

University of St Andrews



Full metadata for this thesis is available in
St Andrews Research Repository
at:

<http://research-repository.st-andrews.ac.uk/>

This thesis is protected by original copyright

I declare that this thesis, submitted for the degree of Ph.D., is my composition and that the work of which it is a record has been done by me. The thesis has not been accepted in any previous application for a higher degree.

The higher study undertaken is in the field of Latin literature. The thesis contains a commentary on Terence's Adelphoe and a study of the relationship of that play to the Menandrian comedy on which it is based.

I was admitted as a research student under Ordinance no.12 in October 1964 and was enrolled as a part-time candidate for the Ph.D. under Ordinance no.88 in November 1966.

John N. Grant



Tm 5768



From
The Associate Dean of Graduate Studies
in the Faculty of Arts.

St. Salvator's College,
University of St. Andrews,
St. Andrews,
Fife, Scotland.

St. Andrews 4343

**This is to certify that Mr John N. Grant
has fulfilled the conditions of Ordinances 12 and
88 in submitting his thesis entitled A Commentary
on Terence's Adelphi for the degree of Ph.D.**

CONTENTS

TERENCE'S <u>ADELPHOE</u> AND THE MENANDRIAN ORIGINAL	1
The beginning of the play	12
The end of the play	74
Appendix: The role of Canthara	124
Notes	138
 COMMENTARY	 157
 SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY	 657

The play opens with a monologue by the senex Micio. He is worried that some misfortune may have befallen his son Aeschinus, who has not yet returned from a dinner party of the previous evening. Despite the depth of his anxiety Aeschinus is not, he explains, his natural son but his nephew (the son of his brother Demea) who he has adopted as his own. Micio and his brother have lived quite different lives. Demea has had a hard and thrifty life in the country, Micio has enjoyed a life of ease and comfort in the city. While he has remained a bachelor, Demea married and had two sons. Of these Micio adopted the elder on whom he lavishes his love, and whom he treats in such a way that his love will be reciprocated. He does not always exercise the prerogative of a father but overlooks much and gives him a generous allowance. The result of this, Micio says, is that Aeschinus does not, unlike other young men, have any secrets from his father. Micio does not believe that fear should be the controlling factor of a young man's actions but rather his own integrity and sense of what is right. These methods do not please Demea who accuses Micio of corrupting Aechinus by his lavishness (vv.59 ff.). But Demea

Micio believes, is far too harsh. He is mistaken in believing that one's authority should be imposed forcibly instead of being administered in a spirit of affection. For constraint makes a man do what is right only as long as he fears discovery, while kindness inspires the desire to please in return and he will act honorably on all occasions. The former method is the mark of a dominus, the latter (Micio's own) of a pater. At line 78 Micio announces the arrival of Demea and from the latter's mien guesses that he is about to endure another heated attack. His fears are not groundless. Demea enters with news of yet another example of Aeschinus' wild behaviour. He has forcibly entered a house, attacked its members and stolen a woman he is in love with. Demea points to his own son, percus ac sobrius, as a model for Aeschinus to follow, but the blame for Aeschinus rests, Demea alleges, on Micio's lavishness and permissiveness. Micio denies that the actions of Aeschinus are as bad as the other believes and, turning to the offensive, suggests that Demea should allow his own son more freedom. Moreover, Micio points out, Aeschinus has been adopted by him and the responsibility for the manner of his upbringing lies with him alone. He proposes that Demea should confine himself to looking

after his own son, and Micio do likewise. Demea's concern for both is tantamount to asking for the return of Aeschinus. This veiled threat is sufficient to dissuade Demea from further interference and he agrees to Micio's proposal and goes off. When Micio is left alone, he admits that he is not so untroubled by Aeschinus' behaviour as he appeared to be in front of Demea. He thought that his son had quietened down when he had mentioned the subject of marriage. He goes off to the forum to look for him.

It is clear that one theme of the play is the contrast and conflict between the two genes, Demea and Micio, in terms of their way of life and methods of upbringing. The effect of giving Micio the opening monologue and making him expound the differences between the two is to render Micio the more sympathetic. He is cool, thoughtful, and restrained, while Demea is impetuous and passionate and the manner in which Micio's description of Demea is substantiated on the latter's entrance is in itself an indication of his perceptiveness. On the other hand he is sententious and not free of the arrogance and self-assurance that the conviction in one's own superiority over others often brings. His tone in the monologue is sometimes pretentious and self-congratulatory, in the dialogue sometimes patronising.

Micio prides himself on the philosophical basis of his methods and no one would disagree with him that it is better for one's children to do what is considered good sua sponte rather than alieno metu (v.75). At the same time, however, Micio's motives are not completely unselfish, since one of his reasons for treating his son in the way he does is that he wishes to have his deep love reciprocated. The excessive anxiety for his son's safety exemplifies how much he dotes on him. Moreover, if Demea's account of the raptio is true, something may be said in Demea's favour.

The stage is set for an interesting development of the differences between the two men and although the theme enunciated in vv.26-154 seems doomed to wither, since the two senes have agreed to go their own ways, we know that something will happen which will bring it to life: a dramatist does not introduce a theme at such length simply to let it die. In the subsequent scenes we discover that the girl has been snatched by Aeschinus, not for himself, but for his brother, Ctesipho, and that Aeschinus has love troubles of his own. He has violated the young girl who lives next door and she, as a result of the violation, gives birth to a child in the course of the play. The

interesting point is that neither of the fathers knew of his son's difficulties at the time of their initial encounter. The claims which each father made with respect to his own son are not borne out by the facts. Contrary to vv.52 ff. Aeschinus has kept his association with Pamphila secret although we are told (vv.150-151) that he has tentatively raised with Micio the possibility of his marrying. Contrary to vv.94-5 Ctesipho is not quite the model son, parcus ac sobrius, devoting himself to the interests of the family estate.

We thus have three elements in the plot - one major, the conflict between Demea and Micio, and two minor, the love affairs of Ctesipho and Aeschinus. The three strands are closely interwoven within the play. Most obviously the subplots are linked together by the seizure of the psaltria by Aeschinus on Ctesipho's behalf: it is the misinterpretation of this event by Geta and Sostrata that leads to the resolution of Aeschinus' problem. The apparent desertion of her daughter by the young man impels Sostrata to take the positive steps towards marriage from which she and Aeschinus had earlier shrunk. But the affairs of the two adulescentes play a part in the

development and resurgence of the main theme. Originally, of course, the raptio brought to a head the clash between the fathers which ended in the agreement that each would look after his own. When, however, Aeschinus asks Micio for the money to pay the lenc and ensure Ctesipho's possession of the girl and Micio, with full knowledge of the circumstances (vv.364-5), gives the money, that agreement is broken. In addition, so far from opposing the presence of Ctesipho and the psaltria in his house, he provides money for a convivium. On the other hand Demea is brought back into the action of the play without the agreement being contravened when Ctesipho's association with the raptio is used to motivate Demea's entry at v.355. His meeting with Hegio as a result of this entrance and his discovery of the violation of Pamphila by Aeschinus draws Demea further into the action by prompting his search for Micio. This search eventually leads to the discovery of the true circumstances concerning Ctesipho (Act V sc.3). At first he is outraged and accuses Micio of breaking faith; at the end of the scene he states that he will take the psaltria back to the country with Ctesipho but from the kind of life he envisages for the girl it is clear that he is not going to accept any sexual

relationship between the two (vv.842 ff.). However, he goes offstage and when he returns he has taken stock of his position. In his important monologue (vv.855-81) he interprets the presence of Ctesipho in Micio's house as tantamount to the desertion of himself by Ctesipho in favour of Micio. He decides to abandon the vita dura and to put it to the test whether he can display the charm and affability of Micio. This experiment is motivated in part by Micio's exhortation to be pleasant (quando hoc provocat, v.878; cf.vv.838,842) and the reason for this request of Micio was the fact that this was Aeschinus' wedding day (cf.vv.755-6). Thus the solution of the love affair of Aeschinus affects how the main theme is resolved, and subsequently the Ctesipho-psaltria element. Demea takes his clementia and facilitas to absurd lengths in a series of scenes in which he makes and carries into effect proposals that benefit in some way Aeschinus, Sostrata, Hegio and Syrus, but which cost Micio money and discomfiture. In his final speech (vv.985 ff.) he states that he has acted in this way to show that the basis of Micio's popularity is his permissiveness and over-generosity. He offers Aeschinus the choice of fathers and Aeschinus chooses Demea, asking what is to become of Ctesipho's

love affair. Demea says that he will allow him to keep the psaltria but she is to be his last amica. With this the play ends.

The themes of the play are well integrated and the plot is constructed in such a way as to create surprise (as in the way the audience learns of the love affairs of the two young men), suspense (as in the repeated postponement of Demea's discovery of Ctesipho in Micio's house), irony (splendidly exploited in Act III sc.3 in the meeting of Syrus and Demea), and humour (as in the reversal of roles of the senes at the end of the play). The Adelphoe must rank as one of, if not the best, of Terence's plays, but for much of what constitutes its excellence - the nicely drawn traits of the minor character Hegio, to take one example - the reader must be referred to the commentary.

But how much credit for this is to be given to Terence? What changes has he made in his adaptation of Menander's play and what was his motive? It is hoped that these questions will be answered, at least in part, in this chapter.

Plautus and Terence were by no means content to adhere rigidly to the Greek originals on which they based their plays. Internal analysis, comparison with

what we have of Greek New Comedy, differences between Plautus and Terence, and the external evidence of Terence's prologues and of the Donatus commentary have all helped to reveal an inventiveness and an eagerness to experiment on the part of the Roman dramatists.¹ They thus have a place in the history of comedy not just as the transmitters of Greek New Comedy but as playwrights in their own right with their own notion of what was dramatically desirable or effective. The nature of these innovations range from minor alterations such as the insertion of jokes or, as in the Adelphoe, the failure of a character to return a greeting as he did in the original (see commentary at v.81) to more extensive structural changes involving the omission of scenes from the model or the insertion into the fabric of the main model of scenes from a different Greek play. This last process, known to us, if not to Terence and his contemporaries, technically as contaminatio, is one that has figured prominently in the analysis of the Roman plays and in the attempts to reconstruct the main model and is attested for Terence's Adelphoe in the prologue to the play.

The statements made in Terence's prologues and the references to the Greek original in the Donatus commentary form a fairly solid foundation on which to

base any attempt to discover the nature and extent of Terence's departures from his model and certainly circumscribe the choice of hypotheses open to us much more than in the study of a play by Plautus, where sometimes we do not know the author or title of the original play. Although the Terentian picture seems rosier than the Plautine, it is by no means easy to get beyond the bald information of the prologues to a detailed description of divergences between Terence's play and his main Greek model. Moreover, the contribution of Donatus is of an uneven quality. Sometimes he tells us of what appear to be important changes on the part of Terence; in a note on And.14 he states that the Andria of Menander began with a monologue and at Hec.825 he tells us that what was acted onstage in the Greek play was narrated in Terence.² But often the information concerns alterations which seem to be localised and have little bearing on any wider structural changes made by Terence. An additional point is that the ancient commentary is a syncretism of the original notes of Donatus and later scholia and much of what was valuable has been lost or mangled. In particular, citations from the Greek original are often corrupt and unhelpful and it is not improbable that some were lost between the time of Donatus and the compilation.

Moreover, when we are simply told of an alteration without any citation from the Greek play, the words of Donatus have been subject to quite different interpretations and their validity has sometimes been questioned. Certainly the commentary deserves to be closely scrutinised, given the history of its transmission, but often the decision comes down to how far one will grant Terence the ability to make changes which but for the information of Donatus may well have passed unnoticed.³ More frustrating, however, is the absence of comment on what are to us major points of interest. Despite what Terence says of the use of a scene from the Synapothneskontes of Diphilus in his version of Menander's Adelphoi, Donatus does not tell us what, if anything, of the Menandrian play this scene replaced; nor does he tell of any adjustments which Terence may have made to accommodate the scene. The sole information given by Donatus at this point, the scholion on v.199, is disappointingly ambiguous, as will be seen below. The other five scholia relevant to the Greek play are at vv.43,81, 275,351 and 938. But only the last seems to have any bearing on structural changes made by Terence.

The two parts of the play with which we will be concerned are the beginning and the end. The problems

in the former revolve around 1. the extent of the Diphilus-scene and the consequences of its insertion into the fabric of the Menandrian play and 2. the manner of exposition in Menander's and Terence's plays. At the end of the play the victory of Demea over Micio and the relationship between the monologue of Demea at vv.855-81 and his words at vv.985 ff. are the main problems.

ii

The beginning of the play

The problem in this part of the play revolves round the statement made by Terence in the prologue that he has incorporated into his play part of the Synapothneskontes of Diphilus. The relevant lines are these :

Synapothnescontes Diphili comoedias:
eam Commoventis Plautus fecit fabulam.
in Graeca adolescens est qui lenoni eripit
meretricem in prima fabula: eum Plautus locum
reliquit integrum, eum hic locum sumpsit sibi
in Adelphos, verbum de verbo expressum extulit.(vv.6-11)

What Plautus omitted must have constituted a "scene" complete in itself. The implication of

Terence's words is that all that was untouched by Plautus was used by him. The part of Terence's play which most obviously accords with these lines of the prologue is vv.155-96. It is inconceivable that a single scene could be taken from one play, translated literally and placed within the framework of a different play, the main model, without the dramatist having to make some adjustments.⁴ If we accept vv.155-96 as non-Menandrian, Terence must have taken one of three courses of action :

1. Vv.155-96 are a complete scene of the Diphilus play, faithfully rendered and all the changes have occurred in the other scenes to bring them into harmony with the foreign element.
2. Part of vv.155-96 are Diphilean but adjustments have been made to allow Terence to return immediately to the Menandrian play.
3. Alterations have been made both to the Diphilean scene and to the surrounding scenes.

Now it is true that Terence says that the Diphilean part has been rendered literally (verbum de verbo expressum extulit) and the tendency has been to place great emphasis on these words in the prologue. Terence would hardly have said this if

he did not adhere closely to the Diphilus-scene but it seems naive to me to believe that the scene is completely free from any Terentian rehandling. Of the two points made about the scene the first, that there was no trace of it in the Plautine play, refutes any charge of furtum, the second, that it has been rendered word for word, the charge of neglegentia. A third factor is that in using a scene from a play which already had been a model for Plautus he was not reducing the number of plays which other dramatists could take as their models, if they were not to be charged with furtum. Therefore, if one accepts that vv.155-96 are a faithful rendering of Diphilus and contain nothing that was not in the Greek scene, one can only wonder at the good fortune of Terence in being able to find a scene which allowed him to refute three possible accusations of his detractors. I am as inclined to believe everything that Terence says as I am to believe all that Cicero tells us of his opponents, his clients or himself.⁵ But before coming to a decision on this point we shall first of all examine the rest of Terence's second act, pointing out difficulties and proposing tentative solutions that may be invoked to explain

or solve them. (For the moment vv.196-208 will be left aside). In the light of what we can deduce of the hypokeimena of the Menandrian play we shall then be able to reduce the number of possible hypotheses. The difficulty lies in the fact that a decision made on one problem cuts down the number of possibilities open to us in another question, and therefore quite different reconstructions can be postulated depending on which decision is made first. It needs to be said that it is to the credit of Terence's skill that the more precise one tries to be about the structure of the Menandrian original, the more hypothetical and unverifiable the reconstruction becomes.

The natural assumption to be drawn from Terence's description of the Diphilean scene is that with the meeting of Syrus and Sannio we are back in the Menandrian play. This assumption is to some extent substantiated when one considers how this scene is linked with vv.155-96 and what we learn in it. At the end of the Aeschinus-Sannio scene we are led to expect the return of Aeschinus : his parting words were delibers hoc dum ego redeo, lepo (v.196). Instead, Syrus enters. His first words, however, at v.209 - tace, egomet conveniam

ipsum ("Be quiet, I shall meet him") - are directed inside to Aeschinus and the implication of them is that Syrus is overriding the wish of Aeschinus to come out and meet the pimp again.⁷ The words therefore look back to v.196. Now in Terence the change of plan can be justified from a dramatic point of view. Syrus has information which is apparently unknown to Aeschinus (or at least it is not utilised by him in the earlier scene) : Syrus tells Sannio that he knows of his imminent departure for Cyprus (v.224). The pimp's position forces him to give up hope of recovering the girl and be satisfied with immediate payment for her. If he delays his departure in order to recover her, he will incur financial loss, while, if he refuses to take the money and goes to court for her recovery when he returns from Cyprus, the delay in bringing the action will count against him. The departure of the leno for Cyprus is the sole motivation appearing in the play that explains both Ctesipho's decision to leave the country (v.275 : according to Donatus the Menandrian Ctesipho intended to commit suicide) and the desperate and precipitate action of Aeschinus in taking the girl by force. The journey must have been an element in the Menandrian play and

'Aeschinus' must have known of this. (The reason that the young man in Terence made no use of the knowledge is of course that the meeting between him and the leno in vv.155-196 does not come from Menander but from Diphilus). Since the dramatic effect of the scene depends on Syrus' knowledge of the journey and on the way in which he exploits the weakness of Sannio's position, we may conclude that the scene is substantially Menandrian.

How the scene was connected with the preceding scenes is more difficult to show. One point of difficulty in the relationship between Acts I and II in Terence concerns the chronological sequence of events. At v.81 Demea comes on stage with news of the raptio of which he has heard. Yet in vv.155 ff. the final stages of the raptio are being enacted and Aeschinus is still in the process of getting the girl. How is it possible for Demea to arrive before Aeschinus and the leno? No convincing explanation of this has been given,⁸ and since we know that vv.155-96 are to a great extent Diphilean, we must suppose that the difficulty has arisen because of the incorporation of this scene into the fabric of another play. In

Menander the raptio was not enacted onstage and Aeschinus' entrance was distinct from the actual snatching of the girl. The most probable hypothesis is that Aeschinus entered before the leno and, as will be argued later, had no dealings with Sannio prior to the latter's meeting with Syrus.

In the scene we learn something of the circumstances that led up to the seizure of the girl by force. Aeschinus had offered to buy the girl but did not have the cash on hand to pay for her. When Sannio dissented, apparently because he was frightened of not getting the money, Aeschinus resorted to force and we can guess the reason when Syrus tells of the journey to Cyprus. Aeschinus could not risk leaving the girl in the pimp's possession until he could find the money, in case they were gone when he returned.

At the end of the scene Sannio has decided that he will be content, provided that the full price be paid him, and asks Syrus to do what he can to accomplish that. After agreeing, Syrus breaks off somewhat abruptly to say

sed Ctesiphonem video: laetus est
de amica (vv.252-3)

Sannio asks about his request but is told by Syrus

to wait. The entrance monologue of the character announced by Syrus follows. The introduction of Ctesipho must have been puzzling to the Roman audience. They know neither who Ctesipho is nor why he should be laetus about the amica, which presumably must refer to the girl seized by Aeschinus. His identity is revealed by the apostrophe in the third line of the monologue (o frater, frater). He is the younger brother of Aeschinus and the son who has remained under Demea's care. But it is not really until v.263 (maledicta, famam, meum laborem et peccatum in se transtulit ⁹⁾) that one learns for sure that the psaltria is in fact Ctesipho's. The manner of his introduction at his first entrance and the surprise revelation of his association with the raptio is not at all typical of New Comedy. If, however, the audience knew before his entrance of his part in the affair, i.e. from the prologue which Terence omitted, vv.252-3 would be enough to identify him, and the reason for his laudatio would be immediately realised by the Greek audience. The difficulties raised against the scene would then be removed and it could have appeared in the

Menandrian play in much the same form. But Drexler (23 f., cf. also Rieth-Gaiser, 137) believed that Terence's hand could be seen at vv.260-1:

SY. O Ctesipho, - CT. o Syre, Aeschinus ubist?
SY. ellum, te exspectat domi. CT. hem!

SY. quid est? CT. quid sit? illius opera, Syre,
nunc vivo.

Drexler objected to Syrus' greeting o Ctesipho as being an incorrect form of address with which to begin a dialogue with a newly-entered character. But this difficulty is removed, if one supposes, as my punctuation suggests, the utterance of Syrus to be incomplete. The full form of the greeting, e.g. OCtesipho, salve (cf. Most. 447-8, O Theopropides, / ere, salve) is cut short by Ctesipho, who in his excitement neglects to acknowledge or give a greeting but asks urgently where Aeschinus is. More awkward is the interjection hem, which is usually prompted by some unexpected disclosure, and is not an exclamatio laetantis, as Donatus explains it here. Now the natural inference to be drawn from Ctesipho's monologue is that he already knows that Aeschinus has got the girl. For if he does not know this, he can hardly draw this conclusion from Syrus' words te exspectat domi (v.260). Yet Ctesipho's

following words illius opera, Syre, nunc vivo etc.... make sense only if he knows that his girl-friend is inside. Hem, therefore, must express Ctesipho's astonishment that Aeschinus, after seizing the girl, has brought her to his own home, thus reinforcing the impression already made that the girl was his (cf. vv. 262-3). Syrus catches the tone of the exclamation and asks quid est? thinking that something is wrong. Although I believe Drexler exaggerated the awkwardness of these lines as they stand in the Terentian context,¹⁰ my conclusions drawn from overall consideration of the problem will be the same as his.

The next difficulty involves the stage action at the end of the dialogue between Syrus and Ctesipho and the entrance of Aeschinus at v. 265. At the end of the scene, Ctesipho hears the sound of Micio's door opening and retreats rapidly from the door. This is shown by Syrus' words mane mane (v. 264) and the slave's next words ipse exit foras show that the reason for Ctesipho's action is that he is afraid that someone other than Aeschinus is coming out and that his association with the raptio will, if that is so, be discovered. The dramatic purpose for the stage action would appear to be that Ctesipho's timidity and nervousness is thereby shown. But

since he has just been told that Aeschinus is waiting for him in the house, the inference is that there is no reason why he should be afraid to go in. The sudden transition from the joy and relief expressed in vv.261-4 to the manifestation of fear in the stage action has been the cause of the erroneous explanation of mane mane given in the Donatus commentary - gaudentis hoc dictum est, non opperiri iubentis. Rieth (50) suggests that the reason for Ctesipho's retreat is that for the first time he sees the leno who on the sound of the doors may have moved towards the door in expectation of the entrance of Aeschinus. If this were so one would expect some verbal information from Ctesipho to convey that he had seen Sannio. Rieth's explanation of the stage action is not persuasive. In fact the reason why the dramatist created this piece of stage business may run completely counter to Rieth's theory. Aeschinus comes out to see Sannio and the latter, who has been silent since Ctesipho's entrance at v.254, expresses the hope that Aeschinus brings the money out with him :

AE. ubi est ill' sacrilegus? SA. me quaerit.
num quid nam ecfert? occidi:
nil video.

Aechinus then sees Ctesipho and the pimp recedes into

the background once more until v.278. Now the motivation for Aeschinus' entrance is in harmony with his final words to the pimp at v.196 (delibera hoc dum ego redeo leno) and if we have been correct in suggesting that Aeschinus did not deal with the pimp in the Menandrian play then the line must be Terentian unless one supposes that Aeschinus saw the pimp approaching before he went inside and before the Sennio-Syrus scene. But if we anticipate our conclusion below that the pimp and Ctesipho were not onstage at the same time, and if vv.254-276 (... peccavi) reflect faithfully a continuous passage of the Menandrian play, then the motivation given Aeschinus at v.265 may result from Terence's attempt to reconcile an entrance of Aeschinus at this point in the Menandrian play with the Diphilus-scene and bring the leno back into the action of the play, even though only momentarily. Ctesipho and the pimp never show any awareness of the other's presence and a possible reason for the retreat of Ctesipho on Aeschinus' entrance was to prevent Ctesipho from hearing what Aeschinus and Sennio said at vv.265-6 and to make the failure of the two characters to see each other more acceptable. But the stage action at v.264 is not then immediately

dropped as one might expect. After the aside of the leno at vv.265-6 Aeschinus sees Ctesipho and says :

ehem opportune: te ipsum quaero: quid fit Ctesipho?
in tutost omnis res: omitte vero tristitiam tuam.

(vv.266-7)

Drexler (25) makes too much of a supposed contradiction between te expectat domi (v.260) and te ipsum quaero (cf.eg.H.T. 619 and 622) and fails to make any attempt to understand the following words. Ctesipho knows what has happened and must therefore, Drexler says, have already cast aside his tristities. Now quid fit? often stands as a greeting (= quid agitur?)¹¹ but it can also have the sense "what's wrong?" (= quid est? of v.261; cf. Ad.768) and this must be the meaning here. The words of Aeschinus are quite understandable if one supposes that he has noticed Ctesipho's apprehension. It is natural to believe that Ctesipho's trepidation was only momentary and should have vanished the moment he saw that the person coming out was his brother. We have to accept a freezing of the action from Aeschinus' entrance until his words at vv.266-7. If, however, vv.265-6 (... video) are a Terentian intrusion, there would be no difficulty in the Menandrian play. The main

point is that the stage business involving Ctesipho at v.264 and Aeschinus' words at vv.266-7 are closely linked. That Terence is responsible for this linkage will be suggested below.

In response to Aeschinus, Ctesipho addresses his brother in a manner that is both emotional and intimate - o mi Aeschine, o mi germane! - and continues

ah vereor coram in os te laudare amplius
ne id adsentandi magis quam quo habeam gratum facere
existimes. (vv.269-70)

I can not really see the validity of the objection of Drexler (26-7) to the comparative amplius. It is true that Ctesipho has not uttered a single word of praise to Aeschinus after the latter's entrance but does not the emphasis fall on coram in os, thus implying a reference to what Ctesipho has said before Aeschinus entered? Aeschinus waves aside any attempt of his brother to praise him. His only regret is that he found out almost too late to give assistance (vv.271-3). With these words Aeschinus could in the Menandrian play be thinking both of the imminence of the girl's departure for Cyprus and the action of Ctesipho to do away with himself. In Terence, however, the audience has the impression that Aeschinus does not know about the journey to

Cyprus and this impression is reinforced by v.278 (see below). After Ctesipho admits that he erred in not letting Aeschinus know before it was almost too late (peccavi, v.276), Aeschinus turns abruptly to Syrus to ask for the reaction of the pimp. On learning that he is now mitis Aeschinus states that he will go to the forum to pay him (hunc) and tells Ctesipho to go inside to join the psaltria. There is no indication in the words of Aeschinus - ego ad forum ibo ut hunc absolvam - that he is going to the forum to look for his father, Micio, and ask him for the money. Yet the manner in which Syrus begins his narration of the offstage action

omnem rem modo seni

quo pacto haberet enarramus ordine (vv.364-5)

suggests that is exactly what Aeschinus and Syrus did. One might have expected a more explicit statement that Micio was going to be approached for the money at Aeschinus' exit or some indication on Syrus' return of an accidental meeting with Micio. But since the money was required immediately and Aeschinus did not himself have it, the generous Micio was the obvious person to go to. Therefore, we must reckon with the possibility that v.277 bears signs of Terentian re-handling. The leno now

comes back into the action, goading Syrus into doing what he had promised. One need not infer from this request that the pimp has not heard Aeschinus' words at v.277 as Fantham (208) suggests. Sannio is still unsure of whether he will receive the full price of the girl and it was to make certain of this that he had originally enlisted the aid of Syrus - meum mihi reddatur saltem quanti emptast, Syre, (v.248). Syrus then addresses Aeschinus :

eamus: namque hic properat in Cyprum (v.278)

Now in the Menandrian play this would be an odd thing for Syrus to tell Aeschinus who must have known about it. Terence, however, does not give his audience any indication that Aeschinus is acquainted with the journey. On the other hand vv.278-80 could have stood in Menander if Aeschinus joined Syrus and Sannio and Syrus says namque hic properat in Cyprum to tease the leno by reminding him of the weak position he is in and by hinting that he may have to be content with ten instead of twenty minae as Syrus had earlier suggested (vv.240-2). Sannio, of course, rises to the bait and insists that the full price be paid. Syrus reassures him and makes to go off after Aeschinus, followed by Sannio. The scene could end quite

naturally at this point, the stage being left empty. It is somewhat surprising that Ctesipho whom we may assume to have gone inside (or made to do so) at v.277 after Aeschinus had instructed him reappears at v.281 to ask Syrus to see to it that the leno is paid off promptly -

ne, si magis irritatus siet,
aliqua ad patrem hoc permanet atque ego tuum *vi*
perpetuo perierim. (vv.282-3)

as the second half of v.283 shows, hoc means Ctesipho's connection with the girl, and since the revelation of this is made to depend on the possible anger of the leno if he is not paid, it would appear that we must conclude that the leno knew that the girl had been seized by Aeschinus not for himself but on behalf of Ctesipho. This is not an unnatural assumption to make, particularly since the leno was in a position to learn this, if he did not know it already, from what both Ctesipho and Aeschinus said in vv.254-76. In fact the leno will be paid almost immediately but Demea nevertheless still manages to hear something that connects Ctesipho with the raptio (vv.355 ff.). The scene ends with Syrus giving Ctesipho instructions to go inside to the girl and put into motion the preparations for a convivium and concludes

ego iam transacta re convertam me domum cum opsonio
(v.286)

By these words Syrus anticipates the future development of the play. The motivation for his return at vv.364 ff. is provided by the money which Micio has given him (vv.370-1). The impression from these lines is that Syrus bought the food or was in a position to do so because Micio gave him the money. If another reason for supposing vv.281-7 to be a Terentian appendage can be adduced, this anticipation of a later development in the play would give support to such a supposition.

The most serious difficulty in vv.209-80 is the continued presence of Sannio after Ctesipho enters, the complete failure of them to notice each other and the almost total absence of interest in the stage action on the part of Sannio. He speaks only when Aeschinus comes to look for him (vv.265-6) and when Aeschinus returns to the question of the pimp's attitude and states his intention to pay him (vv.278 ff.). The abrupt transition of Aechinus at v.276 which prompts Sannio's second remarks has been shown to pick up the motivation for his entry at v.265 and these words could only have been spoken in Menander's play if Aeschinus knew the pimp was onstage and had come out or been called out to discover the outcome of the confrontation between Syrus and Sannio.

But since the two occasions on which Sannio speaks are therefore linked with the end of the scene which from the evidence of the prologue one can assume on prima facie grounds to be non-Menandrian (vv.155-96) and since the movement of the play proceeds somewhat jerkily in the immediate environment of both re-entrances of the pimp into the action, the more plausible explanation is that the leno was not onstage when Ctesipho made his entrance and that, because of the enactment of the raptio in vv.155-96, Sannio appeared much earlier than he did in the Menandrian play, where Ctesipho made his appearance and entered the house before the Syrus-Sannio scene. This order of arrival seems the more likely. As support for it Drexler (34 f.) referred to the Donatus scholion on tace (v.208): 'tace' : si pro adverbio est positum, omnibus dicitur, si pro verbo, Ctesiphoni dicitur maxime sollicito et supplicanti omnibus ob metum patris. The scholion is nonsense in the Terentian context, since Ctesipho is not inside the house and does not make his appearance until v.254. Drexler believed, however, that the scholion in its present state is the result of the "epitomator" and that originally the scholion was concerned with the

person to whom tace was directed and stated that in Menander the corresponding imperative was addressed to 'Ctesipho', probably according to Drexler after a request similar to what Ctesipho says at 281 ff., which therefore preceded the Syrus-Sannio dialogue. This argument must be put aside as highly speculative, confirming or proving nothing.¹² One can not therefore rule out the possibility that Sannio preceded Ctesipho and that after his dealings with Syrus went off with the promise that the money would be paid to him that morning. If that were the case, instead of getting rid of Sannio before Ctesipho appeared, Terence was obliged to keep him onstage because he had brought the leno into contact with Aeschinus and had to keep him there until the latter's return (v.196).

From the points made on vv.209-87 it is evident that no precise reconstruction can be attempted with confidence. Before this can be done we have to bring together all that we can safely deduce of the events envisaged by the dramatist prior to the beginning of the play itself. In fact in this sphere there is much that is open to dispute. But it is desirable that the decisions reached should have some basis in the play itself

and even more desirable that their basis should be, as far as we can tell, Menandrian. First one must determine those characters' exits and entrances essential to the structure of the play.

Did lines 26-154 also begin the Menandrian play (possibly after a prologue)? It is difficult to see the monologue of Micio to be other than an opening one. It is clearly expository in function and the exposition neatly arises from the motivation of his entry. Micio has come out to shout for Storax, one of the slaves who had gone to escort Aeschinus back from the cena. The lateness of the latter's return prompts Micio to express his fears that some mishap may have befallen him. This excessive anxiety leads Micio on to state that Aeschinus is not even his natural son but his nephew. This information leads on in turn to a detailed comparison of Micio and his brother Demea which prepares for the latter's entrance at v.80. The monologue forms a neat, coherent unity and there is no reason to doubt that Terence has rendered it faithfully. 'Aeschinus' therefore could not have been at home when 'Micio' entered at v.26 and must have made his first appearance from one of the wings sometime after v.154.¹³ A similar entrance is required for the psaltria and 'Ctesipho'; it is essential to the plot that they

should be in Micio's house in order to be discovered by Demea.¹⁴ The only alternative to postulating a similar entrance from the wings for the leno is to suppose that he did not make any stage appearance in the Menandrian play. But the Donatus scholion on v.199 discussed below opposes that view. The only personage about whom there is any doubt is 'Syrus' who in Terence makes his first entrance from the house.

Of the events leading up to the raptio we can deduce so much. Aeschinus heard at the last moment when it was almost too late that his brother was in danger of losing his amica; she was about to be taken to Cyprus in the entourage of her owner (vv.272-3). He had to take immediate action: he went to the leno and offered to buy her but since he did not have the ready cash, the leno refused (vv.246 ff.). Aeschinus was therefore obliged to take the girl by force, intending to pay later. He must have learned of Ctesipho's position either at the cena or on the way back. If he had known before this he could have asked Micio for the money. Several questions present themselves. Exactly how did Aeschinus discover Ctesipho's plight and his threat to commit suicide? How did Ctesipho learn of the success of the raptio

and from where does he come on his first entrance?
What part did Syrus play in the seizure of the girl?

At least three points are essential to the plot. First Aeschinus alone of the adulescentes has to seize the girl; the second point is the pact between Demea and Micio not to concern themselves with the other's son and the third is the return of Demea into the action of the play without that agreement being broken. The motivation for Demea's re-entry could therefore concern Ctesipho but not Aeschinus. Thus, when Demea reappears, he says :

disperii! Ctesiphonem audivi filium
una fuisse in raptione cum Aeschino.(vv.355-6)

Obviously this does not agree with anything we have seen or heard up to this point in the play or with the action which gives the plot its initial impulse and engenders its complication. For it is imperative, if the misinterpretation of that action, first by Demea, then by Geta, is to be convincing, that Aeschinus alone of the brothers was involved in the actual raptio. How then could Demea have heard that Ctesipho was present with Aeschinus at the event? This contradiction with the facts deserves closer attention that Drexler gives it. "The audience" he says (17) "has learned that the raptio concerned

Ctesipho and does not question how the rumour arose and how Demea heard it and we need not question it either". Now it is possible that Menander was content to invent a false rumour about Ctesipho in order to provide an ad hoc motivation for Demea's return, but I do not believe it reasonable to hold this view if another reconstruction of equal validity can be found which takes vv.355-6 into account. It seems better to start with what we learn from those parts of the Terentian play that are outside the section where re-working on the part of Terence is recognised than to reconstruct mainly from the re-worked part and lightly shrug off what we have no reason to suspect is other than Menandrian.¹⁵ Admittedly there were other considerations which brought Drexler to the conclusion that Ctesipho entered first from the country, accompanied by Syrus, and therefore could not possibly have been with Aeschinus. He was therefore forced to believe that the rumour behind vv.355-6 was a motivation "momentarily conceived" and was of no significance for the Menandrian reconstruction. In support of this he points out that at vv.400 ff. Demea seems to have forgotten the rumour and already at vv.359 ff. his thoughts have taken a different turn. The validity

of either of these points I can not see: vv.359-60.

ubi ego illum quaeram? credo abductum in ganeum
aliquo: persuasit ille impurus, sat scio.

show simply that Demea does not conceive it as possible that Aeschinus would bring the girl to his own house. One may compare his reaction to learning that the psaltria is in Micio's house at vv.388-90.

DE. quid? istaec iam penes vos psaltriam?
SY. ellam intus. DE. eho an domum habiturus? SY.
dementia DE. haec in fieri! credo, ut est

If vv.400 ff. give the impression that Demea has forgotten the rumour, it should be noted that Demea said (vv.362-4) that he would conceal from Syrus that he was looking for Ctesipho and this would account for the apparently casual way in which Demea broaches the subject. The tale which Syrus spins him (vv.402 ff.) would explain the source of the rumour and satisfy Demea. The three points mentioned at the beginning of the paragraph can be reconciled with vv.355-6 if we suppose that Aeschinus and Ctesipho return together after Aeschinus had alone of the brothers gained possession of the girl. This is quite possible, given what we know of the circumstances.

Since the raptio was common knowledge in the city (v.93) and Geta had witnessed it (v.329), the event took place in the morning rather than in

the dead of night. We have shown that Aeschinus could only have learned of Ctesipho's circumstances either at the cena or on his way home. For the source of his knowledge the choice lies between Ctesipho himself and friends of Aeschinus who knew of Ctesipho's situation and were present at the cena. The most likely candidate for telling him is Ctesipho himself. Ctesipho's love affair was doomed to be cut short if his father learned of it (cf. his anxiety in IV,1) and secrecy of his connection with the girl is therefore in accord with the sentiments and character he presents in the play itself as well as necessary for the complication of the plot. We may suppose then that Aeschinus is imagined to have met Ctesipho in the city on the way back from his cena, to have learned of the position from him, and to have decided that he would try to get the girl from him. Ctesipho either because of his innate timidity or of his fear of discovery by Demea took no part. He was perhaps sent to a friends to wait. Aeschinus then took the girl there and they all came back together. This reconstruction of the hypokeimeng has two advantages. It explains the time lag between the raptio and the return of Aeschinus after Demea has already appeared with news of the

event, and it creates the basis for the motivation of Demea's entry into the action of the play.

Ctesipho and Aeschinus, accompanied by the psaltria, were seen together on their way to Micio's.

This brings us to the problem of the part played by Syrus in the events before the play began. The rock on which most reconstructions have been built ¹⁶ has been the inference drawn from Syrus' words at vv.210-1:

quid istuc, Sannio, est quod te audio
nescioquid concertasse cum ero?

Syrus then apparently took no part in the raptio. Was this so in the Menandrian play? Lines 210-1 are in accord with the raptio as it is enacted in vv.155-96 where Parmeno is the only slave mentioned. If 'Syrus' participated in the raptio in Menander Terence would have been faced with assigning to Syrus the part of Parmeno in vv.155-96 or removing Syrus from the raptio. The first alternative would be quite understandably rejected. It was we believe 'Syrus' who dealt with the leno in Menander, as in II,2 of Terence's play. That the same character should in one scene act like a minor slave, of the thug type, with nothing to offer apart from a couple of blows and in the next cunningly and shrewdly

show all the characteristics of the servus callidus in the way he forces the pimp to accept the money is I believe intolerable. Therefore, the removal of Syrus from participation in the raptio could well be a necessary consequence of Terence's decision to enact the event onstage by taking the scene from the Diphilus play. There is actually nothing in the rest of the play that could be said to prove Syrus' presence when the raptio took place but what evidence there is inclines me to believe that this is so. Syrus himself says that Micio thanked him for having given the plan (v.368). Therefore, Syrus must have been with Aeschinus when he heard the news of Ctesipho. The slave is named as impulsor by Geta (v.315) but that need not refer to the particular circumstances, only to Syrus' general influence. Demea believes the slave to be caput rei (v.568) which is true certainly insofar as Syrus gave the plan and he says in psaltria hac emunda, hic adiutor fuit, / hic curavit (vv.967-8) when he is recommending his manumission. Again, as emunda shows, this need not refer to the raptio but to the assistance Syrus gave Aeschinus in paying off the leno (cf. vv.364 ff., heard by Demea). More significant are lines 964-6 :

et quidem porro haec, obsonare cum fide,
scortum adducere, adparare de die convivium,
non mediocris hominis haec sunt officia.

The first and third of these officia refer to actions of Syrus within the play and scortum in the second suggests that Demea is thinking of the psaltria and of the raptio. But in Terence Syrus did not scortum adduxit. One may argue that one can not press this statement of Demea's too far. Demea does not know the real situation, the tone of his words is sarcastic, and Demea may be making it up for comic effect just as Aeschinus says (v.940) that he promised Sostrata and her daughter that Micio would marry the mother when he could not possibly have done so.¹⁷ On the other hand there is greater point to what Demea says if Syrus did actually help to bring the girl back and Demea cites this as a reason for his manumission. If one accepts vv.210-11 as Menandrian, some action has to be imagined for Syrus to occupy the time when the plan was given him and his entrance from the house at v.208. The only possible one that would significantly differ from my suggestion that Syrus was present at the raptio is that Syrus is sent to tell Ctesipho the news and/or to bring him from the country. We must assume by this theory that Aeschinus learned of the situation from someone

other than Ctesipho. There is, however, absolutely no evidence that suggests Ctesipho makes his first entry from the country. In Terence certainly we may assume that Ctesipho, like Demea, has heard the news of the raptio on his way into the town. Drexler (17) concluded from v.95 that Demea at least thought his son was in the country :

denique,
si conferendum exemplumst, non fratrem videt
rei dare operam, ruri esse parcum ac sobrium?

But Demea means this in a general sense, contrasting the wild city life of Aeschinus with the quiet, industrious way of life of Ctesipho in the country. I believe that it is simpler and more in accord with what evidence there is to take vv.210-11 to be Terentian arising like v.208 from the use of the Diphilus-scene. Ctesipho told Aeschinus, Syrus advised the plan of campaign, and Aeschinus and Syrus carried it out. An additional support for Syrus' participation may be given by the scholion of Donatus at v.199 which gives a Greek citation which, as will be argued later, probably appeared in a monologue of the leno in Menander's play. The citation is corrupt but the last two words are almost certainly οἰκέτην λαβών. In the Terentian line the Menandrian pimp is describing

X

the actions of 'Aeschinus'. The citation from the Greek play would show that the young man had the help of a slave : cf. Menander Kolax 111 ff.

ἀλλ' ἐὰν αἴσθηθ' ὄδε,
πρόσεισιν ἐξήκονθ' ἑταίρους παραλαβών,
ἴσους Ὀδυσσεὺς ἦλθεν εἰς Τροίαν ἔχων,
βοῶν, ἀπειλῶν.

spoken by the πορνοβοσκός as he contemplates what a young man will do if his amica is sold to a rival. 'Aeschinus' had the help of one slave and the fact that it is one suggests that he was Syrus. If 'Aeschinus' had been assisted by the adversitores mentioned by Micio at v.27, the plural might have been expected.

If Aeschinus returned accompanied not only by the girl but also by Ctesipho and Syrus, Terence has done a considerable amount of recasting of his material. Instead of an entrance monologue by Ctesipho we would expect an entrance dialogue of the two brothers. It is interesting to note that the monologue of Ctesipho at vv.254 ff. could because of its apostrophe-form just as well be spoken to Aeschinus as part of a dialogue. There are some similarities between vv.268-9 and the entrance monologue of Ctesipho : cf. for example

the double apostrophe o mi Aeschine, o mi germane (vv.268-9) with o frater, frater (v.256), quiquidem te habeam fratrem (v.268) with unam hanc rem me habere fratrem principem (vv.258-9), vereor coram in os te laudare amplius (v.269) with quid ego nunc te laudem (v.256). These suggest that Terence could have taken some of the material from Ctesipho's speech in the dialogue to use in an entrance monologue. In the monologue there is only one point which could indicate a re-hashing of material and that is in the connection between vv.256-7 and vv.258-9. The second two lines are introduced by itaque, thus apparently forming the conclusion to what preceded. But more naturally they give the reason why Ctesipho can not find words to match the virtus of Aeschinus and the notion expressed in v.259 may have followed quiquidem te habeam fratrem (v.268) If we are correct in believing that Terence has split what was a speech addressed to Aeschinus into an entrance monologue, then most of vv.260-1 and the stage action at vv.264-6 must be Terentian. The explanation I have given of hem in v.260 in fact mirrors the reaction of Demea when he learns at v.389 that the psaltria is inside Micio's house. Terence may therefore have taken

material later in the play to use in the part where he had to make adjustments because of the decision to use the Diphilus-scene. As for vv.264-6 we have suggested that the reason for the rather strange reaction of Ctesipho when he hears the door opening was that as a result of it Ctesipho could more naturally show no awareness of the lenc. Another possibility presents itself: Terence conceived this stage action in order to facilitate a return to the entrance dialogue of Aeschinus and Ctesipho in the Menandrian play. That is to say, the first words spoken by Aeschinus to Ctesipho were similar to v.267 (in tutost omnis res: omitte vero tristitiam tuam), Aeschinus perhaps saying them after he has sent Syrus into the house with the psaltria. vv.254-5 may present some difficulty to my hypothesis :

abs quivis homine, quom est opus, beneficium
accipere gandeas;

verum enimvero id demum iuvat si quem aequomst
facere is bene facit.

Drexler (25 f.)¹⁸ refused to ascribe them to Menander and thought that they were the work of Terence because of their 'intolerable triteness' and because the two lines are the sole Terentian

example of those 'komparativische Gesprächsanfänge' shown by Eduard Fraenkel¹⁹ to be indicative of Plautine workmanship. Neither of these points is convincing and the second is based on a misunderstanding of Fraenkel's demonstration as Rieth in his review of Drexler's work shows.²⁰ Rieth believed that vv.254-5 refuted Drexler's hypothesis that there was no monologue of Ctesipho in Menander, since he thought that the two lines are suited only to introduce a monologue. This I believe goes too far. Sententiae are by no means confined to the beginning of monologues (cf. e.g. Menander, Epitr. 167 ff.) and the lines could have occurred after Ctesipho says he is abandoning his tristities because he has Aeschinus for a brother (v.268). The connection between tristities and gaudeas iuvat is obvious.

One may therefore tentatively reconstruct the dialogue as following: vv.267-8 down to fratrem, followed by the idea expressed in v.259 that Aeschinus is primarum artium maxime princeps; vv.254-5, giving an additional reason for dropping his tristities; vv.256-7; vv.262-264 (.... nil pote supra in the second person); vv.269-70 (Terence perhaps having added coram in os because the

laudatio in his play has been given in Aeschinus' absence); vv.271-6 (...peccavi). This over-precise reconstruction shows simply that the material in II,3 and II,4 can be reassembled to form one scene, different in structure, and that conversely the reverse procedure which I believe occurred is possible.

At the end of the Menandrian scene Aeschinus sent Ctesipho inside to join the psaltria and probably went into the house himself. Drexler (37) suggests that Aeschinus, instead of doing this, went off to the forum to look for his father. But he could not have known that his father was not at home without first entering the house. Moreover, the description of the offstage action given by Syrus at vv.364 ff. implies that he and Aeschinus went off together. Now the natural place for this exit would be after the Sannio-Syrus scene. Did the pimp go with them? For two reasons I think the answer is in the negative. First Sannio's pleas to Syrus to help him get the price of the girl (vv.247 ff.) would be more understandable and more economical from a dramatic point of view if Sannio did not come into contact with Aeschinus in Menander and if they are spoken, perhaps in a slightly different form, after

Syrus told him that Aeschinus would bring him the money. The situation in Terence is that Aeschinus without any equivocation has offered Sannio the full price (vv.191-2), while Syrus has tried to persuade the pimp to be content with half rather than run the risk of getting nothing at all (vv.240-2). Yet it is to the latter that Sannio entrusts his fate, despite the fact that he must expect to have the opportunity of speaking with Aeschinus again from Aeschinus' final words at v.196. Sannio's request to Syrus is therefore somewhat strange in light of what has preceded. In fact, although the justification for Sannio's continued presence on the stage is v.196, neither Aeschinus nor Sannio have any direct contact with each other. If the reason for the pimp's presence and the lack of contact between him and Aeschinus does not spring from the use of the Diphilus-scene, one has to accept that in Menander the young man entered when the pimp was present and that neither paid the slightest attention to the other or that, if there was a short exchange of words in Menander between the two characters, Terence has omitted it, although v.196 in the Diphilus-scene would seem to foreshadow it and would have allowed him to keep it. Such a dialogue may, however, have made little sense

in the Terentian context and Terence may have omitted it without bothering to write in a new dialogue. The second point is that, if Aeschinus has to take the money to the pimp's after he receives it from Micio, then offstage action is given to Aeschinus which accounts for his movements until his entrance at vv.610ff. One can then suppose that in Menander Sannio left for his home at the end of the Syrus-Sannio scene vv.251-2 (....faciam), after which reddetur reddet (vv.279-80) may have followed.

If Sannio was not on the stage when Aeschinus appeared after the Syrus-Sannio scene, then we must postulate a short dialogue between Syrus and Aeschinus of which only v.276 remains. Lines 278-80 could certainly not have appeared here, since Sannio is involved, and the awkwardness of what Syrus says to Aeschinus, namque hic properat in Cyprum (discussed earlier), would support the view that Terence's hand can be seen in this section. The second part of v.277, tu intro ad illam, spoken to Ctesipho, could obviously not have occurred either at this point in the play. In the dialogue we would expect a more explicit statement from Syrus than iam mitis est, which is understandable to Aeschinus because of the choice he gave Sannio in vv.155-96. The failure of Aeschinus to make

any mention in v.277 of the need to find his father before paying the leno may result from the suppression of most of this scene.

This brings us to vv.281-7. By our reconstruction so far we shall have to suppose that, if Ctesipho did appear at this point in the play, he came out with Aeschinus after the leno had left Syrus. One may ask then why would Ctesipho direct his request that the leno be paid as soon as possible to Syrus and not to Aeschinus. In Terence one may assume that Aeschinus has already left the stage by the time Ctesipho speaks. Is this indicative that in Menander Ctesipho entered not with Aeschinus, but after a short dialogue between Aeschinus and Syrus, when Aeschinus had gone off to the forum, and was in time to catch the slave? The command of Aeschinus to Ctesipho at v.277 was then a means of returning to the Menandrian play. This whole section creates the greatest difficulty for any reconstruction. The dramatic purpose of the lines seems to be twofold. First it shows Ctesipho's fear of his father as does Act IV sc.1. later in the play, also a dialogue between the same persons. It is interesting to note that the stage movements of Ctesipho at the end of this later scene are similar to those here. Syrus tells Ctesipho to go inside at

v.538 and Ctesipho's words at v.539 (si quid rogabit, nusquam tu me: audistin?) imply that he is not going to wait for his father to appear. But after three lines spoken by Demea Ctesipho speaks again :

CT. Syre. SY. quid est? CT. men quaerit?

SY. verum. CT. perii (v.543)

As in v.281 Ctesipho appears to have come back on to the stage, even if in this instance he speaks from the door of the house. Terence may have used this later stage business at the end of Act. II, either in order to get back to Menander at vv.281 ff. or to introduce a scene of his own invention, if. 281 ff. did not occur in Menander at this place. The second purpose is to foreshadow the entrance of Demea at vv.355 ff. We have already noted that vv.281 ff. seem to make Demea's re-appearance into the action of the play dependent on some delay in the payment of the leno: Sannio in fact is paid off promptly but Demea nevertheless returns. We have also noted that in vv.284-6 Syrus appears to anticipate the later development of the play. Taking these points together with the loose connection of vv.281-7 with what has preceded, I am inclined to believe that the lines are Terentian and that this part of the play ended in Menander with the departure of Aeschinus and Syrus for the agora without

Ctesipho appearing onstage. The reason for this addition would be that in Menander Demea's re-entrance was sufficiently motivated by the return of Aeschinus and Ctesipho together after the raptio. In Terence of course this is not so and the Roman dramatist has done his best to compensate by making Ctesipho express the fears that his father would find out. Proof that vv.281-7 are Terentian in their substance as well as in their position is unattainable. It depends on one particular aspect of the hypokeimena, viz whether the leno and Ctesipho knew each other? For if they did not, vv.281-3 can not be based closely on anything in the Menandrian play. It is possible that the situation which sets the play in motion was not simply the departure of the girl's owner for Cyprus but the selling of her to a new owner (Sannio), who would remove her from the city. This is similar to the predicament of Calidorus in Pseudolus where Phoenicium has been sold to a Macedonian soldier who is about to send someone to pay the remaining five of the twenty minae and collect her (Pseud.51 ff.). In the Adelphoe the pimp says :

emptae mulieres
complures et item hinc alia quae porto Cyprum
(vv.229-30)

and the girl could be one of those mulieres whom Sannio

has bought. This is given some support from vv.240 ff. when Syrus advises Sannio to be content with ten minae rather than risk losing everything. The proposal is even more audacious than it appears and Sannio's outraged reply - etiam de sorte nunc venio in dubium (v.243) - more understandable if Sannio has just bought the girl and if, without having made anything from the girl herself, he is not going to get even his money back. Sannio's words refer to Aeschinus' offer to give him the price of the girl, implied by Syrus at 216 ff. and expressly stated at vv.191-2 (i.e. in the Diphilus-scene) :

minis viginti tu illam emisti (quae res vortat male)
argentum tantum debitur.

One may note that this reference of Aeschinus to what the leno paid for the girl is not inconsistent with a recent purchase. It is possible, therefore, that Ctesipho and the leno did not know each other and in that case vv.281-3 are to be ascribed to Terence. If there was no recent purchase, vv.281-3 could be Menandrian, but probably appeared in a different context, most likely at the end of the first dialogue between Aeschinus and Ctesipho.

Now it is time to turn to the Diphilus-scene and Sannio's monologue.

Apart from the chronological dislocation there is nothing in the Diphilus-scene that is obviously inconsistent with the rest of Terence's play. Line 177

SA. quid tibi rei mecumst? AE. nihil. SA. quid?
nostin qui sim? ...

has been taken to show that Aeschinus and the leno have had no dealings with each other and are strangers. Since Aeschinus is acting on his brother's behalf, this would not be out of harmony with the situation in Menander's play. But the question quid tibi rei mecumst?, though it can be spoken by one individual to another whom he does not know (cf. Menaechmi v.323), means rather "What business do I have with you?", i.e. "What arrangements are we going to come to?"²¹ Aeschinus by his answer nihil brazenly assents that he is quite content with the position as it stands. He has the girl and that is all that concerns him. Sannio can do what he wants. Sannio's reaction is one of outrage - "What! Do you know what kind of man I am?" (cf. And.586). On the other side the fact that Sannio addresses Aeschinus by name at v.160 suggests that he knows him and this is consistent with the implication of Sannio's words to Syrus at v.250 (scio te non usum antehac amicitia mea) and Sannio's exclamation at v.237 (hoccin illo dignumst? hoccin incipere Aeschinum, ...). Such an acquaintance

would not be surprising in view of Aeschinus' way of life (cf. quam hic non amavit meretricem, v.149).

The main difficulty revolves round vv.191 ff. -

AE. minis viginti tu illam emisti (quae res tibi vortat male!)
argenti tantum dabitur. SA. quid si ego tibi illam nolo
vendere?
coges me? AE. minime. SA. namque id metui AE. neque
vendundam censeo
quae liberast; nam ego liberali illam adsero causa manu.
nunc vide utrum vis, argentum accipere an causam meditari
delibera hoc dum ego redeo, leno. tuam.

At vv.191-2 Aeschinus offers to buy the girl for the same price the leno paid for her. When Sannio asks if Aeschinus will compel him to sell her, if he does not wish to do so, the other replies "not at all!" Sannio fails to see the latent meaning in the answer and assumes that the girl will be given back to him.

Aeschinus, however, had meant that he would not compel the leno to sell her (i.e. he is quite prepared to keep her without paying anything).²² Sannio is momentarily relieved but Aeschinus clarifies his minime when he says that a girl who is libera ought not to be sold. For he claims her to be free. Clearly if the girl was a free-born citizen, there would be no need to offer the leno money. Indeed the leno would be in danger of being liable to a suit ἀνδραποδισμοῦ. However, the very anomaly in Aeschinus' offering to buy the girl in one breath and claiming her to be free in the next

makes it obvious that the claim is a gambit, designed to make it more difficult for the leno to recover the girl. Aeschinus gives notice that he is not simply going to hand her back. The leno will have to go to law bringing a suit against the young man.²³ It is further noteworthy that Aeschinus says she is libera because he claims her to be free, not that he claims her to be free because he knows her to be of citizen birth.²⁴ The audience would recognise Aeschinus' claim for what it is. Moreover, the use of this ploy is ideally suited to the situation in the Menandrian play. The pimp is all set to go to Cyprus. To delay his journey will cost him money. By making it clear to Sannio that he will have to go to law to get her back, Aeschinus exploits the pimp's position and forces him to accept the money.

Yet it is in the nature of Greek New Comedy that, even if such a claim was invented as a ruse, the audience would take it as a foreshadowing of an eventual recognition. Webster²⁵ states that there are two alternatives: either the claim belongs to the Menandrian play and the girl was finally recognised and married off to Ctesipho or Terence's description of the girl as a meretrix (v.9) is inaccurate and the girl was finally found to be free in that play. Since there is no trace of a recognition

scene in the Adelphoe, the general view has been that Terence has adhered to the Diphilus-scene. Two points can be made in support of this. First Terence says that he has translated the Diphilus-scene literally. But despite similarities in expression between this scene and parts of the Rudens, the original of which was also by Diphilus, I am sceptical about assuming that vv.155-96 in toto are closely based on the Diphilus-scene.²⁶ The second point is that in the following monologue (vv.196-208) the leno surprisingly makes no mention of the vindicatio. This, even if he recognised the claim to be bogus, one might expect. If, however, one accepts that the vindicatio stems from Diphilus, one still has to explain the contradiction between the offer to pay money and the claim. Since we know nothing whatever of the rest of Diphilus' play, it is not too difficult. Fantham (202) explains it by supposing that the young man knew that the girl was free, but had no proof. He had to get the girl before she started practising her trade and therefore offered to buy her to achieve this, despite his knowledge of her citizen-status. Proof of the girl's identity and citizenship would occur later in the play and the young man would not have to pay the money. The truth of the matter is that one just does not know.

The Diphilus-scene began the play and Plautus omitted it. One might infer from this that the scene formed a complete episode in itself and therefore had a definite outcome which the scene lacks in the Adelph. Possibly the pimp agreed to take the money and the plot revolved round the difficulty of the young man in finding it. At any rate whether or not the leno remained onstage in the Diphilus-play after the raptio, Terence was certainly forced to keep him there for the Menandrian dialogue between him and 'Syrus'. It is quite possible that Terence had to abandon Diphilus to achieve this. It could have been done by making the pimp reluctant to sell and by making Aeschinus give some ultimatum which would allow Aeschinus to leave the stage and keep Sannio there for Syrus. The offer to pay twenty minae, the price Sannio had given, is certainly consistent with and assumed by Syrus' words at vv.240 ff. and Sannio's at v.243. The question is "has the Menandrian play been adjusted to suit the Diphilean scene or is the reverse the case (i.e. unless one assumes that Terence is adhering both to Menander and to Diphilus and that in the Menandrian scene vv.240 ff. referred to Aeschinus' offer before the raptio (cf.vv.216 ff.)?". The claim of the girl's freedom and the necessity of the leno's taking legal action thereby raised are, as we have said, also consistent with the Menandrian

situation. It is conceivable, therefore, that the vindicatio is Terence's work. But if so, why did Terence choose this type of ploy and not the knowledge that the pimp was on the point of leaving for Cyprus. And why did he not follow up this insertion in the subsequent monologue of the leno?

There is considerable disagreement about the identity of the dramatist responsible for vv.196-208. Drexler (6 f.) believed that it could not stem from Diphilus because of the contradiction between quando bene promeruit (v.201) and quid tibi rei mecumst (v.177) and denied it to Menander because of the confusion in Sannio's argumentation. But the contradiction rests on a misinterpretation of the latter and the former is ironic anyway. One factor against Drexler's view is the evidence of the Donatus scholion on line 200 which begins HOMINI MISERO secundum illud Menandri. There follows a corrupt Greek citation ending in οἰκέτην λαβών. The reason for the scholion must be that the line quoted had some similarity with v.200 and if the lemma is not abbreviated, the similarity would concern homini misero. Because the citation is introduced in an unusual way, it has been suggested that the Greek line may have come from a Menandrian play other than Adelphoi. Most often quotations are

introduced simply by the Greek dramatists' name, with or without a following sic (cf. e.g. Donatus on Ad.43, Eun.46, Phorm. 562). The scholion on Eun.689 (COLORE MUSTELLINO erravit Terentius non intellegens Menandricum illud) shows that the demonstrative illud is not unique. It is of course possible that a similar line occurred in Diphilus in the leno's monologue, if there was one, but since there are just two lines (at the beginning of the monologue) which can refer back exclusively to the Diphilus-scene, this seems unlikely. These are ob malefacta haec tantidem emptam postulat sibi tradier (v.199) and suom ius postulat (v.201) with which one might take also the first part of the line.²⁷ Both of these look back to Aeschinus' demands that the leno take the money rather than the girl and could hardly have been spoken by the leno in Menander before he meets Aeschinus or Syrus.

We can feel reasonably certain that in Menander the leno had an entrance monologue prior to his confrontation with Syrus. If, however, vv.196-206 are substantially Menandrian, the omission of any mention of his journey to Cyprus is odd. For it is this journey which places the leno in such a weak position. Rieth, who believed that vv.196-208 were Menandrian, thought (46) that this suppression was a

mark of wise 'Oekonomie' on the part of Menander, since the dramatic effect of the revelation in the following dialogue would have been weakened if it had been anticipated in the monologue. He also believed that the omission characterises the leno, who is so suspicious that he expects the most cunning manœuvres on the part of Aeschinus, and yet overlooks that his own hands are tied. This is unconvincing. A second omission is the failure of the leno to make any mention of the vindicatio or the legal action that this claim involved. This has generally been taken to show that the substance of vv.193-4 and of Sannio's monologue have been drawn from different Greek models.²⁸ But, to return to my suggestion that Terence himself may be responsible for the vindicatio, it is interesting to note that both the journey to Cyprus and the possibility of legal action are raised by Sannio later in the dialogue when the slave reveals that he knows about the journey. (vv.228 ff.).

I believe that Terence may have split the entrance monologue into two parts placing the introduction and the decision reached at the end of it after the Diphilus-scene, and postponing the reasons for that decision until Syrus revealed that he knew of

the trip to Cyprus. The monologue vv.196-208 is not as full of "confused argumentation" as Drexler says. It begins with an oath (pro supreme Juppiter), which is followed by Sannio's comment on a sententia of sorts, viz. that iniuria can cause men to become insani. This is a stock opening to a monologue.²⁹ After such introductions we expect some narrative which explains the relevance of the opening words or generalisation to the speaker.³⁰ So here we should be given some indication of the iniuria and insania. If we exclude v.199 and v.201 as Terentian insertions designed to link the monologue with the preceding scene, v.198 and v.200 describe the iniuria. The first difficulty comes with the abrupt decision to give in to Aeschinus' demands. Not only is the decision abrupt, but the reason is meaningless - quando bene promeruit. Aeschinus is to get his way because he has inflicted plus quingentos colaphos.³¹ Rieth (44 f.) tried to explain the absence of any serious motivation by pointing out that the reluctance of pornoboskoi to go to law would be well known to an Athenian audience, and therefore the sudden capitulation would seem less strange to them than it does to us. But in the Menandrian original excellent motivation was at hand - the journey to Cyprus and the loss

of money, if the leno delayed his departure. After his decision the leno states that all he wants is to be paid his money. He predicts, however, that as soon as he agrees to the sale, Aeschinus will have it witnessed but that the money will not be paid to him. He'll be put off. That too Sannio says he can bear as long as he eventually receives it. In the context of the play this means that he will be happy if he gets his money when he returns. At vv.206-7 he appears to sum up - "But I'm facing facts: in my trade you must accept and put up with young men's outrageous behaviour". After this v.208, sed nemo dabit - frustra egomet mecum has rationes puto, returns to the sequence of thought of vv.202-5 and would be more natural immediately after those lines. But the position in which it stands is quite effective to indicate how distraught the leno is and such disturbance of the logical order of thought is not alien to Menander's style.³² What one can say about the monologue, however, is that there is little expansion or exemplification of the insania mentioned at the beginning, except in the last part of the monologue, where the leno is overwrought. But this state arises from the sudden thought, introduced by sed ego hoc hariolor, that he will have difficulty

getting the money after he has decided to give up the idea of recovering the girl. The relevance of insania is clear, however, when one thinks of the quite helpless position in which the leno finds himself and which he explains at vv.228-35. I suggest that these lines, perhaps with some additional material omitted by Terence or used elsewhere (e.g. the mention of the naveis conductam at v.225), followed vv.196-8, 200 and that they were in turn followed by vv.202-8.³³ The mention of legal procedure in the leno's monologue may have been for Terence the source of the vindicatio at vv.193-4 and the alternatives offered to Sannio by Aeschinus. The leno considered that his course of action lay between on the one hand going to law³⁴ and postponing his journey, and on the other hoping to get the money for the girl. Terence in order to move from the Diphilus-scene back to Menander utilised the material in the monologue by making Aeschinus himself give the alternatives. The pornoboskōs may have said that he thought Aeschinus would claim the girl to be free or may have talked in general terms about going to law. In the case of the latter Terence has presumably inferred what the issues in the legal action would be and made Aeschinus claim her to be free, in anticipation as it were of what

might be his defence in the courts. Certainly the ultimatum as it stands gives a fine dramatic flourish with which to end the scene, much more so than if Aeschinus had simply said "Take the money or go to law!"

If I am right about the source of vv.193-4 and the form of the monologue in Menander, why then did Terence omit all reference to the journey to Cyprus in the monologue? Why did he not make use of this journey in the Aeschinus-Sennio scene to force the pimp's hand, instead of giving notice by means of the vindicatio that he was not going to hand over the girl without a struggle? If we examine the three scenes as they stand, we can see that first of all Sennio decides to be content with the money because of the ruthless attitude adopted by Aeschinus. Later, any hopes that he might have of getting the girl are completely dashed when Syrus reveals knowledge of the trip to Cyprus. It is true that the Syrus-Sennio scene is in a sense dramatically redundant in that the leno has already decided to take the money, if he can get it, and the purpose of Syrus is to force the leno to come to that decision. But how much more redundant and less effective would that scene be, if Aeschinus utilised the Cyprus motif at vv.191 ff.! There is good reason, therefore, if Terence had to add to or alter the

end of the Diphilus-scene, for him to have avoided using the Cyprus motif there. Terence's suppression of any mention of the journey in the monologue of the leno would result from this course of action. For it would detract from the portrayal of Aeschinus as the tough negotiator, if the pimp suddenly revealed that he was in no position to insist that the girl be returned to him: from the scene as it stands in Terence, Sannio's decision is forced upon him by Aeschinus' uncompromising attitude. Once Terence omitted the mention of the Cyprus journey in the monologue, the further suppression of any consideration by the leno of legal actions is understandable, since in Menander such legal action is very closely linked with the Cyprus motif. It is true that one might still have expected in the monologue some reference to the vindicatio. All I can say is that, despite the reworking of the Menandrian play at this point and the adjustments to the Diphilus-scene here postulated, Terence has not managed to combine the Diphilean and Menandrian elements in complete harmony.

The Prologue

There can be no doubt that Menander's audience knew both of the true circumstances of the raptio and of the love difficulties of Aeschinus at an earlier

point in the production than Terence's. They must have learned these facts from the prologue. This could have appeared either at the very beginning of the play (as in Dyskolos, Aulularia, Rudens) or near the beginning but preceded by some stage action (as, for example, in Perikeiromene, Heros, Cistellaria, Miles Gloriosus) and could have been spoken either by some divinity or a character in the play. The reconstruction already offered limits the choice open to us. Since apparently only two characters would be in the position to know both of the raptio and of Aeschinus' dilemma, namely Syrus and Aeschinus, and they can not be onstage before Micio's entrance, the choice lies between postulating a divine prologue at the beginning or a deferred prologue spoken either by one of these two characters or by a divinity.

Against a prologue spoken before Micio's entrance two points can be made. It is singularly undramatic for a play to begin with a prologue followed by a monologue of some fifty lines. By contrast one may compare how in the Dyskolos, Phasma and Aulularia a dialogue follows the prologue in this position. A second point is that it is difficult to see how the prologue could with clarity give the necessary information without also explaining the relationship of the

two young men and the senes and thus anticipating to a great extent what Micio will tell in the subsequent monologue. One might argue against both of these points that Terence could have expanded Micio's monologue by incorporating material which appeared in the Menandrian prologue. In its structure and sequence of thought, however, the speech forms a closely-knit unity and bears no obvious traces of reworking. That may be testimony to Terence's skill, but two other factors lead me to suggest that Terence has not used parts of the prologue. First, the section of the monologue which one would most readily suspect in this regard is Micio's description of his own and Demea's way of life (vv. 40ff.). Donatus, however, cites a line from the Menandrian play in connection with vv.43-4. Unfortunately, the citation is corrupt or we might know for certain whether or not the Greek line was spoken by 'Micio'. Now the purpose in adducing the Menandrian line seems to have been to clarify the identity of isti in v.43 (see commentary ad loc). Although it is possible that Donatus or some predecessor could have recognised a line in the Menandrian prologue as the counterpart of vv.43-4 in Terence's play, and quoted it on the problem of isti, it seems more likely that the ancient commentator went to the corresponding

monologue in the Greek play, found the relevant part and quoted it for his purposes.³⁵ In support of this one can say that, since marriage with Sostrata is pressed upon Micio at the end of the play, it is a good dramatic touch if Micio himself should here make some comment on the blessings of avoiding matrimony.³⁶ The second point is that, if vv.44 ff. were spoken by 'Micio', then in the Greek play, as in Terence, the lines had a dual function. Not only would they have given details of the hypokeimena but they would have provided the first indication of the strained relationship between the two brothers. For in Terence the dispassionate and matter-of-fact tone in which Micio describes Demea's way of life contrasts strongly with his excessive anxiety at the delay in Aeschinus' return from the cena (vv.35 ff.) and the more emotional tone of vv.48-9 where he expresses his love for Aeschinus. Moreover, in Terence there is a further contrast between vv.42 ff. and vv. 863 ff. where Demea describes Micio's mode of living in a much more emotional and aggrieved tone. Because the later passage recalls the earlier, Demea's resentment is seen to arise not simply from the recent desertion of Ctesipho but also from the denial on the part of Micio of the sympathy which Demea feels he deserves.

The reason adduced for the position of the prologue at the beginning of the Menandrian play is that the audience has to know the facts beforehand in order to appreciate the dialogue between Micio and Demes in the way which the dramatist desires. This is based on the belief that the Menandrian Micio represented the Peripatetic and thus to Menander the correct viewpoint of education and virtue. The argument, espoused in the main by Rieth-Gaiser,³⁷ is that without such a prologue Micio would seem to be in the wrong, since the audience has no knowledge that Aeschinus has been acting on behalf of Ctesipho. If they had this information, Demes would come off the worse of the two. But, as will be shown in the third part of this chapter, Micio is not, I believe, used as the vehicle for Peripatetic propaganda, or at least not in the way that is assumed by Rieth-Gaiser. Even if the audience knew the true circumstances of the raptio, Micio is still ignorant of them and the manner in which he reacts is just as significant in revealing his character. A further point to note is that if the audience knew of Pamphila's violation by Aeschinus and its concealment from Micio, his own words at vv.52 ff.

postremo, alii clanculum
patres quae faciunt, quae fert adolescentia,
ea ne me celet consuefecit filium.

would rebound against him. It is true that some

opportunity for dramatic irony is lost (in vv. 94 ff. as well as in these lines) but that is about all one can say for the prologue at the beginning of the play.

I much prefer to suppose that the prologue was postponed. In Cistellaria the prologue begins at v.149 after a dialogue and monologue, in Miles Gloriosus at v.79 and Koerte-Thierfelder postulate two scenes before the prologue in Perikeiromene. The most likely position in the Adelphoe would be immediately after Micio's exit at v.154; it must have preceded the entrance dialogue of Aeschinus and Ctesipho, though whether that immediately followed the prologue is not completely certain (see below). In such a position the prologue, with the revelation of the true circumstances of the raptio and of Aeschinus' love affair, is neatly foreshadowed by the words of Micio at vv.150-1 :

postremo nuper (credo iam omnium
taedebat) dixit velle uxorem ducere.

Our choice of prologue-speaker is limited: then either to Syrus, if we suppose him to have been sent on ahead by Aeschinus, or a divinity. The advantage of the latter is that he is able to refer back to what has occurred onstage in a manner that Syrus could not.³⁸ I suggest that there was a divine prologue and that the identity of the speaker may be indicated by frg.13 of the play :

θεός ἐστὶ τοῖς χρηστοῖς δει-
ὁ νοῦς γάρ, ὡς ἔοικεν, ὃ σοφώτατος.

No passage of Terence's play has been found to correspond to this fragment. Gaiser (138-40) suggested that it came from the prologue which was spoken, he thought, at the beginning of the play by Syrus. I suggest that it is part of a divine prologue, delivered by Nous, who spoke these words as he introduced himself. This is not a known deity and therefore presumably a special figure chosen by the dramatist for its relevance to the theme of the play.³⁹

The relevance here lies in the way in which Micio prides himself on the intellectual bases of his methods of upbringing and on his supposed intellectual superiority over Demes, when in fact the pretensions of Micio mask weaknesses in character. Is there perhaps a hint of the falseness of Micio's position in the tone of $\delta\varsigma$ $\xi\omicron\iota\kappa\epsilon\nu$ and an ironic jibe in $\tilde{\omega}$ $\sigma\omicron\phi\acute{\omega}\tau\alpha\tau\omicron\iota$ against the audience?

The final point concerns the position of lines 288-354, the dialogue between Sostrata and Canthara and the scene which begins with the entrance of Geta. The slave returns from the market place after witnessing the raptio. The difficulty is one of chronology and is less obvious in the Terentian play because the final part of the raptio is enacted onstage and it is natural that this should precede Geta's entrance. But if, as is generally agreed, the raptio was not enacted in Menander, the delay in his entrance is much more striking. The time lag would

be easily explained if in the Menandrian play Geta did not actually witness the raptio and if line 329 - his oculis egomet vidi, Sostrata - was Terentian, but it is dramatically economic that there should be no doubt about Geta's disclosure and this is ensured by making him an eye-witness. There is no reason to doubt that the line is Menandrian. A more natural place for the section would be immediately after the divine prologue and before the entrance of Aeschinus and Ctesipho. It is true that there is still a slight dislocation of chronology in that Demea, having only heard of the raptio, arrives before Geta, but this is certainly not so striking as that which one must accept if one keeps vv.288-354 in the same position in the Menandrian play, i.e. after the leno is dealt with.

The advantage of placing both a divine prologue and lines 288-354 of Terence immediately after v.154 is that one can more readily understand why Terence made changes in his model at this point.⁴⁰ The divine prologue of course would have no place in the Latin play but he could not just omit it and proceed to vv.288-354 without running the risk of bewildering his audience by the complexity of plot. As Terence's play stands, we at least learn that the psaltria is Ctesipho's before we know of Aeschinus' dilemma. Admittedly Terence could have omitted the prologue and gone into the scene in which Aeschinus and Ctesipho enter. The main reason that

he did not do so must have been that he wished to use the Diphilus-scene for its own merits. This was suited to the plot of the play and at the same time provided lively and vigorous stage action. A secondary factor, however, may have been that the enactment of the raptio would allow the postponement of Geta's entrance. Certainly the Aeschinus-Ctesipho scene would have added piquancy, if the audience already knew that Sostrata's household had heard of and misunderstood the circumstances of the raptio.

The reconstruction offered may be summarised here:

- (a) Lines 26-154 began the Menandrian play.
- (b) Prologue spoken by a divinity, possibly Nous.
- (c) Sostrata and Canthara;⁴¹ Sostrata, Canthara and Geta.
- (d) Entrance dialogue of Aeschinus-Ctesipho, accompanied by Syrus and the psaltria. All enter house.
- (e) Entrance monologue of the leno, followed by dialogue between Syrus and him, after which the leno probably went off.
- (f) Entrance of Aeschinus, short dialogue with Syrus, before leaving for forum.

This would give a long action before the first choral interlude (329 lines in Terence in addition to the prologue, although allowance should be made for the Terentian additions in the 329 lines). Three other interludes are desirable at vv. 516, 712 and 854. But we do have a postponed prologue which may account for the length and in the Dis Exapaton fragment there appear to be 364 lines in one act.⁴²

The end of the play

A crucial point of the play is reached when Demea finally discovers Ctesipho and the psaltria together in Micio's house and learns that the girl had been snatched from the leno by Aeschinus for Ctesipho. In the ensuing dialogue between the two fathers (vv.789 ff.) Micio defends the actions of the sons. He believes that there is nothing wrong with their character which maturity will not rectify. Demea is far from convinced but agrees to Micio's pleas that for this the wedding day of Aeschinus he should lay aside his misgivings and disapproval and present an affable and cheerful front. On the next day, however, he will return to his farm and from the fate he prophesies for the girl (vv.845 ff.) it is clear that he has no intention of acquiescing in the liaison of Ctesipho and the psaltria.

In the main plot of the comedy we seem to have come to an impasse. Neither brother has yielded from his pedagogical methods or from the way of life he has upheld. Ctesipho's love affair, the sub-plot which is interlocked with the issue between the fathers, seems doomed to die an early and unfruitful death. The monologue of Demea (vv.855-81), however, gives the play the fresh impulse which will lead in a comic finale to the

resolution of the central problem posed by the dramatist. The speech will be examined more closely later, but for the moment it is sufficient to say that Demea comes to two decisions. First he resolves to abandon the way of life he has lived up to this time (vita dura) - one that was devoted to hard work and to the retention of as much as possible of the money he acquired from his labours. Secondly he will take up Micio's challenge and put it to the test whether he can blande dicere aut benigne facere (vv.879-80). The main results of this second decision are that on Demea's initiative the dividing wall between Micio's and Sostrata's gardens is breached so that the formalities of the wedding ceremony may be dispensed with and the marriage may take place immediately, that Micio is persuaded by Demea, with the help of Aeschinus, to marry Sostrata, to give Hegio the usufruct of a piece of his land, to free his slaves, Syrus and Phrygia, and to lend Syrus some money to make his new start as a libertus. When, after these munificences, Micio asks the reason for this change in character and this sudden generosity, Demea replies :

ut id ostenderem, quod te isti facilem et festivom putant, id non fieri ex vera vita neque adeo ex aequo et bono, sed ex adsentando, indulgendo et largiendo, Micio.(vv.986-8)

Now there is no hint in Demea's monologue that the motivation announced here was the reason for the positive course

of action on which he determined. Nor is there any suggestion that his 'change of character' and the type of actions that it engenders are going to be as short-lived as they turn out to be. Indeed, line 881 (deerit: id mea minime refert qui sum natu maxumus) suggests that the trial period will be long enough to affect his resources. But shortlived it is; for Demea turns to Aeschinus and makes it clear that he has not basically changed his belief in how the misdemeanours of the young men should be treated. If they wish someone who will check and correct what they do wrong because of their youth, yet allow certain actions to be done without rebuke, Demea is the man for them. If they prefer all they do to go unchecked, Demea will wash his hands of them and they can do whatever they wish. In other words, they can entrust themselves to Micio. Aeschinus gives his choice to Demea, who thus at the end of the play comes off the better of the two elder brothers.

The surprise revelation in the final speech of the motive behind Demea's behaviour and the concomitant contradiction with the earlier monologue (in terms of the period of time of the experiment) lead one to believe that Terence has deviated from his model at some point or points between line 855 and the end of the play. It is alien to Greek New Comedy for a dramatist to mislead or misinform his audience in this way in a monologue,

one of the dramatic purposes of which is that a character may reveal his reflections on and reactions to a situation. ⁴³ The audience takes what is expressed in the monologue to express the sincere feelings and thoughts of the speaker. If some modus operandi is decided upon, it is assumed by the listeners that the speaker is giving voice to his true intent. Of course circumstances within the play may alter and with them the plans of the character but this would normally be made clear to the audience. But in fact it will be shown that the action between the monologue and the final speech is consistent with the latter without there being any indication of a change of purpose on Demea's part. In the case where a character is going to practise a deceit on another, this will be revealed beforehand, in the monologue, so that the audience will be able to understand the action. Thus in Menander's Samia the young man, Moschion, expresses his annoyance that his adoptive father should ever have suspected him of being the father of a child by the Samian woman, his father's concubine. To teach him a lesson Moschion says that he will pretend that he is going to leave home to fight in the wars (vv.271 ff.). Similarly, at the beginning of the Stichus Antipho contemplates how he should handle his daughters and

decides that first 'ad simulabo quasi quam culpam in sese admiserint' (v.84), but later will say what he really thinks. In the Adelphoe itself there is an example of how the dramatist takes no chance of his audience not realising when a piece of trickery is under way: Micio prefaces the fiction of the Milesian by the aside which shows that there is no such individual (quor non ludo hunc aliquantisper?, v.639), although the audience could readily gather this from what has preceded. At the end of the Adelphoe therefore we must suppose that at the very least Terence made some change either to the monologue or to the final speech of Demea.

Partly because he believed that the monologue formed a coherent unity and that the succeeding scenes prior to Demea's final speech were in harmony with the monologue Rieth (119-20) concluded that Terence was responsible for the final speech and that in Menander the monologue prepared for an ending which Terence did not wish to follow. But the main reason for this view is that Rieth saw the play very much as a piece of propaganda for the Peripatetics. He believed that in the Menandrian original 'Micio' was conceived of as a proponent of the Peripatetic theories of education and virtue: consequently the ending of Terence's play

in which Micio comes off worse could not have been the same in his model. Certainly this play more than any other of its genre that has survived is concerned with a serious problem and it seems unlikely that the comedy should swerve into a highly farcical conclusion which runs completely counter to the 'message' of the rest of the play. Rieth's theory requires examination and it should be said that, although I believe his interpretation to be mistaken, the prominence he gave to the philosophical background against which the play should be viewed is fruitful for the understanding of the play. Several questions need to be asked. Is the defeat of Micio at the end of the play consistent with the dramatist's portrayal of this character and with the action of the play prior to the monologue of Demea? How far are the scenes between the monologue and Demea's final speech in accord with the former, how far with the latter? And finally, how much of the material between lines 881 and 985 is Terence's own work?

As far as the methods of upbringing are concerned, of the brothers Demea is the down-to-earth father who brooks no nonsense and is not concerned with the reasons why certain actions are good or bad or with what one means by 'goodness' or 'badness'. His training system is to point to the actions of others and to advise his

son that some of these are to be copied, others are to be avoided (vv.414 ff.); how he distinguishes one group from the other he gives no indication. Micio on the other hand has pretensions to being something of a philosopher and there is no doubt that, as Rieth shows, in some respects he shares the views of the Peripatetics. This is especially apparent in his opening monologue. There he states that a son's good qualities rather than fear of another person should guide him:

pudore et liberalitate liberos
 retinere satius esse credo quam metu (vv.57-8)

He faults Demea for believing that his authority is all the stronger or more lasting for being based on compulsion. Micio's position is that a person who does good actions because of the threat and fear of punishment refrains from evil only so long as he believes that his actions will be discovered (vv.69-71). Micio therefore stresses the importance of amicitia in the relationship between father and son: a son whom kindness binds close to his father is eager to return it and will behave in the same way whether or not the latter is present. Micio sums up his belief thus :

hoc patriumst potius consuefacere filium
 sua sponte recte facere quam alieno metu. (vv.74-5)

Rieth (19-20) points out similar views stated by Aristotle. In his discussion of πολιτικὴ ἀνδρεία the philosopher

says that those who do an action not through a sense of shame but through fear and because they are compelled to do so are not ἀνδρεῖοι (E.N. III 1116a 27 ff.). Micio draws the distinction between a pater and a dominus (v.76) and from what he has said it is clear that he regards himself as an example of the former and Demea as an example of the latter. Now Aristotle, when discussing the differences between a βασιλεύς and a τύραννος refers to familial relationships for exemplification. The βασιλεύς who has the welfare of his subjects at heart, is like a father who naturally cares for his children. But among the Persians the position of a father is that of a τύραννος since he treats his sons as if they were slaves. The τύραννος like the δεσπότης is concerned solely with what is to his own advantage (E.N. VIII 1160b 22 ff.). But one may well ask how far is Micio's method of upbringing influenced by selfish interests. There is no doubt in my mind that Terence has made it obvious that Micio's generosity to his son and his willingness to overlook his misdeeds spring in part from his desire to be loved by his son. In the opening monologue Micio shows the excessive anxiety of a doting parent and expressly states that the love for his son is the most important feature of his life :

habui amavi pro meo;

in eo me oblecto, solum id est carum mihi. (vv.48-9, cf. vv.38-9)

Moreover he takes pains to see that the love is reciprocated:

ille ut item contra me habeat facio sedulo (v.50).

When he immediately proceeds to say:

do, praetermitto, non necesse habeo omnia
pro meo iure agere; (vv.51-52)

the conclusion must be that his laxity is prompted by the fear that strictness may turn his son against him. There is no evidence to show that Terence has departed from his original at this point and one must suppose that in Menander 'Micio' also justified by philosophical considerations a method of upbringing that was not uninfluenced by selfish motives.⁴⁴ We can not therefore simply equate Micio with the βασιλεύς and Demea with the τύραννος. Demea does have the welfare of his sons at heart and gives priority to the formation of their character over his own popularity with them. What is more, in his insistence on giving direct instructions to Ctesipho on what he should avoid and what he should emulate, Demea, like Aristotle, lays stress on ἔθισμός i.e. 'habituation'. The reasons are given by Aristotle at the beginning of the second book of the Nicomachean Ethics. No form of goodness of character is produced in us by nature. Although nature gives us the senses of sight and hearing and we then use them, we acquire the various forms of goodness by the exercise of

activities in the same way that we have to play the lyre before we can become good lyre-players. At the end of the preliminary section in this book Aristotle states 'it is of no little importance then that we should be habituated this way or that from the earliest youth; it is of great importance, or rather all-important' (E.N. II 1103b 23 ff., Burnet's translation). An additional cause for the importance of the habituation of young man in certain activities is that one's character is formed early in life and does not substantially change thereafter.⁴⁵ It is essential, therefore, that young men receive guidance from their elders whose advice and beliefs have validity in that older men have the eye of experience and 'see aright' (E.N. VI 1143b 11 ff.). In the Adelphoe Demea seems to be in accord with the Peripatetics in this respect, while Micio gives little indication that he gives any prescriptive advice to Aeschinus. It is true that he rebukes him for the violation of Pamphila (vv.684 ff.) but Micio has allowed his son to sow wild oats unchecked (vv.149-50) and the castigation of Aeschinus is akin to closing the stable door after the horse has bolted. Thus the dramatist has presented the central problem of the play by giving to each of the fathers methods of upbringing which, if combined in one, would approach what the Peripatetics

would regard as the ideal method.

Of the two men Demea comes off better in the end. If one looks at the brothers from the Peripatetic standpoint, this is quite understandable, since of the two methods his is likely to be the less harmful. Although Aristotle is concerned primarily with the theory underlying the way to bring up children, he stresses the danger of putting theory in the place of practice. Many men, he says, do not perform the actions necessary if they are to become ἀγαθοί instead they take refuge in the theory of goodness and believe that they are philosophers and that because of this they will become good (E.N. II 1105b 9 ff.). He likens them to patients who pay close attention to what their doctor tells them but who do not carry out any of his instructions. In the part of the play prior to line 855, indeed in the very first monologue, the dramatist portrays Micio as a man who would be open to this criticism. There is nothing to suggest that this dramatist was not Menander. Consequently, the philosophical sermonising of Micio does not in itself justify the belief that the ending of Terence's play differed from that of his model, and consideration of other factors lends support to the view that Terence has in essentials followed Menander at the end of the play.

In general terms there would be greater scope for comic treatment, if a dramatist, wishing to present the

problem of education, portrayed both fathers with weaknesses in character. It makes for good drama too that only one should be the comic butt for most of the play, and that this father should, in the final part of the play, turn the tables on his rival. Such a plot-structure, with this change of movement, provides a good opportunity for creating surprise and suspense at the end of the comedy. Of course, one can not assume on the basis of this that Menander must have presented the theme of the comedy in this way. The play itself must yield the evidence on which one makes a decision on this point.

Micio is not simply a cardboard doll on which the dramatist fits a philosophical garb. The character is rounded out by traits which might appear in one who has no philosophical pretensions, although it is through these that Micio's supreme self-confidence, which approaches arrogance, is for the most part revealed. Micio shows another unattractive side in the meeting with Aeschinus where he pretends to be acting on behalf of a friend who is supposed to be the nearest male relative of Pamphila and to be claiming the girl as his bride because of this. It is true that the deceit is contrived in order to force Aeschinus to reveal his association with Pamphila and Sostrata's household:

quor non ludo hunc aliquantisper? melius est,
quandoquidem hoc numquam mihi ipse voluit credere.

(vv. 639-40)

But that he should choose this method and subject Aeschinus to such mental torture reveals the practical joker's streak of cruelty which manifests itself also in his dealings with Demea. In Act IV.sc.7 he misleads Demea into believing that Aeschinus will retain the psaltria even after he has married Pamphila (vv.745 ff.). It was quite possible for him to state that Aeschinus would not keep her, without revealing at the same time that the girl was actually Ctesipho's. Micio seems to take pleasure in the discomfiture of others and of Demea in particular.⁴⁶ It is poetic justice therefore when Micio himself is the victim of a deception at the hands of Demea, aided, albeit unwittingly, by Aeschinus.

Demea too is not without his weaknesses and is so convinced of the impeccable character of Ctesipho and of the shortcomings of Aeschinus that he fails to see the truth even when he has had clues to arouse his suspicions. Syrus twice exploits the confidence he has in Ctesipho to send Demea off on a fool's errand and thus keep Ctesipho safe in Micio's house. For most of the play Demea is the comic butt. Yet in part he is misled by the agreement, initiated by Micio, that each father should confine himself to the affairs of his own son. Accordingly, Demea never imagines that Ctesipho could be inside Micio's house with the psaltria, who he knows to be there (v.389). The breaking of this agreement

by Micio is an important element in the plot since it sets up and justifies the attempt of Demea to win back Aeschinus. Ironically, the manner in which Demea achieves this springs from Micio's own exhortation to him to be pleasant for his son's wedding-day and Demea achieves what I believe Micio himself has challenged him to do, confident that the other would not act upon his words.

At vv.809 ff. we learn of the reasons for the adoption of Aeschinus by Micio:

tu illos duo olim pro re tolerabas tua,
quod satis putabas tua bona ambobus fore
et me tum uxorem credidisti scilicet
ducturum. eandem illam rationem antiquam optine.
conserva quaere parce, fac quam plurimum
illis relinquant, gloriam tu istam optine.
mea, quae praeter spem evenere, utantur sine.

Two factors led to the adoption. Demea no longer believed that his estate would be large enough for both Aeschinus and Ctesipho when he died. At the same time, contrary to Demea's expectations, Micio had not married and therefore had no direct heirs of his own. The adoption solved two difficulties. By it Aeschinus became heir to Micio's estate and Ctesipho alone would succeed to Demea's estate. When Micio says eandem illam rationem antiquam optine (v.812), he appears to be telling Demea to hold to his former belief that his property would be sufficient

for both sons (cf. fac quam plurimum /illis relinquo, vv.813-4). This Demea can do since Micio offers to pay for all the expenses incurred by the two young men (v.815). Now by the strict letter of Attic law as long as Aeschinus was the adopted son of Micio all of Demea's property would fall automatically to Ctesipho alone. Demea could not leave anything to Aeschinus since he had a son, heir in his own right, and was forbidden by law to make a will.⁴⁷ In an Attic context therefore the implication of Micio's words is that the adoption is to be rescinded and that Aeschinus will regain his former status as co-heir with Ctesipho to Demea's estate. Line 815 supports this interpretation since the plural utantur makes better sense if Aeschinus is going to return to the care of Demea. If Micio is not offering to return Aeschinus but simply to pay for the expenses of Ctesipho as well as of Aeschinus, the sense would be clearer if the subject ambo were expressed or if the verb were in the singular with Ctesipho as subject. This argument is based on the supposition that Terence has faithfully and exactly reproduced what was in his original at this point. One may argue that the interpretation offered here has been made possible by slight changes which one would expect in the process of 'vortere'. To this one can say that the whole section

(vv.809-15) is consistent with this interpretation but more significant is the fact that in his next speech Micio makes a similar challenge to Demea to take both sons under his wing again.

After pointing out how one individual can perform an action with impunity which would be injurious to another who performed it, Micio turns from considerations of a general nature to the particular case of Aeschinus and Ctesipho :

video [eos]sapere, intellegere, in loco
vereri, inter se amare: scire est liberum
ingenium atque animum: quovis illos tu die
redducas. at enim metuas ne ab re sint tamen
omissiores paullo. (vv.827-31)

The sense of the last two and a half lines has usually been taken to be "One can bring them back to the straight and narrow any time one wishes: but one may be afraid that despite their good character they will be a little too careless as far as money is concerned". This interpretation is not a completely happy one. The force of the subjunctive of redducas is not the same as that of metuas. The first is a 'can'-potential and seems unobjectionable.⁴⁸ But what of the second? It seems to be an example of the so-called 'may'-potential which is used almost exclusively with the 'ideal' 2nd person subject.⁴⁹ I find it difficult to believe that the subject of metuas is not Demea. Micio goes on to say

that such a fear is erroneous and springs from senectus (vv.831 ff.), and vv.830-1 recall the beginning of Micio's lecture to Demea when he brought up Demea's concern over the money which the two sons spent (vv.806-7). If the subject of metuas is Demea, the sense would be 'Despite the fact that the sons could be brought back at any time to the right mode of conduct, you, Demea, would be afraid that!' The subjunctive metuas would be unexceptional and vv.830-1 would be brought into line with vv.831 ff. But there is an objection to this interpretation. It seems unlikely that the personal pronoun tu should be used with redducas and omitted when there is a change of subject from the ideal 2nd person to the person with whom Micio is speaking.⁵⁰ The subject of redducas and metuas must be the same, either the ideal 2nd person or Demea. The choice depends on the meaning of redducas. If the subject is the ideal 2nd person, redducas must be used metaphorically in the sense 'redducas in viam'. Madvig (Adv.Crit. II 21-2) believed that scire est in v.828, the reading of the mss., was wrong. One of his objections was "id quod sequitur (quovis redducas) non recte dicitur, nisi praecedit significatio libertatis concessae et usurpatae quae non inest in hoc: 'scias liberum animum'." Although Madvig's solution (to read siris for scire est) is unconvincing, he put his finger on a weakness of the usual interpretation of these lines. Can redducas

mean redducas in viam when there is nothing in the preceding lines to make this metaphorical sense of the verb clear? This example is, rightly so far as I can see, set apart as a unique instance of this usage of reducere without the prepositional phrase.⁵¹ The same holds good for the alternative form in which the same metaphor is expressed - redire in viam. In Act 1 sc.2 of the Andria Simo explains to Davos that he has previously allowed his son to behave as he wished: now that he is about to be married he must give up that mode of behaviour. Simo concludes

dehinc postulo sive sequomst te oro, Dave, ut
redeat iam in viam. (v.190)

While the prepositional phrase is indispensable here, it is true I think that the sense would still be clear if redeat in viam were replaced by redducetur alone. But the reason for this is that Simo has said two lines before sivi animum ut expleret suum (v.188) and the notion libertatis concessae, to use Madvig's words, therein expressed, would allow redducetur to be understood in this way. But in the Adelphoe passage there is nothing similar which prepares for the metaphor and in the absence of any other example of reducere alone some suspicion falls on the usual interpretation. I suggest that tu in v.829 could refer to Demea and that the sense of the lines is "Take them back any day you

like. But you would be afraid that⁵² Redducas has jussive force and Micio is repeating what he implied in vv.809 ff. and re-employing the gambit which worked so successfully near the beginning of the play when Demea's accusations were cut short by Micio's statement that his interference in Aeschinus' affairs was tantamount to asking for the return of his son (vv.131 ff.). Micio is confident that Demea will back down again; he does not believe Demea when he shrugs off the question of money (mitto rem,v.820).

Two objections may be raised. First Micio's challenge seems extremely abrupt. This objection is overruled if what I have said on vv.809-15 is accepted. Micio there tells Demea to have both sons in his charge as before, but to allow Micio to pay for their expenses. Demea raises the question of their consuetudo (v.820). After showing that there is nothing wrong with the character of the sons Micio then repeats the challenge in more direct terms. The second point concerns the use of the plural illos as the object of redducas. Strictly speaking, the object of the verb should be Aeschinus alone, since Ctesipho, although he is at this moment in Micio's house, is still under the authority of Demea. I myself do not find it difficult to believe that the challenge could be made in terms which suggested that

Ctesipho had abandoned Demea and was now like Aeschinus under Micio's control.⁵³ Certainly Demea, although he states that he will return home next day with Ctesipho (vv.840-1), later speaks as if he has lost Ctesipho to Micio. So in his monologue he says spud illum sunt ambo, ego desertus sum (v.873) and eos meo labore eductos maxumo hic fecit suos / paullo sumptu (vv.875-6),⁵⁴ and when he gives Aeschinus the choice of fathers at the end of the play, he uses the 2nd person plural throughout. The implication of vv.989-91 is that if the two sons do not like Demea's system, the status quo will continue and Ctesipho will remain under Micio.⁵⁵

By the interpretation of these two passages this scene becomes even more significant for the preparation of the play's denouement. To what I have said on vv.809-15, it is worth adding that we could have a hint of Micio's marriage. Rationem antiquam optine (v.812) can refer not only to Demea's belief that his property would be sufficient for two sons but also to his supposition that Micio would marry.⁵⁶ More generally the specious defence which Micio puts forward for assisting Ctesipho in his love affair - communia esse amicorum inter se omnia - becomes the principle behind Demea's own actions at the end of the play. He is extremely

generous, but his lavishness affects not his but Micio's pocket. In addition there is an explicit reference to this scene when Demea forces Micio into granting the usufruct of his land to Hegio by recalling the patronising sermon which Micio preaches on the excessive preoccupation with money on the part of the old men (vv.832 ff., cf. 953-4).

A further feature which, to say the least, is not discordant with the return of Aeschinus to Demea concerns the characterisation of the two young men. If it were the dramatist's plan to depict Micio as the ideal father, one would expect the results of his superiority over Demea to be revealed in the differences between Aeschinus and Ctesipho. As it is, there is little to choose between the sons and they are quite typical of the adulescentes in New Comedy. Aeschinus appears to have much more initiative and self-assurance but this picture is formed mainly from the confrontation with the leno in Act II where Terence has incorporated material from Diphilus' Synapothneskontes. If, even apart from this, Aeschinus is still the more enterprising, it should be remembered that he is the older of the two brothers and more experienced. Like most of the young men in New Comedy they are both engaged in a love affair without the knowledge of their fathers and at moments of crisis both incline to helplessness. When, to the consternation

of Ctesipho, Demea arrives back at Micio's house, it is Syrus to whom Ctesipho turns and who deals with the situation (vv.538 ff.). Aeschinus describes in his monologue at vv.610 ff. the mental perturbation caused by fear, and even when he steels himself to take action, his nerve fails before he finally recovers (vv.631-3). Both have their good points. Most strikingly the bonds of love and affection which link them contrast vividly with the animosity which charges the atmosphere when Demea and Micio meet. Aeschinus shows his worth by his loyalty; both to Ctesipho, whose connection with the psaltria he is not prepared to reveal (vv.625-6), and to Pamphila, the necessity of whose marriage to the Milesian he denounces as unjust (vv.661 ff.). On his part Ctesipho deprecates Syrus' suggestion that he should tell a lie to Demea (v.530). Micio himself claims at vv.827 ff. (quoted above) that the young men are of basically sound character. Thus for all the difference between the fathers and their methods of upbringing we are presented with the amusing irony that the young men are much alike and little worse or better than other young men in comedy. Children, it seems, can become what they are in spite of rather than because of their parents. The return of Aeschinus to the care of Demea at the

end of the play is thus consistent with the dramatist's portrayal of the two young men.

Consideration of the hypokeimena also supports the view that Terence has adhered to the ending of the Menandrian play. One must suppose a close inter-relationship between the situation conceived by the dramatist as existing prior to the beginning of the play and the action of the play itself. The greater the number of the elements of the hypokeimena which are functional within the dramatic development of the play, the more likely it is that such interaction is the work of the original dramatist who conceived the hypothesis and plot than of one who has taken someone else's play as a model. The theme of the Adelphoé is the problem of how best to bring up children. The problem is presented dramatically by a contrast between two fathers who uphold quite different methods of upbringing. Two main possibilities were open to the dramatist. Either one guardian could be depicted as the model father and the other shown to be misguided or both could be shown to be at least partly wrong. I have argued that the latter was the choice made by Menander. He further decided that the different methods should be upheld by two brothers. This close relationship allows the two men to argue against each other's methods without being guilty of περιεργία (at

least to the same extent as Chremes in Heauton Timoroumenos.)⁵⁷ Once the decision to pose the problem in this way was made, the most natural step would be to give each brother a son. This is what Menander has done, but with a modification. He has made one of the brothers the natural father of both sons and the other the adoptive father of the elder. Why? The answer concerns the celibacy of Micio. That Micio never married while Demea did so and had two sons is an important difference in the kind of life the two genes have led, distinct from the differences between their pedagogical methods. Both mention this difference in their main monologues (vv.42 ff., 865 ff.). We know from a scholion in the Donatus commentary (v.938) that in Menander 'Micio' married 'Sostrata'. It seems, therefore, that the main reason for Aeschinus' being the natural son of Demea was that Menander envisaged the marriage at the end of the play. One may argue, however, that he could have given Demea only one son and made Aeschinus the adopted son of Micio with no blood relationship to Demea if it was simply a question of Micio's marriage at the end of the play. But because Aeschinus is the natural son of Demea, his adoption by Micio depends only in part on Micio's celibacy. The other reason for the adoption was Demea's belief that his estate would be insufficient for his two sons. This

reason is no longer valid when Demea decides to abandon the vita dura, the purpose of which was to accumulate as large a patrimony as possible (vv.868-9). Once Micio has agreed to marry Sostrata, according to Micio's own words (vv.809 ff.) there is no reason why Aeschinus should not return to Demea, as in fact he does. The play's denouement is thus in harmony with the hypokeimena.

From consideration of all these points - Micio's philosophical position, his characterisation, the lack of any significant distinction in the portrayal of the two sons, the development of the plot up to Demea's monologue, and the accord between the hypokeimena and the end of the play - my conclusion is that there is little to suggest that Menander's play ended differently from Terence's. One cannot, however, separate Aeschinus' return to Demea from the substance of Demea's final speech. It follows, therefore, that the source of the incompatibility between the monologue and the final speech must lie in the former. Rieth's view was quite different. He believed that Demea recognised the superiority of Micio and in his attempt to ape him fell from one extreme into another. Thus, although Micio appears to be on the receiving end, the audience was laughing not at him, but at Demea. But if this were the case, it seems strange that most of Demea's acts of generosity are paid for by

Micio and are aimed at causing Micio discomfiture as well as expense. If Demes truly went to the other extreme, one would expect him to be lavish with his own money and in that case it would be reasonable to see Demes as the comic butt in the final section of the play as elsewhere. One certainly cannot accept Rieth's statement (120) that Demes brought nothing to pass which would not have happened without him.

The asides which Demes speaks are the best guides to the motivation behind his action. On the one hand he wishes to win popularity with everyone he meets (vv.898,911,914). This is inconclusive, since there is no indication whether this is a serious long-term policy or whether he is aiming by these means to show Micio that anyone can win superficial esteem, if he acts as Micio does with Aeschinus. On the other he wishes to discomfit Micio and teach him a lesson. This is shown in vv.912-5, where, after gleefully stating that the breaching of the wall will cost Micio money, he concludes

iube nunciam
dinukeret ille Babylo viginti minas.

The sum of money is a reference to the twenty minae which Micio gave so that Ctesipho would not lose his girlfriend, thus breaking his agreement with Demes. Demes sees his present action as a reprisal and the

implication of the words is that Micio would not have done so if he had known the consequences. After persuading Micio to marry Sostrata, he searches for something else to do - quid ego dicam? hoc confit quod volo (v.946).⁵⁸ And again he comes up with a proposal that causes Micio expense: Hegio should be given the usufruct of a fairly sizeable piece of land. When Micio's own sermonising has been used to persuade him, Demea's aside suo sibi gladio hunc iugulo (v.958) shows his delight in scoring over his brother, and also in the way he has done so. This second motive behind Demea's conduct seems irrelevant if he sincerely wishes to win the love of his sons by Micio's methods but is pertinent if his aim is to show that Micio is wrong in his methods. In connection with this Demea's justification for the manumission of Syrus

et quidem porro haec, opsonare cum fide,
scortum adducere, adparare de die convivium,
non mediocris hominis haec sunt officia. (vv.964-6)

evokes and seems like a parody of Micio's defence of the sons at vv.827-9 where Micio claims that their actions show their liberum ingenium atque animum.

In the part of the comedy between lines 881 and 986 there are three main areas where Terence has been suspected of departing from his model. These concern Micio's reaction to the marriage proposal (vv.934-45), Aeschinus'

participation in the harassment of Micio, and the stage action involving Syrus and Geta at Act V.sc.5 and sc.6. Donatus provides the evidence for the first of these. A scholion on v.938 reads apud Menandrum senex de nuptiis non gravatur: ergo Terentius εὐρητικῶς. Despite an earlier interpretation that Donatus' remarks meant that there was no marriage in Menander,⁵⁹ there can be no doubt that the scholion means that in the original Micio made no objection to Demea's proposition. Consequently, much of vv.934-45 must be Terence's own work, since the badgering of Micio by Demea and Aeschinus would be unnecessary in Menander. Various explanations for the Terentian change have been offered. Leo believed that there was preparation for the marriage earlier in the play whereby Micio's ready acceptance of the proposal was understandable.⁶⁰ Rieth (120) thought that we would never know how Menander made the marriage acceptable, but that we could assume that Micio's assent was to be understood in Menander's play as an expression "seiner heiteren, grosszügigen und hilfsbereiten 'Menschlichkeit'." A desire for greater realism was suggested by Haffter.⁶¹ This last view is the most attractive and at least does not, like the other two, enter the realm of complete speculation. But it is not necessarily the complete or correct explanation. What gives the ending of the play its comic flavour is in part the fact that Demea and Micio have

reversed roles. Up to this point Micio has come off the better of the two in their confrontations. He has met Demea's outbursts and accusations by a lecture on ethics (e.g. vv.101 ff., 821 ff.), by telling him to mind his own business (vv.114 ff.), or by allowing Demea to believe that he sees nothing wrong in the actions against which he is protesting (vv.748 ff.). In the face of these tactics Demea is reduced to helpless silence or outraged incredulity. Now in the final meeting Micio's pride in his knowledge of and adherence to what is right and proper (cf. vv.64, 98, 593, 601, 803) is utilised by Demea when he describes the action he proposes as decens (vv.928, 948, 954) and aequom (vv.933, 960, 968, 976: cf. recte datur, v.951, and tu tuom officium facias, v.980). Micio seems unable to produce any rational argument against Demea. Now the reversal of roles is brought out most clearly in vv.934-45, if anywhere. To enlist the aid of Aeschinus against Micio Demea appeals to his humanitas (v.934) in words that recall what Micio had spoken to him in the first dialogue of the play (v.107). On the other hand Micio reacts to the proposal in the same way that Demea did when he believed that Micio was going to allow Aeschinus to keep the psaltria in the same house as his new bride (vv.746 ff.). The verbal similarities are

striking. Micio defends himself against Demea with the same kind of accusations to which he had been subjected. With ineptis (v.934) compare ut video tuam ego ineptiam (v.749), with deliras (v.936) senex delirans (v.761) and with insanis satin sanus es? (v.937) sanum te credis esse? (v.748). In view of this, Terence's purpose in departing from his original was probably to exploit further the comic potentialities of the situation.⁶² One must state that he has fitted his own contribution so neatly into the framework of the play that were it not for Donatus, traces of Terentian reworking at this point would have been hard to detect.

But is Terence to be given the credit for most, if not all, of vv.934-45? If one accepts the Donatus scholion as it stands, the answer must be in the affirmative. But there are four points, which, when taken together, incline me to the belief that the scholion has suffered corruption. First I find it difficult to believe that Micio should immediately agree to the most startling of Demea's propositions when he shows reluctance to implement all the others and pressure has to be exerted before he yields. Secondly, most of the section is in complete harmony with the rest of the finale and vv.934-7 have links

with earlier parts of the play, as has been shown. The third point is that the scholion is a comment on vv.938-9. It is possible that, like others,⁶³ it is misplaced, but this is hardly verifiable and if some other explanation can be given for its position, precedence should be given to it. This brings us to the fourth factor. It was pointed out earlier how the decision of Demea to abandon the vita dura and the marriage of Micio to Sostrata removed the original causes of the adoption and how therefore the return of Aeschinus to Demea was a natural outcome of the hypokeimena and the development of the plot. There is, however, one strand which at the end of the play still hangs loosely from this otherwise closely-knit plot-construction. Micio's marriage with Sostrata removes one factor of the situation which led to the adoption only if there is a possibility of children and therefore of someone other than an adopted son inheriting Micio's estate. This possibility, however, is explicitly excluded by Demea, who humorously adduces as a point in favour of the marriage the fact that Sostrata is well past the age of child-bearing (v.931). So far from being an attraction to Micio Sostrata's age makes the idea of marriage distasteful:

ego novos maritus anno demum quinto et sexagensumo
fiam, atque anum decrepitam ducam? (vv.938-9).

Nowhere else in the play is there any indication of the

age of Micio or Sostrata. The latter has a young daughter and in view of the early age at which girls married in Athens there is no reason why an Athenian audience should not have seen the marriage as a means of producing an heir for Micio, if Sostrata's age was left unspecified.⁶⁴ There would then be complete agreement between the hypokeimena and the way in which the play ends. I do not think, therefore, that it is coincidence that the Donatus scholion recording divergence from the Menander original is attached to vv.938-9, and suggest that the scholion is incomplete, an adverb such as sic having been omitted.⁶⁵ That is to say, the objections raised by Micio on the grounds of age were not present in the Greek play. Since vv.938-9 are led up to by Demes's words at v.931, the latter is probably to be assigned to Terence also. Lines 934-7 on the other hand would not be encompassed by the Donatus scholion and their substance may well have appeared in the original.

How much of the remainder of the marriage scene is owed to Terence is even more difficult to determine. I believe that Aeschinus must have been present during the harassment of Micio in order that he can see for himself what Demes is trying to show and therefore take the decision to return to Demes. But at v.940 he says that he has promised Sostrata and Pamphile that Micio will

marry the former. Since he has had no prior knowledge of Demea's plan, this can only be a lie. In fact, from the time he knew that his own marriage was to take place he has had no opportunity to speak to either Sostrata or Pamphila. The lie has been taken to be a further indication (i.e. apart from the Donatus scholion on vv.938-8) that much of vv.934-45 is Terentian. But is it impossible for Aeschinus to have said the same thing in Menander's play? Does the lie not give another dimension to the role-reversal motif in that Aeschinus now uses the lie to help to persuade Micio to marry Sostrata in the same way that Micio had earlier fabricated the story of the Milesian in order to make Aeschinus confess the violation of the girl? Rieth (118) argues that one must take objection to the fact that such conduct of Aeschinus is out of character and contradicts his speech at vv.707 ff. His first argument seems to me to prejudge the issue. The fact that Aeschinus lies here may be a significant part of the dramatist's characterisation. If in Menander Aeschinus spoke what the audience would immediately realise to be a lie, there is a nice point of contrast between the two sons: Ctesipho shrinks from the suggestion of Syrus that he should tell a lie to Demea (v.530), Aeschinus does not. Does this difference not justify Demea's claims that Micio's methods are faulty and in turn harmonise with the

return of Aeschinus to Demea at the end of the play? Much the same can be said about the 'contradiction' between his earlier monologue (especially vv.710-11) and the lie. The inability of Aeschinus to adhere to his decision to do nothing that Micio would not wish him to do is in itself an indication of weakness of character. But that there is in fact a contradiction between his resolve of vv.710-11 and the use of a lie in order to persuade Micio to do something against his will I very much doubt.⁶⁶ I do not think that there is enough evidence to show that vv.940 ff. are Terence's own addition to the scene.

Good evidence for other changes in the other scenes between vv.881 and 986 is also lacking. Webster⁶⁷ states that Terence kept Geta onstage after v.898 and that his editors wantonly kept Syrus there after Act V, sc.8. In Terence's play Geta must remain onstage until after the suggestion that the wall be breached. He entered at v.889 to see how soon Micio and Aeschinus would come to Sostrata's. If he leaves the stage after v.897, one must assume that he enters Micio's house and then immediately re-enters with Aeschinus at v.899. A much more natural interpretation of the stage-action is to suppose that the slave's intention to knock at Micio's door is forestalled by Aeschinus' entrance. Once Demea's

proposal concerning the wall has been accepted, Geta naturally returns to his own household. There is nothing to show that Geta's movements were any different in Menander, which is what I take to be the implication of Webster's remarks. Syrus must be onstage at v.916 and, as in the case of Geta, he probably remained onstage after his initial entrance in Terence's play. Otherwise one has to assume a re-entry with Aeschinus at v.899 and there is no indication of this. Three points, however, suggest that Terence may have departed from his original in the stage movements in this part of the play. First the motivation of Syrus' entrance, unlike that of Geta, does not require his remaining onstage. He appeared simply to communicate a message of Micio (v.882) and this somewhat artificial motivation has no purpose other than that of giving Demea an opportunity to practise his charm and affability. He could quite naturally exit after v.887 or v.888, and although he remains onstage in Terence he does not seem to take much interest in the proceedings. He says nothing until addressed by Demea at 916 and his response to Demea's command gives the impression that he has not been following very closely the exchange between Aeschinus and Demea. The second point is that Demea's aside at vv.911-15 is long by Menandrian standards.⁶⁸ Thirdly,

in connection with this, one would expect Aeschinus, once he has shown his approval of Demea's scheme, to go off immediately and implement them. Instead, despite his eagerness to proceed with the wedding (vv.899-900), he remains onstage and gives no indication of any desire to leave. It is decidedly difficult to envisage what he does during Demea's aside. Moreover, it is Demea who gives the order for the wall to be breached and Geta is instructed to bring the members of the other household to Micio's house, although from vv.908-10 one would expect Aeschinus to have given the order to breach the wall and to have taken it upon himself to escort his bride and her household to his father's house. That Demea should despatch Syrus is hardly objectionable but that Geta should be entrusted with the leading of the members of his own household into Micio's seems to be a glaring contravention of the social proprieties observed in Athens. One point of difference between the Attic and Roman marriage ceremony was that in the former the bridegroom escorted his bride to his house while in Rome he was in his house to receive the bride. It is true that the formalities of the wedding have been dispensed with but it is still scarcely credible that Aeschinus (or at least a member of his household) should not conduct the bridal retinue into

the house of the prospective bridegroom.⁶⁹ I believe that in the Menandrian original Demea was left alone onstage at the end of sc.7 and spoke the substance of vv.911-5 as a monologue, and that Aeschinus, instead of remaining onstage as in Terence's play, entered his house and came back on to the stage with Micio, who directs his question iubet frater? (v.924) to him. By cutting out Aeschinus' exit and re-entrance Terence was forced to keep Syrus onstage after vv.887-8 in order to motivate Micio's entrance at v.924. The words which Demea speaks to Syrus and Geta in vv.915-6 would then be Terentian,⁷⁰ and what he says at vv.920-2 (multo rectius) may in the original have immediately followed his speech at vv.906-9.⁷¹ The reason for the change was that Terence wished to avoid any slowing down by a monologue of the dramatic movement of these final scenes.

Since nothing has been found to indicate that Terence has made changes in vv.882-985 which would account for the inconsistency between the monologue and the final speech of Demea, Terence must be suspected of having tampered with the monologue. It falls into three sections. The first (vv.855-61) begins with a generalisation. Demea reflects how, since the circumstances of one's life are everchanging, no one

can take everything into account when deciding upon the principles according to which he will lead his life. A man will come to realise that he knows nothing of what he once thought he understood and will reject that to which he formerly gave priority over everything else. The relevance of these reflections to Demea is shown by his announcement that he is now, almost at the end of his days, giving up the kind of life that he has always led - the vita dura. The reason is that he has learned by experience that nothing is better for a man than facilitas and clementia. That Demea makes a contrast between the external and the internal, between what could be indicative of character and character-attributes, reveals that he views facilitas and clementia as qualities which are quite alien to a man who has lived the vita dura. Thus in the second section (vv.862-76), when Demea and Micio are compared to exemplify the truth of Demea's statement, the primary contrast between the consequences of the vita dura on the one hand and those of facilitas and clementia on the other is expanded by the further antithesis of Demea's life of hard work and toil and of the life of otium led by Micio. And since Demea chose to lead this kind of life for the benefit of his sons (vv.868-9), a further comparison is drawn between the family responsibilities of Demea and the (to Demea)

self-centred life of Micio. The points of difference between the two brothers which Demea makes in the first part of this section may be set out as follows :

MICIO

ill'suam semper egit vitam
in otio, in conviviis:

clemens, placidus, nulli
laedere os, adridere
omnibus;

sibi vixit, sibi sumptum
fecit:

omnes bene dicunt, amant.

DEMEA

contrivi in quaerundo vitam
atque aetatem meam

duxi uxorem dum studeo
illis ut quam plurimum facerem

ego ille agrestis ... tenax

Demea gives a description of Micio in vv.863-5 and then one of himself in vv.866-9, picking up the features of the former in reverse order, i.e. chiastically. In vv.866-9 there is nothing which corresponds to line 864 but the implication is that Demea does not have the clementia and facilitas exemplified there. The main point which is made in these lines is that Micio has won universal affection because of his clementia and facilitas while Demea because of his vita dura has acquired the reputation of being agrestis, saevos, tristis, etc. ... Demea is not saying that he actually is agrestis, saevos,, as Rieth (109) suggests.⁷² The other components of the contrast serve to indicate how unjust this state of affairs seems to Demea. In v.870 Demea turns from considering how differently he and his brother are viewed by the general populace to a description of how the same

differences can be seen in the way that the two sons regard the old men. The transition is marked by a formal change. In vv.870-6 Demea illustrates these differences in a series of short antitheses. Micio enjoys the love and confidences of both Aeschinus and Ctesipho: Demea sees himself as hated, shunned and deserted by his sons. There is nothing to suggest that the reason for his sons' aversion to Demea is other than that given for Demea's lack of popularity among the citizen-body at large. Demea does not blame the strictness of his pedagogical methods for the hostility of his sons but rather the fact that he has spent his life in continuous toil. Since it has been for the benefit of his sons that he has worked so hard, Demea seems to feel that an injustice has been done. Micio enjoys sine labore what Demea feels he deserves because of his labor maxumus. So far Demea has decided on a negative course of action: he will no longer devote himself to toil. On the positive side three possibilities were open to the dramatist. He could allow Demea to turn in disillusionment to a life of ease, spending his money on himself. This development offered little dramatic scope and was rejected, if ever considered, by the playwright. Since he has not blamed his methods of upbringing for the desertion of his sons and since the abandonment of the vita dura removes one of the reasons

for the adoption of Aeschinus by Micio, it would be consistent with his attitude towards clementia and facilitas, attributes which are closely linked with Micio's methods of upbringing and which Demea regards as insincere,⁷³ if he now attempted to win back both sons without surrendering his principles of education. The third possibility is that he can decide to be clemens and facilis and win general popularity and the affection of his sons in the way that Micio has done. This is in effect what he decides upon in the third section (vv.877-81):

age age, nunciam experiamur contra ecquid ego possiem
blande dicere aut benigne facere, quando hoc provocat.
ego quoque a meis me amari et magni pendi postulo:
si id fit dando atque obsequendo, non posteriores feram.
deerit: id mea minime refert qui sum natu maxumus.

It is these five lines which produce the inconsistency between Demea's monologue and the final speech and it is here, if anywhere, that Terence has diverged from his model. It has already been said that line 881 suggests that Demea envisages a much longer period of trial for his clementia than in fact materialises. In one other respect it falls under suspicion; for it prepares the audience to expect that Demea in the succeeding scenes will disburse his own money in an attempt to win the love of his sons, although what actually happens is that Micio incurs the costs of

Demea's generosity. Only once does Demea spend some of his own money and that is when he offers to recompense his brother for the freeing of Phrygia (v.977). But if one suspects that line 881 had no counterpart in Menander (at least in this context), one must also reckon the same for the two preceding lines, since the idea of the shortage of money develops from the intention of giving it to his sons in order to win their love - an intention which is never fulfilled within the play. In vv.879-80 Demea has moreover changed his ground somewhat. In the second section of the monologue Demea sees the popularity of Micio as the result of his clementia and facilitas. The implication of vv.879-80 (especially ego quoque ... postulo) is that in his relationship with his son Micio has been clemens and facilis (dando atque obsequendo) in order to gain his affection.⁷⁴ That this is true is clear from vv.48 ff. It seems therefore that Demea is prepared to abandon not only the vita dura, which he sees has brought him nothing but odium and a bad reputation, but also, at least temporarily, the principles on which he has based his methods of upbringing.

Demea's decision to see whether he too can show clementia and facilitas is a natural outcome of what he has already said in the monologue. It is interesting that Demea gives as an additional reason the fact that this is what his brother has challenged him to do - quando hoc

provocat (v.878). The provocatio to which Demea is referring must be the words of Micio in the immediately preceding scene :

da te hodie mihi:

exporge frontem. (vv.838-9)
hodie modo hilarum te face. (v.842)

Demea seems to be adducing his brother's challenge as justification for what he is about to do because he is not at all convinced that Micio's methods are correct. This use of the challenge to silence his conscience is a neat perceptive touch on the part of the dramatist: it accords with Demea's attitude to facilitas and clementia in the earlier part of the monologue and gives more credibility to Demea's decision to try and emulate Micio despite his misgivings. But this interpretation holds good only if Demea is serious in his attempt to win the affection of his sons in the same way that Micio does - as he appears to be in this part of Terence's play. But did the reason given here for Demea's experiment have the same function in Menander's play?

The interesting feature of Micio's challenges at vv.838-9 and v.841 is that Micio asks Demea to be pleasant for this day only. Recollection of the temporal limitation in the challenges is extinguished in Terence by the way in which Demea's decision, announced at vv.877-8, develops from the earlier part of the monologue. It would be

absurd for the audience to suppose that Demea is taking Micio at his word and is confining his trial period to that day alone and lines 879-81 clearly give the impression of a much longer duration. Yet at the end of the play Demea shows in his final speech that he had no intention in assuming a different character other than that of showing Micio's methods to be wrong. In other words there would be consistency between the monologue and the final speech (and also the intervening scenes) if the audience knew that Demea was taking up Micio's challenge with its temporal limitation.

I suggest that Terence has omitted part of the monologue of Demea in Menander. After comparing the ways in which the two sons differ in their attitude towards Micio and himself, Demea, I believe, asserted that, while he admitted his mistake in the emphasis he placed on accumulating wealth in order to leave as large a patrimony as possible, he stood firm by his belief in the correctness of his pedagogical methods and in the weaknesses of Micio's. The substance of vv.877-8 could then have followed, introduced perhaps by an adversative particle. (lines 879-81 I take to be Terentian although their substance may have been taken in adapted form from the section omitted.) The Greek audience would then realise that Demea is not sincerely trying to change his character in order to win the love of his sons but that

he was simply complying with Micio's exhortations, to which in fact he had already submitted (cf. vv. 839-40). He may well have said that he would show that Micio's methods were unsound and that anyone could win affection if he acted like Micio. Since he has already been deceived by Micio, it is not improbable that he conceived the plan of returning the compliment by using Micio's methods to teach him a lesson. Micio's requests to Demea in the preceding scene thus provided the means by which the plot could be resolved in a comic finale.

Some support for this reconstruction of the Menandrian monologue is derived from a comparison of the Adelphoë and the Dyskolos. In the latter Knemon's dyskolia bars the way to any marriage of Sostratos and his daughter. Menander gets round the impasse by having Knemon fall into the well, and having Gorgias rescue him. The fact that his stepson Gorgias, to whom he has never given any help or spoken a pleasant word (724 ff.) has saved him from the well and possibly death, elicits the admission from Knemon that he was wrong to believe that he could be completely self sufficient (713 ff.), and that no one was capable of showing kindness to another (vv. 718 ff.). Knemon therefore adopts Gorgias and entrusts him with finding a husband for his daughter. Half of his land he gives as dowry and the other half he

presents to Gorgias. At the same time, however, Knemon still wishes to be left alone and the donations of his estate and the loss of the responsibility of his daughter allow him to retreat further from contact with society, though he and his wife will now live together. Knemon claims that if everyone were like him there would be no crime or war (vv.743 ff.). Thus despite the kindness of Gorgias Knemon is still distrustful of the actions of others and their motives. There is no question here of a change of character,⁷⁵ and the manner in which Knemon clings to the beliefs underlying his way of life attests to Menander's realistic portrayal of character. His failure even to attempt to change is repaid in the finale when Sikon and Getas exact revenge for their suffering at his hands earlier in the play and force him to join the wedding celebrations.

In the Adelphoe prior to Demea's monologue the central theme of the play, the conflict between the two methods of upbringing, has been developed to a position of stalemate. Menander's method of creating and resolving an impasse is similar in both the Dyskolos and the Adelphoe. Like Knemon in the Dyskolos, Demea will give fresh impetus to the play by the decisions which he comes to in this monologue. In order that the central theme of the play be fully worked out Demea must do one of two things. Either he must recognise that his methods of upbringing

are wrong and in trying to ape Micio go to the other extreme (thus showing the same basic weakness of character) or he must reaffirm his belief in his methods. ^{what basic weakness?}

In the case of the latter we might expect that, if Menander wished to show that Demea was still in error, Demea would suffer for this in the finale ⁷⁶ or, if Demea's methods were to show as the better, that the weaknesses of Micio's system would be shown up. In Terence's play the faults of Micio and his system are displayed by the manner in which he yields to all of Demea's requests and by the decision of Aeschinus to return to Demea's care. I have argued on other grounds that this was the ending which Menander envisaged when he planned the play. From the way in which the plot and hypokeimena have been put together Demea can be prepared to have both sons under his charge only if he is at the same time prepared to give up his goal of leaving as large a patrimony as possible.

The event in the Adelphoe which corresponds to Knemon's rescue from the well by Gorgias in the Dyskolos in prompting a self-assessment is Demea's loss of Ctesipho to Micio. For so Demea, after some reflection, sees the situation (ego desertus sum, v.873; eos hic fecit suos / paullo sumptu, vv.875-6). One might expect that Demea would now re-appraise his pedagogical methods but this is not the case. The loss of Ctesipho raises in Demea's

mind the much wider question of the reasons that everyone dislikes him. For the first time we learn that Demea is generally unpopular.⁷⁷ Everybody loves Micio but Demea is thought of as being agrestis, saevos, tristis, parcus, truculentus, tenax (v.866). The reason for his having no friends can not be the way in which he brings up his son. Demea, as has been pointed out, explains his unpopularity with everyone at large and with his sons in particular as emanating from the same source, viz. his devotion to work in order to accumulate as much money as possible. Demea has learned the hard way the truth of the sentiments expressed by Sostratos to his father in the Dyskolos. (vv.811-2): ⁷⁸

πολλῶ δὲ κρεῖττόν ἐστιν ἐμφανῆς φίλος
ἢ πλοῦτος ἀφανῆς, ὃν σὺ κατορύξας ἔχεις.

It is true that Demea, like Sostratos, is motivated by self interest, but he has had the courage to examine and the insight to see the flaws in his way of life. Moreover, it is in accord with the rest of the play and with contemporary philosophical theories of the importance of philia and of the way to bring up children that he should place his finger on this point and not on his pedagogical methods. At the same time, however, it is difficult to believe that he said as little as he does in Terence's monologue of his principles in rearing his son. This silence is an additional reason why I think

that Demea, in a fashion similar to Knemon, stated explicitly that he adhered to his methods of teaching children to recognise and to do what was right.

One may feel that the solution which I have suggested Menander chose in order to effect the peripeteia is not a completely satisfactory one. For the two essential points in which Demea and Micio differ, their way of life and their principles of upbringing, are extremely closely linked, and one seems to be a necessary complement of the other. But in terms of character-change it does not seem difficult to accept that a man who is by no means poor but who devotes himself incessantly to work for the benefit of his sons when he is dead can quite suddenly realise that he has been mistaken in his priorities and use the money he has to enable him to spend more time with his sons without giving up his belief that they should be strictly supervised. It is not clear whether in fact Demea has modified his methods of upbringing. At the end of the play he allows Ctesipho to keep the psaltria. But there are to be no others besides her. Demea does say that he will overlook some misdeeds in loco but is no more specific than that. Whether he has always been prepared to do so and what type of action he thinks can be overlooked we do not know.⁷⁹ The problem of a love-affair has never

arisen with Ctesipho and Demea makes it clear that he will not allow Ctesipho to behave as Micio has allowed Aeschinus. That he should permit his son to keep the psaltria must be seen as a concession granted in special circumstances and, from the dramatist's point of view, demanded by the way in which the play has to end. The main point is that in essence Demea stands by his system and his is shown to be the better of the two systems represented in the play.

Why did Terence omit part of Demea's monologue, as I have suggested? Because of the omission scope is given to the element of surprise, the final speech has greater dramatic effect, and the audience shares the puzzlement and wonderment of the other characters within the play. This procedure is quite in harmony with other changes made by Terence, notably in the suppression of the expository prologue. In the Adelphoe itself one thinks of the way in which the audience learns that the psaltria is Ctesipho's and not Aeschinus' girlfriend.

APPENDIX

The role of Canthara

The first two acts of the play centred on the seizure of the girl from Sannio by Aeschinus and the reaction of the two fathers to this event. Although there was at first no reason for the Roman audience to doubt that the girl was Aeschinus' lover, it was revealed in the course of Act II that Aeschinus had been acting on behalf of his brother Ctesipho. In Act III attention now turns to Aeschinus' own love affair. At this point Terence may have been faced with some difficulties arising from the omission of the prologue of the Menandrian play, in which one may assume the Greek audience learned of the relationship of Aeschinus and Pamphila. It is conceivable therefore that Terence was forced to make some alterations in his model if his audience was to follow what was happening onstage. Donatus, however, gives no information of any changes and we must look for internal evidence.

In Act III sc. 1 the audience learns 1. that a girl is about to give birth to a child (vv.289-90), 2. that Aeschinus is connected with this matter in some way (v.292), 3. that he has been solicitous in his attention (vv.293-4) and 4. that he has raped her

(vv.296-7). While the dramatist gives all the information necessary for the comprehension of the situation, the manner in which it is conveyed seems to me to presuppose the listeners' prior knowledge of the circumstances. In the course of this scene several questions must have arisen in the minds of the Roman spectators (Who are these characters? Who is the girl about to give birth to a child? What has Aeschinus to do with this?) and not all of them may have immediately grasped the facts of this new disclosure. I feel, therefore, that the Terentian scene probably reflects a scene from the Menandrian play and that the content of the scenes in both plays was quite similar. It is possible, however, that Terence expanded the content to some extent to ensure that the Roman audience would be fully acquainted with the facts. Perhaps the rather tortuous syntax in vv.295-7 arises from the need to inform the Roman audience that Aeschinus had violated Sostrata's daughter (information which the Greek audience would have, presumably known from the prologue) and that in the Greek play there was simply a laudatio of Aeschinus. Certainly the Greek audience, already knowing the situation from the prologue, could have savoured the praises of Aeschinus in vv.294 and 296-7

in the anticipation that news of the raptio will soon follow and dash the women's high opinion of the young man. The irony and foreshadowing in the scene may well have been lost on the Roman audience. In Terence's play the predominant dramatic ingredient exploited in this scene is surprise.

But if the Menandrian and Terentian scenes were similar in content, there are some grounds for believing that in form they were different. At vv.291-2 Sostrata says :

neminem habeo (solae sumus; Geta autem hic non adest)
nec quem ad obstetricem mittam nec qui accersat
Aeschinum.

Yet Canthara, who is the obvious person to send for the midwife, is standing beside her when she says these words and is in fact despatched by Sostrata on this very errand at v.354. The explanation in Dziatzko-Kauer, that Sostrata is so upset that she overlooks that she could send Canthara for the obstetrix, skates over the difficulty. When one finds features of a Roman comedy which betray looseness in structure or which disregard τὸ εἰκός one should consider the possibility that these have resulted from the hand of the Roman dramatists. That may not always be the case, but I find it hard to believe that Menander composed in the slapdash manner which one must suppose,

if one accepts that Terence has faithfully transmitted Menander in this scene.⁸⁰ One might argue that vv.291-2 make sense in the light of the first three verses of the scene. There Sostrata shows that she is helpless and at a loss what to do now that the labour pains have begun. She cannot send Canthara for the midwife and be left to cope alone until their return. But if this were the case, one might expect that the parenthesis should make this clear (e.g. 'for I won't send you and be left alone'). Furthermore, one has to accept this helplessness as an ad hoc measure, since she sends Canthara away at v.354. As it stands the parenthesis looks like a self-conscious attempt made by the dramatist to make some sense of Sostrata's words. It is hard to believe that Terence was not responsible, and it is equally hard to believe that he added it, if he himself was not responsible for the awkwardness which the parenthesis attempts to explain. The most obvious assumption is that Terence added the parenthesis because he has changed what was a monologue by Sostrata, in which vv.291-2 (without the parenthesis) made sense, into a dialogue by the introduction of Canthara.

If Terence has done this, we must assume

further that Canthara was not present in the next scene either. The nurse does in fact contribute little to this scene. She speaks at v.309 (propius obsecro accedamus, Sostrata), after Sostrata says that she cannot understand what Geta is saying, at vv.323-4 (quid festinas, mi Geta? animam recipe), repeating the sense of Sostrata's words quid est? quid trepidas? and at v.343 where what she says, hem, mea Sostrata, vide quam rem agis, echoes Geta's quid agas? Her most original contribution to the scene is her reaction at vv.335-6 to Geta's question. There would be no great loss to the scene if Canthara was not present. But one would hardly expect the nurse's role in this scene to be anything but minor and stronger evidence is needed to support the assumption that Canthara is an addition of Terence at this point.

If Canthara is Terence's invention, he obviously had to find some way of removing her from the stage. At v.354, as we have noted, she is despatched by Sostrata to fetch the midwife. What is interesting is that, despite the urgency of Sostrata's words at vv.353-4 (propera tu, mea Canthara, / curre, obstetricem accerse, ut quom opus sit ne in mora nobis siet), Canthara does not

reappear with the obstetrix. This is unusual. It is possible that Menander did not bring Canthara back since no dramatic purpose was served by doing so, and v.354 would suggest that the midwife was going to be present when needed. If the audience ever wondered about Canthara they might assume that she has returned via the back door. Nevertheless, one would expect the midwife to enter with Canthara from a wing entrance and go into the house from the stage (cf. And.459, Hec.726). One immediately thinks of how Sosia disappears from the Andria, although the words which Simo addresses to him at vv.168 ff. suggest further participation in the development of the plot. Since Sosia was Terence's invention, one is tempted to assume that Terence has not only changed a monologue into a dialogue in Act III sc.1 of this play but that he has also introduced into his play a character who made no appearance in the original.⁸¹

But Canthara's disappearance is hardly in the same class as Sosia's as an example of false preparation. Moreover, although Canthara is never seen again by the audience, she does perform an important function in the development in the plot. It is she who reveals to Aeschinus that Sostrata has heard of and misinterpreted his snatching of the girl from the leno; as Aeschinus

tells us :

nam ut hinc forte ad obstetricem erat missa,
ubi vidi, ilico
accedo, rogito Pamphila quid agat, iam partus adsiet,
eon obstetricem accersat. illa exclamat 'abi,abi:
iam Aeschine
satis diu dedisti verba: sat adhuc tua nos frustratast
fides'. (vv.618-21)

Aeschinus had met Canthara when she had been sent for the midwife. He had gone up to her, asked how Pamphila was, whether the birth was imminent and if that was the reason why she was going for the midwife. Canthara had summarily dismissed Aeschinus with words which left no doubt in the young man's mind that Sostrata believed that he had deserted Pamphila. This is a neat way of motivating the young man's emotional entrance.

Aeschinus must learn from some source that Sostrata knows of the raptio, unless one is willing to accept that in Menander Aeschinus was distraught, not because he knew of Sostrata's reaction to the snatching, but because he feared that she might have heard of it. This seems unlikely and we must apparently modify our tentative assumptions based on the awkwardness of vv.291-2, the contradiction between these lines and what Sostrata does in v.354, and the failure of Canthara to return with the obstetrix.

A possible compromise would be to suppose that

Sostrata entered alone and that the reason for her entrance was to look for Geta whom she wished to send for Aeschinus (and not the obstetrix). After learning of the raptio from the slave she sent him for Hegio and said that she would despatch Canthara for the midwife. In other words, Canthara never appeared on the stage in Menander's play but was invented for the purpose of motivating Aeschinus' return. Against this, however, one has to accept that Terence added the mention of the obstetrix in v.292 and thus created an awkwardness which he would have avoided if he had adhered to his original at this point. Secondly, it does seem a better dramatic arrangement to have Canthara on the stage when Geta returns with his news, if she is to fulfil the function she does in Terence's play.

Did Canthara perform the same function in Menander as in Terence? When one looks closely at vv.618 ff., all is not well there. Canthara herself must have been the source of Aeschinus' knowledge that she was going for the obstetrix. But the ut-clause, the description of their meeting and in particular the third question (eon obstetricem accersat) imply that Aeschinus knew where she was going before he went up to her. The impression given by vv.619-21 is that

the young man's questions were brushed aside and left unanswered by Canthara, who simply told Aeschinus to go away and have nothing more to do with her household. In other descriptions of offstage action I can find no other example where such actions are given their temporal location by reference to what the speaker could not have known until what he describes took place.⁸² But this is not impossible. Aeschinus could quite naturally say that he met Canthara when she was going for the midwife and one would infer that he learned this from the woman when he met her. The difficulty in this passage is caused by ilico accedo. If these two words were removed, there would be no contradiction between Aeschinus' knowledge and the description of the meeting. One might conclude then that the awkwardness in vv.618 ff. has arisen in the process of 'vortere' and that Terence has added ilico accedo for the vivid effect of asyndeton.

But another possibility presents itself. The reason that the meeting was given its temporal location by reference to the sending of Canthara for the midwife and not, as one would expect, by reference to Aeschinus' movements offstage may have been because Terence could not follow Menander exactly at this point because of some other change

he has made. It was suggested above (pp.46 f.) that Menander may have arranged for the later entrance of Aeschinus some time after the return of Syrus from the market-place by having the young man take the money for the psaltria to the leno's house. In Terence's play the leno went off with Aeschinus and Syrus to the forum and we must imagine that he was paid the money as soon as Aeschinus had received it from Micio. Let us suppose that in Menander the model of vv.618 ff. ran as follows : 'When I had been given the money by my father and was on my way to the pimp's to pay him, I saw Canthara. I went up to her. She said that she was going for the midwife. I asked her etc.' Terence could not have remained faithful to his original at this point without producing an absurdity in the light of Aeschinus' and the leno's exits at the end of Act II. A simple solution (though certainly not the simplest) would have been to extract material from the description of the meeting and use it to replace the part which did not accord with Aeschinus' exit earlier in the play. I would be satisfied with this explanation if vv.618 ff. were being examined in isolation, but we have still not been able to offer a satisfactory solution to the difficulties involving Canthara earlier in the play.

I therefore come back to the solution which vv.618 ff. seemed to refute, viz. that Canthara is the creation of Terence and that in Menander she did not appear on the stage or perform any dramatic function within the play. There is nothing in the rest of the play which conflicts with the suggestion that Sostrata had only one slave. Indeed the possession of a single slave is the mark of a poor household in New Comedy (cf. Staphyla in Aulularia and Daos, the sole slave of Gorgias and his mother in Dyskolos) and much is made of the poverty of Sostrata in the play (cf. vv.303,345,496,729). Hegio's description of Geta at vv.481-2 (alut illas solus, omnem familiam / sustentat) is not inconsistent with the presence of Canthara in Sostrata's household, since the words mean that Geta is the sole source of income to Sostrata, presumably by being hired out to other citizens, and do not exclude the presence of a purely domestic slave such as Canthara.⁸³

If Canthara is Terence's invention, how did Aeschinus learn of Sostrata's knowledge of and reaction to the raptio? Presumably Geta must have been the source of his information. It might be possible to suppose that in Menander Geta was given two missions: he was to fetch both the midwife and Hegio. Certainly

the best moment for the obstetrix to arrive would be at v.447 with Geta and Hegio, since the baby is born during their conversation with Demea (cf.v.486). One may compare how the obstetrix arrives at v.459 of the Andria and the baby is born at vv.473-4, though in that play the short period of time between the arrival of the midwife and the birth is important from a dramatic point of view, since Simo infers from it that he is being deceived. It seems more probable, however, that Geta was sent for Hegio alone. Certainly the smoothness of the entrance of these two would be lost, if Geta was encumbered with the midwife and had to send her inside.

To reconcile such a meeting between Aeschinus and Geta in Menander with vv.618 ff. of Terence's play one need not suppose that Terence had to make extensive changes. Apart from substituting Canthara for Geta the only other alteration he may have been forced to make was to change the time of the meeting (and he may have been forced to do this anyway, as suggested above) and to add the third of Aeschinus' questions. Otherwise the description of the meeting and of Geta's reaction in Menander could have been similar to that described in Terence. ⁸⁴

The mention of the obstetrix in Act III sc. 1 still needs an explanation, if one rejects the view that in Menander's play *Sostrata* never contemplated sending for her and that Terence has introduced her into the scene. Perhaps in Menander *Sostrata* came out to look for Geta in order to send him for the midwife and not, as in Terence, for Aeschinus. When she heard the news about Aeschinus, she changed her intention because of the need for prompt action (cf. quantum potes, v.354) and told him to go and tell Hegio of the situation. She herself would look after her daughter. The mention that she has been present at other births (v.290) may have been made to prepare for the change of plan on *Sostrata's* part.

The advantages of this reconstruction are that it explains all the difficulties concerning *Canthara* in Terence's play and at the same time makes the reason for Terence's introduction of a new character more understandable. The mention of the midwife in *Sostrata's* monologue and her subsequent change of plan gave Terence the idea of changing the monologue into the more dramatic form of a dialogue by introducing a character whom *Sostrata* would send for the midwife. If Terence is responsible for the invention of *Canthara*,

then we can see a marked advance in his technique over what he did in the Andria in his treatment of Sosia. He has integrated Canthara into the play by giving to her, instead of to Geta, the function of informing Aeschinus of the household's knowledge of the raptio.

NOTES

1. The fundamental work is E. Fraenkel, Elementi Plautini in Plauto (Florence 1960), a translation with additions of Plautinisches im Plautus (Berlin 1922). Other important works on the relationship between the Greek and Roman plays are F. Leo, Plautinische Forschungen zur Kritik und Geschichte der Komödie² (Berlin 1912); G. Jachmann Plautinisches und Attisches (Berlin 1931). Of the periodical literature articles by Gordon Williams, e.g. Hermes 84(1956) 424ff. on the Pseudolus and Hermes 86(1958) 79-105 on Miles Gloriosus, and Walther Ludwig, e.g. Philologus 105 (1961) 44ff., 247ff. on Aulularia, are extremely valuable. Terence is served by F. Leo, Geschichte der römischen Literatur I (Berlin 1913) 232-58; G. Jachmann, P. Terentius Afer, RE Pauly-Wissowa Zweite Reihe 5,1 (Stuttgart 1934) 598ff.; H. Haefter, Museum Helveticum 10 (1953) 1ff., 73ff.; W. Ludwig, Philologus 103 (1959) 1ff.; O. Bianco, Terenzio: Problemi e aspetti dell'originalità (Rome 1962) and, more recently, on particular aspects of Terence B. Denzler, Der Monolog bei Terenz (Zurich 1968); E. Lefèvre, Die Expositionstechnik in den Komödien des Terenz (Darmstadt 1969).
2. The Donatus scholia which refer to the Greek originals are conveniently gathered in Wessner, Aemilius Asper (Halle 1905) 25ff. He omits Hec. 825 for some reason.
3. The best example of this is Donatus' statement on Eun. 539 which, when taken naturally, shows that Antipho is an invention of Terence's. Jachmann (RE 636f.) dismissed Donatus' evidence on the grounds

that the character was so well-integrated into the play that it could not have been the work of Terence. Fraenkel (Mus.Helv.25 1968 237ff.) was also of this opinion and attempted to show that the Donatus scholion was suspect as transmitted. But the form which the scholion takes is supported by Donatus' scholion on Ad.986, and there does not seem to be enough evidence to go against the natural interpretation of the scholion: see G.Williams, Tradition and Originality in Roman Poetry (Oxford 1968) 290f.

4. See for example the remarks of Gordon Williams in Hermes 86 (1958) 87f. on Miles Gloriosus III 1.
5. Elaine Fantham (Philologus 112 1968 200) argues that in translating vv.155-96 Terence has followed Diphilus in detail. But her argument rests on the acceptance of Terence's own statement in the prologue and on accepting the conclusions drawn by Marx (Rudens pp.194-6) on similarities of expressions in these lines and in the Rudens. But Marx grossly exaggerates the significance of these similarities which in part arise from similarity of context (see Thierfelder's review of Marx in Gnomon 8 (1932) 640 ff. For example, the style of vv.155ff. (cf.Rud.613ff.) is claimed as exclusively Diphilean, but we have here an example of the clamor armisonus which is found elsewhere in Plautus (these plays Marx promptly concludes are based on Diphilean originals!) and has a long history: see Schulze, Sitzgsber.Berl. Akad. 1918 495ff.

6. The main works on the Adelphoe are F.Nencini, De Terentio eiusque fontibus (Liburni 1891) 117-48; H.Drexler, Die Komposition von Terenz'Adelphen und Plautus'Rudens (Leipzig 1934) - Philologus Suppl.-Bd. 26,2. Terence's play is discussed on pp.1-40 but Drexler confines himself to Act II; O.Rieth, Die Kunst Menanders in den 'Adelphen' des Terenz (Hildesheim 1964), edited and with an appendix by K. Gaiser; E. Fantham, Terence, Diphilus and Menander, Philologus 112 (1968) 196-216.
7. Can these words mean in this context "keep calm! I will interview him (if you are afraid to)"? So Fantham, 205, takes them. The verb of course can be spoken to someone who is perturbatus to calm him down, but it can also be spoken in order to silence a protest: cf.e.g. Plaut. Aul.273. The second sense is the natural meaning to be derived from Aeschinus' conduct in the first scene.
8. See Drexler, 36 n.44. He accepts as convincing the explanation of Hauler that Demea in Act I is telling of Aeschinus breaking into the leno's house, while at II 1 it is a question of bringing the girl to Micio's. But Demea has heard that Aeschinus has left the leno's (eripuit mulierem, 90).
9. For the text of this line see commentary ad loc.
10. So also Rieth, 50; see Arnott's review in Gnomon 37 (1965) 255ff.
11. Cf.Ad.883, Plaut.Bacc.626,775,879,979,Cas.725, Merc.284,366.
12. Rieth (Gnomon 10 1934 640) points to other mistakes in the Donatus commentary: at And.354, (Davos)bene

distulit narrationem ne audirent Charinus et Byrria, when in fact Byrria left before Davos entered; at Hec.810, where the scholiast has confused Bacchis with Philotis.

13. It is most improbable that Aeschinus made his first entrance from the house (having made use of the angiportum): see Nencini, 132; Drexler, 33; Fantham, 210.
14. Drexler (33) rightly stressed that the psaltria has to reach Micio's house in some way so that Demea will discover the two lovers there and their presence there when Demea returns at 355 and 540 creates humour and suspense. Webster (Studies in Menander,² 88-9), followed by Fantham (210), suggests the possibility that Aeschinus entered for the first time alone and that the girl has been deposited with a friend. Fantham also suggests that she never appeared onstage. How then did she get to Micio's house?
15. Stampini (on 355-6) suspected that the contradiction between these lines and Act II sprang from contaminatio but was no more specific than that.
16. So Rieth (48-9) - 'als Basis (of reconstruction) kann die Rolle des Syrus dienen.' Lines 210-1 are taken at face value by Fantham also (205). But cf. on the other hand Nencini (133): 'eum (Syrum) raptioni interfuisse veri est simillimum.'
17. On this see pp.105ff.
18. Although I have come to conclusions similar to Drexler's as far as II,3 is concerned, Drexler also believed that Aeschinus was on the stage before Ctesipho entered.

19. Elem. Plaut. ch. I.
20. Rieth (Gnomon 10 1934 645) shows that Drexler's thesis might be tolerable if Terence had written something similar in sense to Agamemno, qui longe optimus post homines natos frater perhibetur, numquam tantum in Menelaum beneficium contulit quantum ego nunc ab Aeschino accepi.
21. Cf. Phorm. 421.
22. A similar joke is found at Plaut. Pseud. 325ff., there played by the leno on the young man. Ballio says 'quia enim non venalem iam habeo Phoenicium'. Calidorus takes that to mean that Phoenicium will now be his, while the leno means that he has already sold her.
23. The leno could bring a δίκη εξαίρεσεως εις ελευθερίαν or in this case, where violence has been used, a δίκη βιαίων (cf. Lysias 23.12; Lipsius, Att.Recht. 643ff.). The same issues would be at stake in both, since Aeschinus' defence against a δίκη βιαίων would have to be that the violence was justified because the person seized was free.
24. In Roman law the 'slave' who was the subject of a vindicatio in libertatem was provisionally regarded as free until the case was decided: see A. Watson, The Law of Persons. 219ff. The situation was similar in Athens: cf. RE VI,2 1548.
25. Studies in Menander² 88.
26. See note 5.

27. Line 198, domo me eripuit, verberavit, me invito abduxit meam, does not, as far as the first member of the tricolon is concerned, agree with either the Diphilean scene where the leno appears to have left his house of his own free will after a beating inside (cf. 159) or with the Menandrian situation as described at vv. 88ff. Possibly the line is corrupt: the Bembinus reads domi and that might suggest domum mi irrupit: see commentary ad loc.
28. So Drexler, 5; Rieth, 35f. But cf. Fantham, 202, and Nencini, 121ff.
29. Cf. e.g. Menand. Dysk. 666ff., Aristoph. Clouds 627ff., both with triple oath followed by a comparative expression; Menand. fr. 656. Nearer to the form here is Menand. fr. 407 which looks very much like the beginning of a monologue. See Fraenkel, Elem. Plaut. 157ff.
30. So in Menand. fr. 407. After the first two lines
νῆ τὴν Ἀθηναῖν, μακάριόν τι χρηστότης / πρὸς πάντα
καὶ θαυμαστὸν ἐφόδιον βίῳ, the fragment proceeds
τοῦτῳ λαλήσας ἡμέρας μικρὸν μέρος / εἶνους ἐγὼ νῦν
εἶμι. The χρηστότης of the man he has been
speaking to has caused the speaker to become εἶνους
to him.
31. Rieth (48) takes quando bene promeruit literally, referring to a previous association of the young man and the pornoboskos.
32. Cf. Menand. Epitr. 381ff., quoted by Rieth (46 n. 77). See also Handley, Menander and Plautus (London 1968) 11f.

33. Possibly the sentiments of the first half of 201 (quando bene promeruit, fiat!) occurred in the monologue in Menander and were meant in a literal sense, referring to previous business done between Aeschinus and the pimp. See Note 31.
34. So the pornoboskos in Kolax contemplates going to law when he envisages the snatching of one of his girls (120-2). The reluctance with which he faces a possible lawsuit is clear in these lines.
35. Lefèvre (46 n.50) believes that at least part of 40-9 was taken over by Terence from the Menandrian prologue. He thinks especially that the Greek citation (43) supports this view, since the present participle λαμβάνων (he prefers this to the present indicative) can make sense only in a description of Micio spoken by a third party viz. the speaker of the prologue. But an aorist participle would still be more natural if Micio is truly well past the age of marrying. I agree with Rieth (25) that Terence has probably made Micio older than he was in the Menandrian play (see infra pp.105ff.). Lefèvre (39ff.) believes also that Micio's monologue at 141ff. is substantially Terentian because the description of Aeschinus' life at 149ff. is not consistent with what we gather from the earlier part of the play (but cf. 61ff., 86-7, 122) and vv.150-1 are inconsistent with 629f. and 690ff. I cannot see that there is inconsistency here. Aeschinus has broached the question of marriage but has not revealed the difficulties which have caused him to approach Micio on the matter. As for Lefèvre's statement that the monologue adds

nothing to what the audience has already learned, surely the purpose of the monologue is to show that Micio is somewhat perturbed by the news of Demea and to make it clear that his rather carefree reaction to Demea's announcement was prompted by his knowledge of Demea's temperament.

36. From a comic point of view, at least. I argue below (pp.100ff.) that in Menander Micio did object to the marriage. If Terence has departed from his original in 43-4, the reason may have been that he felt that Micio's acquiescence to the marriage was less objectionable if Micio did not express his own views on matrimony in the opening monologue.
37. Although Rieth begins circumspectly (cf.20), from his reconstruction of the beginning of Menander's play, from his discussion of e.g. vv.601ff. (86 n.131) and from what he says on the ending of the play he seems to argue on the basis of what he wants to show. Gaiser follows Rieth in his interpretation of the characterisation of Micio and Demea (145ff.). So also Fantham - 'Was Menander prepared to let his public think Micio a fool and Aeschinus a cad, even for one act?' (214). Cf. Lefèvre, 40. But even if Rieth's interpretation of the Menandrian Micio is correct, I do not think that we can deny to Menander the dramatist this skilful rousing of the audience's curiosity to learn what the true situation is. Cf. Perikeiromene 47 ff. where Agnoia corrects any misinterpretation on the part of the audience.
38. There are exceptions to this in Plautus. See Jachmann, Plautinisches und Attisches, 168 on M.G. 145 and on

the same passage G. Williams, Hermes 86 (1958) 101, who points to the prologue in the Truculentus. Plautus may well have been responsible for both these exceptions. Here there is no necessity for the prologue speaker to refer back to the earlier scenes, though a reference to what has preceded would form a neat introduction to explaining the true situation and showing how both fathers are to some extent in error in their descriptions of their sons. Cf. Perikeir. 7,38. In addition, the information about Aeschinus' love affair could not be introduced so naturally by Syrus as it could by a divinity. The crucial point is whether Syrus knows of the imminent birth of the child. There is nothing in the play that shows that Syrus does know this, although he may be aware of Aeschinus' love for Pamphila. Webster (Studies in Menander², 87f.) and Latte (Lustrum 10, 1965, 127) also suggest a postponed divine prologue.

39. See Handley on Dysk. 1-49. The representation of nous as some kind of divinity is an extension of the metaphor in Menand.fr.749.
40. Such a drastic change in this section of the play might account for the famous statement of Varro reported in Suetonius' Life: nam Adelphorum principium Varro etiam praeferit principio Menandri (sec.3). Whatever changes Terence made, I find it extremely difficult to believe that Varro did not include the Diphilean scene in what he meant by principium.
41. See Appendix, pp.124ff.
42. See Handley, Plautus and Menander 16.

43. See Rieth, 112, and W. Schadewaldt, Monolog und Selbstgesprache, (Berlin 1926) 28ff. See also B. Denzler, Der Monolog bei Terenz. 3f.
44. Lines 48-52 and 50 in particular are the most damaging to Rieth's interpretation of the play. His attempt to get round this difficulty is not convincing. He believed that Menander wished at this point of the monologue to show the emotion of the distressed father by a 'ubersteigerte Ausdrucksweise' and that Terence in line 50 has coarsened(?) the expression (26 n.52). Rieth saw the words of Aeschinus at 707ff., where he resolves to do nothing of which Micio would disapprove because of the latter's commoditas, as vindication of the superiority of Micio's methods. This view would be more persuasive if it were clear that Aeschinus was considering the way in which he had been brought up by Micio. But the distinct impression is that Aeschinus' speech is a reflex of Micio's acquiescence to the marriage and nothing more. Rieth's interpretation of the monologue is similar to what is enunciated in a scholion in the Donatus commentary at 707: et mirantis haec et laudantis oratio est. et paene videtur huiusmodi patrem probare. But I doubt whether, if this is so, the speech would elicit approval for Micio from a Roman audience. Aeschinus is expressing astonishment at the relationship between Micio and himself. The father-son relationship has been inverted. This is shown by the fact that morem gerere is chosen to describe Micio's attitude to Aeschinus, a term used to describe a wife's acquiescence to her husband or a son's obedience to his father (see G. Williams,

JRS 48 1958 27ff.). In the next line the other side of this inverted relationship is described in the phrase hicine non gestandus in sinust? which evokes the picture of a parent holding his child. A Roman audience was likely to have shared Aeschinus' astonishment at the reversal of roles, and so, I suspect, would a Greek audience. For the connection of Demea's and Micio's methods with Aristotle's thoughts on education see pp.79ff.

45. See the fragment of Theophrastus in Stobaeus (II 240 Wachsmuth) discussed by Steinmetz, Der Zweck der Charaktere Theophrasts, Annales Universitatis Saraviensis, Philosophie 8 (1959) 230 ff., cited by Gaiser in Rieth, 149 n.17.
46. So at 843ff. he makes joking remarks, tinged with mockery, on Demea's plans for the psaltria.
47. The law, Solonian, stated that if a man had legitimate sons he could not dispose of his property by will. It is quoted at Demosthenes 46 Steph. ii 14. Harrison (The Law of Athens: The Family and Property, Oxford 1968, 149ff.) expressed the view that the law was not strictly adhered to in the 4th century. Less than half of Konon's property fell to his son (Lys. 19,34-40) and Pasion, who had two sons, made a will (Dem.36, Phorm. 34f.; 45 Steph i.28). But Lacey (The Family in Classical Greece, London 1968, 131ff.) shows that in both cases there were circumstances whereby Solon's law was not strictly contravened. Harrison conceded the point in a review of Lacey's book (CR 19 1969 203). In Rome the pater familias could make a will and appoint as many people heirs

- as he liked (Crook, Law and Life of Rome, London 1967, 121).
48. See S.A.Handford, The Latin Subjunctive (London 1947) 107ff. and C.E. Bennett, Syntax of Early Latin I (Boston 1910) 206f. This 'can'-potential sense seems assured in certain instances of scias, videas, invenias where the subject is the 'ideal' second person. But examples outside these verbs are difficult to find. Handford names three in addition to redducas here : Amph. 705, Asin. 179 and Eun. 1080. But in the first and third the subjunctive can be taken as a straightforward potential subjunctive and it is not at all certain that the subject of pellas in Eun. 1080 is 'ideal'. The subjunctives condias and vorses in Asin. 179-80 could be jussive.
49. "This type is narrowly restricted in its range It occurs with verbs meaning 'think' or 'say'" (Handford, op.cit. 111). Outside these verbs this subjunctive is quite rare in early Latin. The only one which Handford cites is redducas here, but he admits that the subjunctive is not very natural if Demea is the subject.
50. The expression of the 'ideal' second person by tu is not unique, though it is rare: cf. Poen. 836, Phorm. 339ff. and in subordinate clauses Men. 87.90; Catullus 22,9;23,22; Cic. Tusc. I.38 (Cf. Madvig, Latin Grammar, 325: Bennett, Syntax of Early Latin I 206,320ff.). In this line of the Adelphoe tu seems to acquire an unnatural emphasis from the fact that verse ictus falls on it: cf. ibi tu videas, Poen. 836.

The pronoun may be elided in both examples in the Menaechmi. At Phorm. 339ff. the pronoun does have emphasis, but there is a strong antithesis between the indefinite second person singular and ille (rex).

51. See Lewis and Short; Forcellini s.v. Cf. Pseud. 668, suo viatico redduxit me usque ex errore in viam.
52. In the text one would place a period after animum and a colon after redducas.
53. The agreement was proposed by Micio because of Demea's meddling and the implication was that any further interference on the part of Demea was tantamount to his reclaiming Aeschinus. Does not the converse hold good? The circumstances which prompted the agreement might suggest that Micio, by breaking it, has staked a claim to Ctesipho. It is better, however, to take the plural as an illogicality. For a similar example see the following note.
54. The plural eos flies in the face of logic. Demea is really referring to Ctesipho alone here. Aeschinus has been brought up by Micio from an early age (cf. eduxi a parvulo, 48) and paullo sumptu hardly agrees with the accusations of lavishness which Demea levels at Micio (62-3, 988). Demea must be thinking of the 20 minae which Micio has given for the psaltria.
55. While what I have argued on 809ff. and 829ff. may, if Terence reproduces his original faithfully at these points, have been quite comprehensible to a Greek audience, it is true that a Roman audience would hardly have grasped the significance of the

scene until 829-30 where Micio's challenge would be somewhat abrupt. Did Terence not fully understand the implications of 809ff. because of the difference between Greek and Roman law with respect to the powers a father had to dispose of his property? At any rate, if my interpretation of quovis illos tu die / redducas is correct, it would be imperative that the audience should not be left in doubt about the meaning of these words. If ambiguity was possible on purely linguistic grounds, the sense may have been clarified by an actor's gesture accompanying the words.

56. If the Greek audience had some indication of how the play would end in the prologue, they could have appreciated the foreshadowing and the irony of Micio's words. But perhaps Menander made use of his audience's familiarity with the genre for the double meaning to be grasped.
57. See H. J. Mette, Gymnasium 69 (1962) 398-406.
58. For the text see commentary ad loc.
59. See W. G. Arnott, Greece and Rome NS 10 (1963) 142.
60. Geschichte der römischen Literatur, I 245.
61. Museum Helveticum 10 (1953) 89 after Wilamowitz Das Schiedsgericht 136f.
62. See W. Ludwig, Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies 9 (1968) 169ff.
63. For example the scholion Eun. II iii 45¹ should have the lemma continuo accurrit and not incurvus tremulus labiis demissis gemens; the scholion on Eun. 189 (I ii 109) refers to 187: see R. Sabbadini SIFC 3 (1895) 342.

64. Callias' mother-in-law became pregnant (allegedly by him): so Andocides I 124-7. I owe this example to Lacey, The Family in Classical Greece, 152-3. Sostrata could be media aetate like the wife whom Eunomia has lined up for Megadorus, who envisages the consequences of her falling pregnant (Aul. 162ff).
65. One may go further. The scholion V viii 16¹ (ATQUE ANUM DECREPITAM DUCAM facete hoc addidit, tamquam faciendum hoc esset, si puella duceretur seni) is misplaced, coming before a scholion on anno demum quinto et sexagesimo in the previous line. I suggest that this scholion was originally part of the one in which Terence's divergence from Menander was revealed and that the full scholion read something like the following: apud Menandrum senex de nuptiis non gravatur sic: Terentius 'atque anum decrepitam ducam' facete addidit seni. The scholion split into two parts because atque ... ducam was erroneously taken to be a lemma, and were further separated by the intrusion of a scholion which hardly seems worthy of Donatus (V viii 15²). For such intrusions cf. Eun. II ii 43⁴ and see Sabbadini, SIFC III (1895) 343.
66. Surely Aeschinus is thinking of actions comparable to the violation of Pamphila for which he has just been rebuked by Micio. For the lie cf. Menand. fr.421.

67. Studies in Menander², 90.
68. See commentary, note on 549-53. The aside is long by Terentian standards also.
69. Cf. And.952ff.
70. If Syrus remained on the stage as in Terence, Aeschinus may have given the order and announced that he would go for the bridal party.
71. The end of his aside (914-5) with the reference to ille Babulo would serve as a neat introduction to Micio's entry.
72. Ille has the function of introducing terms which in modern punctuation would be placed in quotation marks: cf. Pers. 594, vide sis, ego ille doctus leno paene in foveam decidi.
73. Nulli laedere os, adridere omnibus (864) are actions of a man too good to be true and smack of the insincerity of a flatterer: cf. Gnatho's self-description at Eun.249ff.
74. The implication of ego quoque ... postulo is Micio se postulat amari. If Terence had written me quoque a meis amari, he would not have implied the motivation of Micio that he does.
75. See especially A. Schaefer, Menanders Dyskolos : Untersuchungen zur dramatischen Technik, Meisenheim 1965, 48ff.
76. Like Knemon who suffers at the hands of Getas and Sikon (see Handley on 880-958). But in the Dyskolos Knemon has earlier had the better of the exchanges with Sikon and Getas. In the

Adelphoe the movement is the reverse of this. Demea has come off worse in his meetings with Syrus and Micio. If Terence has remained faithful to Menander at the end of the Adelphoe, Demea becomes victor instead of victim. A. Thierfelder (Menandrea, *Miscellanea Philologica*, Univers. Genua, 1960, 107-12) suggests that the Second Adelphoi is a palinode of Menander for his treatment and portrayal of Knemon in Dyskolos. Even if the triumph of rustic simplicity over city-sophistication was less common in Menander than the reverse, the direct connection between the two plays is hardly justified by the differences in their themes and in the portrayal of their senes rustici.

77. Antipathy between Demea and the citizen-body at large is suggested by 440-5.
78. See Handley ad loc. and on 807-10.
79. The impression is that he would not have allowed Ctesipho to have a lover. This is the reason that Ctesipho fears his father's discovery of his love affair. Cf. also Demea's reaction to Micio's joking suggestion that he should compel Ctesipho to sleep with the psaltria when her physical charms have been diminished by hard work (852-3).
80. Attempts have been made to remove the contradiction between vv.291-2 and the despatching of Canthara at v.354 by emending the former. But the emendations have been too drastic to be convincing. The punctuation has also been tinkered with, but nec nec Aeschinum must pick up neminem habeo: cf. Eun.147f. See Dz.-K. ad loc.

81. Marti (Untersuchungen zur dramatischen Technik bei Plautus und Terenz 79) mentions only And.168ff. as a similar instance. But an interesting example to compare is H.T.614ff. where Sostrata enters from the house with the nutrix. After asking the nurse whether she thinks that the ring is the one with which her daughter was exposed and after urging her to make sure that she has looked at it sufficiently closely, Sostrata tells her to go in - abi nunciam intro atque illa si iam laverit mihi nuntia (618). It is the second half of the line which is interesting. The nurse does not return and Sostrata enters the house at v.667. If in fact Sostrata had just said 'You go in now; I shall wait for my husband', the exit would be much better. Is the meaningless mission which Sostrata gives the nurse an indication of Terentian reworking of this section of the play? It hardly seems worth while to bring the nurse on at v.614 and then send her off again at v.618. I suspect that these lines are a Terentian addition to the play in order to give the Roman audience information about the exposure (which the Greek audience would presumably have known from the expository prologue) prior to her meeting with her husband. Perhaps in the Greek play v.622 followed immediately on v.613.
82. Cf. e.g. Plaut. Amph.203, ut illo advenimus, ubi primum terram tetigimus; Curc.329ff., Ter. Phorm.862ff.
83. Taken in isolation the lines would suggest that Geta was the sole slave of Sostrata: so Handley

(erroneously) on Dysk.26. Handley's statement would be correct, if Canthara had been freed but kept on as a servant (cf. Menand. Sam.21ff.). Although the hiring out of slaves was not an uncommon source of income (see G. Glotz, Ancient Greece at Work 204ff.), I know of no other example of the households in New Comedy hiring out their slaves.

84. Geta's monologue in which he describes what he would do if he met any of Micio's household might be a preparation for the meeting with Aeschinus and for the obvious conclusions which Aeschinus would draw from it. This would carry more weight if Geta at this point directed his wrath on Aeschinus alone. This can hardly be proved, but Geta's speech has almost certainly been expanded by Terence (see Denzler, 68 n.213, and commentary ad loc.).

COMMENTARY

Abbreviations :

- ALL Archiv fur lat. Lexicographie u. Grammatik
- Allardice Allardice, J. T. Syntax of Terence. London 1929.
- Andrieu Andrieu, J. Étude critique sur les sigles de personnages et les rubriques de scène dans les anciennes éditions de Terence. Paris 1940.
- B.-B. Brevis brevians.
- Beare Beare, W. The Roman Stage³. London 1964.
- Bennett Bennett, C. E. Syntax of Early Latin. 2 vol. Boston 1910, 1914.
- Denzler Denzler, B. Der Monolog bei Terenz. Zurich 1968.
- Duckworth Duckworth, G. E. The Nature of Roman Comedy. Princeton 1952.
- Dz.-H(auler) Dziatzko, K.-Hauler, E. Terentius. Phormio⁴. Leipzig 1913.
- Dz.-K. Dziatzko, K.-Kauer, R. Terentius. Adelphoe². Leipzig 1903.
- Fehl Fehl, P. Die interpolierte Recension des Terenztextes. Berlin 1938.
- Gr. L. Grammatici Latini, H. Keil.
- Haffter Haffter, H. Untersuchungen zur altlateinischen Dichtersprache. Berlin 1934.

- Handford Handford, S.A. The Latin Subjunctive.
London 1947.
- Hofmann Hofmann, J.B. Lateinische Umgangssprache³.
Heidelberg 1951.
- Kühn.-Steg. Kühner, R. Ausführliche Grammatik der
lateinischen Sprache. Zweite Auflage.
Neubearbeitet von Carl Stegmann.
2 Band. Hannover 1912-4.
- Laidlaw Laidlaw, W.A. The Prosody of Terence.
London 1938.
- LHS II Leumann, M.-Hofmann, J.B.-Szantyr, A.
Lateinische Grammatik Syntax und
Stylistik. Munich 1965.
- Lindsay ELV Lindsay, W.M. Early Latin Verse.
Oxford 1922.
- Lipsius Lipsius, J.H. Das Attische Recht u.
Rechtsverfahren. 3 Band. Leipzig 1905-15.
- L.-K. P. Terenti Afri Comoediae. Recogn. Kauer,
R.-Lindsay W.M. Oxford 1926. Reprinted
with additions by Skutsch, O. in 1958.
- Neue-Wag. Neue, F.-Wagener, C. Formenlehre d. lat.
Sprache. 3rd ed. 1902.
- OCT Oxford Classical Text (same as L.-K.).
- Otto Otto, A. Die Sprichwörter u. sprichwörtlichen
Redensarten der Römer. Leipzig 1890.
- Questa Questa, C. Introduzione alla metrica di
Plauto. Bologna 1967.
- RE Pauly-Wissowa, Real-encyclopaedie.

- Rieth (-Gaiser) Rieth, O. Die Kunst Menanders in den 'Adelphen' des Terenz, mit einem Nachwort Herausg. von Gaiser, K. Hildesheim 1964.
- Studemund Studemund, W. (ed.). Studien auf dem Gebiete des archaischen Lateins. 2 Band. Berlin 1873-91.
- TLL Thesaurus Linguae Latinae.

References to other persons are to editions/commentaries of Terence or relevant author by the same: see Bibliography at end. Menander is cited from the Teubner edition of Koerte (vol 1³. Leipzig 1955) and Koerte-Thierfelder (vol 2. Leipzig 1959. Abbreviated as K.-Th.), Ennius from Vahlen's edition (2nd Leipzig 1903), the other early Roman tragedians and the writers of comedy from Ribbeck, O., Tragicorum Romanorum Fragmenta, 2nd ed. Leipzig 1871, and Comicorum Romanorum Fragmenta, 2nd ed. Leipzig 1873.

Other abbreviations are in the main those used by L'Année Philologique. For abbreviated titles see Bibliography under the author.

The didascalia

With the exception of the Andria all of Terence's plays are prefaced in the MSS. by notices which announce the name of the Latin dramatist and the play (with its opus number) and which give information about the Greek original, the games at which the play was produced, the magistrates or persons giving the games, the actor-producer, the composer, the types of instruments and the consuls of that year. It is generally agreed that the didascaliae give us the information of the first production of the plays. There are indications, however, that they also contain facts which pertain to subsequent productions after the death of Terence. Thus in the didascalia of the Adelphoe two actor-producers are named for the play - Lucius Ambivius Turpio and L. Atilius Praenestinus in the Bembinus, the latter and Minutius Prothymus in the Calliopiens. There was only one actor-producer for a production and although the Bembinus also gives two actor-producers for the Eunuchus and Hecyra, significantly it has the singular egit on both occasions. More solid proof is offered by the didascalia to the Phormio. There the Bembinus notes as consuls Q. Caepio and Cn. Servilius. The names probably refer to a performance in the consulship either of Cn. Servilius Caepio, consul of 141, or of

Q.Servilius Caepio, consul of 140, or possibly to performances in both years. Similarly, in the didascalía of the Eunuchus the Calliopians give three consuls, of which C. Mummius may in fact be L.Mummius, consul of 146, while the Bembinus offers two different aediles from those given in the Calliopians. Possibly these are the aediles of 146 (see Dziatzko, Rh.Mus.21,1866,66 ff.; Broughton, The Magistrates of the Roman Republic I 466).

From the didascalía of the Adelphoe we learn that the play was produced at the funeral games of L.Aemilius Paullus. These were given by his sons Scipio Aemilianus and Fabius Maximus in 160 B.C. The dominus gregis was L.Ambivius Turpio, who produced all of Terence's plays and delivered the prologues of the Hecyra and Heauton Timoroumenos. The music was composed, as it was for the rest of the plays, by Flaccus, slave of Claudius, and the instruments were tibiae Sarranae (Sarra being the old name for Tyre), which were a special kind of tibiae pares (see Servius on Aen.9 618). All metres other than the senarius had musical accompaniment but the nature of this music and the significance of the length of the tibiae is not clear (see Beare, 168 f.). The Greek model was by Menander who wrote another play with the title 'Αδελφοί on which Plautus' Stichus was based. The model of Terence's play is known as the Second Adelphoi, the title accorded it in antiquity

(see K.-Th.fr.10). For the possibility of the second play having a double title see on 643 and 671.

The origin of the didascaliae is unknown. Some have thought that they are derived from Varro, others from production copies. The question is reviewed by D.Klose, Die Didaskalien und Prologe des Terenz, Diss. Freiburg 1966, 30 ff. He suggests that they go back to the author's copy of the plays which was probably kept in the private library of one of the Scipiones after his death. The main reason for this view is that the didascaliae give the opus number and this is unlikely to have been recorded in producer's copies. On the other hand the information of revival productions suggests that the author's copy could not have been the sole source. Possibly the didascaliae do spring in the main from such a copy, but we may suppose that they suffered corruption by additions from the work of someone who had gathered information about these later productions.

According to what we learn from the didascaliae and Donatus the Adelphoe is the last of Terence's plays, if one excludes the Hecyra, which was presented unsuccessfully (for the second time) at Aemilius Paullus' funeral games, and which finally won acceptance from the audience later in 160. The didascalia also tells us that the Adelphoe was composed last.

The reliability of the didascaliae has been challenging, however, and some scholars have altered the sequence of the plays and the dates of their production: see esp. L. Gestri, SIFC 13 (1936) 61 ff.; 20 (1943) 1 ff.; H. B. Mattingly, Athenaeum 37 (1959) 148 ff.; RCCM 5 (1963) 12 ff. The question has been examined by Klose (op.cit.), who defends, rightly I believe, the traditional order based on the didascaliae. The challenge to the traditional chronology is based on the evidence of the prologues and rests on two main points:

- (1) Phorm. 30-4 must refer to the third and successful presentation of the Hecyra;
- (2) the natural interpretation of the second Hecyra-prologue is that Turpio brought back the Hecyra very soon after the first unsuccessful production and not after an interval of five years as the information from the didascaliae attests.

If one accepts either of these points, the traditional order of the plays is so disrupted that faith in the information of the didascaliae is shaken. But I do not believe that the interpretations of Gestri and Mattingly are more valid than explanations which can

be offered on the basis of the traditional chronology. Phorm. 33-4 can refer to the successful presentation of H.T. and Eunuchus, and 31-2 can refer to the first production of the Hecyra (cf. Hec. 35). As for the second prologue to the Hecyra, it is not true to say that the parallel with Caecilius shows that Ambivius Turpio brought back the Hecyra very soon after the first failure. From Hec. 14 ff. it is clear that Turpio had experienced several failures and near failures with Caecilius before he began to revive his unsuccessful plays. It cannot be said, therefore, that Turpio brought back a Caecilian play immediately after its failure. It is true that taken in isolation Hec. 37-8 might suggest that the second presentation of the play was given soon after the first, although as has been pointed out the analogy with Caecilius cannot be used to support it. But it would hardly strengthen Turpio's plea for the play if he made a point of stating that almost five years had elapsed before he brought it back. Such a time lapse would hardly be indicative of Turpio's confidence in the merits of the play, and the chronology may have been obscured to avoid prompting in the audience's minds the question why Turpio had taken so long to present the Hecyra for a second time.

I believe that too much is made of similarities of diction and subject matter in order to forge close chronological links between individual plays and to give a more organic structure to the controversy between Terence and his rivals. Finally, it should be said that the revised chronology sometimes creates new difficulties. In his later article, not discussed by Klose, Mattingly placed the Adelphoe in second position after the Andria and before the H.T. (cf. Donatus, Adelphoe, praef.I,8) and put the Eunuchus in last position. Yet the words at Eun.19-20, *si perget laedere / ita ut facere instituit*, suggest that the Eunuchus is chronologically near the beginning of his dispute with Lanuvinus. Moreover, the care with which Terence shows in the prologue of the Adelphoe that he is not guilty of furtum seems to me to presuppose the earlier production of the Eunuchus where Terence had been justly accused of taking material from a play which had already been used by a Roman dramatist.

The periocha

A twelve-line summary of the plot is given for the six plays. They are composed in senarii and are the work of C. Sulpicius Apollinaris, a scholar of the second century A.D., who taught Aulus Gellius and also wrote

brief verse summaries of the books of the Aeneid.

Personae

The list of the dramatis personae does not appear in the MSS. and has been compiled by editors from the scene headings, with the addition of Stephanio, who enters with Syrus and Dromo at III,3. The latter is not given in the headings of this scene either, but appears later in the heading of V,2.

The Prologue

The use of the expository prologue in Roman comedy goes back to the Greek New Comedy writers who in turn had been greatly influenced by Euripides.

In the tragedians the prologos meant simply the part of the play preceding the first entrance of the chorus. The purpose of the dramatist at this point of the play was 'to situate the action in its context of legendary tradition, by giving its time and place, a summary of the events leading up to it and the relationship of the principal characters' (Dodds, Euripides Bacchae, p.61). But while Sophocles' surviving plays, with the exception of Trachiniae, begin with a dialogue, Euripides shows a decided preference for a monologue which is most often followed by a dialogue before the choral interlude. Usually the 'prologue' is spoken by a character who appears later in the play, but sometimes the speaker is a supernatural being who on occasions takes no further visible part in the drama. In these cases the structural linkage of the opening monologue with the rest of the play was weakened, though dramatically the play may have been none the worse for this. The supernatural figures differ from other speakers of the opening monologue in

that they often prophesy what will happen (cf. e.g. Alcestis 65-7, Hipp. 42 ff., Ion 71 ff.).

This Euripidean use of divinities was followed by Menander, the most famous of the writers of New Comedy. Thus, for example, in Dyskolos the expository prologue is spoken by Pan, in Aspis by Tyche, in Perikeiromene by Agnoia (not strictly a divinity). In the last two plays the prologue is postponed, coming after the stage action, as it is in the Cistellaria (spoken by Auxilium) and Miles Gloriosus (Palaestrio) of Plautus. There are two main reasons for the expository prologue in New Comedy. It is a simple and economic way of enabling the dramatist to give the audience the situation underlying the play and to begin the play proper at the moment of crisis - the imminent return of a father or the loss of a lover. Secondly, the genre took over from tragedy, and Euripidean tragedy in particular, motifs such as the exposure of children and recognition scenes of reconciliation (see M. Andrewes, CC 18, 1924, 1 ff.). An ingredient of drama which can readily be exploited in the use of this motif is dramatic irony as well as the suspense which is created if the audience knows what will eventually happen at the end of the play. To unleash these elements of drama the prologue had to be spoken by a

being with knowledge unknown to characters in the play - a supernatural being. We know of no Menandrian play that lacked a prologue and from a prologue of another author of New Comedy (Page, Gk.Lit.Pap., p.272) we can infer that the prologue had grown in importance in New Comedy and that its presence was the norm in all plays. In this fragment the author attacks the boring and lengthy prologues of comedy before proceeding to the exposition of his own play.

Only five of Plautus' plays lack a prologue - Most., Pers., Stich., Curc. and Epidicus. Whether Plautus ever wrote a prologue for all of these and what information was given in them, if he did so, we do not know. It does seem likely that there was a prologue to the last two since they are plays of reconciliation. But even in some of the other plays which do have prologues the audience is given little or no information of the contents of the play. The prologue of the Asinaria tells nothing at all of the hypokeimena and that of the Trinummus tells simply that a young man has spent all of his father's resources. In these cases the main function of the prologue has become that of quietening the audience before the play proper began. Much more like what we know of the

Greek type of prologue are the prologues to the Aulularia, Captivi, Cistellaria and Rudens.

Terence has abandoned the expository prologue completely. Why he did so can be surmised from the effects of this omission. The audience is, for a time at least, as much in the dark about the real circumstances of the play as the characters themselves. The Adelphoe provides a good example of this. It is not until Act II sc.3 that the audience learns the psaltria is Ctesipho's and not until Act III sc.1 that it is told about Aeschinus' own love affair (see pp.65 ff. above). The spectators thus share the emotions of the characters to a greater extent than they would if they had superior knowledge, while the dramatist can exploit surprise to good effect. An additional factor in the abandonment of the expository prologue is probably Terence's aversion to the monologue. We know that the opening scene of the Andria was taken from the Perinthia but that in the Greek play the father spoke a monologue, while in Terence Simo speaks to the libertus Sosia (see Haffter, Mus.Helv. 10, 1953, 16 ff.).

All of Terence's plays, however, have prologues but their function is quite different from that of any prologues that we know of in Greek or Roman drama

(see Klose, op.cit.168). His purpose is stated in And.5-7:

in prologis scribundis operam abutitur
non qui argumentum narret sed qui malevoli
veteris poetae maledictis respondeat.

He uses the prologue in all of the plays except Hecyra to answer charges brought against him and his work by Luscius Lanuvinus and his colleagues. These lines in the Andria suggest, as do Ad.22-3, that the expository prologue was still a common feature in Roman comedy. Terence may certainly be credited with some originality in the manner that he has extended to all of his plays Plautus' practice in some, but in the history of Roman comedy a more substantial claim lies in the use of the prologues to refute the allegations of his opponents. In part this may be the outcome of chance. Had not Lanuvinus criticised Terence's treatment of Menander's Andria before it was produced, we might well have had prologues which simply announced the Greek original and continued a *captatio benevolentiae*. It was a shrewd move on Terence's part to use the prologue as a vehicle to air publicly a literary squabble and thus win the attention of his audience before the play proper began. For posterity his decision was a happy one. Because of it we learn of the differing attitudes of the writers of

comedy at this time on the question of the aims of the Roman playwrights should be, as well as of some of the changes which Terence has made from his Greek model.

The rhetorical nature of the prologues

In diction, structure and style the prologues of Terence resemble miniature forensic speeches.

The prologue itself is called an oratio (H.T.15), the speaker is Terence's advocate (H.T.11,12) and the audience has the role of iudices in the dispute between Terence and his opponents (ad.4; H.T.12,25 ff.). This choice of diction is not peculiar to Terence since Plautus uses similar language in the prologue of the Amphitryo (cf. e.g. 33 f.,50) but the structure of Terence's prologues suggests that he is consciously following the precepts of rhetoricians. (We know from Suetonius, rhet.1, that rhetoricians were expelled from Rome in 161.) Of all the prologues that of the Andria is probably the one that most closely conforms in structure to an oratio as described by the teachers of rhetoric (see Leo, Anal.Plaut.II 15 ff.; Klose, op.cit.81 ff.; Fabia, Les prologues de Térence,283 ff.). The prologue of the Adelphoe falls into four parts - vv.1-5, 6-14, 15-21, 22-5. After the introduction

the next two sections serve to refute two charges which have apparently been brought against Terence, that of using a scene which Plautus had previously used in one of his comedies, i.e. furtum (cf. Eun.23 ff.) and secondly that he has been assisted in his work by homines nobiles. The prologue ends with a warning to the audience not to expect the argumentum and an injunction to show aequanimitas and thus encourage Terence to write more plays.

Stylistically the prologues have a rhetorical flavour in the presence of antithesis, parisosis, paranomasia, homoeoteleuton and anaphora. From the Adelphoe one may note :

indicio de se ipse erit, vos eritis iudices (4)

eum Plautus locum
reliquit integrum, eum hic locum sumpsit sibi
in Adelphos (9 f)

quod illi maledictum vehemens esse existumant
eam laudem hic ducit maxumam (17 f)

partem aperient,
in agendo partem ostendent. (23 f)

For examples of paranomasia note indicio ... iudices (4) otio .. negotio (20; cf. Hec.26): for homoeoteleuton in bello in otio in negotio (20), venient .. aperient .. ostendent (23-4; cf. And.22, H.T.40, Eun.38): for

anaphora, less frequent than other figures, eam ... eum ... eum ... eam (7 ff). Alliteration too is present though in a restrained manner in keeping with the prescription of rhetoricians (cf. e.g. Auct. ad Her. IV 12). It is most obvious at the very beginning of the prologues (cf. Ad.1, And.1, Phorm.1), but occurs elsewhere, though often confined to a pair of words, particularly at the end of lines; cf. fecit fabulam (7; cf. And.3, Phorm.4), expressum extulit (11), populo placent (19), sine superbia (21). With their short sentences, packed with antithesis and word play the prologues exemplify the precepts of the Asiatic style (cf. Leo, Geschichte, 305 and see E. Norden, Die Kunstprosa, 134 ff.).

1. postquam : with strong causal force: cf. Phorm. 1 ff., postquam poeta vetus poetam non potest / retrahere a studio, maledictis deterrere ne scribat parat.

2. scripturam : 'his work, what he writes' (cf. Hec.24, quod si scripturam sprevissem in praesentia) contrasting with the specific play about to be produced. So also ab iniquis casts a wider net than advorsarios. By advorsarios Terence means in particular the malevolus vetus poeta (H.T.22, And.6-7; cf. the plural malevoli at H.T.16) whom Donatus identifies for us as Luscius

Lanuvinus (see on And.1,7, Eun.9, 10, Phorm.2,6,15).

2-3. ab iniquis ... sumus : the suggestion is that the action of Lanuvinus and others springs from the information which they have received from the iniqui. Terence thus implies that Lanuvinus and others employ underhand tactics - an excellent way of blackening his opponents' character at the same time as he introduces the points at issue.

3. rapere in peiorem partem : 'are zealously representing the play in a worse light than it deserves': cf. Pollio in Cic.Att.10.33.2, pium consilium meum raperent in contrariam partem.
quam acturi sumus : feminine because fabula is to be understood: cf. Eun.19, quam nunc acturi sumus Menandri Eunuchum.

4. erit : the pyrrhic scansion by B-B of an iambic word is not common at this point in the line but cf. Cist.529 and see Drexler, Akzenstud.I 195-6.
factum : the omission of id in OCT (and Marouzeau) is probably correct. With the strong break after oportet the demonstrative must be retrospective but there is nothing explicit for it to refer to, except the action of the advorsarios. Such a reference hardly fits the words laudin an vitio duci. Some editors have assumed a lacuna while Kauer believed that id picks up what was implicit in indicio de se ipse

erit.

6. Diphili : Diphilus of Sinope, a slightly older contemporary of Menander and a prolific writer of New Comedy, wrote the Greek plays on which the Rudens and Casina are based. See T.B.L. Webster, Studies in Later Greek Comedy, 152 ff.

7. eam : it is uncertain whether words like eam, eum, meam, meum, etc. are monosyllabic by synizesis or pyrrhic by iambic shortening when they occupy the arsis or thesis of a foot. Lindsay (ELV.59 ff.) decides on the basis of emphasis, the emphatic possessives being taken as pyrrhic. In the lines here the anaphora suggests that on this criterion eam and eum should be pyrrhic. Certainly in 10 the synizesis and complete elision on eum after the elision of the final syllable of integrum is unlikely: scan rather in/tegr(um) e(um) hic, hic shortened by B-B.

In the case of iambic words ending in s preceded by a long vowel (meos, deos, etc.) synizesis is probably more frequent, since in other words like bonos iambic shortening is extremely rare: see statistics in H. Lepperman, De correptione vocabulorum iambicorum, etc., Diss. Munster 1890, 78 (table), 80. For Terence see Laidlaw, 67 ff. Opposition to synizesis came from F. Skutsch; see esp. Geras : Abhandlungen zur indogermanischen Sprachgeschichte August Fick ...

gewidmet (Gottingen 1903) 108ff.

7. Plautu': final s after a short vowel and before a word beginning with a consonant should be printed except where the metre demands that the syllable be 'short'. In Terence this occurs almost always in Terence at the end of the senarius, iambic octonarius or trochaic septenarius before a final monosyllable (cf. 429, 839, 873). These examples cannot be explained by iambic shortening, which can be invoked for almost all the other occurrences of the alleged suppression of final s (see note on 971 for the cretic shortening in omnibus). Lindsay's practice in extending the suppression of final s to other parts of the line is not supported by the linguistic evidence and is based on the arbitrary metrical assumption that Plautus and Terence preferred an iambus to a spondee in the even feet of the senarii (see ELV 126). For the evidence against and discussion of Lindsay's practice see P.W.Harsh, TAPA 83 (1952) 267ff.

It is interesting to note that out of 19 examples where final s has to be dropped at the end of the line the following monosyllable begins with s on 18 occasions. This seems to be an attempt on the part of Terence to render a metrical licence more acceptable by phonetic means, since the length of a continuant is more variable in length than other consonants. The exception is at 839 where the monosyllable begins with f (the sound nearest in quality to s).

9. in prima fabula : 'at the beginning of the play':
cf. Hec.39, primo actu placeo, Hec.822, prima nocte.

10. integrum : here in its original literal sense
'untouched'.

10-1. eum ... locum ... in Adelphos : on the extent
of the Diphilean scene and other changes made by
Terence in Act II see pp.12 ff. above.

11. verbum de verbo expressum extulit : the object
of extulit (here = transtulit for the sake of the
sound figure) is eum locum (cf. Eun.32, And.14). The
phrase verbum de verbo is adverbial (= ad verbum),
modifying expressum, which in turn modifies locum, cf.
Cic.Fin.1.4, fabellas Latinas ad verbum expressas and
Cic.Top.8,35, ἑτυμολογία id est verbum de verbo
veriloquium; schol.on Pers.1.4, Labeo transtulit Iliadem
et Odysseam verbum ex verbo ridicule satis. I follow
Nencini, Riv.di Fil.21 (1893) 476-7 and Dz-K. (see ad loc.)

Terence stresses the closeness of his rendering to
combat the charge that he has spoiled the Greek original
by too free a translation. I take free rendering to be
subsumed in the charge of 'contaminatio': see Beare,
310 ff.: but also W.R.Chalmers, CR 7 (1957) 12 f. and
Beare in CR 9 (1959) 7 ff.

12. novam : his play can be called nova since no part

of it has already been presented on the stage.

13. furtumne factum : the charge of furtum was previously laid against Terence because he had taken the characters of Thraso and Gnatho in the Eunuchus from Menander's Kolax, which had been the model for plays by Naevius and Plautus (Eun.25). Terence admits that charge, but shows that he is innocent in his use of the Diphilean scene here. Terence's opponents may have had inexact knowledge of the Diphilean material used by Terence, when they brought the charge. Klose, (op.cit.155 f), suggests that there was no real accusation brought against Terence and that he is indulging in Selbatanklage, but v.3 does not support this interpretation. Possibly Terence deliberately leaked misleading information about the Adelphoe to prompt an accusation which he could easily refute.

14. reprehensum : 'taken' or perhaps 'recovered': but there is a play on the sense 'found fault with'. The double meaning is directed at Lanuvinus, as is the relative clause qui praeteritus neclegentiast. Terence is being facetious. At And.20-1 he said that he preferred to follow the neclegentia of Naevius, Plautus and Ennius than the obscura diligentia of Lanuvinus and his followers. Now he is claiming that he has recovered a scene omitted because of Plautus'

neclegentia. Why then should Lanuvinus attack him for what he did in the Adelphoe?

15. nam quod ... : nam introducing a new point; cf. H.T.16,671.

malevoli : for malevoli against maledici of the Bembinus cf. And.6-7, qui malevoli / veteris poetae maledictis respondeat; H.T.16,22.

homines nobiles : down to the Ciceronian period tradition is united in linking with Terence's name and work Scipio Aemilianus, Furius Philus, and C. Laelius, the leading members of the 'Scipionic circle': cf. e.g. the lines of Porcius Lincinus (writing about 100 . . .) quoted in the Suetonian Vita (6): Scipio nil profuit, nil Laelius, nil Furius, / tres per idem tempus qui agitabant nobiles facillime: cf. also Vita, 2; Cic.Att.7.3.10. Later grammarians, Santra and Fenestella, proposed other candidates because they alleged the traditional candidates were too young, but even in 168 Scipio Aemilianus had showed his Mattingly RCCM 5 (1963) 39 ff., accepts the traditional identification of the homines nobiles but moves Terence's plays into the late 150's to accommodate it. On the 'Scipionic circle' see A.E.Astin, Scipio Aemilianus, Oxford 1967, 294 ff.

16. hunc : the reading in the Suetonian Vita (4). In the prologues Terence is usually referred to by hic (exceptions are H.T.14 and Hec.6 and 8). Hunc has probably

been changed to eum because of the rarity of the former in oratio obliqua.

17. illi : after isti in 15 illi is here resumptive cf. Epid.154-5, qui ubi tibi istam emptam esse scibit atque hanc adductam alteram, continuo te orabit ultro ut illam tramittas sibi: see Keller, TAPA 77 (1946) 291.

18. eam : by attraction to the predicative laudem: cf.274, stultitias istaec, and see LHS II 442.

21. sine superbia : the point that Terence is making is that his audience and the general populace have not been too proud to accept the help of these nobiles.

Why then should Terence? If he spurned their help or advice, he would be guilty of showing superbia.

See G.Cupaiuolo, Boll.di Fil.Class.6(1899) 65 f.

Others, less convincingly, take the prepositional phrase to refer to the nobiles: see C.Knapp, CR 21 (1907) 45 f. and P.Thomas, Mnem. 49(1921) 2 f.

22-3. The lines closely echo Trin.16-7. By 160 B.C. Terence's audience would hardly have expected an expository prologue from him and these two lines have been adduced as support for placing the Adelphoe immediately after the Andria (see above). Perhaps the purpose of the echo is to remind his audience (and Lanuvinus) that in this divergence from the Greek model Terence is following what Plautus has already done.

23-4. i partem aperient, in agendo partem ostendent:

the first clause refers to Micio's monologue, the second to the dialogue between Micio and Demea.

24-5. facite ... industriam : the prologue ends, like the others, with an appeal for the goodwill of the audience, in return for which the dramatist will write further plays: cf. And. 24 ff.

24. augeat : with long vowel in the final syllable. There are very few certain examples of the long vowel before final t: most of them occur at the locus Jacobsohnianus (cf. Eun. 484, Phorm. 160, 250, Hec. 413; see on 142). Cf., however, Phorm. 720, where dicat is better taken as a spondee, and Hec. 576.

Act I sc.1.

The play proper begins with a monologue which is long by Terentian standards (see Denzler, 96 f.). This is not typical of Terence who shows a marked preference for dialogue in the opening scene. Of the other comedies only in Phormio does a character have the stage to himself when the play commences, but there Davos speaks a short entrance monologue and is quickly joined by Geta. Geta is, in fact, like Chaereas in Dyskolos, Grumio in Mostellaria and Sosia in Andria, a protatic character, introduced by the dramatist for the purpose of exposition, but playing no further part in the play. We know that Terence is responsible for the presence of Sosia in Andria, for Donatus tells us 'in Andria Menandri solus est senex' (prol.v.14). In the Adelphoe, however, T. has remained faithful to his original in keeping the monologue (see notes on v.43 and v.81) and the speech itself shows no apparent signs of Terentian reworking (see note on 44).

The speech is delivered by Micio, who enters from one of the doors, and serves a two-fold function. It informs the audience of the hypokeimena, thereby

announcing the theme of the play - the conflict between the speaker and his brother in the matter of how they bring up their sons, and at the same time Micio's character is revealed.

26. Storax! : Micio comes onstage and calls out along the street for Storax, one of the slaves who had gone to meet Aeschinus. After the vocative there is a pause and from the lack of response Micio, who we imagine has been looking without success for his son and the other slaves before entering, infers that, as he feared, neither his son nor his retinue has returned from the cena.

It is absurd to suppose that Micio comes onstage and then shouts into the house for Storax (so Dz-K., Mar.) and, if non rediit ... ierant is made interrogative (cf. Donatus 26⁴, hoc alii interrogative), that he directs these words to him (cf. Schlee, Schol. Terent., 149). It is equally implausible that Storax comes onstage with Micio and then leaves after answering Micio's question by some negative gesture. Certainly the explanation favoured above gives an unusual opening to a monologue but it is a good one in that the vocative motivates the appearance of Micio

on the stage. The suggestion has been made that storax is an exclamation and not the name of a slave (cf. Giardelli, Boll.di filol.Class. VIII 83-5; Kroll, Rhein.Mus. 60 1905 513 ff.), but the evidence in support of it is weak. We would have a unique example of storax as an interjection (but cf. tuxtax, Plaut. Pers. 264, and prox/prax, Pseud. 1279), while the name Storax, though rare is attested; CIL VI 6407: cf. Austin, The Significant Name in Terence 61. As Donatus suggests (ab odore Storax), the name is connected with the Greek στόραξ, a tree producing scented resin or the name of the resin itself. For an early example of the representation of Greek upsilon by o one may note Tondrus, CIL I² 567.

26. Aeschinus: for the second declension form of the proper noun cf. Plaut. Pseud. 757, trapezitam Aeschinus; CIL I² 904 AISCINUS. The name was also the title of one of Caecilius' plays (cf. Gell. 15.14.5).

27. servolorum. This particular diminutive is used in Terence only by senes (480, 566 And. 83, H.T. 471, 530) and once (H.T. 191) by an adulescens. The forms in these instances do not indicate that the slave in question is young but marks the speaker's social superiority. For other nuances of the diminutive

see note on 101.

ierant: by normal prosody this form of the perfect of eo would be an anapaest and several editors have written iverant (cf. Plaut. Most. 842 and see Leo, Rhein. Mus. 38 1883 22 f.). But ierant is supported by the unanimity of the MSS. and the evidence of Donatus (ierant producta I pronuntiandum, nos addita V 'iverant' dicimus). The form may be explained as a back-formation based on the alternation audierit/ audierit etc. where the long-vowel form is an analogical extension from the -ivi forms. Although L-K. read ierant here (cf. Lindsay on Capt. 194), somewhat inconsistently they reject audierit at Hec. 813 (all MSS) and audieras at Phorm. 573(A).

28. profecto vere dicunt: "It's a true saying". Cf. H. T. 795-6, verum illud, Chremes, / dicunt: 'ius summum saepe summast malitia'.

28-9. si absis uspiam aut ibi si cesses: I read atque ibi si cesses, an emendation of Sydow, de fide librorum Terent., diss. Berlin 1878, inaccessible to me but defended by Engelbrecht, W. St VI (1884) 246. The cause of Micio's anxiety and of the thoughts of the imagined wife is not simply the absence of Aeschinus

E doesn't mention Sydow

and the husband respectively but the delay in their return. So in v.32 the second part of the protasis, si cesses, is repeated. In the context, therefore, the second conditional seems to be a necessary completion of the idea expressed in the first and cannot be linked with aut. Neither vv.145-6, si augeam / aut etiam adiutor sim eius iracundiae, nor v.601, si ita sequom censes aut si ita opus est facto, can be adduced as parallels and support for aut here (so Spengel Dz-K.). In the second example aut introduces an alternative, in the first a modification and it would be relevant, if the sense of the two conditionals here was e.g. 'If you are delayed somewhere or even if you are just out of the house'. Other suggestions include et ibi ... (Langen, Phil.Rundschau 1881 1122); ea tibi, si cesses ... 4 (Havet, Manuel sect.1/54); the merging of 29-30 into one line by expunging aut ibi si cesses and et quae in animo cogitat (Ritschl, Opusc.III 797 ff., leaving irata, however, in an extremely awkward position) si absis ... cesses, ... satius est: utterances of this kind, with the subjunctive in the protasis and the indicative in the apodosis, are much commoner than one would suppose (statistics are in ALL IX 25). Most of the examples fall into the following groups: 1. where the protasis has strong modal force, as in Ad.202:

2. where the relationship between apodosis and protasis is not quite logical, as in Plaut. Epid. 730, invitus do hanc veniam tibi, nisi necessitate cogar (logically one would expect sed cogor): 3. where the modal verbs like possum / debeo appear in the apodosis: 4. where the subject of the protasis is the 'ideal' second person and no modal force is felt (cf. e.g. gaudeas in 255). See more fully the discussion in Handford 110,127 ff., to which this note is indebted, and further examples in Bennett I 274 ff., 319.

29. ea satius est: only example in Terence of a proceleusmatic in the fifth foot of a senarius. But the uniqueness is insufficient to provide grounds for removing it in some way. Phillimore (CR 16 1922 174) proposed ea venire because the demonstrative antecedent usually bears the ictus, but there are exceptions to this; cf. Hec.391, ceterum de redducenda id facias quod in rem sit tuam.

30. in te : "against you." cf. 60, And.874, Eun.4, H.T.878, etc.

31. irata .. parentes propitii : the two adjectives are not uncommonly contrasted: cf. Plaut.Poen.334, an irata est? #propitia hercle est (of Venus): Curc.557,

quoi homini di sunt propitii, ei non esse iratos
puto: Cic.Cael.42, Fiso 59, Att.8.16.2. As in the
first four examples, propitii is almost always an
epithet of deities (cf. Phorm.636). At Att.8.16.2
Cicero uses the word as a jibe at the divine awe in
which Caesar is held (cf. the end of sect.1 of the
letter). Rare exceptions to this usage of propitii
are at Cic.N.D.II 145 and Livy 28.34.10 but in the
latter the words of Scipio to the Spanish (propitios an
iratos habere Romanos mallent) underline what the
relationship between the Romans and Spanish is to be.
The divine connection of the words is quite clear
also at Plaut.Merc.956, tam propitiam reddam quam
quom propitiast Juno - Jovi. The associations of the
adjective and the alliteration are an indication of
Micio's self superiority.

propitii: the frequency with which quadrisyllabic
words of the type appear at the end of an iambic
line or a trochaic septenarius, with the verse ictus
falling on the first syllable, suggests that these
words have retained the earlier initial stress accent
of Latin for a longer period than others, since there
seems no good reason why they should be limited to
this position to the extent that they are (see Lindsay
ELV 33 f., Laidlaw, 12 ff. and W.Sidney Allen, Journ.

of Ling. V 1969 197 ff.). In the case of some words, however, the verse ictus falls on the second syllable. These are explained by Thierfelder (in Fraenkel, Iktus und Akzent ..., 357 ff.) by metrical considerations (e.g. they often appear before the hepthemimeral caesura as ceciderit, 37, and facilitas, 391) or by their position in a syntactic group which affects the word accent. But as Laidlaw points out, there are other examples of these words which Thierfelder's theory does not explain.

33. aut tete amari : I believe the text to be corrupt at this point. I do not think that one can have both tete and amari. If amari were right, the emphasis should surely fall on that, and an emphatic tete anticipates and weakens the strong antithesis in v.34. If tete is wrong, then amari cannot stand because the line is unmetrical. Even apart from this, the distinction between an active and a passive role in lovemaking is weak, particularly in the order that they are presented in the MSS. If one wishes to retain both notions, then I think that one must read aut te amari cogitat / aut tete amare: it would seem bad enough to a wife if her husband is seduced, but how much worse if he is the seducer! However, I would read aut aleri in

place of tete amare after a suggestion of Havet (aut te aleari in ALL (IX) 578). This verb appears only in a glossary (aleatur: cotizat, CGL V 264,39), although the noun aleator is found. How gambling can be regarded as a 'fremden Begriff' (so Kauer, Krit. Anhang ad loc.) I fail to see. Dice was as much an ingredient of the convivium as female company: cf. Plaut. Capt. 72-3, nam scortum in convivio / sibi amator, talos quom iacit, scortum invocat; Asin. 862-3, verum hoc facto sese ostendit, qui quidem cum filio / potet una atque una amicam ductet, decrepitus senex and 904 iace, pater, talos, ut porro nos iaciamus; Bacc. 71.

In the Epitrepontes Smicrines delivers a monologue describing the misdeeds of his son-in-law who has deserted his daughter. Although only fragments of the speech survive, he mentions psaltria and kuboi in vv. 424-5. One may compare the pleasures which the Unjust Logic says have to be given up if one wishes to be sophron (Aristoph. Clouds 1073).

atque animo obsequi : the phrase though meaning 'indulge oneself' probably refers here to eating, since it goes closely with potare and there is no other mention of food: cf. Plaut. M.G. 678, es, bibe, animo obsequere mecum.

34. This line has been bracketed by some editors (Umpf., Fleck.¹, Prete). It does not appear in the Bembinus and there is no lemma or scholion on this line in Donatus. But there are no strong reasons to expunge the line, which was probably omitted in the Bembinus because the succeeding line also began with E. (so Spengel: see Bianco, ASNP 25 1956 96 f.). Cf. Plaut.Most.52.

et tibi bene esse soli, quom: it makes better sense to take soli with sibi rather than with tibi, as L.-K. punctuate, with the meaning 'on her own'. The wife's miserableness derives from her being left at home alone. If one takes soli with tibi, the wife's male esse is left in limbo. So in the elegiac poets separation from one's lover means misery and torment: cf.e.g. Prop.1.12.13 f. The objections to this punctuation, that Terence uses the -ae ending for the dative feminine singular of solus and alter (cf. Eup.1004, Phorm.928 and H.T.271 and see Engelbrecht, Stud.Terent.37) do not seem to me to outweigh the better sense which the punctuation favoured here (with Fleck., Mar. and Rubio) gives.

35. ego: emphatic position, standing in strong contrast to uxor in 32, as Micio illustrates the second

part of the general sentiments expressed in 28-31. The rise in emotional level as he turns from the thoughts of the imaginary wife to his own personal anxieties is clear. The sentence begins as if it will parallel the structure in 31 but becomes exclamatory. Note how in 35-9 each line runs over into the next, the slight tension between logic and grammar in 36 (see note below), and how the section ends with another exclamation, this time accusative and infinitive which is preceded by the interjection. Cf. 866 ff. for a similar change.

35-6. quae cogito et / quibus : all MSS have et but those where line division is observed have the connective at the beginning of 36 (L is an exception). The connective is attested by Servius (on Aen.4.379) but is missing in a lemma in the Donatus commentary (35²). Et here serves to fuse vv.35 and 36 more closely together (see previous note) and I follow the evidence of the MSS. For the monosyllabic connective at the verse ending cf. e.g. Eun.260-1, ubi ... videt mi esse tantum honorem et / tam facile victum quaerere ..., and see Vahlen, Versschlüsse, 15,35.

36. I would remove the exclamation mark after rebus and make ne ... alserit ... dependent on sollicitor. There is a slight illogicality: one would expect quam sollicitor ne ..., but this seems better than taking the ne-clauses as independent exclamations or supposing that metuo is to be understood.

37. aut uspiam ceciderit aut praefregerit / aliquid: the idea of falling makes little sense on its own in this context: ceciderit and praefregerit must form one idea which is an alternative to alserit. Thus Donatus: CECIDERIT AC PRAEFREGERIT iungendum ut non solum 'ceciderit' sed etiam 'praefregerit aliquid'. The MSS all have cec. aut prae. and most editors have printed the line in this form. I agree with Dz.¹ and Prete that ac should be read. The content of the passage which is usually cited as a parallel for Micio's anxiety, Plaut. M.G.719 ff., supports the change of ac for aut. There Periplectomenus states how anxious he would have been if he had had children:

si ei forte fuisset febris,
censerem emori:cecidissetve ebrius aut de equo uspiam,
metuerem ne ibi diffregisset crura aut cervices sibi.

He thus envisages two contingencies - illness (cf. alserit)

or a fall. If his children were ill, he would think they were dying; if they had a fall, he would think they had broken a limb or their neck. Micio is here envisaging the same two contingencies. Ritschl (Proleg. Trin.p.120) also removed aut but re-cast the whole line.

38. vah : here an expression of anxiety or despair: cf.614, And.688. It sometimes conveys anger (cf.415), admiration (589, Eun.730) or derision (cf.187): see Richter, Studemund I 635-42.

quemquamne hominem : on -ne see note on 330 and for the use of quisquam as an adjective see note on 366: the accusative and infinitive of exclamation is here equivalent to a negative statement - 'no one (emphatic) should

38-9. in animo instituere aut / parare ..: these words raise two problems, one a minor problem of syntax, the other a much more important one of meaning. The MSS are divided between in animum (VPE) and in animo. Support for the accusative case is given by Plaut.Most. 82, argumentaque in pectus multa institui (cf. also Rud.936, magnas res hic agito in mentem / instruere) and by the fact that the ablative is the more common and therefore less likely to have been expunged, if it

is the correct reading. I would therefore print the accusative.

The meaning of the phrase causes some difficulty because it is linked by aut with parare and must therefore have the relative clause as its object. Vahlen (Veresschlüsse, 40) interprets the phrase thus: "etwas in das Herz oder in den Sinn stellen das man nicht besitzt, aber zu besitzen wünscht". He is followed by Lewis and Short - "to set one's heart upon". I cannot see how this meaning can be extracted from the Latin: the phrase must mean 'to ponder' or 'to decide, resolve' (cf. Conradt, Hermes 10 1875 109). Aut, I believe, must be removed and parare must be dependent on in anim.instit. Cf. Hec. 99, ut posset animum inducere uxorem habere. As for how aut got into the line, I suggest that at some time it was marginal gloss on 37, offered as a variant or (supposed) correction of ac, and that it became attached to 38 even after the preceding line had been changed in the MSS.

40. atque: 'and yet' -adversative as often in Terence; cf. 362, And.225, miquidem hercle non fit veri simile: atque ipsis commentum placet., 350, H.T.207, Phorm.389. et also can have this sense:

cf.726 and see Fraenkel, Horace, 358 n.2 on Epist.

1.20.7 and Leo, Nach.Gött.Ges.1895 423-4.

is adeo: adeo is intensive, emphasising is: cf. And.

579, tute adeo iam eius audies verba, Eun.303. Most

editors take it in the sense 'quite / very' with

dissimili, as in Eun.204, adulescentem adeo nobilem

(see Dz-K.), but metrical considerations support the

view given here. Terence, unlike Plautus, occasionally

admits a tribrach- or anapaest-word at the end of a

senarius or trochaic septenarius. But such words are

always preceded by a monosyllable and the two words

go closely together to form a quadrisyllabic unit:

cf. quid agitur (Ad.373,883,885, Phorm.610); quid

agimus (Eun.1088). Thus adeo here should be taken

with is rather than with dissimili. See Drexler,

Akzentstud.I 117; O.Skutsch, Pros.u.metr.Ges.65;

Laidlaw, Prosody,103. The Bembinus reads ex fratre

meo / is ... (unmetrical) and some editors have

followed the testimony of the codex antiquissimus

by transposition of words (ex fratre est meo, Dz.:

fratre ex meo, Fleck.): Prete reads sed ex meo fratre

at the end of 40! Adeo is clearly right.

42. ego hanc: the demonstrative hic is usually

shortened after ego: cf. e.g. 553, And.708, Phorm.529,

Eun.794. Phillimore (CR 34 1920 150) therefore proposed ego hanc ille ... But there are a few exceptions (cf. Ad.757, ego hos convenio, H.T.1012) and complete uniformity does not have to be postulated. Emphasis may fall not so much on ego but on hanc, picking up the idea of dissimili studio: i.e. I've lived this (accompanied by a gesture?)...., he on the other hand ... L-K. admit hiatus after ego, but the evidence for this kind of hiatus is very slender (cf. Laidlaw, Prosody,92), and, as stated, I am not sure that ego is necessarily as emphatic as the admission of hiatus would suggest. I would scan the first foot as an iambus.

clementem vitam urbanam: vitam urbanam forms one unit and no connective is required to link clementem and urbanam: cf. Varro, R.R. 3.11, duae hominum vitae, rustica et urbana.

clementem: the word evokes the metaphor of a 'sea of troubles': although the adjective is first applied to winds and rivers etc. in later literature (cf. Catull. 64.282, clementi flamine; Ovid Met.9.116, qua sit clementissimus annis), this is thought to be its original usage (cf. Ernout-Meillet, s.v.) It is interesting to note that Seneca uses this image in connection with otium: Epist. Mor.19.8, aliquid et pro

otio audendum est, aut in ista sollicitudine
procurationum et deinde urbanorum officiorum
senescendum in tumultu ac semper novis fluctibus ...;
de otio 1.2.

otium : the philosophical basis of Micio's methods of upbringing, expounded in the second part of the monologue and contrasted with the complete absence on Demia's part of any theoretical foundation, is consistent with the Aristotelian and Greek notion of schole. In his description of the ideal city Aristotle says that citizens should not be involved in trade or be georgoi, since these activities are inimical to virtue (Polit.VII 1328b 33 ff.). In other words, those for whom Aristotle primarily outlines his theory must not, like Demia, devote themselves to work, but, like Micio, have the means to allow them to live most of their lives in schole and thus to follow a vita contemplativa, superior to a life of practical activity (cf. E.N. X 1177b 4 'It is thought that happiness consists in leisure'.) It is doubtful whether many of Terence's audience would have been able to see the otium of Micio in the same light, since there is little to suggest that otium had in 2nd. cent. Rome the same positive notions of schole in 4th cent. Athens.

See J.L. Stocks, CQ 30 1936 177 ff.; O. Skutsch, Studia Enniana, 163 ff. (with further references there).

44-5. quod putant, / ... habui : jokes against and complaints about marriage and wives (especially one's own) are commonplace in New Comedy (cf. Demea's remarks at 867 and see note there). It is natural to take Micio's words in this way also and to take uxorem numquam habui as picking up quod fortunatum. (Dz-K. and L-K. mark off uxorem, following an interpretation recorded by Donatus and the punctuation of Iovialis. This is not attractive.) Micio is not, however, saying that he feels the same way as isti (see below on this) and at the end of the play he is pressured into marrying Sostrata.

43. isti: referring to Micio's fellow citizens. R.M. Keller (TAPA 77 1946 261 ff) has ably refuted the view put forward by Bach (Studemund II 211 ff.) that iste has always the connotation of the second person. Keller shows that the primary force of iste is strongly deictic. I believe that that is the force of isti here, and that there is no reference in the pronoun to the Roman audience. Nor is this likely since there is no other instance in Terence of the

dramatist's breaking of the dramatic illusion. One might have expected a relative clause (cf. Men. 766 ff., Afran. 156 ff.) to define isti, since elsewhere the demonstrative has a particular reference when used pronominally (cf. 806, And. 15, Phorm. 704). Probably isti is used here to indicate (more clearly than quidam would have) that Micio does not agree with this attitude towards marriage (see W.G. Arnott, G & R N.S. 10 1963 140 ff.).

The word created difficulties of interpretation even in antiquity. In the Bembinus we find a scholion isti: qui uxorem habent and in Donatus 'isti' autem id est: hi qui a me dissentiunt (43⁵). There are other scholia on this line in Donatus which also seem to be attempting to explain the pronoun: 43² ET QUOD FORTUNATUM ISTI PUTANT Romani scilicet, qui caelibem quasi caelitem dicunt, et item Graeci, apud quos sunt huiusmodi sententiae Now it is rubbish to suppose that isti can refer either to the Romans or the Greeks in general, but the scholion is indicative of the awkwardness of isti felt even in antiquity. The third scholion on this line reads FORTUNATUM ISTI PUTANT utique uxorem non ducere - dicit autem Romanis id videri, quos spectatores habet. Menander ... After

'Menander' there is a citation from the Greek dramatist which is corrupt but the final words appear to be

οὐ γυναῖκα λαμβάνω. I suggest that the first part of the third scholion (FORTUNATUM ducere) is misplaced and should belong to the fourth scholion on this line and that dicit autem λαμβάνω is a continuation of 43². That is to say, because there was doubt whether the pronoun isti referred to the Romans or Greeks, recourse was made to the Menandrian original for help (cf. Don. on And. 483). Because Menander is cited after it is stated that isti refers to the Romans one might conclude that 'Micio' at this point in the Menandrian play made no reference to the Greek audience or to his fellow citizens (i.e. in terms of the play). But since μακάριος or some word like it appears to be imbedded in the first part of the citation it is probable that 'Micio' said he regarded himself as lucky in not having a wife. If this is so, Terence may have changed the Greek to make the agreement of Micio to marry Sostrata at the end of the play more acceptable.

44. numquam habui: since the Greek fragment on which this line is based seems to have had either λαμβάνω or λαμβάνων it is likely that Terence has made Micio

older than he was in the Greek play (so Rieth,²⁵ and cf. discussion of the changes which Terence may have made in connection with the marriage of Micio at pp.104 ff. above). Lefèvre, who accepts the present participle, argues on the basis of the participle that this section has been taken over by Terence from the Menandrian prologue (see p.144 n.35 above). ille contra haec omnia: with L-K. I punctuate after omnia, taking contra as an adverb and assuming an ellipse of the verb: cf. Lucilius 720, ille contra omnia inter plures sensim et pedetentim foris / ne quem laedat. Some editors take contra as a preposition, haec being retrospective. The only other possible prepositional usage of contra in Terence is at Phorm. 521-2, nunc contra omnia haec / repperi qui det neque lacrumet. But I prefer to punctuate after haec and with F. Skutsch to take the sense as 'now all this is changed': cf. Varro R.R. 1.13.6, itaque illorum villae rusticae erant maioris preti quam urbanae: quae nunc sunt pleraque contra, 3.2.4. (see Dzied.-Hauler ad loc. Krit.Anhang).

45 ff. Note the long series of clauses, conspicuous for their brevity and the asyndeton (45-52). This stylistic feature was noticed in antiquity as a

characteristic of Menander's style (see Handley on Dysk. 19 ff.) but is also frequent in Terence. A good example is at Eun. 540 ff.

45-6. agere se habere: the historical infinitive is usually the equivalent of an imperfect tense (cf. e.g. And. 62 ff.) but can denote an action that continues into the present (cf. 864). The historical infinitive is very rare in the case of reflexive verbs (see Bennett I 419 ff.; Wölfflin, ALL X 177 ff.).

47. inde: = ex eis; used personally, as often, though not exclusively, in Comedy: cf. Phorm. 1006 f. (uxorem duxit) . . . et inde filiam / suscepit iam unam; 1015, eam compressit unde haec natast, etc. See LHS II 208 ff.

48-9. The two lines show a more complex form of a tricolon crescendo, since the second and third members themselves consist of two clauses in asyndeton: cf. the similar structure in 61-2 (1) quor perdis adolescentem nobis? (2) quor amat? / quor potat? (3) quor tu his rebus sumptum suggeris, / vestitu nimio indulges?

One finds the same phenomenon in a succession of words also: cf. 319 ruerem - (1) agerem (2) raperem (3) tunderem et prosternerem (see note there) and 472-3 (1) lacrumans (2) orans obsecrans (3) fidem dans, iurans . . .

Terence is extremely fond of the tricolon structure,

sometimes of the crescendo type, often reinforced by anaphora, especially when the level of emotion is high: cf. in addition to 61-62, 305, 758, 789-90. See J. Straus, Terenz und Menander 1 ff., who points out how much more frequent anaphora is in Terence than Menander (see pp. 10-1 for list of triadic anaphora) and B. Denzler, 75 ff., where his statistics show that anaphora increases in Terence's later plays.

How deeply ingrained the tricolon structure is in Terence's composition can be seen by a closer analysis of vv. 45-9. These lines can be divided into three parts:

- (1) ruri agere vitam; semper parce ac duriter
se habere;
- (2) uxorem duxit; nati filii
duo; inde ego hunc maiorem adoptavi mihi;
- (3) eduxi a parvulo; habui amavi pro meo;
in eo me oblecto, solum id est carum mihi.

The third section is itself a tricolon crescendo, as has been stated, and so also is the second: but the three sections taken together fall into the same structure.

49. in eo: the demonstrative is neuter, as id and the construction with oblecto suggest, and the sense is 'in this' viz. in his being my son.

50. facio sedulo: Hauler (W.St.40,1918,81-4) suggested that the Bembinus, which often retains archaisms which have been lost in the Calliopians (cf. e.g.168,531), offers the correct reading here in adsedulo. It is certainly difficult to explain, but in the absence of any corroborative evidence of this reading in the grammarians (Servius has sedulo at Aen.10.567), sedulo must be read.

51-52. do, praetermitto ... agere: another example of the tricolon crescendo (see on 48-9). The context makes it clear that the objects of do and praetermitto which are to be understood are argentum/sumptum and peccata respectively or some such words. These actions exemplify how Micio attempts to have the love he feels for Aeschinus reciprocated, and it is difficult not to feel that Micio acts in this way because he fears that strictness may turn his son against him, although he goes on to defend his methods in a more philosophical discussion of what the aims of a father should be and how best they can be attained. Compare the sentiments of Demaenetus at Asin. 64 ff., esp.76-7.

52. pro meo iure: the patria potestas gave a Roman pater familias almost unrestricted powers over the

members of his household, in particular ius vitae necisque: see A. Watson, The Law of Persons, ch.8; Crook, Law and Life of Rome 107 ff. Note that Micio still implies that on the occasion he acts toward Aeschinus as one subject to his potestas, though there is little other evidence of this in the play. One feels that the reproach made by Laches to Phidippus in Hecyra might be directed at Micio : etsi ego meis me omnibus scio esse adprime obsequentem, / sed non adeo ut mea facilitas corrumpat illorum animos: / quod tu si idem faceres, magis in rem et vostram et nostram id esset. / nunc video in illarum potestate esse te, 247 ff.: cf. Aeschinus' monologue at 707 ff. Demea's opinion of Micio's methods is very similar to Laches' (cf. e.g. 61 ff.). 52 ff. postremo filium; for his last point the simple and fast-moving style (with asyndeton and absence of subordination) gives way to a more complex structure where use is made of word- and phrase-position and of the abstract as subject of a transitive verb (see note on 104) to give a more lofty tone to Micio's expression as he claims in a rather proud and self-satisfied manner his superiority over other fathers. The position of alii clanculum patres

outside the relative clause strengthens the contrast between alii and filium, while clanculum patres is balanced by ne me celet in a chiastic-type arrangement. Note the effect of vowel assonance as the predominant a in 52-3 gives way to e in 54 and of the alliteration in 54 (celet consuefecit filium).

clanculum: used only here as a preposition. Diminutives are often used to sharpen contrasts and such a purpose may be the reason for the diminutive here cf. 562-3 (tantillum) and see J.S.Th.Hanssen, Latin Diminutives. A Semantic Study 11 ff., 42.

54. Micio is blissfully unaware, as is the Roman audience, that Aeschinus has not told him of his violation of Pamphila nine months before or that a baby is about to be born as a result of that union. If there was an expository prologue before Micio's monologue in Menander, the Greek audience would have enjoyed the satisfaction of the dramatic irony in Micio's claims. If, on the other hand, as I have argued (see pp.65 ff. above) the prologue was spoken in the Greek play after the departure of Micio at v.154, the immediate effect of Micio's words would be lost, though the Greek audience could look back

and see the irony of Micio's monologue and of the claims of the two fathers.

55-6. Editors have disagreed to a considerable extent over the text of these two lines and Umpf. obelised 56. I read (after Speng.¹, Plessis, Psichari)

nam qui mentiri aut fallere insuerit patrem,
audebit tanto magis audacter ceteros.

The MSS have aut between patrem and audebit and read audebit for audacter. The difficulty lies in the semantically awkward combination of insuerit and audebit. One or other would be suitable in the protasis, not both. Also, without aut the emphasis falls where one would expect - on the antithesis of patrem and ceteros. As the text stands aut audebit bears the emphasis, diverting it from patrem. Perhaps the presence of aut between 55 and 56 arose from some marginal note or query on the use of aut in the phrase mentiri aut fallere: aut was incorporated into the text, and audacter was changed to audebit in order to provide a verb for the apodosis. Or has aut been added to make sense of the passage after corruption of a different kind had occurred? Certainly the end of 56 as proposed seems readymade for corruption by

haplography - AUDACITERCETEROS (cf. the spelling of the adverb in the Bembinus at H.T.58, Phorm.11).

For the sound figure in the proposed reading of Plaut.Capt.630, qui id tam audacter dicere audes? The sound play would be in accord with the stylistic level of the context: cf. note on 52 ff. and liberalitate liberos in 57.

On the basis of instituerit in the citation of the line by Martianus Capella (see crit.app.) Kauer retained aut and read institerit, the reading which is found in OCT. But although institerit / aut audebit makes better sense than the one in the MSS, the improvement is minimal.

57. pudore et liberalitate: Micio is thinking of attributes which a parent cultivates in his children and which will prevent them from going astray. On pudor 'a sense of shame' see note on 827 ff. Micio hopes that by being lenient Aeschinus will be restrained by the feeling of shame from taking advantage of his father's generosity: cf. And.261 ff., amor misericordia huius, nuptiarum sollicitatio, / tum patris pudor, qui me tam leni passus est animo usque adhuc / quae meo quomque animo lubitumst facere, eine ego ut advorsor? Liberalitas is a more general

term embracing qualities like honesty, integrity and comes close to humanitas in some instances: cf.e.g.664. For liberalitas as an important theme in the play cf. 449,684,828 and see McKendrick, Riv.di Fil.Class N.S.32 (1954) 18-35, who suggests (unconvincingly because of the treatment of Micio in the play) that the contrast between Micio and Demea is to be seen as mirroring the real-life differences between Aemilius Paullus and Cato. The Greek eleutheriotes is often discussed in terms of its being a mean between lavishness and stinginess (see Aristot. E.N. IV), but like liberalitas, embraces other qualities (cf.ps.Aristot.V.V.1250b 32f.).

For similarities with Micio's theory expressed here and in 66-7 cf. Menand.fr.609 and see K-Th. ad loc.

Note the absence of the normal caesura -penthemimeral or hepthemimeral - in this line, inevitable here because of the length of liberalite. Such lines are unusual but not rare: cf.107,463,833. Sometimes there is elision after the arsis of the third foot: cf.47, 114,119,355. See Drexler, Lizenzen. 124 ff.

liberalitate liberos : a figura etymologica, much more common in lyric and long verses than in senarii, where it often appears in philosophising passages or

in highly emotional contexts: see Haffter, ch.1
esp.30 ff.

59. haec, conveniunt: cf. Nepos Alcib.10.2, quae
regi cum Lacedaemoniis convenissent, Cic.Tusc.5.39,
hoc . . . mihi cum Bruto convenit, Livy 23.39.2, quae
cum Hannibale legatis convenissent. The construction
is rare in early Latin cf. Plaut.Pseud.1111-2 cum nis
mihi nec locus nec sermo/convenit. 'I do not share
their company or in their conversation'. The tone is
perhaps rather solemn: note the abundantia.

60. venit ad me saepe clamitans 'quid agis?': the
line can be retained as transmitted, only if clamitans
is dactylic and if one accepts a proceleusmatic in
the fourth foot with a pyrrhic ending as the first
half. The line is quoted with clamitans by Cicero
(de inv.1.27: cf. Victorinus on Cic.Rhet.p 303H) and
to Craig (CC 23 1929 117) this early testimony provides
overwhelming evidence for retaining the line as
transmitted. But despite this, the metrical anomaly
can hardly stand and clamitans is the obvious suspect
part of the verse. With most editors I would read
clamans (see Feh1,40; Questa, Mnem.12 1959 334).
Other editors who retain clamitans either omit agis
or change it to ais (see e.g. Marouz. and cf. Ernout,

Rev.Ph. 76 1950 220-2) L-K. print the reading of the MSS, defending it by suggesting that the abnormal rhythm expresses trepidatio. But it seems oversubtle to suppose that Terence had Micio here convey Demea's excitement by these means.

63. vestitu: usually taken as a dative; cf. neglectu, H.T.357 (but anui, H.T.639). But syntactically it seems better to understand eum (cf. Eun.222, H.T.988) and regard vestitu as an ablative.

64. nimum ipse durust: 'he himself is extremely harsh': durus is always metaphoric in Terence (see Langen, Jahrb.f.class.Phil.125.689). It can refer to a man's character or temperament as here, or to the external circumstances of life such as those that a poor man endures (cf. vita dura in 859).

praeter sequomque et bonum: this use of -que et to link words that are near synonyms or closely connected with each other has a solemn and lofty tone which fits the patronising and didactic tone which Micio adopts here. Cf. the tone of Davos' words at And.675 ff., ego, Pamphile, hoc tibi pro servitio debeo, / conari manibus pedibus noctesque et dies; Ph.1051 (solemn promise); Eun.87^f, accipioque et volo; Ann.trag.2, sileteque et tacete; Pacuv.340, annisque et aetate. See note on

301 and cf. LHS II 515.

66. qui ... credat: a causal relative - 'since he (Demea) believes': the transition from the particular occurs at 69. Demea is the subject of errat.

67. quam illud quod amicitia adiungitur: these words form a contrast with vi quod fit, the sense of which I take to be 'authority which is exercised by/with force' (si vi imperes). The words illud ... adiungitur can mean 1. 'that authority which is imposed by means of friendship' (adiungere = iniungere; cf. Cic. Catil 4.8, adiungit gravem poenam municipiis) or 2. 'that authority which is acquired by friendship' (cf. Cic. Rosc. Amer. 116, auxilium sibi se putat adiunxisse; Mur. 41, benevolentiam adiungit lenitate audiendi). This second meaning seems to be the one taken by Marouzeau- que celle (autorité) qu'on se ménage par l'affection'. However, the acquisition of imperium is not relevant here, since Micio is talking of the imperium which a man has over his son qua father - the patria potestas, and the point under discussion is how that imperium is administered. The first meaning is therefore preferable.

But I am not altogether convinced that the text is correct here, and would find it more acceptable if this meaning of adiungere was attested in early Latin

where the sense of 'adding' (cf. Cas.441-2) or 'joining, linking' (cf. Aul.236, Curc.190) is always present, and if adiungere in this sense of 'imposing' did not seem to be an inappropriate verb for Micio to use of his own system. Although qualified by amicitia it evokes a dominus-servus relationship, the very type of relationship which Micio disclaims for himself (cf.76). A possible emendation would be quam illud quod amicitia adiungitur, quod having been corrupted to quod because of the antecedent: cf. Plaut. Bacc.543, nullus est quod inuideant(nullus est qui inuideat, codd.). For the sentiment cf. Nepos Dio 5, ex quo intellegi potest nullum esse imperium tutum nisi benevolentia munitum.

68 ff. Micio now gives in general terms the reason that he thinks the beliefs of Demea are erroneous. The main point which he makes is one which he shares with the Peripatetics: that there is no virtue in anyone's doing out of compulsion or fear what is thought to be morally good. Such a person will abandon such actions if he thinks that his behaviour will escape detection. On the other hand, a person whose trust you gain by kindness will follow your

advice whether or not you are there to see what he does. Rieth (19 f.) aptly quotes Aristot. E.N. VI, 13, 1144a 13 ff. and III 11, 1116a 27 ff. Micio sums up his theory in 74-5 and draws a distinction between dominus and pater (see pp. 81 ff. above).

68. The verse introduces Micio's summary in general terms and the tone accords with the pontificating didacticism to which Micio is prone. The two phrases mea sic est ratio and sic animum induco meum mean much the same. This type of phrase doubling is often found in highly emotional contexts and its frequency in tragedy gives a rather pompous air to Micio's words. See Haffter, ch. 3. and Davies CQ N.S. 18 1968 142 ff. The effect is reinforced by the example of makrologia: animum induco meum= persuasum habeo.

69-73. A good example of some aspects of Terence's style and of why he was a favourite author of the teachers of rhetoric. Note how he varies the length of clause and colon in the first part of the lines so that one finds coincidence of metrical caesura and syntactic break at the penthemimeral

in 69,71 and 73, hepthemimeral at 70 and 72: the use of rhyme (facit, credit, redit, facit, erit) and other sound-figures (officium facit, see on 603, praesens absensque): how the apodosis in 72-3 forms a tricolon crescendo.

70. Two difficulties in this line. First the Bombinus reads pavet against cavet of the Calliopians and Donatus. Cavet ('he is on his guard; i.e. against doing other than what is expected of him) makes a better contrast than pavet with ex animo facit, while pavet is the lectio facilior and can stand more readily on its own to complete the sense. See Bianco, ASNP 25 1956. 97, who defends cavet.

The second difficulty involves id. To what does the pronoun refer? It is not easy to accept that it refers to something which is itself understood as the object of cavet. I would bracket the pronoun as an interpolation, which was inserted to make clear the subject of rescitur iri was not personal. Marouzeau prints dum is resc.iri. This makes better sense but since there is no mention of id in the apparatus, it is not clear whether is is a 'happy' misprint.

72. ille: the final vowel of ille is sometimes, though by no means always, as is the case with nempe, suppressed when followed by a word beginning with a consonant: cf. 213, 265, 395, 476, 863. The older view that ille in such contexts where a trochee was impossible was scanned as a pyrrhic was ousted by F. Skutsch (Plaut. u. Roman. 97 ff.). See Laidlaw, 28.

quem ... adiungas: 'whom you bind close to you': see on 67. The mood of adiungas is accounted for by the 'ideal' second person subject: see on 254.

ex animo facit: the line stands in contrast to 69 and we are to understand suom officium: ex animo 'voluntarily, of his own free will' and not by compulsion (malo coactus): cf. 919.

73. studet: pyrrhic by iambic shortening. Most often it is in the first element of an iambic line that an iambic word becomes pyrrhic: cf. 118, 145, 154, 250, 373, 402, 407, 639, 673, 728, 900, 924, 931. On the other hand, iambic words in this position are more often not affected by iambic shortening: cf. e.g. 23, 53, 69, 83, 120, 370, 392, etc. It seems, therefore, that the dramatist could invoke such shortening when he wished.

The explanation of this phenomenon is still

incomplete, although much work has been done to clarify the conditions under which iambic shortening is permitted. In brief, a long syllable can be shortened, if it is preceded by a short syllable (brevis brevis) and if that short syllable or the syllable following the long bears the word accent. This means in fact that a long syllable bearing the word accent can not be shortened. See Lindsay, *ELV* 35 ff., Laidlaw, 16 ff. *Quaest.*, 31-70.

Although it seems certain from words like bene, male, ego, etc., which are regularly pyrrhic in the classical period, that iambic shortening reflects a phenomenon in the spoken language, one may wonder how far the comparative frequency of iambic shortening in early drama (i.e. compared with later literature) is an artificial extension for metrical purposes. Some scholars have felt that it is the verse ictus and not the word accent which is a factor in the shortening: since verse ictus and word accent coincide to a considerable degree, it is difficult to decide. However, certain observable phenomena point to a connection with word accent. When an iambic word ends an iambic line or a trochaic septenarius, it can not be

preceded by another iambic word (Bentley-Luchs 'law': see on 559) and in general a sequence of two iambic words is avoided. The reason for this would seem to be that a long syllable could not retain its quantity if flanked by two short syllables when both of them have a word accent: the law suggests that the verse ictus is not powerful enough to counteract this tendency (see Harsh, Iambic words 66 ff.).

I incline to accept that the word accent plays the predominant part in causing shortening, though it is difficult to explain the shortening of the initial syllable of ille, ipse and iste. One has to assume that these words were unaccented when subject to shortening: cf. Laidlaw.20.

73. par referre: cf. Eun.445, par pro pari referto (or tu par pari referto? see Dz.-K. on this line): Plaut. Asin.172 and see Otto, par 3.

74 ff. Note how Micio sums up in a triadic anaphora (see on 48-9).

76. hoc ... interest: note the personal construction and the use of singular verb (cf.340,837 with note there). The case of hoc is probably accusative: cf. Eun.232,

232, stulto intellegens quid interest?: for the distinction between pater and dominus cf. Menand. Epitr. 510-1.

qui nequit: consuefacere ... metu is to be understood.

77. nescire: the omission of a pronominal subject accusative is extremely common: cf. 162, 151, 359, 401, 402, 415 f.

78. sed estne hic ipse ...: Micio now sees Demea approaching. Whether the latter enters from the forum or from the country it is not clear. If we are to imagine that Micio's house is near the forum, then Demea may have heard the news he brings as he was going to the forum and instead of proceeding there he has come to Micio's house. He could thus enter from the country. In v. 92 hoc (= huc) could refer to Demea's journey from the country into the city or to his visit to Micio from the forum. I am inclined to feel that he enters from the country and that he continues on his way to the forum at 140. While there, he hears of Ctesipho's part in the raptio.

79. nescioquid: the o is short as usual: for such vowel weakenings cf. quandoquidem, siquidem and see

note on 539 and 969. Here nescioquid is adverbial:
cf. And.340, H.T.620.

80-1. salvum ... gaudemus: this form of greeting
is given when the newcomer arrives from a distance,
either from the country, as perhaps here (cf. Eun.976),
or from overseas (cf. Phorm.610, Plaut.Most.805). See
note on opportune in 81.

Act I sc.2.

Demea's first words complete the verse begun by
Micio. This type of 'scene'-opening is favoured by
Terence: cf. 635, 958 And.580, Eun.1049, H.T.954, Phorm.
795, Hec.767 and see note on 166 and 956-8) but is
rare in Plautus (cf. Bacc.583, Capt.658).

81. ehem: an interjection primarily indicating
surprise and uttered (1) when one person suddenly
see another (cf. esp. And.317 f, Phorm.375) and (2)
when a person suddenly remembers something that he
or she has forgotten: cf. Plaut. Poen.118, Eun.504 ff.

Luck (Interjektionen 69-70) explains it as a kind
of 'filler', spoken when a person does not know how
and where to begin and is groping for words. This is
not convincing and I believe that Luck is wrong in

this respect, although he is right to question the supposed concomitant pleasure which Richter (Studemund I 425 following Hand.Turs.s.v.) alleged was present in the interjection. The examples of ehem which do not appear in greeting-scenes are the basis for this new interpretation of Luck's (see op.cit.74 ff.) But it seems to me to Poen.118 and Eun.504 ff. are better explained as above. Similarly in M.G.36, PYR. quid illuc quod dico? AR.ehem...., I take ehem to indicate that Artotrogus pretends to have suddenly realised what the soldier is talking about. At Most.726 Tranio is playing the innocent and ehem performs much the same function as it does in M.G.36. At Rud.804-5 ehem shows that Daemones has caught sight of the clavator. Of the other examples given by Luck in this section ehem in Plaut.Stich.224 and Truc.505 is certainly used in an unusual way but in the latter ehem is a conjecture and better, I feel, would be eho, as it would be in the former also. At And.682 I would read em (cf. And.351-2; MSS.read hem). At Phorm.387 we find in the MSS. hem, ehem, eho and em (according to Umpf. in A). This is a difficult example, and Luck's interpretation does make better sense than em or hem. This, however, would be the

only example of monosyllabic ehem (Luck believes that ehem was not disyllabic). But even if Luck is right in printing ehem here, can one not understand the interjection as indicating that Phormio has suddenly thought of how he can get out of his difficulty?

opportune: ellipse of verb as often in Terence with adverbs (cf. 417 ff., 805). The first syllable of opportune is short by E-B. to give a tribrach in the second foot. Anapaests with a break after the first short do occur, but only when that element is a monosyllable or when the two words are closely connected (cf. And. 155 propter amo/rem; Ad. 386, an/te pedes but pedes may be pyrrhic: see Laidlaw, 34-5).

Donatus tells us that Terence made a change from his original at this point: in Menander 'Demea' returned the greeting, Terence illum ad iurgium promptiorem ... facit. This is a nice touch and indicates how upset and angry Demea is (see Haffter, Mus. Helv. 10, 1953, 25). Straus (38 f.) attempts to minimise the significance of the change by pointing to other instances in Plautus and Terence where the greeting is not acknowledged and concluding that this formula is not a greeting at all. But where there is no acknowledgement to the salvom te advenire gaudeo

type of greeting the person to whom it is spoken has already greeted the person onstage: so H.T. 406-7, Hec.353. Eun.976 shows that this expression was one type of greeting. The failure to return the greeting is indicative either of the character or of the emotional state of that person: cf. Eun.976, And.533, where Chremes cuts short the greeting, since he is disturbed about the news he has heard. See G. Williams CR NS 7 (1957) 121.

81. quaerito: frequentative form with intensive force as often: cf. e.g. rogito in 558, 619, H.T.251, all of which are spoken in emotional contexts.

82. rogas: it is rare to find an iambic or spondiac word occupying the third foot of a senarius. The reason seems to be that a clash of word accent and verse ictus is avoided. Even here there is no clash, since the following me probably affected the accent: cf. And.774 where dsbit is preceded by non (do these form a word-group?). See note on 131 and cf. Drexler, Lizenzen 124.

82-3. rogas sum?: a much discussed passage. I would read (with the older editors and Marouzeau of the more recent) rogas me, ubi Aeschinus / siet, quid

tristis ego sim? - 'You ask me when we have Aeschinus (for a son) why I am out of sorts?' Even with the punctuation of the OCT sim, the repudiating subjunctive (cf. fecerit, 85; 288 and note there), is preferable to sum, the reading in GVE and in the citation of this line by Donatus on 789.

The difficulties concern (1) the position of siet and (2) the meaning of ubi. The sense required by ubi (quandoquidem) is rare but is paralleled by Plaut. Epid.588, non patrem ego te nominem, ubi tu tuam me appelles filiam? Editors have been reluctant to accept ubi in this sense and have therefore had to get rid of siet to make sense of the passage. For example, Ritschl (Proleg.in Trin.,120) proposed rogas me? ubi nobis Aeschinust? / scin iam and variations have been rung on Ritschl's conjecture (see Dz.-K. ad loc.). These changes seem to have some justification because of the unique position of siet in this line. In Terence the forms siem, etc. occur predominantly at the end of the line: where they appear internally, we find them at the diaeresis (Hec.737, Phorm.822) or at the end of the dipody (Hec.567,637, Eun.479). There are two exceptions - at Hec.

860 and Eun.240 but sit and siet appear in the MSS. and either is possible metrically. It may be that the archaic form has replaced the classical (see note on 712).

I suggest that Terence has placed siet in this unusual position deliberately in order to obscure the line division and to convey Demea's sense of outrage: cf. the frequency of hyperbole in his language - neque .. quicquam, 85. neque .. quemquam neque ... ullam, 84-6; omnem ... omnes .. omni, 89 ff.

Kauer retained siet, punctuating with a question mark after it and taking ubi in the sense 'where?', but his interpretation, that Demea, absorbed with thoughts of Aeschinus, thinks that Micio also knows of Aeschinus' misdeed and has asked him where Aeschinus is, does not convince.

83. dixin: the words dixin hoc fore? are given to Micio by editors. Spengel² makes an extremely attractive suggestion by giving these words to Demea and comparing 507, non me indicente haec fiunt. In the Bembinus, in fact, the letter B (for Demea) is placed before these words, although it is difficult to account for its presence there since the preceding

words must be spoken by Demea also, unless it comes from a marginal note stating that D. spoke these words. I would follow Spengel in this respect: spoken as an aside by Micio (and referring back to 79-80) the words seem to me to come dangerously close to breaking the dramatic illusion in a most un-Terentian manner, if they do not actually do so.

84. quid fecerit: repudiating subjunctive, picking up quid fecit?: cf. 261, quid est? quid sit?. See on 288.

84-5. quem ... pudet ... metuit .. putat: the relative pronoun is not normally repeated in a series of connected relative clauses: cf. And. 93 ff. Plaut. Rud. 291.

86-7. nam ... dissignavit: this seems an extreme example of elliptical nam. Ashmore supplies the ellipse '(and there is renewed evidence of this) for ...'. Nam makes sense if taken with modo quid dissignavit and I would make illa quae ... omitto parenthetical: cf. H. T. 457 f, nam ut alia omittam pytissendo modo mihi / quid vini absumpsit, ...: Hec. 418 ff. o fortunate, nescis quid mali / praeterieris qui numquam es ingressus mare. / nam alias ut mittam miserias unam hanc vide. Nam would then be elided before the parenthesis: cf. the elision

of the final syllable of imperium in Phorm.232 before the parenthesis ac mitto imperium.

87. modo quid dissignavit: modo is emphatic contrasting with antehac: cf. H.T.216 ex sua libidine moderantur nunc quae est, non quae olim fuit.

dissignavit: the sense is 'what shameful deed he has just done': cf. Nonius 76, dissignare - cum nota et ignominia facere. But how it acquired this meaning is not clear. Kauer (ad loc.) argues for the spelling diss= (all MSS. except A and E) on the better manuscript support for this spelling at Plaut.Most.413 and Hor. Epist.1.5.16. Perhaps the prefix suggests that the semantic development was from 'tearing open something illegally' to 'performing any violent or disgraceful act'. See Nettleship, Journ.of Phil.10 206, Contributions to Latin Lexicography, 441.

88 ff. This fine tirade of Demea's is worth looking at closely. Note the hammer-like effect of the series of clauses in asyndeton and how Terence avoids monotony by the use of enjambement and by varying (1) the point in the line where the clauses end, (2) the position of the verbs in these clauses and (3) the length and nature of the clauses (statement, exclamatory and interrogative).

The section ends with the forceful antithesis in 96-7, haec quom illi Micio / dico, tibi dico, tu illum corrumpi sinis. with antithesis and word repetition. The effect of the whole passage is enhanced by sound figures. Note for example how certain vowels predominate in different sections: quam amabat; clamant (91), illi Micio / dico, tibi dico (96-7), orest omni populo (93). Demea describes Aeschinus' action in strong terms: effregit, mulcavit usque ad mortem, eripuit. These one feels might be more suited to the description of a military exploit (cf. Eun.773) than to the snatching of the girl. Certainly Demea seems prone to exaggeration, not only in his narration of the deed but also in the reaction of the citizens (omnes indignissime ... omni populo).

89. dominum: Demea does not identify the dominus as a leno but the audience would readily have gathered this from the frequency of such raptiones in New Comedy: cf. Menand. Kolax 120 ff. and the complaints of Battaros in Herodas II esp.63 ff.: also Plaut. Pers.569 ff.

92. hoc advenienti: the word order favours taking

hoc as the archaic form of huc rather than the neuter object of dixere (see on 878).

quot : the MSS. have quod; for the common orthographic differences in the MSS. see Dz.-Hauler, Krit.Anhang on 159.

93. in orest omni populo: on the dative see note on 318. For the sentiment cf. Menander, Epitr. 408-9.

denique: introducing the final point; cf. postremo in 123.

94 ff. Demea points to the son who has remained in his charge as an example for Aeschinus to follow: cf. Cic.Rosc.Amer.43, patres familiae qui liberos habent, praesertim homines illius ordinis ex municipiis rusticanis, nonne optatissimum sibi putant filios suos rei familiari maxime servire et in praediis colendis operae plurimum studique consumere?

Unknown to Demea and to the Roman audience Ctesipho, the son in question, has been having an affair with a psaltria and it was to help him that Aeschinus stole her from her owner. See note on 54.

95. rei: i.e. rei familiari (see previous note). The word is probably monosyllabic: cf. 854. Eun.540 and how

the datives fidei and spei are always disyllabic and monosyllabic respectively (see Laidlaw, 70-1).

96. huius: referring to Ctesipho, in contrast to Aeschinus (illi).

96-7. illi ... tibi: the equivalent of in illum and in te : cf. 140.

97. tu illum: although not demanded by the metre, it seems desirable to allow prosodic hiatus with shortening of the initial syllable illum because of the obvious emphasis which tu bears. Most of the certain examples of monosyllables in prosodic hiatus occur when the monosyllable bears the verse ictus: see note on 118.

98. This type of comparative expression is common in both Greek New Comedy and in Plautus and Terence: cf. Menand. Epitr. fr. 6, fr. 596, 491, 539, Diphilus II K fr. 87, 104, Plaut. Bacc. 394, Poen. 504. The usage reflects a tendency of Umgangssprache to describe events or persons in somewhat exaggerated terms: see Hofmann, 89 ff. and note on 211-2.

100. quorsum istuc?: strictly, quorsum means 'whither? / to what end?' and elsewhere in Terence

the idea of 'motion towards' can usually be felt: cf. And.127, 176. One would logically expect a purpose clause in response - 'to show you that you are mistaken'. : cf. Cic.Red. adquir.5. But for a similar response to quorsum cf. Cic.Brut.292, quorsus inquam istuc? non enim intellego. quia ...

101. flagitium: the word seems to have been used of a noisy, insulting protest made by a person who has been cheated or wronged to the perpetrator in an effort to recover his rights: cf. Plaut.Merc.417. The word in Plautus and Terence usually refers, as here, to the kind of action which would have prompted the self-help procedure. See Usener, Rhein.Mus.56 1901, 1 ff.

101. mihi crede: in other occurrences of this parenthesis or variants of it in Roman comedy the imperative comes first (cf. Phorm.494, H.T.85, Eun.898, Plaut.Men.1089) and this seems to have been the usual form in the late Republic (see Schmalz, Zeitschr.f.d. Gymnialwesen, reported by Landgraf, Rosc.Amer.p.187). The tone of the parenthesis here may be more assertive and didactic than crede mihi. The significance of the word position may well be what Donatus is drawing attention

to in his note: quasi imperito dicit 'mihi crede', non enim 'me intellege'. quod imitatus Cicero sic Caecilium exagitat 'magna sunt ea quae dico, mihi crede; noli haec contemnere: hic enim et auctoritas'. I suspect that non enim 'me intellege' may be a later addition to the commentary.

adulescentulum: diminutives often carry emotional overtones, although here the word may be used to minimise the misdeeds of Aeschinus and to refute the charges of Demea (cf. Phorm. 661 ff. and see Hanssen, Latin Diminutives 39 ff.). The diminutive ending is naturally well suited for verse endings and only on two occasions (Eun. 539, 102) does adulescentulus not appear in final position. Other diminutives, however, occur frequently enough internally to refute any idea that the use of diminutives is for metrical purposes alone (cf. parvolo, 48; paullulum, 217; lectulos, 285, 585). On the "affective" use of diminutives see Hanssen, passim; Fordyce on Catullus 3.18.

Lower class characters use a wider range of diminutives than senes or adulescentes. (e.g. aedricula, cistella, complusculi, diecula, lacrimula, plusculus, puellula, ratiuncula, tantillus, pauxillulus)

but a senex uses grandicula, muliercula, pauperculus and an adulescens meliuscula. It does not seem, therefore that Terence is differentiating to any significant degree the idiolects of the social classes in the use of diminutives. The difference lies rather in the role of the slave, etc. in the play and the kind of action he takes part in (see Hanssen 71 ff.).

104. siit: this form of the perfect is supported by the citation of this line by Diomedes, Gr.L. I 374, 16, in support of a similar form in Varro - ad mortem me perducere non siit. At And. 188 sivi is the form of the perfect.

siit egestas: Haffter (ch.4) points out that in Plautus the use of an abstract noun as subject of a transitive verb is confined with few exceptions to the long or lyric metres, while in Terence there are more than forty examples of this type in senarii. He maintains, however, that there is still a difference of tone in the construction, which depends on the kind of line in which it is used. In the senarii the construction is used to give special emphasis to an idea that is being expounded: so here Micio lays

stress on the fact that Demea and he did not do such things in their youth because of their lack of money. Certainly special emphasis does lie on egestas but the construction must still have struck the audience as highflown and sententious. It is interesting to note that most of the examples of this construction in senarii in this play are spoken by Micio (cf. 53, 833, 855) to whose character and fondness for sermonising it is well suited, and by Hegio (470) who speaks in a way which seems at times to approach a parody of rhetoric (cf. 471 ff., 494 ff.) as he assumes the role of champion of the poor, helpless household against the outrages of the privileged and the rich. Thus I believe that Terence employs this stylistic feature in the play to add to his delineation of character.

105. id laudi ducis: i.e. no praise is deserved if one does what is good simply because one did not have the opportunity to do otherwise. Micio repeats to Demea the thought which underlies his philosophising in his monologue (see note on 68 ff.). So Aristotle in the discussion of the panegyric

speech stresses that the orator must show that the person being praised acts kata proairesin (Rhet.I 9 32).

Laus is a powerfully emotive word. To the Romans with their strong consciousness of their personal and familial status the desire for public recognition of services to the state was a very potent driving force behind personal and national achievements: cf. Cic.Imp.Pomp,7, semper appetentes gloriae praeter ceteras gentis atque avidi fuistis: Naev.trag.17, laetus sum laudari me abs te, pater, a laudato viro. See J. Hellegouarc'h, Le vocabulaire latin des relations et des partis politiques sous la republique (Paris 1963) 365 ff.

106. si esset ... faceremus: for the use of the imperfect subjunctive in past unreal clauses (the original usage) cf. Plaut.Aul.742, deos credo voluisse. nam ni vellent, non fieret; Asin.678, Accius 614 ff. See Handford, sect.139-40, Bennett, I 278-9.

fieret: the i, usually short (cf.624,690), is long in fieri, fierem, etc. when these forms are in final position: cf. And.792, Eun.92 and see Laidlaw,96.

107. si esses homo: the noun implies not only that Demea is stupid (i.e. contrasted with e.g. lapis, cf. note on 579) but also probably that Demea lacks understanding of human nature and fails to make allowance for its weakness. It is in T. that to any great degree we find homo, humanus embracing positive aspects of human nature - sympathy, kindness, equanimity etc. In Menander anthropos denotes man's weakness as opposed to the power of the divine, although fr.484, ὡς χαρίεν ἔστ' ἄνθρωπος, ἂν ἄνθρωπος ᾖ, may be an exception (see Rieth, 21, on ἀνθρώπινος in Demosthenes. In Terence cf. 145, 736, Hec. 554, And. 113. Plautus has few examples of this pregnant sense of humanus: cf. Most. 814, Merc. 319. On the pregnant use of homo, humanus etc. see P. Kolaklides, Terentiana (Athens 1954) 48 ff.; H. Haffter, Neue schweiz. Rundschau 11 (1954) 719-31; K. Buchner, Studium Generale (1961) 636 ff. with bibliography there.
108. dum per aetatem decet?: the evidence of the MSS. favours licet and I prefer this to decet which is printed by Dz-K. and L-K. The sense of the dum-clause is 'while his age permits him (dum aetas fert / sinit)'; cf. And. 443, dum licitumst ei dumque aetas tulit,

amavit, where licitumst refers to Simo's attitude (cf. 198, sivi animum ut expleret suum) and aetas not to the young man's age but to his circumstances, the contrast being made between how a young bachelor with no commitment to marriage can behave differently from one with such a commitment. In this passage the distinction is between youth and old age. Because of this contrast Dz-K. thought that only deceat could stand in this line: "alieniore aetate can only refer to an age when the activity of an Aeschinus is no longer seemly, not to an age when such behaviour is not allowed". But Micio is surely not saying that Aeschinus' behaviour is decens, as the argument of Dz-K. suggests. It seems to me to be begging the question to state that there is an exact comparison between the dum-clause and alieniore aetate. The parallels they adduce for the sense of alieniore aetate - Tib. 1.1.71, iam subrepet iners aetas, nec amare decebit, and Hor. Epist. 2.2.216, et pulset lasciva decentius aetas - show simply that it was not decens for an old man to engage in love affairs and that it was decentius for a young man to do so. Rather is Micio saying that allowance is made for

youth in such matters (licet): cf. Cic.Cael.28, datur enim concessu omnium huic aliqui ludus aetati, et ipsa natura profundit adulescentiae cupiditates and Varro, Sat.Men.87, properate vivere, puerae, quas sinit aetatula ludere, esse, amare et Veneris tenere bigas (cited by Austin in his note on the Ciceronian passage).

109. te expectatum: compression of thought: 'on your long-awaited death'.

eiecisset foras : 'rushed you out for burial': The verb, stronger than extulisset, implies that the proper funeral rites for a citizen will not be observed and that instead of 'lying in state' for a period of days the body will be removed from the house with precipitate haste: Cic.Milo 33, Clodi cruentum cadaver eiecisti domo (i.e. the body still uncleaned): Horace, Serm.1.8.8 huc prius angustis eiecta cadavera cellis / conservus vili portanda locabat in arca. At Cic.Sulla 89, non iam de vita P.Sullae, iudices, sed de sepultura contenditur; vita erepta est superiore iudicio, nunc ne corpus eiciatur laboramus, the sense of the verb is 'throw away' rather than 'throw out'.

110. alieniore aetate : cf. Plaut.Cas.518, cano capite, aetate aliena; Bacc. 1163, tun, homo putide, amator istac fieri aetate audes?; M.G.618 ff. me tibi istuc aetatis homini facinora puerilia / obicere neque te decora neque

tuis virtutibus

tamen : i.e. despite the constraint D. has placed on him.

111. tu homo : homo is pejorative: cf. And.778 tu pol homo non es sobrius? and at the same time Demea rejects Micio's notions of what is humanum (in 107). So later in the play Micio challenges Demea's idea of humanum (734-6).

112. ah: probably uttered as a sigh rather than an ejaculation, ah can cover a wide range of feelings - exasperation as here (cf.127,853), pleasure (e.g.269,445) and sorrow (309,329). See Richter, Studemund I 393 ff.

113. ne .. optundas: purpose clause - 'so that you may not repeat your frequent barrages on my eardrums'. cf. Donatus on And.341 translatio a fabris, qui saepe repetunt tundendo aliquid malleo et item obtundunt atque hebetant; Plaut. Cist.118, aures graviter optundo tuas; H.T.879-80, desine deos, uxor, gratulando obtundere / tuam esse inventam gnatum. Saepius is slightly awkward. Micio is telling Demea not to worry him again on this point and the comparative implies that B. has often done so in the past. Here saepius is almost a strengthened form of the positive: see LHS II 168 f.

116. illi : Donatus takes this as an adverb and is followed by most editors, but ego illi seems to pick

up and balance mihi peccat and I would take illi as the dative of the pronoun.

fero : the tense has been changed to the future in the Calliopians (printed by Marouzeau) because of the influence of the future tenses in 118 ff. But Micio is talking in this line about the expenses he has borne up to this time. It is only in 120 that he refers specifically to the event described by Demea.

117. obsonat: the verb implies the buying of fancy and luxury foods (cf. 964). The reading scortatur which appears in Varro's citation of the line (L.L.7.84) I take to be an erroneous recollection of 102. The presence of scortatur in the first tricolon anticipates and disrupts the sequence of thought. Micio begins with the peripheral expenses of a young man engaged in a love affair and then in 118 ff. turns to the costs of love affairs themselves. Craig (CQ 21 1927 90-4) prefers scortatur and Lindsay gave notice that scortatur should be read for opsonat in the OCT (CQ 23 1929 113).

117 ff. The clauses opsonat ... unguenta, amat, fores effregit and discidit vestem are equivalent to conditional clauses in relation to the clauses which follow them.

The vigour and incisiveness of the parataxis make this a stylistic feature which is at home in colloquial speech and in Kunstsprache: cf. Eun.251 ff. id rursum si negant, laudo id quoque; / negat quis: nego; ait: aio: Note how a conditional clause leads into the asyndeton as in 115 of this play: cf. also H.T.487-8, Horace, Serm.1.1.45; Cic.Phil.11.19 and see LHS II 657.

118. de meo: for the possessive pronoun cf. Plaut. Bacc.89, Men.149, Truc.953: cf. de te in 940.

dum erit: dum must be left in prosodic hiatus. The examples where the elision of monosyllables is metrically necessary are more numerous than those where hiatus is demanded. For the latter in this play cf. 111 (me ad), 514 (si est), 780 (quo abis), 903 (te amat), 920 (tu ais): in iambic oct. 183 (o hominem), 211 (cum ero) 215 (qui hodie), 336 (mi homo), 341 (quom amat), 527 (me ubi): in trochaic lines 304 (o hominem), 680 (te amo), 680 (quae agis), 705 (quam ego). In all these examples except 514 and 183 the monosyllable bears the verse ictus. See Soubiran, L'éli-sion dans la poésie latine, 332 ff. and notes on 143, 313, 946.

120-1. discidit vestem : although Micio seems to be thinking of the particular incident described by Demea (fores effregit: cf.88), Demea made no mention of the tearing of clothes. But since this was almost a traditional part of amorous encounters (cf. e.g. Hor. C. 1.17.28, Prop.2.5.21, Lucian 3.299, ὅστις ... μήτε .. περιέχειρεν ἢ τὰ ἱμάτια περιέσχισεν, ἔτι ἐραστῆς ἐκεῖνος ἐστίν; quoted by Headlam-Knox on Herodas 2.69 and see note there), there is hardly any need to suppose that we have here any indication of Terence's carelessness in vortere or of contaminatio: cf. Menand.fr.655 ἱμάτιον ἀκούμεθα, also Epitr.312 ff.

121-2. et - dis gratia - / est unde haec fiant, et ... with Fabia I read et est dis gratia, / est unde haec fiant: et ... (with shortening of est after et). Such parataxis is rare, a causal clause being the usual construction (cf.138, And.771); Hec.653, evenit, habeo gratiam dis, (cited by Spengel) is not good support for there is a clear break after evenit, as the punctuation in OCT makes clear. However, compare Ovid.F.1.701-2, gratia dis domique tuae, religata catenis / iam pridem vestro sub pede bella iacent, Met.7.511, gratia dis, felix et inexcusabile tempus. I take this example here to be an antecedent (with est) of this construction.

At any rate, I feel that est must have been present in 121 in order to cause the corrupt et in all MSS. at the beginning of 122. Et there must, I believe, be changed to est, although Marouzeau for some reason keeps it. The corruption of est to et in 122 and the absence of et in 121 in some MSS (CPDGEv) are probably connected. I suggest that in a common ancestor of the MSS. et was omitted in 121 and that this word was placed in the margin and that instead of and in addition to being added in the appropriate place in 121 it ousted est in 122. Something similar may have happened with aut at vv.37-8 (see note there).

123. cedo : imperative formed from the deictic particle and dare : cf. Oscan ce-bnust and see LHS I 309.

arbitrum: both in Athens and in Rome it was a common procedure for two parties to submit a dispute to an arbitrator (diaitetes,arbiter), and swear to abide by the decision he gave. The parties involved could be citizens, aliens, or slave.: cf. Menand.Epitr. 42 ff., Plaut.Rud.1005 and see RE IX 313-4. Such an arbitrator necessarily judged the issue on the grounds of equity: cf. Arist.Rhet.I.13.19, ὁ γὰρ διαιτητῆς τὸ ἐπιεικὲς ὀρᾷ, ὁ δὲ δικαστῆς τὸν νόμον.

124. ei mihi : here a groan of disgust and anger; cf. 452, 753: sometimes expressive of grief; cf. 789. The interjection is always spoken by male characters, though whether that is significant in the case of this interjection seems doubtful. See Richter, Studemund I 460 ff.

125. disce ab aliis: two interpretations are possible. Either Demea is telling Micio to learn how to be a father from him or he is making a sarcastic comment on Micio's alleged superior knowledge (i.e. disce is not directed at Micio: cf. 372, 914). I prefer the latter since the one is in keeping with the cutting sarcasm in 127 and 138.

aliis is the reading of Donatus and is supported by Laidlaw (AJP 57 1936 415) who pointed out that a monosyllable is never the brevis brevians of a demonstrative if that demonstrative is unemphatic (but cf. 757). Since he felt that illis was weak here, he preferred with L-K. aliis. But illis can have strong deictic force as Demea refers in a disparaging tone to Micio and I would print illis of the MSS.

126. For the sentiment of this line cf. Menand. monost. 647, πατήρ ὁ θρέψας, οὐχ ὁ γεννήσας πατήρ.

127. tun consulis quicquam?: Demea picks up consiliis and throws it back at Micio in verbal form : cf. the reverse at 741-2 corrigas ... corrector! The Bembinus and E read consilis and most editors have printed consiliis. I prefer the verbal form with L-K. Prete records in his apparatus that in the Bembinus there seems to be some mark between the I and L. This may be a trace of a correction of I to V.

Some support is given for consulis on metrical grounds. Terence, like Plautus, usually has an iambus in the second and fourth feet of a senarius if a polysyllabic word ends there (Meyer's 'law': see *Quaest.*, 194 ff.): so 76, 95, 111, 114, 131, 143, 153, 366, 413, 458, (twice), 462, 488, 503, etc. The 'law' does not hold if the final syllable of the polysyllabic is elided or if it is followed by a monosyllable or if the final dipody consists of one word or word-group. But the law is still broken in the trochaic lines 549 and 683² where these conditions are not met: see *Quaest.*, 200 f. Certainly spondaic words are a rarity in the second or fourth feet of the senarius (sanum at 748, but followed by te: haecin at 379) and the reason for the phenomenon underlying Meyer's law seems to that clash of ictus and word accent is avoided.

127. si pergis, abiero: although it is often stated or implied by editors that the future perfect in apodoses is not different from the simple future and is used for its metrical convenience (see e.g. Shipp on And.397-8 and Dz-Heuler on Phorm.220) and this does seem to be the case in some exx., the future perfect does on occasion seem to add some notion that would not be conveyed by the simple future. So here I think abiero refers to the completion of some action before another can take place: the sense here 'I won't be here to listen to you'. Cf. Plaut.Aul.656 hunc si amitto, hic abierit (i.e. before I can catch him).

128. sicin agis?: 'Is that so?' spoken with more than a tinge of sarcasm. Cf. Thais' retort to Parmeno Eun. 99 f., PA. credo, ut fit, misera prae amore excludi hunc foras / TH. sicin agis, Parmeno?, also Eun.803-4 CH. diminuam ego caput tuum hodie, nisi abis. GN. ain vero, canis? / sicin agis?.

In iambic lines the break of a dactyl after a trochaic word occurs almost exclusively in the first foot: cf.457, ille tibi; 752, t(u) inter eas; 237 hoccin illo (?illo). In most cases the two words are closely connected. For such a caesura internally cf.139, iste tuos, and Eun.403, sicub(i) eum. See Laidlaw, 36,

and Drexler, Lizenzen, 1 ff.

128. an ... : the introductory particle marks a sharpening of Micio's tone as his hackles rise at Demea's sarcasm: cf. 136,468, and 185 with note there.

129. curaest mihi : the subject is Aeschinus. Demea does care deeply for his son as is shown by his concern for his moral welfare: cf. 137, and the reluctance with which he severs all connection with his son at 436-7.

131. ambos : spondaic words or word-endings are very rare in the third foot of the senarius in Terence, and Fleck.² transposed ambos curare to avoid the clash of ictus and word accent. But the examples seem frequent enough to make emendation on these grounds alone somewhat dangerous. In some instances there is no clash of ictus and accent, since the spondaic word goes closely with the word following: cf. illum tuom, 107: gnatum tuam, And. 540; gnato meo, H.T.429; noster Chreme, Phorm.609; omnes vos, H.T.26; also istuc in Ad. 450. Examples where there does seem to be clash are at And.526 (illud); H.T.495(illos); Phorm.307 (istum); Ad. 463(adoptandum); 833 (adfert) and Eun.190 (Thais): cf. Laidlaw,4.

132. repscere illumst quem deisti: Micio very shrewdly silences Demea (or almost does so) by suggesting that Demea's interference is tantamount to asking for Aeschinus back. We learn the reasons for the adoption at 809 ff. Demea thought that his estate would not be large enough for two sons and in fact he devotes most of his time to accumulating as large a patrimony as possible for Ctesipho (cf. 868). Micio knows full well that Demea has no wish to take Aeschinus back and thus have to support him. Demea is quick to deprecate Micio's suggestion (ah Micio!).

133. quid istic?: a formula expressing submission or resignation to another's argument or request. Cf. Donatus on this line: deest loquor aut resisto: nam proprie significatio est de sententia sua decedentis and his notes on And. 572 and Ad. 350. It is not at all clear what the original fuller expression was.

134. profundat perdat peraet : tricolon with alliteration. Demea has yielded, but his annoyance at Micio's tactics is shown by the perhaps too forceful renunciation of any interest in Aeschinus. Note how the tricolon is favoured, although only two ideas are

expressed: 'let him squander his money (profundat, perdat), let him destroy himself (pereat)': see note on 497. For profundere in this sense cf. Cic. Cat.2.10, patrimonia profuderunt; Off.2.55, prodigi qui ... pecunias profundunt.

135. iam si verbum unum posthac: Micio cuts Demea short as he threatens to launch into another tirade: cf. And.790. Other editors suggest that there is aposiopesis as at 140 (so Ashmore, Dz-K.) This seems less satisfactory. Cf. Micio's impatience with Hegio and how he cuts him off at line 600.

136. an non credis? repeto quem dedi?: the punctuation could be improved. I do not think an non credis? makes much sense here. Marouzeau punctuates an non credis ...? repeto quem dedi? and this is an improvement. But one does not need to mark a pause or change of construction. I would take the two clauses together in parataxis - an non credis repeto quem dedi? a coalescence of an repeto quem dedi? and non credis? Cf. And.313 credo impetrabo ut, where I hardly think one can explain credo as parenthetic (so McGlynn) and And.578 num censes faceret..

The Calliopians have repeton. The addition of -ne to

indicate the interrogative is not uncommon in the Calliopians: cf. H.T.707, Phorm.737 and with metrical disruption H.T.684, Phorm.120, See Craig, Jovialis,35.

137. alienus: 'unrelated' opposed to cognatus: see note on 672.

si obsto ... : aposiopesis; cf. And.164, Eun990.

137. em, desino: 'There! I say no more'. The explanation, upheld by F. Skutsch (Philol. 13 1901 497 f.), that em is etymologically linked with the verb emo (i.e. the imperative with apocope) has been rejected by G. Luck (Interjektionen, ch.II) who links the form with Greek ἤν and thinks that em represents a 'short, unmodulated nasal sound', (op. cit. 11). The connection with ἤν is not in itself improbable, since both interjections have a similar deictic function, but I am not convinced that Luck is right. He does not discuss Plaut. Capt.859 (cedo manum. # em manum), which provides good grounds for supposing some verbal force in em, and to some extent misrepresents Skutsch's arguments - e.g. (1) there is no certain example of total elision of em and (2) em

is never found with a plural dative or imperative (see J.G.Griffith's review in CR N.S.18 1968 304). Is the explanation of (1) that the final m was consonantal (because of its connection with emere)? (hem, which Luck plausibly describes as a 'long, rising nasal sound', does seem to suffer total elision at And.270, though Luck would remove the interjection from the text rather than admit total elision, op.cit.31).

138-9. Demea gets in a final jibe as he sarcastically echoes Micio in style and words: cf. the asyndeton in 117 ff. and Micio's words at 121-2.

139. quom ... est: a causal clause is common with verbs of thanking : cf. And.770 and Ad.596.

quom ita ut : elision, though not required here, is extremely common at the beginning of lines; cf.654,

nam habitat Miletii: see Soubiran, 341-2, Drexler, Akzentstudien II 326 ff. Of conjunctions quom and dum suffer elision most often (about 50% of their total number of occurrences): see statistics in Soubiran,428.

iste tuos: on trochaic caesura see on 128. The phrase, like the preceding words, picks up sarcastically an earlier expression of Micio's, viz. is meus est factus, 115, iste having strong deictic force.

139-40. sentiet posterius ... aposiopesis again as in 135. To take sentiet in the pregnant sense 'He'll feel it later.' (cf. H.T.752, Phorm.171) and punctuate with a period after posterius makes nolo ... dicere very abrupt. See note on 853.

140. gravius: surely the comparative adverb and not the neuter adjective, despite the reading gravius quicquam dicere in 8: cf. Hec.717, oremus, accusemus gravius ...

Demea now leaves the stage, probably to the forum, either to complete or begin whatever business has brought him from the country.

In the MSS. there is no scene heading after this line. New scenes are indicated when a character enters, not generally when one character remains onstage to give an exit monologue: cf. Sannio's monologue at 196, Hec.444 but, exceptionally, before Hec.274: see Andrieu, La dialogue antique, 140 f.

141. tamen: Donatus takes tamen with what precedes, going closely with neque omnia contrasted with nec nil, but nec nil neque omnia forms too coherent a unit to punctuate after rather than before tamen. It is never-

theless true that tamen in a logical sense does pick up the idea that not everything that Demea said was true.

142. mihi :sed : to avoid the pyrrhic caesura of the tribrach one must take mihi as iambic (no other certain example in Terence: see Laidlaw, 98) or assume syllaba anc. in pausa. It is interesting to note that most examples of this type of tribrach occur before the final dipody, i.e. at one of the loci Jacobsohniani where in Plautus, unlike Terence, hiatus and syllaba anceps are admitted (see Questa, 151 ff., Enk in Appendix of edition of Mercator: denied by Lindsay, ELV 231 ff. and Laidlaw, CQ 30 1936 33 ff.): so 343, Sostrata vide; 521, rectius.ita; 598, virginis eas, 394 nisi sapientia; 839 scilicet ita. Possibly then in the pyrrhic caesura of the tribrach in the fourth foot we have vestiges of locus Jacobsohnianus (see now Questa, Mais 20 1968 373-89). Similarly in the iambic octonarius we find on occasion a syllaba anceps at the diaeresis (Ad. 260, 348, 619, Phorm 830) although, especially in this play, Terence has gone a long way to abandoning the bipartite octonarius with diaeresis of the fourth foot and an iambus there (see on 170).

Note too that some of the awkward example of iambic tibi, sibi, etc. occur in the locus Jacobsohnianus: Hec.680, tibi causam vides; And. 112, mihi faciet patri; Hec.997, neque tibi (at the first cretic of a trochaic septenarius). But one must say that one finds examples at other parts of the line: e.g. tibi begins a senarius at Hec.623. 143. nam itast homo: nam in prosodic hiatus. Otherwise there is contrevention of Bentley-Luchs 'law'. The 'law' does not hold if the final iambic word is preceded by a monosyllable, but even if one regards itast as the equivalent of ita and est, nam must still be elided by Drexler's extension of the law. He showed that the penultimate foot cannot consist of two monosyllables if these go closely with each other or with the final iambic words (Akzentstudien II 34).

144 ff. I cannot make much sense of the passage as it is punctuated in OCT. A comma must be placed after deterreo and advorsor sedulo et deterreo taken as dependent on quom, the two verbs going closely together and adding to the sense of placo (see note on 856-7).

This is the punctuation in most editions. What does advorsor sedulo et deterreo mean? It must describe some action which is opposed to that implied in 145-6. There Micio seems to imply that he would increase Demea's iracundia if he rebuffed him in the same emotional way as Demea attacked him. I would translate the line thus: 'Though I try to placate him, though I am very careful in opposing and deterring him, ...' On this sense of sedulo, 'carefully' rather than 'eagerly', 'zealously' or 'strenuously' cf. Plaut.Aul.113, nam nunc quom celo sedulo omnis ne sciant. For the apo koinou construction cf. And.24, favete, adeste aequo animo et rem cognoscite.

This type of arrangement of a series of three verbs with two linked together by a connective appears also at 988 (see note there): cf. Eun.928-9, sine molestia / sine sumptu et sine dispendio; 466-7, ut liceat ... dare huic quae olumus, convenire et conloqui: see notes on 263,319,846. Apart from instances like these Terence generally avoids the use of et (or atque) to link the second and third members in tricola. Usually the three are in asyndeton or et links the three members: cf. audio.. et video et valeo, H.T.244. In this respect Terence is similar to Cicero where et does not appear between the second and third members unless the third is general

in nature and subsumes the first two: cf. e.g. Brut.238,
vox gestus et omnis actio. Contrast Plautus in this
respect: e.g. Asin.571, damno molestiae et dedecori;
Amph.1011.

145. humane: 'with equanimity': see on 107.

145-6. si augeam aut etiam adiutor siem eius iracundiae:
zeugma; the object of augeam is iracundiam understood
from the second part of the clause.

siem: the MSS. have sim. I am not sure why Lindsay
reads siem; probably, I think, because he did not wish
the ictus to fall on the initial syllable of eius (cf.
ELF.65), but why can one not accept sim in prosodic hiatus?

147. etsi: 'and yet'. This use of etsi to introduce
a main clause arose from the positioning of the subordinate
clause after the main clause, as in Plaut.Capt.842, gaudeo
etsi nihil scio quod gaudeam. Yet there are few examples
in early Latin where the connection with what has preceded
is quite as tenuous as here. Cf. Plaut.Pers.600 f. adi sis
tute atque ipse itidem roga / ut tibi percontari liceat
quae velis; etsi mihi / dixit dare potestatem eius; sed ...;
H.T.412. Most of the examples of this usage of etsi appear
in Plautus and Terence and in Cicero's letters, as one
would expect, since etsi in this usage often adds an

afterthought and is more at home in colloquial speech than in studied prose. Terence in this short monologue gives the flavour of everyday speech-its liveliness, and the lack of logical exactitude in the expression and connection of thought (cf. tamen in 141; the implied contrast in 145-6 with the conditionals in 144; etsi here; nisi in 153; the connection of ecce autem de integro with what has preceded).

148. non nullam ... iniuriam: yet another example of litotes (cf. nec nihil neque omnia ... non nihil, 141 ff.) Note how this use of language reinforces the contrast between the two brothers' characters (cf. the extreme terms used by Demea in 88 ff.).

postremo : 'finally', introducing the whole section down to de integro. The final point to be brought against Aeschinus is that despite giving signs that he was settling down, his amorous activities have resumed. Note the absence of subordination and how the logical connection of the three clauses with ecce .. integro is shown rather by autem. The three clauses could have been expressed as concessive clauses modifying ecce de integro. By these means and by the exclamatory nature of the final clause Micio's words gain in vigour.

151. dixit ... ducere: Aeschinus has simply broached

the subject of marriage without telling Micio of the awkward circumstances in which he stands: cf. 629 f., 690-1. I cannot see that there is any contradiction between this and the two later passages. This 'contradiction' is one of the factors (none of them, I believe, substantial) which led Lefèvre to believe that the whole monologue is a Terentian addition to acquaint the Roman audience of information given in the Menendrian prologue. See p.144 n.35 above.

152. defervisse: cf. Cic.Cael.43, cum adulescentiae cupiditates defervissent, and see Austin ad loc. The metaphor is from wine-making: cf. Col.9.15.fin, dum musteus fructus defervescat; 12.38.3.

153. ecce autem: 'but look ...', the adversative force in contrast to defervisse. See note on 722.

nisi: 'but'. This usage of nisi develops from instances where a nisi-clause gave a correction or modification of a thought expressed in a preceding negative clause. See note on 545.

154. Micio leaves for the forum. Later Aeschinus will follow (277) and meet him there (cf.364 ff.).

Act II sc.1

It is this scene to which Terence refers in the prologue when he says that he has taken material from Diphilus' Synapothneskontes. On the extent of the borrowing and other possible changes in this act see pp. 12ff.

Here the leno attempts without success to recover the girl whom Aeschinus has seized from him. The scene is an effective one not only because of the lively stage action but also because of the contrast between Aeschinus' cool contempt and Sannio's protests of outrage. In the face of the young man's ruthless and uncompromising attitude Sannio's initial defiance and threats give way to protests and eventually to a tone of conciliation. But when he finally thinks that the girl is to be returned, Aeschinus plays his trump card, which dashes the leno's hopes, and leaves Sannio to consider his position (196ff.)

Although some of the comedy is of the low knockabout type and the scene is humorous in itself, the dramatist exploits the motifs of New Comedy for comic effect. Thus the basic comic idea rests on the exchange of the traditional roles and character of the adulescens and leno. Here the leno is doing the importuning and has a taste of the medicine usually doled out by his colleagues -

a complete lack of sympathy or regard for equity. The idea is brought out most obviously when Sannio exclaims o hominem inpurum - a splendid example of the poet calling the kettle black.

Metre: in the first part of the scene there is oscillation between iambic and trochaic lines until the iambic octonarius takes over at 170 until 196, after which the metre becomes trochaic until the end of the scene. The three types of line used in the first section are the trochaic acatalectic (A), the trochaic catalectic (B), and the iambic acatalectic (C). The section displays features which occur in other passages of mixed metre in Terence. By way of example a description of 517ff. is placed alongside that of the lines here:

155-7	tr.oct.	A	517	tr.oct.	A
158	tr.dim.cat.	B	518	tr.sept.	B
159	iam.oct.	C	519-22	iam.oct.	C
160	tr.oct.	A	523	tr.oct.	A
161	tr.sept.	B	524	tr.dim.cat.	B
162	tr.oct.	A	525	tr.oct.	A
163-4	tr.sept.	B	526	tr.sept.	B
165	tr.oct.	A	527ff.	iam.oct.	C
166-9	tr.sept.	B			
170ff.	iam.oct.	C			

Typical of Terence is (1) the virtual exclusion of the iambic septenarius from such passages (Eun. 549ff. is an exception); (2) the predominance of the trochaic octonarius, which Terence employs to a far greater extent than Plautus (see Laidlaw, 111), and its use as the initial

entry line; (3) the basic sequence ABC (cf. And.607ff., L-K.; H.T.562ff.), with variations such as ABABC (cf. Phorm.153ff. and Hee.281ff.) or ABCBC (cf. Eun.643ff. and Phorm.479ff.) or ABABCBC (cf. H.T.175ff.). Terence avoids the sequence CBA and a trochaic acatalectic line is never followed by an iambic line (see on 166).

155. Sannio comes on stage calling in the form of the clamor armisonus to his fellow citizens to come to his aid: cf. Plaut.Rud.615ff., pro Cyrenenses populares! vostram ego imploro fidem,.... ferte opem inopiae ... vindicate ..: Amph.376. The motif is common in Greek drama (cf. e.g. Arist.Clouds 1322) and has a long history: see W. Schulze, Sitzgber.Berl.Akad.1918 495ff. and E. Fraenkel, Elem.Plaut. 114 n.1. Because of the ius provocacionis it would be quite at home in a Roman context. On similarities between this scene and parts of the Rudens, the Greek original of which was also by Diphilus see Marx, Rudens pp.293-6, and E. Fantham, Philologus 112 (1968) 200 (see also p.139 n.5 above).

155-6. ferte ... auxilium,/subvenite inopi: an example of abundantia, a stylistic feature which is extremely common in the fragments of the early Roman tragedians: cf. e.g. Andronicus 20f., da mihi hasce opes quas peto quas precor; porrige, opitula; Enn.343, pacem inter sese

conciliant, conferunt concordiam, 161, 213, 363, Acc.587-8.

When the fragments can be compared with the Greek passages on which they are based, this word and phrase doubling can be seen to be a distinctive feature of high flown style in Latin: cf. Enn.259ff. and Eur.Med.214ff.; Acc.592 and Eur.Phoen.593; and in comedy the well known passages of Caecilius' Plocium and the Menandrian original compared in Gellius (2.23): see O.Skutsch, Studia Enniana, 166 166ff.; Williams, Tradition and Originality, 359ff., 682ff.

This stylistic feature and its elevated tone had its origin in religious and legal decrees where near synonyms were used to cover all contingencies: cf. e.g. CIL I² 366, neque exvehito neque exferto; I² 581, conlourasse neve convovisse neve conspondisse. In Plautus and Terence it occurs more frequently in the lyric or long verses than in the senarii. In the latter it is usually confined to highly emotional contexts or to philosophising passages. See Haffter, ch.III.

156. otiose: nunciam ...: Aeschinus addresses these words to the psaltria. The adverb nunciam normally appears in enclitic position (cf.168,170,175,And.171, 329,H.T.618) and would be very emphatic if taken with

consiste. I would punctuate with a colon after nunciam rather than after otiose - 'relax now'. Cf. And. 842, animo nunciam otioso esse impero. For the use of the adverb without verb see note on 81.

illico: here in its original locative sense; cf. Rud. 328, illico hic opperiar, 878, Most. 887. More commonly the adverb has temporal force; see note on 369. /5

157. numquam: often used, as here, for an emphatic non: see Hofmann, 80-1, who compares And. 610, sed inultum numquam id auferet and H.T. 918, at ne illud haud inultum . . ferent.

dum ego adero: since a proceleusmatic is never found in trochaic verse in Terence (Laidlaw, 42-3), dum is elided. We thus have a tribrach of the type \cup, \cup in a trochaic line. This is extremely common when the first short is a monosyllable (cf. 551, 556, 568, 569, 579, 574, 635, 696, 857, 877, 972, 987) but much rarer when the first short is a final syllable; see notes on 563, 588, 634.

158. ego . . . omnibus: here, with most editors, I think that Sannio is cut off by Aeschinus' threat (veiled in that he is still addressing the girl) that he will suffer another beating if he attempts to recover her. I would punctuate with a dash after omnibus.

159. non committet ..ut: 'he will never lay himself open to ..'. For this sense and usage of committo cf. Plaut. Bacc.1037, neque ego haud committam ut, si quid peccatum siet, fecisse dicas de mea sententia, Stich.640, Trin.704.

non ... hodie unquam: the temporal sense of hodie can be felt here, the implication being that the leno may try something later. In some instances, however, the literal force of hodie is awkward and because of its frequent appearance with numquam it seems to have become an almost automatic adjunct with intensifying force: cf. e.g. 570 and see Dz.-Hauler on Phorm.377; also Van Wageningen, Mnem.46(1918)161ff. So Donatus on 215, 'hodie' non tempus significat, sed iracundiam eloquentiam ac stomachum. But in that line the literal sense of hodie can be felt.

160. meorum morum: a common sound figure, found particularly at the end of long verses. More often the words are etymologically linked: sola soli, Hec.35; dicta dictis, Rud.364; factu facilem, H.T.704; faciat. # faciam, Phorm.785. In the tragedians cf. Naevius 38, acrem acrimoniam; 42, inflexu flectitur; Ennius 249, nominatur nomine (senarius), 298. For the collocation of words not related etymologically cf. Ennius 343 (quoted in note on 155-6); 287 opulentum oppidum. (with rhyme as here).

161. leno ego sum: despite Donatus' comment ('leno' terribiliter pronuntiandum) it is better if they are spoken in a concessive tone (so Marouzeau) since at seems to introduce a qualification and the para prosdokian joke is more effective.

fide .. optuma: a para prosdokian joke. The leno was renowned for unscrupulousness, dishonesty and perjury, qualities which the leno himself often humorously admits: cf. Rud. 1373f., iuratus sum et nunc iurabo, si quid voluptati est mihi; iusiurandum rei servandae, non perdendae conditum est; Pseud.376-7, si tu argentum attuleris, cum illo perdidero fidem: hoc meum est officium. One might therefore expect Sannio to have completed the sentence with pessuma rather than with optuma and thus to warn Aeschinus that because he surpassed all others in unscrupulousness he would stop at nothing to recover the girl. The joke here is that Sannio, untypically of a leno, is going to keep his word when he threatens to exact financial reparation for what he has suffered. For the fides lenonia cf. Plaut. Pers. 243-4, omnes sunt lenae levifidae, neque tippulae levius pondus quam fides lenonia; Rud. 1386 and see Fraenkel, TLL VI,1 676,15ff.

162. quod .. purges: quod here has almost conditional force; cf. Plaut. Aul. 91, quod quispiam ignem quaerat, extinguere volo (see Bennett I 338). This usage is a development of the use

of quod in legal decrees: cf. idque ei .. facere liceto, quod sine malo pequlatuu fiat ..; CIL I² 587 1,4, and see LHS II 572f and note on 986.

163. huius: genitive of value, accompanied by a gesture such as the snapping of the finger: cf. Most.393, quid si igitur abeamus hinc nos? #non hoc longe, Delphium; Trin.483, and see Bach, Studemund I 190f.

meum ius persequar: at this point the leno seems to be confident of recovering the girl, since the excuse which he puts in the mouth of Aeschinus at 162-3 and 165-6 would hardly be applicable if Aeschinus still held the girl. Sannio is promising to bring an aikias dike: if successful, he would receive compensation from Aeschinus (see Rieth, 53).

165-6. "nollem factum: iusiurandum hac": I have argued in Phoenix 20 (1966) 302-4 that dignum should be read for indignum of the MSS. in 166. The main reason is that it does not make sense in the context for Sannio to suppose that Aeschinus will promise to swear that Sannio was undeserving of the assault. The words which Sannio ascribes to A. must be such that they will prevent Sannio from gaining financial reparation (neque tu verbis solves, 164). Nollem factum is an apology - 'I wish it hadn't happened' (cf.162-3). The second gambit, if one reads dignum, is a threat to swear

that Sannio had done something to provoke the assault. This makes better sense, though admittedly the change from apology to threat is abrupt. Rieth (53) believed that nollem factum contained the notion of lack of intent. If this were so, the two parts of the quotation would be more smoothly linked, but I cannot see that the Latin can bear this sense (cf. Phorm. 796). It is possible that the notion of intent or rather the lack of it was present in the Greek play at this point and that Terence has misunderstood, but there is no means of telling. Dignum has support from considerations of metre and syntax. Firstly, if one follows the MSS., we have a trochaic acatalectic line followed by an iambic line. There are only two other examples of this sequence. One is at 209-10 of this play where there is MSS. disagreement in 209; the other is Hec. 767-8, where, because Phidippus enters and speaks in the middle of 767, one would expect 768 to be an iambic septenarius, the metre of the rest of the scene (see note on the metre of 956-8). In 768 an easy change of quod opust for quod opus sit would make the line an iamb. sept. (for the absence of an iambus in 4th foot see Laidlaw, 113). Secondly, the syntactic relationship of the quom-clause is better (see e.g. Knapp, CR 21, 1907, 45-6) and the emphatic egomet is comprehensible. The pronoun refutes the implication in the oath that Aeschinus had suffer-

ed some outrage at the hands of Sannio.

166. acceptus: ironic sense like ornatus in 176: cf. Aul.

630, miseris iam accipiam modis.

167. abi prae strenue: much to Sannio's disgust (ceterum hoc nihili facis?) Aeschinus shows how he values the leno's threats by ignoring them and giving instruction to the girl. The adverb praestrenue, suggested by Donatus and Eugraphius, is not found: cf. And. 171 i prae, sequar.

nihili: preserved by Donatus alone, who records it as a variant reading. It is supported by 452 where nihili or nili is required by the metre, against AD¹G (so Umpf., aliter L.-K.).

168. i intro nunciam. SA. enim non..: on i intro see note on 854. L.-K. print the reading of the Bembinus with which there is hiatus at change of speaker (see Laidlaw, 86-7, and note on 767). The absence of tu in A and the different position of the pronoun in the Calliopians suggest that the pronoun is an interpolation. Certainly enim is more probable than at enim by virtue of its being the lectio difficilior. For enim in initial position with asseverative force cf. Phorm. 983, enim nequeo solus, Hec. 238. The divergence in the MSS. may have been known to the Donatus scholiast: AT ENIM NON SINAM 'enim' inceptiva particula apud veteres fuit, sed 'at'

convenit perturbato.

169. istoc: on the form see note on hoc (huc) on 878.

em sic volo: 'there, that's what I want'. Parmeno has taken up the desired position: cf. Plaut. Truc.787, omnium primum divorsae state - em sic volo. The Calliopians give the words to Sannio probably because of hem, which some of them read: see Andrieu, 80.

170. The metre now changes to the iambic octonarius. In this type of verse Terence regularly avoids diaeresis after the fourth foot. So in this section we find it at 180, 184, 188 (4th foot is not iambus). Plautus favours the type with diaeresis: cf. e.g. Amph. 180-218 with these lines. There is a progressive tendency in Terence's play towards favouring the type without diaeresis (see Laidlaw, 107) but he does invoke on occasion syllaba anceps (see on 260, 348, 619 and Laidlaw, 115f.).

171. For the instructions and the stage action cf. Rud.731ff.

innuerim: subjunctive by attraction; see Handford, 148ff.

haereat: a strong term; literally 'stick'. Translate 'bury itself'.

172. istuc volo ... experiri: 'I wish then to put that to the test'. Sannio attempts to catch hold of the girl to see if

hem all Mrs except Pand
C ante corr.

Aeschinus will put his threat into action.

AE. em serva. PA. omitte mulierem: em serva must mean 'watch out': (cf. And. 416 em serva, spoken by Davos to warn Pamphilus that his father is approaching) and be spoken by Aeschinus to Parmeno. Since the humour of the scene is Parmeno's over-eagerness to strike the leno, it is best to give omitte mulierem to him. He says it as he lands a blow on Sannio, thus prompting the exclamation o facinus indignum. Spengel gave em serva to Parmeno (- tene tibi hoc verber, cf. Asin. 431) mainly on the basis of the similar scene in Persa: 809ff.
TO. perge ut coeperas. PA. hoc, leno, tibi. / DO. perii!
Perculit me prope. PA. em serva rusum. / DO. delude ...

But when Paegnium says em serva rusum, he is just pretending that he is going to hit the leno again. Note the absence of any vocal reaction to a second blow on the part of the leno.

Andrieu (35ff.) gives the four words to Aeschinus, mainly because E omits any mention of Parmeno in its rubric. However E also omits Phrygia from the rubric on H.T. IV, 4, although she speaks at 732. Luck (Interjektionen 63ff.) agrees with Andrieu in his apportioning of the words, but unconvincingly takes em serva to be the equivalent of ἤν· καὶ τὸν βυθμὸν σου τήρει at Menand. Dysk. 910.

173. ei misero mihi: in Plautus and Terence ei is never

accompanied by an accusative. Thus, ei miseriam of the Calliopians is wrong. At the beginning of the line they have o miserum facinus for o facinus indignum, but this reading makes the line a trochaic septenarius, unlikely in this sequence. It looks as if the Calliopian reading there has arisen from the misapplication of a corrective gloss on ei miseriam. The interjection is prompted by another blow from the over eager Parmeno.

With the reading o facinus indignum there is clash of verse ictus and word accent in the third foot. This is not common in Terence in iambic octonarii, but may be a relic of the iambic octonarius with diaeresis, where such a clash is inevitable if the hemistich ends in an iambus word (cf. e.g. Amph. 190, 195, 201 and 194 where there is not diaeresis). See on 535. There is no need to emend to avoid the clash. Moreover, considerable recasting of the line is required to achieve this : see Richter, Studemund I 468 n.26.

174. peccato: the future imperative often seems to be used for solemn effect: see note on 500. Note the alliteration here. X

175. i nunciam: spoken to the girl, whose entry into the house at 167 was prevented by the action of Sannio at that point.

quid hoc reist: L.-K. shorten hoc after quid but the first

syllable of reist must then be heavy. There is no certain example of rē- in Terence (And.457, cited by Laidlaw, 70, is dubious). It is better to keep hoc as a heavy syllable and to take reist as a monosyllable by synizesis as often: cf.854. See Drexler II 74f. for examples of this kind and for his comment on this line.

regnumne: the point of Sannio's question is that Aeschinus has acted as if he were above the law in simply seizing another's property and assaulting him in the process: cf. Phorm.405f., quandoquidem solus regnas et soli licet / hic de eadem causa his iudicium adipiscier. Autocratic rule was abhorred in Athens as well as in Rome (see on 183).

176. ornatus esses ex tuis virtutibus: ironic, ornare having the sense 'honoured'. Also perhaps a play on the sense 'dressed'.

177. quid tibi rei mecumst?: in view of quid? nosti qui sim?, which means 'what? do you know what kind of a man I am?', I take the question to mean 'what do you want of me?' i.e. 'what arrangement are we going to come to?'. Sannio expects Aeschinus to make some offer of compensation. But by his answer Aeschinus makes it clear that he is simply going to keep the girl. In his question tetigin tui quicquam? Sannio implies that the young man has no justification for

such highhanded action.

Others take the words to show that Sannio and Aeschinus have never had any dealings up to this point: see on pp.53f. above.

178. infortunium: 'misfortune', euphemistically in this case for 'a beating': see Dz.-Hauler on Phorm.1028.

179. magis licet meum..: I would read meám magis lícet with Bentley (L.-K ascribe it to Leo). The succession of two iambic words (i.e. without shortening) is extremely rare in Plautus and Terence (see Harsh, Iambic Words and Regard for Accent in Plautus, Stanford 1949, 70ff.,90f.).

Cf., however Trin.321, qui ipse sibi satis placet. But in addition magis is always pyrrhic in Terence (magis magisque at Eun.507 is hardly relevant) and the complete elision of meum, which one feels should be emphatic, is not attractive.

180. convicium: close in sense here to flagitatio, the original meaning of flagitium: see Usener, Rh.Mus.56 (1901) 19f. and note on 101. Cf.Bacc.873-4, vis tibi ducentos nummos iam promittier, / ut ne clamorem hic facias neu convicium.

181. abripiere: the 2nd pers. passive form in -ris occurs only once in Terence, at Hec.317 where loquere would be

ambiguous since this is also the form of the imperative. See Müller, Glotta 17 (1929) 137-42 for an examination of the occurrence of the -ris forms in Plautus, outnumbered by the -re forms by fifteen to one in places where both are metrically possible. The -ris form seems to have arisen by analogy with age: agis from the need to differentiate the indicative from the imperative.

182. loris liber: Sannio humorously objects to being whipped as if it would be less reprehensible if he were beaten. Whipping was a punishment thought suitable only for slaves (see RE Suppl. IX 1590). In law the Roman citizen was protected from corporal punishment: cf. Cic. Verr. II. V 170, facinus vincire civem Romanum, scelus verberare, prope parricidium necare. So also in Athens slaves could suffer summary whipping, while citizens committing the same offence would be subject to a fine: see e.g. Plato Laws VI 764b.

183. o hominem inpurum: a comic reversal of roles for a leno to be calling a young man inpurus - the common epithet applied to pimps: cf. 281, Phorm. 83, lenoni inpurissimo and see note on 360.

hicin: the MSS. and Don. have hicine. For the circumstances under which one finds -ne or -n see note on 379. Hicin is preferable here since a dactylic word rarely forms a foot of

the line other than the first.

libertatem aequam: Sannio repeats the idea of the autocratic -like action of Aeschinus (175). Equality before the law (isonomia) is often contrasted with autocratic rule: cf.e.g. Herod.5.37.2;3.80.6;3.142.3. See RE Suppl.VII 293ff.

184. debacchatus: 'raged', implying loss of self-control and referring to Sannio's outraged reaction in the preceding lines. Sannio picks it up in the next line, applying it to Aeschinus and using it with the notion of physical violence.

185. egon deb. an tu in me?: autem is used in exclamatory questions which repeat what another person has said and is usually placed after the repeated and emphatic word: cf. 934,940,Eun.798. The position of autem here shows that the emphatic word is the verb. Most editors however take the sentence as expressing alternative questions. This puts the emphasis on ego. Fleckeisen in fact read egon autem debacchatus sum an tu?. It is better to read egon debacchatus sum autem? an tu in me?. The particle an 'praecedentem quaestionem ipse corrigit vel amplificat vel omnino retractat' (TLL II 76).

istaec: see on 677-8.

186 quam rem? quo redeam?: Sannio sarcastically recalls Aeschinus' reply nil to his question quid tibi rei mecumst?

in 177. By Aeschinus' own words there is no res to return to.

187. vah iniqui ... loqui: Aeschinus scoffs at the request of a leno for aequi aliquid. Cf. Plaut. Curc. 64ff., neque quicquam queo / aequi bonique ab eo impetrare. PA. iniuru's / qui quod lenoni nulli est id ab eo petas.

188-9. Sannio's admission is quite in keeping with the self-confessed dishonesty of pimps in New Comedy: cf. e.g. Pseud. 265ff., 339, Rud. 724f., 728f.

188. pernicies comm. adolescentium: cf. Pseud. 364, where Pseudolus accuses the leno of being the pernicies adolescentium and Asin. 133 in the young man's description of the meretrices. Note the rare anapaest word-ending at the diaeresis: cf. however Hec. 775, oportet: quod si perficio non paenitet me famae. Some editors (Fleck., Dz., Prete) read leno sum, per. com. fateor to remove the anapaest: unnecessarily, I believe, in view of how Terence has broken away from the iambic oct. with diaeresis: see on 220.

189. periurus: see on 161.

pestis: cf. Pseud. 204, quin una omnes peste hac populum hunc liberant (of Ballio). The word is often combined with pernicies, presumably because of the forcefulness of the alliteration: cf. Catull. 76.20, pestem perniciemque; Cic. fam. 4.3.1, ex pernicie et peste rei publicae, Catil. 1.33, off.

2.51, Rabir.perd.2: see Otto, pestis.

190. nam hercle etiam hoc restat: nam is best taken here with asseverative force (see LHS II 504f.) and the tone of the sentence is sarcastic: literally; 'by heavens this still remains' i.e. we can be sure to expect this. Hoc (iniuria mihi a te orta) picks up Sannio's words.

quaeso: parenthetic and in enclitic position as often. When it appears at the beginning of a clause, it seems to carry a more urgent tone. In such position it is often followed by hercle or edepol (cf.e.g.Asin.417, Most.897, 1026, Merc.614, Men.742) or it introduces a repetition of a plea (cf.Bacc.744, Trin.146-7). Sometimes the context makes it clear that the request is urgent: cf.Cist.747 and its use and position in the prologues at And.8 and Hec.8.

191. quae res tibi vortat male: these words make better sense if taken with Aeschinus' statement that he will give Sannio the twenty minae which he paid for the girl (so Spengel, Dz.-K.). Cf.Aul.217ff., quoniam tu me et ego te qualis sis scio, / quae res recte vortat mihique tibiue tuaeque filiae, / filiam tuam mi uxorem posco; (here minis viginti ... emisti stands in a causal relationship to what follows) and Capt.36lf., quae res bene vortat mihi meoque filio / vobisque, volt te novos erus operam dare / tuo veteri domino...

Dz.-K. accept the reading in the Bembinus and punctuate emisti, id - quae r.t.v.male - / argenti ... But id looks corrupt. It may have been a gloss on quae res (to explain that quae res referred back to the preceding clause?) or possibly it was a marginal gloss which was incorporated into the text in the wrong place. The Calliopians offer id restat in the preceding line and it hardly seems likely that the disagreements in the two branches of the transmission in these two lines are unconnected.

193. minime: Aeschinus' reply is ambiguous. What he means is that he will not compel Sannio to sell the girl. He is quite prepared to take her for nothing. Sannio misunderstands: see p.54 above and p.142, n.22.

namque: elliptical: 'I asked you, for this is what I feared'. See Langen, Beitr.262. Sannio is relieved that Aeschinus will not compel him to sell the girl but his relief is short-lived as Aeschinus explains what he meant in his next words.

194. liberali .. adsero causa manu: a formal phrase spoken by a person claiming that a person held in slavery is free: cf. Plaut. Cure.490f., si quisquam hanc liberali / causa manu adseret, .., 668,709, Poen.905f. Since in the next breath Aeschinus rather illogically gives the leno the choice of taking the money, to which he would certainly not be entit-

led if the girl was in fact free, or of going to law, Aeschinus' words can be recognised as a gambit designed to make it clear to the leno that he is not going to recover the girl without going to law. In Rome the action would be a vindicatio in libertatem, Aeschinus being the assertor libertatis. In Athens the pimp would have to bring an ἐξαιρέσεως εἰς ἐλευθερίαν δίκη or βιαίων δίκη : see p.142, nn.23,24 above. On the question of whether these lines appeared in the Diphilean scene and the significance for the rest of the Diphilean play see pp.54ff. above.

196. dum .. redeo: for dum ('until') with the present tense see on 785. With this ultimum Aeschinus enters Micio's house.

196-208. In what is virtually a new 'scene', though there is no rubric in any of the MSS. (see note on 141), Sannio describes what has happened to him and what he sees will happen if he gives in to Aeschinus. His emotional state is shown by the jerkiness and interruption in the sequence of thought; see pp.60ff. The metre changes to the trochaic septenarius at 187 and this metre continues to the end of the scene. See note on the metre at 934ff. and 956-8.

196. pro supreme Iuppiter: in the sense 'highest' (i.e. summus) supremus is used only as an epithet of Iuppiter

in early Latin. Used in this sense the superlative probably had an archaic flavour and in later Republican literature it appears only in poetry in this sense. Probably the adjective has retained this meaning through its religious association. In comedy this particular phrase occurs only once in *senarii* (Poen.1122) and this phenomenon would confirm our view.

197. miror qui .. occipiunt: eos to be understood; cf.H.T.

897, equidem miror qui alia tam plane scias.

198. domo me eripuit: these words hardly fit the Diphilean scene, if it began in the same way as the scene in Terence's play and if, as seems probable, the leno's house was on the stage. At first sight it does not agree with Demea's description of the raptio at 88ff. where the impression is that the beating took place inside the house. On the other hand Demea's words do not preclude a beating of the leno in the street after he has been dragged out there and from the fact that Demea has learned these facts from hearsay, one may suppose that the beating of the leno and the members of his household is to be imagined as having taken place in public. I would therefore keep the reading of the MSS. Gaiser (Rieth, 43 n.65) suggested domum irrupit, me verberavit (iamb. oct.). Apart from the unusual first dipody with spondaic

word ending in the second foot one can hardly agree with Gaiser that metrically the line would go with what preceded since line 197 is a trochaic septenarius. If the line is corrupt (and the reading of the Bembinus, domi me er. suggests that it might be), domum mi irrupit would be better.

198-200. L.-K. retain the order of these lines as transmitted in the MSS. against most earlier editors who placed 199 after 200. I believe they are right, but the punctuation would be improved, however, if a comma were placed after verberavit and a period after meam. Nor does one need to place 199 in brackets. In 198 S. gives a brief description of what Aeschinus did; in 199 he exclaims at the impudence of Aeschinus' demands in the light of such behaviour and in 200 he repeats in exaggerated terms the description of the beating, as if to justify his sense of outrage at the request of Aeschinus. Moreover the irony in quando bene promeruit is better, if it immediately picks up the plus quingentos colaphos.

200. colaphos infregit: the accusative is internal, unusual, but cf. Pliny N.H.8.130, colapho infracto.

On the Donatus scholion HOMINI MISERO secundum illud Menandri, etc., see on pp.58f. and K.-Th.fr.4. Perhaps the purpose of citing the Menandrian line was to illustrate plus quingentos colaphos rather than homini misero.

201. Sannio rather suddenly and unexpectedly decides to give in to Aeschinus' demands. For the change to calm resignation from anger cf. Menand. Sam. 110ff. and see Rieth, 44. The pimp of New Comedy was sometimes reluctant to face the trouble of going to law (cf. Menand. Kol. 121-2) and see pp. 61f.

bene promeruit: ironic, picking up plus quingentos colaphos. The irony continues in suom ius postulat.

202. sed hoc hariolor: 'but I prophesy this'. Cf. Phorm. 492, PH. nondum mihi credis? DO. hariolare. PH. sin fidem do? DO. fabulae!, where the verb means 'you have second sight'. See Knapp (CR 21 1907 45-6) for the correction of Langen's interpretation of the verb in Terence (Beitr. 260ff.).

203. testes faciet ilico: 'he will immediately summon witnesses to attest my having sold her'. Facio has the sense of adhibeo: cf. Phorm. 714, hoc temere numquam amittam ego a me quin testes adhibeam and Curc. 565, ne facias testes; Livy 1.59.1, vosque, dii, testes facio.

204. de argento - somnium: 'as for the money - nothing but empty talk': somnium is used to describe words or objects which have no truth or reality to them, i.e. as little substance as dreams. Cf. Phorm. 494, crede mihi, gaudebis facto; verum hercle hoc est. #somnia!, preceded by fabulae! and logi!, and 974. See Otto, somnium.

"mox; cras redi": a typical ploy of young men: cf. Plaut. Most.579, redito huc circiter meridie, 653, petito cras. The punctuation is improved if quotation marks are placed round mox and cras redi separately.

205. reddat: 'pay' (the money) as in 202: cf.279.

206. verum . . . res est: 'but I am facing facts.' Verum is in contrast to quamquam iniuriumst.

quando . . . occeperis: only here does Terence use quando in a temporal sense in a subordinate clause. For a comparison of the use of quando in Plautus and Terence see Scherer, Studemund II 87ff. and see LHS II 607.

occeperis: all MSS. have inceperis which also appears in the lemma in Donatus. The line is quoted at Hec.840 with occeperis and the scholion on this line of the Adelphoe reads ut in Andria 'dein quaestum occipit'. Inceperis is the lectio difficilior, since quaestum occipere is the usual form, and I would follow the MSS. For the transitive use of incipere cf. Phorm.225, in re incipiunda, And.539, quae (amicitia) incepta and Phorm.709-10, ante brumam autem novi / negoti incipere.

207. mussitanda: frequentative form of musso which is based on

Greek muzo meaning 'to mutter, moan': cf. Enn. ann. 182, intus in occulto mussitabant. The verb acquired the sense 'to do nothing more than moan at' and thus 'to put up with in silence, to say nothing'; cf. M.G. 476f., ergo si sapias, / mussitabis; plus oportet scire servom quam loqui, Pseud. 501, Truc. 312.

208. Sed seems to pick up the thought expressed in 205. The disruption in logical sequence betrays Sannio's anxiety and feeling of helplessness.

Act II sc. 2.

The door of Micio's house opens, but instead of Aeschinus whom the audience might expect from his words at 196 a slave enters. His first words are directed into the house.

209. tace, egomet conveniam: a neat dovetailing of this apparently Menandrian scene with Aeschinus' exit at the end of sc. 1, the Diphilean scene. Because of Aeschinus' words at 196 the audience may conclude that Syrus is insisting that he meets with the leno. For the use of tace to quell obstreperous resistance cf. Aul. 273.

Although the change of plan results from Terence's use of the Diphilean scene, the reason for the entrance of Syrus instead of Aeschinus is explained later in the scene. It appears that he knows that the leno is about to leave for Cyprus. This information, which is apparently unknown to Aes-

chinus (cf.278), is used by the slave to force the leno to be satisfied with receiving the money for the girl.

conveniam iam ipsum: the Calliopiens read conveniam ipsum. Since the reading of the Bembinus makes this line a trochaic octonarius and the rest of the scene is in iambic octonarii, I believe that the corruption lies in the Bembinus (ditto-graphy). It is extremely doubtful whether a trochaic acatalectic line is ever followed by an iambic line in Terence: see the description of the metre at the beginning of the preceding scene and note on 165-6.

faxo: an early form of the future in Latin of the sigmatic type (as in Greek): cf. also faxim etc., with the optative ending as in sim (siem). In Terence faxo has always the sense 'I'll see to it that' and is accompanied by the subjunctive as here (cf.847), the future indicative (And.854, Eun.285) or a noun in the accusative and the perfect passive participle (H.T.341). The subjunctive is to a great extent limited to stereotyped phrases (lubens bene faxim, 887,896; utinam ita di faxint, H.T.161; cf.Hec.102,134; cave faxis, H.T.187) but cf. H.T.198, vereor quam nequid in illum iratus plus satis faxit. In Plautus both future and subjunctive have a much wider range of usage: see Lindsay on Capt.172.

Sannio: Donatus notes that while Aeschinus always addressed Sannio as leno (184,187,196) Syrus treats the pimp in a much

more relaxed and conciliatory manner, until, that is, he drops the bombshell in the leno's lap, when almost casually he reveals that he knows about the journey to Cyprus. Syrus' handling of the leno forms a pleasing contrast with the brusque treatments meted out by Aeschinus.

211. nescioquid concertasse: 'that you have had something of an argument'. Sannio's tactics are to play down the violence and cool Sannio's emotions. He therefore minimises the physical aspects of the raptio by inserting nescioquid and by using a verb which need not imply any physical violence. Concertare, which is rare and not found elsewhere in early Latin drama (although conjectured at Pac.73), in Cicero means 'to dispute, argue': cf. Att.3.12.2 and the usual meaning of concertatio.

211-2. numquam vidi iniquius... comparatam: Sannio has not lost his sense of humour. Note the pun in comparare, in the sense 'to match' (cf. compar) picking up iniquius and 'to arrange' (cf. bellum comparare, frequent in the historians). Cf. Phorm.41. quam inique comparatumst; Cic. Cluent.57.

This type of expression often begins a monologue in New Comedy; cf. Phorm.591, ego hominem callidiores vidi neminem..., Cist.653, Most.532f. Menand. Epitr.205f. Naturally it is by no means confined to that position: cf. besides this passage Aul.60, And.844. See E. Fraenkel, Elem. Plaut.158ff.

213. ill': see on 72.

usque: 'completely': cf. Eun.220, ut defetiger usque. For the development of this sense from the meaning 'continuously, from beginning to end' see Ph.Thielmann, ALL V (1888) 447f. Cf. also 559. Sannio's words are more humorous if the exhaustion is emphasised. Some editors take usque with verberando.

214. tua culpa: ablative: cf. Eun.980, culpa non factumst mea, Hec.228, non mea opera neque pol culpa evenit, 476.

quid agerem: L.-K. prefer the reading of γ against facerem of the other MSS. But it seems more likely that FACEREM was corrupted to AGEREM by the loss of the initial letter. With most other editors I would print facerem.

morem gestum oportuit: 'you ought to have fallen in with his wishes'; on morem gerere see note on 431, and 708. The use of the perfect infinitive with the past tenses of oportere seems to indicate aoristic force in the perfect (as in the perfect subjunctive). For the perfect infinitive active cf. And.238f. nonne oportuit / praescisse me ante?, Eun.981f., oportuit / rem praenarrasse me?; for the passive, with which esse is usually omitted cf. H.T.200, mansum tamen oportuit, 247, 536, 635. Contrast Ad.672-3 an sedere oportuit / .. virginem .. dum .. veniret. See LHS II 352.

215. qui: archaic ablative: see on 477.

usque os praebui: Donatus notices the sexual double-entendre, picking up the sexual connotation of morem gerere. Usque has here the meaning 'all the time, continuously': cf. usque basiare in Catull.48.2;5.7ff.

scis quid loquar: 'you know what I mean': cf. Pseud.1178, etiamne - facere solitum es - scin quid loquar?. Here the words are better taken as a statement than a question.

216. For the sentiment cf. Capt.327, est etiam ubi profecto damnum praestet facere quam lucrum.

hui: marking Syrus' astonishment (feigned) that the leno could ever have had any doubts about Aeschinus' intentions to pay.

217. The line is hypermetric, but the final syllable of atque is elided before adulescenti: cf. also 375,465.

Plautus avoids such elision between lines.

218. hominum homo stultissime: cf. Phorm.863, homo hominum ornatissime; Capt.836, quantum est hominum optumorum optume. The juxtaposition of optumorum optume and hominum homo gives the expressions an elevated tone: cf. also Enn.trag.56, mater optuma, tu multo mulier melior mulierum and Eurip.Andr.590.

219. ne non tibi istuc faeneraret: 'that would not profit you'; an unusual meaning for faenero (normally - 'to lend on interest'). Dz.-K. take Aeschinus as the subject of the verb, comparing Phorm. 493, faeneratum istuc beneficium pulchre tibi dices, but to be parallel one would have to read faenerares here.

ego spem pretio non emo: 'I don't pay cash for hope (i.e. I don't lay out money on anything that is not certain)'.

220. abi: interjection, spoken here in a tone of rebuke: see on 564.

nescis inescare: only example of a spondaic word or word ending in the 4th foot of a long iambic line in Terence. Some editors have read inescare nescis (e.g. Bothe, Umpf., Dz.-K., Ashmore, Prete; Bentley read non scis), but since one finds anapaest word endings (see on 188) in this position, I would adhere to the MSS. For unusual metrical features in Terence cf. e.g. note on 131.

223-4. age, novi obsequare: 'Come, I know what you are thinking - as if you have any chance of getting your twenty minae while you do what Aeschinus wants. (i.e. let him keep the girl on credit).' These words have caused considerable trouble even in antiquity. I have taken quasi ... obsequare as an extension of tuom animum, reflecting Sannio's

own attitude to the situation. The meaning given seems to me to be the best in the context: it is in accord with 220-1 and with the sentiments expressed by Sannio himself in his monologue (202ff.). Syrus is feigning sympathy and understanding but the sting comes in the tail in the casual way in which he lets it drop that he knows that Sannio is about to leave for Cyprus (praeterea autem...). The journey is an additional reason (apart from the usual conduct of young men in such affairs, cf. 202ff.) for Sannio thinking that if he lets Aeschinus keep the girl, he will never see the twenty minae. Admittedly by this interpretation dum .. obsequare is awkward (subjunctive in virtual oratio obliquae). One would expect si rather than dum. But dum may be explained if obsequare refers, not to a decision to sell the girl, but to willingness on the part of the leno to allow Aeschinus to keep the girl on the promise of later payment. Such a business arrangement is what Syrus has been advocating at 216ff. X 10

The difficulties in the passage have been caused in part by usquam. Donatus explains the phrase quasi in numero aliquo ducas but this sense does not seem possible and the relationship of the dum-clause is incomprehensible. The meaning of usquam is more easily seen by considering the implication of the quasi-clause. The thought underlying the clause is iam nusquam tibi sunt viginti minae for the meaning of which one

may compare Pseud.1145-6, sed tu, bone vir, flagitare saepe clamore in foro, / quom libella nusquamst, nisi quid leno hic subvenit tibi. Donatus, however, is followed by Spengel², Kauer, Ashmore, and Marouzeau. But no parallel for the sense of usquam has been given. The objections to it still seem sound (see e.g. Bentley ad loc.). For attempts to explain the difficulty see Dz.-K.

The most recent interpretation is that of K.Vretska, Philologus 105 (1963) 153-4. It is based on Drexler's explanation that the leno is supposed by Syrus to be thinking that he has only to agree to Aeschinus' offer to pay and he will pocket the money. The quasi-clause is therefore Syrus' repudiation of such thoughts: 'as if you have any chance of getting the 20 minae provided that (i.e. just because) you give in to Aeschinus'. The translation shows the awkwardness of the connection of the dum-clause. Vretska does not in fact translate the words in question but paraphrases and fills in the hiatus in the sequence of thought. The transition after novi tuom animum is abrupt and the contradiction between such supposed thoughts of Sannio and what he has spoken in the monologue and the preceding lines makes it difficult to accept that any audience could understand what was going on, if Vretska is right.

224. praeterea autem: autem here gives added emphasis to

praeterea; cf. tum autem in 315.

225-6. hoc, scio, animus tibi pendet: hoc is better taken with pendet than with scio. It is either the adverb (see on 878), the equivalent of ad hanc rem, pendet here having the sense of propendet (cf. propensus ad) or it is ablative of cause, pendet meaning 'is in a flutter'. However, the usual construction when pendeo has this meaning is animi pendeo: cf. e.g. H.T.727, Merc.128, 166. I prefer the former.

227. nusquam pedem: 'I'm trapped'. Better taken as a cry of despair than as an assertion that he will not 'stir a foot' (so Ashmore).

228. The change of metre from the iambic octonarius to the senarius, harmonises with the dramatic movement of the scene. The dialogue between Syrus and Sannio reaches its climax in the former's revelation that he knows of the trip to Cyprus. Now, at 228ff., in what is virtually a monologue Sannio takes stock of his situation. For such changes of metre see note on 956-8. The metre changes at 228 rather than 229 because his monologue really begins at 227 (note the third person illi .. inceperunt).

inieci scrupulum: 'I've cast doubt in the fellow's mind': scrupulus literally means 'a small stone' (cf. Serv.Aen.6.238 and Capt.185, scruposam ... viam) and then metaphorically

'something that causes annoyance'. For the metaphor cf. And. 940, unus scrupulus etiam restat qui me male habet; Phorm. 954; Cic. Cluent. 78. Awareness of the literal meaning of the word seems to have been quickly lost: cf. Cic. Rosc. Amer. 6, hunc ... scrupulum qui se dies noctesque stimulat ac pungit ut evellatis postulat, where the language suggests the picture of a thorn (cf. Hor. Epist. 2.2.212) rather than a stone, however sharp.

228. illuc vide: the older form of the neuter, frequent in Plautus (cf. e.g. Aul. 46, Men. 606), has virtually disappeared from the Terentian MSS. It is attested here, however, by the γ -group and L-K. are right to print it: cf. Eun. 782, where the Calliopians have illuc against illud of the Bembinus; Eun. 782, A illut, P¹D¹G¹ illuc, cett. illic. Possibly illuc has been modernised elsewhere (e.g. 766): see Kauer, W. St. 28 (1906) 131f.

229. in ipso articulo: 'he caught me at exactly the right moment'; referring to the seizure of the girl by Aeschinus. For the temporal sense cf. Cic. Quinct. 19, ut eum ... in ipso articulo temporis adstringeret. The expression comes from butchers' language - of striking a carcass at the joints to cut it up (cf. Epid. 488-9, te articulatim concidit, senex, tuos servos). Hanssen, Latin Diminutives, 11f. points to an interesting parallel development in Old Norse.

in ipso: the shortening of ips-is unnecessary and the ictus falls better on the emphatic ipso than on the preposition. So also on the contrary in 231 ad is better shortened.

231. ad mercatum: 'to the market, fair': probably the equivalent of the Gk. πανήγυρις here (cf. Gr.L. IV 575,6); because it is in Cyprus, probably a festival in honour of Aphrodite: cf. Phorm.837-8, ego me ire senibus Sunium dicam ad mercatum. For the peripheral activities that went on at such a festival (cf. Menand.fr.416, Strabo 10.5.4.).

232. I prefer nunc si hoc omitto ac tum agam ubi, the reading of most editors after Bentley, though the suggestion is not his (see ad.loc.). It has the support of 226, ubi illinc, spero, redieris, hoc ages, and one does not have to postulate an unconvincing hiatus after omitto. For illinc see on 42 and for atque linking two closely connected conditional clauses cf. 217-8,980-1,

233. refrixerit res: 'the case will have a cool reception', exemplified by the succeeding quotations. For this use of verbs like caleo, frigesco to express popularity, interest or the opposite of these cf. Caelius, Cic.fam.8.6. Curioni nostro tribunatus conglaciat; Planc.53, and see Haffter, 10ff.; Hofmann, 154.

233-4. The delay in bringing an action will naturally weaken

Sannio's case: see on 339.

234. perdere: 'to lose, give up all claim to the girl': other editors take the object to be argentum. But in 231ff. Sannio has discussed the disadvantages of trying to recover the girl by going to law immediately or when he returns (Sannio having refused to take the money and Aeschinus having kept the girl in the meantime). He surely means here that it is better to be satisfied with the price of the girl and surrender her legally to Aeschinus.

235. quam hic nunc manere: I would read quam aut hic manere with Kauer (W.St.28, 1906,130). He shows convincingly that nunc is likely to be the interpolated gloss here: cf. Phorm. 1025 where CPD² read quid mi nunc adfers for quid mi hic adfers; 992, where nunc appears in different position in v and in the δ-group; And.433 where D has added nunc (expunged by m²) beside hic; Hec.355, where the Bembinus alone adds hunc.

236. quot ad te rediturum: the reading of OCT is hardly right. Even if one accepts the indeclinable form of the future infinitive (see Lindsay, Syntax, 76), quot does not make any sense. What is the plural to be understood? Quod of the MSS is to be read and id is to be taken as an interpolation: see Feh1,52.

putes: the subjunctive arises from contamination of quid rediturum sit and quod rediturum esse putas: cf. Cic.Phil.2.7,

litteras, quas me sibi misisse diceret, recitavit, and see Handford, 154.

237. hoccin incipere: on -ne in the accusative and infinitive of exclamation see on 330.

239. labascit: an aside, but unum hoc habeo is spoken to Sannio. A period should be placed after labascit and a colon after habeo. The verb labascit, here of imminent capitulation (cf. Rud. 1394), evokes the images of a tree tottering: cf. Lucr. 4.1285f. and see Donatus ad loc.

240. venias in periculum: 'face the test as to whether .. or ..'
dividuom face: 'split it in two'; i.e. keep half and lose half:
cf. Rud. 1408, dividuom talentum faciam.

242. conradet: frequently used of 'scraping money together';
cf. H. T. 141, Phorm. 40, Poen. 1363 and frequently in Apuleius;
Met. 7.8; 8.28; 9.9; 10.19. Probably colloquial when used of money or property.

243. etiam de sorte: sors is the principal, here the money which Sannio has laid out in buying the girl. After being prepared to release the girl at cost price without profit, *unclear* Sannio is in danger of being deprived of that sum as well.

244. puDET nil?: a comic accusation in the mouth of one of

the leno, one of the most shameless of all characters in New Comedy: see on 161 and 188.

246. defraudet: with L.-K. I prefer the subjunctive, here an extension from the use of the repudiating subjunctive in repeated questions. Sannio protests against the injustice of the proposed action, the implication being 'it's unfair that he should...!': cf. Hec. 589, illius stultitia victa ex urbe tu rus habitatum migres? (cf. 586) and see Handford, 70. It is unlikely that the indicative would have been changed to the subjunctive here.

The spelling with u is preferable: cf. Prisc. (Gr. L II 39, 11) in 'u quoque longam transit 'fraudo-defrudo'. See Ritschl, Parerg. 540.

246-7. Syrus shrewdly calls Sannio's bluff (nusquam abeo) by preparing to leave him with the affair unsettled.

248. utut haec sunt acta: 'no matter how this was done': utut is used only with the indicative (630, Phorm. 468, 531, H.T. 200) and is rare outside comedy; cf. Cic. Att. 15.26.4 and see LHS II 635. For a study of the forms like utut, quantusquantus, quisquis, etc. and a comparison with the -cumque forms see Ferrarino, cumque e i composti, Bologna 1942. On utut F. points out (200ff.) that it is generally used when a speaker is referring to an action or state that he knows

about. Thus there is usually an implication of the manner in which things were done, as here (cf. Phorm. 406ff., etsi mihi facta iniuriast, verum tamen / potius quam litis sector...). In contrast cf. Bacc. 662, utquomque res sit, ita animum habeat, where the clause is truly indefinite, admitting the full spectrum of a semantic field.

The Calliopians read facta or fata and may be right here, the initial F. having been easily lost after T. in the Bembinus: cf. on 213.

249. I would punctuate with a comma after reddatur, the sense being 'let what is mine be paid me - at any rate, the price I paid for her'. Syrus implies that he is due more than that.

251. sed Ctesiphonem video: Ctesipho is the brother of Aeschinus but his entrance and introduction seem untypical of New Comedy. It is not until 263 that the audience learns that Aeschinus has stolen the girl, not for himself, but for his brother. The words laetus est de amica must have been very puzzling to the spectators. The lack of clarity almost certainly arises from the changes Terence made as a result of incorporating the Diphilean scene: see pp. 19ff.

253. paullisper mane: spoken to Sannio. Syrus does not go indoors after these words to return at 260 as Dz.-K. suggest. There is no reason for him to do so. Aeschinus does not

know of Ctesipho's arrival (cf.265) and is unaware of Sannio's readiness to accept the twenty minae (cf.276). Why then would Syrus leave the stage?

Act II sc. 3.

The metre changes to the iambic octonarii, marking a change in the emotional level as Ctesipho enters, filled with joy and gratitude at what Aeschinus has done: see on 934ff.

254. abs quivis: the preposition abs is extremely common in Plautus and Terence but generally in the phrase abs te. For its appearance here before q cf. Men.345, abs qua cavendum; Pers.159, abs chorago. On the appearance of abs te in later literature see J.C.Rolfe, ALL X (1898) 478-9. On the ablative qui see on 477.

gaudeas: the subjunctive has no modal force but is used because the subject is the ideal 2nd person; cf.e.g. Trin.913-4, fieri istuc solet, / quod in manu atque oculis videas, id desideres: see Handford, 109f.

255. verum enim vero: verum is accompanied, for emphasis, by two asseverative particles, both of which appear independently with it: see following note.

id demum: demum often emphasises a particular person or thing

which is being contrasted with others: cf. Sall. Cat. 2.9, multi mortales dediti ventri atque somno vitam ... transferunt .. verum enim vero is demum vivere .. videtur qui, etc.

Here Ctesipho marks out the special joy which help from a brother gives. For the bonds between brothers cf. Plato

Politeia II 362D, τὸ λεγόμενον, ἀδελφὸς ἀνδρὶ παρείη;

Aristot. EN. 8 1159b 32, and in Latin Cic. Att. 1.5. tibi persuadeas te a me fraterne amari and see A. Otto, ALL V (1888) 373.

256. o frater, frater: for the repetition of the vocative in emotional outbursts cf. And. 282, memor essem! o Mysis, Mysis; Hec. 856, Eun. 91, Curc. 625, Rud. 523, 1235.

257. ita: not infrequent with adjectives and adverbs in Terence: cf. And. 243, 553, H.T. 665: see Allardice, 95.

258. itaque: not the smoothest or most logical of connectives here. More naturally vv. 258-9 give the reason for 256-7, but see note on 972-3.

259. fratrem, neminem hominem .. principem: the syntax of this reading (also Dz.-K.) with fratrem picking up unam hanc rem and being followed by an accusative and infinitive is extremely difficult to accept. The choice of earlier editors is preferable - fratrem homini nemini esse ... principem.

primarum artium mage principem: 'more superior in the possession of the highest qualities': for such a genitive dependent on the personal princeps cf. Cic. Verr. II. 5. 4, flagitiorum omnium vitiorumque princeps. For artes in this sense cf. Trin. 72, artes antiquae artes. Ctesipho means all the qualities which embody virtus -decisiveness, love, loyalty, etc.

260. I punctuate o Ctesipho - CT. o Syre, etc. Syrus gives an emotional greeting to the young man but is cut off by the excited Ctesipho before he can complete it: cf. And. 902, 783, Most. 447-8. On the affective force of o see Richter, Studemund I 594. in the last example the word refers to persons out of sight.

hem: the exclamation marks Ctesipho's surprise that Aeschinus has brought the girl to his home: cf. the reaction of Demea at 389. On hem see on 696.

261. quid est?: 'what's wrong?', prompted by Ctesipho's exclamation; cf. Eun. 747, CH. ubi east? TH. domi apud me. CH. hem. TH. quid est?; H.T. 757.

nunc vivo: with pregnant meaning as often; cf. Catull. 5. 1, vivamus ... atque amemus, and Fordyce ad loc. See on 275.

[o] festivom caput: caput with an attributive was probably originally a hypocoristic usage (usually with lepidum; cf.

966, M.G.725) and the tone is quite different from when it is used with the possessive or demonstrative pronoun, where it is the equivalent of the personal pronoun. A comma is better than a semicolon after caput. For the irregularity in concord cf. And.607, ubi illic est scelus qui perdidit me.

262. quin ... putarit: with causal force (see Handford, 79, for the origin of this subjunctive in the repudiating question). The -ne in this type of clause sprang from instances like Cist.653-4, nullam ego me vidisse credo magis anum excruciablem / quam illaec est: quae dudum fassast mihi, quae ne infitias est?, where an ellipse is to be assumed: see Handford, ibid.: cf. Hor.Serm.1.10,2lf., o seri studiorum quine putetis difficile et mirum.

omnia sibi: pyrrhic caesura of the tribrach in the second foot. The unusual caesura suggests that the dative which seems loosely attached syntactically to the rest of the sentence is the 'sympathetic' dative going closely with omnia (the equivalent of omnia sua: see on 314.).

post ... esse: contrast Phorm.908, nam omnis posthabui mihi res; Hec.483. The infinitive shows that post is an adverb here: cf. Sall.Cat.23.6, invidia atque superbia post fuere.

263. meum laborem et peccatum: I prefer the reading of most

MSS. (including the Bembinus) meum amorem et peccatum, which vv. 5-6 of the periocha, famam rei, / amorem in sese transferebat, show was in the MSS at the time of Sulpicius Apollinaris. The phrase forms the last member of a tricolon and the two nouns should go closely together (cf. note on 48-9, 319). Peccatum is better taken to refer to Ctesipho's having become involved in a love affair than the snatching of the psaltria: cf. the frequent use of peccare in an amatory context; Aul.738, and see Enk on Prop. 2.6.40. With peccatum amorem forms a better unit than laborem. The change to laborem (attested also in Nonius and Donatus) has been prompted by the same kind of thought which Bothe expresses: amorem Ctesiphonis in se transferre Aeschinus nec voluit nec potuit famam amorum eius potuit: scan me(um) am̄or-: see Laidlaw, 34.

But meum amorem won't scan!

264. nil pote supra: pote, attested by Donatus alone (cf. on 389) is likely to be correct, the rare form having been replaced by potest in the MSS.: cf. how pote fuisset has been changed in some MSS. to potuisset at Phorm. 535.

foris crepuit: elsewhere Terence uses the plural, but the singular is not infrequent in Plautus; cf. Cas.874, Most.1062. The sound of a door opening is a stock method announcing the entrance of a character: cf. e.g. in Greek Menand. Dysk.188, Epitr. 586.

mane, mane: Ctesipho, fearful of who will come out, makes to go off: see pp. 21ff.

Act II sc. 4.

Aeschinus now returns to the stage.

265. sacrilegus: with humorous effect Sannio's me quaerit shows that he has no doubts that Aeschinus is referring to him as sacrilegus, applied to a leno at Pseud.363, Rud.706: cf. Pseud.974-5, hominem ego hic quaero malum, legerupam, inpium, peiurum atque improbum. EA. me quaeritat. See note on 161 and 188.

num quid nam: implying the fear or inner belief that Aeschinus will not bring the money: see Shackleton Bailey, CQ (1953) 47.121ff.

266. chem opportune: see on 81.

te ipsum quaero: there is no contradiction with Syrus' words at 260, te exspectat domi; cf. the words of Sostrata at H.T. 622, te ipsum quaero, although she has said at 619 hic ego virum interea opperibor. The verb quaero need not imply an active search.

quid fit?: 'what's wrong?' The expression refers to Ctesipho's frightened appearance as the next words show; cf. 768, quid fit? quid tu es tristis?, Merc.284.

omitte vero: vero strengthening the imperative as often:
cf.e.g. Eun.912, move vero ocius te nutrix; Phorm.435;
Aul.768, et al.

tristitiem: reading of the Bembinus alone. Nouns ending in
-ia often oscillate between the 1st and 5th declensions,
though usually only in the nominative and accusative. For
tristities cf.Pacuv.trag.59; Tac.A.2.4.3; Apul.Met.6.9.

268-9, o mi Aeschine, / o mi germane: see on 256.

269. coram in os: 'openly to your face'. Coram is always
adverbial in Plautus and Terence. For a similar emphatic
pleonasm cf.Eun.794, quae mi ante oculos coram amatorem
adduxti tuom.

270. adsentandi: earliest attested example of the gerund of
purpose: see LHS II 75.

mage quam quo habeam gratum: 'rather than because I am
grateful (for what you have done)': gratum here is neuter,
quod fecisti (e.g.) being understood; cf.Merc.527, honoris
causa quicquid est quod dabitur gratum habebō; Truc.582,
and see G. Williams on the uses of gratus in CQ 9 (1959)
155ff. For quo in clauses of denied reason cf.825,Eun.28,
96, H.T.554,Amph.913. See Handford,68, n.2, for the origin
of this usage.

271. inepte: vocative; cf. And.791, eho inepta, nescis quid sit actum; Eun.311,1007.

norimus: with original long i of the perfect subjunctive (optative in origin); cf. Phorm.772, gesserimus; H.T.1026, memineris.

nos inter nos: inter se is commonly used to express reciprocal action with transitive verbs (e.g. amare at 828, Capt. 420, Cic.ad Q. fr.3.3; aspicere at Cic.Catil.3.13) and with verbs which would be accompanied by a prepositional phrase or a dative (e.g. Stich.689, nos volo ludere inter nos; Cic.Att.10.4.10, nos inter nos locutos). In this line the notion of reciprocity is reinforced by nos (nominative) in the same way that ipsi often appears with se (Caes.B.G.6. 37.10, se ... ipsi adhortantur); cf. also Cic.Att.14.13b.5, ut nosmet ipsi inter nos conjunctiones simus; Lucr.1.760: see ALL VII 345ff.

272. hoc mihi dolet: dolet in this sense, 'to cause pain', is frequent in Plautus and Terence (cf. e.g. 451, 682, 733). This usage has probably survived through the influence of other impersonal verbs which appear with it more often than not: cf. Catull.63.73, iam iam dolet quod egi, iam iamque paenitet, Cic.Mur.42, cui placet obliviscitur, cui dolet meminit; Sen.dial.3.12.2. The change to the common classic-

al usage has developed from instances like Most.891, oculi dolent, where the subject is part of the body.

sero: 'too late': cf. Aul.249, H.T.344.

273-3. et paene in eum locum / redisse ut: impersonal; more commonly the subject is res (cf. H.T.359,113, Phorm.686), and Bentley's emendation et in eum rem locum has won wide acceptance. But paene is required by the sense (the situation did not come to the point where no one could help) and metrically the tribrach et in e- with the ictus on in is not attractive.

274. tam ob parvolam: for the separation of tam from the adjective or adverb it qualifies cf. H.T.955, tam in brevi spatio; And.111, tam fert familiariter; Hec.568, Eun.210.

275. paene e patria! turpe dictu: the punctuation is improved if one places a dash instead of an exclamation mark after patria. It is an example of aposiopesis rather than of ellipsis (see Donatus ad loc.) The sense of turpe dictu is 'I shudder to say the word' (e.g. perire: cf. Capt.537, periisti e patria tua).

On this line Donatus states Menander mori illum voluisse fingit, Terentius fugere. It is not uncommon for young men to contemplate suicide when their love affair seems doomed

(cf. H.T. 971, Phorm. 686, Asin. 606ff., Merc. 472, Pseud. 88ff.).

In view of the frequency of this motif one wonders why Terence bothered to make the change. It has been suggested that he did so in the interests of realism (Haffter, Mus. Helv. 10, 1953, 96; Rieth, 40: cf. Dz.-K., Einl. 16, where it is thought that Terence made the change, since he felt such an irrevocable decision did not suit the character of the weak-spined Ctesipho). This may be right, but possibly Terence did not abandon his model in this point. Another solution for a young man in Ctesipho's plight was to go overseas, usually to fight in Hellenistic armies (cf. H.T. 117, Merc. 644f. and see on 385-6 of this play). An interesting example from Menander is in the Samia. Moschion says that had it not been for other factors he would have left the country (282ff.).

ἀλλ' ἀποφθαρεῖς

ἐκ τῆς πόλεως ἂν ἐκποδῶν εἰς Βάκτρα ποι

ἦ Καρίαν διέτριβον αἰχμᾶζων ἐκεῖ.

The verb ἀποφθεῖρεσθαι is interesting. For the sense 'leave, be gone from' cf. Sam. 158, Eurip. H.F. 1270. The possibility arises that this verb appeared in Menander at this point and that the source of the Donatus scholion misunderstood it. The Menandrian line may have been quoted in the commentary to show that aposiopesis was absent in Menander. This was

then misunderstood and the purpose of the citation was taken to show that the young man in Menander committed suicide. Such an error could have been helped by nunc vivo in 261, although this phrase has been felt by some to be a trace of the young man's intent in Menander (so Rieth, 40-1).

deos quaeso ut: quaeso with a dependent ut-clause marks an urgent, emotional appeal (cf. 598, Hec. 786) and is often coupled with verbs such as peto (Cic. Fam. 3.2.1; 5.4.2) and precor (Cic. dom. 144; Livy 23.9.2). The construction belongs to the formal, elevated language of religious invocations (cf. Cato. R.R. 141.2, Mars pater, te precor quaesoque uti sies volens propitius mihi) and many of the examples in Plautus and Terence are appeals to the gods as here (Amph. 720, Cas. 389, 396, Rud. 499, 1256, Amph. 934, Aul. 611, Merc. 678, Ad. 491). This suggests that at Eun. 466, quaeso hercle ut liceat, pace quod fiat tua, etc., Parmeno is poking fun at Thraso, addressing him as if he were the exalted being he thinks himself to be. In Plautus, Terence, and Cicero's correspondence quaeso is much more frequently parenthetical.

In his appeal to the gods Aeschinus is praying that they will succeed in persuading Sannio to sell the girl. Otherwise Ctesipho may still go into exile.

276. quid ait tandem nobis: tandem marks Aeschinus' impatience (cf. And. 859, Phorm. 799) see Dz.-Hauler on Phorm. 373 and note on 794). The presence of nobis, an ethic dative, also conveys emotional overtones: see LHS II 93f.

277. ego ad forum .. absolvam: Aeschinus' words do not suggest that he is going to the forum to look for his father to ask him for the money. Yet Syrus' words at 364f. and 369 seem to me to presuppose the audience's knowledge that this was the purpose in going there. The natural inference to be drawn from Aeschinus' words here is that he had money at his disposal in the forum, irrespective of whether he met his father. I suspect that this untidy linkage arises from Terence's re-working of the end of the second act: see p.26 above.

278. insta: 'be insistent': used absolutely; cf. Phorm. 717, si altera illaec magis instabit (see TLL VII,1 2000,61ff.). But one may understand a personal or impersonal object (cf. Curc. 376, H.T. 895).

278-9. ne tam quidem / quam vis: I can make no sense of ne .. quidem here and I accept Madvig's conjecture non tam quidem.., 'I'm not in as great haste as you wish me to be' (Adv.Crit. II 20). For tam = tantum cf. H.T. 299, 413, 1052, Phorm. 998. Editors

who retain ne .. quidem give no convincing explanation or parallel for the meaning which ne .. quidem requires here, whether they punctuate as the OCT or take quamvis with otiosus.

279. etiam: 'still'.

279. ne time: on this form of a negative command in later literature, extremely common in Plautus and Terence and probably colloquial, see LHS II 340.

281. Ctesipho calls Syrus back. Aeschinus, who must have started to leave the stage after Syrus' words at 278, has by this time made his exit.

em quid est?: hem must be read; cf. And.184, SI. Dave. DA.
hem quid est? SI. eho dum ad me. Em is impossible here; see Richter, Studemund I 505, and Luck, Interjektionen, 20.

282. absolvitote: future imperative plural: see notes on 377 and 500.

283. permanet: for the metaphor (cf. English 'leak'; cf. Capt. 221, neu permanet palam haec nostra fallacia).

perpetuo perierim: see on 160; perpetuo frequently occurs with verbal compounds in per-; cf. Eun.1043, H.T.862, Most.550, Pers.281.

284. bono animo esto: since elsewhere in Terence the imperative

es is always glossed in at least one member of the Calliopians, usually by esto (cf. Eun. 84, Ad. 543, 696, Phorm. 965), but is never replaced by the gloss, it seems likely that esto is right here and that TO has been lost in the Bembinus because of the following TV: see Kauer, Bursians Jahresber. 143(1909) 263.

intus te oblecta: this reading is required, if one prints esto tu and is substantiated by the fact that the reflexive pronoun is rarely separated from the verb in Terence (cf. 46, 49, 286, 322, 519, 575, 623, 632, 756, 763, 838, 842, 886; on the other hand 614): see Dz.-K. ad loc.

286. transacta re convertam me: the tone is somewhat formal and grandiose. On the ablative absolute, freely used in the long verses, but limited to stock phrases in senarii, see Haffter, 49f. On convertam me cf. Donatus: 'convertam' magnifice dictum: verbum enim magni moliminis et gravaminis ingentis, and Stich. 402, bene re gesta salvos convertor domum, in a speech thanking Neptune for a safe homecoming.

ita quaeso; 'please do so': cf. 927, H.T. 502, and the use of ita to confirm a statement (e.g. 521, Amph. 379, Cas. 402 and see Thesleff, Yes and No, 26).

sumamus: i.e. consumamus ('let us use up, spend'). An

adverb is required with this meaning (cf. Pseud.1288, hunc diem sumpsimus prothyme). The adjective hilarem in the MSS. has arisen from the declension of the word in the later period. There is no certain example of hilaris in Plautus or Terence (cf. the divergence of the MSS. at 756 and Donatus ad.loc. - hilarum vetuste, non hilarem). There is no certain example of hilaris, -e, in Plautus and Terence. Bentley's emendation of hilarem to hilare at Poen.1366 is surely right: see Dz.-K. on this line.

Ctesipho enters the house and Syrus exits to the forum.