

## TERENTIUS ORATOR AN POETA: THE ENDINGS OF *EUNUCHUS* AND *ADELPHOE*

The analytical study of Roman comedy – the reconstruction of lost originals and of the process of adaptation – remains controversial and uncertain, with different practitioners operating very differently and few gaining general approval for a thesis. But that is not to say that anything goes. There has indeed been progress, and all analysts do agree, first appearances aside, on a thing or two. Contamination has long ceased to be the solution of default. And it is no longer thought acceptable, as it was into the mid-twentieth century, to impute vast changes to Roman poets while supplying only the vaguest motive for them. Rather differences between *véa* and *palliata* are studied, argued over, and kept near the centre of attention, to be invoked as justification when a Roman intervention is proposed. To those motives for alteration that have already been identified I should like to add another, applicable only to the work of Terence.

Terence's plays are distinguished from the otherwise extant *palliata*, and at the same time from the extant *véa*, by their rhetorical sophistication and their subordination of other matters thereto. Their rhetoricality has been particularly noticed in the prologues, and indeed it is very evident there.<sup>1</sup> Understandably, for these are extended compositions entirely Terence's own, intended as pleadings. Paronomasia and paromoion, figures with oratorical associations, are abundant in them, and at least one, that of *Andria*, is structured in ways characteristic of a courtroom speech.<sup>2</sup> But the phenomenon goes far beyond the prologues. A rhetorical conception of the writer's craft informs the whole of Terence's work, and this conception must have been developed through formal rhetorical training. His plays show awareness of rhetorical matters so specific that they can hardly have been imparted save by instruction. For example, he knew that an encomium was to be organized around the subject's achievements and virtues. *Eunuchus* 1090: *collaudai secundum facta et uirtutes*.<sup>3</sup> Similarly, he had not just the usual Old Latin affection for repetition of sounds, but experimented with homoeoteleuton, the repetition of

<sup>1</sup> F. Leo, *Analecta Plautina: de figuris sermonis, II* (Göttingen, 1898), 15–28 (= *Ausgewählte kleine Schriften* [Rome, 1960], 1.135–49); G. Focardi, 'Lo stile oratorio nei prologhi terenziani', *SIFC* 50 (1978), 70–89; S. Goldberg, 'Terence, Cato, and the rhetorical prologue', *CPh* 78 (1983), 198–211; id., *Understanding Terence*, (Princeton, 1986), 31–60.

<sup>2</sup> Leo (n. 1), 15–16; D. Klose, *Die Didaskalien und Prologe des Terenz* (Diss. Freiburg, 1966), 81–93; H. Gelhaus, *Die Prologe des Terenz. Eine Erklärung nach den Lehren von der inventio und dispositio* (Heidelberg, 1972), 32–40. The organization of the *Andria* prologue follows the classic scheme *exordium–narratio–argumentatio–conclusio*; the *exordium* moreover shows the technique of *insinuatio* (Gelhaus, 32–4). Gelhaus analysed the other prologues, too, rather less successfully: the shortcomings of his work are documented in E. Lefèvre's review, *Gnomon* 48 (1976), 346–53.

<sup>3</sup> The virtues and achievements of the subject were already prescribed matter in *Rhet. ad Alex.* 35=1440b–1441b and *Arist. Rh.* 1.9=1366a–1368a (cf. 3.16.2=1416b); note also *Rhet. Her.* 3.15; *Cic. De or.* 2.342–8, *Part. or.* 70–82. Thereafter they became such a fast convention that none of the four cardinal *ἀπειραί* might be omitted; hence in the *laudatio* that he composed for Claudius' funeral Seneca was obliged to praise the wisdom of the deceased, drawing guffaws

end-syllables, particularly so as to coincide with syntactical and metrical breaks. When the homoeoteleuton occurs together with isocolon, we may be confident of formal study. *Phormio* 305–6:

nil suaue meritumst: hominem commonstrarier  
mihi istum uolo aut ubi habitet demonstrarier.

And a bit further on in the same play (l. 374):

bonorum extortor! legum contortor!

Complex systems of isocolic and homoeoteleutic units occur, too. *Eunuchus* 74–9:<sup>4</sup>

| quid *agas* ? nisi ut te redimas captum quam *queas* (14 syllables)  
| minimo ; si *nequeas* (7 syllables) | paullulo, at quanti *queas* ; (7 syllables)  
| et ne te adflictes. (5 syllables) | :: itane suades? (5 syllables) | :: si sapis,  
neque praeter quam *quas* ipse amor molestias  
| habet *addas*, et *illas* (7 syllables) | *quas* habet recte *feras*. (7 syllables) |  
sed ecce ipsa egreditur, nostri fundi calamitas.

I would willingly see a further sign of rhetorical training in another aspect of Terence's style, one that was already identified during antiquity. In praising Terence as *puri sermonis amator*, Julius Caesar recognized at work in him the principle of linguistic normality – avoidance of the archaic, the dialectal and the eccentric – which could be called *καθαρότης* or *puritas*.<sup>5</sup> Terence's Latin does indeed stand apart within his genre, lacking the fanciful neologism of Plautus and Caecilius as well as some of their characteristic forms and vocabulary. Nor will this be a simple effect of his date. Fragments of later comic drama show features rejected by Terence to have been spoken from the stage through his time and beyond.<sup>6</sup> Poets of the *togata* have for example, like Plautus, *baetere* and compounds thereof, avoided by Terence (Titinius fr. 17, Pomponius fr. 150, where *betet* is Palmer's correction of *uetet*). Terence followed the spirit of *καθαρότης* in morphology as well as in his choice of words.<sup>7</sup> So both Caecilius (100) and Plautus (*passim*) show a vocative

from the crowd (Tac. *Ann.* 13.3.1). Line 1090 of *Eunuchus* will come in for more comment below. Significantly, it occurs in a scene bearing multiple indications of Terentian authorship.

<sup>4</sup> Discussion and further examples in Leo (n. 1), 14–15, in J. Straus, *Terenz und Menander. Beitrag zu einer Stilvergleichung* (Diss. Bern, 1954, published Zurich, 1955), 7, 9, 34, and especially in M. Schlossarek, 'Die Sprache des Terenz unter hauptsächlicher Berücksichtigung ihres rhetorischen Elements', in *Festschrift zur Jahrhundertfeier der Universität Breslau* (Breslau, 1911), 275–99.

<sup>5</sup> Caes. fr. 1 Blänsdorf = Suet. *Vita Terenti* 7; Cic. fr. 2 Blänsdorf (= Suet. *ibid.*) makes the same point in praising Terence for his *lectus sermo*. For *καθαρότης/puritas* see esp. Dion. Hal. *Lys.* 2, also *Rhet. Her.* 4.17 and Cic. *Orat.* 79 (equating *purus* with *latinus*), all probably underlain by the lost *Περὶ λέξεως* of Theophrastus.

<sup>6</sup> This aspect of comic diction has been treated briefly (though very ably) by M. Deufert, *Textgeschichte und Rezeption der plautinischen Komödien im Altertum* (Berlin and New York, 2002), 32–43, and at greater length (though rather amateurishly) by E. Karakasis, *Terence and the Language of Roman Comedy* (Cambridge, 2005), esp. 150–68, 204–46. The discussion that follows owes much to Deufert.

<sup>7</sup> Not formally discussed by Dion. Hal. (n. 5). Neither Dionysius nor his model Theophrastus had reason to, working as they did within the settled morphological system of mature Greek literary prose.

*puere*, continued in the *togata* (Afranius fr. 193) but apparently not in Terence.<sup>8</sup> The *togata* also makes freer use of the s-stem subjunctive, as does Plautus, against the small number of formulaic expressions kept by Terence (Afranius fr. 83 *fortunassint*, 264 *mactassint*); a similar pattern is seen with *fuam*, *fuas* etc. The same holds for *ibus/hibus* (Titinius 59, Pomponius 104), and perhaps *ted*, if this is correctly restored to Titinius (fr. 65). Terence would seem to have avoided such features through conscious choice, a choice guided by rhetorical theory.

Caesar was not the only one aware of a rhetorical element in Terence: the whole exegetical tradition is quite sensitive to this aspect of his writing. Eugraphius, *An. pref.*:

Cum omnes poetae uirtutem oratoriam semper uersibus exequantur, tum magis duo uiri apud Latinos, Virgilius et Terentius, ex quibus, ut suspicio nostra est, magis Terentii uirtus ad rationem rhetoricae artis accedit.

Whereas all poets emulate in verse the qualities of good oratory, nevertheless two men among the Latins, Virgil and Terence, do so especially. Of them, I suspect, it is Terence's artistry that has more in common with the technique of rhetoric.

Eugraphius goes on to treat Terence to a complete rhetorical commentary. Donatus, too, expends much space on the analysis of arguments and figures. Moderns have been aware that rhetoric left some mark on our poet, though they have not seen in it more than that – a feature of the surface.<sup>9</sup> In fact it goes to the heart of his artistic principles. The finest moments in Terence's work come when something difficult must be done with words: Demea calmed, Chremes cajoled into offering Philumena to Pamphilus, Phidippus' suspicions about his daughter's pregnancy dispelled, Thais turned from Chaerea's accuser to his marriage broker. Terence was as fascinated by argument and its technique as Plautus was by deception, selecting material where they had a certain prominence and – it may be suspected – heightening this prominence in adaptation. Among arguments, he had a special fondness for the paradoxical. Consider this passage from *Hecyra* (536–9, 550–6), where Phidippus claims that Pamphilus' infidelity really makes him a *good* husband:

sed nunc mi in mentem uenit  
de hac re quod locuta es olim, cum illum generum cepimus:  
nam negabas nuptam posse filiam tuam te pati  
cum eo qui meretricem amaret, qui pernoctaret foris.  
....  
audisti ex aliquo fortasse qui uidisse eum diceret  
exeuntem aut intro euntem ad amicam. quid tum postea?  
si modeste ac raro haec fecit, nonne ea dissimulare nos  
magis humanum est quam dare operam id scire qui nos oderit?

<sup>8</sup> At *Hec.* 719, where *puere curre* has been read by conjecture, *curre puer* should instead be read with ms. F (which has a number of excellent readings in this play). *Puere* has also been conjectured at *Eun.* 624, unmetrical as transmitted, but there are other possible remedies (e.g. *puer*, *i*, *Pamphilam* / *adcerse* Bentley).

<sup>9</sup> The *ornatus* of Terence's style has best been treated by Leo, Schlossarek, Straus and Focardi (nn. 1 and 4). Perceptive remarks will also be found in N. Terzaghi, *Prolegomeni a Terenzio* (Turin, 1931), 95–100, in A. Gratwick's commentary to *Adelphoe* (Warminster, 1987), esp. on 855–81 and 985–97, and *passim* in Goldberg (n. 1).

nam si is posset ab ea sese derepente auellere  
 quicum tot consuesset annos, non eum hominem ducerem  
 nec uirum satis firmum gnatae.

I recall now what you said about this business in the past, when we betrothed our girl to him: you said you couldn't bear to see your daughter married to one who loved a courtesan, who spent nights away from home ... Maybe you heard that from somebody who said he'd seen him going into his girlfriend's house, or coming out of it. So what? If he did it moderately and seldom, isn't it more decent of us to turn a blind eye, rather than know things that would make him resent us? You see, if he could suddenly tear himself away from a woman he had spent so many years with, I should not think he had a human heart, or that he would make a reliable enough husband for our daughter.

Or this one from the *Eunuchus*, where introducing a teenage boy into a prostitute's house becomes a way to improve his morals (*Eun.* 929–40):

tum hoc alterum,  
 id uero est quod ego mihi puto palmarium,  
 me repperisse quo modo adulescentulus  
 meretricum ingenia et mores posset noscere  
 mature, ut quom cognorit perpetuo oderit.  
 quae dum foris sunt nihil uidetur mundius,  
 nec magis compositum quicquam nec magis elegans,  
 quae cum amatore quom cenant ligurriunt.  
 harum uidere inluuiem sordes inopiam,  
 quam inhonestae solae sint domi atque auidae cibi,  
 quo pacto ex iure hesterno panem atrum uorent,  
 nosse omnia haec salus est adulescentulis.

There's something else, too, and I really think it's my masterpiece: I found a way for a young fellow to learn what courtesans are like and learn it in time, so as to shun them for good once he understands. When they're away from home they seem the picture of grooming, of elegance, of taste, as they nibble at supper in company with their lovers. To see that they're filthy slovenly beggars, see how indecent they are when alone at home and how gluttonous, how they gulp down black bread soaked in yesterday's gravy – such knowledge will save a young man much hardship.

I imagine Terence smiling a proud-schoolboy smile as he wrote such lines, and it is as a proud schoolboy that we should think of him: a young man flush with the discovery of new skills, out to display them soon and often. Even better, they were during Terence's career uncommon skills with something risqué about them. Rhetoric, after all, was taught by learned freeborn Greeks, such, we may gather from Polybius, as only came to Rome in numbers after 168.<sup>10</sup> It would seem significant in this regard that we have the name of no rhetor working at Rome until the 140s,<sup>11</sup> though we do know by name several *grammatisteis* and *grammatici*

<sup>10</sup> 31.24.6–7 (reporting Polybius' advice to the young Scipio Aemilianus) *περὶ γὰρ τὰ μαθήματα, περὶ ἃ νῦν ὀρῶ σπουδάζοντας ὑμᾶς καὶ φιλοτιμουμένους, οὐκ ἀπορήσετε τῶν συνεργησόντων ὑμῖν ἐτοιμῶς, καὶ σοὶ κἀκεῖνων πολὺ γὰρ δὴ τι φύλον ἀπὸ τῆς Ἑλλάδος ἐπιπρρόον ὀρῶ κατὰ τὸ παρὸν τῶν τοιούτων ἀνθρώπων* ('As for the learning for which I see you earnest and eager, you will have no lack of willing helpers, both for yourself and your brother. For I see that a very great drove of such persons is flooding in at this moment from Greece').

<sup>11</sup> Diophanes of Mytilene, teacher of Tiberius Gracchus (Cic. *Brut.* 104).

before then.<sup>12</sup> And it was during Terence's career, in 161, that controversy over the foreign rhetoricians and their new learning came to a head, with the senate ordering their expulsion from the city.<sup>13</sup>

### *EUNUCHUS*

At the beginning of this paper new understanding of the process of adaptation was promised. Let us take first the ending of *Eunuchus*, which has generated much discussion. Some have found that the last scenes of this play cohere poorly with the rest, but there is no general agreement how they came to be written as they are or what their author hoped to achieve by them.<sup>14</sup>

Thais, a Rhodian courtesan living at Athens, has two lovers: Phaedria, a sympathetic young Athenian, and Thraso, a wealthy and crude foreign soldier.<sup>15</sup> Thraso comes to Athens with a beautiful slave girl, Pamphila, intending to offer her as a gift to Thais. She is in fact Thais' intimate childhood companion, who, having been kidnapped from Attica in childhood and raised by Thais' mother on Rhodes, has now been sold as a slave. Wishing to secure Pamphila in her house and reunite her with her Attic family, Thais asks Phaedria to yield to Thraso for two days. Jealous and wounded, Phaedria retires reluctantly to the country. During his absence, Pamphila is delivered to Thais. So, too, are two gifts from Phaedria – a eunuch and an Ethiopian maidservant – by arrangements made before his departure. But Phaedria's brother Chaerea has himself substituted for the eunuch; thus disguised he is taken into Thais' house, where he rapes Pamphila. Meanwhile Thais concludes her search for Pamphila's Attic relatives. On discovering the rape and confronting Chaerea, she listens to his protestations of love and forgives him. She further invites Chaerea to meet with Pamphila's brother and *κύριος*, paving the way for his marriage to her. As regards Phaedria, his hand strengthens toward the end of the play: Thraso and Thais quarrel; Thraso tries to force his way into Thais' house but fails; Thais establishes good relations with Phaedria's father and places herself under his legal protection. As a result, we are told, Thais will be all Phaedria's and 'the soldier will be sent packing' (*miles pelletur foras*, 1041). That is the solution we have been led toward, for Thraso has been loutish and despicable – just the sort of figure whom comedy sets up for punishment. It is

<sup>12</sup> Suet. *Gram.* 1.2 (Andronicus and Ennius), also Jer. *Chron.* 1830=187 B.C. (Andronicus); Plut. *Quaest. Rom.* 59=278E (Sp. Carvilius); id. *Cat. Mai.* 20.5=348a (Chilon); Suet. *Gram.* 2.2 (Octavius Lampadio). The famous Pergamene grammarian Crates of Mallos, who taught briefly in Rome (ibid. 3.1), may perhaps be counted, too.

<sup>13</sup> Suet. *Rhet.* 25.2; Gell. *NA* 15.11.

<sup>14</sup> (Relatively) recent bibliographies of analytical research on this play are available in: E. Lefèvre, 'Terenz', in R. Herzog and P.L. Schmidt (edd.), *Handbuch der lateinischen Literatur*, 1 (Munich, 2002), 232–53, esp. 242–5; id., *Terenz' und Menanders Eunuchus* (Munich, 2003); A. Antonsen-Resch, *Von Gnathon bis Saturio. Die Parasitenfigur und das Verhältnis der römischen Komödie zur griechischen* (Berlin and New York, 2004), 153–78 (with a helpful summary). Problems specific to the ending are reviewed thoroughly and insightfully by P. Brown, 'The Bodmer codex of Menander and the endings of Terence's *Eunuchus* and other Roman comedies', in E. Handley and A. Hurst (edd.), *Relire Ménandre* (Geneva, 1990), 37–61.

<sup>15</sup> In what follows, the Terentian names will designate characters both of *Eunuchus* and *Εὐνοῦχος*. Several names of the latter are known (see Kassel–Austin, *PCG test.* iv), but to use them would hamper readability.

announced in a monologue by Chaerea (V.viii) in the presence of Gnatho and Thraso. Then the very last scene of the play (V.ix) changes everything. Thraso sends the parasite Gnatho to plead with Phaedria, asking that Thais be shared between the two rivals. Gnatho argues that Phaedria, having not the means to satisfy a woman of Thais' greed, should find such an arrangement advantageous; he also assures him that Thais' true affections will not go over to Thraso, who is too unlovable. Advised by his brother Chaerea, Phaedria agrees to the proposition.

Critics have felt swindled, and with good reason: Thraso has earned more punishment than he gets, while Phaedria has abruptly swapped his jealous nature for a very different one.<sup>16</sup> The ending supposes that money is Phaedria's greatest worry, though little has been made of that issue before.<sup>17</sup> It also gives Thais no say in the settlement between Thraso and Phaedria. Yet as a free courtesan she has the right to choose her lovers, and has been seen in no way reticent to exercise her rights.<sup>18</sup> Worst of all, the play seems designed to establish her as a good courtesan, work now undone.<sup>19</sup>

Certain things are known about the genesis of *Eunuchus*. Terence himself tells us that it fuses two Menandrian comedies, *Eὐνοῦχος* and *Κόλαξ* (prologue, 19–20). Everything involving the eunuch must of course come from *Eὐνοῦχος*; this will include all of the Chaerea plot and at least enough of the Phaedria plot to lead to the gift of a eunuch and motivate Phaedria's absence when the eunuch is delivered.<sup>20</sup> Terence admits (31–2) to taking over the 'characters' (*personae*) of Thraso and his hanger-on Gnatho from *Κόλαξ*. What he means is clarified first by Donatus *ad Eun.* 228, according to whom the following passage (perhaps as much as the entire scene II.ii) derives from *Κόλαξ*, Parmeno's lines presumably excepted.<sup>21</sup> A book fragment of *Κόλαξ* (no. 3 Körte–Thierfelder), translated by *Eunuchus* 498, confirms that Terence has not only staged a soldier and parasite like those of *Κόλαξ* but used some of their dialogue as well. Indeed Luscus' accusation, that Terence's *Eunuchus* 'is' the *Colax* of Naevius (prologue, 25), implies a degree of textual correspondence to the *Κόλαξ* of Menander. Now Terence has also been suspected of taking much more from the same source. The soldier and flatterer of *Κόλαξ* were indeed the young lover's rival and rival's companion of that play.<sup>22</sup> One might find therein support for theories deriving the reconciliation scene of Terence's play from

<sup>16</sup> F.H. Sandbach, *The Comic Theatre of Greece and Rome* (London, 1977), 144.

<sup>17</sup> Brown (n. 14), 56.

<sup>18</sup> Sandbach (n. 16), 144; Brown (n. 14), 53.

<sup>19</sup> G. Pasquali, 'Un personaggio e due scene dell' *Eunuco*', *SIFC* 13 (1936), 117–29; see 127–9. W. Ludwig, 'Von Terenz zu Menander', *Philologus* 103 (1959), 1–38, at 36–8. As Pasquali put it, 'un personaggio di siffatta nobiltà intima non può essere sollevato a tanta altezza per essere poi rigettato nel fango.'

<sup>20</sup> The matter of what necessarily comes from *Eὐνοῦχος* is well presented by Ludwig (n. 19), 3–8.

<sup>21</sup> The alternate theory deriving this scene from a third model (E. Meyerhöfer, *Der Aufbau des terenzischen Eunuchus* [Diss. Erlangen, 1927], 32–4; A. Klotz, 'Der Eunuchus des Terenz und seine Vorlagen', *WJb* 1 [1946], 1–28 at 6–7) is not to be considered seriously: see M. Pernerstorfer, *Menanders Kolax. Ein Beitrag zu Rekonstruktion und Interpretation der Komödie* (Berlin and New York, 2009), 95–6.

<sup>22</sup> Clearest from Phaedria's reaction to the soldier's arrival (perhaps in company of the parasite) at 11–39. For the nature of the soldier and parasite's relations, see especially the book fragments 2 and 3 Körte–Thierfelder.

*Κόλαξ*, since it involves Thraso and Gnatho.<sup>23</sup> But the young lover of *Εὐνοῦχος* had a rival, too, motivating his absence when the eunuch is delivered. So, was Terence's finale grafted from *Κόλαξ*? Was an arrangement between lover and rival at the end of *Εὐνοῦχος* rewritten to accommodate characters of the *Κόλαξ*?<sup>24</sup> Such an ending would satisfy the tendency of comedy to draw to a close amid relief and general good will. Or did Terence invent the whole reconciliation himself?<sup>25</sup>

Of our three scenarios, a finale borrowed from *Κόλαξ* is easiest to discard. Gnatho's argumentation in *Eunuchus* V.ix assumes a free courtesan who may reject lovers (1080) and moreover stands in a gift-giving relationship with them, whereas the love object of *Κόλαξ* was a slave woman owned by a procurer.<sup>26</sup> Even if removed from the procurer's control in the course of the play, such a woman would become not an independent courtesan but either the private slave of her buyer or, if freed, a wife or concubine. And most importantly, the soldier of *Κόλαξ* was like Thraso, hence unfit for reward.

There is also much reason to reject a sharing arrangement at the close of *Εὐνοῦχος*. The objections raised to the sharing of the courtesan have already been mentioned: the injustice of rewarding Thraso; the abruptness of Phaedria's retreat from jealousy; Phaedria's worries about money, not seen before; the incoherence that results when Thais is excluded from the dealings between Phaedria and Thraso. The first of these loses force when it is realized that the rival of *Εὐνοῦχος* need not have been as dislikable as Thraso, who was of course imported from *Κόλαξ*.<sup>27</sup>

<sup>23</sup> This idea had been almost general in the nineteenth-century scholarship, which tended to see Terence as a mere translator, not a composer of scenes in his own right, hence to assume that everything in this play not derived from *Εὐνοῦχος* must come from *Κόλαξ*. For a summary of such theories regarding the ending see Meyerhöfer (n. 21), 56–8. A few later investigators have likewise held the ending derived or inspired by *Κόλαξ*: Pasquali (n. 19), 127–9; U. Knoche, 'Über einige Szenen des *Eunuchus* (Zweiter Teil)', *NGG Phil.-hist. Kl.* 1938, 31–87, at 78–85; W. Ludwig, 'The originality of Terence and his Greek models', *GRBS* 9 (1968), 169–82, at 172–3.

<sup>24</sup> F. Leo's rather sketchily presented view of the ending was along these lines: 'Menanders Kolax', *NGG Phil.-hist. Kl.* (1903), 673–92, at 691. Similarly H. Drexler, 'Terentiana', *Hermes* 73 (1938), 39–98, at 97–8; P.W. Harsh, 'Certain features of technique found in both Greek and Roman drama', *AJPh* 58 (1937), 282–93, at 286; H. Lloyd-Jones, 'Terentian techniques in the *Adelphi* and the *Eunuchus*', *CQ* 23 (1973), 279–84, at 283–4; W. Steidle, 'Menander bei Terenz', *RhM* 116 (1973), 303–47, at 345–7; Brown (n. 14), also concluded cautiously for an ending derived in the main from *Εὐνοῦχος*.

<sup>25</sup> Free Terentian composition was first (as far as I know) suggested by Theodor Benfey, among the remarks prefaced to the play in his translation (*Publius Terentius im Versmass der Urschrift übersetzt* [Stuttgart, 1839], 546). It has been best defended by K. Büchner, *Das Theater des Terenz* (Heidelberg, 1974), 305–6, and E. Lefèvre (n. 14 [2003]), 120–2.

<sup>26</sup> Lines 126–56 Pernerstorfer = 109 ff. Körte = 120 ff. Sandbach.

<sup>27</sup> There are indeed indications that the rival of *Εὐνοῦχος* was at least less blustery and insensible of others: see esp. *Eun.* 434–46, which only make sense within the plot of *Εὐνοῦχος*, with U. Knoche, 'Über einige Szenen des *Eunuchus* (Erster Teil)', *NGG Phil.-hist. Kl.* (1936), 145–84, at 158–64. We need not therefore suppose that this rival was not a soldier. The examples of Polemon in *Περικειρομένη*, Thrasonides in *Μισούμενος* and Stratophanes in *Σικυνώνιοι* should remind us that Menander's soldiers covered a certain range of ἦθη. The rival of *Εὐνοῦχος* has at times been thought something other than a soldier, never on convincing grounds: G. Jachmann, 'Der *Eunuchus* des Terenz', *NGG Phil.-hist. Kl.* (1921), 69–88, at 70–71; Knoche, op. cit. at 181 n. 3; Drexler (n. 24), 77; Klotz, (n. 21), 2 ('Wenn Terenz die Personen des Soldaten und des Parasiten in seinen *Eunuchus* übertragen hat, so ist es sicher, daß im *Εὐνοῦχος* des Menander weder ein Soldat noch ein Parasit eine Rolle gespielt haben').

The second and third carry little weight in themselves.<sup>28</sup> The last, that Thais ought to have her say, carries much. Even if we imagine more elaborate negotiations in *Eὐνοῦχος*, shortened by Terence so as to place the most striking development in the last scene of the play, we must still reckon with confusion surrounding Thais' character. The play has slowly revealed her a *ἐταίρα χρηστή*, only to muddle this point at the very close. And we must reckon with much more, too. Terence's ending is at odds not only with Thais' character and rights, but with all the action that involves her. She has in the course of the play acquired a legal protector at Athens in the father of Chaerea and Phaedria, securing her against the outrages of men like the soldier. She has got Pamphila recognized as free and reunited her with her family, leaving the soldier of no further use to her. Finally she has quarrelled with the soldier. The whole sweep of this story prepares us to see the soldier driven off empty-handed. Hence the yes-that's-it one feels on reading Walther Ludwig's analysis of this play: in his vision *Eὐνοῦχος* ended with the two brothers Chaerea and Phaedria concurring in their admiration of Thais (*Eunuchus*, 1051–3), Terence having added scenes V.vii, a few bits of V.viii and V.ix but for a little at the beginning (in other words, as much of the ending as involved Thraso and Gnatho).<sup>29</sup> Karl Büchner and Eckard Lefèvre have concluded very nearly the same, and in so doing declared that Terence invented the additional material *ex nihilo*.<sup>30</sup> The solution of Büchner and Lefèvre, allowing *Eὐνοῦχος* the most artistically satisfying finish through the easiest surgery, therefore seems the right one.

A prick of doubt remains. Comedies end in an atmosphere of festivity and forgiveness. In so far as they involve a young lover, figures who have until then stood in his way are often reconciled to him, sharing in the general happiness.<sup>31</sup> Does not this pattern suffice to explain inclusion of Thraso, by Menander, in a distribution of rewards? Well, the final reconciliation of a comedy conventionally includes the lover hero's relatives (such as the severe and parsimonious father) and his in-laws to be. It necessarily includes slaves of the hero's family (excepting the criminal and runaway Stalagmus of *Captivi*, who has effectively forfeited his rights within the household, and whose actions in any case belong not to the play but to its background). Normally, however, it does not extend to rivals. In the basic pattern the rival is excluded, a pattern obtaining even when, as in *Eunuchus/Eὐνοῦχος* the beloved remains unmarried because not revealed to be of citizen birth (so in the *Miles Gloriosus*). When the rival is reconciled, it is

<sup>28</sup> As for the issue of Phaedria's jealousy, Drexler (n. 24), 97 points to *Eun.* 480–1 *atque haec qui misit non sibi soli postulat | te uiuere et sua causa excludi ceteros*. The matter of money has in fact come up at *Eun.* 79–80 and 984–5. Likewise Pers. 5.161–75, conflated from the opening scene of Menander's *Eὐνοῦχος*, the corresponding lines of Terence, and Hor. *Sat.* 2.3.259–71, makes money a central issue, raising the suspicion that Terence has suppressed this element of the Menandrian scene (such was the conclusion of F. Nencini, *De Terentio eiusque fontibus* [Livorno, 1891], 80–3; for an opposing view see Büchner [n. 25], 232–3).

<sup>29</sup> Ludwig (n. 19), 36–8, leaving open the origin of the non-*Eὐνοῦχος* material. In a later publication he wrote that Terence's intervention was inspired by the ending of *Κόλαξ*: see Ludwig (n. 23), 172–3.

<sup>30</sup> Büchner (n. 25), 300–6; Lefèvre (n. 14 [2003]), 120–2. Similar, though more tentative, conclusions in J. Barsby, 'Problems of adaptation in the *Eunuchus* of Terence', in B. Zimmermann and N. Slater (edd.), *Drama. Beiträge zum antiken Drama und seiner Rezeption 2: Intertextualität in der griechisch-römischen Komödie* (Stuttgart, 1993), 160–79.

<sup>31</sup> Some discussion of this aspect of comedy will be found in C. Saylor, 'Inclusion and exclusion of characters in the New Comic society in Plautus and Terence', in C. Deroux (ed.), *Studies in Latin Literature and Roman History* 14 (Brussels, 2008), 115–30.

because he turns out to belong to the category of relatives (he may be the young lover's father, as in Plautus' *Mercator* = Philemon's *Ἐμπορος*) or of in-laws to be (*Περικειρομένη*, *Curculio*).<sup>32</sup> Of course, neither of these two conditions can apply to *Ἐδνοῦχος*. Rather Thraso becomes more and more of an outsider in the course of the action, losing his tie of ownership to Pamphila and of patronage to Thais, hence more and more marked for exclusion.

The comedy extant as Plautus' *Truculentus* might seem a parallel to the inclusive ending of *Eunuchus*. It closes with the courtesan Phronesium shared between two men, the rustic youth Strabax and the foreign soldier Stratophanes, each ready to continue the bidding war for her favours. A third lover, Diniarchus, has by then been eliminated by a forced marriage. Similarities to *Eunuchus*, and for that matter to *Ἐδνοῦχος*, there plainly are. But there are more important dissimilarities. The two lovers who remain at play's end are bloodless figures, particularly Strabax, who has barely been seen on stage and certainly allowed none of the pathos that defines the lover hero. He has not exposed the depth of his sentiment or the pains caused him; rather he has served as a minor prop in a play about other people altogether – Diniarchus and especially Phronesium. The *Truculentus*, after all, is Phronesium's story: she makes all moves that drive the plot; she is the only character who attains a goal; she alone has much of anything to celebrate when we hear the call for applause. She is also everything but a *ἑταίρα χρηστή*. In short, Strabax and Phronesium are only very superficially comparable to Phaedria and Thais, and the *Truculentus* is no template from which to draw a reconstructed *Ἐδνοῦχος*. The *Bacchides* of Plautus, based on Menander's *Δίς ἐξαπατών*, would seem to offer a better precedent. This play opposes Mnesilochus and Pistoclerus to their fathers Nicobulus and Philoxenus. Mnesilochus and Pistoclerus are lovers of two courtesans, sisters, both named Bacchis. In the fifth act, conserved in Plautus' version only, the conflict reaches an impasse. Nicobulus has discovered that the slave Chrysalus has duped him to provide money for Mnesilochus' affair, and Philoxenus recognizes that he cannot save Pistoclerus from debauch. Then Nicobulus and Philoxenus at last see the courtesans close at hand and hear their blandishments. They are so enamoured as to drop their anger and agree to attend a common banquet, where they are to recline beside them.<sup>33</sup> Again, the only similarity to *Eunuchus* is a sort of sharing, and it must not lead us to overlook differences. In the *Bacchides*, a reconciliation between antagonists is required because of the family tie, however surprising may be the form it takes. The fathers are not offered a continuing relationship with the courtesans, but merely invited to one sexy party. What we have seen of the *Bacchides*, particularly the Bacchis loved by Pistoclerus, does not establish them as *χρησταί*. What is more, it is doubtful that such an encounter between fathers and courtesans, with such a result, stood in the original. In the scene that we have from Plautus signs of his workmanship

<sup>32</sup> Conflict between the convention of reconciling relatives and that of excluding rivals accounts for violation of the former in *Asinaria*, where Demaenetus is not seen making up to his son Argyrippus (though it should be remembered that the last scene of Plautus' version must, on grounds of stagecraft, stand at significant remove from the corresponding scene of the Greek original).

<sup>33</sup> Philoxenus assumes beside (at 1189) that they will be allowed a complete sexual conquest of the sisters, though nothing confirms his assumption.

are numerous, and some of them pervasive.<sup>34</sup> Four voices take part.<sup>35</sup> The tone is operatic. There is much repetition, particularly of the metaphor making tame sheep of the old men. Philoxenus and Nicobulus are allowed to view themselves from without, as it were, a technique not in keeping with Menandrian realism:

Tactus sum uehementer uisco;  
cor stimulo foditur

I've been all coated with the bird-lime; my heart is goaded hard  
(1158–9 [Lindsay's colometry]; similarly at 1180 and 1199–201)

Most Plautine of all perhaps is the scene's fascination with, and caricature of, the old men's foolishness: theirs is a 'heroic stupidity', as Gestri put it, counterpart to the slave Chrysalus' heroic cunning.<sup>36</sup> This play, too, can tell us nothing about Menander's *Eὐνοῦχος*.

Even if we were to admit a sharing of Thais in the last act of *Eὐνοῦχος*, it would not have come about there at all as it does in Terence. Stagecraft alone would guarantee much reworking: all three last scenes of Terence's play involve four speaking actors – a flat impossibility at Athens.<sup>37</sup> Moreover, Terence has the arrangement effected by a parasite for parasitic motives (1056–60, 1070, 1084), but it is most unlikely that a parasite appeared in the *Eὐνοῦχος*.<sup>38</sup> Indeed, Gnatho's entire approach in V.vii and V.ix supposes that he makes his living from Thraso's generosity while privately despising him (see esp. 1079–80 *fatuus est, insulsus, tardus* ...; 1087 *comedendum uobis propino et deridendum*). That makes him not just a parasite, but the same parasite that we met in II.ii and III.i, two scenes whose

<sup>34</sup> The marks of Plautus' hand in this scene have been exposed thoroughly and perceptively by E. Fraenkel, *Plautinisches im Plautus* (Berlin, 1922), 72–5 = *Plautine Elements in Plautus* (Oxford, 2007), 52–5, and by L. Gestri, 'Studi plautini II: il monologo di Nicobulo in *Bacch. V.1*', *SIFC* ns 17 (1940/1), 237–50 at 249–50; similar conclusions in K. Gaiser, 'Die plautinischen *Bacchides* und Menanders *Dis Exapaton*', *Philologus* 114 (1970), 51–87 at 79–80 and A. Primmer, *Handlungsgliederung in Nea und Palliata: Dis exapaton und Bacchides* (Vienna, 1984), 92–3. One account has laid more emphasis on a Menandrian component: C. Questa (ed.), *Bacchides* (Florence, 1975), 70–1.

<sup>35</sup> See n. 37 below.

<sup>36</sup> Gestri (n. 34), at 250.

<sup>37</sup> *Pace* Steidle (n. 24), 321–2, 344–5 and 346–7. Whatever the number of actors available to Menander, the limit of three speakers on stage was absolute. In no extant scene of New Comedy do more than three characters speak, nor is there even a scene where a character stands silent on the stage while three others converse, only to begin speaking once one of the other three has exited: A.W. Gomme and F.H. Sandbach, *Menander. A Commentary* (Oxford, 1973), 17; F.H. Sandbach, 'Menander and the three-actor rule', in J. Bingen et al. (edd.), *Le monde grec: hommages à Claire Préaux* (Brussels, 1975), 197–204 (overly timid). Should any stronger proof of the three-speaker rule be needed, it will be found in the devices used to make less awkward the silence of mutes: K.B. Frost, *Exits and Entrances in Menander* (Oxford, 1988), 3, 11.

<sup>38</sup> That the rival's helper in *Eὐνοῦχος* was a slave was suggested by W.J. Oudegeest, *De Eunuchi Terentianae exemplis Graecis disputatio* (Diss. Amsterdam, 1906), 33. Indeed, certain functions of the rival's helper in *Eὐνοῦχος* elements of the story best suit a senior slave. For one thing the helper must deliver Pamphila to Thais. Likewise scene IV.vii (see esp. line 780) presents him as a member of Thraso's household, who supervises its servants (note, however: the extent to which this scene reproduces *Eὐνοῦχος* admits debate). So do lines 499–500 (*abi prae, curre ut sint domi parata*), and it has been argued (Meyerhöfer [n. 21], 19 n. 2; Knoche [n. 27], 156 n. 3) that the word *curre* there betrays an original where the order was addressed to a slave. However, the rival's helper could not have been present at that point in *Eὐνοῦχος* unless played by a mute, since three other speaking actors are indispensable.

origin in *Κόλαξ* is firmly grounded. We are led in sum to suppose the ending, if not free composition by Terence, then a rewriting of *Εὐνοῦχος* so radical as to amount, practically, to free composition. On now to another question, the one central to our inquiry: why did Terence write it as he did?

Terence created the ending of *Eunuchus* so as to transform the tension of its plot into the sort of tension he most savoured – that between the persuader and those to be persuaded – and so as to resolve it as he most liked – through a surprise argument. It is time to look closely at Gnatho's plea to the brothers in the final scene:

**PHAEDRIA** quem ego hic audio? 1060

o Thraso. **THRASO** saluete. **PH** tu fortasse quae facta hic sient nescis. **TH** scio. **PH** cur te ergo in his ego conspicio regionibus? **TH** uobis fretus. **PH** scin quam fretus? miles, edico tibi, si te in platea offendero hac post umquam, quod dicas mihi 'alium quaerebam, iter hac habui': periisti.

**GNATHO** heia haud sic decet. 1065

**PH** dictum est. **TH** non cognosco uostrum tam superbum. **PH** sic ago. **GN** prius audite paucis: quod cum dixerō, si placuerit, facitote. **CHAEREA** audiamus. **GN** tu concede paulum istuc, Thraso. principio ego uos ambos credere hoc mihi uehementer uelim, me huius quidquid facio id facere maxime causa mea; 1070 uerum si idem uobis prodest, uos non facere inscitia est. **PH** quid id est? **GN** militem riualem ego recipiundum censeo. **PH** hem? recipiundum? **GN** cogita modo: tu hercle cum illa, Phaedria, ut libenter uiuis (etenim bene libenter uiuitas), quod des paulum est et necesse est multum accipere Thaidem. 1075 ut tuo amori suppeditare possit sine sumptu tuo ad omnia haec, magis opportunus nec magis ex usu tuo nemo est. principio et habet quod det et dat nemo largius. fatuus est, insulsus tardus, stertit noctes et dies: neque istum metuas ne amet mulier: facile pellas ubi uelis. 1080 **CH** quid agimus? **GN** praeterea hoc etiam, quod ego uel primum puto, accipit homo nemo melius prorsus neque prolixius. **CH** mirum ni illoc homine quoquo pacto opust. **PH** idem ego arbitror. **GN** recte facitis. unum etiam hoc uos oro, ut me in uostrum gregem recipiatis: satis diu hoc iam saxum uorso. **PH** recipimus. 1085 **CH** ac libenter. **GN** at ego pro istoc, Phaedria et tu Chaerea, hunc comedendum uobis propino et deridendum. **CH** placet. **PH** dignus est. **GN** Thraso, ubi uis accede. **TH** obsecro te, quid agimus? **GN** quid? isti te ignorabant: postquam is mores ostendi tuos et conlaudauit secundum facta et uirtutes tuas, 1090 impetraui. **TH** bene fecisti: gratiam habeo maximam. numquam etiam fui usquam quin me omnes amarint plurimum. **GN** dixi ego in hoc esse uobis Atticam eloquentiam? **PH** nihil praeter promissum est. ite hac. uos ualete et plaudite!

PHAEDRIA Whom do I hear nearby? Thraso!

THRASO Greetings.

PH Perhaps you are unaware what has happened here.

THR I am aware.

PH Why then do I see you whereabouts?

THR Because I trust in your goodness.

PH Do you know just how trusting you are? I am telling you, soldier, if ever I find you again in this street, say all you like 'I was on my way somewhere else, I happened by here': you're a dead man.

GNATHO Whoa there, that's no way to talk.

PH It's what I've said.

THR I wouldn't guess either of you would speak so haughtily.

PH Well, I do.

GN First hear a few words from me. When I've finished, act on them if you are so minded.

CHAEREA Let's listen.

GN You step back a bit that way, Thraso. First of all, I should insist that you both believe me when I say: whatever I do in this affair, I do chiefly for my own good. But if the same is advantageous to you, it is foolishness for you not to do likewise.

PH What is that?

GN I move that your rival, the soldier, be included at your gatherings.

PH What? Included?

GN Just think about it: how, by God, you live the good life with that woman, or should I say you live, live, live the grand life. You've not much to give Thais, and she requires a lot. To allow the support of your love affair, extending to all needs, at no expense to yourself, there is no one more suited or better meeting your requirements. First, he has the money to put up, and nobody is freer with it. He is stupid, charmless, dull, asleep even when he's awake, and there's no chance the woman will fall in love with him: you could be rid of him whenever you wish.

CH What are we to do?

GN Moreover there is this, too, which I consider most important of all: no one entertains better or more lavishly.

CH Surely that man can be put to good use somehow.

PH That's what I think, too.

GN You've made the right decision. I ask just one more thing of you, that you make room for me in your club. I've carried this burden long enough.

PH Yes, we shall.

CH Gladly.

GN And I in exchange, Phaedria, Chaerea, offer you this man to eat out of house and home and make your laughing stock.

CH Decided.

PH He's earned it.

GN Thraso, come back whenever you like.

THR Please tell me, what are we doing?

GN Well, well. Those others didn't know you. After I explained your character and gave a glowing description, with all your achievements and fine qualities, I got what we wanted.

THR Good work. I am utterly grateful. Everywhere I've been, everyone has always liked me the best.

GN Didn't I tell you his speech had Attic polish?

PH He is exactly as promised. Go that way.

CANTOR Spectators, farewell! Applaud!

Gnatho has pulled off the feat that all orators aspire to, making of the weaker case the stronger. To do so he has used certain conventional tactics – delaying an unpopular proposition until after the *captatio benevolentiae*, appeal to utility<sup>39</sup> – and also a highly unconventional one. To denigrate the person whom you represent was never recommended in any handbook. Terence has contrived to make the unthinkable work. I daresay he was prouder of Gnatho's speech than of anything else in the play, and he cast aside dramatic coherence to accommodate it. Note also lines

<sup>39</sup> This was recommended to all symbuleutic orators, but especially when they must counter prejudice: *Rhet. ad Alex.* 29=1437a–b, *passim*.

1089–91: Thraso has now come back within earshot; Gnatho tells him that what won the day was the part of the speech about his character and deeds.<sup>40</sup> There is more here than just another joke at the soldier's expense. Terence is also winking at the rhetorically savvy among the audience, underlining how very original the speech was.

### *ADELPHOE*

We turn now to another long contested point of Terentian scholarship, the last act of the *Adelphoe*.<sup>41</sup> In this play, adapted from an original of the same title by Menander, the gruff Attic farmer Demea is contrasted with his urbane brother Micio, to whom he has given one of his sons in adoption. Micio raises the adoptive son, Aeschinus, on liberal principles, Demea the other, Ctesipho, under strict discipline. Ctesipho has fallen in love with a music girl owned by a procurer. He is disconsolate because the procurer plans to sell her abroad, and vows to leave Athens should it come to pass. Aeschinus therefore abducts the music girl from the procurer by force. As the action opens news of the abduction has just reached Demea. Scandalized, and not yet understanding that the girl was meant for Ctesipho, he blames Micio and his lax fashion of rearing Aeschinus. We next see Aeschinus quarreling with the procurer, driving him away though promising to repay him the girl's price. He delivers the girl to Micio's house so that she may be enjoyed by Ctesipho. Micio pays for the girl and sends supplies for a banquet to the house. Demea arrives again angry, having heard that Ctesipho was involved in the abduction. Micio's slave Syrus assures him that Ctesipho's only role was to criticize Aeschinus. Demea departs, still believing that the music girl is Aeschinus' mistress. It is then revealed that Aeschinus has impregnated a poor citizen girl, who presently bears him a child. He is for a time suspected of abandonment, but it is established that he has indeed intended to marry her and still desires to do so. Plans are made for the wedding. Learning then that Ctesipho has been inside Micio's house, Demea enters there and discovers the truth about the music girl. Outraged, he confronts Micio, reminding him that neither of them was to interfere in the rearing of the other's child. Then, alone on the stage, Demea announces in a monologue that he will change his ways, 'speaking sweetly and acting kindly'. He next incites Micio's slaves to tear down the wall separating Micio's property from that of Aeschinus' new mother-in-law, Sostrata. Supported by Aeschinus, he obliges Micio to marry Sostrata. Demea continues with extravagant demands: the liberation of the slave Syrus and of his wife, gifts of land and cash to a new in-law and the new freedmen. Aeschinus is delighted by these proposals, and Micio cannot refuse him. When Micio finally asks him 'What has got into you?', Demea answers 'I've done this to show that your popularity rests on weakness and lavish giving'. He offers himself as the true model father, to which Aeschinus agrees. Something is known about Terence's alterations from ancient testimonia: in the prologue itself

<sup>40</sup> On the virtues and achievements of the subject in rhetorical treatises, see n. 3 above.

<sup>41</sup> Bibliographical guidance on this problem may be sought in P. Kruschwitz, *Terenz* (Hildesheim, 2004), 141–64; there is also a good collection of references in Lefèvre (n. 14 [2002]), at 246–7. Little will be gained by reading scholarship that predates Rieth (see n. 45, below). Once again, I have used the Terentian names to designate both characters of the Latin play and those of the Greek original.

we learn that the scene where Aeschinus delivers the girl and repels the procurer (II.i) comes not from the principal model but from the *Συναποθνήσκοντες* of Diphilus; a number of Donatus' scholia record changes made in adaptation, that on line 938 being particularly important (*apud Menandrum senex de nuptiis non grautur; ergo Terentius εὔρετικῶς*).<sup>42</sup>

Most have recognized that something is very wrong with the end of the play as we have it from Terence. Demea's victory over Micio is too abrupt and too unprepared. 'Worlds away from the New Comedy of Menander', in one judgement;<sup>43</sup> in another, 'a punch in the face' to any with artistic sense.<sup>44</sup> Debate about the ending (which had gone on since the eighteenth century) was raised to a high level with the posthumous publication in 1964 of a monograph by Otto Rieth.<sup>45</sup> Rieth concentrated his attention on Micio, whose educational theories he showed to reflect mainstream philosophical, and especially Peripatetic, thinking. At the same time he read Demea as a rash, unreflecting figure, whose transformation in Menander was mere self-delusion. Rieth concluded that Terence made the ending more favourable to Demea as a concession to Roman ideals of *severitas*. A good many have thought along similar lines, focussing suspicion on the scenes (V.viii–ix) in which Micio is humiliated. Most of these have assumed that in Menander's play Micio was less discomfited,<sup>46</sup> or Demea more so;<sup>47</sup> it has also been proposed that the whole fifth act is by Terence (impossible, in light of Donatus' scholion on 938).<sup>48</sup>

Rieth's point of view was soon met by a reaction defending Demea's victory as Menandrian. It had already been noticed that elements of Aristophanic *κῶμος*, including humiliation and hasty marriages, were not alien to Menander's last acts.<sup>49</sup> It was now also observed that Micio is shown in the wrong at V.iii, as violating his promise not to interfere in the rearing of Ctesipho;<sup>50</sup> that his character is marred

<sup>42</sup> F.H. Sandbach sought significance in places where Donatus speaks of 'Terence', thinking it possible that this was sometimes shorthand for 'not the Greek poet but Terence': 'Donatus' use of the name Terentius and the end of Terence's *Adelphoe*', *BICS* 25 (1978), 123–45. The endeavour must be judged a failure. For one thing there are too many places where Donatus attributes to 'Terence' matter that must have stood in the Greek. For another it is unexplained why, if for Donatus *Terentius* by itself could mean 'Terence as distinct from his model', he never uses *Menander* or *Apollodorus* in a similar way, to mean 'the Greek poet, followed by Terence': Donatus nowhere says anything like *hoc egit Menander ut ...* or *bene Apollodorus hanc personam induxit*.

<sup>43</sup> Gratwick (n. 9), 56.

<sup>44</sup> Büchner (n. 25), 422: 'Der letzte Akt, uneinheitlich in sich selbst, kehrt das Resultat der ersten vier Akte um. Es läßt sich nicht leugnen, und das harte Urteil muß ausgesprochen werden: der fünfte Akt ist für jeden mit den Personen eines Kunstwerkes fühlenden Zuschauer ein Schlag ins Gesicht.'

<sup>45</sup> O. Rieth (K. Gaiser, ed.), *Die Kunst Menanders in den 'Adelphen' des Terenz* (Hildesheim, 1964).

<sup>46</sup> Sandbach (n. 42), 140–1; B. Sherberg, *Das Vater-Sohn-Verhältnis in der griechischen und römischen Komödie* (Tübingen, 1995), 112–19. This view had been prevalent in the older scholarship: e.g. K. Dziatzko and R. Kauer, *Ausgewählte Komödien des P. Terentius Afer, II. Adelphoe* (Leipzig, 1903), 16.

<sup>47</sup> Gratwick (n. 9), 57; see also his article 'Micion et Déméa dans les *Adelphes* de Térénce', *Pallas* 38 (1992), 371–8.

<sup>48</sup> Büchner (n. 25), 409–26.

<sup>49</sup> W.G. Arnott, 'The end of Terence's *Adelphoe*: a postscript', *G&R* NS 10 (1963), 140–4. The point was taken up later by H. Tränkle, 'Micio und Demea in den terenzischen *Adelphen*', *MH* 29 (1972), 241–55, at 253, and by Lloyd-Jones (n. 24).

<sup>50</sup> E. Fantham, 'Hautontimorumenos and *Adelphoe*. A study of fatherhood in Terence and Menander', *Latomus* 30 (1971), 970–98, at 985, 993–4; Tränkle (n. 49), 246–7.

by smugness, weakness and an inability to acknowledge fault;<sup>51</sup> that his method of education must be considered a failure;<sup>52</sup> that Demea's educational views are at least as philosophically respectable.<sup>53</sup> This last point, giving Demea new credibility in Menander's intellectual world, made a weighty counter to Rieth.

As obstacles fell away to a Menandrian ending in Demea's favour, others still stood. In Terence's play at least, Demea is until V.iii hard to like or to take seriously. Especially remarkable is his treatment at the hands of the slave Syrus, who has revelled out loud in his credulity, mocked him to his face and sent him on a fool's errand to the far edge of town. Demea would thus seem marked as a blocking figure, such as is normally set up for defeat, not victory, at the end of the play. This state of affairs, I daresay, has weighed unconsciously on all readers with a feel for ancient comedy and its conventions. It leaves them dismayed to see in Terence, and unwilling to imagine in Menander, the play closing with Demea's triumph. It is largely for this reason that the ending seems so un-Menandrian: one feels inadequately prepared for Demea's final speech, shutting the book, or seeing the curtain fall, with the impression that somebody has cheated. Eckard Lefèvre has shown how and by whom some of the cheating was done. From the structural features that are his favourite object of study he has argued that signs of Roman dramaturgy are concentrated in scenes of confrontation between Syrus and Demea, namely IV.i, IV.ii, V.i and V.ii. These scenes are introduced by unmotivated appearances of characters, contain much dialogue that does not advance the action, and at times mirror other scenes of the play (especially pronounced in IV.ii, which reproduces III.iii). Any Menandrian kernel in them will have been much modified.<sup>54</sup> IV.i and IV.ii are especially relevant here, since it is in them that Demea is thoroughly mocked and hoodwinked. Thus is removed another barrier to a Menandrian *Ἀδελφοί* closing, as does its Latin adaptation, with Demea at last revealing his purpose to Micio and lecturing him on the folly of excessive generosity.<sup>55</sup> Menander's audience had not seen Demea mistreated by a slave to the same degree as Terence's; they accordingly would not have perceived him as a comic butt, or his vindication as contrary to the rules of the game.

Another detail points in the same direction. At line 81 of Terence's play Micio greets Demea politely, but in reply gets only an angry outburst. Donatus ad loc. implies that in the original Demea first returned Micio's greeting: 'Melius quam Menander, quod hic illum ad iurgium promptiorem, non resalutantem facit'. Terence evidently thought he could improve on Menander in the matter of characterization, and he may have done likewise in other scenes involving Demea. Whether or not

<sup>51</sup> The bad side of Micio's personality is well exposed by W.R. Johnson, 'Micio and the perils of perfection', *CSCA* 1 (1968), 171–86; see also J. Klowski, 'Terenz' *Adelphen* und die modernen Erziehungsstile', *Gymnasium* 107 (2000), 109–27. Neither attempts to answer the question of the original.

<sup>52</sup> Tränkle (n. 49), 245–6.

<sup>53</sup> Most knowledgeably and insightfully by C. Lord, 'Aristotle, Menander, and the *Adelphoe* of Terence', *TAPhA* 107 (1977), 183–202; note also J.N. Grant, 'The ending of Terence's *Adelphoe* and the Menandrian original', *AJP* 96 (1975), 42–60, at 46 (on lines 414–18); R.H. Martin (ed.), *Terence, Adelphoe* (Cambridge, 1976), 28–9 (on 985–95).

<sup>54</sup> E. Lefèvre, 'La structure des *Adelphes* de Térence comme critère d'analyse', in *Théâtre et spectacles dans l'antiquité. Actes du colloque de Strasbourg, 5–7 novembre 1981* (Leiden, 1983), 169–79.

<sup>55</sup> Lefèvre himself, it should be added, stopped short of concluding that Menander's ending was, like Terence's, favourable to Demea.

this was part of a conscious strategy for a more spectacular final reversal, the effect will have been the same: a less sympathetic Demea through the body of the play.

In fact, to speak of Demea's 'triumph', 'victory' or 'vindication' is to simplify misleadingly. His last 'statement of position' at 993–4 is not one of doctrinaire severity: rather he offers both to correct what the boys 'in their youth do not understand' and to 'support when it is called for'. Moreover he softens his opposition to Ctesipho's love affair at 996–7. Demea thus gives a little ground himself, so that he may be seen as articulating, in the end, a balanced ideal.<sup>56</sup>

Taken as a whole, the indications are that for Menander Demea had, despite obvious faults, a fair claim to the audience's sympathy throughout the play, emerging at the end as the effector and spokesman of its resolution. In accepting Demea's right to the last word, we give Menander a fifth act much closer to Terence's. Indeed, it has even been maintained that the Roman playwright need have changed nothing of substance there.<sup>57</sup> That view entails grave difficulty. It remains, even after all that we have seen to Demea's credit, that his final speech at 985–95 contradicts his monologue in V.iv. In the monologue he said that he was changing his ways; his last speech reveals that most of his 'change' was put on. Some have claimed that there is no real contradiction: the last speech simply makes more explicit what was less so in the monologue, that Demea changed practice, not principle.<sup>58</sup> Now these readers are not fanatical apologists, bent on defending Terence no matter what: they are on to *something*. The monologue can indeed be understood, after the fact, as compatible with Demea's revelation at 985–8. But no reader or hearer, not yet knowing the end of the play, would think to understand it so. It thus violates a principle of Menander's dramaturgy whereby characters announce plainly what they are about to do and why. So Moschion in the *Σαμία* says that he will feign leaving Athens to serve as a mercenary, his aim being to shame his adoptive father for having mistrusted him;<sup>59</sup> likewise in the *Ἀσπίς* we know well ahead how Chaerestratus' death will be faked so that Smicrines will relinquish his claim to Cleostratus' sister; in *Ἐπιτρέποντες* Habrotonon details how she will extract a confession of rape from Charisius by pretending to be his victim. All this is of a piece with Menander's omniscient prologues, which ensure that the audience know from the start who is really whose child and foresee the overall outcome.

I should like to revive a suggestion made in 1971 by Elaine Fantham.<sup>60</sup> She proposed tentatively that it was Demea's monologue, not his last speech, that Terence had reworked, his purpose being to create a surprise ending. John Grant took up her idea and elaborated: Terence translated the monologue from Menander but omitted material between lines 876 and 877, where the Demea character of

<sup>56</sup> Martin (n. 53), 27–9.

<sup>57</sup> For example, U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorf, *Das Schiedsgericht* (Berlin, 1925), 136–7; Lloyd-Jones (n. 24); N. Holzberg, *Menander. Untersuchungen zur dramatischen Technik* (Nuremberg, 1974), 171; Martin (n. 53), 27–9.

<sup>58</sup> So Tränkle (n. 49), 248–50; G. Lieberg, 'Das pädagogisch-dramatische Problem der *Adelphen* des Terenz', *GB* 15 (1988), 73–84; id., 'Il monologo e le parole conclusive di Demea negli *Adelphoe* di Terenzio', *Mnemosynum. Studi in onore di A. Ghiselli* (Bologna, 1989), 355–73; a slightly different defence of the monologue's acceptability in R.W. Carrubba, 'The rationale of Demea in Terence's *Adelphoe*', *Dioniso* 42 (1968), 16–26.

<sup>59</sup> Moschion's conscious departure from character makes this a particularly close parallel, already appreciated by Rieth (n. 45), 112–13.

<sup>60</sup> Fantham (n. 50), 992–3.

the original defended his own methods of child-rearing; Terence's aim, again, was surprise.<sup>61</sup> Let us now examine in detail Demea's monologue. Surprise is indeed achieved by it, but so are other effects beside, and it is in them that Terence's purpose is best seen. More precisely, what has yet to be taken into account is the speech's thoroughgoing ambivalence. It teases the hearer with double meanings.<sup>62</sup>

Numquam ita quisquam bene subducta ratione ad uitam fuit	855
quin res aetas usus semper aliquid adportet noui,	
aliquid moneat, ut illa quae te scisse credas nescias	
et quae tibi putaris prima, in experiundo ut repudies.	
quod nunc mi euenit; nam ego uitam duram quam uixi usque adhuc	
prope iam excurso spatio omitto. id quam ob rem? re ipsa repperi	860
facilitate nihil esse homini melius neque clementia.	
id esse uerum ex me atque ex fratre quouiuis facile est noscere.	
ille suam semper egit uitam in otio, in conuiuuiis,	
clemens placidus, nulli laedere os, adridere omnibus;	
sibi uixit, sibi sumptum fecit; omnes bene dicunt, amant.	865
ego ille agrestis saeuus tristis parcus truculentus tenax	
duxi uxorem: quam ibi miseriam uidi! nati filii,	
alia cura. heia autem, dum studeo illis ut quam plurimum	
facerem, contriui in quaerundo uitam atque aetatem meam.	
nunc exacta aetate hoc fructi pro labore ab eis fero:	870
odium. ille alter sine labore patria potitur commoda.	
illum amant, me fugitant; illi credunt consilia omnia,	
illum diligunt, apud illum sunt ambo, ego desertus sum;	
illum ut uiuat optant, meam autem mortem expectant scilicet.	
ita eos meo labore eductos maximo hic fecit suos	875
paullo sumptu: miseriam omnem ego capio, hic potitur gaudia.	
age age, nunciam experiamur contra ecquid ego possiem	
blande dicere aut benigne facere, quando hoc prouocat.	
ego quoque a meis me amari et magni fieri postulo:	
si id fit dando atque obsequendo, non posteriores feram.	880
deerit: id mea minime refert, qui sum natu maximus.	

Nobody's ever had life so figured out that events, age and experience don't always offer him something new, don't raise his awareness. You find yourself not knowing what you think you know, and rejecting as you go what you used to believe most essential. That's what has happened to me now. With my race almost run, I am setting aside the austere life I've been living so far. Why? Events have taught me there are no better things in the world than kindness and leniency. Anyone can see that's so by looking at me and at my brother. He's spent his whole life in leisure and play: mild, sweet-tempered, never offends anyone, smiles at everyone; he's lived for himself, spent his money on himself, and everybody's full of good words for him and fond thoughts. I'm the one who's countrified, nasty, humourless, parsimonious, quarrelsome and rigid. I married: what rough times I went through then! I had sons, one worry more. Well, while I tried to do everything I could for them I wore myself out. Now with my life about over this is what I get for my labour: loathing. The other one has all the rewards of fatherhood, without the labour. They love him; they run from me. They make him their confidant in all things. They're full of affection for him; they're both with him all the time; I'm left alone. They wish him long life; plainly they can't wait for me to die. And so, at just a little expense, he's

<sup>61</sup> Grant (n. 53), 53–9.

<sup>62</sup> Rieth (n. 45), 112 raised the idea of a *Trugrede* only to reject it. Granted, convention prohibits deception in monologues, but such a convention should be invoked for the Greek original only – unless it can be demonstrated (but I do not see how) that Terence had a fine appreciation of his genre's rules (really, an alien genre's rules) and a sense of obligation toward them.

won over children raised through my very hard work. I get all the pain; he takes the joy. Very well then, let's see if I can say a sweet phrase and do a kind gesture, now that he's issued the challenge. I'm set on being loved and honoured by my children, too. If giving and complying are the way to make it happen, I'll not come off second best. Hardship there will be. But as the eldest, I've the least to fear on that score.

With *omitto* in 860 Demea seems to renounce his manner of life for all time. If that is so then it must be out of conviction that it was fundamentally wrong. Or does he? *Omitto* means to relinquish something, often for good *but not necessarily*. So *bellum omittere* is regularly said when a war is only suspended, to be continued afterward (Livy 6.15.8; 23.25.4 – note there *omitti et differri*, *ibid.* 25.6; 31.31.19); it is the same with construction projects begun and interrupted (Cic. *Q. fr.* 3.1.5; Suet. *Claud.* 20.1) and objects momentarily laid down or dropped (Cic. *Har. resp.* 23). Similarly Nero is said to enjoy Piso's villa at Baiae *omissis excubiis* (Tacit. *Ann.* 15.52.1): he of course resumed his usual precautions on leaving the property. And it is noteworthy that *omittas* is set in antithesis to *repetas*, 'you should resume', at Horace, *Epistles* 1.6.48. Most importantly, *omitto* in the sense of *intermitto* was known and used elsewhere by Terence: *Ad.* 232 *nunc si hoc omitto ac tum agam ubi illinc rediero, nihil est*.<sup>63</sup> In saying *uitam duram omitto* Demea need not promise much at all, even as he seems to make a very sweeping promise indeed.

Line 861, *facilitate nihil esse homini melius neque clementia*, might suggest 'there is nothing better for mankind than kindness and leniency': the audience, just tricked into imagining a profound change of heart, is now invited to suppose that Demea has in mind a moral principle. But the expression need mean no more than 'there is nothing more advantageous for him who practises them ...'.<sup>64</sup> In the *narratio* from 862 to 876 Demea details what his ways have brought him, and what Micio's have brought Micio. He never says there that the child he raised himself was the worse for it, or Micio's foster-child the better. Demea thus does not discredit his methods in this speech; he merely observes that they have had unpleasant side effects. The audience, however, having heard Demea's quasi-philosophical preamble, will suppose that these are his grounds for a radical change of principle.

At 877–8 Demea formulates his resolution, saying *experiamur ... ecquid ego possiem | blande dicere aut benigne facere*. He thereby promises no more than a test of his powers. Again expecting something farther-reaching, the audience does not notice how limiting the expression is. Finally the speech ends with three carefully plotted ambiguities. If the reader doubts my interpretation of the monologue thus far, thinking it a straightforward statement of intent, let him consider lines 880 and 881. Demea names his goal – to secure his children's affection – and the means – *dando atque obsequendo*. But *who* is to do the giving and the complying? Only in the scenes following will we learn that it is chiefly Micio; for the moment there is no reason to think anyone meant but Demea. Then comes the impersonal *deerit*, 'there will be hardship', not a common or natural expression for financial loss. Why was it chosen? For its ambivalence: it can mean that Demea's wealth will be diminished, or that Micio's will. The audience, of course, thinks only of

<sup>63</sup> It is still necessary to understand 'postpone' even if one prefers to read (e.g. with Lindsay) *actum agam*.

<sup>64</sup> So Lieberg (n. 58 [1988 and 1989]) took it.

the former. Finally Demea's explanation, 'As the eldest, I've the least to fear': one's first thought is to understand 'because I am closest to death, I have least use for money', and indeed it has been so taken by commentators since antiquity.<sup>65</sup> In fact Demea's reasoning runs as follows: because I am older than my brother I am unlikely to get a legacy from him in any case; therefore causing him to give away his money carries little risk to me. In all this Demea has thoroughly misdirected his hearers.<sup>66</sup> Yet he has never uttered any out-and-out falsehood. The monologue is thus a riddling speech, a form of discourse of interest to the rhetoricians, who are seen discussing it as soon as their work comes back into the light in the first century B.C.<sup>67</sup> They had a name for it, *emphasis*.<sup>68</sup> And it was from rhetoricians that a writer would most easily become aware of it.

Now the monologue will not be entirely Terentian composition. Line 866 can be identified with a book fragment of Menander, ensuring that the speech does correspond to something in the original.<sup>69</sup> But the features of it at the centre of our controversy – those that cause readers to feel betrayed by the end of the play – can come from no one but Terence. We have seen his taste in oratorical devices running to the rare and the bold. *Emphasis* is certainly among those. Indeed, we have even seen him practising it (on a more limited scale) at *Eunuchus* 1089–91 and 1094. Moreover, the crowning riddle can only be due to a Roman poet. *Deerit: id mea minime refert, qui sum natu maximus* would not have had the desired ambiguity at Athens, where Demea, even if very much younger than Micio, could hardly have expected anything from Micio's estate so long as Aeschinus was alive.<sup>70</sup> We have also seen Terence's affection for the paradoxical argument defending the indefensible. This, too, is at work in the monologue. Demea begins by claiming to have found *facilitate nihil esse homini melius neque clementia*, seeming thereby to elevate a non-virtue and a marginal virtue to the status of *summa bona*. He then proves his paradox in good sophistic fashion, by exploiting ambiguity in *homini* and especially in *melius*. The monologue as we have it, then, is through and through characteristic of Terence. At the same time it is wholly uncharacteristic of Menander, a writer with little interest in rhetoric, nothing of the sophistic manner and moreover, as we have seen, a radically different attitude to dramatic surprise.

<sup>65</sup> A. Spengel (Berlin, 1879), ad loc.: 'Er meint, für die wenigen Jahre, die er noch zu leben hat, werde das Geld jedenfalls ausreichen.' Such an interpretation is implied by Donatus: 'uide remanere in Demea non penitus eiectam seueritatem' (*seueritatem* Bentley: *securitatem* codd.). See also Rieth (n. 45), 110.

<sup>66</sup> When the audience is meant to understand that it has been tricked is not easy to say. I think that lines 884–5, where Demea admits to adding polite greetings *praeter naturam*, would be taken to mean only that his transformation is not coming naturally to him, so that he must work hard at it. Certainly, though, by 914–15 a spectator should begin to catch on.

<sup>67</sup> *Rhet. Her.* 4.67; Demetr. *Eloc.* 282–94; Quint. *Inst.* 9.2.64–92 (9.2.74 gives an instance of practical application in the Roman courts). The possibility of deliberate ambiguity is allowed as early as Arist. *Rh.* 3.5.4=1407a and *SE* 4 = 165b–166b.

<sup>68</sup> *Ἐμφασίς* ('suggestion') is the term of Demetrius and Quintilian; *significatio* (no doubt calqued thereon) is that of *Ad Herennium*.

<sup>69</sup> fr. 14 ΚΑ ἐγὼ δ' ἄγρικός, ἐργάτης, σκυθρός, πικρός, | φειδωλός = *Ad.* 866 *ego ille agrestis saeuus tristis parcus truculentus tenax*.

<sup>70</sup> Though testamentary legacies do come into view at Athens in the fourth century, the overwhelming pattern remains there that male descendants (a category including adoptive sons) take all, and that wills are made by men without them. The evidence is collected in A.R.W. Harrison, *The Law of Athens* (Oxford, 1968–71), 1.122–62.

Other features, too, mark V.iv as mostly inorganic. This scene coheres poorly with those preceding. Demea says in it that he wants to be loved by his children and to see Micio beaten at his own game. But why should Demea become obsessed with the love of others? Before he had been concerned with the morals of the youths and their use of money, not with their attitude toward him. The most recent events (the discovery that the music girl is Ctesipho's and that Micio has paid for her) have heightened his frustration, but they have not, so far as we can see, caused him to reflect on filial affection and how it is engendered. They *could* have, but that is not how the matter was presented in V.iii: it is plain there that Demea's anger is directed against Micio and his doubletalk.

It is also excluded that the last two scenes of Terence's play (lines 924 to 997) exactly reproduce Menander. Four speaking actors are on stage from 958 on.<sup>71</sup> Of them, either Syrus or Aeschinus may be imagined to have been added by Terence. If Syrus, then in Menander his manumission was merely promised, not enacted. On the other hand, there is better reason to think Aeschinus the intruder. His lines from 935 to 945 cannot have stood in the original, since there, as we have seen, Micio did not resist his marriage to Sostrata. What is then left of his part submits tamely to excision.<sup>72</sup> But the absence of Aeschinus need hardly change the essence of the ending:<sup>73</sup> we get the point very well without seeing him egg Micio on and cheer each largesse. The sudden affection that Demea receives from Syrus is proof enough of his thesis, that popularity is all too easily bought.

And so I incline toward a Menandrian play whose last two acts ran in most respects like Terence's. It will have differed in that, at the end, Micio's weakness was pointed out to Micio alone, not to Aeschinus too. Syrus' fun at Demea's expense will have taken up less stage time. And Demea's monologue in front of Micio's house will have had nothing riddling about it. As in Terence, the Menandrian Demea there expressed frustration with Micio, whom he contrasted to himself.<sup>74</sup> But he did not hide the underlying reason for his frustration – that Micio had spoiled the children.<sup>75</sup> *And he explained to the audience how he planned to teach Micio a lesson.* Any remaining differences were of tone, not substance. Such a reconstruction has more than the advantage of economy: the changes supposed are not just slight but motivated. The additional scenes between Syrus and Demea are in line with overall Roman tendencies: fond of the struggle between clever *servus* and dull *senex*, Roman playwrights are elsewhere seen doing violence to their originals to give it more prominence.<sup>76</sup> As for the modification of Demea's

<sup>71</sup> See n. 37 above.

<sup>72</sup> Sandbach (n. 37), 203; id. (n. 42), 140; id., review of Rieth in *CR* 16 (1966), 47–8, at 48; J.C.B. Lowe, 'Terence's four-speaker scenes', *Phoenix* 51 (1997), 152–69, at 168.

<sup>73</sup> As was claimed by Sandbach (n. 42), 140.

<sup>74</sup> fr. 14 KA (see n. 69 above).

<sup>75</sup> As Grant (n. 53 above) understood.

<sup>76</sup> That Plautus heightened the element of contest between slave and master has of course been a regular theme of analytical criticism since Fraenkel. Interest in the *servus-senex* antagonism led not just to the expansion of roles and a shift in tone but to the modification of plots as well. Such modification is most certain in the *Epidicus* of Plautus, anomalies of whose ending are neatly explained by supposing a truncation, so as to make of the slave's triumph the conclusion and focal moment of the play: E. Fantham, 'Plautus in miniature: compression and distortion in the *Epidicus*', *Papers of the Liverpool Latin Seminar* 3, Liverpool (1981), 1–28. Other plot features of *Epidicus* have been accounted for in a similar way by T. Baier, 'Griechisches und Römisches im plautinischen *Epidicus*', in U. Auhagen (ed.), *Studien zu Plautus' Epidicus* (Tübingen, 2001), 15–56, at 17–33.

monologue in V.iv, it creates for one thing a surprise ending, hence a livelier final scene, such as Terence sought elsewhere. And by now of course we know Terence's interest in rhetoric, particularly in its more difficult feats. Of Demea's monologue he made a showpiece. As in *Eunuchus*, it was above all pride in his oratorical virtuosity that led him to rewrite it. The careful motivation of action and speech, the coherence of the whole, the spirit of the model and the traditions of its genre – these meant nothing to Terence. Rhetorical bravado meant everything.

*Université de Montréal*

BENJAMIN VICTOR  
benjamin.victor@umontreal.ca