Transactions of the American Philological Association 108 (1978) 103–114

THEMATIC UNITY IN TERENCE'S *ANDRIA*

TERRY McGARRITY
El Paso, Texas

Scholarship on the *Andria* has focused primarily on two additions by Terence: first, the freedman Sosia in the opening scene, and then the second young lover Charinus and his slave Byrria.[1] The attention on these two alterations has been directed particularly toward a consideration of Menander's Greek original of the *Andria*. The purpose of this paper, however, is to show that there is a continuing theme in the *Andria* of Terence and that these two changes by Terence develop and support this theme.

The father-son relationship is a favorite theme of Terence, and it appears most fully developed in the *Adelphoe*. The *Andria,* however, offers the first treatment of this theme and in a manner quite different from the later *Heautontimorumenos* and *Adelphoe*.[2] In the *Andria* Terence does not employ two fathers and sons (as in the two later plays mentioned above) to contrast approaches to child rearing and the results of these approaches. Rather, one father and son are shown, and in their ideas and goals there is

[1]Among the scholars considering these two points are Eckard Lefèvre, *Die Expositionstechnik in den Komödien des Terenz* (Darmstadt 1969) 49–59; Felix Jacoby, "Ein Selbstzeugnis des Terenz," *Hermes* 44 (1909) 363–69; Gilbert Norwood, *The Art of Terence* (Oxford 1923) 18–36; A.W. Gomme, *Essays in Greek History and Literature* (Oxford 1937) 32–33; Luciano Perelli, *Il teatro rivoluzionario di Terenzio* (Firenze 1973) 58; T.B.L. Webster, *Studies in Menander* (Manchester 1960²) 78; Hans Drexler, "Terentiana," *Hermes* 73 (1938) 39–59; Antonio Mazzarino, *Da Menandro a Terenzio* (Messina 1966) 76–79; Karl Büchner, *Das Theater des Terenz* (Heidelberg 1974) 31–119; Walther Ludwig "The Originality of Terence and His Greek Models," *GRBS* 9 (1968) 169–82; Helen Rees Clifford, "Dramatic Technique and the Originality of Terence," *CJ* 26 (1930–31) 605–18; and Philip W. Harsh, "A Study of Dramatic Technique as a Means of Appreciating the Originality of Terence," *CW* 28 (1934–35) 161–65. The text throughout is that of R. Kauer and W. M. Lindsay, *P. Terenti Afri Comoediae* (Oxford 1958). Subsequent references will be to author's name only.

[2]Webster 211: "The problem of education is treated most fully in the *Adelphi,* less fully in the *Heautontimorumenos;* the relation of Simo and Pamphilus in the *Andria,* which is more slightly sketched, has some of the same elements, mildness in the father, sense of shame in the son, and the damage is done by the father's conventional judgment of the son's genuine love as liaison with a hetaira."

virtually no area of difference. Pamphilus and his father Simo are not at odds with each other; they are in fact striving for the same end, namely, that Pamphilus assume the duties of a responsible young man. These duties include the taking of an honorable wife and becoming a father. Whatever differences they have arise concerning the path to this end.

Pamphilus makes his first appearance immediately after he has been falsely informed by Simo that a marriage to Chremes' daughter, which Chremes had earlier opposed, has once more been arranged and is to take place that very day. Overwhelmed by this announcement, Pamphilus rushes on stage and cries out: *hoccinest humanum factu aut inceptu? hoccin*[*est*] *officium patris?* (236). This concern for proper behavior as a human being and as a father is a statement of the theme and the motive of the play. It is this concern which directs the actions of both Simo and Pamphilus.

The two forms of proper action create a problem for Pamphilus, as he is torn between his love and feeling for his beloved Glycerium and his respect for his father (260–62). Placed in this quandary Pamphilus is uncertain as to what he should do (264), but, when upbraided by Mysis, the *ancilla* to Glycerium (267–70), Pamphilus shows his character by resolving to stand by Glycerium. The bases given for his decision are first his moral responsibility to Glycerium and then his love for her (271–76). Just as Pamphilus has first cited his obligation as a human and then his personal feelings of affection as the reasons for his decision, so does he again include love as only one element among those traits which will cause him to behave honorably and to accept his obligation.

> adeon me ignavom putas,
> adeon porro ingratum aut inhumanum aut ferum,
> ut neque me consuetudo neque amor neque pudor
> commoveat neque commoneat ut servem fidem? (277–80)

This leads to Pamphilus' account of Chrysis' prayer to him as she lay dying. This beautiful and emotional speech answers the questions posed at the beginning of the scene concerning what is *humanum* and what is the *officium patris.*

> O Mysis Mysis etiam nunc mihi
> scripta illa dicta sunt in animo Chrysidis
> de Glycerio. iam ferme moriens me vocat:
> accessi; vos semotae: nos soli: incipit
> "mi Pamphile, huiu' formam atque aetatem vides,
> nec clam te est quam illi nunc utraeque inutiles
> et ad pudicitiam et ad rem tutandam sient.
> quod ego per hanc te dexteram [oro] et genium tuom,

per tuam fidem perque huiu' solitudinem
te obtestor ne abs te hanc segreges neu deseras.
si te in germani fratri' dilexi loco
sive haec te solum semper fecit maxumi
seu tibi morigera fuit in rebus omnibus,
te isti virum do, amicum tutorem patrem;
bona nostra haec tibi permitto et tuae mando fide[i]." (282–96)

Chrysis' first concern is for the physical and financial security of Glycerium, so that she will not be forced into the life of a *meretrix* as had befallen Chrysis earlier.[3] Her own affection and the feeling of Glycerium for Pamphilus are the final points in her argument. She then assigns Pamphilus his responsibilities and rôles: *te isti virum do, amicum tutorem patrem* (295).[4] Sexual love is one function, but the culminating rôle of responsibility is that of *pater*. The constraint assuring this commitment is not Pamphilus' love for Glycerium or affection for Chrysis, but the *fides* which he was eager to protect earlier (280). Chrysis calls upon this *fides* twice (290, 296) as the source of assurance that Pamphilus will honor her request.

Thus the *officium patris* and *humanum factu* are defined in terms of the rôles of *amicus, tutor,* and *pater*. The responsibilities of these rôles are *ad pudicitiam et ad rem tutandam* (288), and the safeguard is *fides*. Pamphilus does not try to avoid this responsibility, but assumes it deliberately and succinctly: *accepi: acceptam servabo* (298). In this way Pamphilus has himself become a *pater*.[5]

Has the portrayal of Pamphilus been sufficiently developed prior to this scene so that his actions here are credible and consistent? What information about Pamphilus has been provided? In considering the evidence it is worthwhile to keep in mind the premise of Ortha Wilner that descriptions of a character are more likely to be true if he is absent and less

[3]Harry L. Levy, "Terence *Andria* 74–79 and the Palatine Anthology," *AJP* 89 (1968) 470–71. Levy cites examples in the Palatine Anthology of women confronted with the same choice as Chrysis. Donatus on 71 says that Chrysis is *partim defendenda, partim etiam laudanda.* But contrast the later statement of her kinsman Crito (797–98): *quae sese inhoneste optavit parere hic ditias / potius quam honeste in patria pauper viveret.*

[4]For a discussion of *tutor* and *tutela,* see A. Watson, *The Law of Persons in the Later Roman Republic* (Oxford 1967) 102–54. For the Greek *kurieia* see W. K. Lacey, *The Family in Classical Greece* (London 1968).

[5]Gordon Williams, *Tradition and Originality in Roman Poetry* (Oxford 1968) 401–402, argues that Terence has created the atmosphere of a marriage and that Pamphilus considers himself married, but at the same time Terence makes it clear that no legal marriage has taken place. See also Williams'"Some Aspects of Roman Marriage Ceremonies and Ideals," *JRS* 48 (1958) 16–29.

likely so if he is present.[6] Since Pamphilus is not present during the earlier scenes there may be a presumption of truth concerning the remarks about him.

Simo, his father, begins by saying that it is impossible to appraise a young man's character while his age, fear, and his guardian restrain him (53–54).[7] Pamphilus has engaged in the normal activities of horses, hunting, and philosophy, but not in excess, a fact which gives pleasure to Simo (58–60). After Sosia interjects that the golden mean (*nequid nimis,* 61) is the best way of life, Simo continues his description and praise of Pamphilus. He recounts the association of Pamphilus with the suitors of Chrysis, and his concern for his son's well-being is made obvious by his relief at hearing that Pamphilus was not involved romantically with Chrysis (83–91). *Gaudebam* (89) is his reaction here just as it was earlier (60). From this example Simo concluded that Pamphilus' virtue was intact (91–98). This report of Pamphilus' character not only pleased Simo but caused Chremes to arrange the marriage of his daughter to Pamphilus.

At the death of Chrysis, Pamphilus mourned (*nonnumquam conlacrumabat,* 109), and this also pleased his father.

> sic cogitabam "hic parvae consuetudinis
> causa huiu' mortem tam fert familiariter:
> quid si ipse amasset? quid hic mihi faciet patri?"
> haec ego putabam esse omnia humani ingeni
> mansuetique animi officia. (110–14)

The *officia humani ingeni* are important to Simo, and he takes delight once more in seeing their presence in his son, although he is somewhat mistaken in attributing all of his son's emotions to grief.

Pamphilus, then, has performed according to the expectations which the descriptions of him have created. Here, now, an explanation for the noble character of Pamphilus is suggested. In the second scene Davos sets forth the primary (and only explicitly stated) reason— it is the *lenitas* of Simo (175). Similarly, Pamphilus acknowledges the gentle rearing by Simo as one of the causes of his respect for his father (262–63).

At this point it is essential to deal with the opening scene of Terence's *Andria.* Donatus has stated quite clearly that in the Greek *Andria* the *senex* spoke in a monologue and that in the *Perinthia* there was a dialogue between the old man and his wife, but that in Terence's *Andria* the old man

[6]Ortha L. Wilner, "The Technical Device of Direct Description of Character in Roman Comedy," *CP* 33 (1938) 20–36.

[7]This same idea is repeated in *Ad.* 74–75: *hoc patriumst, potiu' consuefacere filium / sua sponte recte facere quam alieno metu.*

speaks with his freedman.[8] Critics do not question the testimony of Donatus, but their approaches and explanation for the change vary greatly.

Lefèvre attacks the problem through a consideration of the format of the Greek plays and by detailing the difficulties which retaining the original form would create. He explains the change to a freedman by Terence in terms of the inconsistencies which retaining the wife would intrude.[9] But this is essentially a negative approach, and Lefèvre does not consider the positive reasons for the choice of a freedman rather than a slave. Sosia is not distinguished from a slave except by the speech of Simo and is later dismissed to keep an eye on Davos and Pamphilus (169–70). This is the same task which Charinus later assigns to his slave Byrria (412–15). Furthermore, Sosia is a protatic character, and hence his freedman's status has no further function in the play.

But Simo pointedly states that Sosia is a freedman (37–39),[10] and Sosia is the only freedman in extant Roman comedy.[11] Jacoby suggested that Terence was, in fact, portraying his own situation in order to pay homage to his own master who had freed him.[12] While this is possible, it poses two problems: first, any argument based on Suetonius' life of Terence must be viewed with skepticism since this life admits such great uncertainty;[13] second, the praise is directed toward the freedman rather than toward the master. If Terence had wished to express his personal gratitude, he might have been more generous in his thanks. Furthermore, an explanation derived from the theme of the drama is available.

The substitution of Sosia for the wife of the *Perinthia* allows Terence to introduce the ideas which will suggest the theme of *officium* and of the growth of a young man into a responsible person. The traits of faithfulness and taciturnty in Sosia are praised (34),[14] and he is described as having behaved like a free man (*liberaliter,* 38). These qualities are attributed, to a

[8]Donatus on 14: *quia conscius sibi est primam scaenam de Perinthia esse translatam, ubi senex ita cum uxore loquitur, ut apud Terentium cum liberto. at in Andria Menandri solus est senex.*

[9]Lefèvre 49–53.

[10]The oxymoron of *servibas liberaliter* highlights Simo's remark.

[11]A freedman is mentioned in *Eunuchus* 608, and a nurse who has been freed appears in Menander's *Samia* 236–38 *(OCT).*

[12]Jacoby 363–69.

[13]For an extreme view on the unreliability of Suetonius' life of Terence, see William Beare, "The Life of Terence," *Hermathena* 59 (1942) 20–29.

[14]When Sosia proceeds to display his taciturnity, he gains only critical scorn for himself and Terence: Norwood 32; and Gomme 269: ". . . there is no virtue in the scene, and not a little tedium."

great extent at least, to the gentle manner with which Simo has treated Sosia.[15] In talking to Sosia Simo first commends these aspects of Sosia's personality and then describes his treatment of Sosia.

> ego postquam te emi, a parvolo ut semper tibi
> apud me iusta et clemens fuerit servitus
> scis. feci ex servo ut esses libertus mihi,
> propterea quod servibas liberaliter:
> quod habui summum pretium persolvi tibi. (35–39)

Thus the fair and gentle treatment by Simo has resulted in a trustworthy freedman. Just as Sosia has become a free man through his good character and the gentle direction of Simo, so also through the continued mildness of Simo and through Pamphilus' own proper actions will Pamphilus become "free." Throughout the play Pamphilus gradually undergoes a freeing, but it is a freeing which leads not to license but to the acceptance of duty and responsibility.

Simo relates to Sosia the entire situation involving Pamphilus and the supposed marriage. At the opening of this exposition there begins a correspondence between Sosia and Pamphilus. The proper behavior of the slave/son is commended and is implied to result from the guidance of the master/father. Sosia's life is described by *liberaliter* (38), and Pamphilus' is called *liberius* (52). Yet Simo recognizes that a man cannot be judged truly while constrained by *aetas metus magister* (54). Thus Sosia must be free for his rôle to have any significance. If he were still a slave, then fear of his master would negate Simo's appraisal of his character and eliminate his usefulness based on his trustworthiness. These same restraints have held Pamphilus up to this point but are now coming loose.

Simo has mentioned Pamphilus' completions of duty as an ephebe (51) which removes age as an obstacle for his freedom. *Metus* will be replaced in Pamphilus' mind by *pudor* as seen in I.v. Any remaining fear is later directly removed by Davos in a scene with Charinus. In this manner two restraints are taken away from Pamphilus, and he begins to be allowed to show his character.

Only the *magister* remains to block Pamphilus' complete emergence as a free man. Simo is, of course, the *magister* for Pamphilus, and he is aware of his son's proper behavior, as has been indicated earlier. But, Simo does not realize consciously that the actions of Pamphilus are the natural

[15]Perelli 58: ". . . egli [Terence] ha voluto additare un nuovo tipo di rapporto fra padrone e servo, fondato sulla liberalità, così come sulla liberalità si fonda il sistema educativo de Simone, illustrato nei versi successivi."

consequences of his teaching. Due to his conscious ignorance, then, Simo becomes a comic figure as he first lurks about the house of Chrysis asking about his son's activities and then contriving a test for Pamphilus. Simo knows the moral damage which a bad teacher can inflict on a student as he indicates by his description of Davos as a *magistrum . . . improbum* (192), but he fails to consider the analog of this: that his good teaching will result in a good product, his son.

The foundation of Pamphilus' character has been well laid, both morally and dramatically. The audience is prepared for a noble youth, and that is what Terence has supplied. The main cause for Pamphilus' nobility is cited as the gentle treatment by his father, first by Davos (*lenitas,* 175), then by Simo himself (*sivi,* 188), and finally by Pamphilus (*leni . . . animo,* 262). Simo connects this thought with the idea of age and maturing.

> dum tempus ad eam rem tulit, sivi animum ut expleret suom;
> nunc hic dies aliam vitam defert alios mores postulat: (188–89)

Pamphilus has acted properly within the limits set for a youth, but now he must leave that behind and become something else. The alternative which Simo is striving to arrange is for Pamphilus to become a husband and father. These are the same rôles which Pamphilus chooses for himself as part of his *officium patris* (295).

Since the character of Pamphilus is dependent on the teaching of Simo, it is necessary to consider the evidence of his instruction. This includes the words of Simo and others but also includes the actions of Simo and Chremes, the other father. Together they show the attitude and actions which exemplify the responsibilities and functions of a father. Simo shows his concern for his rôle as a tolerant father when he explains why he has not approached Pamphilus directly with an accusation concerning his association with Glycerium. He begins his remarks to Davos with the extremely casual *meum gnatum rumor est amare* (185), and follows with an explanation.

> sed nunc ea me exquirere
> iniqui patris est; nam quod ant(e)hac fecit nil ad me attinet. (186–87)

Although Simo has in fact investigated his son's activities, he wishes to avoid the stigma of being an *iniquus pater,* and he is reluctant to tell everything to Davos, whom he mistrusts (159–60). Davos later reveals his understanding of Simo's motives (and confirms Simo's apprehensions) as he tells Pamphilus that Simo would feel unjust if he criticized Pamphilus before any offense was actually committed, and Davos agrees that this would indeed be an injustice (376–78).

The encounters between Simo and Chremes, the father of Philumena, demonstrate the concern each of them has for the welfare of his own child. Simo greets Chremes and begs of him that the marriage be reinstituted. Simo's basis for his request is that the marriage will be good for Pamphilus (538–43). Chremes is hesitant to agree and for the same reason, his concern for the welfare of his daughter. In this regard he asks Simo to examine the situation as if Philumena were his daugher (546–49). The concern for Philumena's well-being is continued in the refusals of Chremes (563–64, 566), as Simo expresses his hopes that the marriage will take Pamphilus away from Glycerium. Finally, Simo sums up his argument by comparing the possible loss to the certain gains from the marriage (567–71).[16]

Thus Chremes and Simo have shown that their concern is to watch over the welfare of their children.[17] This is the specific responsibility which Chrysis had assigned to Pamphilus and which Pamphilus had accepted in his rôle as *tutor* and *pater* (295): *ad pudicitiam et ad rem tutandam* (288). Once more near the end of the play when Chremes has again cancelled the marriage, he expresses his distress for the damage nearly done to his daughter, not to himself: *dum studeo obsequi tibi, paene inlusi vitam filiam* (822). The well-being of a child and the duty of the father in that regard are the motivation for the actions of Simo and Chremes. Money is never mentioned until all the problems are resolved and Chremes assigns the dowries (950–51).

This overly conscious effort to fulfill his responsibility as a father is, however, the trait which causes Simo to complicate the action and to expose himself to the schemes and tricks of Davos. Duckworth has observed that the typical Terentian *senex* outwits himself by refusing to accept the truth, whereas Plautine *senes* are all too willing to accept falsehoods as truth.[18] This is precisely the situation with Simo: he so fears and distrusts Davos that Davos is able to fool him with piety and truth. First Davos convinces Pamphilus to agree to the marriage (418–20). Simo has foreseen this possibility (165–67), but he is taken by surprise at the birth of the child to Glycerium, and he persuades himself that this is a trick of Davos (469–80). Simo's self-satisfaction provides Davos with further

[16]Francis Cairns, "Terence, *Andria* 567–8," *CR* (1969) 263–64. Cairns denies that any particular Roman flavor need be attached to these lines, for Greek marriage contracts on papyrus seem to indicate that the father of the bridegroom guaranteed the return of the dowry (264). Jonathan Foster, "Terence, *Andria* 567–8 Again," *CR* 21 (1971) 170–71, believes 568 is a translation from part of a Greek wedding ceremony.

[17]Simo's concern is quite one-sided, however, as he is little troubled about the welfare of Philumena. This same narrow point of view appears in his attitude toward Glycerium.

[18]George E. Duckworth, *The Nature of Roman Comedy* (Princeton 1952) 172.

opportunity (498), and he seizes upon it to confuse Simo (524–26). Much of the comedy of the play is centered in these scenes, particularly when Mysis and Davos explain the story of the childbirth to Chremes (740–95). Chremes, however, is not self-righteous and does not expose himself to trickery as does Simo. Although Simo's reluctance to believe the truth makes him appear somewhat foolish, it is in no way the cause of the recognition scene; the knowledge revealed by Crito, the kinsman of Chrysis, brings this about.[19]

Criticism has been directed at Terence for his handling of the characters of Charinus and Byrria, and this criticism is, for the most part, deserved.[20] The rôles of Charinus and his slave Byrria are said by Donatus to be the creations of Terence,[21] although they are often believed to be derived from the *Perinthia*.[22] Regardless of their source, Charinus and his love for Philumena do not suit the standards for the dual plot as defined by Norwood and as practiced by Terence in his later plays, particularly the *Phormio*. The dual plot is "the method of employing two problems or complications to solve each other."[23] Duckworth has modified this definition by saying that the two problems only need affect one another, for in several dramas one love affair complicated the other.[24] The *Andria* does fit Duckworth's definition but only with difficulty, for the main love story is that of Pamphilus which is not affected at all by the desires of Charinus.[25] Yet, despite any flaws in the dramatic presentation, Charinus does have a definite function in the play. In addition to providing contrast to Pamphilus,[26] his scenes with Pamphilus accent the theme of responsibility and duty and are closely linked to the idea of freedom.

Charinus differs from Pamphilus particularly in his lack of initiative as he longs for Philumena. His slave Byrria acknowledges this fault in his

[19]Duckworth 173: "Actually, deception of this type, although amusing, is sometimes pointless and ineffective, . . . contributing little to the solution of the plot which depends primarily on the recognition scene."

[20]Clifford 609–11; and Harsh 162: ". . . we may admit that Terence in the *Andria* handled the characters of Charinus and Byrria somewhat clumsily." For a more favorable opinion see Büchner 57–63, 118–19.

[21]Donatus on 301.

[22]Webster 78; Ludwig 173 and note 8; Drexler 51; Mazzarino 76–79. But in support of a strict interpretation of Donatus see William Beare, "The Secret of Terence," *Hermathena* 56 (1940) 27–32.

[23]Norwood 146.

[24]Duckworth 186, note 20.

[25]Richard Levin, "The Double Plots of Terence," *CJ* 62 (1967) 301–305, dismisses the *Andria* from consideration as a "first, tentative approach to the dual structure" (301, note 2).

[26]William Beare, *The Roman Stage* (London 1964[3]) 98; and Drexler 54. Neither Beare nor Drexler explains the features through which the contrast is set forth.

master by offering this aphoristic advice: *quoniam non potest id fieri quod vis, / id velis quod possit* (305–306). The arrival of Pamphilus spurs Charinus to seek help, but it does not suggest any line of direct action for him. Pamphilus, on the contrary, has chosen his course in his acceptance of Glycerium and is steadfast in his decision. He does seek assistance from Charinus and Byrria here (333–34) and later from Davos (383), but his desire is for them to facilitate the acceptance of his decision by Simo. Charinus twice uses morality as a pretext for his inertia, when Byrria points out to Charinus that his interest in Philumena will imply a possibility that he might become Philumena's lover after her marriage to Pamphilus (315–17), and again when Pamphilus asks if Charinus has been involved prior to this time with Philumena (325). Pamphilus' *quam vellem* (326) sums up his disappointment in Charinus' inactivity. Charinus' only active plan is to remove himself from the sight of the marriage either permanently (322) or at least for a few days (328–29).[27]

Pamphilus shows his consciousness of his growing stature as he disclaims any credit for his effort to forestall the marriage (330–32). The *officium liberi hominis* (330) introduces the arrival of Davos who further amplifies both the idea of freedom and the contrast between Charinus and Pamphilus. After the typical *servus currens* entrance, Pamphilus begs Davos that he free him from his fear, a request which Davos gladly grants (351–52). The freeing of a master by his slave is comical enough to justify its use by Terence, but its greater significance for the drama is shown when Charinus asserts that he too is free (370). Davos immediately rejects this claim as unfounded, for Charinus has not yet earned freedom from his fear. Until Charinus is willing to assume responsibility and to work to achieve his desires, he cannot be free. That a close relationship exists between initiative and success is indicated later by Pamphilus when he blames his misfortune on his own inactivity and his willingness to rely on Davos (607–609). For Pamphilus the lack of resolve is brief, but for Charinus it is a way of life.

Pamphilus is now freed from *aetas* and *metus,* although *metus* is replaced by *pudor.* It is with respect to *pudor* and *fides,* the defined limits for *officium,* that Charinus makes his next appearance. Byrria has overheard Pamphilus agree to the marriage and has informed Charinus of the seeming lack of faith on the part of Pamphilus.

[27]It can be argued that Charinus has done as much as society would expect in that he has already solicited Chremes and his friends and was rejected in favor of Pamphilus. The dramatic image of him, however, is as an indecisive, inactive young man in strong contrast to Pamphilus, and this seems to be the intent of Terence.

CH. immo id est genus hominum pessumum in
denegando modo quis pudor paullum adest;
post ubi tempu' promissa iam perfici,
tum coacti necessario se aperiunt,
et timent et tamen res premit denegare;
ibi tum eorum inpudentissuma oratiost
"quis tu es? quis mihi es? quor meam tibi? heus
proxumus sum egomet mihi."
at tamen "ubi fides?" si roges,
nil pudet hic, ubi opus [est]; illi ubi
nil opust, ibi verentur. (629–38a)

When Pamphilus attempts to explain, Charinus again accuses him of breaking his word (*solvisti fidem,* 643). Pamphilus assigns the major portion of the blame for the situation to Davos, but he does accept his share of the responsibility because he listened (664).

The criticism of Davos by Pamphilus sets the scene for the removal of the last obstacle to Pamphilus' becoming a man. Davos does not let this criticism pass, but forces Pamphilus to face his new rôle as he becomes aware of his position as *magister.*

ego, Pamphile, hoc tibi pro servitio debeo,
conari manibu' pedibu' noctesque et dies,
capitis periclum adire, dum prosim tibi;
tuomst, siquid praeter spem evenit, mi ignoscere.
parum succedit quod ago; at facio sedulo.
vel meliu' tute reperi, me missum face. (675–80)

Davos is not displaying disrespect, for he previously had admonished Pamphilus about the respect due Simo (380), but he is reminding Pamphilus of the duty of his position as *magister.* For his part, Davos has long been aware of his duty. He debated to whom he owed the greater obligation (209–14), and he provides a great deal of the humor and action in the drama by striving to fulfill his responsibility. Moreover, he does not seek any personal gain for himself, least of all his freedom.

Pamphilus reacts to the instruction of Davos and then to the concern of Mysis by once again pledging his steadfast devotion to Glycerium (694–97). This proclamation of faith shows that Pamphilus has not changed since his original decision in spite of the difficulties which have arisen.[28]

Simo grudgingly, and at times bitterly, accepts this decision of his son but is not convinced either of the legality or propriety of it. He speaks sarcastically of the *pietatem gnati* (869), and asks Pamphilus if he is not

[28]Pamphilus becomes aware of his moral position as a *paterfamilias* at this point, but physical fatherhood came to him in Act III.

ashamed of himself (871). Simo calls the actions damaging to Pamphilus' reputation and contrary to custom, law, and the will of his father (879–81). The complaint that Pamphilus has acted contrary to the will of his father is clearly the fact which troubles Simo most, for after he gives his sanction to Pamphilus' relationship with Glycerium (886–89), he reacts sharply to Pamphilus' exclamation of joy (*mi pater,* 889).

> quid "mi pater"? quasi tu huius indigeas patris.
> domus uxor liberi inventi invito patre;
> adducti qui illam hinc civem dicant: viceris. (890–92)

Simo complains that Pamphilus has a home, wife, and children, yet these are exactly what Simo was attempting to arrange for Pamphilus. Simo, however, has been denied his prerogative as a *pater* because Pamphilus has already assumed the duties of a father for himself.

Although Pamphilus has himself become a *pater,* nevertheless he does not forget his responsibility as a son. Pamphilus denies having suborned Crito to support the story that Glycerium is a citizen (899). Pamphilus further offers to abandon Glycerium and marry Chremes' daughter if only Simo will dismiss his suspicion that Pamphilus is responsible for Crito's timely arrival.[29] Simo has pointedly rejected Crito's story because he believes his son has brought about Crito's appearance to establish Glycerium's citizenship (892). Should Simo set aside his only expressed basis for doubt, then his own reasoning will compel him to accept Crito's story as the truth. This is then an arrangement in which Pamphilus cannot lose, for if Simo accepts Crito's testimony that Glycerium is really an Athenian citizen, then Pamphilus will be obliged to marry her. Thus Pamphilus has gambled nothing for everything. Chremes concludes the scene by suggesting to Simo the proper attitude for a father toward his son: *pro peccato magno paullum supplici satis est patri* (903). This scene, then, which marks the final liberation of Pamphilus and reveals his evolution as an adult capable of assuming the *officia patris,* ends with another responsibility included in those *officia.*

If one accepts that the theme of the *officium patris* is present in the *Andria,* then one must also acknowledge that the scenes involving first Sosia and then Charinus and Byrria, far from weakening the play, strengthen the drama both dramatically and thematically.

[29] *Publius Terentius Afer, Andria,* George P. Shipp, ed. (Melbourne 1960²) 10: "If he [Pamphilus] surrenders in the end it is to a father backed by the whole force of the society to which he belongs, whose customs and laws it does not occur to him to question." Webster 64: Pamphilus' respect for his father "is a real factor in his conduct and at the end the idea of deceiving his father is as repugnant to him as to Simo himself." Pamphilus' *tibi pater me dedo* (897) is in blatant contradiction to his earlier vow (694–95), but is meaningless as he and the audience know.