

TERENCE, *ADELPHOE*: PROBLEMS OF DRAMATIC SPACE AND TIME*

INTRODUCTION

So far as we can judge from his one completely preserved play and extensive fragments of others, Menander carefully worked out the movements of his characters on and off stage, so as to give an appearance of realism,¹ within certain conventions, and avoid inconsistencies that might distract the audience.² Menander's observed practice confirms the famous anecdote, according to which he regarded the construction of a plot as of primary importance, adding the lines as secondary.³ Thus a character who returns to the stage after an earlier exit always re-enters through the same stage door or wing by which he made his exit; if, for example, he makes his exit in the direction of the market-place, he will be seen by the audience to return from there. Although the ancient evidence is confused, it seems clear, at least, that convention allowed the Athenian audience to regard one wing as leading to the market-place, the other to the country.⁴ Similarly, dramatic time is carefully articulated by means of the conventional choral interludes which divide a play into five acts. Some acceleration of dramatic time is possible within an act, but major lapses of dramatic time take place between acts; if a character makes an off-stage trip of some length, for example to the market-place, his exit and re-entry are separated by a choral interlude.⁵ Within the act a strict unity of time is maintained and dramatic time (*gespielte Zeit*) does not greatly exceed performance time (*Spielezeit*).

In so far as a Latin adaptation by Terence faithfully follows a Menandrian model, we must expect the same principles to apply. We know, however, that Terence is not always faithful to his Greek model. His plays were performed under very different conditions from Menander's, and Roman scenic conventions certainly differed in some respects from Greek. For the most part Plautus and Terence follow the convention that a re-entrant should be seen to come from the place to which he made his last exit, but there are a number of exceptions. Sometimes Plautus explains an apparent discrepancy with an explicit statement that a character has gone or will go by a back way.⁶ These cases confirm that his audience would expect a character normally to

* This article has benefited from Peter Brown's helpful criticism, for which I express my thanks.

¹ Arist. *Poet.* 1451b13: τὰ εἰκότα.

² E. W. Handley, *Entretiens Hardt* 16 (1970), 9f.

³ Plut. *Mor.* 347E; cf. E. Lefèvre in G. A. Seck (ed.), *Das griechische Drama* (Darmstadt, 1979), pp. 339f.

⁴ W. Beare, *CQ* 32 (1938), 204–10 = *The Roman Stage*³ (London, 1963), pp. 248–55; A. W. Pickard-Cambridge, *The Theatre of Dionysus in Athens* (Oxford, 1946), pp. 234–7; N. C. Hourmouziades, *Production and Imagination in Euripides* (Athens, 1965), pp. 128–36; N. J. Lowe, *BICS* 34 (1987), 126–34; K. Frost, *Exits and Entrances in Menander* (Oxford, 1988), p. 103, n. 5.

⁵ *Hermes* 111 (1983), 442–4 with references; T. B. L. Webster, *An Introduction to Menander* (Manchester, 1974 = *Introduction*), pp. 72f.; N. Holzberg, *Menander: Untersuchungen zur dramatischen Technik* (Nürnberg, 1974), pp. 118f.; A. Primmer, *Handlungsgliederung in Nea und Palliata: Dis Exapaton und Bacchides* (öst. Ak. Wiss., phil.-hist. Kl., Sitzungsab. 441, Vienna, 1984), pp. 11f. The fact that the choral interludes between acts can cover the passage of an unspecified amount of time allows Menander sometimes to blur the chronological implications of off-stage action; cf. W. G. Arnott, *Menander, Plautus, Terence* (Oxford, 1975), p. 21.

⁶ M. Johnston, *Exits and Entrances in Roman Comedy* (New York, 1933), pp. 34f., 137–41;

return by the same way as he left. There are also discrepancies, however, for which Plautus gives no explanation; in at least one case the discrepancy demonstrably results from changes by Plautus to his Greek model, and other cases can plausibly be thus accounted for.⁷ We can readily believe that Roman audiences would not be at all demanding with regard to consistency of off-stage action. Where Terence made changes to the structure of his Greek model, this was likely to affect the entrances and exits of characters, together with the implied off-stage action; and in a number of places it is probable that such changes have resulted in discrepancies or at least in some obscurity with regard to the off-stage action.

Three times in the *Phormio* a character must be assumed to visit a house on stage by a back way, in each case probably because of a change by Terence to his Greek model. In *Pho.* 829 Phormio describes how he has visited Dorio's house, given him money and taken away Phaedria's *amica*. Although Dorio's house is on stage (cf. 484), the action Phormio describes has not been seen by the audience, and we have to suppose that Phormio visited the house by a back way, although the text does not make this explicit. The most likely explanation of this irregularity is that Terence moved Dorio's house on stage; if it was off stage in the town, as probably in the Greek original, there would be no problem.⁸ The same Terentian change will account for an irregularity at 310. In accordance with Demipho's instruction to him to fetch Antipho, Phaedria presumably makes his exit in the direction of the forum. In fact he goes to visit his *amica* in Dorio's house, and he next appears from there at 484; again there is no explicit statement that he will go by a back way, but his intended destination is made clear by Geta's aside comment *nempe ad Pamphilam* and probably also by a gesture accompanying *illuc* (unseen by Demipho).⁹ The third irregularity is that Demipho's exit at 314 is into his house but his next entry at 348 from the forum. Lefèvre has convincingly shown that this results from Terence's introduction of the *advocati* and Demipho's trip to the forum to fetch them.¹⁰ In 311 Demipho states clearly his intended movements, *domum devortar: inde ibo ad forum*, implying, but not explicitly stating, that he will go by a back way. The inexplicit indications of the characters' movements in these cases are in keeping with the fact that Terence in general gives fewer stage-directional indications than Plautus. Sometimes his script leaves it unclear when or in which direction characters enter or leave the stage, leaving room for disagreement among editors; and he has been accused of 'failure to visualize the stage business as successfully as Plautus

Beare, *Roman Stage* (n. 4), pp. 258–62; G. E. Duckworth, *The Nature of Roman Comedy* (Princeton, 1952 = *NRC*), p. 119, n. 43.

⁷ Cf. Duckworth, *NRC* (n. 6), pp. 119f. In the *Bacchides* Nicobulus leaves for the forum at 348 but at 530 is unaccountably at home (cf. 507), an inconsistency which is now explained by Plautus' omission of two scenes from his Menandrian model; cf. E. W. Handley, *Menander and Plautus. A Study in Comparison* (London, 1968), p. 20, n. 11. At *Asin.* 248 Argyrippus leaves for the forum, but at 591 he comes out of Cleareta's house; cf. *CQ* 42 (1992), 163–5. At *Stich.* 146 Antipho goes to consult his friends, presumably in the forum, but his next entry at 505 is from the harbour; cf. T. B. L. Webster, *Studies in Menander* (Manchester, 1950 = *Studies*), pp. 144f., *Introduction* (n. 5), pp. 112f. At *Curc.* 524 Curculio presumably goes with Planesium towards the harbour, but at 599 Planesium comes out of Phaedromus' house; cf. G. Burckhardt, *Die Akteinteilung in der neuen griechischen und in der römischen Komödie* (Diss. Basel, 1927), p. 28, n. 4. See also Johnston, *Exits* (n. 6), pp. 70, 91, 98 on *Amph.* 1009, *M.G.* 1281, *Truc.* 669.

⁸ A. Frickenhaus, *Die altgriechische Bühne* (Strasbourg, 1917), pp. 26f.; cf. *Hermes* 111 (1983), 450.

⁹ Some editors less probably suppose that Phaedria straightaway slips into Dorio's house, in sight of the audience but unseen by Demipho.

¹⁰ E. Lefèvre, *Der Phormio des Terenz und der Epidikazomenos des Apollodor von Karystos* (Zetemata 74, Munich, 1978), pp. 15–20; cf. J. Barsby, *C&M* 43 (1992), 141–5.

had done'.¹¹ The passages cited above, however, suggest that Terence knew very well what he was doing, as one would expect from a generally fastidious writer; and after all, the actors would have to be told when and where to make their entrances and exits. Rather Terence deliberately avoided the more obviously theatrical formulae used by Plautus; in being less explicit he is more naturalistic.

An audience will be less critical about off-stage action than about what it sees on stage, and even Menander leaves some things unexplained, for example the reasons for Callippides' late arrival in the *Dyskolos*. In Terence the off-stage action seems rather more often to be cloaked in some obscurity, especially and not surprisingly when he is known or suspected to have altered his model. The movements of Simo early in the *Andria* may be cited as an example. He enters from the forum at 28 with Sosia and slaves carrying provisions, which are taken into his house. At 205 he returns to the forum, where he meets Pamphilus and informs him that he is to be married the same day (252–4). The armchair critic notices, though an audience in the theatre would not, least of all a Roman one, that it is left unclear why two trips to the forum were necessary and why Simo did not approach Pamphilus on his first trip.¹² There is a lack of logic in Simo's movements for which a simple explanation lies ready to hand. Donatus informs us that Terence added Sosia to the opening scene of his play, and that in the corresponding scene of Menander's *Andria* the old man was alone. Now Sosia is a freedman cook, and the entrance of a party bringing provisions from the market is connected with his profession. Probably Menander's Simo made his first entrance from his house on the way to the market-place.¹³ Vagueness over the off-stage action has also been noted in connection with other characters attested as Terentian introductions, Charinus and Byrria in the *Andria*, Thraso, Gnatho, and Antipho in the *Eunuchus*,¹⁴ and characters probably introduced by Terence into extra scenes, Antipho in the central section of the *Phormio*, Parmeno in the finale of the *Hecyra*.¹⁵ It should be emphasized that to recognize loose ends left by Terence's changes is not to condemn them; it is necessary also to recognize the positive dramatic gains which Terence achieved in return.

With regard to dramatic time, it is clear that Roman conventions differed from Greek. The chorus which divided Menander's plays into five acts was dropped by writers of *palliatæ*.¹⁶ In Terence's *Andria*, for example, the stage is not empty four times, and at 235/6 it seems possible to see how Terence has bridged a Menandrian act-division by keeping Mysis on stage,¹⁷ with the result that a drastic acceleration of dramatic time is required between 205 and 236 for Simo to go to the forum and meet Pamphilus and for Pamphilus to come from there.

All these factors must be borne in mind if we try to trace the off-stage movements of the characters in the *Adelphoe*. Always we have to deal with two layers of authorship. For the most part we are likely to be observing the mechanics of the plot worked out in detail by Menander and preserved by Terence. The evidence for off-stage action, however, can only be found in Terence's Latin text, and we have to allow for the possibility that Terence has obscured what was clearer in Menander's *Adelphoi* B', or

¹¹ Duckworth, *NRC* (n. 6), pp. 120f.; cf. *Hermes* 111 (1983), 433.

¹² K. Büchner, *Das Theater des Terenz* (Heidelberg, 1974), p. 66, drawing different conclusions.

¹³ H. Drexler, *Hermes* 73 (1938), 40f.

¹⁴ H. R. Clifford, *CJ* 26 (1930–1), 609–12; Büchner, *Theater* (n. 12), p. 271.

¹⁵ Büchner, *Theater* (n. 12), pp. 164, 347f., 454f.

¹⁶ R. L. Hunter, *The New Comedy of Greece and Rome* (Cambridge, 1985), pp. 35–40.

¹⁷ B. Denzler, *Der Monolog bei Terenz* (Zurich, 1968), pp. 45–51.

even altered the original action.¹⁸ In this play Terence has on his own admission (6–11) introduced a scene from another Greek play, the *Synapothneskontes* of Diphilus; how far that has affected the original action of Menander's play is a matter for discussion. Terence has also left very unclear the antecedents of the plot. It is beyond doubt that he has omitted information that Menander must have given, and it is in my view probable that he omitted a divine prologue which in the Greek play followed the opening scenes.¹⁹ These changes are relevant to the following examination of the movements of certain characters in the first part of Terence's play.

DEMEA'S MOVEMENTS

Scholars are divided on whether Demea's first entry at 80 is from the country²⁰ or from the market-place.²¹ They are apparently agreed that his exit at 140 is to the market-place and that he returns from there at 355. I wish to argue that a different sequence of movements better fits such indications as Terence has provided, namely entry at 80 from the market-place, exit to the country at 140, entry from the country at 355. From Terence's (and probably Menander's) opening scene the audience knows that Demea lives in the country (45) and that the action of the play opens in the early morning (26f.); precisely how early is naturally not indicated. We have to assume, then, that Demea has come to town early on the same morning; it is only a short trip since he lives close to the town, as is later emphasized (523–5). As Dziatzko–Kauer noted, Micio's words of greeting, *salvom te advenire, Demea, gaudemus*, constitute a formula regularly addressed to someone coming from the country or abroad.²² This does not, however, exclude the possibility that Demea left home at first light, which would be in character (cf. 841), came to town before the beginning of the play, and has already visited the market-place when he enters at 80. Indeed, as Dziatzko–Kauer also observed,²³ this interpretation is strongly supported by Demea's account in 91–3 of how he learnt about the abduction, *clamant omnes indignissumel factum esse. hoc advenienti quot mihi, Micio, dixere! in orest omni populo*. The alternative interpretation, that he 'heard the news on the way [from the country]',²⁴ is not impossible but is at least not the one most naturally suggested by *in orest omni populo*.

There is nothing in the text to indicate where Demea is going when he makes his exit at 140. Now if he entered from the market-place at 80, any business there having presumably been completed, it would be perfectly natural for him to continue on his way home at 140 without any explicit motivation for his exit. When, however, Martin

¹⁸ On the title of Menander's play, see Webster, *Studies* (n. 7), p. 86.

¹⁹ Cf. A. S. Gratwick, *Terence. The Brothers* (Warminster, 1987), pp. 34–40. I think it possible, but less likely, that in Menander the missing exposition was given in a deferred 'quasi-prologue' (cf. *CQ* 33 [1983], 441f. on *Eun.* 197–206) by Syrus returning home from a mission to Ctesipho; cf. M. Damen, *JCS* 12 (1987), 74–7.

²⁰ K. Dziatzko, *Ausgewählte Komödien des P. Terentius Afer*, vol. II: *Adelphoe* (Leipzig, 1881), p. 13; L. Havet, *Cinquantenaire de l'École Pratique des Hautes Études* (Bibl. de l'École des Hautes Études, Sciences hist. et philol., 230, Paris, 1921), p. 6; Johnston, *Exits* (n. 6), p. 54; Webster, *Introduction* (n. 5), p. 114; Gratwick, *Brothers* (n. 19), p. 83.

²¹ K. Dziatzko and R. Kauer, *Ausgewählte Komödien des P. Terentius Afer*, vol. II: *Adelphoe* (Leipzig, 1903), p. 19; R. H. Martin, *Terence, Adelphoe* (Cambridge, 1976), p. 113; B. Radice, *Terence, The Comedies* (Harmondsworth, 1976), p. 342.

²² Dziatzko–Kauer (n. 21), p. 38; cf. *Eun.* 234, *Hec.* 456f.; K. Dziatzko and E. Hauler, *Ausgewählte Komödien des P. Terentius Afer*, vol. I: *Phormio* (Leipzig, 1913), on *Pho.* 255.

²³ Dziatzko–Kauer (n. 21), p. 19 with n. 1.

²⁴ Webster, *Studies* (n. 7), p. 89.

(on 140), following Dziatzko–Kauer, states that ‘he departs for the forum to complete the business that he had interrupted’, that is pure speculation without any foundation either in the text or in logic; it is clearly an explanation designed to justify the preconceived view of these scholars that Demea enters from the forum at 80 and returns to it at 140. If it were certain that Demea’s exit at 140 was to the market-place, this would be an argument for supposing his entry at 80 to be from the country. But what is the basis of the generally held view that he heads for the market-place at 140? ‘To hear more bad news (355)’, says Gratwick (on 141–54;), voicing what seems to be a general assumption that it must have been in the market-place that Demea heard the rumour of Ctesipho’s involvement in the abduction. There are other possibilities, however, and Demea’s plain *audivi* in 355 gives much less ground for supposing him to refer to gossip in the market-place than his words in 93, *in orest omni populo*. In fact, examination of 355ff. will reveal several reasons for supposing that Demea there enters from the country; and we shall see that there is no difficulty in explaining how he can have heard the rumour there.

On his entry at 355 Demea at once makes clear his reason for coming. He has heard a rumour that Ctesipho *una fuisse in raptione cum Aeschino*. Now it is clearly implied by the story of the abduction reported by Demea in 84ff., by Ctesipho’s words in 263, *maledicta, famam, meum laborem et peccatum in se transtulit*, and by Aeschinus’ own words in 628, *egomet rapui ipse*, that Ctesipho was at least not present at the abduction, even if privy to it. Either, then, the rumour was false or *una fuisse* has to be interpreted as meaning involvement rather than physical presence.²⁵ In any case Demea is extremely shocked at the idea that Ctesipho should have been in any way involved; he blames Aeschinus for corrupting his brother and regards this as an aggravation of Aeschinus’ guilt. In consequence he has come looking for Ctesipho but does not know where to begin. 359f., *ubi ego illum quaeram? credo abductum in ganeuml aliquo*. This suggests that he has just come from the country to the town, rather than that he has come from the market-place to the vicinity of Micio’s house; for low eating houses would presumably be located around the market-place.²⁶ Confirmation is found in what he says at the end of this scene. Having been told (falsely) by Syrus that Ctesipho has gone back to the country (401f.), he announces his intention of following him there (433); and in a monologue after Syrus’ exit he adds 435f., *ego vero hinc abeo, quando is quam ob rem huc veneram! rus abiit*. In the context *hinc* and *huc* are naturally interpreted as ‘from/to the town’ in contrast to *rus*; and this implies that Demea had come to town to look for Ctesipho. A further corroborative argument presents itself if we consider the staging of Demea’s meeting with Syrus in 361ff. If Demea is coming from the country, it is perfectly natural that he should at 361 catch sight of Syrus coming towards him from the market-place. If, on the other hand, he enters from the market-place, we can only suppose, with Ashmore, that he is heading for Micio’s house ‘to find the young man—or at least to learn where he keeps himself’;²⁷ but it is then much less natural that he should catch sight of Syrus *following* him from the market-place. Finally, although this is a weak argument, if Demea has

²⁵ Cf. Men. Asp. 393: *μετὰ τούτων*.

²⁶ In Cas. 241–5 Lysidamus, who has clearly entered from the direction of the forum, claims to have been helping a friend buy perfumes but is suspected by his wife of having been drinking in *lustra*. At Trin. 1008 Stasimus enters from the forum (727), where he has been drinking in a *thermopolium* (1013f.); cf. Johnston, *Exits* (n. 6), p. 123. Such establishments should be distinguished from inns for travellers near a city gate; cf. Pseud. 658, Men. 436, Johnston, *Exits* (n. 6), pp. 47, 135.

²⁷ S. C. Ashmore, *The Comedies of Terence*² (New York, 1910), p. 277.

been in town all morning, it is improbable that he has not met Micio, Aeschinus, or Syrus, who have all been in the market-place (154, 277, 286, 364ff.). As to the rumour of Ctesipho's involvement in the abduction, Demea can easily have heard it from one of his slaves at home; there was no need for the dramatist to make that explicit. If Demea, on returning to his farm, unexpectedly found that Ctesipho was not there, he would naturally make enquiries, would learn from his slaves that Ctesipho had gone to town and would hear enough of the truth to make him hasten back to town in search of his son; that is the dramatic function of the rumour. This leads us, however, to an examination of Ctesipho's movements.

CTESIPHO'S MOVEMENTS

Ctesipho's first entrance is at 254. Nothing in the text indicates whether he comes from the country or the forum; it is clear that he does not come from either of the houses on stage.²⁸ Some scholars have opted for the country, others for the forum. The decision is connected with how one reconstructs the 'prehistory' of the play, about which Terence has given us woefully inadequate information. Moreover it is highly probable that Terence has made significant changes in 254–87, the scenes depicting the entry of Ctesipho and his subsequent meeting with Aeschinus; these may, but need not, have affected the movements of Ctesipho.

What can we infer from Terence's text? From Demea's rhetorical question in 94f., *non fratrem videt! rei dare operam, ruri esse parcum ac sobrium?*, we know that Ctesipho lives in the country with his father. Moreover, as Drexler well argued, these words imply that Ctesipho was at least believed by Demea to be at that moment at home and, in default of any indication to the contrary, raise an expectation that he will enter from the country.²⁹ Again 524–31, in which Ctesipho emphasizes how difficult it is for him to escape Demea's watchful eye and in particular to stay in town overnight (531), are against supposing that he spent the preceding night away from home; Demea would hardly be expected to express himself as predicted in 527, *rogabit me ubi fuerim: 'ego hodie toto non vidi die'*, if he knew that Ctesipho had also been out during the previous night. The possible objection raised by Drexler, that if Demea knew Ctesipho to have been safely at home during the previous night, he could not take seriously the rumour that he was present at the abduction (355), is not cogent. Assuming that *una fuisse* does denote physical presence, there is no need to suppose that Demea believed the rumour;³⁰ if he discovered Ctesipho unexpectedly not at work on the farm, he would still wish to find him and investigate whether anything lay behind the rumour.

Is there anything in what Ctesipho himself says at his first entrance to contradict this? In his entrance monologue he expresses in extravagant terms his gratitude to his brother for sacrificing his own reputation on his behalf (262f.); and when Aeschinus comes out of his house, Ctesipho briefly expresses this gratitude to his face. Aeschinus in turn disclaims any special merit and reproves Ctesipho for not revealing his predicament until it was almost too late to help him (271–5). It is clear from this that Ctesipho at least knows about Aeschinus' plan to abduct the girl from the *leno*, although, as we have seen, he was not present at the actual abduction. Not so clear is

²⁸ E. Fantham, *Philologus* 112 (1968), 205.

²⁹ H. Drexler, *Die Komposition von Terenz' Adelphen und Plautus' Rudens* (*Philologus* suppl. 26.2, Leipzig, 1934), pp. 16–22; so Johnston, *Exits* (n. 6), p. 55.

³⁰ O. Rieth, *Die Kunst Menanders in den 'Adelphen' des Terenz, mit einem Nachwort herausgegeben von K. Gaiser* (Hildesheim, 1964), p. 39.

whether Ctesipho is already aware of the successful outcome of the abduction. The extravagance of his gratitude perhaps suggests that he is, but does not prove it.³¹ Aeschinus' reassuring words in 267, on the other hand, in *tutost omnis res: omittit vero tristitiam tuam*, suggest the opposite, but are again inconclusive. What seems decisive in favour of supposing that Terence regarded Ctesipho as fully informed is the way Syrus comments on his approach in 252f., *laetus est de amica*. If Ctesipho does already know of the successful outcome of the abduction, how does he know about an event which has very recently taken place and at which he was not present?

Various answers have been proposed, none entirely satisfactory. Martin (on II.3), following Dziatzko-Kauer (on 252), infers 'Since he has heard the news that Aeschinus has carried off his *amica*, it can be assumed that he enters from the entrance that leads to the forum, since it is in that direction that Sannio's house lies.'³² These scholars suppose that in the early morning, after Demea left home but before the play begins, Ctesipho came to town to the house of the *leno* and there learnt of the abduction, a not impossible hypothesis but without any positive support in the text. Gratwick even supposes that in Menander Ctesipho spent the preceding night at Micio's, with Demea's knowledge and approval, and was himself present at the abduction;³³ but this is a very improbable hypothesis, which involves supposing that a whole series of contrary indications in the Latin text are all due to Terence, and which is not supported by 355f. (discussed above), or by Syrus' (false) claim in 402 to have seen Ctesipho off to the country, since this is equally consistent with his having come to town at 254. Gaiser supposes that in Menander the *leno*'s house was situated on the road leading to the country, so that Ctesipho could learn of the success of the abduction on his way into town;³⁴ but it is intrinsically much more likely that a *leno*'s house, if not on stage, should be envisaged as somewhere in the town centre,³⁵ and this fits better with Geta's movements (see below). Several scholars, on the other hand, suppose that in Menander Syrus was sent by Aeschinus to inform Ctesipho and that Terence cut a scene depicting Syrus' return;³⁶ but it is difficult to fit in such a trip by Syrus *after* the abduction and it is clear from his dialogue with Sannio in 209ff. that Syrus was not present at the abduction.

There are strong grounds, however, as we shall see, for attributing to Terence rather than Menander Syrus' announcement of the approach of Ctesipho in 252f., *sed Ctesiphonem video: laetus est / de amica*. If this sentence is removed, nothing in the text forces us to suppose that Ctesipho has yet heard of the success of the abduction. Ctesipho's expressions of gratitude for Aeschinus' efforts on his behalf are not inconsistent with this, and Aeschinus' words in 267, in *tutost omni' res: omittit vero tristitiam tuam*, can then be taken as conveying the good news to his brother. It seems likely that this was the situation in Menander; and there is then no reason why the Menandrian Ctesipho should not have entered from the country.³⁷ If that is the case, it

³¹ Fantham (n. 28), p. 208, n. 1.

³² Cf. Ashmore, *Comedies* (n. 27) on 254: 'Ctesipho enters from the right'.

³³ Gratwick, *Brothers* (n. 19), p. 38. Havet (n. 20), p. 5 had already argued unconvincingly that Ctesipho was in town the preceding night for a religious festival.

³⁴ Rieth, *Die Kunst Menanders* (n. 30), p. 140, n. 7.

³⁵ In the *Phormio* Dorio's house is on stage, but in the Greek original it was probably off stage in the direction of the market-place; see above n. 8.

³⁶ Drexler, *Komposition* (n. 29), pp. 34f.; Webster, *Studies* (n. 7), pp. 88f., *Introduction* (n. 5), p. 114; Rieth, *Die Kunst Menanders* (n. 30), p. 49, n. 80; Gaiser in Rieth, *ibid.*, pp. 139f. with n. 7; *ANRW* 1.2 (1972), 1055; cf. n. 19 above.

³⁷ It might be objected that on my hypothesis he should then have met Demea on his way

seems probable that Terence simply preserved Ctesipho's entry from the country; he could be sure that his audience would not be troubled by any curiosity concerning Ctesipho's off-stage movements or question how he could have learnt of the success of the abduction.

SANNIO'S MOVEMENTS AND TERENCE'S CHANGES IN 155–287

In the Latin play Sannio enters at 155, in pursuit of Aeschinus³⁸ and clearly coming from his house off stage from which Aeschinus has forcibly abducted the *psaltria*. In Menander the timing and manner of his entry is open to question, as we shall see, but he must have come from his house and probably therefore from the direction of the market-place. There is a problem over Terence's staging, since Sannio enters with Aeschinus but Aeschinus must not meet Micio, who has just left for the forum at 154 in search of him. In the Greek play a deferred prologue probably here prevented a meeting, and the Terentian staging problem is one of the strongest arguments for such a prologue. How did Terence manage the staging? No certain answer is possible. Gratwick supposes that the whole party enters from the country-entrance;³⁹ but there are a number of similar difficulties of staging in Plautus, and it seems more likely that the Roman audience simply accepted that the entering and departing characters did not meet, perhaps aided by a brief musical interlude from the *tibicen*.⁴⁰

Sannio makes his exit at 280 towards the market-place to receive payment for the *psaltria* (277; cf. 404–7). There can be no doubt that the Menandrian *leno*'s exit was in the direction of the market-place, since this is required by the plot; but the timing and manner of his exit, as of his entrance, require discussion.

Sannio's presence on stage falls into three sections: (i) protesting in vain, he follows Aeschinus and Parmeno as they bring home the *psaltria* (155–96a); (ii) after a monologue in which he reflects on his problems, he engages in a dialogue with Syrus (196b–253); (iii) he is a passive observer during Ctesipho's monologue and following dialogue with Aeschinus, after which he leaves for the forum with Aeschinus (254–80). There can be no reasonable doubt that (ii) as a whole derives from Menander, subject to some uncertainty concerning the beginning and end of the section; this is now generally accepted and does not need to be argued.⁴¹ It is obvious, on the other

home, but the off-stage movements of Sostratos, his mother, and Getas in the *Dyskolos* provide a Menandrian example of characters failing to meet off stage; cf. N. J. Lowe (n. 4), p. 134: '... their paths fail to cross twice, on Sostratus' way home and on his way back. (Menander is wisely not too explicit on the routes here, nor on the precise nature of the day's movements for Callippides.)'

³⁸ The suggestion of V. J. Rosivach, *CQ* 23 (1973), 85–7, that Sannio enters first, pursued by Parmeno, and that Aeschinus addresses 156b–7 to Sannio, not the *psaltria*, is unconvincing and hardly compatible with 168–74, in which Aeschinus encourages Parmeno to hit Sannio. The difficulties Rosivach finds in 155–8 are partly explained by the transfer of the Diphilean scene to a different context, partly non-existent; 158 *ego* adds emphasis to the threat, 'Oh yes I will' (cf. McGlynn's *Lexicon Terentianum* s.v. III [5]). More attractive is the suggestion of B. Schneider, *RhM* 127 (1984), 135–40, and G. Maurach, *WJA* (1985), 86, n. 5, that Aeschinus addresses 156b to Sannio but in 157 turns to the girl, although one might have expected some indication in the text of a change of addressee.

³⁹ Gratwick, *Brothers* (n. 19), pp. 91, 237.

⁴⁰ *Amph.* 550, *Asin.* 248, *Capt.* 460, *Cas.* 143, *Merc.* 498, 802, *Stich.* 682; cf. Johnston, *Exits* (n. 6), pp. 106–14. A similar problem is presented by Eur. *Alc.* 860; cf. A. M. Dale, *Euripides*, *Alcestis* (Oxford, 1954), ad loc.

⁴¹ Cf. Dziatzko-Kauer (n. 21), p. 14, n. 1; Drexler *Komposition* (n. 29), pp. 7–11; Webster, *Studies* (n. 7), p. 88; O. Bianco, *Terenzio: problemi e aspetti dell'originalità* (Nuovi saggi 41, Rome, 1962), pp. 183–6; Rieth, *Die Kunst Menanders* (n. 30), p. 31f., 42–8; Fantham (n. 28), pp. 204f.;

hand, that (i) is the scene which Terence introduced from Diphilus, depicting an *adulescens* . . . *qui lenoni eripit meretricem* (8f.).⁴² What was in the scene for which Terence substituted the Diphilean scene cannot be established without consideration of the neighbouring scenes; but we may provisionally note that Terence certainly here diverged from Menander and that it is at least possible that Sannio was not present in the rejected Menandrian scene. In any case there are strong grounds for believing that Terence introduced Sannio in (iii). Drexler showed that his presence in this section involves a certain amount of awkwardness, which can best be explained by the hypothesis that he was not present in the original Menandrian version of the scene and was added by Terence; and most scholars since, although rejecting some of Drexler's arguments, have followed him in postulating a Menandrian Ctesipho–Aeschinus scene in which Sannio was not present.⁴³ The principal arguments are as follows, not all of equal weight but cumulatively making a powerful case.

(1) The transition from the preceding scene is awkward. The conversation between Syrus and Sannio is suddenly interrupted by Syrus' announcement of the approach of Ctesipho, 252b–3a, apparently spoken aside. It is implausible that Sannio should so readily allow himself to be diverted by Syrus' *paullisper mane*, without further explanation, and should take no notice of Ctesipho but remain patiently in the background during his entrance monologue, brief exchanges with Syrus, and dialogue with Aeschinus.

(2) Although Sannio's presence throughout this scene as a comically expectant figure in the background is not without dramatic effect, it does nothing to advance the plot and flouts realism. Neither Ctesipho nor Aeschinus speaks to Sannio; in 276, *quid ait tandem nobis Sannio?*, Aeschinus speaks as if Sannio were not present to answer for himself; only 277 *hunc* shows that he is aware of Sannio's presence. Nor does Sannio make any attempt to speak to Ctesipho and Aeschinus or even to eavesdrop on their conversation, which directly concerns him, although he hears and comments on Aeschinus' entrance line 265 and Syrus' remark addressed to Aeschinus and Ctesipho in 278.

(3) Aeschinus' entrance line 265a, *ubi est ill' sacrilegus?*, implies that he has come out looking for Sannio and expects to find him waiting outside his house. This is inconsistent with the way he ignores Sannio throughout this scene and with his statement in the very next line that he is looking for Ctesipho. On the other hand, it fulfils the expectation raised by Aeschinus' final words at the end of the Diphilus scene, 195–6a, *nunc vide utrum vis, argentum accipere an causam meditari tuam./ delibera hoc dum ego redeo, leno*. The fact that 265a refers back to the Diphilus scene,

Martin, Adelphoe (n. 21), pp. 242f.; J. N. Grant, *CQ* 30 (1980), 342; Gratwick, *Brothers* (n. 19), pp. 59f., 239f.; Damen (n. 19), p. 67. There is disagreement on how much of Sannio's monologue 196b–208 is from Menander, how much Terentian invention to link the following scene with the preceding one; see below n. 68.

⁴² Cf. Drexler, *Komposition* (n. 29), pp. 1–6; Webster, *Studies* (n. 7), pp. 87f.; Bianco, *Terenzio* (n. 41), pp. 180–3; Rieth, *Die Kunst Menanders* (n. 30), pp. 34f.; Gaiser in Rieth, *ibid.*, pp. 138–41; Fantham (n. 28), pp. 199–204; Martin, Adelphoe (n. 21), pp. 242f.; F. H. Sandbach, *The Comic Theatre of Greece and Rome* (London, 1977), p. 140; Grant (n. 41), p. 342; Gratwick, *Brothers* (n. 19), p. 43.

⁴³ Drexler, *Komposition* (n. 29), pp. 12–15, 23–5; Webster, *Studies* (n. 7), p. 89; Gaiser in Rieth, *Die Kunst Menanders* (n. 30), p. 139; *ANRW* 1.2 (1972), 1065; Fantham (n. 28), pp. 206–8; Martin, Adelphoe (n. 21), pp. 242f.; Sandbach, *Comic Theatre* (n. 42), p. 140; Grant (n. 41), p. 343; Gratwick, *Brothers* (n. 19), pp. 43f., 59; Damen (n. 19), pp. 70f., 77–9. Dissenters are Rieth, *Gnomon* 10 (1934), 643–6; *Die Kunst Menanders* (n. 30), pp. 49–52; Bianco, *Terenzio* (n. 41), pp. 186–91; H. J. Mette, *Lustrum* 10 (1965), 39f.

but is inconsistent with the Menandrian context in which it occurs, strongly suggests that it is a Terentian addition. Confirmation of this is provided by the comment of Sannio which it prompts. *Sacrilegus* prepares for Sannio's joke against himself, *me quaerit*; and the occurrence of the same joke in Plaut. *Pseud.* 975 further supports the hypothesis that it is here a Terentian addition. Sannio's further remarks, *num quid nam ecfert? occidi: nil video*, are hardly consistent with the preceding scene, after which Sannio has no reason to expect Aeschinus to come out with money *in his hand* (cf. 242, *minas decem conradet alicunde*); but they are consistent with the end of the Diphilus scene and set the tone for Sannio's passive role in this scene, as one whose hopes are snubbed. Thus everything points to 265–6a being a Terentian insertion designed to accommodate the presence of Sannio in a scene to which he did not originally belong.

(4) In 278–80, the only other place in the scene where Sannio speaks, his appeal to Syrus for his help in recovering his money from Aeschinus duplicates 247–51 and leads nowhere. Aeschinus has already in 277 announced his intention of going to the forum to pay Sannio. After 278f. Sannio's appeal is in fact unnecessary. Sannio may be supposed not to hear 276f.; but in that case it is strange that he accepts Syrus' assurances in 279f. and makes no comment on Syrus' failure to speak to Aeschinus on his behalf, as he promised in 251f.

(5) It is hardly realistic that, after Aeschinus has set out for the market-place at 280 together with Sannio, Ctesipho should call Syrus back for a brief private conversation without Sannio also turning back; yet Sannio must not hear 281f. Noteworthy also is the fact that Syrus' order to Ctesipho in 284f. to go indoors duplicates Aeschinus' order in 277b. A plausible explanation, not considered by Drexler, is that Terence has kept Ctesipho on stage in order to converse with Syrus in 281–7. This hypothesis would also absolve Menander of an anomaly in 286, trivial in itself, that Syrus prematurely promises to buy provisions for a party before he has received the money for that purpose from Micio (370).⁴⁴ At any rate there are grounds for suspecting some Terentian rewriting around the exits of Sannio, Ctesipho, and Syrus.

(6) To Drexler's arguments can be added that the involvement of four speaking characters in this scene has no parallel in the extant corpus of Menander.⁴⁵

Drexler went on to argue that the presence of Sannio in (iii) resulted from the transposition by Terence of (ii) and (iii), which he supposed to have occurred in the reverse order in Menander. On Drexler's view Sannio was not present in the Ctesipho–Aeschinus scene in Menander because he had not yet come on stage. Drexler's hypothesis of a transposition has in essentials been accepted by most of those who have subsequently written about the *Adelphoe*. It underlies several reconstructions of Menander's play that differ in other respects but agree in putting the entry of Ctesipho before that of Sannio. Drexler supposed that Ctesipho entered, probably with Syrus, to find Aeschinus still on stage after he had sent the *psaltria* into his house.⁴⁶ Others

⁴⁴ Fantham (n. 28), pp. 205, 209, notes similarities between this passage and the unrealistic but comic aside dialogue between Syrus and Ctesipho during Demea's entrance monologue in 540–53; in both cases Ctesipho returns to the stage after starting to make his exit to make unnecessary appeals to the slave for protection. Fantham uses the later recurrence of the same 'comic motif' as an argument for the Menandrian origin of 281ff., although she admits that the passage is not essential. It is also possible, however, that it is the first of the two passages (less comic) that imitates the second, or that Terence is responsible for both. It is true that 281c–3 look Menandrian, but they could well have been originally spoken by Ctesipho to Aeschinus, perhaps in response to 277 (*absolvam :: quam primum absolvitote*), if 278–81b are a Terentian insertion.

⁴⁵ Grant (n. 41), p. 343; Gratwick, *Brothers* (n. 19), pp. 42f.; Damen (n. 19), pp. 68, 71.

⁴⁶ Drexler, *Komposition* (n. 29), p. 37.

have supposed that Aeschinus went into his house with the *psaltria* but came out again to find Ctesipho alone (Gaiser⁴⁷), Ctesipho and Syrus (Fantham,⁴⁸ Martin⁴⁹), or Ctesipho and Sannio (Damen⁵⁰); others that, when Aeschinus escorted the *psaltria* home, he was accompanied by Ctesipho (Gratwick⁵¹), or even Ctesipho and Syrus (Grant⁵²). I wish to argue that Drexler's theory of a transposition has been too readily accepted and has been responsible for leading much subsequent discussion up a blind alley. There is another hypothesis that will explain the phenomena at least as well but which Drexler apparently never considered, namely that in Menander the Sannio–Syrus scene (ii) and the Ctesipho–Aeschinus scene (iii) occurred in the same order as in Terence but that Sannio's exit preceded the entry of Ctesipho, as Webster suggested.⁵³

Neither Drexler nor his followers have produced any compelling arguments in favour of the transposition hypothesis. That it makes Terence's introduction of Sannio in the Ctesipho–Aeschinus scene (iii) the result of his introduction of the Diphilus scene (i) has evidently influenced scholars in its favour.⁵⁴ But that is not a cogent argument. That Terence should have prolonged Sannio's presence on stage from (ii) to (iii), and perhaps also introduced him early in (i), is an equally plausible hypothesis and supported by Terence's well-attested practice elsewhere.⁵⁵

Drexler objected to the repetitiveness of Ctesipho's monologue 254–9 and argued that Terence created it by transferring material from the following Ctesipho–Aeschinus dialogue; he then inferred from the 'Nicht-Existenz des Ctesipho-Monologs bei Menander' that in Menander Aeschinus was already on stage when Ctesipho entered. This is obviously a very flimsy argument, however, which has been tacitly dropped in most later discussions.⁵⁶

Drexler further argued that, since Aeschinus himself had no ready cash with which to pay Sannio but had to rely on Micio, he should not meet Sannio before he has secured a promise of money from Micio. That may perhaps have some slight force as a further argument that in Menander Sannio was not present during the Ctesipho–Aeschinus scene and that the motive given for Aeschinus' entrance in 265a, to find Sannio, is a Terentian addition; but it is certainly not a valid argument for supposing that Aeschinus' meeting with Ctesipho must have preceded Sannio's entrance rather than following his exit. It had clearly always been Aeschinus' intention to pay Sannio the cost price of the *psaltria*; not only does he offer to do so in 191f. (cf. 199, 202–8) but this intention is implicit in the Sannio–Syrus scene, in which Syrus' object is to persuade Sannio to agree to sell (209f.). Aeschinus must have counted, with justification, on Micio's readiness to provide the necessary money (369, 742f.; cf. 115–22).

⁴⁷ Rieth, *Die Kunst Menanders* (n. 30), pp. 137–9.

⁴⁸ Fantham (n. 28), pp. 208–11.

⁴⁹ Martin, *Adelphoe* (n. 21), p. 243.

⁵⁰ Damen (n. 19), pp. 77–82, improbably supposing that Ctesipho enters before Sannio but then remains silently in the background during Syrus–Sannio and Aeschinus–Sannio scenes before meeting Aeschinus. Damen also assumes (*ibid.*, p. 75; cf. *ICS* 15 [1990], 91, n. 10) that in Menander Aeschinus brought the girl to Micio's house unbeknown to Micio before the beginning of the play.

⁵¹ Gratwick, *Brothers* (n. 19), pp. 43f, 59.

⁵² Grant (n. 41), pp. 347f. Grant is led by a speculative reconstruction of the prehistory of the play to the unconvincing conclusion that Syrus was present at the abduction in Menander (approved by Damen [n. 19], p. 70, n. 12).

⁵³ Webster, *Studies* (n. 7), p. 89.

⁵⁴ Drexler, *Komposition* (n. 29), pp. 38–40; Gaiser in Rieth, *Die Kunst Menanders* (n. 30), p. 138; *ANRW* 1.2 (1972), 1065; Grant (n. 41), p. 343; Sandbach, *Comic Theatre* (n. 42), p. 140; Gratwick, *Brothers* (n. 19), p. 43.

⁵⁵ *CQ* 33 (1983), 428–31.

⁵⁶ Rieth, *Gnomon* 10 (1934), 645, effectively answered Drexler; cf. Gaiser in Rieth, *Die Kunst Menanders* (n. 30), p. 137, n. 5; Büchner, *Theater* (n. 12), p. 378. Grant (n. 41), pp. 346f., revives Drexler's objections, no more convincingly, but comes to different conclusions.

Having learnt from his household that Micio had gone to the market-place, it would be entirely reasonable for Aeschinus, after meeting Ctesipho, to proceed there himself to find Micio and then pay Sannio; if 277 mentions only paying Sannio and says nothing about obtaining money from Micio, that may be because the end was more important than the means, which could be taken for granted, or because Terentian *vortere* has omitted a few words.

Finally Drexler used as an argument Donatus' mistaken note on 209: '*tace*' *si pro adverbio est positum, omnibus dicitur, si pro verbo, Ctesiphoni dicitur maxime sollicito et supplicanti omnibus ob metum patris*; in fact the line must be addressed to Aeschinus inside the house, as Ctesipho has not yet appeared. Drexler explains this note as a garbled version of a note which originally stated that in Menander the line was addressed to Ctesipho.⁵⁷ Pointing out that 209 would provide a good answer to a frightened plea by Ctesipho along the lines of 281c–3, Drexler supposes that in Menander 209 did follow 283 and that this formed the link between a Ctesipho–Aeschinus–Syrus scene and a following Syrus–Sannio scene. This argument does not hold water. In the first place the error in Donatus may be a mere slip, which does not need special explanation.⁵⁸ Secondly, Drexler's explanation lacks plausibility. Nothing in Donatus' note suggests that it has been garbled or abbreviated, or indeed that it is based on knowledge of Menander's play; it starts from a linguistic question, whether *tace* is addressed to one or more persons, and gives an answer which is clear and consistent, even if wrong. Nothing in Terence's text supports Drexler's theory that in Menander 209 was addressed to Ctesipho. It is no real argument to observe that the sentence could appropriately have served as a response to 281c–3, when it is perfectly appropriate in its Terentian context as a talking-back entrance line addressed to Aeschinus inside the house and could have performed the same function in Menander. Drexler's theory presupposes a Menandrian Ctesipho–Aeschinus–Syrus scene that ended with exchanges between Ctesipho and Syrus corresponding to 281–3; but, as suggested above, the peculiarities of the passage point rather to the hypothesis that the exchanges between Ctesipho and Syrus in 281–7, after the exit of Aeschinus, are a Terentian insertion.

Drexler's objections to the Ctesipho–Aeschinus section centred on the role of Sannio in it. He did not pay so much attention to Syrus, although his hypothesis requires Syrus to be on stage at least at the end of the corresponding section in Menander, in readiness for the entry of Sannio. The general objection that Sannio should not be present while Ctesipho and Aeschinus talk about the abduction does not apply to Syrus. Nevertheless the particular objections raised by Drexler in fact cover all the passages in which Syrus is involved. If Sannia was not present in the Ctesipho–Aeschinus scene in Menander, Terence must have added not only all the utterances of Sannio but also any utterances of Syrus addressed to Sannio (253b–c, 279b–80). We have already seen that Syrus' announcement of the approach of Ctesipho in 252b–3a, *sed Ctesiphonem video: laetus est! de amica*, is problematic and that his brief dialogue with Ctesipho in 281–7 is unnecessary and unrealistic. Drexler also drew attention to peculiarities in 260f. and 264b;⁵⁹ even if some of his objections can at a pinch be answered,⁶⁰ it is at least unnecessary for Syrus to inform Ctesipho

⁵⁷ Gaiser in Rieth, *Die Kunst Menanders* (n. 30), p. 157, n. 5, Fantham (n. 28), p. 205, and Damen (n. 19), p. 74, n. 24, are inclined to agree with Drexler.

⁵⁸ Comparable errors in Donatus are cited by Rieth, *Gnomon* 10 (1934), 640f.; cf. H. Lloyd-Jones, *CQ* 23 (1973), 280f.

⁵⁹ Drexler, *Komposition* (n. 29), pp. 23f.

⁶⁰ H. Marti, *Lustrum* 8 (1963), 75f.; Grant (n. 41), p. 346.

that Aeschinus is at home, to enquire after Ctesipho's circumstances, and, at the sound of the house door, to warn him *mane mane: ipse exit foras*, and all these exchanges seem to lack Menander's lucidity.⁶¹ Syrus' statements about Sannio addressed to Aeschinus in 276 and 278 are also dispensable.⁶² In short, there are positive grounds for attributing part of Syrus' role in this section to Terence and none for attributing any of it to Menander.

A plausible hypothesis, which accounts for all the peculiarities of the section, is that Terence kept both Sannio and Syrus on stage from the previous scene. If we exclude all the passages which involve Sannio and Syrus (252b–3, 260–1a, 264b–6a, 276b–c, 278–81b, 284–7), what remains can plausibly be seen as the substance of a Menandrian entrance monologue of Ctesipho, leading to a Ctesipho–Aeschinus dialogue. Such a meeting between Ctesipho and Aeschinus, unaccompanied by any other characters, could well form a self-sufficient piece of stage action, preceded and followed by an empty stage. Indeed, research by Denzler provides some support for the hypothesis that in Menander Ctesipho entered on to an empty stage to deliver a monologue corresponding to 254–64 (an *Auftritts-Monolog*).⁶³ He observes that in New Comedy it is normal for the entrance monologue of a young man in love at his first appearance to be of this type; whereas Terence avoided *Auftritts-Monologe* and sometimes turned one into an overheard monologue (*Lauscher-Monolog*), e.g. Pamphilus' monologue in *And.* 236ff.⁶⁴

On this hypothesis both Sannio and Syrus will in Menander have left the stage after their dialogue (~209–52a), 252b–3 being a Terentian device to keep them on stage for the following scene. Grant has plausibly suggested that 279b–80 originally followed 252a (*reddetur* answering 249 *reddatur*) and were transferred by Terence to their present position;⁶⁵ and if in fact 280 reflects the ending of the Menandrian Sannio–Syrus scene, this supports the hypothesis that in Menander Sannio and Syrus made their exit together. They must have gone in the direction of the market-place. We know that Syrus met Micio and Aeschinus there (364ff.) and can reasonably assume that Sannio received payment there. It would be natural enough for Syrus, knowing that Micio was in the market-place, to take Sannio straight to him; it is possible, but seems less likely, that Sannio went home and was paid later by Aeschinus after he had received money from Micio, as Grant supposes.⁶⁶ Provided it was made clear to the audience that Syrus and Sannio had met Micio in the market-place and that Micio had supplied money to pay Sannio, it was not necessary to give precise details of the off-stage action. Equally it is unobjectionable that Syrus and Sannio should go first to the market-place and that Aeschinus should follow later.

This hypothesis differs from that of Webster only in supposing that the Menandrian Syrus left for the market-place with Sannio at 252 rather than with Aeschinus at 277 or later. I believe it has the advantage over Webster's hypothesis because without Sannio there seems no place for Syrus at the meeting of Ctesipho and Aeschinus.

In order to establish when the Menandrian Sannio made his entry, we must now consider what Terence omitted from the *Adelphoi* B' in favour of the Diphilus scene. When Micio comes out of his house at 26, his first words clearly imply that neither

⁶¹ Gaiser in Rieth, *Die Kunst Menanders* (n. 30), p. 137, n. 6.

⁶² Drexler, *Komposition* (n. 29), p. 24 and Fantham (n. 28), p. 208 have noted the abrupt change of subject after 276a *peccavi*. Grant (n. 41), 349, objects to 378 that Aeschinus must already have known about Sannio's journey; but even so, Syrus might mention it as a reason for haste.

⁶³ Denzler, *Monolog* (n. 17), p. 62.

⁶⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 45–51, 105.

⁶⁵ Grant (n. 41), p. 349.

⁶⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 352; *Philologus* 117 (1973), 72.

Aeschinus nor the *psaltria* is inside. When, however, Syrus comes out of Micio's house at 209 he talks back to Aeschinus inside, and Aeschinus subsequently comes out from there at 265; equally the presence of the *psaltria* in Micio's house is required from 209 for the rest of the play (cf. 277, 284, 388f., 589, 746, 759, 842f.). Terence uses the Diphilus scene to bring both Aeschinus and the *psaltria* to Micio's house. It is very probable that it replaced a Menandrian scene which performed the same essential dramatic function. For this purpose the minimum content of the Menandrian scene would be a monologue by Aeschinus as he escorted home the mute *psaltria*, probably with one or more other slaves (cf. 26f.).⁶⁷ It seems most likely that this was in fact all that the scene contained. In view of what has been said above, it is very unlikely that Ctesipho had yet appeared. Nor is there any good reason for supposing that Syrus accompanied Aeschinus. Again it is unlikely that Sannio entered with Aeschinus and the girl. Some time must have elapsed between the actual abduction and Aeschinus' entry with the girl, since Demea already knew about it at his first entry; we therefore have to suppose that Aeschinus came by a devious route, not explained by Terence, and for Sannio to have trailed him all the way is somewhat implausible. In its original context the action of the Diphilean scene probably took place outside the *leno's* house, depicting an abduction in its early stages, so that the presence of the protesting *leno* was entirely appropriate; in introducing it into his *Adelphoe* Terence had to accept some lack of realism. It is probable, then, that in Menander the *leno* entered immediately after Aeschinus' exit. Sannio's monologue 196b–208 has no doubt undergone some Terentian modification but need not differ very greatly from an original entrance monologue.⁶⁸

I thus attribute to Terence two separate changes in 155–287, first the introduction of the Diphilus scene, 155–96a, and secondly the keeping of Sannio and Syrus on stage for an extra scene in 252–87. The two changes are similar, and characteristic of Terence, in that both involve thickening the texture of the stage action by the addition of extra characters.⁶⁹

GETA'S MOVEMENTS AND THE END OF MENANDER'S FIRST ACT

Geta enters at 299, in a great hurry, to report to his mistress the abduction which he has himself witnessed (329f.). It seems most natural that he should come from the direction of the market-place, where he has presumably had some (unspecified) business; this provides confirmation that Sannio's house is situated in that direction. A chronological problem is presented by the fact that, despite his haste, Geta appears so long after the event, being preceded by Demea, Aeschinus, and Sannio. There are good grounds for believing that this problem is largely one of Terence's making rather than Menander's.

Geta's entry in 299ff. is a classic case of the *servus currens*. If not as extreme as some of Plautus' examples, it nevertheless uses a long-winded, exaggerated, paratragic

⁶⁷ Fantham (n. 28), 210, thinks it possible that Aeschinus did not bring the girl with him but had already deposited her with a friend. How, then, did she reach Micio's house? A trip behind the scene is a theoretical possibility, but there is no evidence for it.

⁶⁸ Fantham (n. 28), p. 204: 'his wavering emotions are depicted with a vividness worthy of Menander'. The monologue contains nothing that is inconsistent with the plot of the *Adelphoe*. Büchner, *Theater* (n. 12), p. 382, and Gratwick, *Brothers* (n. 19), p. 239, seem to me to suppose an unnecessary degree of Terentian rewriting.

⁶⁹ H. Haffter, *MH* 10 (1953), 74–9; Büchner, *Theater* (n. 12), pp. 453–62 'Bereicherung des Bühnenbildes'; cf. Grant (n. 41), p. 352.

monologue by the slave, punctuated by aside comments by the characters already on stage, together with the conventional motif of breathlessness (323f.),⁷⁰ to delay the delivery of Geta's news for 25 lines. It is unrealistic, and characteristic of the Plautine *servus currens*, that Geta forgets he is in a great hurry to deliver his news and after wasting much time in talking has to remind himself to get on with his job (320, *sed cesso eram hoc malo inperituri propere?*).⁷¹ Again it is unrealistic, even when allowance is made for his excitement, that Geta so long fails to observe the presence of the very person he is seeking, and that Sostrata and Canthara move closer to him in order to eavesdrop on his monologue (308f.) but do not at once accost him. How exactly Terence envisaged the staging of this passage can only be conjectured,⁷² but it seems that Geta does not at first head for the door of Sostrata's house, near which Sostrata and Canthara are presumably standing, but goes straight across the stage past the women, so that he then has his back to them; hence, when Sostrata does at last accost him, she has to call him back (320, *revocemus*) and even then Geta does not at once recognize Sostrata (320f., *hem quisqui's, sine me*). Now Fraenkel showed that this motif of *revocatio*, although it had Greek antecedents, was greatly developed by Plautus, and that in using it in *Pho.* 847–51 Terence too has probably elaborated his model Apollodorus.⁷³ All this, in conjunction with the almost Plautine bombast of Geta's monologue, suggests that Geta's monologue has not merely been expanded by Terence,⁷⁴ but is essentially Terence's creation, together with the asides of Sostrata and Canthara and the *revocatio*, and that 299–322 owe little, if anything, to Menander. The hypothesis that Terence here created an overheard *servus currens* monologue, which does not advance the plot but serves to heighten the pathos of Sostrata's situation, is supported by his predilection, demonstrated by Denzler,⁷⁵ for overheard entrance monologues designed especially to depict the emotional reactions of the listeners. Moreover, I have elsewhere shown that Terence probably created an overheard *servus currens* monologue, with *revocatio*, in *Pho.* 179ff.⁷⁶ Finally, Gratwick observes that in 335–50 Geta shows 'initiative and orderly argumentation' inconsistent with his 'comically distraught' entrance.⁷⁷

Without the exaggerated emphasis on Geta's haste, there is no real chronological problem. If the dramatist chooses to introduce in succession a series of characters involved in or affected by the recent event of the abduction, an audience would hardly be inclined to query the long interval between the first of the series (Demea) and the last (Geta), or the order in which they arrived. A proviso has to be made however; in

⁷⁰ Cf. Denzler, *Monolog* (n. 17), pp. 114f.

⁷¹ Cf. Plaut. *Asin.* 290f., *Capt.* 827, *Merc.* 130, *Most.* 362, and, for similar phrases at the end of a Plautine digression, E. Fraenkel, *Plautinisches im Plautus* (Philol. Untersuch. 28, Berlin, 1922), p. 143 = *Elementi Plautini in Plauto* (Florence, 1960), p. 136.

⁷² Cf. Dziatzko-Kauer, (n. 21), p. 18.

⁷³ Fraenkel, *P. im P.* (n. 71), pp. 220–7 = *El. Pl.*, pp. 211–17.

⁷⁴ Denzler, *Monolog* (n. 17), p. 68; Gratwick, *Brothers* (n. 19), p. 242.

⁷⁵ Denzler, *Monolog* (n. 17), pp. 45–51, *et passim*.

⁷⁶ *Hermes* 111 (1983), 433f.; cf. *St. Urbin.* B. 68 (1997/8), 244–6.

⁷⁷ Gratwick, *Brothers* (n. 19), p. 243. That the *servus currens* routine had antecedents in Greek drama I do not dispute, but I think E. Csapo, *Phoenix* 41 (1987), 399–419, *AntKunst* 36 (1993), 41–58, underestimates the extent to which it was developed in Rome. Even if Csapo is right to regard *Ad.* 311–19 as a reversal of the running slave's conventional threat, *de via secedite*, which I doubt, this does not prove that there was a running slave in the corresponding scene of *Adelphoi* B'. A more or less threatening 'get out of my way' is neither confined to the stock figure of the running slave nor his sole distinguishing feature (cf. *ἐκποδών* Ar. *Eq.* 1151, *Vesp.* 1340; *πάπες* μὲν Men. *Sic.* 189).

the Greek play it would be desirable that Geta's entrance should not be separated from the preceding scenes by an act-division, which would suggest the passage of further time.

Gratwick argues that in Menander Geta cannot have witnessed the actual abduction, since he would not have been 'wandering about Athens in the middle of the night', that what he saw must have been the sale of the girl to Micio in the market-place and that this must have taken place during an *entr'acte* after 287.⁷⁸ Since, however, Terence has suppressed the details of the abduction and its aftermath, this argument rests on a very doubtful premise. Why should Geta, arriving in the market-place around dawn, not have witnessed the abduction, which may be supposed to have taken place at about this time, just before the play begins? The first place at which the off-stage action points to an act-division in the Greek play is after 354: in accordance with Menander's normal practice an act-division should separate Syrus' departure for the market-place (287) from his return (361), and Geta's departure to fetch Hegio (354) from his return (447).⁷⁹ Moreover it would be characteristic of Menander to end the act with a scene which introduces a new theme and provides a link with the following act;⁸⁰ in 288–345 attention is switched to the affairs of Pamphila, which will remain the centre of interest during the following scenes.

It will be objected that a single act corresponding to 26–354 is too long, but this is not an insuperable objection. Menander's extant acts vary considerably in length, the longest being *Epitrepontes* III (290+ lines), the shortest *Samia* V (122 lines). Moreover Terentian expansion is probable in several places. In 288–354, an extended polymetric *canticum*, besides the probable Terentian insertion of the *servus currens* routine, there are signs of substantial Terentian rewriting. Donatus on 354 informs us that in Menander Hegio was Sostrata's brother; hence 335–50 must have been rewritten by Terence, since if Sostrata had a brother to look after her interests, there would be no question where she should turn for help.⁸¹ The effect of the change was again to exaggerate Sostrata's isolation and the pathos of her situation, and there are further signs of this Terentian tendency in Sostrata's dialogue with Canthara in 288–99.⁸² It seems likely that in Menander Canthara was mute.⁸³ The corresponding Menandrian scene could well have been 40 lines shorter than Terence's version. Terence's insertion of the Diphilus scene and additions to the Aeschinus–Ctesipho scene might account for another 50 lines. Against this we have to set Terence's probable omission of a prologue of perhaps 40 lines; because the opening scene gave much of the exposition, a deferred prologue could have been shorter than the 52 lines of the *Aspis* prologue. These figures are no more than guesses but they suffice to show that supposing the

⁷⁸ Gratwick, *Brothers* (n. 19), p. 42, following Gaiser in Rieth, *Die Kunst Menanders* (n. 30), p. 143.

⁷⁹ P. E. Legrand, *Daos; tableau de la comédie grecque pendant la période dite nouvelle* (Lyons and Paris, 1910), p. 468; Grant (n. 41), p. 354; cf. Dziatzko–Kauer (n. 21), p. 15, n. 1.

⁸⁰ E. W. Handley, *Entretiens Hardt* 16 (1970), 11–13.

⁸¹ Cf. Bianco, *Terenzio* (n. 41), pp. 191f.; Rieth, *Die Kunst Menanders* (n. 30), p. 73; Büchner, *Theater* (n. 12), pp. 388f.; Gratwick, *Brothers* (n. 19), pp. 36–8.

⁸² Cf. Dziatzko–Kauer (n. 21) on 291f.; J. N. Grant, *Philologus* 117 (1973), 70; Büchner, *Theater* (n. 12), p. 384.

⁸³ Webster, *Introduction* (n. 5), p. 115; F. H. Sandbach in J. Bingen *et al.* (edd.), *Le monde grec—hommages à Claire Préaux* (Brussels, 1975), p. 202. The theory of Grant, *Philologus* 117 (1973), 73–5, followed by Gratwick, *Brothers* (n. 19), pp. 46f., that Canthara is entirely Terence's invention, is unconvincing; she plays a small but vital role later (612–24) and it seems better, with Mette (n. 43), p. 40, and Webster, *loc. cit.*, to suppose that Terence cut a brief scene depicting her return with the midwife.

first act-division at 354 need not imply a first act of more than 280 lines, including the prologue, perhaps less.⁸⁴

Islip, Oxford

J. C. B. LOWE

⁸⁴ Cf. Damen (n. 19), pp. 72f. I agree with Grant (n. 41), p. 354, n. 27, in putting the other Menandrian act-divisions at 516 (covering Hegio's trip to the market-place, 516–92), 712, and 854. Pace Gaiser in Rieth, *Die Kunst Menanders* (n. 30), p. 144, and Gratwick, *Brothers* (n. 19), p. 247, an act-division is not essential at 510; Hegio's visit to Sostrata need not have been very long and could by convention have been covered by Demea's monologue, 507–10, if this was somewhat longer in Menander (Webster, *Introduction* [n. 5], p. 115, n. 8).