

THE *EUNUCHUS*: TERENCE AND MENANDER*

A vast amount has been written on the relationship between Terence's and Menander's *Eunuchus*. On some points a good measure of agreement has been reached, but much remains in dispute. In an important article W. Ludwig convincingly demonstrated the inner unity of Terence's plot, against earlier theories of large-scale 'contaminatio'.¹ The nature of the changes made by Terence in introducing two characters from Menander's *Colax* (30–3) is now fairly clear, although argument is possible over details.² The changes are numerous but relatively small and do not affect the main lines of Menander's plot. In this paper I shall argue that Terence made similar changes in two other parts of the play, and that these caused certain anomalies which have prompted theories of more drastic Terentian change.

The known Terentian changes, some attested by Terence himself, others by Donatus, fall into a pattern and show recurring features. In the first place they involve the introduction of extra characters. In *Eun.* 391–500 the *Colax* characters Thraso and Gnatho probably replaced one speaking character, the Rival of Menander's *Eunuchus*, perhaps accompanied by a mute attendant; the change produced a scene with four speakers, contrary to Menander's practice.³ Similarly in *Eun.* 771–816 and 1025–94 the introduction of the *Colax* characters produced scenes with more than three speakers,⁴ as did the introduction of the non-Menandrian characters Byrria and Charinus in *And.* 412–31 and 625–714.⁵

Secondly they often involve the replacement of monologue by dialogue. Donatus on *Eun.* 539 explicitly states that Terence added Antipho (*bene inventa persona est, cui narret Chaerea*) to avoid a long monologue by Chaerea (*ne unus diu loquatur, ut apud Menandrum*). This has often been doubted, but without sufficient reason.⁶ Again, whereas Terence's *Andria* begins with a dialogue between Simo and his freedman Sosia, Donatus (on 14) informs us that in Menander's *Andria* the old man was alone. There is no reason to doubt that Terence transformed a monologue into a dialogue, even if the precise nature of his changes is uncertain.⁷ We know from Terence's own admission in *Ad.* 6–11 that the lively dialogue between Aeschinus and Sannio in 155 ff. was imported from Diphilus' *Synapothnescontes*; it is not certain what it replaced, but

* My thanks are due to the Fondation Hardt, where this paper was conceived, and to the British Academy for supporting my visit there; to Peter Brown, who made helpful comments on an earlier draft; and to other friends who have suggested improvements. A shortened version was read to the Seminar für klassische Philologie, Freie Universität Berlin, in June 1981.

¹ *Philologus* 103 (1959), 1–38 = *Die römische Komödie: Plautus und Terenz (Wege der Forschung 236)*, ed. E. Lefèvre (Darmstadt, 1973), 354–403.

² cf. K. Gaiser in *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt*, ed. H. Temporini, i. 2 (1972), 1064 f., with references to earlier literature, F. H. Sandbach, *The Comic Theatre of Greece and Rome* (London, 1977), 142–5.

³ T. B. L. Webster, *An Introduction to Menander* (Manchester, 1974), 140, Sandbach in *Le Monde grec – Hommages à Claire Préaux* (Brussels, 1975), 201.

⁴ Webster, *Studies in Menander* (Manchester, 1950), 69, Ludwig (n. 1), 24 n. 1, Sandbach (n. 3), 201.

⁵ Donatus on 301 *has personas Terentius addidit fabulae – nam non sunt apud Menandrum*, cf. on 977, Sandbach (n. 3), 199.

⁶ cf. Gaiser (n. 2), 1078 f., K. Büchner, *Das Theater des Terenz* (Heidelberg, 1974), 265–72, 460–2. It is possible that in Menander Antipho appeared after Chaerea's monologue and that Terence brought his entrance forward (Webster, *Introd. Men.* 140).

⁷ cf. Gaiser (n. 2), 1077 f., Büchner, *Theater des Ter.* 31–41, 448–51.

the simplest and in my opinion most likely hypothesis is that it replaced a monologue of Aeschinus as he conducted the girl home.⁸ In *Eun.* 391–500 and 771–816 the *Colax* material occurs mainly in dialogues between Thraso and Gnatho at the beginning and end of the scenes; if Thraso and Gnatho here replaced the Rival of Menander's *Eunuchus*, then these dialogues probably replaced monologues of the Rival,⁹ 391–453 and 771–91 entrance monologues, 497–500 a link monologue until Thais comes out of her house (perhaps also his exit monologue),¹⁰ 811–16 an exit monologue. In 1025–60 Thraso and Gnatho are glaring intruders into the *Eunuchus* context, even if we allow for the possibility that the Rival appeared in Menander's finale;¹¹ it seems likely that their brief dialogue 1025–30 replaced a link monologue of Parmeno between the exit of Pythias and the entrance of Chaerea (reduced by Terence to the single line 1024). The result of these Terentian changes was sometimes increased comic effect, but always livelier stage action.¹²

Analysis has discovered examples of similar changes by Terence. Lefèvre¹³ has convincingly demonstrated that in *Pho.* 348–459 the *advocati* are Terence's addition; in 446–59 the dialogue between four speakers probably replaced a link monologue of Demipho covering Geta's visit to his house to see whether Antipho has returned home. Similar to the *advocati* of the *Phormio* are a number of very small speaking parts which Terence probably created by giving a few words or lines to an originally mute character;¹⁴ thus a monologue could become a miniature dialogue. Examples are *And.* 459–67, *H.T.* 614–18, 743–8, *Eun.* 500–6, *Hec.* 415–29. On a larger scale is the part of Dorias in the *Eunuchus*, which, as Webster¹⁵ suggested, is probably Terence's creation, a doublet of Pythias. In Menander it was probably Pythias who escorted Chremes to Thraso's house at 538 and spoke 615–28 on her return. Terence, having given that rôle to Dorias, then kept her on stage in 629–726, where she is conspicuously redundant, producing a scene with four speakers from 668. The brief dialogue between Pythias and Dorias in 664–7 and the somewhat longer one in 718–26 then must be Terentian; it is probable that the former replaced a link monologue of Pythias while Phaedria is fetching Dorus and that the latter has been created out of a deliberative monologue of Pythias.¹⁶

Even if Dorias is not entirely a Terentian doublet of Pythias, it is highly probable that Terence has kept her on stage for several scenes after the exit of her Menandrian

⁸ Webster, *Stud. Men.* 89, *Introd. Men.* 114, H. J. Mette, *Lustrum* 10 (1965), 39, 126 f., Büchner, *Theater des Ter.* 382 f., 459, W. G. Arnott, *Menander, Plautus, Terence* (Oxford, 1975), 49. For different views see Gaiser (n. 2), 1065, R. H. Martin, *Terence Adelphoe* (Cambridge, 1976), 242–5, J. N. Grant, *CQ* n.s. 30 (1980), 341–55.

⁹ Webster, *Stud. Men.* 72, *Introd. Men.* 140, Ludwig (n. 1), 24 f., 31 n. 2.

¹⁰ 494 f. suggest that in Menander's *Eunuchus* the Rival left before Thais. It would have been better that he should not be present when Thais gives instructions to Pythias concerning Chremes in 500–3.

¹¹ Ludwig (n. 1), 2, 37, B. Denzler, *Der Monolog bei Terenz* (Zürich, 1968), 53–5, 132–4, N. Holzberg, *Menander: Untersuchungen zur dramatischen Technik* (Nürnberg, 1974), 160. Büchner, *Theater des Ter.* 305.

¹² F. Leo, *Geschichte der römischen Literatur* 1 (Berlin, 1913), 240, H. Haffter, *Mus. Helv.* 10 (1953), 75–8, Ludwig *Gr. Rom. Byz. St.* 9 (1968), 176 f., Denzler, *Monolog* 147, Gaiser (n. 2), 1065 f., Büchner, *Theater des Ter.* 523, Register s.v. 'Bereicherung des Bühnengeschehens', Arnott, *Men. Plaut. Ter.* 50.

¹³ *Der Phormio des Terenz und der Epidikazomenos des Apollodor von Karystos* (Munich, 1978), 15–20. I reached the same conclusion independently.

¹⁴ Gaiser (n. 2), 1077, Sandbach (n. 3), 199.

¹⁵ *Stud. Men.* 73 'Terentian multiplication and thickening up'. Cf. Ludwig (n. 1) 18 n. 1, Denzler, *Monolog* 63–5, Sandbach (n. 3), 201.

¹⁶ H. Drexler, *Hermes* 73 (1938), 93, Denzler, *Monolog* 131 f.

equivalent. By this means, or by the early introduction of a character (as of Parmeno at *Eun.* 394), Terence could thicken the texture of the play without adding new characters. It is probable that he did this not infrequently and that the procedure sometimes resulted in the substitution of a dialogue for a monologue. G. Rambelli¹⁷ and Denzler¹⁸ have shown that in *And.* 236–300 Terence has probably kept Mysis on stage from the previous scene. The change avoided a sequence of two monologues separated by an empty stage, a pattern much rarer in Terence than in Menander;¹⁹ it is likely that it served to bridge Menander's first act-division.²⁰ In 236–66 then Pamphilus' monologue has been enlivened by the comments of the eavesdropping Mysis,²¹ and in 267–300 original monologue has been turned into dialogue. In *H.T.* 381–409, a scene with four speakers, Terence has probably kept Syrus on stage, substituting the lively dialogue 375–80 for a link monologue of Clinia in Menander.²² It is generally agreed that Terence is responsible for the unnecessary and awkward presence of Sannio in *Ad.* 254–80, another scene with four speakers;²³ it seems to me most likely that Terence kept both Sannio and Syrus on stage from the preceding scene. If so, the brief exchanges between Syrus and Ctesipho in 260 f. (cf. 264b) have been inserted into the original entrance monologue of Ctesipho 254–64a, and the dialogues between Sannio and Syrus and Syrus and Ctesipho in 278–87 probably replaced Ctesipho's exit monologue.²⁴ In *Hec.* 806 ff. I believe that the mission of Parmeno to fetch Pamphilus is a Terentian innovation, that Parmeno was not present in the final scene in Apollodorus and that the dialogue between Pamphilus and Parmeno 841–53 replaced an entrance monologue of Pamphilus.²⁵ Büchner²⁶ has convincingly argued

¹⁷ *St. It. Fil. Cl.* 13 (1936), 130–60.

¹⁸ *Monolog* 45–51.

¹⁹ Denzler, *Monolog* 109.

²⁰ A lapse of time is required between 205 and 236 for Simo to go to the forum to meet Pamphilus (253–5) and for Pamphilus to come home, and between 227 and 338 for Davus' trip to the forum and back by a circuitous route (355 ff.). Webster, *Stud. Men.* 78, *Introd. Men.* 117, and Mette (n. 8), 43 f. suppose the act-division at 227, but the appearance of Mysis at the very end of the act would be characteristically Menandrian (E. W. Handley, *Entretiens Hardt* 16 [1970], 11).

²¹ Denzler, *Monolog* 35 f., shows that overheard monologues are much commoner in Terence than in Menander.

²² Webster, *Stud. Men.* 85, *Introd. Men.* 145, Büchner, *Theater des Ter.* 190–3, 453 f., Sandbach (n. 3) 200. I am not persuaded by the attempt of A. J. Brothers, *CQ* n.s. 30 (1980), 108–17, to show that Bacchis is a Terentian addition in *H.T.* 381 ff.

²³ Drexler, *Die Komposition von Terenz' Adelphen und Plautus' Rudens* (Leipzig, 1934), 12 f., 24 f., E. Fantham, *Philologus* 112 (1968), 206–8, Gaiser (n. 2), 1065, Sandbach (n. 3), 202.

²⁴ Webster, *Stud. Men.* 89, suggested that Terence kept Sannio on stage in 254–80. Drexler (n. 23), 12–16, 23 f. however convincingly detected the hand of Terence in all the passages of this scene which involve Syrus (252b–3, 260–4, 276–87); there is therefore no reason to suppose Syrus to have been present during the meeting of Ctesipho and Aeschinus in Menander. Denzler, *Monolog* 61 f., showed that the presence of Sannio and Syrus to overhear Ctesipho's entrance monologue 254 ff. is abnormal for New Comedy and likely to be due to Terence. An exit monologue of Ctesipho will save the 3 actor rule in 287 f.; this is more likely than the act-division supposed here by Sandbach (n. 3), 202, since an act-division is probable at 354 to cover Geta's trip (354–447) to fetch Hegio (cf. Grant [n. 8], 354). I hope to discuss this passage more fully elsewhere.

²⁵ I take it as probable that in Apollodorus' *Hecyra* the *anagnorisis* was completed in the Bacchis–Pamphilus scene (cf. Donatus on 825, Gaiser [n. 2] 1072 f.). Büchner, *Theater des Ter.* 163 f., points out that Parmeno could not know where to find Pamphilus. Lefèvre, *Die Expositionstechnik in den Komödien des Terenz* (Darmstadt, 1969), 75, observes the improbability that Bacchis takes no notice of Pamphilus and Parmeno in 841–53. I discuss this passage more fully in *Hermes* 111 (1983).

²⁶ *Theater des Ter.* 330–5, 338–41, 347–50, 454–7. Cf. Denzler, *Monolog* 62 f., on the unusual features of 465–84.

that in *Pho.* 465–566 and 606–712 Terence has brought Antipho back early, creating two scenes with four speakers; it seems probable that the dialogue of Geta and Antipho 682–712 has replaced a link monologue of Geta covering the visit of Demipho and Chremes to Chremes' house, and that their dialogue 471–84, with Antipho's monologue 465–70, has replaced another link monologue of Geta.²⁷ In *And.* 904–56 I suspect that Terence introduced Pamphilus early, producing a scene with four speakers and transforming an exit monologue of Simo into the dialogue 952–6; in Menander Crito can eventually have remembered (cf. 943 *id quaero*) the essential fact that Glycerium's original name was Pasibula, which in Terence is given by Pamphilus (945).²⁸

There are also general grounds for believing that Terence not infrequently shortened or eliminated monologues which he found in his Greek models. J. Blundell²⁹ has demonstrated the great importance of monologue in Menander's plays. He estimates that in the *Samia* 'monologue can hardly count for less than 370 lines in a play of about 900' (*Men. Mon.* 44), i.e. about 40%. His figure for 'all forms of non-dialogue (audience address, private soliloquy, asides, "speaking back")' in the *Dyscolus* is 'about 340 lines in a play of 969' (*ibid.* 64), i.e. about 35%. If very long monologues are less prominent in the *Dyscolus* than the *Samia*, the second half of *Dyscolus* Act I shows an extended series of monologues.³⁰ Denzler provides figures for both Menander and Terence, although differently estimated and excluding the Bodmer fragments of *Samia* and *Aspis*.³¹ His figure for the proportion of monologue in *Dyscolus* is 28%, in *Adelphi* 25%, in *Eunuchus* 21% (including Gnatho's long monologue 232–64 added by Terence). His overall statistics give an average length of 12.7 lines for Menander's monologues against 8.3 for Terence's. The relative frequency of monologues in Menander and Terence is in the proportion of 9 to 7. Although one must have reservations about these figures, they clearly indicate a smaller amount of monologue in Terence than in Menander. Denzler warns against ascribing to Terence a general antipathy to monologue, but notes a marked reduction in certain types of monologue, including very long monologues,³² sequences of monologues³³ and *Auftritts-Monologe* (monologues by characters entering on to an empty stage).³⁴

After this introduction I turn to the detailed examination of two passages of Terence's *Eunuchus*, one at the beginning, one near the end. Much more space will be required for the first passage, since it involves the questions of whether Terence has altered the opening scenes of exposition and has omitted a divine prologue, questions which have attracted much discussion recently.

Eunuchus 46–231

Terence's *Eunuchus* opens with a short but effective scene depicting a young man Phaedria and his slave Parmeno (46–80). Phaedria cannot make up his mind how to react to the behaviour of his mistress, who, having shut him out on the previous day

²⁷ Donatus' note on 482 *non optat saluum patrum venire secundum Apollodorum* seems to imply that this line is based on Apollodorus. In Apollodorus the wish that Chremes might not return could have been expressed by Geta in his monologue, picking up Demipho's last words in 460–2.

²⁸ cf. Sandbach (n. 3), 199 f.

²⁹ *Menander and the Monologue* (Göttingen, 1980).

³⁰ *Men. Mon.* 45–8, cf. Denzler, *Monolog* 109–11, 125–32.

³¹ *Monolog* 5, 145 f.

³² *Monolog* 103.

³³ *Monolog* 109–11.

³⁴ *Monolog* 105.

(83), has now summoned him again. He stands outside her house and at one moment is inclined to go to her, at the next to assert his independence, *exclussit; revocat: redeam? non si me obsecret* (49). Parmeno however advises him not to fight in vain against the irrational power of love but to make his peace as cheaply as possible. Parmeno has a low opinion of Phaedria's ability to resist the wiles of his mistress: *haec verba una mehercle falsa lacrimula... restinguet* (67–9). He assumes that she is a typically unscrupulous and mercenary *meretrix* (*nostri fundi calamitas* 79).

This scene seems to have been very well known later; its opening lines are quoted once by Cicero and four times by Quintilian.³⁵ Horace too alludes to it in *Sat.* 2. 3. 259–71, when he wishes to give an example of the irrational behaviour of the lover. Horace follows *Eun.* 46–63 closely, taking many phrases from Terence, e.g. 264 *exclussit; revocat: redeam? non si obsecret* ~ *Eun.* 49.

There can be no doubt that Terence took over the substance of the scene from Menander. Donatus implies that Phaedria's opening sentences *quid igitur faciam? non eam ne nunc quidem quom accersor ultro?* follow Menander closely, and gives the original of *quid igitur faciam?* as ἀλλὰ τί ποιήσω (fr. 161 K–T); and fr. 162 K–T μὴ θεομάχει μηδὲ προσάγου τῷ πράγματι χεიმῶνας ἑτέρους, τοὺς δ' ἀναγκαίους φέρε, attributed by Stobaeus to Menander's *Eunuchus*, has long been recognized as in all probability the original of Parmeno's advice to Phaedria in *Eun.* 76–8. Confirmation is provided by Persius, *Sat.* 5. 161–74, which allude to the same dramatic situation but name the lover Chaerestratus and his slave Davus; a scholiast explicitly states that Persius *hunc locum de Menandri Eunucho traxit* and that Terence changed the names.³⁶ How far Terence's version of the scene differed from Menander's in detail we cannot say. Comparison of Men. fr. 162 K–T with *Eun.* 76–8 shows that Terence can translate freely, even when he keeps the basic ideas of the original; the Greek conception of love as a god disappears and the metaphorical χεიმῶνες are replaced by the more prosaic *molestiae*.³⁷

Can Persius help us to reconstruct Menander? Persius was clearly influenced by Horace in introducing the dramatic allusion, and 161 f. *finire dolores praeteritos meditor* echoes Horace 263 *mediter finire dolores?* In 172 f. *quidnam igitur faciam? nec nunc, cum arcessat et ultro supplicet, accedam?* Persius probably owes something both to Horace 262 f. *nec nunc, cum me vocet ultro accedam* and to *Eun.* 46 f. *quid igitur faciam? non eam ne nunc quidem quom accersor ultro?* Otherwise Persius owes nothing to Terence's version of the scene, but apparently has in mind Menander's original version. The possibility has to be considered that he may be in some respects closer than Terence to Menander, particularly in his treatment of certain motifs which appear in Persius and Terence in different forms: the lover's patrimony damaged 164 f. *an rem patriam... frangam* ~ *Eun.* 79 *nostri fundi calamitas*, the girl in tears 168 *censen' plorabit, Dave, relicta?* ~ *Eun.* 67–9 *haec verba una mehercle falsa lacrimula... restinguet*, the lover punished 169 *solea, puer, obiurgabere rubra* ~ *Eun.* 69 f. *dabis ultro supplicium*,³⁸ the lover advised not to fight against captivity 170 *ne trepidare velis, atque arctos rodere casses* ~ *Eun.* 74 f. *ut te redimas captum quam queas minimo*. However Persius certainly departs from Menander in at least one important respect. In Terence

³⁵ J. Marouzeau, *Térence* 1 (Paris, 1942), ad loc.

³⁶ I shall use the familiar Terentian names even when speaking of Menander's *Eunuchus*.

³⁷ E. Reitzenstein, *Terenz als Dichter* (Leipzig, 1940), 54 f., P. Flury, *Liebe und Liebessprache bei Menander, Plautus und Terenz* (Heidelberg, 1968), 23 f., Büchner, *Theater des Ter.* 231 f.

³⁸ cf. *Eun.* 1028 *utinam tibi conmitigari videam sandalio caput!* spoken by Gnatho in a passage probably invented by Terence. Terence may have taken the motif from the opening scene of Menander's *Eunuchus* (U. Knoche, *Nachr. Gött. Ges.* 1936, 180 n. 2).

the scene opens, as the dramatic situation requires, with the lover asking whether to comply with the summons which he has already received from his mistress (*non eam... quom accersor ultro?* 46 f.); and the same must have been true of Menander. Persius postpones this motif, making Davus predict that that is what Chaerestratus will say *if* his mistress summons him (171–3). The purpose of the change was to fit the passage into the context of Persius' argument; Davus answers Chaerestratus' question *si totus et integer illinc exieras, ne nunc*, and Persius draws the moral *hic, hic quod quaerimus, hic est*, i.e. the man who is free of the tyranny of emotions. It seems likely that Persius has in general used Menander very freely.

In Terence the first scene slides naturally into the next;³⁹ Thais comes from her house at 81 to find Phaedria and Parmeno outside. A conversation ensues in which Thais assures Phaedria of her love for him and explains why she had shut him out; she wishes to keep on good terms with a soldier, Phaedria's rival for her favours, because he has in his possession a girl, whom she believes to be an Athenian citizen and wishes to restore to her family. The scene is skilfully designed to give the audience in a natural way the essential background information; and Thais' narrative is enlivened by comic interruptions from Parmeno, who maintains the same suspicious attitude towards Thais which he demonstrated in the previous scene and provides a contrast to the emotional Phaedria.⁴⁰ Phaedria finally accepts Thais' explanation and is persuaded to go into the country to keep out of the way for two days. In 187–9 Phaedria announces his decision, *rus ibo*, and instructs Parmeno to deliver to Thais his present of an Ethiopian slave girl and a eunuch, already mentioned in 165–9, with the words *tu, Parmeno, huc fac illi adducantur*. Parmeno replies *maxume*, and the natural presumption is that he immediately goes into his master's house, which is next to that of Thais. Phaedria says his farewells to Thais and makes his exit at 196. It is not indicated in the text where he goes to, but he must follow Parmeno into the house, from which the two emerge at 207, to converse briefly before Phaedria goes off to the country at 224.⁴¹ After Phaedria's exit Thais speaks a monologue (197–206) before she returns to her house, leaving the stage empty. In this monologue she reiterates the genuineness of her affection for Phaedria, but goes on to reveal that she is closer to discovering the family of the girl than she had told him; whereas in 110 f. she admitted only that she thought her to be a citizen and stressed that she knew nothing for certain (*arbitror; certum non scimus*), she now expresses the hope that she has already all but identified the girl's brother (*nam me eius fratrem spero propemodum iam repperisse, adolescentem adeo nobilem*) and announces that she has arranged to meet him on that very day (203–6). This last statement prepares for the arrival of Chremes at 507.

The fact that the second scene coheres so closely with the first to form a carefully integrated complex constitutes a *prima facie* argument for supposing that Terence is throughout following Menander's original plan. Nevertheless objections have been raised against the second scene by a number of scholars and on the basis of one or

³⁹ Webster, *Stud. Men.* 70.

⁴⁰ Ludwig (n. 1), 30 n.

⁴¹ Because of the lack of definite indications in the text, which will be discussed below, it has been doubted whether Terence intended Parmeno and Phaedria to leave the stage at all, most recently by A. J. Brothers, *CQ* n.s. 19 (1969), 317 f. It would have been unnatural however to keep them on stage during Thais' monologue 197–206, which they must not hear. Moreover in 207 they give the impression of entering in conversation; and *isti* (cf. 189 *illi*) suggests that they have just seen the Ethiopian and eunuch in the house (G. Burckhardt, *Die Akteinteilung in der neuen griechischen und in der römischen Komödie* [Diss. Basel, 1927], 10, Denzler, *Monolog* 10 n. 34).

more of these have been founded several theories of changes by Terence. The following are the main objections in brief: (i) that it is inconsistent with the later behaviour of Parmeno and Phaedria that they should hear Pamphila described as a *civis Attica* (110), (ii) that the exit of Parmeno and Phaedria at the end of the scene is inadequately motivated and that Phaedria's order to Parmeno at 189 is duplicated at 207, and (iii) that Thais' reference to Chremes in 203–6 is inconsistent with what Chremes himself says in 507 ff. Not all the critics of the scene have subscribed to all these objections; and each must be examined in detail. I wish first however to consider three theories put forward to meet them, and to show that they in turn all raise serious problems.

(a) F. Nencini⁴² suggested that Parmeno was not present in the second scene in Menander. He has been followed by W. E. J. Kuiper,⁴³ Webster⁴⁴ and Büchner.⁴⁵ This theory meets objections (i) and (ii) so far as Parmeno is concerned, though not Phaedria. On the other hand without Parmeno the scene would lose much if not all its life, and this argument alone in my view suffices to make the theory very unattractive. It has been rejected for this reason by, among others, P. J. Enk,⁴⁶ Ludwig,⁴⁷ Lefèvre⁴⁸ and W. Steidle.⁴⁹ A less serious difficulty is how Menander would have motivated the exit of Parmeno after the first scene.⁵⁰

(b) Lefèvre⁵¹ suggested that all the references in this scene to the citizenship of Pamphila were inserted by Terence from the divine prologue which he assumes Menander's *Eunuchus* had. This theory, which meets objection (i), has been accepted by Ludwig,⁵² Gaiser⁵³ and Holzberg.⁵⁴ The references to the citizenship of Pamphila however cannot easily be isolated from their context. Lefèvre's theory requires us to believe that Terence has woven a considerable amount of alien material into the original structure of Menander's scene in such a way as to produce a smooth-flowing dialogue which shows no trace of any awkward joins or inconsistencies.⁵⁵ Lefèvre starts by isolating 110–15 as a Terentian insertion, observing that '116 schliesst eng an 109 an'. He then marks 144–9 as Terentian, since the reference to restoring Pamphila to her family implies her citizenship. This passage however cannot simply be a Terentian insertion; 150 ff. imply that Thais has just given *some* reason for wishing to gain possession of Pamphila and we could only suppose that Terence has in 144–9 completely rewritten the reason which she gave in Menander. Moreover Lefèvre seems to have overlooked 155b–7, in which Phaedria summarizes the essentials of Thais' narrative.⁵⁶ 155b–6a *parvola hinc est abrepta* echoes 108–10 *parvolam puellam... ex Attica hinc abreptam*; 156b *eduxit mater pro sua* echoes 116 f. *mater... coepit... educere, ita uti si esset filia*; 157a *soror dictast* echoes 118 *sororem plerique esse credebant meam* and 146 *soror est dicta*; 157b *cupio abducere, ut reddam suis* echoes 145–7 *cupio abducere... ut suis restituum ac reddam*. The phrases *hinc est abrepta* and *ut reddam suis* imply Pamphila's citizenship and correspond to passages in Thais' narrative which Lefèvre regards as Terentian additions. Lefèvre's theory requires that 155–7, in which these phrases are embedded, must also be Terentian. These lines however are indispensable to their context and again we could only suppose substantial Terentian

⁴² *De Terentio eiusque fontibus* (Livorno, 1891), 83 f.

⁴³ *Grieksche Origineelen en Latijnsche Navolgingen* (Amsterdam, 1936), 19 ff.

⁴⁴ *Stud. Men.* 70.

⁴⁵ *Gnomon* 15 (1939), 127.

⁴⁶ *Expositionstechnik* 20.

⁴⁷ art. cit. (n. 1), 30 n.

⁴⁸ *Gnomon* 44 (1972), 825 f., *Die römische Komödie* (n. 1), 404.

⁴⁹ op. cit. (n. 2), 1053.

⁵⁰ Brothers (n. 41), 317.

⁵¹ *Theater des Ter.* 236–44.

⁵² *Rh. M.* 116 (1973), 326.

⁵³ *Expositionstechnik* 21 f.

⁵⁴ *Menander* 89.

⁵⁵ Büchner, *Theater des Ter.* 243 n. 25.

rewriting. I should prefer to see the echoes in 156 f. of 110 and 145–7 as evidence for the Menandrian origin of all three passages. Lefèvre's theories of Terentian *Zudichtung*, in this and other plays of Terence, are too drastic.⁵⁷ His theory hardly leaves enough material for a plausible scene in Menander. In particular it removes from Thais' narrative its main *raison d'être*.⁵⁸ Lefèvre argues that it would be sufficient for Thais to tell Phaedria that she wished to rescue from the soldier the girl who had been brought up as her sister. To do that however it was not necessary for her to relate Pamphila's whole history. Moreover to give only the sentimental motive of wishing to help her supposed sister would be both insincere and less likely to win over the reluctant Phaedria. In fact she had another reason for wishing to gain possession of Pamphila, to win friends for herself by restoring Pamphila to her family, as stated in 146–9; her search for a *patronus* is a central theme of the plot, as Ludwig has shown.⁵⁹ That she should frankly admit this motive of enlightened self-interest makes her plea to Phaedria more credible. It is also in character and thoroughly Menandrian; Gratwick⁶⁰ well compares the attitude of Habrotonon in *Epitr.* 538–49.

(c) Lefèvre⁶¹ further suggested that 202–6 is a Terentian insertion from Menander's prologue, and he is followed by Gaiser.⁶² This meets objection (iii). Lefèvre regarded it as probable moreover that the whole of Thais' monologue 197–206 is a Terentian addition and that in Menander Phaedria and Parmeno did not leave the stage at the end of this scene. Brothers⁶³ put forward a similar theory, but regarded the Terentian insertion as extending from 190 (or perhaps about a line and a half later) to 206, framed by Phaedria's repeated command to Parmeno in 189 and 207. This meets objection (ii). A serious disadvantage of the theory however is that it requires us to suppose that 197–201 were written by Terence 'from his own head' (Brothers), 'als Überleitung eingedichtet' (Lefèvre).⁶⁴ There is nothing in these lines which one could not happily attribute to Menander. They are entirely in keeping with what Thais has said already, and especially with her brief entrance monologue 81–3, as Steidle emphasizes.⁶⁵ They are also in keeping with her actions later in the play.⁶⁶ Brothers cites Donatus' note on 198 as evidence for the Terentian origin of the kindly *meretrix*. But Thais' kindness, which is blended with realism, is built into the fabric of the plot⁶⁷ and must be Menandrian (cf. Habrotonon in *Epitrepontes*). Nor need Donatus be taken as implying otherwise; he is praising a virtue in Terence's play, but does not here contrast Terence with Menander. Thais' monologue resembles that of Micio in *Ad.* 141–54, in which he expresses more of his true feelings than he had revealed to Demea in the

⁵⁷ cf. reviews by A. S. Gratwick, *CR* n.s. 22 (1972), 29–32 and P. G. McC. Brown, *JRS* 63 (1973), 301 f.

⁵⁸ Steidle (n. 49), 327, Büchner, *Theater des Ter.* 243 n. 25.

⁵⁹ art. cit. (n. 1), 23, cf. Steidle (n. 49), 327 f.

⁶⁰ op. cit. (n. 57), 31 n. 1.

⁶¹ *Expositionstechnik* 23–5.

⁶² op. cit. (n. 2), 1053.

⁶³ art. cit. (n. 41), 314–19.

⁶⁴ Whether 191–6 are Terentian is not crucial to the present argument. Brothers sees the passage as 'almost entirely padding by Terence' and as having 'a Roman solemnity about it'. He notes that it starts from 'Phaedria's humorous literal interpretation of *numquid vis aliud?*' and that this formula is here used abnormally. I see nothing abnormal in the use of the formula; in *Ad.* 432 it is similarly addressed by Syrus, who is about to return to his house, to Demea, who is about to go off to the country. Even if this passage is Terentian in form however, it does not follow that it is not Menandrian in substance. Flury, *Liebe* 63 f. and Steidle (n. 49), 333 f. wisely argue rather for Terentian *Umgestaltung*. 190 *in hoc biduom*, Thais, *vale* seems an inadequate farewell from the emotional Phaedria, and a final injunction to Thais 'Remember to think of me when you are with the soldier' is eminently appropriate.

⁶⁵ art. cit. (n. 49), 334.

⁶⁶ Brothers (n. 41), 316 n. 5 admits this, but suggests that Terence 'has considerably altered the last part of the play'.

⁶⁷ Ludwig (n. 1), 36 f.

preceding scene.⁶⁸ Moreover neither Lefèvre nor Brothers considers the question of where Menander's first act ended, if the stage was not empty at a point corresponding to 206 in Terence's play.⁶⁹ After 206 the stage is not again empty until 390, Parmeno being on stage throughout, and 390 seems too late for the end of Menander's Act I. There is no reason to doubt that Menander's *Eunuchus* had scenes corresponding to 232–390 depicting the arrival of an emissary of the Rival to deliver Pamphila, followed by the arrival of Chaerea in pursuit of the girl, although for the original emissary Terence has substituted the colourful character of Gnatho from Menander's *Colax*.⁷⁰ Holzberg suggests that Terence has bridged an original act-division at 227, but there is nothing positive to be said in favour of this further hypothesis.⁷¹

It is time to look more closely at the objections raised against Terence's second scene. I shall try to show that (i) and (iii) are invalid, that (ii) is valid, but that a more satisfactory explanation can be given of it than has so far been done.

(iii) is easily dealt with. Thais says nothing in 203–6 which is inconsistent with 507 ff. Drexler's⁷² argument that, whereas in 507 ff. Chremes describes a previous meeting with Thais, 203–6 imply that Thais has not yet met Chremes, was amply refuted by Knoche.⁷³ It is true that an earlier meeting is not mentioned in 203–6, but it is not excluded. 203–6 imply that Thais' investigations are far advanced and that she is almost certain that Chremes is Pamphila's brother, although she still lacks final proof; *propemodum iam repperisse* describes this situation perfectly.⁷⁴ How could Thais be so confident if she had not already had an opportunity to question Chremes such as is described in 507 ff.? There was however no dramatic necessity for Thais to mention her previous meeting with Chremes in 203–6, and some reason for her not to anticipate the full account to be given by Chremes.⁷⁵ If there is any slight discrepancy between 203–6 and 507 ff., it consists in Thais' failure to mention her previous meeting with Chremes, rather than in anything which she does say. If not essential, it would perhaps have been better, or more Menandrian, if Thais had said somewhat more about her investigations; an account from her point of view of her meeting with Chremes could have complemented Chremes' account. This suggests, not that Terence has inserted 203–6, as Lefèvre supposes, but that he may have omitted something in Thais' monologue 197–206. To this possibility I shall return.

(i) is a more substantial objection. Lefèvre puts it in its strongest form: 'dass Pamphila aus Athen stammt und somit *civis* ist...dürfen...weder Parmeno noch Phaedria wissen' (*Expositionstechnik* 22). So far as Phaedria is concerned, Lefèvre took up the observation of Knoche⁷⁶ that in 643 ff., after the discovery of Pamphila's rape, Phaedria never mentions her citizenship, which would greatly aggravate the seriousness of the incident. Knoche however rightly argued that this could as well be attributed to Menander as to Terence. In the first place Thais had stressed her lack of certain knowledge. Then Phaedria was sceptical of her story.⁷⁷ In 155–9 he hints that it is a mere pretext: *nempe omnia haec nunc verba huc redeunt denique: ego excludor, ille*

⁶⁸ Büchner, *Theater des Ter.* 241.

⁶⁹ Steidle (n. 49), 334.

⁷⁰ Knoche (n. 38), 176 f., Ludwig (n. 1), 26, Holzberg, *Menander* 158 f.

⁷¹ Holzberg, *Menander* 76, oddly supports it with the argument that Parmeno was called Daos in Menander and that the first acts of *Asp.*, *Dysc.* and *Peric.* end with a monologue of a Daos.

⁷² art. cit. (n. 16), 74.

⁷³ *Nachr. Gött. Ges.* 1938, 35 f., *Hermes* 76 (1941), 253–6, cf. Drexler, *Hermes* 76 (1941), 75 f.

⁷⁴ Even before Sophrona provides proof of her identity, Pamphila is regularly described as Chremes' sister: 617, 621, 745, 766, 806, 891. These references admittedly follow the second meeting of Thais and Chremes at Thraso's house, but that meeting was cut short by Thaso's jealousy (623 ff.) and can hardly have advanced Thais' knowledge much.

⁷⁵ Reitzenstein, *Ter. als Dichter* 16.

⁷⁶ art. cit. (n. 38), 181 n. 2.

⁷⁷ Steidle (n. 49), 329 f.

recipitur (158 f.). Thus Thais comments in 197 *forsan hic mihi parvam habeat fidem*. These factors would prevent Phaedria from paying too much attention to Thais' story. When later he is convinced that the rape has taken place and that Chaerea is responsible, he is sufficiently alarmed (701 *occidi*) and we may well imagine that recollections of what Thais had said are passing through his mind; but there is no implausibility, in a drama at least, in his failing to mention Pamphila's possible citizenship. As Gratwick⁷⁸ puts it, 'Phaedria's alleged ignorance is merely the absence of the irrelevant: the dramatic theme is his acute embarrassment and quick thinking on discovering the truth. He gets himself and Dorus away from Pythias with the minimum fuss and the least said'.

More often the objection has been raised with regard to Parmeno. Thus Gaiser writes (loc. cit. n. 53): 'Wenn Parmeno schon gehört hat, dass Pamphila vermutlich *civis Attica* ist, kann er später schwerlich den Rat geben, sie zu verführen'. Again however Knoche⁷⁹ was surely right to deny that there is any real inconsistency, or at least one which would have worried Menander any more than Terence. Certainly it would have been highly implausible for Parmeno to instigate the rape of a girl he knew to be a citizen, but if we examine the text carefully we can find considerable evidence of an attempt to avoid this implausibility. Already Donatus commented on 110: *bene 'arbitror' et nihil certi: quomodo enim ausurus esset Parmeno adornare Chaeream ad vitiandam virginem, si praescisset civem esse?* Moreover Parmeno has been consistently inclined to disbelieve anything Thais may say; this is a central motif of the second scene, and was foreshadowed in the first. We may note further that only after the exit of Phaedria and Parmeno does Thais in her monologue 197–206 reveal more information for the benefit of the audience. Donatus' note on 197 makes this point: *recte Thais nunc partem argumenti exsequitur tacitam apud Phaedriam propter praesentiam servi, quem poeta vult ita nescire, ut audeat ad vitiandam virginem subornare Chaeream*.⁸⁰ Nor is it true that Parmeno deliberately instigated the rape of Pamphila. Parmeno's suggestion that Chaerea might impersonate the eunuch arose merely as a joking response to Chaerea's exclamation *o fortunatum istum eunuchum quiquidem in hanc detur domum!* (365). When Chaerea takes him seriously, Parmeno is horrified and tries to stop Chaerea: *quid agis? iocabar equidem. perii, quid ego egi miser! quo trudis? perculeris iam tu me. tibi equidem dico, mane* (378 f.). Chaerea of course knows nothing of Pamphila's history and is by nature impulsive; having once determined on the escapade he would hardly have been deterred from it if Parmeno had mentioned the unconfirmed report of Pamphila's citizenship. So Parmeno accepted the inevitable and contented himself with disclaiming all responsibility (388–90). When after the event Pythias asked him whether he knew that Pamphila was a citizen (952), he gave a brief and evasive answer, *nescio*. Donatus' comment is apposite: *perturbatus Parmeno nec negare potuit nec consentire, quare quasi defensionis loco dixit 'nescio'*. It was strictly true that he did not *know* that Pamphila was a citizen, but it was not the whole truth. It must be remembered that the plot of the *Eunuchus* presented the dramatist with a problem in his opening scenes. Thais had to give enough information to persuade Phaedria to accede to her plans, but not so much as to thwart the development of the other strand of the plot, the rape of Pamphila by Chaerea. If this problem seems to have been skilfully solved in Terence's play, we may surely recognize the hand of Menander, the author of the plot.

⁷⁸ op. cit. (n. 57), 30.

⁷⁹ art. cit. (n. 38), 182 n. 2, cf. Steidle (n. 49), 328–31, Gratwick (n. 57), 30.

⁸⁰ Thais also had a psychological reason for not telling Phaedria of the impending visit of Chremes, fear of aggravating Phaedria's jealousy; cf. Reitzenstein, *Ter. als Dichter* 15, Gratwick (n. 57), 31.

(ii) There remains the objection that the end of this scene shows some awkward features. These have often been noted,⁸¹ but their proper appreciation has been hindered by linking them to the invalid objections to the scene which have just been discussed. Gaiser writes, 'am Schluss der Szene 1 2 ist das Weggehen und Wiederkommen von Phaedria und Parmeno... nicht befriedigend motiviert' (loc. cit. n. 53). More particularly the difficulty concerns Phaedria. Terence gives no indication that he enters the house after 196 or why he does so. After his statement in 187 *rus ibo*, if he had set out immediately for the country there would be no need for any further motivation of his exit; but if he goes into his house first, one would expect some explanation of this to be given in the text, as is the case at *Hec.* 610–12. This anomaly would be sufficiently explained if in Menander Phaedria did go straight off to the country at 196.

So far as realism is concerned there was no need for Phaedria to visit his house, as Drexler⁸² observed. One can, of course, suppose that he goes to get ready for his trip, 'um sich reisefertig zu machen' (Büchner, *Theater des Ter.* 241). No preparations would in fact be necessary however for a trip from the town house of the family to its country house. When Knoche⁸³ describes Phaedria as coming from his house at 207 'zur Reise gerüstet – trägt also den Hut', he has failed to consider the distance involved. It is not uncommon in plays of the New Comedy for a wealthy family to possess both a town and a country house,⁸⁴ and the latter is regularly conceived as not far from the town; characters move freely between the two in the course of the play.⁸⁵ For example in the *Mostellaria* Tranio is sent at 929 to fetch Philolaches from the country and in 1075 ff. he can pretend to have been there and back. So in the *Eunuchus* the country house is described as *propinquo* by Phaedria's father in 971; and Phaedria returns at 629 having in his distracted state walked a long way past the house before realizing his mistake (633 f. *praeterii imprudens villam. longe iam abieram quom sensi*). If it is objected that an intended stay of two days would require preparations, one can cite Plaut. *Cist.* 104 ff., where Gymnasium agrees on the spur of the moment to stay in Alcesimarchus' house for a *triduom*; she does not have to go home first to fetch anything. The case of *Hec.* 610 ff. is different in that Sostrata intends to stay in the country for an indefinite period. Menander's audience would have felt no implausibility if Phaedria had immediately set off for the country at 196.

Confirmation that he did so can be found in the motivation of Parmeno's exit in 189. It is essential to the development of the plot that before Phaedria goes to the country he should instruct Parmeno to deliver the eunuch to Thais. In Terence however this order is given twice, in 189 *tu, Parmeno, huc fac illi adducantur*, and again in 207 *fac, ita ut iussi, deducantur isti*. The second order occurs appropriately when Phaedria is taking leave of Parmeno before setting out, but the first is pointless⁸⁶ in its Terentian context when Phaedria is about to go into his house. Those who suppose that in Menander Parmeno was not present in this scene of course suppose that 189 is a Terentian addition. We have seen however that there is no other valid reason for supposing that Parmeno was not present in this scene in Menander. Because 189 is pointless in its Terentian context, it is intrinsically more likely that it is a relic of the

⁸¹ cf. n. 41. See especially H. W. Prescott, *C. Ph.* 37 (1942), 19 n. 53.

⁸² art. cit. (n. 16), 82.

⁸³ art. cit. (n. 38), 171.

⁸⁴ Webster, *Introd. Men.* 26 n. 5. Cf. Plaut. *Merc.* Lysimachus, *Truc.* Strabax.

⁸⁵ We may assume that a country house often supplied the needs of the town house, as happens in Men. *Georg.* 35 ff., or vice versa, as is mentioned in Plaut. *Most.* 62, 68. In the *Adelphi Demea* does not have a town house, but his country house is near the town (as his son complains in 523 ff.) and Demea can come and go between country and town during the play.

⁸⁶ cf. Büchner, *Theater des Ter.* 241 'ohne Funktion'.

Menandrian situation and that 207 is the Terentian addition; 189 would have been entirely appropriate as a prelude to Phaedria's departure for the country at 196. Why should Terence have invented 189? It is not sufficient to argue that Parmeno had to be removed from the stage before Phaedria's private farewells to Thais in 190–6, 'um den Abschied nicht zu stören' (Büchner, *Theater des Ter.* 240). Terence could so easily have devised a more convincing pretext for Phaedria to send Parmeno into the house ahead of him. In fact then the motivation of Parmeno's exit in 189 provides confirmation that he was present in this scene in Menander.

There are other reasons for regarding the little scene between Phaedria and Parmeno in 207–24 as a Terentian addition. Already Donatus (on 207, 216) observed that it repeats what has been said before. It has perhaps not been fully appreciated however how completely this scene consists of the elaboration of ideas which occur earlier in the play. The first section 207–15 not only starts with a repetition of Phaedria's command in 189, but goes on to elaborate it with further commands to Parmeno; 211 contains a pun on *pereo*, 213 *numquid aliud imperas* echoes 191 *numquid vis aliud*, and 214 f. *istum aemulum... ab ea pellito* expresses the same jealousy towards the soldier as does 192 *cum milite istoc praesens absens ut sies*. The second section 215–24 starts with a repetition of Phaedria's words in 187 *rus ibo* and goes on to elaborate his statement of resolve in 187 f.; 223 *tandem non ego illam caream, si sit opus, vel totum triduum?* is an exaggeration of 187 *ibi fac me macerabo biduum*, 224 *stat sententia* is close to 188 *ita facere certumst*, and Parmeno's scepticism concerning Phaedria's powers of endurance is foreshadowed in 50 ff. (cf. 178). The fact that the passage is good comedy is no argument for Menandrian rather than Terentian authorship. The fact that it is a polymetric *canticum* favours Terentian authorship.

A more substantial argument for attributing this scene to Menander was given by Knoche,⁸⁷ who pointed out that it prepares for the early return of Phaedria in 629. More precisely it is the second section, 217 ff., which performs this function. Now Phaedria's character, as depicted in the opening scenes, would sufficiently prepare for his early return, and an explicit explanation is given in his entrance monologue 629 ff. Nevertheless one can concede to Knoche that a reminder of Phaedria's weakness at this point in the play is appropriate and may well have occurred in Menander's *Eunuchus*. The dialogue 207–24 is immediately followed by a monologue of Parmeno, in which he comments on Phaedria's love-sick condition before noticing the approach of Gnatho with Pamphila. If 207–24 is a Terentian insertion, it probably replaced a longer monologue by Parmeno, of which 225 ff. are the truncated remains. This monologue will have contained more reflexions on Phaedria's state of mind, and it is very likely that these included a prediction that Phaedria would not stay in the country for long, which inspired 217 ff. in Terence. Thus in Menander a monologue probably performed the same dramatic functions as Terence's dialogue, on the one hand picking up the themes of the preceding scene, on the other preparing for Phaedria's return.

To sum up the argument so far, it is probable that Menander's *Eunuchus* contained a complex corresponding to 46–206, Phaedria–Parmeno scene, Phaedria–Parmeno–Thais scene, monologue of Thais, and then, after an empty stage, another complex corresponding to 225–390, monologue of Parmeno, Parmeno–Gnatho scene, Parmeno–Chaerea scene. Where did Parmeno go between his exit and his re-entry in Menander? In Terence, on receiving Phaedria's command in 189 to deliver the slaves to Thais, he goes into his house. It is clear that the slaves are already in the house (cf. 231

⁸⁷ art. cit. (n. 38), 172.

meo...hoc eunucho),⁸⁸ and that is what we should expect, since they had been purchased on the previous day (165–9, 357). It is probable that the situation was the same in Menander. Mette⁸⁹ supposes that in Menander Parmeno went 'nach draussen' to fetch the slaves (from the town or the harbour?) but that implies further alterations by Terence and is not supported by anything in the text.

How did Menander motivate Parmeno's second entrance? The motivation of his exit in 189 arouses an expectation that at his next appearance he should be complying with Phaedria's command. Now the plot requires that he must not in fact deliver the eunuch before he meets Chaerea. His next entrance therefore cannot be to deliver the slaves to Thais; a delay is inevitable. The expectations of the audience would however be satisfied so long as Parmeno was seen to be taking some steps towards carrying out his order; and an entrance line for Parmeno which satisfies these requirements can in fact be found in Terence's *Eunuchus*. In 394 f. Parmeno enters unseen during a conversation between Thraso and Gnatho with the words *hoc proviso ut, ubi tempus siet, deducam*. Parmeno's rôle in 394–460 is merely to eavesdrop and comment on the dialogue of the *Colax* characters Thraso and Gnatho and therefore Terence's creation; it is probable that in Menander he did not enter until about 461, when he brings out the Ethiopian girl and Chaerea disguised as the eunuch.⁹⁰ It seems very likely that Terence transferred to 394 a line from Parmeno's earlier entrance monologue, for which he had substituted the dialogue scene 207–24. It would be very appropriate in that context, recalling Phaedria's command in 189 and preparing for Parmeno's reference to the eunuch in 230 f.; and *ubi tempus siet* could well have inspired *mature* in 208. It has generally been assumed that *mature* here means 'soon'; and already the Bembine scholiast glossed it *cito*. 394 suggests however that it has its rarer but older meaning, 'when the time is ripe' (*T.L.L.* s.v.A. 1). This is also preferable dramatically; a delay is necessitated by the plot, and it would be wanton of the dramatist to arouse expectations which cannot be fulfilled.

How much time was supposed to have elapsed between Parmeno's exit and re-entry in Menander? The most we can say is that the pause represented by an act-division would be in no way inappropriate and even desirable. Terence's Parmeno had a reason for coming out soon, to see Phaedria off, but his Menandrian counterpart probably did not; a certain lapse of time before his re-entry would therefore seem more natural. Other considerations also favour the assumption of an act-division in Menander at 206 (= 224), even if final proof is lacking. The appearance of the slave at the beginning of the second act, preparing to execute the order given to him at the end of the first (189), is in accordance with the Menandrian technique of linking acts to which Handley has drawn attention.⁹¹ The next place where an act-division is probable is at 390,⁹² but that seems too late for the end of the first act. That the second act ended at 390 is supported by the fact that the scheme to disguise Chaerea is devised in 369–90; schemes are introduced in the second act of *Aspis* and *Dyscolus* certainly, and probably of *Andria*, *Dis Exapaton* and *Heauton Timorumenos*.⁹³ The two scenes of 46–196, amounting to 151 lines, provide sufficient action for a Menandrian first act. Comparable figures for extant Menandrian first acts are: *Aspis* 197 lines, *Dyscolus* 183 lines,

⁸⁸ cf. also 207 *isti* and n. 41.

⁸⁹ *Lustrum* 10 (1965), 67.

⁹⁰ Knoche (n. 38), 165 f., Drexler (n. 16), 86, Ludwig (n. 1), 31 n. 3.

⁹¹ loc. cit. n. 20.

⁹² A lapse of time is necessary for Gnatho to return to Thraso with Thais' acceptance of his invitation to dinner and for Thraso to come to fetch her (287–391), also for Chaerea to disguise himself (390–472, most of which was added by Terence).

⁹³ Webster, *Introd. Men.* 75 f.

Samia not more than 128 lines. Since the question whether Menander's *Eunuchus* had a prologue has still to be discussed, these figures exclude the divine prologues of the *Aspis* and *Dyscolus*, the long expository monologue of Moschion which opens the *Samia*, usually regarded as a prologue, and, for reasons which will soon become apparent, Thais' monologue 197–206.

It is now time to turn to the prologue question. If, as we have concluded, Menander had a scene corresponding to Terence's second scene, in which Thais gives a full narrative of Pamphila's history, a preceding divine prologue seems out of the question; a repetition of the narrative would be absurd.⁹⁴ A deferred prologue at 206 however is unlikely, since an extra-dramatic divine prologue immediately preceding a choral interlude is hard to accept; the function of choral interludes is to provide a break in the action of the play and after a divine prologue there would be no point in one. Moreover this play would gain nothing from a divine prologue. Thais was from the start in possession of all the relevant facts.⁹⁵ Most of them she reveals either to Phaedria or in her following monologue. If in Terence she leaves some points unclear, that cannot be attributed to her ignorance. She better than anyone could have given a full account of how she had found Chremes and of the information which she had obtained from him. In 522 f. Chremes tells how, amongst other questions about his lost sister, Thais had asked *quid habuisset quom perit; ecquis eam posset noscere*; we can therefore presume that she knew even about the nurse Sostrata who could recognize Pamphila's *signa* (cf. 112). Thais' remaining task was to obtain possession of Pamphila and the *signa*, and with Chremes' help to effect the recognition. The action of the play depicts her efforts, in the face of difficulties, to achieve this; it does not bring any new facts to light. A divine prologue could therefore have given no information which Thais could not. A prologue god could no doubt, as Ludwig suggested,⁹⁶ have expressed his active concern for Thais (hardly for any of the other characters) but there is no cogent reason to suppose that one did. The case of Pan rewarding his worshipper in *Dyscolus* is quite different. The references to the gods by Chaerea in 875 and 1031–3, cited by Ludwig, are commonplace and prove nothing; in Men. *Sam.* 600 Demeas says *θεῖον δ' ἔστ' . . . τὸ γεγενημένον*, but the *Samia* has no divine prologue.⁹⁷ Even if Menander seems to have had a preference for divine prologues, the *Samia* proves that he sometimes dispensed with one. If then in his *Eunuchus* there seems no place for a divine prologue and no positive reason for one, it must be regarded as probable that none existed. It is more likely that, as Gratwick⁹⁸ suggests, Thais' monologue 197–206 has been shortened by Terence and that in Menander Thais gave a fuller account, part of which may perhaps have been transferred by Terence to 507 ff. How much Terence cut we have no means of knowing. There could be no objection to a monologue by a character of the play immediately preceding an act-division; Thais' monologue could have ended with the announcement of the approach of the chorus which seems to have been conventional at the end of the first act.⁹⁹ If one is to call Moschion's monologue at the beginning of the *Samia* a prologue, one could call Thais' monologue a deferred prologue. It must be emphasized however that Moschion's monologue is spoken in character and differs only in its position from other monologues

⁹⁴ Büchner, *Theater des Ter.* 244.

⁹⁵ Gratwick (n. 57), 31 'Thais... is in the unusual position of knowing the whole truth...'.
⁹⁶ *Entretiens Hardt* 16 (1970), 95.

⁹⁷ cf. Steidle (n. 49), 328 n. 90a, who cites *Sam.* 163, and Holzberg, *Menander* 111.

⁹⁸ op. cit. (n. 57), 31. Ludwig (n. 1), 20 n. 1, 28 n. 4, suggested the possibility that Terence cut a reference to the nurse from 1. 2.

⁹⁹ cf. *Asp.*, *Dysc.*, *Epitr.*, *Peric.*, Plaut. *Bacch.* 107, Handley on *Dysc.* 230–2.

in the play, being little longer than Demeas' in Act III. Menandrian monologue-speakers frequently address the audience directly.¹⁰⁰ It seems better to reserve the term 'prologue' for extra-dramatic superhuman speakers; for a long opening monologue by a character of the play such as Moschion's, the term 'quasi-prologue' would perhaps be appropriate. In any case in the *Samia* the exposition is given entirely by characters of the play, partly in monologue and partly in dialogue. The same was probably true of Menander's *Eunuchus*.

To conclude, I have argued that in *Eun.* 207–24 Terence transformed a monologue at the beginning of Menander's Act II into a short dialogue scene, by delaying Phaedria's departure to the country and bringing him back on stage to converse with Parmeno; also that he probably curtailed the exit monologue of Thais at the end of Menander's Act I. The changes thus posited fit admirably into the pattern of Terentian changes with which I started. In particular we may note that they enabled Terence to avoid two monologues separated by an empty stage.

Eunuchus 905–42

This passage contains a number of peculiar features, which have given rise to several theories of Terentian alteration.¹⁰¹ In 894 f., after the reconciliation between Thais and Chaerea, Thais invites Chaerea into her house to wait for the arrival of Chremes with the nurse. It was dramatically desirable that Thais and Chaerea should go indoors before the arrival of Chremes, if the recognition was to take place off stage,¹⁰² and Thais' invitation motivates this well. It is in character that Chaerea should accept with alacrity (896 *percupio*)¹⁰³ and Pythias protest (896–904). All this is Menandrian enough. It is not unlikely that in Menander Chaerea also expressed his unwillingness to remain in the street in the eunuch's clothes (cf. 906 f., 840–7).¹⁰⁴ In 905 however Thais announces the approach of Chremes, *adest optume ipse frater*; and this draws an alarmed response from Chaerea, *perii hercle: obsecro abeamus intro, Thais: nolo me in via cum hac veste videat*. The announcement of Chremes' approach is thus the immediate cause of Thais' and Chaerea's withdrawal into the house. This however duplicates the motivation in 894 f. It is awkward moreover that they should beat a hasty retreat *after* the appearance of Chremes and the nurse, on whom both their futures depend. Nor is it clear why Chaerea should be less ashamed of being seen *by Chremes* in the eunuch's clothes in the house than in the street. There are therefore grounds for suspecting that 905 is an addition by Terence, who has brought forward the arrival of Chremes. A dramatic gain from the change would be the momentary comedy of 905–7. Similarly in *H.T.* 375–80 Syrus' announcement of the approach of Bacchis and Antiphila, probably inserted by Terence, leads to a piece of comic dialogue.¹⁰⁵

In the following scene confusion reigns. Pythias speaks a 2½ line monologue, in which she wonders how she can take revenge on Parmeno (910–12a). This is cut short by the entrance line of Chremes urging the nurse Sostrata to hurry (912 f.); without any

¹⁰⁰ D. Bain, *Actors and Audience* (Oxford, 1977), 186 ff.

¹⁰¹ G. Jachmann, *Nachr. Gött. Ges.* 1921, 82–5 = *Ausgewählte Schriften*, ed. Ch. Gnlika (Königstein/Ts., 1981), 145–8, Klotz (n. 50), 26, Holzberg, *Menander* 159 f., Büchner, *Theater des Ter.* 295 f., cf. Ludwig (n. 1), 35 n. 4.

¹⁰² Webster, *Stud. Men.* 74, Ludwig (n. 1), 35 n. 4.

¹⁰³ Büchner, *Theater des Ter.* 292.

¹⁰⁴ Webster, *Stud. Men.* 74 n. 1, W. Görler, *Philologus* 105 (1961), 305.

¹⁰⁵ In *And.* 234 Mysis' announcement of the approach of Pamphilus prepares for her eavesdropping on his monologue and is therefore probably due to Terence.

greeting Pythias starts to question Chremes and is informed that Sostrata has recognized Pamphila's *signa* (914 f.). Then, instead of taking Chremes into the house in accordance with Thais' instruction in 909, Pythias sends him in (917) and stays out herself. She observes the approach of Parmeno (918 f.) and announces that she has thought of a way to punish him (920); but instead of putting this into effect at once, she decides to go indoors first. She gives as the reason for this decision her desire to learn the truth about the recognition of Pamphila (921 *ibo intro de cognitione ut certum sciam*), although she has just learned the essential fact from Chremes in 914 f.

Analysis of the scene may begin with Pythias' announcement of the approach of Parmeno in 918 f. This makes her immediate exit surprising and serves no dramatic purpose except to prompt her further thoughts of revenge on Parmeno in 920–2. Moreover the motivation of her exit in 921 shows the hand of Terence; it hardly makes sense after a meeting with Chremes such as takes place in 912–17. It seems probable that in Menander Pythias left before Parmeno appeared and that Terence inserted 918 f., as he probably inserted Thais' announcement of Chremes' approach in 905. So far I agree with Holzberg,¹⁰⁶ who regards 918–22 as a Terentian insertion. However, although 920–2 are out of place in their Terentian context, they would fit very well after 912a as a continuation of Pythias' monologue. 920 *spero me habere qui hunc meo excruciem modo* would admirably supply the expected answer to the questions of 910–12a *quid, quid venire in mentem nunc possit mihi, quidnam qui referam sacrilego illi gratiam...?* A good parallel can be found in the monologue of the scheming Syrus in *H.T.* 674–7 *quid agam? aut quid comminiscar? ratio de integro ineundast mihi...euge habeo optumam*.¹⁰⁷ Since 920–2 cohere so well with 910–12a, it seems likely that they are Menandrian in substance and have been transferred rather than invented by Terence. If so, we can infer from 921 that in Menander Pythias went into Thais' house before the arrival of Chremes. This is likely on other grounds. We have already seen reason to believe that Terence has brought forward the arrival of Chremes with the insertion of 905. Neither the awkward transition from Pythias' monologue 910–12a to her dialogue with Chremes nor the dialogue itself look Menandrian. It seems likely that in Menander Chremes, accompanied by a mute Sophrona,¹⁰⁸ delivered an *Auftritts-Monolog* and that this was preceded by an exit monologue of Pythias, in which she conceived her plan to punish Parmeno before following Thais and Chaerea into the house.¹⁰⁹ 909 would be a Terentian addition consequent upon the addition of 905; in Terence Thais' order to Pythias to wait for Chremes mitigates the awkwardness of her not waiting herself, but in Menander Pythias could stay behind to deliver her monologue without any special reason. If this hypothesis is correct, Terence has, by delaying Pythias' exit, replaced Chremes' original *Auftritts-Monolog* with a brief dialogue, and he has split, and perhaps shortened, Pythias' exit monologue; without the changes he would have had a sequence of three monologues, Pythias' exit monologue and *Auftritts-Monologe* of Chremes and Parmeno.

Another fragment of the exit monologue of the Menandrian Pythias can perhaps be found. Problems are raised by the first two lines which she utters after her next

¹⁰⁶ Menander 159 f.

¹⁰⁷ cf. *And.* 343 f. *sed ubi quaeram?... habeo, 702–4 consilium quaero... quin iam habeo*, Men. *Asp.* 315b–19a (perhaps spoken entirely by Daos as a reflective monologue, cf. *Bull. Inst. Cl. St.* 20 [1973], 95), Ar. *Thesm.* 765–9, 849 f., *Eccles.* 363–5.

¹⁰⁸ In Terence she speaks one word. *V. supra* p. 429 with n. 14.

¹⁰⁹ Klotz (n. 50), 26, Webster, *Introd. Men.* 141 and Sandbach (n. 3), 201 suggested that in 910–12a Terence has shortened a longer monologue of Pythias. My arguments in support of the Terentian changes posited by Sandbach in *H.T.* 375–80 and *Eun.* 910–12 reinforce his case for the validity of the 3-actor rule in Menander.

entrance, 941 f. *ego pol te pro istis dictis et factis* [*factis et dictis* A], *scelus, ulciscar, ut ne inpune in nos inluseris*.¹¹⁰ These lines must be spoken aside; they preface a faked entrance monologue in 943 f., intended to be heard by Parmeno and forming part of Pythias' scheme to punish him. On the natural interpretation *istis dictis et factis* imply that Pythias has heard at least part of Parmeno's immediately preceding monologue; but it would be abnormal technique for Pythias to enter silently and unnoticed in the middle of Parmeno's monologue. In another context *istis dictis et factis* (or *istis factis et dictis*) could, as Arnott¹¹¹ suggests, refer to Parmeno's earlier activities, but here this interpretation is forced and does not produce a convincing entrance line. Whether we put Pythias' entrance at 941 or earlier, there is some awkwardness. It seems probable that 941 f. is a Terentian addition and that in Menander Pythias, like Daos in *Asp.* 399 f., uttered her faked cries of woe as she came out of the house. Similarly in Plaut., *M.G.* 991 f. an aside before a faked entrance monologue has been shown by Bain¹¹² to be probably a Plautine addition. The motive for the addition in both cases was presumably to prevent any misunderstanding by an unsophisticated Roman audience. Menander's audience would have been adequately prepared by Pythias' preceding exit monologue, as it was for Daos' faked entrance monologue in *Asp.* 399 ff. by the plotting at the end of the preceding act. The fact that 941 f. cohere thematically with 910–12a and 920–2 suggests that Terence transferred these lines (*mutatis mutandis*) from that exit monologue.

Bedford College, London

J. C. B. LOWE

¹¹⁰ Jachmann (n. 101), 83, Arnott, *Rh.M.* 108 (1965), 374–6, Büchner, *Theater des Ter.* 295, Bain, *Actors* 173 f.

¹¹¹ art. cit. (n. 110), 376.

¹¹² *Actors* 171.