

Philoctetes comes or not, and then urge Neoptolemus to speak quietly, lest the fevered sleeper perceive what they are planning. Thus, when for a second time they press their argument that Neoptolemus should steal the bow then and there, they use the deliberately vague *κεῖνο* ("that suggestion I made before"), adding, equally cryptically, "you know what I am talking about." They avoid all explicit mention of what the "stealthy accomplishment" is to be.

(2) At 853 the MSS variations all point to a reading *ταύταν*, sharply contrasted, as Jebb saw long ago, with *κεῖνο*. This contrast is even more pointed with the asyndeton: "[But] if you have *this* purpose in relation to this man..." "This man" is clearly Philoctetes,

6. So T. B. L. Webster, "Sophocles *Philoctetes*" (Cambridge, 1970).

and not Odysseus, as some of the editors would wish it.⁶ Odysseus is nowhere mentioned in this *kommos*, the audience's attention being wholly directed to Neoptolemus, the chorus, and the figure of the sleeping Philoctetes.

The resolve (*γνώμην*) in question is Neoptolemus' desire to wait until Philoctetes awakes and take both him and his bow to Troy. And the *ἄπορα πάθη*, which the chorus warn are inevitable if this plan is pursued, are the problems both medical and emotional of shanghaiing Philoctetes.

ALAN S. HENRY

UNIVERSITY OF NEW ENGLAND,
ARMIDALE, NEW SOUTH WALES

THE NUMBER OF SLAVE ROLES IN PLAUTUS' *AULULARIA*

A minor, yet vexing, problem in the structure of the *Aulularia* is the question of how many slave roles there are in the play. Among the *personae* in the Oxford text, W. M. Lindsay lists three slaves in order of appearance: Strobilus, Pythodicus, and servus Lyconidis.

The problem is as follows: in Act II, Scene 2, after Megadorus has completed making the wedding plans with Euclio, he calls to his slave, who must have been on stage during the scene, "heus, Strobile, sequare propere me ad macellum strenue" (264). Scenes 4-6 of Act II establish firmly that Strobilus belongs to Megadorus as he supervises the preparations for his master's wedding to Euclio's daughter and engages in witty repartee about Euclio's meanness with the cooks whom he has hired for the occasion. Scene 7 of Act II, however, bears the superscription Pythodicus, and a slave presumably of that name delivers a monologue, lines 363-70, whose content is such that it should have been delivered by Strobilus as he continued to supervise the cooks. No slave then appears until Act IV,

Scene 1, in which there is a nameless slave (servus Lyconidis) who calls Lyconides *erui meus* (603) and refers to Megadorus as *huic Megadoro* (604). This slave is not certain of Euclio's identity when he first sees him: "atque hic pater est, ut ego opinor, huius erus quam amat <meus>" (619). When Euclio foils this slave's attempt to steal the treasure from the shrine of Fides (Act IV, Scene 4), there is no indication that he knows him, although Euclio certainly would have recognized Strobilus. Additional confusion is added to the problem in lines 697 and 804, in which Lyconides calls his slave by a name which has been emended to †Strobilum† in 697 and †Strolum† in 804.

Various solutions to the question of the number of slaves have been offered, dating from the Beroaldus edition of the *Aulularia* in 1500 to the present time. (1) All three slaves are the same.¹ (2) Megadorus and Lyconides each have a slave. The one belonging to Megadorus in Act II should really be called Pythodicus, notwithstanding the fact that the name Strobilus clearly appears in the text at

1. Some supporters of this theory are T. B. L. Webster, *Studies in Menander*² (Manchester, 1960), p. 123; E. Fraenkel, *Elementi Plautini in Plauto* (Florence, 1960), p. 235; and B.

Krysiniel-Josefowicz, "Once More about Plautus' *Aulularia*," *Eos*, XLVI (1952-53), 128-29.

264, 334, 351, and 354, and the slave belonging to Lyconides should be called Strobilus.² (3) Strobilus belongs to Megadorus, Pythodicus is a graphic error in the superscription of Act II, Scene 7, and the name of Lyconides' slave has been lost from the text.

This third solution can be convincingly proved. W. Ludwig, supported by E. W. Handley, has shown that the word *fitodicus* which appears in Codices BVJ before Act II, Scene 7, and which was transcribed by editors as the name Pythodicus, is probably an orthographic error for Strobilus and not a phonetic error for Pythodicus. Thus the name Pythodicus can disappear from the cast of characters.³ Ludwig has also suggested an explanation for the emended names †Strobilum† in 697 and †Strolum† in 804. He thinks that the name of Lyconides' slave was similar to Strobilus for purposes of comic intent, was confused with it in the manuscripts, and is now totally lost.⁴ Both slave roles were probably played by the same actor (since they do not overlap), and at some time, through this fact and the similarity of names, confusion crept into the manuscripts. The textual evidence, set out above in the statement of the problem, clearly shows that Strobilus of Act II and servus Lyconidis of Act IV are not the same character. In addition to this, there is a decisive difference between the two slaves that seems to have

been overlooked by commentators. Plautus has portrayed two distinctive slave characters. Strobilus of Act II is intent on carrying out his master's commands as ordered. In spite of his witty exchanges with the cooks in Scenes 4 and 5, he directs himself to the completion of the wedding preparations. He causes no delay in the accomplishment of Megadorus' plans. The slave of Act IV does not heed Lyconides' instruction to keep a close watch on Euclio (680–81), but rushes off to steal the treasure for his personal gain. In the few lines of Act V which are extant, this slave tries to deceive Lyconides with lying and impertinence. He is a "rascally" Plautine slave type like Tranio in the *Mostellaria* or Pseudolus in the play bearing his name. Strobilus, while quick with words, is faithful and carries out his assigned tasks. This slave type is illustrated also by Lampadio in the *Cistellaria* and Trachalio in the *Rudens*.

The orthographic and textual evidence and the discrepancy in character types are conclusive in establishing that there are two different slaves in the *Aulularia*—one belonging to Megadorus, one to Lyconides—and that time has caused the loss of the name of Lyconides' slave.

DOROTHY LANGE

DOUGLASS COLLEGE

2. This solution is endorsed by F. Leo, ed., *Plauti Comediae* (Berlin, 1895–96); E. Burck, "Zur Aulularia des Plautus (vs. 280–370)," *WS*, LXIX (1956), 265, n. 1; P. Arnott, *The Clouds and the Pot of Gold* (New York, 1967), p. xv.

3. W. Ludwig, "Aulularia-Probleme," *Philologus*, CV

(1961), 255–58, and "Berichtigung," *Philologus*, CVI (1962), 153. E. W. Handley, "Plautus, *Aulularia* 363–370," *Philologus*, CVII (1963), 316–17.

4. Ludwig, "Aulularia-Probleme," p. 257.

NOTICE: Will the author of the article, "Who Went to Luca?" please write immediately to The Editor, *Classical Philology*, Box I, Faculty Exchange, The University of Chicago, Illinois 60637.