

THE LOT-DRAWING SCENE OF PLAUTUS' CASINA

The prologue of Plautus' *Casina* states explicitly (31–4) that the Latin play is a version of the *Kleroumenoi* of Diphilus. That statement leaves open the question of how faithful the Latin version was to its Greek model. That Plautus made substantial alterations at the end of the play is virtually certain, although the extent of these alterations is still disputed and likely to remain so.¹ It has long been generally accepted that Plautus at least cut the end of the Greek play and the return of Euthynicus; that is the natural interpretation of verses 64–6 of the prologue, warning the audience that the young man will not return home *in hac comoedia* because *Plautus noluit, pontem interruptit, qui erat in itinere*. It also seems clear that Plautus cut the *anagnorisis* that led to the marriage of Euthynicus and Casina, substituting a bald statement in the epilogue that this will happen off stage, 1012–14 *spectatores, quod futurumst intus, id memorabimus. haec Casina huius reperietur filia esse ex proximo eaque nubet Euthynico nostro erili filio*. Significant Plautine changes have also been found in other parts of the play. Fraenkel argued convincingly that in a number of passages Plautus made Cleostrata aware of her husband's passion for Casina earlier than her Greek counterpart;² this implies a number of Plautine additions in the Cleostrata–Myrrhina and Cleostrata–Lysidamus scenes (II.2–3), while Cleostrata's entrance-monody (II.1), very Plautine in style, is probably to be attributed to Plautus in its entirety.³ The effect is to emphasize the role of Cleostrata as counter-schemer, determined to punish her erring husband, whereas in other passages she displays a more modest character. Lefèvre has identified further likely Plautine additions, even if his arguments for substantial structural changes fail to convince.⁴ I wish to focus on a single scene.

¹ Cf. W. T. MacCary and M. M. Willcock, *Plautus, Casina* (Cambridge, 1976), 36–7, n. 2; M. Waltenberger, *Hermes* 109 (1981), 440–7.

² E. Fraenkel, *Plautinisches im Plautus*, Philol. Untersuchungen 28 (Berlin, 1922), 294–305 = *Elementi plautini in Plauto* (Florence, 1960), 282–92, following P. E. Legrand, *REG* 15 (1902), 373. The counter-arguments of G. Jachmann, *Plautinisches und Attisches*, *Problemata* 3 (Berlin, 1931), 107–12, based mainly on 58–63, are not cogent.

³ The motivation of Cleostrata's entrance in 145–6 is a doublet of Myrrhina's in 165–7 (cf. *Stich.* 67, *M.G.* 480); and the brief appearance of Pardalisca with Cleostrata, immediately after the exit of Olympio and Chalinus, would require four actors, even if Pardalisca only speaks 147 (see below p. 179 with n. 25). I guess that in Diphilus Myrrhina's entry preceded that of Cleostrata and that Plautus brought forward Cleostrata's entry, as he certainly did that of Pistoclerus at *Bacch.* 526 (cf. *Men. Dis Ex.* 91ff.), and possibly that of the money-lender at *Mostell.* 532 (cf. *Phoenix* 39 [1985], 6–9) and that of Antipho at *Stich.* 58 (cf. *Hermes*, 111 [1983], 451).

⁴ E. Lefèvre, *Hermes* 107 (1979), 311–39. Lefèvre's arguments for attributing the *cena* entirely to Plautus are not compelling, whereas it is likely enough that Plautus should have developed the motif, as in the list of fish that prompts Latin puns in 493–8. Lysidamus' and Olympio's brief trip into the house after 423 is indeed obviously designed to clear the stage for Chalinus' monologue, 424–36, but this device can be attributed to Diphilus, with Chalinus' eavesdropping in the following scene. The motivation of Lysidamus' and Olympio's exit, 422–3 *hortemur ut properent*, is not unreasonable, the ignorance of Lysidamus' plans implied by Chalinus' comments in 429–33 is inconsistent with the Plautine situation, in which Cleostrata is already informed, but fits the situation postulated for Diphilus (Fraenkel, *P. im P.* [n. 2], 294 = *El. pl.* 283), and Chalinus' link-monologue, 504–14, performs a technical function in covering Lysidamus' brief visit to Alcesimus' house. Lysidamus' plan to use Alcesimus' house as a love-nest prepares for Myrrhina's

The title of Diphilus' play, 'The lot-drawers', implies beyond doubt that a central element in the plot, as in Plautus' play, was a drawing of lots to decide between the rivals for the girl known in the Latin play as Casina.⁵ It is *a priori* probable that the Greek play contained a scene in which lots were drawn on stage, although the possibility cannot entirely be ruled out that this action took place off stage.⁶ Even if Diphilus' play contained a lot-drawing scene, however, Plautus need not have followed it closely. I wish to argue, in fact, that the lot-drawing scene of the Latin play (353–423) is very largely Plautus' creation and owes little to Diphilus beyond the basic idea. The resemblances to the arbitration scene of the *Rudens* (1045ff.) 'especially in the interchanges between master and slave', which MacCary and Willcock in their commentary see as 'without doubt the result of the Diphilean origin of both plays',⁷ I would attribute largely, if not entirely, to the Plautine reworking of both scenes.

The lot (κλήρος, πάλος, *sors*) was widely used in the ancient world, originally as a means of seeking the will of the gods.⁸ Leaving aside the drawing of lots inscribed with oracles for the purpose of divination,⁹ we are here concerned with lot-drawing to select a person or a group for some purpose, to decide who should undertake a task or fill a religious, judicial, or political office, who should receive a piece of property, which group should vote first, and so on. The procedures involved took various forms and the evidence for them is patchy. Homeric heroes shook marked pebbles in a helmet until one jumped out to decide who should go into combat.¹⁰ The Athenian democracy made extensive use of the lot to appoint certain magistrates and select jurors, and developed elaborate machines for the purpose.¹¹ In Roman public life it was used especially at the *comitia* to choose the century (*praerogativa*) or tribe (*principium*) to vote first and the tribe with which Latins should vote, also to allot *provinciae* to magistrates and later to select jurors for the lawcourts.¹² The mechanisms of lot-drawing at Rome are less well documented than those of the Athenians. It is clear, however, that the technical term for the vessel from which lots were drawn at a public *sortitio* during the middle Republic was *sitella*.¹³ Several references to *sortitio* in judicial

visit to Lysidamus' house and hence, we may guess, in Diphilus for the discovery that Casina is Alcesimus' daughter (F. Leo, *Plautinische Forschungen* [Berlin, 1912²], 209 n.).

⁵ For precedents in Greek myth, see W. T. MacCary, *Hermes* 101 (1973), 198.

⁶ The participial title does not necessarily imply action on stage. It seems more likely that Men. *Synaristosai*, like Plaut. *Cist.*, began with a scene showing the two women emerging from the house after a shared meal than that it depicted the meal taking place on stage, cf. A. W. Gomme and F. H. Sandbach, *Menander: A Commentary* (Oxford, 1973), 12–13, n. 2.

⁷ MacCary and Willcock (n. 1), 140. Badinage between master and slave is *a priori* at least as likely to be Plautus' work as Diphilus'. For evidence of substantial Plautine changes in *Rud.* 1045ff., see K. Gaiser, *ANRW* 1.2 (1972), 1075–6; J. C. B. Lowe, *AJP* 112 (1991), 41–4.

⁸ V. Ehrenberg, *RE* XIII.145ff. s.v. *Losung*.

⁹ Cf. J. Champeaux, *MEFR* 102 (1990), 271–302, 801–28.

¹⁰ For example, *Il.* 7.171 κλήρω νῦν πεπάλασθε, 175–6 κλήρων ἐσημῆναντο ἕκαστος, ἐν δ' ἔβαλον κυνέη, 182 ἐκ δ' ἔθορε κλήρος κυνέης.

¹¹ E. S. Staveley, *Greek and Roman Voting and Elections* (London, 1972), 61–72; M. H. Hansen, *The Athenian Democracy in the Age of Demosthenes* (Oxford and Cambridge, MA, 1991), 50–2, 197–9, 230–7, 247–8; Arist. *Ath. Pol.* 63–6 with P. J. Rhodes, *A Commentary on the Aristotelian Athenaiion Politeia* (Oxford, 1981), 700–17.

¹² L. R. Taylor, *Roman Voting Assemblies* (Ann Arbor, 1966), 70–83; N. Rosenstein, *AJP* 116 (1995), 43–75; A. H. J. Greenidge, *The Legal Procedure of Cicero's Time* (Oxford, 1901), index, s.v. *sortitio*.

¹³ At *comitia* Cic. *Corn. fr.* 30 *est utique ius vetandi . . . dum sitella deferatur, dum aequantur sortes, dum sortitio fit*, fr. 31 *neque enim maius est legere codicem, cum intercedatur, quam sitellam ipsum coram [cum codd.] ipso intercessore deferre* (67–65 B.C.); *Nat. D.* 1.106 *Ti. Gracchum . . .*

contexts describe the *sortes* as *pilae*, implying manufactured balls, for which the easiest material would be wood, but bronze or clay would also be possible;¹⁴ it is likely, if not certain, that this follows earlier practice at the *comitia*. Before use, the lots were subjected to a scrutiny, the precise nature of which is unclear but for which the technical term was evidently *aequare*.¹⁵ *Sitella*, 'water-jug', suggests, but does not necessarily imply, a water-filled jug.¹⁶

The occurrence of the technical terms *sitella* (296, 350, 363, 396) and especially the verb *aequare* (387) in our scene of the *Casina* leaves little doubt that Plautus intended to remind his audience of the familiar procedure of *sortitio* at the *comitia*, the use of which in a very different context on stage would enhance the comedy of the scene.¹⁷ The Roman character of the procedure depicted by Plautus is further emphasized by the traditional language of Roman prayers used by Chalinus in 382 and by Lysidamus in 402 *quod bonum atque fortunatum mihi sit*; both the initial *quod* and the combination *bonum atque fortunatum* belong to the formula that Cic. *Div.* 1.102 *omnibus rebus*

deferentem sitellam (133 B.C.; cf. Plut. *Tib. Gracch.* 11.1 τὸν δῆμον αὐτοῦ καλοῦντος ἐπὶ τὴν ψῆφον, ἡρπάσθησαν ὑπὸ τῶν πλουσίων αἱ ὕδριαι); Rhet. Her. 1.21 *Saturninus . . . sitellam detulit* (103 or 100 B.C.), Liv. 25.3.16 *sitellae lata est ut sortirentur ubi Latini suffragium ferrent* (trial of *publicani*, 212 B.C.); to assign *provinciae* Liv. 41.18.8 *sortem in sitellam in templum latam* (176 B.C.). The verb *deferre* is also formulaic. Taylor (n. 12), 74 plausibly identified as a *sitella* the pitcher which with a *lituus* is a regular symbol of the augurate on coins; cf. Rosenstein (n. 12), 56–7. *Sitella* is also used in the Lex Acilia Repetundarum of 122 B.C., *CIL* I².583.53 (*Roman Statute*, ed. M. H. Crawford, *BICS Suppl.* 64 [London, 1996], no. 1), <qui iudex . . . > *ad sitellam sorti veniet, is in eam sitellam manum demittito* of the receptacle for the boxwood *sortes/sorticolae* inscribed with the jurors' votes. Later, apparently, *sitella* gave way to *urna* to denote either a receptacle for lots or a voting-urn (*OLD* s.v. 2a–b). The *urna versatilis* mentioned in Tabula Hebana 23 (V. Ehrenberg and A. H. M. Jones, *Documents Illustrating the Reigns of Augustus and Tiberius* [Oxford, 1955²], no. 94a, *Roman Statutes*, no. 37) in connection with the reallocation to centuries of senators and *eques*, for the purpose of the *destinatio* of consuls and praetors in A.D. 19, must be the pivoting urn depicted on a number of artefacts in judicial or agonistic contexts, first as a control-symbol, together with a *pila*, on coins of L. Roscius Fabatus, 64 B.C. (C. Nicolet and A. Beschtaouch, *CRAI* [1991], 486–500); such an apparatus can hardly have been called a *sitella* and is unlikely to have been used in Plautus' time.

¹⁴ *CIL* I².596 *pilas . . . aequanturque* (*Roman Statutes* [n. 13], no. 6, law regulating court procedures); Asc. *Mil.* 34 Clark *ut . . . coram accusatore ac reo pilae, in quibus nomina iudicium inscripta essent, aequarentur*; Tabula Hebana [n. 13], 23 *pilae quam maxime aequatae*; Prop. 4.11.20 (*Aeacus*) *in mea sortita vindicet ossa pila*; cf. Augustan edict of Cyrene (Ehrenberg and Jones [n. 13], no. 311.1) σηκωθεισῶν τῶν σφαιρῶν καὶ ἐπιγραφέντων αὐταῖς τῶν ὀνομάτων . . . κληρούσθω.

¹⁵ At the *comitia* Cic. *Corn. fr.* 30 (cited above, n. 13), in other contexts *CIL* I².596, Asc. *Mil.* 34, Tabula Hebana 23 (n. 14). According to the Cyrene Edict (n. 14), the balls were to be weighed (σηκωθεισῶν); cf. A. von Premerstein, *Sav. Zeitschr.* 48 (1928), 453–4. *Aequare* in Cic. *Div.* 1.34 *cuius generis oracula . . . non ea quae aequatis sortibus ducuntur* apparently refers to mixing up divinatory *sortes*; cf. 2.86 *sortis . . . quae Fortunae monitu pueri manu miscentur atque ducuntur*.

¹⁶ Cf. n. 22 below. *Effusum* in *Hist. Aug.* (Vopiscus) *Probus* 8.6 *in urnam milites iussit nomen suum mittere, ut aliquis eum (equum) sorte ductus acciperet. . . . Probi nomen effusum est* would fit an *urna versatilis* (see above, n. 13) as well as a water-filled jug. What purpose water would serve is not clear; MacCary and Willcock (n. 1), on *Cas.* 296 suggest, not very convincingly, that it would prevent the marks on the lots being legible while they lay on the bottom, but see below n. 19. Taylor (n. 12), 73 recounts modern experiments with wooden balls in a water-filled jug.

¹⁷ So Taylor (n. 12), 72; Staveley (n. 11), 231; Rosenstein (n. 12), 70. Rosenstein argues that 'some type of sortition between magistrates' would be more like the situation of the *Casina*; but the selection of the *praerogativa* or *principium* at the *comitia* would surely be more familiar to most of Plautus' audience. Cf. the parody of Roman wedding ritual in 815ff. (G. W. Williams, *JRS* 48 [1958], 17–18). R. Düll, *Sav. Zeitschr.* 58 (1938), 17–35, unconvincingly sees in the scene the ritualized violence of an archaic *vindictio*; but actual or threatened violence is ubiquitous in Plautine comedy.

agendis 'quod bonum faustum felix fortunatumque esset' praefabantur attests as regularly used by Romans before any undertaking.¹⁸ Historians are justified in using this scene to supplement other evidence for the procedure of Roman public life, although it should not be assumed that the comic scene follows real life in all respects. That the *sortes* of the *comitia* were of wood is confirmed (384). The repeated references to water (296, 380, 385) also seem to confirm that the *sitella* was regularly filled with water; they would otherwise have no point in Plautus' parody. Plautus' text provides no clues as to the action involved in *aequare*. It seems clear from 415 (CL.: *teneo sortem*. LY.: *ecfer foras*) that Cleostrata draws the lot by inserting her hand into the water rather than by pouring the jug.¹⁹

Now it could be that Plautus has done no more than superficially Romanize by linguistic means a piece of action taken from Diphilus' play. It seems likely, however, that the Romanization goes beyond the merely linguistic and that in one material respect, the use of water, it introduces a specifically Roman procedure. It is true that Plautus himself refers in 399–400 to a Greek parallel of a kind for the drawing of lots from water, the mythical story of Cresphontes and the sons of Aristodemus, who drew lots for Messenia in the division of the Peloponnese among the descendants of Heracles; Temenus had craftily made one lot of baked clay, the other of sun-dried clay, which dissolved in the water, ensuring the success of Cresphontes.²⁰ It might seem natural to assume that the allusion to a Greek myth goes back to Diphilus; Fraenkel showed, however, that Plautus must be held responsible for a number of such allusions, although he regarded this as a doubtful case.²¹ Moreover, the Cresphontes story is unique in the Greek tradition. It is an essential element of that story that the lots were immersed in water in a *hydria*; but there is no evidence that in the Greek world lots were normally drawn from a water-filled vessel.²² Thus the form of lot-drawing depicted in the *Casina* probably corresponds to regular Roman practice, but has no precise parallel in the Greek tradition (the lots of the Cresphontes story being of clay,

¹⁸ Cf. Donatus on *Pho.* 131 *veteres 'quod faustum felixque sit' dicebant aliquid aggressuri*; Plaut. *Aul.* 787–8 *quae res . . . bene felicitertue vortat*; *Pers.* 329 *quae res bene vortat* (comic in the mouth of a parasite; cf. E. Woytek, *T. Maccius Plautus Persa* [Vienna, 1982], ad loc.); *Trin.* 41 *bona fausta felix fortunataque evenat*; Liv. 1.17.10 *quod bonum faustum felixque sit*; Petron. *Sat.* 117.11 *'quod bene felicitertue eveniret' precati*; Suet. *Aug.* 58 *'quod bonum' inquit 'faustumque sit'*; G. Appel, *De Romanorum precationibus* (Giessen, 1909), 172–4.

¹⁹ Düll (n. 17), 19, 25 cannot be right that in this case the decision depended on whether the lots sank or floated, as with the nuts in wine of Petron. *Sat.* 137; such a procedure could give a favourable or unfavourable omen or verdict (cf. Champeaux [n. 91], 804, n. 10) but could not select one lot from others, and it is inconsistent with *Cas.* 415. One could, however, perhaps see the use of a water-filled jug as a survival from a form of hydromancy (Champeaux [n. 9], 806, n. 12).

²⁰ Cf. MacCary and Willcock (n. 1), 146.

²¹ Fraenkel, *P. im P.* (n. 2), 59–100, 302–3, n. 3 = *El. pl.* 55–94, 290, n. 3. I do not think N. Zagagi, *Tradition and Originality in Plautus*, Hypomnemata 62 (Göttingen, 1980), 15–67, has refuted Fraenkel's contention that Plautus could and often did invent grotesquely exaggerated mythological comparisons. In *El. pl.* 423–4 Fraenkel himself admitted to having overstated his case, and that Plautus may sometimes have merely exaggerated a mythological comparison that he found in his Greek model. The possibility must be allowed that in the *Kleroumenoi* there was some allusion to the story of Cresphontes as an example of cheating in a drawing of lots; even so, that would not necessarily imply that in Diphilus' play a water-filled jug was used.

²² Taylor (n. 12), 72 'It is not attested in the abundant sources for the Athenian lot in politics.' Arist. *Ath. Pol.* 63–4, in a detailed description of the procedures of the Athenian lawcourts, states that each juror drew from a *ὕδρεια* the *βάλλανος* which allotted him his court but says nothing about water. Inconclusive evidence for Syracuse is Cic. 2 *Verr.* 2.127 *scriptum erat ut, quot essent renuntiati, tot in hydriam sortes concicerentur, cuius nomen exisset, ut is haberet id sacerdotium*.

not wood) and is not attested as regular Greek practice. We cannot rule out the possibility that Diphilus' scene depicted lots being drawn from a water-filled vessel,²³ but it seems more likely that Plautus' Romanization of the scene replaced a simpler form of lot-drawing with the procedure of the *comitia* or at least characteristic elements of that procedure.

Other considerations point to a drastic Plautine rewriting of his model in this scene. Lefèvre has rightly observed that the fact that four speaking characters take part in the scene is itself a strong argument for supposing substantial Plautine rewriting.²⁴ How far Greek New Comedy was subject to a 'three-actor rule' is still disputed, but in my view it is beyond reasonable doubt that New Comedy did not normally employ more than three speaking characters in a scene, and that Plautus and Terence on the other hand not infrequently introduced extra speaking characters.²⁵ Lefèvre also observed that Lysidamus, Olympio, and Chalinus are all indispensable to the scene, and that the Plautine addition can only be Cleostrata. She has a substantial role in the scene, so that if Plautus is responsible for her presence he must also be responsible for much of the dialogue. Detailed examination of the scene will support this conclusion; much of the dialogue is typically Plautine and none of Cleostrata's part in it has to be attributed to Diphilus.

Before we examine the scene itself, verses 295–300 deserve attention, since they prepare for the entry of Cleostrata in 353 together with Chalinus and the apparatus of *sortitio*. There are several indications that these lines derive from Plautus rather than Diphilus. First, in 295–6 Lysidamus orders Chalinus to go into the house to fetch Cleostrata and bring out *sitella*, water, and *sortes*. In 297–9 he goes on to boast that by means of the lot he will take his revenge on Chalinus (and his supporters, *suffragatores*, meaning Cleostrata) for refusing to give up his claim to Casina. This boast, however, is empty, since Lysidamus cannot foresee the outcome of a *sortitio*. His confidence here contrasts with the pessimism he expresses in a soliloquy in 303–6. There he recognizes realistically that if Cleostrata persuades Olympio to give up his claim to Casina he is lost; only if Olympio resists Cleostrata does *sortitio* offer a slight hope, *specula*, no more. Chalinus replies with the equally empty boast that in fact the winning lot will be his. Playing on the ambiguity of *sors*, Lysidamus in return retorts that it will be Chalinus' lot to be hanged, *ut quidem pol pereas cruciatu malo*. Thus 295–300 consist of idle boasts and verbal skirmishing that do not advance the plot and are typical of

²³ So R. Düll, *Sav. Zeitschr.* 61 (1941), 17–18. Taylor (n. 12), 72 suggests that 'the use of a hydria of water may have survived in Greek private rather than public life'.

²⁴ Lefèvre (n. 4), 327–8.

²⁵ Cf. K. Gaiser, *ANRW* I.2 (1972), 1037–8, 1073–9. It is highly probable that Menander did not normally, at least, write scenes involving more than three speaking characters, and certain that Terence sometimes added an extra character (A. Blanchard, *Essai sur la composition des comédies de Ménandre* [Paris, 1983], 267; K. B. Frost, *Exits and Entrances in Menander* (Oxford, 1988), 2–3; J. C. B. Lowe, *Phoenix* 51 [1997], 152–69). It is likely that Diphilus would have followed the same convention as Menander, and there are other grounds for believing that Plautus has added one or more extra characters in a number of scenes involving more than three speakers, e.g. in the *Rudens*, also based on an original by Diphilus (Gaiser [n. 7], 1075–6; Lowe [n. 7], 39–44). H.-D. Blume, *Menander*, *Erträge der Forschung* 293 (Darmstadt, 1998), 64–9, 168–9 is inclined to deny a strict three-actor rule for New Comedy but accepts that Plautus and Terence not infrequently added extra speaking characters. Waltenberger (n. 1), 444–5 suggests that in Diphilus' lot-drawing Chalinus was present but did not speak until after the other three characters had left the stage, but Menander at least provides no certain parallel for such a piece of staging. I do not accept her argument that Cleostrata's presence was essential, and in any case her hypothesis also implies extensive Plautine rewriting.

Plautus. Secondly, Chalinus' restatement in 301 of his determination to have Casina repeats the substance of 294; and Lysidamus' angry *abin hinc ab oculis?* in 302 repeats his order to Chalinus in 295 *intro abi*. These repetitions favour, if they do not prove, the hypothesis that 295–300 are a Plautine insertion.²⁶ Thirdly, the actual order to Chalinus to fetch the apparatus of *sortitio* comes suddenly and without preparation;²⁷ objectively considered it is premature. Logically the time for Lysidamus to make definite preparations for a *sortitio* is after he has met Olympio, as he does in the following scene, and learnt that Olympio has in fact resisted Cleostrata. Thus the introduction of the idea of *sortitio* in 296 anticipates 306, where it is mentioned as an hypothetical possibility, and 342, where Lysidamus expresses the definite intention of resorting to the lot.

If 295–300 and the mission of Chalinus to fetch Cleostrata and the apparatus of lot-drawing are a Plautine addition, Plautus must also have altered 350–2 and 358–9, which refer to that mission. It is a reasonable guess that in Diphilus' version, Lysidamus and Olympio left the stage after 349, that a choral interlude followed, and that Lysidamus came out of his house at the beginning of a new act with both slaves and the apparatus of lot-drawing. Plautus will then have linked the two acts by keeping Lysidamus and Olympio on stage.²⁸

The exchanges between Cleostrata and Chalinus as they enter provide further support for the hypothesis that the mission to fetch Cleostrata and her presence in the lot-drawing scene are Plautine additions. Verses 353–7 were recognized by Fraenkel as a Plautine addition that delays the meeting between the new-comers and the characters already on stage with some momentary comic effects but at the expense of realism.²⁹ Granted that it was a regular convention of New Comedy for characters to enter as if in the middle of a conversation, sometimes saying things for the benefit of the audience that more realistically they should have said already off stage,³⁰ it is particularly unrealistic that in 353 Cleostrata should belatedly ask what Lysidamus wants of her; her enquiry is obviously designed to lead up to Chalinus' sardonic reply that her husband wants her dead, a favourite joke of Plautus,³¹ with here an allusion to cremation outside the Esquiline gate.³² Cleostrata comments bitterly that she believes that to be true, and Chalinus replies that he knows it so. This prompts an aside from

²⁶ Cf. Fraenkel, *P. im P.* (n. 2), 111–16 = *El. pl.* 105–10.

²⁷ Jachmann (n. 2), 112 and W. H. Friedrich, *Euripides und Diphilos*, *Zetemata* 5 (Munich, 1953), 175 observed the abruptness with which the *sortitio* is here introduced but were unable to explain it; they assumed that the lot-drawing itself must derive from Diphilus but failed to consider the possibility that the manner of its introduction might have been altered by Plautus. Friedrich's objection that the lot-drawing itself is entirely unmotivated was answered by Lefèvre (n. 4), 326–7 and Waltenberger (n. 1), 444–5.

²⁸ 143 is too soon for the end of the Greek first act, and after that the action of the Latin play is unbroken until 514. T. B. L. Webster, *Studies in Later Greek Comedy* (Manchester, 1953), 162, n. 2 supposes that Plautus bridged a Greek act-division at 216, but nothing in the text supports that.

²⁹ Fraenkel, *P. im P.* (n. 2) 302 = *El. pl.* 290, following P. Langen, *Plautinische Studien* (Berlin, 1886), 124; so Jachmann (n. 2), 121.

³⁰ Gomme and Sandbach (n. 6) on Men. *Dysc.* 233.

³¹ Cf. 227, 234; *Most.* 703–7; *Pers.*, 901, 905, 909; *Trin.* 41, 51; G. E. Duckworth, *The Nature of Roman Comedy* (Princeton, 1952), 283–4; E. Schuhmann, *Philologus* 121 (1977), 55–64. Such crude jokes must be distinguished from expressions of misogyny to be found in the remains of Greek New Comedy or Terence, and from Stobaeus 4.22, 50 *γυναικα θάπτειν κρείττον ἐστὶν ἢ γαμεῖν*, formerly thought to be a quotation from comedy but more probably from the tragedian Chaeremon (71 F 32 Snell).

³² Cf. J. Marquardt, *Pas Privatleben der Römer* (Leipzig, 1886), 341–3.

Lysidamus that he apparently owns more *artifices* than he thought; Chalinus has shown the insight of a soothsayer, *hariolus*. The roundabout, riddling form of the comment is characteristic of Plautus, and the word *hariolus*, though not without Greek equivalents, has particularly Roman associations.³³ Finally, Lysidamus proposes to Olympio that they should advance their forces to meet the enemy, 357 *quid si propius attollamus signa eamusque obviam*; the stage-directional aside and the military metaphor, repeated from 352, are both typical of Plautus.³⁴ Thus Cleostrata's first two utterances in the scene are probably Plautine additions.

Verses 359b-62, consisting of altercations between the slaves, could in substance derive from Diphilus but could equally well be Plautine. It is at least very likely that the exploitation of the double meaning of *comprime*, with the imputation to Chalinus of passive homosexuality (362b), is entirely due to Plautus.³⁵

At 363 Lysidamus has the *sitella* beside him and the lots in his hand, and his call for attention, *animum advortite*, leads one to expect the *sortitio* to begin. Instead in 364 he breaks off to make a final, unsuccessful attempt to persuade Cleostrata to give in, before returning to the *sortitio* in 374. Fraenkel recognized 365-71 as a Plautine addition, of which the main function is to introduce Lysidamus' comic slips of the tongue in 365-70;³⁶ the same comic device, with some almost identical phrases, recurs in 672-4 and 702-4, of which at least the latter passage is probably also to be attributed to Plautus and perhaps both.³⁷ Fraenkel also noted that this is one of the passages which presuppose that Cleostrata is already aware of Lysidamus' designs on Casina but are inconsistent with the ignorance of these designs Chalinus displays in 424-68. He further observed that *censeo* in 373 picks up *censui* in 364 and regarded these lines as relics of the Greek original framing a Plautine insertion. Verses 364-73, however, form a single, self-contained episode, with ring-composition marked by the repetition *censui/censeo*; this episode delays the progress of the action and can be attributed to Plautus in its entirety. Thus Cleostrata's involvement and five utterances in this section of the scene are probably to be attributed to Plautus.

In 374-82 Lysidamus hands out the lots to the slaves, who raise various objections. After a brief and dispensable expression of agreement (374 *quis votat?*) Cleostrata probably takes no part in this section of the scene.³⁸ Elements of this section may well

³³ Jachmann (n. 2), 60, n. 2; cf. similar joking asides *Most.* 571 *hic homo est certe hariolus*, *Amph.* 323 *illic homo superstitiosus*, *Curc.* 397.

³⁴ Cf. *Bacch.* 535 with J. Barsby, *Plautus Bacchides* (Warminster, 1986), 144.

³⁵ For obscene puns on *comprimere*, cf. *Am.* 348-9, *Asin.* 291-2, *Rud.* 1073-5, *Truc.* 262-4. Jokes about homosexuality, often exploiting a *double entendre*, are common in Plautus (e.g. *Asin.* 703, *Capt.* 867, *Cas.* 454-66, 812-13, *Cure.* 401-2, *Cist.* 457) and probably for the most part Plautine additions; cf. S. Lilja, *Homosexuality in Republican and Augustan Rome* (Helsinki, 1982), 15-50. Plautus' predilection for the theme of homosexuality, no doubt reflecting Roman ideas of characteristically Greek behaviour (*pergraeuari*), is apparent in the frequency of these jokes and in three *pueri* with speaking roles who are for other reasons probably to be regarded as Plautine creations, Phaniscus in *Most.* 885-903 (I. Weide, *Hermes* 89 [1961], 198-203), Paegnium in the *Persa* (D. Hughes, *RhM* 127 [1984], 46-57), and the nameless boy of *Pseud.* 767-89 (H. D. Jocelyn in *Dramatische Wäldchen: Festschrift für E. Lefèvre*, ed. E. Stärk and G. Vogt-Spira [Hildesheim, 2000], 431-60). There is at least no need to suppose that Plautus was here inspired by anything in the *Kleroumenoi*, even if we cannot rule out the possibility that Diphilus might have included a similar obscenity in an altercation between slaves (cf. *Men. Dysc.* 892 and Gomme and Sandbach [n. 6], ad loc.).

³⁶ Fraenkel, *P. im P.* (n. 2) 296 = *El. pl.* 284.

³⁷ Jachmann (n. 2), 110, n. 1; Lefèvre (n. 4), 322, n. 106, 327, n. 77.

³⁸ The distribution of speakers is here uncertain, but I agree with MacCary and Willcock (n. 1) on 379-81 in accepting F. Groh's attribution of 381b *nulla est. habe quietum animum modo* to

derive from Diphilus, including Chalinus' prayer in 382, despite its Roman form.³⁹ There are grounds for suspecting, however, that Plautus has made a significant contribution. The objections raised by the slaves in 379–80, and 384–5, that an extra lot may be lurking under the water and that one of the lots may be of a light wood such as would float, both refer to the water; but water, I have argued, is probably a specifically Roman feature of the lot-drawing.

In 387 Cleostrata is told to scrutinize the lots, *aequa*. Here she has an important role in the action of the scene; but so far as our evidence goes, *aequare* was a purely Roman procedure. The following lines, 388–92, consist merely of altercations between the slaves; and Chalinus' interruption of Olympio's prayer in 389–90 with curses alluding to slave-punishments is thoroughly Plautine.⁴⁰

After repeating his call for attention in 393 *animum advortite ambo*, in 394–5, Lysidamus orders Cleostrata to draw the lots, *tute sorti*; she expresses her thanks, 396a *bene facis*, but does not comply until Lysidamus repeats his order in 413 *sorti. vos advortite animum*. The intervening passage, 396b–412, consists of further altercations between the two slaves which culminate in an exchange of blows. Fraenkel recognized the fisticuffs of 404–12 as Plautine, but hesitated over the preceding lines.⁴¹ The whole passage coheres, however, and bears the stamp of Plautus throughout.⁴² To be noted is the word-play on *ecfugerit/fugitivos* (396–7) and *deliquerit/liquescat* (399–400), of which the latter arises directly from the allusion to the lot-drawing of Cresphontes (398–9). The context in which the mythological allusion occurs provides some support for the hypothesis that it is a Plautine addition, although, of course, it could have occurred in a different context in Diphilus. Also noteworthy is the comic comparison of the quarrelling husband and wife with Jupiter and Juno (406–8).⁴³ In this section again Cleostrata's involvement and verbal contributions (403d?, 404b?, 406a, 407a, 410a) can all be attributed to Plautus.

In 413–18 the actual lot-drawing takes place. Cleostrata draws one of the lots with the words *teneo sortem* (415b); probably she also speaks 417a *victus es, Chaline*, the

Lysidamus rather than Cleostrata (cf. 387 *habe animum bonum*). I prefer, however, to assign to Chalinus 379b–80a *cedo. mane, unum venit in mentem modo: vide ne quae illic insit alia sortis sub aqua*, balancing Olympio's objection in 384 *sed manedum: num ista aut populna sors aut abiognast tua?* I take 380b–81a *verbero, men te censens esse?* to be Olympio's retort to Chalinus' insinuation that he is cheating.

³⁹ Cf. Luc. *Hermot.* 40 ἑκαστος προσευξάμενος τῷ Δίῳ καθείς τὴν χεῖρα ἐς τὴν κάλπιν ἀνασπᾶ τῶν κλήρων ἓνα (Olympic competitors).

⁴⁰ Cf. 300, *Cist.* 497, 596, *Pers.* 292–3, *Poen.* 869, *Pseud.* 37, 947. On the theme of slave-punishments, cf. Fraenkel, *P. im P.* (n. 2), 19 = *El. pl.* 17. The grotesque expression *ut oculos emungare ex capite* (391) is paralleled by *Most.* 1110 *cerebrum . . . e capite emunxti*.

⁴¹ Fraenkel, *P. im P.* (n. 2), 302 = *El. pl.* 290.

⁴² Langen (n. 29), 124. Jachmann (n. 2), 121 with n. 1 rightly observes that the *Prügelei* is not in itself conclusive; but it adds to the cumulative case for attributing 396b–412 to Plautus. Webster (n. 28), 161–2 collects Greek parallels for this and other features of the scene, concluding that 'there is no reason to ascribe them to Plautus'. The motifs themselves, however, are less important than their frequency and the contexts in which they occur in the Latin plays; I have tried to show that some motifs, while not impossible in Greek comedy, are typical of Plautus. There is at least no *a priori* reason to ascribe such motifs to Diphilus rather than to Plautus; and the probability is that the majority of them, even if not all, are due to Plautus, especially when other evidence points in the same direction. For Plautine jokes on the theme of *fugitivi*, cf. 950–9, *Capt.* 116–24 (with L. Benz in *Maccus barbarus*, ed. L. Benz and E. Lefèvre, *Scripta Oralia* 74, Reihe A: *Altertumswiss.* Reihe 18 [Tübingen, 1998], 82–5), *Stich.* 312 (with Fraenkel, *P. im P.* [n. 2], 105, n. 6 = *El. pl.* 99 [n. 7]).

⁴³ Cf. 230 with MacCary and Willcock (n. 1), ad loc., 331–7.

official announcement of the result. From Plautus' point of view it was appropriate that she, rather than either of the interested parties, should actually draw the lot. We can only speculate how Diphilus might have managed a lot-drawing scene without her; but it would not have been impossible. If in Diphilus Chalinus was not yet aware of his master's ulterior motives, as seems highly probable, he could hardly object to Lysidamus conducting the lot-drawing himself. That Olympio attributes his victory to the *pietas* of his *maiores* (418) is a recurring Plautine joke.⁴⁴

Finally, in 419–21 Cleostrata is ordered to go indoors to make preparations for Olympio's wedding. In three curt sentences (419 *faciam ut iubes*, 420 *scio*, 421 *licet*) she hints that she may not be altogether compliant. The motivation of her exit, though reasonable in itself, virtually duplicates the motivation of Lysidamus' and Olympio's exit, which immediately follows, 422 *eamus nos quoque intro, hortemur ut properent*, and raises the question why they did not all go into the house together. This duplication can be explained by the hypothesis that Cleostrata was not present in the corresponding scene of the Greek play and that Plautus manufactured a motivation for her exit.

In short, there are strong grounds for recognizing the hand of Plautus in the Roman character of the lot-drawing, in the involvement in the scene of four speaking characters, in the passage that prepares for the entrance of Cleostrata with the apparatus of lot-drawing, and in practically all the dialogue of the scene. There is no reason to doubt that the corresponding scene of Plautus' Greek model contained a lot-drawing. It is possible that some motifs of the Latin dialogue, for example the prayers which precede the lot-drawing and the altercations between the slaves, were in some degree inspired by motifs in Diphilus' scene. It must be regarded as probable, however, that Plautus' debt to Diphilus was here very small.

Islip, Oxford

J. C. B. LOWE

⁴⁴ Cf. MacCary and Willcock (n. 1), ad loc.