TERENCE'S FOUR-SPEAKER SCENES

J. C. B. Lowe

In the now substantial corpus of Menander there are apparently no scenes involving more than three speaking characters, although mute extras are freely used (Gomme-Sandbach 1973: 16–19; Frost 1988: 2–3). The fragmentary nature of the texts makes it impossible to state categorically that they contain no four-speaker scenes, but there is no indisputable example. Even less can we be certain that Menander never wrote such a scene, given that we possess only a small fraction of his total output. Nevertheless, the evidence is now strong that Menander's normal practice, at least, conformed to that of fifth-century tragedy rather than that of Aristophanes (cf. Pickard-Cambridge 1968: 135–156; MacDowell 1994: 325–335). By contrast, in the four plays of Terence based on originals by Menander there are at least 18 scenes involving more than three speaking characters. The discrepancy is too great to be ascribed to chance; moreover, we know from the evidence of Terence himself or of Donatus that in seven of the scenes in question Terence made changes to his Greek model. Whereas Leo (1912: 226, n. 3) assumed, on the basis of the Latin adaptations, that New Comedy enjoyed the same freedom as Old Comedy, it is now clear that the Latin adapters not infrequently added extra characters to their Greek models (Gaiser 1972: 1073–79). This had indeed been explicitly stated by the grammarian Diomedes, who contrasts Greek practice, reflected in Horace's dictum *nec quarta loqui persona laboret* (*Ars P.* 192), with Roman: *at Latini scriptores complures personas in fabulas introduxerunt ut speciosiores frequentia facerent* (Keil, *Gramm. Lat.* 1.490–491). Sandbach (1975: 197–204) discussed breaches of the "three-actor rule" in Latin adaptations of Menander, whether this is interpreted as a weaker rule "that not more than three actors should speak in any scene" or as a stronger rule "that not more than three actors should be used in a play." He showed that all breaches of the rule, in either sense, may with varying degrees of probability be attributed to the Latin adapter rather than Menander, and cautiously concluded that the evidence recommended "a provisional belief that he [Menander] usually observed the weak form of the rule and perhaps the strong form also" (204). Sandbach was only concerned with Menander, but there are good grounds for believing that other dramatists of the Greek New Comedy were normally, if perhaps not universally, subject to the same "three-actor rule" as Menander (Gaiser 1972: 1037–38). Of Terence's two plays based on originals by Apollodorus, the *Hecyra* contains no four-speaker scenes, the *Phormio* four; but in each case cogent arguments have been adduced for ascribing to Terence

The nucleus of this paper was presented in August 1994 to the F. I. E. C. Congress in Quebec. I am indebted to Peter Brown and to the editor and referees of *Phoenix* for improvements to its content and form.

rather than to Apollodorus the involvement of four speaking characters. There is thus a strong probability that all or most of Terence's four-speaker scenes result from changes to his Greek models. Exactly how he changed his models is more difficult to establish and in some cases frank agnosticism is the wisest policy. Some of Sandbach's theories were admittedly speculative and other scholars have propounded different theories. My main purpose is to discuss the dramatic uses to which Terence put four speaking characters in the scenes where he employed them. I relegate to the end of the article a catalogue of all the scenes, with a selection of references to, and some comment on, theories of how Terence changed his Greek model in each case; but the evidence contained in the catalogue for changes by Terence underpins the preceding discussion.

DRAMATIC EFFECTS ACHIEVED BY TERENCE'S FOUR-SPEAKER SCENES

Since in all or most of these scenes Terence has very probably altered his Greek model, we may hope that they will shed some light on Terence's artistic aims. Each scene is unique and needs to be examined in its dramatic context, but that is beyond the scope of this article; as a complementary approach it is also useful to observe frequently recurring features. One such feature obvious at first sight, both in scenes where Terence is known to have introduced extra characters and in many others, is the presence of one or two eavesdroppers who, unnoticed, overhear a dialogue between other characters and in emotional asides express their reactions to what they hear.

A particularly clear case is *An.* 412–425, where Byrria, known to be a Terentian addition, eavesdrops unseen on a dialogue between Simo, Pamphilus, and Davos and reacts in a series of emotional asides to what he takes to be Pamphilus' betrayal of his master Charinus, 419 *timeo . . . quid hic respondeat*, 420 *hem*, 421 *quid dixit?*, 425 *nullane in re esse quoiquam homini fidem.* The dialogue between the other characters is coherent and integral to the plot, presumably faithful to Menander in essentials: Pamphilus, coached by Davos, reluctantly pretends to agree to Simo's proposal that he should marry Philumena. The addition of Byrria to the scene has a structural function in Terence's plot, preparing for the subsequent appearance of Charinus; but principally the presence of Byrria here as an interested spectator, at the cost of some artificiality, adds an extra emotional dimension to the scene itself. Byrria is a pathetic figure, but also a slightly comic one, for the audience knows that he has misunderstood the situation and has earlier seen him dismissed by his master as useless (336–337). It is reasonable to speculate that an actor on the Roman stage would exaggerate this comic element with appropriate gesticulation.

In two other scenes a single character eavesdrops and comments aside on a dialogue between three other characters. In *An.* 904–944 Pamphilus listens to 40 lines of dialogue in which Crito provides the information which leads to the recognition of Glycerium as a citizen and Chremes' daughter; his reactions to what he hears are expressed in a series of excited asides, e.g., 914 *perii, metuo ut substet hospes*, 933 *arrige auris, Pamphile*, 937–938 *vix sum apud me: ita animu' spe*

gaudio, mirando tanto tam repentino hoc bono. In 945 Pamphilus steps forward to reveal Glycerium's original name, Pasibula, and his betrothal rapidly follows; but for the greater part of the scene his presence in the background commenting on the dialogue, in the outcome of which he has the greatest interest, serves only to add an extra emotional dimension to the developing *anagnorisis.* In *Phorm.* 606–681 Antipho eavesdrops unseen on Demipho, Chremes, and Geta discussing plans for his divorce from Phanium and her marriage to Phormio; he is unaware that these plans form part of Geta's scheme to extract money from Demipho and expresses mounting alarm in a series of highly emotional exclamations, 607–608 *ei mihi, quam timeo adventus huiu' quo inpellat patrem,* 626 *quid hic coeptat aut quo evadet hodie?,* 636 *satin illi di sunt propitii?,* 641 *occidi,* 659–660 *utrum stultitia facere ego hunc an malitia dicam, scientem an inprudentem, incertu' sum.* Antipho's presence here in no way advances the plot but serves only to arouse in his mind exaggerated fears which are then allayed by Geta. Donatus (on 606) put it well: *ad errorem cumulandum persona Antiphonis interponitur utque ei adaucto metu amittendae uxoris maior fiat repentinae repetitio laetitiae* (cf. Lefèvre 1978: 69). Antipho is a comically pathetic figure, the epitome of the highly emotional and helpless young lover.

In a number of cases we have what may be called a double dialogue, that is, two characters in dialogue are overheard by another two who, unnoticed by the first pair, carry on a second dialogue, usually quite short, commenting on the first (cf. Duckworth 1952: 113–114). In *Eun.* 1031–49 Thraso and Gnatho, known to have been introduced by Terence, eavesdrop unseen on a dialogue between Parmeno and Chaerea in which the happy outcome of Chaerea's and Phaedria's love-affairs is reported and the consequent banishment of Phaedria's rival Thraso predicted; Thraso and Gnatho exchange aside comments on what they hear, 1037 GN. *audin tu, hic quid ait?,* 1043–44 TH. *numquid, Gnatho, tu dubitas quin ego nunc perpetuo perierim?* GN. *sine dubio opinor.* Again in 1049–60 Thraso and Gnatho, still unobserved, eavesdrop briefly on the joyful meeting of Phaedria and Chaerea, and in 1053–60 Thraso's woeful exclamation *perii, quanto minu' spei 'st tanto magis amo* leads to a short aside dialogue in which Thraso urges Gnatho to try to secure a continuation of Thais' favour in the interest of them both. Throughout this section the eavesdropping presence of Thraso and his parasite provides a comic/pathetic foil to the rejoicing of the young lovers. The foolish Thraso is a figure of fun whenever he appears in the play, the uncomprehending butt of Gnatho's ironic flattery, no less so now in defeat and in the final arrangement whereby he is accepted only as a source of funds.

In *An.* 459–467 Simo and Davos, eavesdropping on the brief dialogue of Mysis and Lesbia, react with exclamations of apprehension and horror to Mysis' revelation that Pamphilus is the father of Glycerium's baby and intends to acknowledge it, a revelation that threatens to wreck both their plans: 462 SI. *quid dicit?,* 462–463 SI. *hem.* DA. *utinam aut hic surdus aut haec muta facta sit!,* 464–465. SI. *o Iuppiter, quid ego audio? actumst, siquidem haec vera praedicat.* It is

a moot point whether one can speak of Simo and Davos as carrying on an aside dialogue. Davos certainly does not intend Simo to hear 463, but they are aware of each other, Simo's exclamations can be taken as directed at Davos, and, if we accept the admittedly uncertain reading *narras*, Davos addresses Simo in 461. One must surely ascribe to Menander the basic situation here, that Simo overhears Mysis' revelation with initial horror before jumping to the false conclusion that it is a fiction devised by Davos; but if Terence gave Lesbia a speaking role, the effect was probably to prolong slightly and emphasize the eavesdropping situation.

In *Haut.* 242–250 Clinia and Clitipho, eavesdropping on the entrance dialogue of Syrus and Dromo, comment on it in an aside dialogue. Clinia, who was already in a highly emotional state, impatient to meet his beloved Antiphila but full of fears for her fidelity (231, 234, 236, 240–241), at first expresses joy at the imminent approach of Antiphila, 244 *audio nunc demum et video et valeo*; but references to a crowd of maids and much baggage lead him to believe that Antiphila must have been unfaithful to him and he bursts out in a series of anguished exclamations, 246 *perii, unde illi sunt ancillae?*, 247 *ei mihi*, 250 *vae misero mi, quanta de spe decidi.* In a brief soliloquy after the exit of Dromo, Syrus again comments on the approaching crowd of women and the devastation they will wreak on his master's household (254–255); and this provokes Clinia to a longer outburst against Antiphila's supposed unfaithfulness (256–263) before Syrus finally accosts him and explains that his suspicions are unjustified. The dramatic purpose of this eavesdropping scene is clearly to prompt Clinia's emotional reactions. As Brothers (1988: on 245) observes, "The humour here lies in the devastating effect that the slaves' conversation, and, later, Syrus' musings, have on Clinia."[1] Even if he was developing a motif already present in his Menandrian model, it seems probable that Terence has here at least expanded, and perhaps created, the eavesdropping situation, delaying the meeting of Syrus with the two young men for 20 lines and exaggerating Clinia's comically misplaced fears. If he created the Syrus-Dromo dialogue by giving Dromo a small speaking role, this would help to prolong the eavesdropping. Again in 381–402 Clinia and Syrus eavesdrop on the entrance dialogue of Bacchis and Antiphila and carry on a brief aside dialogue commenting on it. Bacchis at considerable length congratulates Antiphila on her loyalty to one lover and reflects on her own different situation, to which Antiphila briefly replies (381–397). This prompts highly emotional outbursts from Clinia, the pathos of which is undercut by the slave's sardonic comments, 397–402 CL. *ah ergo, mea Antiphila, tu nunc sola reducem me in patriam facis...* SY. *credo.* CL. *Syre vix suffero: hocin me miserum non licere meo modo ingenium frui!* SY. *immo ut patrem tuom vidi esse habitum, diu etiam duras dabit.* The dramatic interest of the passage lies in the reactions of the eavesdroppers; Bacchis' eulogy of Antiphila, hardly consistent with her characterization elsewhere or with Antiphila's supposed social status, serves to provoke Clinia's emotional outbursts. Even if it is uncertain just how

[1] Cf. Lefèvre 1994: 147–148 on the comic pathos of this whole passage.

Terence altered his model here, it seems probable that this eavesdropping scene was his creation.

The same play contains two further examples of attenuated double dialogues. In 614–621 Chremes and Syrus eavesdrop on the entrance dialogue of Sostrata and the nurse before the nurse's exit at 619, and comment on it in an aside dialogue, Chremes expressing curiosity, 615 *quid volt sibi, Syre, haec oratio?*, and Syrus anxiety, 619–620 *te volt: videas quid velit. nescioquid tristis est: non temerest: timeo quid sit*, without apparently taking in what Sostrata says. The dramatic effect of the eavesdropping is slightly to prolong the moment of suspense before Sostrata delivers her news to Chremes and Syrus. It seems likely that it was Terence who created this small effect and that giving a few words to the nurse contributed to it. In 723–743 Clinia and Syrus eavesdrop on Bacchis and her maid Phrygia. Bacchis' entrance monologue, threatening dire punishment for Syrus, prompts an exchange of aside comments between the eavesdroppers, cynical on the part of Clinia, anxious on the part of Syrus, 729–730 CL. *sati' scite promittit tibi.* SY. *atqui tu hanc iocari credis? faciet nisi caveo.* In 730–736 a faked dialogue between Bacchis and Phrygia, deliberately intended to frighten Syrus, duly draws from him exclamations of alarm, 734 *quid inceptat?*, 736 *perii hercle*, before he finally steps forward to renew his promise that she will soon be paid what she expects and to communicate the latest part of his plan. The eavesdropping here serves to provide a little comic interlude, delaying the progress of the main action; the scheming slave is depicted as temporarily frightened, in order to enhance his ultimate achievement. It seems probable that this dramatic effect, and Phrygia's role in it, is to be ascribed to Terence, even if it is uncertain how he altered his Greek model here.[2]

In *Phorm.* 485–503 Antipho and Geta eavesdrop on a dialogue between Phaedria and Dorio before Antipho accosts Phaedria. The aside exchanges of the eavesdroppers once again contrast the emotional lover and the cynical slave, 490–491 AN. *ei, metuo lenonem nequid* ... GE. *suo suat capiti. idem ego vereor*, 501 AN. *miseritumst.* GE. *quam uterquest similis sui!*[3] Both in this eavesdropping passage and in the following confrontation with Dorio the presence of Antipho, very probably added by Terence, serves only to enhance the comic pathos of the helpless lovers' futile pleading with the heartless *leno*; Antipho can only support Phaedria and in effect duplicates his role in the scene.

Nearly half of Terence's four-speaker scenes thus exploit the dramatic potential of emotional asides by one or, usually, two eavesdroppers reacting to what they overhear. In all cases there are more or less strong grounds for believing that Terence has at least expanded, if not created, the eavesdropping situation. That this is a peculiarly Terentian technique is supported by other cases, not four-speaker scenes, where it is probable that Terence has introduced an eavesdropper.

[2]The fact that such dissimulation scenes had Greek antecedents does not exclude the possibility that the Latin writers extended the technique; cf. Bain 1977: 171–177.

[3]The interpretation of both these lines and the division of 490 between speakers is uncertain; cf. Martin 1959: *ad loc.* This does not affect the present argument.

In *An.* 236–266 where, as was shown by Denzler (1968: 45–51), Terence probably kept Mysis on stage from the preceding scene to eavesdrop on Antipho's monologue, incidentally bridging the Greek act-division (Lowe 1983a: 430 with n. 20; 1983b: 432, n. 15), Mysis' emotional asides are very similar to the ones we have been examining: 237 *quid illud est?*, 240 *miseram me, quod verbum audio!*, 251 *oratio haec me miseram exanimavit metu*, 264 *misera timeo "incertum" hoc quorsus accidat.* So in *Phorm.* 179–195 are the rhetorical questions with which Antipho reacts to the running-slave entrance monologue, again bridging a Greek act-division (Lowe 1983b: 432–434; cf. Primmer 1984: 20 n. 27). Such emotional effects are characteristic of Terence in general and of his eavesdropping scenes in particular.[4]

Two other scenes involving Thraso and Gnatho in the *Eunuchus* contain aside comments by eavesdroppers, the effect of which is purely comic. In 454–460 Parmeno's asides underline Thraso's boorishness, 457–458 *quam venuste! quod dedit principium adveniens!*, 459–460 *em alterum: ex homine hunc natum dicas?*; the four-speaker scene, 454–493, forms only part of a longer section, 391–506, depicting the comic interaction of boastful soldier and flatterer. In 771–816 Thraso and his allies prepare to assault Thais' house—Terence's only five-speaker scene and a clear case of a Terentian introduction containing not only verbal comedy but a lively piece of comic action, like the scene borrowed from Diphilus, *Ad.* 155–196. While Thraso marshals his troops in 771–791, Chremes and Thais watch in the background and in 783–786 react with an exchange of asides, CH. *viden tu, Thais, quam hic rem agit? nimirum consilium illud rectumst de occludendis aedibus.* TH. *sane quod tibi nunc vir videatur esse hic, nebulo magnus est: ne metuas*; this brief aside dialogue adds an extra comic touch by providing further evidence of Chremes' cowardice (cf. 755–770).

Although not a normal eavesdropping scene, the dramatic effect of Sannio's presence in the background in *Ad.* 265–280, generally agreed to be a Terentian innovation, is not dissimilar to that of some of Terence's eavesdroppers. Sannio, who hopes that Aeschinus is bringing him money, on seeing him appear empty-handed expresses his disappointment in an aside, 265 *me quaerit. num quid nam ecfert? occidi: nil video*; thereafter he neither comments on nor apparently takes in the content of the dialogue between Aeschinus and Ctesipho, but merely renews his demand for prompt payment in 278–279. Throughout the scene, however, he has dramatic value as a comically expectant figure whose hopes are constantly disappointed; and we may guess that his actor would not stand motionless but would emphasize the comedy of the situation with appropriate gestures. If, as seems probable, Syrus is present throughout *Haut.* 954–969 as a silent observer, we may guess that he indicated with gestures his horror at what he overhears before his final aside outburst in 970 *disperii: scelestu' quantas turbas concivi insciens!*

[4] Denzler 1968: 112–117; Büchner 1974: 523 index s.v., *Intensivierung von Affekten*; Lefèvre 1994: 146–149. In a comedy pathos, especially if exaggerated, usually has a comic dimension, but Terence differs from Plautus in avoiding grossly exaggerated effects. The Roman adapters of Greek tragedy also tended to heighten emotional effects (Beare 1964: 70–78; Traina 1964: 112–142).

One conclusion, therefore, that emerges from a study of Terence's four-speaker scenes, is that in modifying his Greek models he often exploits the dramatic effect of eavesdroppers and their aside comments. Only occasionally do the eavesdroppers learn information which affects the development of the plot; sometimes they apparently fail to hear or comprehend what is said in their presence. Usually the dramatic function of the eavesdroppers is simply to show the reactions of the eavesdroppers by means of their aside comments, pathetic, comic or both in varying degrees, and thereby to give a new dimension to the scene as a whole. Writing about Plautus, Slater (1985: 17–18, 164) has well noted the theatricality of the conventions of eavesdropping and asides: "The eavesdropper on the page is a virtual cipher; on stage he is a powerful presence, coloring and shaping our perception of the scene and characters he overhears even when not commenting aside," "The eavesdropping scene is a rudimentary form of the play-within-the-play." Terence's eavesdropping scenes are hardly less theatrical, even if he aims at different effects from Plautus. *Eun.* 771–787 can well be described as a "play-within-the-play," Chremes and Thais providing the stage-audience; but the presence of an eavesdropper in the background during any dialogue, as of Byrria in *An.* 412–425, in some degree increases the theatricality of the scene. Terence's plays are much more naturalistic than those of Plautus; but it must not be forgotten that he too was a man of the theatre.

Terence's other four-speaker scenes are too diverse to allow much generalization. Besides *An.* 904–952 and *Eun.* 1031–94 several others occur at or near the end of plays: *Haut.* 1045–67, *Phorm.* 990–55, *Ad.* 958–997. Substantial alteration by the Latin adapter is particularly likely at the end of a play and some alterations at the end of the *Adelphoe* are attested by Donatus; it is hardly an accident that the final scenes of many of Plautus' plays involve more than three speakers. To establish just what changes Terence has made, however, is very difficult, if not impossible; any attempt to do so must involve consideration of each play as a whole, but previous attempts do not encourage optimism. It is hard to see any particular dramatic effect in a dialogue between four rather than three speakers; and sometimes one speaker says little (Aeschinus in *Ad.* 958–997). One may suspect that Terence has completely rewritten the end of the play, perhaps by conflating originally separate scenes, and that this led incidentally to the four-speaker scenes.

In the *Eunuchus* Dorias is probably a Terentian doublet of Pythias, as Webster (1950: 73) suggested, but it is not clear what were Terence's motives for her introduction; Dorias' presence in the four-speaker scene 668–717, during which she speaks only once, is probably the incidental result of her presence in the preceding scenes, 615–667. In *An.* 684–708 the presence of Charinus in a four-speaker scene, in which he has only a small speaking role, is incidental to his presence throughout 625–715; in 625–683 and 708–715 he has more to say. Terence's introduction of Charinus, here and elsewhere, as a sort of doublet of Pamphilus, served to enhance the comic pathos which regularly attaches to the

role of the young lover; even when he says little his mere presence has something of this effect. His comically pathetic role is comparable to that of Antipho in *Phorm.* 606–712 discussed above.

The brief utterances of Syrus and Geta in *Ad.* 899–916 probably belong to a more general Terentian rewriting of the end of the play, but in themselves are of no importance. Nor can one attach much significance to the few words spoken by the *lorarius* Dromo in *An.* 861–867; at most they may possibly mark a greater emphasis by the Latin writer, after the example of Plautus, on the motif of slave-punishment. Finally, *Phorm.* 446–459 constitute a scene different from any of Terence's other four-speaker scenes. In this little interlude, in which three *advocati* give contradictory advice, Terence has apparently created a witty piece of satire, not explicitly Roman in the manner of Plautus but with unmistakable echoes of Roman legal procedure.

In conclusion, although in some of Terence's four-speaker scenes it is not possible to see any special dramatic effect in the participation of more than three speakers, the majority do show a recurring pattern of eavesdropping and comic/pathetic asides. This recurring pattern reinforces the other evidence, statistical and analytical, that all Terence's four-speaker scenes result from changes to his Greek models. The implication is that Terence made many more changes to his models than he admits in his prologues.[5] This puts in a new light the changes he does acknowledge, involving the introduction of material from a second Greek model, so-called *contaminatio.* His introduction of Thraso and Gnatho into the *Eunuchus* from the *Kolax* is now seen to be only a special case of a much more widespread practice; it was apparently more reprehensible in the eyes of Terence's contemporary critics but, so far as Terence's originality is concerned, it is not different in principle from many other cases where he introduced additional speaking characters. *Contaminatio* is shown to be a much less important aspect of Terence's originality than was once thought. This has implications also for Plautus. Theories of widespread *contaminatio* were based on Terence's admitted practice. If Terence made many innovations without benefit of a second Greek model, it is unlikely that Plautus did so any less.

CATALOGUE OF FOUR-SPEAKER SCENES AND EVIDENCE FOR TERENTIAN INNOVATION

An. 412–425. Byrria eavesdrops and comments aside on a dialogue between Simo, Pamphilus, and Davos. Byrria was "not in Menander" (Donatus on 301). Some scholars, e.g., Webster (1974: 116–118), suppose him taken from Menander's *Perinthia* (cf. *An.* 9–14); but see Büchner (1974: 91–93). His entry and exit speeches delay the progress of the main action and some obscurity surrounds his offstage movements (Büchner 1974: 69).

[5] Terence does not mention the introduction of Antipho in *Eun.* 539–614, attested by Donatus *ad loc.*

An. 459–467. Simo and Davos eavesdrop and comment aside on a dialogue between Mysis and Lesbia (double dialogue?). Webster (1950: 79, n. 1) and Sandbach (1975: 199) plausibly suppose Lesbia, who speaks only two sentences (466–467), mute here in Menander; cf. Lowe 1983a: 428–431, with references, on Terentian substitution of dialogue for monologue.

An. 684–708. Dialogue between Pamphilus, Davos, Mysis, and Charinus. Charinus, who speakes a few sentences, all dispensable (691, 702, 704, 705), was "not in Menander" (Donatus on 301).

An. 861–867. Dromo, summoned by Simo to seize Davos, in the presence of Chremes, speaks a few words of no importance (861–862, 864?). Sandbach (1975: 199) plausibly supposes Dromo mute in Menander; cf. mute *lorarii* in *Ad.* 155–196? (Andrieu 1940: 35–38), Plaut. *Bacch.* 799–862, *Rud.* 656–660 (Lowe 1991: 39-41).

An. 904–952. Pamphilus eavesdrops and comments aside on a dialogue between Simo, Chremes, and Crito; at 945 he steps forward to contribute the information that Glycerium had formerly been known as Pasibula, clinching her recognition as Chremes' daughter. Sandbach (1975: 199–200) favours the suggestion of Webster (1950: 81) that in Menander Pamphilus, having gone to fetch Crito (900), did not return with him but only appeared later after Crito's exit. Certainly Terence altered the final scene, 957–981, by introducing Charinus. It is likely that he has telescoped the action of Menander's final scenes, including the recognition of Glycerium and her betrothal to Pamphilus (cf. 980 *intu' despondebitur*), to make room for the conclusion of the Charinus subplot; it is a plausible hypothesis, if not the only possible one, that this led to the early introduction of Pamphilus into the Simo-Chremes-Crito scene.

Haut. 242–250. Clinia and Clitipho eavesdrop on a dialogue between Syrus and Dromo and exchange aside comments on it (double dialogue). After Dromo's exit at 250 Clinia and Clitipho continue their aside dialogue; Syrus notices them at 256 and finally addresses them at 264. Webster (1950: 86; 1974: 145) and Sandbach (1975: 199) suppose Dromo, who speaks 242 *sic est* and probably (*pace* Brothers 1988: *ad loc.*) 245–246a, mute in Menander. It is a plausible hypothesis that Terence converted an entrance monologue of Syrus into a brief dialogue as part of an expansion of the eavesdropping scene. There are some small indications supporting the hypothesis of Terentian expansion in 242–263, although we can hardly hope to establish just how much of this passage derives from Menander and how much was added by Terence. In 243 *illae sunt relictae* and 245–246 *adeo inpeditae sunt: ancillarum gregem ducunt secum* the plural subject raises questions; the second passage, at least, implies unequivocally two women besides *ancillae.* That the two women are Antiphila and Bacchis is known to the slaves, but Clinia

and Clitipho expect only Antiphila (hence 243 *mulier tibi adest*). When Syrus casually mentions in 271–272 another woman besides Antiphila, Clitipho is quick to ask after the identity of this second woman. Why does he not react similarly to *ducunt* in 246 (Lefèvre 1994: 127)? The inconsistency is trivial but perhaps less likely to be due to Menander than to Terence; and it should be noted that it occurs in the context of a reference to the *ancillarum grex* which dashes Clinia's hopes. When we also note that the idea of *ancillarum grex* is repeated in 254 *quid turbaest!*, the suspicion is aroused that the references in 245–248 to *ancillae* and the baggage they carry are a Terentian doublet of 254–255. Conceivably, but perhaps less likely, even the appearance of Dromo here and his dismissal at 250 are a Terentian innovation. Syrus needs to appear before the women, in order to explain his scheme to Clinia and Clitipho; besides providing Syrus with an interlocutor, Dromo contributes to the motivation of his early arrival (242–243, 247–250).

Haut. 381–409. Syrus and Clinia eavesdrop on the entrance dialogue of Bacchis and Antiphila, commenting on it in an aside dialogue (double dialogue); in 403 Bacchis catches sight of the men and an emotional meeting between Clinia and Antiphila ensues. Several peculiar features in this section point to changes by Terence to his Menandrian model, even if the extent of his changes is difficult or impossible to establish. (1) Bacchis' attitude in 381–395 contrasts with her depiction elsewhere as a grasping *meretrix*; and her eulogy of Antiphila serves to provoke Clinia's emotional reactions but is hardly consistent with Antiphila's supposed status as a Corinthian *hetaera* (Brothers 1980: 110; 1988: on 381 ff.; Lefèvre 1994: 156–158; Konstan 1995: 123–125). (2) The eavesdropping passage, 381–402, unrealistically delays the meeting of the lovers, which itself is not very convincing (Brothers 1980: 109–110; 1988: on 403). (3) When Syrus observes the approach of the women in 375, he hastily dismisses the protesting Clitipho to prevent his meeting Bacchis. This makes an amusing little episode (375–380), yet it is illogical that Clitipho should be dismissed but not Clinia; Syrus' scheme requires that Clinia's relationship with Antiphila should be concealed as much as Clitipho's with Bacchis (Brothers 1988: on 380; cf. Büchner 1974: 190; Lefèvre 1994: 99). (4) Syrus' warnings to Clitipho in 360–373 raise an expectation that he will go into Chremes' house, and it is from there that he comes out on his next appearance at 562. Yet in 381 Syrus' order *ambula*, although not incompatible with an entrance into a stage-house (= *i*, Plaut. *Poen.* 717, *Pers.* 250), suggests a wing-exit and looks like a doublet of Syrus' dismissal of Clitipho at 587 *abi deambulatum* (Kunst 1919: 76; Mette 1965: 59; Büchner 1974: 190–193, 203–204; Lefèvre 1994: 99, n. 44). (5) The general exit at 409 is effected by Syrus' command *ite intro; nam vos iamdudum exspectat senex*; Syrus here states what is neither known to him nor strictly true (Büchner 1974: 192; Lefèvre 1994: 100). Brothers (1980: 112–119; 1988: 16) supposes that Bacchis and Antiphila did not appear at all in Menander's play, at least as speaking characters. This is unlikely;

Menander's practice seems to require a scene depicting the women arriving at Chremes' house. An *hetaera* who combines some altruistic qualities with a realistic acceptance of the need to exploit her clients is not impossible for Menander (cf. Thais in the *Eunuchus*, Büchner 1974: 192, n. 31; Knorr 1995: 221–235) and Terence may well have altered details of Bacchis' characterization in places. A more likely hypothesis is that in Menander all the men made their exit before the appearance of the women and that Terence delayed the exit of Syrus and Clinia in order to highlight Clinia's display of emotion in the eavesdropping scene and following meeting with Antiphila. Webster (1950: 85; 1974: 145) suggested that in Menander Syrus went into the house with Clitipho before the appearance of the women, but that Clinia remained (cf. Sandbach 1975: 200). There is little to be said for the hypothesis of Lefèvre (1994: 100) that in Menander Syrus alone remained on stage to meet the women, or for Webster's idea that the Menandrian Syrus spoke 409 from inside the house-door. The fact that the exit-lines both of Clitipho (380) and of Clinia and Syrus (409) are problematic supports the hypothesis of some structural changes by Terence. It is possible that in Menander Antiphila was played by a mute extra; she does not speak elsewhere in the Latin play.

Haut. 614–621. Chremes and Syrus eavesdrop and comment aside on the brief entrance dialogue of Sostrata and the nurse until the latter is dismissed at 619 (attentuated double dialogue). Webster (1950: 85; 1974: 145) and Sandbach (1975: 199) plausibly suppose that the nurse's two short utterances (616–617) are a Terentian addition and that in Menander she either appeared as a mute extra (Sandbach) or remained unseen inside the house and was addressed by Sostrata as she came out, in accordance with the regular convention (Webster). This hypothesis is supported by several features of the eavesdropping passage, 614–621, before Sostrata catches sight of Chremes. This passage resembles 242–250 in that the nurse appears very briefly before being dismissed. Her entrance is unmotivated; she contributes nothing to the dialogue with Sostrata beyond reiterating the identification of the ring which she had already given off stage (616–617). Her exit is motivated by an order to report back to Sostrata if Antiphila has finished her washing (618), but this does not happen (Büchner 1974: 206). On the other hand, the behaviour of the eavesdroppers raises questions. Sostrata's opening sentence 614–615a *nisi me animu' fallit, hic profectost anulus quem ego suspicor, is quicum expositast gnata* might have been expected, in light of 626–667, to provoke in Chremes a more definite response than 615b *quid volt sibi, Syre, haec oratio?* Either he has not heard properly or he completely fails to understand Sostrata's clear statement. In the following lines, 616–618, Sostrata and the nurse continue to talk about the ring, but neither Chremes not Syrus shows any sign of taking in what is being said, although it concerns them both. Only on Sostrata's statement *hic ego virum interea opperibor* does Syrus comment aside to Chremes *te volt: videas quid velit* (619). Syrus then continues *nescioquid tristis est: non temerest:*

timeo quid sit (620); Sostrata's *tristitia* will be demonstrated in what follows (cf. 623–624, 664–665) but must here be inferred from her appearance, not from anything she has said. To this Chremes retorts with a gibe of a type conventional in the mouth of husbands in comedy, 620–621 *quid siet? ne ista hercle magno iam conatu magnas nugas dixerit* (cf. Duckworth 1952: 283–285; Lefèvre 1994: 106, 165–166; Stärk 1990: 71). In short, the eavesdroppers in aside comments here express curiosity (615) and anxiety (620) about the new entrants' purpose but largely fail to take in what they say; one can compare *Phorm.* 179–194, another eavesdropping scene in which the eavesdroppers fail to hear much (Lowe 1983b: 433–434). It is possible that a reason for introducing the nurse here was to make the situation clearer for a Roman audience which had not had the benefit of an expository prologue. Büchner (1974: 206), noting "eine gewisse dramatische Abundanz" in the nurse's role, uses it as an argument against the existence of a prologue in Menander's play; but, as he anticipates, this argument can be reversed.

Haut. 723–743. Clinia and Syrus eavesdrop and exchange aside comments on a (one-sided) dialogue between Bacchis and Phrygia until 736 (double dialogue); a dialogue between Syrus and Bacchis follows. Webster (1950: 86) and Sandbach (1975: 199) suppose Phrygia, who speaks only two words (732), mute in Menander (as well as Dromo, who is summoned immediately after the exit of the women and speaks four short sentences in 743–749; cf. Mette 1962: 402, n. 1; 1965: 61, n. 1). This hypothesis is perhaps supported by peculiar features of this eavesdropping scene. Bacchis observes the eavesdroppers at 730 and puts on a little performance with the deliberate intention of frightening them (730b *dormiunt: ego pol istos commovebo*; cf. *Phorm.* 351 *iam ego hunc agitabo*). That this piece of play-acting forms a self-contained and dispensible comic episode which delays Syrus' delivery of his message to Bacchis raises a suspicion that it may be entirely a Terentian insertion. Brothers (1988: 16–17 and on 729) less plausibly ascribes to Terence the role of Bacchis and this whole scene; similarly Lefèvre (1994: 108–109). Sandbach (1975: 199, n. 1) suspects that Clinia's presence is due to Terence. At least there are serious grounds for believing that Terence has substantially rewritten the scene. It is odd that Clinia's last utterance in the play should consist of a joking aside (729); and it is not entirely clear when he makes his exit, though most natural to assume that he goes with Bacchis at 743 into his father's house, where we find him at 842. Dziatzko's attribution (1884: xxv) of *sequere hac* in 743 to Clinia is an improvement, but Clinia still seems underemployed in this scene. Finally, the transfer of Bacchis' entourage from the house of Chremes to that of Menedemus in 744–748 involves drastic telescoping of off-stage action.

Haut. 954–960. A doubtful case. Certainly Chremes, Clitipho, and Menedemus are present, probably also Syrus; it is not certain when Syrus enters but in the absence of any indication in the text it seems most natural that he should come out of the house at 954 together with Clitipho and Menedemus. Menedemus must

be supposed to go back into the house at 960 (Brothers 1988: *ad loc.*). Sandbach (1975: 200) plausibly suggested that in Menander Menedemus, having gone into his house to find Clitipho at 948 (cf. Brothers 1988: on 948, 950), did not come out with him, and that it was Terence who reintroduced him here, replacing an original entrance monologue by Clitipho with the little dialogue 954–960. In any case Syrus does not speak until 970, after the exit of Menedemus, and if present in 954–960 is merely a silent observer. Maltby (1983: 32) suggests that Syrus may here be a Terentian addition. Büchner (1974: 228, 477–479) and Lefèvre (1994: 82–84, 114–117) argue unconvincingly that Chremes' "disinheriting" of Clitipho and Syrus' counter-scheme are entirely Terence's invention.

Haut. 1045–67. Dialogue between Clitipho, Chremes, Menedemus, and Sostrata. There are grounds for supposing substantial Terentian changes at the end of the play (Büchner 1974: 227–229; Maltby 1983: 27–41). Even when allowance has been made for the difference between ancient and modern ideas about marriage, the speed with which Clitipho gives up Bacchis and agrees to marriage, as the price of reconciliation with his father, is quite unrealistic. The theme of Terence's final scene is the reconciliation between Clitipho and Chremes. Both Menedemus and Sostrata act as mediators on behalf of Clitipho, and their roles in a sense duplicate each other. The similarity to *Ad.* 933–945, where "Demea and Aeschines join forces to persuade Micio to marry" (Brothers 1988: 226) is significant, for Aeschinus' role in that passage must be a Terentian addition (see below). There are even close verbal similarities: *Haut.* 1049–50 *da veniam, Chreme: sine te exorem*, *Ad.* 936–937 AE. *sine te exorem, mi pater.* DE. *age, da veniam filio.* Webster (1950: 86; 1974: 146) suggested that Terence added Menedemus to the scene; against this is the neatness of a final confrontation between the two old men reversing the situation of the opening scene, which looks like part of Menander's original plan. Sandbach (1975: 200) sees Sostrata rather as the Terentian addition in this scene, justly observing that most of her utterances are dispensable and that her proposal of a bride for Clitipho (1060–61) would in an Athenian family more naturally come from the father (cf. Maltby 1983: 38; Brothers 1988: 226). It seems likely, however, that Terence's changes went beyond adding one character to this scene and were so extensive that we cannot hope to establish how Menander's play ended.

Eun. 454–493. Parmeno eavesdrops and comments aside on a dialogue between Thais, Thraso, and Gnatho until 461, when a dialogue between all four ensues. Terence introduced Thraso and Gnatho from the *Kolax* (*Eun.* 30–32). The plot of the *Eunuchus* requires a rival lover, corresponding to Thraso, and it is probable that he appeared at this point in Menander's *Eunuchos*; but it is a plausible hypothesis that, if he was here accompanied by an attendant (slave?), the latter was mute (Webster 1974: 140). Gnatho here speaks twice, echoing his patron (472, 487–488; on 459 see Fraenkel 1970: 683; 1994: 81). There are good grounds for believing that Parmeno's presence as an eavesdropper in 454–461 is

also due to Terence and that in Menander he actually came out of the house at 461 instead of merely pretending to (Drexler 1938: 86).

Eun. 668–717. Dialogue between Phaedria, Dorus, Pythias, and Dorias. Webster (1950: 73) convincingly suggested that Dorias, who here speaks one sentence of no importance (675) but has a substantial role in the preceding and following scenes, is Terence's creation, a doublet of Pythias, and that in Menander it was Pythias herself who escorted Chremes to Thraso's at 538 in accordance with Thais' instructions in 503, and returned with Thais' gold ornaments at 615 (cf. Ludwig 1959: 18, n. 1; Sandbach 1975: 201). The hypothesis that in Menander Pythias was out of the house (cf. 818 *ego non adfui*) accounts for her failure to prevent the rape and delay in discovering it; on this hypothesis Phaedria's entrance-monologue, 629–642, during which Dorias' presence on the stage is clearly otiose (Denzler 1968: 63–64), covered Pythias' discovery of the facts on returning home.

Eun. 771–816. Thais and Chremes eavesdrop and exchange aside comments (783–786) on a dialogue between Thraso, Gnatho, and Sanga (double dialogue) until 791, when a dialogue between all five ensues. It is probable that the rival lover appeared at this point of the *Eunuchos* but that Terence introduced the abortive siege of Thais' house by Thraso and his little army, including Gnatho and Sanga as well as mute extras (Ludwig 1959: 24–29). Pythias, sent into the house at 754 to fetch the tokens, produces them at 767 with the word *adsunt*; her exit is not indicated but probably followed immediately, since she does not speak again. In Menander she could easily have been mute.

Eun. 1031–49. Thraso and Gnatho eavesdrop and exchange aside comments on a dialogue between Parmeno and Chaerea (double dialogue); after the exit of Parmeno at 1042 Chaerea soliloquizes as if alone. The *Kolax* characters, Thraso and Gnatho, conspicuously ignored by the others, have clearly been inserted by Terence into a context to which they did not originally belong (Ludwig 1959: 37; Denzler 1968: 53–55; Holzberg 1974: 160).

Eun. 1049–94. Thraso and Gnatho eavesdrop on a dialogue between Chaerea and Phaedria and then converse aside (double dialogue) until 1060, when a dialogue between all four ensues. As noted above, the entry of Thraso and Gnatho at 1025 and their isolation from the other characters until 1060 is in all probability to be attributed to Terence. Whether the rival lover, corresponding to Thraso, appeared at all in the finale of the *Eunuchos* is uncertain, but if he did, the manner of his entry will have been different and it is unlikely that he was accompanied by a flatterer; it can hardly be doubted that Gnatho's role here is a Terentian addition based, perhaps loosely, on the *Kolax*. It is significant that Gnatho's principal dramatic function in this scene is to persuade Phaedria to share Thais' favours with Thraso. Many have felt that this conclusion is inconsistent with the

previous characterization of both Thais and Phaedria (cf. Brown 1990: 49–61 with references).

Phorm. 446–459. Dialogue between Demipho, Hegio, Cratinus, and Crito during Geta's brief trip into the house. Lefèvre (1978: 15–20) convincingly demonstrated that the *advocati*, Hegio, Cratinus, and Crito, and Demipho's trip to the forum to fetch them are very probably Terentian additions (cf. Barsby 1993: 141–145). This hypothesis explains the long silence of the *advocati* in 348–445 and the anomaly that at 314 Demipho goes into his house (311–312) but at 348 comes from the forum; it is supported by the fact that Demipho's consultation of the *advocati* does not advance the action and duplicates his consultation of Chremes (460–461), and that the representation of a *consilium* and the allusion to the Roman concept of *restitutio in integrum* (450–452), which does not fit the circumstances of the plot, give the scene a marked Roman colouring.

Phorm. 485–533. Antipho and Geta eavesdrop and exchange aside comments on a dialogue between Phaedria and Dorio (double dialogue) until 503, when a dialogue between all four ensues. Büchner (1974: 330–335, 347–350, 454–457) put forward cogent arguments for supposing that Antipho did not appear in the part of the Greek original corresponding to 465–712 but was added by Terence (cf. Lefèvre 1978: 65–68). His return, after running away at 218, is premature, not well motivated and inconsistent with the dramatic situation. In his entrance lines he implies that he has returned in order to protect Phanium's interests (465–470), but he does not and is in no position to do so. He has no reason yet to risk meeting his father by returning home; and when he returns again at 820, what he says in 826–828, *neque me domum nunc reciperem ni mi esset spes ostenta huiusce habendae. sed ubinam Getam invenire possim, ut rogem quod tempu' conveniundi patri' me capere iubeat*, is hardly consistent with an earlier return. Geta expresses his intention of seeking Antipho in order to inform him of what has happened (463); but what he has to report (474–481) is of no help to Antipho and already known to the audience (Denzler 1968: 63). Antipho's presence in a passage concerned with Phaedria's affairs is inessential; he merely provides Phaedria with extra support in his argument with Dorio, leaving Geta, the scheming slave, with less to say than one might have expected. At least one of his comments repeats a motif used earlier: 507 *neque quo pacto a me amittam neque uti retineam scio* = 176 *ut neque mihi sit amittendi nec retinendi copia* (cf. 502–505 = 162–167, and Maltby 1984: 34–35 for such repetitions as a possible indication of Terentian additions).

Phorm. 606–681. Antipho eavesdrops and comments aside on a dialogue between Demipho, Chremes, and Geta; only after the exit of the others does he step forward and accost Geta. His unnoticed entry and eavesdropping is very similar to that of Byrria in *An.* 412–431. In addition to those given above the following are further reasons for believing that Terence is responsible for Antipho's presence in

this section of the play (cf. Arnott 1970: 44; Büchner 1974: 338–341; Lefèvre 1978: 69–70). The motivation of his entry in 606, *exspecto quam mox recipiat sese Geta*, is similar to that which Terence provided for Charinus in *An.* 957 *proviso quid agat Pamphilus.* The list of *monstra* with which Geta manages to allay Antipho's fears with somewhat improbable ease in 705–710 has a marked Roman colouring (*impluvium, hariolus, haruspex*; cf. Bianco 1962: 175–176). Finally, his exit is motivated with a pointless mission to Phaedria (712), which is inconsistent with his inquiries about Phaedria's intentions in 833–835.

Phorm. 990–1055. Dialogue between Demipho, Chremes, Phormio, and Nausistrata. Büchner (1974: 355–359, 479–481), followed by Lefèvre (1978: 34–58, 75–78), has argued persuasively that his whole scene is a Terentian addition, even if attempts to reconstruct how Apollodorus' play ended are unconvincing. It is psychologically implausible that Phormio, having obtained all he desires, should gratuitously court disaster with a display of reluctance (948–951); once Chremes' secret is revealed to Nausistrata Phormio loses his bargaining counter, as Demipho realizes (955–963), and is entirely dependent on Nausistrata's decision. Some details of the scene support the hypothesis of Terentian authorship. 1017–18 *vinolentu' . . . eam compressit . . . neque postilla umquam attigit* is inconsistent with 873 *cum eius consuevit olim matre* (cf. 1012). In 1053 *me ad cenam voca* the depiction of Phormio as a conventional *edax parasitus* is out of line with his general characterization and probably due to Terence (Martin 1959: *ad loc.*; cf. Gaiser 1972: 1099).

Ad. 265–280. Dialogue between Aeschinus, Ctesipho, and briefly Syrus (276, 278); Sannio comments aside (265–266) and converses with Syrus (278–280). The presence of Sannio in this scene was convincingly shown to be a Terentian innovation by Drexler (1934: 12–15, 23–25). Although other parts of Drexler's thesis are questionable, this part deserves to be accepted and generally has been (cf. Webster 1950: 89; Sandbach 1975: 202; Grant 1980: 343; Gratwick 1987: 44; Damen 1987: 70–71). I have discussed the passage and Drexler's thesis in "Terence, *Adelphoe*: Problems of Dramatic Space and Time," *CQ* forthcoming, and argued that Terence probably kept both Sannio and Syrus on stage for an extra scene.

Ad. 899–919. Dialogue between Aeschinus and Demea, and briefly also Syrus and Geta (short replies to Demea's orders in 916–919). Some Terentian changes in the following scene are certain (see below) and are likely to have affected this scene also. Sandbach (1975: 203), following Webster (1950: 90), makes the admittedly speculative suggestion that in Menander Geta made his exit before 899 and that Aeschinus himself was sent to fetch his bride at 917. Still speculative, but perhaps slightly better founded, is the theory of Gratwick that Terence introduced Syrus in 882–916, and that in Menander Aeschinus was despatched to have the

garden-wall dismantled; he points out (1987: *ad loc.*) that in 882–888 "Terence duplicates the comic theme of Demea's rehearsal of affability."

Ad. 958–997. Dialogue between Syrus, Demea, Micio, and Aeschinus. That Terence made some changes in the final scenes of the play is attested by Donatus' statement (on 938) that in Menander Micio did not object to marrying Sostrata. Nearly half of Aeschinus' part in these scenes occurs in the passage 934–945, in which he urges Micio to marry Sostrata and which must be Terence's addition. Sandbach (1975: 203) suggested that Terence kept Aeschinus on stage longer than Menander did, producing a four-speaker scene after Syrus' entrance at 958. Gratwick (1987: 56–57) supposes more extensive Terentian changes, including the introduction of Syrus in 958–997. The generally felt inconsistency between the roles played by Micio and Demea in the final scenes and their characterization in the earlier part of the play constitutes another reason for believing that Terence made substantial changes to the end of the play. It is widely held that these changes were connected with the re-evaluation, for a Roman audience, of the characters of the two fathers; but the precise nature of the re-evaluation and of the resulting changes to Menander's play is disputed and likely to remain so (cf. Sandbach 1978: 123–145 with bibliography; Gratwick 1987: 55–57; Brown 1990: 40–41).

ISLIP, OXFORD

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Andrieu, J. 1940. *Étude critique sur les sigles de personnages et les rubriques de scène dans les anciennes éditions de Térence.* Paris.

Arnott, W. G. 1970. "Phormio *parasitus*," *G&R* 17: 32–57.

Bain, D. 1977. *Actors and Audience.* Oxford.

Barsby, J. 1993. "The Stage Movements of 'Demipho' in the Greek Original of Terence *Phormio* 311 ff.," *Classica et Mediaevalia* 43: 141–145.

Beare, W. 1964. *The Roman Stage*[3]. London.

Bianco, O. 1962. *Terenzio.* Rome.

Brothers, A. J. 1980. "The Construction of Terence's *Heautontimorumenos*," *CQ* NS 30: 94–119.

—— 1988. *Terence: The Self-Tormentor.* Warminster.

Brown, P. G. McC. 1990. "The Bodmer Codex of Menander and the Endings of Terence's *Eunuchus* and Other Roman Comedies," in E. W. Handley and A. Hurst (eds.), *Relire Ménandre.* Geneva. 37–61.

Büchner, K. 1974. *Das Theater des Terenz.* Heidelberg.

Damen, M. 1987. "Reconstructing the Beginning of Menander's *Adelphoi* (B)," *Illinois Classical Studies* 12: 67–84.

Denzler, B. 1968. *Der Monolog bei Terenz.* Zurich.

Drexler, H. 1934. *Die Komposition von Terenz' Adelphen und Plautus' Rudens. Philologus* Suppl. 26.2. Leipzig.

—— 1938. "Terentiana," *Hermes* 73: 39–98.
Duckworth, G. E. 1952. *The Nature of Roman Comedy*. Princeton.
Dziatzko, C. 1884. *P. Terenti Afri Comoediae*. Leipzig.
Fraenkel, E. 1970. "Esercitazioni sull' Eunucho," *Belfagor* 25: 673–689.
—— 1994. *Corsi seminariali di Eduard Fraenkel. Sussidi Eruditi* 43. Rome.
Frost, K. B. 1988. *Exits and Entrances in Menander*. Oxford.
Gaiser, K. 1972. "Zur Eigenart der römischen Komödie," *ANRW* 1.2: 1027–1113.
Gomme, A. W., Sandbach, F. H. 1973. *Menander: A Commentary*. Oxford.
Grant, J. N. 1980. "The Beginning of Menander, *Adelphoi* B," *CQ* NS 30: 341–355.
Gratwick, A. S. 1987. *Terence: The Brothers*. Warminster.
Holzberg, N. 1974. *Menander: Untersuchungen zur dramatischen Technik*. Nurnberg.
Knorr, O. 1995. "The Character of Bacchis in Terence's *Heautontimorumenos*," *AJP* 116: 221–236.
Konstan, D. 1995. *Greek Comedy and Ideology*. Oxford.
Kunst, K. 1919. *Studien zur griechisch-römischen Komödie*. Vienna and Leipzig.
Lefèvre, E. 1978. *Der Phormio des Terenz und der Epidikazomenos des Apollodor von Karystos. Zetemata* 74. Munich.
—— 1994. *Terenz' und Menanders Heautontimorumenos. Zetemata* 91. Munich.
Leo, F. 1912. *Plautinische Forschungen*^{2}. Berlin.
Lowe, J. C. B. 1983a. "The *Eunuchus*: Terence and Menander," *CQ* NS 33: 428–444.
—— 1983b. "Terentian Originality in the 'Phormio' and 'Hecyra'," *Hermes* 111: 431–452.
—— 1991. "Prisoners, Guards and Chains in Plautus, *Captivi*," *AJP* 112: 39–41.
Ludwig, W. 1959. "Von Terenz zu Menander," *Philologus* 103: 1–38.
MacDowell, D. M. 1994. "The Number of Speaking Actors in Old Comedy," *CQ* NS 44: 325–335.
Maltby, R. 1983. "The Last Act of Terence's *Heautontimorumenos*," *Papers of the Liverpool Latin Seminar* 4: 27–41.
Martin, R. H. 1959. *Terence: Phormio*. London.
Mette, H. J. 1962. "Die περιεργία bei Menander," *Gymnasium* 69: 398–406.
—— 1965. "Der heutige Menander," *Lustrum* 10: 5–211.
Pickard-Cambridge, A. 1968. *The Dramatic Festivals of Athens*^{2}. Rev. J. Gould and D. M. Lewis. Oxford.
Primmer, A. 1984. *Handlungsgliederung in Nea und Palliata. Öst. Ak. d. Wiss., Phil.-hist. Kl.*, Sitzb. 441. Vienna.
Sandbach, F. H. 1975. "Menander and the Three-Actor Rule," in J. Bingen, G. Cambier, G. Nachtergael (eds.), *Le Monde grec: Hommages à Claire Préaux*. Brussels. 197–204.
—— 1978. "Donatus' Use of the Name Terentius and the End of Terence's *Adelphoe*," *BICS* 25: 123–145.
Slater, N. W. 1985. *Plautus in Performance*. Princeton.
Stärk, E. 1990. "Plautus' uxores dotatae im Spannungsfeld literarischer Fiktion und gesellschaftlicher Realität," in J. Blänsdorf (ed.), *Theater und Gesellschaft im Imperium Romanum*. Mainzer Forschungen zu Drama und Theater 4. Mainz. 69–79.
Traina, A. 1964. "Pathos ed ethos nelle traduzioni tragiche di Ennio," *Maia* 16: 112–142.
Webster, T. B. L. 1950. *Studies in Menander*. Manchester.
—— 1974. *An Introduction to Menander*. Manchester.