

TRANSLATING SCENES: PLAUTUS' ADAPTATION OF MENANDER'S *DIS EXAPATON*

MARK L. DAMEN

THE THREE PASSAGES discussed below, *Mostellaria* 858–932, *Aulularia* 682–726, and *Bacchides* 178–384, may seem on the surface unconnected. I hope to show that they are, in fact, linked by the particular method in which Plautus reworked his Greek model.¹ In each case he has, I believe, displaced a short scene from its *locus* in the Greek play to a point at which there was an act-break in the original. This scene then served to cover

¹The list of works concerning Plautus' revision of Greek originals is immense, especially that of *Dis Exapaton*. Below is a select bibliography of those works which have direct bearing on this article: W. G. Arnott, *Menander, Plautus, Terence* (Oxford 1975) = Arnott (1975); *id.*, "Time, Plot and Character in Menander," in F. Cairns (ed.), *Papers of the Liverpool Latin Seminar* 2 (Liverpool 1979) 343–360 = Arnott (1979); *id.*, *Menander* 1 (Cambridge, Mass. 1979, Loeb Classical Library); D. Bain, "Plautus vortit barbarez: Plautus, *Bacchides* 526–61 and Menander, *Dis Exapaton* 102–12," in D. West and T. Woodman (eds.), *Creative Imitation and Latin Literature* (Cambridge 1979) 17–34, 202–206; J. A. Barsby, "Actors and Act-Divisions: Some Questions of Adaptation in Roman Comedy," *Antichthon* 16 (1982) 77–87 = Barsby (1982); *id.*, *Plautus Bacchides* (Warminster 1986) = Barsby (1986); A. Blanchard, *Essai sur la composition des comédies de Ménandre* (Paris 1983), esp. 278–293; V. Castellani, "Plautus versus Komoidia: Popular Farce at Rome," in J. Redmond (ed.), *Farce* (Cambridge 1988, Themes in Drama 10) 53–82; K. Gaiser, "Die plautinischen 'Bacchides' und Menanders 'Dis Exapaton'," *Philologus* 114 (1970) 51–87 = Gaiser (1970); *id.*, "Zur Eigenart der römischen Komödie: Plautus und Terenz gegenüber ihren griechischen Vorbildern," in ANRW I.2 (Berlin 1972) 1027–1113, esp. 1039–41, 1073–79 = Gaiser (1972); S. M. Goldberg, "Act to Action in Plautus' *Bacchides*," *CP* 85 (1990) 191–201; A. W. Gomme and F. H. Sandbach, *Menander: A Commentary* (Oxford 1973); E. W. Handley, *Menander and Plautus: A Study in Comparison* (London 1968) 18; R. L. Hunter, *The New Comedy of Greece and Rome* (Cambridge 1985); J. C. B. Lowe, "Plautine Innovations in *Mostellaria* 529–857," *Phoenix* 39 (1985) 6–26 = Lowe (1985); *id.*, "Plautus' Choruses," *RhM NS* 133 (1990) 274–297 = Lowe (1990); A. Primmer, *Handlungsgliederung in Nea und Palliata: Dis Exapaton und Bacchides* (Vienna 1984); C. Questa, "Alcune strutture sceniche di Plauto e Menandro," in E. G. Turner (ed.), *Ménandre* (Vandoeuvres-Geneva 1970, Fondation Hardt: Entretiens sur l'antiquité classique 16) 183–228 = Questa (1970); *id.*, *Parerga Plautina: struttura e tradizione manoscritta delle commedie* (Urbino 1985) 15–86 = Questa (1985); F. H. Sandbach, *Ancient Culture and Society: The Comic Theatre of Greece and Rome* (London 1977); H-P. Schönbeck, *Beiträge zur Interpretation der plautinischen "Bacchides"* in *Sprach- und Literaturwissenschaften: Klassische Philologie* (Düsseldorf 1981); T. B. L. Webster, *An Introduction to Menander* (Manchester 1974).

Henceforth, all references to these works will be by last name with date of publication where necessary. Citations of Plautus come from the text of W. M. Lindsay, *T. Macci Plauti Comoediae* (Oxford 1904); those of Menander come from the text of F. H. Sandbach, *Menandri Reliquiae Selectae* (Oxford 1972).

necessary offstage action which took place during the Greek act-break. The discussion which follows is arranged in order of increasing complexity, from an easily discernible inversion of two scenes to a redistribution of scenes entailing further adjustments in the original plotline. But in all instances the principle is the same: Plautus' need to cover act-breaks underlies and actuates the changes he has effected.

METHODOLOGY

The methodology used in this article is based on a fundamental and well-known principle of Menandrian dramaturgy: four act-breaks divide the action of Menander's comedies into five acts.² These act-breaks not only punctuate the action but are often used also to mark an advance in stage time when it is disproportionate to time in the theatre. With great regularity these interludes cover the lengthy offstage journeys Menander's characters take to the market or harbor, trips that constitute more than short errands.³ During act-breaks a chorus of some sort performed, as evidenced by the consistent use of the designation XOPOY ("the chorus' [song]") at act-breaks in Greek texts, and added credence to the notion that time had passed during the interlude.

In Plautus' theatre, on the other hand, there seems not to have existed any such chorus or "five-act rule." If there were regular interruptions in the dramatic action of Roman comedy, they are not preserved or readily apparent in our texts. Rather, it seems much more likely that Plautus (and probably Terence also) scored his dramas for continuous action.⁴ At the same time, however, Roman adaptations follow the general plotline of their models closely enough that it is possible in many cases to reconstruct the act-breaks of the Greek originals.⁵ For instance, a lengthy journey off stage taken by a character in a Roman comedy usually indicates that an

²Lowe (1990) 274-297; Hunter 36-40; Barsby (1982) 77-79; Bain 23; Arnott (1975) 9; Webster 70-79; Gomme and Sandbach 19.

³Menander is quite fastidious in covering any lengthy journey with an act-break. Presumably his purpose is to give his drama a realistic feel, as if the comedy were comprised of five installments of "real time" taken from a single day; cf. Arnott (1979) 345-349, and see below, n. 29.

⁴Goldberg 193-194; Sandbach 113-115. The understanding that Roman comedy is composed for continuous action is not new; cf. J. N. Hough, "Continuity of Time in Plautus," *CP* 31 (1936) 244-252; C. C. Conrad, *The Technique of Continuous Action in Roman Comedy* (Menasha, Wisc. 1915).

⁵Arnott (1975) 38-41. E. Fantham, "Adaptation and Survival: A Genre Study of Roman Comedy in Relation to its Greek Sources," in P. Ruggiers (ed.), *Versions of Medieval Comedy* (Norman, Okla. 1977) 34, concludes that "[Plautus'] alteration of balance between scenes, while it inevitably changes the emphasis of a play, does not entail substantial changes in the plot itself."

act-break fell somewhere between the departure and return of that character's counterpart in the Greek play. This simple but reliable guideline to reconstructing the general constitution of the Greek original, when complemented by a more sophisticated analysis applying the "five-act rule" to what is known otherwise about Greek and Roman theatre, can reveal much about both genres.⁶

In order to understand this more complex methodology we must look at Roman comedy from Plautus' perspective. He is faced with several imposing tasks, among which is to re-compose for continuous performance stage action that was originally disposed into acts. Although on the surface this sounds simple, it is, in fact, a venture fraught with peculiar difficulties. To begin with, some of Menander's ingenuities are lost with the omission of act-breaks. For example, Menander sometimes introduces just before an act-break a character who could prove to be an obstacle to the happy resolution of the plot.⁷ This is a device useful in arousing the audience's curiosity. Roman theatre, in which there are no regular act-breaks, disallows such a device, thus diminishing the impact of an adaptation and challenging the adapter to find a dramatic equivalent in his own theatrical milieu to compensate the loss.⁸

More fundamental, however, are the mechanical problems of character movement. It is not at all uncommon for a character in Menandrian comedy to set off on a lengthy journey at or near the end of an act and return at or near the beginning of the next act. In the Greek theatre this disposition of action will not appear inconsistent because the choral interlude suggests the passage of the time necessary for the journey. Plautus, however, whose theatre does not routinely employ interludes, confronts the dilemma of either following the original and thus presenting action that may seem

⁶Sandbach (113) aptly points to an important difference in the presentation of drama written for continuous performance in ancient as opposed to modern theatre. The continuous drama of Shakespeare, for instance, regularly uses a momentary empty stage to reflect the passage of time, but often reinforces that interval with a change of scene. As Sandbach notes, "the spatial disruption facilitates the temporal disruption." In New Comedy, however, where playwrights generally avoid changes of scene, empty stages can leave the viewer confused as to whether or not any time has passed. Though Plautus does not always make the temporal framework of the drama explicitly clear, his comedies show often enough that he felt some pressure to refer overtly on stage to the passage of time off stage, if those times are disproportionate, in order that the audience may follow the general flow of time in the drama, cf. *Cas.* 759-779, *Bacch.* 530-533, *Men.* 882-887, *Mostell.* 547-555; also, Terence *HT* 171-173.

⁷Daos, *Dysk.* I/II; Kallippides, *Dysk.* IV/V; Demeas, *Samia* I/II; Sostratos' father, *Dis Ex.* III/IV. See Arnott (1975) 22; Gomme and Sandbach 20; Goldberg 192, esp. n. 2; E. W. Handley, "The Conventions of the Comic Stage and their Exploitation by Menander," in E. G. Turner (ed.), *Ménandre* (Vandoeuvres-Geneva 1970, Fondation Hardt: Entretiens sur l'antiquité classique 16) 11-12.

⁸Questa (1970) 201-202; see below, n. 12.

inconsistent to his viewers—a character walks off stage and immediately returns having completed a long trip—or re-constituting the drama in some way. To his credit as an adapter, he persistently chooses to take responsibility for presenting consistent stage action in the context of his own theatre and reworks the Greek plot when necessary around act-breaks.⁹ It is the aim of this paper to study one way in which he did this and what the results of his restructuring were in the case of three plays, with special focus on *Bacchides*.

MOSTELLARIA 858–932

Barsby, following Gaiser, has shown that in all probability at the third act-break of the Greek original of Plautus' *Mostellaria*, "Tranio" and "Theopropides"¹⁰ entered their neighbor's house, inspected it during the act-break, and immediately after the act-break re-emerged onto the stage.¹¹ It would, of course, look unnatural in the continuous action of the Roman theatre for these characters to enter and instantly re-appear discussing the house as if they had taken a lengthy tour. In order to fill this gap in the action, which Barsby proposes was covered in the Greek play by an act-break, Plautus has brought the servants Phaniscus and Pinacium on stage one scene before their counterparts appeared in the original. Thus, the servants function in the Roman play essentially as the Greek chorus did in the original: they suggest to the audience the passage of sufficient time for Tranio and Theopropides to inspect the house (see Figure 1). Plautus then removes the focus of the action from Phaniscus and Pinacium who stand silent on stage for almost thirty lines, while he brings Theopropides and Tranio back outside (904–932). Evidently, to Plautus it was preferable to "freeze" Phaniscus and Pinacium rather than to have Tranio and Theopropides enter the house and walk outside again immediately.¹²

⁹Plautus covers act-breaks in a wide variety of ways. At one extreme, in *Curculio* he covers offstage action by giving the stage manager a brief speech (462–486). At the other, he leaves some act-breaks uncovered, as in *Pseudolus* 573/574.

¹⁰For the sake of simplicity I refer to characters in Greek plays by the names of their Roman counterparts when their Greek names have not been preserved. To distinguish between Greek and Roman characters I put the names of the characters from the Greek plays in double quotes: Tranio (the Roman character) versus "Tranio" (the Greek character).

¹¹Barsby (1982) 86–87. The idea of the displacement of scenes in *Mostellaria* at this point is drawn from Gaiser (1972) 1039–41.

¹²To Barsby ([1982] 87), *Mostellaria* 858–932 "is not one of [Plautus'] more successful attempts to cover a Greek act-break, since he has only created a second awkwardness in his attempt to remove the first." Awkwardness is subjective and we can only assume that, if the silence of Phaniscus and Pinacium suited Plautus, the silence of characters on stage was tolerated at least to that extent in the Roman theatre; cf. D. Bain, *Actors and Audience* (Oxford 1977) 154, n. 1. Lowe ([1985] 26) aptly notes that in the Roman

Line nos.	Characters on Stage			
<i>Plautus' Disposition of Action</i> (Plautus' changes in italics)				
854-857	Tranio	Theopropides		
858-884			<i>Phaniscus</i>	
885-903			<i>Phaniscus</i>	<i>Pinacium</i>
904-932	<i>Tranio</i>	<i>Theopropides</i>	(<i>Phaniscus</i>)	(<i>Pinacium</i>)
933-992		Theopropides	Phaniscus	Pinacium
<i>Proposed Disposition of Action in the Greek Original</i> (three actors) ¹³				
"854-857" ¹⁴	"Tranio"	"Theopropides"		
		ACT-BREAK		
"904-932"	"Tranio"	"Theopropides"		
"858-884"		("Theopropides") ¹⁵	"Phaniscus"	
"885-903"	"Pinacium"	("Theopropides")	"Phaniscus"	
"933-992"	"Pinacium"	"Theopropides"	"Phaniscus"	

Figure 1

This passage is not the only example of this sort of scene displacement in Plautus. Lowe, also following Gaiser, has proposed that in *Mostellaria* again Plautus moved a passage (532-540) forward to cover offstage action—Theopropides meets the previous owner of his house—which was covered in

theatre the "gross discrepancy between the dramatic time required by offstage action and the actual time taken by the action on stage . . . would perhaps make it easier for [the audience] to accept situations where time seems to stand still for a character in one part of the stage while a dialogue is in progress in another." To a similar charge that Plautus has "plastered over" the act-break at *Dis Exapaton* 63/64 (= *Bacch.* 525/526), Goldberg (201) counters correctly that Plautus has intentionally reworked the stage action of *Dis Exapaton* to suit his own taste and theatre: "Plautus is not 'plastering over' a technical difference but reveling in it." See also Castellani 60-61, 68-73.

¹³Since Greek comedies were performed by only three actors, reconstructions of Greek comedy should provide for this limitation; cf. Barsby (1982) 79-81. Here I suggest that, if Plautus is following the general scenic structure of the Greek original and has not added Pinacium as a speaking character to this scene, the actor who plays "Tranio" changes costume off stage during "Phaniscus'" entrance monologue (858-884) and re-enters at 885 as "Pinacium"; cf. "Eunomia"/"Euclio" in *Aulularia* (below, 211) and Lydos/"Nicomachus," Moschos/Sostratos and Syros/"Philoxenus" in *Bacchides* (below, 214); for another possible division of roles, see Barsby (1982) 83.

¹⁴Line numbers in double quotes refer to passages in Plautus corresponding to passages in the Greek original. Note that the Latin text may be only a rough guide to the content and form of the Greek text.

¹⁵Parentheses indicate speaking characters who are momentarily silent or uninvolved in the main action on stage. They may or may not overhear other characters or speak in aside.

the original by an act-break.¹⁶ A pattern begins to emerge. In each case Plautus displaces a scene from its original situation in the Greek play so that, even if onstage and offstage time are not perfectly commensurate, at least some stage action covers offstage action necessary to the plot. Seen from the perspective of his Greek model, he has inverted the first and second scenes of an act or simply reversed the order in which the characters who originally came first and second in the act entered. Two examples from one play, however, do not make a rule. Happily this is not the only play in which we can show that Plautus displaced scenes in this manner.

AULULARIA 682–726

At *Aulularia* 682–726 Plautus has probably also adapted the structure of the original by displacing a scene.¹⁷ The sequence of action runs as follows (see Figure 2). At 676 Euclio leaves the stage to hide his gold in a field. Acting in behalf of his young master Lyconides, an unnamed slave commonly known as the *Servus Lyconidis* follows the old man, watches where he buries the gold, and steals it. Meanwhile, Euclio does not return home. Instead, obsessed with suspicion, he goes back to the field to make sure his gold has not been stolen. As he is going back, the *Servus Lyconidis* sneaks by him with the gold and returns to the stage before the old man does. Euclio, having found his gold stolen, follows close behind lamenting wildly.

This extensive stretch of offstage action is covered in Plautus only by a short scene in which Lyconides appears on stage with his mother Eunomia (682–700). They are going to visit her brother Megadorus. Lyconides begs his mother to help him claim Euclio's daughter in marriage, even though his uncle Megadorus is planning to marry her. Inasmuch as Lyconides has raped and impregnated the girl, who fortuitously reinforces his plea by giving birth at that very moment, Eunomia has little choice but to argue her son's case to her brother. She goes inside Megadorus' house, while

¹⁶Lowe (1985) 6–13. In these scenes Tranio is trapped between Theopropides and the *danista* to whom Theopropides' son is in debt (see my Appendix, below 231). The sequence of events in Plautus runs as follows. The *danista* enters at 532. Tranio reacts with horror to his presence. At 541 Theopropides enters. Tranio turns and speaks with him until 562, leaving the *danista* "frozen" on stage for over twenty lines. Lowe suggests that Plautus has inverted these scenes and that in the original "Theopropides" entered before the Greek counterpart of Plautus' *danista*. In the Greek play the act-break, presumably the second, would have permitted the old man's departure and quick return. It is interesting and possibly meaningful that the technique Lowe proposes Plautus has used to cover the act-break here is the very same (inversion of scenes beginning an act) as that proposed to have been used at 858–932; see below, 225.

¹⁷The author and nature of the Greek original are debated; cf. W. G. Arnott, "The Greek Original of Plautus' *Aulularia*," *WS* 101 (1988) 181–191; R. L. Hunter, "The 'Aulularia' of Plautus and Its Greek Original," *PCPS* NS 27 (1981) 45, n. 2.

Line nos.	Characters on Stage			
<i>Plautus' Disposition of Action</i> (Plautus' changes in italics)				
667-676	Euclio	(Servus Lyconidis)		
677-681		Servus Lyconidis		
682-695			<i>Lyconides</i>	<i>Eunomia</i>
696-700			<i>Lyconides</i>	
701-712		<i>Servus Lyconidis</i>		
713-726	<i>Euclio</i>			
727-802	Euclio		Lyconides	
<i>Proposed Disposition of Action in the Greek Original</i> (three actors)				
"667-676"	"Euclio"	("Servus Lyconidis")		
"677-681"		"Servus Lyconidis"		
ACT-BREAK				
"701-712"		"Servus Lyconidis"		
"682-695"	"Eunomia"		"Lyconides"	
"696-700"			"Lyconides"	
"713-726"	"Euclio"		("Lyconides")	
"727-802"	"Euclio"		"Lyconides"	

Figure 2

Lyconides waits outside. Though Plautus leaves it unsaid, the young man's motivation in urging his mother to go inside the house and speak for him is that he fears confronting his uncle with the terrible truth. Other cowardly young rapists in Menandrian drama hesitate to face the consequences of their transgressions in much the same way.¹⁸ Lyconides, however, waits about for fewer than four lines and then, contrary to his natural trepidation, enters the house.

The explanation for his sudden change of heart lies probably not with him so much as with Plautus. In the Greek theatre there was no need to insert stage action between the slave's departure and arrival because the long journey off stage would have been covered by a choral interlude.¹⁹ The question posed at the end of the act—will the slave steal the gold?—could be immediately resolved at the beginning of the next act. The slave came

¹⁸Moschion, *Samia* 65-69; Aeschinus, *Adelphoe* 690-691; cf. Choricus (Kock 3.37). Just like Lyconides, Moschion of *Perikeiromene* waits outside a house in fear of confronting an indignant relative, in this case his mother (299-304). The combination of cowardice and rape raises the possibility that Lyconides' model may have been named Moschion; cf. W. T. MacCary, "Menander's Characters: Their Names, Roles and Masks," *TAPA* 101 (1970) 286-289.

¹⁹The first and second act-breaks fell most likely at 119/120 and 279/280; cf. Webster 119-122. The fourth act-break would have fallen after the Plautine text breaks off; cf. Hunter (above, n. 17) 37-40.

back with the gold and sneaked across an empty stage into the house. Then the young man entered with his mother and sent her inside to confront his uncle for him. He would then have been waiting outside his uncle's house when the Greek "Euclio" returned, frantic because his gold had been stolen. Now the scene was set for their humorous confrontation, the comical climax of the next sequence of action.

This sequence will not work, however, in the continuous stage action of the Roman theatre. If Plautus followed his model precisely, the slave would have to exit and return immediately bringing with him the gold and a report of his extensive activity. So, to create a workable sequence of uninterrupted action Plautus has moved the second scene of this act (Eunomia and Lyconides) forward. In doing so, he interjects some stage time between the departure and return of Euclio and the *Servus Lyconidis* (681/701). But then he cannot leave the young man on stage, since the slave cannot be seen entering the house with Euclio's gold. That the slave has hidden it undetected is important to the subsequent action of the play (808 ff.). Plautus, therefore, has the young man exit into his uncle's house despite his apprehensions and in full knowledge that his mother is at that very moment handling his problem for him.²⁰ Thus, just as in *Mostellaria*, Plautus displaces a scene forward in the stage action to cover an act-break, with only the minor complication (if it is to him a complication at all!) that the young man acts counter to his fears. Unlike what he does in *Mostellaria*, however, Plautus hides his re-working off stage. Here no "frozen" character sits idly by, waiting for his cue to re-enter the stage action. Only a weak motivation to exit and re-enter betrays the adapter's hand.

The stage action of *Aulularia* is well managed in other ways, too. With Lyconides inside the house, Plautus' Euclio enters onto an empty stage, unlike in the Greek original where, according to the reconstruction above, "Lyconides" was on stage when "Euclio" arrived. Plautus takes advantage of the old man's momentary solitude to have him deliver a frenzied soliloquy about the theft of his gold (713-726). This masterstroke of comic writing is familiar to modern audiences from Molière's adaptation (*L'Avare* IV.7). If, however, in the Greek play the young man were already present, "Euclio" could not have ranted about the theft of his gold in such detail as his Roman

²⁰Webster (120) proposes a different reconstruction requiring the presence of "Lyconides" in his uncle's house from 371 onward. The young man's hesitation to confront "Megadorus" on his own and his enlistment of his mother's aid (682-695) argue against his presence in his uncle's house before the fourth act. For Plautus' disinterest in the character of the young man except in so far as he contributes to the play's humor, see Castellani 58. Note also that the young man's reason for returning to the stage (*quinam homo hic ante aedis nostras eiulans conqueritur maerens?* 727) is as bland as his motivation to exit is inconsistent. Why, if Lyconides hears Euclio's loud cries of distress, do not Megadorus, Eunomia, and the cooks and slaves inside the house also?

counterpart does, because, had he made it clear that the "she" in question were a pot of gold (not his daughter, as the young man thinks), the central joke of the next scene in which the two confuse the referent of "she" would no longer work. It follows then that Euclio's comic appeal to the audience for help is Plautus' free invention and an ingenious exploitation of a re-adjustment necessitated by the structure of the original.²¹ As we will see below, this passage is not unique in that respect. In *Bacchides* it is also possible to reclaim not only the Greek original from Plautus but Plautus from the Greek original too.

BACCHIDES 178-384

In *Bacchides* the sequence of action culminating in the so-called "first deception" begins with the entrances of Pistoclerus and his pedagogue Lydus who has followed him from the market to the house of the courtesan Bacchis (see Figure 3). After quarreling with Lydus over whether he should visit such an establishment, Pistoclerus enters the brothel, and Lydus follows, horrified but determined to rescue his ward from debauchery. Next, the slave Chrysalus appears. He and his young master Mnesilochus have just returned home from a long journey abroad. Pistoclerus emerges from Bacchis' house and sees Chrysalus. Amidst much comic banter, Chrysalus informs him that Pistoclerus' friend Mnesilochus is back in Athens. In turn, Pistoclerus tells Chrysalus that he has found Bacchis, Mnesilochus' lost love, as Mnesilochus had written and asked him to do. He also tells Chrysalus that she lives in the house on stage. Pistoclerus returns inside Bacchis' house. In order to secure Bacchis for his young master, Chrysalus sees that he must swindle Mnesilochus' father Nicobulus out of the money they have brought home. Nicobulus enters. In the long "first deception" (235-348), Chrysalus deceives Nicobulus with a complicated fabrication amounting to the fiction that Mnesilochus has returned with only a small portion of the money his father had sent him to recover. This he caps with another lie that Mnesilochus, who is at that moment coming from the harbor, has gone ahead into town. The old man heads to the market to find his son. Chrysalus exits the other way to the harbor to tell Mnesilochus about the deception and that the money is his with which to buy Bacchis' freedom. The stage is empty.

²¹Other aspects of the monologue lead to the conclusion that Plautus at the very least expanded the old man's entrance speech in the Greek play. Such direct and extensive interrogation and abuse of the audience is unknown in Menander but is paralleled in other speeches of Plautus; cf. N. W. Slater, *Plautus in Performance* (Princeton 1985) 89, n. 35. Also, Euclio's loud ravings run counter to his unwillingness elsewhere to mention the gold in public (634-654; 731-762, especially 759-762). While not "flaws," these features of the speech are un-Menandrian.

Line nos.	Characters on Stage			
<i>Plautus' Arrangement of Action</i> (Plautus' changes in italics)				
109-169	Lydus	Pistoclerus		
170-177			Chrysalus	
178-228		<i>Pistoclerus</i>	<i>Chrysalus</i>	
229-234			<i>Chrysalus</i>	
235-348			Chrysalus	Nicobulus
349-367			Chrysalus	
368-384	<i>Lydus</i>			
385-403				Mnesilochus
403-499	Lydus			Mnesilochus Philoxenus
<i>Proposed Disposition of Action in the Greek Original</i> (three actors)				
"109-169"	Lydos	Moschos		
"170-177"			Syros	
"368-384"	Lydos		(Syros)	
"229-234"			Syros	
"235-348"	"Nicobulus"		Syros	
"349-367"			Syros	
		Sostratos	Syros	
		ACT-BREAK		
		Sostratos	Syros	
"385-403"		Sostratos		
"403-499"	Lydos	Sostratos	"Philoxenus"	

Figure 3

Suddenly Lydos rushes out of Bacchis' house, horrified at the amorous proceedings inside and the corruption of his adolescent charge. He marches off swearing to tell Pistoclerus' father Philoxenus the terrible news of his son's moral decay. After Lydos' exit Mnesilochus appears from the harbor. He has spoken with Chrysalus and learned, much to his joy, about the successes that Pistoclerus and Chrysalus have had. Lydos reappears with Philoxenus in tow. They confirm what Mnesilochus already knows, that his friend has found Bacchis, but his joy at having won Bacchis melts into horror as Lydos describes the intimacy with which Bacchis has greeted Pistoclerus. Confusing Bacchis I with Bacchis II, Mnesilochus wrongly infers that the Bacchis he loves (II) is being unfaithful to him. His misunderstanding leads him to give the money swindled by Chrysalus back to his father in order to spite his supposedly promiscuous girlfriend.

In terms of reconstructing Menander's original, two features of Plautus' sequence of action stand out immediately. First, in the Greek play an act-break must have fallen between the Greek Lydos' exit and return at what

corresponds to *Bacch.* 384/403.²² The realistic conventions of Menandrian drama require that Lydos be given some time to search for "Philoxenus," whose exact whereabouts he presumably does not know when he leaves the brothel.²³ The movements of Nicobulus also support this assertion. At the end of the first deception Nicobulus heads off to the market. Although in the Roman play he does not appear again until 770 (or perhaps 393), we know that his Greek counterpart returned in the next act (*Dis Ex.* 30).²⁴ Thus, this character's movements also require the interposition of an act-break in the Greek play at some point between the end of the first deception and "Nicobulus'" return from the market.²⁵

²²As is so rarely the case, the names of several characters in the Greek original (*Dis Exapaton*) are known: Syros = Chrysalus, Sostratos = Mnesilochus, Moschos = Pistoclerus and Lydos' name went basically unchanged (Lydos).

²³Barsby (1986) 127-128, III.i.4; Primmer 32 ff.; Blanchard 282-287; J. C. B. Lowe, *CR* ns 23 (1973) 23-24; Webster 130-132; Gaiser (1970) 61-64. It is also likely that during the second act-break Syros told Sostratos about the deception; see below, 224. Hence, there can be little doubt an act-break fell somewhere between what corresponded in *Dis Exapaton* to *Bacchides* 170-404. But where exactly? It is not likely to have taken place before the "first deception" at 229/230 or 233/234, because the presence of Chrysalus on stage continually from 170 to 367 and the need for sufficient action in the act argue strongly against it. For similar reasons a later act-break around 405 is not likely either. Mnesilochus is on stage continuously from 385 to 525 and there would be very little action in the act. Most likely this act-break came at what corresponds to *Bacch.* 367/385. It would then be the second, making the one preserved in the *Dis Exapaton* fragment (63/64 = 525/534) the third, although it is sometimes said to be the second; cf. Barsby (1986) 128; Questa (1985) 32-34. The other act-breaks of the original would have fallen at the equivalent of 108/109 (first) and 715/761 (fourth) in Plautus. Such an arrangement allows in each case an act-break to cover the time necessary for lengthy offstage action: Moschos goes shopping (first act-break), "Nicobulus" searches for Sostratos off stage (second act-break), Sostratos returns the money to his father (third act-break) and Sostratos writes the letter (fourth act-break). The third deception (925-1075) has long been thought to be Plautus' expansion of the original plot; cf. Barsby (1986) 170; Primmer 65 ff.; Bain 203-204, n. 13; A. L. Wheeler, "The Plot of the *Epidicus*," *AJP* 38 (1917) 237-264, at 259, n. 1. But see also G. Williams, "Some Problems in the Construction of Plautus' *Pseudolus*," *Hermes* 84 (1956) 424-455, at 452-455, who argues that from the title of the original, *Dis Exapaton*, Menander's play must have included a third deception; cf. also L. Finette, "Le *Dis Exapaton* et les *Bacchides*. Deux ou trois fourberies?," *CEA* 15 (1983) 47-60; Gaiser (1970) 78-79.

²⁴If *Bacch.* 393 (*sed eccum video incedere*) is not an interpolation, the character whom Mnesilochus sees there must be Nicobulus, since he was the last person mentioned (*patrem* 392). Because the old man is at home when next seen (770), this silent entrance and exit are perhaps intended to show the audience that he has returned from the market and is now in his house; cf. V. J. Rosivach, "The Stage Settings of Plautus' '*Bacchides*,' '*Cistellaria*' and '*Epidicus*,'" *Hermes* 114 (1986) 429-442, at 434, n. 18; Gomme and Sandbach 119; Questa (1970) 205-210.

²⁵At *Bacch.* 367/368, the shift in Plautus' meter from iambic senarii to trochaic septenarii, that is, from speech to recitative, also suggests there was an act-break at the corresponding locus in *Dis Exapaton*. At *Bacch.* 525/526, which from the papyrus

Second, Lydus stays inside Bacchis' house for nearly two-hundred lines (170–367). If not inconsistent—and it may not have seemed so to Plautus—this is at least remarkable.²⁶ Before entering the brothel, the prim pedagogue was aghast at the notion of Pistoclerus visiting such a place (146) and only reluctantly entered himself (169). It is improbable that so long a time would pass before he would see the arrangements in the house and Bacchis in amorous embrace with his young ward.²⁷ The very sight of these things, he later claims, sent him running immediately from the brothel: *quae ut aspexi, me continuo contuli protinam in pedes* (374).²⁸ There is a curious discrepancy here between time on and off the stage: Lydus' words envision a rather brief encounter with Bacchis, yet the audience has seen for itself his stay was not short. The presence of *continuo* in the quote above and in general the extremity of Lydus' revulsion give his soliloquy at 368–384 the appearance of a knee-jerk reaction in response to a sudden shock, as if he had walked into the brothel, witnessed its horrors and rushed out. Later in the play his words again create this impression (486–488):

*Quid opust verbis? Si opperiri vellem paullisper modo,
ut opino, illius inspectandi mi esset maior copia,
plus viderem quam deceret, quam me atque illo aequom foret.*

we know covers another act-break of Menander's play, the meter changes in exactly the same way; cf. Goldberg 196: "[Pistoclerus'] monologue is therefore not the cover, which was provided by the music"; cf. also Hunter 18. Similarly at *Bacch.* 108/109 which corresponds to the first act-break of *Dis Exapaton*, the meter again shifts, this time the opposite way, from septenarii to senarii (cf. *Aul.* 660/661). While we certainly cannot construe every shift of meter in Plautus as the remnant of a Greek act-break, given that in *Bacchides* alternations between these particular meters occur at 108/109 and 525/526, which cover act-breaks in the original, were we to find no shift of meter at 367/368, the argument for reconstructing an act-break there would be weakened somewhat. Thus, even if only a negative indicator, Plautus' meter must not be overlooked as a source of information concerning the act-breaks of the original.

²⁶Schönbeck (66) correctly points out that this inconsistency is not readily apparent to the casual viewer. Hunter (57) concurs: "Once Lydus leaves the stage at v. 169 he is out of sight and out of mind until he re-enters; we do not wonder what he is doing while Pistoclerus and Chrysalus converse." However, whether the Roman audience noticed or not, it is still surprising that so prudish a man would remain in a brothel for so long, especially in the context of Menandrian realism. The point here is not to condemn or reject either playwright's work, but to reconstruct the original using the dramaturgical tendencies demonstrable in the work of each.

²⁷*Bacch.* 42–100, esp. 42–61. Bacchis I has made careful arrangements with Pistoclerus that he will stay with her for lunch and protect her sister in return for her amatory favors; cf. Thais and Chremes, *Eunuchus* 764–770. Thus, the expectation is well established that the intimacy of Pistoclerus and Bacchis, the true source of Lydus' horror, will begin almost immediately upon Pistoclerus' entrance into the brothel.

²⁸If the antecedent of *quae* (374) is to be understood as the general situation in the house, all Lydus saw before he was driven away in disgust was a lunch-party in preparation and Mnesilochus kissing and fondling Bacchis.

The pedagogue's assertion that, had he wished, he could have seen more of Bacchis' intimacy with Pistoclerus presumes that his venture inside the brothel was relatively brief. In any case, whether we are to understand that his visit lasted a moment or a minute, two-hundred lines are far more than necessary to cover the offstage action.

Menander is known to have avoided such marked discrepancies between onstage and offstage time. In his surviving dramas offstage time is so often commensurate with that on stage that it seems safe to assume it was a standard feature of his dramaturgy. To give just a few examples: Sostratos requires less than a minute of onstage time to fetch water from the shrine off stage (*Dysk.* 203/211); it takes Getas but a moment of onstage time to perform the simple task of reporting to Sikon off stage that Knemon would not give him a pot (*Dysk.* 480/487); after Demeas exits, it takes him just ten lines of onstage time to find and evict Chrysis and the baby who he knows are in his house (*Sam.* 360/369). On the other hand, it takes longer by the measure of onstage time for Sostratos to go out to the fields and convince the reluctant Gorgias to join in his family's celebration (*Dysk.* 573/611), or for Getas to leave, find and return with Thrasonides whose whereabouts the slave seems to know (*Mis.* 237/259). Thus, in general if characters in Menander exit to find some other character whose whereabouts they know or to perform a simple task, it usually takes little time. When the offstage action entails an exit to the wings, the passages covering it may be a little longer, though not much. In any case, offstage time in Menander is generally realistic and equivalent to onstage time.²⁹

Later in the play the plot seems again to call for only a brief encounter between pedagogue and prostitute. If Lydus stays inside Bacchis' house for as long as he does in the Roman play, it is reasonable to suppose that he would learn about the existence of a second Bacchis, as indeed he does in Plautus where the plural prostitutes obsess and horrify him (371-373). Why then does he not make reference to this fact, so important to him in

²⁹While Sandbach (114) is correct that "Menander's plays require no strict correspondence of stage-time with that of events off-stage," time on stage and time off stage in Menander are so often harmonious that it is difficult not to see them as the product of a careful and intentional integration aimed at endowing the dramatic action with a sense of realism. Some compression of time is permissible, often for the sake of comedy. For instance, concerning Getas' busy morning in *Dyskolos*, Arnott ([1979] 349) notes: "... time off-stage is not as realistically imagined as time on-stage, although Menander, so far as we know, never transgressed the rules of plausibility to the extent that his tragic forebears or some of his comic contemporaries did." It should also be noted that what relatively few distortions of offstage time can be shown to exist in Menander entail more often the compression than the extension of offstage time. This is natural. After all, that is exactly what he already does as often as four times a play at the act-breaks. Thus, if not always "strict," some sort of realistic correspondence between time on and off stage seems always to have been sought by Menander, and a reconstruction of his work which entails a gross distortion of this relationship must be suspect *per se*.

the monologue earlier, when he is arguing later in III.3 with Philoxenus in front of Mnesilochus and saying that houses like Bacchis' are dens of iniquity and places unfit for impressionable young men (470–488)? The answer is obvious: he cannot do so without drastically affecting the plot, because his statement that there are two Bacchises would spoil the dissolution of the first deception which is based on Mnesilochus' ignorance that there exists a second woman named Bacchis.

Together these plot elements make it unlikely that the sequence of action involving Lydus' trip into Bacchis' house stems as such from Menander. It is un-Menandrian that the time the pedagogue spends off stage in Bacchis' house (almost a sixth of the play) is both grossly disproportionate to time on stage and entirely unnecessary for his relatively simple mission (to see what is going on inside the brothel). And later in the play when he should mention the two Bacchises but does not, the demands of plot play against and ultimately overshadow the demands of the realistic portrayal of character and this is also unlike the Greek playwright. It was, in fact, a hallmark of Menander's style that plot arose naturally from character. Therefore it seems improbable that at least in this respect the plot action derives from him. It is also not difficult to envision a more Menandrian scenario reconciling time, character, and plot if we suppose that the pedagogue remained in the prostitute's house only briefly, just long enough to see the debauchery but not so long that he saw or learned about "Bacchis'" sister.³⁰

Given these two features of Plautus' sequence of action—Lydus' extended stay in the brothel and the need for an act-break in the original somewhere in the vicinity of what corresponded to *Bacch.* 367/384—and knowing that in other plays Plautus covers act-breaks by displacing scenes, we should explore the possibility that this is no coincidence but that Plautus has moved Lydus' monologue from its original *locus* for the purpose of bridging an act-break. From Lydus' extended stay it follows that his exit from the brothel occurred earlier in the Greek play.³¹ But when exactly? The precise dynamics of this displacement are not as readily apparent as those in *Mostellaria* and *Aulularia*. Plautus' pedagogue flees just after the long first deception (235–367). Like his Roman counterpart, Menander's

³⁰Primmer (42) notes that, just before they exit at *Bacch.* 108, Bacchis I suggests that Bacchis II take a bath to clean off after her journey: *aqua calet; eamus hinc intro ut lavas* (105). If it derives from Menander, the bath seems designed to explain how it was possible that during his brief venture inside the brothel the Greek Lydos did not see "Bacchis II": she was bathing.

³¹In his reconstruction of the second act of *Dis Exapaton*, Webster (130) says: "... Moschos goes into Chrysis' house; Lydos goes away to tell Philoxenus into what dangers his son is falling." By moving Lydos' departure in the Greek play to a point earlier in the action than where Plautus has put it, Webster without employing the principle of scene displacement anticipated what seems to be essentially the correct reconstruction of the action in Menander's original.

Lydos probably did not disrupt this scene, a set piece best left uninterrupted. Preceding the first deception is Chrysalus' entrance and his conversation with Pistoclerus. Preceding that is Lydos' entrance into the house. The Greek Lydos cannot have left the house before he entered it and must, therefore, have fled the house at some point before, during or after the conversation between Chrysalus and Pistoclerus (II.2, 178–234). This is the most straightforward solution to the problem of Lydos' extended stay.

Looking no deeper, we could stop here and reconstruct Menander's stage action by positing that somewhere in the vicinity of what corresponded in the original to Plautus' II.2 the Greek Lydos left the brothel. However, this arrangement of the action is unsatisfactory in two respects. First, it is imprecise. Although it seems generally more likely that Menander's Lydos would emerge at the beginning of the scene with Pistoclerus rather than wait inside without him, nothing in Plautus' text supports the assumption. If this happened in the original, Plautus has eradicated every vestige of Lydos' appearance here. It would be more compelling if there were at least some shred of evidence that Menander's play included such a scene. Second, according to the plot of the Roman play Lydos cannot be privy to even the most general features of the conversation between Chrysalus and Pistoclerus. Later plot developments speak strongly against it because in their discussion Pistoclerus and Chrysalus focus, as is natural, on Bacchis, Mnesilochus, and their relationship. One, if not *the*, major purpose of the scene is that Chrysalus receive from Pistoclerus crucial information about Mnesilochus' involvement with Bacchis. Were Lydos to learn this, it would disrupt the later scene in which he plays a central role in the dissolution of the first deception (*Bacch.* 405–499; *Dis Ex.* 1–17). His willingness to praise Mnesilochus (*Bacch.* 451–462) and leave to him the chastisement of Pistoclerus (*Bacch.* 499), a feature known to derive from *Dis Exapaton* (15–17), depends on the pedagogue's ignorance that Mnesilochus' needs lie behind Pistoclerus' actions.

So, if Plautus is following even just the general outline of Menander's plot—and the papyrus shows that he is³²—the Greek Lydos cannot have joined in Syros' and Moschos' conversation as either an active or a passive participant. He can only burst forth probably at or near the beginning of the scene and, if he speaks at all, curse Moschos' debauchery, threaten to tell "Philoxenus" and exit without any substantial interaction with the others, especially Syros. This is, in fact, a fairly accurate depiction of what his Roman counterpart does when he finally emerges from the brothel (*Bacch.* 368–384, III.1): he delivers a furious diatribe against the Bacchises and their immorality. Whether he is on stage alone or with Pistoclerus and

³²The papyrus shows that Plautus is also following the original closely, in at least one point (*Dis Ex.* 55–56 = *Bacch.* 306); cf. Primmer 44, n. 86.

Chrysalus, the fact that he must not interact with the others raises the possibility that Plautus has altered the original less than the displacement of III.1 across more than a hundred lines would make it seem. He may, in fact, have retained the original form of Lydus' speech, a monologue. Thus, the restrictions of this complex and tightly woven plot demand a scenario something like this: Syros enters from the harbor, Moschos and Lydos enter from the brothel, Lydos denounces Moschos and "Bacchis" and storms off (without speaking with or probably even seeing Syros), Moschos and Syros speak, and finally Moschos returns inside. All in all, it is a rather long course of action, though not terribly hard to follow, and the scene is now properly set for the first deception and its aftermath.

If, however, we look at the play through Syros' eyes, we can circumvent this cumbersome sequence and create one that is smoother and more economical though not necessarily simpler, all of which is to say "more Menandrian." From Plautus' play we know that on his return to Athens the *servus callidus* Chrysalus is aware of four important plot elements: (1) his master Mnesilochus is in love with a courtesan named Bacchis, (2) Bacchis has been transferred to Athens by a soldier, (3) Mnesilochus has written his friend Pistoclerus in Athens and asked him to find Bacchis, and (4) if Mnesilochus hopes to recover her, he will have to buy her from the soldier. In order to bilk his old master of money and secure Bacchis for his young master, Chrysalus needs to know only three more things: (1) whether Pistoclerus has found Bacchis, and if so, (2) where she lives, and (3) for what sum she can be purchased from the soldier. In their conversation in *Bacchides* II.2 Pistoclerus tells Chrysalus the first two of these three things—he has found Bacchis and she lives next door to Nicobulus—but does not mention the third, Bacchis' price. This is peculiar in view of the fact that Bacchis' price is central to Mnesilochus' problems and, thus, Chrysalus' concerns. At the very least, one would expect Chrysalus to ask Pistoclerus at some point during their fifty lines together on stage whether or not he knows the price, and Pistoclerus as a representative of Mnesilochus' interest in Bacchis can be expected at least to have researched, if not ascertained, this information. It is a natural extension of his quest for Bacchis and concern for his friend.

But neither mentions the price. In fact, despite the length of their conversation (178–228) Pistoclerus in general tells Chrysalus remarkably little. For all the slave learns, he might as well have spoken with the hostile Lydus as the trusty Pistoclerus, which points up a curious coincidence. Lydus knows the very two facts Chrysalus learns from Pistoclerus: Pistoclerus has found a courtesan named Bacchis, and she lives in the house next door to Nicobulus. Moreover, in referring to both Bacchis and Pistoclerus by name, as he does in his monologue in Plautus (371/376), Lydus makes these facts clear, at least to the wary listener, and does so without any provocation. This coincidence, which may be no coincidence at all, opens the door for a

different reconstruction of Menander's sequence of action preceding the first deception. If, when he exited the brothel, the Greek Lydos called Moschos and "Bacchis" by name, as his Roman counterpart does, and the Greek Syros overheard him, the slave would learn without even speaking with the pedagogue or asking him a single question all the information his Roman counterpart learns from Pistoclerus, and in far fewer words. With the information transferred in this way, there is no need for Moschos to appear on stage at all, because the point of his meeting with Syros, at least as far as the plot is concerned, has already been achieved. The play can move on swiftly from the overhearing to the first deception.

There are several advantages to reconstructing the original this way. First, it elucidates something that happens in the next scene. During the first deception Nicobulus questions Chrysalus about the precise amount of money his son Mnesilochus has brought back from Ephesus. Chrysalus hedges and claims not to know (315–324), not because he is unaware of how much money Mnesilochus has—he knows Mnesilochus has the full sum—but because he does not know how much Bacchis will cost and therefore how much to subtract from the amount in Mnesilochus' possession. The Roman slave's confusion here is probably a remnant preserved by Plautus from the original. If the Greek Syros knew about the situation at home only from some secondary source such as overhearing Lydos, it follows naturally that he would not know the prostitute's price because Lydos would not have learned it. Unlike his ward, the pedagogue knows nothing of the arrangements to buy "Bacchis II" and would have had little chance to learn about them if he stayed in the brothel only briefly. In short, overhearing makes Chrysalus' confusion during the first deception more realistic.

Second, that this course of action is less straightforward than Plautus' in which Pistoclerus delivers the information directly to Chrysalus argues in favor of rather than against the reconstruction. The plot development of Menander's drama is often circuitous and, while the ultimate outcome is almost always predictable, the path the plot follows hardly ever is. Sudden disclosures of information more than once steer Menander's plots in new and startling directions that threaten disaster or renew hope, and eavesdropping is one of the most common devices used to execute such disclosures. The basic pattern of the overhearing scene as reconstructed above—an excited speaker, who because of his agitation is unaware of another's presence, inadvertently reveals important information—is well exemplified elsewhere in Menander.³³ The added irony that what Lydos says falls by chance on the ears of Syros, the very person who will ultimately engineer

³³*Daos of Perikeiromene* (354–372), for example, learns from an incensed Sosias, who does not see him on stage, that Polemon is home. In *Misoumenos* 284–322, Getas is so absorbed in his indignation that he does not see Kleinias on stage and, while ranting to himself, unwittingly delivers important information to him. If Terence has followed

the corruption of both sons (and also both fathers!), is classic Menander. Also, the economy of action inherent in this sequence, as Syros in rapid succession is introduced, informed, and impelled to initiate the first deception, is characteristic of the Greek playwright. Whether or not he did, Menander certainly *could* have written this sequence of action, which is as far as one can hope to take a reconstruction.

Third, it would follow from all this that the scene between Pistoclerus and Chrysalus (II.2; 178–234) derives entirely from Plautus. Close inspection shows that indeed the scene is full of Plautus' favorite types of expression: puns (181, 200–202, 229), a riddle (189–193), wordplay (188, 194, 207–212, 232), a mock greeting (184–189), the imitation of serious verse (199), a mythological joke (217), and the boasting of a *servus callidus* (224–226). He even includes an undisguised reference to himself (213–215).³⁴ More, however, than an opportunity to run his favorite comic devices, the scene also incorporates additional exposition. Plautus reminds his audience of Pistoclerus' mission to find Bacchis (196–200), Bacchis' current situation (203–206), her love for Mnesilochus (206–212) and her need for money (218–223). Here, as in general, Plautus is careful to reinforce in his audience's mind the dramatic situation and the characters' motivations, especially since the situation is so complex.³⁵ From the words alone, one can readily see that this scene must be largely Plautus' work.

Further inspection reveals three structural features which all but seal the case that Menander does not underlie II.2. First, Pistoclerus' exit and entrance motivations are unclear, just like Lyconides' in *Aulularia*. One would expect Pistoclerus to have little inclination to leave Bacchis after her warm reception of him (cf. 477–483). His motivation to return inside her house is equally unconvincing. Chrysalus' injunction, *tu intro dicito Mnesilochum adesse Bacchidi* (227–228), is hardly crucial in the plot. That those inside the brothel know Mnesilochus has returned safely in no way affects the course of the drama.³⁶ Second, although he is aware that there are two

Menander's stage action at *Andria* 236–266, this may be another case: Pamphilus in extreme distress bemoans his impending marriage to the wrong girl, while Mysis overhears.

³⁴ Barsby (1986) 113, II.ii.3; Schönbeck 31–35. E. Fraenkel, *Elementi Plautini in Plauto* (Florence 1960) 112–113, and Leo before him, noted the "plautinisches" in this speech, particularly in Plautus' undisguised reference to himself (214). At least one part of Chrysalus' soliloquy concluding the scene (232–233), where he boasts about the deception prior to its execution, probably also comes from Plautus' hand.

³⁵ Questa ([1970] 197–198) notes that, whereas Menander gives little exposition in Sostratos' monologue (*Dis Ex.* 18–30 = *Bacch.* 500–525), Plautus "vuole che al suo pubblico siano ben evidenti le cause delle azioni di Sostrato-Mnesiloco."

³⁶ In the original Syros probably carried the message of Sostratos' return inside the brothel; see below, n. 40. For a discussion of Pistoclerus' entrance motivation at 526–527, see Bain 25. Both entrance and exit motivations involve Pistoclerus' strong attraction to Bacchis, a factor Plautus has probably expressed in stronger terms than Menander; cf.

Bacchises, Pistoclerus never mentions this important detail to Chrysalus in II.2, despite the fact that he has just found them and knows of their homonymy (39). At one point in the scene, however, he comes very close (*Bacch.* 200): CH. *Eho, an invenisti Bacchidem?* PI. *Samiam quidem.* Plautus leaves the discussion at this, continuing on with a pun involving Samian ware. As such, Chrysalus hears what Pistoclerus is saying not as "the Samian (Bacchis)," but "the woman from Samos," an ingenious play on words which seems to satisfy two requirements of the plot at once: that Pistoclerus allude to the fact there are two Bacchises and that at the same time Chrysalus be unaware of them. Chrysalus indeed must not know that there are two Bacchises when he speaks to Mnesilochus later (366–367, 390–393), because on the young man's failure to know this crucial detail depends the dissolution of the first deception and the necessity for a second which we know to have been in the Greek original from its title, *Dis Exapaton*. Third and most important, it is unnatural and unthinkable in Menander that the pedagogue should stay inside the brothel, where in Plautus' words *omnis ad perniciem instructa* (373), if his ward were not there. Lydus should follow the young man outside in II.2 and bombard him with exhortations not to return. It is difficult to believe that such plot elements, especially the last, derive from the ever scrupulous Menander.

Whether or not Menander's Syros learned about the necessary information from speaking with Moschos or, as seems more likely, by overhearing Lydos, the evidence suggests that Plautus has again displaced a short scene to cover an act-break much as he did in *Mostellaria* and *Aulularia*, but with a few notable differences. In *Bacchides* the displaced scene, Lydus' monologue, has been moved to a point later, not earlier in the play, to cover the act-break. And although this scene has been removed only one scene from its original context, the change seems more complicated than those in the other plays because that intervening scene, the first deception, is long. Also, whereas in the other plays Plautus has simply reversed the original sequence of action, affecting two scenes but only one contiguous passage, in *Bacchides* he has affected two discrete *loci*, that from which Lydus' monologue was removed (178/228) and that into which it was inserted (368/384). We have already examined the consequences of Plautus' removal of the monologue from Menander's sequence of action preceding the first deception. We should now examine the impact of Plautus' reworking at that point in the drama where he inserted the monologue, the sequence of action that follows the first deception.

Primmer 44, n. 87. The motivations underlying the movements of Menander's characters are quite often clear, though not always explicitly laid out for the viewers as Plautus is fond of doing; cf. Arnott (1975) 21; K. B. Frost, *Exits and Entrances in Menander* (Oxford 1988) 5–17.

If we remove Lydus' monologue at 368–384 from Plautus' play, Chrysalus exiting toward the harbor at 367 runs into Mnesilochus entering from it at 385. Since Chrysalus' purpose in exiting is to find Mnesilochus and tell him about the deception, it may be that their Greek counterparts met on stage and Menander's audience witnessed for themselves the transferral of information from Syros to Sostratos. In *Bacchides* this meeting takes place off stage. Thus, at first glance it would seem that Plautus has reworked Menander substantially by sequestering off stage a scene that took place on stage in the original. Yet, just as with Lydus' monologue, it is still possible that, in spite of the apparent gravity of these changes, Plautus is still following his Greek model with some fidelity.

At the end of a fairly long act beginning with Moschos and Lydos and culminating in the first deception, Sostratos may have appeared in Menander only long enough to have Syros usher him hurriedly inside his father's house in order to inform him of the deception.³⁷ The slave would not want the young man to encounter his father, who has just exited, before he can tell him about the deception, because ironically Sostratos is the one person in Athens who can expose Syros' lies to "Nicobulus" by failing to confirm them. Therefore, like his Plautine counterpart, the Greek slave at the end of the deception probably sent his old master off in the wrong direction on a wild-goose chase (346–348), which bought the slave the time necessary to brief his young master on the newly revised history of their trip. The second choral interlude then followed their exit into "Nicobulus" house. At the opening of the third act Sostratos emerged from the house most likely with Syros and, with the emergency now past, expressed in a more leisurely fashion his satisfaction with Syros' deception, much as his counterpart in Plautus does in his soliloquy (385–404). Thus, the Roman play is not that far from the Greek; a conversation interrupted by an act-break in Menander takes place entirely off stage in Plautus.

This reconstruction finds support from two unexpected quarters. First, the *Dis Exapaton* fragment, although it does not include this part of Menander's play, does show that Plautus reworked the action around the third act-break in essentially the same way it is suggested here he did around the second. From either side of these act-breaks he removes homologous scenes, conversations between the same characters: Sostratos and Syros at II/III, and Sostratos and "Nicobulus" at III/IV. In both cases he covers the excision with a monologue by Mnesilochus (385–404/500–525) but follows

³⁷*Dyskolos* 773–860 suggests a way in which Menander might have handled this. That part of the conversation between Sostratos and Kallippides that ends the act is considerably shorter than that which begins the next act (779–780 vs. 784–860). Also, if the reconstruction of *Dis Exapaton* above is correct, Sostratos here would constitute another example of a character who arrived late in an act and provided dramatic tension across an act-break; see above, n. 7. See also the discussion above, n. 23.

the original insofar as the essential activity (Syrus' informing Mnesilochus about the deception and Mnesilochus' returning the money to Nicobulus) still takes place for the most part off stage. Second, the reconstruction of *Mostellaria* (above, note 16) shows that this may be more than just a coincidence. There we saw that in all likelihood Plautus used the same technique, simple inversion of scenes, twice in succession at points where there were act-breaks in the original (532–559, 858–932; see Lowe [1985] 25). If this reconstruction of *Dis Exapaton* is correct, Plautus did the same in *Bacchides*: twice in succession at act-breaks he used the same technique, in this case the omission of a dialogue along with the displacement of scenes. The pattern suggests that once Plautus had used a technique successfully in adapting a particular Greek comedy and thus had it in mind, he was inclined to try it again immediately. Or perhaps he knew that certain techniques worked particularly well with certain Greek authors or plot-types. In either case, the coincidence that Plautus is likely to have employed a particular technique twice in succession in *Mostellaria* can only reinforce the case for his having done the same in *Bacchides*.

On balance, this reconstruction of the sequence of action that in *Dis Exapaton* preceded the well-known fragment is plausible, not because of any one "fact" but because of the assembled arguments. When seen as a whole, Lydus' extended stay in Bacchis' house, his failure to mention Bacchis II to Philoxenus and Mnesilochus, Pistoclerus' failure to mention her to Chrysalus, the general Plautinity of II.2 and the other features mentioned above become one large system of reworking motivated by the need to cover an act-break.³⁸ Now that we have isolated the "elementi plautini," we can reconstruct a sequence of action, which, if not Menander's very own, is demonstrably Menandrian in its irony, eavesdropping, economy of stage action, and the like.

RECONSTRUCTION OF ACT II OF *DIS EXAPATON*

Lydos follows Moschos from the market into the house of "Bacchis." Inside he sees a meal being prepared and "Bacchis" embracing and kissing his young master. Meanwhile outside Syros is walking down the street. He has just returned home from a long trip abroad and is worrying about

³⁸In the business of reconstruction, one does well to bear in mind J. Grant's sane advice ("The Beginning of Menander, *Adelphoi* B," *CQ* NS 30 [1980] 341–355, at 341): "Reconstruction starts with the gathering of clues in the . . . play which may indicate changes from the original—inconsistencies, contradictions, awkwardness in the stage action One works . . . with a group of 'facts' and builds a reconstruction which best accounts for them all." More recently, Lowe ([1990] 277), uses "breaches of realism and consistency as signs of Plautine modifications" and rightly notes that "this method has been much criticized but is justifiable. It is not invalidated by the fact that it has often been abused."

his young master Sostratos whose girlfriend has been dispatched to Athens. Sostratos has sent Syros ahead but will follow soon. As Syros ambles along wondering to himself whether his master's friend Moschos has found "Bacchis" and how this problem can be solved, the door of the house next to the one in which he lives bursts open and an enraged pedagogue rushes out cursing "Bacchis" and Moschos and threatening to bring Moschos' father "Philoxenus" to the hetaira's house. The pedagogue, unaware of Syros' involvement in the affair, marches off without speaking to Syros, if he sees him at all.

From that monologue Syros deduces that Moschos has indeed found "Bacchis," but before he can knock on her door and announce Sostratos' return, "Nicobulus" walks out of his house and sees his slave. Syros is trapped. He has not had the chance to find out how much money will be required to buy Sostratos' girlfriend from the soldier but must now secure the funds for Sostratos' use before "Nicobulus" suspects what his son is up to. When the old man begins to badger him with questions about the journey, he devises the fiction of the "treachery of Archidemides," a story that would be all too true if the name were Syros. "Nicobulus," suspicious by nature, demands details about their failure to return with the money. Syros must think fast to concoct a convincing story. Tension mounts as "Nicobulus" continues to interrogate Syros, the lies compound and, as time passes, the possibility increases that Sostratos may arrive. Not knowing Syros' story, he could inadvertently disrupt the whole deception by not confirming it. Syros must remove "Nicobulus" from the vicinity before he meets his son.

When the old man finally asks where his son is at present, Syros seizes the opening and points him off in the wrong direction. By now enraged and eager for a confrontation, "Nicobulus" storms off. His son enters from the other side of the stage.³⁹ Sostratos, who is unaware of the details of the deception, walks on stage only to have Syros usher him hurriedly inside his father's house. The slave wants to tell him about the lies and does not want "Nicobulus" to glance back and see Sostratos standing there, and thus catch Syros in not one but two lies: Archidemides' treachery and Sostratos' whereabouts. An act-break follows. At the beginning of the third act Sostratos and Syros emerge from the house. Sostratos expresses his gratitude to Syros for deceiving his father and sends him into the prostitute's house to announce his return.⁴⁰ Syros exits, but before the young man

³⁹For the stage setting of *Bacchides*, see Rosivach (above, n. 24) esp. 433, n. 12; Schönbeck 53–54; Primmer 24–27.

⁴⁰It can be gathered from *Dis Exapaton* 102–103—"He's heard that I'm here. Where is he?"—that the speaker (Moschos) knows that his friend Sostratos is aware that he is in "Bacchis'" house. But who has told Moschos that Sostratos knows of his whereabouts? The fact that Plautus does not mention Pistoclerus' awareness of Mnesilochus' knowledge

can leave to retrieve the money, "Philo Xenus" and Lydos enter and the dissolution of the first deception begins.

As reconstructed here, Menander's sequence of action around the "first deception" in *Dis Exapatōn* offers alternate comic possibilities to Plautus' sequence in *Bacchides*. The sudden turn in the action as the angry Lydos storms past the surprised and then relieved Syros is quietly amusing. Menander most likely underscored, where Plautus did not, the subtle comedy in Syros' accelerating desperation as "Nicobulus" persists in questioning him, while the threat grows ever greater that Sostratos will disrupt the deception. The slave's purposeful misdirection of his master is inherently humorous, but even more so if Sostratos is on the horizon.

Still it is not hard to imagine why Plautus would wish to recast such a sequence. Menander's style of comedy was probably too delicate to suit the Roman audience's taste. Furthermore, the Greek playwright's depiction of a desperate, reactive slave would have run counter to the cool-headed, manipulative *servi callidi* Plautus preferred to present. Menander's Syros, no doubt, resembled more Onesimos of *Epitrepontes*, who is as much a victim of circumstances as his beleaguered master, than Tranio of *Mostellaria*, the arch-manipulator proud of his ability to deceive, the forefather of crafty villains like Vice in Medieval moralities. The omission of subtleties, such as the overhearing, would not have seemed like much of a loss to the Roman comedian.

On the other hand, the scene Plautus inserted to give Chrysalus the information necessary to carry out the deception, the conversation between Pistoclerus and Chrysalus (II.2), offered the Roman playwright several advantages important to him. It established Chrysalus as a *servus callidus* in control of and not controlled by his environment, it allowed him to indulge in his favorite sorts of jokes, and it served to remind the audience of the present situation in the drama, just before the important first deception. But in order to incorporate this scene he was compelled to bend logic in a

may provide the essential clue. If, as I suggest, Plautus has rearranged the action so that Chrysalus meets Mnesilochus off stage where in Menander's play their counterparts met on stage, Syros in the Greek original probably went inside "Bacchis'" house after his conversation with Sostratos at the opening of the third act. He has no other pressing business until after the dissolution of the first deception. It is natural for him to go in and tell Moschos and the others that Sostratos is home, knows they are in "Bacchis'" house and will join them with the money as soon as possible. They would expect Sostratos to be delayed briefly collecting the gold but to come as quickly as possible to "Bacchis'" house. Unbeknownst to those inside, this plan fails when, before he can enter the brothel, Sostratos hears from Lydos that Moschos has been kissing "Bacchis." Sostratos assumes that *his* "Bacchis" is being unfaithful to him and betrays the deception to his father. Only after Sostratos has not shown up at "Bacchis'" house for an unreasonable amount of time does Moschos come outside to see what is detaining his friend. At that point, it is logical for Moschos to say, "He's heard that I'm here. Where is he?"

small way (but in a way Menander never does) and suppress mention of the essential fact that there were two Bacchises, a detail the plot at that point prohibits Pistoclerus from telling Chrysalus. But later in the play Plautus could include it, where Menander could not and did not. In Lydus' monologue (368–384), which had been displaced further back in the act and which unlike its equivalent in Menander was a true soliloquy, on an empty stage with no *servus callidus* to overhear what the plot does not permit the slave to know, the Roman pedagogue may mention the homonymous prostitutes. And so he does, in one of Plautus' finest lines: *Bacchides non Bacchides, sed Bacchæ sunt acerrumæ* (371). If the reconstruction above is correct, these words as such cannot derive from the equivalent speech in Menander, because the Greek Lydos never learned about the existence of another "Bacchis."⁴¹ Realism forbade it.

More than "plautinische Sorglosigkeit," the line shows Plautus taking responsibility for his own changes and exploiting to the fullest the comic potential in a dramatic situation that *he*, not Menander, has created (Primmer 43). It is also tempting to suppose that Plautus' exuberant genius is the source of another great line from this speech, *nisi quem spes reliquere omnes esse ut frugi possiet* (370), the inspiration for Dante's immortal inscription on the Gates of Hell (*Inferno* 3.9), *Lasciate ogni speranza voi ch'entrate*.⁴² As in *Aulularia* 713–730, Plautus used his rearrangement of the original action to good advantage, and if *Bacchides* does not reflect precisely Menander's finely crafted plot, why should it? Menander's plays still existed in Plautus' day. If the audience had wanted Menander, if translation had been all they were after, a playwright with Plautus' sensitivity to what makes good theatre would have been unnecessary.⁴³ To the contrary, responsible adapter that he is, Plautus presents his viewers with not just Menander but the tradition of Greek comedy which is instilled in and underlies Menander.⁴⁴ And just as Menander had composed variations on

⁴¹For the Plautine element in *Bacch.* 371, see Fraenkel (above, n. 34) 64.

⁴²Fraenkel (above, n. 34) 144; Questa (1985) 19.

⁴³Goldberg (201) observes that the comparison of *Dis Exapaton* and *Bacchides* "provides one more reminder that the 'Menander' performed in Latin at Rome was not trying to be Menander, and neither, of course, was Plautus."

⁴⁴Questa ([1970] 201) sees rightly that Plautus can "out-Menander" Menander: "Plauto è stato più menandro di Menandro in questo particolare scenico," i.e. Pistoclerus, as he enters, speaks back over his shoulder to Bacchis inside the house (*Bacch.* 526–527). Again and again Plautus' drama shows that he is fully aware of the Greek tradition of comedy and can exploit traditional elements of that genre to his benefit as much and often as well as his Greek predecessors; cf. E. Csapo, "Plautine Elements in the Running-Slave Entrance Monologues?," *CQ* NS 39 (1989) 148–163; J. C. B. Lowe, "Cooks in Plautus," *CIAnt* 4 (1985) 72–102; G. Williams, *Tradition and Originality in Roman Poetry* (Oxford 1968) 285–294; and Part One of S. L. Hines, *The Metaphorical Use of Mythological and Historical Allusions in Plautus* (diss., Univ. Minnesota 1973).

themes that he himself and others too, no doubt, had used before, Plautus adapted the comedy he found in Menander to suit a new world and new tastes.

CONCLUSION

The question remains why Plautus effected simple changes in reworking some originals (*Mostellaria* and *Aulularia*) and more complex changes in reworking others (*Bacchides*). The answer must surely lie in both the plays themselves and Plautus' genius. Twice he saw the opportunity in *Mostellaria* to advance the entrance of one character (the *danista*) or group of characters (Phaniscus and Pinacium) to cover necessary off-stage action that had been covered by act-breaks in the original. Similarly, in *Aulularia* he saw a chance to let the brief scene between Lyconides and Eunomia give the young man's slave the time necessary to steal the gold. These relatively simple changes gave Plautus' uninterrupted stage action a sense of coherence and integrity.

The same principle of scene displacement worked at the third act-break of *Dis Exapaton*, albeit with the omission of two scenes, but precipitated a number of problems at the second.⁴⁵ Here Menander's tightly woven plot allowed no simple inversion of scenes. The sequence which led from the "first deception" to Sostratos' return and then to the dissolution of the deception had to come strictly in that order. That is, for the purpose of covering the second act-break Plautus could not put the first deception after Sostratos' return or its dissolution before his return, and still stay within the parameters of Menander's plot. Plautus had to look further afield than usual for a scene that could be displaced to cover the act-break. Nothing that followed the sequence could be used, as in *Mostellaria* and *Aulularia*, because the scenes that followed (the return of the money and Sostratos' and Moschos' confrontation) were direct consequences of the preceding action. Nor could he merely advance the entrance of one of the characters. Pistoclerus, for instance, cannot be present when Lydus is denouncing him to Philoxenus. Plautus could use only what preceded the entire sequence, extending from the deception all the way to its undoing, to cover the act-break, and the first scene just prior to the deception, the flight of "Lydus" from the prostitute's house, was the most obvious candidate. So, unlike in the other plays, he

⁴⁵More likely than not, Plautus wrote *Bacchides* in his later years; cf. Questa (1985) 15–22; Barsby (1986) 1. That the scene displacement in *Bacchides* is more sophisticated than that in *Mostellaria* and *Aulularia* would also seem to indicate that it was written after the others. The nature of *Dis Exapaton*, however, probably had more to do with the complexity of Plautus' reworking in *Bacchides* than any growing technical expertise on the part of the Roman playwright. Thus, no conclusions about Plautus' development as an adapter are possible or implied here.

displaced a scene which came before, not after the act-break and forestalled rather than advanced a character's entrance.

This sort of progressive displacement had certain advantages over other regressive displacements. It precluded the "freezing" of characters on stage. Whereas Phaniscus and Pinacium (and also the *danista*) of *Mostellaria* were left "frozen" on stage, Lydus was left "frozen" off stage in the brothel. The obligatory reworking was now hidden behind the set. Viewers would have to be fairly astute to follow the complex action on stage and at the same time detect a minor anomaly off stage. Besides, even if some did notice Lydus' extended stay in the brothel, especially when he finally emerged, Plautus could use it to his advantage and play up the pedagogue's horror in a comical fashion beyond what Menander is known to have done. The opportunities for humor surely outweighed in Plautus' mind any consideration of what was "realistic."

But there was another, graver problem created by the displacement of Lydus' speech. In order to carry out the deception, Plautus' Chrysalus had to learn what Menander's Syros knew, that Moschos had found "Bacchis" and that she was living in the house next to Sostratos' father. In the original Syros had learned this information by overhearing Lydos, but that monologue was now resituated and could no longer serve that purpose. To bridge the gap, Plautus devised a dialogue between Chrysalus and Pistoclerus which gave the Roman slave the same information as his Greek counterpart. It was not an ideal solution. By this point in the play Pistoclerus had discovered not only the courtesans' situation but also their nominal gemination. If he should speak to Chrysalus, he ought to mention their plurality, and also Bacchis II's price. But because it was inherent in Menander's plot that the slave not know either of these facts, Plautus suppressed mention of both and by moving the scene along quickly and humorously assured himself that few, if any, of his spectators would ever notice these "flaws."

In conclusion, understanding the nature of the changes Plautus made in his Greek models is important in two ways equally: it recovers a bit of the original and it sheds light on the nature of Plautus' craftsmanship. In these ways we come closer to both Greek and Roman authors and are made more aware of their values, their skills, and their preferences. From *Bacchides*, for instance, we can recover a glimpse of the clean, clockwork unwinding of Menander's neatly laid-out plot, the sort of excellence which earned him the title "the star of New Comedy." At the same time we can also see more clearly Plautus' genius for exuberant language and comical dialogue, if we understand how he in all likelihood saw and created on his own the opportunity for turning Greek monologues into Latin soliloquies like Euclio's hilarious, metatheatrical lament (*Aul.* 713-726) and Lydus' dazzling display of comic frenzy (*Bacch.* 368-384). Plautus used the inevitable restructuring

around the Greek act-breaks to his own advantage, brilliantly translating not only scenes from place to place but necessity into opportunity.

DEPARTMENT OF HISTORY
UTAH STATE UNIVERSITY
LOGAN, UTAH 84322-0710

APPENDIX

Mostellaria 532-559 (see above, note 16)

Line nos.	Characters on Stage		
<i>Plautus' Disposition of Action</i> (Plautus' changes in italics)			
431-528	Tranio	Theopropides	
529-531	Tranio		
532-540	<i>Tranio</i>		<i>Danista</i>
541-559	<i>Tranio</i>	<i>Theopropides</i>	(<i>Danista</i>)
560-654	Tranio	Theopropides	Danista
<i>Proposed Disposition of Action in the Greek Original</i> (three actors)			
"431-528"	"Tranio"	"Theopropides"	
"529-531"	"Tranio"		
		ACT-BREAK	
		"Theopropides" (?)	
"541-559"	"Tranio"	"Theopropides"	
"532-540"	"Tranio"	("Theopropides")	"Danista"
"560-654"	"Tranio"	"Theopropides"	"Danista"