

PLAUTINE ELEMENTS IN THE RUNNING-SLAVE ENTRANCE MONOLOGUES?*

Despite a growing body of evidence to the contrary, the running slave ('servus currens'), and particularly the often lengthy entrance monologue of the running slave, is generally considered a distinctly Roman phenomenon, an exuberant growth of the Latin soil, albeit from Greek seed.¹ There are two reasons for this. One reason is the frequency with which the motif appears in the comedies of Plautus and Terence, in sharp contrast with the absence of any single undisputable New Comic example. The second reason is Eduard Fraenkel's *Plautinisches im Plautus* which, sixty-five years after its publication, remains the most authoritative scholarly work in the field of Roman comedy. In this book Fraenkel argues that Plautus' running-slave scenes, particularly the monologues of the *Curculio* (280–98) and the *Captivi* (790–828), are a veritable nexus of original Plautine traits.²

The first reason is totally inconclusive. The lack of direct evidence is offset by a number of passages which appear to give indirect testimony to the existence of a developed tradition of the running slave in Greek comedy.³ Yet even without these passages, there could be nothing to recommend a statistical argument of this type: despite valuable papyrus finds, the extant corpus of New Comedy is still slight and very fragmentary by comparison with the remains of Roman comedy.⁴ Moreover, to date, the majority of New Comic papyrus finds, and all of the extensive gains, are from plays of Menander. Everything we know about Menander leads us to believe that he of all dramatists would be least inclined to overwork this brand of humour.

The second reason for supposing the extended running-slave monologues to be original with Plautus is a variety of small details of style or content which are said to show the marks of Plautus' creativity. Fraenkel relied heavily upon such minutiae in his search for Plautine originality and, despite frequent complaints that Fraenkel

* I would like to thank R. E. Fantham, J. N. Grant and R. M. H. Shepherd for helpful comments on an earlier version of this article, as well as the anonymous *CQ* referee for valuable suggestions for improving the final draft.

¹ This article is a companion to 'Is the Threat-monologue of the "servus currens" an Index of Roman Authorship?', *Phoenix* 41 (1987), 399–419, where an argument is made for the development of the running slave's extended threat-monologue in Greek New Comedy. There I do not deal with the arguments adduced by Fraenkel and others to show original Plautine composition in these monologues; the present article is designed to compensate for this deficiency.

A balanced review of the evidence and the arguments for the Greek origins of the running slave can be found in T. Guardì, 'I precedenti greci della figura del "servus currens" della commedia romana', *Pan* 2 (1974), 5–15. The question of original Roman input does not lie within the scope of Guardì's discussion.

² E. Fraenkel, *Plautinisches im Plautus* (Berlin, 1922), updated in the Italian translation *Elementi plautini in Plauto* (Florence, 1960). References are given to the latter version. See especially pp. 123–7.

³ In addition to the articles cited in note 1, see R. L. Hunter, *The New Comedy of Greece and Rome* (Cambridge, 1985), pp. 164f. n. 35; and K. Gaiser, *Menander's "Hydria"* (*AHAW* Abh. 1, Heidelberg 1977), p. 177 and n. 18 on CGF 244, 348ff., the 'Strobilos Fragment'.

⁴ The statistical argument goes back to Konrad Weissman, who argued that if the running-slave had been as important a figure in Greek as in Roman Comedy, an unimpeachable example would have survived 'in tot comoediarum Graecarum exemplis' (and this at a time when the remains of Greek New Comedy were far fewer): C. Weissmann, *De servi currentis persona apud comicos Romanos* (diss. Giessen, 1911), p. 47.

exaggerated their significance,⁵ the 'Plautine elements' continue to be the foundation of most discussions of Roman contributions to the New Comic tradition. In this paper, I wish to show that the original Plautine traits Fraenkel found in the running-slave monologues are at best dubious and, in any case, do not support the view that these monologues are substantially a Roman invention. In addition to Fraenkel's arguments, I will consider arguments more recently put forward by A. S. Gratwick to demonstrate that the running-slave monologue at *Trinummus* 1008ff. was written by Plautus without the benefit of a Greek model.⁶

The value of matters of form or content in distinguishing Greek from Roman material in New Comedy is severely limited, and seems to diminish with the specificity of the criterion. Arguments which force concentration upon single words or short phrases in a close, line-by-line analysis may at first seem more objective than broader considerations of structural relevance, or necessarily subjective notions about the tastes, interests and inclinations of an author or his culture. Yet, in the final analysis, specific words, single concepts or quirks of style are far less secure indices of the source of a passage's composition. In particular, they fail to account for Plautus' own skill as a translator, the possibility of contamination by other Greek models, or a more erudite kind of Roman artistry which is securely grounded in Greek technique.

The various criteria that have been used as touchstones of Plautine craftsmanship can be organized into four groups: (1) Roman cultural phenomena, (2) Roman concepts, (3) features of Plautus' style, (4) Roman themes. If it can be proved that distinctively Roman institutions or Roman ideas appear in the text of Plautus, then it is certain that Plautus is not literally translating his Greek model. Here is a valid criterion for distinguishing Plautus' contribution to the text – but how important is it? No one really believes that Plautus translated his texts literally, and if it can be shown that he referred to a distinctively Roman concept or institution where his model may have referred to a distinctively Greek one, does this not simply show that Plautus is a good translator? The first two groups of criteria can never show free creation on the part of the Roman poet. Indeed, inferences based on the presence of words designating Roman institutions and ideas are scarcely more useful for this kind of analysis than the nineteenth-century practice of marking the presence of Greek words and ideas as proof of Plautus' adherence to his Greek model.

The third criterion is much more elusive and difficult to assess. In general, however, it is safe to say that recurrent habits of expression for which there are few parallels in the Greek texts merely indicate the likelihood that all the Latin renditions in which these stylistic traits appear were the product of the same Latin poet. Characteristically Plautine habits of expression cannot show that the *basic stuff* was not present in the model. At best it may merely *suggest* that the *stylistic trait* was not found in the original.⁷

⁵ H. W. Prescott's review of Fraenkel's book in *CP* 19 (1924), 90–3 and 'Criteria of Originality in Plautus', *TAPA* 63 (1932), 103–25; H. H. Law, 'Hyperbole in Mythological Comparisons', *AJP* 47 (1926), 361–72; P. W. Harsh, 'Possible Greek Background for "Rex" as Used in Plautus', *CPh* 31 (1936), 62–8; J. J. Tierney, 'Some Attic Elements in Plautus', *PRIA* 40 (1945), 21–58; B. Gentili, *Theatrical Performances in the Ancient World* (Amsterdam, 1979), pp. 15–45 [= *Lo spettacolo nel mondo antico* (Bari, 1976), pp. 3–39]; G. P. Shipp, 'Linguistic Notes', *Antichthon* 11 (1977), 1–9; N. Zagagi, *Tradition and Originality in Plautus (Hypomnemata* 62, Göttingen, 1980), pp. 15–67.

⁶ A. S. Gratwick, 'Curculio's Last Bow: Plautus, *Trinummus* IV.3', *Mnemosyne* 34 (1981), 331–50.

⁷ Good general cautions against the use of stylistic traits as criteria for separating Plautine and Attic elements are given by J.-C. Dumont, 'La stratégie de l'esclave plautinien', *REL* 44 (1966), 182–203, at 186f.

The fourth group of criteria, that which isolates a number of favourite themes in the Plautine corpus, is the most productive of the 'elements', but the hardest to justify. The tendency of those who use this kind of criterion is to suppose that recurrent themes are less likely to be found in the works of several different Greek playwrights than in the works of a single Latin playwright, and indeed so much so that they consider the presence of these thematic developments tantamount to proof of Roman authorship. Yet Greek New Comedy was a genre addicted to conventional scenes and themes like no other. In this genre there is never any need to posit the activity of a single mind in explanation of even the most detailed recurrent patterns. Let us examine how each group of criteria is applied to the running-slave monologues.

1. ROMAN CULTURAL PHENOMENA

Legrand was convinced that 'la kyrielle de titres helléniques' in the *Captivi* and *Curculio* indicated Greek authorship.⁸ Leo supplanted this naive view with an attractive paradox. A Roman dramatist may use Greek words to give colour, in some contexts, a discernibly Roman colour. A good example of this was the Greek litany of Curculio's entrance monologue: the description of the philosophers proved that this was original Plautine composition in Greek dress (288–95):⁹

tum isti Graeci palliati, capite operto qui ambulant,
qui incedunt suffarinati cum libris, cum sportulis,
constant, conferunt sermones inter sese drapetae,
opstant, opsistunt, incedunt cum suis sententiis,
quos semper videas bibentes esse in thermopolio,
ubi quid surrupuere: operto capitulo calidum bibunt,
tristes atque ebrioli incedunt: eos ego si offendero,
ex unoquoque eorum crepitum exciam polentarium.

According to Leo: 'Dies ist ein Bild frisch von der römischen Strasse: die Gelehrten unter den griechischen Freigelassenen, Schulmeister und Winkelphilosophen, die sich nach der mächtigen Barbarenstadt aufgemacht haben... Dabei trägt die Rede eine griechische Kapuze wie jene: "nec strategus nec tyrannus" u.s.w., sie heissen "Ausreisser", mit dem griechischen Worte "drapetae", das sie als Freigelassene oder auch als entlaufene Sklaven bezeichnen soll...'¹⁰

We do not know Greek comedy well enough to decide the authorship of this difficult passage on the strength of a single word. The argument's allure lies in the fact that the word 'drapetae' seems to gain in connotative value when levelled by a Roman against Greeks. Here is a Roman in his most familiar pose, showing contempt for the 'Graeculi'.¹¹ But is the term in fact more piquant when aimed by Romans at

⁸ P. E. Legrand, 'Daos, Tableau de la comédie grecque pendant la période dite nouvelle', *Annales de l'Université de Lyon* N.S. 11, 22 (1910), p. 430 = *The Greek New Comedy* (tr. J. Loeb, London and New York, 1917), p. 342.

⁹ F. Leo, *Geschichte der römischen Literatur* i (Berlin, 1913), pp. 142, 146.

¹⁰ Leo, op. cit., p. 146 (cf. J. L. Ussing *ad loc.*). Since Leo most scholars have considered this passage a Plautine original: Fraenkel 123; E. Fantham, 'The *Curculio* of Plautus: An Illustration of Plautine Methods of Adaptation', *CQ* 15 (1965), 84–100, at 88f.; F. Bertini, *Curculio* (Rocce San Casciano, 1969), p. 90; G. Monaco, *Curculio* (Palermo, 1969), p. 170; B. Gentili, op. cit., pp. 95f. and G. Petrone, *Teatro antico e inganno: finzioni plautine* (Palermo, 1983), p. 171; with some caution, L. Deschamps, 'Epidaure ou Rome', *Platon* 32–33 (1980–1), 168 n. 116; H. D. Jocelyn, 'Anti-Greek Elements in Plautus' *Menaechmi*?', *PLLS* 4 (1983), 1–25, at 2.

¹¹ Jocelyn, art. cit., demonstrates how unreliable this criterion is.

Greeks than by Greeks at philosophers? 'Drapetes' is a common term of abuse in Greek for persons displaying evasive and unproductive patterns of behaviour.¹² Moreover, Lucian frequently employs the metaphor of the runaway slave when speaking of philosophers,¹³ particularly those who abandoned other walks of life for a philosophical career.¹⁴ This metaphor is also used of those who abandon philosophy for a less disciplined manner of living: the seminal conceit behind Lucian's dialogue named *Δραπέται*.¹⁵ Helm argued that this dialogue was based on a Menippean satire, itself inspired by comedy.¹⁶ The comic fragments offer no confirmation of this, at most a few intriguing titles: Cratinus' *Drapetides*, Alexis' *Drapetae*, Antiphanes' *Drapetagogos*, Plautus' *Fugitivi*. The few fragments leave it uncertain whether any of these titles indicate philosophers: Antiphanes' play seems to discuss the eating habits of Pythagoreans (Ath. 4.161); someone mentions Chaerephon acting like a parasite in Alexis' *Fugas* (257 K.). However, both of the metaphors used by Lucian (the *δραπέτης* abandoning the workaday world for philosophy, and the *δραπέτης* abandoning the rigour of philosophy) are demonstrably earlier than Lucian himself.¹⁷

Most other details of Curculio's description of the philosophers sooner indicate an acquaintance with Greek literary stereotypes than the kind of critical autopsy which Leo suggests. Idle chatter (290) is a distinguishing characteristic of Greek comic philosophers,¹⁸ as are bibulousness,¹⁹ petty theft (293),²⁰ and the sober and gloomy demeanour (294).²¹ Of the philosopher's equipment, the 'pallium' ('palliati' 288) may designate a philosopher (as opposed to an ordinary citizen) as well as a Greek (as

¹² See Gomme and Sandbach *ad Men. Karchedonios* 33. The word *δραπετεύειν* means 'shirk' in Demosthenes 42.25. This meaning is still prevalent in Modern Greek usage (see e.g. Stamatakis' *Lexicon* s.v. 'δραπέτης τοῦ καθήκοντος'. The *Suda* and *Etymologicum Magnum* attest to this usage in the Byzantine period, when, moreover, the false etymology of the word from *δράω* and *πέτομαι* was popular (*Et.M.*: ὁ ἀπόπτας καὶ ἀποστάς τῆς ὑπερεσίας ἢ ὁ τὸ δρᾶν <ἡρουν τὸ πράττειν> πεττεύων, τούτεστιν ἐκκλίνων. Cf. *Suda*, s.v. *δραπέτης*).

¹³ *Jupp. Trag.* 42 (Zalmoxis); *Peregr.* 21 (Peregrinus), and the passages cited in the following two notes.

¹⁴ *Bis Acc.* 13 (Diogenes), 17 (Polemon), 21 (Dionysius); *Somn.* 12 (Socrates); cf. the pseudophilosophers in *Fug.* 17.

¹⁵ See especially *Fug.* 13, and 27, 32, 33 ('Cantharus', 'Lecythion', 'Myropnous').

¹⁶ R. Helm, *Lucian und Menipp* (Leipzig/Berlin, 1906), pp. 307–21.

¹⁷ To philosophy: Philo, *Spec.* 3.5 (also post-Lucianic, cf. Gregory of Nyssa in Migne, *PG* 46.557.16). From philosophy: Plut. *Mor.* 46e (cf. 47e); or analogues of philosophy: Philo, *Migr.* 209 where the mind runs away from objects of intellection to objects of sense perception (also post-Lucianic: Gregory of Nyssa, *De deitate adversus Euagrion* 335.15f. Jaeger [runaway from faith]; *Hist. Alex. Magni Γ* 2.35A.4 [runaway from ἀρετή]). The use of the term to describe philosophers may have been stimulated by the metaphorical application of the image to elusive abstractions by the philosophers themselves: Pl. *Meno* 97d–e (correct opinion); Baton, 4 *PCG* 2.3f. and 5.14f. (the 'sensible man'); Luc. *Vit. Auct.* 27 (a joke on ἀκαταληψία). E. Fantham, *Comparative Studies in Latin Republican Imagery* (Toronto, 1972), pp. 55f., expresses the opinion that the Roman use of 'runaway' imagery applied to concrete as well as abstract objects had Greek roots.

¹⁸ Ar. *Clouds* 1485, *Frogs* 1492; *PCG* 506.2; Eupolis, *PCG* 386, 387; Alexis fr. 180 K. See R. Helm, 'Lucian und die Philosophenschule', *Neue Jahrb.* 9 (1902), 199.

¹⁹ The archetype for the comic topos of the intemperance and gluttony of philosophers was probably Eupolis' *Kolakes*: Eupolis, *PCG* 157, 158, etc. See also: Baton, *PCG* 3.2; 5.12f.; Helm, loc. cit., 263ff.; Athen. 4.162b.

²⁰ Ar. *Clouds* 179, 497ff., 856ff., 1498, *PCG* 295; Eupolis, *PCG* 162, 395.2; Eubulus, *PCG* 137.3; Ephippus, *PCG* 14.3. Cf. Hegesand. fr. 1.2 (Müller); Luc. *Symp.* 46.

²¹ Amphis fr. 13 K.; Alexis fr. 196/7.6 K. Cf. Luc. *Icarom.* 5, 21, *Pisc.* 37, *Vit. Auct.* 7, *Bis Acc.* 11, *Dial. Mort.* 10.8, *Fug.* 18; D.L. 7.16.

opposed to a Roman), for 'pallia' can refer to either *τρίβων* or *ἱμάτιον*;²² by the same token, the 'crepitum pollentarium' (295) need not indicate a Roman diet ('pultiophagi') as opposed to a Greek diet (so Petrone), or a Greek as opposed to a Roman diet (so Deschamps), but the contrast between the diet of stereotypical philosophers and ordinary Greeks.²³ Even the 'crepitum' is anticipated by the Greek tradition as a likely effect of the philosopher's lupine diet (D.L. 6.94).

More surprising are the baskets (289) and covered heads (288, 293) in Plautus' description. In Greek literature, the philosopher's *πήρα* is so universal as to render the *σπυρίς* an unlikely substitute.²⁴ Yet this is hardly enough to vindicate the theory of original Plautine composition – is it likely that the Greeks in Rome really carried baskets? It is easier to believe that Plautus substituted a kind of luggage used by poor Romans for the *πήρα* which had no direct Roman equivalent.²⁵ Still less likely a slice of the real contemplative life at Rome are the philosophers' covered heads. The detail is not clearly attested as a standard feature of either the Greek or the Roman literary or iconographic tradition: apart from the hooded statue of Empedocles mentioned by Diogenes Laertius (8.72), a description of a typical Academic as wearing a 'pilos' (Antiphanes, fr. 33 K., perhaps a sign of Academic elegance, cf. Ephippus, fr. 14 K.), and an epigram by Hegesander describing philosophers as *εἰματανωπερίβαλλοι*,²⁶ we are told that Diogenes sometimes wore a hood (Plut. *Mor.* 995d; D.L. 6.22, 6.77), a fashion perhaps also implied by Lucian's comparison of Diogenes' *τρίβων* with Heracles' *λεόντης* (*Vit. Auct.* 8, cf. *Fug.* 33). Conversion into a hooded garment is, in any case, a notable convenience of the philosophers' *τρίβων* (cf. Ar. *Pl.* 713f.). Yet these examples are too sparse to indicate any sure connection between Curculio's covered heads and stereotypical philosophical fashion, and Bosscher is perhaps right to see the point of this detail primarily in connection with the runaway metaphor, citing Seneca's reference to a stock scene in mime which introduced the runaway slaves of the Rich Man wearing hoods to escape detection.²⁷ This also is a convention deeply rooted in the Greek literary tradition: the portrait of the deserter and the runaway covering his head for shame and for fear of detection can be found in Plato (*Phaedrus* 237a4: *ἐγκαλυψάμενος ἑρῶ, ἢν' ὅτι τάχιστα διαδράμω τὸν λόγον...*), Aeschines (*In Ctes.* 55 *κἂν μὴ θέλω ἀποκρίνασθαι, ἀλλ' ἐγκαλύπτωμαι καὶ ἀποδιδράσκω...*), Plutarch (*Demetr.* 52.2: *εἴτε τοὺς ἐν τῷ νήφειν ἀναλογισμοὺς τῶν*

²² Varro, *Sat. Men.* 311; Val. Max. 2.6.10; Gell. 9.2.4. The ambiguity of 'palliati' need indicate no more than a felicitous translation on Plautus' part.

²³ Petrone, op. cit. 172, argues on the hypothesis that 'pollenta' = 'puls' = lupine, yet *θέρμος* (= 'lupinus') is the Greek comic philosopher's staple *κατ' ἐξοχήν*: Antiphanes, fr. 226/227 K.; *TrGF* 100 Lycophron F 2.10; Luc. *Pisc.* 44; *Dial. Mort.* 1.1.1, *Merc. Cond.* 24, *Fug.* 20; D.L. 6.86. Deschamps, op. cit. 167, (following E. Fournier, s.v. 'cibaria', *Dar.-Sag.* i.3, p. 1143) equates 'pollenta' with *μάζα*, and argues that as *μάζα* was the 'nourriture habituelle des Athéniens... on a donc ici une plaisanterie toute Romaine sur les coutumes alimentaires d'un peuple étranger'. But *μάζα* is also the food of the stereotypical philosopher in the comic literature: Antiphanes, fr. 226/227 K.; *adesp.* 127 K.; Luc. *Fug.* 14. Whatever the Greek translation of 'pollenta' this word is attached to Greek literary stereotypes: Aus. *Epigr.* 49.1 ('pera, polenta, tribon, baculus, scyphus, arta suppellex ista fuit Cynici').

²⁴ D.L. 6.13 does not seem to indicate the contrary.

²⁵ *πήρα* and books occur together in Luc. *Pisc.* 44; *Vit. Auct.* 9.19.

²⁶ *FHG.* 4.413.3. The adjective is of uncertain meaning: C. B. Gulick translates 'cloaks-over-shoulders-slinging' (*Athenaeus: The Deipnosophists* ii [Cambridge, MA, 1967], p. 237) and LSJ 'one who wraps his cloak about him'.

²⁷ Sen. *Ep.* 114.6; Juv. 13.110. See H. Bosscher, *De Plauti Curculione disputatio* (diss. Leiden, 1903), p. 38.

παρόντων ἀποδιδράσκων καὶ παρακαλυπτόμενος τῇ μέθῃ τὴν διάνοιαν) and occasionally also in Greek historical descriptions.²⁸

There is little in the description of the philosophers which is alien to the Greek literary stereotype, and nothing which better suits a Roman context. Moreover, the presence in Rome of large numbers of Greek philosophers of however dubious qualifications is quite uncertain for any period within Plautus' lifetime. Gruen's demonstration that early second-century Rome witnessed widespread Hellenization among the upper classes²⁹ does not discount Jocelyn's sufficient and perhaps more likely explanation that this Greek learning, at least until Pydna, was acquired mainly through books and foreign travel.³⁰ In any case, we know of no Greek philosopher resident in Rome before the expulsion of the Epicureans, Alcaeus and Philiscus, in 173 B.C. (or 154 B.C.) and the expulsion of some unnamed philosophers in 161 B.C.³¹ Even conceding that the names of a few uncelebrated 'Winkelfilosophen' have escaped the record, no argument can justify Leo's hypothesis of an intellectual ghetto in Plautine Rome. By contrast, philosophers were ubiquitous in late fourth-century and early Hellenistic Athens, particularly in and around the agora;³² an Athenian audience could readily sympathize with the parasite's complaint (even in a play set in Epidaurus).³³

Fraenkel added a new argument to Leo's demonstration that Curculio's Greek vocabulary was Plautine: the officials listed in verses 285–6 ('strategus, tyrannus, agoranomus, demarchus, comarchus') could not co-exist 'in nessun angolo della terra'.³⁴ The assumption that Greek playwrights would feel the constraint of strict

²⁸ Diod. 38/39.19.1.11ff.; Dio Cass. 58.11.2; John Chrysostom, *In Psalmum* 118 (Migne, PG 55.685).

²⁹ E. Gruen, *The Hellenistic World and the Rise of Rome* i (Berkeley, 1984), pp. 250ff.

³⁰ H. D. Jocelyn, 'The Ruling Class of the Roman Republic and Greek Philosophers', *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library* 59. 2 (1977), 323–66, esp. pp. 332, 343, 350.

³¹ Athen. 12.547a; Aelian, *VH* 9.12; Sueton. *Gramm.* 25.1; Gell. 15.11.1.

³² The very convention that the running-slave is obstructed by characters typically found in the agora/forum ought to show the Greek origins of the motif: according to Greek theatre convention, the agora is just off the right wing and beyond it the road to Peiraeus, both the principal sources of news for running slaves: Pollux 4.126f.; *Vita Aristophanis* (Dindorf, *Prolegomena de comoedia* 36); A. E. Haigh, *The Attic Theatre*³ (New York, 1968), p. 194 n. 1. There have been several attempts to prove on the basis of Vitruvius 5.6.8 that forum and harbour were consistently at opposite ends in the Roman theatre and that Roman stage conventions were consistently different from the Greek: e.g. A. Simon, *Comicae Tabellae* (Emsdetten, 1936), p. 143 n. 6.; W. Beare, *The Roman Stage* (London, 1950), pp. 240–7; G. Duckworth, *The Nature of Roman Comedy* (Princeton, 1952), pp. 85–7. In at least one instance the Greek convention is observed on the Roman stage. In *Epidicus*, Epidicus and Thesprio enter from the port, followed by the two young men. They go into the nearest house, which is that of Chaeribulus (67a ff.: 'ille me votuit domum venire, ad Chaeribulum iussit huc in proximum'). When Epidicus exits he sees the old man standing in front of Periphanes' house (186) and runs towards them pretending to come from the forum (208). In this case the same wing must lead from the forum and 'a peregre'.

³³ New Comedy frequently adds conventional material without troubling to adapt it to unconventional settings, e.g. *Cur.* 644ff.: Planesium is abducted at the Dionysia (a variation on the rape-at-festival motif), yet drama at Epidaurus was part of the Asclepieia. Collart's observation (*ad loc.*) that the collapse of the seats in the theatre described by Planesium necessarily describes a Roman theatre is incorrect. The theatre of Dionysus at Athens had wooden tiers of benches until the building of the 'Lycurgan' theatre (at some time around 330 B.C.). Planesium describes events that are presumably about fifteen years old. In any case the lines are acceptable to any Greek audience which knew, as proud Athenians did, that not all Greek theatres had stone seats.

³⁴ Fraenkel, *op. cit.*, p. 123. Hellenistic Greek despots naturally avoided 'tyrannus' as an official title, but men like Demetrius of Phaleron and Lachares were styled 'tyrants' in the

historical and geographical relevance when composing a comic list is highly questionable: the officials are paradigms of the class of powerful men; their juxtaposition is to be understood not literally, but tropologically. Similar comic lists appear in Menander, *Kolax* 90–4:

ὅσοι τύραννοι πάποθ' ὅστις ἡγεμὼν
μέγας, σατράπης, φρούραρχος, οἰκιστὴς τόπου,
στρατηγός – οὐ[...] ἀλλὰ τοὺς τελέως λέγω
ἀπολωλότες – [νῦν τ]οῦτ' ἀνῆρκεν μόνον,
οἱ κόλακες. οὗτοι δ' εἰσὶν αὐτοῖς ἄθλιοι.

and Diphilus, *PCG* 23.1–3:

ὁ γὰρ κόλαξ
καὶ στρατηγὸν καὶ δυνάστην καὶ φίλους καὶ τὰς πόλεις
[Dobree Adv. ii, p. 312: καὶ τύραννον καὶ πόλιν
Kock fr. 24 βασιλέας τε καὶ πόλεις]
ἀνατρέπει λόγῳ κακούργῳ μικρὸν ἡδύνας χρόνον.

(also Alexis fr. 116 K.; Menander fr. 213 K.–T.; Diphilus, *PCG* 23.2). Like Curculio's, these comic lists are a compound synecdoche for 'the rich and powerful', and equally unusable as local directories. The tyrants, generals, satraps and kings, at least, appear together in such lists by rhetorical convention,³⁵ while the 'agoranomus' is added as the immediately relevant authority (cf. Alexis fr. 247 K.: the authority of the 'agoranomus' is compared with that of tyrants).

Fraenkel then fastened upon the butchers in Ergasilus' list (*Capt.* 818). In *Plautinisches im Plautus* he noted in support of his argument for the Plautinity of this passage that the word 'kreopoles' did not appear in any fragment of Greek Comedy nor did any profession in Athens perform a function corresponding to that performed by the Roman 'lanii'.³⁶ In the *Appendix* to the Italian edition of his work he was forced to admit that the functions of the Roman 'lanii' were executed in Athens by 'mageiroi' who had stalls and sold meat in the Athenian market as well as letting themselves out for hire to conduct sacrifices and cook banquets. Fraenkel nevertheless retrenched his position by claiming that the 'mageiroi' only sold piecemeal such scraps as goats' heads and extremities and therefore could not be considered butchers in the same way as 'lanii'.³⁷ Though this admission is enough to invalidate his comment on Curculio's monologue, it is worth noting that his claims are not supported by recent investigation into the function of the 'mageiroi'. The work of Guy Berthiaume clearly demonstrates that whole animals were slaughtered for the purpose of being cut and sold in the Athenian market.³⁸ Moreover, the details of the passage in *Captivi* satisfy the occupational habits of the Greek 'mageiros' very well (818–22):

tum lanii autem, qui concinnant liberis orbas ovis,
qui locant caedundos agnos et dupla agninam danunt,
qui Petroni nomen induunt verveci sectario,
eum ego si in via Petronem publica conspexero,
et Petronem et dominum reddam mortalis miserrumos.

popular vocabulary of the time (H. Berve, *Die Tyrannis bei den Griechen* [Munich, 1967], pp. 386f.). All of these officials are known to contemporary Attica.

³⁵ E.g. Xen. *Vect.* 3.11.4; Isoc. *Antid.* 30.8f., *Philip.* 81.2f.; Pl. *Alc.ii* 142c7f., *Leg.* 908d5f.; Plut. *Arat.* 15.3; Luc. *Necyom.* 14, 17; *Dial. Mort.* 1.1.10f.; *com. adesp.* 145 K.; Walz, *Rhet. Gr.* 4.544.24; 8.37.12ff.

³⁶ Fraenkel, *op. cit.*, pp. 124, 408–13.

³⁷ Fraenkel, *op. cit.*, pp. 411f.

³⁸ G. Berthiaume, *Les Rôles du Mageiros* (*Mnemosyne Suppl.* 70, Montreal, 1982), pp. 62ff.

The passage shows that the 'agni' and 'vervex' have not yet been butchered. The normal terms of a Greek cook's contract were that the cook should provide a live animal for sacrifice, and then cut and prepare the meat on the premises of the hirer. It is extremely doubtful whether Roman 'lanii' had any trade in live animals. According to J. C. B. Lowe: 'there is no evidence that "lanii" ever sacrificed' and the Roman butchers were 'purely secular butchers and meat-sellers with none of the other functions of "mageiroi"'.³⁹

Lowe mentions the possibility that, even though they did not themselves perform sacrifice as did 'mageiroi', 'lanii' may have sold live animals for others to sacrifice. In support of this statement he cites Varro, *RR* 2.5.11, and Plautus, *Ps.* 327f. But neither of these passages seems to support the statement. On the contrary, Varro seems to imply just the opposite (*RR* 2.5.10f.): 'eos cum emimus domitos, stipulamur sic: "illosce boves sanos esse noxisque praestari"; cum emimus indomitos, sic: "illosce iuencos sanos recte deque pecore sano esse noxisque praestari spondesne?" paulo verbosius haec, qui Monili actiones secuntur lanii, qui ad cultrum bovem emunt: qui ad altaria, hostiae sanitatem non solent stipulari.' In this passage Varro is not distinguishing between two alternative functions or attitudes of 'lanii', but between the concerns of those who buy cattle for butchery (i.e. 'lanii') and those who buy cattle for sacrifice (i.e. others). 'Lanii' is not the subject of both relative clauses.

The passage from the *Pseudolus* (which Fraenkel considered Plautine)⁴⁰ clearly shows reference to the trade of the Greek 'mageiros', not the Roman butcher. When Ballio tells Calidorus that his girlfriend is no longer being sold, Calidorus rejoices (prematurely), saying (*Ps.* 326f.):

...Pseudole, i accerse hostias,
victumas, lanios, ut ego huic sacrificem summo Iovi.

By Lowe's own pronouncement Roman butchers did not perform sacrifice. But why would Calidorus ask Pseudolus to fetch butchers along with the victims except to perform sacrifice? It is clear that either Plautus is translating this passage from his source, or he has in mind the functions of the Greek 'mageiros'.⁴¹

There is nothing specifically Roman about *Captivi* 818–22, then, except the translation, nor any reason why the presence of Latin nouns without exact Greek equivalents would indicate a Plautine origin.

Under 'cultural phenomena' we may also consider references to local geography. As may be expected, the Roman playwrights often suppressed obscure references to local Greek geography. On at least one occasion we find Terence diluting a reference to the deme of Halae (Men. fr. 127 K.–Th.) with a banal generality 'in his regionibus' (*Hau.* 63). Plautus sometimes chose the more colourful alternative of replacing Greek with equivalent Roman locations. The 'tour' given by the 'Choragus' in *Curculio* 461–85 is unquestionably a tour of the Roman forum. If Plautus had any Greek model for this scene, it was totally re-worked. Roman topography also appears in *Captivi* 815, where Ergasilus refers to 'subbasilicanos' being driven into the forum by the odour of the fish market. The 'basilica' is also linked with the fish market in *Curculio* 472ff. (cf. Leo, *ad Capt.* 815). It is fairly certain, therefore, that the 'subbasilicani' are Roman, even though no 'basilica' is attested in Rome at this

³⁹ J. C. B. Lowe, 'Cooks in Plautus', *ClAnt* 4 (1985), 78f.

⁴⁰ Fraenkel, *op. cit.*, pp. 109f.

⁴¹ On the related question of meat-eating in Greece, see Tierney, *art. cit.*, pp. 48–51.

date.⁴² Nevertheless, the single reference to Roman geography in the *Captivi* need not show more than the most superficial kind of independence from the Greek source and is hardly a proof that 'tutto il brano è composto tenendo conto della situazione romana' as Fraenkel thought.⁴³

2. ROMAN CONCEPTS

According to Fraenkel the word 'rex' in the *Stichus* to signify a 'powerful person' as opposed to a specific individual has no equivalent in Greek: 'Figure di re appaiono naturalmente nei miti eroici e per conseguenza nella tragedia (Menandro, *Eptir.*), ma in tutti gli altri passi in cui si parla d'un 'basileus' – e ciò avviene spesso – l'allusione si riferisce sempre a un personaggio determinato, per esempio ad uno dei reali despoti dell'Oriente oppure al Gran Re o ai principi di Cipro e, più tardi, ai Diadochi d'Egitto, di Siria ecc.'⁴⁴

'Basileus' does appear without such specific reference in Menander, fr. 549 K.–T. and Philemon, fr. 31 K.,⁴⁵ yet Fraenkel is right to point out how rare this sense of the word is, though the fact in no way supports his argument for Roman originality. An Athenian of the late fourth century would not naturally use the word 'basileus' but rather 'tyrannos' to indicate the generic embodiment of magnificence and power. As Fraenkel himself points out, when unqualified the term would normally be taken to refer to the archon 'basileus' (LSJ II.1), to the Persian king (LSJ III.1), or to Alexander and his successors (LSJ III.2). The word 'tyrannos', on the contrary, is frequently used in Greek drama with reference to a generic retainer of absolute power and not to a specific person. The abstract noun 'tyrannis', not 'basileia', is correspondingly used for absolute power.

Though the word 'tyrannos' was at first interchangeable with 'basileus', by the fifth century B.C. it came to represent more unrestrained and arbitrary power than 'basileus'.⁴⁶ In tragedy the word continued to be used in the neutral sense of 'monarch' perhaps because of the archaic flavour of this usage. Euripides uses 'tyrannos' in this sense three times as often as 'basileus' and 'tyrannis' almost four times as often as 'basileia'.⁴⁷ But because of the contemporary connotation of 'unrestrained absolute power' the words 'tyrannos' and 'tyrannis' more readily represented power in the abstract (e.g. *E. Or.* 1155–6; *Her.* 642–6). Comedy regularly uses the words 'tyrannos' and 'tyrannis' to refer to 'absolute power' as it had little use for the archaizing neutral sense of 'monarch' and 'monarchy',⁴⁸ e.g. Aristophanes, *Knights* 1115; *Pseudepicharmea* CGF 91a; Alexis fr. 247 K.; Menander, *Kolax* 90 (cited above); Philemon fr. 31 K.

⁴² For the question of the origin of the basilica see F. Sear, *Roman Architecture* (Ithaca, NY, 1983), pp. 22f. No building of the basilica type is known in Athens before Hadrianic times (see *Hesp.* 42 [1973], pp. 136ff.). It is theoretically possible, but very unlikely, that the Greek models referred to Aetolian and Epidaurian topography.

⁴³ Fraenkel, *op. cit.*, p. 125.

⁴⁴ Fraenkel, *op. cit.*, p. 179.

⁴⁵ Perhaps also Aristophanes, *Plutus* 170; see K. Holzinger, 'Kritisch-exegetischer Kommentar zu Aristophanes' *Plutos*', *SBWien* 218 (1940), *ad loc.*

⁴⁶ Cf. Berve, *op. cit.*, pp. 3ff.

⁴⁷ These statistics are based upon the entries in Allen and Italie's *Concordance to Euripides* (London/Berkeley, 1954).

⁴⁸ Note, however, that in *Wasps* 464–549 'tyrannis' and 'basileia' are both used to designate 'absolute power', the choice of word depending on whether the attitude is positive or negative (464, 488, 489, 495, 498, 546, 548; cf. 502, 507).

In contrast to the preference of 'tyrannos' to 'basileus' in Euripides, the word 'tyrannus' rarely occurs in early Latin drama. Ribbeck notes three uses in Latin tragedy (Accius 217, 270; Pacuvius 149) as opposed to 21 uses of 'rex'. In Plautus 'tyrannus' occurs twice (*Cur.* 285, *Ps.* 703) and not at all in Terence or the comic fragments. 'Rex', however, appears no less than 52 times in Plautus, 6 times in Terence, and twice in the fragments of Roman 'palliata'.⁴⁹ These statistics would seem to indicate that the Greek word 'tyrannos' must normally have been translated into Latin as 'rex'. We might have guessed this on the general grounds that no better Latin word existed for the translation (the word 'tyrannus' was still perceived as foreign), or from such evidence as Pacuvius' *Hermiona* v.177 (Ribb.):

O flexanima atque omnium regina rerum oratio!

probably a translation of Euripides' *Hecuba* 816:⁵⁰

πειθὼ δὲ τὴν τύραννον ἀνθρώποις μόνην.

or the evidence of Donatus' comment on Terence's *Adelphoe* 175 ('regnumne Aeschine hic tu possides?'), 'bene hic, id est Athenis, ubi gravius crimen est dominari velle', which makes it clear that 'tyrannis' stood in the Greek original.⁵¹

Fraenkel's theory that the frequent references in Plautus to the concept of kingship as the abstract embodiment of power are Plautine additions whose general function is to glorify the slave is not supported by the fact that no parallels exist for the use of 'basileus' in Greek for an abstract, non-specific reference to a powerful person. The word 'rex' must certainly have been used as a regular translation of Greek 'tyrannos', which is used in Greek tragedy, Old and New Comedy in the same way as Plautus used 'rex'.⁵²

In Latin, a parasite may refer to his patron as his 'rex'. The Greek equivalent, 'trephon' is a considerably less colourful term. In Ergasilus' monologue (*Capt.* 825) the term appears in opposition to 'parasitus':

non ego nunc parasitus sum sed regum rex regalior

The phrase employs 'rex' in two senses, as patron of the parasite and as an embodiment of power and wealth. Fraenkel refers to this special Latin sense of 'rex' as a mark of the monologue's Plautinity.⁵³ Even if Fraenkel is right that the double sense of 'rex' cannot be found in 'basileus',⁵⁴ Ergasilus' words need show nothing more than a felicitous translation.⁵⁵ But even this is questionable. The following line (826)

tantus ventri commeatus meo adest in portu cibus

⁴⁹ Based on G. Lodge, *Lexicon Plautinum* (Leipzig, 1924) and P. McGlynn, *Lexicon Terentianum* (London/Glasgow, 1963).

⁵⁰ As Fraenkel observes, *op. cit.*, p. 187.

⁵¹ Cf. K. Dziatzko and R. Kauer, *Ausgewählte Komödien des P. Terentius Afer* ii (Amsterdam, 1964), *ad loc.*, who compare also *Ter. Ph.* 405.

⁵² Harsh, *op. cit.*, p. 66, deserves credit for first arguing that 'rex' translated more Greek words than 'basileus' alone. By arguing that 'rex' covers for 'tyrannos' I do not mean to exclude 'satrapes' and other terms signifying 'powerful personage'. Harsh (*op. cit.*, pp. 65f.) collects examples of τυραννικός as parallels for the adjective 'basilicus', which Fraenkel considered especially Plautine (*op. cit.*, pp. 183ff.), but Harsh did not find a comic parallel for the adverb 'basilice', which is present in Aristophanes, *Wasps* 507 (τυραννικά).

⁵³ Fraenkel, *op. cit.*, pp. 125, 182.

⁵⁴ Shipp, *art. cit.*, 7-9, argues that βασιλεύς does in fact signify a parasite's patron in Hellenistic Greek.

⁵⁵ Cf. Prescott, *art. cit.* (1932), 124 n. 21. Harsh, *op. cit.*, p. 63, suggests that the same pun may be implicit in *Luc. Paras.* 23.

suggests that a double meaning in Greek was lost in the translation, for a shipload of food is not an attribute normally associated with the concept of a king, but it does help to make one a 'trephon', i.e. a 'nourisher' or 'provisioner' (cf. LSJ s.v. *τρέφω* III.2).

3. STYLISTIC TRAITS

In addition to these Roman cultural phenomena, Fraenkel identified these passages as Plautine invention because of the recurrence of a number of stylistic quirks. Hyperbolic mythological comparison can no longer be considered a touchstone of Plautinity. The work of Prescott, Law, Tierney and, above all, Zagagi have refuted Fraenkel's claim that nothing similar existed in Attic comedy.⁵⁶ There is, therefore, no longer any compulsion to believe that passages such as *Stichus* 274f. and 305 are Plautine additions.

The identification of the parasite as a king (*Capt.* 825) is said to be characteristically Plautine.⁵⁷ The basis of this claim is again the frequency with which this form of expression is found in Plautus and its relative scarcity in Attic comedy. The various types of expression studied by Fraenkel have been shown to be not nearly as rare in Attic comedy as he supposed.⁵⁸ Since Fraenkel, identifications and transformations have not received the attention paid to hyperbolic mythological comparisons, yet the Greek examples are sufficiently numerous to caution against using this criterion as a mark of Plautine creativity.

4. THEMES

(a) 'Cataloghi di costumi'

According to Fraenkel, Plautus shows a marked predilection for certain themes in adding to and altering the text of his Greek models. One of these is introduced under the highly elusive rubric of 'cataloghi di costumi': 'Questi brani, collegati in maniera debolissima col vero e proprio argomento delle rispettive scene, contengono invettive contro le condizioni generali della vita pubblica e sociale; le invettive sono rese più vivaci dall'inserzione di elenchi d'uomini e di oggetti.'⁵⁹

The utility of this criterion of Plautine authorship is severely compromised by the admission that 'cose del genere si trovano nella Commedia greca di tutte le epoche'. Nevertheless, Fraenkel argues that the running-parasite monologues in *Curculio* II.3 and *Captivi* IV.2, though probably based on Plautus' respective Greek models, have been so thoroughly reworked as not to leave the slightest trace of the original. It is a matter of some importance, therefore, to review Fraenkel's reasons for identifying these monologues as 'Plautine'.

Fraenkel argues the Plautinity of the monologue of the *Curculio* by referring to (1) Leo's point about 'drapetae', (2) the fact that the officials identified in verses 285–6 could not co-exist 'in nessun angolo della terra' and (3) its resemblance to Ergasilus' monologue in *Captivi* IV.2. The first two arguments have already been questioned.

⁵⁶ Zagagi, op. cit., pp. 15–67; Tierney, op. cit., pp. 21ff.; Prescott, art. cit. (1932), 104–7 and *CP* 19 (1924), 91f.; Law, op. cit., pp. 361ff.

⁵⁷ Fraenkel, op. cit., pp. 64, 125.

⁵⁸ Prescott, art. cit. (1932), 107–13; cf. I. Lana, *RFIC* 90 (1962), 70.

⁵⁹ Fraenkel, op. cit., pp. 123ff.

As to the third, unless the passage in the *Captivi* can be shown to be Plautine, the fact that both passages involve stock motifs in a stock scene is enough to explain their similarity.⁶⁰

Fraenkel argues for the Plautinity of the monologue in the *Captivi* by referring to (1) the 'lanii', (2) references to Roman topography, (3) the identification at line 796, (4) the identification at line 825, (5) the opposition 'parasitus'/'rex' in 825, and (6) references to the aedileship in 823 and again, disguised in Greek dress ('agoranomus'), in line 824. We have already examined and found inconclusive all but the last of these arguments.

Fraenkel may be right in thinking there is some Plautine addition here. The best reasons for this view, in my opinion, are simple matters of taste and economy: Hegio makes an unusual number of asides during Ergasilus' monologue, including some lengthy two-line asides at lines 805f., 811f. and 823f.; moreover, 823 duplicates 811, while 812 duplicates 805–6. This would suggest that Plautus has increased the number of asides. However, the use of asides to enliven entrance monologues is a favourite Greek technique,⁶¹ and arguments which distinguish Greek from Roman on the basis of taste are notoriously misleading.

Fraenkel, however, chooses to argue from the reference to 'agoranomus' (823f.):

eugepae! edictiones aedilicias hiquidem habet,
mirumque adeost ni hunc fecere sibi Aetoli agoranomum.

According to Fraenkel, Plautus is using Greek terms, but thinking like a Roman: the 'agoranomus' is a poorly disguised 'aedilis'. To support this view Fraenkel refers to the authority of Mommsen (who gives no argument), the duties of the 'aedilis' to keep dangerous wandering animals off the streets (not relevant here!) and the duty to prevent the sale of sick beasts (no mention of sick beasts in the monologue!), and, finally, to the difficulty involved in the concept 'Aetoli agoranomum': 'l'istituzione dell'agoranomo è presentata come una misura decisa "dagli Ètoli", cosa davvero strana se si riflette che ben difficilmente sarà stato il κοινόν ad occuparsi di quest'autorità di polizia cittadina.'⁶²

The last point is somewhat obscurely made. Epigraphic evidence attests the existence of 'agoranomi' in Aetolia in the third century B.C. (and presumably earlier).⁶³ Fraenkel's point, however, appears to be that the error of attributing the appointment of 'agoranomi' to the federal government (as opposed to local governments)⁶⁴ is the result of the barbarian poet's assimilation of the magistracy to the aedileship. But the phrase 'Aetoli agoranomus' has no constitutional reference. The setting of the *Captivi* is no more specific than 'in Aetolia'. 'Aetoli' therefore, and not the specifically designated citizenry of a member state, would make the appointment. If there was a more specific setting in the Greek text (e.g. in Pleuron), Plautus would have changed it to avoid confusing his Roman audience with unfamiliar geographical details (as does Terence, *Hau.* 68).

Fraenkel caps his argument by claiming that the entire reference is the product of

⁶⁰ See Tierney's remarks, op. cit., pp. 32–4. Tierney refers to the use of generic motifs with the anachronistic term 'plagiarism'. Note that Tierney (pp. 34–41) demonstrates that the other passages identified by Fraenkel as Plautine 'cataloghi di costumi' are solidly planted in the Greek tradition.

⁶¹ F. Leo, *Der Monolog in Drama* (Abh. Gött. 10, Berlin, 1908), p. 89; D. Bain, *Actors and Audience* (Oxford, 1977), pp. 90f., 100ff., 105ff.

⁶² Fraenkel, op. cit., p. 126.

⁶³ *SIG*³, 546, 30ff. = *IG* ix.1.188.

⁶⁴ Each member of the league kept its local officials, see M. Dubois, *Les Ligues Étolienne et Achéenne* (Paris, 1885), p. 210.

a Roman not a Greek mentality: 'Ma la certezza che *Capt.* 824 è una trovata di Plauto non deriva solo dalla formulazione particolare, bensì anche dall'idea che la ispira. Il concetto che certe azioni riguardanti la collettività (come nel nostro caso gli immaginari editti di polizia) possono in realtà essere intraprese solo da chi possiede la necessaria competenza in virtù della magistratura di cui è investito: questo concetto il pubblico di Plauto l'aveva nel sangue. In un poeta attico, il parassita o lo schiavo potrebbero senz'altro arringare il popolo per la strada e arrogarsi una qualche fantastica ed illimitata autorità.'⁶⁵ If this is true, the Plautine expansion need only extend as far as the 'edictiones aedilicias hicquidem habet' in line 823, which recycles line 811, 'basilicas edictiones atque imperiosas habet', and may serve to interpret the reference to 'agoranomoi' in the original for the Roman audience. The implication in Plautus' model may be that Ergasilus acts like an 'agoranomos', not because he harangues the populace and arrogates authority, but because he complains about the prices and quality of the merchandise and threatens the merchants with immediate corporal punishment. Athenian 'agoranomoi' carried whips and were empowered to mete out corporal punishment on the spot.⁶⁶ It is doubtful whether Roman 'aediles' could act with this kind of authority.⁶⁷

There is, therefore, no reason to believe that the running-parasite monologues which served as Plautus' models differed from the respective adaptations of the scene in the *Curculio* or *Captivi* in any significant way. The 'cataloghi di costumi' is nothing other than the standard development of the running slave's threat monologue. The same is true of the threat monologue in the *Stichus* (274ff.), which Fraenkel identifies as Plautine on the basis of the similarity to its counterparts in the *Curculio* and *Captivi*, though adding only one new point to the argument.⁶⁸ The expression 'pedes hortare' (*St.* 280) is marked as Plautine, because related to a theme Plautus develops in the *Pseudolus* (1246–51) and perhaps also because it is a personification of a part of the body.⁶⁹ But this expression may be nothing more than a fairly literal rendering of the poetic expression ὀρμᾶν πόδα.⁷⁰

(b) *The ring motif*

Using persuasive structural arguments Fraenkel showed that Plautus assembled Stasimus' running-slave monologue in the *Trinummus* from two sources: from an

⁶⁵ Fraenkel, op. cit., pp. 126f.

⁶⁶ Aristophanes, *Ach.* 723f., 968, with scholia *ad loc.*; Pollux 10.177.

⁶⁷ The question of the limits of the aedile's power of 'coercitio' is complicated by the fact that the *lex Porcia de tergo civium* falls within Plautus' productive period. Cato the Elder's law (of 198 or 195 B.C.) forbade the whipping of Roman citizens as a form of 'coercitio'. An exception to this was apparently the power granted the aediles to whip actors; see T. Mommsen, *Römische Strafrecht* (Leipzig, 1899), p. 47. But even before the *lex Porcia* the power of 'coercitio' had probably been gradually limited (Mommsen, loc. cit.). *Trinummus* 990 ('vapulabis meo arbitratu novorumque aedilium') may, however, be evidence for flogging by aediles before the *lex Porcia*, because it is difficult to see what jurisdiction an Athenian 'agoranomos' may have had in this case: 'Charmides' lives beyond the 'horoi' of the agora and though it is possible to summon a wrongdoer to the 'agoranomoi' (cf. Aristophanes, *Wasps* 1407) the particular kind of fraud here in question does not seem to lie within the jurisdiction of the 'agoranomoi'. A. W. Lintott, *Violence in Republican Rome* (Oxford, 1968), p. 94, believes that the *Trinummus* passage may reflect the vulnerability of actors to aedilician flogging.

⁶⁸ Fraenkel, op. cit., pp. 181f.

⁶⁹ Cf. Fraenkel, op. cit., p. 101. See the examples of Greek personifications of parts of the body and the further discussion below.

⁷⁰ Cf. Aristophanes, *Frogs* 478. The expression is borrowed from the language of tragedy, cf. P. Rau, *Paratragedia* (Zetemata 45, Munich, 1967), p. 117 and finds its counterpart in the expression στῆσαι πόδα (E. *Ba.* 647; *POxy* 2746.1).

unknown Greek comedy Plautus grafted the first section (1008–27) onto his principal model, Philemon's *Thesauros*.⁷¹ There is no occasion for a running entrance at this point in Philemon's plot. The reason the slave gives for his haste (that he will get a thrashing for his long absence) is not consistent with Philemon's characterization of slave and master,⁷² but has logical connections with the remainder of the first (contaminating) segment of the monologue. In this instance it is clear that Plautus expanded by adding a running-slave monologue to the monologue already in the *Thesauros*, but Plautus made his contribution by mixing Greek models, Fraenkel argued, not by tapping his own creative resource.

Gratwick argued that Plautus himself had created *Trinummus*' running-slave monologue (1008–27).⁷³ Fraenkel never gave explicit reasons for hypothesizing a Greek model rather than Plautine creation for this passage; perhaps we can find two which are implicit: first, that this part of the monologue, 'tratteggiando con estrema grazia un frammento della vita ateniese di tutti i giorni', is simply too good for Plautus;⁷⁴ secondly, that the passage has too little to do with the *Trinummus*' narrative for anyone, even Plautus, to have written it for that play. On the contrary, it appears to intimate a totally different narrative plan. In effect, the passage is at once deemed too graceful and too awkward to be original with Plautus, a judgement which seems to require a degree of nicety difficult to reconcile with such necessarily subjective considerations as taste and relevance. Yet, for reasons already given, such broad considerations are rarely turned by criteria like the 'Plautine elements', for though at first blush they seem tangible and 'quantifiable', upon inspection they often appear more ambivalent and arbitrary than the most authoritarian verdicts of the connoisseur's palate.

The point may be illustrated by Gratwick's arguments for Plautine invention in the *Trinummus* monologue. Gratwick argues from (1) the similarity of this scene to *Curculio* 280–364: both are running-slave monologues, both share the motif of the stolen ring;⁷⁵ and (2) a proposed emendation in the text of the monologue which, if accepted, would make a specific and unmistakable reference to the *Curculio*.

The parasite *Curculio* reports that he stole the signet ring of a soldier who had a contract on the girl with whom the parasite's master is in love (*Cur.* 346ff.). The stolen ring provides a means of tricking the pimp into surrendering the girl to the soldier's agent, who is to be identified by the ring. In *Trinummus*, Stasimus also mentions that he has lost his ring. Moreover, he believes that he lost it while drinking with his umbrageous companions: similarly, in the *Curculio*, the parasite stole the ring of the soldier while the latter was in a drunken slumber.

It is very remarkable, as Gratwick states, that 'the *Curculio* is the only play of Plautus, indeed of the surviving Greco-Roman theatre, in which there occurs the motif of a ring stolen during a drinking-session, other than the *Trinummus*.'⁷⁶ Remarkable, but not significant. One would have expected to find many examples of this motif. The plot of several now lost plays must have revolved around the imminent transfer of the young man's girl to a soldier or his attendant by a pimp, as it does in the *Curculio*, *Pseudolus*, and probably Menander's *Kolax*. One of the ways in which

⁷¹ Fraenkel, op. cit., pp. 146–50, 416–21.

⁷² Gratwick, op. cit., p. 334.

⁷³ Gratwick, op. cit., pp. 331–42. Cf. R. Hunter, 'Philemon, Plautus and the *Trinummus*', *MH* 37 (1980), 227f., who argues for Plautine expansion in the second section of Stasimus' monologue.

⁷⁴ So Gratwick restates Fraenkel's argument: Gratwick, op. cit., p. 335; Fraenkel, op. cit., p. 149.

⁷⁵ Gratwick, op. cit., pp. 335ff.

⁷⁶ Gratwick, op. cit., pp. 335f.

both the pimp and the soldier can be tricked out of the girl is for someone to impersonate the soldier or his envoy. In the *Pseudolus* the slave manages to acquire a letter of identification by deceit, in the *Curculio* the impersonation succeeds by means of a stolen ring. Stealing rings from the fingers of drunken men was also an important stock element of Greek recognition plays since Euripides' *Auge*.⁷⁷ There is no reason to suppose that the 'ring motif' was used only once in New Comedy, indeed a passage in Menander's *Epitrepontes* (499–507) attests the popularity of just the kind of scenario we find in the *Curculio* and *Trinummus*. Habrotonon is careful not to jump to any hasty conclusions in associating Charisios, whose ring was lost at the scene of a rape, with the paternity of the foundling to whom the ring was attached. The conclusion seems obvious, but Habrotonon knows of one other possibility: someone could have lost the ring at a drinking party, either using it as a pledge while gambling (as does Curculio's host at *Cur.* 356), or giving it up as a surety in making a deal; many such things happen at drinking parties (506f.):

ἔτερα μυρία
ἐν τοῖς πότοις τοιαῦτα γίνεσθαι φιλεῖ.

This is one of Menander's ironic references to the highly patterned world of New Comedy (not real life). In the *Epitrepontes* the same sophisticated literary logic pervades most of the calculations of the slaves who contribute to the dramatic solution (cf. 321–43, 450–6, 473–6, 495f., 538–40). In sum, the comparative material strongly supports Fraenkel's case and points to a source for the 'ring motif' in the plot structure of the Greek play from which Plautus lifted the contaminating entrance monologue.

Yet the bulwark of Gratwick's argument is not the motif, but an emendation which removes a perceived difficulty in the transmitted text (*Trin.* 1013–16):

St.... ecce hominem te, Stasime, nihili! satin in thermopolio
condalium es oblitus, postquam thermopotasti gutturem?
recipe te et recurre petere <re> recenti. Ch. huic, quisquis est,
gurgulios exercitor: is hunc hominem cursuram docet.

Gratwick argues that 'gurgulio', 'windpipe' cannot have the metonymous meaning 'appetite' in Latin.⁷⁸ Instead Gratwick would like to read 'Curculios' at line 1016, thus Stasimus would say:

huic, quisquis est,
Curculios exercitor: is hunc hominem cursuram docet.

If this emendation could be supported, it would indeed bolster the argument for the Plautine invention of this running-slave scene. Unfortunately, the same objectionable word 'gurgulio' can be used to argue for the Greek origin of the present passage. Gratwick shows that 'windpipe = appetite = thirst' is without parallel in Latin; this

⁷⁷ Other plays with rings from drunken men: Ter. *Ad.* 347 (see Gratwick, op. cit., p. 336 n. 3); Men. *Epir.* 471ff.; possibly, Men. *Daktylios* (see T. B. L. Webster, *Introduction to Menander* [Manchester, 1974] pp. 127–9); in *Hecyra* 821ff. the convention is reversed, the drunken youth steals the ring from the girl he rapes. See, further, Fraenkel, op. cit., p. 150 n. 1; Gratwick (loc. cit.) fails to discount the possibility that this ring could have been a recognition token in its original context. For the *Auge*: C. Pilling, *Quomodo Telephi fabulam et scriptores et artifices veteres tractaverint* (diss. Halle, 1886), pp. 28–31; L. Koenen, 'Eine Hypothese zur Auge des Euripides und tegeatische Plynterien' *ZPE* 4 (1969), 7–18, at 10, ad ll. 7–8. A silver bowl recently discovered in Rogozen, Bulgaria, shows a naked and bedraggled Auge (inscribed) clasping the hand of Herakles, who barely sits upright in a drunken stupor. The bowl perhaps depicts the theft of the ring after the rape.

⁷⁸ Gratwick, op. cit., p. 340.

could indicate the Greek origins of the image, for in Greek *λάρυγξ* ('windpipe') is very commonly used as a synonym for *φάρυγξ* ('throat') when the word is used figuratively of the throat as the seat of gluttony.⁷⁹ This free substitution of 'windpipe' for 'throat' occurs nowhere in Latin literature outside of Stasimus' monologue: here Charmides' 'gurgulio' (1016, = *λάρυγξ*) is clearly intended to pick up on Stasimus' use of the word 'guttur' (1014, = *φάρυγξ*) after the Greek fashion.⁸⁰ Such personification of parts of the body is at least as common in Greek as in Roman comedy,⁸¹ while the personification of recognized seats of appetite is extremely common throughout Greek literature.⁸² In particular, *λάρυγξ* and *φάρυγξ* are both personified in the sense of 'glutton' in extant comedy.⁸³ Moreover, to say 'Curculio [or rather 'A weevil'] is this man's trainer: he teaches him how to run' would not make a great deal of sense to anyone who was not looking for an internal allusion to the *Curculio*. A further point in favour of the traditional reading: 'gurgulio est exercitor: is hunc hominem cursuram docet' is one of the riddling identifications for which Fraenkel finds so many parallels in Plautus,⁸⁴ though, here, as elsewhere, the Plautine form does not guarantee a totally original Plautine content.

In summary we may say that the evidence for original Plautine composition in the running-slave monologues does not indicate changes or additions which affect the basic structure of the monologues as a whole. Judging from Stasimus' monologue in *Trinummus* and Hegio's asides in the monologue of the *Captivi*, these monologues were probably fertile ground for Plautine expansion. Nevertheless, there is no reason to think that Plautus ever transcended Greek precedent in expanding this material. Expansion was either the result of contamination or, in some cases perhaps, a freer composition based on a close knowledge of the Greek stock.

University of Toronto

ERIC CSAPO

⁷⁹ Aristophanes, *Frogs* 571, 575; Pherek. fr. 32.3 K., fr. 108.7 K.; Crobylus, *PCG* 8; Eubulus, *PCG* 137.2; E. *Cyc.* 215; Aristotle *EN* 1118a33; see Gow *ad* Machon. 88 and Headlam *ad* Herod. 6.16.

⁸⁰ Cf. especially Ar. *Frogs* 571, 575.

⁸¹ E.g. Aristophanes, *Clouds* 193, *Peace* 325, *Frogs* 415, *Plutus* 275. Cf. Fraenkel, *op. cit.*, p. 101.

⁸² E.g. Hom. *Od.* 6.133; Ar. *Lys.* 928; Xen. *Mem.* 1.6.8, 2.1.2.

⁸³ Ar. *Frogs* 571, Eubulus, *PCG* 137.2.

⁸⁴ Fraenkel, *op. cit.*, p. 36.