THE CONSTRUCTION OF TERENCE'S *HEAUTONTIMORUMENOS*

In the twentieth century the question of the relationship of Terence's *Heautontimorumenos* to its Greek original has been largely neglected or else dismissed on the grounds that it presents no major problem. It is true that, because of the new light which the discovery of the Cairo codex of Menander shed on the nature and role of the chorus in Greek new comedy, there was a flurry of activity concerning the difficult passage 167 ff.;[1] but the far more fundamental problem of *contaminatio* in general and of the meaning and interpretation of lines 4 to 6 of the play's prologue has attracted comparatively little attention.[2] H. Marti produced a two-part survey of work done on Terence in the years 1909 to 1959;[3] in it he says that in the period under review the question of *contaminatio* in *Heauton*—in the sense of the fusion of two originals —has been totally abandoned, with the exception of one article by F. Skutsch in which he holds to his earlier views on the subject.[4] Marti also refers to Köhler's earlier work on the same problem, and to the discussion to be found in Kuiper's more comprehensive work on Roman comedy,[5] but that is all.

There are, it seems to me, several reasons for this situation. Firstly, for this play alone the commentary of Donatus has not survived, and we do not therefore possess even such small pieces of information on Terence's workmanship as it can supply for the other five plays—this may help to explain the comparative dearth of literature on the play in general as well as in regard to the specific problem, and, in particular, the absence of a good full-scale edition; secondly, the whole problem was exhaustively discussed in the latter half of the last century and in the early years of this, and every degree of *contaminatio* and every possible interpretation of 4–6 (together with several impossible ones) was advanced as an attempt at a solution;[6] thirdly, in spite of, or perhaps

[1] See especially R. C. Flickinger, 'Χορού in Terence's *Heauton*', *CPh* 7 (1912), 24 ff.; F. Skutsch, 'Χορού bei Terenz', *Hermes* 47 (1912), 141 ff.; G. Jachmann, *Plautinisches und Attisches* (Berlin, 1931), pp.245 ff.; H. Drexler, 'Terentiana 4: Zum *Hautontimorumenos*: 'Χορού bei Terenz'?', *Hermes* 73 (1938), 65 ff.; and W. Beare, 'Χορού in the *Heautontimorumenos* and the *Plutus*', *Hermathena* 74 (1949), 26 ff.

[2] Notable exceptions are R. C. Flickinger, 'A study of Terence's prologues', *PhQ* 6 (1927), 235 ff., esp. 241–58, and B. Castiglioni, 'Il prologo dell' *Heautontimorumenos* e la commedia *duplex*', *Athenaeum* 35 (1957), 257 ff. See also H. Gelhaus, *Die Prologe des Terenz* (Heidelberg, 1972), pp.70–80.

[3] *Lustrum* 6 (1961), 114 ff., and 8 (1963), 5 ff.

[4] *Lustrum* 8 (1963), 45–6. The article to which Marti refers is that cited in n.1 above; for Skutsch's earlier article, see *Philologus* 59 (1900), 1 ff. All other articles, including those mentioned in n.2 above, while discussing lines 4–6 of the prologue, reject any possibility of *contaminatio*.

[5] O. Köhler, *De Hautontimorumeni Terentianae compositione* (Leipzig, 1908), and W. E. J. Kuiper, *Grieksche origineelen en latijnsche navolgingen, Zes komodies van Menander bij Terentius en Plautus* (Amsterdam, 1936), in which our play is discussed on pp.52–90, with an English summary on pp.254–6.

[6] A full bibliography is given in M. Schanz and C. Hosius, *Geschichte der römischen Literatur* i: *Die Zeit der Republik*[4] (Munich, 1927), pp.107–8 (the prologues) and p.112 (*Heauton*); for later work, see Marti, *Lustrum* 8 (1963), 15–16, 19, and 45–9 and W. G. Arnott, *Menander, Plautus, Terence* (*G & R* New Surveys in the Classics 9) (Oxford, 1975), pp.45 ff.

because of, these many suggested solutions, the problem still seems as intractable as ever, and seems likely to remain so unless the text of Menander's original is discovered; and fourthly, the tendency of scholarship in recent years has been to move away from the narrower, analytical approach and to concentrate on the wider and perhaps more profitable study of the plays as living drama.[7]

Even so, it might not be without interest to reopen the discussion. My purpose in this article is briefly to restate the problem, to examine the more important of the solutions which have been advanced, and then to put forward some new thoughts, particularly on the part of Bacchis in the play, which, while not perhaps producing any radically new answer, might contribute towards a better understanding and further the search for an acceptable solution.

I. THE PROBLEM

The extent of any possible *contaminatio* in this play must of necessity take into account what is said in 4–6. In Lindsay and Kauer's Oxford Text these run:

> ex integra Graeca integram comoediam
> hodie sum acturus H[e]auton timorumenon,
> duplex quae ex argumento facta est simplici.
>
> 6 simplici] duplici *A* (*corr. Iov.*)

At first sight this sentence seems to contradict itself. 4 seems to indicate a faithful adaptation of the Greek original, whereas 6 seems to imply that Terence has converted a play with a single plot into a play with a double one. The action of the play revolves around the fortunes of two pairs of lovers, Clinia and Antiphila and Clithipho and Bacchis, and the implication of 6 would seem to be that Terence has added one of these pairs—presumably Clithipho and Bacchis, since Clinia, as the son of the 'self-tormentor' of the title, is integral to the original Menander play—either from another Greek play or of his own free invention; we have the testimony of Donatus[8] that he had added the parts of Charinus and Byrria in his adaptation of *Andria*, his first play, and it seems quite possible that he would try much the same thing in his second.[9] Moreover, *contaminatio* was clearly very much in Terence's mind when he wrote *Heauton*, since in 16–21 of the prologue he replies to the charges made against him in this respect; and the reply is a singular one, since he admits to having indulged in the practice, states that he is unrepentant and expresses his intention of doing the same thing again. The situation is further complicated by the existence of the variant reading *duplici* in 6, which is found only in A (the codex Bembinus), but has been corrected afterwards by Iovialis to the *simplici* of the later,

[7] Cf. Arnott, op. cit., p.4: '. . . research could be more profitably directed into what the comedies of Plautus and Terence have themselves to offer than into their uncertain relationships with lost sources.'

[8] *Ad Andr.* 301, cf. 977.

[9] His second successful production, that is; I omit the first unsuccessful attempt to put on *Hecyra*. But the failure of *Hecyra* may have made Terence even more determined to have a play with a double intrigue in *Heauton*, since *Hecyra* is his only play with a single plot, and he may have felt that this fact had contributed to its failure. (I do not accept the arguments of those who would place *Eunuchus* before *Heauton*; but, even if this were the case, it would not materially affect any of the discussion in this article.)

Calliopian group of manuscripts. Acceptance of *duplici* would, of course, remove the apparent contradiction between 4 and 6, and mean that Terence was specifically denying having practised *contaminatio* in this play.

But, quite apart from what is said in the prologue, anyone who wishes to learn how far, if at all, Terence did in fact deviate from or alter his original must of course look at the play itself. But he must do this without possessing more than a few odd lines of Menander's play to act as a guide, and without any hints from Donatus. Proceeding therefore from purely internal evidence, it seems quite impossible to remove one of the two pairs of lovers without totally destroying the whole fabric of the play; the affairs of Clinia and Clithipho, and indeed of Antiphila and Bacchis, are interrelated and interdependent to such an extent that it is difficult to imagine that Terence has introduced one of the pairs into the play unless we are to assume that he virtually rewrote the whole thing from scratch—which we know from the few extant fragments of the Greek original that he did not do. It is the very impossibility of removing one pair of lovers from the play in this way that has led, or perhaps forced, the great majority of those who have considered the problem to deal with 4–6 in such a way as to preclude the possibility that they refer to any form of *contaminatio*; by contrast, as Marti says,[10] the champions of *contaminatio* have been very few indeed, particularly of more recent years. The result of the theorizing of this large anti-*contaminatio* majority and the small pro-*contaminatio* minority has been to produce a bewildering variety of solutions, the most important of which will be examined in the following section.

II. SOME SOLUTIONS

One of the more drastic solutions designed to remove the apparent contradiction between 4 and 6 has simply been to delete 6 as being the interpolation of a *grammaticus*. Several scholars, not only some who accepted the reading *duplex . . . simplici*, but also others who supported *duplex . . . duplici*, favoured this course in the nineteenth century.[11] Dziatzko, for example, accepting *duplex . . . simplici*, said:

> v.6 grammaticorum sapientiam redolet. . . . is versus intellegi quidem ita potest, ut prologus dicat argumentum fabulae, quae cum duorum adulescentium amores contineat, ita duplex dici possit, non ex contaminatione, sed ex simplicis (graecae) comoediae argumento tale factum esse. sed cum haec nimis contorte dicta sint, grammatici potius alicuius (cf. Euanth. de com. sub fin.; Don. arg. Phor. et Ad.; in Andr. II, 1, 1 cet.), quam Terenti ingenio ea deberi arbitramur atque cum Fl. al. uncis inclusimus.[12]

Karsten, on the other hand, accepted *duplex . . . duplici*, and explained:

[10] See n.4 above.

[11] Besides Dziatzko and Karsten, quoted below, see among others G. Ihne, *Quaestiones Terentianae* (Bonn, 1843), p.42; F. W. Ritschl, *Parergon Plautinorum Terentianorumque* i (Leipzig, 1845), 381n.; A. Fleckeisen, *P. Terenti Afri Comoediae*[2] (Leipzig, 1898), p.53; and Ph. Fabia, *Les prologues de Térence* (Paris, 1888), p.18, who claims: 'C'est, en effet, le seul vers des prologues qu'on ne puisse défendre.'

[12] K. Dziatzko, *P. Terenti Afri Comoediae* (Leipzig, 1884), p.xxiii; he had first supported this view in his earlier work *De prologis Plautinis et Terentianis quaestiones selectae* (Bonn, 1863), pp.10–11. It is interesting to see that Dziatzko's interpretation of the meaning of the line here is the same as Leo's earlier one—see p.107 below; but Leo did not regard that meaning as ground for deletion. ('Fl.' at the end of the quotation means 'Fleckeisen'.)

simul vero sentimus versum non esse Terentianum, sed sequioris doctrinae scholasticae specimen, vitiosum in metro, quaesitum et fucatum in anthithesi *duplex . . . duplici*, otiosum in re, cum non haec tantum, sed omnes fabulae Terentianae praeter Hecyram eatenus sint duplices. excogitavit autem magistellus hunc versum ut aemularetur praecedentem, ubi poeta, non sane feliciter, luserat in voce *integra*.[13]

But in more recent years the tendency of scholarship has been to put more faith in the manuscript tradition, and only to have recourse to deletion as a most extreme measure. It seems to me that this is certainly the right attitude to take in the case of Terence's prologues, particularly since it was only the prologues, and not the actual plays, which were felt to need such drastic treatment in the last century; there seems no reason to think that the textual tradition in regard to the prologues is any different from that in regard to the rest of Terence's writing, and it is the treatment of the prologues, not of the rest, which was misguided. Moreover, as far as concerns *Heauton* 6, it seems to me that the very reason which led Dziatzko to recommend deletion is precisely that which assures us of the genuineness of the line. The play on words which it contains, and which to Dziatzko smelt of *grammaticorum sapientia*, is precisely the sort of trick which Terence indulged in elsewhere in his prologues—and this is as true of Karsten's repeated *duplex . . . duplici* as of the contrasted *duplex . . . simplici* which Dziatzko accepted.[14]

Dziatzko may be thought to have had more reason for deleting 6 than had Karsten, since at least in his case he was removing what he felt was an impossible contradiction between 4 and 6, whereas Karsten's reading *duplex . . . duplici* involved no such problem. But in fact there is no such contradiction between the two lines. The crux of the matter is the meaning of the two words *integra* and *integram* in 4. Etymologically, *integer* means 'untouched', and the argument has centred upon whether 'untouched' should in this context be interpreted as 'new', 'fresh', 'untreated' or as 'whole', 'entire', 'unadulterated'.[15] Without, I hope, my begging the question, it will be obvious that the former interpretation involves no contradiction of 6, whereas the latter certainly does. These alternatives have each had their champions; for example, 'new' was favoured by F. Skutsch ('aus einem noch unübersetzten griechischen Stück ein noch

[13] H. T. Karsten, 'Terentiani prologi', *Mnemosyne* N.S. 22 (1894), 197. It will soon become clear that I accept some of Karsten's reasoning, such as 'vitiosum in metro', but only as argument against acceptance of the reading *duplici*, not as argument for denying Terentian authorship of the line as a whole.

Several of these scholars also deleted other lines of the prologue (particularly 7–9), indicated lacunae and indulged in wholescale transposition of lines, some even regarding its present form as a combination of two prologues written for two different productions of the play. All this was done in an effort to bring the prologue into a form which it was felt would be more in line with the statement of intention in 1–3. This problem has caused almost as much trouble as has the interpretation of 4–6, but is outside the scope of this article. It is sufficient to say now that I consider that our present text can be maintained without any of these Draconian measures.

[14] For contrasting words, see *Andr.* 20–1: *neglegentiam . . . diligentiam*; *Eun.* 8: *bonis . . . non bonas*; *Eun.* 43: *veteres . . . novi*; *Hec.* 17: *incerta . . . certum* etc. For repetition of words, *Heaut.* 20: *exemplum . . . exemplo*; *Hec.* 39–40: *auctoritas . . . auctoritati*; *Hec.* 55: *causa . . . causam*; and, of course, the *integra . . . integram* of *Heaut.* 4; there are many more.

[15] See *Oxford Latin Dictionary* fasc. IV, 934, *integer* 1 and 5 respectively. F. Leo (*Analecta Plautina de figuris sermonis* ii (Göttingen, 1898), 22) differentiated by using the words ὁλοσχερής (*tota*) and ἀκήρατος (*intacta*), but both these words seem to me to apply to our second group of meanings.

unaufgeführtes lateinisches')[16] and Shuckburgh ('a play never before represented in Latin, from a Greek original of which no adaptation had before been made'),[17] whereas 'whole' was supported by Dziatzko ('ex graeca fabula cuius nemo quidquam praeripuit, latinam cui non oportuit quidquam addi')[18] and Gray ('an entire [Latin] play adapted from an entire Greek play').[19] There seem to me to be compelling arguments in favour of the interpretation 'new', all of which are quite independent of any consideration of the relationship of 4 to 6. The first, and least weighty, is that the balance of the ancient opinion is in favour of it; the scholia in the Codex Bembinus interpret *integra* as 'a nullo translata' and *integram* as 'novam, in sc(aena nondum vi)sam',[20] while the *commentarius antiquior* of Schlee's edition of the scholia of Terence has for *ex integra Graeca* 'ex ipsa Menandri fabula intacta ab aliquo Latino' and for *integram* 'quam nemo Latinus conscripsit hactenus stilo'.[21] Secondly, as has often been pointed out, we can compare a precisely similar use of *integer* in this meaning in the prologue to *Adelphoe*, where the meaning 'whole' is not possible.[22] Thirdly, the recapitulation of *Heaut.* 7 'novam esse ostendi', which must refer to 4–5 just as 'et quae esset' later in the same line must refer to 6, shows, to my mind conclusively, that Terence intended the meaning 'new' in 4.[23] There are two further points that should be made before we leave this matter. The first is that the famous reference in Cicero (*Top.* 18, 69) where *integra* are specifically opposed to *contaminata* need not support the 'whole' interpretation here. *Topica* was written over 100 years after Terence's death, and the reference only shows us what Cicero felt about the meaning of the words he was using, a feeling probably influenced by his knowledge of and literary interest in the *contaminatio* issue; what the reference does not give is any indication of what Terence intended when he used the word *integer* in *Heaut.* 4 or anywhere else (whether in the context of *contaminatio* or not), especially since, when Terence was writing, literary *contaminatio* was a very new concept, quite possibly invented by Luscius Lanuvinus himself for the express purpose of attacking his rival, and was only just beginning to acquire the character of a technical term.[24] Secondly, I fail to see the force of Flickinger's argument[25] that the adoption of the same meaning for both *integra* and *integram* 'makes the phrase . . . which strikes the eye and looks as though it ought to be powerful and significant, a mere piece of

[16] *Philologus* 59 (1900), 4.

[17] E. S. Shuckburgh (ed.), *The Heauton Timorumenos of Terence* (London, 1887), p.64.

[18] *De prologis Plautinis et Terentianis quaestiones selectae*, p.8.

[19] J. H. Gray (ed.), *P. Terenti Afri Hauton Timorumenos* (Cambridge, 1895), p.64.

[20] J. F. Mountford, *The Scholia Bembina* (London, 1934), p.50. The supplementation of the second scholion is due to W. Studemund, 'Über die editio princeps der Terenz-scholien des codex Bembinus', *Neue Jahrbücher für Philol. und Paed.* 97 (1868), 555.

[21] F. Schlee, *Scholia Terentiana* (Leipzig, 1893), p.113.

[22] *Ad.* 9–11: 'eum Plautus locum / reliquit integrum, eum hic locum sumpsit sibi / in Adelphos'. R. H. Martin, in his edition of *Adelphoe* (Cambridge, 1976), p.101, says 'as *Ht.* 4–5 . . . shows, *integer* may also be applied . . . to the new, hitherto unattempted play'.

[23] Terence was fond of insisting on the 'newness' of his plays, cf. *Phorm.* 24; *Hec.* 2, 5; *Ad.* 12. We might, in passing, notice the use of *novus* and *integer* together in Plautus, *Cas.* 626, 'novam atque integram audaciam'. My argument here would not, of course, be accepted by those scholars who reject the authenticity of 7—see n.2 above.

[24] In saying this, I am aware that Terence did not actually use the noun-form *contaminatio* (though Luscius may have done); but he did employ the verb *contaminare* at e.g. *Heaut.* 17.

[25] 'A study of Terence's prologues', *Pb Q* 6 (1927), 249.

tautology.' On the contrary, such a use of the same word in the same meaning twice in the same sentence is precisely in Terence's manner,[26] and so Flickinger does not appear to be right in supporting the 'a nullo translata' interpretation for *integra* and yet feeling that by *integram comoediam* Terence is denying *contaminatio*. Nor, incidentally, do I agree with his statement at the same point that 'even if it be insisted that *integram* must bear the same meaning ("untranslated") here as *integra* in the same verse, it all comes to practically the same thing anyhow.'

Having therefore established that there need not be, and to my mind is not, any contradiction between 4 and 6 (even with the reading *duplex . . . simplici* in the latter), since the one line is talking about the 'newness' of the play to be produced and the other about what has happened in the process of its adaptation by Terence, it is now time to turn to the matter of the reading in 6. Each of the four possible combinations of the words *duplex* and *simplex* has been supported at one time or another though only two of them rest on any manuscript authority. The other two, those with *simplex* at the start of the line, are conjectural emendations and must inevitably therefore invite more scepticism. Of these latter, *simplex . . . duplici* has found its most renowned exponent in Bentley, though he was not in fact the first to suggest it,[27] and it has been championed as recently as 1932;[28] It has the disadvantage not only of resting on no manuscript authority, but also of being prey to the same doubts about the scansion of *duplici* as will shortly be raised in the context of the reading of the codex Bembinus. The other, *simplex . . . simplici*, was first proposed by the German dramatist Lessing in 1768 in one of the articles in his *Hamburgische Dramaturgie*, and it has all the signs of being a rather desperate attempt to cut the Gordian knot and dispense at a stroke with all the difficulties and arguments to which the play has given rise. It has found occasional support,[29] but the lack of any ancient testimony for it must be the overriding factor against accepting it provided one of the attested readings will make sense.

We are therefore left with the rival manuscript readings *duplex . . . simplici* and *duplex . . . duplici*, the former more generally accepted but more difficult for the opponents of *contaminatio* to explain, the latter less frequently championed but simple to explain if one wishes to deny *contaminatio*. When weighing up these alternatives some writers have tended to dismiss *duplex . . . duplici* as contemptuously as the two conjectural emendations,[30] but recently the variant has attracted more attention than for some time. Prete, in his much-criticized edition, mentions the support of Ferrarino for it, but nevertheless retains *duplex . . . simplici*,[31] shortly afterwards, however, Castiglioni published a long article which agrees with and relies on Ferrarino's (unpublished) views.[32]

[26] See n.14 above.

[27] R. Bentley (ed.), *Publii Terentii Afri comoediae* (Cambridge, 1726), pp.162–3.

[28] In E. Chambry's French edition of Terence (Paris, 1932), ii.9.

[29] See, e.g., W. Meyer, *Quaestiones Terentianae* (Leipzig, 1902), pp.60–1.

[30] See Flickinger, 'A study of Terence's prologues', 252n.: 'It is unnecessary to comment upon the variant reading *duplici* or upon Bentley's conjecture, *simplex . . . duplici*.'

[31] S. Prete (ed.), *P. Terenti Afri comediae* (Heidelberg, 1954), p.117: 'lectionem Bembini defendit Petrus Ferrarino qui privatis ad me litteris ostendit hunc versum magni esse momenti ad contaminationem apud Terentium intellegendam.'

[32] Op. cit. n.2 above. For Ferrarino see especially pp.262 n., 265 n., 275.

Unfortunately, the article is at times not well argued. In particular, Castiglioni seems to be acting rather like Lessing when he states quite early on that *duplex . . . duplici* must be the original and authentic reading because only on that supposition can all the difficulties about the play be cleared up.[33] Further, several of his arguments against the various explanations of *duplex . . . simplici* lack both support and conviction; and, above all, his discussion of the metrical arguments, the principal arguments by which the reading of the codex Bembinus must stand or fall, seems very weak indeed.

But, before discussing Castiglioni's article, and his metrical arguments in particular, any further, there are two more general observations about the two readings which should be made. Firstly, arguments about the line seeming to demand a contrast of terms rather than a correspondence (or vice versa) cannot carry much weight, since, as already mentioned, both contrast and correspondence are equally in Terence's manner and therefore either could be equally likely here. More significant is the question of how, as the result of a copying error, the two rival readings are likely to have come into existence in the first place; in this connection it seems far more likely that a copyist would erroneously write *duplici* for *simplici* in the codex Bembinus under the influence of the preceding *duplex* than that one would erroneously write *simplici* for *duplici* in the ancestor of the Calliopian manuscripts without any such preceding influence—and the fact that the codex Bembinus is our oldest manuscript covering the passage need not affect the force of this argument at all.

The principal objection to *duplici*, however, has for a long time been seen to be that it simply will not scan where it appears in this particular iambic senarius, since its first syllable—a short vowel followed by a mute and a liquid—must remain short and cannot be lengthened.[34] This principle concerning such syllables has been frequently repeated, as being true either for early Latin verse as a whole[35] or at least for early dramatic, as opposed to epic, verse,[36] and its general acceptance seemed to have settled the argument for good in favour of *simplici* here. But Castiglioni has reopened the issue and attempted to defend *duplici* on metrical grounds;[37] he has not got a strong case and his arguments are not convincing. He draws attention to the fact that the principle was first fully formulated only by Ritschl,[38] that no earlier students of Terentian metre appear to have noticed it, and that no trace of it is to be found in any of the ancient *grammatici*. But, quite apart from this being largely an argument from silence, it assumes that the earlier Terentian scholars and the *grammatici* had as great and as detailed a knowledge of early metre as it is possible to acquire today after the researches of the last 150 years—and, as far as the early scholars at least are concerned, this is clearly not the case. However, Castiglioni goes further in the case of the ancient *grammatici*, and cites one instance (but only one) where one of them provides testimony in the opposite direction, that is for just such a lengthening as Castiglioni would wish to see in *dūplici*. It comes in one of the few extant fragments of the work of the Plautine commentator Sisenna, preserved in

[33] Op. cit., p.262.

[34] See, e.g., O. Skutsch's review of Prete's edition in *CR* N.S. 6 (1956), 129: '. . . neither Prete nor his unfortunate friend [Ferrarino] . . . seems to be aware that *duplici* does not scan.' We have seen (n.13 above) that this was one of Karsten's reasons for deleting the line.

[35] D. S. Raven, *Latin Metre* (London, 1965), p.25.

[36] W. M. Lindsay, *Early Latin Verse* (Oxford, 1922), pp.255–6.

[37] Op. cit., pp.262–7.

[38] At loc. cit. in n.11 above.

Rufinus' *Commentarium in metra Terentiana*,[39] seemingly a comment on Plautus' *Rudens*, it reads 'latronem producit metri causa', meaning that Sisenna felt he had found the scansion *lātro* in that play. Unfortunately *latro* does not occur in *Rudens* (unless it did once, suggests Castiglioni, at a point where there is now a lacuna), and Castiglioni therefore accepts the possibility discussed earlier by Ritschl that the citation in Rufinus is corrupt or wrong and that Sisenna's comment should refer instead to *Curculio* 548, where much earlier some editors had replaced a difficult *lenonum* by a more explicable *lātronum*.[40] Castiglioni concludes that it is incontestable that Sisenna had found at least one example in Plautus where a short syllable followed by a mute and a liquid was lengthened; but we do not know how sound was the Plautine text which the commentator was using and, in any case, the inaccuracy of the reference has rendered it so suspect as evidence that some scholars have simply dismissed it.[41] Castiglioni's further statement that such syllables must be considered at least of doubtful quantity (*latro*, for example, only definitely having a short first syllable once in Plautus, at *Stichus* 135) is not evidence for their having at any time to be considered long. His further possible example of *dūplos* from *Amphitruo* (fragment XII in the O.C.T.) is from a line of doubtful text, and, all in all, the sum of his evidence is very far from being, as he puts it, 'sufficient to shake the traditional metrical principle, if nothing else'. Moreover, the fact remains that nowhere else in Terence or in Plautus does the first syllable of *duplex* have to be scanned long, and in Plautus it is certainly short on six of the ten occasions on which the word is used.[42] Finally, Castiglioni sees in *Heaut.* 6, scanned *dŭplex . . . dūplici*, an example of a rare device of prosody whereby the alternative ways of scanning a syllable consisting of a short vowel followed by a mute and a liquid are both employed in the same line. He says that the device is known to exist at least from the time of Lucretius, but the parallel he quotes, the most renowned example, is late.[43] In a long footnote he suggests that a similar use of this trick, amazingly with the same word *duplex*, may perhaps be found in Plautus' *Bacchides* 641; unfortunately, however, that particular line is one of those all too frequently found in Plautus which admit of scansion in several different ways, and there is not even agreement as to whether it is trochaic or anapaestic. As the single directly relevant parallel to the particular rare device which he seeks to find in *Heaut.* 6, *Bacchides* 641 is about as shaky a piece of

[39] H. Keil (ed.), *Grammatici Latini* vi (Leipzig, 1874), 561.

[40] 'quam pars lenonum, libertos qui habent et eos deserunt' (Troch. sept.). Most modern editors, however, retain *lenonum*, despite the difficulty in meaning, because of the arbitrary nature of the emendation (first suggested by Dousa in 1587) and because of the metrical problem. Fleckeisen suggested the equally arbitrary but metrically acceptable *latronum pars*, which would entail that Sisenna was not after all referring to *Curculio*; *lenonum* is ingeniously defended by E. Paratore in his edition of *Curculio* (Florence, 1958), p.85. (One wonders, incidentally, whether Dousa, if he had had our knowledge of early metre, would ever have suggested *latronum*, and, likewise, whether Ritschl, if Dousa had not suggested *latronum*, would ever have suggested that Sisenna might be referring to *Curculio*.)

[41] Cf. Lindsay, op. cit., p.256: 'Sisenna, we feel, must have erred when he ascribed 'lātronem' to Plautus.'

[42] In Terence it is short in *Phorm.* 603 and *anceps* at the start of *Heaut.* 6. In Plautus it is short in *As.* 695, *Cas.* 722, *Men.* 546, *Poen.* 15, *Pseud.* 580 and *Truc.* 781, and *anceps* twice in *Baccb.* 641 (but see below) and once in *M.G.* 295 and 296.

[43] Vergil, *Aen.* 2.663: 'gnatum ante ora pătris, pātrem qui obtruncat ad aras.' For further examples, also late, see R. D. Austin's edition of *Aen.* 2 (Oxford, 1964), p.250.

evidence as is Sisenna's comment as testimony for the more general principle about the scansion of these syllables.[44] Moreover, such a sophisticated device of prosody does seem a little too refined for early writers like Terence and Plautus, and perhaps also more appropriate to the written literature of the Golden Age than to the dramatic texts of earlier times, especially the comic texts with their greater approximation to the spoken language.

It would seem, therefore, that attempts to prove *duplici* acceptable on metrical grounds do not succeed, since the amount of evidence which can be produced in support of it is very small, and the nature of that evidence is far from convincing. Whatever the attractions of the reading from the point of view of the meaning of the line, it must not be accepted simply because it makes things easier to explain; on the contrary, it must be rejected in favour of the metrically unexceptionable *simplici*, whatever the difficulties of interpretation to which such a decision might give rise.

And the difficulties of interpretation are indeed considerable, at least for those who would deny the fact that Terence practised *contaminatio* in this play. As has been said, it is they who constitute the majority of the scholarly opinion about the play; but, before examining their various explanations of *Heaut.* 6, it will perhaps be best to deal first with the opinions of the smaller number of scholars who are forced to admit (some of them, one feels, without much conviction) that the line in question must be an admission by Terence that he has indulged in *contaminatio* of some sort or other. The proposer of the most extreme view was Rötter, who was led by his interpretation of 6 and by certain inconsistencies in the plot to suggest that neither Clithipho nor Bacchis, nor the supper at Chremes' house nor Syrus' intrigues against his master, had been present in Menander's Ἑαυτόν, but had come from another Greek play.[45] He admits that the removal of these elements from the play would leave an original plot by Menander which would be too thin and short to constitute a full five-act play, but he suggests that, to compensate, Terence must have omitted or altered all such sections of the original as would have clashed with the new elements he introduced. If this were the case, Terence must surely have had to omit (and not

[44] Castiglioni tactfully omits to mention that, on his own views about the scansion of *duplex*, its first occurrence in *Heaut.* 6 could also have a long first syllable.

[45] E. Rötter, *De Heautontimorumeno Terentiana* (Bayreuth, 1892), esp. pp.17–18. It must be admitted that one of the seeming inconsistencies which upset Rötter does appear serious. It is that the long and intimate friendship between the two sons, Clinia and Clitipho (183–4) contrasts strangely with the fact that the two fathers, Menedemus and Chremes, had until very recently been complete strangers to one another (53 ff.). As a way out of this difficulty, it has been suggested that in writing 183–4 Terence was merely making a clumsy mistranslation of the word *συνεφήβοι* which appeared in the Greek at the corresponding point; but this would still not account for the fact that Clitipho obviously knew Clinia well enough to invite him to dinner (182–3). Rötter's explanation is that Clitipho did not appear in the Greek original, and that the inconsistency is one of Terence's own making, introduced when he inserted the character of Chremes' son from another play. But perhaps there is no inconsistency here; after all, many sons do not reveal to their fathers the identity of all their friends, particularly if they suspect that their fathers may not approve of the company they keep. Though would they then invite them home for a meal? (Ph. E. Legrand, 'La composition et la date de l' Ἑαυτὸν τιμωρούμενος de Ménandre', *REG* 16 (1903), 349 ff., thinks that this and the other awkwardnesses in Terence's play are not his fault but Menander's, and indicate that it was a very early work by the still inexperienced Greek dramatist which was faithfully adapted 'warts and all' into Latin.)

merely alter) an awful lot—as great an amount, in fact, as he introduced; and, though we must at all times beware of assuming that Terence was so unskilled that his points of alteration will always be obvious to us if only we look for them hard enough, nevertheless he must have been an exceptionally clever dramatist to be able to sew up the joins while only leaving the few inconsistencies which worried Rötter. If he could do all that, why, one wonders, did he not bother to remove the few remaining awkwardnesses as well? Earlier Venediger had taken a somewhat different line. Like Rötter, he feels that Terence has taken from Menander a simple, that is single, plot, and has introduced a second plot to make his play *duplex*; but he suggests that the new elements were added not from another Greek play, but of Terence's own free invention—it apparently does not worry him, as it was later to worry Rötter, that the original Menander play must have been thin, to say the least.[46] Terence is thus practising some sort of *contaminatio*, but not the type for which Luscius had attacked him; he can therefore defend himself against Luscius' type later in the prologue with a clear conscience.[47] Moreover in adding his own material he has done something new and hence he stresses this in 7. Venediger is forced to admit that Terence has united his own intrigue so closely to the one he took from Menander that it is impossible to attempt to separate the two components in any detail—thus proving that he has reached his conclusions not as a result of any evidence from the play itself, but because of what he feels must be the meaning of 6. But he goes on to make a further point which at first sight seems to have some force, namely that the title which Terence took over from the single plot of Menander only suits half of Terence's version of the play, and the other half of it must therefore have come from somewhere else.[48] Now it is true that the interest shifts from Menedemus, the self-tormentor of the title, to Chremes fairly early on in the play almost immediately after the return of Clinia, and it stays with Chremes until the end. But that is not to say that the relationship between the title and the content of the play is a sufficient reason to postulate *contaminatio*; those who do that are being deceived by the title and the first scene into supposing that the troubles of Menedemus and Clinia are all that the play was originally about. The counter-arguments are well put by Köhler.[49] He first of all dismisses one rather contrived suggestion that the title refers to Chremes as well as to Menedemus, and he does so for the very good reason that it is singular not plural, and that Chremes tortures himself unconsciously. But he then goes on to point out that there is

[46] C. Venediger, 'Zum Heautontimorumenos des Terentius', *Neue Jahrbücher fur Philol. und Paed.* 109 (1874), 129–36. This theory has been given further publicity much more recently by B. A. Taladoire, *Térence, un théâtre de la jeunesse* (Paris, 1972), pp.50–1, as part of a brief survey of some suggestions about the play. Taladoire admits that Venediger's views are attractive (though without acknowledging their origin), but cannot pronounce himself unreservedly in their favour; he airs the possibility that Terence may have been attracted to Menander's Ἑαυτόν precisely because it was rather thin and gave him scope to give it more body by doubling the plot. (It is often felt that the characters of Charinus and Byrria in *Andr.* were similarly added out of Terence's own head, though they may have come from a third Greek play—other than Menander's Ἀνδρία or Περινθία, that is.)

[47] For the bearing which Terence's defence of his *contaminatio* (16–21) may have on the likelihood of his having indulged in it in this play, see p.105 below.

[48] Venediger's views on the title, and on the Terentian origin of Chremes, are shared by Betty Radice; see her introductory note on *The Self-Tormentor* in her translation, *Terence, Phormio and other plays* (Harmondsworth, 1967), p.78.

[49] Op. cit. in n.5 above, pp.53–4.

ample evidence from Greek new comedy for plays which were not named after their principal characters, and he cites Menander's Περικειρομένη, where it is Polemon's character, not Glykera's, which is the centre of attention, his Ἐπιτρέποντες, named after one scene of the action, and his Ἥρως, named after the prologue. Then, changing his tack somewhat, he remarks that Menedemus is in some sense the principal character anyway, since from him all the action of the play derives; it is Menedemus' grief which moves Chremes, all unwittingly, to start off the whole intrigue, when he resists his impulse to tell Clinia the true state of his father's feelings—believing that he will thereby be doing Menedemus a good turn (199).

The rock on which the views of people like Rötter and Venediger have foundered has always been their inability to indicate any real traces of wholescale *contaminatio*, and their recourse to vague statements about the skill with which Terence has done his patchwork so as to leave little or no trace of the joins. Whatever help they may gain from 6, their case is clearly far from proven as far as the play itself is concerned; and the case against them is a strong one, namely that if, in finding fault with individual points, we do not neglect to view the plot as a whole, we will see that the play simply cannot be broken up in the way they want without being totally destroyed.[50] In view of all this, F. Skutsch took up a very much more moderate position in favour of *contaminatio*.[51] He still feels convinced that the obvious interpretation of 6 ('Griechisch wars einfach, lateinisch ist's contaminirt') is the right one, but does not believe that the Menander play contained only one pair of lovers, to which Terence added another. He feels instead that Menander, too, had a double intrigue in his play, and that the *contaminatio*, as elsewhere in Terence, refers only to relatively unimportant matters like alteration to the character of an incidental figure in the plot.[52] The first point to be made against such a view is that the phrase 'as elsewhere in Terence' ignores the much larger alterations in *Andria* (Charinus and Byrria), *Eunuchus* (the *colax* and *miles gloriosus*) and *Adelphoe* (the scene from Diphilus). And how, if he recalls these alterations, can Skutsch claim that there is by comparison any real *contaminatio* in *Heauton*? Certainly there would, on his own admission, not be enough to merit saying that the play had become *duplex* instead of *simplex*, and one wonders whether Terence would bother to mention such trifling changes in his prologue.[53] It seems that Skutsch sees the overwhelming objections to the theories of Rötter, Venediger, and others, and

[50] See, e.g., Köhler, op. cit., p.31.

[51] In the two articles cited in nn.1 and 4 above. The representation of Skutsch's views which follows is mainly based on the lengthy final footnote in the later of the two.

[52] He compares A. Körte's views on the alteration of the midwife's character in *Andr.* 228 ff. (*Hermes* 44 (1909), 309 ff.)

[53] The main difficulties in discussing the whole *contaminatio* issue are the impossibility of ascertaining precisely what Luscius had in mind when he accused Terence of it and the impossibility of knowing whether Terence was accurately representing the charges instead of twisting, exaggerating or even belittling them. Nobody would surely have expected Terence to be an absolutely literal translator of his originals, so how major (or minor) did an alteration have to be before it merited the charge? Did the use in *Ad.* of the discarded Diphilus scene class as *contaminatio* as well as *furtum*? And was adding material of one's own invention as serious as introducing material from another Greek original, and was that *contaminatio* or not? To the last question the answer is presumably 'no', but one would wish to be absolutely certain about the answers to these questions and to several others like them.

is only being compelled by his interpretation of 6 to cling to the *contaminatio* theory. But he does bring forward one new argument in its favour, based on Terence's defence against the charge in 16-21. To Skutsch the extraordinary nature of this defence is the final proof that *Heauton* is 'contaminated'. No thief, he says, would defend himself against a further charge of stealing, of which he this time happened to be innocent, by saying: 'I've stolen in the past, am not ashamed of it and shall do so again; anyway, other people steal too.' Instead he would play his trump card; he would stress that on this particular occasion he happened to be innocent. So Terence, if he were innocent of the charge of *contaminatio* this time, would not hesitate to say so; the absence of such a protestation proves his guilt here too. At first this seems attractive, but an opposite case can be made out; it is that Terence takes this opportunity of combating the charge of *contaminatio* precisely because he is at the moment clear of it, and it is simply not true to say that 16-21 have no place in the prologue of an uncontaminated play.[54] One final point on the arguments of the believers in *contaminatio* is that one passage in this defence by Terence, the phrase 'multas contaminasse Graecas' (17), has been seen by some of them as giving further support to their views. What, they argue, are the 'many' Greek originals which Terence has used? Two, Ἀνδρία and Περινθία, for his *Andria*, together with a possible third from which Charinus and Byrria came, and only one for *Hecyra* (assuming that it counted, since it was not successfully produced); these do not constitute 'many' but the addition to the list of two from a 'contaminated' *Heauton*—rather than of one from an 'uncontaminated' one—would give more point to the jibe. But, in fact, the phrase clearly represents an exaggeration, either by Luscius to make Terence's 'crime' appear worse or by Terence to make Luscius' criticism seem ridiculous; therefore it is not necessary to be able to amass a list of 'many' originals for Terence to have used by the time this prologue was written.[55]

And so it appears that those who believe *Heauton* to be a 'contaminated' play have not been able up to now satisfactorily to prove their case from their examination of the structure and the text of the play; they either fail to indicate convincing signs of wholescale *contaminatio* or else seek to limit the application of the term to such an extent that the alterations they can point to hardly seem to merit the charge. But they still have 6 as their principal piece of evidence, and the conclusions they draw from their interpretation of the line—that the play had a simple plot and Terence made it double—still seem inescapable. It is obvious that all the pro-*contaminatio* scholars have started from this interpretation of 6 and then gone to the body of the play rather than the other way round; the weakness of their arguments from the play speaks for itself.

By contrast, those who reject *contaminatio* have proceeded in the opposite manner. Their examination of the play has convinced them that it is not 'contaminated', and they have then turned to 6 to see if they can interpret it in such a way as to bring it into line with their conviction. Some of their attempts seem far-fetched, to say the least, and even the saner ones still have to avoid

[54] Köhler, op. cit., p.37, cf. Flickinger, 'A study of Terence's prologues', p.251.

[55] See F. Schöll, 'Zwei alte Terenzprobleme', *RhM* N.F. 57 (1902), 49 n.2, and Flickinger, 'A study in Terence's prologues', pp.236 and esp. 243. Flickinger points out that some scholars have also (or alternatively) seen in this phrase evidence for the fact that *Eun.*, also using two originals, was produced before *Heaut.*—see n.9 above. But the counter-argument about exaggeration will be equally forceful here too.

what one might term the 'obvious' meaning of the line. There is no need to linger long over the more fanciful explanations, all of which have more than a trace of desperation in them. Schöll suggested that *duplex* should be interpreted as meaning *dolosus* (the same sense that Greek διπλοῦς sometimes has), quoting parallels like 'duplex Amathusia' (Catullus 68.51) and 'duplicis . . . Ulixei' (Horace, *Odes* 1.6.7); thus the line would say nothing about the way in which Terence has dealt with the play, but would contain his judgement on Menander's original (as in *Andria* 10–12), namely that it is not simple although it comes from one single plot.[56] But this destroys any proper contrast between *duplex* and *simplex* and is far too contrived and over-ingenious to be credible. Leo, on the other hand, wondered whether *duplex* referred to the fact that the action of Terence's play is spread over two days with a night supposedly having passed between acts 2 and 3 (409–10), and this theory has attracted occasional support.[57] Now it has long been realized that *Heauton* is one of very few ancient dramas (Aristophanes' Πλοῦτος probably being another) to exhibit this feature; and a case has been made out that in *Heauton* the feature is due to Terence who, to avoid upsetting Roman susceptibilities by depicting a drunken meal at midday, altered Menander's ἄριστον to a *cena* and therefore had to interpose a night.[58] But in relating this fact to 6 Leo is giving a most obscure twist to the meaning of *duplex* (and, by implication, to the meaning of *simplex* too), and one which would surely never have been picked up by his audience; in another context Flickinger talks of 'the deliberate policy of teasing and bewilderment which is pursued throughout this prologue',[59] but to expect the audience to interpret in Leo's manner would turn teasing and bewilderment into downright obfuscation. Third among the more fanciful suggestions is the idea that the 'doubling' of the play consisted in producing a Latin version to stand alongside the Greek original, thus producing two plays where previously there had been only one; this was the view of Eugraphius, of the scholiast in the codex Bembinus and of Schlee's *commentarius antiquior*.[60] More surprisingly, it was strongly supported by Flickinger who, while conceding that 'such a conceit may appear far fetched', feels that it is more suitable than any other theory and connects it with Caesar's famous address to Terence as 'dimidiate Menander'.[61] However, for Terence to have intended this meaning seems to me to be not so much a conceit as a weak

[56] Schöll, op. cit., pp.48–9.

[57] F. Leo, *Geschichte der römischen Literatur* i: *Die archaische Literatur* (Berlin, 1913), 242 n., supported later by H. Haffter *MH* 10 (1953), 80. Much earlier Bentley (loc. cit. in n.27 above) reported that Scaliger even believed that the first performance of the play was similarly divided into two, with the first two acts in the evening and the rest the following morning; his scornful comments on this extraordinary idea are in the best Bentleian tradition. Castiglioni (op. cit., p. 268 and n.37) seems to think that Leo was of the same mind as Scaliger, but Leo was thinking of the action of the play, Scaliger of its performance.

[58] See A. Körte, *Menander: Reliquiae* ii (Leipzig, 1959), 58 on fr. 133. T. B. L. Webster, *Studies in Menander*[2] (Manchester, 1960), p.85, thinks that the night-interval occurred in Menander also.

[59] 'A study of Terence's prologues', p.254.

[60] Eugr. in P. Wessner *Aeli Donati Commentum Terenti* iii.i (Leipzig, 1908), 154: 'ut argumentum sit duplex, dum et Latina eadem et Graeca est.'; schol. Bemb. in Mountford, loc. cit. in n.20 above: 'duplex: Graeca et Latina.'; Schlee, loc. cit. in n.21 above: 'Graeca Menandri et latina mea'. Eugraphius' *eadem* may be intended to imply something about non-contamination and the faithful nature of Terence's adaptation.

[61] 'A study of Terence's prologues', pp.252 ff., cf. 'Terence and Menander', *CJ* 26 (1931), 676 ff., esp. 688–9.

and obvious truism, and the idea is strongly and convincingly attacked by Castiglioni; such an idea is no more in place in the prologue to *Heauton* than in any other prologue, and it makes the adjectives *simplex* and *duplex* lose their multiplicative force, equating them with the cardinal numbers 'one' and 'two' respectively.[62]

Strangely enough, however, it is the suggestion that, though *duplex* retains its normal force, *simplici* is written for the more usual cardinal *uno* that has provided what is perhaps the most attractive and persuasive of all the theories about 6. This is again the work of Leo, and his reasoning is so clear that it is best to transcribe the relevant passage in full:

> *duplex quae ex argumento factast simplici* verba quam sententiam habere debent ea simplicius fortasse et ad intellegendum facilius sic enuntiaretur: quae argumento cum sit duplici ex una tamen comoedia conversa est. sed Terentius potius dixit duplicem fabulam esse quidem quae scilicet duo adulescentium negotia complectatur (ut ante Heautontimorumenon in Andria fecisset, sed contaminatis duabus attici poetae fabulis), argumentum vero unum esse, id est uni fabulae a poeta attico substructum: διπλοῦς μὲν ὁ λόγος, ὑπόθεσις δ' ἐστὶν μία. ac nemo dubitaret, si sic potius locutus esset: duplex quae ex argumento facta uno est tamen; nunc figurae causa *simplici* pro *uno* post illud *duplex* extulit, quam elocutionis venustatem eo obscuritatis modulo compensavit qui satis fuit ad criticorum dubitationes emendationes condemnationes excitandas. tamen simplex pro uno alias quoque et sine figura ponitur, cuius usus exempla in lexicis vulgo feruntur. primum igitur novam esse fabulam Terentius sic enuntiat ut unam graecam esse simul appareat [sc. in 4], deinde unam esse propriis verbis dicit, ne propter duplex fabulae negotium suspicio oriatur idem hic quod in Andria poetam fecisse.[63]

This suggestion is not open to Castiglioni's objections about loss of the multiplicative force in the adjectives in the same way as the earlier one; in the first place only one of the adjectives is treated in this way, and in the second it can be seen why Terence used *simplici* instead of *uno*—'figurae causa'—and such a practice is quite in keeping with the style of the prologues. After the trouble caused by his treatment of *Andria*, and with the failure of the single-plot *Hecyra* very much in mind, Terence had been lucky enough to find a Menander play with a double plot already in it, and he was at pains to point out that the double plot of his own play came from a single original. Yet there are difficulties even here; for if this is really what he has done why has he couched the fact in terms which seem to express exactly the opposite? Why does he run the risk of being misinterpreted? Is this part of the 'deliberate policy of teasing and bewilderment', and is Terence purposely setting a trap for Luscius to fall into? Yet surely he would not believe that Luscius, even if he did not know the Greek original, would be tempted to accuse him of repeating what he had done in *Andria* without first checking the facts? And anyway, 7–9 imply that not only the authorship but also the character of the Greek original was already well known. There are also two difficulties about the language of Leo's paraphrase 'duplex quae ex argumento facta uno est tamen', raised by F. Skutch.[64] The first is that he has introduced *tamen* from nowhere and thus given to his version of the line a nuance which is not there in

[62] Op. cit., p.267 n.36.

[63] *Analecta Plautina de figuris sermonis* ii.22–3. Since this work appeared fifteen years before Leo published his *Geschichte der römischen Literatur* i (where he supported the two-day action idea) it seems that in those fifteen years he had abandoned this earlier attractive idea. One would like to know his reasons.

[64] 'Der Prolog zum Hautontimorumenos des Terenz', pp.5–6.

Terence's. The other is that he has treated *duplex* as though it were *duplicem* belonging to *Heautontimorumenon* in 5, whereas it must really have a predicative force belonging as it does inside the relative clause *quae . . . simplici.* It is not 'a double play which has been made from . . .' but 'a play which has been made double from . . .'. Whether Skutsch is being quite fair here when he expects Latin of a Ciceronian clarity and correctness from a poet, and an early one at that, I am not sure. I am rather inclined to the view that Leo's 'figurae causa' can be used to explain the use of *duplex* for *duplicem* as well as the use of *simplici* for *uno*; about *tamen* I am not so certain.

But despite these objections and difficulties, it still seems to me that this idea of Leo's is by far the most attractive and convincing of all those that I have discussed in this section. It is not perfect, in so far as the objections and difficulties are still there and cannot be completely explained away; but the objections are not so serious nor the difficulties so great as those raised by other suggestions. Yet simply because it is not perfect and has been rejected by many scholars,[65] one is left with an awkward feeling of doubt, a feeling that is compounded as one struggles to see one's way through the bewildering plethora of theories. It was precisely that feeling, coupled with the lingering suspicion that the obvious interpretation of 6 ought to be the right one, that led me to re-examine the play to see if by any chance there are any indications of *contaminatio* which had for one reason or another been overlooked. In this I do not think that I have achieved any great breakthrough, but I hope to have found one pointer which might at least help to bring an eventual solution a little nearer.

III. THE PART OF BACCHIS

The most obvious interpretation of 6, as already stated, is that in his adaptation Terence has added one of the pairs of lovers, presumably Clitipho and Bacchis, to the plot he found in Menander's play; but the insurmountable problem facing those who would seek to prove this is the impossibility of removing these two characters from the plot of the Latin play without destroying its fabric entirely. How the fabric would be destroyed can be seen by considering just two elements in the plot where the fortunes of Clitipho and Bacchis and of Clinia and Antiphila are closely interrelated and dependent upon one another. The first is the pretence that Bacchis is really Clinia's girl, not Clitipho's, in order to conceal from Chremes the real reason for her presence in his house. This is first suggested by Syrus in 331–2, and it is not until 908 that Chremes is finally convinced by Menedemus that it is indeed a pretence and not the truth. Between those points we are frequently reminded of it; once the idea has been put into effect, Clitipho is upbraided for not having played his part in it and kept his hands off Bacchis (562 ff.), Clinia has to be persuaded to continue it even after the recognition of Antiphila's true identity (694 ff.) and Bacchis has accordingly to be removed from Chremes' house to that of Menedemus (722 f.), a situation which Clitipho laments (805 ff.). It can be seen, then, that this is an element intimately involving both pairs of lovers which underlies the action for almost 600 lines in the middle of the play. The second element, though not so important and of lesser duration, equally closely unites the two pairs' fortunes. It is the ruse of the debt which is

[65] Skutsch's arguments are supported by Castiglioni, op. cit., p.273, and it is obvious that Flickinger, Haffter, and Schöll also found Leo unconvincing here.

supposedly owed to Bacchis and for which Antiphila supposedly stands surety, a story invented by Syrus at 599 ff. as a means of obtaining money for Clitipho to give to his mistress. The slave's first plan is to get this money by persuading Menedemus to buy Antiphila; but later, after Antiphila's recognition as free born means that she cannot be sold to anyone, he has to change his tactics (668 ff.) and actually extracts the amount from Chremes (790 ff.), since he is the girl's father. Again, the depth of the involvement of both 'sides', of Menedemus and Chremes, Clinia and Clitipho, Antiphila and Bacchis, is obvious. These, then, are just two points which show us that Terence cannot have added Clitipho and Bacchis (or, for that matter, even Bacchis alone) to the plot, and that they must have been present in Menander's plot too. The only alternative to such a conclusion would be to assume that, from at least about 170 onwards, Terence has totally rewritten his original so as to create an entirely different play, but in such a way as to leave hardly any trace of having done so; such a thing is obviously not impossible, but it seems extremely unlikely.

However, another way of looking at the role of a character is to consider his or her involvement, not in the plot of the play, but in its action as actually presented on stage; a character might be an essential component of the story which is being enacted, but yet appear on stage very infrequently, if at all. In other words, in our context, might Terence perhaps have altered, enlarged or even created the stage role for a character who, though essential to the plot of his Greek original, took little or no part in its action? If we apply this theory to Clitipho's part in *Heauton*, we shall again draw a blank. He is on stage from 175 to 380, 562 to 590, 805 to 834, 954 to 996, and 1024 to 1067, a total of 352 lines, or rather more than one-third of the play excluding the prologue; and, apart from his one monologue (213–29), his appearances are all in dialogue scenes which would have had to have been totally rewritten if his part had been inserted into them. Therefore, as far as regards Clitipho, there seems to be no case for suggesting that Terence has written his part into his version of the play when his role in Menander had been that of an off-stage or silent character. But if we consider the part of Bacchis in the same light, we might well feel inclined to come to a rather different conclusion. Though, as I have said, Bacchis is intimately involved in the plot of Terence's play, she only appears on stage for two short scenes, 381 to 409 and 723 to 748. Since the first of these scenes in particular exhibits some remarkable features, it will be best, as well as logical, to examine that one first.

The scene falls naturally into two parts. In the first (381–97), which is written in trochaic septenarii, Bacchis is predominant, and it consists in the main of a long speech by her (381–95) which is followed by a conventional answer from Antiphila (396–7). In contrast, the second part (398–409) is written in iambics (first octonarii, then senarii), and in it Bacchis takes no important part at all; she merely asks four short questions which Antiphila makes no attempt to answer. The centre of attention in this second part is now not Bacchis, but Clinia and Antiphila, whose reunion after long separation is the principal 'event' of the scene. (There can be no similar meeting between Clitipho and Bacchis, since Syrus got Clitipho out of the way at the end of the previous scene (380), before Bacchis and Antiphila arrived.) Moreover, the speech which Bacchis delivers in the first section is extraordinary in more ways than one. In the first place it holds up the action in a quite impossible way. The whole of the two previous scenes, over 150 lines, have been looking forward to the arrival of Antiphila and her reunion

with Clinia; throughout all that time, Clinia has been on stage, downcast when the women have not come, excited when the slaves arrive, downcast again when he hears of the extravagant *grex ancillarum*, and finally overjoyed when assured of Antiphila's continued good character. But when Antiphila arrives, what happens? Not the expected joyous reunion, but fifteen lines of pompous moralizing by Bacchis on the difference between the *meretrix* and the 'good girl'. Only after that is over, and Antiphila has made her prim little reply, can the reunion go ahead.[66] Secondly, the character of Bacchis as revealed by the speech is not at all what we have been led to expect. We have heard from Clitipho himself in his monologue that she is always saying 'give me' and 'bring me' (223) and is 'potens procax magnifica sumptuosa nobilis' (227), and the information about the *grex ancillarum* which emerged from the conversations of 245 ff. has added to our impression that Bacchis is the typical greedy *mala meretrix*. Later on this will be confirmed by what Chremes has to say of her conduct at dinner (455 ff.). But in 381–95, though she is by her own admission a *meretrix*, she does not seem to be either greedy or *mala*, and she is certainly not typical; she displays a moral insight and a philosophical resignation which make her a very extraordinary *meretrix* indeed.[67] There is also a third item of interest in the speech which is somewhat more complicated. In the codex Bembinus there is a scholion relating to 384 ('nam mihi quale ingenium haberes fuit indicio oratio') which preserves some Greek, though without citing its source; it reads ἀνδρὸς χαρακτὴρ ἐκ λόγου γνωρίζεται et item λααε.[68] The last word cannot be dealt with at all, but the preceding iambic trimeter makes sense and is obviously at least a parallel to 384. However, the same trimeter is also quoted by Orion (*Antholog.* 1.11) as coming from Menander's Ἀρρηφόρος, a play which is alternatively titled Αὐλητρίς or Αὐλητρίδες, and the source of the fragment has accordingly been the subject of some debate. Meineke felt that the phrase was a proverbial one and could therefore perfectly well have occurred both in Menander's Ἀρρηφόρος and in his Ἑαυτόν, Ihne denied that it belonged to the original of Terence's play, but Kock supported Meineke.[69] Körte followed Ihne and thought it likely that the fragment belonged only to Ἀρρηφόρος; he argued that the Greek line, containing the word ἀνδρός, was not appropriate to Terence's conversation between two women, and explained that the phrase was not proverbial since in fact Menander was here the first Greek writer to use χαρακτήρ of the individual traits of individual men.[70] It may be,

[66] Of course, the preceding action has also been looking forward to the arrival of Bacchis, but not quite in the same way. She is not stated to be definitely coming as well until 311, and thereafter interest shifts to getting Clitipho to agree to her arrival and to the mounting of the plan to pretend that she is Clinia's not Clitipho's—a plan which Clinia finally joins in advocating. The audience already knows Bacchis to be a typical *mala meretrix*, and therefore has not the same amount of sympathy for her, (nor, for that matter, for Clitipho either) as it has for Antiphila and Clitipho. A meeting between Bacchis, a mere *meretrix*, and Clitipho, a typically wild young man, has not the same romantic appeal as the reunion of a long-separated pair of genuine young lovers; accordingly Clitipho is made to leave before Bacchis' arrival.

[67] By contrast, J. Marouzeau, in the Budé edn. of Terence, ii (Paris, 1956), 43 n.1, says of 381–95: 'Le verbiage prétentieux et moralisateur convient assez bien au portrait sommaire qui nous est tracé de Bacchis, v. 227.' But it seems to me to do exactly the opposite.

[68] Mountford, op. cit., p.65.

[69] A. Meineke, *Fragmenta Comicorum Graecorum* iv (Berlin, 1841), 111; Ihne, loc. cit. in n.11 above: T. Kock, *Comicorum Atticorum Fragmenta* iii (Leipzig, 1888), 42.

[70] Op. cit. in n.58 above p.36 on fr. 66; cf. his article 'Χαρακτήρ', *Hermes* 64 (1929), 69 ff., esp. 79 and n.1.

therefore, that the scholiast of the codex Bembinus was merely quoting a line which provided an interesting parallel to the thought of Terence's Latin—a supposition which might perhaps be strengthened by the possibility that in 'et item λαᾳε' he was about to add a second parallel; but there is an almost equal chance that he was quoting what he felt was the Greek original for the line. It then becomes possible that the original for Terence's *Heauton* 384 came from Menander's Ἀρρηφόρος, and this would mean that Körte's arguments against the line coming from Ἑαυτόν could stand and need no answer.

We have therefore reached a position where it seems that Bacchis' speech in 381–95 holds up the action of the play in a most awkward manner and portrays the speaker's character in a light far different from what we expect, and where there is at least a chance that one line of the speech did not originate from Menander's Ἑαυτόν. I would therefore venture to suggest that Terence took 381–95 from another source and inserted the passage into his adaptation of Menander's Ἑαυτόν, putting the words into the mouth of Bacchis in order to provide her with something to say when she arrived on stage with Antiphila. Because of the evidence of the scholia Bembina there is a distinct possibility, but by no means a certainty, that the Latin poet's other source was Menander's Ἀρρηφόρος; this cannot, of course, be proved, but it is by no means impossible that such a speech could have come from Ἀρρηφόρος, since it is at least as relevant to the theme implied in that title as are the other extant fragments of the play[71] and, in view of the play's alternative titles, probably more relevant. If I am right in thinking that the speech did not come from Menander's Ἑαυτόν, then neither did Antiphila's reply in 396–7; there are then two possibilities as to the origin of these two lines. They could be either a rejoinder to the speech which was actually found in the Greek source and transferred to *Heauton* with it, or a reply invented by Terence for Antiphila so that Bacchis' words would not go unanswered and the inserted material would not be unconnected to what follows; if we incline to Terentian authorship, it would be kinder to him to say that the repetition *commodo . . . commodum* in 397 echoes his style than that the trite nature of the sentiment reflects his lack of inventiveness. It will be seen that the end of the inserted passage, now extended to 397, coincides with the change of metre from trochaics to iambics in the middle of the scene, a change for which there is otherwise no obvious reason.[72] Finally, if this hypothesis is correct, it will now be possible to understand why Bacchis' contribution to the second half of the scene is so insignificant and why it takes the rather odd form of four unanswered questions, three of which are extremely short. The remarks will be insertions by Terence who, having given her the speech at 381–95, felt that he had to give her a little more to say since she had been introduced as a speaking part; the best way in which he could do this without rewriting the section entirely was to allow her a few questions which the other characters ignore.[73] One last point should be made before we leave the scene. It is that I have not based any of my argument about

[71] Körte, op. cit., pp.33–6, frs. 59–65 and 67.

[72] Contrast the change from octonarii to senarii within the iambics of the second part of the scene at 404–5, where the shorter lines indicate the climax as Clinia and Antiphila finally meet.

[73] It might seem that the questions are rather peculiar ones for Bacchis to ask anyway, since it would be reasonable to suppose that she would have learned from Antiphila about Clinia and ought to be able to deduce who he is and why the sight of him affects Antiphila so strongly. But I would not wish to press this point.

it on the fact that it contains more than three speaking characters. In the past much play has sometimes been made of the fact that any scenes in Roman comedy containing four or more such characters must break the three-actor rule which was rigidly adhered to in the Greek originals; it has therefore been possible to attempt to recover the form of the original by reducing the number of speaking actors back to three and calling the others additions by the Latin poet. More recently our increased knowledge of Greek new comedy has made such an argument slightly less reliable, since we now know that the rule may not have been quite so rigid as was once thought, particularly where very brief appearances by supernumerary actors are concerned.[74] We can now say no more than that such scenes might invite a suspicion, rather than produce a certainty, of alteration. In my suspicions on that basis about this scene, the candidate for removal would obviously be Bacchis.

With regard to the other scene in which Bacchis appears (723–48), it is rather more difficult to make out as strong a case suggesting that her part has been inserted; but I think that there are some indications which might point that way. Since Bacchis takes a very full part in this scene, speaking in almost every line from 723 to 743, the implication of such a possibility will be that the whole of the scene (possibly, though not necessarily, excepting the last five lines) will have been a Terentian invention, the purpose of which will again have been to introduce Bacchis as a speaking character instead of having her merely as a silent figure in the plot. If we begin by employing the admittedly somewhat unsure argument with which I ended my discussion of 381–409, we can see that this scene too 'might invite a suspicion . . . of alteration', since it too contains more than three speaking characters; in fact this one contains not four such, but five, and is the only scene in the whole play to contain more than four.[75] And there is a peculiar feature about the characters in this scene; it is that, of the five, no less than three take only very small parts in its dialogue. Clinia makes only one short remark near the start (729) to which Syrus answers, the whole exchange commenting on Bacchis' opening words in 723–8; Phrygia only makes two one-word statements in 732, both in answer to Bacchis' questions; and Dromo asks three very short questions (743, 745) and makes one very short comment (748) at the end of the scene, all as a part of the process of receiving instructions from Syrus. It is not, of course, rare for scenes to contain one character whose contribution is so small, but to find as many as three out of five is unusual. Moreover, all three of these minor contributions have something odd about them. Clinia's remark is his last in the play, since he does not reappear after the end of this scene, and it seems extremely unsatisfactory that his final words should be just this one insignificant comment. Indeed, a feeling of unease about Clinia's part in this scene is one of the reasons which have led some editors to ascribe 'sequere hac' (743) to him as well, against all manuscripts. As Dziatzko put it: 'Cliniam nihil prorsus ipsum dicere non consentaneum est

[74] See A. W. Gomme and F. H. Sandbach, *Menander, a Commentary* (Oxford, 1973), pp.16–19; contrast T. B. L. Webster, *An Introduction to Menander* (Manchester, 1974), pp.82–3.

[75] It is also one of only five such scenes in the whole of Terence, the others being *Andr.* 459–80, *Eun.* 454–506 and 771–816 and *Phorm.* 441–64. The first and last of these constitute special cases, since in *Andr.* 459–80 the fifth voice is that of Glycerium as she makes her one cry of pain from within the house at the moment of childbirth (473), while the scene in *Phorm.* contains Demipho's three *advocati*, Hegio, Cratinus, and Crito.

neque usitatum eum plane tacentem de scaena abire.[76]

Phrygia's two words are the only ones she utters in this, her only appearance in the play; her role is clearly nothing more than simply to provide an interlocutor for Bacchis as she comes out of the house and before she gets into negotiations with Syrus. Finally, Dromo's contributions, though unexceptionable in themselves, recall to the mind the fact that his only other appearance in the play is equally insignificant and perhaps also arouses suspicion. This other appearance is at the start of the long scene 242–380, but only at the very start, and once again it is in a scene with more than three speaking actors. Here his role is clearly to provide an interlocutor for Syrus as they enter ahead of—and a long way ahead of—Bacchis, Antiphila, and the *grex ancillarum*; their exchanges are overheard and commented upon by Clinia and Clitipho, as are the remarks which Syrus makes alone after Dromo has been hastily dispatched back again at 250 to guide the women on their way. If, in this scene too, Terence has added a fourth character in his Latin version to only three he found in the Greek, it will obviously have been Dromo; Terence will have altered an opening monologue by Syrus (with asides by Clinia and Clitipho)—a monologue which may have included instructions to a non-speaking slave—into a dialogue between the two slaves (with the same asides by the other two).[77] It therefore looks at least possible that the speaking role of Dromo could well have been the product of Terence's adaptation in both his brief appearances in the play. I would agree with Webster that this is so and that the same is true of Phrygia's role in 723 ff.;[78] but I would go further and suggest the possibility that Terence created the whole scene, prolonging Clinia's presence on stage when he did so and giving him a short remark to say in order to justify his presence and to tie him in with the action of the new section. This action is clearly the discussion between Bacchis and Syrus, the only two characters who make any significant contribution to 723–48, and it is to them that we now turn.

The core of the scene is the conversation between Syrus and Bacchis from 737 to 743 in which the slave promises the money to the *meretrix* and persuades her to transfer herself and her *grex* from Chremes' house to that of Menedemus; to this section Bacchis' threat to go elsewhere is a humorous preamble, and Syrus' orders to Dromo to supervise the transfer of the women and their effects are a pleonastic conclusion. The two central topics do not advance the plot at all, and do not add anything to our knowledge of the situation. We know that Syrus is trying to get money for Bacchis, and we assume that she will in all

[76] In his edition of 1884 cited in n.12 above, p.xxv.

[77] Oddly enough, there is disagreement among the manuscripts even about the small part which Dromo does play at this point. Only E attributes the words 'verum interea, dum sermones caedimus, illae sunt relictae' (242–3) to him, and only the second hand in P gives him 'minime mirum: adeo inpeditae sunt: ancillarum gregem ducunt secum' (245–6); in both instances all the rest give the words to Syrus. This means that the manuscripts agree only in ascribing to Dromo the two words 'sic est' (242). But I think that this is a coincidence, and cannot be used to support any arguments about the *origin* of Dromo's contribution to the scene. (See, however, J. Andrieu, 'Les sigles de personnages dans la comédie (à propos de Térence, *Heaut.* 242–50)', *REL* 16 (1938), 53–4, who gives 'ain tu?' and 'sic est' in 242 to an unconvinced Clinia and a soothing Clitipho respectively, thereby reducing Dromo to a non-speaking role in this scene in the Latin version too. He argues that this gives real meaning to the words instead of leaving us to suppose that they are the tail-end of an unspecified conversation between the two slaves.)

[78] *Studies in Menander*[2], pp.84–5 on 242 ff., and p.86 on 723 ff.

probability know it too—her words at 723–4 merely confirm this; and the transfer of the women is something which it has been said will be done at the end of the previous scene (722 'age, age, transducatur Bacchis') and which Chremes makes it clear has been done by the time the next scene starts (749 ff.). Nothing else happens except that Bacchis is actually shown agreeing to the move, something which in all probability would normally be left to the imagination of the audience; there is no hint at the end of the previous scene that it will be necessary to obtain her agreement, and, when in 743 that agreement is given, after slight objection in 740–2, it seems to be given very abruptly and readily—too readily, we might feel, for credibility. Looked at in this way, this scene, with its very thin dramatic content and its almost complete failure to advance the plot in any way, might well seem to be just the sort to have been written in by the Latin poet in his adaptation; it fills out the action, but does not introduce any new aspect which might cause difficulties or inconsistencies later.

There are one or two more detailed matters of interest in the scene. The first concerns the first line of the scene (723 'satis pol proterve me Syri promissa huc induxerunt'). It is the subject of an anecdote in Suetonius' *Vita Terenti*—part of a discussion of the charge that Terence was helped by his aristocratic friends—which tells how Cornelius Nepos claimed to have found out on good authority that it was written by C. Laelius.[79] The story is too well known to need repeating in detail here, but I wonder whether it might not possibly retain the trace of a tradition that the passage from which the line comes was actually Latin and not Greek in origin. Certainly such an implication cannot properly be read into Suetonius' Latin, but one would like to know the true facts on which the anecdote is based. The second point concerns the occurrence of the proper name 'Charini' in 732. Some have seen in this mention of a person who has no further part in the plot additional evidence of innovation by Terence, as, for example, does Mrs. Radice with the mention of Phania (169) and Simus and Crito (498).[80] But the situation here is not the same as in the two cases she cites; in 169 and 498 the proper names are connected with particularly awkward exits and entrances by Chremes and may also help further to characterize him as a busy-body, but in 732 there are no such difficult stage movements and there is no connection with Chremes. Even so, 'Charini' might conceivably be an indication of Terentian workmanship, but is probably no more than Pooh Bah's 'touch of corroborative detail' which could have been introduced equally well by Menander or Terence; to my mind the fact of its use should not be twisted into telling us anything about the origins of the scene. The third point is also in my opinion a 'non-argument'; it concerns the Dionysia. In 733 Bacchis says that the (or a) soldier is keeping the festival at Charinus' farm, which is conveniently next door ('apud eum miles Dionysia agitat').[81] There is here no inconsistency (such as might indicate introduction of new material) with earlier mentions of the Dionysia taking place on the day before, not even with Chremes' remark 'Dionysia hic sunt hodie' (162). The Dionysia was not a one-day festival, however much 162 might seem to imply that it was, and in any

[79] *Vita Terenti* 4 in P. Wessner, *Aeli Donati Commentum Terenti* i (Leipzig, 1902), 6.

[80] Loc. cit. in n.48.

[81] The soldier may or may not be the same as the *miles* mentioned in 365 as being found by Syrus entreating Bacchis' attentions. Most probably he is, and the writer (be he Menander or Terence) had the earlier passage in mind when composing these lines.

case the phrase 'Dionysia agitare' could surely refer to the Greek equivalent of our long weekend, in much the same way as we can talk of 'spending Easter' somewhere without wishing to imply that we were there only for Easter Day itself.

There is a lot of movement among the characters at the end of the scene. After 748 Dromo presumably goes into Chremes' house, fetches the *grex ancillarum* and returns, and then Bacchis, the *grex*, Dromo, and Phrygia must be supposed to enter Menedemus' house. Presumably Clinia goes with them, since he is in his father's house when Mendemus comes out of it at 842 talking back to his son inside. Syrus' movements are less obvious, but it looks as though he stops on stage, since Chremes notices him at 757 and they start a conversation. Movement of a group of people like the *grex* at a scene change inevitably calls to mind the entr'acte performances of the chorus in Greek new comedy, and this could have important implications for this scene, and also for 381–409 where the *grex* is again assumed to be on stage at some point. But it is strange that such implications have attracted much less attention here than have similar possibilities at 170–1 where the Oxford Text marks a 'saltatio convivarum'. Of the works cited at the start of this article, only Flickinger's extends the discussion, fairly briefly, from 170–1 to 409 and 748, while Beare's repeats Flickinger's views but does not pursue the matter.[82] Flickinger suggests that the *grex* appears from one house after 748 (when according to him, the stage is empty), performs a dance, and retires into the other house before 749; he further suggests that a similar thing happens between 409 and 410, and sees the chorus's change of role from *convivae* in 170–1 to *ancillae* later as proof that such changes of role could occur rather than as evidence for any *contaminatio* in the play.

Let us for a moment confine the discussion to 748. In view of what has been said about the nature of 723–48, I would suggest that it is not impossible that a choral interlude, rather than appearing in the Greek at a point corresponding to the scene change between 748 and 749 as Flickinger suggests, appeared instead where the whole scene 723–48 now stands, and that Terence wrote in the scene to replace it. Thus the Greek text would have ended at Clinia's important statement of agreement in 722 'age, age, transducatur Bacchis', Syrus' remark 'optuma ipsa exit foras' in the same line being connecting material by Terence; Clinia's part in the action would thus finish with a strong remark at the end of an act, which would mean that the unease expressed above about the weakness of his final appearance would not have been felt in the Greek. The two would then have retired from the stage, Clinia into Menedemus' house and Syrus into that of Chremes,[83] and the entr'acte would have followed, being intended to cover the transfer of Bacchis and her *pompa.* When it was over, Chremes would have emerged from his house, confirmed that the transfer had taken place and been followed very shortly by Syrus whereat the action would

[82] See n.1 above; Flickinger, op. cit., p.27, and Beare, op. cit., p.30.

[83] Possibly they both retired into Chremes' house, in which case Clinia would have to be thought of as transferring at the same time as the women. But this is unlikely, since the audience must see him entering his father's house and it would be unusual for an actor to be seen transferring with the chorus. In either case there is some awkwardness in that he enters the house for the first time since his return without ceremony or advance notice—though, admittedly, now that he knows that Antiphila is Chremes' daughter, he has much less reason to shrink from meeting his father.

have resumed. Such a sequence of events is smooth and natural, much more so than when 723–48 are inserted into it. This hypothesis is not, of course, capable of proof, but, when 723–48 are closely examined and seen to have a rather unsatisfactory and 'bitty' quality and content, it does seem likely.

We now turn to the other appearance of the *grex*, in connection with the earlier scene we have discussed, 381–409. It looks as if in Terence the *grex* arrives with Bacchis and Antiphila, stays on stage all through the scene, and departs with them into Chremes' house at 409. It could, however, be thought of as not arriving until some long time after the women, in the gap between 409 and 410 as another entr'acte, and this is undoubtedly Flickinger's view; it is certainly what I think happened in the Greek original. But I have argued above that this scene was probably much shorter in the Greek—well under half its present length; the arrival of the *grex* much more closely after Antiphila (and Bacchis) would then have seemed less awkwardly delayed than it does, on Flickinger's hypothesis, in the Latin version.

What effect the hypothesis about choral interludes after 409 and 723 will have on views of 170–1 (and vice versa) is uncertain, but there are two points to bear in mind when thinking about the matter. The first is that there are alternative theories about what is 'wrong' at 170–1, namely that it is the place where a delayed prologue stood in the Greek or that the whole passage is Terentian; yet we must admit that the role of *convivae* suits evidence from new comedy about the tipsy character of the Greek chorus as announced on its first appearance. The second point is that we simply do not possess enough of Greek new comedy to be able to state categorically whether its chorus could ever have a changing dramatic role, or indeed any dramatic role, properly speaking, at all—though on the last point we might wish to compare the fisherman in Plautus' *Rudens*. It may be that the chorus was felt to be so far removed from the action that it could be regarded as having any or no dramatic role, a consistent or changing one, as suited the poet or as it pleased the audience to imagine. A more fundamental objection to the theory is that it leaves acts of extremely disparate lengths according to the Latin version, whereas we have every reason to believe that the Greek play on which it was based had acts of approximately equal length.[84] Assuming act divisions in the Greek at points corresponding to Terence's 170–1, 409–10 (though with 381–97 removed), 722–49 (with 723–48 removed), and 873–4, we have acts corresponding to 118, 222, 313, 125, and 194 lines of Latin; the original would therefore have been a play which contrasted strongly in this respect with Menander's Δύσκολος which has acts of 183, 194, 164, and 185 lines. If on the other hand Menander's Ἑαυτόν was constructed like his Δύσκολος, either the hypothesis is weakened or Terence must have made considerable alterations to his original by way of addition and/or omission, and of this, as has been said, there is little trace. The suggested division can be improved by following Webster on one point.[85] He accepts the idea of a prologue at 170–1 and suggests that the first act ended at a point corresponding to Terence's 229; acceptance of this view would give acts of 177, 163, 313, 125, and 194 lines in a revised version of the division, which removes the disparity between acts I and II, but not the greater one between acts III and IV. Yet I remain convinced that the probability of an act

[84] Arnott, op. cit. in n.6 above, p.9; contrast Webster, *An Introduction to Menander*, pp.71–2.

[85] *Studies in Menander*², p.84.

division in the Greek at the moment when Bacchis and her *pompa* move house is extremely high—the more so as everyone is agreed that a similar act division occurred earlier at the point corresponding to 409–10; I would prefer to suppose expansion and contraction by Terence in acts III and IV than to send the *grex* across the stage, or even round by the back door, in the middle of an act. In any case the suggested scheme as revised is hardly worse than Webster's, whose divisions, corresponding to 177, 180, 181, 283, and 194 lines of Latin, contain a very long fourth act.[86]

IV. ANTIPHILA

In conclusion, I should like to float one further idea. It is only an idea, since I cannot at the moment see how to give it any stronger status by appealing to detailed points of evidence in the play itself; but it is one which for me has considerable attraction. It is the suggestion that Antiphila might have been introduced as a speaking character in much the same way as I have tried to show that Bacchis was. Though, like Bacchis, she is an essential character in the plot, Antiphila only appears on stage in the scene 381–409 which we have already discussed, and her contribution is therefore smaller even than that of Bacchis. If my removal of 381–97 is correct, then that scene is reduced to the twelve lines 398–409, in which Antiphila only speaks in 403–7. I wonder whether the reduced section, containing the reunion of Clinia and Antiphila, is not also Terence's creation, making the whole scene in our texts an innovation designed to replace a choral interlude in a way precisely parallel to what I have suggested for 723–48.

This suggestion entails that the end of the previous scene has also been altered, since if neither young man is to meet his girl on stage, then there is no need for Syrus to single out Clitipho to be sent off. It follows that Terence would have begun to diverge from his original immediately after Syrus has said 'sed quam cito sunt consecutae mulieres' (375), and possibly picked it up again at 409 with 'ite intro: nam vos iamdudum exspectat senex', again spoken by Syrus; these two lines, in fact, run together well for the sentiments required at the end of an act: 'Here are the women; inside everybody—the master's waiting.' Clinia, Clitipho, and Syrus would then have retired into Chremes' house, with the choral interlude meant to cover the arrival of Bacchis, Antiphila, and the *grex ancillarum*; in Menander, therefore, Bacchis and Antiphila need never have appeared on stage at all—though their presence as mute characters would not destroy this present suggestion. Terence, however, was attracted by the idea of portraying the reunion of Clinia and Antiphila on stage, and therefore created a speaking role for Antiphila. But he did not want to bother with a reunion of Clitipho and Bacchis; it did not attract him in the same way, since the relationship between them was not so 'pure' and romantic nor their separation so long, and so he got Clitipho out of the way in the manner of 376–80. Bacchis herself, however, he probably felt obliged to portray, because he knew that he would be needing her again in another new scene, 723–48; accordingly he wrote her in to the planned reunion scene in the rather clumsy manner which I have indicated,

[86] Based on *Studies in Menander*², pp.84–6; in *An Introduction to Menander*, pp.144–6 he alters his scheme to divisions corresponding to 177, 180, 258, 206, and 194 lines.

putting into her mouth a speech from another Greek source which seemed reasonably suitable, if not exactly right in every detail.

I am aware that acceptance of this idea concerning Antiphila will require adjustment, though not abandonment, of one of the arguments which I employed when talking of Bacchis' part in this scene. I argued there that one of the reasons for thinking that Bacchis was not a speaking part in Menander (though, by my implication at that stage, Antiphila was) was that her speech of 381–95 held up the action and delayed the reunion of Clinia and Antiphila to which the previous two scenes had been looking forward. If we wish to advocate the idea that Antiphila too is Terentian, we will have to draw a contrast, not between a Menandrian Antiphila and a Terentian Bacchis, but between an Antiphila whom Terence really wanted to write in and a Bacchis whom he included simply because he had to since he wanted to use her again later at 723–48. It looks as if his own feeling that he had to include Bacchis because of her future appearance rendered his other innovation, the reunion of Clinia and Antiphila, less effective by delaying it in the manner I have described. The two other arguments I used about Bacchis—those concerning the characterization in her speech and the fragment of Greek which probably corresponds to one line of it—remain unaffected and could apply equally well, whether Antiphila is a speaking character found in Menander and Terence or only in the Latin version.

I readily admit that this suggestion concerning Antiphila's role is no more than conjecture—in contrast to that about Bacchis' role, where detailed arguments can be advanced. But, when we look at the participation in the action of the two women in the context of the play as a whole, it is surprisingly easy to remove them both with hardly any disturbance to the rest of the text; removal of 381–409 only involves the removal of 376–80 as well, while 723–48 can be taken away without any effect whatsoever. The extreme ease with which this can be done might be thought to lend credence to the idea; for what can easily be taken away would have been equally easy for Terence to write in. Moreover, if the idea happened to be correct and if both women were introduced into the plot as speaking characters by Terence, it might lay the way open for a new interpretation of *duplex . . . simplici* in 6. I wonder whether it is not possible that Terence, when he talked of making his play *duplex*, was referring to the fact that he had introduced two of the four lovers, not into the plot since they were already there in his original, but into the action of the play as he intended to present it on the stage. In other words, Menander's play, centred upon the story of four people but only portraying two of them, was now transformed to show all four of them participating in the action; thus the plot remained very much as it was, but the action was doubled by showing to the audience the two women as well as the two young men. Such an explanation might seem contrived—as contrived, perhaps, as some of those which I have rather briefly dismissed earlier in this article—and it is still not that obvious interpretation which I have already often mentioned; but it is an explanation which is within the obvious sphere from which, it seems, the right explanation should come, namely in the sphere of some form of alteration to the original which might be classed as rendering the play 'double'. Of course, if this is the alteration to which Terence was referring when he wrote 6, then his statement remains a vast exaggeration and can be regarded as highly misleading, but it is not untrue. It is an exaggeration because, naturally, doubling implies the addition of something roughly as large as what is already there, whereas the two women only feature

in two short scenes and take a part in the action which is very much smaller than that of Clinia and Clitipho.[87] It is also misleading, firstly because the additions are not to the plot and to the action but to the action alone, and secondly because the explanation is not the obvious one, the doubling being not the addition of a second pair of lovers to a first but provision of two women for the two men; this, if we like to think of it that way, could be part of the 'deliberate policy of teasing and bewilderment' of which Flickinger speaks. But the statement is not untrue, because there are in the central love intrigues four speaking characters in Terence when in Menander there were only two; the *comoedia* is therefore, in one sense at any rate, made *duplex*.

If there were any truth in this idea, what would we make of *ex argumento simplici*? Probably something along the lines of Leo's suggestion that *simplici* has been employed for *uno* 'figurae causa'. The play has been made 'double' in its action from a single plot; the plot has remained the same while only the action has been altered. Such an interpretation would retain the principal attractive feature of Leo's view but would remove the two objections raised against it by Skutsch, since no *tamen* is needed and *duplex* does have its predicative force, belonging as it does inside the relative clause.

And so one more possibility has been added to the 'bewildering variety of solutions' about which I complained at the start of this article. It is not a possibility which must be rated too highly, since in common with several of the others it cannot, at any rate in its final form which embraces Antiphila as well as Bacchis, be reinforced by any detailed evidence from the text. But the parts of it which concern Bacchis only can be so reinforced, and, if they do nothing else, may indicate an alternative course which any further consideration of this very vexed question may take.

St. David's University College, Lampeter A. J. BROTHERS

[87] It might be felt that the small extent and self-contained nature of these additions is evidence of a certain lack of enterprise and inventiveness on the part of Terence or else of a desire to keep his alterations small and restricted to choric interludes through fear of further attacks from his opponents—particularly after the attacks on *Andria* and the failure of *Hecyra*.