

IS THE THREAT-MONOLOGUE OF THE *SERVUS CURRENS* AN INDEX OF ROMAN AUTHORSHIP?

ERIC CSAPO

THE RUNNING-SLAVE SCENE like any stock scene in comedy is a semi-autonomous structure: it contributes to the dramatic narrative as a messenger scene on the one hand, but resists the efficient development of the narrative on the other. When the eponymous hero of Plautus' *Curculio* brings news from Caria, fully forty-eight lines of long verse (trochaic septenarii) separate the entrance of the parasite from his first report of factual information, nearly a fourteenth part of the total text of the play (280–327). Clearly, the appeal of the running slave in comedy was not merely that of a convenient and ready-made syntagm of narrative structure; it was also a thing in itself, a set piece for humorous development. Modern critical jargon would label these two functions respectively "intratextual" and "intertextual."

The *servus currens* scene resists and retards the development of the play, standing out from its specific context as something in part alien and unfolding according to laws of its own, not necessarily those of the plot. It has therefore received special attention from the aficionados of ancient comedy. In ancient times the running slave became a kind of generic symbol for comedy itself. In modern times scholars have noticed the seams where the

The following works are cited by author's name: W. S. Anderson, "A New Menandrian Prototype for the *servus currens* of Roman Comedy," *Phoenix* 24 (1970) 229–236; W. Geoffrey Arnott, *Menander, Plautus, Terence* (Oxford 1975, *G&R New Surveys in the Classics* 9) = Arnott (1975); *Menander* 1 (Cambridge, Mass. and London 1979) = Arnott (1979A); "Time, Plot and Character in Menander," *PLLS* 2 (1979) 343–360 = Arnott (1979B); J. P. Cèbe, "Le niveau culturel du public plautinien," *REL* 38 (1960) 101–106; W. R. Chalmers, "Plautus and his Audience," in *Roman Drama*, eds. T. A. Dorey and D. R. Dudley (New York 1965) 21–50; G. E. Duckworth, *The Nature of Roman Comedy* (Princeton, N.J. 1952); P. Fabia, *Les prologues de Térence* (Paris 1888); E. Fraenkel, *Elementi plautini in Plauto* (Florence 1960), the revised Italian translation of *Plautinisches in Plautus* (Berlin 1922); C. Garton, *Personal Aspects of the Roman Theatre* (Toronto 1972); S. Goldberg, *Understanding Terence* (Princeton, N.J. 1986); A. W. Gomme and F. H. Sandbach, *Menander: A Commentary* (Oxford 1973); A. S. Gratwick, "The Origins of Roman Drama," in *Cambridge History of Classical Literature* 2, *Latin Literature*, eds. P. E. Easterling and E. J. Kenney (Cambridge 1982) 77–93; E. W. Handley, "The Conventions of the Comic Stage and their Exploitation by Menander," in *Ménandre*, ed. O. Reverdin (Vandoeuvres-Geneva 1970, *Entretiens Hardt* 16) 3–42 = Handley (1970); "Plautus and his Public: Some Thoughts on New Comedy in Latin," *Dioniso* 46 (1975) 117–130 = Handley (1975); E. Schild, *Die dramaturgische Rolle der Sklaven bei Plautus und Terenz* (diss. Basel 1917); N. A. Slater, *Plautus in Performance* (Princeton, N.J. 1985); P. P. Spranger, *Historische Untersuchungen zu den Sklavenfiguren des Plautus und Terenz* (Stuttgart 1984, *Forschungen zur antiken Sklaverei* 17).

stock scene is welded to the individual play, and read special significance into them. Elements of the *servus currens* sequence appear as touchstones now of Greek,¹ now of Roman,² originality.

The current orthodoxy on the historical evolution of the running slave is the view developed by Schild (56–62) and Fraenkel (123 ff., 211 f.): the Greeks did indeed invent and use the stock scene, but with great restraint, so as to prevent its humour from interfering with the efficient development of the overall plot structure of the drama; Plautus, however, greatly expanded these scenes for their own sake, caring little for the economy of the narrative; Terence, who had no appetite for such crude humour, essentially reproduced what he found in his Attic models. The discovery of the Bodmer papyrus, which contains the barest rudimentary running-slave scene at *Dyscolus* 81 ff., served to confirm the view that the Greek running slave was merely the embryonic form of a scene which Plautus or his contemporaries (compare Caecilius *Fallacia* fr. 5 Ribbeck² and *Capt.* 791–793) brought to maturity.³ Fraenkel and his followers found the lengthy monologue delivered by the running slave (or parasite) upon entering the stage to be most typically Plautine, and particularly the motif of the threat to the public at large or specific groups of people who might stand in the slave's way and hinder his progress as he rushes to bring news to his master (Pl. *Merc.* 115–119, *Capt.* 791–822, *St.* 284–287, *Curc.* 280–298). These passages were

¹P. E. Legrand, "Daos: Tableau de la comédie grecque pendant la période dite nouvelle," *Annales de l'Université de Lyon* ns 11, 22 (1910) 429–431 (translated by J. Loeb, *The Greek New Comedy* [London and New York 1917] 342 f.)

²C. Weissmann, *De servi currentis persona apud comicos Romanos* (diss. Giessen 1911) 47; W. W. Blancké, *The Dramatic Values of Plautus* (diss. Philadelphia, Geneva, N.Y. 1918) 45–50; Duckworth 106 f.

³The Greek fragments give direct testimony to only the barest rudiments of monologues in running slave scenes. Pyrrhias delivers a two line warning to anyone in his path in the *Dyscolus* (81 f.): πάρες, φυλάττου, πᾶς ἄπελθ' ἐκ τοῦ μέσου· / μαίνειθ' ὁ διώκων, μαίνεται. A papyrus fragment of Middle or New Comedy gives a similar outburst to a character who runs on stage to take refuge at an altar and is probably to be identified as a pimp (G. Zuntz, "De papyri Berol. 11771 comoedia Alexidi ascripta," *Mnemosyne* ser.3 5 [1937] 53–61, at 57). As in *Dyscolus*, the running man is closely pursued, in this case by a master and slave. When the running man enters he warns bystanders to clear out of his way (*CGF* 239, 7–9). The Greek fragments are conspicuously short and without the menacing explicitness of some Plautine scenes. Like the Berlin papyrus fragment, the *Dyscolus* passage does not follow the standard pattern of the *servus currens*. Menander has altered the motivation of the scene: the slave does not run because he has an urgent message (though incidentally he has), but because he is being pursued by a madman. A similar scene appears in the *Aulularia* (406 f.) where the cook Congrio is chased out of Euclio's house:

*attatae! cives, populares, incolae, accolae, advenae omnes,
date viam qua fugere liceat, facite totae plateae pateant.*

Here, however, the cook is able to continue his monologue for several lines before his pursuer appears.

a veritable nexus of what Fraenkel identified as Plautine traits. The only serious attempt to challenge this view was that of Anderson, who showed that the entrance monologue at *Aspis* 399 ff. had much in common with the running slave and probably drew directly upon the tradition.⁴ Though the scene in *Aspis* is distinguishable from the running slave as a scene of the *exangelos* type, it is a useful, if inexact parallel. Nevertheless, Anderson did not succeed in shaking Fraenkel's position. The monologue in the *Aspis* had nothing to compare with the threat motif at the very core of the Roman monologues.

Sander Goldberg's splendid new book on Terence adds a new chapter to the history of scholarship on the running slave's threat-monologue. So far as I know, Goldberg (16–18) is the first person to have noticed in print that Terence's *Adelphoe* 311–319 is an ironic transformation of the convention of the running slave's threat-monologue:

*nil est quod malim quam illam totam familiam dari mi obviam,
ut ego iram hanc in eos evomam omnem, dum aegritudo haec est recens.
satis mihi id habeam supplici dum illos ulciscar modo.
seni animam primum exstinguerem ipsi qui illud produxit scelus;
tum autem Syrum impulsorem, vab, quibus illum lacerarem modis!
sublime[m] medium primum arriperem et capite in terra statuerem,
ut cerebro dispergat viam;
adulescenti ipsi eriperem oculos, post haec praecipitem darem;
ceteros—ruerem agerem raperem tunderem et prosternerem.*

The violence of Geta's proposed treatment of Micio's family has many parallels in the running slave's threat-monologues. The treatment of Syrus is especially typical: Ergasilus (*Capt.* 793) and Curculio (*Curc.* 287) also threaten to leave their victims lying on their faces or standing on their heads in the middle of the street. Here we have a *reversal* of the threatening-slave motif. Instead of warning people out of his way with an offer of violence, Geta wishes that Micio's family would enter his path so that he could realize the violence of the customary threats.

With this new interpretation of Geta's monologue, the orthodox view is no longer tenable. We must *either* retain Fraenkel's logic and assume that Terence is faithfully translating his Greek original (Menander's *Second Adelphoi*), thereby proving indirectly that both the tradition of the running slave's threat-monologue and the ironic transformation of the convention are Greek, *or* we must abandon the notion that Terence had no taste for running-slave humour and simply reproduced his originals. Goldberg (18) uses the passage from the *Adelphoe* as an example of Terence's approach to writing comedy:

⁴There is in fact no evidence that Daos runs onto the stage in this scene. See Gomme and Sandbach *ad Asp.* 409–410.

Terence capitalizes on the expected behavior of the running messenger, using its traditional comic value but giving it added dramatic point.

Nevertheless, Goldberg (xii) does not exclude the possibility that a scene identical or very similar to this appeared in Menander's play. Like many recent writers on Roman comedy he has put aside the question of Terence's sources in order to concentrate on the effect of the plays themselves and their place in the development of Roman drama. With this new piece of evidence we may re-open the discussion of the origin of the extended monologue of the running slave and ask: Was *Menander* or *Terence* the creator of Geta's outburst in the *Adelphoe*?

This monologue is of particular interest because of its play with convention. Since the existence of the ironic transformation reveals a desire on the part of its author to exploit the audience's knowledge and expectation of a conventional sequence of events, Geta's monologue is not just another example of a stock scene, but testimony to the author's judgment that the tradition was sufficiently long and full to trigger the audience's expectation of the motif upon which the monologue plays. This brings us to a second related and equally interesting question: Was the technique of the ironic transformation of conventional motifs available to the Roman authors and, if so, within what limits?

There was a time when the mere observation of such transformations was deemed sufficient in itself to establish the Greek origin of a motif. So far as I know, Thierfelder was the first to make *explicit* use of this criterion:⁵

Für manches der weiter unten besprochenen Stücke Menanders und Apollodors, das vom Widerspruch gegen die Durchschnittspraktiken einen wesentlichen Teil seiner Reize empfang, konnte zwar Plautus selbst bei seiner fraglos bedeutenden Belesenheit auf dem Gebiete gewiss alles Verständnis aufbringen; aber bei seinen Zuschauern fehlten noch die Ermüdungserscheinungen, mit denen Menander hatte rechnen können. Ein Beispiel: In Philemon's 'Emporos' (Plaut. Merc. 830 ff.) verlässt der betrubte Sohn in einer hochpathetischen, später auch komisch belebten Szene das Vaterhaus; in der 'Samia' Menanders (271 ff.) wird dasselbe Motiv entwertet: der Junge meint es gar nicht ernst, ihm steigen selbst Bedenken auf, gewiss kam es gar nicht zum Ausrücken, höchstens zu einer Blamage. Man sieht, dass Plautus gewählt hat, wie er musste.

More recently, scholars have challenged this assumption and asked if the ironic transformation of convention in the *palliata* may not originate with the Latin author. The running-slave scene, as it is still commonly regarded as substantially a Roman invention, is most frequently cited as an example or

⁵A. Thierfelder, "Die Motive der griechischen Komödie im Bewusstsein ihrer Dichter," *Hermes* 71 (1936) 320-337, 323, n. 2. The same critical principle is employed by W. H. Friedrich (*Euripides und Diphilos* [Munich 1953] 263) and Anderson (233-234) in relation to the running slave.

proof of such transformations by the Roman author. To this end the *servus currens* is invoked by Cèbe, by Handley, by Petrone, and by Hunter.⁶ Niall Slater's book on Plautus represents an extreme reduction of this tendency to view the innovative use of convention as Roman, doubting the ability of the Greek playwrights even to recognize the conventionality of the running-slave role (148):

New Comedy was also characterized by conventionalized roles, as the existence of the stock masks in the performance tradition shows . . . Role is not yet thought of as an entity that can exist independently of character. This is no small step: once the *servus currens* role or the *adulescens* role can be conceived of as distinct entities, the way for the comedy of role variation lies open.

For fear lest the running slave remain the standard-bearer of Roman independence even despite a demonstration that the extended running-slave threat monologue was a Greek dramatic convention, let us first examine the arguments for Roman play on New Comic conventions before proceeding to a discussion of our first question, whether Geta's threat monologue can be attributed to Menander's or to Terence's creative inspiration.

I THE ROMAN USE OF CONVENTIONS

The experience of the poet who is an active part of a developing tradition and the poet who approaches a genre as an imitator from without are necessarily quite different. So too are the experiences of an audience which nourishes a living tradition and an audience which adopts a tradition as a foreign pageant. The former audience is steeped in the conventions of its theatre and expects them to be used with sophistication. The latter is concerned only that the conventions be intelligible.

It is a tricky matter to decide whether, at some time after the *palliata* was introduced, the Roman playwrights developed a strong enough sense of the traditional elements of Greek comedy to create their own innovative traditions after the Greek models. Could not Plautus and Terence, both very learned in the Greek dramatic tradition, have incorporated conventional material in such a way as to make it indistinguishable from the use of the same conventions in the Greek tradition? The answer is probably "Yes, they could have." But would they?

To answer this question it is necessary to determine the degree of self-consciousness in the use of the convention. The appreciation of the subtleties associated with the ironic transformation of conventional material requires of the audience a considerable familiarity with the particular conven-

⁶Cèbe 103 f.; Handley (1975) 125 f.; G. Petrone, *Teatro antico e inganno: Finzioni plautine* (Palermo 1983) 166 ff.; R. L. Hunter, *The New Comedy of Greece and Rome* (Cambridge 1985) 80 ff.

tions involved. Failure to recognize the meaning or humour of a convention in ironic transformation does not always make it incomprehensible, though this may be the result. The point is that it is extremely unlikely that Plautus or Terence would themselves have composed a passage in which a convention is used in ironic transformation, unless they could be reasonably sure of their audience's ability to recognize the transformation.

What level of familiarity with the traditions of New Comedy could Plautus and Terence expect from their audience, if we assume, as we must, that they wrote to please it? The majority view still urges the response "not much,"⁷ though many scholars have pleaded against this view, most notably Eric Handley (1975). Still, no one has ever produced anything remotely like proof that the Romans who attended Plautus' performances had sufficient theatrical acculturation to recognize and enjoy the kind of ironic play upon convention which presupposes the existence of trained expectation in the mind of the audience.

Those who argue in favour of a high degree of theatrical acculturation for the Roman audience customarily point out that (1) there were frequent opportunities for dramatic presentations in Plautus' Rome, (2) the Roman audience could have had contact with touring Greek companies, and (3) Plautus' audience was a second generation of theatregoers and Terence's a third. Let us consider each of these points in turn.

The number of "opportunities for dramatic performance" is an impressive figure, all told. According to Lily Ross Taylor, the evidence allows a minimum estimate of about 934 days on which dramatic performances may have taken place between 216 and 159 B.C.⁸ The majority of these occasions belong to the second century B.C., leaving an arguable minimum of 193 days on which theatrical presentations might have taken place from 216 to 201 B.C., sometime around the middle of Plautus' career as a playwright, and 456 down to the end of his career (184 B.C.).

What do these figures mean? First of all, the plural in Plautus *Poenulus* 8 (*qui non edistis, saturi fite fabulis*) and Suetonius' *Vita Terenti* 39 allow us to guess that more than one play might be presented on each of these occasions.⁹

⁷Gratwick (81) is perhaps a little more generous than the *consensus*, but his contrast of the cultural standard of the Roman audience with that of the Greek might stand for the "majority view:" "The prologues to Plautus' *Poenulus* and Terence's *Hecyra* show that audiences were mixed as to class, age, and sex, and that they could be unruly . . . The audiences of the Greek Artists at great festivals like the Delphic *Soteria* had read the authors of the repertoire at school and could be expected to be knowledgeable and discriminating. At Rome, although there were apparently revival-performances already in Plautus' time (cf. *Bacch.* 214 f.), most plays, light or serious, were new, and most of the audience would neither know nor care about the models; if they were bored, they would vote with their feet. The cultural level of the audiences could hardly be more different."

⁸L. R. Taylor, "The Opportunities for Dramatic Performances in the Time of Plautus and Terence," *TAPA* 68 (1937) 284-304.

⁹See K. Dziatzko and E. Hauler, *Phormio*⁴ (Leipzig 1913) 37.

A naive interpretation of these figures would lead us to believe that the generation of Romans who fought the Second Punic War might have seen as many as 900 adaptations of Greek drama, of which perhaps half were comedies. But Taylor herself is careful to point out how weak the statistical evidence is for our present purpose. Even in Terence's day *ludi scaenici* could mean anything from singing, dancing, and juggling to boxing and acrobatics (cf. the prologue to *Hecyra*), and probably meant just about any entertainment which was neither racing nor a gladiatorial contest. There is clear evidence, moreover, that the same plays might be shown on more than one of these occasions, indeed that there was a monetary incentive for re-staging a play as many times as public demand would tolerate.¹⁰ The statistics for *ludi scaenici* are no help whatsoever in determining either the degree or the variety of theatrical exposure enjoyed by the Roman audience.

We are better off with the statistics we can get by just totting up the number of *comoediae palliatae* attested by our sources. We know of the titles of about 162 *palliatae*, roughly 140 of which were conceivably written by the time of Terence's death. By the height of Plautus' career in, let us say 200 B.C., some 40 attested *palliatae* had been produced (mostly by Naevius), not including the plays of Plautus himself. Obviously many plays from this period were lost; no doubt many now unknown titles were among the 130 plays which survived under the name of Plautus in L. Aelius Stilo's day, towards the beginning of the first century B.C. (Gellius *NA* 3.3.12). On the other hand we have no reason to believe that any productive author of *palliata* is unknown to us. If one were rash enough to make a guess, no more than 150 different Greek New Comedies would have been adapted by the end of the third century B.C., and at most twice that by the time of Terence's brief career. For the sake of comparison, one could show that the two major Athenian festivals alone saw nearly 1,200 different comedies before the performance of Menander's first play (455–321 B.C.), several of which were certainly re-staged at the many lesser Attic, not to mention foreign, festivals. To this one might also add the kind of exposure which can be got through the circulation of the texts of Old and Middle comedy, for which there is every reason to believe Athens had an active market.¹¹

¹⁰For re-performance in Terence's day, see the prologue to *Hecyra* (esp. 5 f.), Suet. *Vita Ter.* 40 (Rostagni), Donatus *Eun. praef.* 1.6; Plautine *retractatio* (prologue to *Casina*; the double ending of *Poenulus*—cf. *Andria*) may have been contemporary with Terence or later (W. Beare, *The Roman Stage*³ [London 1968] 75; Duckworth 66). Re-performances in Plautus' day are clearly implied by *Bacchides* 214 f. (cf. J. Barsby, *Plautus: Bacchides* [Warminster and Oak Park, Illinois 1986] *ad loc.*)

¹¹For the known output of Old and Middle Comedy see E. Mensching, "Zur Produktivität der alten Komödie," *MH* 21 (1964) 15–49. Mensching's figures for Old Comedy may have to be increased in light of *POxy* 2737, 44–51: see W. Luppe, "Die Zahl der Konkurrenten an den komischen Agonen zur Zeit des Peloponnesischen Krieges," *Philologus* 116 (1972) 53–75 and G. Mastromarco, "Guerra peloponnesiaca e agoni comici in Atene," *Belfagor* 30 (1975) 469–473. E. G. Turner (*Athenian Books in the Fifth and Fourth Centuries B.C.* [London 1956] 16 ff.)

Attempts to show a wide range of theatrical experience for the Roman public by appealing to contacts with touring Greek companies are fruitless. We know of only two instances where Greek actors may have performed for a Roman audience, at the games of Fulvius Nobilior in 186 B.C. (Livy 39.22.2) and at the games of L. Anicius in 167 B.C. (Polybius 30.22). Greek companies no doubt performed regularly in places like Tarentum and Syracuse,¹² but this fact hardly attests to a high level of theatrical acculturation in Rome. Still, the optimistic figure of 150–300 different comedies, of which some were re-performed, is certainly enough to familiarize an audience with most of the conventions of the comic tradition, all things being equal. But here is the rub. Was the Roman audience sufficiently diligent for the task?

There are two types of evidence available to anyone who would attempt to construct an answer to this question. One is the few scraps of direct testimony as to the makeup and character of the Roman audience. The prologues of Plautus' *Poenulus* and Terence's *Hecyra* show them mixed and unruly, if at all, barely tolerating the imposition of dramatic performance as an intermezzo between more popular entertainments.¹³ Moreover, Polybius' description of the reception of Greek artists by the Roman crowds (30.22) does little to enhance the impression of the Roman audience's theatrical sophistication. Meditation upon such scraps as these may well force one to concur with Beare's depressing assessment that Plautus' audience was "an audience whose powers of attention, comprehension, and memory, as far as artistic things are concerned, can hardly be underestimated"¹⁴ and to wonder whether the same was not true of Terence's—a far cry from the δριμύεις τῶν τεχνῶν ἀκροαταί, θεαταὶ συνεχεῖς (Herakleides Criticus 1.4 [Pfister]) who judged Greek New Comedy.

The second source of evidence is, of course, the plays themselves—the

doubted Wilamowitz' theory (*Einleitung in die griechische Tragödie* [Berlin 1907] ch. 3) that tragedies were the first books and that a "book trade," in a real sense, existed by the late fifth century. Classical drama certainly circulated widely by the mid-fourth century (for comedy, specifically, see the fragment of Alexis in Athen. 4.164b–d, where "Epicharmus" is presumably the comic poet, though the imagined work could conceivably be philosophical). Remember that Aristophanes' *Clouds* is a revision of the performed text which circulated in written form (K. J. Dover, *Aristophanes: Clouds* [Oxford 1968] xcvi). One should also note the possibility of private recitations of comedy such as existed for tragedy by the late fifth century: see L. Woodbury, "The Judgment of Dionysus: Books, Taste, and Teaching in the *Frogs*," in *Greek Tragedy and its Legacy: Essays Presented to D. J. Conacher*, eds. M. Cropp, E. Fantham, S. E. Scully (Calgary 1986) 241–257, 242 f. and n. 38.

¹²Cf. Gratwick 81. B. Gentili (*Theatrical Performances in the Ancient World* [Amsterdam 1979] 32 = *Lo spettacolo nel mondo antico* [Bari 1976] 23 f.) claims that "it is natural that the Roman public itself should have attended such representations" and even believes that the Roman public knew Greek!

¹³See F. H. Sandbach, "How Terence's *Hecyra* Failed," *CQ* NS 32 (1982) 134–135.

¹⁴W. Beare, "Plautus and his Public," *CR* 42 (1928) 106–111, at 107.

most reliable witness, if only the testimony were clear. On this evidence the Romans fare a little better. The prevalence of paratragedy and frequent mythological allusion do indicate the assumption of some degree of literary and theatrical acculturation on the part of their audience by the Roman poets.¹⁵ Yet indications in the texts of the *palliata* show that the Roman poets do not take many of the basic characters and structures for granted. Chalmers notes, amongst other examples, an instance where Plautus aids his audience in interpreting the role of so basic a stock character as the pedagogue.¹⁶ Detecting explanatory additions of this sort can be of great significance for any attempt to draw a portrait of the Roman audience, provided it can be shown that they are just that, explanations, and not some conventional tag as yet improperly understood. The danger is well illustrated by another of Chalmers' "examples," the parasite's explanation of his nickname, which turns out in fact to be a conventional introduction for the parasite in Greek comedy.¹⁷ A secure example of the technique by which a Roman poet might explain the character of a stock figure which the Greek audience would take for granted can be found amongst the very few fragments for which both Greek original and Roman adaptation survive, the passages of Menander and Caecilius compared by Gellius (*NA* 2.23.12). The Old Man who gives the first monologue in Menander's *Plokion* has only to say that his wife is an heiress (*epikleros*) and the audience assumes that she is overbearing and shrewish. This is the stock character of an *epikleros*, and the comic burden of men who marry above their station. Caecilius' adaptation of the passage does not translate "heiress," but rather takes pains to make the conventional character, implicit in the Greek noun, explicit in his circumlocution (Caecilius *Plocium* fr. 1 Ribbeck²):

uxor . . .

*quae nisi dotem omnia,
quae nolis, habet. qui sapit de me discet,
qui quasi ad hostis captus liber servio salva urbe atque arce.*

. . .

¹⁵Demonstrated by Cèbe, 101, and Fraenkel, 84 ff. Paratragedy, however, can be enjoyed even without familiarity with the work being seen.

¹⁶Chalmers 33 f.: "The description *paedagogus* is another which is not translated from the Greek. If Plutarch is right and the soldiers of Fabius Cunctator did actually call him Hannibal's *paedagogus*, the term must already have been familiar in Rome during Plautus' life-time. It is, however, worth noting that when the *paedagogus* Lydus appears in the *Bacchides* (109 ff.), the dialogue makes it clear what his functions are, and an explanatory note is provided at *Merc.* 90 f., where the term is used; *paedagogus fuerat, quasi uti mihi foret custos*. This suggests that Plautus was doubtful whether the word would really be understood." Spranger (82 f.), however, argues for the Roman use of slaves as pedagogues as early as the third century B.C.

¹⁷Chalmers 32 f. The conventional introduction of the parasite is studied by W. Geoffrey Arnott, "Studies in Comedy, I; Alexis and the Parasite's Name," *GRBS* 9 (1968) 161–168, esp. 165 ff.

*quaen mihi quidquid placet eo privatum it me servatam [velim]?
 . . . nunc credo inter suas
 aequalis, cognatas sermonem serit:
 'quis vostrarum fuit integra aetatula
 quae hoc idem a viro
 impetrarit suo, quod ego anus modo
 effeci, paelice ut meum privarem virum?'*

All of this is necessary to create in the Roman audience the same set of dramatic expectations which the single word, *epikleros*, aroused in the Greek.¹⁸

Another example of a Plautine explanatory addition appears in the *Rudens*: when the pimp, Labrax, comes to take possession of Palaestra and Ampelisca, who have taken refuge on the altar of Venus, he asks Daemones if he may not drag the suppliants away. *non licet*, answers Daemones, *ita est lex apud nos* (724). It is impossible that a Greek poet and audience would not take this knowledge for granted. In Rome, however, the altars of the gods were not recognized places of sanctuary and it is clear that Plautus added this line to help his audience follow the plot.¹⁹ Yet no motif is more pivotal nor more prevalent in all of Greek drama.

The evidence permits no rigid distinctions; if the Roman was a stranger to the world of New Comedy, he was a stranger who could usually get by with a few prompts. Rather, the complexity of the issue requires each use of a convention surviving in the texts of the Roman playwrights to be examined on an *ad hoc* basis. In each specific case the critic must apply his own judgment to the question "Could the Roman audience have appreciated the innovative use of this convention?" If the answer is no, then clearly the device was coined by the author of the Greek original and unquestioningly copied by the Roman playwright;²⁰ if yes, then there is no inherent reason

¹⁸For the significance of the *epikleros* stereotype see E. Fantham, "Sex, Status, and Survival in Hellenistic Athens," *Phoenix* 29 (1975) 44–74, 72 ff., esp. 73, n. 60. The view that the *uxor dotata* is a Roman creation largely independent of the type of the *epikleros* is expressed by E. Schuhmann, "Der Typ der *uxor dotata* in den Komödien des Plautus," *Philologus* 121 (1977) 44–65, esp. 48, n. 11, and 65. Unlike Schuhmann, I cannot find the distinction between marriage *in manu* and marriage *sine manu* behind the domineering wives in Plautus. On the contrary, the husbands have possession and use of the wife's dowry (e.g., *Asin.* 87 *argentum accipi*), but are under an obligation to pay back the dowry in the eventuality of a divorce. Husbands fear the discovery of their real or putative adultery, because the wife might then desire or have cause to dissolve the marriage (for divorce at the instance of the wife only, see A. R. W. Harrison, *The Law of Athens* 1 [Oxford 1968] 40–43). The background to Plautus' *uxores dotatae* is therefore Greek. Note also that knowledge of the Athenian laws governing the disposition of the *epikleros* could not be taken for granted even in Terence's day (*Ph.* 125 ff.).

¹⁹In Rome specific shrines gave right of sanctuary, but altars in general did not (cf. Spranger 88).

²⁰Cf. Chalmers, 44, who notes a few instances in which even things not intelligible to the Roman audience were retained by the Roman poet.

why it could not be a Roman transformation of a Greek convention. Using this criterion, then, let us examine the evidence in Roman comedy for the ironic transformation of the running-slave threat monologue.

II AN IRONIC TRANSFORMATION IN PLAUTUS

Ironical transformations are not common in Plautus' running-slave scenes, provided we distinguish between transformations in which conventional material is presented in a manner studiously deviating from the expected conventional norm and the Plautine expansions in which conventional material is exaggerated in such a way as to outdo audience expectations. The two techniques are qualitatively distinct, though both may suggest an ironic disposition on the part of the author, for the one, here called "ironic transformation," plays with convention by the alteration of familiar forms, while the other makes play by fulfilling conventional expectations with exaggerated thoroughness.²¹ If we set aside the examples of Plautine exaggeration, there are three passages of interest for our inquiry.

Metatheatre is a sort of ironic transformation in the restricted sense. By "metatheatre" is meant those scenes which place a conventional sequence of events in inverted commas, as it were, with the primary purpose of drawing attention to their sign value rather than to their referent (i.e., theatrical convention rather than dramatized event). So, for example, when Ergasilus in the *Captivi* announces his intention to deliver news to Hegio (777 f.):

*nunc certa res est, eodem pacto ut comici servi solent,
coniciam in collum pallium, primo ex med hanc rem ut audiat*

his statement that he will impersonate a comic slave is not limited to the draping of his cloak, but extends to the entire running-slave routine, including thirty-eight lines of threat monologue. The Plautinity of this scene, and of its twin, the faked *servus currens* sequence in *Epidicus* 194 ff., has not been doubted since Fraenkel. Niall Slater, in particular, makes a good case for Plautus' predilection for metatheatrical transformations. This does not permit one to conclude that the same technique was not widely used in Greek New Comedy. The dearth of comparable material can be explained by the fact that the bulk of the longer fragments are Menander and Menander was normally careful to preserve the dramatic illusion. Yet the faked entrance monologue by Daos in *Aspis* 399 ff. comes very close, lacking only the announcement—"Now I will act like a tragic *exangelos*." Other Greek parallels for this kind of play with the dramatic illusion are discussed by

²¹On this see Handley (1970) 4. Elsewhere I refer to the exaggerated fulfilment of conventional prescriptions as "intensification." A more theoretical view may be attained by comparing the distinction between *écarts par structuration* (= exaggeration) and *écarts par destructuration* (= suppression, permutation, inversion, etc.) in M. J. Lefebvre, *Structure du discours de la poésie et du récit* (Neuchâtel 1971) esp. 71.

David Bain.²² Of particular relevance is Eubulus fr. 136 where the unknown speaker proclaims "I will do everything in the style of Nicostratus," a tragic actor particularly famous for his messenger speeches.²³ Nevertheless, these Plautine passages are intelligible in themselves, for the metatheatrical frame encloses a straightforwardly conventional, if exaggerated, running-slave monologue, and, at least from the point of view of the criterion established above, they may be Plautine in origin.

Similar to the metatheatrical running slaves of *Epidicus* and *Curculio* is Plautus' *Amphitruo* 984 ff. Quite apart from Mercury's illusion-threatening impersonation of a running slave, there is an ironic transformation in the form of a reversal. Though he has no news to bring, Mercury enters as a running slave threatening anyone who might cross his path (984–990):

*concedite atque apscedite omnes, de via decedite,
nec quisquam tam avidax fuat homo qui obviam opsistat mihi.
nam mihi quidem hercle qui minus liceat deo minitarius
populo, ni decedat mihi, quam servolo in comoediis?
ill' navem saluam nuntiat aut irati adventum senis:
ego sum Iovi dicto audiens, eius iussu nunc huc me adfero,
quam ob rem mihi magi' par est via decedere et concedere.*

Mercury takes the trouble to justify his threats: if comic slaves can threaten the public when bringing news of the return of a ship or of the old man, then, *a fortiori*, so can a god when acting at the behest of Jupiter. Mercury's appropriation of a motif, which, as he himself indicates, is normally to be associated with a running slave, is motivated by nothing but a desire to drag in a little scurrilous humour. The evidence suggests that running slaves often compared themselves with such mythological paragons of the messenger's art as Hermes and Talhybius (cf. *Stichus* 274 f., 305). Self-aggrandizing comparisons are almost surely part of the Greek comic convention for running messengers. This is evident from the implied comparison with an Olympic runner in Aristophanes *Birds* 1121 and in the "Strobilos Fragment" (CGF frs. 244, 348), which also appears in the running-slave scene of Plautus' *Stichus* (306).²⁴ Running slaves commonly build up their roles by urging themselves on as if they were undertaking a task requiring super-human endurance. Acanthio in the *Mercator* (112–114) speaks as one who is finishing a Marathon. In the *Amphitruo*, Mercury transforms the self-

²²D. Bain, *Actors and Audience* (Oxford 1977) 208–222.

²³See R. L. Hunter, *Eubulus* (Cambridge 1983) *ad loc.* for references to Nicostratus.

²⁴Whether or not the Strobilos fragment is a running-slave scene has long been debated. I am inclined to agree with Gaiser that, although not properly a running-slave scene, it nevertheless draws heavily and self-consciously upon the running-slave convention. See K. Gaiser, *Menanders "Hydria": Eine hellenistische Komödie und ihr Weg ins lateinische Mittelalter* (AbAkWiss Heidelberg 1977.1) esp. 177 and n. 18. The comparison of the slave with Mercury also appears in *Stichus* 274 f. Fraenkel (8) thought it Plautine.

aggrandizing formula of running slaves by a reversal: the mythological paragon compares himself with the meanest of particulars. This passage can easily be appreciated by those with no knowledge of the convention and, on this criterion, may also be Plautine in origin.

III IRONIC TRANSFORMATIONS IN GREEK RUNNING-SLAVE MONOLOGUES

The prologue to Terence's *Hauton Timorumenos* gives evidence for another play on the convention in a production by Luscius Lanuvinus (30 ff.):

ne ille pro se dictum existimet [i.e., *sine vitiiis*]
qui nuper fecit servo currenti in via
decesse populum: quor insano serviat?

It is clear that Terence conveys the information as evidence of a fault in Luscius' composition, but the precise nature of the flaw is not immediately apparent. There have been many attempts to explain this difficult passage. All of them fall into one of three categories depending on whether emphasis is given to the fact that Luscius presented a *servus currens*, or to the fact that the populace *yielded* to the slave, or to the final question (*cur insano serviat?*).

Those who see Luscius' fault in the fact that he introduced a running slave into one of his comedies go back as far as Eugraphius. Eugraphius believed that the point of Terence's criticism was that running slaves are not the proper stuff of comedy, the proper stuff being errors, the injuries caused by *meretrices*, supposititious children, *aut aliquid tale, quod ad moralitatem videtur esse coniunctum*.²⁵ If this were Terence's intent, then it was hypocritical of him to condemn Luscius for a vice to which he himself had yielded, because the *Andria*, Terence's first play by the usual chronology, has a fine example of a running slave (338 ff.) and the *Hauton Timorumenos* itself makes some use of a kindred scene (510 ff.), to mention nothing of the *Phormio* and *Adelphoe*.

Charles Garton's explanation (131–135) of Terence's criticism emphasized the question *cur insano serviat?* Garton would take the running slave as the subject of *serviat*: "Why *should* the slave serve a madman?" The point of Terence's criticism, according to Garton, is that Luscius' running slave came on stage warning the public to clear out of his way because he served a madman. But according to Roman law no one is obliged to serve an insane master. Therefore, Garton thinks, Terence faults Luscius on a legal technicality. Now, if the master really was insane, and was shown to be so, what is the point in Terence's evocation of the running-slave scene? If the master's insanity was only claimed by the running slave in his monologue, then the

²⁵Donatus 3 (Wessner) *ad Haut.* 31.

Roman audience was not so literal-minded as to overlook the figurative sense of the claim and worry about a legal anomaly. It does Terence little credit to suppose that he encouraged them to do so.

Schild and Langer followed the more thoughtful interpretation of Fabia which put the emphasis of the charge on the fact that the crowds *yielded* to the running slave.²⁶ More recently, Ronconi has followed much the same line, adding that a *servus currens* for whom the crowds willingly make way “si perde l’effetto comico inerente alla scena.” According to Ronconi, Terence criticizes Luscius for robbing the motif of its coherence.²⁷

Schild, Langer, and Ronconi write as if they actually envisioned a stage crowded with extras, jumping out of the slave’s way instead of waiting to be knocked aside. But, as Fabia had already argued, the use of supernumeraries as mere passers-by is impossible for either the Greek or Roman theatre, and is in no way attested by the monologues in which running slaves threaten the public.²⁸ In these scenes the crowds, if they need to be imagined at all, are to be imagined just offstage, in a *platea* (bordered on one end by the houses of the stage)²⁹ from which the running slave emerges.

The abovementioned authors are correct in thinking that the emphasis of the charge should be put on the fact that the crowds *yielded* to the running slave. The information that the crowds yielded must have been drawn from the slave’s entrance monologue. Luscius’ entering slave, therefore, must have complained that he had no one to threaten since everyone in the street readily obliged him. This would be a complete *reversal* of the usual motif. Luscius must have lifted it directly from his Greek original. An audience could not find it funny unless they had been trained to expect that a running slave in the theatre would complain about the urban mob obstructing his course. Without this expectation they would not recognize the *reversal*. Not recognizing the *reversal* they might well ask *cur insano serviat?*—“Why *should* the crowds (*populus*) yield (*serviat*) to the slave (*insano*)?” Terence, at any rate, puts this question to the audience, trusting in their incapacity to detect the deft inversion of a monologue convention beneath the apparent illogic. This explanation agrees with what we know of Luscius. He seems to have advocated a close adherence to the Greek text, even when this resulted in apparent absurdity. Indeed this is the substance of Terence’s criticism of Luscius in the prologue of the *Eunuchus*, where Terence condemns Luscius’ *Thesaurus* because Luscius faithfully translated an arbitration scene where,

²⁶Schild 60; C. R. Langer, *De servi persona apud Menandrum* (diss. Bonn 1919) 37; Fabia 271 ff.

²⁷A. Ronconi, *Interpretazioni letterarie nei classici* (Florence 1972) 23 ff.

²⁸Fabia 275. On this point cf. Garton 133 f.

²⁹The characters in the lists of Ergasilus and Curculio are typical *agorai*. The slaves are conceived as just emerging from part of the agora. Reference to the *platea* is made in *Curc.* 278; *Trin.* 1006; Philemon fr. 58 K; cf. *Aul.* 407.

according to the Greek *literary* convention (not legal practice), the successful party, in this case the so-called "plaintiff," spoke last.³⁰ Terence complains that it is nonsense to make the "plaintiff" speak last at an arbitration. The implication is that Luscius should have made some allowance for the Roman audience, who were unfamiliar with conventions of the Greek stage, and would only feel confusion at the disparity between stage convention and actual legal procedure. In the *Eunuchus* Terence complains that Luscius lost an opportunity to entertain his audience through fidelity to his Greek model. Similarly the prologue to the *Hauton Timorumenos* faults Luscius for translating a running slave monologue *verbatim* without consideration for the Roman audience's inability to appreciate its humour.

Terence, then, is not championing Attic purity, as Ronconi would have it, but criticizes Luscius for having faithfully reproduced his original without thought for the Roman audience's incapacity to appreciate the humour of the Greek author's play upon the stock motif. Fabia expounds the view that the substance of Terence's criticism was that Luscius had been doggedly faithful to his original in translating a passage which was little suited to the Roman audience. Yet, here and elsewhere, Fabia found that Terence's appeal was to a standard of *decorum*, as if the Roman groundlings might feel righteously indignant at seeing free men, even if only Greeks, paying the same respect to a steamrolling slave, as a Roman would pay only to civil magistrates preceded by lictors.³¹ The slightly prudish image of Terence fostered by the ancient commentators persists, rightly or wrongly, in many discussions of Terence's relationship to his originals, while others appeal to Terentian "realism," which at times seems to be the same "prudery" elevated to the status of an artistic concept;³² in this particular instance I would prefer to think that, as one comic artist to another, Terence is criticizing Luscius' method, not for its moral or representative, but purely for its entertainment value.

There is one other piece of evidence to show that the Greeks were perfectly capable of rendering this convention with all the ironic twists we find in the running-slave monologues in Plautus and Terence. We are fortunate to

³⁰On the meaning of the charge in the *Eunuchus* prologue, see E. Fraenkel, "Zum Prolog des terenzischen Eunuchus," *Sokrates* 6 (1918) 302–317, esp. 308 f.

³¹Fabia 276–277. Fabia was following up Calphurnius' suggestion: "in hoc notatur adversarius, qui decorum personae non servaverit. Quid enim magis praeter servi decorum, quam ut illi populus in via decedat?" Cf. Spranger 111, n. 3.

³²H. Haffter turns to the concept of artistic realism in "Terenz und seine künstlerische Eigenart," *MH* 10 (1953) 1–20 and 73–102, 86: "Beides, den rennenden Sklaven, dem man ausweicht, und den jungen Menschen in seiner Vision tragisch-pathetischer Verzückung [mentioned in the prologue to the *Phormio*], hat Luscius Lanuvinus den griechischen Originalen entnommen: Terenz würde beide Motive nicht zur Darstellung bringen und damit gegebenenfalls am Original ändern. Was will Terenz vermeiden? Er sucht zu vermeiden das Komische, Theatremässige, Spielerische, Unreale."

have an example of a very similar twisting of the same convention in *Dyscolus* 153–168. All but Sostratus have fled when Knemon enters the stage, having given up his chase of Pyrrhias (a true running slave), but still propelled by a violent rage. Though unaware of Sostratus' presence until verse 167, he enters in monologue, cursing the urban mob, who to his mind regularly come swarming into Phyle to obstruct him and to destroy his peace. This mob is the creature of Knemon's mad fantasy. Just as fantastic are the threats of the punishments he would give anyone who got in his way if he were in the enviable position of Perseus. Like Geta, Knemon begins his threat monologue with a wish (cf. *Pl. Tr.* 1028, *Ter. Ad.* 311) that he might have the Gorgon's head so that he could turn anyone who got in his way into stone (153–159):

εἴτ' οὐ μακάριος ἦν ὁ Περσεὺς κατὰ δύο
τρόπους ἐκείνος, ὅτι πετηνὸς ἐγένετο
κοῦδενὶ συνήγντα τῶν βαδίζόντων χαμαί,
εἴθ' ὅτι τοιοῦτο κτῆμ' ἐκέκτηθ' ὧ λίθους
ἅπαντας ἐποίει τοὺς ἐνοχλοῦντας; ὅπερ ἐμοὶ
νυνὶ γένοιτ'· οὐδέν γάρ ἀφθονώτερον
λιθίνων γένοιτ' (ἅν) ἀνδριάντων πανταχοῦ.

The situation is full of irony: the remote reaches of Phyle are spoken of as if they were the *agora*: people are spoken of as strollers (βαδίζοντες 155), obstructors (ἐνοχλοῦντες 157), idly chattering as they swarm over the countryside (160–162):

νῦν δ' οὐ βιωτόν ἐστι, μὰ τὸν Ἀσκληπιόν.
λαλοῦσ' ἐπεμβαίνοντες εἰς τὸ χωρίον
ἦδη·

Though Knemon is clearly the pursuer he speaks as though he himself had been chased off his wonted paths (162–166):

παρ' αὐτὴν τὴν ὁδὸν γάρ, νῆ Δία,
εἴωθα διατρίβειν· ὅς οὐδ' ἐργάζομαι
τοῦτο τὸ μέρος (τοῦ) χωρίου, πέφευγα δέ
διὰ τοὺς παριόντας. ἀλλ' ἐπὶ τοὺς λόφους ἄνω
ἦδη διώκουσ'.

He calls the invaders a “throng of multitudes” (ὦ πολυπληθείας ὄχλου 166). We begin to see Phyle as it appears to Knemon's warped imagination, barely distinguishable from the *agora*, the traditional setting for obstructed *curren-tes*. He is horrified when he actually notices the urbanite, Sostratus, standing alone by his door. Sostratus corroborates Knemon's hallucination by offering the pretext that he is waiting for someone—as if Phyle were a likely spot for a rendez-vous. Knemon sarcastically asks the audience to think that the

stoa of Leos (probably in the North or Northeast of the Athenian *agora*)³³ stands in front of his doors. Before departing, Knemon mourns his ill luck once again: ὦ τάλας ἐγώ, / ἐπηρεασμός τὸ κακὸν εἶναι μοι δοκεῖ (177–178). Aristotle indicates that the word ἐπηρεασμός is the term for an extreme form of obstructionism (Arist. *Rh.* 1378b18).

The running-slave monologue delivered by Pyrrhias was truncated, Knemon's arrival being built up by an unrealistically lengthy but suitably anxious exchange between the slave, Sostratus, and Chaereas. When Knemon does arrive, he is running (148)³⁴ and muttering threats in monologue. The main theme of his discourse is the obstruction caused by others, not to his progress through the streets, but to his peace of mind. He threatens the public at large with impossible punishments and speaks in terms which liken his surroundings to the most populous regions of Athens. He moves from the wings to the vicinity of the house-door before he notices the presence on stage of another person. His movements would have resembled the halting stylized "run" of running slaves who have long monologues to deliver while traversing this relatively short distance. All these factors taken together would have impressed the audience with the strange familiarity, in form and content, of a stock device performed by a character never before associated with it, and for an effect (*transference*) which was truly unique.

The Adelphoe?

Knemon's entrance monologue in the *Dyscolus* and the details of Terence's report of a scene in a play of Luscius show that the Greeks both used and made ironic play with the convention of the running-slave threat monologue. Thus, there is nothing particularly Roman about this convention or the ironic transformation of it and no Roman prejudice left to hamper an investigation of our original question: Was Menander or Terence the original creator of Geta's transformed threat-monologue in the *Adelphoe*?

It is best to approach this problem through what we know of Menander's technique in the use of conventional material, a subject on which Eric Handley and W. Geoffrey Arnott have written with considerable insight. In their work I find three characteristics of Menander's use of convention which are of particular relevance to our question: these may be called "paradox," "integration," and "economy."

By "paradox" I mean the kind of technique which comes across so clearly

³³See Gomme and Sandbach *ad loc.* Note that "the stoa of Leos" is a plausible, not a certain reading for the papyrus text.

³⁴Sandbach *ad* 148 believes that ἐσπούδακε in line 148 means "is bent on business," rather than "hurry," but the language seems to be standard for running-slave scenes (cf. Ar. *Ach.* 179, *Th.* 572). βαδίζων in line 150 simply means "go" (cf. the running slave of *Sic.* 123 and cf. Ar. *Pl.* 227 where the word means "go" without indication of the speed of the movement as lines 222, 229 show).

in Menander's manipulation of the standard repertoire of characters, where Menander, in Arnott's words, makes "an individual character react and clash startlingly against his type," thereby creating an illusion of reality and of flesh-and-blood realism.³⁵ In this there are two distinct artistic manoeuvres: one is the simple reaction against ossified dramatic forms, the other is to control this reaction in such a way as to create an "effect of the real." Insofar as it is possible to separate conventions of character from stock motifs and actions in ancient comedy, we may equate this first aspect, the reaction against type, with the ironic transformation of stock motifs. This general manoeuvre need have no other objective than the creation of ironic humour, as, for example, in the "running-slave scene" of Plautus' *Amphitruo*. The second aspect, that which Arnott identifies as truly Menandrian, is the use of this clash with convention to create an illusion of three-dimensionality by making the particular stand out against the background of the convention from which it is drawn. It is this second manoeuvre, as Goldberg saw, which gives point to the ironic transformation of Geta's monologue in the *Adelphoe*. The unexpected transformation of the stock threat motif into a fantasy of revenge presents Geta as a faithful slave reacting with human (even if slavish) indignation against a perceived injustice to his ward and mistress; this motivation for Geta's conventional wrath stands in stark contrast to the trivial frustrations of the stock running slave vented against abstract and often anonymous objects.³⁶

Very closely related to this technique is "integration," by which I mean the reduction, so far as possible, of the structure of the conventional material to the overall pattern of the dramatic narrative.³⁷ A large part of this technique may be satisfied by the method of characterization above. For the general point, one need only compare the contribution of Knemon's and Geta's monologues to the central dramatic problems of their respective dramas with Curculio's (*Curc.* 791 ff.), which is nothing but postponement and interruption.

The third notable characteristic of Menander's use of convention is "economy" or "restraint."³⁸ By this is meant the minimal use of conventional motifs for merely conventional effects. An example of this can be found in

³⁵Arnott (1975) 24; see also Arnott (1979A) xxxii–xxxv, (1979B) 353 ff. and Handley (1970) 4 f.

³⁶Geta's extreme subjection to his passion is slavish, however the wrath itself, being well-motivated, is a virtue and reflects well on Geta in the eyes of Peripatetic philosophers and apparently also of Menander: see Men. fr. 725 K.-Th., Arist. *EN* 1126a3–8 and A. Barigazzi, *La formazione spirituale di Menandro* (Turin 1965) 82–86. Knemon's irascibility, on the other hand, shows him to be pusillanimous (Ar. *EN* 1124a13 ff.; Men. *Georgos* fr. 3), giving extra point to the assimilation of Knemon's monologue to that of a running slave.

³⁷Cf. Arnott (1979B) 352–357: Menander's techniques make conventional characters more real and more sympathetic (357) "without ever clogging the progress of the plot."

³⁸Handley (1970) 32; Arnott (1975) 25, (1979A) xxxi, and (1979B) 354.

the running-slave scenes just examined. Pyrrhias' running-slave scene in *Dyscolus* was skeletal, as it offered Menander nothing beyond the possibility of purely conventional running-slave humour, while Knemon's monologue, drawing directly upon the running-slave tradition, is fully developed for the sake of its unorthodox effects. The same pattern can be found in those plays of Terence which are based upon Menandrian prototypes. *Andria* 338 ff. is rudimentary, while Geta's monologue in *Adelphoe* is as fully developed as Knemon's. It is of some significance to our question to note that the running-slave scene of *Phormio* 178–196, appearing in a play based on Apollodorus, is of a different pattern altogether, being purely conventional both in effect and in length.

For these reasons the style and technique of Geta's monologue are indistinguishable from what we know of Menander's and it is reasonable to conclude that Terence's text at *Adelphoe* 311 ff. differs little from Menander's corresponding scene in the *Second Adelphoi*. Indeed, a second argument can be adduced to show the Hellenic character of the monologue: that is the peculiarly Greek psychology that it reveals, a psychological realism (to Greek eyes) which it shares with Knemon's entrance monologue. There is no better illustration of the psychological framework within which these monologues are meant to operate than the passage in Aristotle's *Rhetoric* devoted to the subject of wrath. Aristotle explains that "we become angry when vexed because someone who is vexed is bent upon some task and if anyone puts an obstacle directly before him . . . or hampers him in any other way when in this state, he is angry at all [who impede him]" (1379a10 ff. Kassel). The impeded person grows angry because he perceives the obstruction as a manifestation of contempt, a perception which grows more acute according to his sense of the importance or urgency of his task (1378a32, 1379a33 f. Kassel). "And some pleasure from the hope of revenge follows all wrath . . . Indeed a certain pleasure results both from this and because they let their minds dwell upon the thought of vengeance: the ensuing imaginings (φαντασία) create pleasure just like those of dreams" (1378b1–9 Kassel).

Acanthio's monologue in *Mercator* 111 ff. exemplifies the trivial comic application of ideas such as these. Acanthio, convinced of the consuming importance of his undertaking, is indignant at the indifference of the public and piqued to thoughts of violence. By comparison, however, Knemon's and Geta's monologues are careful to develop the kind of character psychology which a Greek would find more realistic: the trivial and literal obstructions of the crowds are replaced by serious and permanent sources of irritation, while the characteristic threats, elsewhere merely serving as a medium for servile bravado, are here transformed into vivid and convincing revenge fantasies.

This is not to claim that Philemon or Menander wrote to illustrate Peripa-

tetic doctrine, or even that they were well versed in it, though this is likely.³⁹ It is enough that Aristotle shows this theory of the well-springs and emanations of anger to be attractive and plausible to contemporary thought. Indeed Geta's monologue is sometimes cited in illustration of the *Rhetoric's* dreamlike *phantasia*,⁴⁰ and it is no surprise to find that Knemon is sometimes called to witness Menander's Peripatetic leanings. Of particular interest is Knemon's identification of the source of his irritation as ἐπηρεασμός (see above, 415), a very rare word, elsewhere found only in the lexica and in Aristotle's *Rhetoric*, where it is named as one of the three ways in which the contempt which causes wrath and the desire for vengeance may be manifested (1378b14 Kassel).⁴¹

The matter, style, technique, and background to Terence's running-slave monologue in the *Adelphoe* are Greek. Should one wish to object to the obvious conclusion on the grounds that in copying Menander's reversal of the convention of the threat monologue Terence would be doing just what he criticized Luscius for doing (supposing him to be beyond such double standards), it is necessary, again, to indicate the crucial difference. Geta's monologue is intelligible and even humorous without a knowledge of the reversed convention. The complaint of Luscius' slave that the mob got out of his way was not, for this was, no doubt, how people behaved in real life when about to be trampled.

The study of the running-slave threat monologue does little to alter the common view that Terence copied conventional material and Plautus expanded it, when he found it in his models, and often added it, when he did not. There is no good reason to think, however, that Plautus used techniques in the exploitation of New Comic conventions which he did not find fully developed in Greek drama. Indeed he probably rendered more conventional much that in his models was subtle, pointed, and too clever. Nor need we think that Menander's contemporaries were conventional if "conventional" implies the uncreative use of ready-made formulae. In this respect the difference between Menander and the more adept of his contemporaries was sooner one of degree than quality. The creation of conventions of plot and character was the work of *Middle Comedy*, and far from being the involun-

³⁹Arnott (1975) 14 ff.

⁴⁰Beginning with Christoph Schrader, *De Rhetoricorum Aristotelis sententia et usu commentarius* (Helmstedt 1674) 209–210. Cf. E. M. Cope and J. E. Sandys, *The Rhetoric of Aristotle* 2 (Cambridge 1877) 14.

⁴¹See W. Schmid, "Menander's Dyskolos und die Timonlegende," *RhM* 102 (1959) 157–182, 171 and "Menander's Dyskolos, Timonlegende und Peripatos," *RhM* 102 (1959) 263–266, esp. 264 f.; cf. F. Stoessl, *Menander Dyskolos* (Paderborn 1965) 65 f. I do not feel, as Schmid does, that his argument is weakened, but rather strengthened by the attribution of *Dyscolus* 178 to Knemon (instead of Sostratus).

tary result of degenerating standards, the Greek comic poets of this period treated the development of perfect stereotypes as a labour of love. It is not inept to speak of this search as a search for the essences and forms of human character and experience, or Aristotelian categories of the sort we find in the *Characters* of Theophrastus. By contrast, the distinguishing feature of *New Comedy* was its destructive pleasure in exposing and inverting these stereotypes.⁴²

TRINITY COLLEGE
TORONTO, ONT. M5S 1H8

⁴²I wish to thank W. Geoffrey Arnott, Sander Goldberg, and John Grant for generous suggestions for the improvement of this paper.