

STRUCTURE AND SYMMETRY IN THE BACCHIDES OF PLAUTUS

JOHN R. CLARK

University of Pennsylvania

It is generally agreed that the *Bacchides* is a late play of Plautus which exhibits a dualism of structure rarely to be seen in a Plautine comedy.¹ There has been a good deal of scholarly debate concerning this play: to what extent its structure is due to Menander or to what degree Plautus has embellished the story of his Menandrian original, the *Dis Exapaton*. The symmetry which results from this dualism of structure can most easily be seen in the seducing of the *iuuenis* at the beginning of the play and the seduction of the *senes* at its conclusion. Scholarly debate has centered on these two scenes in attempting to ascribe the parallelism to Menander or Plautus.² But in restricting attention to the two most obviously linked scenes, the overall symmetry of the entire play has generally been ignored. New fragments of the *Dis Exapaton* of Menander, published in 1968 and belonging to the central part of the *Bacchides*,³ now offer additional clues to this investigation. These fragments reveal two scenes in the Menandrian play which have been omitted by Plautus, and I will attempt to show that by their omission the Roman playwright has increased the structural symmetry

¹ George E. Duckworth, *The Nature of Roman Comedy* (Princeton 1952) 164: "The plot is complex, with a dualism of structure rare in Plautus." U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, "Der Landmann des Menandros," *Neue Jahrbücher* 3 (1899) 517: "... den 'Doppelbetrug,' die *Bacchides*. Da sehen wir wie den Betrug so die Jünglinge und die Hetären und die Alten verdoppelt." See Duckworth 55 for dating.

² Eduard Fraenkel, *Elementi plautini in Plauto* (Florence 1960) 68 f., maintained that the ram metaphor of lines 1120-48 was Plautine but that the general outline was Menandrian. T. B. L. Webster, *Studies in Menander* (Manchester 1960²) 131-32, would claim a Menandrian origin for the linking of the two scenes. W. Thomas MacCary, "Menander's Old Men," *TAPA* 102 (1971) 323, note 47, attributes the pattern of imagery to Plautus.

³ E. W. Handley, *Menander and Plautus: A Study in Comparison* (London 1968).

of the immediately surrounding scenes. Considerations of both theme and imagery will be introduced to illustrate the new balance of the Plautine play.

The problem which immediately arises in dealing with the structure of the *Bacchides* is the fact that, due to a gap in our manuscript tradition, the beginning of the play is lost: only twenty short fragments survive of as many as 200 to 300 lines. Most recently two German scholars, B. Bader and Konrad Gaiser,⁴ have re-examined all the available evidence and put together a reasonable reconstruction of the stage action antecedent to the seduction of Pistoclerus by the twin *meretrices*, the Bacchides. For the purposes of this paper I have accepted Gaiser's reconstruction. The play opens with the entrance of the Athenian Bacchis, probably accompanied by her maid.⁵ They are busy preparing the house for the arrival of her sister from Samos, who not only is her identical twin but also has the same name:

sicut lacte lactis similest (fragment 5)

illa mea cognominis fuit (fragment 6)

Pistoclerus then enters, explaining in a delayed prologue that he has been commissioned by letter to locate the Samian Bacchis, the girlfriend of Mnesilochus, in Athens.⁶ While abroad, Mnesilochus fell in love with this Bacchis, but in his absence she was hired by a soldier and taken away to Athens. The scene is then set for the arrival of

⁴ Bernd Bader, "Der verlorene Anfang der plautinischen *Bacchides*," *RhM* 113 (1970) 304-23; Konrad Gaiser, "Die plautinischen *Bacchides* und Menanders *Dis exapaton*," *Philologus* 114 (1970) 65-69. The main evidence for their reconstruction is three-pronged: metrical considerations, a new papyrus fragment containing the opening words of the *Dis Exapaton*, and the alphabetic notation of speakers in the tenth-century manuscript B of Plautus.

⁵ The servant of Bacchis may be referred to in fragment 4: "*ecquis euocat / cum nassiterna et cum aqua istum inpurissimum?*" The evidence provided by the new papyrus fragment with the opening words of the *Dis Exapaton*, πρὸς τῶν θεῶν, μειράκιον, in which μειράκιον probably refers to Pistoclerus, conflicts with the manuscript evidence which makes Pistoclerus the third speaker. Gaiser (above, note 4) 66 suggests that Plautus has simply changed the order of speakers in his adaptation of the *Dis Exapaton* into the *Bacchides*. It may also be true that a short interchange between Bacchis and her maid took place in Menander before Pistoclerus actually spoke.

⁶ See C. Questa, ed., *T. Maccius Plautus: Bacchides* (Florence 1965) 10, who discounts the opinions of Leo and Webster: "Io penserei più volentieri ad un monologo di Pistoclero, il quale magari leggesse pubblicamente, commentandola, la lettera di Mnesilochos."

the Samian Bacchis in company with the soldier's slave.⁷ In a typical Plautine canticum, the slave contrasts the lot of a good servant with that of a bad.⁸ These, then, are the three scenes which precede the dialogue between Pistoclerus and the two Bacchides at which point our manuscripts begin.

The central problem of the play is how to acquire the money needed to free the Samian Bacchis from her contract with the soldier. Before the action on stage even begins, Mnesilochus has already obtained the necessary funds, since his mission abroad had been to collect a debt owed to his father. The slave Chrysalus, sent ahead by Mnesilochus, arrives on stage to trick the father into believing that the debt is still unpaid, thus enabling Mnesilochus to use the money to free his girlfriend. A series of complications, however, arising from the secondary love-plot of Pistoclerus and the Athenian Bacchis, obstructs any simple solution. For, while Mnesilochus and Chrysalus are proceeding with their plans, the two Bacchides devise their own scheme. Pistoclerus is enlisted to aid them in their struggle against the soldier. He is seduced into providing a banquet at the courtesan's house in order that he might be present when the soldier arrives. This seems innocent enough until we are reminded that Mnesilochus is unaware that there are two Bacchis sisters. When he returns from Ephesus and hears that his friend has also fallen in love with Bacchis, he suspects treachery

⁷ There is evidence from later in the play for this character:

tu dudum, puere, cum illac usque isti semul:
quae harum sunt aedes, pulta. adi actutum ad fores. (577-78)

W. M. Lindsay, ed., *T. Macci Plauti Comoediae* (Oxford 1904), will be the text used throughout this paper. In this particular scene a parasite of the soldier has come to the house of Bacchis to demand that she either follow the soldier to Elatea or pay back the 200 gold coins with which the soldier had contracted her. The *puer*, who had first brought Bacchis here, is now a mute character.

⁸ Cf. Messenio in *Menaechmi* 966 f.:

... quoi cor modeste situmst. (971)
quibus ingenium in animo utibilest, modicum et sine vernilitate
(*Bacch.* fr. 1)

uerbera, compedes,
molae, [magna] lassitudo, fames, frigu' durum,
haec pretia sunt ignauiae. (974-76)

uincla, uirgae, molae: saeuitudo mala
fit peior (*Bacch.* fr. 2)

and in anger returns the tricked money to his father. Suddenly then, after 500 lines, the action of the first half of the play has been negated and the drama must begin anew.

To mark this new shift in the play,⁹ a parasite of the soldier now arrives to warn Bacchis that the soldier himself will soon be present to collect his money or take her away. As if to remind us that the play, so to speak, must begin anew, the parasite is accompanied by the slave who first brought the Samian Bacchis on stage:

tu dudum, puere, cum illac usque isti semul:
quae harum sunt aedes, pulta. adi actutum ad fores. (577-78)

Pistoclerus, too, is present, as enlisted by the Bacchides, to chase the soldier's emissary away from their door.

To Mnesilochus, however, the appearance of the parasite serves as a reminder that the soldier, not Pistoclerus, is his real enemy. His suspicions of Pistoclerus are put to rest by his realization that there are two Bacchides. But now Chrysalus the slave must be called upon again to trick the father of Mnesilochus into paying the money needed to free the Samian Bacchis. After the success of this second deception, the Bacchides reappear in the play's finale to cajole the fathers of Mnesilochus and Pistoclerus into submission. The play thus falls naturally into two parts:

Slave of the soldier (missing Scene 3)

Bacchides seduce Pistoclerus (35-169)

Chrysalus and the first deception (170-367)

Mnesilochus' error committed (368-572)

Parasite of the soldier (573-611)

Mnesilochus' error regretted (612-691)

Chrysalus and the second deception (691-1075)

Bacchides seduce Nicobulus and Philoxenus (1076-1211)¹⁰

We must take into account the missing three scenes from the beginning of the play before we can speak of the structural symmetry of the

⁹ See Willy Theiler, "Zum Gefüge einiger Plautinischer Komödien," *Hermes* 73 (1938) 269: "... auch die Handlung ist zweifach: mit 573 beginnt sozusagen die Komödie neu."

¹⁰ Cf. G. K. Galinsky, "Scipionic Themes in Plautus' *Amphitruo*," *TAPA* 97 (1966) 206, for a similar diagram of the symmetry of the *Amphitruo*.

Bacchides. It is no longer accurate to say that the play both begins and ends with scenes of seduction. Yet it is true, as we have seen above, that the Athenian Bacchis is the first person to speak on stage. This prominent position of Bacchis also fits in well with the fact that the Bacchides sisters appear on stage only in the first and last episodes. The action on stage revolves about them, though they do not appear during the central action of the play. Thus their two appearances serve to frame the entire play in a display of their power, first over Mnesilochus (implicitly, by means of his letter) and Pistoclerus, and finally also over the fathers of the two young men at the play's end. Their physical presence is unnecessary but their influence is pervasive.

The actions of Chrysalus, the intriguing slave, dominate the stage action. His two deceptions comprise almost one-half of the entire play and his rôle must be dealt with first in any discussion of the overall symmetry of the *Bacchides*. The importance of these two deceptions as structural units in the play can, I think, be best illustrated by drawing attention to the verbal and thematic links which connect them.¹¹

The first deception by Chrysalus stands forth as a self-contained unit framed between two short monologues. Chrysalus dominates the stage for 200 lines embracing the entire episode with his introductory monologue (170-77) and victory speech (349-67). In his entrance lines he is anxious to see Pistoclerus about Mnesilochus' girl, ending his monologue with . . . *super amica Bacchide* (177). By the end of the first trick he is anxious to see Mnesilochus to report on his success:

super auro amicaque eius inuenta Bacchide. (367)

Two scenes take place between these monologues, first his meeting with Pistoclerus (178-234) and then with Nicobulus, where in twice as many lines (235-348), he proceeds to trick Nicobulus out of his debt money by means of a tall tale involving pirates and a treacherous night attack. The method he employs for his deception is important because of the imagery which it elicits, both for this scene and his later deception.

Archidemides is Nicobulus' debtor in Ephesus and Chrysalus has made him the villain of the piece in hopes of keeping the money which Mnesilochus had collected. According to Chrysalus' story Archidemides paid his debt only after repeated denials, but not even then

¹¹ See Fraenkel (above, note 2) 56 f. and 226 f. for evidence of Plautine elaboration in the Chrysalus scenes.

were Mnesilochus and Chrysalus permitted to sail home safely. A large, fierce-looking pirate ship sailed out in pursuit:

CH. postquam aurum apstulimus, in nauem conscendimus
domum cupientes. forte ut adsedi in stega,
dum circumspecto, atque ego lembus conspikor
longum, strigorem maleficum exornarier. (277-80)

...

is erat communis cum hospite et praedonibus. (282)

They were forced to beach their ship quickly and to leave the money behind in Ephesus. It is now necessary for Nicobulus himself in his old age to travel by sea once more in order to reclaim his debt:

NI. censebam me ecfugisse a uita marituma
ne nauigare tandem hoc aetatis senex;
id mi haud utrum uelim licere intellego:
ita bellus hospes fecit Archidemides. (342-45)

During the narration of his son's odyssey by Chrysalus, Nicobulus applies the image of a ship to himself. When Chrysalus first describes the appearance of the pirate ship, Nicobulus exclaims:

perii hercle, lembus ille mihi laedit latus. (281)

He is worried about both his money and his son and is caught up in Chrysalus' tale. Chrysalus himself, I believe, picks up this image when, victorious in his deceit, he begins his concluding monologue:

ille est oneratus recte et plus iusto uehit. (349)

I take the word *oneratus* as referring to a *navis oneraria*, a ship of freight. Nicobulus indeed was originally headed for the harbor to see if a *navis mercatoria* (236) had arrived from Ephesus carrying his son. Instead, by the end of the scene, he has himself become a ship of burden. *Et plus iusto uehit*, according to this reasoning, would refer to Nicobulus who, though beyond the age for sea-faring, must sail to Ephesus.¹²

¹² The usual interpretation of this line is that Nicobulus is being described with the imagery of a pack-mule. See Alfred Ernout, *Plaute: Bacchides: Commentaire* (Paris 1935) 58, and Elaine Fantham, *Comparative Studies in Republican Latin Imagery* (Toronto 1972) 106. If the image is taken as a dead metaphor, the tone of Chrysalus' story, with its emphasis on ships and sailing, suggests at least a secondary meaning here.

This image recurs later in the play during the second deception by Chrysalus. Now, however, Nicobulus is wary of Chrysalus and greets him sarcastically:

bone serue, salue. quid fit? quam mox nauigo
in Ephesum, ut aurum repetam ab Theotimo domum?
(775-76)

But even a Nicobulus on his guard is no match for Chrysalus. The second trick depends upon a letter of Mnesilochus to his father, which Chrysalus himself dictated. When he perceives that Nicobulus has accepted the letter as genuine and is swallowing the bait, Chrysalus again alludes to his trick in terms of ship imagery:

bene naus agitur, pulchre haec confertur ratis, (797)¹³

though literally this time no ship is involved.

This is but a small part of the grand imagery used by Chrysalus for his second deception. The naval imagery, well-suited to the story he fabricated for his first trick is no longer appropriate. His second great deception, however, extending over twice as many lines (170-367, 691-1075), takes on the air of a military triumph, leading up to Chrysalus' great canticum (925-78) in which he likens his feat to the taking of Troy.¹⁴ Since Chrysalus' main target is to free Bacchis from the soldier, it is fitting for him to assume the role of *imperator* (759) for his intrigue.

Thematically, too, there are links between the first and second deceptions of Chrysalus. It is the pedagogue Lydus who is responsible for the failure of the first deception. He is terribly upset by his pupil Pistoclerus' conduct. To him the Bacchides are Bacchantes who are so avaricious that they suck the blood of men:

Bacchides non Bacchides, sed Bacchae sunt acerrumae.
apage istas a me sorores, quae hominum sorbent sanguinem. (371-72)¹⁵

¹³ *agitatur* is the manuscript reading; *agitur* is the emendation of Bentley accepted by Lindsay, Ernout and Questa. J. M'Cosh, ed., *Plauti Bacchides* (London 1896), read *agitatur*, with *navis* referring to Nicobulus and *ratis* to Chrysalus. If Bentley's emendation is correct, *navis* and *ratis* refer to Chrysalus and his intrigue.

¹⁴ H. D. Jocelyn, "Chrysalus and the Fall of Troy," *HSCP* 73 (1969) 135-52.

¹⁵ Cf. Pistoclerus' initial fear:

... quia, Bacchis, Bacchas metuo et bacchanal tuom, (53)

and Lydus in conversation with Mnesilochus:

atque acerrume aestuosam: apsorbet ubi quemque attigit. (471)

In the second half of the play, when the confusion has been cleared away, it is fear of the soldier which necessitates Chrysalus' second deception. But when Cleomachus the soldier does appear and threatens to suck the life-blood out of both Bacchis and her lover:

iam illorum ego animam amborum exsorbebo oppido, (869)

he is incorporated by the slave into the trick. Chrysalus convinces Nicobulus that the soldier is the husband of Bacchis whom he must buy off for the sake of his son. Unlike the unfortunate meeting between Lydus and Mnesilochus, the appearance of Cleomachus the soldier is incorporated into the context of the second trick and is at least partially responsible for its success.

We come now to the heart of the play, the reversal of fortune caused by the ignorance of Mnesilochus. It is at this point that the new fragments of the Greek original of the *Bacchides*, the *Dis Exapaton* of Menander come into play.¹⁶ These new fragments are from this central portion of the play and reveal two extra scenes which are omitted by Plautus. In the *Dis Exapaton* Nicobulus, the father of Mnesilochus, reappears on stage opposite his son and they go off to exchange the money as the act ends. The mark for the Menandrian chorus (*XOPOY*) occurs now in the fragments. The next act begins when Nicobulus and Mnesilochus re-emerge and the old man heads for the forum, leaving Mnesilochus alone again on stage to confront Pistoclerus.

Although choral interludes provide an artificial break in the dramatic action, Menander was a master at using these interludes where a natural break in the action would occur. In the *Dis Exapaton* Nicobulus appears on stage before the end of an act and he and Mnesilochus (Sostratos)¹⁷ withdraw during the choral interlude for the exchange of money. When these two characters reappear at the beginning of the next act, the money has been paid and Nicobulus has been persuaded

Note also that the two appearances of Lydus in the play, before and after Chrysalus' first intrigue (109-69, 368-499), serve to weave the first trick into the context of Pistoclerus' infatuation for the other Bacchis sister.

¹⁶ See Handley (above, note 3) and Viktor Poeschl, *Die neuen Menanderpapyri und die Originalität des Plautus* (Heidelberg 1973), for a critical treatment of these fragments.

to pardon Chrysalus (Syros)¹⁷ for his deception. This tendency of Menander to introduce a new character to the action before the end of an act, whose reappearance again at the beginning of the next act provides a bridge for the dramatic movement over the choral interlude, can be illustrated from several of the Menandrian plays now extant.¹⁸

It is precisely here that we can begin to speak of Plautine workmanship on the structural symmetry of the *Bacchides*. For unlike the act structure of Menander, the continuous action of Plautine comedy does not make use of these linking scenes.¹⁹ In the *Bacchides* Mnesilochus does leave the stage momentarily to return the money to his father but returns almost immediately, again alone, to face his falsely accused friend Pistoclerus. Plautus' only concession to the end of the Greek act and the dramatic time needed for Mnesilochus to return the money is a short four-line entrance monologue delivered by Pistoclerus (526-29). Without the reappearance of Nicobulus we have a balance of scenes separated by the parasite episode.

Konrad Gaiser mentions the symmetrical arrangement of Menander's *Dis Exapaton* before and after the act pause, which is sacrificed by Plautus: "a) Freund—b) Mädchen—c) Vater // c) Vater—b) Mädchen

¹⁷ Plautus changed some of the names from the Greek, which are given now by the new fragments.

¹⁸ E. W. Handley, "The Conventions of the Comic Stage and their Exploitation by Menander," *Ménandre*, Fondation Hardt, Entretiens 16 (Geneva 1970) 1-42. He cites *Samia* II.96; *Epitrepontes* II.206; *Sikyonioides* III.120; *Dyskolos* IV.775; and *Aspis* 491. Cf. also Plautus' *Curculio* 463-86 with the interlude scene of the *Choregus*.

¹⁹ The lack of such linking scenes in Plautus has often been thought to be a source of embarrassment to the Roman playwright. Characters leave for the harbor or the forum only to return a few lines later. Duckworth (above, note 1) 98 f. and 127 f. dealt with such criticism by emphasizing that elasticity of dramatic time is an accepted convention of Roman comedy. The dramatic time required for off-stage action is covered by song and dance or by monologue. Cf. Jacques Andrieu, *Le Dialogue Antique* (Paris 1954) 70 f. In the *Bacchides* Nicobulus was described as heading for the forum at line 348, but when he reappears at line 770 it is from his house. That such a detail would bother a Roman audience, especially after over 400 lines, would seem to be at least debatable. In the *Dis Exapaton*, however, although we are not told where Nicobulus has come from when he encounters Mnesilochus (Sostratos), when they depart at the beginning of the next act, he then heads for the marketplace. Whether or not Plautus has garbled the exact movements of Nicobulus throughout the play, the important factor is that he has omitted Nicobulus from the center of his play. In Plautus the re-entrance of Nicobulus, delayed till after Mnesilochus' discovery of his mistake and the planning of the second deception, serves to balance the two tricks.

—a) Freund.”²⁰ In the episodic structure of the *Bacchides*, however, as I see it, the entrance of the soldier’s parasite is the pivotal point of the play. The disappearance of Nicobulus from the middle of the play permits parallel scenes between Mnesilochus and Pistoclerus to surround the report of the soldier’s imminent appearance:

Mnesilochus’ error committed (489–525)

He meets with Pistoclerus (526–72)

parasite of the soldier (573–611)

Mnesilochus’ error regretted (612–24)

He meets with Pistoclerus (625–39)

Pistoclerus is present to console the repentant Mnesilochus, as he was present before to receive his abuse. Nicobulus reappears in the *Bacchides* only to be victimized a second time by Chrysalus.

The major emphasis according to the Plautine reconstruction is the theme of friendship emphasized by the immediate confrontation of the two friends. When Mnesilochus first appears, his opening monologue (385–404) sings the praises of friendship and in particular of his great friend Pistoclerus. But after his encounter with Lydus, when he learns that Pistoclerus is in love with a Bacchis too, his friends are now described as *inimici*:

Inimiciorem nunc utrum credam magis
sodalemne esse an Bacchidem incertum admodumst. (500–01)

This notion of friendship which had meant so much to Mnesilochus reaches its climax in the encounter between Mnesilochus and Pistoclerus (534–72). Pistoclerus greets him as *sodalis*; Mnesilochus retorts with *hostis*:

PI. estne hic meu’ sodalis?

MN. estne hic hostis quem aspicio meus? (534)

To Mnesilochus Pistoclerus has replaced the soldier as his main enemy. The incredulous Pistoclerus agrees with Mnesilochus that there is nothing worse than a friend-turned-enemy, but he refuses to be labelled such a person himself. While the *Dis Exapaton* fragments

²⁰ Gaiser (above, note 4) 60, note 16: “Plautus hat diese auch psychologisch ausgewogene Struktur zerschlagen zugunsten einer Schritt für Schritt weiterführenden Aktion.”

use the word for "friend" three times (lines 13, 17, 108), Plautus alone seems to have created the "enemy" motif. In the *Dis Exapaton* Mnesilochus (Sostratos) actually exonerates Pistoclerus (Moschion), putting the blame instead on Bacchis. Indeed, E. W. Handley suspects that lines 540–51, in which the "enemy" theme is developed, are the work of Plautus himself.²¹

In the *Bacchides* the pivotal moment in the play is the arrival of the soldier's parasite. While Mnesilochus is off-stage learning of his disastrous mistake, the parasite is present to demand the return of the Samian Bacchis. He describes the soldier as *nequam atque improbus* (573), the same adjectives which had been used in the previous scene to describe Pistoclerus as a friend-turned-enemy (557, 552) and which Mnesilochus will use in the next scene to describe himself (616a, 620). Indeed, now it becomes apparent that the soldier, not Pistoclerus, is the main foe of Mnesilochus. The parasite warns that the soldier will soon appear and it is his threat to take Bacchis away which hangs over the second half of the play. And so we find ourselves coming full circle. The confusion in the play seems to be as to who is the real enemy. To the *Bacchides*, the soldier is the enemy, but to Lydus the pedagogue the *Bacchides* themselves are a moral enemy. When he expresses his worry to "friend" Mnesilochus, the "traitorous" Pistoclerus becomes the new enemy. In this sense too the entrance of the parasite reorients the action of the play. Pistoclerus is not the main foe, but the soldier is. The second half of the play then is directed to ward him off. When he is incorporated by Chrysalus into the second deception, the emphasis falls again on the old man. Chrysalus becomes the great *imperator* in his successful attempt to trick Nicobulus a second time. We have moved in the play from Pistoclerus as a friend and apparent enemy to the soldier who, though an enemy, provides a friendly assist to Chrysalus' second trick.

Finally, we must speak in more detail of the last scene of the *Bacchides*, the seduction of the two fathers by the *Bacchides*, which corresponds nicely with the beginning of the play and the seduction of Pistoclerus. Here too we can find verbal echoes which unite the two scenes: the men worry about the plotting of the *Bacchides* (40, 1154), appeal to their ages as being unfit for love (56, 1163), describe the birdlime of the

²¹ Handley (above, note 3) 17–18.

women's words (50, 1159), and their similar enticements (55, 81, 1150-51).²² Then, within the final scene itself there is further evidence of Plautine workmanship in the elaborate sheep-ram metaphor (1120-48), considered by Fraenkel and now other scholars to be an example of Plautine elaboration.²³ The image of the ram is a motif used elsewhere in the play by Plautus for trickery and deception, though not in the seduction of Pistoclerus scene. Thus Chrysalus spoke before the first deception of Nicobulus:

adibo hunc, quem quidem ego hodie faciam hic arietem
Phrxi, itaque tondebo auro usque ad uiuam cutem, (241-42)

recognized by Nicobulus as a *fait accompli* after the second deception:

is me scelus auro usque attondit dolis doctis indoctum ut lubitumst. (1095)

Just as the Bacchides pick up this image at line 1120, so it seems fitting that the Bacchides, the real victors in the play, should conclude their victory by also borrowing from the military imagery used by Chrysalus:

lepide ipsi hi sunt capti, suis qui filiis fecere insidias. (1206)

In the *Bacchides* then, as outlined, the dual plot gives rise to a symmetrical structure of episodes around a central scene of pivotal importance. If such a structure is not strictly Plautine, I think we have shown that through a series of elaborations and judicious cuttings he has made the play his own. The secondary love plot of Pistoclerus and the Athenian Bacchis provides a delaying action in the first half of the play. The true solution of the play takes place during the second half when the Samian Bacchis is released from her financial bonds to the soldier. And we know that Plautus has omitted two scenes from the act structure of his Menandrian original, and by this omission the symmetrical arrangement of these episodes has been more sharply defined.

²² Cf. MacCary (above, note 2) 323, note 47: "What connects the two scenes is the recurrence of an image pattern more than the development of a theme—the lovers describe themselves as caught in birdlime (50, 1158 f.), urged on by goads (64, 1159) and in bondage to the mistress (92 f., 1205 f.)—and this is more characteristic of Plautus than Menander."

²³ Fraenkel (above, note 2) 68 f.; Fantham (above, note 12) 103-04; and James Svendsen, *Goats and Monkeys: A Study of Animal Imagery in Plautus* (Diss., Minnesota 1971) 345 f.