalities he puts on stage. … The role of each prologue is to emphasise the continued precariousness of this dramatist's literary career, with each play offered as a different kind of hostage to fortune.[35]

The idea that the prologues foreshadow the plots while the plays constitute a slideshow of Terence's fictionalized career is very intriguing. For one, it would be a peculiarly reversible expansion of Plautine metatheater: whereas his characters from within the play refer to the "real" world outside the stage, Terence's "real" outside world projects onto the play as well.

Gowers' model could be improved by elaborating on the effects of the analogy and pursuing its further ramifications. First, Terence's prologue pseudo-biography consists entirely of his poetic choices and the difficulties he experiences because of them. The plots that are showcasing this are thus better understood as metapoetic commentaries specifically on the *process of playwriting*. Second, since both the prologues and the plays are tightly scripted compositions, the correspondence between them amounts to more than a playful collage: it creates a metapoetic system. Exploring this system may considerably contribute to our

[32] Cf. Germany 2013.
[33] See also Frangoulidis 1995.
[34] Evidence enough of latent possibilities is the fact that Sharrock 2009: 232-249 is able to interpret, equally attractively, the failure of the *Hecyra* as a metaphor for failed marriage in the play.
[35] Gowers 2004: 151, 163.

understanding of both prologue poetics—nearly always puzzling, occasionally downright contradictory[36]—and plays, which pose moral problems and feature frequent dramaturgic awkwardness and inconsistencies.[37] The most useful direction of developing Gowers' approach, I suggest, is to streamline it on the recurring elements in the prologues and the play. It turns out that these come down to two, precisely those two initially connected by Dessen, which also happen to be equally problematic for interpretation: in the prologue, plays; and in the plays, women.

Terence's programmatic analogy of plays as women, I suggest, is interpretively useful as it explains his poetics of self-legitimation discussed above in light of the basic tenets of this type of comedy: ownership of and access to women. Ariana Traill summarizes the issue for Menander: "Disputes over the position a woman holds or ought to hold in a community figure prominently in almost every Menandrian play. ... These disputes are largely between men and usually over sexual access to the woman: who has it and on what terms."[38] In Plautine comedy every unmarried woman stands in different relations to several men simultaneously or her relation to one man changes during the play, including combinations thereof.[39] All the while,

[36] For some attempts to resolve practically Terence's puzzling explanation of how he combined Menander's *Andria* and *Perinthia*, see e.g. Beare 1940. For the *Eunuchus*, see my discussion in Chapters 2-5.

[37] Scholars typically resort to incompetent adaptation and related explanations: "slight but real inconsistencies... which do reflect Terentian fiddling" (Gratwick 1972: 31). "It is generally agreed that Terence is responsible for the unnecessary and awkward presence of Sannio in *Ad*. 254-80" (Lowe 1983: 430; in which respect, see my discussion of the scene below, sect. 5). Brothers 1969: 319 seems to suggest that Terence was not in control of his own text (my emphasis): "Terence seems to have *failed to notice* that on his arrival at [*Eu*.] 507 Chremes was to say that he was on his way to a second meeting with Thais; or alternatively, *he may have noticed* the fact but considered it unimportant; whichever it was, the result is the two incompatible statements in our text." When things go well, it is not Terence who gets the credit: "The fact that the second scene [of the *Eu.*] coheres so closely with the first to form a carefully integrated complex constitutes a prima facie argument for supposing that Terence is throughout following Menander's original plan" (Lowe 1983: 433). Lowe implies it is preposterous to "believe that Terence has woven a considerable amount of alien material into the original structure of Menander's scene in such a way as to produce a smooth-flowing dialogue which shows no trace of any awkward joins or inconsistencies" (434). One of the last surveys of inconsistencies is Barsby 1993.

[38] Traill 2008: 14-15.

[39] Most conventionally, an inaccessible *meretrix* is acquired (*Ps.*); an apparent *meretrix* turns into a wife (*Cist.*, *Cur.*), or even a sister (*Cur., Epid.*), a slave turns out to be freeborn daughter (*Cas.*), freeborn daughter temporarily

New Comedy and *palliata* are heavily concerned with the implicit connection between a woman's respectable pedigree, sexual purity, and good character.[40] Terence's focus is on contrasting two love affairs; except the *Hecyra*, where the male protagonist is torn between his wife and a *meretrix*, all others include two male lovers as well. Dorota Dutsch rightly observes that "[t]he plays of Terence evince an almost obsessive interest in the kind of plot that juxtaposes prostitutes and future wives. In fact, every single one of Terence's plots brings together a *meretrix* and a girl whose ability to become a wife and mother is temporarily thrown into question."[41]

Terence's prologues display a similarly obsessive interest in pairing and comparing plays. The *Andria* (first mention of the obscure practice of *contaminatio*), the *Eunuchus*, and the *Adelphoe*, are based on two Greek models, the *HT* is suggestive (*duplex*, 6; *contaminasse*, 17), and the *Hecyra* is contrasted to another kind of entertainment. Most to the point, the emerging controversies are evocative of those regarding women: is playwriting a privilege (*Ph.* 16-17, *Hec.* 47); are plays shareable and equally accessible, and how is authorship recognized and proven; does a playwright's claim to a play ever expire (*Eu.* 25-34), or can he forfeit the claim (*Ad.* 10); can a play be simultaneously duplicitous and simple (*HT* 4-6); can it belong to two authors in different ways (*HT* 7-9); is a decent play better than a cheap spectacle (*Hec.*); how does one distinguish between two plays (*An.* 10). In a word, Terence's prime concern is *poetic control*. This concern indeed takes part in a long and rich tradition of troping poetry as a woman. A brief survey will be instructive.

---

disguised as a slave (*Per.*); *meretrices* are shared asymmetrically between lovers (*Mil., As.*; *Truc.*; so is even a *matrona*: *Am.*) or they are to be shared between father and son (*As., Cas., Bac., Mer.*), and so on.

[40] Discussion of Menander in Traill 2008: 1-13 and *passim*; for Roman comedy, Konstan 1983 (*passim*).

[41] Dutsch (forthcoming); the various versions of the juxtaposition are apparently of perennial interest for ancient comedians: cf. Amphis, frg. 1. KA, where a hetaera is deemed more desirable than a wife.

5. Poetry as a woman in antiquity: articulating ownership and access

Ancient poets' erotic relation to their poetry operates almost exclusively within the dichotomy of chastity, fidelity, and exclusivity, as opposed to promiscuity, infidelity, and prostitution. Pindar illustrates the commercial aspect of poetry with the image of a prostitute in *Isthmian* 2; the Muse is a "greedy woman for hire" whose songs are put out sale (φιλοκερδής... ἐργάτις... ἐπέρναντο 6, 7).[42] Poets of Old Comedy debate exclusivity by portraying poetry as a wife or a hetaera.[43] Aristophanes says that comic production is a difficult job, "For indeed many have courted her, but she has granted her favors only to a few."[44] Dionysus in the *Frogs* summarizes the decadence and lack of talent of Euripides' successors, who, instead of creatively impregnating Tragedy, urinate on her only once.[45] Alan Sommerstein astutely comments: "Tragedy is imaged as a *hetaira.* To be awarded a chorus is, as it were, to secure a first date with her; but for these 'young lads' the first date is also the last, for they are so lacking in masculine power as to be totally incapable of giving her any satisfaction."[46]

Cratinus' fragmentary *Wine-flask* (Πυτίνη) imagines poetic competition as erotic rivalry.[47] The poet-protagonist is married to Comedy, who wants to divorce him because he is an

---

[42] *Isthm.* 2.5-8: ἀ Μοῖσα γὰρ οὐ φιλοκερδής | πω τότ' ἦν οὐδ' ἐργάτις· | οὐδ' ἐπέρναντο γλυκεῖαι μελιφθόγγου ποτὶ Τερψιχόρας | ἀργυρωθεῖσαι πρόσωπα μαλθακόφωνοι ἀοιδαί. ("For in those days the Muse was not yet greedy, | nor did she work for hire. | And sweet gentle-voiced odes did not go for sale, | with silvered faces, from honey-voiced Terpsichore"). While "she-worker" need not necessarily imply selling sex (Verdenius 1988: 123, ad loc. is skeptical), this interpretation is supported by the mention of ripeness and Aphrodite (4, 5), while ἐπέρναντο is very evocative of πόρνη: Simpson 1969: 470-1, with fn. 65, citing Wilamowitz. For venality of poetry (specific conclusions notwithstanding), see Kurke 1991 for Pindar, Carson 1993 for Simonides.

[43] Hall 2006: 171 speaks of "Old Comedy's tendency to offer metapoetic comment on itself and its creators, and these creators' capacity for talking about their own history and their rivals, found in the discourse of gender, the female body, and sexuality a rich seam of metaphor, allegory, and personification."

[44] *Eq.* 516-7: κωμῳδοδιδασκαλίαν εἶναι χαλεπώτατον ἔργον ἁπάντων· | πολλῶν γὰρ δὴ πειρασάντων αὐτὴν ὀλίγοις χαρίσασθαι. The feminine pronoun comes as a surprise: "[s]uddenly *komododidaskalia* is a woman (to be precise, a *hetaira),* dramatists are her (would-be) lovers, and mastery of the art is imaged as sexual conquest;" Sommerstein 2005: 162-3.

[45] Ar. *Ran.* 95, with Dover 1993: 202, ad loc.: "impotent are being contrasted with the fertile". Cf. Henderson 1991: 194; Hall 2006: 179.

[46] Sommerstein 2005: 166, and ff., on a host of other instances.

[47] A play "composed in the context of intertextual dialogue between Cratinus and Aristophanes, and is probably the culmination of this dialogue and of Cratinus' authorial self-presentation;" Bakola 2010: 59.

alcoholic. But Cratinus mocks himself as a poor husband of his art only to assert his legal rights and duties towards her. Ralph Rosen observes that "[b]eing married to the woman who allegorizes the entire genre in which one composes is a humorously arrogant stroke, since it implies special privilege and perhaps insight into the essence of the form;" Aristophanes' rivals, Emmanuela Bakola adds, are left out "as mere circumstantial suitors."[48]

Perhaps the most picturesque description of art as a sexual relation is found in Pherecrates' *Cheirons* (frg. 155 KA), where "[i]nnovations in the lyre and musical keys are presented as serial sexual abuse of personified Music." [49] A hetaera describes with juicy double-entendres how is she treated by her lovers, the new poets.[50] Especially to the point is that hetaerae comparing customers is itself a comic scene (e.g. Phoenicides frg. 4 KA), which Pherecrates repurposes into a discussion of aesthetics.

In the widely debated Epigram 28, Callimachus associates poetry of the Epic cycle with frequented roads, a public fountain, and a promiscuous lover.[51] The link may be, for example,

[48] Rosen 2000: 28; Bakola 2010: 61-62. The response came in Aristophanes' second *Clouds* after the first performance was defeated by the *Wine-flask*: in contrast to Cratinus' matronly wife, Aristophanes' comedy is the virginal Electra: Hall 2006: 175; more on the *Clouds* passage in Chapter 4.3.1. Very suggestive is Plutarch's simile: Aristophanes' poetry "is like a hetaera past her prime and playing the rôle of a wife" (ὥσπερ ἑταίρας τῆς ποιήσεως παρηκμακυίας, εἶτα μιμουμένης γαμετήν, *Mor*. 854a).

[49] Rusten 2011: 161.

[50] A selection will suffice to illustrate the poetologic imagery: "The first of my troubles was Melanippides, the very first to take and let me out, and make me wide enough for twelve strings. ... But Phrynis, sticking in his special pine cone, bent and screwed and wrecked me completely with twelve scales on five strings" (3-5, 14-16, tr. Rusten: ἐμοὶ γὰρ ἦρξε τῶν κακῶν Μελανιππίδης, | ἐν τοῖσι πρῶτος ὃς λαβὼν ἀνῆκέ με | χαλαρωτέραν τ' ἐποίησε χορδαῖς δώδεκα. | ... Φρῦνις δ' ἴδιον στρόβιλον ἐμβαλών τινα, | κάμπτων με καὶ στρέφων ὅλην διέφθορεν, | ἐν ἑπτὰ χορδαῖς δώδεχ' ἁρμονίας ἔχων.) Of the elaborate wordplay in the fragment particularly clever is on *chorde*, both a lyre-chord and a slang word for penis: complete commentary in Olson 2007: 182ff. (frg. D14 in his numbering). While most critics accept the identification of the speaker as a hetaera (e.g. Lloyd Jones 1981: 25, Olson 2007: 182), Slater 1996 rejects it on the grounds that the "joke and the double entendres work far better if she is a distinguished lady in reduced circumstances." Yet Dobrov and Urios-Aparisi 1995: 158 are undoubtedly correct to observe that "a scenario in which two professionals (as opposed to *parthenoi* or wives) compare notes is arguably the only social context in which the exchange of frg. 155 K-A. would be compelling, even acceptable;" cf. e.g. the confidential professional gossip in the opening scene of Plautus' *Cistellaria*. But Slater's impression need not be so off the mark after all: every prostitute is arguably a woman "in reduced circumstances" (on which see my Chapter 7).

[51] 28.1-4 Pfeiffer: ἐχθαίρω τὸ ποίημα τὸ κυκλικόν, οὐδὲ κελεύθωι | χαίρω τίς πολλοὺς ὧδε καὶ ὧδε φέρει, | μισέω καὶ περίφοιτον ἐρώμενον, οὐδ' ἀπὸ κρήνης | πίνω: σικχαίνω πάντα τὰ δημόσια ("I hate poems in the Epic Cycle, I

"excessive easiness,"[52] but also repetition and reuse.[53] Whatever the ultimate purpose of the poem, for Callimachus sexual partner and literature are reference points of equal standing. The metapoetics of erotic exclusivity and circulation will resurface in Augustan elegy, where poetry is figured as a woman by definition: *amor* is both the beloved one and the poem itself.[54] For Tibullus, Propertius, and Ovid, a stock blocking character is the *lena* in charge of their *puellae*. Sara Myers offers a trenchant synthesis:

> [the *lena*] establishes her position in erotic poetry as a rival and enemy of the poet-lover primarily because of her emphasis on the marketability of love or sexual favors. Her influence over the *puella* competes and conflicts with the interests of the elegiac poet-lover who traditionally offers poetry instead of gold... Although gift-giving is a traditional feature of erotic courtship, the elegists must constantly negotiate the implication that the relationship is a purely mercenary one. A concomitant suggestion is that what is purchasable is accessible to all.[55]

Myers concludes that "[a]lthough elegy's authorial first-person narrator attacks the *lena* as an enemy, she is revealed as an ally and an alter-ego... Ultimately, for the poet to achieve fame his poetry must become the property of the many, the poet and patron become the *lena* or *leno* who promotes his wares."[56]

---

don't like highways that are heavily traveled, I despise a promiscuous lover, and I don't drink from public fountains: everything public disgusts me;" tr. Lombardo and Rayor).

[52] Fantuzzi 2011: 431. Somewhat differently, Henrichs 1979: 211: "Poetry in the tradition of epic cycle touches on too many subjects, just as a busy road, a promiscuous lover, and the parish pump serve too many needs." Cf. Cameron 1995: 387ff.

[53] In the much contested last two lines of the epigram the figure of Echo appears to produce a phonetic echo Ἠχώ/ἔχει (see e.g. Boegehold 2004); perhaps the Echo additionally encapsulates the three images in the previous lines—the epic cycle, a lover running around, and the public well—all of which point to recurrence and repetitiveness. It may also be related that the word κύκλος is obscenely used for bodily orifices in Old Comedy (Henderson 1991: 139, §1470-8).

[54] For the latter meaning, *OLD* s.v. 5; bibliography on this motif in elegy in Sutherland 2005: 53, fn.3.

[55] Myers 1996: 13-14.

[56] Myers 1996: 20-21. Nor was this the only way of framing the anxiety; the poet could embody the venality himself: Horace "attempt[s] in such poems as *Epistles* 1.17 and 1.18 to trope the dependent poet as a *matrona fidelis* rather than a *levis meretrix*: a literary spouse rather than poetic whore;" Fear 2000: 217, with references.

The many different shapes of the idea of promiscuity of poetry offered plenty of potential and appealed to nearly all Roman poets from Catullus onwards.[57] For most of those cited above some connection with Terence has been proposed,[58] and the single play most closely linked with elegy is the *Eunuchus*.[59] Direct lines of influence are untraceable, however, if only because the trope is not attested in Terence's most important precedent, Menander (hardly an openly self-reflexive poet anyway). But, ever so fascinatingly, biographical tradition filled the gap, in connection with his rivalry with Philemon—which, incidentally, we have seen, was a legend that may have influenced Terence. Athenaeus reports that Menander had an affair with the hetaera Glykera, his own character:[60] "That Menander the poet loved Glykera is common knowledge. But he was ashamed of it. For when Philemon fell in love with a hetaera and called her "good" on stage, Menander wrote in response that no hetaera was good."[61] Not only is rivalry between male poets so matter-of-factly imagined as erotic, but their supposed claim to the women is in direct correlation with their literary portrayal.

We now return to Gowers' reading of Terence's *Adelphoe* mentioned above. In the prologue Plautus is said to have adapted a comedy by Diphilus but left out one scene (10), which Terence added to his adaptation of Menander's *Adelphoe*, and now invites the audience to decide whether that counts as theft (*furtum*, 13). Gowers notices that the "stolen" scene (155-96)

[57] Besides Myers 1996, see Oliensis 1997 on elegy; Oliensis 1998 on Horace; for Augustan poetry in general, see esp. Fear 2000. Poetry as a sexual act broadly: Sharrock 1991 and Keith 1994 on Ovid, Sutherland 2005 on Horace, Seo 2009 on Martial (see also below, 4.3.2), Caston 2012: 113-140 on elegy. On Juvenal, see references in Fear 2000: 220; for Persius, first chapter of Bartsch 2015. For the idea of literature as a body, Most 1992; for women as various personifications in general, Smith 2011.

[58] For Old Comedy and Callimachus, see above; *palliata* and elegy: Hunter 1985: 64 (on the *exclusus amator* motif); Konstan 1986; James 2012.

[59] Konstan 1986: 391: "[T]he ambiguous status of the mistress, who remains aloof from marriage; the problem of greed and gifts; the necessary role of the rival; and the emphasis on sincerity and inner feeling, for which the Roman elegists have been honored as the inventors of subjective love lyric."

[60] Lefkowitz 2012: 110. For the character, see Men. frg. 240 KA.

[61] ὅτι δὲ καὶ Μένανδρος ὁ ποιητὴς ἦρα Γλυκέρας κοινόν· ἐνεμεσήθη δέ. Φιλήμονος γὰρ ἑταίρας ἐρασθέντος καὶ χρηστὴν ταύτην ὀνομάσαντος διὰ τοῦ δράματος, ἀντέγραψεν Μένανδρος ὡς οὐδεμιᾶς οὔσης χρηστῆς (Ath. 13.594d, tr. slightly modified from Traill 2008: 8).

actually stages a theft: an *adulescens* kidnaps, for his brother, a prostitute in front of her pimp; the audience therefore has to "make a moral decision about whether the abduction itself counts as "theft" or well-deserved "rescue"."[62] The observation is all the more interesting because there are more textual clues. The pimp in the scene keeps threatening to hand the issue over to the authorities to decide: he will pursue his rights (*meum ius persequar*, 163); he then protests that the law is unfair (183) and sarcastically retorts that the abductor is also pursuing *his* rights (*suom ius postulat*, 201). Most to the point, the young man, Aeschinus, tells the girl not to worry, no one will "touch" her while he is there (*numquam dum ego adero hic te tanget*, 157), and the pimp protests by asking "Have *I* touched anything of *yours*?" (*tetigin tui quicquam*? 178). The pimp is not allowed to "touch" his own property just as Plautus' rights to this scene are revoked once he left it "untouched" (*reliquit integrum*, 10).[63] Terence "expressed out" Diphilus' scene word for word (*verbum de verbo expressum extulit*, 11), like the boy "oppressed" the pimp out of the girl (*per oppressionem ut hanc mi eripere postulet*, 238).[64]

The case of the *Adelphoe* exemplifies an important point. This scene is integrated in Terence's play (however it got there) and makes substantial ripples in the plot and character portrayal; and the ambiguity of literary theft is very characteristic of Terentian poetics. Short-circuiting the two further could offer useful insights into both his practiced dramaturgy and

[62] Gowers 2004: 161.
[63] For erotic and metapoetics of *tangere*, cf. Chapter 4.4, fn. 68.
[64] Finally, one also wonders if there may have been a joke at the occasion: the didascalic notice informs us that the *Adelphoe* was performed on funerary games for L. Aemilius Paulus, and the title of Diphilus' play Terence gives is *Synapothneskontes*, and Plautus' corresponding Latin title *Commorientes*, "Partners in death." The correspondence is not easy to explain away as coincidence. Even if Terence was free to choose a scene from a suitably titled play (how easily transportable are scenes between plays is yet another question), what are the odds that Plautus happened to have left out precisely one scene from such a play? Either the composer of the production record imaginatively inferred from the prologue or Terence is pulling a prank. For what that is worth, Wright 2013: 612, fn. 44, detects multiple instances in Greek comedy where "the joke also seems to depend on deliberate misattribution of a quotation." Most interestingly, Lucius Accius (*ap*. Varro, *ap*. Gell. 3.3.9.4), presumably in his work on history of theater a generation later (Erasmo 2004: 42-3), specifically denies Plautine authorship of *Commorientes*. It might be very significant that the issue in the *Adelphoe* prologue is Terence's theft from Plautus, just like in the *Eunuchus* prologue, which is the only other time Terence lists a Plautine title, and again an extracanonical one, the *Colax* (*Eu*. 25).

professed poetics. In the following chapters I investigate women as metapoetic tropes in Terence: I interpret his claims about, and claims to, his plays in light of the portrayal of his female characters, and vice versa.

One missing link in the survey of eroticization poetics above is Plautus; for all his theatrical self-awareness, this specific trope is hard to find. In the first chapter, however, I explore a possibility in one of his last plays, interpreting it as a one-time occasioned exception. The analogy between *Casina* the play and the eponymous Casina the girl in my reading supports the suggestion that in his swan's song Plautus designed that play as its own revival, humorously anticipating his own reception. In Chapter 2 we begin following the "reception" of Plautine and other comedy in Terence's *Eunuchus*, a play whose parts reportedly overlap with existing Latin adaptations by Plautus and Naevius. Terence pretends not to have known about them, I argue, in order to appropriate and obliterate his Roman predecessors. In Chapters 3 and 4 I examine the impact of this program on the rivalry between two men over the prostitute Thais, and portrayal of the girl Pamphila, respectively. The two women, I propose, manifest the issues of poetic and romantic primacy and exclusivity; they are appropriate metaphors for the two plays referred to in the prologue: the available and the unavailable one. Chapter 5 focuses on the metapoetics of the quest for Pamphila, concluding that the violation of the girl and the play are framed in paradoxes of initiative and imitation, with the purpose of problematizing the chronological position of the *Eunuchus* on a comic timeline. One of the effects is that this play is conceived of as a prehistory of comedy, both Greek and Roman.

Metapoetry in the *Self-Tormentor* is the topic of Chapters 6 and 7. I first interpret the cryptic reference to a *duplex comoedia* not as structural duplicity, but as performative, between what is staged and what is to be imagined in the background, which I term "ontological

duplicity." I then put that concept to use in investigating the role of Antiphila, a curious hybrid of a *virgo*, pseudo-*meretrix*, and a concubine. One of the main problems that her character exposes is that of verifying a woman's inner feelings, and hence dramatizing how they are expressed and perceived. Finally, Chapter 8 makes a full circle, showing that this is an enduring concern of Greek New Comedy and Roman *palliata*. I end by investigating how Menander, and especially Plautus in the *Miles gloriosus*, encoded the uncertainty about a woman's emotions as deceptiveness, and duplicity, of performance.

Chapter 1

Posthumously humorous: the revival and metapoetic afterlife of Plautus' *Casina*

You always wonder what happens after you die. Well, everything happens; it just doesn't include you.

— Louis C.K.

tun illam ducas? hercle me suspendio,
quam tu eius potior fias, satiust mortuom.
...
si nunc me suspendam, meam operam luserim
et praeter operam restim sumpti fecerim
et meis inimicis voluptatem creaverim.
quid opus est, qui sic mortuos? equidem tamen
sorti sum victus, Casina nubet vilico.
...
protollo mortem mihi;
certum est, hunc Acheruntem praemittam prius.

You, marrying her? I'd rather hang and kill myself
than let you take her!
...
If I hang myself now, it would be waste of effort,
and the waste of buying a rope on top of that,
and that would cause joy to my rivals.
And what's the point, anyway? I'm dead as it is.
I lost by the lot, Casina will marry the superintendent.
...
I'll put off my death.
I'm eager to send him to the Netherworld before me.

— *Casina*, 111-112, 424-8, 447-8.

Plautus' *Casina* is well known as a metatheatrical sex farce.[1] Old Lysidamus and his son are both in love with Casina, a girl abandoned in infancy and adopted by Cleostrata, Lysidamus' wife. They delegate their slaves as surrogate suitors, to marry Casina nominally but in practice hand her over to them. Lysidamus' proxy, Olympio, wins Casina by lot but the wedding is sabotaged;

[1] On metatheater in the *Casina*, see Beacham 1991: 88-116; Williams 1993; Moore 1998: 158-180; Slater 2000: 70-6. A brief commentary with some bibliography on sexuality, Florence 2014: 375-6.

the rival suitor, slave Chalinus, disguises himself as the bride and makes a comic butt out of Olympio and the *senex amator* Lysidamus.

For the present discussion it will be important to keep in mind, first, the fundamental link between the sexual and the theatrical—substitution, role-playing and cross-dressing.[2] Second, what made the *Casina* especially relevant for literary history, is that a part of the prologue seems to claim that the play was revived sometime after Plautus (5-22):

qui utuntur vino vetere sapientis puto
et qui libenter veteres spectant fabulas;
<atque> antiqua opera et verba cum vobis placent,
aequom est placere ante <alias> veteres fabulas:
nam nunc novae quae prodeunt comoediae
multo sunt nequiores quam nummi novi.
nos postquam populi rumore intelleximus
studiose expetere vos Plautinas fabulas,
antiquam eius edimus comoediam,
quam vos probastis qui estis in senioribus;
nam iuniorum qui sunt non norunt, scio;
verum ut cognoscant dabimus operam sedulo.
haec cum primum acta est, vicit omnis fabulas.
ea tempestate flos poetarum fuit,
qui nunc abierunt hinc in communem locum.
sed tamen absentes prosunt <pro> praesentibus.
vos omnes opere magno esse oratos volo,
benigne ut operam detis ad nostrum gregem.

People who drink old wine I consider wise,
and also those who enjoy watching old plays.
Since you are pleased by old works and words,
it's only fair you are pleased by old plays before others.
These new comedies that appear now
are more worthless than new coins.
After we heard the word on the street
that you eagerly desire Plautine plays,
we're bringing an old comedy of his,
which was approved by those older among you.
The younger ones have not seen it, I know.
But we'll do our best to have them know it.
When it was first staged, it beat all other plays.
Poets flourished in that climate,

[2] For metatheatricality of sex and gender in the play, see Gold 1998.

who have now gone away to the common place.
Although absent, they benefit us [as if?] present.
I want to appeal to all of you very much
that you pay benevolent attention to our company.

Lines 5-20 (or 22) are traditionally interpreted as post-Plautine interpolation because they *purport* to speak about the play's revival, or *retractatio*.[3] I use the reservation advisedly, for below I will examine whether these lines are indeed interpolated and thus evidence of the play's revival. To do so, I focus on curious parallels between the prologue and the play, which seem to indicate a much more organic relation than one would expect from a revival prologue that is simply patched onto the existing script.

We begin by briefly restating some useful, uncontroversial observations about the play's elaborate imagery.[4] Catherine Connors analyzes in detail the thematic importance of herbal and olfactory language, demonstrating, among other effects, its sexual overtones: "in the *Casina* scents signify the relations of the characters. The aromatic names Pardalisca [leopard known for scent], Casina [spice herb *casium*], and Myrrhina [myrtle] constitute a spectrum of erotic appeal."[5] George Franko adds and discusses three other major groups of imagery, likewise redolently erotic: animals, especially dogs; food, and especially wine; and combat imagery.[6] After convincingly outlining patterns of imagery in the play, Franko summarizes and provocatively ends his essay by recalling the imagery from the prologue:

> "This imagery is pervasive, interwoven, coherent, and meaningful. It provides ample testimony that Plautus, the poet with a barking name ([*latranti nomine*] 34), was indeed one of the *flos poetarum* (18) and a purveyor of fine vintage plays ([*vino vetere*; *veteres fabulas*] 5-6) that defeated all rivals ([*vicit omnis fabulas*] 17)."[7]

[3] Abel 1955: 55 extends the interpolation for two lines, accepted by MacCary and Willcock 1976: 98; the question of interpolation has not been properly revisited since Abel, apart from Slater 2000, discussed below. For a discussion of the concept of *retractatio*, based primarily on the *Casina* prologue, see Duckworth 1994: 65-68.
[4] A survey of imagery in MacCary and Willcock 1976: 27-34.
[5] Connors 1997: 309.
[6] Franko 1999.
[7] Franko 1999: 13.

We find the same metaphors, then, in the play itself and referring to the circumstances of the play's production; Franko does not continue on to explain how this came to be. If the text of the *Casina* is written by Plautus, and the prologue section cited above is a later interpolation, then one explanation of the corresponding imagery would have to be that our *retractator* noticed existing images in Plautus' *Casina* and activated them as poetologic metaphors in the new prologue. Because the current scholarly consensus is that the *Casina* prologue is partly a later addition, I begin my analysis by attributing these correspondences to a revival producer. Once they are outlined, however, I offer an alternative, more plausible interpretation.

The metaphors in question turn out to be very old and widespread, as is easily confirmed by René Nünlist's survey of early Greek poetologic images.[8] To name a few, "flower" is a mainstream metaphor for literature (hence anthology, *florilegia*).[9] Further, more recently, Isabelle Torrance surveys some ancient sources where wine as the Dionysiac beverage symbolizes drama.[10] In the *Casina* there is a humorous reference to Bacchants' frenzy (979-81), which Niall Slater reads as metatheatrical confrontation between Lysidamus and his wife.[11] Besides helping us date the play (on which more below), these lines might be recalling the comparison of plays with wine in the prologue. Poet as a dog is another known association; biting, for example, was seen as fitting for iambic invective and satire.[12] Lastly, comparing new plays with new coins would belong to a long tradition of imaging poetry as money or treasure.[13]

Clearly the author of the prologue was well-acquainted with, and very fond of, Greek poetologic imagery. We might therefore consider investigating some potentially implicit metapoetic allusions as well. Indeed many possible cases turn out in the following, presumably

[8] Nünlist 1998.
[9] Nünlist 1998: 206-223.
[10] Torrance 2011: 182-6 (= 2013: 19-24). See also Bierl 1990.
[11] Slater 2000: 79; I cite and further discuss the passage below.
[12] A list of ancient loci and bibliography in Branham 1989: 266-7, n.34.
[13] Nünlist 1998, ch. 15; cf. Pi. *P*. 6.-7-8; *I*. 1.50-51; cf. Torrance 2013: 20-23, and see Chapter 4.2.2.2, esp. fn. 43.

authentically Plautine, part of the prologue. The financial imagery continues immediately (23-34):

eicite ex animo curam atque alienum aes.
ne quis formidet flagitatorem suom:
ludi sunt, ludus datus est argentariis;
tranquillum est, Alcedonia sunt circum forum:
ratione utuntur, ludis poscunt neminem,
secundum ludos reddunt autem nemini.
aures vocivae si sunt, animum advortite:
comoediai nomen dare vobis volo.
Clerumenoe vocatur haec comoedia
graece, latine Sortientes. Deiphilus
hanc graece scripsit, post id rursum denuo
latine Plautus cum latranti nomine.

Don't worry about debts,
let no one fear his debt-collector.
The games are on—we played a game with the bankers.
It's calm, it's Alcyon Days around the forum.
They calculate: during games don't collect from anyone,
and after the games they don't return anything to anyone.
If your ears are available, heed here:
I want to give you the name of the comedy.
This comedy is called *Kleroumenoi*
in Greek; in Latin, *Men Casting Lots*. Diphilus
wrote it in Greek; after that, once more again,
Plautus with the barking name wrote it in Latin.

The audience is encouraged not to worry about debt, lit. "someone else's money" which might allude to what the play's revival is supposed to represent: "borrowing" the *Casina* from another playwright, Plautus. Such a metapoetic reference to appropriating another poet's work would aptly resonate with the information that Cleostrata adopted the exposed infant Casina and raised her "almost as if she were her own daughter" (*quasi si esset ex se nata, non multo secus*, 46; *puellam expositiciam*, 79). Raising abandoned children is as such of course a stock dramaturgic

device, but the *Casina* might recall a particular use of the image: in antiquity a literary work is routinely figured as an author's child.[14]

I suggest, then, that the adoption of Casina the girl is activated as a metapoetic trope of revival of *Casina* the play. The Greek title Κληρούμενοι might partake in the joke as well: the κληρ- root conflates the ideas of lot and inheritance (cf. e.g. κληρόνομος, "heir"). One thing seems certain so far: Casina the girl—exposed, adopted, won by lot—and *Casina* the play—written by Diphilus, adapted by Plautus, reportedly restaged by our anonymous—have changed their "owners" several times. In that respect especially suggestive are lines 25-6. No debt-collectors are around during the Days of Alcyon—a time of exceptionally calm weather around the winter solstice, when the bird kingfisher, *alcyon*, is believed to migrate. Alcedonia, a fictitious festival named after that period might be, as MacCary and Willcock think, "of course merely a passing joke."[15] Yet it may be more than that. Calm weather accompanying the *Casina*'s revival would effectively contrast the "stormy" conditions of the play's original performance (*ea tempestate*, 18). It is extremely significant, further, that the only reason why the kingfisher migrates during calm weather at all is to hatch eggs.[16] There is a curious association of quiet surroundings and adoption in the play itself. Myrrhina and Cleostrata speak about the girl's origin (196-8):

> MYR. *obsecro*
> *tace*. CLE. *nam hic nunc licet dicere:*
> *nos sumus*. MYR. *ita est. unde ea tibi est*?
>
> MYR. Please
> be quite. CLE. We can talk:
> it's just us. MYR. Oh, right. So where did you get the girl?

[14] Adoption is a metaphor for a play produced by someone other than its author in Aristophanes' *Clouds* parabasis (530-36); see detailed analysis and further examples in connection to the "*adespoton* Pamphila" in the *Eunuchus*, Chapter 4.2.2.2 and 4.3.
[15] MacCary and Willcock 1976: 101.
[16] See Dunbar 1998: 163-4 and 493, on Ar. *Av*. 251 and 1591-5.

The thematic thread I am positing, therefore, is that when it is quiet all around, one can temporarily get away with appropriating someone else's money, someone else's child—and someone else's play.[17]

Particularly appropriate is the bird allegory. From Pindar onwards, a poet is frequently compared to a bird.[18] Besides being associated by singing,[19] a poet is like a bird laying and sometimes counterfeiting literary offspring. Latin uses the same image of cuckoo's eggs—*suppono*, "place under"—for falsely planting a person (typically children: Pl. *Cist*. 553, 725; *Truc*. 804) and for compromising literary authenticity.[20] In a creative variation of the link, Horace imagines poetic plagiarism as plucking and putting on another bird's feathers.[21] Finally, bird-catching was idiomatic for "word-catching," both in the sense of petty quibbling (*aucupia verborum*, Cic. *Caec*. 65.10; cf. *de Orat*. 2.30, 59, 256) and of spying and interloping (e.g. *auceps sermoni*, Pl. *Mil*. 955; *dictis auceps auribus*, *St*. 102).

Analogies between *Casina* the play and Casina the girl surface throughout the prologue. In lines 5-8 the spectators are repeatedly "pleased" (*placere*) by old plays and old wine. Later in

[17] Interestingly, Slater 2000: 68 notices the quickened pace of the play after the allotment of Casina, and purposely or not uses meteorological language: "We are now halfway through the play. The pace until now has been fairly slow. Only one thing has really happened: the award of Casina to Olympio by the lot. Lysidamus' plans are in motion, but Chalinus has found him out. The short scene between Lysidamus and Alcesimus is a moment of poised calm before the storm breaks. The storm arrives in the person of Cleostrata (531)."

[18] Nünlist 1998: 39-60.

[19] Cf. Goldman 2008 on unmusicality of ravens in Petronius.

[20] *OLD* s.v. 7, cf. noun *suppositio* and adj. *suppositicius*; for *supponere* as forgery, see Speyer 1974: 16.

[21] See the discussion (and translation) of Seo 2009: 587: Horace describes "a mediocre poet, Celsus, who imitates the poetry he reads in the Palatine library, just as a little crow dresses up in scavenged plumage (Horace, *Ep*. 1.3.15–20): *quid mihi Celsus agit, monitus multumque monendus, | privatas ut quaerat opes et tangere vitet | scripta, Palatinus quaecumque recepit Apollo, | ne, si forte suas repetitum venerit olim | grex avium plumas, moveat cornicula risum | furtivis nudata coloribus*? — "What is my Celsus up to, he's been warned and I must keep warning him | all the time that he should rely on his own resources and avoid profaning | the writings that Palatine Apollo has received, lest someday a flock of birds | should happen by to recover their own feathers and the little crow raise a | laugh when it has been stripped of its purloined finery?"… This constitutes Horace's most explicit mention of literary *furtum*."

the prologue it is narrated with very suggestive language what happened once Casina was adopted (47-9):

> *postquam ea adolevit ad eam aetatem, ut viris*
> *placere posset, eam puellam hic senex*
> *amat efflictim, et item contra filius.*
>
> After the girl matured to an age that she could
> please men, this old man fell madly in love
> with her, and, in opposition to him, his son did too.

Casina the girl "pleases" men like good wine. Additionally, *adolevit* might equally be a form of *adolesco*, "grow mature," and *adoleo*, "release scent" (cf. the odor imagery: *olent* 236, *subolet* 266, 277). This ambiguity would befit Casina's name: tasty and fragrant, she is best consumed, like wine, past a certain age.

Casina's coming of age is in fact crucial. She has grown from a metapoetic child into a yet another common poetologic image: poetry as a sexual partner.[22] The erotic dimension of appetite and savoring come to the fore as the analogy of the girl and wine continues. The *prologus* claims that slaves' weddings are possible in Greece, Carthage, and Apulia, and challenges anyone who thinks otherwise to a bet him a pitcher of honeyed wine (*id ni fit, mecum pignus si quis volt dato | in urnam mulsi*, 75-6). The wine as the prize of the contest foreshadows the lengthy gambling scene (353-423), from which presumably derives the play's Greek title: casting lots determines who will marry Casina.

Craving for Casina the girl is expressed in the same language as craving for *Casina* the play. The prologue informs us that the two slaves "desire" to marry the orphaned Casina (*puellam expositiciam... uxorem expetunt*, 79-80) just like the audience is rumored to "desire" Plautine plays (*expetere vos Plautinas fabulas*, 12). Finally, during the dicing scene Lysidamus makes several Freudian slips and refers to himself marrying Casina instead of his slave (365-9);

[22] See Introduction, sect. 5, and discussions throughout Chapters 3-5.

he explains his confusion: that happens when you "desire" something so much (*ita fit, ubi quid tanto opere expetas*, 370).

Sexual undertones of restaging continue. This is an old play which the older members of the audience have already "approved" (*probastis*, 14) but the younger have not (14-15). The mixed audience of *Casina*'s revival corresponds to two claimants for Casina the girl, the *senex* and his son: it is all about who will get to the girl first (cf. 882, 884, 890). With that in mind it is noteworthy that access to both Casina the girl and *Casina* the play is mediated: by proxy-slaves, and by revival production.[23] The prologue explicitly warns the audience that they will not see Casina the character in the play (82-3)—and they will not see *Casina* the play for that matter. Instead they are presented with a mock-bride and a remake of the play. In the wedding-drag-show scene, which has long been recognized as a play-within-a-play,[24] Olympio makes a move on the bride unaware that "Casina" is the other slave Chalinus disguised; the humiliated Lysidamus reflects on the theme of substitution: he asks if there is someone in the audience to step in for him (*sed ecquis est qui homo munus velit fungier | pro me*? 949-50).

Likewise, Chalinus' remark that he is treated unusually for a "new bride" (*novae nuptae*, 1011; cf. 881) is only fair if this *Casina* is not a premiering play. The prologue's explanation that, despite what some may say, slave-weddings are nothing "new" ("…*novom attulerunt, quod fit nusquam gentium.*" | *at ego aio...* 70-1) acquires another layer of meaning in retrospect: this wedding and this play have been seen already.

This might explain the nostalgic reference to forever gone golden age of the *flos poetarum*. One recalls that flower is a standard metaphor for virginal youth, especially female. The image is old (*HDem*. 105ff.), found in both Menander (εὐήλικος προσώπου | ἄνθος, *Dysk*.

[23] Line 20 is textually uncertain (MacCary and Willcock 1976: 100) but clearly has something to add to this idea of surrogacy.
[24] Gold 1998; Williams 1993; cf. also now Dutsch 2015: 23-26.

950-1) and Terence (*flos ipse*, sc. Pamphila, *Eu*. 319), and welcomed by Latin love poetry (*floridam... puellulam*, Catul. 61.57; cf. 17.14, 62.39); conversely, Apuleius will use *virgines* for rosebuds (*Met*. 3.29). The title character of the *Casina* is named after the aromatic herb to titillate the senses of horny old Lysidamus.[25] This ironically plays with the *prologus*' claim that the older generation now in the audience has had the pleasure of seeing the play some time ago: it has been "deflowered" at its original, virginal performance, and the poetic bloom is gone.[26]

At this point we should pause and ask: if the prologue really testifies to the revival of *Casina*, then how do we explain the striking parallels between thematically significant images in the play and the prologue? The hypothesis I have been testing so far is that they are to be credited to a supposed *retractator*: he detected imagery with poetologic potential, and activated it in the interpolated prologue so as to reconfigure the *Casina* into a metapoetic commentary on its own revival. But possible allusions to restaging go beyond the presumably interpolated prologue well into the play. And it is hard to believe that so many innocent but coherent references just happened to be lying dormant in Plautus, waiting to be metapoetically assembled into an equally coherent programmatic prologue some decades later.[27] *If* this is really a revival prologue, than at least some of this language in the play must have been added by the later producer. This would in turn have to mean that Plautus' *Casina* is not only revived but altered in the process—and there would be no way of telling how much.

[25] Connors 1997: 305: "A Roman audience would have been ready to laugh, or groan, at punning references to fragrant cosmetics or condiments in a play about a woman named Casina," and *passim*.
[26] Note the difference in the poetologic image of the flower: unlike Pindar's ἄνθεα ὕμνων (*O*. 9.48), Plautus' *flos poetarum* can suggest that the flower *belongs to* the poets.
[27] Thus problems remain even if one accepts the suggestion of Slater 2000:59-60 that most of the prologue is post-Plautine. Slater's reasoning is that "[n]o other prologue gives us so much irrelevant information about the Greek original [as the *Casina* prologue]" (58), and that "[t]he whole of 30-83 seems to reflect someone's interest in filling in all that Plautus left out" (60). I hope to have shown, however, that much of it is thematically very significant.

But such an alarming conclusion would have to follow only if we take the prologue account of revival *literally*. A more plausible alternative scenario, I argue, is to take these lines not as *evidence of* revival but a *joke about* revival and attribute it to Plautus. Revivals and related production-related situations seem to have been a standing metatheatrical joke; one immediate example is in the *Bacchides*, where a character says that he cannot stand Plautus' own *Epidicus* if one Pellio is starring (213-15).

One such covert joke, indeed *the* joke of the *Casina*, might be heard when the groom Olympio asks the audience's attention as he recounts how he was tricked by the fake Casina (879-80):

> *operam date, dum mea facta itero: est operae pretium auribus accipere,*
> *ita ridicula auditu, iteratu ea sunt quae ego intus turbavi,..*
>
> Pay attention, while I repeat my deeds: your ears will get their money's worth,
> so hilarious to hear and repeat is the mess I made inside...

Like the entire play, the drag farce as its miniature summary is worth repeating. The reference in these lines to play's monetary value recalls the old coins and debt relief from the prologue, advertising this play as a good investment: good old currency that retains its market value. Thus, the *repeated* repetition (*itero, iteratu*) signifies not only a restaged play, but an inherently *restagable* play: this is one play you will want to see again and again. This perfectly resonates with the otherwise odd redundancy in line 33: Diphilus wrote this comedy in Greek, and Plautus wrote it in Latin, *rursum denuo*: again—*and again*. That is, Plautus is spoken of as having already designed the *Casina* as its own reperformance.[28]

[28] Damen 1985: 247, fn. 17 is heading in a somewhat different direction but rightly notices that the redundancy might be significant: "The joke implies that there was a Latin version of the play before Diphilus wrote the original, so that Plautus could put it *back again* into Latin" (original emphasis); for a different interpretation that this means considerable reworking of the Greek original (*denuo* taken to mean "from scratch"), see O'Bryhim 81-2, with fn. 7. Yet the choice of words is suspicious for a prologue that speaks about repeated performance.

To this we add that both in the prologue and the play there are playful references not only to Casina's and the *Casina*'s past but also to their future. The playwright teasingly denies Lysidamus access to the mysterious heroine by postponing access. The old man is eager to kiss Casina "today," and hug and kiss her "now, right now" (*ut ego hodie Casinam deosculabor… iam hercle amplexari, iam osculari gestio*, 466, 471), but Olympio is pessimistic: "I don't think that can happen today" (*at non opinor fieri hoc posse hodie*, 473). Lysidamus' goal is not just unattainable but a self-conscious literary fantasy, rescheduled as it is for after the play is over. Ever so appropriately, Lysidamus persists by incentivizing Olympio with another metatheatrical fantasy: manumission tomorrow (*cras*, 474).[29] The prologue announced that Casina will likewise stay out of reach—for now (81-6):

> *ea invenietur et pudica et libera,*
> *ingenua Atheniensis, neque quicquam stupri*
> *faciet profecto in hac quidem comoedia.*
> *mox hercle vero, post transactam fabulam,*
> *argentum si quis dederit, ut ego suspicor,* 85
> *ultro ibit nuptum, non manebit auspices.*
>
> She will be discovered to be both chaste and freeborn,
> a legitimate Athenian, nor in any fornication
> will she engage—at least not in this play.
> But… soon… after the play is finished,
> if anyone gives her some money, I guess
> she'll marry him of her own accord, without waiting for the augurs.

The *prologus* is inviting the audience to stay for the after-party: this play will go on. Even better, it will keep on going repeatedly. If we imagine that this invitation was hypothetically said when the play was supposedly staged previously, it would effectively anticipate the play's revival, that is, the "current" version of it. The *Casina*, therefore, is a self-replicating show from its inception.

[29] For *cras* and other the metadramatic uses of time in Roman comedy, see the excellent study by Dunsch 2005.

Stick around, the prologue says, because as soon as the play ends it will have already begun again.[30]

For the end, two questions are worth addressing: could have this metapoetic joke about *Casina*'s revival practically worked before a live audience? Second, *why* would Plautus do something like this in the first place?

As for the first question, the audience would have in all probability known if they were watching a revival or not. But there is no reason to think that the prologue intended to fool them either. As much as modern critics crave for hard evidence for Roman theatrical practices, comic prologues do not necessarily help, or at all.[31] Random information about titles and authors of Greek models, for example, are a proof that Roman audiences—and poets—cared about them much less than we do.[32] Especially misleading can be references to comic competitions (e.g. *Am.* 64-85) because there were no comic competitions in Rome like there were in Athens—and even there dramatic competitions were already a regular topic of jokes.[33] Remarks of this kind became ritualized conventional jokes, such as when Plautine clever slaves habitually boast about winning the victory palm.[34] Therefore, no matter how optimistic one may be about mining the *Casina* prologue for data, one piece of information that certainly cannot be literally true is that the

[30] Very interesting is the unique description of Plautus "with a barking name:" *latine Plautus cum latranti nomine* (34). While the poet as a dog might have something to do with the canine imagery in this play, there might be an additional metapoetic level of barking: its sound. Namely, Plautus refers to his Latin adaptation with the formula "translated into barbarian language" (*vortit barbare*, *As.* 11; *Trin.* 19); ancient popular etymology seems to have sometimes interpreted *barbarus* onomatopoetically as barking, from the inarticulate sound of foreign language (Maltby 1991, s. vv. *barbaricum: "clamor exercitus": barbarismus: "quod barbari prave locuntur"*) Thus, Plautus the "Barking Bard" of the *Casina* sounds like an alternative of his own formula, the "Barbarian Bard," and not just any alternative. It is the repetition that matters: *latine latranti* unpacks the *bar-bar* repetition and alludes to reperformability of this particular Latin adaptation.
[31] This needs to be repeated often; cf. e.g. for Old Attic comedy, Wright 2012: 10: "There is nothing in comedy that we can absolutely rely on as being serious, even (or especially) the bits which tell us that they are serious."
[32] Cf. Gratwick 1982: 96.
[33] Wright 2012: 31-69.
[34] Fantham 1972: 31-34.

Casina defeated *other* comedies (17). In other words, there would have been nothing unusual whatsoever if the Roman audience of the mock-revived *Casina* was in on the joke.

One possible answer to the second question depends on dating; while such arguments can never be fully conclusive, I believe the possibility is far too interesting to be left unexamined. It is now universally accepted that the *Casina* is one Plautus' very last plays. The traditional date of his death is 184, and the play almost certainly alludes to the senatorial prohibition of celebrating Bacchanalia, dated two years earlier, 186.[35] Lysidamus comes outside with his cloak, the comedy's eponymous *pallium*, torn by the fake bride and runs into his wife (978-81):

> CLE. *quin responde, tuo quid factum est pallio*?
> LYS. *Bacchae hercle, uxor*... CLE. *Bacchae*? LYS. *Bacchae hercle, uxor*...
> MYR. *nugatur sciens*,
> *nam ecastor nunc Bacchae nullae ludunt*. LYS. *oblitus fui*,
> *sed tamen Bacchae*... CLE. *quid, Bacchae*? LYS. *sin id fieri non potest*…
>
> CLE. How about if you tell me what happened to your *pallium*?
> LYS. Bacchants, my wife... CLE. Bacchants? LYS. Bacchants, my wife...
> MYR. He is talking gibberish on purpose;
> there are no Bacchants reveling now. LYS. Oh, I forgot…
> but, but still, Bacchants... CLE. *What* Bacchants? LYS. Well, if that's not possible…

This passage, we should note, is more thematically relevant than it may appear at first sight; Slater, for example, sees it as a social commentary wrapped into the symbolism of performance: "This structural pattern [of role-reversals] is knit to one pattern of imagery only at the moment of the Bacchae reference. ... Lysidamus' lust is not human, not a straying within the limits that society and comedy can tolerate, but animalistic, frenzied, Bacchic."[36] If so, the exchange between Lysidamus and Cleostrata would seem to have most effect precisely at a time when the ban on Bacchanals was fresh in memory, shortly after 186 and before 184.

[35] No significant contribution to the scholarship on the dating has appeared since the overview of Frank 1933, who also convincingly rejects an alternative proposal to date the play to 210 BCE.
[36] Slater 2000: 75.

If, therefore, the *Casina* was Plautus' "swan's song," one is tempted to speculate that the seasoned Barbarian Bard may have pulled one last prank: constructing the revival of the *Casina* and securing his own afterlife and literary reception. It is worth recalling that biographies of ancient dramatists, especially comic ones, regularly report their deaths in some connection with their literary activity.[37] These fanciful inferences and fabrications of course speak more about the biographers than the poets, but precisely so they help us understand the widespread ancient traditions of biographical speculation. One wonders if the poets themselves were aware of, and perhaps even deliberately contributed to, such traditions. To take one famous example, Sophocles' last play, the *Oedipus at Colonus* (produced posthumously by his sons), has been often read autobiographically: the old blind hero is taken to represent the nonagenarian poet on his deathbed.[38] Moreover, Gwendolyn Compton-Engle attractively proposes that Sophocles-as-Oedipus inspired Aristophanes to pay homage to the tragedian in his own last play, the *Ploutos*, through the figure of another old and blind man, personified Wealth.[39] Poets' deaths, therefore, seem to have been a topic of their own interests, not just of their biographers. It is possible, then, that Plautus took part in that tradition and, being what he is, chose to have a laugh at his own impending demise. As if the old comedian is saying: "My end may be near and this may be my last play—but I'm not going anywhere."

[37] Eupolis was allegedly drowned by Alcibiades for attacking him in comedies; Cratinus, who cheated on his wife Comedy with Drunkenness in his mock-autobiographic *Wine-flask*, reportedly died of alcoholism. Philemon died either of laughing too much, or immediately after finishing his last play, when nine Muses told him in a dream that he is about to die. Menander's drowning is narrated as a Hellenistic romance, while his Roman heir, Terence, is said to have drowned with manuscripts of adapted Menander's plays; Lefkowitz 2013: 109-12; *Life of Terence,* Suet. *Poet*, 11.80-3.

[38] See e.g. Markantonatos 2007: 15: "one cannot help being aware that there must be some kind of structural relation between Sophocles' assumed appreciation of heroic beneficence and Oedipus' elevation to the level of protecting daemon." Cf. Hanink 2010: 60.

[39] Compton-Engle 2013.

Chapter 2

The *Eunuchus* prologue: plagiarism and appropriation

> Creer un poncif, c'est le genie. / Je dois creer un poncif.
>
> (Creating a cliché, now that's genius. I must create a cliché.)
>
> — Charles Baudelaire, "Fusées" (1897)

> When a person vehemently denies something that has not been affirmed, we wonder why he goes to the trouble, and we conclude that expressly what he is denying is true… Now, instead of using the word no, a patient may burst out laughing… In the comic world, if possession is the ultimate fact, dispossession is the ultimate act. … To steal is to falsify, for it is to forge, as it were, a title to ownership.
>
> — Eric Bentley, "On the other side of Despair" (1964)

2.1. Prologue problems

The *Eunuchus* prologue offers the greatest concentration of literary-critical and biographical information that we find variously grouped in other Terence's prologues. The speaker begins by claiming that the poet is only responding to his opponent's provocation (4-6) and refers to one of the rival's plays where the defendant spoke before the plaintiff (11-13). We then hear that sometime before the today's performance the poet's opponent interrupted the performance and accused him of "stealing" the characters of the soldier and a parasite from Plautus' and Naevius' *Colax* (*exclamat furem*, 23; 20-27;). The poet swears he took these two characters directly from Menander's *Kolax*, unaware that it had been already adapted by Plautus and Naevius (27-35; *factas prius | Latinas*, 33-4). He then lists stock comic characters and motifs claiming they are all generic anyway, and that he should not be blamed for saying what has already been said (36-43; *nullumst iam dictum quod non dictum sit prius*, 41); he is only doing what the older poets were doing (43).

If taken literally, the prologue contains numerous practical puzzles and contradictory poetics. First, it is unclear why are we hearing about the inverted order of the plaintiff's and defendant's speech in his rival's play.[1] Second, it is hard to imagine the occasion where the charges of plagiarism could have been put forward.[2] Third, the charges are unparalleled; indeed the *Colax* attributed to *both* Plautus *and* Naevius (25) implies that one could be imagined as "plagiarizing" from the other, apparently with impunity.[3] Further, it is somewhat suspicious that Terence did not know about previous adaptations, while his opponent was so familiar with them as to recognize plagiarized portions precisely and immediately.[4] What was the purpose of the

[1] It can hardly mean poor dramaturgy; the same order is found, for example, in Menander's *Epitrepontes* (Barsby 1999: 84, ad 10-11); Menander's is as good of a precedent as we would need and Terence must have been well acquainted with his dramaturgic technique.

[2] The preview apparently organized by Terence's rival (*perfecit sibi ut inspiciundi esset copia*, 21) would have been most unusual; Barsby 1999: 85-6: "This is our only record of a preliminary performance of a Roman play before state officials. Since the play had already been bought, this performance cannot have been part of the normal selection process. T.'s account rather implies that Luscius had demanded a preview of the play in order to voice his criticisms of T.'s methods;" similarly Germany 2008: 149. This, however, would require that the rival had reason to suspect something; Goldberg 2005: 50 offers a somewhat strained conspirative rationale: "Having learned via the professional grapevine that Terence's new play took a soldier and parasite from an old *Colax*, he contrived to hear the parts, to confirm his suspicions, and then to shout out his objection at the appropriate moment."

[3] Plautus' *Cistellaria* and Caecilius' *Synaristosae* (197-98 Ribbeck = Gell. 15.15.2) are possibly both adaptations of Menander's *Synaristosae*. For an attempt to explain this, see McGill 2012: 126, 127: "We cannot know if the concept of plagiarism that Terence points to in the *Eunuchus* had already been established and was more broadly recognized in Roman literary culture, simply because no other source gives voice to that way of thinking... it becomes plausible that the concept of plagiarism with which Terence was working was not in place when they [Plautus and Naevius] wrote;" cf. Barsby 1999: 16, 85-6, ad 25-6. Goldberg 1986: 95 speculates that by Terence's time the rules may have become stricter because of the shortage of new Greek models; from the biographical detail that Terence died in Greece with Menander's manuscripts (Suet. *Vita* 11.82ff.) Goldberg infers that Terence went in search of new plays. Reliability of Terence's biography aside, one could in fact argue that under limited supply it would make more sense that Romans allowed for revival adaptations rather than imposed restrictions (moreover, even if there were restrictions on old and short supply of new plays, a poet who managed to find an unadapted one would hardly risk including a second one; and Terence did precisely the opposite). Terence does not even mention the possibility of a sanction; Goldberg 2005: 73 observes that "aediles were not overly scrupulous or inquisitive about their purchases;" similarly, McGill 2012: 125ff.; but see my discussion of "monopoly" in the Introduction, sect. 2-3 The restriction on repeated adaptation may have easily been *invented* by Terence only to be negated; cf. Callimachus postulating and denying a "one poet—one genre" rule, only to introduce his project of *polyeideia* (*Iamb*. frg. 203.30-4 Pfeiffer); Acosta-Hughes 2002: 82-9, Knox 2007: 155.

[4] Some recent critics believe he did not (Deufert 2002: 26-9; Fontaine 2013); an often mentioned possibility is the difficulty of access to texts of earlier plays: Duckworth 1994: 63; Goldberg 1986: 91ff., 2005a, 2005b: 50; Deufert 2002: 44-57. Yet Terence's verbatim quote along with the verse-number of Pl. *Capt.* 800 ~ *Eu*. 801 (Fontaine 2013) indicates he knew the Plautine corpus rather well. Brown 2009: 6, fn. 22, leaves some room for doubt: "[B]ut in the Prologue to his very first play he had claimed that he took Naevius and Plautus as his stylistic models (*Andria* 18-21). Can we really believe he did not know that each of them was thought to have written a play called *Colax*? If he did know, would he not have been curious to see how his two great predecessors had handled subject-matter that

allegation when the aediles did not cancel the commission and the *Eunuchus* made it to the stage, plagiarized content and all? Next, what from Menander's *Eunouchos* could Terence have left out and why, in order to accommodate two characters from the *Kolax*? How did he manage to integrate them so seamlessly?[5] Finally, why would he take the trouble to do that, if he claims that all the comic characters are generic anyway?[6] The cumulative implausibility of the account is overwhelming unless we follow one considerable scholarly minority and allow that the information, here and in other prologues, is largely invented.[7] In this chapter I will address all of the problems above preliminarily and argue that they constitute the sophisticated poetic program of the *Eunuchus*.

2.2. *Dictum prius*: poetics of response

In many ways crucial for interpreting the play will be the theme of originality and plagiarism in the prologue. It is instructive to keep in mind that charges of plagiarism were a frequent topic of banter between Greek playwrights, an inside joke rather than any objective concern for

---

was likely to be similar to his own?" Skeptics include Fabia 1888: 225, Norwood 1923: 138, fn. 3; Sharrock 2009: 91ff.; further references in McGill 2012:132, fn. 71.

[5] For Menander's *Kolax*, see Pernerstorfer 2009; Minarini 1987: 31-58 offers an analysis of fragments of Menander's *Eunouchos* in light of Terence's play; a bibliography on adaptation issues of the *Eunuchus* in Barsby 1993: 160, fn. 1

[6] Barsby 1993: 165: "The question is complicated in this case by the fact that the soldier and the flatterer are stock characters, as Terence himself goes on to say in his prologue (35- 41). How does transferring two stock characters from one play differ from transferring those same two stock characters from another play? It cannot be a matter of transferring their characteristics, because these are stock. It cannot be a matter of transferring their names, because in any case Terence has changed their names..." Similarly already Beare 1948: 79-80: "Terence cannot have borrowed the Captain and Parasite entire. What, then, did he borrow? The general outlines of their characters? But these are stock types in New Comedy; Terence's Captain is boastful, lecherous and cowardly, like all other Captains; his Parasite is greedy and crafty, like all other Parasites. How, then, did Terence's enemies come to accuse him of taking them from a particular play? And how is it that they were able to give the name of the play so accurately?" Cf. McGill 2012: 134: "This is to try to have it two ways. While Terence asserts that his flattering parasite and boastful soldier derive from a particular Greek model, which means that they are not merely stock figures, he also implies that similarities between his and his Latin predecessors' characters result from their working with the same stereotyped personae and are accidental."

[7] Beare 1937: 108ff.; 1940: 33ff.; 1948: 70ff.; 1950: 90ff. For recent works, with various degree of skepticism, see Gruen 1992: 210ff., Dessen 1995 (see my discussion in chapter 4), Gowers 2004; Sharrock 2009; Germany 2008, 2013; Papaioannou 2014; see Introduction.

intellectual property.[8] If anyone was policing plagiarism, it was the poets themselves, and Terence knew this: he constructs the plagiarism affair precisely as a stock allegation. According to the *Eunuchus* prologue no one except his unnamed rival would have noticed the "stolen" portion (or really cared, for that matter) had Terence not publicized it. He makes it perfectly clear that he would not have been obliged to report on the backstage scandal even if it had really happened.[9]

Significantly, Terence inverts the stock Greek joke by posing as the defendant, not the accuser. Instead of denouncing commonplaces he seems to be justifying them and apologizing for not having, in effect, anything original to say. After denying knowledge of the Latin *Colax* plays he is accused of plagiarizing (28-34) he claims that Roman comedy is inherently derivative (41-3):

> *nullumst iam dictum quod non dictum sit prius.*
> *qua re aequom est vos cognoscere atque ignoscere*
> *quae veteres factitarunt si faciunt novi.*
>
> Nothing is said now that has not been said previously.
> So it's fair that you should recognize and pardon
> if new ones do what old ones kept doing.

[8] Consistently from the fifth century onwards "comedians had been making tongue-in-cheek claims about the supposed novelty of their own work, while accusing everyone else of staleness or plagiarism," Wright 2013: 605, with references. Heath 1990: 152: "[A]ny poet could lay claim to originality (since he gave the pooled material a novel twist); and any rival could make a counter-claim of plagiarism (since the material was in part drawn from the pool). Both claims have to be evaluated (and discounted) in the light of this constant process of exchange and evolution of material. The charges of plagiarism are part of a system of ritualized insults; they are not meant to be believed, but to make the other party lose face." See further Stemplinger 1912: 7-8, 12-14, 35, 42; Heath 1990; Sonnino 1998; Wright 2012, 2013. For Menander, see Fontaine 2014: 551-2.

[9] The incident did not take place in public (20-22); when it is disclosed there is no hint that the audience, for example, heard some rumors. Cf. McGill 2012: 129, fn. 60: "It also seems safe to suppose that most audience members would not have known the plot of Menander's *Eunuchus*." So also Germany 2008: 217: "Presumably the audience of 161 BCE may have included people who knew the Menandrian originals well, but I think we can be fairly sure that the vast majority of viewers did not. Perhaps they knew other plays or perhaps they had some vague awareness of the themes and style of Greek New Comedy, if only through its reworking *as fabulae palliatae*. That is to say, the average Roman viewer probably knew roughly as much about the sources of the *Eunuch* as we do." See now Papaioannou 2015: 56: "Menander's reputation is stereotyped and serves as literary *topos*... assessment of Menander by the Latin sources... is most likely to have been extracted not from Menander's texts themselves but from Roman Comedy." Whatever the case may be, Terence's plagiarism would have passed unnoticed according to his own version of the event.

The distinction drawn here is that between intentional theft of specific material from his Roman predecessors and unintentional deployment of commonplaces.[10] Denying intention is perhaps an adequate moral defense but on an aesthetic level it is not really commendable that in adapting Menander, Terence accidentally ended up with a play hardly distinguishable from previous Latin adaptations. On the face of it, it would seem that Terence preferred to be seen as uninventive to appearing fraudulent.[11] Indeed, acknowledging and apologizing for one's incapacity and underachievement is yet another commonplace of ancient literature.[12] But knowing that self-deprecations are as a rule disingenuous[13] demands inquiry into what Terence could gain by presenting himself as a second-rate, derivative poet.

First, he is not just any second-rate poet but indeed *the* second-rate poet par excellence. Once all the stock accusations of comic tradition at large are aggregated into this one concrete contemporary allegation, we are given a Terentio-centric view of literary history, where all the earlier poets accuse no one else but him. The single most contributive factor to Terence's poetic inferiority, then, is his defensive position. In fact it is precisely the dynamic of accusation and response that turns out to be programmatic. The first thing we hear in the prologue is that the following polemic is not the poet's fault; he is merely responding (4-6):

---

[10] McGill 2012: 135 provides a basic discussion; Barsby 1999: 88 conjectures that the idea of line 41 must have been proverbial.

[11] The issue of novelty and originality is frequent in ancient comedy: Ar. *Eq*. 518f; *Vesp*. 60, 1051; *Nub*. 537ff. (esp. 547ff); *Pax* 739ff. At *Ran*. 1-18 Xanthias complains he cannot use the same jokes as Phrynichus (correspondingly, Aeschylus denies using the same material as Phrynichus at 1298ff.); Ar. *Ec*. 547ff. See now a full survey in Wright 2012, 2013. In Roman comedy, see esp. Pl. *Ps*. 400ff., with Farrell 1991: 298; cf. prologue to *Am*. 118: *veterem atque antiquam rem novam ad vos proferam*. For this motif in the *Casina* prologue, see Chapter 1.

[12] Wright 2013: 607, fn. 16, lists, with further references, e.g., "the fourth-century tragedian Astydamas, who wrote an often-cited epigram expressing the wish that he had been born earlier, so as to compete on equal terms with the great fifth-century tragedians... Earlier poets had already bemoaned the fact that nearly everything worth saying had been said before…" On prose conventions of authorial incompetence, see Janson 1964: 124-140.

[13] Regarding one famous example, the complaint that comic poets, unlike tragedians, must invent everything from scratch (Antiphanes' *Poiesis*, frg. 189 KA), Wright 2013: 606 comments: "Perhaps the joke depends on a quite different underlying attitude: it could just as plausibly be read as an indirect assertion of the comedian's own superiority (despite the difficulty of his task), rather than as anxious apologetics."

tum siquis est qui dictum in se inclementius
existumavit esse, sic existumet
responsum, non dictum esse, quia laesit prior.

And if there is anyone who thinks that something was said against
himself rather harshly, let him consider it
a response, not (something) said, because he offended previously.

But the opening disclaimer acquires a new meaning when read against the closing disclaimer in line 41:

nullumst iam dictum quod non dictum sit prius.

Nothing is said now that has not been said previously.

The correspondence is extremely intriguing. Terence's *deliberate response* to *specific* accusations mirrors his *unintentional repetition* of *generic* literary material.[14] This amounts to an analogy, which we will examine in detail: the accusation stands for the earlier Latin *Colax*-tradition, and Terence's response for the literary reuse of that tradition; response, it is worth reminding, is an established trope of intertextuality of later Roman poetry.[15] Two complementary aspects of this analogy are worth scrutinizing, both equally paradoxical: intentionality and specificity, and temporal sequence.

2.2.1. Intentionality and specificity

Since Terence's defense is based on lack of intention and on the claim that everything is a commonplace, the correspondence of 6 and 41 is puzzling: while unintentionally repeating something that must-have-been-said previously, Terence is at the same time consciously responding to what he knows has been said previously. In my interpretation, the poetics of the

[14] Some manuscripts read *quia laesit prius* at line 6; if it is a scribal error, it is very telling that at least one person associated it with 41.
[15] Barchiesi 2001: 139-140.

controversy is the following. The basic premise is that Roman comedy is derivative by origin and conventional by self-definition; *quae veteres factitarunt si faciunt novi* (43) suggests that Terence's predecessors whom he is accused of repeating were repeating their predecessors just the same, and—we note the frequentative—repeatedly so. Terence now overemphasizes the conviction that there is nothing new to come up with, only to subvert it: one should *not* look for new at all. Where absolute primacy is unattainable, hence originality always questionable, one should promote one's own secondariness. If one must recycle from a worn-out repository, the only way to leave a personal signature is to recycle openly and with design.

It is programmatically imperative for Terence to stress that something *has* been said before; indeed the very line *nullumst iam dictum quod non dictum sit prius* self-reflexively repeats the *dictum* within itself. I argue that he advertises the *Eunuchus* as a planned literary response to Latin adapters lest it appear to be a random repackaging of commonplaces and wholesale adaptation.[16] Consider his alleged situation. Instead of embracing the opportunity of being the indisputably first Roman playwright to adapt Menander's *Eunouchos*, he chooses to include a portion of Menander's *Kolax*; it is as if an as-yet unadapted Greek play was not good enough.[17] He decides to (he was in no way obliged to) specify that only after he included it, this secondary model turned out to have been already adapted by two authors.[18] By postulating a problematic history of the *Kolax*'s ownership *in Rome*, Terence aims to expropriate Menander from his *Roman* predecessors.

[16] Goldberg 1986: 93 (although arguing from a completely different angle) points in this direction: "[Terence] had thus unwittingly borrowed from Roman predecessors instead of sticking to Greek sources." As Sharrock 2009: 87 observes, "the only lesson Terence teaches in the prologues is that clever readers of his drama must look out for the weaving together of many plots and plays (both external and internal to the present performance): that is, that we must watch out for intertextuality." Bland translation is what Terence accuses his opponent of: *qui bene vortendo et easdem scribendo male | ex Graecis bonis Latinas fecit non bonas* (7-8).

[17] If so, we may think with Beare 1937: 109, who similarly wondered why Plautus would bother to combine individually adapted scenes: "Would it not have been easier for Plautus to write a play for himself?"

[18] Cf. Caston 2014: 45, fn. 13: "With the *Kolax*, Terence seems to have chosen a play that was frequently in circulation, suggesting there really was nothing new to be done with it."

But while explicitly telling us to *expect* precise characters from earlier Latin plays, Terence insists that the similarities are accidental; the quasi-generic-apologetic *dictum prius* tightly resonates with the two specific Latin adaptations *factas prius* (33). The message that unintended generic intertexts are specifically targeted, and vice versa, expresses the paradox of literary appropriation at its best: the "property" must belong to an earlier author and be taken away from him at the same time. Terence both makes sure that the *Colax* is attributed to Plautus and Naevius and pretends that this is irrelevant as far as he is concerned. Whether he knew of earlier adaptations is programmatically unanswerable: his project is precisely to imitate and circumvent his Roman predecessors simultaneously. To express it in the terminology of G. B. Conte, even if a specific Plautine passage is the "example-model" for Terence, he presents it as a "code model"—and vice versa.[19] As we shall see, this is further supported by the motif of puzzling chronological inversion.

2.2.2. Sequence: primacy and secondariness, simultaneously

In claiming superiority by posing as a copyist Terence pays special attention to the paradoxical temporal aspect: he claims primacy by boasting secondariness. The prologue abounds in language of priority (*prior/prius*: 4, 6, 10-11, 33, 41), precisely the kind that ancient literary criticism uses for artistic ranking.[20] Terence's response to his literary predecessors makes him

[19] According to Conte (1985: 121-2), "example-model" signifies "the model constituted by the accretion of a series of individual imitations" and reproduction "of single loci," while 'code model' stands for assimilation of "rules and codifications" where the earlier author serves as "the representative of the institution of... poetry itself." See also Hinds (1998: 41) who summarizes Conte' distinction as a "subordination of modelling *by particular source-passages* to modelling *by code*." For Conte's "modello-esemplare" and "modello-codice" the English translation of Segal (1986: 31) gives "exemplary model" and "code model." Following Hinds 1998: 41-2, fn. 46, I retranslate the former as "example-model."

[20] See Horace's canon of comic poets introduced by *uter utro sit prior*, Hor. *Ep*. 2.1.55-9; Volcacius Sedigitus' canon (Gell. 15.24) arranges them in ordinal numerals; more on both in Introduction, sect. 2. For Vergil as *secundus* Homer, cf. Quint. *Inst.* 10.1.86 (Hinds 1998: 95, fn. 85). For an independent and different discussion of primacy in the *Eunuchus*, see Caston 2014. On self-fashioning of literary succession, Hardie 1993: 88-119; Hinds 1998: 123-144; Whitmarsh 2001: 41-89.

literally "second;" the analogy of accusation (earlier Latin text) and response (Terence's later text) aptly captures the issue of which should come first. But in the prologue the order is paradoxically inverted into a sort of a *hysteron-proteron*. Terence's rival offended *prior* (6), but Terence responds (4-6) before we hear what is the accusation (20ff.).[21] This detail would seem trivial had not Terence, precisely in the intervening lines, pointed out that this expected sequence is inverted—in his rival's play. There the defendant speaks before the prosecution (10-13):

> *atque in Thesauro scripsit causam dicere*
> *prius unde petitur, aurum qua re sit suom,*
> *quam illic qui petit, unde is sit thensaurus sibi*
> *aut unde in patrium monumentum pervenerit*.
>
> And in his *Treasure* he made the defendant say
> why the gold was his, prior to the plaintiff showing
> how he came to own that treasure and how it
> found its way into his father's tomb.

Whatever this play was about, these four lines are what Terence chose to give us.[22] The use of *dicere prius* betrays a programmatic function and commands attention.[23] There should be nothing extraordinary about a defendant beginning his speech before the accuser begins his. It would be much more remarkable, however, if this defendant started responding to charges

[21] Significantly, corresponding to two Latin adaptations of one *Kolax*, the same allegation is mentioned twice: once reported as spoken by his rival (*parasiti personam inde ablatam et militis*, 26) and once from the poet's spokesperson (*personas transtulisse* 32), that is, line 32 repeats the line 26 that accuses Terence of "repeating" previous Latin versions; and since line 26 is supposed to be relating the rival's direct speech, line 32 repeats the repetition of line 26.

[22] Barsby 1999: 84, ad 10-11 notes that these lines are "less than telling" and discusses several major problems regarding this plot. Turner 2010 considers other evidence for the *Thesaurus* and Menander's *Phasma* (mentioned at *Eu*. 9); for the latter, see also Turner 1969.

[23] Caston 2014: 46, fn. 17 independently notices the parallel between these two inversions but does not pursue it further: "This reordering is counterintuitive and confusing and shows how much Luscius fails to respect the proper sequence of things." Sharrock 2009: 88-99 is casually lucid: "More important is the possibility that there is some hint at a metaphorical connection here with the quasi-legal altercation between the two playwrights, where the issue of 'who speaks first' and 'who damaged whom' is important," and offers a potentially illuminating but still underdeveloped metapoetic reading: "It might even be possible to make the play match the 'reality' quite closely. Luscius has the *Pot of Gold* which is Comedy (it is hard not to hear a reference to Plautus here, especially remembering the metaphorical work done by the Pot in that play); Terence seeks to get it from him because he is the true heir of Comedy, of Plautus. But Luscius spoke first to defend his possession, of something which should not rightly be his. It was Terence who was cheated out of his inheritance, which he now rightly claims back, but the usurper abused him still further by speaking first. Be that as it may..." Especially significant is that the trial in question is over the possession of gold, which I discuss in detail below (Chapter 4.2.2.2).

without yet having been accused. That is, he claims that the gold belongs to him before anyone requested it back in the first place. The defendant questions his own possession only to justify it. As a subsequent owner he presumably has more to explain than the previous owner, so he jumps ahead of the line to turn the tables of the debate: it is now he, the defendant, who is the presumed owner until proven otherwise, not the plaintiff. The defendant usurps the position of the "primary" possessor and leaves the plaintiff as a "secondary" claimant.[24] The plaintiff who found the gold in his father's tomb now has to explain how it arrived there to begin with.

This curious little narrative, I suggest, mirrors the poet's position in the prologue. Just like this defendant, Terence overtly assumes undue primacy in the debate *over* primacy. By preempting the accusation that he is not the first Roman adapter of the *Kolax*, Terence accuses himself, of his own accord, with something no one else would have noticed. Terence emphasizes theft from earlier Roman playwrights partly to challenge *their* claim on the *Kolax* just the same: how did they get hold of it in the first place? Once there is no such thing as an original owner of an adapted play, what one can do is speak up first. Terence compensates for the lack of absolute primacy by offering *relative* primacy instead—a peculiar motif that we will keep seeing throughout the play in the next chapters. By troping intertextual reuse of Roman playwrights as a proactive response he simultaneously affirms and undermines his secondariness. On one hand, such a response means poetic priority; to precede the "prompt" means to antedate predecessors. Yet Terence at the same time needs the Latin *Colax*-tradition so he can hijack it. Appropriately, preempting a prompt requires that there *is* a prompt to begin with. The actions of Terence and the defendant in the four lines of his rival's play are both a response and self-initiated at the same

[24] Note that the order of possessors of the gold in the prologue reverses its perceived trajectory: first the defendant, the latest owner (*suom*, 11); then the plaintiff, the previous owner (*sibi*, 12), and lastly the implied initial location, *patrium monumentum* (13).

time. As a result, the *Eunuchus*-project is simultaneously an original adaptation and a repetitive one.[25]

Being simultaneously the first and the second, therefore, is the dominant paradox of the play. In that regard, I will argue in the next three chapters, the play and the story of its genesis are informing each other. I will interpret prostitution as a metapoetic commentary on impossibility of poetic exclusivity and primacy (Chapter 3), and female citizenship and virginity as a trope of poetic restrictions, which suggest that there must be some exclusivity and primacy after all (Chapter 4). These two confronting requirements I elaborate in Chapter 5, and argue that in the *Eunuchus* primacy is attained precisely by secondariness and imitation. Because the *Eunuchus*' allegedly partly overlaps with Plautine material, we shall pay special attention to how some of the themes in the *Eunuchus* have been treated by Plautus.

[25] Sharrock 2009: 92 briefly notes that Terence "play[s] with the whole question of tradition and originality."

Chapter 3

Romantic and metapoetic primacy in the *Eunuchus*

> How does it feel not being the first man on the Moon?
> — Ali G, interviewing Buzz Aldrin

A summary of the *Eunuchus* is the following. Phaedria, *adulescens* in love with the *meretrix* Thais, is annoyed that she keeps him at bay. She explains that her childhood friend Pamphila, possibly of citizen birth, is now in the possession of Thais' other lover, the soldier Thraso. He promised her as a gift to Thais, who now judges it best to keep pleasing him. Phaedria, who has a gift for Thais as well, a eunuch, reluctantly agrees to withdraw until Thais gets Pamphila from the soldier. Phaedria's younger brother Chaerea sees Pamphila on the street as she is being taken to Thais, and gets very attracted to her. At the suggestion of his slave Parmeno, Chaerea disguises himself as a eunuch and goes to Thais' house instead of the eunuch that Phaedria bought her. Thais goes to Thraso's place for dinner, and leaves Pamphila with her slaves and Chaerea at her house. Pamphila's brother Chremes arrives, invited by Thais to help identify Pamphila, and he goes to Thraso's party. Meanwhile, Chaerea, dressed as a eunuch, comes out and runs into his friend Antipho. He tells him that he raped Pamphila, stimulated by a painting of Jupiter and Danaë. Thais' maid comes out of Thraso's house with Pamphila's jewelry which Thais stole at the party and secretly gave her. Phaedria unexpectedly shows up at Thais' house only to hear that a eunuch raped Pamphila. Thraso, with his parasite Gnatho and household slaves, comes to Thais' house to take Pamphila back, but Chremes protests that Pamphila is freeborn, and Thraso withdraws. Thais laments Pamphila's situation and criticizes Chaerea but

then agrees that he marries her (she is now recognized as eligible for citizen marriage). Thraso comes back with Gnatho, begging him to find a way for him to stay with Thais. Gnatho persuades the two brothers to accept the soldier who will financially support Thais' relationship with Phaedria, and they agree.

3.1. Phaedria unprompted: erotic and poetic invitation

The opening scene immediately concretizes and develops the main theme of the prologue, responding to a prompt. Mere two lines away from the prologue, the *adulescens* Phaedria is confused as to why his girlfriend, Thais the *meretrix*, after shutting him out, has now suddenly initiated a meeting "unprompted" (*ultro*, 53)—that is, a meeting that he himself has not called for. He decides it is better to go now than later, of his own accord, when he will not be wanted; he is on stage with his slave Parmeno (46-55):

> PHA. *quid igitur faciam?*[1] *non eam ne nunc quidem*
> *quom accersor ultro? an potius ita me comparem*
> *non perpeti meretricum contumelias?*
> *exclusit; revocat: redeam? non si me obsecret.*
> [PAR.[2]] *siquidem hercle possis, nil prius neque fortius.* 50
> *verum si incipies neque pertendes gnaviter*
> *atque, ubi pati non poteri', quom nemo expetet,*
> *infecta pace ultro ad eam venies indicans*
> *te amare et ferre non posse: actumst, ilicet,*
> *peristi: eludet ubi te victum senserit.*
>
> PHA. So what am I to do? Not go, even now when she's summoning

[1] This is one of three places in the *Eunuchus* for which Donatus provides Menander's Greek original: ἀλλὰ τί ποήσω (frg. 137 KA). The expression does not sound distinctive as to warrant citation: cf. e.g. the same formula in Men. *Pk.* 976 or τί γὰρ πάθω in *Sam.* 604 (with Gomme and Sandbach 1973, ad loc); the sentiment is that of Medea's *quo nunc me vortam*? (followed by more rhetorical questions; Enn. *trag.* frg. 104 Jocelyn). Donatus cites nothing for the following lines: either he did not have access to the full Greek text or after this line Terence departs from the Greek so considerably that there is no parallel to cite. In either case the ensuing lines can easily be Terence's independent work. Minarini 1987: 49 rightly stresses the importance of a play's *incipit* in the light of Conte's (1985) concept of poetic memory. Indeed it would have been a clever move that Terence opens the play with a literal translation of his source's *incipit* but immediately switches to crafting a wholly new passage about imitation and originality: see below.

[2] The manuscripts are divided as to whether the speaker of 50ff. is Parmeno or Phaedria in self-address; the attribution is not decisive for the present discussion.

me unprompted? Or should I rather make up my mind
not to put up with the insults of prostitutes?
She shut me out; she calls me back. Return? Not if she begged me!
[PAR?] Well, if you could—there's nothing of higher priority or braver.
But if you make a start and don't carry it through firmly,
and when you can't bear it, when no one is asking you,
without signing a truce, you go to her unprompted, showing that
you love her and can't stand it: then it's all over; you're done; you've
had it: she'll fool you when she realizes you're defeated.

Phaedria's confusion about Thais' invitation suggests that there is something unusual about it. Indeed a passage in Plautus' *Asinaria* suggests that it is rather the enamored *adulescens* who should be pushing for a meeting. Cleareta the procuress criticizes her daughter, Philaenium the young *meretrix*, for behaving naively and unprofessionally in dealing with the *adulescens* Argyrippus (524-7):

quid dedit? quid ad nos iussit deportari? an tu tibi
verba blanda esse aurum rere, dicta docta pro datis?
ultro amas, ultro expetessis, ultro ad te accersi iubes.
illos qui dant, eos derides; qui deludunt, deperis.

What has he given you? What did he have delivered to us? Or do you
think sweet talk is money, and witty words count as awards?
You love him unprompted, ask for him unprompted, you summon him unprompted.
Those who give, you mock; those who are swindling you, you're dying for.

Cleareta's reproach throws Philaenium's unconventional devotion toward Argyrippus into relief. Instead of being a business-oriented *meretrix* who waits for the *adulescens*-customer to show up, thus presumably gaining the upper hand by playing hard to get, Philaenium invites the young man *ultro*. Her conduct, the precise inversion of the "brothel's business-principle,"[3] is formulated in terms very similar to that of Terence's Thais. The parallels between the *Eunuchus*

[3] Hurka 2010: 195, ad loc.

and the *Asinaria* passages are both verbal (*ultro, expetere, accersi*) and thematic: both Plautus and Terence turn the expected relation between the two stock characters upside down.[4]

There are two important points to make here. First, Terence inverts the already inverted commonplace, for in the *Eunuchus* the relation is presented not from the female perspective but from that of the *adulescens*. Second, and accordingly, Phaedria is wondering if he should respond to the girl's self-initiated invitation in kind; it is *adulescens* now who should not show affection of his own accord. Since Terence tropes literary repetition as a response to provocation,[5] it is appropriate that the historically earlier character, Plautus' Philaenium, is seen inviting and the Terentian character is shown on the responding side.

Given Terence's paradoxical poetics of specificity and intentionality that we have elaborated above, it is beside the point to ask whether Phaedria is responding specifically to the *Asinaria* passage or to a hypothetical stock scene: Terence activates the motif of "who should make the first move" precisely *as* a commonplace. This is further implied by the generalized "when *no one* will be asking for you" (*quom nemo expetet*, 52), which Barsby thinks "must in fact refer to Thais."[6] But the vagueness may be precisely the point; when (un)invited by his specific girlfriend, Phaedria immediately thinks of a *generic* (lack of) invitation. We preliminarily note therefore one metapoetic quality of Thais. Being a specific girl that may as well be any comic *meretrix*, she represents earlier texts: both specific and in some sense generic, as good as any.[7] To this point we shall return shortly and elaborate it in detail.

[4] Cf. also the protest of the excluded Phaedria (46-49) with Argyrippus' (*As.* 127-9): *sicine hoc fit? foras aedibus me eici*? More on the *Asinaria* passage below.
[5] See Chapter 2.
[6] Barsby 1999: 93, ad 52.
[7] A curious parallel is Plautus' use of *expetere* for both *Casina* the play and Casina the girl: see Chapter 1, pp. 30-31.

3.2. *Nil prius*?

Let us further explore the metapoetic import of lines 46-56. If Phaedria could resist the temptation to respond to Thais' call, that would be the best thing to do, "nothing of higher priority or braver" (*nil prius neque fortius*, 50). The phrase *nil prius* is only nine lines away from the prologue remark that "there's *nothing* said now that has *not* been said previously" (*nullumst iam dictum quod non dictum sit prius*, 41). In line 50 *prius* is usually translated as "preferable," but my inelegant paraphrase "of higher priority" aims to highlight its temporal dimension. Temporality, and especially the issue of sequence, is the dominant motif in the opening scene.

First, in Phaedria's response to Thais' invitation the sequence is inverted. For three lines (46-8) he tells us that she wants him back, and only then we hear that she had kicked him out in the first place (*exclusit; revocat: redeam?* 49). On a strictly textual level, he is called back in before he was shut out. Next, Phaedria is wondering what to do about Thais' invitation. If he could ignore it and resist acting upon it, there would be, literally, "nothing prior to" his resistance, i.e. lack of response. The choice of *prius* is strange because an invitation by definition precedes the response. It will help to generalize this curious arrangement. If the respondent does not respond, the prompt is deprived of its function: without a response that would follow after it, the prompt can no longer be regarded as something "previous." This seemingly minor implication of Phaedria's monologue in fact fits very well with the prologue controversy. There, *prius* is shorthand for all previous texts, but Terence emphatically denies knowledge of, and thus asserts independence from, *specific* texts. Simply put, if we ignore those previous plays, Terence is as good as the first. Not responding to prompts of literary predecessors guarantees Terence's primacy; there is nothing prior to not-responding.

But independence of the prompt—*siquidem hercle possis*, in Phaedria's case—is impossible: how can a young man in comedy not submit to a *meretrix*?[8] The conventional reality of the character conditions the professed reality of the poet: how can one not say in comedy what has been said previously in comedies? For Phaedria, this utopian scenario of independence is followed by the alternative, worst-case scenario. He is doomed if he tries resisting but eventually gives in and comes when no one is calling him (*quom nemo expetet*, 52), showing up of his own accord (*ultro*, 53). Such proof of weakness would render him even more powerless and fully dependent on Thais. This also reads back onto Terence's poetic program: it is pointless to pretend that one can escape generic restrictions so it is better to embrace them. Like Phaedria, the poet envisions a situation where he would fail in attempt to stay independent and end up guilty of an unwanted imitation after all. So Terence choses the middle road and responds to predecessors self-consciously and with clear design, all the while denying the existence of anything *prius*.[9] Phaedria's dilemma of whether to act as a conventional *adulescens* reflects Terence's disingenuous poetic anxieties.[10]

In this respect one detail is significant in Thais' first appearance. The cause of strife between her and Phaedria is a rival lover, but at the time she arrives we still do not know that

[8] The point is made explicit: Phaedria: "Do you think I can pull this through and not return in the meantime?" Parmeno: "You? God, no." (PHA. *censen posse me obfirmare et | perpeti ne redeam interea*? PAR. *tene? non hercle arbitror*; 217-8).

[9] Fontaine 2013: 200 speaks about "models and intertexts—which Terence tells us he did *not* intend for us to know about, because he did not know about them himself" and "the rival poet's sudden revelation of the prior Latin versions of the parasite and soldier, these *unwanted* intertexts..." I argue that the question of Terence's familiarity and intentionality is programmatically unanswerable.

[10] See also Parmeno's list of love-affair commonplaces (59-61): *in amore haec omnia insunt vitia: iniuriae, | suspiciones, inimicitiae, indutiae, | bellum, pax rursum...* These have been announced in the prologue among other dramaturgic motifs reworked over and over (*amare odisse suspicari*, 40). Phaedria is bound in a circular world, from war to truce and back (*rursum*, 61), which may evoke the cyclical rotation of provocation and response, of earlier and later texts. The military imagery of (*infecta pace*, 53; *victum*, 55; *indutiae, bellum, pax*, 60-61) foreshadows the upcoming rivalry with the soldier Thraso, but, importantly, we have not yet learned that Phaedria has a rival to begin with. When Parmeno advises Phaedria to put up with his current misfortunes and not add more (*neque praeterquam quas ipse amor molestias | habet addas, et illas quas habet recte feras*, 77-8), we may recall Terence's threat from the prologue: he has many more counter-charges waiting for his rival unless he stops bullying him (*habeo alia multa quae nunc condonabitur, | quae proferentur post si perget laedere | ita ut facere instituit*, 17-19).

(except for the masculine pronoun in Parmeno's elliptic "quotation" of Phaedria's thoughts, "*egon illam, quae illum, quae me*,..." 65; more below). The first and the only thing Thais says as she approaches Parmeno and Phaedria (77-80) is that she had shut Phaedria out yesterday (*heri intro missu' non est*, 83). She thus repeats the only piece of information that we have actually heard since Phaedria had already said it (*exclusit*, 49). She finally addresses him at 86-7: "Who's that? Oh, Phaedria, dear, it's you. Why are you standing there, won't you come in?" (*quis hic loquitur? ehem tun hic eras, mi Phaedria? | quid hic stabas? quor non recta intro ibas?*). We can imagine that Parmeno and Phaedria did not hear her mentioning Phaedria's exclusion at 83, because Parmeno sarcastically comments on her brazenness: "And yet not a word about shutting him out!" (*de exclusione verbum nullum*, 88). But this is the only thing that she *did* say. The use of *nullum*, recalling the prologue's *nullumst iam dictum*, suggests another oblique enactment of the prologue polemic. Parmeno did not hear what Thais said, but she did say it;[11] Terence did not know about earlier Latin plays, but they were produced. Parmeno's emphasis further implies that everything must have been previously said even when one assumes, or is even completely positive, that it was not.

Phaedria, hitherto struggling not to go after Thais' call, will now start repeating her words—and her name (90-91):

THA. *missa istaec face*. | PHA. *quid "missa"? o Thais, Thais*,...

THA. let it go. | PHA. what do you mean "let it"? O, Thais, Thais,...

[11] Notice an inversion in Parmeno's reading Phaedria's thoughts of lovesickness: *et quod nunc tute tecum iratus cogitas* | "*egon illam, quae illum, quae me, quae non . . ! sine modo,* | *mori me malim: sentiet qui vir siem*" (65-6); he is "quoting" something that has not been said previously. Compare the Prologue's cryptic quotation of the rival poet: *ne frustretur ipse se aut sic cogitet*, | "*defunctu' iam sum, nil est quod dicat mihi*" (14-15). Both quote someone *thinking about dying* in the first person: *cogitet* (14), *cogitas* (64).

Even more to the point is that he repeats her request not to repeat (*missa face*: "forget about it," "let's not talk about this anymore"). Later in the conversation he will quote her verbatim again. She ends her account of Pamphila (130-153) by asking Phaedria to reply: "Will you not respond?" (*nil respondes*? 152). He angrily retorts but nevertheless picks up the verb (*pessuma, | egon quicquam cum istis factis tibi respondeam*? 152-3), and then indeed does respond by reiterating her speech (155-7):

> *ut ego nescibam quorsum tu ires? "parvola*
> *hinc est abrepta; eduxit mater pro sua;*
> *soror dictast; cupio abducere, ut reddam suis"...*
>
> As if I didn't guess where you were heading with that! "As a young girl
> she was abducted; my mother raised her as her own;
> she is said to be my sister; I want to get hold of her to return her to her family"...

This is a summary of Thais' words at 108-10 (*parvolam... puellam... hinc abreptam*), 116-18 (*mater ubi accepit, coepit studiose omnia | docere, educere, ita uti si esset filia. | sororem plerique esse credebant meam*) and 146-7 (*primum quod soror est dicta; praeterea ut suis | restituam ac reddam*). As Phaedria quotes Thais yet once more, Parmeno underlines the verbal dimension (174-8):

> THA. *potius quam te inimicum habeam, faciam ut iusseris.*
> PHA. *utinam istuc verbum ex animo ac vere diceres*
> *"potius quam te inimicum habeam." si istuc crederem*
> *sincere dici, quidvis possem perpeti.*
> PAR. *labascit victus uno verbo quam cito!*
>
> THA. Rather than have you as an enemy, I'll do as you say.
> PHA. If only you say that word truthfully from your heart.
> "Rather than have you as an enemy." If I would believe
> that is said sincerely, I could put up with anything.
> PAR. How quickly he crumbles, defeated by one word![12]

[12] Parmeno's repetition of *verbum* highlights Thais' contrived honesty and fidelity, much like repeated *dicit* and ὤμοσε convey the unreliability of the lover's expression of loyalty in Catul. 70 and Call. *Ep*. 25 Pfeiffer.

Having first expressed anxiety over whether to respond to Thais' invitation or not, Phaedria starts quoting her words openly. In metapoetic interpretation: repetition of previous texts is inevitable, resistance is impossible, so one should follow the prompt, but assume agency by repeating intentionally.[13]

To corroborate this point, we go back to Parmeno's reaction to Phaedria's emotional outburst (59-70). Terence skillfully develops the motif of responding-by-reclaiming-initiative as he manipulating the semantics of the word *ultro*. Parmeno warns Phaedria that Thais will feign tears, and that "she will accuse you *in turn* and you'll be punished *instead*" (*et te* <u>*ultro*</u> *accusabit, et dabis* | <u>*ultro*</u> *supplicium*, 69-70).[14] Barsby observes that here he may be deliberately echoing Phaedria's *ultro* (referring to Thais' self-initiated invitation above, 47, 53) with a different meaning.[15] The close repetition is arresting, and the range of meanings of *ultro* deserves a closer look. Very interestingly for the present discussion, *ultro* can ultimately mean both "prompted" and "unprompted." Four of the basic meanings I place in a sequence that might explain the semantic development. First, *ultro* designates an action done reciprocally, in response, in turn (*OLD* 3b), that is, as a reaction to a previous action. Second, it can mean more precisely turning the tables and taking over the initiative (*OLD* 4a; Parmeno's *ultro* at 69-70). From there it comes to denote something done "into the bargain," additionally, on top of, moreover (*OLD* 3a; one

[13] Caston 2014: 56-7 observes that Phaedria assumes a superior position when he takes over Thais' request that he disappears for the time being (151, 159) and then asks *her* to be spiritually absent when she is with the soldier (*cum milite istoc praesens absens ut sies*, 192ff.; more on this passage below). Interestingly, Phaedria initiated this changing of roles as a response to Thais' *numquid vis* (191), a phrase which, in this context, suggests role-reversal as well; see Brothers 1969: 316-7: "[T]here is something strange about the appearance of the phrase *numquid vis aliud*? as it now stands in our texts; on every other occasion that it occurs in Terence, it is used by the person who is about to, or trying to, depart, a fact upon which Donatus often comments. Here, however, it is used by someone who is anxious for her interlocutor to leave while she herself stays behind." In Roman comedy the formula is often facetiously responded to as if it is an actual question: Hough 1945.

[14] Catullus uses the same phrase for turning the tables of the literary invective, in the very last line of his corpus as we have it: *contra nos tela ista tua evitabimus acta:* | *at fixus nostris tu* <u>*dabis supplicium*</u> (116.7-8); for Callimachean import of the poem, Knox 2007: 163ff., with references.

[15] Barsby 1999: 95, ad 69-70.

thinks of a poker game: "I follow *and raise* by twenty"). Finally, *ultro* means unprompted, spontaneously, of one's own accord (*OLD* 5a; Phaedria's *ultro* at 47, 53; Pl. *As.* 526, above).

Even though the word *ultro* does not appear in the prologue, this semantic vicious circle is a virtual epitome of the prologue controversy. The word itself entails two sides of the same coin. One, "of one's own accord" means that there *is* a hypothetical prompt that would otherwise be the norm; "un-prompted" by definition imagines a prompt. When Terence and the defendant from his rival's play (10-13[16]) both preempt the accusation, it only confirms that there is an accusation to respond to. Intertextually speaking, in claiming independence of earlier texts Terence thereby acknowledges their existence. Second, a conscious response—that is, every response—always entails initiative on the part of the respondent. A poet attains superiority not despite his reuse of earlier texts but precisely by means of it.

3.3. Prostitution and the poetics of secondariness

This awareness of inescapable secondariness surfaces illuminatingly in the romantic rivalry between Phaedria and the soldier Thraso. Phaedria raises the issue of primacy in his very first address to Thais. Immediately before his repetition of her *missa* in 90-91 (quoted above) she starts the conversation (88-91):

> THA. *quid taces*?
> PHA. *sane quia vero haec mihi patent semper fores*
> *aut quia sum <u>apud te primu'</u>*. THA. *missa istaec face*.
> PHA. *quid "missa"*?...

> THA. Why aren't you saying anything?
> PHA. Well, probably because your door is always open for me,
> or maybe because <u>I'm the first with you</u>. THA. Let it go.
> PHA. What do you mean "let it"?...

[16] For this passage, see Chapter 2, pp. 46-47.

The language of chronological sequence in measuring affection strikes a metapoetic chord. Ruth Caston points this out as well but reaches a different conclusion: "[I]t is difficult not to feel that Phaedria's annoyance at being in a second and dependent position echoes that of the playwright, who has also described frustration at the need to contend with others' preferences. The situations are *not exactly parallel*, to be sure: for Phaedria, the problem is not being first in Thais's affection, while for Terence, it is not coming earlier in a literary tradition."[17] I believe, however, that the situations are more parallel than Caston allows.

Namely, Phaedria's primacy is threatened by his rival Thraso, to whom he must leave Thais for two days and step aside. Thais asks Phaedria (151-2):

> *sine illum priores partis hosce aliquot dies*
> *apud me habere*.
>
> Grant him the prior role for a few days
> with me.

The exact words of Thais' request signal that not only is Phaedria not the "first," but is asked to let Thraso come even before. Thraso himself, according to Thais, expresses his ambitions in those exact words: "He says, if he believed he is placed before you | with me..." (*ait, si fidem habeat se iri praepositum tibi | apud me*,... 138-9). Expressions of temporal advantage become virtually technical language for amorous rivalries in the *Eunuchus*. Phaedria at one point accuses Thais of feeling threatened by Pamphila: "You're now afraid that the girl who is brought here will snatch such a man before you" (*istam nunc times | quae advectast ne illum talem praeripiat tibi*, 160-1). The well-known theatrical metaphor of *pars*, "role,"[18] in line 151 above reinforces the link between intra- and extra-dramatic primacy, and unmistakably so. Phaedria is unable to

[17] Caston 2014: 48; emphasis mine.
[18] Cf. later Chaerea's remark that Phaedria will have a "tough role to play" if Thraso is his opponent (*duras fratri' partis praedicas*, 354). Donatus comments on 354: *'partes duras'* μεταφορικῶς *ab actoribus scaenicis*. Cf. Germany 2008: 130-1, with bibliography. For theatrical imagery in Terence, see Fantham 1972: 33ff.

be *primus*, "favorite," not in absolute terms, but conditioned by his rival's priority. His acknowledgment of not being *primus* with Thais is just as relative to Thraso's *prior* as Terence's "not coming *earlier* in a literary tradition" according to Caston.[19]

The figure of Thais perfectly complements this image of relative primacy. She is a prostitute and no one can be the "first" with her. Being the first with a *meretrix* is just as inconceivable as being the first comic poet to come up with something new. Terence manages his literary secondariness by reminding us that primacy is irrelevant when all Roman playwrights are adapting Menander. Indicatively, by the time Phaedria uttered *primus* (90) nobody has yet mentioned the particular rival lover, Thraso. Thais is presented not as woman in a complicated relationship with two specific men, but as generically shared merchandise. Her occupational prerogatives aptly reflect the perception of playwriting according to the *Eunuchus* prologue: the entire Greek comic repertoire is in the public domain.[20]

3.4 The ending: metapoetics of jealousy and inclusivity

This metapoetic reading of comedy as a *meretrix* would well explain the controversial ending of the *Eunuchus*, which is probably the most often debated problem of Terentian dramaturgy.[21] In a shocking coup de théâtre the soldier's parasite Gnatho arranges that Phaedria and Thraso after

[19] Since the prologue polemic about primacy refers to a competition between old and young poets (*quae veteres factitarunt si faciunt novi*, 43), it is significant that Phaedria, who is relegated to the second position, gives Thais an old eunuch, while Thraso, who currently holds primacy, gives her the *young* Pamphila (compare the clash of generations analyzed in chapter 5.6). Their gifts to Thais are frequently and emphatically contrasted: *si scias quod donum huic dono contra conparet*, 355; *homo quatietur certe cum dono foras*, 358; *perpulchra credo dona aut nostri similia*, 468. Possibly a nice metapoetic touch is Phaedria's urge to Parmeno to praise his gift "with words" (*munu' nostrum ornato verbis, quod poteris, et istum aemulum, | quod poteris, ab ea pellito*, 214-5). When Parmeno finally brings the *fake* eunuch, Chaerea, to Thais and brags that she can "test him in literature" (*fac periclum in litteris*, 476), he is subtly recalling the *Eunuchus*' questionably literary origin.

[20] Cf. Gardner 2011 on metapoetry of *Cynthia prima* in Prop. 1.1.1.

[21] Comparable only to the ending of the *Adelphoe*; for doxography and a recent reassessment of both, see Victor 2012, with a bibliography at 675, fn. 14; I discuss his interpretation of the *Eunuchus* below.

much strife continue to share Thais (1072-80). An ironic exchange between Parmeno and Chaerea shortly before the agreement shows that the ending is meant to be surprising (1040-1):

> PAR. *fratris igitur Thais totast*? CHA. scilicet.
> PAR. *iam hoc aliud est quod gaudeamu': miles pelletur foras.*
>
> PAR. So Thais now belongs entirely to your brother? CHA. Of course.
> PAR. Then there's one more reason to rejoice: the soldier will be kicked out.

Neither will happen. Gnatho convinces Phaedria that Thraso is rich enough to keep financially supporting Thais and stupid enough not to pose a real threat to him. As a rule, critics describe this ménage à trois as dramaturgically inconsistent and ethically disturbing.[22] As Benjamin Victor most recently restated, "Thraso has earned more punishment than he gets, while Phaedria has abruptly swapped his jealous nature for a very different one... Worst of all, the play seems designed to establish her [sc. Thais] as a good courtesan, work now undone."[23] These three major problems concerning the ending—Thraso's punishment, Phaedria's jealousy, Thais' good character—can be interpreted metapoetically.

Terence exploits the fruitlessness of pursuing exclusivity in the play and the prologue analogously. According to the prologue, rival poets disagree on the issue of authorial exclusivity. The opponent claims that Terence has no right to adapt a Greek play which has been adapted already, while Terence insists that they are all available. Likewise, Thraso and Phaedria compete for Thais according to the same rules (giving her expensive gifts) but with opposite approaches. Thraso is explicit: "First tell me this, Thais: when I give you the girl, do you promise to give

[22] See, e.g. Germany 2008: 24, 216-7: "This disgusting resolution has confused and disappointed readers for the last century... If this tale of moral infection is disturbing to us, perhaps it should be, and if it casts a shadow over the generically prescribed happy ending, then it only makes the *Eunuch*, like every other Terence play, something of a black comedy." Brown 1990 offers a characteristically sensible reading, though without addressing all the implications. The majority opinion is that the ending cannot have come from Menander because of the violation of three-speaker rule; Victor 2012: 680, with fn. 37.

[23] Victor 2012: 676; he argues that Terence aimed precisely at arriving at an unexpected resolution by means of clever rhetoric, of which, according to Victor, Terence was extremely proud. I find this surprise-effect an attractive but partial solution; a striking ending seems a high price to pay *solely* in exchange for a short and, arguably, a relatively unimpressive display of Gnatho's persuasiveness.

yourself to me alone?" (*Thai', primum hoc mihi responde: quom tibi do istam virginem, | dixtin hos dies mihi soli dare te*? 792-3). But Phaedria does not ask for exclusivity nor does he feel disadvantaged by his girlfriend's professional restrictions. On the contrary, he turns it to his advantage, by throwing the *solus* over to the rival; at one point he asks her: "Is he the only one to give you gifts? When have you seen that *my* generosity failed you?" (*num solus ille dona dat? num ubi meam | benignitatem sensisti in te claudier?* 163). Simply put: I know I am not the only one, says Phaedria—but *neither is the other guy*.

When Thais recalls how she came to Athens with Thraso, with whom alone (*uno*, 119) she had had affair at the time, Parmeno similarly turns the tables: "Neither were you satisfied with one man nor was he the only one to give you gifts; this man [sc. Phaedria] gave you fine and valuable gifts as well" (*neque tu uno eras contenta neque solus dedit*; *nam hic quoque bonam magnamque partem ad te attulit* 122-3). Thus, the essence of one of the central driving forces of the play, Phaedria's jealousy, has been routinely misinterpreted.[24] He *is* crazy about Thais, but as a *meretrix*, not as a steady girlfriend. Parmeno will later bring Phaedria's gifts to Thais and point out precisely this realistic attitude as his master's advantage (480-5):

> *atque haec qui misit non sibi soli postulat*
> *te vivere et sua causa excludi ceteros,*
> *neque pugnas narrat neque cicatrices suas*
> *ostentat neque tibi obstat, quod quidam facit;*
> *verum ubi molestum non erit, ubi tu voles,*
> *ubi tempu' tibi erit, sat habet si tum recipitur.*
>
> And he who sent these gifts is not asking you to be
> only with him and shut out all others,
> and he does not narrate battles nor brags with his scars
> nor gets in your way as a certain man does.
> But whenever it's no trouble for you, when you want it,

[24] Among many others, e.g. Brown 1990: 53: "Phaedria... has been portrayed as a jealous and demanding lover;" similarly, Barsby 1999: 140: "Phaedria's romantic view, based on the ideal of mutual devotion;" Germany 2008: 24: "Phaedria, the arch-lover of Act 1 and model for the future elegiac tradition, has by the end of the play been disabused of his ideals of love..."

whenever you find some time, he's happy if you see him then.[25]

Even Phaedria's lovesick behavior in the opening scene, which is often taken as decisive evidence of his unconditional jealousy,[26] actually demonstrates the opposite attitude. For one, throughout that scene Phaedria's main problem was not that Thais is with someone else but that she is not with him. Finally, as she is about to leave he states his terms (190-6):

> THA. *mi Phaedria*,
> *et tu. numquid vis aliud?* PHA. *egone quid velim?*
> *cum milite istoc praesens absens ut sies;*
> *dies noctesque me ames, me desideres,*
> *me somnies, me exspectes, de me cogites,*
> *me speres, me te oblectes, mecum <u>tota</u> sis:*
> *meu' fac sis postremo animu' quando ego sum tuos*.
>
> THA. Phaedria, dear,
> goodbye to you too. Anything else you want? PHA. Anything *I* want?
> That when you're with that soldier of yours you are present and absent;
> day and night *me* to love, for *me* to yearn,
> of *me* to dream, *me* to want, of *me* to think,
> for *me* to long, in *me* to delight, with *me* to be <u>entirely</u>:
> In short, be my heart as I am yours.

In unpacking the tension between business and emotions in this passage David Konstan asks: "Can one really buy such devotion?"[27] The answer may be to reformulate the question: when Phaedria asks Thais to be spiritually with him while physically with Thraso, what exactly is he asking from her? Nothing else than to be professional and separate business from pleasure: a *meretrix* at her best. Phaedria is perfectly able to imagine that Thais belongs entirely (*tota*) to him *while* she is with another man.[28]

---

[25] Konstan 2013: 103 comments that this is a "sign of his superior character;" cf. Barsby 1999: 162 -3, ad 454-506: "Parmeno loyally carries out his instructions... praising Phaedria's gifts ... and contrasting his master's restraint with Thraso's absurd demands". Barsby is on the mark: to ask a prostitute for exclusivity is absurd. Cf. Pl. *Mos*. 190: *matronae, non meretricium est unum inservire amantem*. For a checklist of difficulties in imagining Thais "settling down to a quiet concubinage with Phaedria," see Brown 1990: 57.

[26] E.g. Konstan 1995: 135: "These lines [191-6], together with his earlier expostulation about mutuality and sincerity [91-4], have established Phaedria as a figure of deep feeling."

[27] Konstan 2013: 101; similarly, Konstan 1986 and 1995: 131ff.

[28] For sharing a hetaera in Athenian real life and comedy, see some references in Brown 1990: 54, fn. 34.

If Thais symbolizes a Greek source play, sharing her is indeed the outcome that would perfectly fit Terence's case in the self-constructed controversy. In defending his right to reuse anything from Greek comic tradition, Terence, represented by Phaedria, posits that once primacy is unattainable exclusivity is completely irrelevant. In the quest for Thais the question of whose should she be is replaced by the question of *whether* she can belong to one man at all, and answered negatively.

The mild treatment of Thraso is the second, closely related, corollary of the play's ending that has been frequently misunderstood. Thais was either shared (before Phaedria stepped aside, and after the sharing agreement) or solely with Thraso (throughout the play). In other words, should we have to choose, we would have more grounds to call her Thraso's girl than Phaedria's. It is not Phaedria who makes a compromise by sharing her, it is the soldier: he will be a sponsor and a laughing stock of those who share *his* girlfriend despite his efforts to secure her for himself alone.[29] Thraso eventually admits defeat in the same terms according to which the game was played so far; he begs Gnatho to find a way for him to keep "playing some part with Thais" after all (*perfice hoc | precibu' pretio ut haeream in parte aliqua tandem apud Thaidem*, 1054-5; cf. *apud*, 90, *apud, partes*, 151-2, discussed above). Contrary to the scholarly consensus, therefore, Thraso got *exactly* the punishment he earned. This is moreover a deft inversion of conventional comic closures in that here the punishment of a "blocking character" is not his exclusion from the final harmony but precisely his inclusion.[30]

[29] Brown 1990: 52 rightly sees "mockery of Thraso" as the main aim of the last scene, though in my view plays down the implications (as he partly admits: 53, fn.32, with references) when he concludes: "...nothing very serious is going on in this scene... such details are subordinate to the aim of making Thraso the figure of fun... If we thought about the emotional implications, we might not feel entirely happy to end the play this way. But the emphasis on Thraso's stupidity diverts us from this line of thought..." (52-53, 58).

[30] For "blocking characters" see Frye 1957: 165: "In Plautus and Terence he is usually either the pimp who owns the girl, or a wandering soldier with a supply of ready cash. The fury with which these characters are *baited and exploded from the stage* shows that they are... usurpers, and their claim to possess the girl must be shown up as

Just as Phaedria's flexibility is starkly contrasted to Thraso's possessiveness, so the poetics of exclusivity of Terence's rival puts Terence's program into perspective as the latter wins the day. In the prologue, Terence plants a crucial flaw in the rival's poetic agenda. The cryptic phrase *Colacem esse Naevi et Plauti veterem fabulam* (25) suggests that Greek plays could have more than one Latin adapter each. Plautus and Naevius as near contemporaries might even be imagined as "sharing" a *Colax* at roughly the same time, whether as two consecutive adaptors or even as co-authors. Whatever may be the case with the *Colax*-authorship issue—if any—Terence advocates that, once on the market, women and comedies are up for grabs.

The third problem of the ending is the perceived inconsistency of Thais' character. She is reduced to the bare essentials of her profession despite numerous clues implying that she is a full-fledged person. This surprise is deliberate on Terence's part. Just as with Phaedria we were led to expect a conventional jealous *adulescens* but we got an unconventionally unjealous one, with Thais we were led to expect an unconventionally principled *meretrix* but got a conventionally venal one. Our expectations are thereby frustrated in two opposite directions, which, I argue, are mutually reinforcing.

With Thais as an "open-access" play, Terence deploys the unexpectedly stereotypical portrayal of a venal *meretrix* to proclaim generic availability of the entire comic tradition. Terence disingenuously stereotypes Thais just as in the prologue he lumps—entirely disingenuously—all comedies in one drawer. Terence's accuser protests that individual plays exhibit unique identifiers but Terence pretends that they are all the same. He invites us to "judge" (*iudicare*, 29) that his reuse is generic rather than targeted, much as Thais at one moment metatheatrically fears she will be "judged" according to the stereotype, "characters of other

somehow fraudulent" (emphasis mine). Frye's emblematic figure is undoubtedly Pyrgopolinices from Plautus' *Miles*, on whom see Chapter 8.

women" (*ex aliarum ingeniis nunc me iudicet*, 198).[31] The prologue explicitly listed *meretrices malas* as stock types (37), thus alerting us to previous incarnations of the comic type. We should perhaps think of Menander's *Thais*, a fragment of which suggest that its eponymous heroine was construed as an embodiment of the *mala meretrix* stereotype.[32] It would be fascinatingly metapoetic if Terence actually aimed at portraying his Thais as a generic prostitute by alluding to this one *specific* elaboration on the generic prostitute.

Phaedria, representing poetic innovativeness, goes the opposite way. An *adulescens* can demand exclusivity with a prostitute only if he believes that she is not a mere instantiation of an abstract type, that she is, somehow, different. But an *adulescens* who keeps in mind that he is not the first and fully accepts that, consequently, he cannot be the only one, is apparently a dramaturgic innovation. That is, both Terence and Phaedria are marked as distinct from others precisely when they disingenuously acknowledge that their options are limited and predictable.

[31] See e.g. Germany 2008: 130-133: "Thais, the only other character around whom role-playing is framed in such clearly metatheatrical terms... her trickery has taken the form of assuming the character traits of a comic *meretrix*... she has pretended that her love is totally venal, so that he [sc. Thraso] may hope to regain her affections with an expensive gift. She is, in effect, playing her own stock character... [when she speaks of] 'the characters of other women' (*ex aliarum ingeniis*) she once again shows her keen awareness of the stock theatricality of her role, even as she insists that there is an ethical gap between her persona and herself." Her language, however, is characteristic of her role: Barsby 1999: ad 87, 128, 130. For some recent remarks on the metatheatricality of Terence's prostitutes, see Demetriou 2010.

[32] Men. *Thais*, parodying the opening lines of the *Iliad* (163 KA): ἐμοὶ μὲν οὖν ἄειδε τοιαύτην, θεά, | θρασεῖαν, ὡραίαν δὲ καὶ πιθανὴν ἅμα, | ἀδικοῦσαν, ἀποκλῄουσαν, αἰτοῦσαν πυκνά, | μηδενὸς ἐρῶσαν, προσποιουμένην δ' ἀεί ("So sing for me goddess, of such a woman, bold, beautiful, and seductive too, unfair, a locker-out, always demanding, loving no one, but always pretending," tr. Rusten et al. 2011: 640). Turp. *pall*. 187 seems to be alluding to Plautine Erotium of *Menaechmi* and Thais of *Eunuchus* in particular: see below, Chapter 7.3. Afranius wrote a *togata* titled *Thais* (frg. 332t). In later poetry, possibly mediated by Terence, the name Thais appears almost as a metonymy of all *meretrices*: Prop. 2.6.3, 4.5.43 (*Thais pretiosa Menandri*); Ov. *Ars*. 3.604; *Rem*. 383-6. Virtually a common noun in Martial (3.8, 3.11, 4.12, 4.50, 4.84, 5.43, 6.93, 11.101, 14.187), it testifies to its enduring lascivious associations.

3.5. Inclusivity and priority in the *Asinaria* and the *Truculentus*: retroactive metapoetic license

It is of course possible that some comic *adulescens* before Phaedria was self-aware of his secondariness and compliant with rivals, but it is sufficient for Phaedria to act contrary to some characters that emphatically were not.[33] Interesting points of comparison appear in Plautus' *Truculentus*, a play which similarly exposes mercenary erotic affair for what it is,[34] and ends with the prostitute Phronesium being shared by (three) lovers, Diniarchus, Strabax, and Stratophanes.[35] Yet none of them is pleased with the arrangement.[36] Another play that extensively elaborates on exclusivity is the *Asinaria* (a possible "prompt" for Phaedria's *ultro*-dilemma discussed above). The *adulescens* Argyrippus,[37] having exchanged a series of *solus*-jokes with the mother-procuress Cleareta,[38] eventually agrees to buy a year's worth of

[33] Terence clearly acknowledged the convention in *HT* 912-13: *quemquamne animo tam comi esse aut leni putas | qui se vidente amicam patiatur suam...* ? ("Who do you imagine can be so generous and tolerant to stand by watching his girlfriend...? [sc. being shared]"); where editors print *comi* MSS give *communi*, a reading worth considering given the context: for exchanging girlfriends in the *HT* and Plautus' *Miles*, see Chapters 7 and 8, respectively.

[34] "Satiric comedy," as labeled by Dessen 1977; similarly, Konstan 1983: 142-164. Cf. Sharrock's assessment of the *Eunuchus*' ending (2009: 275): "At one level, because plays have crazy endings, because they can pretend that actions do not really have consequences and nothing really matters, *Eunuchus* can play itself out in one big farcical party. But underneath that, there is the seed of social comment, which comedy allows us to take or leave. It is a social reality for lovers of prostitutes to share their women: stripped of its playful pretences, this ending takes a stark look at that reality."

[35] Fantham 2000: 287-299 (= Fantham 2010: 144-156) usefully compares the romantic relationships in *Truculentus* and the *Eunuchus*; for example, both Phaedria and Diniarchus are called *intumus* by Thais and Phronesium respectively (*Eun*. 127, *Truc*. 153). See especially 2000: 298-9 (=2010: 155-6) on the issues of sharing the prostitutes. Fantham's remark on Phronesium applies perfectly to Thais: "Like those odd little weather houses, Phronesium's house is one into which one figure is expelled as another is admitted" (2000: 290 = 2010: 147).

[36] Diniarchus is angry (*quid? amator novos quispiam*? 724); he implies he wants exclusivity when he accuses Phronesium of taking money from multiple customers *(quae adversum legem accepisti a plurimis pecuniam*, 760). In the final showdown, *adulescens* Strabax—ironically, previously referred to as *solus* (727)—and the soldier Stratophanes exchange insults and threats (928-963) and, similarly to Thraso and Phaedria, banter over who invested more in Phronesium (STRAT. *dedi ego huic aurum*. STRAB. *at ego argentum*, 946). Phronesium takes over and invites them both; Stratophanes reluctantly agrees (*ut rem gnatam video, hoc accipiundumst quod datur*, 962), while Strabax still cannot stand him (*meum quidem te lectum certe occupare non sinam*, 963).

[37] De Melo (2011: 136), following Havet 1905, assigns lines 127-248 to Diabolus, not Argyrippus; Marshall 2014 argues convincingly for Argyrippus, following Hurka 2010.

[38] Argyrippus protests: "I alone rescued you from loneliness and poverty; if I were the only one to hire her, you could never repay me" (*solus solitudine ego ted atque ab egestate abstuli; | solus si ductem, referre gratiam numquam potes*, 163-4) and gets an equally witty response: "You can be the only one to hire her if you are always the only one to give me what I want" (*solus ductato, si semper solus quae poscam dabis*, 165). He realizes he has been fooled: "You used to tell me that you and her love me and only me of all people" (*me unice unum ex omnibus*

exclusivity with her daughter, Philaenium the *meretrix*.[39] Meanwhile, for the same purpose the parasite of the rival lover Diabolus prepares a detailed contract particularly emphasizing the issue of exclusivity.[40]

Neither in the *Truculentus* nor in the *Asinaria* is there a trace of lovers willingly sharing their girlfriends, even though—or maybe precisely because—they will be forced to do so one way or another. Despite Diabolus' parasite's hopes (*As*. 915-19), Argyrippus will not share Philaenium with Diabolus but with his own father, and reluctantly so (*ea res me male habet*, 844). What makes Terence's Phaedria original is that he knows the rules of sharing and plays along.[41] Phaedria's seemingly odd admittance of Thraso at the end of the *Eunuchus* provides a perfect response to the reluctance of Diniarchus in the *Truculentus*, who would rather die than have his rivals, one of whom is also a soldier, benefit from his gifts.[42] But Phronesium's maid Astaphium tells Diniarchus that envying enemies is foolish; it is better to have *them* envy you; to envy means to lack, to be envied means to be in possession.[43] This is exactly what Phaedria does: he assumes a tolerant pose and leaves the musing of exclusivity to Thraso. If one must share—and, as Terence tells us, share one must—it is better to acknowledge it and turn the tables.

---

te atque illam amare aibas mihi, 208: cf. Diabolus echoing *unicus* at 748, below). Cf. also Pl. *Mos*. 204 where Scapha the maid ridicules the prostitute Philematium for being unprofessional (*solam ille me soli sibi suo <sumptu> liberavit: | illi me soli censeo esse oportere opsequentem.*)

[39] *annum hunc ne cum quiquam alio sit*, 230; *nec quemquam interea alium admittat prorsus quam me ad se virum*, 236; cf. 721.

[40] Parasite: "...'So that Philaenium is with him day and night this whole year'. Diabolus: "And with no other man." Parasite: "Should I add that?" Diabolus: "Yes, add it, and write it nice and clear." Parasite: "...'And with no other man'." (PAR. ... '*Philaenium ut secum esset noctes et dies | hunc annum totum'*. DIAB. *Neque cum quiquam alio quidem.* | PAR. *addone*? DIAB. *adde, et scribas víde plane et probe.* | PAR. '*alienum hominem intro mittat neminem*;' 753-6); her door is to be shut for everyone except Diabolus (*fores occlusae omnibus sint nisi tibi*, 759).

[41] For some general observations on mercenary erotic relationships in, inter alia, the three plays discussed here, *Eunuchus*, *Asinaria*, and *Truculentus*, see James 2012: 253-268.

[42] With the appropriate military metaphor: "should my enemies slaughter my gifts?" (*meane [ut] inimici mei | bona istic caedent*? 744-5).

[43] *pol mavelim | mihi inimicos invidere, quam med inimicis meis; | nam invidere alii bene esse, tibi male esse, miseria est. | qui invident egent; illis quibus invidetur, i rem habent* (743-6).

Further, both Plautine plays subtly muse about the issue of priority with prostitutes. In the *Truculentus*, the two rivals Strabax and Stratophanes compete in wasting money on Phronesium with a repartee, "You first—No, *you* first" (STRAT. *age prior prompta aliquid*. STRAB. *immo tu prior perde et peri*, 951), only to foreshadow Stratophanes' defeat: "What? What are you saying? You'll be with *him*? And me? I was giving to you, and I am to come second?" (*quid tu? quid ais? cum hocin eris? ego ero posterior , qui dedi?* 959).[44] Elsewhere in Plautus we find literal priority as well, an *adulescens* running against the clock to fetch the girl before the competitor by intercepting the payoff (e.g. *Ps.* 55ff). But in the *Asinaria* this priority criterion is established on generic grounds; Argyrippus must raise the money for one year with Philaenium or else *anyone* showing up before him gets the girl (*si alius ad me prius attulerit, tu vale*, 231).

To be sure, there is no need to claim that in the *Asinaria* and the *Truculentus* Plautus imagined exclusivity and priority with prostitutes metapoetically. But it is at any rate perfectly conceivable that Terence playfully misread them in that way and retroactively constructed Plautine plays as his own metapoetic statement.[45] There are, I suggest, several instances with sufficient potential for Terence's misreading. Diabolus asks his parasite to read out loud the exclusivity contract (*As.* 746-8):

> *agedum istum ostende quem conscripsti syngraphum*
> *inter me et amicam et lenam. leges pellege.*
> *nam tu poeta es prorsus ad eam rem unicus.*
>
> Do show me the contract you've composed,
> between me and my girl and the procuress. Read over the terms.
> You are the one and only poet for that kind of thing.

[44] The text is corrupt and variously supplemented (see apparatus in Enk 1953 ad loc.) but the basic meaning is not affected. See also the *prior/posterior* joke at 410-11, where Diniarchus realizes that Phronesium acquired a suppositious baby: "Now the woman who gave birth to him previously did not gave birth to him, but you, coming after her." — "You've got it; that's how the story goes" (DIN. *eum nunc non illa peperit, quae peperit prior, sed tu posterior*. PHR. *ordine omnem rem tenes*). Phronesium effectively uses the metaphor of "sequence," *ordo*, for punning on the inverted primacy; see a possibly related idea of giving birth to and adoption of plays, chapter 4.

[45] Cf. the preliminary remark by Hunter 2006: 2: "Roman poets were under no obligation to give an equal hearing to all parts of any model's oeuvre, or indeed a fair one to any part."

In describing his parasite as a "unique" poet, Diabolus nicely picks up *unice unum* of Argyrippus' unsuccessful exclusivity with the girl (208). We may detect Terence's further metapoetic response to the development of the issue of timesharing in the *Asinaria*. After Argyrippus got to Philaenium first, Diabolus' parasite hopes to come to an agreement if he persuades the procuress by bringing the money nevertheless (*poste demum huc cras adducam ad lenam, ut uiginti minas ei det*, | *in partem hac amanti ut liceat ei potirier*, 916; the verb is significant: see below). But he would also have to convince Argyrippus to share Philaenium every other night with Diabolus (*sese alternas cum illo noctes hac frui*, 918). We do not hear what comes of this, or whether the parasite would have to persuade his master, the previously possessive Diabolus, and not to mention Argyrippus. The whole play revolves around monopolizing Philaenium, so the parasite would have had little chance of succeeding. In the *Eunuchus*, Thraso's parasite Gnatho conducts the similar negotiations, with the same motive of pleasing his patron so he can benefit from it himself (*As*. 918-9 ~ *Eun*. 1054-60). But the Terentian negotiator *finalized* what the Plautine parasite hoped for: buying *half* of the girl for his patron. The *Eunuchus* thus provides one possible ending for the conspicuously open-ended *Asinaria*.

The expression of contractual sharing used by Diabolus' parasite above, *licet* (916), occurs in the *Truculentus* as well. Immediately following Astaphium's advice to Diniarchus quoted above, he is appalled that not only are others using his investment but he himself is not even allowed a share in it (*non licet do<nati> obsoni me participem fieri*? 747).[46] Ordinary as it may be, both in the *Asinaria* and the *Truculentus* the verb *licet* is used in the same, very specific

[46] Text is again corrupt; several readings are offered for the *do* of MSS: *non licet d<imidi>o opsoni* (Hoffmann 2001, after Lindsay 1905); *non <mei> licet [do] obsoni* (Kruse 1974, following Leo 1896); *non licet do<nati> obsoni* (Enk 1956, after Spengel 1868). The variants do not essentially affect the meaning except in Diniarchus placing more or less emphasis on the gifts being "his own."

context: for an excluded claimant pleading for admittance from an inferior position. The verb resurfaces in crucial places in the *Eunuchus* and is particularly apt for a retroactive metapoetic trope. We have seen that in the lack of absolute primacy both Terence and Phaedria give up on priority and exclusivity. In the prologue Terence is even taking pride in his secondariness to ensure for himself a place *alongside* the others and aspires to be a participant (35-6):

> *quod si personis isdem huic uti non licet:*
> *qui mage licet currentem servom scribere...*
>
> But if he is not allowed to use the same characters,
> how is it more allowed to write about the running slave...

Phaedria uses the same language of "license" over Thais, with the same protasis *si non licet*. Even though he had agreed to step aside and leave town, letting Thraso be *prior* with Thais for a while, he eventually grows impatient and returns before the deadline (638-41):

> *si non tangendi copiast,*
> *eho ne videndi quidem erit? si illud non licet,*
> *saltem hoc licebit. certe extrema linea*
> *amare haud nil est.*
>
> If I don't have a chance to touch her,
> why, will I not even have a chance to look at her? If that is not allowed,
> then at least this will be allowed. Surely, to be a lover at the end of the line
> is better than none.

Thais does begin and end the play as shared property, but in the meantime Phaedria's access to her is restricted because another claimant, Thraso, is granted *temporary* primacy. It is from Thraso that Parmeno has to beg permission to deliver Phaedria's gifts: "I ask, if you would be so kind, that we be allowed to give her what we brought, and meet her for a conversation" (*quaeso hercle ut liceat, pace quod fiat tua, | dare huic quae volumu', convenire et conloqui*, 466-7).[47] Thus Phaedria, hoping for a *copia videndi*, comes to function as Terence's rival from the

[47] Gnatho uses the same language in an instructively comparable context. He self-licensed himself to distribute an old "doctrine" of *kolakeia* as his own; prospective followers ask for permission to learn it: *ut sibi liceret discere id de me: sectari iussi* (261); cf. Fontaine 2013.

prologue, who is obliged to hold back but manages to take a peek at the performance, *copia inspiciundi* (21). The metapoetic assignment of Terence as Phaedria and Thraso as rival poet is thereby rotated.[48] The prologue, I believe, advocates precisely this interchangeability. Terence has the exclusive temporary authorization to present his version of Menander's *Eunouchos* that is otherwise available to all, just like the *Kolax* or any other of Menander's plays—adapted already or not—may be Terence's, for the time being, under those same liberal terms. The market is open until one gets there first, and it will be open again once the allotted time expires; the effect is comparable to that of the time-limited contract in the *Asinaria*. Both Phaedria and Terence's rival have to sit in the back and wait for their turn, and neither of them has enough patience to do so.[49]

The phrasing and context of "shareholding" in the *Truculentus* and the *Asinaria* strongly suggest that Terence activates the language of conditional access to women for expressing a temporary *licentia poetica*, as opposed to ownership. All of these *licet*-passages stress the acquisition of women by paying, so Terence's "license" to use stock types like everyone else is likewise monetized. By the time Terence's rival accuses him of theft (*fur*, 23; *furtum*, 28) the

[48] Rivalry and intrusion in fact operate in many directions. For the rivalry of Thraso and Chaerea, see Gilmartin 1975: 264 and compare Sharrock 2009: 90: "But what is happening here is that Luscius has got 'inside' the play, intrusively, deceitfully, in order to attack it. This may hint at the central point of the play we are about to see, which is the intrusion of Chaerea into the house of Thais, in order to rape Pamphila. At the least, the story serves to draw the audience into the world of the play." We might add Pamphila's brother Chremes who is also perceived as a rival, (v. 434, with Barsby 1999, ad loc; 501; 617-26), and he managed against all odds to get admitted into Thraso's party and make progress on recognizing Pamphila. I attempt to sort out these complicated links in Chapter 4.5.

[49] Phaedria's obscure metaphor *extrema linea* from the passage above (besides literally sitting at the end of the verse: *OLD* s.v. *linea* 3a, "anything written") might be articulating the position of secondariness in playwriting: *linea* can denote a line dividing theatre seats (although this usage is late, *OLD* s.v. 6b). Barsby: 1999: 206-7, ad 640-641, sees no purpose of such a metaphor; see further his note on some rationalizations offered by ancient commentators; see also Germany 2008: 44 on Donatus' concept of *quinque lineae amoris.* Another interesting possibility is the meaning of a genealogical stemma (although again very late, *OLD* s.v. 7); on genealogy as literary tradition, see below, Chapter 4.2-3.

aediles have already bought the play (*emerunt*, 20); as if these plays have price tags.[50] A prostitute's customer is then a fitting metapoetic vehicle. Phaedria turns out to be, contrary to the romantic conventions, nothing more than a business-minded user who ultimately even, as Robert Germany remarks, pimps Thais out to Thraso for money.[51]

Therefore, Terence's response to accusations of plagiarism is the figure of Thais: a generically shared woman, publicly accessible for a regular fee. But the accusation was that the portion of the *Kolax* he used is privileged content and should not have been, as it were, put on sale in the first place.[52] This restricted play Terence tropes as the other girl in the play, Pamphila. In the next chapter we explore the metapoetic effects of her character.

[50] McGill 2012: 126 points out an important implication: "For the only time in extant Latin literature an act of plagiarism is consequently seen to bring direct financial gain." Cf. my comments on the financial allusions throughout Chapters 4-5.
[51] Germany 2008: 24.
[52] Terence's defense of open-access market—*si personis isdem huic uti non licet*...—may be a pun on a cognate verb: *licet*, "it is allowed," but also *liceo*, "to be worth (a price)," i.e. "to be on sale:" see esp. Pl. *Men*. 549, 1159, with commentary in Gratwick 1993; cf. also a girl on sale in Martial 6.66.1. Thus *quod si personis isdem huic uti non licet, qui mage licet currentem servom scribere...* (35-6) need not mean only "but if it is not *allowed* for him to use the same characters, then how is it more *allowed* to write about a running slave…" but something like "but if using the same characters is not *available for him to buy*, then how..."

Chapter 4

Pamphila in the *Eunuchus*: A special girl and a privileged play

4.1. Virginity, citizenship, and plagiarism

In the Introduction we have seen various possibilities a woman as a trope of poetry. What is at stake in all of them is, broadly speaking, the poets' possession of their poetry. Literary work is part of a tradition that also belongs to other poets, and the ultimate destination of the work is the audience. Erotic relationship thus articulates the tension between the poets' exclusive claim on their work and its public dimension. In Terence's *Eunuchus* we have seen the latter half of analogy with the prostitute Thais in the previous chapter. A suggestion towards the former has been first advanced by Cynthia Dessen for the *virgo* Pamphila. She briefly and provocatively proposes that the prologue "transposes two major themes of the play, aggression and violation, to a literary context;" here is her view:

> "In the second half of the prologue Terence refutes charges of theft (*furtum*, 28) and, by implication, contamination. He denies that he stole the figures of Thraso and Gnatho from earlier Latin versions of Menander's *Kolax* by Plautus and Naevius. Rather, he claims, he borrowed them directly from Menander (*ex Graeca*, 33). Goldberg (1986, 94-95) glosses the peculiar metaphor of defilement implicit in this action. The Greek play was "spoiled" for complete adaptation by another playwright once Terence had touched it. The literary imagery here strongly suggests the analogy of sexual violation; for what is the rape of a virgin (like Pamphila) if not a theft from her male relatives and a stain or contamination of her intact virginity? ... Female virginity, too, was an overriding concern in ancient society. Given the rape scene in this play, therefore, Terence's discussion of *furtum* and *contaminatio* in the prologue seems peculiarly apt. Like Chaerea, Terence pleads ignorance of any wrongdoing (34; cf. 858). ... He asks us, like Thais, to "know and pardon" any fault in the execution (*cognoscere atque ignoscere*, 42 […])."[1]

[1] Dessen 1995: 136, citing Goldberg 1986.

The idea that the rape of Pamphila mirrors the poet's violation is very attractive but requires some adjustments. In the *Eunuchus* prologue the violation is not mentioned under the notoriously obscure label *contaminatio*. Even if in this prologue Terence alludes to *contaminatio* in his other prologues (*An*. 16, *HT* 17), Goldberg's interpretation cited above would not apply to the *Eunuchus*. If "contaminating" plays means taking select pieces and thereby rendering the whole play unsuitable for a complete adaptation, precisely the opposite happens in the *Eunuchus*: Terence did not "spoil" a play for someone else but (un)intentionally used a play already adapted by others.

This is where Dessen's intuitively useful approach needs modification. In the *Eunuchus* there are *two* plays and *two* girls: the sexual violation in question is plagiarism. The difference between Thais and Pamphila, I argue, is the same that Terence posits between Menander's *Eunouchos* and Menander's *Kolax*. The availability of the two girls is decisively different in that Thais, a prostitute, is a generically "open-access" woman, while the virgin Pamphila is not. Menander's *Eunouchos*, still unadapted in Latin, is available for prospective adapters; the *Kolax* is not.[2] The exceptional standing of both Pamphila and Menander's *Kolax* is yet to be discovered, with much noise—and too late. The illicit use of the Latin *Colax* is the focal point of the prologue's "plot," while establishing Pamphila's identity is the central concern in the play.[3] The poet is accused of theft (*furem*, 23; *furtum*, 28) and the same language is used in the dispute

[2] In a way, this equation—the prostitute as a premiering play and the virgin as the one already "used"—is counterintuitive. Indeed Martial 1.66 suggests the opposite, advising a plagiarist to take up an unknown text, an untouched virgin; see Anderson 2006 and Seo 2009, with further references; cf. Catullus who speaks of his brand new *libellus* and invokes a virgin Muse (*patrona virgo*, 1.9; cf. 65.2). This potential paradox of the *virgo* in the *Eunuchus* may have been precisely the point (see the present discussion below); for further problems with Pamphila's virginity, see Chapter 5.

[3] Her status directly affects everyone: Thais seeks to benefit from restoring Pamphila in finding a patron for herself. Pamphila as Thraso's gift is invalidated and thereby his negotiating position with Thais; Chremes finds his sister; Chaerea marries Pamphila when she proves to be marriageable, and consequently Parmeno got away unpunished for inducing Chaerea into assaulting a citizen girl.

over ownership of Pamphila (*furti*, 809).[4] Very oddly given the circumstances, thus significantly, Thais' maid Pythias not only feels sorry for the raped girl but suspects that the rapist stole something from the house (*aliquid domo abeuntem abstulisse*, 660-1); the verb recalls the poet's theft in the prologue (*parasiti personam inde ablatam et militis*, 26).

Tampering with Pamphila, however, is a violation not just because she is a virgin, but specifically a virgin citizen. After the rape Chaerea faces Pamphila's guardian, Thais, and her slave Pythias (856-8):

> THA. *quid feceras?* CHA. *paullum quiddam.* PYT. *eho "paullum," inpudens?*
> *an paullum hoc esse tibi videtur, virginem*
> *vitiare civem?* CHA. *conservam esse credidi.*
>
> THA. What have you done? CHA. No big deal... PYT. "No big deal," you villain?
> Does it not seem a big deal to you to violate a girl—
> a *citizen*? CHA. I thought she was a fellow-slave.

Now we compare Terence's plea in the prologue (27-34):

> *si id est peccatum, peccatum inprudentiast*
> *poetae, non quo furtum facere studuerit.*
> *id ita esse vos iam iudicare poteritis.*
> *Colax Menandrist: in east parasitus Colax* 30
> *et miles gloriosus: eas se non negat*
> *personas transtulisse in Eunuchum suam*
> *ex Graeca; sed eas fabulas factas prius*
> *Latinas scisse sese id vero pernegat.*
>
> If that wrong has been done, it was done in ignorance
> of the poet, not because he strove to commit a theft.
> That this is so, you will now be able to judge.
> The *Flatterer* is by Menander; there's a parasite flatterer,
> and a boastful soldier. He does not deny that he took over
> those characters into his *Eunuch*, from the Greek play;
> but that he knew that those plays had been presented previously
> in Latin—that he utterly denies.

[4] I analyze this scene and the issue of "ownership" of Pamphila below in detail. For theft as adultery, see e.g. Catul. 7.8, 68b.135ff.; Hunter 2006: 108.

Terence intensifies the denial in separating the two charges (*non negat... sed... id vero pernegat*)[5]. He does not deny adapting a play as such, nor does Chaerea deny sex as such: the issue is reworking a *Latin* play and violating a virgin of *local* citizenship.[6] Terence specifies the stock accusations of plagiarism from Greek comedy[7] for the Roman context of adaptation; as Scott McGill reminds us, charges against Terence "define plagiarism in exclusively Latin terms."[8] Pamphila/*Colax*, already claimed for in Athens/Rome, is explicitly contrasted to Thais/*Eunouchos*, an immigrant prostitute who is looking for a patron in her new place of residence: even when she finds one, Phaedria's father, she remains on the market; poetics of inclusivity is at work. But Pamphila *should* be a different story altogether. Her metapoetic function is precisely her portrayal vis-à-vis Thais. The difference between the two girls elucidates Terence's agenda in using the two source plays, and vice versa.

4.2. Constructing Pamphila

The background for assessing this crucial distinction between Thais and Pamphila is found in Plautus. The slave Palinurus in the *Curculio* metaphorically speaks of women as public and private property.[9] With a very Plautine pun on *testis*, "testicle" and "witness,"[10] he warns the *adulescens* Phaedromus that illicit advances may be punished by castration (31-8; tr. De Melo):

---

[5] Barsby 1999: 87 ad 33-4 on the intensifying prefix; so also McGill 2012: 133, fn. 72. Perhaps significant is the slave Pythias' first explanation of how was rape even possible: "They deny it was the eunuch" (*illum eunuchum negant | fuisse*, 822-3). For a possibly related metapoetic reading, see Sharrock 2009: 229: "By dressing up, Chaerea becomes a sign for Drama as a whole; by cross-dressing, the fact of his disguise is a self-referential sign for the play: he is, quite spectacularly, not what he seems."

[6] Note a possibly metapoetic valence of Pamphila's torn clothes after the rape (*virgo conscissa veste*, 820), signifying a play torn in pieces and abused by Terence. While the detail is very Menandrian (*Epit*. 488-90; Gardner 2012), it has been attractively suggested that Orestes' clothes in Euripides' *Electra* are a metaphor for literature, especially the Aeschylean version of the same story: see Torrance 2011: 187, with further references; see also Nünlist 1998: 224-7. For weaving as poetic composition see references in Torrance 2011: 181, fn. 12; Nünlist 1998: 110-118.

[7] See above, Chapter 2.

[8] McGill 2012: 116.

[9] Cf. the suggestive language on an inscription (*CIL* 6.13074): *EMIT ET COMPARAVIT LOCVM VIRGINEM.*

PAL. *caute ut incedas via:*
quod amas amato testibus praesentibus.
PHA. *quin leno hic habitat*. PAL. *nemo hinc prohibet nec vetat,*
quin quod palam est venale, si argentum est, emas.
nemo ire quemquam publica prohibet via; 35
dum ne per fundum saeptum facias semitam,
dum ted abstineas nupta, vidua, virgine,
iuventúte et pueris liberis, ama quid lubet.

PAL. Tread carefully on your road;
love what you love in the presence of your testifiers.
PHA. Well, a pimp lives here. PAL. Nobody stops or prevents you from buying from here what's openly for sale, if you have the money.
Nobody forbids anyone to go on a public road. 35
So long as you don't take a path through a fenced property,
so long as you stay away from the married woman, the widow, the virgin, the youth, and freeborn boys, love whatever you like.

Palinurus' *publica via* is a known poetic metaphor for "well-trodden" commonplaces as seen, for example, in Callimachus' epigram 28; the metapoetic road imagery occurs in the *Eunuchus* as well, as we shall see again below and in the next chapter.[11] Just as it was the case with the motif of exclusivity in the *Truculentus* and *Asinaria* in chapter 3, Plautus needed not have designed this passage as metapoetic, but it would be a godsend for Terence to misread it in that way.[12] Terence's and Chaerea's apology perfectly, albeit tacitly, acknowledges these exact restrictions: they trespassed on private property assuming it was public. Chaerea's slave Parmeno interprets the rules a bit more assertively. After the rape, Pythias makes a prank telling him that Chaerea is being punished in the way adulterers usually are (*quod moechis solet*, 957), implying castration.

[10] *Mil*. 1416-26 (see Chapter 8.4.5); *Truc*. 837; cf. *Priap*. 15.7. See Fontaine 2010: 116.
[11] For Call. *Ep*. 28, see Introduction, sect. 5 (pp. 17-18), with references; cf. esp. the *Aetia* prologue, 1.26-7 Pfeiffer. On Epigram 28 and Theognis, see Henrichs, 1978: 210 and Cameron 1995: 387ff.; Gutzwiller 2007: 34. For Verg. *Geo.* 3.8 in relation to *Eunuchus* (*primus inveni viam*, 247), see Fontaine 2013: 189ff.; cf. also Gnatho's *tota erras via* (*Eu*. 245). On the road metaphors for (early Greek) poetry, see Nünlist 1998: 228-264. For "tracing" predecessors, Torrance 2011: 186. Regardless of a possibly metapoetic *via* in the *Curculio*, Plautus or his Greek original seems to be punning on the name Phae-dromus, who is lighting his way with a lamp in this scene (9).
[12] Cf. possible traces of Plautine metapoetics as well (besides the *Casina*, Chapter 1): in a metatheatrical aside in *Bac*. 215-13 Chrysalus says he cannot stand the *Epidicus* if Pellio is starring, even though he loves that play as much as himself (*quam ego fabulam aeque ac me ipsum amo*, 214); Phronesium in the *Truculentus* describes her affection for the soldier in similar terms: *quem ego ecastor mage amo quam me* (887).

Parmeno protests that such a punishment is outrageous: "Who has ever seen someone for adultery in a brothel—*arrested*?" (*quis homo pro moecho umquam vidit in domo meretricia | prendi quemquam*? 960-1). Significantly, just a few lines earlier (952-3) Parmeno learned that Pamphila is *not* a prostitute. But even so, he implies, Chaerea should not be blamed because the girl *happened to be* in the brothel, where women are up for grabs. She was violated on the assumption that all women there are alike and hence equally available.

4.2.1. Presumption of availability

Presumed availability of women is an appropriate trope for Terence's "brothel-poetics," an a priori open market. As we have seen in the previous chapter, he enacts this disingenuous claim by disingenuously stereotyping Thais. This will affect Pamphila severely: even though she should be decisively different, the misperception of her is precisely the result of the *mala meretrix* stereotype. Throughout the opening scene Parmeno sees Thais as a lying prostitute,[13] and her reputation directly shakes the credibility of anything she says about Pamphila's possibly legitimate ancestry.[14] Most revealing is Parmeno's first reaction. Thais summarizes Pamphila's history (109-120) adding that she received her from Thraso, with whom alone she had a relationship at the time. Parmeno instantly judges the narrative to be phony (121), but he picks up only her last words for an ad hominem argument: "Neither were you satisfied with one man

[13] Comic slaves are habitually biased against prostitutes: Fantham 1975: 72, fn. 58 (=Fantham 2010: 79-114, at 111, fn.58); add Onesimos in Men. *Epit.* 538-40 who thinks that Habrotonon wants to profit from the baby's recognition.

[14] Parmeno warns Phaedria about Thais' sneaky tactics (53-5, 66ff), interrupts her address with a sarcastic remark (98) and says he will be a skeptical listener like a vessel that leaks out lies (100-8). Phaedria likewise mockingly repeats some keywords regarding Pamphila's background from Thais' speech (155-7, discussed above, Chapter 3.2, and further below), but only to accuse her that helping Pamphila is an excuse to kick him out (159-161). Thais herself is metatheatrically aware that Phaedria might not believe her because he judges her according to the stereotype (*forsan his mihi parvam habeat fidem, | atque ex aliarum ingeniis nunc me iudicet*, 197-8; see Chapter 3.4, pp. 65-66, with fn. 31). Cf. Caston 2014: 49: "Thais's ability to help Pamphila will depend upon others' trust in her. If Thais has barely persuaded Phaedria to believe her, then she may not be able to persuade another crucial figure, Pamphila's brother, whom she is meeting later the same day (202–6). As much as Phaedria is constrained by wanting to please Thais, the very same scene suggests how much Thais' ability to act is restricted by unflattering judgments of her character."

nor was he the only one to give you gifts" (122).[15] Only because Thais is perceived as professionally promiscuous, Pamphila's legitimacy is implicitly still in question, with the corollary that she is a prostitute as well.[16]

This unflattering assumption looms large in the scene where Chaerea got infatuated with Pamphila at first sight (292-298). Brown reasonably concludes that "Chaerea, who has just seen his girl escorted through the streets by a parasite (347), would no doubt take it for granted that she either is already or is destined to be a prostitute."[17] Parmeno will indeed soon confirm that she is taken to Thais' house (350-2), but even *before* that, Chaerea begs Parmeno to find access to the girl by any means possible: violence, trick, or persuasion (319-20; cf. 362). Of course, in Roman comedy slaves regularly obtain girls for their young masters but those girls are prostitutes; it is clearly in that sense that Chaerea presumes Pamphila accessible. Moreover, she turns from an unidentified female into a metonymy of the brothel in no time. Chaerea justifies his plan to reach Pamphila in Thais' house by trickery as an adequate revenge for the maltreatment that the *adulescentes* suffer from *meretrices* (382-7).[18]

4.2.2. Contradictory evidence

Thus far the presumption is straightforward: when all plays and women are equally accessible, an earlier Latin *Colax* would not make much difference anyway. But critics have duly noted that this dismissive argumentation is contradictory. If they are all alike, why would it matter whether

[15] See analysis of this passage in Chapter 3.4, pp. 61-64.
[16] It may be significant that Pamphila is a *fidicina* (133, 985), whom Thraso will invite to perform so as to make Thais jealous (443, 625). Dobrov and Urios-Aparisi 1995: 155 attractively propose that the woman personifying Music in Pherecrates' *Cheirons* (frg. 155 KA; see Introduction, sect. 5) is specifically a *kitharistria*, a hetaera specialized in music, which would make her associative on several levels: a musical performer and the character whom she plays, as well as the personification of the performance.
[17] Brown 1993: 231.
[18] To be sure, Chaerea's plan may be taken to imply doing harm to Thais (so Barsby 1993: 164), but it is symptomatic that, if so, he sees Pamphila as an appropriate means to that end.

Terence knew of earlier versions of not?[19] If Terence bothered to accommodate two characters from another play, that surely means they must have exhibited some individuality. The resulting paradox is that plays and comic characters can be both generic and unique at the same time. The paradox applies analogously to Pamphila in two respects. One, the men in the *Eunuchus* treat her as if she is of Thais' kind, but are attracted to her precisely by how different she is. Second, Terence devotes a lot of attention to characters' oversight of Pamphila's special status, subtly telling us that they should have known better.

4.2.2.1. A new girl in town

The first time Pamphila appears in the play (though never on stage), Parmeno spots Gnatho leading her to Thais' house (228-31):

> *attat hicquidem est parasitus Gnatho*
> *militis: ducit secum una virginem dono huic. papae*
> *facie honesta! mirum ni ego me turpiter hodie hic dabo*
> *cum meo decrepito hoc eunucho. haec superat ipsam Thaidem*.
>
> Oh, no! It's Gnatho the parasite
> of the soldier; he's bringing the girl as a gift for her. Oh my,
> what a fine appearance! I guess I'll look like a fool
> with this wreck of a eunuch. This girl surpasses Thais herself!

The passage is packed with metapoetry. Parmeno immediately identifies Gnatho by name and role, thus self-referentially calling attention to the recognizable stock types.[20] Furthermore, as he announces precisely the two characters that Terence is accused of plagiarizing,[21] he is virtually signaling the beginning of the problematic *Colax* portion. Pamphila, introduced by an interpolated parasite as a gift from an interpolated soldier, is not only a new girl in town but

[19] See discussion and references above, Chapter 2.1, p. 40, fn. 6.
[20] Brown 1993: 234. Chaerea will later also immediately identify Gnatho's role even though he merely saw him, and so for the first time (PAR. *comites secuti scilicet sunt virginem*? | CHA. *verum: parasitu' cum ancilla*. PAR. *ipsast: ilicet*, 346-7). Thraso is later again clearly labeled (*miles Thraso* | *Phaedriae rivali'*, 353-4; cf. Germany 2008: 131).
[21] Even the line-break is reproduced: *in east parasitus Colax* | *et miles gloriosus* (30-1); *parasitus Gnatho* | *militis* (228-9).

clearly belongs in another play. She is immediately contrasted both to Thais and the old eunuch, Phaedria's gift. In other words, Pamphila, Terence's secondary source-play, is superior both to the eunuch character eponymous of the primary model, and to Thais who embodies the commonness of that primary model.[22] The reference to Pamphila's appearance as *honesta*, like earlier by Thais (132), is a subtle hint at her respectable ancestry.[23] Chaerea is likewise struck by her uniqueness (292-7):

> *Occidi!*
> *neque virgost usquam neque ego, qui illam e conspectu amisi meo.*
> *ubi quaeram, ubi investigem, quem perconter, quam insistam viam*
> *incertu' sum. una haec spes est: ubi ubi est, diu celari non potest.*
> *o faciem pulchram! deleo omnis dehinc ex animo mulieres:*
> *taedet cotidianarum harum formarum*.
>
> I am ruined!
> The girl is lost, and so am I who lost her from sight.
> Where to look, where to trace her, whom to ask, which road to take,
> I have no idea. There's only one hope; wherever she is, she cannot hide for long.
> Oh, the beautiful face! From now on I remove all other women from my mind;
> I am sick of these everyday beauties.

Chaerea's road imagery recalls the metaphor for poetic inventiveness,;[24] *investigare* rings strongly metapoetic as well.[25] Pamphila is a brand new *virgo* as opposed to experienced *mulieres*, whose "everyday" charm alludes both to their averageness and steady access to them. Chaerea continues (313-18):

> CHA. *haud simili' virgost virginum nostrarum, quas matres student*
> *demissis umeris esse, vincto pectore, ut gracilae sient.*
> *si quaest habitior paullo pugilem esse aiunt, deducunt cibum:*
> *tam etsi bonast natura, reddunt curatura iunceas:*
> *itaque ergo amantur*. PAR. *quid tua istaec*? CHA. *nova figura oris*. PAR. *papae*.
> CHA. *color veru', corpu' solidum et suci plenum*.

[22] For *superare* and similar metapoetic comparisons, see Hinds 1998: 42ff., 92ff., 126.
[23] *OLD* s.v. 2-3.
[24] See reference for the *Curculio* passage above, p. 78, fn. 11.
[25] Famously in Statius' *Thebaid* 12.817. Second out of three instances of the verb in Terence is used by the slave Syrus coming up with tricks: *nil tam difficilest quin quaerendo investigari possiet* (*HT* 675). The metapoetic imagery of following the footsteps is well attested; see Torrance 2011: 186; cf. e.g. Nünlist 1998: 242 on διώξω in Pi. *O*. 3.44-45.

> CHA. She is nothing like these girls of ours, whom their mothers urge
> to round their shoulders and bind their breasts, to look skinny.
> If some is a bit sturdier they say she's a boxer, and cut down her meals;
> Even if one is naturally endowed, she ends up thin as a reed.
> And they're popular! PAR. And this girl of yours? CHA. New type of face. PAR. Oh my!
> CHA. Genuine complexion, body firm and juicy.[26]

Pamphila is is elaborately contrasted with *nostrae*,[27] but only at this point; shortly after Parmeno praises the beauty of Thais and Chaerea asks: "But nothing like this girl of ours?"—"No, totally something else" (CHA. *at nil ad nostram hanc*? PAR. *alia rest*, 361). Chaerea appropriates Pamphila as *nostra*, symptomatically, immediately after he learned (352) that she is admitted in the prostitute's house; *nostra* might suggest that he automatically deems her available to *multiple* male possessors. After all, Pamphila's name might be deliberately ambiguous: both a chaste "All-Lovely" and "Loving everyone," i.e. "Promiscuous."[28]

---

[26] The imagery is gratuitously extensive, hence significant. Pamphila is contrasted with *nostrae* on two accounts: natural as opposed to artificial and juicy as opposed to skinny. The first one is fairly straightforward: makeup is a device of prostitutes: e.g. Pl. *Mos*. 258-278; Alexis, *Isostasion* (103 KA), with Arnott 1996: 273ff. Cf. "harlot Muse" on sale in Pi. *I.* 2 (see Introduction), for which Simpson 1969: 471-3, with fn. 65, proposes that "silver-plated faces" (ἀργυρωθεῖσαι πρόσωπα, 8) refer to artificial embellishment of poetry for commercial purposes. For Pamphila's genuine complexion, *color verus*, cf. the effect of comparing the color of hair in Euripides' *Electra*: Torrance 2011: 185 notes that "[t]he word χρῶμα commonly means color or texture, but it can also be used to describe the texture of poetic and musical composition (as at Plato *Republic* 601a–b)." The second criterion is more intriguing. Chaerea's preference for juicy Pamphila over the anorexic *nostrae*, recalls the Greek metaphor of "slenderness" for aesthetic refinement, best known from Hellenistic poetry and Old Comedy (a useful synthesis in Gutzwiller 2007: 32-34). Terence's inversion the Hellenistic preference is in keeping with advertising the *Eunuchus* as a composite product, "stuffed" with external ingredients, in contrast to his rival, who produces bland, tasteless translations of Greek plays (7). It is also tempting to consider the use of fat in Roman wedding rituals and its possible symbolism of fertility (Hersch 2010: 180). For another case of Roman inversion of Callimachus' poetics—significantly, precisely of the erotic-poetic exclusivity of epigrams 28 and 31—see Hor. *Sat*. 1.2.101ff., with Hunter 2006: 109ff. For poetry as food in Greek comedy, see Dobrov 2002 (esp. 182-190); Wright 2012: 129-140, 2013: 607-610; Gowers 1993: 50-110 for Plautus. For alimentary metaphors of communication in Latin, see Short 2013. Food and sex go together almost naturally, as Pamphila's brother remarks: *verbum hercle hoc verum erit "sine Cerere et Libero friget Venus"* (*Eu*. 732); cf. e.g. a detailed description in Pl. *Cas*. 217ff. or 803 (*tibi amor pro cibo est*); Franko 1999: 5-8. Lastly, the "reed" of *Eu*. 316 might be anticipating 319, where Parmeno calls Pamphila *flos ipse*, reminiscent of another metaphor for poetry (Nünlist 1998: 206-223); see esp. *flos poetarum* in the *Casina* (18), Chapter 1.

[27] Who are *nostrae*? Brown 1993: 231, rightly reading that Chaerea assumes Pamphila is a prostitute (quoted above), proposes that "that the girls are prostitutes, and that their mothers (whose aim is to make men fall in love with their daughters) are setting them up in the trade... we should expect the girls he compares her with to be of the same type;" Alexis' *Isostasion* (103 KA; see previous note) would be a good comparandum; cf. Fraenkel 1912: 87. But it is also possible to follow Donatus who speculates that *nostrarum* means citizen girls because Pamphila is a foreigner. The ambiguity of whether they are citizens (Donatus) or prostitutes (Brown) might be precisely highlighting the complexity of Pamphila's identity.

[28] In the otherwise fixed system of comic nomenclature (Chapter 5.6, fn. 69), Pamphila seems to indicate precisely the uncertainty of status. In Terence's *Adelphoe* Pamphila is also a freeborn virgin violated by the *adulescens*, and

In a later passage Pamphila is again discreetly associated with and distinguished from a *meretrix* at the same time. Parmeno delivers an anti-*meretrix* invective and describes prostitutes as filthy bilge water (*inluviem sordes*, 937). Previously Chaerea narrates how he stalked Pamphila while she was bathing; he uses six forms of *lavare* within nine lines (592-560). The emphasis reminds us that in Plautus bathing is what prostitutes do (*Mos*. 157ff, esp. *Truc*. 322ff.);[29] Pamphila is, after all, in a prostitute's house. But on the other hand, the choice of imagery recalls a Callimachean poetologic image: public or bombastic poetry is a public fountain or a polluted river; refined poetry is a pure stream of fresh water.[30] Depending on whether we read Pamphila's bathing from a Plautine or Alexandrian perspective, she is either a prostitute preparing for work or a specimen of untouched maidenhood.[31]

This ambiguity is programmatic. Parmeno begins his invective above saying that Chaerea benefitted from the brothel invasion since he will stay away from prostitutes once he learned to "recognize" them (*meretricum ingenia et mores posset noscere | mature, ut quom cognorit perpetuo oderit*, 932-3). The verb *cognoscere* is expectedly used of establishing Pamphila's identity (767, 893, 915). Distinguishing between common and privileged property is precisely the point of Terence disingenuous plea that the audience "recognize and pardon"—or

---

the young wife raped before marriage by her now-husband in Menander's *Epitrepontes*. In Terence's *Phormio* the name is of a music girl, like Pamphila in *Eu*. 133, 985. Some MSS assign Pamphila to the young wife in Plautus' *Stichus* but likely by inference from the name of her husband Pamphilippus.

[29] Philematium vividly describes herself as being cleansed from mire: *rear esse deficatam* (=*defaceatam*), *Mos*. 158. One wonders about the entirely gratuitous reference to bathing of the "*virgo*" Antiphila in the *Self-Tormentor* (618).

[30] Locus classicus is Callimachus' *Hymn to Apollo* 105-112; Cameron 1995: 403ff; at 406 he compares "Horace's imitation, his well-known criticism of the "muddy" style of Lucilius (*Serm*. 1.4.11): *cum flueret lutulentus, erat quod tollere velles*." For the public fountain in Epigram 28 Cameron thinks that the fountain "*might* have a literary reference," but is certainly erotic (1995: 390, original emphasis); the imagery is from Theognis; Henrichs 1978: 210, Fantuzzi 2011: 431.

[31] Note also the imagery of staining and dripping in Chaerea's description of Jupiter, who tricked the woman through the skylight: *per inpluvium fucum factum mulieri* (*Eu*. 589); the word *fucum*, metaphorically "deception" (*OLD* 4) but originally "seaweed dye" (*OLD* 1-2a), is also used for makeup (*OLD* 2b: esp. Pl. *Mos*. 275), and eventually for artificial rhetorical embellishment (*OLD* 5); for more on the *inpluvium* in the *Eunuchus*, see below, Chapter 5.5, pp. 119-121, with fn. 48. Unsurprisingly, several later Roman authors explain the name of the Roman aqueduct Virgo (built in 19 BCE) in terms of sexual purity: Plin. *Nat*. 31.42; Cassiod. *Var*. 7.2; Mart. 7.41 is likewise suggestive.

"overlook"—his reuse of previous texts (*cognoscere atque ignoscere*, 42). The *anagnorisis* of Pamphila, as we shall immediately see, can be rewardingly interpreted as a metapoetic device.[32]

4.2.2.2. Obviously obscured origin

The frequently mentioned uncertainty about Pamphila's status is particularly suspicious since recognition is a dramaturgic cliché that always works.[33] Terence invites reflection on it as he takes special care to problematize Pamphila's origin. Thais cannot prove it because Pamphila herself has no clue about it (112-3). Thraso buys Pamphila for Thais, explicitly unaware of the girl's tumultuous past (*inprudens harum rerum ignarusque omnium*, 135-6). Remarkably, no one in the *Eunuchus* will be able to confirm Pamphila's identity, not even her own brother who is summoned precisely for that purpose.[34] Apart from Chaerea's ignorance (858, above), dramaturgically most consequential is that of Parmeno. Although he has heard Thais' lengthy story (99-175) that Pamphila might be freeborn, he still later advises Chaerea to go after her. When Chaerea takes it seriously, Parmeno tries to withdraw saying he was only joking (369-390), but even then does not mention the possibility of Pamphila's citizenship, which could have been his key argument. Parmeno's alternating feelings of fear (378-390, 997-100) and pride

[32] For metapoetic recognition in Euripides' *Electra*, see Torrance 2013: 15-18, citing Goldhill 1991: 5, 24, who points out that ἀναγιγνώσκειν means both "recognize" and "read." For Greek novel, cf. König 2008: 138: "The bewildering experience of mistaken identity is thus something we experience through our own difficulty as readers in telling different scenes apart. In Heliodorus' *Charicleia and Theagenes*, the unfathomability and cultural hybridity of Charicleia—the Ethiopian/Greek heroine, born white from black parents—and of Calasiris—the Greek-Egyptian sage whose mendacity and accompanying physical deceptiveness we have glimpsed already—are images for, and mirrored by, the text itself. Like the bodies of Charicleia and Calasiris, the novel's tricky surface is full of puzzles and riddles; like them it does finally reveal its secrets. Like Charicleia, it also flaunts its own cultural hybridity, its own transgressive literary genealogy, by its relocation and reformation of the *Odyssey* and other founding texts of Greek cultural tradition."

[33] Cave 1988: 2: "[S]uch [recognition] scenes are somehow too neat to be real, like the mechanism of a cuckoo clock, and so draw attention to themselves—and to the literary form as a whole—as an artifice;" cited in Sharrock 2009: 150, fn.131.

[34] See below.

(923-940) for his contribution, and the insistent denial of any complicity (980, 988), indicate not only the uncertainty about but the inherent ambivalence of Pamphila's status.[35]

If Pamphila's legitimacy of birth reflects the privileged status of a Greek play with an already existing local owner, it is useful to observe how turbulent is the history of possession of the girl, as described by Thais (107-143). Thais' mother was a Samian prostitute on Rhodes where she received Pamphila, a captive possibly an Athenian citizen, as a gift from her customer, a merchant; from pirates who sold Pamphila to him the merchant heard that she had been kidnapped from Sunium.[36] Thais' mother raised her as her own daughter; Thais then moves to Athens with Thraso, Thraso travels abroad; back on Rhodes Thais' mother dies and her brother, Thais' uncle, puts Pamphila on sale. Thraso happens to be around and buys her for Thais. In short, people who in various capacities exercised authority over Pamphila thus far were: presumably her unknown parents (0); pirates (1); merchant (2); Thais' mother (3); Thais' uncle (4); Thraso (5). Now, as the action begins, Thraso gives her as a gift to Thais (6), on whose watch she is usurped by Chaerea (7).[37] When Pamphila's brother Chremes shows up to verify kinship (8), the process of recognition, as we shall see immediately, becomes especially perplexing.

---

[35] Parmeno's involvement is problematized throughout; when he begs Chaerea not to turn the blame on him, Chaerea promises to take full responsibility: *numquam defugiam auctoritatem* (390); Pythias will later echo this *auctoritas* (a word with sufficient metapoetic potential: *OLD* s.v. *auctor* 9) when she accuses Parmeno for what Chaerea did: *te auctore quod fecisset | adulescens* (1013-14; cf. Pl. *Poen*. 145-8). Parmeno's claim of innocence before Chaerea's father (*quidquid huiu' factumst, culpa non factumst mea*, 980; *ere, ne me spectes: me <u>inpulsore</u> haec non facit*, 988) flies in the face of the clever slave conventions: Christenson (2013: 272) rightly contrasts the boldness of Plautus' Tranio (*Mos*. 916: *me suasore atque <u>impulsore</u> id factum audacter dicito*); cf. also Pseudolus to Callidorus: *verum ego te amantem, ne pave, non deseram* (*Ps*. 103). For a similar motif in a possibly Menandrian papyrus fragment, see Nervegna 2013: 241. Scholars usually exculpate Parmeno for suggesting the ruse to Chaerea; Gratwick (1972: 30) believes that "Parmeno's proposal (not envisaging rape anyway) is an absurd joke, taken seriously to his consternation (*iocabar equidem*, 377);" similarly, Lowe 1983: 437, Germany 2008: 46ff. But if so, Parmeno's lengthy self-gratulatory revel in Chaerea's misdeed (923-940) is hard to account for.

[36] Terence exposes maritime adventures as a dramaturgic cliché in his first play, hence programmatically: *Andria* 220-4, 923-5, with Knorr 2007: 167-9. In *HT* 608-610 the slave Syrus plans a trick based on an alleged abduction of Antiphila.

[37] Note that Thais' rightful restoration of Pamphila to her family (*suis | ita ut aequom fuerat atque ut studui <u>tradere</u>*, 869-70) is phrased in the same terms as Chaerea's usurpation (*vel vi vel clam vel precario | fac <u>tradas</u>*, 320).

In New Comedy recognition is often brought about by the use of personal belongings revealing a person's ancestry. Pamphila's token will thus be a significant piece of the metapoetic puzzle, all the more so since as actual recognition device it turns out to be surprisingly insignificant. The token is moreover never specified but vaguely called *aurum* (626, 727), *monumenta* (753), and *signa* (767, 808, 914)—bafflingly, since the whole point of recognition tokens is that they are distinctive, hence uniquely informative. The first two terms recall the prologue "trial" over the legitimate ownership of some gold, which Terence ascribes to his rival's play entitled *Thesaurus* (10-13); there the question of how the gold arrived to its earliest location, the *patrium monumentum* is left elusively unanswered.[38] The initial location, sequence of transmission, and the question of authority over Pamphila's *aurum* are similarly intricate. Following her gold closely through the play is worth a digression.

The gold is introduced strangely late in the play; Thais earlier disclosed her plans to verify Pamphila's free birth (107-206; esp. 203-5) but did not mention this potentially crucial piece of evidence. On the dinner party at Thraso's house, Thais took the gold from Pamphila and gave it stealthily to her slave woman Dorias to take them away.[39] Thus the first thing we learn about Pamphila's gold is that it was stolen, before hearing, just as for the prologue *aurum*, that there was any gold in the first place. Symptomatically, we hear this not from Thais but from Dorias, the next person in line (626-7). The transmission is already underway.

At this point we can only assume that Thais stole the gold to show it to Pamphila's brother Chremes, who is to appear shortly and help recognizing the girl (203-6). Before Chremes arrives, Pythias tells Dorias to take the gold inside (727). Chremes comes, Thais tells him she

[38] See discussion of this passage in Chapter 2.2.2, pp. 45-48.
[39] For what it is worth, Donatus says that Dorias is Terence's invention; Barsby 1999: 212, ad 538.

found his sister; he is thrilled; but Thraso is on his way to take Pamphila back. An interesting exchange then takes place (751-5):

> THA. *at enim cave ne priu' quam hanc a me accipias amittas, Chreme;*
> *nam haec east quam miles a me vi nunc ereptum venit*
> *abi tu, cistellam, Pythias, domo ecfer cum monumentis*.
> CHR. *viden tu illum, Thais,...* PYT. *ubi sitast?* THA. *in risco: odiosa cessas*.
> CHR. *militem secum ad te quantas copias adducere*?
>
> THA. But make sure you don't lose her before you take her from me, Chremes;
> for she's the one whom the soldier is now coming to take away from me.
> Pythias, you go inside and bring the box with the tokens.
> CHR. Do you see him, Thais,... PYT. Where is the box? THA. In the chest. You're so slow and annoying!
> CHR. (continues)... the soldier, how many troops he is leading?

At the first mention of Pamphila's gold as *monumenta* Thais' phrasing recalls the prologue inversion: *ne priu' quam hanc a me accipias amittas*. Just as the prologue gold was reclaimed before it had been reported stolen, Chremes might lose Pamphila before getting her back. The sequence of possession is going in reverse. Pamphila's only surviving relative and presumably the ultimate authority for establishing her legitimacy is already in danger of lagging behind current usurpers of his sister. Even though the location of Pamphila's *monumenta* is so forced into the spotlight as to call immediate attention, by this point the tokens are already obsolete. Just a moment ago Thais had already, very quickly (745-750), convinced Chremes that Pamphila is his sister, without showing him the gold—or the girl, for that matter. Additionally strange is that when Thais first spoke of arranging a meeting with Chremes (203ff.) it was beyond doubt that she needed his testimony, not vice versa.

When Pythias returns with the gold (767), it is not to show it to Chremes as we would expect, but for Chremes to show it as evidence to Thraso. Chremes was about to go and find arbiters in helping his case, but Thais assures him: "Just tell him that she's your sister, that you lost her as a small girl, and that you've now confirmed her identity. Show him the tokens."

Pythias: "Here they are." (767-8). Something is very odd here. The use of tokens was not Chremes' preferred solution, as if he is not confident about them; indeed he now sees them for the first time. Thais furthermore insists that Chremes says that he recognized his sister whom he has not seen *at all*.[40]

When Thraso arrives, Chremes first tells him that Pamphila is his sister (805-6) and then threatens that he will show the tokens—strangely, not to Thraso but to yet another character, nurse Sophrona, who is now introduced literally out of nowhere (807).[41] Chremes is still on stage when Thraso admits defeat and leaves without having seen the tokens at all (811), which was, so we were led to believe, why Thais had given it to Chremes in the first place. With Thraso gone, Chremes much later returns with the nurse (912), who is presumably the final authority on the issue. Even though she is a speaking character in that scene (913), Pythias asks not her but Chremes whether the nurse recognized the tokens (914-5). He confirms, Pythias rejoices (916ff.), but yet another surprise is coming: Pythias will go inside and somehow "make sure" about the recognition (*ibo intro de cognitione ut certum sciam*, 920).[42] We do not hear how she intends to do that, what is there still left to make sure about, or indeed what comes of it; this is the last mention of the search. Pythias' exit remark curiously calls attention to the fact that Pamphila's identity has yet to be fully verified.

---

[40] Barsby 1999: 227, ad 767 comments that *ostende* is "probably an instruction to Chremes to show the tokens to Thraso (to convince him that there is proof of Pamphila's identity) rather than one to Pythias to show them to Chremes. If so, there is an element of bluff, since Chremes cannot himself recognise the tokens but will need to fetch an old nurse to do so (807-8)." This is about as close as one can get to a rational explanation.

[41] Barsby 1999: 237, ad 805: "Chremes boldly makes this assertion [*eam esse dico liberam*], even though he has not finally established Pamphila's identity; he has the *signa* in his hand (767n.), but they still need authentication from the nurse."

[42] Barsby 1999: 255, ad 920-1 notices staging issues: "There are two unusual elements here: (i) Pythias is speaking a monologue (one of only two exit monologues in the play: 197- 206n.), rather than explaining her movements to another character, and (ii) a new character enters in her absence, so that the MSS mark a new scene after her departure. It is not clear why T. makes Pythias leave the stage at all, once Parmeno has appeared; her eagerness to confirm Pamphila's recognition indicates the genuineness of her concern for the girl, but this scarcely justifies the awkwardness of her exit and re-entry (941-2n.)."

Strikingly, therefore, Pamphila's gold does not fulfill its one and only dramaturgic purpose. While recognition tokens are by definition plot clues that eventually justify their existence, like a "Chekhov's gun," Pamphila's gold is a red herring. It is constantly derailed from the expected trajectory and we keep losing track of who has the authority to confirm their validity. Especially intriguing is the similarity with the prologue *aurum*, whose earliest reported location, the father's *monumentum*, is not its original location. Pamphila's *aurum* is likewise traced down not to her parents but to the next person in line, the nurse who raised her. The gold in the *Eunuchus* prologue, Pamphila's conspicuously generic "gold," and Pamphila herself, are a fitting allegory for a quasi-generic play of debated ownership; indeed scholars have pointed out the metapoetic capacity of *thesaurus*, here and elsewhere.[43] The two previous Roman owners of Menander's *Kolax*, Plautus and Naevius, are only the distributors. As soon as the *Kolax* is taken away from Menander it gets lost in transmission. Just like plagiarism can never be proven, for discovering Pamphila's legitimacy there is no hard evidence; Chremes takes Thais' word for it, Thraso takes his word.

[43] On the *Thesaurus*-Pot in the *Eunuchus* prologue as literary inheritance, see Sharrock 2009: 88-99, cited above, Chapter 2.2.2, fn. 23. Another conceptual link between vessels and inheritance is the alleged practice of exposing unwanted children in pots, the so-called *enchytrismos*: Méndez Dosuna 2015. The analysis of *thesauros* in Euripides' *Electra* by Torrance 2011: 182-3 is astute: "We are prepared for the explicit allusions to Aeschylus with such a metaphor by the announcement of the Old Man that he has brought "this old treasure of Dionysus" (παλαιόν τε θησαύρισμα Διονύσου τόδε, *El*. 497). The reference is ostensibly to the wine he has brought but the phrase could equally well function as a metaphorical signal for the passage from the *Libation Bearers* to which he will shortly refer. An old tragedy by Aeschylus might well be described as an "old treasure of Dionysus." Poetic song is a "treasure" (*thesauros*) of the Muses in Timotheus *Persians* fr. 791.232 PMG... Pindar refers to a *thesauros* of song (*Pythian* 6.7–8); and Hesiod discusses the *thesauros* of the tongue (*Op*. 719–20)." For poetologic usage of financial imagery in early Greek poetry, Nünlist 1998: 284-290. Batchelder 1995: 37ff., partly relying on an Old Irish word *cerd* meaning "craft," attractively suggests that *kerdos* is a metaphor for poetic composition in the *Odyssey* and Sophocles' *Electra*; her claim may well be supported by Pi. *I*. 1.50-51; Nünlist 1998: 289. The same metaphorical expression of adultery, *adulterare* (cf. κιβδηλεύω), was used for both textual forgery and counterfeit seals and coins: Speyer 1971: 16; the image was current in Terence's time: Pl. *Bac*. 266.

4.3. Adoption and abduction

The metapoetic role of Pamphila, then, is conditioned by two virtually inseparable attributes, free birth and social status. Two known ancient metaliterary tropes are worth bringing into discussion: text as the author's child, and as the author's slave.

4.3.1. Literary offspring

Most explicitly, Alexandrian librarians used a metaphor of kinship for literary authenticity: "Genuine works of a writer they classified as *gnesioi* (legitimate), the same term applied to legitimate children; spurious ones were *nothoi* (bastards)... Genuine writing, in short, had for them an organic relation to the writer who produced it."[44] The imagery of an author's offspring being raised by someone else is found in the parabasis of Aristophanes' *Clouds.* The female chorus leader first invokes Dionysus who "raised" her (ἐκθρέψαντά με, 519), then mentions the failure of the first performance of the play (524ff), and says that one of Aristophanes' earlier plays was staged by another producer (*Nub*. 530-3, tr. Henderson):

> κἀγώ, παρθένος γὰρ ἔτ' ἦν, κοὐκ ἐξῆν πώ μοι τεκεῖν,
> ἐξέθηκα, παῖς δ' ἑτέρα τις λαβοῦσ' ἀνείλετο,
> ὑμεῖς δ' ἐξεθρέψατε γενναίως κἀπαιδεύσατε·
> ἐκ τούτου μοι πιστὰ παρ' ὑμῶν γνώμης ἔσθ' ὅρκια.
> νῦν οὖν Ἠλέκτραν κατ' ἐκείνην ἥδ' ἡ κωμῳδία
> ζητοῦσ' ἦλθ', ἤν που 'πιτύχῃ θεαταῖς οὕτω σοφοῖς·
>
> [A]nd when I, being a maiden still unmarried and not yet allowed
> to be a mother, exposed my child and another maiden took it up,
> and you nobly raised and educated it—
> since that time I have held sworn pledges of a favorable verdict from you.
> So now this new comedy of mine, like the legendary Electra,
> has come on a quest, hoping somewhere to find similarly intelligent spectators...

[44] Grafton 1990: 12; cf. Speyer 1971: 15-7. The intuitive analogy of unique literary style and blood relation may have also influenced biographical traditions; as Arnott 1996: 26 observes, familial connections alleged for Alexis and Menander "are supported by, and may even have been fabricated because of, the presence of remarkable similarities between passages in their works."

Without going into detailed analysis of the passage, one notices how the parentage imagery can be used to express complex relations between poets, producers, audience, and poetry itself.[45] The similar expressions of raising and educating found at the beginning of the *Eunuchus* allow for the possibility that the adoption of the presumed orphan Pamphila represents Terence's appropriation of the as yet *adespoton* part of a play (116-8):

> *mater ubi accepit, coepit studiose omnia*
> *docere, educere, ita uti si esset filia.*
> *sororem plerique esse credebant meam*.
>
> When my mother took her, she started devotedly
> teaching her everything and raising her, as if she were her own daughter.
> Most people believed she was my sister.[46]

Thais emphasizes that her mother had raised Pamphila *as if* she were her own daughter (cf. 145-7), raising the issue of the distinction between a creator and a custodian.[47] Phaedria accuses Thais of lying, mockingly reverberating her words (155-7), specifically "*eduxit mater pro sua*" (156); it might be relevant that later Latin authors will use the modifier *pro suo* in reference to passing texts of others as one's own, that is, for plagiarism.[48] When Phaedria repeats Thais'

[45] Aristophanes' mouthpiece is a *step*-daughter of his poetry's patron god and the poet gave a *virgin birth* to a play but had to expose it: Dover 1968: 167, ad 530-2 escapes the paradox by taking παρθένος to mean "unmarried," but given the complexity of the imagery ambiguity should not be ruled out. Next, the current play, the second *Clouds*, is a virgin since the repeated performance is all new but that virgin is the fatherless Electra. Perhaps in accordance with the motifs of authorial property, novelty, and repeated performance, the speaker shortly after accuses Aristophanes' rivals of appropriating his original tricks (547ff.). A particularly stimulating reading of the passage is offered by Telò 2010. For the fatherhood metaphor used of contesting poetic primacy between Aristophanes and Cratinus, see Leitao 2012: 124ff, and *passim* for the metaphor in Greek literature more broadly. For Euripides, see Torrance 2011: 192, fn. 40, with further references. Leitao 1997 explores possible traces of the metaphor from Plato's *Symposium* in Plautus' *Stichus*. Compare the 4th-c. CE rhetor Libanius who relates how his favorite copy of Thucydides has been stolen and fortunately recovered like a long lost child (*Or*. 1.148-150).

[46] Devotion (*studiose*, 116) is a buzzword of Alexandrian and Neoteric poetics: Call. *Ep*. 27 Pfeiffer, Catul. 1.7; 116.1; Syndikus 1987: 144.

[47] This connection perhaps sheds some light on the notoriously obscure procedure of *contaminatio*. However we understand the intervention, later authors use the word for "contaminating" tribes and bloodlines; for example, in the first attestation after Terence, in Accius' *Atreus*, the royal stock is "contaminated and alloyed" (*contaminari stirpem ac misceri genus*, 206-8 R). For this and other passages, see Germany 2008: 200ff. It is a tempting idea that Terentian *contaminatio* implies disturbing the "literary DNA" of his Greek sources by a sort of grafting. Some discussions of *contaminatio* include Beare 1959 and Goldberg 1986: 91-122.

[48] See McGill 2012:9ff; Elder Seneca, for example, with reference to authors using other people's *sententiae* as one's own (*pro suis dicunt*, *Contr*. 1. *praef*. 10). The possessive pronoun ambiguously referred both to the author

remark that Pamphila was like a sister to her, lit. "*said* to be her sister" (THA. *soror est dicta*, 146; PHA. "*soror dictast*," 156), he reminds us of the programmatically untraceable *dictum prius* from the prologue. Phaedria is implicitly questioning Pamphila's origin by repeating *dicta*: Thais says that it is said that Pamphila is her sister; Phaedria repeats Thais saying that it is said that Pamphila is her sister. The more one repeats Pamphila's "allegedness," the more her true identity is obscured, and by extension more likely that she is a public woman like Thais. Hidden behind consecutive layers of repeated hearsay is not even Pamphila's legitimacy of birth, but her next phase, upbringing by a *lena* alongside her prostitute daughter. Terence slyly makes us wonder whether at the earliest detectable point of her ancestry Pamphila is already in trade. Analogously, the major concern of the prologue was whether the repeated *dictum prius* is part of the generic comic legacy or someone's claimed property. The more often a specific text is repeated, the sooner it becomes a commonplace and its source more difficult to establish.

4.3.2. Emancipation and appropriation

A girl of untraceable origin would suit Terence's disingenuous program that every bit of Roman comic tradition is by definition in public domain as soon as it is taken away from its Greek source. The fact that at the same time Pamphila is explicitly *not* public supports my claim from chapters 2 and 3: Terence implies that his theft is planned lest his play appear like a random assemblage of commonplaces. Stealing what is public will not do; he needs to appropriate something that belongs to someone already. Now two important related questions arise: how can

and the owner of the manuscript (McGill 2012: 10, fn. 34); Martial and Younger Seneca make sport of this absurdity: Seo 2009: 580ff.

a property simultaneously be someone's and nobody's? Second, once Terence invites us to see his intertexts as targeted, what could he gain by denying intention?[49]

The answer to both might be found in the essence of the stolen goods. A convenient vehicle for symbolizing property that can be possessed but lacks a "natural owner" is a slave. Ancient literature again provides interesting comparanda. The literary trope of a book as a slave is found, for example, in Horace and Ovid.[50] Younger Pliny explicitly compares unpublished poetry with runaway slaves, and advises a friend: "Unless you recall them [sc. your verses] to be incorporated in the whole, like runaway slaves they will find someone else to claim them" (*hos nisi retrahis in corpus, quandoque ut errones aliquem cuius dicantur invenient*, *Ep*. 2.10.3). Martial is likely the first to use the legal term for a kidnapper, *plagiarius*, as a metaphor for literary thief; he asks a friend to defend his verses: "And when that fellow calls himself their master, say that they are mine and that they have been freed. If you declare this three and four times, you will shame this kidnapper" (*et, cum se dominum vocabit ille, | dicas esse meos manuque missos. | hoc si terque quaterque clamitaris, | inpones plagiario pudorem*, *Ep*. 1.52.6-8).

In an illuminating analysis of these passages, Mira Seo contends that "Martial's innovation in the history of literary plagiarism goes beyond coining the term, however: he uniquely treats plagiarism as a distinct poetic theme."[51] But Terence, I believe, is clearly Martial's precedent. Most specifically, one can easily replace Martial with Terence in Seo's claim that for Martial the slave-as-a-book is "explicitly a piece of property to be contested and

[49] That is, excluding the unlikely scenario that he would suffer any serious consequences otherwise; surely if plagiarism had been such a grave offence it would have taken much more than mere denial to exculpate him; see my discussion in Chapter 2.
[50] E.g. Hor. *Ep*. 1.20; Ov. *Tr*. 1.1. For the following examples and translations I am indebted to Seo 2009.
[51] Seo 2009: 567; cf. Anderson 2006.

reclaimed in court."[52] In the *Eunuchus* prologue, Terence assumes his characteristic pose of the defendant in a forensic dispute.[53] Just like Martial's friend will prove the true owner of verses if he claims theft verbally (*clamitaris*), so the accusation against Terence is only verbal (*exclamat furem*, 23); likewise, for establishing Pamphila's legitimacy tokens were useless and mere words sufficed (*eam esse dico liberam*, 805).

Since Terence keeps raising the question of who owns Pamphila and Menander's *Kolax*, the exact phrasing of his disingenuous apology that commonplaces cannot be privatized indicates metapoetic design: "if he's not allowed to use the same characters, how is it more allowable to write about a running slave... (*quod si personis isdem huic uti non licet, | qui mage licet currentem servom scribere*,... 35-36). The *servus currens* is arguably the only stock motif from the prologue that does *not* come up in the play.[54] Its function in the prologue may well be implied by the double entendre: *currentem servom scribere* need not mean only "*write about* a *running* slave" but also "*enlist* a *runaway* slave."[55]

Terence anticipates Pliny's and Martial's idea that unpublished writing is liable to misattribution and, most importantly, he capitalizes on the unresolved issue of intentionality.[56]

---

[52] Seo 2009: 576; she likewise suggests (573) that Martial is the first poet to introduce the financial aspect of plagiarism, though subsequently (Seo 2014) she acknowledges the importance of the motif in Terence.

[53] For the effect of this pose, see Introduction and Chapter 2.

[54] The prologue announces the braggart soldier and edacious parasite (38); Brown 2006: 324 does not allow for disingenuousness on Terence's part, and, unlike any other editor, marks the line 38 "for deletion as an interpolation: given that a parasite and a soldier are the very characters under discussion, it makes no sense to include them in his list of characters which it is (by implication) 'more allowable' for him to use." The stock characters also listed are *bonas matronas* and *meretrices malas* (37): for both we may well think with Thais, a maternal figure for Pamphila, and, curiously, Chaerea's *patrona* (887); on Thais as a patron, see Pierce 1998: 134ff. Next, the suppositious child (*puerum supponi,* 39) is in fact Chaerea whom Parmeno planted: *hunc supposivit nobis* (912); see below, chapter 2.1; the commonplace *falli per servom senem* (39) is evidently not the case if it means a slave *tricking* an old man, but Parmeno, himself tricked by Pythias, will *mislead* the *senex* into thinking that Chaerea is being punished (971ff.). The romantic cliché *amare odisse suspicari* (40) surfaces right at the beginning of the play: *in amore haec omnia insunt vitia: iniuriae, | suspiciones, inimicitiae, indutiae, | bellum, pax rursum* (59-61). Disingenuous dismissal of commonplaces is an old trick: Ar. *Nub*. 537ff.; cf. for the scatological humor in Ar. *Ran*. 1ff. Compton-Engle 2003: 526, with references: "a kind of comic preterition, in which [the poet] claims to be above such low devices but exploits them to full advantage nevertheless."

[55] *OLD* s.v. *scribo* 7; the *servus currens* is the only commonplace in the prologue associated with *scribere*.

[56] Lex Fabia de plagio sanctioned kidnapping or *knowingly* buying a freeborn person: *OLD* s.v. *plagium* 2).

On the one hand, if he is perceived like Martial's conscious kidnapper, the message is that he aspires to a place alongside Plautus and Naevius. Terence does not need the Latin *Colax*-tradition to be "public" after all. The best, indeed the only way to appropriate it is to admit that he knew that it could—and did—belong to other authors. But at the same time Terence poses as a Plautine pimp who unknowingly acquires a freeborn girl but must return her when her legitimacy is established.[57] If Terence's claim of ignorance is taken literally Latin *Colax* plays are as good as unpublished. By both citing earlier adaptations of the *Kolax* and disregarding them entirely, Terence obliterates its previous owners. He does not want to monopolize a Greek model, because that he could have done with Menander's *Eunouchos* without interpolation. Terence wants to take over Menander from his *Roman* predecessors. To notice a contrast with a tricked Plautine pimp, when Terence is caught holding somebody else's play—he does not return it. What is more, illicit acquisition is precisely what assigned him the play. He first called the play *Menandri Eunuchum* (20), but after admitting the ("inadvertent") theft it became his *own Eunuchus* (*Eunuchum suam*, 32).[58]

4.4. Rape and marriage.

Terence's situation matches that of Chaerea extremely well. Pamphila's citizenship was previously bad news for Thraso, Parmeno, and Chaerea (805, 858, 952), but after the rape it became an advantage for Chaerea, who can now marry her, to his utter joy (1031-49; esp. 1036: *scis Pamphilam meam inventam civem?*). Karen Pierce rightly observes that "Chaerea is not

[57] The pimp Dordalus in Plautus' *Persa* is tricked into buying a freeborn girl, while Cappadox in the *Curculio* did so in ignorance. For the poet as a pimp, see esp. Myers 1996, Fear 2000; Introduction, sect. 5.

[58] On the feminine *sua* agreeing with the implied *fabula*, see Gowers 2004: 157-8. It is a tempting notion, however, that "[s]uch variations of gender are found elsewhere in Latin poetry, often to draw attention to Greek models... Catullus [1.2] performs the gender switch to recognize that the Greek for *pumice* is κίσηρις (f.). Thus the polish applied to his roll is, in a sense, Greek, and the verbal markers in the descriptive terms point to Callimachean aesthetics," Knox 2007: 157-8, with Wiseman 1979: 167-8. On plays with sex and gender in Latin poetry, see now Corbeill 2015: 41-103.

punished for his rape, and suffers no real remorse for what he did. He is ultimately rewarded for his act by being given the girl in marriage."[59] Yet it is in fact not altogether clear that being *permitted* to marry the girl is necessarily desirable: in other comedies men in Chaerea's situation are more or less explicitly *forced* to do so. Moreover, while the marriage convention is conceived of as a prerequisite for pardon,[60] Chaerea is forgiven before he promises to marry Pamphila.[61] In other words, he raped her *in order* to marry her.

Rape and marriage go hand in hand; both are under the auspices of Jupiter (584, 1048) and accompanied by the identical expressions of satisfaction.[62] Donatus comments that many details of Pamphila's rape recall a wedding ritual.[63] Katerina Philippides points out one that the commentator glosses over, locking the door from within.[64] The last thing Chaerea reveals is that he bolted the door once he was alone with Pamphila (*solu' cum sola... pessulum ostio obdo*, 579, 603). The wedding symbolism of the door is all the more pronounced by the contrast with

[59] Pierce 1998: 135.

[60] James 2013: 186-7: "The staged solution to rape is always marriage, as it might well also be in actual life, but *this penalty could in fact be called a reward*. In Menander, a rapist—young or old—is expected to feel guilt over his violation of community norms, not to mention his violation of the girl he loves and of the inevitable baby whose life he has endangered by allowing it to be born out of wedlock. He is then expected to seek to do right by both beloved and baby (*Samia*, *Epitrepontes*, *Heros*, *Hiereia*, among others). Thus marriage is *effectively* his reward" (emphases mine). See detailed discussion in Scafuro 1997: 238ff. Diniarchus in Pl. *Truc*. 794ff. is shamed into marrying the girl by her father; the fact that meanwhile the girl got betrothed to another man, "is an important exception to the rule that a woman in comedy, if she is not a virgin, may marry only the man she has known carnally," Konstan 1983: 160, fn.17; cf. James 1998: 33, n. 17.

[61] Scafuro 1997: 227: "Chaerea's admission of impaired mental state—he had not intended an insult but acted out of love—wins him immediate forgiveness (879). Significantly, he is pardoned before he offers to marry the girl (885-88). Terence's scenario does not fit the usual one in New Comedy; a rapist's admission of his deed is usually followed by a demand that he marry his victim unless the rapist makes the offer voluntarily at the moment of confession; certainly no young man is ever forgiven before he makes an offer of marriage."

[62] Sex-related: *commodis*, 372, 573; *gaudium*, 550, 552; *quid laetu' sim*, 555; *quid est quod laetus es*? 559; engagement-related: *commoda*, 1033, *gaudiis*, 1035; *quid hic laetus est*?, 1034.

[63] Philippides 1995; James 1998: 40, with n. 37. Details of the ritual in Treggiari 1994. Also significant is the use of the verb *ducere*, which "in Comedy is used indifferently of marriage or illicit love" (Preston 1916: 18); in the *Eunuchus* the verb and its compounds are very frequently referring to Pamphila: *educere*, 117 (=156; cf. 748); *producit*, 134; *abducere*, 145 (=157); *ducit*, 229; *deducere*, 266; *ducis* 282; *abducta*, 350; *deducta*, 352; and finally, *uxorem duxero*, 888. According to Adams 1982: 174, *ducere* was "an euphemism for engaging in paid intercourse. Much the same terminology is used in comedy (notably of Plautus) for taking a wife and a prostitute." See a full discussion in López Gregoris 2002: 166-184.

[64] Philippides 1995: 276, listing Catul. 61.224-8, and Theocritus 18.5-6 where Menelaus married Helen and locked her in a room (κατεκλήϊξατο).

Phaedria, who begins the play with a paraclausithyron and sarcastically acknowledges his exclusion (*patent semper fores*, 89; Chapter 3.1). The erotic connotation of the doorstep and the motif of *exclusus amator* have a long history in ancient poetry,[65] but some Plautine passages provide specific background for the function of the contrast between the two brothers in the *Eunuchus*: the issue of exclusivity with women.

In the *Curculio*, shortly after the "*publica via*" passage quoted above (4.2), Phaedromus sings a serenade to the closed door of the *leno's* house wherein his beloved Planesium is shut, elaborately apostrophizing the bolts (*pessuli, heus pessuli*, 147ff.).[66] Women behind bolted doors in Plautus are expected to be of dubious morals;[67] Phronesium, the arch-*meretrix* of the *Truculentus* is likewise *intra pessulos* (351).[68] Now Planesium will turn out to be a "pseudo-*meretrix*," a chaste girl thought to be a prostitute or on the verge of becoming one.[69] The "brothel-bolts" in the *Curculio* are symbolically undone once she becomes Phaedromus' chaste

[65] Canter 1920. Ar. *Eccl*. 752ff, with Olson 1988; in New Comedy, Menander's *Misoumenos*; in Plautus, e.g. *Curculio*, with Frangoulidis 2013 (and see below). Tib. 1.2.17; Prop. 1.13.34. For doors and passageways as female genitals in Old Comedy, Henderson 1991: 137ff.

[66] We might read the *Curculio* bolt-serenade further into Phaedria's paraclausithyron; compare the anaphora and *morem gerere* (*pessuli, heus pessuli, vos saluto lubens* | *vos amo, vos volo, vos peto atque obsecro,* | *gerite amanti mihi morem, amoenissumi*, 147-9; *tandem edepol mihi morigeri pessuli fiunt*, 157) with Phaedria's *me ames, me desideres,* | *me somnies, me exspectes, de me cogites,* | *me speres, me te oblectes* (193-5), and yielding to Thais' demands (*mos gerundust Thaidi*, 188). For the thematic importance of the door in the *Curculio*, see Moore 2005.

[67] Perhaps significantly, Greek equivalent of *pessulus*, βάλανος, is used of a penis not only in comedy (Ar. *Lys*. 410ff.; Henderson 1991: 119, §40) but in technical texts as well (LSJ s.v. II.2). For the image of a prostitute's house locking men in for ruin, see the discussion in Fontaine 2010: 25-27 and 208-9 (the "biting" door as *vagina dentata*).

[68] The only remaining Plautine instance of *pessulus* is in the *Aulularia*, guarding Euclio's pot of gold (*occlude sis fores ambobus pessulis,* 103); it is extremely intriguing given the later cross-purpose conversation between the miser, who accuses Lyconides of stealing his pot, and the *adulescens* who has in mind violating Euclio's daughter: "How could you dare to touch what is not yours?... You knew she/it didn't belong to you: you should not have touched her/it" (*cur id ausu's facere, ut id quod non tuom esset tangeres*? 740; cf. *quid tibi ergo meam me invito tactiost*? 744; *tu illam scibas non tuam esse: non attactam oportuit*, 754). For the sexual meaning of *tangere*, see e.g. *intacta* in Catul. 62.45, 56; in comedy, López Gregoris 2002: 184-190; for Pamphila, *Eu*. 797-8, 809; cf. my discussion of *locum integrum* in *Adelphoe*, Introduction, sect. 5 (building on Gowers 2004). On the interpretation of the "pregnant pot" in the *Aulularia*, see Telò 2014. The only other mention of *pessulus* in Terence (*HT* 278) is likewise noteworthy, since the girl behind it, Antiphila, is suspected to have "gone bad" while her lover Clinia was abroad—a possibility which is suspiciously elaborately and defensively denied: see Chapter 7.

[69] More on pseudo-*meretrices* and Antiphila in the *HT* in Chapter 7.

spouse. He foreshadows the outcome in the "bolt-serenade" as he bribes the bibulous doorwoman by sprinkling the doorpost with wine, recalling a wedding ritual.[70]

Plautus' *Cistellaria* supports this reading of the bolts by giving us the opposite perspective. The *adulescens* Alcesimarchus, finally united with a beloved pseudo-*meretrix* of his own, Selenium, takes her over the doorstep into his house and orders the slaves to bolt the door *behind* them (*ubi estis, servi? occludite aedis pessulis*, 649). Carrying the bride over the bridegroom's threshold is another element of the Roman wedding ceremony,[71] but the bride was precisely *not* supposed to be carried by her husband; this ritual detail "reinforced the bride's carefully guarded virginity, and she was helped along—for the last time, by children and women, who could not assail her chastity—to propitiate the goddess whose protection she was leaving."[72] Alcesimarchus emphatically taking Selenium himself (*hanc ego tetulero intra limen*, 650) underlines his exclusive possession of the girl he has rescued from going public.

In these passages to be bolted in indicates newly-established exclusivity with a newly-discovered chaste woman; to be bolted out means precisely the opposite, being the only one without access to a woman who is, or is thought to be, accessible to *everyone else*.[73] The implication of crossing from the outer to the inner side of the bolts, therefore, is not only that the woman now belongs to one man but that otherwise she would have explicitly been available to many. Importantly, Pamphila in the *Eunuchus* was not going to become a prostitute; she is not owned by a pimp, but by Thraso, who either wants her for himself (so Thais suspects), or will give her to Thais, who wants to restore her to her family. Precisely while Chaerea was with the

[70] *agite bibite, festivae fores; | potate, fite mihi volentes propitiae* (88-9); on ritual besmearing of the doorposts in the wedding ceremony, see Hersch 2010: 177ff.
[71] On the practice, see Hersch 2010: 180ff. Plautus knew the procedure: *sensim super attolle limen pedes, nova nupta*... (*Cas*. 816).
[72] Hersch 2010: 182.
[73] For the inherent ambiguity of the *limen* in Roman elegy, see Pucci 1978: 68: "'open signifier,' which holds in its grip several opposite significations—absence and presence, power and weakness, distance and closeness." Cf. Debrohun 2003: 127-155.

girl Thais was meeting Pamphila's brother in an attempt to establish her identity. In other words, the girl whom Chaerea "privatized" was not about to become public, but precisely about to be recognized to belong to someone else.[74]

Thus, deserved or not, Chaerea's seamless transition from a sexual usurper to lawful spouse is very simple. Had he raped a *meretrix*-Pamphila there would be no transgression, but no chance of a marriage either. What enabled him to possess the girl permanently is that she was not public to begin with. In line with the genre's convention, the fastest way to ensure subsequent exclusivity with Pamphila was to violate her.[75] Not by chance Chaerea referred to Pamphila as *nostra* after he heard she is in the brothel (361); but after the rape-cum-engagement he rightly calls her *mea* (1036).[76]

4.5. Brothers and the poet

Let us finish this chapter by breaking down the metapoetic assignment of roles, so far as it can be done at this point. In the previous chapter I have argued that Phaedria mirrors the poet, but now Chaerea as the poet comes into play.[77] The soldier Thraso's primary rival in the play is certainly Phaedria but it has been noticed that Chaerea, a soldier himself figures prominently as well.[78]

---

[74] It is intriguing that Pamphila's expected (yet useless: see above) recognition tokens are contained in a *cistella* (753), a Terentian hapax: see esp. Pl. *Cist*. 770.

[75] Cf. Pl. *Aul*. 754-8, where Lyconides argues that Euclio's daughter, whom he violated, should now belong to him.

[76] Pythias suspects that the rapist stole *something* as he was leaving (*aliquid domo abeuntem abstulisse*, 661); the *Cistellaria* seems to explain what; right after Alcesimarchus carried Selenium over the threshold, Melaenis comments: *abiit, abstulit* | *mulierem* (650-1).

[77] There may be yet another poet-like figure in the play, Parmeno: while passing off the *Colax* as his own, Terence failed to "fool" his opponent (*nil dedisse verborum*, 24), but he did not "strive" to commit theft (*non quo furtum facere studuerit*, 28); Parmeno, Pythias tells us, "strove to fool" them by planting Chaerea instead of the eunuch (*adduxti pro eunucho adulescentulum,* | *dum studes dare verba nobis,* 949-50).

[78] Gilmartin 1975: 264: "These two attacks, upon the same house and seeking the same person, are in fact mirror images. Chaerea sneaks in as a eunuch, but his successful rape reveals that his weakness is mere disguise... In fact, he is always quick to seize opportunity (376-77), and willingly assumes command and responsibility for his campaign, in military language ... (389-90). Thraso-Pyrrus (783), on the other hand, leads a frontal assault (from the rear, 781), but his ignominious (and verbal) defeat demonstrates that he is indeed weakness masquerading as strength. While Chaerea is not only a successful amatory expert (313-18, 565-66), but has his friends' dinner party

The layout I propose is the following. Thraso, we have seen, represents the prologue straw-man, a dummy foil who claims exclusivity is possible, desirable, and mandatory. Terence's reply is contradictory because his poetic agenda is represented by the two programmatically contrasted *adulescentes.* His persona is a sort of a Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde. One half of Terence's divided poetic self, Phaedria, replies that there is no such thing as exclusivity when women (and plays) are all alike anyway. He plays by the rules of sharing and properly pays for Thais' gifts (169, 984). Chaerea, the "younger Terence," has a feeling that *not* all of them are alike; he is sick of everyday women and wants a brand new girl (297). When caught in violation, he says that he thought that she was as available as any (858). In effect, he claims he was only doing what his older brother is doing. One hears Terence's disingenuous plea to pardon the young for doing what the old ones used to do (*quae veteres factitarunt si faciunt novi*, 43). It is noteworthy that the contrast between old and young is frequent in Terence's prologues, but elsewhere it is the rival poet who is old as opposed to young Terence.[79] Here, however, Terence pledges allegiance to the older poets against the intruder and his absurd demands of exclusivity.

The younger finally outdo their elders. The only way Phaedria could escape paying for a prostitute (*sine sumptu*, 1074) was to yield a share of her to Thraso.[80] Chaerea, in stark contrast, was not planning on paying in any event. He even self-consciously rejects the comic convention

---

all arranged, too (607-08), Thraso breaks up his party and leads out his kitchen-army (816) because he suspects the sexually timid Chremes (531-32, 535-36) as a rival (623, 794). Not only in strategy of attack, but in his handling of basic matters, food and sex, Thraso's actions show him to be as inept as Chaerea is clear-eyed and efficient."

[79] *An*. 7, *Ph*. 1; for the metatheater of the generation gap in the *Andria* and the *HT*, see Moodie 2009.

[80] The mercenary connotation of Phaedria's relationship with Thais is never lost from sight; see Konstan 2013: 101: "the twenty minae that Phaedria has the poor taste to mention aloud [*heri minas viginti pro ambobus dedi*, 160], thereby exposing the monetary nature of the transaction;" earlier Parmeno suggested that Phaedria should try to pay as little as possible (*quid agas? nisi ut te redimas captum quam queas | minimo; si nequeas paullulo, at quanti queas*, 74-5); Sharrock 2009: 153. Note the possible financial undertones of Phaedria's frustration: "If only I didn't give a damn—or *a dime*—for what you've done" (*ego istuc abs te factum nihili penderem*, 94).

of tricking the father for money to buy the girl.[81] Parmeno triumphantly stresses how extraordinary is this achievement: Chaerea managed to get the most "dear" (beloved and expensive) girl from the brothel—completely free of charge (*amorem... carissimum... sine sumptu et sine dispendio*, 929).[82] While Phaedria is conspicuously unable, eventually even unwilling, of being *solus* with Thais, Chaerea strives and succeeds in being with Pamphila *solu' cum sola* (579). Moreover, having had sex with a virgin, the younger brother is the only male in the play who is literally the first with his girl. In the next chapter we shall explore the metapoetic ramifications of his primacy and consider whether it is actually possible.

[81] "Or is it fair to my father that he be tricked by me instead?" (*an potius haec patri aequomst fieri ut a me ludatur dolis?* 386); cf. Barsby 1999: 155-6 ad 386: "Chaerea is saying, in effect, 'Would you rather I behaved like my stereotype in comedy'?"

[82] Plautus' Menaechmus succeeded emphatically against all odds (*Men*. 475, 1142), but only because the *meretrix* mistook him for his twin brother; cf. Sharrock 2009: 224, fn. 149. Cleareta the procuress of the *Asinaria* is explicit: *nec meum quidem edepol, ad te ut mittam gratiis* (190).

Chapter 5

Echoes and thunders: metapoetics of initiative and imitation in the *Eunuchus*

> Why did *Star Wars* episodes 4, 5, 6 come before 1, 2, 3?
> Because in charge of planning, Yoda was.
> — Anonymous

If invading Pamphila's much contested legitimacy reenacts Terence's tampering with other poets' property, the metapoetic function of the rape deserves closer scrutiny. In this chapter we investigate the motifs of primacy and repetition in the events preceding the rape and Chaerea's account of it. In these passages, I will argue, his violation comes across as both original and repetitive, and Chaerea as the first and second simultaneously.

5.1. Initiative and repetition: first encounter

In his first appearance in the play Chaerea is marked with posteriority. The very first thing he says is that he lost sight of a girl (292-5): that is, the moment he stepped on stage he is already lagging behind.[1] Caston rightly notices his junior status; Parmeno introduces him for the

[1] The reason for his belatedness is subtly self-reflexive. He was stalled by his father's friend named Archidemides, whom he has not seen is six or seven months (332); he told Chaerea to remind his father to speak for Archidemides at court tomorrow (*advocatu' mane mi esse ut meminerit*, 340). To the impatient Chaerea it seemed to him like Archidemides went on for hours (341), but he additionally stalls the action by narrating how he was stalled. This long and detailed digression (326-341) is completely gratuitous and thus remarkable. Caston 2014: 50 notes that Chaerea's obedience to Archidemides reminds us of his junior status, but also, since Chaerea cites Archidemides' words verbatim, his first assignment in the play is to repeat what has been said previously. The temporal indicators—six months ago, trial tomorrow—take us off the map of the dramatic time. Six or seven months is roughly the time elapsed between the Ludi Megalenses on which the *Eunuchus* was reportedly staged, in early April, and another dramatic festival, the Ludi Plebei in early November. Interestingly, the parasite Gnatho previously said that the soldier's gifts secured him six months to enjoy with Thais uninterrupted, during which time Parmeno may stop playing the running slave (*sex ego te totos, Parmeno, hos mensis quietum reddam | ne sursum deorsum cursites neve usque ad lucem vigiles*, 277-8). The plot of the *Eunuchus* takes place between the two other annual dramatic festivals. This Archidemides has virtually walked in from an earlier play, only to tell us what he will do after this play is over. His trial tomorrow morning (*cras*, 338; *mane*, 340) takes us into the real world after the play is finished and court sessions resumed after the festival recess (on trials held during the games, see Geffcken 1973: 10ff). On the metatheatrical *cras* in Roman comedy, see Dunsch 2005; cf. Germany 2008: 14 on Phaedria's two-day

audience as the younger son (*filium minorem*, 287), and shortly after as the "other" brother (*alterum*, 297).[2] But Chaerea then takes over and Phaedria becomes the "other one;" Chaerea, Parmeno continues, is sheer madness compared to whom the other, older brother is all fun and games (*ludum iocumque dices fuisse illum alterum*, 300).[3] By using *alter* Terence plays with the notion that secondariness is relative.[4]

Shortly after comes the plotting. Besides the inherent metatheatricality of Chaerea impersonating the eunuch,[5] the scene when the idea of imitation first appears is scripted as a series of verbal imitations. Chaerea cannot stand the notion that some wrinkly old eunuch will be so *fortunatus* to be close to Pamphila (365) and Parmeno tickles his imagination proposing that he might be just as *fortunatus* (369). Chaerea advances the repetitive mode: "How so, Parmeno? Respond" (*responde*, 370). Parmeno suggests the costume, Chaerea repeats (PAR. …*vestem*.— CHA. *vestem*? 370). Parmeno then virtually reverberates his plan within one line (PAR. *pro illo te ducam.* CHA: *audio*. PAR. *te esse illum dicam*, 371) and acknowledges repeating the eunuch's

---

abstinence from Thais: "[T]he total length of time that passes in the make-believe world of the play cannot be more than one day. If Phaedria does stay in the country for two days he will have fallen off the edge of the world, as far as the play is concerned." Potentially significant is the only occurrence of the name Archidemides elsewhere, in Plautus' *Bacchides*: likewise an offstage acquaintance, in a reported arbitration scene (259ff.) he denied his debt saying that the contract seal is a forgery (*adulterinum*, 266). Once we think that Terence's Archidemides stalls Chaerea on his way to commit "adultery" with a girl of questionable legitimacy (Chapter 4), one is tempted to conjecture that the *Bacchides* arbitration is the trial that Terence's character has scheduled for tomorrow: Terence's Archidemides may well be the yesterday's version of Plautus' Archidemides.

[2] Caston 2014: 50, with fn. 27.

[3] Chaerea is prone to repetition. When Parmeno says that Archidemides was such an inconvenient distraction (*incommode*, 329) Chaerea replies by paraphrasing Parmeno's description of himself: other things are "inconvenient," compared to them this is a disaster (*immo enimvero infeliciter; | nam incommoda alia sunt dicenda*, 329-30).

[4] It is indicative of this relativity that Germany 2008: 167-8 is able to read Chaerea vs. Phaedria in the opposite way: "[W]hen Chaerea first comes on stage in Act 2, Parmeno immediately *subordinates his character to Phaedria's* by describing him as being like his brother, only more so" (emphasis mine).

[5] Frangoulidis 1993, and 1994a on script vs. improvisation (cf. Saylor 1975); Dessen 1995, Sharrock 2009, Christenson 2013; Caston 2014. Fullest treatment is Germany 2008; see e.g.: "The most irrefutable example may be Parmeno's boast, in Act 5, that his handiwork in scripting the day's events deserves the Palme d'Or (*palmarium,* 930)... a witty reference to the *palma,* the dramatic prize that would shortly be given to the *Eunuch*" (117); "Phaedria responds ambiguously, *hem quae haec est fabula?* ("Ah, what is this farce?" 689). He may well doubt the veracity of her [sc. Pythias'] "story," but he also begins to recognize the signs of comic subterfuge behind the mounting evidence of mistaken identity, for the word *fabula,* even more than *ludus,* is linked to the technical language of theatrical entertainment" (17).

privileges which Chaerea listed a moment ago (*tu illis fruare commodis quibu' tu illum dicebas modo*, 372).[6] Chaerea takes seriously Parmeno's proposal to imitate the eunuch and his *commoda*—the *commoda* which Parmeno previously repeated from Chaerea. When Parmeno says he was only joking (*iocabar*, 378), Chaerea assumes leadership by repetition; he insists on action by repeating Parmeno's disclaimer on itself (*garris*, 378)—in effect, "you're joking that you're joking."

Therefore, Chaerea is at first verbally repeating the instructions but then takes over the initiative in executing them. Allison Sharrock notices the unusual development: "But now Parmeno does something no *architectus* has ever done before: he tries to retract. He says he was only joking, and it would be terribly dangerous, and really not a good idea, but he has not reckoned with the dynamism and daring of his pupil."[7] The metapoetic effect is that by overtly disowning his proposal Parmeno enables Chaerea to be both a follower and an initiator at the same time. This ambivalence is programmatic since the eunuch of the play's title may refer both to the old eunuch, the "original," and to young Chaerea as his copy. One of Chaerea's comments on the plan confounds originality and imitation: he has never seen a better plan than this disguise (*numquam vidi meliu' consilium dari*, 376). A similar marker of competitive allusions was used, for example, by Greek tragedians,[8] but in the *Eunuchus* the ambiguous phrasing is particularly significant. "No plan is better than this" can mean that this plan is *better* than all others, but also that it is just as good as any other. This ambiguity resonates with the target of the plot, the simultaneously unique and generic Pamphila that we have seen in Chapter 4.

[6] Cf. some remarks of Germany 2008: 46, who takes the discussion in a different direction.
[7] Sharrock 2009: 154.
[8] Sharrock 2009: 226 compares *Eu*. 376 with Eur. *Ba.* 824. For the self-consciousness of the trick in Euripides' *Helen* 1050ff. (Menelaus pretending to be dead) and possible reference to Sophocles' *Electra* 59ff., see Allan 2008: 258ff., Finglass 2007: 109ff. Critics have likewise noticed Sophocles' self-positioning vis-á-vis Aeschylus' *Choephoroe* in the Tutor's emphatic change of the expected strategy: S. *El*. 82, with Finglass 2007: 116.

5.2. Responding to Plautus

For the metapoetic reading of the rape the crucial detail is that Chaerea justifies entering Thais' house in disguise as a response. Parmeno is afraid that his intrusion will be perceived as an outrage, *flagitium*, but Chaerea persists (382-7):

> *an id flagitiumst si in domum meretriciam*
> *deducar et illis crucibu', quae nos nostramque adulescentiam*
> *habent despicatam et quae nos semper omnibus cruciant modis,*
> *nunc referam gratiam atque eas itidem fallam, ut ab is fallimur?*
> *an potius haec patri aequomst fieri ut a me ludatur dolis?*
> *quod qui rescierint, culpent; illud merito factum omnes putent*.
>
> Is it an outrage if I'm taken into a prostitute's house,
> and those tormentors, who despise me and all the young men,
> and who are always torturing us in every way,
> if I now pay them back equally and trick them just as we are tricked by them?
> Or is it fair to my father that he be tricked by me instead?
> Whoever would hear that would blame me; but all would say this is justly done.

Chaerea's self-conscious refusal to pay for prostitutes like other comic young men (386), as I have argued above, is a trope for Terence's poetics of intertextual appropriation.[9] The future rapist's prank is moreover a tit-for-tat response (*referam gratiam... itidem... ut*) for the financial losses that young men in Roman comedy conventionally suffer. Phaedria begins the play explicitly complaining about that (*meretricum contumelias*, 48, and ff.), and the similar expression of him asking Thais for emotional reciprocity (*pars aequa... ac pariter... itidem ut*, 91ff.) suggests that Chaerea now takes revenge for his brother's frustrations.[10] Just as the

[9] On the metatheatricality of 386, see Barsby 1999: ad loc., cited in Chapter 4.5, p. 102, fn. 81.

[10] Chaerea's *despicatam* (384) perhaps deliberately inverts complaints made by Plautine women: Erotium in the *Menaechmi* says she is despised by Menaechmus undeservedly (*tu me bene merentem tibi habes despicatui*, 693); the *matrona* Cleostrata in the *Casina* is despised by her husband (*despicatur*, 186; *despicatam*, 189). Appropriating a feminine complaint works as an adequate response since he is a quasi-male, a eunuch. In this context *despicare* might even be a pun on the vegetal meaning of *spica* ("plant," *OLD* s.v. 1, 4) and come to mean "de-fertilize," "unman." Parmeno calls the *meretrix Thais nostri fundi calamitas* (79), literally, "threat to our crops" (*OLD* s.v. *calamitas* 1).

disingenuous stereotype of Thais as a greedy prostitute may be read metapoetically,[11] so can Chaerea's revenge. An *adulescens* taking advantage of the brothel is rare enough in comedy to indicate Terence's jibe at the tradition at large. But particularly noteworthy is one passage in Astaphium's second song in Plautus *Truculentus* (95-111 Enk, tr. De Melo):

ad fores auscultate atque adservate aedis, 95
nequis adventor gravior abaetat quam adveniat,
neu, qui manus attulerit sterilis intro ad nos,
gravidas foras exportet. novi ego hominum mores;
ita nunc adulescentes morati sunt: quinei aut
senei adveniunt ad scorta congerrones; 100
consulta sunt consilia: quando intro advenerunt,
oenus eorum aliqui osculum amicae usque oggerit, dum illi agant ceteri cleptae;
sin vident quempiam se adservare, obludiant qui custodem oblectent
per ioculum et ludum; de nostro saepe edunt: quod fartores faciunt.
fit pol hoc, et pars spectatorum scitis pol haec vos me hau mentiri, 105
ibist ibus pugnae et virtuti de praedonibu' praedam capere.[12]
at ecastor nos rursum lepide referimu' gratiam furibu' nostris: 107-110
nam ipsi vident quom eorum abgerimus bona atque etiam ultro ipsi aggerunt ad nos.

(*back into the house*) Listen at the door and watch over the house, 95
so that no customer leaves more heavily laden than he was when he arrived
and so that the man who brings barren hands inside to our place
does not take them outside teeming. (*to the audience*) I know people's ways;
this is what young men are like nowadays: five or
six boon companions arrive at the prostitutes' at one time; 100
their plans are settled. When they come in,
one of them keeps kissing his girlfriend while the other thieves are doing their business.
But if they see that someone's watching them, they play the fool in order to entertain
the guardian through joke and jest; they often eat from what belongs to us: they do what
sausage makers do.
This does happen, and some of you spectators know that I'm not lying to you in this.
For them it's an exploit and an honor to rob the robbers of their booty there.
But we return the favor to our thieves nicely: they themselves look on when we bring
their possessions here, and they themselves carry them here to us of their own accord.

[11] Chapter 3. Note that Chaerea says that prostitutes torture young men (*cruciant*, 384), while Thais earlier begged Phaedria not to torture *himself* (*ne crucia te obsecro*, 95). The detail supports the main thrust of Chapter 3, that Phaedria stands for those men who choose such a relationship *willingly*.

[12] The text is uncertain; Enk glosses it *ibi pugnant et gloriae sibi ducunt de praedonibus* (sc. *de nobis*) *capere praedam*;

Several details are worth comparing to the raid of the brothel in the *Eunuchus*. Astaphium commands vigilance lest the customers rob the brothel (*cleptae, furibus*) using pranks (*obludiant... per ioculum et ludum*), much like Pythias later suspects that Chaerea stole something (*abstulisse*, 661; discussed above) during the rape of Pamphila, which originated with Parmeno's joke. Military imagery is appropriate in both plays since one rival is a soldier.[13] Most remarkably, Astaphium explains the prostitutes' habitual despoliation of their customers as a response to the young men's plundering (*referimus gratiam*, 107-10), exactly as Chaerea describes his revenge for the prostitutes' despoliation of young men (*referam gratiam*, 385).[14]

Although there are some possible prototypes in Menander for the situation described by Astaphium,[15] her wink to the audience (105) highlights that there is something important about this scenario.[16] The *Truculentus* and its coldblooded *meretrix* Phronesium notoriously expose the polite fiction of the relation with prostitutes in comedy. In stripping the conventions bare and showing that this mercenary relation is inherently opportunistic, Plautus, I propose, devised a one-time rationale for the conventional greed of *meretrices*. Diniarchus lamented their cruelty in

[13] Astaphium refers to young men as a band of plundering soldiers (*consulta consilia, pugna, virtus, praedo/praeda* wordplay); Hofmann 2001: 141, ad 101: "Die Bordellplünderer handeln als organisierte Bande;" cf. also his note on 106. Chaerea uses military language when he orders Parmeno to execute the plan and takes full command responsibility (PAR. *iubesne*? CHA. *iubeam? cogo atque impero*: | *numquam defugiam auctoritatem. sequere*; 389-90). On military imagery in the *Eunuchus* see Christenson 2013; cf. Fantham 1972: 27-32, 85, Maltby 2007.

[14] Although Chaerea is after the girl, a detail reminiscent of stealing food in the *Truculentus* is that Chaerea raped Pamphila on his way to dinner: more on this below, esp. fn. 54. Enk 1953, ad *Truc*. 104, compares *saepe edunt* at Pl. *As*. 218, where prostitutes set traps for the customers: they feed them only to feed on them afterwards.

[15] Leo 1912: 149 finds it unlikely that this could have come from Attic comedy; cf. Hofmann 2001: 141. However, in several places in Menander, the choral interlude after the first act is introduced by speaking of the chorus as a rowdy band of partying teenagers: *Dysk*. 230-2, *Asp*. 245-9, *Pk*. 261ff., with Gomme and Sandbach 197, ad loc., and their introduction, 12; cf. Gomme 1936: 64. In *Epit*. 169-70 a group of youngsters is referred to as a tipsy mob which is best not bothered now (μειρακυλλίων ὄχλος | εἰς τὸν τόπον τις ἔρχεθ' ὑποβεβρεγμένων | οἷς] μὴ 'νοχλεῖν εὔκαιρον εἶναί μοι δοκεῖ, 169-71). Note similar phrasing in the *Samia*: unless the old Demeas takes Chrysis as a concubine he will be threatened by young rivals (ὑπ' ἀντεραστῶν μειρακίων ἐνοχλήσεται, *Sam*. 26); more on the *Samia* below, 5.5, and in Chapter 8. Kruse 1974, ad *Truc*. 100 suggests that *congerrones* is the Latin equivalent of *komastai*.

[16] See also some remarks of Fantham 2000: 293 (=2011: 150). For the common address to the audience of the "*ne miremini*"-type, see Kruse 1974: 85. Cf. Fraenkel 1912: 86ff, esp. 87: "Truculenti poeta iuste et festive operam dat, ut a nobis, postquam adulescens questibus suis aures nostras implevit, audiatur et altera pars. Nam secunda scaena priori paene respondet: illic adulescens scorta lenasque, hic meretricis ancillula adulescentes fraudis scelerisque accusato Astaphium quoque illorum quales nunc sint mores describit."

the previous scene (22-90),[17] but Astaphium then explains that the outrage of men is precisely the *aition* of the conventional comic prostitutes' greed.[18] Now when Chaerea responds to Astaphium's *canticum* from the male angle in turn, he is reversing the aetiology. Since men storming the brothel are the prerequisite for Astaphium's revenge, Chaerea's retribution anticipates the dramatic time of the Plautine play. In line with the prominent theme of inverting the prompt and response in the prologue and the play,[19] Chaerea *causes* what he is responding to, in effect *preceding* his prompt. Plautine greedy *meretrices* now all respond to Chaerea, who is singlehandedly taking revenge for the entire ensemble of young men in comedy (*nos nostramque adulescentiam*, 383). With Chaerea's response, Terence retroactively turns Plautus' ad hoc rationale into the generic prehistory of the *Truculentus* only to hijack it.

5.3. Phony antiphony: anticipating the protatic character

The rape of Pamphila is undoubtedly the climax of the plot. As usual in comedy, the rape is not acted on stage but reported, and perhaps unusually, by the rapist himself.[20] For that purpose Chaerea is supplied with a protatic character, a characteristically Terentian dummy interlocutor who initiates the conversation.[21] Chaerea's exchange with the significantly named Antipho, "Replier,"[22] demonstrates an awareness, and inversion, of the dynamics of prompting and responding.

---

[17] For the commonplace greed, see Alexis' *Isostasion* (103 KA), with comparanda cited by Arnott 1996: 273: only the *Asinaria* and the *Truculentus* of Plautine plays.

[18] Appropriately, Astaphium remembers how it used to be: *nos divitem istum meminimus atque iste pauperes nos: | verterunt sese memoriae* (220-1).

[19] See esp. Chapters 2 and 3.1.

[20] Moschion in Menander's *Samia* is an extremely interesting parallel: detailed discussion below.

[21] Duckworth 1994: 108ff. Donatus calls special attention when Terence does *not* use protatic characters: *adnotandum sane, quod haec fabula* προτατικὸν πρόσωπον *non habeat, hoc est personam, quae ad argumentum nihil attineat quaeque sit adsumpta extrinsecus, ut est in Andria Sosia* (ad *Ad. prol.*).

[22] Germany 2008: 179 (cf. 206): "Antipho's name essentially means 'protatic character'." Donatus (ad *Ad.* 26) remarks that comic names should have *rationem et etymologiam*, either descriptive of or contrasting with character (per ἀντίφρασιν). For a brief summary of *redende Namen* in comedy, see Segal 2001: 159; for case-studies Gratwick

In his first appearance Antipho spots Chaerea dressed as a eunuch: "What the hell is this? I cannot stop wondering and cannot even guess. Whatever it is, I think I'll first investigate it from distance" (*quid illud malist? nequeo satis mirari neque conicere; | nisi, quidquid est, procul hinc lubet priu' quid sit sciscitari*; 547-8). As he lets Chaerea initiate the disclosure first, *prius*, Antipho postpones his protatic role and plays an eavesdropper.[23] Chaerea enters highlighting the eavesdropping convention (549-56):

> *numquis hic est? nemost. numquis hinc me sequitur? nemo homost.*
> *iamne erumpere hoc licet mi gaudium? pro Iuppiter,*
> *nunc est profecto interfici quom perpeti me possum,*
> *ne hoc gaudium contaminet vita aegritudine aliqua.*
> *sed neminemne curiosum intervenire nunc mihi*
> *qui me sequatur quoquo eam, rogitando obtundat enicet*
> *quid gestiam aut quid laetu' sim, quo pergam, unde emergam, ubi siem*
> *vestitum hunc nanctu', quid mi quaeram, sanu' sim anne insaniam*!
>
> Is there anyone? No one. Anyone following me here? Not a person.
> Is it allowed that I let my joy out? By Jupiter,
> I would rather die now than
> have life "contaminate" this joy by some grief.
> But there is no busybody to come to me now
> and follow me wherever I go, nagging me with questions:
> why this excitement and joy, where I'm going, where I'm coming from, where I
> got hold of these clothes, what I'm up to, am I sane or insane!

Critics are divided as to whether Chaerea is relieved or disappointed to find no one.[24] Since Terence conflates the desirable protatic interlocutor and an undesirable interloper, the dilemma seems to be precisely the point. For one, it reflects the ambiguous view of the rape which would be the subject of disclosure. The question of whether the (ab)use of "privileged content" is something to hide or brag about is the very epitome of the *Eunuchus* poetics. For wondering whether he is allowed to revel in his (mis)deed Chaerea uses the same language of "license"

1990 and Papaioannou 2009. O'Hara 1996: 1-56 provides an overview of etymological wordplay in ancient literature. See my discussion of names in Plautus' *Miles* in Chapter 8.4.5, pp. 210-213.

[23] Brothers 2000: 185, ad 548: "A sure indication in the text that Antipho is going to eavesdrop."

[24] Doxography on "relieved" and "disappointed" interpretations in Germany 2008: 205; for the latter, add now Sharrock 2009: 225.

(*licet*, 550) as Terence asking for permission to reuse commonplaces (*licet*, 35-6).[25] The correspondence is significant. There is no reason why Chaerea should not be allowed to disclose everything of his own accord, but he recalls a dramaturgically preferred situation where he would be prompted to do so. As I have elaborated in the previous chapters, Terence wants his reuse of previous texts to be recognized simultaneously as a planned response to a specific literary prompt and as a self-initiated composition. Chaerea's oscillation between wanting and not wanting a prompt reflects this program. He needs a desired precedent or none at all, a desired interlocutor or no interloper.

Antipho certainly takes it that an interlocutor is desired and poses those exact questions that Chaerea anticipated (557-9):

> *adibo atque ab eo gratiam hanc, quam video velle, inibo.*
> *Chaerea, quid est quod sic gestis? quid sibi hic vestitu' quaerit?*
> *quid est quod laetus es? quid tibi vis? satine sanu's?*
>
> I'll go up to him and do him this favor that I see he wants.
> Why all this excitement? What are you up to with these clothes?
> What is this joy? What is this about? Are you sane?[26]

Antipho is aware of the perfunctory nature of the protatic role, which normally entails asking opportune questions, thus providing occasion for the protagonist to disclose relevant information.[27] But here the convention is inverted. It is Chaerea who is dictating the questions

[25] The verb *contaminare* (552) appears only here outside of Terence's prologues; Germany 2008: 206 attractively interprets it in relation to Donatus' comment that Antipho is Terence's addition to the Menandrian original (ad *Eu.* 539): "Terence has tinkered with Menander's play and mixed in a new character to a scene that was "supposed" to be all Chaerea," and notices moreover that "[a]s it turns out, this line about contamination had already been contaminated [sc. from his own *Andria*, 959]." Fraenkel 1968 disputes the validity of Donatus' remark.

[26] Brothers 2000: 186, ad 558-9: "Four of Antipho's seven questions deliberately pick up four of the seven Chaerea envisaged the nosey-parker asking in 555-6." Antipho also inverts Parmeno's question to Chaerea before the rape: *quid tu's tristi'?* (304); Parmeno later does it himself: *quid hic laetus est*? (1034). Barsby 1999: 191, ad 557: "his echoing of Chaerea's questions (558-9 ~ 555-6) can only be mischievous." Note also the back-and-forth effect of Antipho's phrase *gratiam inire* (557), which does not mean "do a favor," but "earn a favor in return."

[27] The argument of Fraenkel 1968 that Antipho is not invented by Terence would not affect an intuitive impression voiced by Donatus (ad 539): a dialogue is more naturalistic than talking into thin air (*bene inventa persona est, cui narret Chaerea, ne unus diu loquatur, ut apud Menandrum*). Modern critics found the device artificial and have been less sympathetic; e.g. Duckworth 1994: 108 (citing also criticisms of Norwood 1923 and 1932): "Terence

and Antipho, true to his name, responds verbatim to him, not vice versa. Indeed Chaerea wanted—or not—to be "followed" (*sequitur*, 549; *sequatur*, 554). In other words, Chaerea comes to cause the prompt only so he can respond to it in turn. By the chronological inversion Terence once again provides aetiology of a convention. Once we see that predictable conversation-starters are in fact a result of the need for an interlocutor, we are witnessing how protatic characters came into being.

The eavesdropping-dilemma is then solved. Once Chaerea makes sure there are no unwanted interlopers, only his friend the Replier who asks him exactly what he wants, he says there is not a person whom he would now rather see (*nemost hominum quem ego nunc magis cuperem videre quam te*, 561). When Antipho finally starts the conversation—"So I ask you to tell me what is going on,"—Chaerea one-ups him so as to take over: "No, rather, I beg *you* to *listen*" (ANT. *narra istuc quaeso quid sit*. CHA. *immo ego te obsecro hercle ut audias*, 562).[28] Antipho pops in again when Chaerea arrives at the first climactic point in his account, the disguise: "And what was that?" Chaerea: "You'll hear sooner if you keep quiet: to exchange clothes with him..." (ANT. *quid id est*? CHA. *tacitu' citius audies:* | *ut vestem cum illo mutem*...571-2). Chaerea does not allow Antipho to perform his role and advance the conversation. Antipho's interruption is there only so that Chaerea can reclaim his initiative in communicating the information. Chaerea then glosses Antipho's question as a question by responding to it with a question —"What privileges were you planning to gain?; You need to ask me that?" (ANT. *quid ex ea re tandem ut caperes commodi*? | CHA. *rogas*? 573-4), only to

---

deserves praise for the laudable desire to substitute dramatic dialogue for the monologue of the Greek original but he has not been entirely successful with his protatic characters; there is no harm in the fact that they do not appear later in the play; the fault is that they are colorless and have no personality; they contribute nothing to the scene and are, as Donatus says, *extra argumentum* [ad *Ph*. 35]. Such scenes are not really dialogues but monologues which pretend to be dramatic." This artificiality, I argue, is precisely what Terence is emphasizing in this scene.

[28] Barsby 1999: 192, ad 562, glosses: "you may think that you need to ask me to tell the story but on the contrary I am actually begging you to listen."

repeat emphatically the *commoda* which Parmeno had in the earlier scene repeated from him (cited above).

Chaerea then describes in detail (580-603) what happened inside prior to the rape (580-593 analyzed below), and cuts off Antipho at the final climactic moment; he is alone with Pamphila (603) so Antipho asks (604-6):

> ANT. *quid tum*? CHA. *quid "quid tum," fatue*? ANT. *fateor*. CHA. *an ego occasionem mi ostentam, tantam, tam brevem, tam optatam, tam insperatam amitterem*?
>
> ANT. What then? CHA. What "what then?" dummy? ANT. Duh! CHA. Such an occasion opened up for me, so great, so brief, so desired, so unexpected— should I have let it go?

Not by chance is it Antipho's prompt that fails to lead to full disclosure. His question is thrown back at him so as to remind us of the hollowness of his repetitive role. Chaerea calls him "stupid," *fatuus*, so Antipho immediately resumes his resonating function and reaffirms *fatuus* by repetition, *fateor*.[29] Chaerea's rhetorical device of aposiopesis, stopping right before the climax, produces two complementary effects. He is telling us that he did use the ideal opportunity to have sex, but stresses even more that he is not using the ideal occasion to talk about it. Chaerea uses his prompter only to forfeit the opportunity of using him to full advantage. He needs Antipho's conventionally prescribed questions not so that his own speech would flow more naturalistically, but precisely to forge an opportunity of speaking as if unprompted.[30]

[29] Similarly to *aio*, *fateor* is one of the verbs of confirmation par excellence (*OLD* s.v. 1, 3); cf. esp. Pl. *Men*. 1107, *Rud*. 285. An interesting possibility is that *fateor* might be related by real or popular etymology to *fari* in its oracular meaning (Vaan 2008: 205, s.v.). Thus Antipho's *fateor* could refer back as a confirmation and at the same time ahead as prediction of what Chaerea will leave unsaid; this would manifest the confusion of who should repeat after whom in this scene.

[30] Germany 2008: 179, following a different line of inquiry, observes that "it is hard to believe that he [sc. Antipho] is there just to make a dialogue of Chaerea's monologue, since he only slips in one real interruption."

5.4. Poetic prelude or erotic *prae-ludus*

The passage omitted from Chaerea's account is his iconic description of the painting of Jupiter and Danaë (580-593):

> *"ego" inquit "ad cenam hinc eo."* 580
> *abducit secum ancillas: paucae quae circum illam essent manent*
> *noviciae puellae. continuo haec adornant ut lavet.*
> *adhortor properent. dum adparatur, virgo in conclavi sedet*
> *suspectans tabulam quandam pictam: ibi inerat pictura haec, Iovem*
> *quo pacto Danaae misisse aiunt quondam in gremium imbrem aureum.* 585
> *egomet quoque id spectare coepi, et quia consimilem luserat*
> *iam olim ille ludum, inpendio magis animu' gaudebat mihi,*
> *deum sese in hominem convortisse atque in alienas tegulas*
> *venisse clanculum per inpluvium fucum factum mulieri.*
> *at quem deum! "qui templa caeli summa sonitu concutit."* 590
> *ego homuncio hoc non facerem? ego illud vero ita feci—ac lubens.*
> *dum haec mecum reputo, accersitur lavatum interea virgo:*
> *iit lavit rediit; deinde eam in lecto illae conlocarunt.*

> "I'm off to dinner," she says [sc. Thais]. 580
> She takes slave-girls along; a few of them stay with her [Pamphila],
> apprentices. In no time they start preparing a bath for her.
> I urge them to hurry. While they are getting things ready, she is sitting in her room,
> looking at a painting. On the picture there was Jupiter,
> how once he sent, so they say, a shower of gold into Danaë's lap. 585
> I start looking at it myself too, and because he had put on a similar
> show once already, my heart was rejoicing all the more,
> a god transformed into a man, and onto another man's roof-tiles
> climbed secretly, tricking a woman through the *inpluvium*.
> And what a god! "Who shakes with thunder the heavenly regions up high!" 590
> Was I, a mere man, not to do the same? Why, I did so—gladly!
> As I am tossing this around in my mind, meanwhile the girl is summoned for her bath:
> she went, bathed, returned; then they placed her on a bed.

The metatheatrical dimension of the imitation of Jupiter's *ludus*-within-a-play has been well studied.[31] But Chaerea's acknowledgement of his fictional status points to an external model as well. The textual gloss, *aiunt*, "they say," indicates imitation of a *literary* precedent.[32] This "Alexandrian footnote," additionally flavored with *iam olim* and, especially, *quondam*—an

[31] Full discussion and bibliography in Germany 2008 (*passim*).
[32] For emphasis on writing in Terence, see Introduction, 3-4, with fn. 29

intertextual signpost in later Roman poetry—invites us to consider possible intertextual import of the passage.[33] After all, ecphrasis, a verbal description of a work of art, is a known trope of intertextuality in ancient literature.[34] Livius Andronicus and Naevius wrote Danaë plays, and the latter is mentioned as a predecessor in the *Eunuchus* prologue. Potentially very interesting is a similarity between Chaerea's *qui templa caeli summa sonitu concutit* (590) and Naevius' *Danaë*: *suo sonitu claro fulgorivit Iuppiter*. Naevius' Jupiter likewise "struck once previously:" *quae quondam fulmine icit Iuppiter*.[35]

We should not miss another metapoetic layer of rape-imitation. Chaerea's imitation mirrors Terence's use of previous texts. Rape is a trope for poetic plagiarism—that is, transgressive imitation of earlier poets—and Chaerea "copies" that rape from Jupiter. In other words, transgressive imitation of predecessors entails imitating their transgression. In the prologue Terence dismisses charges of plagiarism by claiming that he is doing only what his literary predecessors had done previously (42-3), implying that they imitated *their* predecessors. If Chaerea imitates specifically Naevius' Jupiter, he reads Naevius' *quondam* as a further intertextual reference on Naevius' part—whether or not it originally had an intertextual charge. This intertextual game would be all the more remarkable since in the prologue Terence claims that the *Eunuchus* partly overlaps with Naevius' *Colax*.

[33] Germany 2008: 182, fn. 70 acknowledges the possibility. On *quondam* in Roman poetry broadly, see Hinds 1998: 78; in Catullus and Callimachus, Knox 1997 (esp. 161ff), with further references; Gaisser 2009: 134ff.
[34] Barchiesi 2001: 135ff. Given the possibility of Terence's frequent engagement with Plautus' *Asinaria* discussed above (Chapter 3) it may be worth recalling that Diabolus' exclusivity-contract curisously requires that the *meretrix* Philaenium should dispose of any "useless painting" in her house (*si qua inutilis | pictura sit, eam vendat*, *As*. 763-4); he is presumably afraid that Philaenium might use such a painting to exchange secret messages to other lovers (explicit at 767; Hurka 2010: 247, ad 763-4). In Terence the painting becomes the carrier of (inter)text. Cf. Burton 2007: 40 on the famous description of the *Eunuchus* scene in Augustine's *Confessions* 1.16: "Augustine's representation of the young man before the wall-painting is itself an ecphrasis, with Terence's play as the object depicted and himself as the young man fatally demoralized by his reading of it."
[35] Frgs. 2-3 Schauer (= 8-9 Warmington), respectively.

In that respect Donatus' comment on line 590 is intriguing: *sonitu concutit*, he writes, is a "parody of Ennius" (*parodia de Ennio*), while *templa caeli summa* is tragic-like, "but deliberately, not by accident" (*tragice, sed de industria, non errore*). Deliberately or not, Donatus himself put his finger on the essence of the *Eunuchus* poetics: he cries "Ennius" on the basis of mere two words and speculates about Terence's intentions. It is as if he wanted to avoid the resemblances with Naevius and rescue Terence from inadvertent intertext.

Sharrock seems right to qualify line 590 as "a generic marker of paratragedy rather than allusion;"[36] quite a few similar-sounding lines are preserved both in other Roman dramatists and in Ennius' non-dramatic works.[37] After all, as we have seen in the previous chapters, Terence insists that unintentional intertexts should be interpreted as deliberate and vice versa. It is thus not only beside the point that we look for one specific Roman target play; it would even be perfectly appropriate that Terence "quotes" from one concrete Latin text, but a line so common as to make Chaerea's model, and Terence's literary predecessor(s), both specific and generic at the same time. Acoustic allusion to Jupiter's thunder in epic or tragedy recalls the notion that celestial phenomena are the domain of elevated heroic poetry, which generated the image of thundering poets early on.[38]

[36] Sharrock 2009: 223.

[37] For the alliterative effect, e.g. Pac. frg. *Teuc*. 336 Ribbeck: *strepitus fremitus, clamor tonitruum et rudentum sibilus*. Barsby 1999 ad loc. lists Ennian passages: *ad caeli caerula templa* (48 Skutsch); *in caerula caeli | templa* (54-5); *summo sonitu quatit ungula terram* (263); *o magna templa caelitum* (*trag*. 171 Jocelyn). Perhaps worth noting are the phonetic resemblances with another *comic* Jupiter, in Plautus' *Amphitryon*: *strepitus, crepitus, sonitus, tonitrus: ut subito, ut propere, ut valide tonuit* (1062), *ibi continuo contonat | sonitu maxumo* (1094-5). Sharrock 2009: 223, fn. 145 argues plausibly from silence: "That subject is not recorded for Ennius, but it would not be necessary for the quotation to be from a *Danaë* play."

[38] Pi. *P*. 1.1-28; Call. *Aet*. prol. 19-20 Pfeiffer, recalling Hes. *Th*. 40-41; Acosta-Hughes and Stephens 2002: 249. By contrast, the antihero of the *Eunuchus*, the soldier Thraso, "snores day and night" (*stertit noctes et dies*, 1079); for bodily sounds as a parody of thunder, see Cowan 2011.

5.5. The *Eunuchus* and the *Samia*: Menander's Jupiter and Terence's Zeus

So much for Roman predecessors. But well worth comparing is the only mention, and indeed a remarkably similar treatment, of the Danaë myth in extant Menander. In the *Samia*, Nikeratos' daughter Plangon was raped by Moschion, a stepson of his neighbor Demeas; without Nikeratos' knowledge, Moschion and Demeas agree to pretend that the resulting baby is a child of Demeas and his Samian concubine, Chrysis. At one point Demeas tells the story of Jupiter and Danaë to lead Nikeratos to realize that the baby is actually his grandchild (589-604, tr. Arnott):

ΔΗΜ. οὐκ ἀκήκοας λεγόντων, εἰπέ μοι, Νικήρατε,
τῶν τραγωιδῶν, ὡς γενόμενος χρυσὸς ὁ Ζεὺς ἐρρύη
διὰ τέγους, καθειργμένην τε παῖδ' ἐμοίχευσέν ποτε;
ΝΙΚ. εἶτα δὴ τί τοῦτ'; ΔΗΜ. ἴσως δεῖ πάντα προσδοκᾶν; σκόπει,
τοῦ τέγους εἴ σοι μέρος τι ῥεῖ. ΝΙΚ. τὸ πλεῖστον. ἀλλὰ τί
τοῦτο πρὸς ἐκεῖν' ἐστί; ΔΗΜ. τότε μὲν γίνεθ' ὁ Ζεὺς χρυσίον,
τότε δ' ὕδωρ. ὁρᾶις; ἐκείνου τοὖργον ἐστίν. ὡς ταχὺ
εὕρομεν. ΝΙΚ. καὶ βουκολεῖς με. ΔΗΜ. μὰ τὸν Ἀπόλλω, 'γὼ μὲν οὔ.
ἀλλὰ χείρων οὐδὲ μικρὸν Ἀκρισίου δήπουθεν εἶ·
εἰ δ' ἐκείνην ἠξίωσε , τήν γε σήν — ΝΙΚ. οἴμοι τάλας·
Μοσχίων ἐσκεύακέν με. ΔΗΜ. λήψεται μέν, μὴ φοβοῦ
τοῦτο· θεῖον δ' ἐστ', ἀκριβῶς ἴσθι, τὸ γεγενημένον.
μυρίους εἰπεῖν ἔχω σοι περιπατοῦντας ἐν μέσωι
ὄντας ἐκ θεῶν· σὺ δ' οἴει δεινὸν εἶναι τὸ γεγονός.
Χαιρεφῶν πρώτιστος οὗτος, ὃν τρέφουσ' ἀσύμβολον,
οὐ θεός σοι φαίνετ' εἶναι; ΝΙΚ. φαίνεται· τί γὰρ πάθω;
οὐ μαχοῦμαί σοι διὰ κενῆς.

DEM. Nikeratos, just tell me, haven't you listened to
our tragedians, who tell us how once Zeus turned into gold—
dropping through a roof he ravished a young girl locked in a room.
NIK. What of that, then? DEM. We should be prepared for anything, perhaps—think—
is any part of *your* roof leaking? NIK. Most of it—but what's
that to do with what you said? DEM. Zeus sometimes comes transformed to gold,
sometimes, though, to rain — you follow? This is all *his* doing! How quickly
now we've found the answer! NIK. You are making fun of me!
DEM. No, I'm not! You're every bit as noble as Acrisius,
certainly. If Danaë deserved him, then your girl... — NIK. (*distressed*) Oh dear!
Moschion has diddled me! DEM. He'll wed her, have no fear
of that. What has happened is the work of higher powers, be quite, quite sure!
I can name for you so many sons of gods who walk around
In our streets, and yet you think that our misfortune is bizarre!

> First there's Chaerephon, who never pays his bill for what he eats —
> don't you think that he's *divine*? NIK. (*puzzled*) I think so — oh, what can I do?
> There's no point in fighting you there! 605

Before considering the possibility of Terence's knowledge of Menandrian Danaë(s), let us read the myth in the *Eunuchus* with the *Samia* passage in hindsight.[39] First, Menander explicitly references tragedy (λεγόντων... τῶν τραγωιδῶν, 589-90), Terence implicitly so, by line 590 discussed above; in both cases the target text might be equally (un)specific.[40] The exact verse number correspondence in the *Samia* and the *Eunuchus* may be a coincidence due to uncertain numbering of missing lines in the *Samia*'s fragments.[41] However that may be, it is certainly noteworthy that in both plays the myth is placed in a similar moment of the plot.[42]

The paratragic coloring is a reminder that not everyone involved might find this amusing. In both plays the adulterous god's breaking-and-entering is the genre's excuse for virgins being violated behind their caretakers' backs. Demeas assures Nikeratos that it must be a work of a god (θεῖον... τὸ γεγενημένον, 600); Chaerea likewise excuses himself before Thais (*quid si hoc quispiam voluit deus*? 875).[43] The Danaë story is very apposite since her father Acrisius locked her in a chamber to protect her virginity. Menander's Danaë is locked in (καθειργμένην, 591) much like Pamphila was to be guarded from men (*edicit ne vir quisquam ad eam adeat*, 578; cf.

[39] For a basic comparison of the two scenes, see Papaioannou 2010: 151-162.
[40] Like Donatus for Terence, Gutzwiller 2000: 110ff. argues that Menander parodies one source in particular, Euripides' *Danaë*; the *Hippolytus*, however, features prominently as well: Sommerstein 2013a: 36-42, 2013b. Whatever the case, both playwrights chose not to specify a source.
[41] Even though it would not have been unimaginable that Terence did it deliberately: see Fontaine 2013 on Pl. *Capt*. 800 ~ *Eu*. 801. The fragmentary state of the *Samia* prevents any conclusive discussion.
[42] Although the *Samia* is estimated to be some hundred verses shorter than the *Eunuchus*; for calculation see Introduction in Arnott 1979-2000, vol. 3, with bibliography; Sommerstein 2013a: 54ff. Barsby 1999: 198 ad 590, calls attention to the structure: "we cannot tell whether there was a similar parody of Greek tragedy in Men. [sc. *Kolax* or *Eunouchos*] at this point."
[43] Apparently a stock excuse; cf. Lyconides' defense before the girl's father, Euclio, in Pl. *Aul*. 741-2: *quid vis fieri? factum est illud: fieri infectum non potest.* | *deos credo voluisse; nam ni vellent, non fieret, scio*. Pamphilus in Terence's *Hecyra* underlines the convention when he finds out that the victim was his now-wife: *deu' sum si hoc itast*. Slater 1988: 258 rightly calls him a "divine rapist in the spirit of Jupiter."

conclussissem, 667).[44] Curiously, in the *Eunuchus* the rapist himself bolts the door before the rape (*pessulum ostio obdo*, 603). While the detail is dramaturgically necessary, Terence must have known that the whole point of the myth is that Danaë is locked away by her father, who was hoping to escape the prophecy that he will be killed by her future son. Chaerea, abusing the privileges of a eunuch chamberlain, assumes the roles of both the guard and the intruder and in some sense is trespassing onto his own property.[45]

Menander lucidly foreshadows Zeus leaking through the roof (διὰ τέγους, 591). At the beginning of the *Samia*, Moschion explains how he spotted Plangon at Demeas' house, where Chrysis hosted the Adonia, the festival celebrated by dancing on the roof (ἐπὶ τὸ τέγος, 45). David Bain's suggestion that Plangon was indeed raped *on* Demeas' roof would add effect to Demeas' joke that Nikeratos should check *his own* roof for leaks (593).[46] Moschion was infatuated by the roof-spectacle and narrates the violation himself, like Chaerea. In one reading of the text—"I became a spectator, I think" (ἐγινόμην οἶμαι θεατής, 43)—the rape of Plangon is a play-within-a-play just as the rape of Pamphila.[47] Jupiter's erotic transgression in the *Eunuchus* is described as stepping onto "someone else's roof tiles" (*in alienas tegulas*, 588), but Terence replaces the entry point with the exclusively Roman architectural element, the *inpluvium* (589). His deviation from the Greek model at this climactic moment might be justified practically, as choosing a detail more familiar to Roman audience. But it may also be that, as opposed to

[44] It is in place that Chremes, Pamphila's brother and *kyrios*, will later be in charge of bolting the door at the sight of Thraso approaching (*obsera ostium intu'*, 763).
[45] On "bolting" as signifying prostitution and marriage at the same time, see Chapter 4.4.
[46] Bain 1983: 126, ad 593. It may be more than an accident of transmission that Menander uses τέγος only in the *Samia*; Pompella 1996, s.v.
[47] This reading might create a metatheatrical link with Moschion's remark that he served as a *choregos* (13), strange, because he would be young for that service: Gomme and Sandbach 1973, ad 13. No less interesting would be the reading ἐνθεάτης, corrupted from ἐνθεαστής, "divinely possessed," based on ἐνθεαστικῶς in Men. *Dysk*. 44, again of a lover's state of mind (Gomme and Sandbach 1973: 550, ad 45). The commentators' conclusion would apply unmistakably to Chaerea: "Moschion's rape will be palliated by his having been under the influence of a supernatural power."

anomalous and occasional cracks on Greek roofs, the *impluvium* on the roof of a now-Roman prostitute's house symbolizes a *permanent* "passageway to adultery"—as a metapoetic comment on the essence of Roman adaptation.[48]

In both plays the shower of gold is put to effective use. The exact phrasing in the *Samia* refers to gold and rain as two different metamorphic epiphanies, even two separate literary versions (τότε μὲν γίνεθ' ὁ Ζεὺς χρυσίον, | τότε δ' ὕδωρ, 594-5). It is a known crux of the *Eunuchus* that Jupiter likewise comes in two shapes simultaneously, as a man and as rain (*deum sese in hominem convortisse*, 588; *venisse clanculum per inpluvium*, 589).[49] Significantly, gold into which Zeus transforms is χρυσίον, also denoting a gold coin.[50] Gomme and Sandbach may be right that "[a]ny suggestion that Plangon had sold herself to Moschion is utterly out of place."[51] Yet Menander might be teasing our imagination: the roof-party where Zeus-Moschion "leaked through" was hosted by the Samian ex-hetaera Chrysis, "Goldie." Moschion pointedly introduces her by name right before the preserved text breaks off (ἡ Χρυσίς· καλοῦμεν τοῦτο γὰρ

[48] In Plautus' *Miles* the *impluvium* is thematically central, being the hole through which adultery is spied on (159, 175, 287, 340, 553); compare Periplectomenus ordering that a stranger caught on the roof tiles spying is to be punished (*posthac quemque in tegulis | videritis alienum*, 156-7). Potentially significant is the inversion: the downward peek through the *inpluvium* in the *Miles* (*per inpluvium huc despexi*, 287; *despexe ad te per inpluvium*, 553) becomes Pamphila's upward gaze at the painting (*suspectans*, 584). I discuss adultery in the *Miles* in Chapter 8. Terence's jibe at the earlier braggart-soldier-play is very plausible since the only other use of *impluvium* in Terence, describing a portent of a snake coming down (*anguis per inpluvium decidit de tegulis*, *Ph*. 707), may well recall the snakes strangled by baby Hercules in Plautus' *Amphitryon* (*devolant angues iubati deorsum in impluvium* duo, 1108). For passageways as metaphors for female genitals, see Henderson 1991: 137ff. Leaking is curiously associated with treachery in the *Eunuchus*: Parmeno tells Thais he will be a vessel that leaks out her lies (*quae vera audivi taceo et contineo optume; | sin falsum aut vanum aut finctumst, continuo palamst: | plenus rimarum sum, hac atque illac perfluo*, 103-5; see above, Chapter 4.2.1, fn. 14). The fact that Parmeno does not "leak out" only one piece of information, Thais' Samian origin (107-8) recalls the unreliable *amica* in Plautus' *Bacchides*, figured as the proverbially fragile Samian ware (*scis tu ut confringi vas cito Samium solet*, 202); a crack is another metaphor for female bodily orifices: Henderson 1991: 147. For the symbolism of filthy water in the *Eunuchus*, see Chapter 4.2.2.1, p. 84, fn. 30-31. Cf. Terence's metaphor of "window to evil," i.e. debauchery (*quantam fenestram ad nequitiem patefeceris*; *HT* 481; Maltby 2007: 148) with *fenestra* in *Mil*. 377-9.

[49] Donatus rationalizes the problem by inferring that the painting contained both versions: *hic apparet separatim Iovem, separatim auri fuisse picturam* (ad *Eu*. 588). What matters, however, is that Chaerea chose to *report* both.

[50] LSJ s.v. 3.

[51] Gomme and Sandbach 1973: 619, ad 595.

[...], 56).[52] Meanwhile on the *Eunuchus* passage Donatus ingenuously observes that the painting of Jupiter's golden rain is a suitable decoration for a prostitute's house, a place where sex is paid in gold.[53]

The point to make is that neither Moschion nor Chaerea pay for sex, expectedly, since their partners are freeborn virgins.[54] But it may be more than coincidence that both "golden rain-rapes" were possible only because Chrysis and Thais, women with a history of selling sex, left their protégées unattended. Sex with the two girls would presumably not have been possible had Menander's ex-hetaera (see esp. *Sam*. 130, 337) and Terence's *meretrix* kept closer watch on them—or else it would have to be paid for. The playwrights relieve us from considering this alternative by safely removing the guardians, but perhaps precisely thereby they are implicitly

[52] Perhaps interestingly, Chrysis is a courtesan's name in Menander's *Kolax* (frg. 4 Pernerstorfer = Ath. 13.587d). Plangon's name would have been most suitable for the victim of Zeus if Menander knew that πλάγγος is a rare word for a kind of an eagle; and perhaps he might have, since it occurs in a peripatetic source (Arist. *HA* 618b23); on Menander and the Peripatetics, see Nervegna 2013 (*passim*).

[53] Papaioannou 2010: 159, fn. 29, attractively speculates that the "portrayal of Danaë as a courtesan was popularized" in the fourth-century mythological paratragedies.

[54] This financial aspect of physical pleasure might explain Demeas' joke, which Nikeratos emphatically fails to understand, about the parasite Chaerephon as an example of a walking divinity since he eats for free, "without chipping in" (ἀσύμβολον, 602-4). Chaerephon's situation perhaps alludes to Moschion's quasi-divine, implicitly "toll-free" sex like Zeus, who does *not* shower gold on this occasion. There might be traces of the joke in the *Eunuchus*: Chaerea is a party crasher and has an issue with *symbola*. He is late to meet Antipho for a dinner because he stayed with Pamphila ; Antipho says time and place was agreed, guests would share expenses, Chaerea was to organize (*heri aliquot adulescentuli coiimus in Piraeo | in hunc diem, ut de symbolis essemu'*, *Chaeream ei rei | praefecimus; dati anuli; locu' tempu' constitutumst*, 539-41). Immediately after Chaerea finishes his account of the rape with a punchline—"I would be a eunuch if I missed such an opportunity" (603)—Antipho abruptly changes the topic to ask about the arrangement; we learn that despite Antipho's expectations, Chaerea, for some reason, outsourced the hosting: "Good point. Anyway, what's going on with chipping in for dinner?" Chaerea: "It's prepared." Antipho: "Nice of you. Where, home?" Chaerea: "No, at the freedman Discus' place." (ANT. *sane hercle ut dici'. sed interim de symbolis quid actumst*? CHA. *paratumst*. ANT. *frugi es: ubi? domin?* CHA. *immo apud libertum Discum*. 606-7). Barsby 1999: 201, ad 608, explains away this inconsistency as a slippage in combining the two models, which is somewhat dismissive given how easily it could have been fixed; the two references are perfectly gratuitous. They frame the rape-description tightly; exactly between the two mentions of "chipping in" Chaerea intruded Thais' place and had sex for free: after that he is no longer a host but will dine at someone else's place, maybe even at their expense. On Pamphila and food, cf. Chapter 4.2.2.1, fn. 26. Plautus implies that there is something inherently parasitical in having sex for free: in the *Amphitryon*, Mercury twice refers to his assistance to Jupiter in the affair with Alcumena as "*sub*-parasitizing" (515, 993; cf. 521); in the *Menaechmi*, the wrong twin brother emphatically "wined and dined for free" when he had sex with his brother's *amica* (475, 1142). On a separate note, there is an interesting wordplay of "call" and "invite" on Chaerephon in Apollodorus (31 KA, Ath. 6.43), καλῶ δὲ Χαιρεφῶντα· κἂν γὰρ μὴ καλῶ, ἄκλητος ἥξει, which seems to be the Greek version of the parasite's *in-vocatus* pun in Pl. *Capt*. 70-74 and Gnatho's reading of it in *Eu*. 1059 (cf. next fn.). On Chaerephon, Gomme and Sandbach 1973: 614.

pointing at it. For no apparent reason Chaerea specifies that the girls whom Thais left in charge of Pamphila were apprentices (*noviciae puellae*, 582); the implication might be that more experienced ones would have done their duty properly—whatever that duty may be, guarding or charging.[55]

All of the parallels above raise an important question regarding Terence's models. The mythological precedent of Chaerea's rape, the focal point of the *Eunuchus*, is very similarly thematically integrated in Menander's *Samia*, which is not among the two plays that Terence lists as sources of the *Eunuchus*. Unless yet another extended Danaë reference appeared in Menander's *Eunouchos* and/or the *Kolax*, this is further evidence that the information Terence gives about his compositional methods should not be taken for granted.[56] He either introduced the Danaë story on his own or used the *Samia* as a third source; strong resemblances seem to suggest the latter. However, knowing that Terence had once already made a point of Menander repeating himself (*An*. 9-12),[57] it is conceivable that the *Kolax* or the *Eunouchos* featured a

[55] Given the central thematic importance of Chaerea having sex for free against all odds (Ch. 4.5), there may be a financial double entendre in his ecstatic reaction to the painting: *inpendio magis animu' gaudebat mihi* (587). The adverb *inpendio*, a Terentian hapax, is usually translated "exceedingly" (cf. *OLD* s.v.), but since the primary meaning of *inpendium* is "expense," the line might mean, e.g., "I got all the more thrilled by the expense" (i.e. by the "value" of Pamphila); note a possibly similar allusion in the only Plautine instance of *inpendio*, *Aul*. 18, uttered by the Lar familiaris guarding the treasure (*mihi id aurum credidit*, 15). Furthermore, one Plautine pun on *inpendiosus*, "spendthrift," and *inpensus*, "unpaid," "worthless," betrays the inherently ambiguous prefix (*nam pol quidem meo animo ingrato homine nihil inpensiust; | malefactorem amitti satius quam relinqui beneficum; | nimio inpendiosum praestat te quam ingratum dicier*; *Bac*. 394-6: "To my mind there's nothing more worthless than an ungrateful man. It's better to let off a malefactor than to leave a benefactor in the lurch. It's far better for you to be called prodigal than ungrateful;" tr. De Melo; cf. *OLD* s.vv.). This was a very Plautine trick and Terence knew that: the only time he uses the verb *invocare* (*Eu*. 1059), it is the parasite Gnatho picking up the parasite Ergasilus' Latin-only pun on *invocatus*, "invited" and "uninvited" (Pl. *Capt*. 70-74). Terence, in other words, could have coined *inpendio* meaning both "with expense" and "without expense." The ambiguity would suit the situation of the violator Chaerea, just as of the violator Terence. Notice also that Chaerea's *reputo* that ends the description (592) can mean financial calculation (*OLD* 1). For financial overtones of the golden rain, see Hor. *C*. 3.16.8, *converso in pretium deo*.

[56] Barsby 1999: 196 in passing suggests that the source might be *Eunouchos*, presumably because everything is supposed to come from Terence's reported primary model unless explicitly stated otherwise (as it is for the two characters). This is certainly one option.

[57] While this may of course be only the image Terence uses for his own purposes more or less disingenuously (cf. Germany 2013), examples provide enough basis to make such a claim credible; e.g., the parasite Chaerephon from the *Samia* (fn. 54 above) also appears in other plays of Menander; Gomme and Sandbach 1973: 614. Cf. the famous anecdote in Plutarch where Menander implies that once he composed the plot assembling verses is a formality

Danaë scene. Both plays would be (perhaps) too much of a coincidence, and the *Eunouchos* seems (perhaps) a likelier candidate. Namely, a fragment reads: "Don't fight the gods or add to your trouble further tempests, but bear the ones you have to bear" (μὴ θεομάχει, μηδὲ προσάγου τῷ πράγματι | χειμῶνας ἑτέρους, τοὺς δ' ἀναγκαίους φέρε).[58] In the same way that Menander foreshadowed Zeus on the roof in the *Samia*, it is possible that the "tempest" which falls upon those who fight the gods in his *Eunouchos* will have had something to do with Zeus' rain.[59]

To conclude, any combination of the following options is theoretically possible, though, perhaps, not equally plausible. Menander used the Danaë scene at least once and up to three times; Terence could have known of none, some, or all. Some of the scenarios would be really interesting. If Menander had used the scene more than once, but Terence did not know that, the coincidence would be a fascinatingly ironical testimony to the inherent repetitiveness of comedy that Terence speaks of in the prologue. But if Terence's claims of ignorance and genericity are as disingenuous as I argued above, it is tempting to think that he *did* know. Menander's self-imitation may have, moreover, particularly triggered Terence to infuse the rape scene with repetitions and imitations.[60] None of this is, of course, anything more than a guess. In any case,

---

(λέγεται δὲ καὶ Μενάνδρῳ τῶν συνήθων τις εἰπεῖν, "ἐγγὺς οὖν, Μένανδρε, τὰ Διονύσια, καὶ σὺ τὴν κωμῳδίαν οὐ πεποίηκας;" τὸν δὲ ἀποκρίνασθαι, "νὴ τοὺς θεοὺς ἔγωγε πεποίηκα τὴν κωμῳδίαν: ᾠκονόμηται γὰρ ἡ διάθεσις: δεῖ δ' αὐτῇ τὰ στιχίδια ἐπᾶσαι..." *Mor*. 347f). This, at any rate, seems to have been Menander's *reputation*; the truth of the matter is another question.

[58] 138 KA, tr. Barsby 1999: 305.

[59] On the rare and thematically significant verb θεομαχεῖν in Euripides' *Bacchae*, see Dodds 1960: 68, ad 45, with references. In Plautus' *Mostellaria* the *adulescens* Philolaches refers to the *meretrix* Philematium as *tempestas* (162). For the elaborate thematic association of romantic, financial, and meteorological misfortune in that play, see the insightful study by Leach 1969.

[60] If the Danaë episode by any chance appeared in the *Kolax*, Terence could have even capitalized on the fact that he is not the first to adapt Menandrian self-repetition. At any event, remarkable repetitions continue after the rape scene as well, and specifically in relation to it (cf. bolting the door: 603, 763). When Chaerea lost Pamphila from sight he wonders where to look for her (*ubi quaeram, ubi investigem, quem perconter*, 294; see ch. 1.2), much like he anticipated what he will be asked after the rape (*unde emergam, ubi siem | vestitum hunc nanctu', quid mi quaeram*, 555-6; see above, 5.3). After the rape Phaedria asks Pythias wonders where to find the perpetrator: *ubi ego illum scelerosum misera atque inpium inveniam? aut ubi quaeram?* (643); reverberation continues when Phaedria appears: PHA. *quem quaeri', Pythias*? PYT. *ehem Phaedria, egon? quem quaeram*? (650-1). Parmeno picks up the Antipho-Chaerea exchange as he reports the scandal to Chaerea's father: SEN. *pro eunuchon*? PAR. *sic est* (991-2); cf. ANT. *pro eunuchon?* CHA. *sic est* (574). Pythias refers to Chaerea as *veneficus* (648), Thais addresses Pythias as

since the prologue controversy over Terence's knowledge of earlier play(s) is programmatically insoluble, it is perhaps even for the best that we cannot tell how many Menandrian Danaës Terence could have known.

5.6. Time warp: Chaerea and temporal paradoxes

While the problem above must remain open, comparing the effect of the virgin myth in the two plays is very instructive for interpreting the *Eunuchus*. In both plays the proximity of prostitutes throws the virginity of Plangon and Pamphila into relief: Moschion and Chaerea are emphatically the first with their sexual partners. In the *Samia*, as far as we can tell, romantic primacy is not as big of an issue as in the *Eunuchus*.[61] But when the other two men in Terence's play, Phaedria and Thraso, end up sharing the prostitute Thais, Chaerea's primacy stands out as spectacular. There might be considerable metapoetic potential of associating Moschion and Chaerea with Zeus/Jupiter, latent (for all we know) in the *Samia* but activated by Terence. When Demeas compares Moschion with *multiple* literary treatments of one of Zeus' adventures—"our tragedians say"—he juxtaposes actual one-time primacy and recurrent literary primacy. Since Chaerea, like Moschion, imitates the god qua literary character (*aiunt*; λεγόντων... τῶν τραγωιδῶν), repeatedly lost virginity might be Terence's commentary on textual reuse: however many times the myth of defloration may have been employed previously, it can always be revived as new. Danaë keeps renewing her virginity with every subsequent poetic incarnation, in a sort of a "Groundhog's Day"-effect. The problem of Pamphila's virginity, as we have seen in the previous chapter, is a powerful metapoetic vehicle in the *Eunuchus*. Chaerea's choice of

venefica (825), both in reaction to the discovery of the rape; cf. in the same context: THA. *quid feceras*? CHA. *paullum quiddam*. PYT. *eho "paullum", inpudens? | an paullum hoc esse tibi videtur...* (856-7). Parmeno and Pythias ironically invert this repetition speaking about Chaerea's punishment: PAR. *qua audacia | tantum facinus audet?* PYT. *quid ita "tantum"? pa. an non tibi hoc maxumumst*? (958-9).

[61] Although there are several allusions to Chrysis' former profession (see esp. Chapter 8.2); for exclusivity with her, see above on Demeas and his potential younger rivals, fn. 15.

words to describe her to Antipho might be alluding to this once more: "If you see her, you'll say she's *the first*, I'm sure" (*primam dices, scio, si videris*, 567).[62]

Especially telling are the differences between the two comic versions of the mythic rape.[63] Moschion opens the play narrating a rape from the past. The child thereby conceived, the stock suppositious baby of New Comedy, is a comic equivalent of the hero Perseus, miraculously conceived via golden rain. But the conspicuous absence of a child in the *Eunuchus* defies not only the *telos* of the myth but also the comic conventions. The rape of Pamphila does not fulfill arguably the only dramaturgic purpose of comic rapes, accounting for the extramarital origin of a baby.[64] This should immediately be a red flag if only because in the prologue Terence listed supposititious babies as stock elements (*puerum supponi*, 39).

This anomaly is in fact the only possible outcome of another, even more striking anomaly: there is no child *yet*, because the rape took place just a moment ago. As Moschion reminds us, comic rape always happens long before the action of the play begins. In the *Eunuchus*, absolutely uniquely in the surviving corpus, the rape is staged mid-play.[65] The metapoetic implications are neatly paradoxical. In some sense, Chaerea is late: he should have raped Pamphila at least nine months before the play. But on the imaginary comic timeline he is

[62] Barsby 1999: 193, ad loc. refers to Gnatho's use of *primus* as "the best" (248), yet I hope to have shown that primacy in the *Eunuchus* is more complex than that. Cf. Gardner 2011: 111ff. on metapoetry of *Cynthia prima* in Prop. 1.1.1.

[63] Moschion' misadventure takes place in the ideal alleviating circumstances: youth, nocturnal festival, wine (40ff; 340ff.) followed by feeling of shame and responsibility (46ff., 333ff.); Chaerea, by contrast, has no such excuse: "the rape of Pamphila in *Eunuchus* is premeditated, occurs within the drama, and is committed by a stone-cold sober young man, all of which seem to be unprecedented in Roman comedy" (James 1998: 40). Cf. Germany 2008: 60: "[W]hen the crime occurs, the clear absence of both festival context and inebriation works as a kind of dramaturgical anacoluthon. The stylization of the formula is so iron-clad and this situation so unique that the audience listens to Chaerea's narration in rapt expectation that it will disclose the missing elements." What would Terence's audience expect is difficult to guess, however; Plautus had already been repeatedly dismantling alcohol as a conventional and convenient excuse: *Aul*. 740-51, *Truc*. 830-3.

[64] The device was so dramaturgically useful that it was worth the sacrifice of plausibility: "The most unrealistic feature here [i.e. in comic rapes], of course, is the inevitable pregnancy" (James 2014: 30).

[65] On rape conventions in Terence, see Gilula 2007: 211ff.; for New Comedy, Pierce 1988, 1997; Omitowoju 2002: 137-229.

early: if in all other plays the rape had already happened in the past, then the rape of the *Eunuchus* belongs in the prehistory of the genre. When characters from other plays recall a rape in the past, they recall Chaerea. Appropriately, his purported punishment, Pythias says, will be an example for the future (*quae futura exempla dicunt in illum indigna*, 946).[66] All comedies featuring a child born from rape become the *Eunuchus*' possible future. The rape of the *Eunuchus* thus retroactively becomes an *aition* of all comedy, a sort of a zero-episode filmed after the series has ended to explain what happened before it had begun.[67]

At this point we may survey the instances where the *Eunuchus* is retroactively inaugurated as a prehistory of specific comedies and of comedy as a whole.[68] Pamphila's brother Chremes is an *adulescens*, younger than Thais (527), yet his name is a generic name reserved for old men in comedy. The simplest explanation is that this Chremes is the stock comic *senex*—but while he was still young.[69] Likewise, Chaerea gives us a rare view of an early stage of comic

[66] Parmeno's immediate response calls attention to the divine "exemplarity": *o Iuppiter* (946). Pythias' *dicunt* might be retroactively anticipating the *dictum* from the prologue.

[67] Note that Chaerea began his report of the rape in present tense (*abducit, manent*, 581; *adornant*, 582; *adhortor*, *adparatur*, *sedet*, 583), but switches to past to describe the mythical past of the painting (*luserat*, 586), and situates himself within that past (*animu' gaudebat mihi*, 587*, feci*, 591).

[68] For Archidemides as the possible precursor of the one in Plautus' *Bacchides*, see above, fn. 1. Euripides, another self-conscious literary latecomer, is famous for constructing his plays as aetiologies: Wilson 1968; Dunn 1996: 40-63; Scullion 2000.

[69] Nomenclature is fixed even, or especially, for generic names (cf. *Parmenones, Syri*, virtually common nouns in Pl. *Bac*. 649): Chremes is an old man since Aristophanes' *Ecclesiazusae* and in all plays of Terence except the *Adelphoe*. The anomaly is noticed by commentators but rarely accounted for; closest to making a conclusive point is Fontaine 2013: 184. Terence's choice is noteworthy since Chremes in the *Eunuchus* is assigned to do what is normally done by older characters: "[T]he role of recognition agent which Chremes here plays is more often played by an *elderly* relative (Crito in *Andria*) or by a nurse. In fact, since we have Sophrona in *Eunuchus* to confirm the identity of Pamphila, we do not actually need Chremes as a recognition agent at all. And the role of potential *prostates* for Thais, for which Chremes is set up as Pamphila's brother, also turns out to be superfluous; in the end it is Chaerea's *father* who assumes this role" (Barsby 1993: 172; emphases mine). Terence's Chremes is "rejuvenated" verbally as well. After he pointedly introduces himself (*ego sum, Chremes*) Pythias calls him *capitulum lepidissimum* (531), a diminutive which Barsby (1999: 182, ad loc.) rightly stresses: the *senes* Demeas in Terence's *Adelphoe* (966) and Periplectomenus in Plautus' *Miles Gloriosus* (725) are addressed as *lepidum caput*. These only two instances of the "grown version" of *lepidum caput* gain further weight given their proximity to the phrase *ecce me* (*Ad*. 995; *Mil*. 663), which Gratwick 2001 meticulously analyzed in formal and thematic detail, concluding that "there seem to be too many coincidences here for us just to dismiss the correspondence of *Mil*. 663 and *Ad*. 995 as accidental" (62). Another possible instance of a "young *senex*" is the generic name Antipho: he is an *adulescens* in the *Eunuchus* (Terence's invention, according to Donatus) and the *Phormio*, but an old man in the single Plautine example, the *Stichus*. For Terentian generic names, cf. Chapter 7.3, fn. 11.

romance. Barsby notices that "[i]t is in fact unusual to see young men in comedy in the first flush of infatuation... normally they have fallen in love before the play begins, and the dramatist is more concerned to explore their reactions to the problems of the affair than their initial symptoms."[70] We have seen the protatic Antipho waiting in wings until Chaerea invites him. This is a unique case of a protatic character popping up mid-play, not at the beginning.[71] Of course, this is only because Chaerea postpones the description of the rape until the middle of the play, unlike Moschion who narrates it at the opening of the *Samia*. All the events in the *Eunuchus* preceding the rape thus take place in a time when other plays, such as the *Samia*, had not yet even begun.

But the *Eunuchus* comes to precede earlier plays, paradoxically, by repeating them and responding to them. In being the *protos heuretes* of comic rape Chaerea is imitating what Jupiter had already been doing *repeatedly*.[72] When Chaerea travels back in time into the brothel to cause mayhem—which Plautus' Astaphium established as the reason for prostitutes' cruelty—he is responding to her tit-for-tat with her own words (*referam gratiam*: *Eu*. 385; *Truc*. 107-110).

Therefore, comic aetiology of the *Eunuchus* is temporally paradoxical. A remarkable indication is that Chaerea is called a "supposititious" intruder (*quidnam qui referam sacrilego illi gratiam | qui hunc supposivit nobis*? 911-2). He is "planted" like a baby that would result from an earlier extramarital affair (prologue *puerum supponi*, 39). But as a comic rapist he is also an

[70] Barsby 1999: 140, referring to Sostratos in Menander's *Dyskolos* as the nearest parallel.
[71] Without exception in the plays which unquestionably feature protatic characters (Ter. *An.*, *Hec., Ph.*; Pl. *Epid., Mer.*, *Mil.*, *Mos*; convention virtually acknowledged at *Cur*. 1-2). Duckworth 1994: 108, presumably having this postponement in mind, acknowledges Antipho's uniqueness: "Antipho thus serves a purpose *very similar to* that of the protatic character" (emphasis mine); see also other possible borderline cases listed by Duckworth.
[72] There is a symptomatic *hysteron-proteron* in Chaerea's ecphrasis of the painting. The climactic moment at first sight seems to be marked by "Oh, I *did* so—gladly" (*ego illud vero ita feci—ac lubens*, 591), but then it turns out that at that moment he did not do anything yet, he was still only thinking about it (*dum haec mecum reputo*..., 592). He retrospectively narrates that he imagined himself as having done something before actually doing it. This is not merely an understandably garbled exposition of an excited youth. His *reputo* refers both to earlier rape(s) that he imitates, and to the rape he has yet to commit and which will come to precede all other comic rapes.

imaginary father of such a child himself. Likewise, as we have seen in Chapter 4, the plot is centered not on tracing the ancestry of the yet unborn child, but of Pamphila. She is a long lost girl herself, but since she is subjected to premarital sex she is also the prospective mother of a spurious baby. With a few simple strokes Terence sends Chaerea and Pamphila back and forth in an imaginary literary past and future, making them their own literary ancestors and descendants simultaneously. This is especially noteworthy given the possible metapoetic dimension of parentage in the play; the verb *supponere* itself is attested to mean compromised literary authenticity.[73] Conflating parents with children does not merely invert the sequence of literary predecessors and successors, but it challenges the very possibility of a literary-historical sequence. The *Eunuchus* and its protagonists are both first and second at the same time.

[73] The spurious ending of Terence's own *Andria* is labeled *suppositicius* in the manuscripts; cf. Speyer 1971: 16, and above (4.2.2.2-4.3.1) on the kinship metaphor. Childless rape as a metapoetic trope of the allegedly-unoriginal literary creation would befit the title character; cf. Philippides 1995: 280: "The choice of the eunuch disguise provides an ironical aspect to the rape itself, since the male nature of the rapist is neutralized."

Chapter 6

Ars simplex, vita duplex: The *Self-Tormentor* prologue and the ontology of the script

> I feel like I've been watching our friendship on a split screen. The friendship I perceived on one side and the truth on the other.
>
> — *Hannibal* (NBC, season 2)

The *Eunuchus* prologue, implausible as it is in practical terms, coherently revolves around the theme of plagiarism. By contrast, the prologue of the *Heauton Timorumenos* is notoriously episodic, or "rather rambling."[1] The speaker begins by saying that the poet cast an old man in the role of the young (1-3) and goes on to outline the play's origin: it is made *duplex* from a *simplex argumentum* (4-6) and most of the audience probably already knows the Greek author (7-9). Next, he says he was assigned to plead on the poet's behalf, as in a court (10-15); he confirms rumors that our poet "contaminated" many plays (16-21) and leaves unanswered the charges that the poet's friends are helping him in his career (22-26). After a short plea for fair hearing, he disparages the rival poet and promises our poet's retribution (26-34). He announces the sedated tone of the play and lists stock characters (35-40): acting rowdy characters is laborious for the old actor, who needs an attentive audience to ease some of that labor (41-45); the *oratio* in this play is "pure;" the speaker is able to perform both kinds of action (46-47); the audience should make an *exemplum* of him (51-2).

It is fair to consider if the seemingly rambling assemblage might be deliberate, if only because almost all these topics are regular components of Terence's prologues. In the following pages I demonstrate that on closer inspection a thematic thread emerges: a dichotomy between

[1] Brown 2006: 316.

appearance and substance, image and reality, form and content. I refer to it as the "ontological" controversy. This idea in my view ties numerous otherwise unrelated passages into a coherent poetic program (sect. 1-4). Perhaps most significantly, the ontological model solves the puzzling reference to the *duplex comoedia* (sect. 5). In the next chapter I investigate how this duplicity informs our understanding of the play, primarily through the figures of two female characters, Antiphila and Bacchis, and conversely, how these two characters articulate the poetic program of the prologue.

6.1. Binary authorship

In lines 7-9 the speaker omits naming the authors of the Greek model and its Latin adaptation:

> *nunc qui scripserit*
> *et quoia Graeca sit, ni partem maxumam*
> *existumarem scire vostrum, id dicerem.*
>
> Now, who wrote it
> and whose is the Greek, if I didn't estimate the vast majority
> of you knew already, I would say it.

The lines are often taken at face value, sometimes as a proof that this information was publicly posted in advance.[2] Even if so, this passage is hardly evidence of that. The speaker can do no more than *estimate* that *only a part* of the audience is informed, and he needs to spell out the title (5).[3] Like Plautus, Terence names Greek playwrights only sometimes (*An.* 9; *Eu.* 20, 30; *Ad.* 6); the inconsistency indicates that when he does name them, his purpose is not the mundane one of

[2] The literal reading of Brothers 1988: 162, ad 7, leads to an improbable conclusion: "It seems that this information, and the fact that the original was by Menander, was already known, perhaps through notices posted by the aediles .... By contrast, some of Plautus' prologues imply that *the audience did not know the author's name, nor who had written the original, nor even the title of the play*" (emphasis mine). Cf. Barsby 2001: 181, ad loc.

[3] Brown 2006: 316, ad 7: "it is curious that Terence withholds this information on the grounds that *most* of his audience know it, rather than enlightening the rest" (original emphasis). Cf. Lefèvre 2013: 244: "...Greek title ("Self-Tormentor"), which was only comprehensible to experts."

supplying basic information.[4] The omission in *HT* is so gratuitous and emphatic that it makes clear that Terence is deliberately avoiding revealing the authors.

The exact formulation, I argue, raises the ontological question by positing a distinction between *two kinds* of authorship, who wrote the play and to whom it belongs; we have seen a similar controversy between "owners" and "custodians" of plays in the *Eunuchus*.[5] If the "writer" is Terence and the "owner" is the author of the Greek original (*quoia*: cf. genitives *Menandri*, *Eu*. 9, 20, 30) the ontological divide operates metapoetically across generations. The older Greek poet owns the "substance," while the younger Roman adapter produces a version, a "presentation" of the Greek substance.[6] Yet, logical though this should be, Terence acknowledges his junior status disingenuously, precisely to obliterate the chronology. In lines 7-9 the generations are subtly blurred by receiving equal treatment. The speaker withholds from the audience the names of both their Roman contemporary and the name of an at least a century-old Greek playwright, which would have been arguably much more obscure. Identities of Terence and of his Greek predecessor are peculiarly presented as one and the same piece of information (*id*, 9). Terence's presentation is in some way on par with the Greek substance.

[4] Apostrophizing "wise spectators" is a stock component of Old Comedy parabases: Revermann 2006.
[5] See esp. Chapter 4.3.
[6] The age element in lines 4-9 is noteworthy because the speaker interrupts the announced sequence of exposition`, that he will first explain the anomaly of old man playing young and then "why he came" (*id primum dicam, deinde quod veni eloquar*, 3). A. J. Brothers interprets this as a necessary compromise: "before doing either, the speaker gives, almost in parentheses as the recapitulation of 10 shows, the essential facts concerning the origin of the play (4-9). *These can appear nowhere else*, since if inserted in the prologue they would interrupt the argument, and if put at the end they would spoil the effect of the speaker's plea. Once these essentials have been dealt with, the plan set out here is faithfully carried out; there is thus no need to transpose large sections of the prologue, as did some earlier editors in attempts to avoid a *seeming* inconsistency" (1988: 161, ad 3; emphases mine; for editorial interventions, see e.g. Dziatzko 1884: xxii-xxiii). Brothers' rationalization is worth reviewing because once it is disproved in detail one can only conclude that the design is deliberate: 1) the inconsistency is not "seeming" when the speaker insists on the order of exposition from which he deviates; 2) the *Hecyra* prologue and many Plautine examples attest that information about Greek models was optional; 3) the "essential facts" of 7-9, we have seen, are too uninformative to be worth a disruption or even including at all, if informing was the goal; 4) it cannot be said that the plan is "faithfully carried out" afterwards, since at 11 the speaker explains he is assigned to speak on the poet's behalf (*oratorem voluit esse me*; more below), but does not address the age issue; instead he replies to accusations without interruption until 34, when he mentions the old age issue again but without answering his own initial question. The easiest solution, therefore, would be that the old-vs.-young-motif has been alluded to when it was said it would be explained, i.e. that is somehow written into lines 4-9.

Terence thus at the same time separates and conflates a play's appearance and its substance. This move is visible in all the passages discussed below.

6.2. Two-tiered delivery

Ontology of the script of the play next manifests as assessing authorial agency. The problem of "binary authorship" continues as the speaker separates layers of his speech, the content and the appearance (10-15):

> *nunc quam ob rem has partis didicerim paucis dabo.*
> *oratorem esse voluit me, non prologum:*
> *vostrum iudicium fecit; me actorem dedit.*
> *sed hic actor tantum poterit a facundia*
> *quantum ille potuit cogitare commode*
> *qui orationem hanc scripsit quam dicturu' sum.*
>
> Now why I learned this role, I'll briefly explain.
> He wanted me to be an advocate, not a prologue-speaker:
> he made you into a court and turned me into the *actor*.
> But this *actor* can only achieve so much by eloquence
> as much as he was able to devise it adequately,
> he who wrote this speech that I'm about to deliver.

The arrangement is straightforward: the *oratio*, the script, functions as substance, and rhetorical skill (*facundia*) as presentation. The thought that the success of delivery of a script depends on that script, or that appearance of anything depends on the content, has perhaps all the logic it needs. But the relation between the two, and between the two persons in charge of them, is much more complex, for they are distinguished only to be merged.

Several verbal maneuvers confound the issue of who is responsible for what. There is a paradox of agency if *qui orationem hanc <u>scripsit</u>* (15) is read against the "writer" of the play, *qui <u>scripserit</u>* (7). In both cases "*who* wrote it" is the Roman poet, Terence, but *what* is written is conceivably the opposite. In 15 it is the "written substance," the script that needs to be learned

(*didicerim*, 10) and presented; but in 7 it is the adaptation of a play, that is, the presentation of substance that belongs to someone else (*quoia*).

Likewise paradoxical in terms of agency is the nature of this mediation itself. If the speaker's delivery can only be as good as the content, then this representative is the author's mouthpiece and the mediation is just an embellishing outer layer. The represented poet only pretends to entrust responsibility to the representing speaker, and the representative pretends to assume it. It comes thus as no surprise that this is the only Terentian prologue speaker who explicitly says what should go without saying: that the speech he is delivering is written by the poet.[7] But now this seemingly gratuitous reference to the poet as the scriptwriter calls attention to the ambiguity of the word *actor*, a theatrical performer and a court pleader. The difference is crucial: the former delivers a speech written for him, the latter delivers the speech he wrote himself.[8] Moreover, in the passage above the role that is written for the theatrical *actor* to learn and deliver is precisely the role of a forensic *actor* who performs his own speech.[9] What we see here, therefore, is not just outsourced ventriloquism but—correspondingly—a memorized role of a creative *orator*. This paradox distinguishes between the underlying text and the presented text

[7] Despite this statement, Gratwick 2014: 158, fn. 14 speculates that all of Terence's prologues are actually written by Terence's producer or actor believed to be delivering this (and the *Hecyra*) prologue, identified in the didascalia as Ambivius Turpio: "for the 'Asianic' rhetoric of these pieces is so unlike the generally unobtrusive 'Atticist' style of the plays." Gratwick denies Terence the ability of writing in different styles—the ability which may be precisely hinted at in *HT* 46-7. Gilula 1989: 98 reasons well: "cf. *cogitare* to invent, [*HT*] 14. The actors do not invent, cf. Varro *LL* 6.58."

[8] On this ambiguity in sources from the classical period see Fantham 2002; in relation to the present discussion, see esp. 363: "[T]he speaker [of a forensic or a public speech] was an *actor* no less than the stage performer of comedy and tragedy to whom the word was more often applied. Yet it is sometimes difficult to determine which sense of *actor* or *agere* is intended. The orator is an *actor* both because he pleads his case (*causam agit*), and because he enacts the speech he has (normally) himself composed." For more on oratory and acting, see Bexley 2013.

[9] Cf. Gilula 1989: 100, 105, who analyzes how Terence wrote the speaker into his own character: "Unlike the deliverer (or deliverers) of these prologues [sc. *Ph., Eu., An.*], Terence gave Ambivius Turpio a biographical past with a distinctive personality. He wrote two prologues for him in which he appears as himself and as himself acting the part of Terence's pleader." Although I have some reservations about the specific identity of the speaker, Gilula's analysis is characteristically insightful.

only to confuse them. Central to the program of the *HT* prologue, therefore, is the uncertainty as to whether a text can and should be ontologically stratified.

A related extraordinary feature is the prologue's ontological self-presentation: the poet wanted him "to be an advocate, *not* a prologue-speaker" (11). Since all of Terence's prologues sound like court addresses, every *prologus* is more or less explicitly an *orator*.[10] To say that this speaker is not an advocate *prologue* but an *advocate* prologue amounts to separating the two otherwise inseparable functions of the prologue. While one might perhaps intuitively think that Terence's prologues are "essentially" audience addresses merely formatted as forensic orations, the *Hecyra* prologue, for example, says the opposite: "I have come to you as an *orator* in the guise of the *prologus*" (*orator ad vos venio ornatu prologi*, 9); that prologue, then, is "essentially" a forensic speech merely "appearing" as a component of drama. Since this ontological division is a dynamic relation that Terence adjusts according to his purposes, it is beside the point to try to map it permanently. What matters is that in the *HT* the *prologus*-part seems to be excluded at the expense of the advocate-part.

This is programmatic in two mutually complementary ways. First, dramatic prologues and forensic speeches take opposite approaches to content and presentation. The duty of a *prologus* is, ideally, to disclose some useful information;[11] the *orator*'s job is, on the contrary, to

[10] The *HT* prologue is packed with forensic language, e.g. *orationem*, 15; *arbitrium*, 25; *vos oratos volo*, 26; *peccatis*, 33; *maledictis*, 35; *causa... causam iustam*, 41. For oratorical elements in Terence's prologues, see examples in Victor 2012: 671-4, with further references, fn. 1-7, 9; Manuwald 2013, with bibliography at 287, fn. 30-33.

[11] Plautine prologues often enough postpone and avoid informing the audience (Sharrock 2009: 22-63). The strictly expository comic prologue is thus surely a mythical creature yet regular subversion of the convention indicates its honorary status. In the prologue of his first play, the *Andria* (5-7) Terence says he is criticized for using prologues for polemical purposes instead of "narrating the plot" (*argumentum narret*, 7); Gowers 2004: 151-2 demonstrates that narrating is exactly what he is doing; similarly, Germany 2013. Cases like Pl. *Mer*. 1-3, where the prologue speaker emphasizes that he is both a prologue and a character, show that it is risky to study prologues and play separately; so also Williams1956 ("futility of isolated consideration of the prologues"), criticizing Abel 1955. See a useful recent discussion of comic prologues by Dunsch 2014.

manipulate all information.[12] The former narrates the *argumentum*, "plot" or "backstory," as part of the script he learned, while the latter *makes* his own *argumentum*, "case."[13] Removing the prologus means that no objective information about the play's backstory will be delivered, everything will be a narrative construct. Second, by insisting on the exclusivity of manipulative forensic oratory, the prologue speaker is already practicing it. He is testing the deceptiveness of appearance and limits of perception, as he claims that he is *not* what he appears to be, a prologue speaker.[14]

6.3. Authorial input: crowdsourcing and outsourcing

The idea of unreliable appearance dominates the controversy around authorial input in lines 16-26. Appropriately, the operating mode is rumor, an attractive verbal surface that may lack substance in reality. What is more, rumor as a medium here addresses the ontological controversy from both sides: the first accusation is called "rumor" but is true; the second one, on the contrary, is not referred to as "rumor" but is treated as an inherently improvable gossip.

The first charge of the poet's opponents is that he "contaminated" many Greek plays while producing few Latin ones (*nam quod rumores distulerunt malevoli | multas contaminasse Graecas, dum facit | paucas Latinas*, 16-18). At first sight one indeed gets the impression that this accusation "probably had no relevance to this particular play."[15] But it does highlight two layers of Terence's literary output: a heterogeneous foundation that lies beneath the unified surface. These "rumors" turn out to have all the substance there is; not only does our poet not

[12] Cf. Fantham 2002: 363: "Our own experience tells us that public speakers often distort the facts. The court defender often has to disguise the truth on behalf of his client."
[13] I continue the detailed analysis of this ambiguity of *argumentum* below, 6.5.
[14] Cf. the trend described by Manuwald 2013: 281: "The notion that the skills of using language and the theoretical awareness thereof had developed by Ennius' time agrees with his own self-confident assessment of his literary position, as he distinguishes his poetry from that of earlier *Fauni vatesque* and calls himself the first *dicti studiosus* in his epic *Annales* (Enn. *Ann*. 206–7, 208–9 Sk.)."
[15] Brown 2006: 316, ad 17-20.

deny anything, he does not even regret it and promises to do it again (19). Suitably, the justification that is offered likewise distances the poet from immediate agency and distributes responsibility elsewhere: he is following "the *exemplum* of the good" and deems himself entitled to do what they did (*habet bonorum exemplum quo exemplo sibi | licere facere quod illi fecerunt putat*, 20-1). Questioning direct poetic agency is explicit in the second accusation (22-6):

> *tum quod malevolu' vetu' poeta dictitat*
> *repente ad studium hunc se adplicasse musicum,*
> *amicum ingenio fretum, haud natura sua:*
> *arbitrium vostrum, vostra existumatio*
> *valebit.*
>
> And as for the malevolent old poet who keeps saying
> that he [our poet] joined the pursuit of poetry suddenly,
> relying on his friends' *ingenium*, not his own *natura*:
> your verdict, your estimate,
> will prevail.

The success of the young upstart poet is a facade, but it is unspecified what kind of assistance lies behind it. This vagueness stands in contrast to the explicit charges of collaboration in the *Adelphoe* prologue (*dicunt malevoli, homines nobilis | hunc adiutare adsidueque una scribere*, *Ad*. 15-16).[16] In the lack of precise details, one can plausibly deduce that help which a cheating poet can get from friends ultimately comes down to only two kinds: ghostwriting and lobbying, i.e. help with producing the substance and help with promoting it. Not specifying which of the two is meant is fitting for the ontological controversy.

[16] Combined with anecdotal material in Suetonian biography these accusations have often been seriously considered; see a recent summary in Hanchey 2013: 126-9. One should keep in mind that such charges are a polemical cliché from fifth-century Greek drama: Sidwell 1993 ("part of an elaborate series of jokes"); Halliwell 1989, arguing ultimately that some of them might be true, notes that "[g]ibes and counter-gibes of collaboration, plagiarism and the like, had by this date [i.e. the last third of the fifth century]... become a stock comic *topos*—a recurrent motif in the twin techniques of self-promotion and denigration of others that played an explicit part in the rivalry of comic poets competing for public prizes" (519); lists including references to both tragic and comic playwrights in Halliwell 1989: 517-19, Lefkowitz 2012: 105.

The terminology contributes to the controversy. Whereas the poet's *natura* should be the stronghold of his independence from external inputs and reliance on his inner abilities,[17] the only other instance of the word in the play suggests the exact opposite. The *senex* Menedemus pinpoints a very prominent motif in the play: that the "nature of all humans is arranged in such a way that they observe and settle other people's issues better than their own" (*ita conparatam esse hominum naturam omnium | aliena ut meliu' videant et diiudicent | quam sua*, 503-5).[18] According to this view human *natura* is a centrifugal instinct of reaching out towards *aliena* instead of dealing with one's own. Thus the poet's independent authorial agency is no less in question even if the charges are false and he is relying on "his own *natura*." Most tellingly, this is to be decided by the audience, and so by two potentially distinct kinds of judgment: *arbitrium vostrum, vostra existumatio* (25). While *arbitrium* is a "decision" broadly, the *existumatio* is a more subjective "evaluation," an impression made by one's personal reputation, which "in a society like Rome... counted for a great deal;" public opinion based on *existumatio* could have played a significant role in Roman litigation.[19] Thus what will determine the true essence and ownership of the *HT* is how the play and its poet *appear* to the public.

In granting the audience discretion in deciding by observation nothing less than the issue of authorship, Terence highlights the relativity of defining the play's essence. Moreover, he activates the forensic trick of reciprocal *existumatio*. Namely, one could hope for a more favorable verdict if the jury members are praised for *their* esteem (*existimatio*) and told with

[17] The juxtaposition of talent and craft, inborn and external embellishment, is a well-known feature of ancient literary criticism, but the terminology is not fixed; cf. Ov. *Trist*. 2.1.424: *Ennius ingenio maximus, arte rudis*.
[18] For the *senex* Chremes, the notorious busybody, see e.g. Jocelyn 1972, Karakasis 1999, Henderson 2004.
[19] Kelly 1966: 21, with fn. 1, citing Cicero's *Pro Quinctio* featuring "rhetorical equation of one's good name with life itself." Yavetz 1974: 37-40 discusses some of the factors which affected *existimatio* in Late republic, pointing out that the term is "generally of neutral connotation from a moral point of view" and that "from a social and political point of view" it is "best translated as one's standing in society" (39); cf. *OLD* s.v. *existimatio* 2-3.

what interest their decision is awaited.[20] As if following this advice, the *HT* prologue speaker flatteringly "estimates" (*existumarem*, 9) that most of the audience are already well-informed about the writer and the owner of the play. After all, *vostra existumatio* (25) can equally mean "your reputation" (cf. *tuam existimationem*, Cic. *Fam*. 5.20.1, 13.73.2.). For Terence, therefore, *existumatio* is an ad hoc specialized term for both possessing and assessing literary competence. As Thomas Habinek put it, "the playwright and the audience constitute a mutual admiration society, or artistic economy, exchanging positive evaluation for positive evaluation."[21]

6.4. Measuring ontology

In investigating socio-cultural and political implications of *existimatio* in early Latin sources, Habinek pays due attention to its quantitative and monetary origin. He detects, for example, in the preface to Cato's *De agricultura* a moment of transition from the literal to the metaphorical meaning of *existimare*, and interprets it as "surface tensions produced by a deeper cultural anxiety over value... Cato assigns to the inevitably controversial and ambiguous determination of a man's worth the simplicity of an economic calculation."[22] Related and equally significant, I suggest, are the *literary* ramifications of converting quality into quantity in the *HT* prologue. Relations between plays, playwrights and audience are frequently quantified. In the next chapter we shall examine closely how truthfulness and moral essence of the female characters in the play are quantified.

[20] *Rhet. Her*. 1.5.8: …*si quae de iis existimatio, quae iudicii expectatio sit aperiemus*; Yavetz 1974: 37.
[21] Habinek 1998: 55; compare his earlier remark (52) on interpreting reputation in funerary inscriptions: "the reader is instrumental in the validation of th[e] tradition." See also an interesting discussion of Greek poetry by Von Reden 1995, who argues that quantifying poetry as currency aims at measuring the truth of narrative.
[22] Habinek 1998: 48, 49. For a similar approach to value in Menander, see Von Reden 1998, who discusses among other things "the "tension... between... the type of value (price) of things that can be purchased and the (indeterminate) type of value of civic symbols" (261). More on moral "evaluation" in the *HT*, below, Chapter 7.

Meanwhile, a quick survey of the prologue shows that quantity is the defining criterion for the ontological controversy. An "estimated great majority" of the audience surely knows the writer and the owner of this play (*partem maxumam* | *existumarem scire*, 8-9). The ability of the presenter to make the desired impression is only measurable against the script he is delivering (*tantum poterit... quantum ille potuit...*, 13-14). It is a topic of many "distributed rumors" that when Terence adapts Greek plays it results in extreme quantitative disproportion (*rumores distulerunt malevoli* | *multas contaminasse Graecas, dum facit* | *paucas Latinas*, 16-18).[23] Depending on the audience's *existumatio* Terence's plays may be attributed to him alone or his plural friends (24-5). The impacts of competing verdicts on this issue are as if placed on a scale (*ne plus iniquom possit quam aequom oratio*, 26-7, echoing *tantum poterit... orationem*, 13-15). The poet's artistic integrity is proven by the "abundant supply" of new plays, in return for which he should be "supplied a chance to grow" (*date crescendi copiam* | *novarum qui spectandi faciunt copiam*, 28-9). Prospective conflict with the rival is imaged as counting points: our poet will have "much more" to say when he goes on to "give" new ones, unless the rival sets "a limit" to his badmouthing (*de illius peccatis plura dicet quom dabit* | *alias novas, nisi finem maledictis facit*, 33-4).[24]

The *senex*-speaker ends by quantifying his ability to play the assigned role. He asks to be allowed to play a "low-motion" play in silence (*statariam agere ut liceat per silentium*, 36). For

[23] By contrast, numbers of plays were not the issue in the comparable reference to *contaminatio* in the *Andria* prologue (*contaminari non decere fabulas*, *An*. 16). In the *HT* it is further suggestive that in imitating best practices of good poets Terence invokes them as an *exemplum* (20), a standardized measure, according to the attractive model of Habinek 1998: 46, 57, developed from Festus' etymology: "An *exemplum* is something "taken out of" (*eximo*) a group in order to serve as a standard by which other instances of the type can be evaluated (*existimare*). ... The words [*exemplum* and *existimare*] fit into the same semantic field; if one is to conduct an evaluation, a standard is a necessity." By way of comparison, when referring to other poets in the *Andria* and the *Eunuchus* prologue Terence does not use *exemplum*, nor is the word attested in any other prologue.

[24] The comparable passage in *Eu.* 17-19, for example, features neither "increase" nor "limit": *habeo alia multa quae nunc condonabitur,* | *quae proferentur post si perget laedere* | *ita ut facere instituit*. "Limit" in *Ph*. 22-23 seems appropriate to the prominent idea of "rationing" in that prologue: cf. Gowers 2004: 158.

three lines he lists the stock roles, such as the running slave and *senex iratus* (37-9), but postpones the reason why he finds them difficult: it is the amount of resources required for acting them, the "highest volume and greatest labor" (*clamore summo, cum labore maxumo*, 40). He does not mind the essence of these roles, he minds performing them in an extreme manner. The audience should help him by "diminishing a part" of his labor, since writers of new plays don't "spare the *senex* one bit" (*ut aliqua pars labori' minuatur mihi.* | *nam nunc novas qui scribunt nil parcunt seni*, 42-3). It is as if one can calculate the gap between performed role and the person behind it.

6.5. Duplicity of performance

In every possible context, therefore, the relation between the apparent and the underlying is quantified. This image of "measuring reality," I argue, sheds light on the notoriously problematic, hence programmatic, passage of the prologue (4-6):

> *ex integra Graeca integram comoediam*
> *hodie sum acturus H[e]auton timorumenon,*
> *duplex quae ex argumento facta est simplici.*
>
> An integral comedy from an integral Greek
> I'm going to act today, the *Self-Tormentor*,
> which is made double from a simple *argumentum*.

The exact nature of this duplication is one of the notorious cruces of Terentian studies.[25] Before offering my own solution, I argue for a metapoetic effect of these lines, which I believe helps streamline the debate. The *HT* is one of five Terence's "double-plot" plays—two families, two love affairs, and so on—but only in this one he emphasizes the *procedure* of doubling. He tightens the relation between the prologue and the play by highlighting the obvious: that the

[25] Dunsch 1999 provides an inconclusive but extensive and well documented reassessment of the problem and doxographical survey.

doubleness in the characters' fictional world is produced by a certain manufactural "duplication." This means that the doubleness in the *HT* is not the same as in his other plays; in fact no line of interpretation that assumes that it is has proven satisfactory.[26] This passage, after all, does not refer to composing a double "plot," but a double *play* (*quae... facta est* [sc. *fabula*], 6).

Likewise, it is hard not to see in the mention of *simplex/duplex/integra* an allusion to using multiple Greek models; crowdsourcing is the hallmark of Terence's his prologues, including this one (*multas contaminasse*, 17; *An.* 9-16, *Eu.* 25-34, *Ad*. 6-14). But the whole point of *HT* 4-6 is that Terence enters *another* variable in the equation. This play is "integrally integral" and its *argumentum* is originally *simplex*, but now something else is double. There might perhaps be ways of reconciling "one-from-one" and "double-from-simple," but the fact that such confusion within three lines is even possible shows that it must be intended. In other words, the *HT* is neither "double-plotted" like the *Adelphoe*, nor made of two models like the *Andria*: it is clear that the duplicity of this play lies elsewhere.[27]

One possibility has not yet been considered. An important manifestation of any play's duplicity is the distinction that Dwora Gilula made for Terence; she points out that "dramatic stage plot... namely, the words and deeds of the characters who enact before the audience the

[26] One way of reading line 6 is that to the originally simple "plot" (*argumentum*) Terence added something that may represent "another half." Yet the two plotlines created by the parallel sets of characters are so closely intertwined as to suggest a more coherent design than the one achievable by adaptation; so rightly e.g. Richardson 2006: 14; Brothers 1980: 96, 108ff.; after all, the basic layout of two neighboring households is found in Menander's original (frg. 77 KA corresponding to *HT* 61-4). Alternatively, if Terence's interventions into the preexisting twin arrangement are minor (Brothers and Richardson suggest extending the role Bacchis), it is a long way from that to referring to the whole play as "duplicated." Second, if Terence made any changes whatsoever, it is strange that he chooses to emphasize that this is an "integral," lit. "untouched," play from a likewise "integral" Greek model. If nothing else, it remains puzzling why both the Greek and the Latin play are *integra*. Goldberg 1986: 135-6 takes *integra* to mean a Greek play previously unadapted in Latin (as it seems to mean in *Ad.* 9-11) but Slater 1993: 91 rightly comments that "[i]f it means only that, the repetition of *integram* is an empty pleonasm."

[27] Already Leo 1898: 22-3 notices the emphatic juxtaposition of *duplex* and *simplex*, though his explanation of it cannot stand: that Terence emphasized that the *HT* is based on one model (with *simplici* being used instead of *uno*, "*figurae causa*") even though it is "double-plotted," so as to preempt accusations of contamination. Brothers 1980: 10 rightly wonders: "Why does he run the risk of being misinterpreted?" Indeed, if anything, Terence proudly confesses it and promises to do it again (17-19).

actual stage events" need not necessarily coincide with the "story of a play," a narrative summary aimed at "extrapolating" the plot; offstage events narrated by characters onstage are "incorporated into the present tense stage event, but with a *different mode of existence*."[28] For the present discussion, it is useful to clarify her terminology and refer to her former category of "dramatic stage plot" as "stage action," and reserve the "plot" for extrapolated narrative summary, which she calls "story" (the term can be misleading so it is probably best avoided). This disambiguation is useful in addressing the Latin term for "plot," *argumentum*, as explained by Boris Dunsch. From numerous instances in Plautus and Terence he deduces that

> *argumentum* cannot be understood to refer to what is actually happening on stage (i.e., the enacted *comoedia*). ... *argumentum* was seen as a separate narrative in its own right that can be abstracted from the actual play as a 'plot.' Whereas, therefore, the word is used to refer to the (material) *substance* and often also the back of a play, it does not directly refer to its structure.[29]

Given the prologue's focus on the complex relation between the underlying and the apparent elaborated above, this notion of two "different modes of existence" within a dramatic text, I suggest, solves the *duplex comoedia* puzzle. The duplicity means two dimensions of representation: everything that is imagined as taking place during a play, an underlying "substance," as opposed to everything that is presented on stage, its outer appearance. Stratifying a play into these two ontological levels is arguably the easiest way to account for dramaturgic duplicity and some sort of simplicity at the same time. This division, after all, is important for

[28] Gilula 1991: 83-4, emphasis mine; ironically for the purposes of the present discussion, she insists on this distinction precisely to demonstrate stronger formal symmetry; namely, some critics observed that not all plays of Terence are really "double-plotted" because, for example, two love affairs are not equally developed; but, she proposes, the seemingly underdeveloped half grows once we include offstage events related to it. Cf. also a useful discussion in Gilula 2007, esp. 207-9, 213-15, citing Hor. *Ars* 179, "The events are either enacted on stage or described as having occurred" (*aut agitur res in scaenis aut acta refertur*).

[29] Dunsch 1999: 111-12, emphasis mine. Cf. an interesting ambiguity of *argumentum* in Pl. *Men*. 5, 11-16 (textual difficulties notwithstanding: Gratwick 1993: 135-6).

interpreting drama as such, for otherwise we are left with a vague idea of "plot."[30] In the *HT* prologue, therefore, Terence is activating the inherent duplicity of theatrical performance to address the tension between reality and appearance. Since dramaturgic *argumentum* is a separate narrative, extrapolated from stage action, one can say that what duplicates any *simplex argumentum* is the performance itself.

Essential in this model of "performative ontology" is the imagery of court oratory in the prologue. Terence fleshes out the duplicitous deceptiveness of performance by playing with the theatrical and forensic meanings of *actor* and *argumentum*. Side by side with dramaturgic *argumentum* as described by Gilula and Dunsch, there is the rhetorical kind of *argumentum*, or "making a case" by means of evidence or inferences; Cicero defines it as "a probable invention for producing credibility" (*probabile inventum ad faciendam fidem*, *Part. Or.* 5.12).[31] When *argumentum* refers not to the structure of argument as a whole but to individual elements of argumentation it conspicuously hovers between meaning on one hand solid evidence, and alleged grounds or merely plausible indication.[32] Thus one broad definition that might ultimately capture both the theatrical and the forensic *argumentum* is "one version of reality."

Here the *actor* is instrumental. As I have mentioned above, a forensic *actor* is expected to construe, tendentiously, his own *argumentum*, while the *actor* as a dramatic *prologus* is expected to deliver, objectively, a memorized *argumentum*. Terence uses the same word for both because "objective" delivery of a theatrical script is just as deceptive as a forensic address. The dramaturgic *argumentum*, by virtue of its "different mode of existence" from the stage action,

[30] See the cautionary remarks of Lowe 2004: ix, 4: "For many theorists a suspect term, worryingly slippery to define... Much of the answer must lie in its very ease of use. 'Plot' is a vernacular term, and as such not only resists formal definition, but is in a way designed to substitute for it. We use the word to talk about a variety of things we recognise in the way stories are put together, and the way they affect us."

[31] For Lucretius it is evidence gathered for proving a point (*commemorando argumenta fidem dictis conradere*, 1.401); in Christian context faith is the *argumentum* of invisible things (*fides... argumentum non apparentium*, Vulg. Heb. 11:1).

[32] For this range of meanings, see e.g. *OLD* s.v. 1-2.

becomes subject to manipulative presentation that is characteristic of a forensic *argumentum*. Both *actores* unpack the *presumed* simplicity of a *simplex argumentum* by "enacting it" in their respective domains (*acturus*, 5).[33] When the tendentious *orator* takes over and excludes the informative prologue (*oratorem esse voluit me, non prologum*, 11)—but the noun *actor* is retained for both—the message is that the only way factual information can surface is through manipulative presentation.[34] The allegedly informative prologue, therefore, is already a part of the play's performance. The circumstances of the play's production that he speaks of constitute the program for approaching the duplicity of the play.

To conclude, dramaturgic *argumentum* exists only as an arbitrary and hypothetical reconstruction of what might be happening besides what is presented. There is no factual counterpart to stage presentation because from what is performed it is impossible to extrapolate objectively "what actually happens." One need only remember that no two viewers or readers could ever come up with identical plot summaries of a play. This transition from *simplex* to *duplex*, "single-layered" to "double-layered," resonates with the imagery used in the prologue to describe writing comedy. Our poet joined poetic profession, *se applicasse* (23); the image is of "applying" an embellishing coating (*-plex, -plic-*) of stage performance—deceptive by definition—onto an underlying raw material.[35] Literary representation is inherently duplicitous, and an unequivocal, *simplex argumentum* does not exist.

Briefly put, programmatic for the *HT* is the notion that appearance is an unreliable indication of essence but that it is all that will ever be given. Terence thereby in effect turns the tables. Once performance is all that is left, it can no longer be understood as "deceptive:" simply,

[33] *OLD* s.v. *ago* 25-26 (theatrical), 40-44 (oratorical-forensic).
[34] Cf. Henderson 2004: 57, regarding *facundia* and *oratio* (13-15): "[g]etting the ideas across depends on delivery—and on receptivity. That is, we would do well to apply the thinking flashed up here when we come to decide what to make of *HT*... Whatever gets said, wonder what is meant."
[35] The verb *applicare* resurfaces in an important moment in the play: see Chapter 7.5.

it is what it is. It is not theatrical representation that is the problem, it is the (un-)reality behind it. In the next chapter we explore how this principle helps interpret the dramaturgy of female roles in the play, and how their characters materialize these programmatic concerns.

Chapter 7

Donna e mobile: ontological duplicity of the *Self-Tormentor*

> *flete meos casus—tristes rediere tabellae*
> *infelix hodie littera posse negat.*
> ...
> *ergo ego uos rebus duplices pro nomine sensi:*
> *auspicii numerus non erat ipse boni.*
>
> Weep for my misfortune: my miserable tablets have returned
> sadly reporting that she is not available today.
> ...
> I realized you are two-faced in deed, as befits your name;
> your very number was not a good sign.
>
> — Ovid, *Amores* 1.12.1-2, 27-8

In the following chapter we look into how the ontological controversy informs and is informed by the portrayal of female characters, the *meretrix* Bacchis and the unclassifiable Antiphila. Terence problematizes all components of the latter's identity: her civic status, social role, comic type. Similarly to the metapoetic roles of Thais and Pamphila in the *Eunuchus*, in the *HT* Terence materializes the program by juxtaposing the two girls, around whom the entire play ultimately revolves. A summary is the following.

The *senex* Menedemus opposed the love affair between his son Clinia and a poor foreigner, Antiphila. He eventually shamed Clinia into leaving home to serve as a mercenary, but now regrets and wants him back; out of guilt, Menedemus punishes himself with near-poverty and farm labor. This is the backstory that Menedemus narrates to his busybody neighbor, the *senex* Chremes, who reproaches him for his sternness and decides to interfere. Chremes, it turns out, is unaware that meanwhile his own son Clitipho, a friend of Clinia, has an affair with an expensive prostitute Bacchis. From Clitipho Chremes hears that Clinia has secretly returned. Chremes commissions his slave Syrus to find a way to help Clinia without him knowing that the

help comes from his now-lenient father, who would thus not compromise paternal authority. Clinia upon his arrival sends his slave Dromo to bring Antiphila. He fears she has become promiscuous in his absence, but Clitipho's slave Syrus, who joined the task, convinces Clinia that Antiphila is still as poor and loyal as before. Along with Antiphila Syrus summons Bacchis to act as Clinia's girlfriend and disguises Antiphila as her servant; only later we learn that he planned to trick Chremes that Antiphila had been given as deposit for a debt to Bacchis and needs to be redeemed. After a dizzying series of misunderstandings and aborted plans, Syrus fools Chremes into paying Bacchis. Chremes realizes too late that it was his own son who was in love with a *meretrix* all along, and threatens to disinherit him. Antiphila is discovered to be Chremes' daughter and is engaged to Clinia; Clitipho leaves Bacchis and is allotted another bride.

Everything depends on the two girls: all the trickery aims at covering up the love affairs and providing money for Bacchis, and the moral focus is on the conflict between fathers and sons, cause of which is the sons' choice of female companions. More specifically, everything depends on how the girls are perceived.

7.1. Misrepresentations and misperceptions

The play begins and ends with Menedemus and Chremes protesting that Antiphila and Bacchis are unsuitable for legitimate spouses (96-114 and 1056-66 respectively). Both girls are equally unable to perform the required social role but for different reasons—Antiphila is a foreigner, Bacchis is a *meretrix*—and their ineligibility will be remediated by different means: Antiphila will be discovered to be a citizen, while Bacchis will need to be replaced. But precisely in highlighting the contrast between them, the ring composition inevitably compares them. Most

importantly, throughout most of the play the two relationships leave opposite impressions, with crucial impact on the action. Menedemus initially saw Clinia as an irresponsible comic *adulescens* but Antiphila is actually a citizen. Clitipho is implicitly considered a decent young man, although involved with a *meretrix*. This central irony of the play is a result of misperception. Antiphila's uncertain civic status is complicated (only partly, as we shall see) by a routine recognition plot, while Bacchis' affair with Clitipho is kept secret. Out of these elementary dramaturgic devices Terence develops the programmatic structure concerned with what is presented as opposed to what is actually there.

We spot some programmatic red flags. One is when Clitipho, like many a comic *adulescens*, begs his slave Syrus to help him in his amorous escapades: "Syrus, I entrust to you myself, my love affair, and my *reputation*. You are the judge; make sure not to become a defendant" (*immo, Syre, | et me et meum amorem et famam permitto tibi. | tu es iudex: nequid accusandu' sis vide*, 350-2). Forensic imagery casts Syrus into the role of the prologue *orator*. His role is likewise to ensure not only his patron's success, but also his public image.

Another signpost is Chremes' suggestive misdiagnosis of the troubled relationship between Menedemus and Clinia: "But you did not know him well enough, nor he you. And how come? When people do not live truthfully" (*verum nec tu illum sati' noveras | nec te ille; hoc qui fit? ubi non vere vivitur*, 153-4). Susan Lape offers insightful observations:

> Chremes, a compromised character, is actually wrong about the lack of truthfulness between Clinia and Menedemus—truthfulness actually led to their estrangement. Menedemus knew about Clinia's involvement with a poor foreigner and Clinia knew that his father wished him to terminate the affair [*haec clam me omnia. | ubi rem rescivi*... 98-9]. More commonly, fathers and sons hide their true feelings from each other, making them seem like strangers rather than kin. … [I]n the *Self-Tormentor* Chremes himself unfailingly advises deception rather than honesty when dealing with sons (436f., 466-68, 470-89). Instead of straightforwardly disclosing his own desires and rules to his son, he communicates them indirectly through the example of Menedemus and Clinia, a fact that

is not lost on his son (201-10, 219). He even advises his son that secrecy is best in matters of romance (574-77).[1]

Chremes ominously shoots off the mark as he inadvertently describes his own misperception of his son. This mistake of his is indeed only the tip of the iceberg. Most of the stage action consists of the two girls being misperceived, sometimes as one another.

They are disguised or more than half of the play and no one knows why. Syrus plans to present Bacchis as Clinia's girlfriend (332-3), but he says it would take too long to go into the reasons (*longumst, Clitipho, | si tibi narrem quam ob rem id faciam*, 335-6). Meanwhile Antiphila should accompany her but no one at this point knows in what capacity, or why she is to be taken to Clitipho's mother (335). Only much later, Syrus tricks Chremes into believing that Antiphila is given as a deposit for a debt to Bacchis, and that she now asks Clinia to bail the girl out (600-13). But not even then does Syrus explain the purpose of Antiphila's disguise to anyone else.

Immediately after, Clitipho's mother Sostrata comes out saying she recognized on Antiphila the ring of her long lost daughter (614-15). After Antiphila's citizenship is discovered, Clinia is ready to announce engagement with her to Menedemus, but Syrus urges him to continue the pretense until Clitipho's case is solved as well, that is, until Bacchis is paid; Menedemus should hear the truth, but Chremes, if he finds out, will not believe it (701-21). Syrus' promises to trick both old men by telling the truth (*vera dicendo ut ambos fallam*, 711). And so he does; he announces to Chremes that he will tell him the truth (*verum dico*, 766): he first tells him that Clinia told Menedemus what we know is the truth, that Bacchis is Clitipho's girl, Antiphila is

[1] Lape 2004: 42. In investigating the *duplex/simplex* prologue puzzle, Goldberg 1986: 139-144 focuses on *simplex* and argues for a teleological uniformity of the play: "The plot strips away his [i.e. Chremes'] pretense and reveals at the end what he truly is. This unmasking of Chremes creates the *argumentum simplex* of *Heauton timorumenos*. The play features a revelation of character... The various interests and intrigues have not only a common denominator but a common purpose. They move toward the same conclusion, and a single process of action resolves them" (143-4). Unmasking of a hypocritical character is very much in keeping with the program, though one still needs to explain how the play is *made* double (*facta*).

Clinia's. But Syrus tells Chremes that it is only a part of the ruse, and that he, Chremes, should not believe it (767-74). When Menedemus comes to report that it is Clitipho who has an affair with Bacchis, Chremes dissuades him: "That's what they say; and you believe it all!" (853). Shortly after, at some offstage moment, Menedemus realizes that this is the truth after all, and mocks Chremes for not believing (908). Chremes is outraged and angry with himself for failing to put two and two together: "So many clues there were for me to figure out what's really happening, if only I hadn't been such a blockhead! The things I saw!" (*quot res dedere ubi possem persentiscere, | ni essem lapis! quae vidi!* 916-17).

Bacchis' entire role, therefore, can be reduced to just one function: to keep the fathers confused as to whose girlfriend is she. Just like the play in the prologue (*qui scripserit | et quoia… sit*, 7-8), Bacchis simultaneously belongs to one man nominally, Clinia, and to the other actually, Clitipho.

7.2. Antiphila's antecedents

We now turn to the identity of Antiphila, which is complicated simultaneously with and independently of the recognition plot. She is first referred to in the opening scene. Menedemus explains to Chremes that the main reason for his conflict with his son is that Clinia treated his *amica* Antiphila "almost as a wife" (*prope iam ut pro uxore haberet: haec clam me omnia*; 98, *amicam ut habeas prope iam in uxoris loco?* 104). It is very unclear what she is—a sort of a concubine, perhaps—but she is emphatically not what she is *held as*, a wife. In other words, the moment she is introduced she embodies the gap between appearance and essence, and the essence is conspicuously unclassifiable.[2]

[2] In the next chapter I analyze her role of the "quasi-concubine" in detail.

The first next thing we hear is that her affection for Clinia might no longer be taken for granted, as it presumably used to be. Clitipho tells Chremes that Clinia has returned but secretly: "He fears everything, his father's anger and his girlfriend's feelings toward him. He loves her desperately; she is the reason for all of this mess and him leaving home" (*timet omnia, patris iram et animum amicae se erga ut sit suae. | eam misere amat; propter eam haec turba atque abitio evenit*, 189-90). Chremes leaves Clitipho alone on stage, who reveals his own affair with an expensive *meretrix* (225-7):

> *nam hic Clinia, etsi is quoque suarum rerum satagit, attamen*
> *habet bene et pudice eductam, ignaram artis meretriciae.*
> *meast potens procax magnifica sumptuosa nobilis*
>
> For Clinia here, even though he also has a lot on his plate, still
> he has a girl raised well and chastely, untrained in the trade of prostitution.
> Mine is tough, arrogant, glamorous, expensive, fancy.

Clitipho adds that his father still knows nothing about this (*neque etiamdum scit pater*, 229), just like Menedemus had been initially unaware that Clinia is seeing Antiphila (98); problems started once he had found out. Now Clinia's decision to keep his arrival a secret further reminds us that neither of these relationships would be approved by the fathers. So far, then, the two girls have more in common than not—except, that is, the contrast Clitipho stresses above. The contrast, however, is so forceful as to become immediately suspicious. One gets the impression that it is meant to preempt any possible confusion, because there could be some. Clitipho's language of quantity effectively places the girls on a measuring scale. He tells us that his own prostitute asks for a lot and holds the bar high (*magnifica sumptuosa*), only after an apologetic disclaimer that "*even though* Clinia *also* has more than his fair share of…". The record-breaking Bacchis "ranks high" only in comparison to Antiphila, who requires a lot of "resources" as well. The vague *rerum* conveniently does not specify what Clinia has to offer her: emotional security, money,

social support? Whatever it is, Antiphila's investment in relationship with him is expressed in quantity.[3]

It is noteworthy that Clitipho distinguishes her from Bacchis by glossing her as *bene et pudice educta*, a traditional Plautine formula for identifying the so-called pseudo-*meretrices*. Girls of this type are raised by a pimp or a mother-procuress but remained untouched by the profession so as to be eventually marriageable when discovered to be of citizen birth. The exact formulation is used of Selenium in the *Cistellaria* (172-3) and Planesium in the *Curculio* (518-19, 698).[4] Three implications of associating Antiphila with pseudo-*meretrices* are remarkable. First, it is programmatic, since the pseudo-*meretrix* is a role based on mismatch of essence and appearance par excellence. Second, to speak of Antiphila as a pseudo-*meretrix* only makes sense if she is somehow connected to prostitution. There is not much point in clarifying that she is "raised chastely" unless there is some suspicion that she is not.

The third implication arises from a closer look at the role in Plautus. The whole point of the pseudo-*meretrix* scenario is that girls like Selenium and Planesium stayed virgins against all odds. It is interesting to observe how so. In the *Cistellaria* these odds are not specified. Nothing of the kind is mentioned in the long opening scene (1-148) where a *lena*, a prostitute, and the pseudo-prostitute Selenium extensively discuss emotional, social, and financial aspects of prostitution. (Since this would have arguably been the perfect place to mention the circumstances, it is fairly safe to assume that they did not appear in the lost portions of the text.) Plautus does not account for the conditions from which Selenium emerged miraculously

[3] Cf. Clinia's language: uncertainty about Antiphila "increases" his anxiety (*animum exaugeant*, 232).
[4] It is also applied to the "pseudo-slave" Tyndarus in the *Captivi* (*bene pudiceque educatust usque ad adulescentiam*, 992), whom several critics indeed see as reflecting the *pseudo-meretrix* tradition: McCarthy 2000: 175, 200 (cf. 179, fn. 24), following Segal 1987: 213; Philippides 2011. Sosia in the *Amphitryon* says his tongue is "kept well and chaste" (*bene pudiceque adservatur*, 349), presumably meaning that he does not perform oral sex. There are other similar cases of girls raised chastely without the exact formula, e.g. Pamphila in the *Eunuchus* (115-17). Even when a girl is raised by a matron, as Casina in the *Casina*, the emphasis is on preserved virginity (*ea invenietur et pudica et libera*, 81).

undamaged, but takes it as a given and uses it as a means toward the happy outcome. One reason for this, I suggest, is that the pseudo-*meretrix*'s immunization against prostitution is felt to be all too implausibly convenient. Like *anagnorisis*, the uncanny preservation of virginity is a petrified convention, a dramaturgic device that must always work. Indeed the little that we do hear about how and why Planesium in the *Curculio* made it through shows that special reasons were required. The pimp Cappadox, whose illness and the play's location in the sanctuary at Epidaurus are central to the plot, is believed to have explicitly spared Planesium for the purpose of assuaging Asclepius; otherwise he would not (697-700). Precisely because the outcome is so apologetically rationalized, the *Curculio* stands out as the exception that proves the rule that the exact workings of the device are normally tucked away under a ritualized convention.

Terence's Antiphila, by contrast, is designed to unpack the implicit. A few seconds after Clitipho disclosed his affair with an expensive *meretrix*, Clinia enters the scene and explains why he is worried about Antiphila, who is running late (230-4):

> *si mihi secundae res de amore meo essent, iamdudum scio*
> *venissent; sed vereor ne mulier me absente hic corrupta sit.*
> *concurrunt multae opiniones quae mihi animum exaugeant:*
> *occasio locus aetas mater quoius sub imperiost mala,*
> *quoi nil iam praeter pretium dulcest*.
>
> If my love affair were doing well, long ago they would
> have arrived, I know. But I fear the woman has been corrupted during my absence.
> Many things come to mind that raise my temperature:
> the opportunity, the place, her age, her evil mother who controls her,
> who delights in profit more than anything.

The first thing Clinia says about his girlfriend—because of whom the whole mess began in the first place and for whom he now returns—is that something does not feel right. The bare fact that we are hearing the details shows that Terence will not just hand us the happy outcome as a matter

of course. It is helpful to try to reconstruct the hypothetical prehistory of the play regarding Antiphila.

Before Clinia left she was some sort of a mistress, whom Menedemus regards as an *amica* (104) and informs us that her mother is a poor Corinthian immigrant (*e Corintho hic advena anu' paupercula*, 96). Since, further, her mother is now perceived as a *lena*, Antiphila resembles a Selenium-type pseudo-*meretrix*. And the formula *bene et pudice educta* can only mean that Antiphila had been resistant to some external influences and loyal to Clinia before his departure. So far so good. But after he leaves everything starts over. Antiphila had once already risen to the occasion and despite unspecified challenges stayed virtuous, but now Clinia fears that in the meantime she has to do it *again*. His return sets off the "second episode" of Antiphila's pseudo-*meretrix*-phase. In her previous incarnation in the "Plautine" setting, she was (for all we know) destined to make it, no questions asked. In the Terentian sequel, however, the convention is disassembled: not only are Antiphila's challenges now explicit, but the outcome is not certain.

We note preliminarily that Antiphila's uncertain future speaks in several complementary ways to the programmatic duplicity in the prologue. Antiphila represents not only a chronological sequel to Plautus, but also an alternate reality, a parallel dimension of the Plautine universe. Ingeniously, to present a girl who need not survive her pseudo-*meretrix*-ordeal, Terence simply repeats the ordeal. His decision to call attention to her hypothetical first ordeal by *bene et pudice educta* means that she is designed to show traces of both successful pseudo-*meretrices* and unsuccessful ones. Terence does not want to overwrite Plautus, but to revise the existing template visibly.

For appreciating the full effect of Antiphila as an embodiment of ambiguous outcome, it is worth remembering that Terence himself had already pioneered the worst-case scenario in his first play, the *Andria*. Simo describes the situation of the title character, Chrysis from Andros (74-9):

> *primo haec pudice vitam parce ac duriter*
> *agebat, lana ac tela victum quaeritans;*
> *sed postquam amans accessit pretium pollicens*
> *unus et item alter, ita ut ingeniumst omnium*
> *hominum ab labore proclive ad lubidinem,*
> *accepit condicionem, dehinc quaestum occipit*.
>
> At first she led a chaste life of thrift and effort,
> earning by spinning wool at the loom;
> but after a lover approached her promising money,
> one and then another, human character being what it is,
> preferring pleasure to labor,
> she accepted the offer and joined the profession.

This Terentian self-allusion serves a programmatic purpose, as it crucially contributes to the open-endedness of Antiphila's character. While Chrysis' misfortune exposes the pseudo-*meretrix*'s happy ending as a fanciful, corny convention, Antiphila revisits it without a foregone conclusion. Central to her role is precisely the uncertainty: she may have ended up like Chrysis but she also may have ended up like Plautus' Selenium and Planesium.

Everything heard about Antiphila so far—and much more is to come—makes us wonder with Clinia whether she passed the pseudo-*meretrix*-test this time, or she has failed it and become a prostitute, contrary to the Plautine conventions, but according to Terence's reconfiguring of them. At the moment, she is at the ontological crossroads, marking the point where *argumentum simplex* evolves into a *duplex* play, in two complementary ways. Namely, if dramaturgic *argumentum* means both chronological "backstory" and ontological "backstage-story" (simultaneous, extrapolated "plot"), it is instructive to consider what would *simplex* mean

with both. The *simplex* premise of the plot might refer to *bene et pudice educta* scenario, which in Plautus is always the backstory and leads to a predictable outcome; the duplicity of the *HT* is that after such a history Antiphila can now go either way. The ontological *argumentum simplex* would mean only one possibility of reconstructing the background events from what is staged; Antiphila's duplicity, by contrast, is that if she is judged by how she is perceived (as we shall see in detail) one can reach two opposite conclusions. The distinction between pseudo-*meretrix*-Antiphila and *meretrix*-Antiphila maps onto the difference between her hypothetical "Plautine" past and her possible present, but also onto the difference between how she is perceived and what she "really" is now. Her pseudo-*meretrix* ordeal is not only the play's history; if she is tempted again during this play (as Clinia fears), her ordeal is also the possible behind-the-scenes currently. In the next two sections we look in detail into how Antiphila's possible present can be reconstructed from a remarkable report.

7.3. Anticipating Antiphila

Controversy between what is presented and what must be extrapolated is elaborated throughout the following scene where Clinia waits for Antiphila (230-409). It is subtly foreshadowed, as Clinia continues to worry why Antiphila is late: "I have a bad feeling about this." Clitipho: "Will you keep on jumping to conclusions before you know what is true?" (CLIN. *nescioquid profecto mi animu' praesagit mali*. CLIT. *pergin istuc prius diudicare quam scis quid veri siet*? 236-7). It is not Clinia's but Clitipho's words that are soon proven prescient: as we shall see in a moment, when Antiphila's appearance seems to confirm Clinia's fears, Syrus will insist at length that it does not match her substance. But until then her reputation literally precedes her.

It is worth pausing on why is Antiphila's slow arrival such a problem. Terence does not yet specify why exactly, thereby inviting a momentary comparison of Clinia with the generically impatient *adulescens amans*, a staple of Roman comedy. In the *Poenulus*, to take an elaborate example (504-49), Agorastocles waits for arbitrators (*advocati*) to help him rescue the girl from the pimp, but to him they seem to be walking at a snail's pace; he twice complains that tardiness is inconsiderate "especially towards a man in love" (*praesertim homini amanti*, 505, 512). In the *Miles gloriosus*, Pleusicles is ready to run away with Philocomasium, but she is evidently not (1292-5, tr. De Melo):

> *mulier profecto natast ex ipsa Mora;*
> *nam quaevis alia quae morast aeque, mora*
> *minor ea videtur quam quae propter mulieremst.*
> *hoc adeo fieri credo consuetudine*.
>
> Woman was indeed born of Delay herself:
> any other delay that's equally much of a delay
> seems smaller than that which one has on account of a woman.
> What's more, I believe they do it as a matter of custom.

The biological aetiology makes delay into a woman's inborn trait, like hunger is to parasites: Gelasimus is born from Hunger herself (*St*. 155-73).[5] Philocomasium's *consuetudo* proves that her behavior is habitual, that is, a literary convention.[6] Terence favors specifically the motif of exaggeratedly panicking about the lapse of time.[7] Clitipho comforts Clinia: "You know women; it takes a year before they get ready and get going" (*et nosti mores mulierum:* | *dum moliuntur, dum conantur, annus est*, 241-2). Here, I suggest, Terence activates the passage of time metapoetically. The intra-dramatic hyperbolic "year" becomes an extradramatic reference, as

[5] For more on this type of joke, Bettini 2002.
[6] The character of Philocomasium is a problem of its own: see Chapter 8. For an analysis of the motif of waiting in Latin elegy, see Gardner 2013: 145-180.
[7] In the *Eunuchus*, Parmeno predicts that Phaedria will not make it two full days without seeing Thais (217-26), and he is right (629-40), if only because when Thais had asked for those two days off, Phaedria's only fear was that it does not turn out to be twenty days (181-8). Meanwhile, Phaedria's brother Chaerea is in pursuit after Pamphila when a family friend pulls him over and stalls him for what seems to him like an hour (*dum haec dicit abiit hora*, *Eu*. 341).

Clinia and Antiphila meet in a different era, a post-Plautine sequel. Their relationship may have changed because she had had to go through the whole life-cycle of a comic character all over again, and she may have ended up like a different one.

It turns out that she is late because she is followed by entourage of slaves carrying a lot of baggage. The slaves Syrus and Dromo approach mid-conversation (242-53, 256-8):

> SYR. *ain tu?* DRO. *sic est.* SYR. *verum interea, dum sermones caedimus,*
> *illae sunt relictae.* CLIT. *mulier tibi adest. audin, Clinia?*
> CLIN. *ego vero audio nunc demum et video et valeo, Clitipho.*
> DRO. *minime mirum: adeo inpeditae sunt: ancillarum gregem* 245
> *ducunt secum.* CLIN. *perii, unde illi sunt ancillae?* CLIT. *men rogas?*
> SYR. *non oportuit relictas: portant quid rerum!* CLIN. *ei mihi!*
> SYR. *aurum vestem; et vesperascit et non noverunt viam.*
> *factum a nobis stultest. abi dum tu, Dromo, illis obviam.*
> *propera: quid stas?* CLIN. *vae misero mi, quanta de spe decidi!* 250
> CLIT. *quid istuc? quae res te sollicitat autem?* CLIN. *rogitas quid siet?*
> *viden tu? ancillas aurum vestem, quam ego cum una ancillula*
> *hic reliqui, unde esse censes?* CLIT. *vah nunc demum intellego*.
> ….
> CLIN. *o Iuppiter, ubinamst fides?* 256
> *dum ego propter te errans patria careo demens, tu interea loci*
> *conlocupletasti te, Antiphila, et me in his deseruisti malis,*…

> SYR. …You don't say…? DRO. It's so. SYR. While we are "cutting the speech"[8]
> the women are left behind. CLIT. Your girl is here; hear that, Clinia?
> CLIN. Indeed finally I do hear and I see and I feel good, Clitipho.
> DRO. (*continues with Syrus*) No wonder: they're so burdened, bringing a company
> of maids. CLIN. I'm ruined! Where did she get maids? CLIT. How should I know?
> SYR. We shouldn't have left them, they have a lot of baggage. CLIN. Woe me!
> SYR. That gold and clothes; it's getting dark and they don't know the way.
> How foolish of us. Dromo, go meet them.
> Hurry; what are you waiting for? CLIN. Oh poor me, all that hope is lost!
> CLIT. Why so? What troubles you so much? CLIN. What, you ask?
> Can't you see? She has maids, gold, clothes, and I left her with only one maid
> here; where do you think she got them? CLIT. Huh… now I finally get it.
> …
> CLIN. O Jupiter, what happened to loyalty? 256
> While I was wandering madly without a homeland because of you, you meanwhile
> got rich, Antiphila, and abandoned me in my misfortunes…

[8] I analyze the phrase further below, 7.4.4.

Antiphila's image is constructed by different sense perceptions. Upon hearing "women" (*illae*), Clitipho instinctively concludes it is good news, without wondering why is there more than one or why are they left behind (both of which will shortly prove significant). The *sound* itself is supposed to make Clinia feel good: *audin Clinia?* At this point they see Syrus from some distance (241), and Antiphila is slowly lagging far behind him (245-6), to arrive on stage only considerably later (381, discussed below). In other words, even though Clinia cannot see Antiphila at all, but only hear about her, by his exact response *audio… et video et valeo* (244) he automatically converts auditory information into visual. His wellbeing, finally, depends on indirect and imaginative sensory experience. Clinia echoes Clitipho's *audin, Clinia?* (243) and asks him in turn: "Don't you *see*" what is going on (*viden tu*? 252), even though Antiphila is clearly still far from sight. They are constructing a story of her, a quasi-visual projection, out of scraps of report. They are compensating for the lack of stage action by extrapolating the plot.

The explanation of Antiphila's belatedness stirs Clinia's suspicion that she is corrupted during his absence: how else could she afford more than one slave unless she is financially supported by lover(s).[9] The big question, of course, is whether this is so. Clitipho's retort—"How should I know?"—confirms that Clinia's question is not rhetorical and that the answer is not obvious. Since Clitipho is bankrolling an expensive prostitute himself and should know how these things work, his comment is especially sinister.

Here we recall the discussion of ontological quantification from the previous chapter: measuring the correspondence between appearance and underlying content in the *HT* prologue, I argued, is comparable to the phenomenon of quantifying a person's quality, as outlined by Habinek. With this in mind, Antiphila's increased property would manifest her duplicity in two complementary ways. Since Clinia stresses that he left her with only one slave, multiplied

[9] Hefty entourage is a property of *meretrices*: Pl. *Truc*. 533.

entourage would practically betray materialistic amatory opportunism (i.e. prostitution). But also, and precisely thereby, wealth would prove that she is morally twofaced: maybe she no longer pseudo-*meretrix* devoted to Clinia, but available to the highest bidder.[10]

Tellingly, it is at this moment of epistemological aporia that Antiphila's name is spelled out for the first time (I have used it so far for the sake of convenience). Clinia grasps for the last available criterion of locating Antiphila on a map. Since Terence uses only a limited number of generic names (in contrast to diverse and elaborate Plautine nomenclature), his characters invoke at least some intertextual association with stock-types and/or their specific earlier instantiations.[11] The name Antiphila is not attested elsewhere before or in Terence but it is in a fragment of Turpilius, a comic playwright of the next generation (†103 BCE). There it is the name of a *meretrix*, listed alongside other well-attested names of prostitutes (*meretricis … | … Thais atque Erotium, | Antiphila*, frg. 185 Ribbeck).[12] Having seen in the *Eunuchus* the *adulescens-senex* Chremes, deliberately misnamed for metapoetic purposes, it is reasonable to suspect that Antiphila's name has a similar function. It has been interpreted as a speaking name, meaning "Loving in return," explaining her reciprocal devotion to Clinia.[13] On the other hand, Emil König proposes that Antiphila means "Loving *in exchange for*" and is "nomen meretrice

[10] It contributes to this idea of undesirable quantitative increase that Clitipho places Bacchis and Antiphila on a scale (225-7, discussed above, 7.2), and that Clinia confesses that uncertainty about Antiphila "increases" his anxiety (*animum exaugeant*, 232).

[11] Franko 2013: 41: "Where Terence recycles the same realistic, trite names (Geta, Chremes, Davus, etc.), many Plautine creations carry fantastical "speaking names" which celebrate the function or archetypal nature of the characters;" Franko does not, however, pursue the effect of generic names. Cf. Fontaine 2014: 542: "[B]y repeatedly using the same names for the characters of the dramatis personae from one play to the next, Terence makes his characters self-consciously reflect earlier incarnations of themselves in a manner reminiscent of mythologically based poetry." For Plautine names, see e.g. Gratwick 1982: 104; Fontaine 2010: 161-4. For Terence, Austin 1922 (comprehensive but unimaginative).

[12] Erotium is the *meretrix* in Plautus' *Menaechmi*, Thais in Terence's *Eunuchus* and Menander, frg. 163 KA (see Chapter 3.4, p. 66, fn. 32). For Turpilius, see Wright 1974: 153-182.

[13] Austin 1922: 101 "The appropriateness of this name [i.e. "loving back"] to the character is not difficult to discover… She fully returns his [i.e. Clinia's] vehement and over-mastering love; he fully returns her steadfast and patient love. The name is exactly descriptive and significant of her whole rôle and character as it is delineated in the play."

dignissimum (ἀντί = für Entgelt)."[14] The ambiguous etymology, I believe, is precisely the point: not that she is or is not a prostitute but that interpreting the essence by means of formal properties is by definition unreliable.

7.4. It's (not) what it looks like

Clinia continues lamenting Antiphila's perceived infidelity by remembering how his father was warning him, lit. "kept chanting," "about the characters of these women" (*qui harum mores cantabat mihi*, 260); "these women" are, of course, *meretrices*.[15] If *cantabat* is taken metapoetically it would add appropriate effect. The *meretrix*-Antiphila and pseudo-*meretrix*-Antiphila would be different stock characters of earlier comedy. Evidently Clinia now, in retrospect, takes his father's view of Antiphila differently than he had originally. Clinia reassesses his father's words in light of new (mis)information, just like Terence retroactively undermines the positive image of Plautine pseudo-*meretrices* by dramatizing the scenario of a potentially unsuccessful pseudo-*meretrix*.[16]

The portrayal of Antiphila then becomes exceptionally intriguing. Syrus hears Clinia's woes of despair and promptly intervenes (263-8):

> SYR. *hic de nostris verbis errat videlicet*
> *quae hic sumu' locuti. Clinia, aliter tuom amorem atque est accipis:*
> *nam et vitast eadem et animu' te erga idem ac fuit,*
> *quantum ex ipsa re coniecturam fecimus*.
> CLIN. *quid est obsecro? nam mihi nunc nil rerum omniumst*
> *quod malim quam me hoc falso suspicarier*.
>
> SYR. (*to Dromo*) He obviously misunderstood the words we

[14] König 1876: 10, with the appropriate financial etymology of German ("Geld"); LSJ s.v. ἀντί III3.
[15] The other *senex* Chremes confirms this when he says that objections to "frequent whoring" are universal to all fathers (*parentum iniuriae | uniu' modi sunt ferme, ... | scortari crebro nolunt*, 204-6); more on this passage in the next chapter, 8.1.
[16] Cf. Konstan 1993: 147: "Note how readily Clinia includes Antiphila in the same class as courtesans in general. She had differed only in that she was still at the beginning of her career; in her first affair, her motives might still be pure."

were just saying. Clinia, your love affair stands differently than how you perceive it:
her lifestyle and feelings for you are the same as they were,
as much as we inferred from the situation.
CLIN. How so? There's no situation now that I would
want more than that reason for my suspicions prove false.

The slightly redundant *verbis… locuti* emphasizes that the whole story is mediated by verbal rendering; the vague *accipis* (264), "you receive information"—instead of e.g. *audis*, "you hear"—shows that Clinia is constructing a multimedial sensory experience from what is being told. Even though the best Syrus himself can do is to speculate from what he saw, Clinia asks him for further *verbal* confirmation.

7.4.1. Mother matters

We have seen that Clinia listed many factors that would facilitate Antiphila's corruption (*occasio, locus, aetas*, *mater quoius sub imperiost mala | quoi nil iam praeter pretium dulcest*, 233-4, discussed above). Now Syrus is as if about to address them one by one and parse Antiphila into a set of entries and variables, a narrative project made of checkboxes. The first thing that Clinia needs to know, Syrus is explicit (*hoc primum*, 269), is that the woman said to be her mother, the perceived greedy *lena*, is not actually her mother and has, moreover, died (*anus, | quae est dicta mater esse ei antehac, non fuit; | ea obiit mortem*, 269-71). If Clinia did not know that the old woman was not Antiphila's mother (Antiphila did: 271-2, below), their relationship turns out to have been much more casual than one would be lead to believe. Since meanwhile he believes that the old woman is money-loving and controls Antiphila, everything points to a version of a relation between and adulescens and a (pseudo-)*meretrix* that is now retroactively modified. The convention that procuresses are always mothers, as in Plautus' *Asinaria* and *Cistellaria*, explains Syrus' otherwise gratuitous insistence that the main danger is doubly out of

the way: practically speaking, once the woman is dead and gone it should matter little if she was her mother. Syrus is rather retroactively removing the *literary* association; he is eradicating the last thread of organic connection between Antiphila and prostitution.[17]

Further, Syrus learned about the death of the old woman only by overhearing Antiphila saying that to the mysterious "other woman" on their way here (*hoc ipsa in itinere alterae | dum narrat forte audivi*, 271-2). Thus, the crucial piece of information which Syrus emphatically reveals "first off" is the one which reached him last, and indirectly so (incidentally or not, the "mother"-*lena* is last on Clinia's list). Everything else Syrus had previously seen with his own eyes—which he will describe in painstaking detail immediately—he apparently does not deem conclusive.

But who *is* the other woman, anyway?, Clitipho interrupts him (*quanamst altera*? 272). Syrus pompously postpones the exposition: "Wait. Let me deliver the narrative that I began, Clitipho; I'll get to that later" (*mane. hoc quod coepi primum enarrem, Clitipho: | post istuc veniam*, 273). Syrus uses the semi-technical term for plot exposition, *enarrare* (cf. Pl. *Mil*. 79), and reminds us of the *HT* prologue speaker who announces the sequence of exposition (*id primum dicam, deinde*…, 3) but changes the topic and returns to it later (10). This is a remarkable correspondence between *prologus*, an old man (1, 39) and Syrus, "that old schemer," as he is once referred to (*veterator*, 889). Pursuing this analogy provides interpretive clues for Syrus' role in the scene. The prologue speaker is assigned to embellish the script with *facundia* (13-15). Syrus' report indeed sounds scripted to please, to the point of persuasion and beyond. The *prologus*, we have seen, "digresses" not to disclose information but to riddle us with *integra integram* (4), *duplex/simplex* (6); the question is how many plays are behind this play, one or

[17] Cf. Konstan 1993: 148: "The knowing spectator will recognize the cue in *est dicta* [270]: Antiphila will prove to be of citizen status."

two. Both the prologue speaker and Syrus teasingly leave us wondering: if, purportedly, Antiphila/play is *simplex* and *integra*, then who or what is the other one?

Syrus avoids identifying Antiphila's company, having slyly brought it up himself. Since no other woman besides Clitipho's *meretrix* Bacchis has been mentioned so far, the reference is perhaps less obscure than it seems—especially if we understand Syrus' response to Clitipho *post istuc veniam* to mean "Later I'll return to that business *of yours*," i.e. your *amica*. Soon enough Syrus reveals it is Bacchis (311), but the repeated mention of her and the obvious preterition are so specious and gratuitous as to suggest that the "other woman" is a part of Antiphila's identity. In a situation where Antiphila is like a split personality between a loyal pseudo-*meretrix* and a venal *meretrix*, Bacchis the *meretrix* will come across as her unspoken alter ego.[18]

Syrus then begins detailing the fetching of Antiphila. Dromo knocks, some old woman opens (*anus quaedam*, 276; *anus*, 278). The repeated reference to the old doorwoman seems purposeful since she is a mute character without active contribution to the scene. Removing Antiphila's reputed mother-procuress meant removing association with prostitution, but now, at the literally first step of inspecting the girl, another old woman takes over the function of the mother-like gatekeeper (Syrus does not count the *anus* as an *ancilla*: 292-4). The mention of the old woman in this context is reminiscent of the old Cerberus-like doorwoman, "Lioness," in Plautus' *Curculio* (*anus… ianitrix*, | *nomen Leanae*, 76-7), who controls access to the pseudo-*meretrix* Planesium in the pimp's house.[19] With the Plautine character in hindsight, one notices that Antiphila has exchanged one "guardian-manager" for another. The two Terentian old women are so alike yet decisively different, in that one was thought to be biologically related. This otherwise unnecessary emphasis on the two unnamed old women exhibits an interesting

[18] I return to this below, 7.5.
[19] The door in the *Curculio* is thematically significant (Moore 2005); cf. Chapter 4.4.

metapoetic potential. We have seen in the prologue the distinction between "whose *is* the play" (*quoia Graeca sit*, 8) and who has "presented it now" (*qui scripserit*, 7), where I have argued that the unnamed earlier "owner" is in effect equated with the unnamed current "presenter;"[20] the Greek owner is subsumed in the adaptation, but the play *remains* Greek (*sit*). Analogously, as soon as the first old woman dies, she is posthumously deprived of a biological relation with Antiphila, and another old woman, without familial pretensions, takes over. Yet, for Clinia, the whole question is whether or not Antiphila is vestigially still "her mother's daughter." If the prologue has any bearing on this, the present tense *sit* suggests that the legacy continues.[21]

Indeed there is a practically curious detail. Clinia made a big deal out of Antiphila wearing gold jewelry (*aurum*, 252) because it would mean she is well-paid. At that point he does not know that all her accoutrement is part of the trick. But it is extremely interesting that precisely under that disguise her real mother Sostrata recognizes on her the ring of her infant daughter (*anulus*, 614). It is as if Antiphila is born with the disguise of a *meretrix*.

7.4.2. Nobody expects the Spanish Inquisition

Dromo then rushes in, lit. "infers" himself (*coniecit*, 276), so as to restate the speculative nature of the quest, Syrus' *coniectura* (266). The seemingly irrelevant detail that Syrus enters second (*ego consequor*, 276) subtly distances him as the narrator from the source of information. Syrus pauses to introduce the narrative to Clinia for proper understanding (279-84):

> *hic sciri potuit aut nusquam alibi, Clinia,*
> *quo studio vitam suam te absente exegerit,*
> *ubi de inprovisost interventum mulieri.*
> *nam ea res dedit tum existumandi copiam*
> *cotidianae vitae consuetudinem,*

[20] See above, Chapter 6.1.
[21] Very germane to this argument is Lape 2004, who analyzes the conflict between social and natural kinship in the *HT*, specifically as enacted between fathers and sons.

quae quoiusque ingenium ut sit declarat maxume.

It was here, and nowhere else, Clinia,
that it was possible to find out how she spent her life in your absence,
when a woman is paid an unexpected visit.
For that gives a chance of estimating
the daily routine,
which best illustrates what is a person's character.

Syrus' gloss signals how much the whole story depends on interpretation. A woman cannot be trusted if she can prepare, but even when she is caught off-guard the final assessment takes three epistemological levels: *studium* indicates *consuetudo*, which illustrates *ingenium*—indeed, provides only an *estimate* of her *ingenium*. The language recalls the prologue, where subject to spectators' arbitrary *aestumatio* was whether the poet's authorship is honestly his or brought about by his (plural) friends' *ingenium* (24). Even when, or precisely because, the unquantifiable moral character is quantified, the *aestumatio* remains an arbitrary personal impression. Syrus describes the sight (285-92, text of Barsby 2001):

SYR. *texentem telam studiose ipsam offendimus,*
mediocriter vestitam veste lugubri
(eius anui' causa opinor quae erat mortua)
sine auro; tum ornatam ita uti quae ornantur sibi,
nulla arte malas expolitam muliebri;
capillus passus prolixus circum caput
reiectus neglegenter; pax! CLIN. *Syre mi, obsecro,*
ne me in laetitiam frustra conicias.

SYR. We bumped into her diligently weaving at the loom,
dressed modestly in mourning clothes,
(because of the deceased old woman—so I presume)
no jewelry on her, dressed as those who dress for themselves,
her cheeks untouched by womanly makeup;
her hair loosened, falling around her head
carelessly tossed back; that's it! CLIN. My dear Syrus, don't
throw me into joy in vain.

The speculation continues into gratuitous detail. The fact that Antiphila *might* be mourning her mother complicates the girl's relation to her assumed past. According to Clinia her mother was

pimping her out and exercised firm control (*pretium; imperio*, 233); but, if Syrus guesses right, Antiphila is not as happy about losing that kind of mother as Clinia seems to want. In this respect it is noteworthy that absence of makeup and unadorned hair was a known trick of *meretrices*, which the maid Scapha recommends to Philematium (Pl. *Mos*. 273-295). In mourning her *lena*- "mother" by letting hair loose, Antiphila might be behaving precisely like a *meretrix* feigning naturalness.[22]

Syrus swiftly notices the absence of gold (estimates, as it were, her balance), and then scans her head to toe, to conclude that she is *like* those women who do not expect male company. Clinia questions the narrator's reliability by hijacking Syrus *coniectura*: I hope you're not merely "inferring" me, "conjecturing" me, into this idyllic scene. The truth of his beloved depends on how Syrus talks about her—and he can make it all work out for the best. Reality of the situation stands or falls on its narrative representation.

At this point it is worth recalling the traditional elements in Syrus' description. Literary archetype of a woman patiently weaving at the loom in her husband absence, such as Penelope (or Lucretia in Livy 1.57.6-9), is an optimistic articulation of male anxiety over the "home-alone" scenario. The many ancient varieties of such *nostos*—featuring, e.g. the less desirable outcomes of Deianeira, Alcumena, Clytemnestra—prove that the whole point of it is that it is open-ended. It has been sometimes been noticed that Antiphila belongs to this tradition, but the implications rarely explored. David Konstan observes in passing: "The scene [of Antiphila weaving] is an antique male fantasy, most familiar from Tibullus' dream of descending from the

[22] Cf. *Phormio* 104-8, with Maltby 2012: 139.

skies to find his Delia demurely at the loom [1.3.83-92]… Antiphila is virtuous, then, according to literary convention."[23]

The elegiac imagination is extremely similar to Terence's. Tibullus' Delia has only one old maid (1.3.84), the poet descends suddenly unannounced (*tum veniam subito, nec quisquam nuntiet ante*, 89), so as to find his beloved unprepared: "come to me just as you are" (*tunc mihi, qualis eris… curre*, 91-2). Tibullus' dream is a perfect reinterpretation of Clinia's anxiety: Syrus' story is unverifiable because Antiphila is ungraspable, in an ontological limbo. It is this uncertainty, and not just the worse-case scenario, for which Terence aggregates various literary possibilities. Antiphila, in a word, is like Schrödinger's cat, neither dead nor alive. After all, feminine weaving is itself ambiguous. A known metaphor for poetry, it is inherently associable with deception.[24]

7.4.3. The medium is the message

For proving Antiphila's virtuousness Syrus then plays the trump card specific for this play: Antiphila has only one slave woman. That one is also weaving alone, unkempt and filthy (*praeterea una ancillula | erat*, *ea texebat una, pannis obsita, | neglecta, immunda illuvie*, 293-5). Clitipho interjects to interpret the sign for Clinia—provided that the sign is *there* to begin with (295-301):

[23] Konstan 1993: 158, n.22, who eventually takes the image as true, as he speaks of "extreme difference between her [i.e. Antiphila's] character and that of Bacchis" (150); "for us, the audience, who are aware of the intensity of feeling between Clinia and Antiphila, and the profound integrity of her character" (151). Goldberg 1986: 140 is categorical and represents the scholarly majority: "Clinia has had the good sense to choose another Lucretia, a girl who sticks to her spinning and is faithful to her love. She deserves to be a citizen, and her eventual recognition as one is hardly a surprise." Boyd 1992: 216, fn. 10, offers a useful list of loci and bibliography on the weaving woman ideal in Rome.

[24] The poetologic image is Indo-European: West 2007: 36-38; bibliography in Torrance 2013: 18, fn.19; Nünlist 1998: 110-118. Locus classicus in Plautus is Pseudolus referencing weaving as he is to "become a poet," i.e. come up with a trick, *Ps*. 399-400 (cf. Farrell 1991: 298). Most pertinently for the present discussion, in Alexis' *Isostasion* (102 KA) prostitutes are said to be "stitching plots" (ῥάπτουσι... ἐπιβουλάς, 2-3).

si haec sunt, Clinia,
vera, ita uti credo, quis te est fortunatior?
scin hanc quam dicit sordidatam et sordidam ?
magnum hoc quoque signumst dominam esse extra noxiam,
quom eius tam negleguntur internuntii.
nam disciplinast isdem munerarier
ancillas primum ad dominas qui adfectant viam.

If this, Clinia,
is really true, as I believe, who is more fortunate than you?
You realize he says she was filthy and dirty?
It is a sure sign that the mistress is free from blame
when the messengers are so neglected.
For it's a custom to tip
the maids first if anyone wants access to the mistresses.

Syrus' story yields too much guessing, hedging, and glossing for a firsthand eyewitness account. Clitipho feels invited to vote for this version, thereby reminding Clinia that it is still not proven, indeed that it can never be. He adds to Syrus' description rhetorical flourish of his own, *sordidatam et sordidam*, as if stressing the importance of verbal embellishment, and finally spells out the implications lest Clinia miss the point. It is perhaps fair to say that an unkempt maid is not an immediately understandable symptom, but choosing such a detail in the first place is not necessary either. The sheer space allotted to it implies that there might be more to it.

First, it is appropriate that Clitipho, who is in a relationship with a *meretrix*, is familiar with rules of the game; Clinia needs some clarification because he has no such experience. But if his relationship with Antiphila had been previously monogamous and based on mutual affection, the main question is has anything changed in the meantime. Syrus' is at pains to prove that it has not, but the mere fact that Antiphila is evaluated by the standards of *meretrices*—and that it takes an experienced "*meretrix*-goer" to diagnose the situation—means that there are no independent criteria for assessing her; she can only be defined in negative terms vis-à-vis prostitutes. To insist that yet another checkbox does *not* apply to Antiphila means that she is still presumed guilty.

Second, the choice of *internuntii* is curious, both in form and meaning. Clitipho uses it in the plural after the singular *dominam* (298) as if one mistress has more than one member of the staff—and enlarged household, we have seen, would indicate that Antiphila got rich from prostitution. Next, even though Clitipho expectedly speaks of female slaves (*sordidatam, ancillas*) he uses masculine *internuntius* instead of feminine *internuntia* (as Plautus in *Mil*. 986[25]). When the whole point is that Antiphila is an all-female household, the masculine noun compromises the idyllic setting, linguistically, and (in fact, thereby) compromises it practically. The only other time *internuntius* occurs in Terence it is for a mediator that could be sent *by* the man, Thraso the soldier, *to* the *meretrix* Thais, not vice versa (*Eu*. 287). There the noun does not refer to any particular character, but it is suggestively spoken by Gnatho the Flatterer who himself falsely reports to Thraso that Thais is crazy about him (*Eu*. 391-4). In Plautus' *Miles* the *internuntius* is the slave Palaestrio scheming on behalf of his previous master Pleusicles, but against his current master, Pyrgopolinices (962). The profile of (masculine) *internuntius* in Roman comedy, therefore, is that of a deceptive envoy who lies or sugarcoats the truth so as to trick and/or please the man who sent him.[26]

With this in mind, and given the context of *HT*, it would make most sense if the *internuntius* in question is Syrus himself. The line *quom eius tam negleguntur internuntii* can mean "since her maid is so ill-maintained" only if we ignore the odd masculine plural. Much more easily it means "when you don't pay attention to the messengers;" that is, approximately:

[25] The context is intriguingly similar; I examine the passage in the next chapter, 8.4.4.
[26] The only remaining instance besides these three (*HT* 299, *Eu*. 287, Pl. *Mil*. 962) is in the *Amphitryon* prologue, again referring to agents of deception, viz. rigging the "competition" (*si per scriptas litteras | sive qui ipse ambissit seu per internuntium, | sive adeo aediles perfidiose cui duint*, 70-2); on absence of competition, see Introduction, sect. 2, pp. 5-8.

your girl is still faithful to you—if you ignore that this is only an account vouched for by Syrus (and the silent Dromo, who is present all along).[27]

As the report finally comes to an end, Clinia once again voices skepticism and signs are once again interpreted for him (302-9, text of Barsby 2001):

> CLIN. *perge, obsecro te, et cave ne falsam gratiam*
> *studeas inire. quid ait ubi me nominas*?
> SYR. *ubi dicimus redisse te et rogare uti*
> *veniret ad te, mulier telam desinit*
> *continuo et lacrumis opplet os totum sibi,*
> *ut facile scires desiderio id fieri tuo*.
> CLIN. *prae gaudio, ita me di ament, ubi sim nescio:*
> *ita timui.* CLIT. *at ego nil esse scibam, Clinia*.
>
> CLIN. Go on, please, and be careful not to earn my gratitude
> falsely. What did she say when you mentioned my name?
> SYR. When we said you've returned and asked her to
> come to you, she left the loom
> immediately and her face all filled with tears,
> so that you could easily tell it was out of longing for you.
> CLIN. By heavens, I don't know where I am out of joy.
> And I was so afraid. CLIT. I knew it was nothing, Clinia.

As he is about to capitulate, for one last time Clinia prays for the best by asking Syrus to do his best. It is as if he is saying, "You have one last question to answer and make sure not to mess up now." For Clinia the implications of the story are derived not from what might have actually happened but from how that is articulated verbally. When he asks what did *she* say (*quid ait*), Syrus instead describes what did she *do* and says himself what is that supposed to mean.[28] Thus, literally the last word of Syrus' on the issue of whether Antiphila is still Clinia's sweetheart as he remembers her is the favorable interpretation of her tears.[29] Otherwise, we should note, the

[27] Since *internuntius* regularly takes objective genitive (Caes. *Civ*. 1.20, Cic. *Phil*. 13.5, *Div*. 2.34, Juv. 6.45) *eius* in the *HT* 299 might mean not "her" but "its," modifying *signum*. The line would thus be even more pertinent to the present discussion: "it is a good sign—if you factor out the bringers of the sign."
[28] Gnatho in *Eu*. 391-4 makes for a good parallel.
[29] Brothers 1988: 185, ad 295: "In their excitement Clitipho and Clinia do not bother to stop and ask who or what is the reason for the maids and the baggage if it is not a change of lifestyle by Antiphila. But that will soon become clear by other means."

message would have been ambiguous at best. Crying in Terence is never out of joy;[30] in the only instance where it is, this is specified (*lacrumo gaudio*, *Ad*. 409; 537). According to Terence's own esthetic practice, therefore, Antiphila's crying would not be a good sign for Clinia—without Syrus' annotation, that is.

7.4.4. Fragmenting the script

We finish the scrutiny of Syrus' role in this affair by looking back once more at his first words in the play, when he notices that he and Dromo got "caught up in conversation" and lost sight of the girls. He uses a strange phrase *sermonem caedimus* (241), lit. "cut the speech," which critics have, expectedly perhaps, taken to mean casual chatter. The idiom is unparalleled in Latin before late antiquity,[31] when the grammarian Priscian compares it with a Greek phrase κόπτειν τὰ ῥήματα.[32] Yet classical Greek collocations of "words" and "cutting" (specifically κόπτειν and cognates) do not mean casual chatter, but quite the opposite, twist and bend the argument rhetorically.[33] Whether or not κόπτειν τὰ ῥήματα comes from Menander's original and Terence rendered the Greek word for word (as Brothers proposes in his commentary), this is the Latin of Terence's choice.[34] It is, I believe, metapoetically effective in two ways. First, on the sentence-

[30] *An*. 109, 126, 129, 136 (death), 558 (contrived, *lacrumae confictae*); *HT* 84, 167 (regret); *Eu*. 659, 820, 829 (rape); *Ph*. 92, 107 (death), 521-2 (lovesickness), 975 (fear and guilt); *Hec*. 355-85 (grief and sympathy), 405 (fear and pain); *Ad*. 335 (disappointment), 472, 679 (guilt).

[31] It appears once in Augustine (*Contra Academicos* 2.7.17), an avid reader of Terence: Burton 2007: 35-62.

[32] 18.220, *GL* ed. Keil 1858, vol. III, p. 232.

[33] Euripides in the *Hecuba* describes Odysseus as a "clever schemer (κόπις), sweet-talking demagogue" who managed to win over the people in a tight stalemate, when the "opposing opinions were stretched across" (λόγων κατατεινομένων... | …ποικιλόφρων | κόπις ἡδυλόγος δημοχαριστὴς | Λαερτιάδης, *Hec*. 130, 131-3). Another attested noun δημοκόπος, "demagogue," suggests that the original connotation of κόπ- root in this compound might normally be that of "pounding" i.e. beating the words into people's heads (so Chantraine 1968, s.v.). But Euripides seems to play precisely with the idea of a "cleaver" (LSJ s.v. κόπις (B), fem.) as Odysseus cuts the tug-of-war in the debate.

[34] I am reluctant to accept the hypothesis of Victor 2010 that some awkward and virtually unintelligible phrases in Terence (this one is not addressed) are due to his misunderstanding of Greek idiosyncrasies. However exciting (or perhaps preferable to textual emendations), this theory essentially requires us to imagine that a) Terence, who made

level: Syrus and Dromo enter the stage mid-sentence (*ain tu*?—"Really?"), muttering a snippet of the conversation. The *sermo* between them is literally shredded into clauses. Second, the speech "in fragments" is ever so fitting for the selective narrative and ontological duplicity discussed so far. Clinia needs to put together an image out of scraps of information verbally patched together by Syrus. Syrus' sole function in this scene is to tease us with a sort of a split-screen, the truth and appearance of Antiphila the pseudo-*meretrix* and "pseudo-pseudo-*meretrix*" side by side.[35]

All of this leaves the impression that there is something about all of these characters that we are not told. We do know that Clinia initially sent only his slave Dromo to bring Antiphila, and that Clitipho, of his own accord, sent Syrus along (191), who then takes over the initiative in reporting. Syrus then goes out of his way into every detail to prove that there is absolutely nothing wrong about Antiphila whatsoever, and Clitipho unreservedly subscribes to his version. It is instructive to try to hypothesize about a possible dramaturgic rationale. One explanation could be that Clitipho assigned Syrus the task of presenting the situation in the best possible terms—like the poet provided the prologue speaker with a script to be optimized for delivery. A reason for this might be that Clitipho, being around during Clinia's absence, learned some incriminating facts about Antiphila and now wants to spare his friend the painful truth. But still something does not fit. Clitipho is not in any way disillusioned about Antiphila (alone onstage at 225-7, he unambiguously praises her). And it is just as difficult to imagine that this is all Syrus' plan and that Clitipho fails to see through it. Syrus would have no explicit reason to lie; he is not

---

a career in writing in the tradition of Menandrian comedy, did not know Menander's Greek all that well, and, more importantly, 2) that even if so, he was satisfied with occasionally producing a demonstrably nonsense Latin.

[35] If there was a Greek equivalent of *sermonem caedimus* in Menander, the phrase could have even meant approximately what it does in Terence (whatever the original context may have been); and Menander can easily be imagined as a conduit of Euripidean images to the Roman playwrights. Purposefully or not, Pflugk 1840, ad E. *Hec*. 132 glosses Odysseus with *palliata* epithets, "callidus ac veterator" (latter is used of Syrus in *HT* 889). For the present discussion of deceptive duplicity it is also worth recalling Odysseus' epithet *duplex* in Hor. *C*. 1.6.7.

Clinia's slave, so he need not, say, fear punishment for bringing him bad news. Nor is it likely that Clitipho would be so easily fooled; he maturely and perceptively diagnoses the problem in his relationship with his father (213-222); and if Clitipho knows anything, he knows how to identify a *meretrix*.

This experiment in reconstructing an *argumentum* is not only purely speculative, it does not actually work. But accepting or rejecting this particular reconstruction is beside the point, because there is no reconstruction that would work. What matters is to acknowledge that to understand this scene we need *some* reconstruction, in fact a lot of it.[36] Terence teases us to extrapolate an *argumentum* behind the defective and selective stage script. The point is not that Syrus *is* lying, but that once the control over narrative is entrusted to him, he might as well be lying and there is no way of verifying. Indeed, after ambushing Antiphila and interpreting the situation on the field for Clinia, Syrus will describe Bacchis in the exact same way to Clitipho (364-8, discussed below). Syrus is not a trickster-character with an agenda but a generic embodiment of deceptive presentation.[37] The point is not that he has ulterior motives in misrepresenting Antiphila or Bacchis, but that the images of both of these women are unreliable constructs.

[36] Cf. Konstan 1993: 57, n. 19: "That he [sc. Clinia] abandoned her [Antiphila], rather than the reverse, evidently does not count with him [sc. when he feels betrayed]. In his own view, he simply suffered in her behalf while he was gone, disobeying his father and deserting his land for her sake (*propter te*, 256). Was this really the case? Did he run off to Asia with the expressed intention of returning to Antiphila? Had they agreed to such a plan in advance, stipulating the amount of time he would be away? Could he realistically have hoped that the situation at home would somehow be different upon his return? Certainly he has not yet acquired such confidence, since he does not have the courage to confront his father. Was he simply seeking respite, then, from the conflicting demands of love and *pietas*? There is no way to answer these questions,..."

[37] For Ovid's play on physical duplicity of the medium of communication (diptych writing tablets) and deceptive love in *Am*. 1.12, see a good analysis by Pasco-Pranger 2012. I believe, however, that she overstates the case that "the joke would not have been quite as easy to make as it is for us to get, [and] that this activation of a metaphorical meaning of *duplices* is quite novel, and is only available to Ovid via his extraordinary engagement with the concept of *simplicitas* throughout his corpus." Precisely in the light of the present discussion it seems that the potential for this connection might be at least as old as Terence. More good discussion of diptych metapoetics in *Amores* 1 can be found in Papaioannou 2008.

Before the two girls arrive, Syrus has just enough time to explain at last that the other woman is Bacchis (311) and that he is planning to take her to Clitipho's father's house (313) to pose as Clinia's girlfriend (*assimulabimus | tuam amicam huius esse*, 332-3); Antiphila he plans to take to Clitipho's mother—and all of this for reasons not specified for long after, if ever.[38] When Clitipho, shocked, demands an explanation, Syrus says it would take too long to explain (335-6); Clitipho metatheatrically notices that Syrus is staging something: "Farce!" (*fabulae*, 336).[39]

In this short interlude we notice some programmatic clues. Ironically, Clinia will actually have a *meretrix* for a date, so Clitipho wonders: "And what will he do with his own girl? Will she also be *called* his, as if just this one is not a disgrace enough?" (*quid faciat sua? | an ea quoque dicetur huiu', si una haec dedecorist parum?* 333-4). Clinia is duplicating his romance, but only formally. The implication of *dicetur huius* is that possession might be only nominal, or indeed that it can only be nominal. As Bacchis approaches, Clitipho instinctively heads towards her, as if forgetting that appearances no longer count, but Syrus holds him back: "She is no longer yours" (*iam nunc non haec est tua*, 376).

Meanwhile Clitipho asks Syrus how did he talk Bacchis into agreeing to all this given that she is very selective and has a busy schedule (*at hoc demiror qui tam facile potueris | persuadere illi, quae solet quos spernere*, 362-3). Syrus blatantly avoids the answer and instead

[38] Brothers 1988: 186, ad 311 combs through the clues and summarizes (emphasis mine): "It is clear from Clitipho's reaction that, though he has asked for Syrus' help in his affair with Bacchis (cf. 330), he was not expecting such a seemingly foolhardy step. Syrus has secured Bacchis' agreement to come along by undertaking (cf. 723-4) that this time Clitipho will indeed pay her the sum of 1,000 drachmas or 10 minae (cf. 601, 724) which he has already promised her (cf. 329, 823). In return for getting the money, Bacchis has agreed to pose as Clinia's, not Clitipho's, and has been "well schooled" (361) in what to do. Syrus explains (364ff.) how he managed to persuade her to agree to all this. (No wonder the party took so long to arrive!) Antiphila, being the "nice girl" she is, presumably acquiesced in Syrus' plans, wanting only to be with Clinia. Though *almost* all this information is to be found in the text, it has to be looked for; *the audience, however, swept along by the action, would not even have time to ask any of the appropriate questions, let alone start searching for the answers*. Ter[ence] wrote his play to be enjoyed in the theatre, not dissected in the study, and he knew just how much (or how little) of such detailed explanation he needed to include."

[39] For the same quip, see *An*. 224 and *Eu*. 689, with Germany 2008: 117.

delivers a miniature version of the narrative he previously presented to Clinia: "the most important thing" is that he caught Bacchis "at just the right time" to see that she is making a fool of his rival, and so "*in order to* please" Clitipho as much as possible (*in tempore ad eam veni, quod rerum omniumst | primum*, … *ut esset apud the hoc quam gratissimum* 364-8).[40]

7.5. Enter Antiphila

By far the most striking feature of the next scene is that Antiphila speaks. By convention, no *virgo* in Roman comedy has a speaking role (except for the one in Plautus' *Persa*, significantly, disguised as a sex-slave on sale).[41] Bacchis and Antiphila appear on stage mid-conversation. The exchange is remarkable and is best quoted in full (381-97, text of Barsby 20001)

> BAC. *edepol te, mea Antiphila, laudo et fortunatam iudico,*
> *id quom studuisti isti formae ut mores consimiles forent;*
> *minimeque, ita me di ament, miror si te sibi quisque expetit.*
> *nam mihi quale ingenium haberes fuit indicio oratio;*
> *et quom egomet nunc mecum in animo vitam tuam considero* 385
> *omniumque adeo vostrarum volgu' quae ab se segregant,*
> *et vos esse istius modi et nos non esse haud mirabilest.*
> *nam expedit bonas esse vobis; nos, quibu'cum est res, non sinunt:*
> *quippe forma inpulsi nostra nos amatores colunt;*
> *haec ubi imminutast, illi suom animum alio conferunt*: 390
> *nisi si prospectum interea aliquid est, desertae vivimus.*
> *vobis cum uno semel ubi aetatem agere decretumst viro,*
> *quoius mos maxumest consimili' vostrum, hi se ad vos adplicant.*
> *hoc beneficio utrique ab utrisque vero devincimini,*
> *ut numquam ulla amori vostro incidere possit calamitas.* 395
> ANT. *nescio alias: mequidem semper scio fecisse sedulo*
> *ut ex illiu' commodo meum compararem commodum.*
>
> BAC. By god, dear Antiphila, I praise you and judge you to be fortunate,
> for you took the effort that your character matches your appearance;
> not the least, heavens be my witness, am I surprised if everyone wants you for himself.
> For me the speech showed what is your nature;
> And now when I consider your life 385
> and of all of you who don't mingle the with the common people,

[40] The extended "it's-not-what-you-think" gloss seems a distinctly Terentian device: see *An.* 86ff.
[41] James 2013: 184; for the *virgo* in *Persa*, see McCarthy 2000: 158-164.

it's no wonder you are like that and we are like this.
It is in your interest to be good; as for us, whoever we are with, doesn't allow us.
Our lovers are all over us because they are attracted by our form;
once it is diminished, they find interest elsewhere.
Unless we plan ahead on time, we end up living abandoned.
But you, once you decided to spend your life with one man,
those who attach themselves to you are those whose character is most similar to yours.
Because of this mutual goodwill you are truly bound to one another
so that no disaster can ever befall your love.
ANT. I don't know about others. I myself always do my best
to gain benefit from his benefit.

First thing to notice is this kind of conversation is a literary commonplace, but in Plautus it is typically between an experienced, materialistic *meretrix*, and the still idealistic younger one. One of the regular topics is the warning that looks fade with age.[42] Once Bacchis addresses Antiphila like this they are to be imagined as more or less equals.

It is a programmatic tour de force that Antiphila (according to Bacchis) realized that beauty does not last forever and took care that her substance rises to the level of her appearance. In a bold inversion of the cliché that beauty comes from inside—and recalling the prologue proclamation that a delivery is only as good as the script, *oratio* (13-15)—Terence provokes us to imagine that, simultaneously, a person's character might be only as good as its outer manifestation.[43] Bacchis' opening *iudico* makes her appraisal into forensic verdict. Bacchis' only source of information about Antiphila is *oratio*, the prologue "script" that lies beneath the surface, and is accessible only through its presentation.

At first sight, the fact that Bacchis is valued by her looks seems to contrast the emphasis on Antiphila's character. But the sentiment can also be taken to mean that Antiphila's "inner beauty" is contrived for an effect; it is "expedient" for her to be good (*expedit*). Perfect romantic

[42] E.g. Scapha and Philematium in *Mos.* 194-202, 216-17; *Cist.* 25-45; cf. Astaphium' monologue in *Truc.* 209-45. Between women in general, see Deianeira in S. *Tr*. 143, with De Romilly 1968: 151; Ar. *Lys*. 594-7.
[43] An interesting modern parallel is when one recent winner of a beauty pageant was asked whether she would prefer to have been born good-looking or smart; she replied she would choose beauty because being smart is "something you can learn."

match takes some conscious effort. Antiphila first "assimilates" her character to her *forma* (*consimiles*, 382). Only then she finds a man whose *mos* is *consimilis* to her *mores*—which she had previously made an effort (*studuisti*) to, as it were, keep in shape. "Inner beauty," therefore, is highly adaptable.

This turns out to be the perspective not just of an acknowledged *meretrix*, for Antiphila concurs, in the only two lines she speaks: she is "working on" conforming her interests to the man's (*fecisse sedulo*, 396). This can and should be understood as both modestly considerate and opportunistically calculated at the same time. The line *ex illiu' commodo meum compararem commodum* need not mean only "base my own interest on his," but also "benefit myself by giving him what he wants." Bacchis herself is referred to as *commoda mulier*, "obliging," "agreeable" (521). And in any case, "what is good for him is good for me" is the policy of Plautus' *meretrix* Philematium (*quod tibi lubet idem mihi lubet, | mea voluptas*, *Mos*. 296-7).[44]

All of this generates metapoetic repercussions. Bacchis notes that Antiphila rejects many suitors, like she herself does (362-3, cited above). For Antiphila and her peers "dissociating" from popular demand, Terence uses *segregant* to allude to *grex*, "theater troupe." The old actor from the prologue complains that those who write new plays expect him to perform like a young actor, or they go to another troupe (*ad alium defertur gregem*, 45). Analogously, when Bacchis and her peers grow old, men turn themselves elsewhere (*animum alio conferunt*, 390). By an apparent contrast to Bacchis, once men find a good match they "apply" themselves permanently to the likes of Antiphila (*adplicant*, 393)—apparent contrast, because the only time Plautus uses the verb it is for *meretrices* "gluing" themselves like leeches onto customers (*se applicant,*

[44] The parasite Ergasilus in the *Captivi*, nicknamed Scortum (69-73), suffers his patron's *incommoda* as his own (146); Hegio's reply that such solidarity is praiseworthy sounds ironic since Ergasilus is a professional attendant; the sentiment of the *lorarius* slave—*ei vos morigerari mos bonust* (*Capt*. 198)—suggests that the ability to adapt is a diplomatic move of the subordinate.

agglutinant, *Men*. 342). The only other instance of the verb in the *HT* is in the prologue, for the poet applying himself to poetry (*se adplicasse*, 23).[45] Prostitution as metaphor for performing plays strikes a programmatic chord. Appearance is not only a priority: putting on a show is all there is.[46] The outer layer of performative duplicity (*plex, plic*-) provides the necessary distance.

7.5.1. *Tu sola*

As Bacchis and Antiphila finally arrive, Clinia sees them and exclaims: "Ah! You, Antiphila, you alone now bring me back to fatherland!" (*ah | ergo, mea Antiphila, tu nunc sola reducem me in patriam facis*, 397-8). The affectionate and solemn address *tu nunc sola* occurs only once elsewhere in Roman comedy, significantly, in the *Cistellaria*; Alcesimarchus addresses the pseudo-*meretrix* Selenium: "O my salvation, more saving than Salvation herself, you alone now make me live, whether I want it or not" (*salute mea salus salubrior, | tu nunc, si ego volo seu nolo, sola me ut vivam facis*, 644-5). Formulaic though the apostrophe may sound, in both instances there is considerable potential of *sola* for articulating the issue of exclusivity. Terence, I suggest, might be activating that potential and reading it back into Plautus.[47] Clinia's main fear was that Antiphila increased her company; more slaves mean more men to pay for them; and Bacchis strangely speaks as if Antiphila has the autonomy to choose one man.[48] In the lecture reminiscent of that conversation, Selenium's *lena* in the *Cistellaria* lays out the *meretrix* manifesto: "For a matron it is better to love one man and spend life with the one whom she married; but a prostitute is like a rich town: she cannot make it alone without many men" (*matronae magis conducibilest istuc, mea Selenium, | unum amare et cum eo aetatem exigere*

[45] The only remaining instance of (*se*) *adplicare* in Terence is *An*. 924 (finding a patron); the verb is twice used in the phrase *adplicare animum*; McGlynn 1963: 19, s.v.
[46] Duncan 2006: 124-159 examines the associations of prostitutes with pretense and acting, arguing that as dramatic characters they are inherently metatheatrical.
[47] On the allusive potential of hymnic *tu*, see Wills 1996: 361.
[48] A curious feature noticed by Konstan 1993: 148, to which I return in the next chapter.

quoi nuptast semel. | *verum enim meretrix fortunati est oppidi simillima:* | *non potest suam rem obtinere* <u>*sola*</u> *sine multis viris*, 78-81).[49] With a targeted misreading of Plautus, Terence's *tu sola* comes to mean not just "only you," but "you—*provided you are alone*."

The formula *tu sola* will become a lyric apostrophe to the *absent* addressee in Latin poetry. Since Alcesimarchus in the *Cistellaria* is holding Selenium as he speaks, it is specifically the Terentian version that becomes the norm. This retroactive interpretation by later Latin poets is extremely indicative of the *HT* program: while pronouncing *tu sola*, Clinia should be seeing Antiphila and will soon hold her, but is she "really" there?

It is worthwhile to follow the formula's afterlife in elegy. As if echoing Clinia's homecoming only for Antiphila (*reducem in patriam*), "only Cynthia" is Propertius' home and parents (*tu mihi sola domus, tu, Cynthia, sola parentes*, 1.11.23). Most relevant for the present discussion is the potential for tendentious modification. Propertius asks for reciprocal exclusivity: "You alone please me Cynthia; may I be the only one to please you" (*tu mihi sola places: placeam tibi, Cynthia, solus*, 2.7.19). From there the extended, reciprocal version takes off. In the Tibullan corpus we read the now-Propertian formula: "You alone please me, and no other in the city… may you displease others, that way I will be safe" (*tu mihi sola places, nec iam te praeter in urbe… displiceas aliis: sic ego tutus ero*, [Tib.] 3.19.3-6).[50] Ovid, characteristically, punches the bubble of convention. He issues a reality check to both those still using the formula and to those who—like Tibullus descending in his dream discussed above—

[49] Cf. also the similar theme highlighted by three instances of *sola* in *Cist*. 308-311. Terence seems well familiar with this play: Brown 2004.

[50] One wonders if it is a subversive innuendo when Martial praises his patroness Marcella "for her successful adaptation to Graeco-Roman culture in spite of her British background. This seems to have been a standard device to compliment those who were well educated despite their provincial background" (Hemelrijk 318: 199). Namely, in 1.21, he first lists all the towns that are associated with Marcella and then disregards them, concluding, "You alone are Rome enough for me" (*Romam tu mihi sola facis*, 1.21.10); one thinks of Plautine association of prostitutes with a frequented city. For Marcella's patronage, see references in Hemelrijk 1999: 318, n. 198, who also discusses (83-4) Martial's ridicule of educated women for their sexual reputation and, relatedly in his view, for speaking Greek.

fantasize about a supernatural epiphany: "Choose to whom you say 'You alone please me.' She is not going to just fall from the sky" (*elige cui dicas "tu mihi sola places." | haec tibi non tenues veniet delapsa per auras, Ars* 1.42).

Being "alone," in fact, by no means indicates a respectable love affair in the *HT*, on the contrary. In its only other instance in the play the adjective is emphatically repeated for Clitipho and Bacchis. Menedemus tells Chremes that two set up a bed in a back room at the party (904-6):

> CHR. *quid postquam hoc est factum*? MEN. *dictum factum huc abiit Clitipho*.
> CHR. *solu'*? MEN. *solu'*. CHR. *timeo*. MEN. *Bacchi' consecutast ilico*.
> CHR. *sola*? MEN. *sola*. CHR. *perii*.
>
> CHR. And then what happened? MEN. No sooner said than done, in goes Clitipho.
> CHR. Alone? MEN. Alone. CHR. I'm worried. MEN. Bacchis followed instantly.
> CHR. Alone? MEN. Alone. CHR. I'm ruined!

We end the present chapter with the last sight of Antiphila on stage. The sentimental reunion with Clinia that follows is too much for her: "Hold me please!" she says to Bacchis (*ah retine me, obsecro*, 403). Antiphila's reaction, which Sharon James aptly dubs "a Victorian-style near-fainting fit,"[51] is very similar to that of Acroteleutium in the *Miles gloriosus* (1220-83).[52] There, however, the "fit" is an elaborate stunt, orchestrated to fool Pyrgopolinices into thinking that Acroteleutium, a *meretrix* disguised as a *matrona*, is in love with him. The fact that Terence chose to stage the same reaction in an allegedly opposite situation is a good indication that we are not meant to find out how sincere is Antiphila.

The entire problem, in fact, is summarized in two words spoken by Bacchis. Antiphila spots Clinia and asks: "Do I see Clinia or not?" Is any of this real, she wonders.[53] But Bacchis is at a loss: "See *whom*?" (ANT. *videon Cliniam an non*? BAC. *quem vides*? 405). It turns out that

[51] James 2013: 184, where, however, she downplays the implications by commenting that Antiphila "is permitted only minimal, generic, speech." Apart from Antiphila's lines discussed above, the remaining ones are: *disperii, perii misera* (404); *o mi Clinia, salve* (406); *salvom venisse gaudeo* (407).
[52] I analyze the scene in the next chapter.
[53] Cf. Clinia two lines later: *teneone te, | Antiphila*..? (407-8)

Bacchis never heard of Clinia, even though she was summoned for no other reason than to pose as his girlfriend.[54] But more importantly, she should have heard about him from Antiphila. Strictly dramaturgically speaking, it is very odd that Antiphila did not mention the man who both left home and came back for her alone, and treated her as a wife (89, 104); but in any case by now it is clear that everything about Antiphila, and especially her feelings for Clinia, will remain a mystery. On a metapoetic level, however, Bacchis' words are remarkable. If she does not know who Clinia is, then her "ode to monogamy"—and Antiphila's reply—was about no one in specific. This indifference is appropriately ventriloquized trough a prostitute: as far as she is concerned, all men are equally anonymous. One of the questions that the prologue raises is who owns this play and whose is it nominally. Bacchis might be giving the answer: it does not really matter.

[54] Additionally, he is Clitipho's friend from childhood (183).

Chapter 8

Double-edged wall: Terentian half-wife in and before Terence

> The cartoon, "Donald Duck's Better Self" (1938) depicts a conflict with which we as humans are all too familiar. The cartoon begins with Donald being awakened by his wind-up alarm clock. An angel, representing Donald's better self, gently extols Donald to get up. But another Donald, this time dressed up as a devil and clearly representing Donald's weaker self, coaxes Donald to fall back to sleep. Eventually Donald gets up to go to school, thanks to the strong exhortations by "Angel Donald" and proceeds to take the road to the schoolhouse. Nevertheless, it is clear that Donald goes to school unwillingly: his heart is not in it. […] Later, Devil Donald capitalizes on Donald's weakened state of will and cajoles Donald to try smoking by giving him a pipe. Eventually, the angel and devil battle presumably for the soul and therefore future direction of Donald. The angel wins and Donald goes off to school.
>
> The ideas raised by the cartoon are immediately understood and obvious, even to young children. Our sense of self, at least at times, is a deeply furrowed entity: we feel conflicted between what we ought to do and what we desire to do. What's more, existing in such a state, where we feel torn, conflicted, divided, [...] inauthentic [...]. How can we be made whole?
>
> — B. Lightbody, *Dispersing the clouds of temptation*, vii

In the previous chapter we have seen Antiphila's character embodying the notion that appearance is an unreliable indication of the essence. On the narrative and performative level, from how she speaks and is spoken about one cannot tell what is actually going on with her. At the same time, her deceptive appearance is an intertextual and metapoetic signpost, in that she is unclassifiable as a comic type. She was inappropriately treated *as* a wife, (*pro uxore*, 98, *in uxoris loco*, 104), but we do not know what should be the appropriate way of treating her, i.e. what she *is*. The closest but significantly not an exact match could be the figure of a concubine, an exclusive unwedded partner. In terms of social conventions concubinage is, as we shall see, a no man's land between a marriage and an affair. Criteria for distinguishing it from the latter were far from clear, and the definition often becomes a matter of impression. Unsurprisingly, in terms of theatrical conventions concubinage is an arbitrary category par excellence. In the present chapter I investigate how the character of Terence's Antiphila reads next to Menander's and especially

Plautus' solutions for meta-dramatizing this middle ground. Both earlier playwrights through concubinage addressed the tension between appearance and substance, and closely linked it to the deceptive nature of theatrical performance.

8.1. *Sola* Antiphila

David Konstan notices some peculiar features in Antiphila's conversation with Bacchis discussed at the end of the previous chapter (381-97). Bacchis praises Antiphila's choice of monogamous relationship as if she has the authority to make such a decision without a male guardian (*kyrios*). Additionally, Antiphila as a foreigner is ineligible for citizen marriage, which is what the description of the steady and monogamous relationship would seem to indicate. (The association is additionally suggestive since Antiphila has yet to be discovered to be marriageable; as if Bacchis is congratulating her prematurely.) Konstan thus reasonably speculates that Antiphila's equivalent in Menander's Ἑαυτὸν Τιμωρούμενος must have been a *pallake*, a fairly regular New Comedy character.[1] Vincent Rosivach, however, rejects this identification on the grounds that the whole point of *pallakia* is that the man and the woman live together.[2] Clinia and Antiphila evidently did not, since Menedemus was initially unaware of the affair.

[1] Konstan 1993: 148-9: "This is all very sweet and edifying, but just what relation between Antiphila and Clinia is being imagined here? Who are the women like Antiphila, praised and envied by Bacchis? ... The permanent, secure bond between man and woman envisaged by Bacchis certainly suggests wedlock. But the dialogue does not square with the picture of a citizen bride, at least as the role is represented in New Comedy. Citizen girls depend upon a male *kyrios* to arrange a marriage for them. Beautiful they may be, but their good comportment is merely taken for granted, a product of their secluded life and careful rearing, not of some special grace or effort of their own. Antiphila, on the contrary, is perceived by Bacchis as a girl to whom another way of life might have been available, but who has freely chosen virtue and fidelity to one man. Her reply suggests the same: no mention of any male figure of authority, only her own resolve to join her interests with those of Clinia. ... It is not just the personal independence of Antiphila that marks her off from the image of a citizen wife. She is also, as we have seen, a Corinthian, to all appearances (96). Marriage between her and an Athenian is out of the question,... Just what is the lasting union to which Bacchis has been referring, then? The only possible arrangement is concubinage..."
[2] Rosivach 1998: 61, n. 46; cf. Traill 2008: 197, fn. 88.

This deviation, indispensable for the plot of Terence's play, seems deliberate when his Antiphila would otherwise fit the profile(s), as recently surveyed by Alan Sommerstein. All of Menander's *pallakai*, both those explicitly named so and inferred, are unmarriageable for different reasons: ex-hetaerae (Chrysis in the *Samia*, Malthake in *Sikyonioi*); without a father or a male relative (*kyrios*) who would betroth them (Glykera in the *Perikeiromene*); or enslaved by some accident and eventually bailed out for *pallakia* (Krateia in the *Misoumenos*), alongside whom one might perhaps mention those women who would have ended up as *pallakai* had they not been discovered to be freeborn (Philoumene in *Sikyonioi*).[3] The very range of options shows that a *pallake* was rather a negative definition of a woman without a *kyrios* and/or freeborn citizen status (including the possible corollaries of such status). What made the *pallake* on stage a particularly fuzzy figure is that recognition was the core of New Comedy.

Except for cohabitation, Terence's Antiphila is very reminiscent of a Menandrian *pallake*, in fact in more respects than would be necessary. Before she is recognized as the daughter of Chremes and Sostrata, Antiphila is without a *kyrios*, as she has only an old woman thought to be her mother (96-7). She is said to be held as a deposit for a debt (603-4; a prank but obviously good enough to fool Chremes). Finally, we have seen that she is associated with a *meretrix* in one too many regards. She is equipped with entourage of the *meretrix* Bacchis whom she is accompanying. When Bacchis takes Antiphila's place, the two old men will not notice anything unusual. Completely separately, Clinia suspects Antiphila has actually become a *meretrix* during his absence. Lastly, Antiphila is named like one later *meretrix*.

One detail suggests that Antiphila is purposefully mismodeled on a Greek template. Konstan is puzzled that Bacchis refers to a whole group of women like Antiphila (*vostrarum;*

[3] Sommerstein 2014; Post 1940 offers a somewhat simplified assessment of *pallakia*, including the Menandrian presentation of it. For *pallake* in general, see De Vries 1927, McClure 2003: 18-21.

vos; vobis; *vostrum*; 386-8, 392-3, 395). But Antiphila slyly responds: "I don't know about others; I for my part…" (*nescio alias: mequidem.…*, 396); this is all she ever says besides the heavily charged "I aim to please" in her second and practically the last line. Antiphila herself, therefore, makes it clear that she is designed to be unassociable and unidentifiable. In that sense Konstan's classification is not wrong because there is no right one. Antiphila, a hybrid quasi-concubine/quasi-pseudo-*meretrix*, is clearly one of a kind.

An additional effect, or even a necessary consequence, of Antiphila's uniqueness is that her character retroactively constructs a mainstream Roman tradition. When Menedemus recalls how he protested against Clinia treating Antiphila "as a wife" (*pro uxore*, 98), he says that in his objections he was following "the well-trodden way of fathers" (*via pervolgata patrum*, 101).[4] The implication is that *amicae*-as-wives and complaints against them are comic commonplaces, yet nothing of the sort is attested in the extant plays of Plautus. Even if something similar to what Menedemus describes occurred in now-lost plays, it can hardly be frequent enough to count as "well-trodden." The seemingly misfired reference, however, strikes two complementary targets.

First, the formula *pro uxore* is found only once more in Roman comedy—in Terence's first play, the *Andria*. Pamphilus is said to have committed an unseemly deed of treating a foreigner "as a wife" (*indignum facinu'; comperisse Pamphilum | pro uxore habere hanc peregrinam*, 145-6; cf. *pro uxore habuerim*, 273). This can only mean that in the *HT* Terence is alluding to himself as the founder of a convention.[5] Second and accordingly, his retroactive

[4] For metaliterary awareness of *pervolgatum*, "hackneyed," cf. Pl. *Bac*. 1071, *Ps*. 124. For metapoetic "path," see Chapter 4.2, p. 78, with fn. 11.

[5] Scafuro 1997: 370, fn. 58 suggests the possibility "that Terence implies no technical status of concubinage when he uses the phrase *pro uxore habere*. In *And[ria]* 146, as suggested above, the phrase might simply allude to the fact that Glycerium is pregnant and that Pamphilus has not deserted her i.e., he is treating her as if she were a wife. *Pro uxore habere hanc peregrinam* is, in that case, a paradoxical statement, a representation of an impossible social reality, similar to Demeas' (likewise hostile) depiction of Khrusis at *Samia* 130 as *gamete hetaira*. Such a non-technical interpretation can be supported by Chremes' later depiction of Pamphilus as a young man in *alio occupatus amore, abhorrens ab re uxoria* (829: "entwined in a different love affair, shrinking from the marital

legacy to Roman comedy does not strictly bypass Plautus but revises him. To say that fathers routinely complain that their sons treat *amicae* as wives means exposing the tacit implications of the *adulescens/meretrix* affair, the type of affair over which father-son conflict in Plautus predominantly occurs.[6] This standard motif is recalled by Chremes, who later says that objections to "frequent whoring" are universal to all fathers (*parentum iniuriae | uniu' modi sunt ferme, ... | scortari crebro nolunt*, 204-6). According to Menedemus' *via pervolgata patrum*, however, every previous Plautine "frequent whoring" is deep down nothing else than the genre's coded surrogate for a socially acceptable bond. What every Plautine *adulescens* wants, according to this revision, is to legitimize passion.

Through the character of Antiphila Terence expounds the complex symbolism of prostitution vis-à-vis marriage in Roman comedy. Sommerstein precisely here misreads him when he observes that "Terence, lacking a Latin word for *pallake* that would clearly distinguish it from *hetaera* (*amica* covered the semantic area of both), settled for *pro uxore* (*An*. 146, 273; *HT* 98)."[7] Below we shall see that in Plautus *amica* does not always mean concubine—on the contrary, the distinction can be fundamental. Second, Plautus' Latin actually had two available terms for concubine, *concubina* and *p(a)elex*; they were non-technical and almost interchangeable, hence easily usable. By deliberately ignoring both these handy nouns at the expense of the circumlocution, Terence signals that he chooses not to fill the gap between *amica* and *uxor* but leave it wide open. After all, Terence did not "settle for" *pro uxore*, he invented it.

It is worth keeping in mind that both in Athens and in Rome concubinage was a grey area in moral, social, and even legal terms, and thus all the more difficult to map through literary

---

state")." While Scafuro's rationale for the *Andria* is worth considering, the case of Antiphila remains obscure. It should also be mentioned that marriage with a foreigner (*peregrinus*) in Terence's time seems to have been more feasible than in Athens as represented in Menander (Roselaar 2013).

[6] Cf. some observations at the beginning of 7.4.

[7] Sommerstein 2014: 13.

representations. Ariana Traill observes, for example, that *pallake* "is a status term of uncertain legal significance. It is not clear just when and how a hetaira became one. … a distinction should probably be made between an obsolete legal sense [of *pallake*] and a slightly honorific social sense, which seems to survive in Menander."[8] The situation does not seem any clearer in Rome at the time of Plautus and Terence; Alan Watson argues that even by the time of Cicero concubinage was "not so formalized as it later became," i.e. in imperial jurists.[9] However this conceptual vacuum may be interacting with underrepresentation of concubinage in Roman comedy, Plautus is simply statistically less interested in that type of affair. There are more potential references to concubinage even in what remains of Menander than in all of Plautus. In fact, were it not for Terence's unclassifiable female characters, concubinage in *palliata* would more or less come down to *Miles gloriosus* alone (which I analyze in detail below).

Especially significant for the present discussion is that concubinage was defined by the man and thus inherently liable to misperception from outside. Susan Treggiari reminds us of "the striking fact that the relationship is not reciprocal. The woman is called *concubina*… but there is no term to describe the male partner." From later non-literary sources she deduces that it was not always easy to diagnose whether a union counted as marriage or *concubinatus*; among other things, "there are subtle indications that it is the intentions of the man which are crucial: arguments in the jurists turn on whether the man *regarded* the woman in the light of a wife or of a concubine."[10]

The definition of Clinia's relationship with Antiphila similarly resides in him. Menedemus warns him that he is wrong to think that he can just keep an *amica* as a wife regardless of what his father thinks (*erras, si id credis, et me ignoras*, *Clinia*, 105). But evidently

[8] Traill 2008: 107-8.
[9] Watson 1967:10.
[10] Treggiari 1981: 59, emphasis mine.

he could until now and even now he can still *believe* he can. Menedemus can now do no more than shame him for it, which means that the only aspect of the affair that matters is moral. The fact that Menedemus perceives Antiphila as an *amica* in a stock comic relationship with an *adulescens*, and that Chremes easily believes that the extravagant *meretrix* Bacchis is Clinia's *amica* (534), indicate just how difficult it is for outsiders to assess the nature of an affair.[11]

Terence, therefore, reshuffles the *meretrix* tradition of Roman comedy so as to retroactively inaugurate the tradition of concubinage as a commonplace. The liminal, deliberately half-baked character of Antiphila serves as fitting instrument for re-charting this uncharted territory between an *amica* and a spouse. While the stroke as a whole is innovative, it is very instructive to see which precedents might be read out of it. In the next sections we shall see how Menander and Plautus inscribed this liminality and arbitrariness of concubinage into deceptiveness of theatrical performance.

8.2. Menander's *Samia*: whorish wife and/or wifely whore

Being the middle ground between a wife and a prostitute, the concubine is inherently associable with both. One among proportionately many examples of concubinage in Menander suffices to show what is at stake.[12] The old Demeas in the *Samia* seems to confirm Treggiari's conclusion above, when he threatens to send his *pallake* and an ex-hetaera Chrysis literally back on the street (*Sam*. 377-97); he shows, as Konstan put it, "how thin the line is between *pallake* and

[11] Bacchis is regularly referred to as *amica* (e.g. 223, 328, 690, 697, 767, 899); the prerequisite for the trick is that the old men do not see the difference between her and Antiphila, specifically in this social and moral aspect (*adsimulabimus | tuam amicam huius esse amicam*, 333).
[12] For a quick and useful summary of the problem concerning the term, see Traill 2008: 107-8, with references.

hetaera, depending more on the grace of the male who takes her in than on a hard and fast distinction between roles."[13]

This ambivalence of *pallakia* is perfectly captured by the reason for Demeas' anger. He first sees Chrysis with a baby and believes it is his, unaware that it is the extramarital (i.e. rape-begotten) child of his stepson Moschion and the neighbor's daughter Plangon (130-2 Sommerstein):

> ΔΗΜ. γ]αμετὴν ἑταίραν, ὡς ἔοικ', ἐλάνθανον
> ἔχ]ων. ΜΟΣ. γαμετήν; πῶς; ἀγνοῶ <γὰρ> τὸν λόγον.
> ΔΗΜ. λάθ]ριό[ς τι]ς ὑός, ὡς ἔοικε, γέγονέ μοι.
>
> DEM: I didn't realize, it appears, that I have a hetaera
> for a wife. MOS: Wife? How so? I don't understand what you're saying.
> DEM: A [secret?] son, it appears, has been born to me.[14]

It is unanimously interpreted that Chrysis would be assuming the role of a wife by producing offspring; children were not expected in concubinage, since they would be illegitimate.[15] Yet Moschion's puzzlement suggests that on first hearing this explanation needed not be the only one. His pause makes the audience consider, even for a split-second, just how many possible associations there are between a hetaera and a wife, only to hear that ultimately it is a matter of (mis)perception. With Demeas' repeated hedging ὡς ἔοικε, "so it appears," Menander uses dramatic irony to point to the arbitrary and unstable distinction between wife and hetaera. Nothing here is as it seems: the child is not Demeas' but Moschion's, the mother is not Chrysis but Plangon.[16] The unreliable appearance connects social and theatrical performance. Chrysis behaves like a wife not only by bearing children, but by her very role of the concubine in the first place: she is a surrogate-wife practically in this scene, but also meta-dramatically in the play.

---

[13] Konstan 1993: 142.
[14] See Gomme—Sandbach 1973: 559, ad 132 on the supplement.
[15] Extensive comment with bibliography in Sommerstein 2013: 144-5, ad 130.
[16] Cf. the preliminary remark by Traill 2008: 2: "By grounding identity mistakes in psychological mechanisms, Menander was able to use comedy to explore questions of perception and subjectivity."

Significantly, the γαμετὴν ἑταίραν oxymoron goes both ways. When Demeas overhears that Moschion is the father (246-8), he suspects that Chrysis cuckolded him (267-80, 313-22) and compares her to the proverbial adulteress, Helen of Troy (337). Chrysis' promiscuity, therefore, would also make her into a wife-acting-like-a-prostitute.[17] Whether she is a hetaera in the guise of a wife or vice versa depends on whose child she has given birth to, Demeas' or Moschion's. In both cases the answer is appropriately the same: neither. She is exactly the middle ground.

Menander further uses the selective and deceptive theatrical medium to explore the relation between moral character, dramatic character, and social status. When Demeas tells Moschion that he refuses to raise Chrysis' bastard son, Moschion (an adoptee himself) observes that legitimacy depends on one's character and behavior: good men are legitimate, bad ones are bastards.[18] Thus even a non-arbitrary quality such as citizen birth can be evaluated subjectively. Finally, when the neighbor Nikeratos hears the current version of the story, that Chrysis gave birth to Moschion's baby, he rages that if it had happened to him he would sell both the concubine and the son (παλλακὴν δ' ἂν αὔριον | πρῶτος ἀνθρώπων ἐπώλουν, συναποκηρύττων ἅμα | ὑόν, 508-10).[19] Since selling a *pallake* was not legally possible, his hypothetical reaction is symbolic, that is, meta-dramatic.[20] Had Chrysis cheated on Demeas, she would have acted true to the comic type at the opposite end of the spectrum, the prostitute. That she would be literally sold only symbolizes her reputed moral venality. Neither Moschion nor Chrysis betrayed

[17] Traill 2008: 5 notes that all "Menander's plots characteristically involve women whose social position is unclear, many of whom could be (and sometime are) called "hetairai" by biased observers."
[18] "Which man is born legitimate, and which is a bastard?... It doesn't make a difference when a man is born, but if you judge them fairly, it is the good one who is legitimate, and bad one the bastard" (τίς δ' ἐστὶν ἡμῶν γνήσιος, πρὸς τῶν θεῶν, | ἢ τίς νόθος, γενόμενος ἄνθρωπος; ... οὐθὲν γένος γένους γὰρ οἶμαι διαφέρειν, | ἀλλ' εἰ δικαίως ἐξετάσαι τις, γνήσιος | ὁ χρηστός ἐστιν, ὁ δὲ πονηρὸς καὶ νόθος | καὶ δοῦλοϛ[... 136-4, 140-2a; tr. mine). For some observations on and parallels of the idea, see Konstan 1993: 157, n. 12. Cf. Sommerstein 2013: 147-9, ad 137-143a.
[19] Commentators assume the son to be Moschion (which is unlikely meant literally at any rate: Gomme—Sandbach 1973: 601; Sommerstein 2013: 259-61); but this might allude to the reputed child of Chrysis, likewise extramarital: compare 130-2, above, where on the topic of that (i.e. his) child Moschion starts talking about himself.
[20] For practical explanations, see doxography in Traill 2008: 197, fn. 87.

Demeas, but at one point they are thought to. If they really had, comedy has ready slur-labels available, bastard and whore, which would in effect alter their civic status. In short, status is created by behavior, and behavior is a matter of (mis)perception.

8.3. Some remarks on concubinage in Plautus

This, then, is one example of theatricalizing the broad and uneasy middle ground between a wife and a prostitute in "Athens" on the Menandrian stage. The concept of monogamous non-wedlock relationship in Plautus seems equally malleable, but far less frequent, and thus less dramaturgically incorporated. Latin terminology is still in flux: there were two terms, *concubina* and *p(a)elex*, almost interchangeable at will. Significantly, *p(a)elex*, possibly akin to Greek παλλακή and almost certainly heard as such,[21] does not mean an unwedded exclusive partner, quite the opposite: in all three instances it signifies the "second" partner, the mistress as a *rival* to the wife (*Cist*. 37, *Mer*. 690, *Rud*. 1047).

As for *concubina*, the fact that Plautus can use its etymology as a basis for a passing joke, "well-trained bedmate" (*scitam… concubinam, Mer*. 757), suggests that the social function of concubinage was disposable if so desired. Similarly, the noun *concubitus* meaning "intercourse" in the *Amphitryon* (1136)," is perhaps again a joke on quasi-marriage, because Jupiter assumes the form of Alcumena's husband Amphitryon;[22] it is also telling that elsewhere Alcumena can be called *paelex* when opposed to Juno (*Mer*. 690). Three times Plautus uses the term *concubina* to mean more properly a non-wedded long-term partner (*Epid*. 466, *Poen*. 102, *St*. 562), but the references are isolated with little or no relevance for the plot. At the same time, there are plays based on what should in every respect be concubinage, such as the *Cistellaria* (Alcesimarchus

[21] Vaan 2008: 439, s.v.
[22] The noun contributes to the acoustics of cuckolding marked by clustered *cu-* syllables (e.g. 802-9), as ingenuously proposed by Hough 1970.

and Selenium live together: 85, 312-19), but no consistent terminology associated with it. When the vocabulary and practice of concubinage walk past each other, it is clear that in Plautus the concept is not at home.

There are two possible interesting exceptions, the *Trinummus* and the *Miles Gloriosus*. The mention of concubinage in the *Trinummus* is brief but informative. Lesbonicus insists to betroth his sister to Lysiteles only with a dowry (688-92):

> *nolo ego mihi te tam prospicere, qui meam egestatem leves,*
> *sed ut inops infamis ne sim, ne mi hanc famam differant,*
> *me germanam meam sororem in concubinatum tibi,* 690
> *si sine dote <dem>, dedisse magis quam in matrimonium.*
> *quis me improbior perhibeatur esse*? *haec famigeratio*…
>
> I don't want you to worry about for how to ease my poverty,
> but rather that in poverty I do not end up infamous, that people don't spread the rumor
> that I gave you my own sister for concubinage
> rather than marriage, if <I give her> without dowry.
> Who would be considered more shameless than me? This rumor-spreading…

Absence of dowry would seem like a clear criterion for distinguishing between marriage and concubinage; the joke on *concubina dotata* in *St*. 562 presupposes this requirement. But Lesbonicus fears that this *might imply* concubinage, not prove it.[23] Outsiders can at best have a subjective impression. The emphasis on *fama* illustrates that the definition depends on how the whole affair appears.

8.4. The *concubina* in the *Miles gloriosus*: monotony of monogamy

These scattered and inconsistent references to concubinage in Plautus suggest that the concept is ill-suited to the operating framework of Roman comedy. By and large, men in *palliata* either have passionate and precarious affairs with *amicae*, or marriages—stable and procreative, but

[23] To the same effect Watson 1967: 3 notes that "the text, in this aspect, cannot possibly be giving Greek law if a dowry was essential to Greek marriage."

monotonous. This bipolar arrangement is at work especially when an *amica* is discovered to be marriageable and becomes the wife. Marriage as a goal is very different from marriage as a state. Desirable marriages between two young people come about in the plays' imaginary aftermath; meanwhile old men already married during the play see themselves as prisoners.[24] In that sense, concubinage as an informal-*yet-monogamous* liaison is exactly the pointless middle as far as comedy is concerned: neither fully socially valid nor adventurous.

Amidst Plautus' evident lack of interest in this kind of affair, the *Miles glorious* (with fourteen out of total nineteen instances of *concubina*) stands out spectacularly as the virtual charter text of concubinage on Roman stage. The exception is all the more remarkable since it ultimately confirms the unsuitability of concubinage for *palliata*. In the *Miles* the figures of *amica* and *concubina* are systematically constructed as foils to each other—moreover, through one and the same character, Philocomasium. Critics have noticed that she is alternately called the *amica* of the *adulescens* Pleusicles and the *concubina* of the soldier Pyrgopolinices (with whom she lives). Convenient though the distinction would be, the terminology is not entirely consistent; as we shall see, one exception is very suggestive. Most importantly, Plautus draws such astounding analogies between the two roles of Philocomasium that they seem precisely designed to invite comparison; the end shows that the concubine-side is unwelcome. Especially illuminating for understanding Terence's *duplex comoedia* starring Antiphila is how Plautus activates theatrical performance as a medium to visualize a woman's divided self as physical duplicity.

A summary of the *Miles* is as follows. Philocomasium the *meretrix* had been the lover of the *adulescens* Pleusicles in Athens, until the soldier Pyrgopolinices tricked her mother-

[24] See e.g. Moore 1998: 158: "Wives do not for the most part fare well in Plautus. Among his plays' most common jokes are second-century B.C.E. variations of Henry Youngman's "Take my wife—please"," followed by a selection of examples.

procuress and took the girl against her will to Ephesus to live with him, as a *concubina*. Pleusicles' slave Palaestrio, who meanwhile got kidnapped and also ended up as Pyrgopolinices' slave, informed his previous master. Pleusicles came to Ephesus and moved into a house adjacent to the soldier's, so as to continue meeting with Philocomasium, through a secret passageway on the shared wall. When once the two lovers are caught in an intimate moment by Pyrgopolinices' slave Sceledrus, Philocomasium will claim that it was her twin sister. This is the backstory narrated by Palaestrio (99-153), and the play begins. With Palaestrio's help Pyrgopolinices is ultimately tricked into believing that another woman, a *meretrix* hired for the deception, is in love with him and unhappily married to his old neighbor Periplectomenus. Pyrgopolinices sends Philocomasium away, adding Palaestrio as a gift; they sail away with Pleusicles, disguised as a captain. The soldier ends up empty-handed and humiliated, barely escaping punishment for adultery.

8.4.1. Mirror/mirror on the wall

The play exhibits consistent parallels between Philocomasium's relationships with the two men. Both Pyrgopolinices and Pleusicles would use their slaves (Sceledrus and Palaestrio, respectively) as informants about the whereabouts of Philocomasium. Both the initial transferal of Philocomasium to the soldier and her eventual restoration to Pleusicles are accompanied by Palaestrio (120; 1205-6). Especially important for a play so committed to deception is that Pleusicles eventually recovered Philocomasium the same way that Pyrgopolinices had acquired her, by trickery. In his prologue Palaestrio even uses the same metaphor of "smearing the face" in referring both to Pyrgopolinices hoodwinking Philocomasium's mother (*sublinit os*, 110) and to Philocomasium posing as her own twin sister before Sceledrus (*sublinetur os*, 153; confirmed:

sublinitur os, 467). One might actually imagine Pleusicles in a hypothetical "pre-prehistory" of the play pulling tricks to gain access to Philocomasium like many a Plautine *adulescens*. On the level of elementary structural layout, then, Philocomasium's relations to the two men are exactly like two sides of the same coin.

When Pleusicles moves next door to the soldier—thereby meeting the main requirement of concubinage, cohabitation—the symmetry is ingeniously reinforced spatially. Philocomasium the *amica* of Pleusicles becomes literally the mirror-image of Philocomasium the *concubina* of Pyrgopolinices. The secret passageway connecting the houses enables her to switch between a *concubina* and an *amica* without going out on the street. Once hidden from the audience's view, her transformation is not only seamless and uncanny, but further displaces the focus from her onto the two men. They are coming in and out while she is inside, as if they are the only variable in this arrangement, while she remains one and the same.

The mirror-effect surfaces in the use of the abovementioned terms for her relation to Pleusicles and Pyrgopolinices, *amica* and *concubina*, respectively. Both nouns are qualified with "of the master," *eri* or *erilis*, whenever possible.[25] The mandatory qualifier is all the more notable since only Philocomasium is referred to as either *amica* or *concubina*, so "of the master" is not meant, for example, to distinguish her from the other *meretrix* in the play, Acroteleutium. Instead, *erilis* highlights the *juxtaposition* of Philocomasium's two roles, which is particularly arresting when the appellatives *concubina* and *amica* are used by Palaestrio, who can uniquely refer both to Pleusicles and Pyrgopolinices as his master.[26] Palaestrio, the authoritative prologue

[25] Unmodified *concubina* is either spoken by Pyrgopolinices (973, 1095) or he is mentioned in the sentence in a way that makes the modifier inapplicable (Palaestrio speaking at 140, 146, 814, 1148; Periplectomenus at 937; cf. 508).
[26] *amica erilis/eri* of Pleusicles: 114, 122; 263; conjecture at 105; *concubina erilis* of Pyrgopolinices: 337, 458. One detail suggests that there is something significant about naming her; Palaestrio recounts in his prologue that when she first saw him in the soldier's house, she winked at him "not to address her by name" (*ubi contra aspexit me, oculis mihi signum dedit, | ne se appellarem*, 123-4).

narrator, functions as an axis around which the two rival lovers rotate, just like around Philocomasium, whom the slave follows in lockstep.

Expectedly, *concubina erilis* formula is also used by Pyrgopolinices' slave Sceledrus (362, 416, 470, 549). But we should not downplay the significance of the single instance where he calls her *amica erilis*, of Pyrgopolinices (274). A clue to this anomaly, I suggest, is that this is the one and only time Sceledrus sees her outside the house of his master, cheating on him in the neighboring house. At this point, and this point alone, he is an external observer and draws conclusions from her appearance. Her title depends on her behavior, and a woman in a passionate romance in *palliata* is called *amica*. Thus, *amica* stands for the clandestine passion of an extramural love affair as opposed to the monogamy—and monotony—entailed by *concubina*'s indoor exclusivity. The prerogatives of theatre as a medium are used to construct different types of romantic affairs against each other.

The character of Philocomasium, designed to exploit the ambiguity of symmetry, manifests the single most prominent motif in the play, the confusing duplicity. After Sceledrus sees her in incriminating intimacy with Pleusicles, Palaestrio advises her to pretend to be her own twin sister. The ruse is viable since she can easily move from one house to another and play the imaginary sister. In an aside, Palaestrio praises her skills: no man can ever come close to the bold confidence of a woman (464-5). Most importantly for the present discussion, he references the staging that symbolizes the puzzling symmetry of Philocomasium's role-playing (466-468):

> *ut utrubique <u>orationem</u> docte <u>divisit</u> suam*
> *ut sublinitur os custodi cauto, conservo meo.*
> *nimis beat quod commeatus transtinet trans parietem.*
>
> How expertly she <u>divided her speech</u> for each part!
> How she will smear the face of her careful guard, my fellow slave!
> I'm so thrilled that that a passage is leading through the wall.

The image of divided *oratio* is ever so reminiscent of Terence's *duplex comoedia*, incarnated as the "split-screen" Antiphila. On the one side there is the performance; on the other, there is what is hidden behind it. The only, and crucial, difference is that in Plautus the separating wall is, so to speak, perpendicular to the audience, who can "see" on either side (they are, in fact, told; the interior is of course invisible). Terence, as it were, rotates the wall by 90 degrees so that no one can see behind it, not even characters in the play.

8.4.2. Di-vision

The emphasis on faulty eyesight throughout the *Miles* means that assessing affection becomes a matter of perspective. In the prologue Palaestrio announced that the pretense will afflict Sceledrus' eyes like a disease (*glaucumam ob oculos obiciemus*, 148) so as to make him not see what he saw (147-9; cf. 199: *id visum ut ne visum siet*), but the audience is in the know: "She will bear the appearance of two women today, from here and from there, but she'll be the same one, pretending to be a different one" (*haec duarum hodie vicem | et hinc et illinc mulier feret imaginem, | atque eadem erit, verum alia esse adsimulabitur*, 150-2). When Sceledrus swears he Philocomasium her "with his own two eyes" (*duobus his oculis meis*), Palaestrio recommends he checks with a doctor (290-2) for otherwise he risks "dying twice over" (*dupliciter*), Palaestrio warns him (293-5), that is, he is doomed either way: whether for spreading misinformation or for bringing bad news (297-8). But also, I suggest, Palaestrio's "double"-pun, effectively connects Sceledrus' two eyes to the deceptive "duplicity" of things seen, that is, whether they are informative of the truth or not.[27]

[27] Palaestrio later hijacks Sceledrus' confidence for opposite effect: "I've seen the twin sister here with my own eyes" (*oculis meis | vidi hic sororem esse eius*, 1104-5).

Sceledrus persists in believing what he saw (301); he has his own eyes so he does not need someone else's, literally, "borrow eyes from outside" (*nec rogo utendos foris*, 347). The imagery is ever so appropriate, for he spied on Philocomasium from outside, from the roof through the *impluvium* (159, 173, 287, 340, 533). This image activates the restrictions of the stage as a medium so as to articulate the anxiety about women's fidelity. The audience cannot see behind the scene and the narrow *impluivum* manifests how privileged is the view at a woman indoors. Even that tiny keyhole-glimpse into the backstage, as Sceledrus will demonstrate, is unreliable; all that is left for judging a character is what the performance allows us.

Plautus thus explores the theatre's limited access to privacy and, consequently, the inherently deceptive nature of what it does present. Sceledrus' in his following encounter with Philocomasium says he is confident about what he saw (*viderim id quod viderim*, 370), and that he cannot be talked out of it, lit. his eyes "cannot be dug out with threats" (374). He thereby privileges cognitive reliability of the visual over verbal, ironically anticipating the eventual reversal where Pyrgopolinices will be tricked by lack of sight and deceptive speech (detailed analysis below). Philocomasium slyly questions the epistemological reliability of sight when she mentions that she dreamt her twin sister coming to visit (382-93; echoing Sceledrus' wondering if seeing Philocomasium was a dream, 272). Sceledrus is confused, as if a mist was thrown onto his eyes (*ob oculos caliginem opstitisse*, 405); he did not see Philocomasium, even if he did (*non vidi eam, etsi vidi*, 407). When next Philocomasium enters playing her twin sister, pretending not to recognize Sceledrus, Palaestrio steps in to increase Sceledrus' bewilderment: "I want to check if we are ourselves or someone else, in case some of the neighbors changed us when we weren't paying attention" (*persectari hic volo, | Sceledre, nos nostri an alieni simus, ne dum quispiam | nos vicinorum imprudentis aliquis immutaverit*, 430-2). Sceledrus finally sees the alleged twin

sister in the neighbor's house: "She is so similar to our girl, unless indeed it is the same one!" (*ita est ista huius similis nostrai tua, siquidem non eadem est*, 519-20); he eventually capitulates, admitting that he was "mad, blind, thoughtless" (*excordem, caecum, incogitabilem*, 544).

8.4.3. Choreography of affection

The only real difference between Philocomasium the soldier's concubine and Philocomasium the *adulescens*' *amica*—besides sharing a home, which Palaestrio solved by the literal (loop)hole—is the presence of affection. Pyrgopolinices took Philocomasium against her will (*invitam mulierem*, 113); Sceledrus threatens to force her back home, *invitam* (449-450). Pleusicles and Philocomasium, by contrast, love each other and enjoy "the best type of love," as Palaestrio tells us in the prologue (100-1).

Significantly, reciprocity is exactly what Pyrgopolinices wants. He intends to monopolize Philocomasium but obliges to grant her the same monopoly on him. The deception depends on everyone being confident that he will send her away to make room for another woman, Acroteleutium, who pretends to be crazy about specifically and only him. Without even having seen the successoress, Pyrgopolinices commits to a relationship as long as she wants it (*cupio hercle equidem si illa volt*, 972). When he sees Acroteleutium in (feigned) trance out of love for him, he says it is mutual (*mutuom fit*, 1253). This is in fact in keeping with Pyrgopolinices' portrayal at the very beginning, before Palaestrio's postponed prologue, where the soldier keeps swallowing his parasite's flattering remarks that no woman can resist him (55-71). The scene introduces a very subtle treatment of exclusivity and reciprocity. For even though the obsessive narcissist is, to comic effect, all too ready to believe that he is in high demand, the whole point of the play is that he can be with only one woman at a time. When he restricts Philocomasium'

freedom by sequestering her in a room where no one can set foot except her (140-1) he only aims to simulate conjugal privileges for *both* of them. Meanwhile on the opposite side, however "best" the love between Pleusicles and Philocomasium is supposed to be, the coordinates are restrictive. The fact that she is a *metretrix* makes the affair inherently precarious and occasional. Pleusicles, after all, did not envision a more regular and exclusive arrangement with her until Pyrgopolinices cheated her mother out of her.

But there is another more conspicuous wrinkle in the otherwise seemingly tidy distinction between Philocomasium's unwilling and consensual romances. When among so many parallels—including acquiring her by trickery—the only real difference is how *she* feels, it is remarkable that the entire second half of the play (765 till the end) is devoted to staging the deceptive nature of affection professed by women.[28] Acroteleutium, the "young *meretrix*" (789) who will pretend to be unhappily married to the neighbor Periplectomenus and enamored with Pyrgopolinices (795-8), states that for women of her trade (*opificina*, 880) such pretense is a matter of course: it is their natural state (887-90; cf. 905-6; 915-22; 941-3). And Philocomasium, we remember, is in the same trade.

Commenting briefly on structural parallels with Terence's *HT* is very instructive for interpreting the theme of assessing female affection in both plays. In both cases there is one heavy-duty professional *meretrix* who effortlessly pretends to be in a relationship with a man; Acroteleutium poses as Periplectomenus' wife, Bacchis as Clinia's *amica*. Next to them there are the more sympathetic female characters who, by contrast, are supposed to harbor emotions for their men, but are likewise associated with prostitution in one way or another, and indeed participate in a ruse of their own: Antiphila pretends to be Bacchis' maid, Philocomasium to be

[28] Some dramaturgic inconsistencies lead to the proposal that the second deception does not come from the same Greek model as the first, however this may be explained (Williams 1958; references in Gratwick 1982: 98; add Jocelyn 1995); if so, it only proves how interested was Plautus in the theme of deceptive affections.

her own twin sister. The same language of trickery used in all instances is telling. The verb *titubare*, "totter," comes to be in Plautus a specialized term for lack of confidence or a wrong move during a disguise trick (only exception is *Men*. 142), particularly in an optative context (*ne quid titubet, docte ut hanc ferat fallaciam*, *Ps*. 765; *vide ne titubes*, *Ps*. 942).[29] In the *Miles* it is used twice, once for the disguise of Philocomasium (the "nicer" of the two girls), once for the entire deception, including perhaps Acroteleutium as well (*ne titubet, si exquiret ex ea miles*, 248; *ne quid, ubi miles venerit, titubetur*, 946). Terence uses it only once, for the disguise of the not-so-nice *meretrix* Bacchis (*verum illa nequid titubet*, *HT* 361). The similarities between these presumably sympathetic girls and the hard core *meretrices* (and the arch-trickster Pseudolus) suggest that deep down the differences between them are more of degree than of essence.

8.4.3.1. Sealing the sail

Indispensable for the deception in the *Miles* is that the soldier has never seen Acroteleutium. When Palaestrio first addresses Acroteleutium, she wonders who is that who calls her *as if* he knows her (*qui tam pro nota nominat me*? 901). The seemingly casual retort announces that this is how the soldier will be tricked (922-6):

> PAL. *nempe tu novisti militem meum erum?* ACR. *rogare mirumst.*
> *populi odium quidni noverim, magnidicum, cincinnatum,*
> *moechum unguentatum.* PAL. *num ille te nam novit?* ACR. *numquam vidit:*
> *qui noverit me quis ego sim?* PAL. *nimis lepide fabulare;* 925
> *eo pote fierit lepidius pol fieri*.
>
> PAL. Surely you know my master, the soldier? ACR. What a question.
> How could I not know such a public menace, braggart, curly-haired,
> perfumed lecher? PAL. But he doesn't know you? ACR. Never saw me;
> how could he know who I am? PAL. You talk very charmingly! 925
> That's how all this will be done more charmingly.[30]

[29] *lacrumans titubanti animo* at *Ps*. 44 might be foreshadowing the disguise trick.
[30] *pote fierit* Lindsay; MSS *potiverim*; the general sense of the line is not in jeopardy.

While she gives a full visual, auditory, and olfactory description of the soldier, the prerequisite for the trick is that his only information about her is what he heard.

Preparations described previously in this scene emphasize that speech and hearing are instrumental. As Acroteleutium and Periplectomenus approach Palaestrio, he first notices her looks: "What a charming appearance... How appropriately furnished she comes, how un-prostitutely!" (*nimis lepida forma… | quam digne ornate incedit, hau meretricie*! 871-2). He then observes that Periplectomenus is coming "charmingly furnished" (*lepide hercle ornatus*, 897), referring to Acroteleutium and her maid Milphidippa; Periplectomenus responds that the girls are "as furnished" as Palaestrio requested (*quas me iussisti adducere et quo ornatu*, 899). But Palaestrio's question to Acroteleutium reveals that "the equipment" is *verbal* freight: "Has he [sc. Periplectomenus] loaded you with instructions?" (*ecquid hic te | oneravit praeceptis*? 902-3). This turns out to be a known Plautine metaphor for trickery (cf. *onerabo meis praeceptis*, *Ps*. 765), but in the *Miles* it is further extended with profound thematic relevance. Acroteleutium picks up the cargo imagery in an elaborate metaphor of the trick as building a ship, a sort of a nautical equivalent of the Trojan horse (915-921). The feminine *navis* with serial feminine adjectives effectively alludes to a deceptive woman: well in line, laid out, arranged, set out, soon to be ready (*bene lineatam… fundata consituta… fundata bene statuta… cito erit parata navis*, 916-18). Instrumentalizing female trickery in this way unambiguously foreshadows Philocomasium's eventual escape on a ship with Pleusicles ("Famous Seafarer") disguised as captain (1108-10, 1177-88, 1283-35, 1340).[31]

[31] Compare Palaestrio saying that Acroteleutium and Philocomasium will "steer more skillfully" after eavesdropping Palaestrio's conversation with the soldier (*lepide factumst: iam ex sermone hoc gubernabunt doctius porro*, 1091). The image of poetry as both carpentry and a ship as a means of transport is well-attested in archaic Greek and Indo-European poetry: West 2007: 38-42.

The thematically activated language of seafaring explains a curious metaphor used by Acroteleutium in her first appearance in the scene. She tells Periplectomenus that she knew exactly what to do after her ears sipped from the shore of his speech (*postquam adbibere auris meae tuae oram orationis*, 882). The emphatic *or-/aur-* alliteration introduces the sounds and imagery that we have seen in 899-918: the deception is a ship "well-furnished," i.e. loaded (*onerata*), but also "furnished" meaning embellished (*ornata*) with scripted speech (*orationis*), approaching the ears (*auris*) like a shore (*oram*). The phonetic journey from orality to aurality captures the symmetrical seafaring rotation in the play: in comes Acroteleutium the decoy ship, crossing the maritime border as she transforms from a *meretrix* into a wife.[32] Correspondingly, out goes Philocomasium for a full circle from Athenian *amica* to Ephesian *concubina* and back.[33]

8.4.3.2. Flush of fabrication: equal to Sappho, she seems

The stunt for Pyrgopolinices begins (1217), as Acroteleutium and Milphidippa pretend not to see him and rehearse a few words in his praise for him to hear. Acroteleutium stresses the auditory medium of deception: "Don't spare the voice, let him hear you" (*ne parce vocem, ut audiat*, 1220). The soldier, who cannot see them (1222), summarizes the essence of their performance, indeed of the whole play, in one sentence: "How I *seem* to be loved!" (*ut amari videor*, 1223). Throughout this scene (1220-83) Acroteleutium feigns losing muscle strength, breath, speech, sight, mind, and claims suicidal intentions. Traill collects references to Sappho throughout the play and attractively argues that in this scene Acroteleutium parodies the image of the archetypal love poetess; she concludes that "[t]he scene draws on a long comic tradition of eroticizing

[32] Sailing is a widespread metaphor for sex in antiquity: Murgatroyd 1995. For the sexual connotation of engulfment and shipwreck, see Anaxilas, frg. 22.18-19; Fontaine 2010: 25-26.
[33] The well-known similarities between the escape scenes in the *Miles* and in Euripides' *Helen* (Leo 1912: 165-167; Raffaelli 2009) add further to the idea of substitution and deception, and above all of the phantom-like nature of women.

Sappho and depicting her as a hetaira" and that she is invoked as "an example of passionate love carried to extremes—a discreditable and immodest love perhaps, but a sincere one. Acroteleutium chooses the role precisely because Sappho offered a credible model of female infatuation, perhaps the most credible model available on the comic stage."[34]

For the present discussion it is just as important that the scene is informed by Plautus' own dramaturgic practice. The scene of Pyrgopolinices "overhearing" his "beloved" Acroteleutium and her maid is very similar to Philolaches really overhearing his beloved Philematium and her maid in the *Mostellaria* (157-292). The parallels are numerous: both maids praise their mistresses' looks and raise the issue of assessing physical appearance (*Mos*. 166-80; 248-65; *Mil*. 1236-8); lovers are recognized by scent (*Mos*. 271-8; *Mil*. 1255-6); the theme of reciprocity and exclusivity comes up (*Mos*. 182-4, 188-90; *Mil*. 1231-3); interlopers invoke Venus (*Mos*. 161-5; *Mil*. 1227-30); and so on. It is not really relevant whether all these parallels are taken as Plautine self-imitation or as stock components of a stock scene. The fact that Plautus placed in the same setting a sympathetic *adulescens* witnessing confession of true love, and an allegedly odious antagonist being duped by false proclamations of love, adds a curious twist to both.

It is perhaps only fair that Pyrgopolinices' amatory pursuits are legitimized in this way. He may be a comic butt in this play, but he is no less selfish and vulnerable to a woman's charms than any (comic) man in need of affection. But this correspondence casts a more uncomfortable shadow of a doubt on the scene with Philolaches and Philematium, and by extension to any instance of affection professed by an *amica*. To press for implications, this would mean that it is always inherently possible that comic enamored men are being fooled by their seemingly devoted sweethearts all along. The mere fact that a loving woman in Roman comedy is presented

[34] Traill 2005: 533.

by and large as a *meretrix* (or the convenient variation, the pseudo-*meretrix*) indicates that the question is unanswerable by definition. The whole point of comic *meretrices* is that they are symbolic product of male anxiety and fantasy. As Pyrgopolinices amazingly testifies, whether women's emotions are sincere or calculated may depend on what men *want* to see. No one proves this better than Terence with Antiphila, left to float in a limbo between spontaneous and staged affection. Her "Victorian-style near-feinting fit," we now realize, is very much Sappho-style. The programmatic question of the *HT* is whether or not it is refracted through Acroteleutium.

8.4.4. Birth and wedding certificates, reproduced

In a play with such interest in both social and dramaturgic grey areas of male-female relations especially significant is the arbitrariness of both social and theatrical roles. A good example is an earlier passage where Pyrgopolinices interrogates Palaestrio about the suitoress (961-8):

> PYR. *quid ea? ingenuan an festuca facta e serva liberast*?
> PAL. *vah, egone ut ad te ab libertina esse auderem internuntius*,
> *qui ingenuis satis responsare nequeas quae cupiunt tui*?
> PYR. *nuptan est an vidua*? PAL. *et nupta et vidua*. PYR. *quo pacto potis* [964-965]
> *nupta et vidua esse eadem*? PAL. *quia adulescens nuptast cum sene*.
> PYR. *eugae!* PAL. *lepida et liberali formast*. PYR. *cave mendacium*.
> PAL. *ad tuam formam illa una dignast*. PYR. *hercle pulchram praedicas*.
>
> PYR. What about her? Is she freeborn or freed from slavery with a rod?
> PAL. Come on: would I dare be a messenger from a freedwoman to you,
> when you can barely respond to all the freeborn who are after you?
> PYR. Is she married or single? PAL. Both married and single. PYR. How can
> one and the same woman be both married and single? PAL. Because she's young but
> married to an old man.
> PYR. Great! PAL. She looks charming and freeborn. PYR. Don't lie to me.
> PAL. She alone is worthy of *your* beauty. PYR. Then you're saying beautiful, by god.

The first prerequisite for marriage, that the woman is not already married, is arbitrary in that it depends on how she feels. Palaestrio soon explains that by "both married and unmarried" he

means that she plans to leave her husband because she does not love him (970-2). Pyrgopolinices understands it soon enough (967), but his question upon first hearing indicates that *et nupta et vidua* is meant to sound paradoxical, just like Menander's γαμετὴν ἑταίραν. Like Menander, Plautus toys with the idea that a concubine is the middle-ground between a wife and a non-wife by basing the oxymoron on the distinction between the visible and the underlying: Acroteleutium is only *formally* married while *in fact* she is available. Acroteleutium's contradictory duplicity is highlighted by the situation of the soldier's other partner: Acroteleutium is supposedly *both* married and single, but actually, just like the other *meretrix* Philocomasium, she is precisely neither. Just as it was the case with Antiphila and Menander's Chrysis in the *Samia*, the truth value of a woman's emotions in the *Miles* determines her social status and the comic type; marital status is forged by forging affection. The second non-arbitrary quality required for citizen marriage, free birth, becomes a matter of impression as well, as Palaestrio pairs Acroteleutium's appearance (*liberali forma*) with her family pedigree (*liberast*).

Her looks has special importance because the condition for the ruse is that Pyrgopolinices has never seen her (as she stresses at 924-5, above) but merely hears about her appearance. He is distanced from the truth about her by yet one more level of representation. Two degrees of mediation are put to use practically as well. In the rehearsal scene analyzed above, Palaestrio specifically reminds Acroteleutium to tell Pyrgopolinices that the preliminary matchmaking has been mediated by two slaves, himself and Milphidippa (*quasique ea res per me interpretem et tuam ancillam ei curetur*, 910). Palaestrio's role of an *interpres* and of an *internuntius* in the last passage above (962) recalls Syrus in the *HT* (*internuntii* at 299, discussed in the previous chapter, 7.4.3). The mediation of both Syrus and Palaestrio reflects the unreliability of literary representation. An alleged form presented through speech is theater at its most deceptive, and

this is all that Terence's Clinia and Plautus' soldier will ever get—and all they need. Both of them are content with a favorable third-hand reproduction of the women.

At the end of the passage Plautus provides a discreet commentary on the character of Pyrgopolinices. Since the soldier longs for romantic reciprocity, it is symptomatic that at 967-8 he is disarmed by hearing that he and his suitoress are formally a match: as if he is looking himself in the mirror. Moreover, especially appealing is that that visual reciprocity is promised verbally. The exact phrasing of 968 (*formam… praedicas*) recalls the only two other Plautine instances of *praedicare* or derivatives referring to *forma*, both in this play. All three times the issue is whether actual appearance rises to the level of its description, *praedicatio*. Acroteleutium feigns modesty for Pyrgopolinices to hear: she fears his eyes might change his mind (1234) because the description he heard from Milphidippa will surpass her appearance (*metuo, ne praedicatio tua nunc meam formam exsuperet*, 1237); Milphidippa, playing along, assures her that she took care not to oversell her, so that her beauty will outdo his expectations (*istuc curavi, ut opinione illius pulchrior sis*, 1238). And Pyrgopolinices himself, Palaestrio says, "describes his beauty as surpassing that of Alexander" (*isque Alexandri praestare praedicat formae suam*, 777). The soldier, who in the opening scene is eager to *hear* about *his* beauty, once again proves that verbal rendering, be it false, is his preferred mode of perception.

8.4.5. Invasions, incisions, incest

Acroteleutium's Sapphic stunt is finally weaved into the "moral of the story." The soldier is never told who she really was, but instead threatened with punishment for adultery (castration) as if he made a move on another man's wife (*subigitare alienam uxorem*, 1402). He ends the play himself lecturing that adultery is a bad thing (1435) but the lesson is dramaturgically and morally

questionable. Acroteleutium is not Periplectomenus' wife, and even if she were, she said that she was going to leave him (1409-10). *Everyone* in the play knows what is going on except for Pyrgopolinices (and Sceledrus who is conveniently removed before the ruse begins, left sleeping at 867). The soldier should be morally the least problematic of the cast. He plans to marry Acroteleutium (1239-42); the first thing he says upon hearing about her is that he must get rid of Philocomasium (973). Finally, charging Pyrgopolinices with adultery seems all the more disingenuous when it is Pleusicles who secretly meets Philocomasium behind the soldier's back.[35] In a word, Pyrgopolinices is framed by comedy itself. Why?

The simplest answer is that Pyrgopolinices' crime is pursuing a permanent relationship. The agenda of partying bachelorhood is one hand specific to this play. In a lengthy digression the old neighbor Periplectomenus praises the benefits of being single (678-725), especially childless (701-25).[36] At the same time, his cameo unpacks the implicit regulations of Roman comedy, in which an affair based on love is encoded as an unstable, passionate relationship with an *amica*. Happy marriages between youths are not staged because they are only an imaginary endgame; unfavorable portrayal of married life of the elderly proves as much.[37] This, if anything, is the only way to explain the otherwise odd ethical implications of the ending of the *Miles*. Philocomasium rejects stable domesticity with the soldier, who would devote himself to her alone; and in his means of acquiring her he is no different than his rival. Instead she chooses, for emotional reasons (a problem in itself, we have seen), the precarious relationship with Pleusicles.

[35] Figuratively speaking: it is uncertain whether *adulterium* with a *concubina* was legally sanctioned: Treggiari 1981: 72-74.
[36] See Jocelyn 1995: 118-119 on the uniqueness of Periplectomenus.
[37] Terence's *Hecyra* is an exception that proves the rule fascinatingly, as it dramatizes the already married young couple, Pamphilus and Philumena, in crisis, or as Konstan 1983: 134 put it, "a kind of morning-after feeling." The twist is unlikely dramaturgically innovative as such since the same scenario features in Menander's *Epitrepontes*; but there is an extremely attractive possibility that Terence added a metapoetic charge. Penwill 2004: 130 reads the *Hecyra*'s couple as an afterlife of Pamphilus and Philumena from the *Andria*: "In effect, what the *Hecyra* presents is a 'Pamphilus and Philumena Part II'."

Her episode with the soldier is evidence enough that her "preferred" type of affair is wholly unpredictable, and there is no indication that it would be any different once she returns to Pleusicles. In other words, Philocomasium would rather stay on the market as a *meretrix* than live with one man.

Such a woman is a very *palliata*-style articulation of male anxieties. One hears the etymology at work in the background: *concubinatus*, for better or worse, implies a regularly shared bedroom. The relationship with an *amica*, conceived of as a series of non-binding (however frequent) visits, offers the *amor*. The irony specific to the *Miles* is that concubinage is a temporary anomaly and the *amica*-type-relationship is the norm that needs to be restored. It is because the "blocking character" does not subscribe to this outlook that Plautus pulls the rug out from underneath his feet. Pyrgopolinices suffers from the exact same syndrome as the soldier Thraso in Terence's *Eunuchus*.[38] Roman comedy is no place for steady and exclusive relationships, even though—or in fact precisely because—marriage is the hypothetical *telos* of comedy, waiting for the man after the play is over.

What additionally denounces the pursuit of conjugal monogamy in the *Miles* is an intriguing nexus of Oedipal allusions. The second halves of the names of the two rivals, Pyrgo-Polynices and Pleusi-cles (more on the first halves below), recall Oedipus' sons, the two Theban brothers Polynices and Eteocles. Oedipus mandated them to alternate on the throne but Eteocles refused to share and step down, so Polynices invaded his own kingdom and ended up as the public enemy. One of the central moral problems of the myth is the issue of taking sides. In the equally symmetrical Plautine quest for "the throne," Pyrgopolinices ends up on the losing side for an ironically inverted reason. It is him ("Polynices"), not Pleusicles ("Eteocles"), who wants

[38] Chapter 3, esp. 3.4.

to monopolize his holdings; Pleusicles seems fairly happy living next door and enjoying his half of Philocomasium. The Theban subtext complicates the question of who is in the wrong.

Oedipal underpinnings add more related effects. Pyrgopolinices, self-styled celebrity, is convinced that he is the most popular person in the community, which cannot be further from the truth (89-94, 1391-2); Acroteleutium's first association about him is *populi odium* (923, above). Likewise, in a textbook example of Sophoclean irony, Oedipus is unaware that he is the murderer of king Laius and thus the most hated man in the kingdom all along. Most importantly, both heroes' ignorance fuels the tension between legitimate and illicit sexual relation. Just as Oedipus inadvertently commits an ultimate sexual transgression, so is the soldier inadvertently guilty of seeking permanent bond; the actual reason that I suggest surfaces all the more since the charge of adultery is blatantly false.[39] By occupying one half of shareable Philocomasium, the soldier represents the public enemy "Polynices" (actually, Eteocles); by aiming for an exclusive long-term communion with Acroteleutium, he becomes the public enemy Oedipus. Marriage in the *Miles* is as outrageous as incest.[40]

Lastly, the inseparable motifs of sight, blindness, and deception in the *Miles* aptly reflect Oedipus' blinding, embodying the hidden truth practically. In a passage cited above, Sceledrus, who witnessed Philocomasium cheating on the soldier, specifies that his "eyes cannot be dug out with threats" (*non possunt mihi minaciis tuis hisce oculi exfodiri*, 375). The reference to Oedipus-like demise is especially sinister as it parallels the threat of removing another set of pair organs at the end of the play, i.e. emasculation of Pyrgopolinices (1394-1422). The very Plautine pun on *testis*, "testicle" and "witness" (*intestatus*, 1416, *intestabilis*, 1417, *salvis testibus*, 1420)[41]

[39] For the revolutionary interpretation that Oedipus is likewise innocent, see Ahl 1991.
[40] The naval imagery of Acroteleutium's proposal-prank might even have something to do with the dangerous harbor used repeatedly as metaphor of incestuous marriage in Sophocles' *Oedipus Tyrannus* (422-4, 1208-10).
[41] Cf. some of my remarks on *Cur*. 31-38 in Chapter 4.2, with references.

is not the least trivial. Removing Sceledrus' two eyes would remove all evidence of illicit romance. Removing Pyrgopolinices' two testicles would remove the essence of marriage: producing children; one notices the chillingly graphic threat that he will wear his severed scrotum around his neck like a baby carries a rattle (*ut ea iam quasi puero in collo pendeant crepundia*, 1399). In the absence of offspring, proving legitimacy of a communion can only be entrusted to untrustworthy vision.

The characters' names are complementarily suggestive from another angle as well. The alliterative *p-/-r-/-l-/-s-* tongue-twisters—Pyrgopolinices, Pleusicles, Philocomasium, Palaestrio, especially Periplectomenus—make the attribution of roles appropriately "perplexing:" one woman two twins, one woman two men (and one wall two houses), one slave two masters, youthful *senex*, and so on. Among them, the names of the two rivals and the women bear special thematic significance in light of the extensive nautical imagery (above, 8.4.3.1). Pleusicles, the "Famous Sea-Voyager," symbolizes a centrifugal adventurer in a never-ending chase for love. Pyrgopolinices, the "Besieger of Many Towers," is the contrasting centripetal force who wants to *break in* and *settle down* in his own coastal Ephesus. Acroteleutium's non-perplexing name stands out as his pinnacle, his "Ultimate Acropolis."

The name of Philocomasium is sometimes dismissively understood as a generic euphemism for a prostitute, "Party-Girl" (κῶμος, "revel"). H. D. Jocelyn lists it alongside other names in the play that have "no particular links with what is said by, or of, the personages who bear them in the *Miles*."[42] Yet the name would very effectively evoke two closely related images, of κόμα, "hair" (Lat. *coma*) and κόμμα, "section," "slice" (from κόπτω, "to cut"). One passage compactly illustrates the connection. Adorned hair in this play is ridiculed as Pyrgopolinices'

[42] Jocelyn 1995: 118: "The names Artotrogus, Palaestrio, Sceledrus, Philocomasium and Milphidippa… suit in a general way the figures of the parasite, the first-order slave, the second-order slave and the whore; at the same time they have no particular links with what is said by, or of, the personages who bear them in the *Miles*."

obsession (64, 923-4), and "trimming" it is the metaphor Palaestrio uses for tricking him; he says he found a neat scheme that will fleece, lit. "mutilate," the long-haired soldier and give Philocomasium a chance to escape (*qui admutiletur miles usque caesariatus atque uti | huic amanti ac Philocomasio hanc ecficiamus copiam,…* 768-9; *k*-alliteration in the second line sounds quite like clipping scissors). The image can hardly be more direct: shearing the soldier's beloved hair means depriving him of the beloved Philo-κομα-sium. The ominously foreshadowed "mutilation," i.e. his castration, reminds us that by losing her he loses the potential child-bearing partner.

And all the while, Philo-κομμα-sium is a "Lover-cut-in-two" in every respect. In order to impersonate her twin sister and in effect create another lover for Pleusicles in her image, she "divided the speech" (*orationem… divisit*, 466, above); indeed κόμμα, Latin *incisum*, is an actual rhetorical term for parts of a sentence.[43] Most obviously, of course, Philocomasium is physically divided by the wall—the wall that that separates the no-strings-attached affair from long-term marriage-like cohabitation. The wall eventually cuts her off from procreative communion just like the soldier's reproductive glands would be cut off from him.

Philocomasium broken in half thus symbolizes the division between passion and accountability. But as she is only a projection of men surrounding her (and creating her literary character), it is not "she" who is the problem. Especially suggestive is one vivid image in the final near-lynch scene. Periplectomenus orders the slaves to snatch Pyrgopolinices, "tear him apart between heaven and earth," and "spread him and stretch him across" (*facite inter terram*

[43] Cic. *Orat*. 211.5: *cum Graeci* κόμματα *et* κῶλα *nominent, nos non recte incisa et membra dicamus*; Quint. *Inst.* 9.4.22: *incisa, quae commata dicuntur*.

atque caelum ut siet, discindite, 1395; *dispennite hominem divorsum et distendite*, 1407).[44] A woman is split at the middle because it is the man who is torn.

To conclude, if there is one thing that concubinage as the middle ground does best, it is highlighting the extremes on either side of it: stable and procreative relationship on one side; unpredictable and pleasure-driven affair on the other. Already in Menander this murky grey area came to be associated with the inherent unreliability of literary representation. It seems to be the contribution of his Roman successors that this ambivalence is conceptualized as formal duplicity. The fact that we are generously guided through seeing on both sides of the dividing wall in the *Miles* warns us that this privileged perspective can be denied, like in Terence's *HT*. If Clinia could see the backstage layer of Antiphila through the outer layer of her scripted role, he *might* see the same deception that is literally staged for Pyrgopolinices, but he also *might not*. While Plautus demonstrates that comic women are poetic tropes articulating male fantasies and anxieties about adventure and responsibility, Terence shows that particularly informative of the forces at work is not so much what the performance shows but what it hides.

[44] Fontaine 2010: 116-118 interprets *dispennite* as wordplay on penis, "de-penis" (appropriate in the context of castration).

Conclusion

Is Terence a quintessentially self-reflexive poet? He might not be parading it as obviously as one might want, but embracing "artificiality" is foundational for *palliata*, as its Latin-speaking Greek-dressed characters keep reminding us. Awareness of this may have stimulated Plautus to keep breaking the fourth wall. But breaking character is, arguably, a cheap trick and, inarguably, a theatrical one. Terence, aspiring to a more textual status, allows us a peek into his version of the backstage through the literary-polemical prologues instead.

The very existence of his prologues tells us more than all the information in them. Terence makes it clear that he is aware of his position in literary history and he speaks of himself as a writer. Whenever he appears to be following his predecessors, deviating from them, or falling short of them, this is by design. He is able cite Plautus verbatim, including the verse-number.[1] He thus comes across much less like a Roman comedian as imagined in the subtitle of G. E. Duckworth's magisterial 1952 monograph—Study in *Popular* Entertainment—than as an Alexandrian-style poet, who knows his reading list by heart. And precisely by assuming a superior position of a knowledgeable reader he contributes to canonization of his predecessors.

This is not a paradox; this is how literary appropriation works. A good example is Terence's revamping of one Plautine joke. Instead of using a phrase "sleep on both ears," Pseudolus updates it and says "sleep on both eyes," because it is "less hackneyed" (*pervolgatumst minus*, 124). This is how Plautus claims superior treatment of old material. The phrase occurs only once more in comedy, in an identical situation: Terence's scheming slave Syrus tells his master not to worry about getting the girl, but he uses the un-updated, integral

[1] Fontaine 2013.

version, "sleep on both ears" (*in aurem utramvis otiose ut dormias*, *HT* 342). Can it be that the phrase which had been hackneyed in 191 BCE somehow got reborn by 160s, so as to be uttered without reservation, completely deadpan? This is how Terence claims superior treatment of old material. He is "rolling it back" to a time before it was hackneyed; he retrojects himself before Plautus. Of course, the whole point is that for the joke to work we must know Plautus.

This peculiar trick we have seen in action in the first part of the present study, while simultaneously explaining some very real dramaturgical problems in the *Eunuchus*. Why does Phaedria agree to share Thais? Why is the history of possession of Pamphila so turbulent, and why is proving her identity scripted so very awkwardly? Why does Chaerea assault her mid-play? My metapoetic interpretation is that these concerns are tropes for poetic primacy and exclusivity. Terence should not have, the story goes, adapted an already adapted play. Since he claims he did it unwittingly, the earlier plays are *as if* nonexistent—and I use the "as if" in its ambiguous meaning that lurks in John Wright's assessment of Terence quoted in the Introduction. The poetics of the *Eunuchus* seemingly challenges the very Roman conception of literary history outlined in the Introduction—peaceful cohabitation and succession—only to confirm it. Terence circumvents his predecessors by envisioning the *Eunuchus* as a prehistory of comedy—of course, entirely disingenuously, for he needs the predecessors wherein to insert himself; accordingly, the *Eunuchus* is a prehistory of the genre and profoundly repetitive at the same time.

Similarly to his fellow-latecomers Euripides and Ovid, Terence's interacts with earlier literature by exposing "how it works." Already his first play, the *Andria*, is poking fun at everything that Plautus' comedy stands for.[2] He continues intervening in Menandro-Plautine comedy by readdressing creatively its greatest assets: timelessness and conventionality. What

[2] A survey in Knorr 2007.

made New Comedy transportable to Rome and beyond is that it offers a surface snapshot of one day in life of some people who may as well be anonymous. Terence starts prying around those boundaries. What happens before and after the play, and, for that matter, during the play? And who are these people, anyway?

He approaches these questions in the *Self-Tormentor* as he tests the limits of literary representation. The unknowability of a woman's sincerity shows that drama is duplicitous by definition. His most effective move in portraying the mysterious Antiphila is remixing what was already there. Her Plautine and Menandrian kinswomen are either honestly devoted or clearly pretending. Terence denies us this piece of information and leaves Antiphila in an ontological limbo. Significantly, once the assessment of a woman's character is shown to be arbitrary, Plautine characters no longer look the same either.

Terence's focus on metapoetics of female characters might be due to the fact that from the playwrights' perspective their portrayal is the single most complex variable in a play. They articulate many interwoven expectations: individual and collective male hopes and fears, social position in both Greece and Rome, literary convention. Since it was men who wrote them, acted them, watched them, and read them, these women are about as "artificial" as can be. In constructing a female character there is most room for highlighting the compositional procedures, if one is so inclined. Not that Plautus had any other option of writing them, as his *Miles gloriosus* shows, but Terence decides to call attention to the process. Finally, my inquiry into the tight connection between theatricality and sexuality in the *Casina* in the first chapter suggests that Plautus could have been well acquainted with the trope and that he may have imaged that play as a woman for one specific purpose. If so, we can never know why not elsewhere as well. But if anyone would have known, it is Terence.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Abel, K. (1955). *Die Plautusprologe*. Mülheim (Ruhr) Saarn: C. Fabri.

Acosta-Hughes, B. (2002). *Polyeideia: The Iambi of Callimachus and the archaic Iambic tradition*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

_____, Stephens, S. A. (2002). "Rereading Callimachus' *Aetia* Fragment 1." *CPh* 97.3: 238-255.

_____, Lehnus, L., Stephens, S. A., eds. (2011). *Brill's companion to Callimachus*. Leiden: Brill.

Adams, J. N. (1982). *The Latin sexual vocabulary*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Ahl, F. (1991). *Sophocles' Oedipus: Evidence and self-conviction*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Allan, W. (2008). *Euripides: Helen*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Anderson, P. (2006). "Martial 1.29: Appearance and Authorship." *RhM* 149.1: 119-122.

Ángel y Espinós, J., et al., ed. (2015). Ὑγίεια καὶ γέλως: *Homenaje a Ignacio Rodríguez Alfageme*. Zaragoza: Pórtico Libros.

Arnott, W. G. (1979-2000). *Menander*. 3 vols. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

_____. (1985). "Terence's Prologues." *PLLS* 5: 1-7.

_____. (1996). *Alexis: The fragments: A commentary*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Augoustakis, A., Traill, A., eds. (2013). *A companion to Terence*. Chichester, UK: Wiley-Blackwell.

Austin, J. C. (1922). *The significant name in Terence*. Urbana: University of Illinois.

Bagordo, A. (2001). *Beobachtungen zur Sprache des Terenz: Mit besonderer Berücksichtigung der umgangssprachlichen Elemente*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

Bain, D. (1983). *Menander: Samia*. Warminster, UK: Aris & Phillips.

Bakola, E. (2010). *Cratinus and the Art of Comedy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Barchiesi, A. (2001). *Speaking volumes: Narrative and intertext in Ovid and other Latin poets*. Ed. tr. M. Fox, S. Marchesi. London: Duckworth.

Barsby, J. (1993). "Problems of Adaptation in the *Eunuchus* of Terence." In: Slater and Zimmermann 1993: 160-179.

_____. (1999). *Terence: Eunuchus*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

_____. (2001). *Terence: The Woman of Andros; The Self-Tormentor; The Eununch*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Bartsch, S. (2015). *Persius: A study in food, philosophy, and the figural*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Batchelder, A. G. (1995). *The seal of Orestes: Self-reference and authority in Sophocles' Electra*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.

Baudelaire, C. (1949). *Journaux intimes: Fusées. Mon coeur mis à nu. Carnet*. Paris: J. Corti.

Beacham, R. C. (1991). *The Roman theatre and its audience*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Beare, W. (1937). "Recent work on the Roman theatre." *CR* 51: 105-11.

_____. (1940). "The secret of Terence." *Hermathena* 56: 21-39.

_____. (1942). "The Life of Terence." *Hermathena* 59: 20-29.

_____. (1948). “Terence, an original dramatist in Rome.” *Hermathena* 71: 64-82.

_____. (1959). “*Contaminatio*.” *CR* 9.1: 7-11.

Bentley, E. (1964). “On the Other Side of Despair.” In: Palmer 1984: 135-50.

Benz, L., Stärk, E., Vogt-Spira, G., eds. (1995). *Plautus und die Tradition des Stegreifspiels: Festgabe fur Eckard Lefèvre zum 60. Geburtstag*. Tubingen: G. Narr Verlag.

Bexley, E. (2013). “Performing oratory in early imperial Rome: courtroom, schoolroom, stage.” Ph.D. Diss., Cornell University.

Bierl, A. (1990). “Dionysus, Wine, and Tragic Poetry: A metatheatrical reading of P. Köln VI 242A = *TrGF* II F 646a.” *GRBS* 31: 353-391.

_____. (2011). “Fest und Spiele in der griechischen Literatur.” In: Chaniotis 2011: 125-160.

Boegehold, A. (2004). “Kallimachos Epigram 28: What Does Echo Echo?” *NECJ* 31: 121-123.

Boyd, B. W. (1992). “Virgil’s Camilla and the traditions of catalogue and ecphrasis (*Aeneid* 7.803-17).” *AJPh* 113.2: 213-234.

Boyle, A. J., ed. (2004). *Rethinking Terence* (*Ramus* 33.1-2).

Branham, R. B. (1989). *Unruly eloquence: Lucian and the comedy of traditions*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Brothers, A. J. (1969). “Terence, *Eunuchus* 189-206.” *CQ* 19.2: 314-319.

_____. (1988). *Terence: The Self-Tormentor*. Warminster, UK: Aris & Phillips.

_____. (2000). *Terence: The Eunuch*. Warminster, UK: Aris & Phillips.

Brown, P. G. McC. (1990). “The Bodmer Codex of Menander and the endings of Terence’s *Eunuchus* and other Roman comedies.” In: Handley and Hurst 1990: 49-61.

_____. (1993). “The skinny virgins of Terence, *Eunuchus* 313-17.” In: Pinsent et al. 1993: 229-234.

_____. (2004). “Plautinisches im Terenz? *Cistellaria* 405-408 and *Eunuchus* 313-317.” In: Hartkamp and Hurka 2004: 433-436.

_____, tr. (2006). *Terence: The Comedies*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

_____. (2009). “Gnatho’s Monologue: Terence, *Eunuchus* 232-264.” (unpublished)

Burnett, A. P. (1971). *Catastrophe survived: Euripides’ plays of mixed reversal*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Burton, P. (2007). *Language in the Confessions of Augustine*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Canter, H. V. (1920). “The Paraclausithyron as a Literary Theme.” *AJPh* 41.4: 355-368.

Carson, A. (1993). “Your Money or Your Life.” *YJC* 6.75-92.

Caston, R. R. (2012). *The elegiac passion: Jealousy in Roman love elegy*. Oxford—New York: Oxford University Press

_____. (2014). “Reinvention in Terence’s *Eunuchus*.” *TAPhA* 144.1: 41-70.

Cameron, A. (1995). *Callimachus and his critics*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Cave, T. (1988). *Recognitions: A study in poetics*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Chaniotis, A., ed. (2011). *Thesaurus Cultus et Rituum Antiquorum* (*ThesCRA*), *Vol. VII: Festivals and contests*. Los Angeles: The J. Paul Getty Museum.

Chantraine, P., et al. (1968-80). *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque: Histoire des mots*. Paris: Klincksieck.

Christenson, D. (2013). “*Eunuchus*.” In: Augoustakis and Traill 2013: 262-280.

Compton-Engle, G. (2003). “Control of Costume in Three Plays of Aristophanes.” *AJPh* 124.4: 507-535.

_____. (2013). “The blind leading: Aristophanes’ *Wealth* and *Oedipus at Colonus*.” *CW* 106.2: 155-170.

Connors, C. (1997). “Scents and sensibility in Plautus’ *Casina*”. *CQ* 47.1: 305-9.

Conte, G. B. (1985). *Memoria dei poeti e sistema letterario: Catullo, Virgilio, Ovidio, Lucano*. 2nd ed. Torino: G. Einaudi.

_____. (1986). *The rhetoric of imitation: Genre and poetic memory in Virgil and other Latin poets*. Tr. C. Segal. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Corbeill, A. (2015). *Sexing the world: Grammatical gender and biological sex in ancient Rome*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Cowan, R. (2011). “Lucan’s Thunder-Box: Scatology, Epic, and Satire in Suetonius’ *Vita Lucani*.” *HSPh* 106: 301-313.

Cropp, M. J., Lee, K. H., Sansone, D., eds. (2000). *Euripides and the Tragic Theatre in the late fifth Century*. Urbana-Champaign: Stipes Publishing LLC.

Cupaiuolo, G. (1991). *Terenzio, teatro e società*. Napoli: Loffredo.

_____. (2014). *L’ombra lunga di Terenzio*. Napoli: Loffredo.

D’Alton, J. F. (1931). *Roman literary theory and criticism: A study in tendencies*. London: Longmans, Green and Co.

Damen, M. L. (1985). *The comedy of Diphilos Sinopeus in Plautus, Terence, and Athenaeus*. Ph.D. Diss., University of Texas at Austin.

Davis, J. E. (2014). “Terence Interrupted: Literary Biography and the Reception of the Terentian Canon.” *AJPh* 135.3: 387-409.

Deacy, S., Pierce, K. F., eds. (1997). *Rape in antiquity*. London: Duckworth in association with the Classical Press of Wales.

Debrohun, J. B. (2003). *Roman Propertius and the reinvention of Elegy*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

De Melo, W. D. C. (2011-2013). *Plautus*. 5 vols. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Demetriou, C. (2010). "Crossing the Boundary of Dramatic Illusion in Terence: Courtesans in Terence and Donatus' Criticism." *Rosetta* 8.5: 16-33.

_____. (2014). "Aelius Donatus and his Commentary on Terence's Comedies." In: Fontaine and Scafuro 2014: 782-799.

De Romilly, J. (1968). *Time in Greek tragedy*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Dessen, C. S. (1977). "Plautus' Satiric Comedy: The *Truculentus.*" *PhQ* 56: 145-68.

_____. (1995). "The Figure of the Eunuch in Terence's *Eunuchus*." *Helios* 22: 123-39.

Deufert, M. (2002). *Textgeschichte und rezeption der plautinischen Komodien im Altertum*. Berlin: W. de Gruyter.

De Vries, M. (1927). *Pallake*. Amsterdam: H. J. Paris.

Dobrov, G. W., ed. (1995). *Beyond Aristophanes: Transition and Diversity in Greek Comedy*. Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press.

_____. (1995a) "The poet's voice in the evolution of dramatic dialogism." In: Dobrov 1995: 47-97.

_____. (2002). "Μάγειρος ποιητής: Language and Character in Antiphanes." In: Willi 2002: 169-190.

Dodds, E. R. (1960). *Euripides: Bacchae*. 2nd ed. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Dover, K. J. (1968). *Aristophanes: Clouds*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

_____, Craik, E. M., eds. (1990). *Owls to Athens: Essays on classical subjects presented to Sir Kenneth Dover*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

_____. (1993). *Aristophanes: Frogs*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Duckworth, G. E. (1994). *The nature of Roman comedy: A study in popular entertainment*. 2nd ed. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press. (1st ed. 1952)

Dunbar, N. (1994). *Aristophanes*: *Birds*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Duncan, A. (2006). *Performance and identity in the classical world*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Dunn, F. M. (1996). *Tragedy's end: Closure and innovation in Euripidean drama*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Dunsch, B. (1999). "Some Notes on the Understanding of Terence, *Heauton timorumenos* 6: *comoedia duplex, argumentum simplex*, and Hellenistic Scholarship." *C&M* 50: 97-131.

_____. (2005). "*Sat habeo, si cras fero*: Zur dramatischen Funktion der temporalen Deixis bei Plautus, Terenz und Menander." *WJA* N.F. 29: 123-150.

_____. (2014). "Prologue(s) and *Prologi*." In: Fontaine and Scafuro 2014: 498-515.

Du Plessis, P. J., ed. (2013). *New Frontiers: Law and Society in the Roman World*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Dutsch, D. (2015). "Feats of flesh: the female body on the Plautine stage." In: Dutsch et al. 2015: 17-36.

_____, D., James, S. L., Konstan, D., eds. (2015). *Women in Roman Republican drama*. Madison, WI: The University of Wisconsin Press.

_____. "On 'Mothers' and 'Whores'." (forthcoming in M. Dinter, ed., *Cambridge Companion to Roman Comedy*).

Dziatzko, C. (1884). *P. Terenti Afri Comoediae*. Lipsiae: Bernhardus Tauchnitz.

Easterling, P. E., Hall, E., eds. (2002). *Greek and Roman actors: Aspects of an ancient profession*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Eliot, T. S. (1920). *The sacred wood: Essays on poetry and criticism*. London: Methuen & Co. Ltd.

Enk, P. J. (1953). *Plauti Truculentus*. Lugduni Batavorum: A. W. Sijthoff.

Ehrman, R. K. (1985). "Terentian Prologues and the Parabases of Old Comedy." *Latomus* 44: 370-376.

Erasmo, M. (2004). *Roman tragedy: Theatre to theatricality*. Austin: University of Texas Press.

Fabia, P. (1888). *Les prologues de Térence*. Paris: E. Thorin.

Fantham, E. (1972). *Comparative studies in Republican Latin imagery*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

_____. (1975). "Sex, Status, and Survival in Hellenistic Athens: A Study of Women in New Comedy." *Phoenix* 29.1: 44-74.

_____. (2000). "*Domina*-tricks, or How to Construct a Good Whore from a Bad One." In: Stärk and Vogt-Spira 2000: 287-299.

_____. (2002). "Orator and / et actor." In: Easterling and Hall 2002: 362-76.

_____. (2011). *Roman Readings: Roman Response to Greek Literature from Plautus to Statius and Quintilian*. Berlin: W. de Gruyter.

Fantuzzi, M. (2011). "Speaking with authority: polyphony in Callimachus' Hymns." In: Acosta-Hughes et al. 2011: 429-453.

Farrell, J. (1991). *Vergil's Georgics and the traditions of ancient epic: The art of allusion in literary history*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Fear, T. (2000). “The Poet as Pimp: Elegiac Seduction in the Time of Augustus.” *Arethusa* 33.2: 217-240.

Finglass, P. (2007). *Sophocles: Electra*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Florence, M. (2014). “The Body Politic: Sexuality in Greek and Roman Comedy and Mime.” In: Hubbard 2014: 366-80.

Fontaine, M. (2010). *Funny words in Plautine comedy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

_____. (2013). “Dynamics of Appropriation in Roman Comedy: Menander’s *Kolax* in Three Roman Receptions (Naevius, Plautus, and Terence’s *Eunuchus*).” In: Olson 2013: 180-202.

_____. (2014). “The Terentian reformation: from Menander to Alexandria.” In: Fontaine and Scafuro 2014: 538-554.

_____, Scafuro, A., eds. (2014). *The Oxford handbook of Greek and Roman comedy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Foxhall, L., Salmon, J., eds. (1988). *Thinking Men: Masculinity and its Self-representation in the Classical Tradition*. London: Routledge.

Fraenkel, E. (1912). *De media et nova comoedia quaestiones selectae*. Diss., Göttingen.

_____. (1968). “Zur römischen Komödie.” *MH* 25: 231-42.

Frangoulidis, S. A. (1993). “Modes of Metatheatre: Theatricalization and Detheatricalization in Terence, *Eunuchus.*” *LCM* 18: 146-151.

_____. (1994a). “Performance and Improvisation in Terence’s *Eunuchus.*” *QUCC* 48.3: 121-130.

_____. (1994b). “The Soldier as a Storyteller in Terence’s *Eunuchus*.” *Mnemosyne* 47.5: 586-595.

_____. (1995). “The parasite as Poet-playwright and the Slave as Parasite in Terence’s *Phormio*.” *BStudLat* 25: 397-425.

_____. (2013). “Transformations of Paraclausithyron in Plautus’ *Curculio*.” In Papanghelis et al. 2013: 267-281.

Frank, T. (1933). “On the Dates of Plautus’ *Casina* and Its Revival.” *AJPh* 54.4: 368-372.

Franko, G. F. (1999). “Imagery and Names in Plautus’ *Casina*.” *CJ* 95.1: 1-17.

_____. (2013). “Terence and the Traditions of Roman New Comedy.” In: Augoustakis and Traill 2013: 33-51.

Frye, N. (1957). *Anatomy of criticism*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Gaisser, J. H. (2009). *Catullus*. Chichester, UK: Wiley-Blackwell.

Gardner, H. H. (2011). “Taming the *Velox Puella*: Temporal propriety in Propertius 1.1.” *Phoenix* 65: 100.

_____. (2012). “Ventriloquizing rape in Menander’s *Epitrepontes*.” *Helios* 39.2: 121-143.

_____. (2013). *Gendering time in Augustan love elegy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Garton, C. (1972). *Personal aspects of the Roman theatre*. Toronto: Hakkert.

Geffcken, K. A. (1973). *Comedy in the Pro Caelio*. Leiden: Brill.

Germany, R. (2008). “Mimetic contagion in Terence’s *Eunuchus*.” Ph.D. Diss., University of Chicago.

_____. (2011). “Roman Comedy of Letters [review of Sharrock 2009].” *CR* 61.1: 99-101

_____. (2013). “*Andria*.” In: Augoustakis and Traill 2013: 225-242.

Gigliucci, R., ed. (1998). *Furto e plagio nella letteratura del classicismo*. Roma: Bulzoni.

Gildenhard, I., Revermann, M., eds. (2010). *Beyond the Fifth Century: Interactions with Greek Tragedy from the Fourth Century BCE to the Middle Ages*. Berlin: W. de Gruyter.

Gilmartin, K. (1975). "The Thraso-Gnatho Subplot in Terence's *Eunuchus*." *CW* 69.4: 263-267.

Gill, C., Postlethwaite, N., Seaford R., eds. (1998). *Reciprocity in ancient Greece*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Gilula, D. (1981). "Who's afraid of rope-walkers and gladiators? (Ter. *Hec*. 1-57)." *Athenaeum* 59: 29-37.

_____. (1989). "The First Realistic Roles in European Theatre: Terence's Prologues." *QUCC*, N. S. 33.3: 95-106.

_____. (1991). "Plots are not stories: The so-called 'duality method' of Terence." In: Scolnicov and Holland 1991: 81-93.

_____. (2007). "Stage Business and Narrative: Plot Construction in Terence." In: Kruschwitz et al. 2007: 207-216.

Gold, B. K. (1998). "'Vested Interests' in Plautus' *Casina*: Cross-Dressing in Roman Comedy." *Helios* 25.1: 17-29.

_____, ed. (2012). *A companion to Roman love elegy*. Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Goldberg, S. M. (1986). *Understanding Terence*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

_____. (2005a). "The early republic: the beginnings to 90 BC." In: Harrison 2005: 15-30.

_____. (2005b). *Constructing literature in the Roman republic: Poetry and its reception*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

_____. (2013). *Terence: Hecyra*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Goldhill, S. (1991). *The poet's voice: Essays on poetics and Greek literature*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Goldman, M. (2008). "The Poet's Croak: The Name and Function of *Corax* in Petronius." *CQ* 58.1: 375-378.

Gomme, A. W. (1936). "Notes on Menander." *CQ* 30.2: 64-72.

_____, Sandbach, F. H. (1973). *Menander: A commentary*. London: Oxford University Press.

Gowers, E. (1993). *The loaded table: Representations of food in Roman literature*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

_____. (2004). "The plot thickens: hidden outlines in Terence's prologues." In: Boyle 2004: 150-166.

Grafton, A. (1990). *Forgers and critics: Creativity and duplicity in western scholarship*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press

Gratwick, A. S. (1972). "Disiecti Membra Terenti." *CR* 22.1: 29-32.

_____. (1982). "Drama." In: Kenney 1982: 77-137.

_____. (1990). "What's in a name? The Diniarchus of Plautus' *Truculentus*." In: Dover and Craik 1990: 305-9.

_____. (1993). *Plautus: Menaechmi*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

_____. (2001). "Paternal '*Obsequelia*:' Some Passages of Plautus, Nonius, and Terence." *Hermes* 129.1: 45-62.

_____. (2014). "Goldberg and Barsby: Two Cambridge commentaries compared." *ExClass* 18: 155-163

Gruen, E. S. (1992). *Culture and national identity in Republican Rome*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press

Gutzwiller, K. J. (2000). "The Tragic Mask of Comedy: Metatheatricality in Menander." *ClAnt* 19.1: 102-137.

_____. (2007). *A guide to Hellenistic literature*. Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Habinek, T. N. (1998). *The politics of Latin literature: Writing, identity, and empire in ancient Rome*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Hall, E. (2006). *The theatrical cast of Athens: Interactions between ancient Greek drama and society*. Oxford: Oxford University Press

Hallett, J. P., Skinner, M. B., eds. (1997). *Roman Sexualities*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Halliwell F. S. (1989). "Authorial collaboration in the Athenian comic theatre." *GRBS* 30: 515-528.

Hanchey, D. (2013). "Terence and the Scipionic *Grex*." In: Augoustakis and Traill 2013: 113-131.

Handley, E., Hurst, A., eds. (1990). *Relire Ménandre*. Geneva: Droz.

Hanink, J. (2010). "The Classical Tragedians, from Athenian Idols to Wandering Poets." In: Gildenhard and Revermann 2010: 35-64.

Hardie, P. R. (1993). *The epic successors of Virgil: A study in the dynamics of a tradition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Harrison, S. J., ed. (2005). *A Companion to Latin Literature*. Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Hartkamp, R., Hurka, F., eds. (2004). *Studien zu Plautus'* Cistellaria. Tübingen: G. Narr.

Harvey, F. D., Wilkins, J., eds. (2000). *The rivals of Aristophanes: Studies in Athenian old comedy*. London: Duckworth and the Classical Press of Wales.

Havet, L. (1905). "Études sur Plaute, *Asinaria*, I: La seconde et la troisième scènes et la composition générale." *RPh* 29: 94-103.

Heath, M. (1990). “Aristophanes and his Rivals.” *G&R* 37.2: 143-158.

Hemelrijk, E. A. (1999). *Matrona docta: Educated women in the Roman élite from Cornelia to Julia Domna*. London: Routledge.

Henderson, Jeffrey. (1991). *The maculate muse: Obscene language in Attic comedy*. 2nd ed. New York: Oxford University Press.

_____. (1998). *Aristophanes, vol. II: Clouds; Wasps; Peace*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Henderson, John. (2004) “Terence’s *Selbstaussöhnung*: Payback time of the self (*Heautontimorumenus*).” In: Boyle 2004: 53-81.

Henrichs, A. (1979). “Callimachus Epigram 28: A Fastidious Priamel.” *HSPh* 83: 207-212.

Hersch, K. K. (2010). *The Roman wedding: Ritual and meaning in antiquity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hexter, R. J., Selden, D. L., eds. (1992). *Innovations of antiquity*. New York: Routledge.

Hinds, S. (1998). *Allusion and intertext: Dynamics of appropriation in Roman poetry*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Hofmann, W. (2001). *Truculentus*. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.

Hough, J. N. (1945). “The *Numquid Vis* Formula in Roman Comedy.” *AJPh* 66.3: 282-302.

_____. 1970). “Jupiter, Amphitryon, and the Cuckoo.” *CPh* 65.2: 95-96.

Hubbard, T. K. (1991). *The mask of comedy: Aristophanes and the intertextual parabasis*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

_____, ed. (2014). *A Companion to Greek and Roman Sexualities*. Chichester, UK: Wiley Blackwell.

Hunter, R. L. (1985). *The new comedy of Greece and Rome*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

_____. (2006). *The shadow of Callimachus: Studies in the reception of Hellenistic poetry at Rome*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hurka, F. (2010). *Die Asinaria des Plautus: Einleitung und Kommentar*. München: Beck.

James, S. (1998). "From boys to men: rape and developing masculinity in Terence's *Hecyra* and *Eunuchus*." *Helios* 25.1: 31-47.

_____. (2012). "Elegy and New Comedy." In: Gold 2012: 253-268.

_____. (2013). "Gender and Sexuality in Terence." In: Augoustakis and Traill 2013: 175-194.

_____. (2014). "Rethinking rape in Menander's comedy and Athenian life: modern comparative evidence." In: Sommerstein 2014a: 24-39.

Janson, T. (1964). *Latin Prose Prefaces: Studies in Literary Conventions*. Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell.

Jocelyn, H. D. (1969). *The tragedies of Ennius: the fragments*. London: Cambridge University Press.

_____. (1972). "*Homo sum: humani nil a me alienum puto* (Ter. *Heauton Timorumenos* 77)." *Antichthon* 7: 14-46.

_____. (1995). "The Life-Style of the Ageing Bachelor and Theatrical Improvisation (Plaut. *Mil*. 596-812)." In: Benz et al. 1995: 107-122.

Karakasis, E. (2002). "A reading of the introductory scene of Terence's *Heautontimorumenos*." *Dodone (philol.)* 31: 247-262.

_____. (2005). *Terence and the language of Roman comedy*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Kassel, R., Austin, C. (1983-2001). *Poetae comici Graeci (PCG)*. Berlin—New York: W. de Gruyter.

Kauer, R., Lindsay, W. M., Skutsch, O. (1958). *P. Terenti Afri Comoediae*. Oxonii: e Typographeo Clarendoniano.

Keil, H. (1858). *Grammatici latini, vol. III.* Lipsiae: Teubner.

Keith, A. (1994). "*Corpus Eroticum*: Elegiac Poetics and Elegiac *Puellae* in Ovid's *Amores*." *CW* 88: 27-40.

Kelly, J. M. (1966). *Roman litigation*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Kenney, E. J., ed. (1982). *Latin literature*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Knorr. O. (2007). "Metatheatrical humor in the comedies of Terence." In: Kruschwitz et al. 2007: 167-174.

_____. (2013). "*Hecyra.*" In: Augoustakis and Traill 2013: 295-317.

Knox, P. (2007). "Catullus and Callimachus." In: Skinner 2007: 151-172.

König, E. (1876). *De nominibus propriis quae sunt apud Plautum et Terentium*. Patschkau: Druck von Ed. Hertwig.

König, J. (2008). "Body and Text." In: Whitmarsh 2008: 127-144.

Konstan, D. (1983). *Roman Comedy*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

_____. (1986). "Love in Terence's *Eunuch*: The Origins of Erotic Subjectivity." *AJPh* 107.3: 369-393.

_____ (1993). "The Young Concubine in Menandrian Comedy." In: Scodel 1993: 139-60.

_____. (1995). *Greek comedy and ideology*. New York: Oxford University Press.

_____. (2013). “Can’t buy me love: The Economy of Gifts in Amorous Relations.” In: Satlow 2013: 96-106.

Kremmydas, C., Tempest, K., eds. (2013). *Hellenistic oratory: Continuity and change*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Kruse, K.-H. W. (1974). *Kommentar zu Plautus Truculentus*. Diss., Heidelberg.

Kruschwitz, P. (2001). “Verszahlresponsionen bei Terenz.” *Philologus* 145: 312-323.

_____. (2004). *Terenz*. Hildesheim: Olms.

_____, Ehlers, W.-W., Felgentreu, F., eds. (2007). *Terentius Poeta*. München: C.H. Beck.

Kurke, L. (1991). *The traffic in praise: Pindar and the poetics of social economy*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Lada-Richards, I. (2004). “Authorial Voice and Theatrical Self-Definition in Terence and beyond: The *Hecyra* Prologues in Ancient and Modern Contexts.” *G&R* 51.1: 55-82.

Lape, S. (2004). “Terentian Marriage Plot: Reproducing Fathers and Sons.” In: Boyle 2004: 35-52.

Lloyd Jones, H. (1981). “Notes on P. Turner 4 (Aristophanes, *Poiesis*).” *ZPE* 42: 23-5.

Leach, E. W. (1969). “*De exemplo meo ipse aedificato*: An Organizing Idea in the Mostellaria.” *Hermes* 97.3: 318-332.

Lefèvre, E. (1978). *Der Phormio des Terenz und der Epidikazomenos des Apollodor von Karystos*. München: C. H. Beck.

_____. (1994). *Terenz’ und Menanders Heautontimorumenos*. München: C. H. Beck.

_____. (1999). *Terenz’ und Apollodors Hecyra*. München: C. H. Beck.

_____. (2003). *Terenz’ und Menanders Eunuchus*. München: C. H. Beck.

_____. (2008). *Terenz' und Menanders Andria*. München: C. H. Beck.

_____. (2013). *Terenz' und Menanders Adelphoe*. München: C. H. Beck.

_____. (2013b). "*Heauton Timorumenus*." In: Augoustakis and 2013: 243-261.

Lefkowitz, M. R. (2012). *The lives of the Greek poets.* 2nd ed. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Leitao, D. D. (1997). "Plautus, *Stichus* 155ff.: A Greek Parody of Plato's *Symposium*?" *Mnemosyne* 50.3: 271-280.

_____. (2012). *The pregnant male as myth and metaphor in classical Greek literature*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Leo, F. (1895-1896). *Plauti comoediae*. 2 vols. Berlin: Weidmann.

_____. (1898). *Analecta Plautina. De Figuris Sermonis, II*. Gottingae: Dieterich.

_____. (1912). *Plautinische Forschungen zur Kritik und Geschichte der Komödie*. 2nd ed. Berlin: Weidmann.

Lightbody, B. (2015). *Dispersing the clouds of temptation: Turning away from weakness of will and turning towards the sun*. Eugene, OR: Pickwick Publications.

Lindsay, W. M. (1903-1905). *T. Macci Plauti Comoediae*. Oxonii: e Typographeo Clarendoniano.

Liveley, G., Salzman-Mitchell, P., eds. (2008). *Latin elegy and narratology: Fragments of story*. Columbus: Ohio State University Press.

Lombardo, S., Rayor, D. J., tr. (1988). *Callimachus: Hymns, epigrams, select fragments*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

López Gregoris, R. (2002). *El amor en la comedia latina: análisis léxico y semántico*. Madrid: Ediciones Clásicas.

Lowe, J. C. B. (1983). “The *Eunuchus*: Terence and Menander.” *CQ* 33.2: 428-444.

Lowe, N. J. (2004). *The classical plot and the invention of Western narrative*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

MacCary, W. T., Willcock, M. M. (1976). *Plautus: Casina*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Maltby, R. (1991). *A lexicon of ancient Latin etymologies*. Leeds: F. Cairns.

_____. (2007). “The Distribution of Imagery by Plays and Characters in Terence.” In: Kruschwitz et al. 2007: 143-166.

_____. (2012). *Terence: Phormio*. Warminster, UK: Aris & Phillips.

Manuwald, G. (2013). “Oratory on the Stage in Republican Rome.” In: Kremmydas and Tempest 2013: 277-294.

Markantonatos, A. (2007). *Oedipus at Colonus: Sophocles, Athens, and the world*. Berlin: W. de Gruyter.

Marshall C. W. (2014). “The young man in Plautus, *Asinaria* 127-248”. 8th *Trends in Classics* International Conference: Roman Drama and its Contexts. Thessaloniki, May 29-June 1. (forthcoming in print)

McClure, L. (2003). *Courtesans at table: Gender and Greek literary culture in Athenaeus*. New York: Routledge.

McGill, S. (2013). *Plagiarism in Latin literature*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Méndez Dosuna, J. V. (2015). “El *enchytrismós* de niños expósitos en la antigua Grecia: ¿realidad o ficción?” In: Ángel y Espinós et al. 2015: 543-554.

Minarini, A. (1987). *Studi terenziani*. Bologna: Pàtron.

_____. (1995). *Il monologo di Gnatone: Spunti e appunti sul metateatro terenziano*. Bologna: Patron.

Moodie, E. K. (2009). “Old men and metatheatre in Terence: Terence’s dramatic competition.” *Ramus* 38.2: 145-173.

Moore, T. J. (1998). *The theater of Plautus: Playing to the audience*. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.

_____. (2005). “*Pessuli, heus pessuli*: la porta nel *Curculio*.” In: Raffaeli and Tontini 2005: 11-36.

_____. (2012). *Music in Roman comedy*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Most, G. (1992). “*Disiecti membra poetae*: the rhetoric of dismemberment in Neronian poetry.” In: Hexter and Selden 1992: 391-419.

Murgatroyd, P. (1995). “The Sea of Love.” *CQ* 45.1: 9-25.

Müller, R. (1997). *Sprechen und Sprache: Dialoglinguistische Studien zu Terenz*. Heidelberg: Universitätsverlag C. Winter.

Myers, K. S. (1996). “The Poet and the Procuress: The *Lena* in Latin Love Elegy.” *JRS* 86: 1-21

Nelson, T. J. (forthcoming). “The Shadow of Aristophanes: Hellenistic Poetry’s Reception of Comic Poetics.” (In: M. A. Harder et al., eds. (2016), *Hellenistica Groningana: Drama and Performance in Hellenistic Poetry*.)

Nervegna, S. (2013). *Menander in antiquity: The contexts of reception*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Norwood, G. (1923). *The art of Terence*. Oxford: B. Blackwell.

_____. (1932). *Plautus and Terence*. New York: Longmans, Green and Co.

Nünlist, R. (1998). *Poetologische Bildersprache in der frühgriechischen Dichtung*. Stuttgart: Teubner.

O’Bryhim, S. (1989). “The Originality of Plautus’ *Casina*.” *AJPh* 110.1: 81-103.

O'Hara, J. J. (1996). *True names: Vergil and the Alexandrian tradition of etymological wordplay*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Oliensis, E. (1997). "The Erotics of *Amicitia*: Readings in Tibullus, Propertius, and Horace." In: Hallett and Skinner 1997: 151-71.

_____. (1998). *Horace and the rhetoric of authority*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Olson, S. D. (1988). "The 'Love Duet' in Aristophanes' *Ecclesiazusae*." *CQ* 38.2: 328-330.

_____. (2007). *Broken laughter: Select fragments of Greek comedy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

_____, ed. (2013). *Ancient Comedy and Reception: Studies in the classical tradition of comedy from Aristophanes to the twenty-first century*. Berlin: W. de Gruyter.

Omitowoju, R. S. (2002). *Rape and the Politics of Consent in Classical Athens.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Palmer, D. J. (1984). *Comedy: Developments in criticism*. London: Macmillan.

Parker, H. (1996). "Plautus vs. Terence: Audience and Popularity Re-Examined." *AJPh* 117.4: 585-617.

Papaioannou, S. (1997). "Portrayal of rape in New Comedy." In: Deacy and Pierce 1997: 163-184.

_____. (2008). "Self-reflections on elegy writing, in two parts: the metapoetics of diptych elegies in Ovid, *Amores* 1.11 + 12." In: Liveley and Salzman-2008: 105-122.

_____. (2009). "What's in a Name? The Real Identity of Palinurus in Plautus' *Curculio*." *CJ* 104.2: 111-122.

_____. (2010). "Postclassical comedy and the composition of Roman comedy." In: Petrides and Papaioannou 2010: 146-175.

_____, ed. (2014). *Terence and interpretation*. Newcastle upon Tyne, UK: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

_____. (2015). "New Comedy and Roman Comedy: With and Without Menander." *thersites* 2: 52-80.

Papanghelis, T. D., Harrison, S. J., Frangoulidis, S. A., eds. (2013). *Generic interfaces in Latin literature: Encounters, interactions and transformations*. Berlin—Boston: W. de Gruyter.

Pasco-Pranger, M. C. (2012). "Duplicitous simplicity in Ovid, *Amores* 1." *CQ* N.S. 62.2: 721-730.

Penwill, J. N. (2004). "The Unlovely Lover of Terence's *Hecyra*." In: Boyle 2004: 130-149.

Pernerstorfer, M. J. (2009). *Menanders Kolax: Ein Beitrag zu Rekonstruktion und Interpretation der Komödie.* Berlin: W. de Gruyter.

Petrides, A. K., Papaioannou, S., eds. (2010). *New perspectives on postclassical comedy*. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars.

Pezzini, G. (2015). *Terence and the verb 'to be' in Latin*. Oxford, United Kingdom: Oxford University Press.

Pfeiffer, R. (1949). *Callimachus*. 2 vols. Oxonii: e Typographeo Clarendoniano.

Pflugk, A. J. E. (1840). *Euripides: Hecuba*. Gothae: F. Hennings.

Philippides, K. (1995). "Terence's *Eunuchus*: Elements of the Marriage Ritual in the Rape Scene." *Mnemosyne* 48.3: 272-284.

_____. (2011). "Tyndarus' Past: The Name Paegnium in Plautus' *Captivi*." *C&M* 62: 99-112.

Pierce, K. F. (1988). "Ideals of masculinity in New Comedy." In: Foxhall and Salmon 1988: 130-147.

Pinsent, J., Jocelyn, H. D., Hurt, H., eds. (1993). *Tria lustra: Essays and notes presented to John Pinsent founder and editor of Liverpool Classical Monthly by some of its contributors on the occasion of the 150th issue*. Liverpool: Liverpool Classical Monthly.

Pociña, P. A., Rabaza, B., Silva, M. F. S., eds. (2006). *Estudios sobre Terencio*. Granada: Universidad de Granada.

Pohlenz, M. (1956). "Der Prolog des Terenz." *SIFC* N.S. 27/28: 434-43.

Pompella, G. (1996). *Lexicon Menandreum*. Hildesheim: Olms-Weidmann.

Post, L. A. (1940). "Woman's Place in Menander's Athens." *TPAPhA* 71: 420-459.

Preston, K. (1916). *Studies in the diction of the* sermo amatorius *in Roman comedy*. Menasha, WI: George Banta Pub. Co.

Pucci, P. (1978). "Lingering on the Threshold." *Glyph* 3: 52-73.

Radice, B., tr. (1976). *Terence: The comedies*. Harmondsworth, UK: Penguin Books.

Raffaelli, R., Tontini, A., eds. (2005). *Lecturae Plautinae Sarsinates VII: Curculio*. Urbino: QuattroVenti.

_____, Tontini, A., eds. (2009). *Lecturae Plautinae sarsinates XII: Miles gloriosus.* Urbino: QuattroVenti.

_____. (2009). "Un racconto arabo, l'*Elena* di Euripide e la struttura del *Miles* di Plauto." In: Raffaelli and Tontini 2009: 135-156.

Revermann, M. (2006). "The Competence of Theatre Audiences in Fifth- and Fourth-Century Athens." *JHS* 126: 99-124.

Ribbeck, O. (1898). *Scaenicae Romanorum poesis fragmenta*. 3rd ed. Lipsiae: Teubner.

Richardson, J. L. (2006). "The Terentian Adaptation of the *Heauton Timorumenos* of Menander." *GRBS* 46.1: 13-36.

Roselaar, S. (2013). “The Concept of *Conubium* in the Roman Republic.” In: Du Plessis 2013: 102-122.

Rosen, R. M., and Marks, D. R. (1999). “Comedies of Transgression in Gangsta Rap and Ancient Classical Poetry.” *New Literary History* 30.4: 897-928.

_____. (2000). “Cratinus’ *Pytine* and the construction of the comic self. In: Harvey and Wilkins 2000: 23-40.

Rosivach, V. J. (1998). *When a young man falls in love: The sexual exploitation of women in New Comedy*. London—New York: Routledge.

Rusten, J. S., ed. (2011). *The birth of comedy: Texts, documents, and art from Athenian comic competitions, 486-280*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Sandbach, F. H. (1982). “How Terence’s *Hecyra* failed.” *CQ* 32.1: 134-135.

Satlow, M. L. (2013). *The gift in antiquity*. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley-Blackwell.

Saylor, C. F. (1975). “The Theme of Planlessness in Terence’s *Eunuchus*.” *TAPhA* 105: 297-311.

Scafuro, A. C. (1997). *The forensic stage: Settling disputes in Graeco-Roman New Comedy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Schauer, M. (2012). *Tragicorum Romanorum Fragmenta. Vol. I: Livius Andronicus. Naevius. Tragici Minores. Fragmenta Adespota*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

Scodel, R., ed. (1993). *Theater and Society in the Classical World*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Scolnicov, H., Holland, P., eds. (1991). *Reading plays: Interpretation and reception*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Scullion (2000). “Tradition and Invention in Euripidean Aitiology.” In: Kropp et al. 2000: 219-227.

Segal, E. (1987). *Roman Laughter: the Comedy of Plautus.* 2nd ed. New York: Oxford University Press.

_____. (2001). *The death of comedy*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Seo, J. M. (2009). "Plagiarism and Poetic Identity in Martial." *AJPh*, 130.4: 567-593.

_____. (2014). Review of McGill 2012. *BMCR* 2014.07.02.

Sharrock, A. R. (1991). "Womanufacture." *JRS* 81: 36-49.

_____. (2009). *Reading Roman comedy: Poetics and playfulness in Plautus and Terence*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Short, W. M. (2013). "'Transmission' accomplished? Latin's alimentary metaphors of communication." *AJPh* 134.2: 247-275.

Sidwell, K. (1993). "Authorial Collaboration? Aristophanes' *Knights* and Eupolis." *GRBS* 34: 365-389.

Simpson, M. (1969). "The Chariot and the Bow as Metaphors for Poetry in Pindar's Odes." *TAPhA* 100: 437-473.

Skinner, M. B., ed. (2007). *A companion to Catullus*. Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Skutsch, O. (1985). *The Annals of Q. Ennius*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Slater, N. W. (1988). "The Fictions of Patriarchy in Terence's *Hecyra*." *CW* 81.4: 249-260.

_____, Zimmermann, B., eds. (1993). *Intertextualität in der griechisch-römischen Komödie*. Stuttgart: M & P.

_____. (2000). *Plautus in performance: The theatre of the mind*. 2nd ed. Amsterdam: Harwood Academic.

Slater, W. J. (1996). Review of Dobrov 1995. *BMCR* 96.08.09.

Smith, A. C. (2011). *Polis and personification in classical Athenian art*. Leiden: Brill.

Smith, L. P. (1994). "Audience Response to Rape: Chaerea in Terence's *Eunuchus*." *Helios* 21: 21-38.

Sommerstein, A. H. (2005). "A lover of his art: the art-form as wife and mistress in Greek poetic imagery." In: Stafford and Herrin 2005: 161-172.

_____. (2013a). *Menander: Samia*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

_____. (2013b). "Menander's *Samia* and the Phaedra Theme." In: Olson 2013: 167-179.

_____. (2014). "Menander and the Pallake." In: Sommerstein 2014a: 11-23.

_____, ed. (2014a). *Menander in contexts*. New York—London: Routledge.

Sonnino, M. (1998). "L'accusa di plagio nella commedia attica antica." In: Giglucci 1998: 19-51.

Spengel, A., Studemund, W. (1868). *T. Macci Plauti Truculentus*. Goettingae: Vandenhoek & Ruprecht.

Speyer, W. (1971). *Die literarische Fälschung im heidnischen und christlichen Altertum: Ein Versuch ihrer Deutung*. München: C. H. Beck.

Stafford, E., Herrin, J., eds. (2005). *Personification in the Greek world: From antiquity to Byzantium*. Aldershot: Ashgate.

Stärk, E., Vogt-Spira, G., eds. (2000). *Dramatische Wäldschen: Festschrift für Eckard Lefèvre zum 65. Geburtstag*. Hildesheim: Olms.

Stemplinger, E. (1912). *Das Plagiat in der griechischen Literatur*. Leipzig: Teubner.

Sutherland, E. H. (2005). "Writing (on) Bodies: Lyric Discourse and the Production of Gender in Horace, *Odes* 1.13." *CPh* 100.1: 52-82.

Syndikus, H. P. (1987). *Catull: Eine Interpretation; Teil. 3, Die Epigramme (69-116).* Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.

Telò, M. (2010). "Embodying the tragic father(s): Autobiography and intertextuality in Aristophanes." *ClAnt* 29.2: 278-326.

_____. (2014). "Pregnant Props: Birth and Narrative in Three Plautine Plots." 8th *Trends in Classics* International Conference: Roman Drama and its Contexts. Thessaloniki, May 29-June 1. (forthcoming).

Torrance, I. (2011). "In the Footprints of Aeschylus: Recognition, Allusion, and Metapoetics in Euripides." *AJPh* 132.2: 177-204.

_____. (2013). *Metapoetry in Euripides*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Traill, A. 2005). "Acroteleutium's Sapphic Infatuation (*Miles* 1216-83)." *CQ* 55.2: 518-533.

_____. (2008). *Women and the comic plot in Menander*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Treggiari, S. (1981). "*Concubinae*." *PBSR* 49: 59-81.

_____. (1994). "Putting the bride to bed." *EMC* 38: 311-331.

Turner, E. G. (1969). "The *Phasma* of Menander." *GRBS* 10: 307-324.

Turner, A. (2010). "Unnoticed Latin hypotheses to two plays mentioned by Terence: The *Phasma* of Menander and the *Thesaurus*." *Hermes* 138.1: 38-47.

Umbrico, A. (2010). *Terenzio e i suoi nobiles: Invenzione e realtà di un controverso legame*. Pisa: ETS.

Vaan, M. A. C. (2008). *Etymological dictionary of Latin and the other Italic languages*. Leiden: Brill.

Verdenius, W. J. (1988). *Commentaries on Pindar*. Leiden: Brill.

Victor, B. (2010). “Terence’s Greek: observations on certain cruxes in his comedies.” *BICS* 53.2: 45-54.

_____. (2012). “*Terentius Orator an Poeta*: the Endings of *Eunuchus* and *Adelphoe*.” *CQ* 62.2: 671-691.

Von Reden, S. (1995). “Deceptive readings: poetry and its value reconsidered.” *CQ* 45.1: 30-50.

_____. (1998). “The Commodification of Symbols: Reciprocity and its Perversions in Menander.” In Gill et al. 1998: 255-278.

Warmington, E. H. (1935-1940). *Remains of Old Latin.* 4 vols. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Watson, A. (1967). *The law of persons in the later Roman Republic*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Wessner, P. (1902-1908). *Aeli Donati quod fertur Commentum Terenti*. 3 vols. Lipsiae: Teubner.

West, M. L. (2007). *Indo-European poetry and myth*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Willi, A., ed. (2002). *The Language of Greek Comedy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Williams, B. (1993). “Games people play: metatheatre as performance criticism in Plautus’ *Casina*.” *Ramus* 22.1: 33-59.

Williams, G. (1956). Review of Abel 1955. *JRS* 46: 212-213.

_____. (1958). “Evidence for Plautus’ Workmanship in the *Miles Gloriosus*.” *Hermes* 86.1: 79-105.

Wills, J. (1996). *Repetition in Latin poetry: Figures of allusion*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Wilson, J. R. (1968). “The Etymology in Euripides, *Troades*, 13-14.” *AJPh* 89.1: 66-71.

Wiseman, T. P. (1979). *Clio’s cosmetics: Three studies in Greco-Roman literature*. Leicester, UK: Leicester University Press.

Whitmarsh, T. (2001). *Greek literature and the Roman empire: The politics of imitation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

_____, ed. (2008). *The Cambridge companion to the Greek and Roman novel*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Wright, M. (2012). *The comedian as critic: Greek old comedy and poetics*. London: Bristol Classical Press.

_____. (2013). "Poets and Poetry in Later Greek Comedy." *CQ* 63.2: 603-622.

Yavetz, Z. (1974). "*Existimatio*, *Fama*, and the Ides of March." *HSPh* 78: 35-65.