

## TERENTIAN TECHNIQUE IN THE *ADELPHI* AND THE *EUNUCHUS*

THE first large discoveries of Menander seem to have given courage to a school of critics who thought Terence a crude and bungling adapter; their attitude is typified by the learned article about him written for Pauly-Wissowa by Günther Jachmann.<sup>1</sup> This exaggeration provoked a counter-exaggeration; a school arose which thought Terence a great original poet, treating his originals as Shakespeare did Plutarch; this was the view of Norwood in England, Croce and various followers in Italy, Erich Reitzenstein in Germany.<sup>2</sup> Then truth began to emerge between the extremes, notably in the exact and intelligent study of Terence's individuality which Hans Haffter published in 1953;<sup>3</sup> in 1968 Walter Ludwig modified the picture, claiming somewhat less for Terence.<sup>4</sup> Scholars are beginning to agree that Terence was an honest and skilful adapter of his Greek material, faithful to the essential unity of the plots deriving from his main exemplars. When Terence worked in material from another play, he did so skilfully, trying to conceal the operation.<sup>5</sup>

Strangely enough, exceptions to these rules are widely believed to occur in Terence's two latest and most successful plays, the *Eunuchus* and the *Adelphi*. The *Adelphi* is thought to show a striking instance of inconsistency resulting from unskilful contamination; and some scholars believe that the ends of both plays have been distorted to gratify Roman bad taste. Let us examine these apparent Terentian infelicities.

Terence tells us in the prologue of the *Adelphi* (6 f.) that he has borrowed the episode of the young man carrying off the girl from the pimp's house from the *Synapothneskontes* of Diphilus, 'translating word for word'. Those who have examined the problem with the greatest care agree that the part taken from Diphilus is the first scene of the second act, extending from l. 155 to l. 196.

During the first act Demea has reported to Micio the rumour that Aeschinus, son of the former and adopted son of the latter, has carried off an hetaira from her owner's house (88 ff.). In the second act we see Aeschinus approaching Micio's house, accompanied by the girl, escorted by slaves and pursued by the pimp Sannio. Sannio has already suffered violence at the hand of Aeschinus and his men (159); 'more than five hundred blows' is his own estimate of its extent (200). Aeschinus stations the slave Parmeno near the door, with orders to strike Sannio upon his signal. At 173 Sannio is hit; at 180 Aeschinus threatens to have him taken into the house and flogged almost to death. But at

<sup>1</sup> R.E. Band v A 1 (1934), 598-650.

<sup>2</sup> G. Norwood, *The Art of Terence*, 1923; B. Croce, *La Critica*, xxxiv (1936), 422 ff. = *Poesia antica e moderna* (1943), 29 ff.; E. Reitzenstein, *Terenz als Dichter* (1940).

<sup>3</sup> H. Haffter, 'Terenz und seine künstlerische Eigenart', *Mus. Helv.* x (1953), 1 ff. and 73 ff. (reprinted Darmstadt, 1967).

<sup>4</sup> W. Ludwig, *The Originality of Terence and His Greek Models*, G.R.B.S. ix (1968), 169 ff.

<sup>5</sup> 'In no case was a radical alteration of the construction of the primary model necessary in order to work in the desired parts of the secondary model': Ludwig, loc. cit. 175; 'Jedenfalls lag dem Terenz daran, so gut wie nur möglich, es an keiner Stelle sichtbar zu lassen, dass der dramatische Aufbau des originalen Stückes verändert wurde': Haffter, loc. cit. 73-4 = 21-2.

184 Aeschinus tells Sannio to listen to something which he has to say; at 191 he comes to his point. Sannio has bought the girl for twenty minas; he is ready to pay for her at cost price. 'Suppose I do not wish to sell!', asks Sannio, 'are you going to compel me?'. 'By no means', says Aeschinus. 'Well, that's what I was afraid of'. 'I don't even think she should be sold', says Aeschinus, 'since she is free; I with my hand vindicate her freedom' (193-4). The last words obviously refer to the *alapa*, the box on the ear given by the master to his slave in token of manumission; they echo a familiar legal formula.<sup>1</sup> 'Now decide which you will do', Aeschinus continues, 'accept the money or get up your case'. Then he disappears into the house, leaving Sannio to soliloquize. He is ready to let the girl go, he says, if only Aeschinus pays him the money; but since Aeschinus has her in his possession he sees little prospect of this happening. Like all comic pimps, Sannio judges others by himself.

The cunning slave Syrus now emerges from Micio's house; as he leaves it, we hear him telling someone inside that he will get Sannio to accept payment, and even be grateful for it (209 ff.). Syrus is as good as his word. But he says nothing of the girl's being free; the trump card which he plays is his awareness that Sannio must soon leave for Cyprus on important business, and stands to lose heavily if he is delayed by legal proceedings in Athens. The bargain has no sooner been concluded than Ctesipho arrives, full of gratitude towards his brother Aeschinus (254 ff.). It is now that Terence's audience learns that it is not for himself that Aeschinus has acquired the girl, but for his brother, the son whom the strict Demea has kept for himself and who, he thinks, fully justifies his own educational methods. Aeschinus comes out, looking for the pimp (265); but when he sees Ctesipho, he keeps Sannio waiting for a little while he calms down his brother's agitation. Then he goes off to the market to pay the slave-dealer.

The Diphilan matter has been worked in, it seems to me, so as to leave no real inconsistency, with the apparent startling exception of the claim of Aeschinus that the girl is free.<sup>2</sup> We hear from Demea of the abduction from Sannio's house (88 ff.) and then see Aeschinus and his party before the house of Micio; that involves no chronological difficulty, since Sannio need not be a near neighbour.<sup>3</sup> It is not surprising that no one mentions that it is not for himself but for his brother that Aeschinus wants the girl; the scene of Ctesipho's entry, in an excited state, has been contrived as an effective way of letting the audience know that he, and not his brother, is the hetaira's lover.<sup>4</sup> Donatus tells us that the words which Syrus as he enters addresses to a person still inside the house (209-10) are spoken to Ctesipho.<sup>5</sup> In Terence's play Ctesipho is not yet present, so that some scholars have assumed that Donatus is thinking of Menander's original. They may be right; but in Terence's play we must

<sup>1</sup> See K. Dziatzko and R. Kauer, *Adelphoe*, 2nd edn. (1903), p. 52.

<sup>2</sup> Several of the inconsistencies discovered in the scene by H. Drexler, *Philologus*, Suppl.-Band 26, Heft 2 (1934), have been shown to be illusory. See O. Rieth, *Gnomon* x (1934), 636 ff. and *Die Kunst Menanders in den Adelphen des Terenz*, ed. K. Gaiser (1964) and Elaine Fantham, *Philologus* cxii (1965), 196 ff. (= Fantham I).

<sup>3</sup> Cf. Fantham I, 201; W. G. Arnott,

*Gnomon* xxxvii (1965), 258 takes this difficulty too seriously.

<sup>4</sup> It is true, as Rieth on p. 36 of his book remarks, that the audience does not know Ctesipho till he arrives and talks to Syrus. But after seeing the first act only a very stupid theatre-goer would fail to understand.

<sup>5</sup> Donatus, ed. Wessner, ii. 46, 12 ff.; see Gaiser ap. Rieth, loc. cit., 136 ff. and Fantham I, 205.

assume that they are addressed to Aeschinus, and this involves no serious inconsistency. It has been argued that the violent young man in Diphilus cannot have paid for the girl he carried off from the pimp's house. This is possible; but Terence is hardly inconsistent in making him willing to legalize his proceedings by making some kind of bargain with Sannio, nor in letting his clever slave reduce by half the payment needed to prevent the pimp from bringing any charge. Minor difficulties are not significant; it is not strange that Syrus converses with Ctesipho while Sannio is present, or that Aeschinus keeps Sannio waiting while he converses with his brother,<sup>1</sup> and Parmeno is not the only named slave in New Comedy who has very little to do.<sup>2</sup> I am not as confident as others about the possibility of guessing how much of the second act after the first scene was written by Terence in order to adapt Menander to the Diphilan material he has inserted. But it is clear that the only major inconsistency is the claim of Aeschinus that the girl is free.

The penalties for enslaving or detaining in slavery a free person were both in Athens and in Rome exceedingly severe.<sup>3</sup> That makes it odd that Syrus in negotiating with Sannio should not have threatened him with such a charge. Some people have supposed that in Diphilus' play the girl was free, and that Terence carelessly left in the allusion to her freedom.<sup>4</sup> If so, the act of negligence is unparalleled in his other works, and is very unlike our impression of his methods; further, why should Aeschinus say that *he gives her* her freedom? Alternatively, it has been suggested that the claim that she is free is a mere empty threat. But then what could conceivably be the point of it?

I suggest that when Aeschinus says that he vindicates the girl's freedom *manu*, with his hand, he is referring to something more than the token blow of manumission. He has taken the girl by force, using considerable violence upon the pimp. It follows that in reminding the pimp of the important fact that he has the girl in his possession, he may make joking allusion to the procedure of *manumissio* by saying that he vindicates her liberty 'with his hand', meaning 'by force'. Instances of *manu* in this sense need not be multiplied; many will be found in *T.L.L.* viii (M), 352, 63 f. Perhaps Aeschinus accompanied the word *manu* with a threatening gesture in Sannio's direction.

Nothing in the play has been more admired than the contrast between the brothers Micio and Demea; and nothing has been more debated. Does the urbane and lenient Micio represent Menander's ideal of the wise and kindly father? Does the rustic and severe Demea serve as a comic foil to this admired personage? Most modern readers have taken Micio's side. In both the plays inspired by the *Adelphi*, Molière sympathizes with the figure who corresponds with Micio. When, at the end of Terence's play, Demea suddenly changes his

<sup>1</sup> See Fantham I, 206.

<sup>2</sup> Rieth, p. 32 n. 61 is rightly careful not to insist that Parmeno's small part is a mark of contamination; cf. Fantham I, p. 205 n. 1.

<sup>3</sup> See A. R. W. Harrison, *The Law of Athens* i (1968), 178 ff.

<sup>4</sup> See Rieth, 56-9 and Fantham I, 202. Rieth's notion (p. 58; cf. p. 119) that Terence had to let Aeschinus play what in Diphilus was his trump card in order not to spoil Diphilus' scene, even though in

Terence's play Syrus will later play a different trump card, conflicts with everything we know about Terence's method of work. For a doxography of the problem, see H. Marti, *Untersuchungen zur dramatischen Technik bei Plautus und Terenz*, Diss. Zürich, 1959, pp. 98-9, with n. 41. For various works in which K. Büchner takes the same view as Rieth, see the notes on p. 244 of Tränkle's article cited below, p. 282 n. 2.

whole course of conduct and outdoes Micio in indulgence in a desperate bid for his son's approbation, thus extracting from Aeschinus a promise that he will in future seek his guidance, many moderns have been indignant, Voltaire among them. Lessing set out to defend Terence against Voltaire; but when Demea persuades the sixty-four-year-old Micio to give up his cherished bachelorhood to marry his son Aeschinus' newly acquired mother-in-law, even Lessing is appalled. When a version of the play was performed at Weimar under Goethe's auspices, Micio's marriage was omitted.<sup>1</sup>

The view that Micio represents Menander's ideal father is defended in a detailed study of the play by Otto Rieth, who died during the war; his book was brought out by Konrad Gaiser in 1963.<sup>2</sup> Rieth believed that Demea's final triumph was due to alterations by Terence designed to please a Roman public which found Demea more congenial. Rieth's view has been disputed by several scholars, most recently and most effectively by Hermann Tränkle in *Museum Helveticum* for 1972.<sup>3</sup> It has been pointed out that Micio's certainty that his own educational method has ensured that his son always takes him into his confidence turns out to be misplaced. When Demea protests to him about Aeschinus' conduct, Micio reminds him of their agreement that Aeschinus shall be his, Micio's, responsibility. It is hard not to feel some sympathy for Demea; but how much more when we learn that Aeschinus has stolen the hetaira not for himself, but for his brother Ctesipho! Rieth, it is true, contends that Aeschinus has done his brother a signal service.<sup>4</sup> In Terence, Ctesipho has been ready to go off to serve as a mercenary if he loses his inamorata; in Menander, he talked of suicide;<sup>5</sup> and Rieth concludes that Ctesipho owes a great debt to Aeschinus. Anyone who takes Ctesipho's statements with perfect seriousness will agree; but the usual attitude of comic poets towards attachments to ladies of this profession hardly suggests that it is safe to do so. Other similar threats by *jeunes premiers* of the New Comedy do not support Rieth; we do not take too seriously the threat of Moschion in the *Samia* (627 ff.) to serve as a mercenary, nor the threat of Alcesimarchus in the *Cistellaria* (639 ff.) to kill himself. True, Clinia in the *H.T.* goes off to serve as a mercenary, only to steal back surreptitiously a few weeks later.

Far from feeling grateful to Micio for helping Aeschinus to save his son's life, Demea is justifiably exasperated with him. The family is rich enough, Micio airily remarks, to pay for any possible damage. He reproaches Demea with caring too much about money, like most old men. But the one who most overrates the importance of money is Micio. The family can afford the damage; but what about the possible damage to the young men's characters? Aeschinus, as Micio says in the monologue at the end of the first act, has had many

<sup>1</sup> On the *Nachleben* of the *Adelphi*, see Rieth's introduction (pp. 1 ff.).

<sup>2</sup> See above, p. 280 n. 2; also K. Gaiser, 'Zur Eigenart der römischen Komödie: Plautus und Terenz gegenüber ihren griechischen Vorbildern', in *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt*, ed. H. Temporini, i (1972), 1100 ff. (a reference I owe to Dr. Colin Austin).

<sup>3</sup> See R. W. Carrubba, *Dioniso* xlii (1968), 16 ff.; W. R. Johnson, *California Studies in Classical Antiquity* i (1968), 171 ff.; Elaine

Fantham, *Latomus* xxx (1971), 970 ff. (= Fantham II); H. Tränkle, *Museum Helveticum* xxix (1972), 241 ff. All these scholars take a general view of the play which is substantially right as against that of Rieth and Büchner; Tränkle's valuable article, which reached me after I had begun to write my own, has enabled me to make mine much shorter.

<sup>4</sup> Rieth, pp. 40 ff.; cf. pp. 37 and 119.

<sup>5</sup> See Donatus, ed. Wessner, ii. 62.

mistresses and given away much;<sup>1</sup> Lefevre<sup>2</sup> has noticed that this prepares the reader for what happens later, but as a believer in Rieth's theory concludes that it was added to Menander's play by Terence, to lead up to the triumph of Demea which Terence inserted in order to gratify the Roman audience.

Demea's soliloquy in the last act (855 ff.) has something in common with Cnemon's moving apologia in the *Dyskolos* (708 ff.), and something with Demeas' remonstrance with Moschion in the last act of the *Samia* (694 ff.). But it is ironical in a way that these are not; and it is more touched than they with the wild extravagance, inherited from the Aristophanic *komos*, that pervades the last act of a Menandrian comedy. If we did not know from Donatus<sup>3</sup> that in Menander Micio did not resist the command of Demea that he should marry, people like Rieth would deny that the marriage had figured in Menander's play. Wilamowitz in 1925<sup>4</sup> rightly said that Micio would have to accept the devil's own grandmother if she were offered him. Even in the early years of the century scholars had drawn attention to the rapidity with which the marriages of Pamphilus in the *Andria* and Clitipho in the *H.T.*<sup>5</sup> are concluded; even before Rieth's book came out, scholars had compared the readiness with which in the *Dyskolos* the rich Callippides agrees not only that his son shall marry Cneomon's impecunious daughter, but that his daughter shall marry her impecunious brother.<sup>6</sup> Even Wilamowitz, like Leo, insisted that the last acts of the *Stichus* and the *Casina* must be of wholly Plautine origin;<sup>7</sup> but the new Menander has vindicated Wilhelm Süss's warning against this assumption.<sup>8</sup>

The whole movement of the plot requires that Demea be vindicated; in the future, the young men will ask his advice, and by agreeing that Ctesipho may keep his mistress Demea gives an undertaking that he will be less severe. In a semi-serious and quasi-philosophical comedy of the kind Rieth thinks this is, this would be inconsistent; in Menander's play, it would be natural.

This conclusion is relevant to the end of another Menandrian adaptation. Ludwig by a masterly analysis<sup>9</sup> has shown that the working into the *Eunuchus* of two characters from the *Kolax* affects only four scenes, and does no damage to the plot. Yet even Ludwig believes<sup>10</sup> that Terence has spoiled Menander's ending; no Greek audience, he claims, could have tolerated the arrangement successfully proposed by Gnatho, that the soldier Thraso shall retain a limited share in Thais' favours, because it will be useful to have him help to pay her bills. Certainly the final scenes have been recast to admit the soldier and parasite from the *Kolax*. But even in Menander's *Eunuchus*, Chaerestratus had a rival; very likely that rival was a soldier,<sup>11</sup> doubtless he was rich. Thais is not a citizen, but an hetaira. Like Habrotonon, she is genuinely good-hearted; but like Habrotonon, she never lets out of sight her own material interests, which happen

<sup>1</sup> 149-50.

<sup>2</sup> E. Lefevre, *Die Expositionstechnik in den Komödien des Terenz* (1969), 39 ff.

<sup>3</sup> Donatus, ed. Wessner, ii. 176, 20: apud Menandrum senex de nuptiis non gravatur.

<sup>4</sup> Wilamowitz, *Menanders Schiedsgericht* (1925), 137. When Leo, *Geschichte der römischen Literatur* (1914), 245 says that Menander must somehow have prepared the audience beforehand for Micio's marriage, he misunderstands Menander, as Haffter, loc. cit. 89 = 37 has pointed out.

<sup>5</sup> See Dziatzko-Kauer, op. cit. above,

p. 280 n. 1.

<sup>6</sup> See A. Thierfelder, *Menandrea* (1960), 107 ff.; cf. W. G. Arnott, *Greece and Rome* x (1963), 140 ff.

<sup>7</sup> Wilamowitz, *Griechische Verskunst* (1921), p. 125 n. 2.

<sup>8</sup> W. Süss, *Rh. Mus.* lxxv (1910), 450 ff.; see the sensible comments of the lamented Armin Schäfer, *Menanders Dyskolos: Untersuchungen zur dramatischen Technik* (1965), 71.

<sup>9</sup> W. Ludwig, *Philologus* ciii (1959), 1 ff.

<sup>10</sup> Loc. cit. 36-7.

<sup>11</sup> See Ludwig, loc. cit. 26.

to be served by helping the other characters to get what they desire.<sup>1</sup> Charming as she is, she is expensive; and when Ludwig insists that the present ending of the *Eunuchus* is an offence to her, I think he is romanticizing her relationship with Chaerestratus, and crediting her with a fastidiousness which neither she nor her audience would have displayed.

*Christ Church, Oxford*

HUGH LLOYD-JONES

<sup>1</sup> Ludwig is well aware of this; at p. 37 n. 3 he reproaches H. Hauschild, *Die Gestalt der Hetaira in der griechischen Komödie* (Diss.

Leipzig, 1933), 36 with making Thais too unselfish.