

**Zeitschrift:** Museum Helveticum : schweizerische Zeitschrift für klassische Altertumswissenschaft = Revue suisse pour l'étude de l'antiquité classique = Rivista svizzera di filologia classica

**Herausgeber:** Schweizerische Vereinigung für Altertumswissenschaft

**Band:** 37 (1980)

**Heft:** 4

**Artikel:** Philemon, Plautus and the Trinummus

**Autor:** Hunter, Richard

**DOI:** <https://doi.org/10.5169/seals-29130>

### **Nutzungsbedingungen**

Die ETH-Bibliothek ist die Anbieterin der digitalisierten Zeitschriften. Sie besitzt keine Urheberrechte an den Zeitschriften und ist nicht verantwortlich für deren Inhalte. Die Rechte liegen in der Regel bei den Herausgebern beziehungsweise den externen Rechteinhabern. [Siehe Rechtliche Hinweise.](#)

### **Conditions d'utilisation**

L'ETH Library est le fournisseur des revues numérisées. Elle ne détient aucun droit d'auteur sur les revues et n'est pas responsable de leur contenu. En règle générale, les droits sont détenus par les éditeurs ou les détenteurs de droits externes. [Voir Informations légales.](#)

### **Terms of use**

The ETH Library is the provider of the digitised journals. It does not own any copyrights to the journals and is not responsible for their content. The rights usually lie with the publishers or the external rights holders. [See Legal notice.](#)

**Download PDF:** 24.05.2025

**ETH-Bibliothek Zürich, E-Periodica, <https://www.e-periodica.ch>**

## Philemon, Plautus and the Trinummus

*By Richard Hunter, Cambridge*

The *Trinummus*<sup>1</sup> is certainly neither the most read nor the most enjoyable of the plays of Plautus: Wilamowitz's damning judgement has often been repeated with approval<sup>2</sup>. This play does, however, lend itself readily to the study of Plautus' method in adapting Greek plays for the Roman stage; analysis of this play is not complicated by any serious structural problems, as the plot is simple and moves in a straight line. In this paper I propose to discuss two aspects of the *Trinummus* which illustrate different sides of Plautine method; in Part 1 I shall consider the allegorical prologue figures of *Luxuria* and *Inopia* and in Part 2 the role of the slave *Stasimus* in the second half of the play.

### *1. Luxuria and Inopia*

Wilamowitz<sup>3</sup> argued that the allegorical prologue figures of the *Trinummus* were a creation of Plautus; he reasoned that since *Luxuria* and *Inopia* say nothing about the coming play, which was the function of Greek prologists<sup>4</sup>, and nothing which is obviously taken over from Greek they must be a Plautine conception<sup>5</sup>. It is certainly true that there seems to be nothing in the *προπεπραγμένα* of the play which would demand a narrative prologue of the type to

1 In the footnotes the following works are cited by author name only: K. Abel, *Die Plautusprologe* (Diss. Frankfurt 1955); E. Fantham, *Philemon's Thesauros as a Dramatisation of Peripatetic Ethics*, *Hermes* 105 (1977) 406–21; Ed. Fraenkel, *Plautinisches im Plautus* (Berlin 1922), translated by F. Munari as *Elementi Plautini in Plauto* (Firenze 1960); G. Jachmann, *Plautinisches und Attisches* (Berlin 1931); P. Langen, *Plautinische Studien* (Berlin 1886); F. Leo, *Plautinische Forschungen*<sup>2</sup> (Berlin 1912); T. B. L. Webster, *Studies in Later Greek Comedy*<sup>2</sup> (Manchester 1970). All references to Menander, unless otherwise indicated, follow the numeration of Sandbach's Oxford Classical Text.

2 "langweilt man sich selbst bei Plautus", *Menander: Das Schiedsgericht* (Berlin 1925) 165; cf. Jachmann 226, H. Haffter, in: E. Lefèvre (ed.), *Die römische Komödie* (Darmstadt 1973) 100.

3 Op. cit. 148.

4 Cf. Ter. *Andria* 5–7, *nam in prologis scribundis operam abutitur, / non qui argumentum narret sed qui maleuoli / ueteris poetae maledictis respondeat*.

5 Wilamowitz is followed, inter al., by Jachmann 242, A. Körte, *Philemon* 7, *RE* 19, 2 (1938) 2142–3, Abel 22–4, Fraenkel, *Elementi* 434. Wilamowitz further argued that, as *Lesbonicus* has long been *inops*, the sending in of *Inopia* is silly and hence (of course) Roman. Webster 140 observes, however, that the young man is "now at a new crisis because he has spent all the money from the sale of his father's house"; I doubt in fact whether even this defence is necessary. Any contradiction seems to be amply compensated by the effectiveness of the scene and could just as well be Greek as Roman.

which we are becoming accustomed in Greek New Comedy. One lesson, however, that Menander's *Dyskolos* has taught us is that we must not interpret too strictly the "need" of any play for a narrative prologue<sup>6</sup>. We are by no means at the stage where a play of the Greek New Comedy may be assumed to have had a narrative prologue (divine or human) until it is proved not to have had, but it is true that the papyri have more to offer to those who believe that most plays did have narrative prologues than to those who hold the opposite view<sup>7</sup>. The obvious striving after novelty in the expository section of their plays by poets of the Greek New Comedy<sup>8</sup> probably resulted, however, in the complete omission of any formal prologue in at least some plays and these two factors suggest that the structure of the expository part of the *Trinummus* will be as good a guide on this matter as the difficult question of "need".

A preliminary problem which must be considered is that of the stage-setting assumed by our text of the *Trinummus*. Although Plautus presumably visualised the stage arrangements when writing his script and the three-door setting was standardised in the theatre both in his time and the subsequent centuries, we need not assume that the arrangements were the same at every performance of the *Trinummus* and, as our texts are ultimately derived from various acting scripts<sup>9</sup>, it need occasion no surprise that inconsistencies in these matters are sometimes to be found, and we should not be too quick to ascribe these difficulties to "Plautine carelessness". With this general proviso, the evidence for the *Trinummus* may be set out and assessed as follows: The house of Charmides, which has been bought by Callicles, is on the stage (v. 40. 124). Where is the entrance to the *posticulum* (v. 194) in which Lesbonicus now lodges? The most obvious alternatives<sup>10</sup> are that Lesbonicus and Stasimus use either the same entrance as Callicles or another of the doors which communicate directly with the stage-front<sup>11</sup>. The latter alternative may seem to require

6 On the prologue of the *Dyskolos* cf. A. Schäfer, *Menanders Dyskolos: Untersuchungen zur dramatischen Technik* (Meisenheim-am-Glan 1965) 31–4, and W. Ludwig, in: *Entretiens Fondation Hardt* 16 (1970) 84–90. An instructive discussion of the "need" for a prologue is D. Sewart, *Exposition in the Hekyra of Apollodorus*, *Hermes* 102 (1974) 247–60.

7 K. Büchner, *Das Theater des Terenz* (Heidelberg 1974) 484–97, is right to warn against the bland assumption of a prologue for any Greek play, but his attempt to deny narrative prologues to the *Epileptontes* and Terence's Greek models is unsuccessful.

8 Cf. Ed. Fraenkel, *Class. Quart.* 36 (1942) 12–3 (= *Kleine Beiträge* II 42) citing *Adesp.* 252 Austin. A good example is the *Cistellaria* which combines both a human and a divine narrative.

9 On the transmission of Roman dramatic texts cf. H. D. Jocelyn, *The Tragedies of Ennius* (Cambridge 1967) 47–57.

10 On the alleged alley running between the houses at right-angles to the stage cf. W. Beare, *The Roman Stage*<sup>3</sup> (London 1964) Appendix C, and id., *Class. Rev.* n.s. 4 (1954) 6–8.

11 For the former alternative cf. (most recently) V. Rosivach, *Trans. Am. Philol. Ass.* 101 (1970) 458–61, and for the latter A. Frickenhaus, *Die altgriechische Bühne* (Strassburg 1917) 26, and K. O. Dalman, *De aedibus scaenicis comoediae novae* (Kl.-Phil. Studien 3, Leipzig 1929) 22–3 and 77–8.

an initial effort of imagination from the audience, but is much the more likely solution. V. 3. 12. 194. 390 and 1085 strongly suggest that the *posticulum* is visible to the audience and v. 600–1 spoken by Stasimus, *ibo huc quo mi imperatumst, etsi odi hanc domum, / postquam exturbavit hic nos nostris aedibus*, and v. 1078–85 in which Stasimus prevents Charmides from entering his former residence are, at the very least, difficult to follow on the assumption that both the house and the *posticulum* were represented by the same door<sup>12</sup>. The fact that the *sycophanta* knocks at Lesbonicus' former house (v. 868) is perhaps not to be explained as a detail intended to convince Lesbonicus that Charmides, who is ignorant of what has happened, has despatched this messenger, as no attention is drawn by the poet to this fact; in the minds of the audience the other house is still a *posticulum* and, of course, the *sycophanta* must knock at the former residence in order to attract Charmides' attention. As for Megaronides, the text clearly suggests that he is imagined to live "off-stage". Only thus are v. 853–4, *ille qui me conduxit* (sc. Megaronides), *ubi conduxit, abduxit domum: / quae uoluit mihi dixit* etc., comprehensible to the audience<sup>13</sup>, and the description of Megaronides at v. 1147–8 seems to me to be good evidence for this view; if he were a *uicinus*, this would almost certainly have been mentioned. His apparent ignorance of local events during the first scene (cf. v. 193–4) is not, however, relevant here, since this ignorance is vital to the expository function of that scene<sup>14</sup>. The lack of an exact parallel for his initial entry<sup>15</sup> is hardly an important obstacle in the way of this interpretation. As for Philto and Lysiteles, the most natural conclusion from the textually uncertain v. 276–7, *quo illic homo foras se penetrauit ex aedibus?*, is, I think, that at v. 223 Lysiteles entered from a house on the stage and that Philto does the same at v. 276; cf. Hegio's words about Tyndarus at Captiui 533 when both have entered from the same stage-house, *quo illum nunc hominem proripuisse foras se dicam ex aedibus*. In fact, however, there are considerable difficulties in the way of this view. At v. 590 Lesbonicus goes off with Philto to find Lysiteles and at v. 627 the two young

12 Cf. Langen 221–2. Not all of Langen's objections are valid: v. 422 does not necessarily refer to the door from which Lesbonicus has just entered, and v. 390 refers, on my view of the stage arrangement, to the *posticulum* and not to the house now owned by Callicles.

13 Cf. Rosivach, art. cit. (n. 11) 459.

14 Cf. *infra* n. 25.

15 This worried M. Johnston, *Exits and Entrances in Roman Comedy* (Diss. Columbia 1933) 30. There is, however, no reason why, for example, Diniarcus in the *Truculentus* should live on the stage. It is perhaps worthy of note that a similar vagueness surrounds two other Plautine *senes* who are, like Megaronides, cast in the role of assistant to the leading *senex*. One is Apoecides in the *Epidicus*: there seems no reason why he should live on the stage and either *cum Apoecide* (Fay, Leo) or *et Apoecidem* (Acidalius) conveys the sense demanded by v. 187 (cf. Duckworth on v. 186), but it would be open to any producer to place his house on stage if so desired. Secondly, Callipho in the *Pseudolus* certainly lives on the stage (v. 410–1. 952), but this house has no part to play in the action of the Latin play, cf. Jachmann 250–1; the contrast between *Pseud.* 411 and *Epid.* 186–7 is instructive.



men enter the stage from one of the side-entrances (cf. v. 622–5); it seems an obvious inference from this that Philto and Lysiteles live “off-stage”. Similarly, the meeting of Lysiteles and Stasimus (v. 1120) takes place off the stage<sup>16</sup> and at v. 716 Lysiteles presumably went home because he did not say that he was going anywhere else<sup>17</sup>. In the final scene there is nothing to indicate that Charmides and his new son-in-law are neighbours and, although the meeting of Stasimus and Lysiteles could be the result of the omission of a scene from the Greek original or even of “Plautine carelessness”, there is no reason not to adopt the simpler explanation, which is that Philto and his son live “off-stage”<sup>18</sup>. Only two stage-doors, therefore, are used in this play, one by Callicles and one by Lesbionicus and his slave.

With his entrance monologue (v. 23–38) Megaronides immediately places himself in a class of comic characters, the most familiar member of which is Chremes in the opening scene of Terence’s *Heauton Timoroumenos*. These are characters who stick their noses into other people’s business; they are πολυπράγμονες<sup>19</sup>. An experienced Greek audience would know that Megaronides condemns himself from his own mouth<sup>20</sup>, and by the end of the scene he has realised his folly. It does not affect this necessary interpretation of the opening scene that Megaronides’ later role in the play is entirely laudable (cf. v. 1147–8); his experience has taught him a lesson and, in any case, it is far from certain that Attic Comedy was more interested in “consistency of character” than in the value of the individual scene. Megaronides’ behaviour in the opening scene accords, as has been recently emphasised<sup>21</sup>, with the peripatetic idea that one has a duty to correct the faults of a friend. If Philemon and Megaronides are

16 This is quite independent of the correctness of Ritschl’s *domi* in v. 1120.

17 Cf. Rosivach, art. cit. (n. 11) 460.

18 Langen 224 compromises by placing Philto’s house in the vicinity of the stage but not quite on it.

19 The earliest example is Blepsidemos in Aristoph. *Pl.*, cf. Leo 139, F. Wehrli, *Motivstudien zur gr. Komödie* (Zürich 1936) 75–6; for Chremes cf. H. D. Jocelyn, *Homo sum: humani nil a me alienum puto*, *Antichthon* 7 (1973) 14–46, and E. Fantham, *Latomus* 30 (1971) 979–81. V. 760–2 are too uncertain to be adduced as evidence of Megaronides’ ‘Geiz’, cf. A. Fleck-eisen, *Philologus* 2 (1847) 73 n. 7.

20 Megaronides pleads *fides* as the excuse for his actions and it is worth tracing this word through the play. At v. 142 Callicles pointedly observes that Megaronides is forcing a breach of *fides* upon him, after M. has earlier accused him of a voluntary breach (v. 117. 128); after M. has seen the error of his ways his *cures tuam fidem* (v. 192) is a neat touch by the poet. The theme reappears in Stasimus’ monologue (cf. Part 2 of this paper): the reference to those who *male fidem seruant* (v. 1048) in a matter of money recalls Callicles whose behaviour has been the very opposite, but who is to be suspected of “bad faith” by Charmides and whose *fides* is to be stressed in the outcome (v. 1096. 1111. 1126). Thus it is Callicles who embodies *fides* in this play and the irony of v. 27 is apparent.

21 Fantham 410–12, following F. Zucker, *Freundschaftsbewährung in der neuen Komödie*, *SB Leipzig* 98, 1 (1950) 11–2.

here indebted to contemporary moral philosophy<sup>22</sup>, then the steeper and more comic is the latter's fall from his pretensions; that Callicles welcomes his friend's interest (v. 90–6) merely highlights the irony in this scene.

The scene between Megaronides and Callicles is striking first for its very great length; it is the longest first scene in extant Comedy<sup>23</sup>. The nearest parallels are the *Asinaria*, the *Pseudolus*, and particularly the *Andria*, *Heauton Timoroumenos*, *Phormio* and *Hecyra* of Terence in which opening expository dialogues almost certainly replace Greek narrative prologues<sup>24</sup>. That some at least of Callicles' account must be known already to Megaronides is no real objection to the dialogue form, since this is inherent in the expository function of the scene and is a phenomenon which can be well paralleled<sup>25</sup>. It should, however, be noted that expository information given in a prologue may be later repeated in dialogue and vice versa<sup>26</sup>, so that only minor changes in the first scene would be strictly necessary to accommodate a narrative prologue as well. Callicles and Megaronides make way for Lysiteles who proceeds to sing a *canticum* in which he outlines his decision to devote himself to *res* rather than *amor*; he in turn is followed by Philto and then father and son converse. Fraenkel<sup>27</sup> has observed that in the Latin play we do not learn Lysiteles' name until v. 604 and that of his father until v. 432. Stranger than this, I think, is the fact that we do not learn what role these two men are to have in the drama until Lysiteles broaches the subject of *Lesbonicus* in v. 326ff. This may be because Plautus' interests lie for the moment elsewhere, but it should be noted that, with one exception, the only other example in ancient Comedy where the second entry is not immediately comprehensible to the audience in the light of the first scene or a narrative prologue is the *Persa* of Plautus, and in that play Saturio introduces himself at once with a stock parasite's monologue<sup>28</sup>. The exception to which I

22 The idea that one should correct one's friends is an old one: Leo 139 n. 2 cites Eur. *Alk.* 1008–10 and cf. Plat. *Laws* I, 635 a; most aspects of the peripatetic view of friendship have, of course, deep roots in traditional Greek thinking, cf. F. Dirlmeier, *Φίλος und Φιλία im vorhellenistischen Griechentum* (Diss. München 1931).

23 An obvious way to shorten the Greek scene is to ascribe the jokes of v. 42–66 to Plautus, cf. J. Wright, *Dancing in Chains* (Rome 1974) 123; such *captatio benevolentiae* jokes are, however, a time-honoured part of the Greek comic tradition (cf., e.g., Aristoph. *Knights* 16–35) and Men. *Samia* 96–112 is a good reason for caution – καὶ ταῦτα μὲν / ἑτέροις μέλειν ἔωμεν (*Samia* 112–3) is not far from Plautus' *aufer ridicularia*.

24 Cf. the relevant discussions in E. Lefèvre, *Die Expositionstechnik in den Komödien des Terenz* (Darmstadt 1969), and N. Holzberg, *Menander: Untersuchungen zur dramatischen Technik* (Nürnberg 1974); for the *Hecyra* cf. Sewart, art. cit. (n. 6).

25 The initial conversations of Aristoph. *Pl.* and Plaut. *Curculio* are good examples; *Curc.* 14 acknowledges and pokes fun at the convention.

26 Cf. Men. *Dysk.* 328–35 which largely repeats the relevant parts of Pan's speech.

27 *Elementi* 441. Ancient drama, in fact, abounds in similar "obscurities", cf. J. Andrieu, *Le Dialogue Antique* (Paris 1954) 276–7.

28 G. Müller, *Das Original des plautinischen Persa* (Diss. Frankfurt 1957) 82–8, argues for a

referred is the *Asinaria*, one of the plays which, like the *Trinummus*, opens with a lengthy dialogue. I believe that Havet<sup>29</sup> was correct to identify the young man of I 2–3 as *Diabolus* the rival, not *Argyrippus* the unhappy lover; any audience might, however, be forgiven for believing this young man to be *Argyrippus* in the light of the opening conversation between the *senex* and his slave<sup>30</sup>. In the *Mostellaria*, for example, a conversation about a young man is followed by a lengthy canticum from that young man, and in the *Mercator* *Acanthio's* account of *Demipho* at the harbour is followed by *Demipho's* entrance-monologue. This confusion in the *Asinaria* is, I think, a strong argument in favour of a narrative prologue in the Greek original of that play<sup>31</sup>. As for the *Trinummus*, if the structural oddity which I have noted requires an explanation, then more than one answer suggests itself. The unusual sequence of entries<sup>32</sup>, first *Lysiteles* and then *Philito*, may not accurately reflect the Greek play, and an easy explanation can be found in Plautus' need to bring on the young man alone to deliver his *canticum*, for most of which there was probably no model in *Philemon*. A word about this *canticum* is necessary at this point. An apparent contradiction between the views expressed by *Lysiteles* on *amor* and *res* and his very proper behaviour towards his father and *Lesbonicus* has worried certain critics<sup>33</sup>, but the contradiction is not, in fact, a real one. The *amor* which *Lysiteles* describes is that of the loose bachelor who is involved with *hetairai* and the expenses that these women bring in their train; there is no reason to doubt that his knowledge

narrative prologue in the Greek original of this play, but the positive indications are very scanty. In *Aristoph. Ekkl.* the audience presumably realise at his entrance that *Blepyros* is *Praxagora's* husband because they know (cf. v. 33–4) that her house is "on stage", regardless of whether she entered from a stage house at v. 1 – I assume at least two on-stage houses for this play. In Tragedy, the nature of the subject-matter means that characters may appear one after the other without a link or explanation, but even here the first scene regularly directs our attention to the person(s) who will enter second, cf. *Soph. El.* 80, *Eur. El.* 48, *Eur. IT* 56.

- 29 *Rev. Phil.* 29 (1905) 94–103, cf. *F. Munari, Stud. It. Fil. Class. n.s.* 22 (1947) 17–8. Other critics (cf. *Leo* on v. 127) believe that Plautus simply took this scene from another play. Havet's change solves the problem of *Demaenetus's* knowledge of the twenty *minae* needed by his son (v. 89); the *lena* charges both young men the same and she implies at v. 231 that there is a rival. This change also makes sense of v. 533–4 and v. 634–5. Despite *Cistellaria* 522–7, the harsh threats of *Asin.* 130ff. perhaps suit *Diabolus* better than the love-struck *Argyrippus*.
- 30 *J. Hough, Am. Journ. Phil.* 58 (1937) 24–6, observes that we expect to see the *amator* after the first scene and that *Diabolus* is not a normal rival. Both observations are true, but the most striking feature of the *Asinaria*, the very number of different motifs and scene types which the play contains, explains both departures from the norm. On the character of this play cf. *A. Traina, Plauto, Demofilo, Menandro, Par. Pass.* 9 (1954) 177–203, and Webster 253–7.
- 31 Cf. *G. Burckhardt, Gnomon* 7 (1931) 422.
- 32 Cf. *Th. Ladewig, Philologus* 17 (1861) 248–50; there is, however, no reason to posit (with *Ladewig*) a lacuna between II 1 and II 2.
- 33 Cf. *Langen* 222–4, *I. Kistrup, Die Liebe bei Plautus und den Elegikern* (Diss. Kiel 1963) 35–6, *E. Burck, Vom Menschenbild in der röm. Literatur* (Heidelberg 1966) 47–8; for the *amor/res* contrast cf. *Donatus* on *Ter. Adelphoe* 94–5.

comes from first-hand experience<sup>34</sup>. No normal<sup>35</sup> Athenian equated σωφροσύνη or ἐγκράτεια for a young man with a monkish abstinence, and so this *canticum* does not destroy the pointed contrast in the play between the two young men, who are clearly the descendants of Aristophanes' καταπύγων and σώφρων<sup>36</sup>. Lysiteles rejects this type of *amor* for the proper path of family alliances, respect for inherited property and assisting poorer friends<sup>37</sup>; he makes the regular change from carefree youth to responsible adulthood. It is, therefore, possible that a core of Greek material which originally formed a monologue by Lysiteles has been incorporated into this *canticum*, and in the Greek monologue he may have made both his past life and his present intentions clear to the audience. Nevertheless, a narrative prologue suggests itself as an obvious way to introduce this character to the audience. If, on the other hand, the *canticum* had no counterpart whatsoever in the Greek play and, for example, Philto and his son originally entered together, a hypothesis which would help to explain the awkwardness of v. 276, then the need for such a prologue becomes pressing.

If Philemon's Thesauros contained a narrative prologue, then the matters it covered can only be the subject of guesswork. Two possible features are, however, worthy of mention. The prologue may have outlined Lesbonicus' exact financial position which remains somewhat unclear during the play. The small farm which he retains and which is of crucial importance, as much of the central part of the play is concerned with whether or not his sister is to receive it as a dowry, makes a rather sudden appearance at v. 508<sup>38</sup>. Ownership of a small farm is, of course, quite consistent with πενία or ἀπορία<sup>39</sup>, but a greater clarity would have been welcome, and a divine prologist could easily have given the necessary details. Secondly, a divine prologist would probably have foreshadowed the return of Charmides, although the play as it stands contains a number of warnings (v. 156. 589–90. 617–9. 744–5) and it is clear that the audience is well prepared for this return without the actual timing of the entry losing its effect<sup>40</sup>. Returns from overseas, whether occurring early or late in the drama, always appear to have been adequately foreshadowed<sup>41</sup>: in the Mostel-

34 Pace, e.g., H.-W. Rissom, *Vater- und Sohnmotive in der röm. Komödie* (Diss. Kiel 1971) 64.

35 Cf. W. S. Barrett on Eur. *Hipp.* 79–81.

36 Cf. Leo 139, Wehrli, op. cit. (n. 19) 49.

37 For the duty to help friends in financial trouble cf. Antiphanes fr. 228 K., Men. *Samia* 15–6, Fantham 412–3.

38 Cf. Abel 23, who, however, misunderstands the issues involved.

39 In the *Dyskolos*, πενία (v. 209) is the curse which afflicts those who own a χωρίδιον μικρόν (v. 23).

40 Contrast Rissom, op. cit. (n. 34) 167.

41 Cf. P. Harsh, *Studies in Dramatic "Preparation" in Roman Comedy* (Diss. Chicago 1933, 1935) 14–5, Sandbach on Men. *Aspis* 283.



laria (Philemon's Phasma?), a play with a technique of exposition similar in certain respects to the Trinummus<sup>42</sup>, the return of the father is clearly foreshadowed (v. 10. 57. 77ff.) and the audience will have been in doubt only as to the timing of the arrival. Careful preparation in a similar situation occurs in Terence's Phormio (v. 147ff.)<sup>43</sup>, a play which seems to have lost a narrative prologue in the course of adaptation into Latin<sup>44</sup>. In Menander's Samia the audience is given a clear hint in Moschion's prologue (v. 53<sup>45</sup>) that it may expect the return of the fathers at any time. The closest parallel to the late return of Charmides is the return of Kleostratos in Act IV of Menander's Aspis, a return which is explicitly predicted in the prologue (v. 110–3) and foreshadowed again at v. 284–6 and probably elsewhere in the lost central sections of the play. This last case differs from all the others in that the character who is to return is believed to be dead and not just absent, and a divine prologue was necessary to put the record straight, as such a death would be out of keeping with the comic tone; this example does, however, belong in the same general category.

It appears that, although there is no "need" for a prologue in Philemon's play, there are certain hints which point in that direction and nothing which tells positively against the hypothesis<sup>46</sup>. Before turning to the role of the prologue figures in the play, the extant Latin prologue must be considered.

Fr. Osann<sup>47</sup> excised the didascalic information in v. 18–20, together with the other places in Plautine prologues where Plautus' name is mentioned or didascalic information given. This criterion was fully elaborated by Ritschl<sup>48</sup> and, although this view is normally disregarded now, the circumstantial case against these passages must be considered a strong one. Terence clearly felt no need to provide full didascalic information in his prologues, and in the Andria, the Eunuch and the Adelphoe what information there is forms part of his

42 The similarities are exaggerated by M. Knorr, *Das gr. Vorbild der Mostellaria des Plautus* (Diss. München/Coburg 1934) 24–5, and D. Fields, *The Technique of Exposition in Roman Comedy* (Diss. Chicago 1935, 1938) 94–100.

43 Cf. Donatus on v. 149 *mire paratur inopinatus subito aduentus senis: nam ipse ueniet, cuius epistolam sperat*.

44 Cf. Lefèvre, op. cit. (n. 24) 81–3.

45 For the text cf. Sandbach ad loc., and add now S. Slings, *Zeitschr. f. Pap. u. Ep.* 30 (1978) 228. It is not necessary to believe, with H.-D. Blume, *Menanders Samia: Eine Interpretation* (Darmstadt 1974) 20–1, that Moschion has already received word that the old men are about to appear or that he himself sent Parmenon to the harbour to keep watch (despite Plaut. *Stichus* 150–4).

46 Pace Abel 22–3, a narrative prologue which hints at what is to happen does not, of course, detract from the significance of the choices made by the characters in the course of the play.

47 *Analecta Critica Poesis Romanorum Scaenicae Reliquias Illustrantia* (Berlin 1816) 176. Th. Bergk, *Opuscula Philologica I* (Halle 1884) 615, placed a lacuna after v. 17 to alleviate the suddenness of the transition to the didascalic details.

48 *Parerga zu Plautus und Terenz* (Berlin 1845/Amsterdam 1965) 233ff.; cf. H. D. Jocelyn, *Yale Class. Stud.* 21 (1969) 119–20.



polemic, not a separate part of the prologue<sup>49</sup>, and it seems more likely that later scholars or actors interpolated this information into some prologues than that Plautus provided this information in some prologues and not others on an apparently random basis. Rather limited evidence, moreover, suggests that in Plautus' time plays were advertised in the name of the Greek poet rather than that of the Latin translator<sup>50</sup>. As for the use of the name *Plautus*, the one "fact" agreed by all is that this occurs three times in the *Casina* prologue, part of which at least is known to be post-Plautine, once in a certainly post-Plautine section (v. 12), once in the didascalical information (v. 34), and once in the narrative of the plot (v. 65)<sup>51</sup>. To this may be added the often observed fact that Terence always refers to himself as *poeta*<sup>52</sup> and names only dead poets, using circumlocutions for the living; in doing this Terence is following a dramatic tradition as old as the Aristophanic parabases<sup>53</sup> and it would be Plautus who would be the odd man out in this regard<sup>54</sup>. I, therefore, consider the case against v. 18–21 to be very strong and that against v. 8 only slightly less strong<sup>55</sup>. With a couple of exceptions<sup>56</sup>, however, the rest of the extant prologue may well be Plautine and,

49 Only in the *Andria* and the *Eunuch* does Terence name the author of his Greek original; in the *Adelphoe* he provides full information on the interpolated scene from Diphilos, but does not mention Menander; for *HT* 7–9 cf. infra n. 52. E. Handley, *Dioniso* 46 (1975) 119, has some useful remarks on the Plautine prologues.

50 Cf. Plaut. *Rudens* 86, H. D. Jocelyn, *Yale Class. Stud.* 21 (1969) 103 with n. 24, and id. *Ennius* (cf. supra n. 9) 5–7. The importance of Ter. *Eunuch* 19–20, *nunc acturi sumus / Menandri Eunuchum*, is somewhat diminished by the fact that this is in the context of the debate about *contaminatio* and the Greek models.

51 *Casina* 5–34 seems to me to form an integrated and coherent passage, but a consideration of the problems of this prologue is well beyond the scope of this present paper.

52 K. Dziatzko, *Über die plautinischen Prologe* (Progr. Luzern 1866) 2, cites Ter. *HT* 7–9 as evidence for the possibility of saying 'Terentius', but this joke seems to refer to the Greek poet and there is, in any case, a great difference between using a word and threatening in a joke to do so. Leo's conclusions (p. 246) from this passage are equally unjustified.

53 Cf. Leo 239–40. Certain traditional features of the comic prologue made it well suited to inherit the role of the parabasis, cf. W. Süss, *Zwei Bemerkungen zur Technik der Komödie*, *Rhein. Mus.* 65 (1910) 442–50, G. Jachmann, *Terentius* 36, *RE* 5 A, 1 (1934) 610.

54 Although poets as early as Hesiod (*Theog.* 22), Alkman (fr. 17. 39. 95b Page) and Sappho (fr. 1. 65. 133 L.-P.) name themselves freely, this seems to have been alien to the dramatic tradition throughout the Greek period: no credence is to be given to the well known lines ascribed to 'Sousarion' (Kock, *CAF* I p. 3) and there is at least a doubt about the origin of Plaut. *Mostellaria* 1149; on this whole subject cf. W. Kranz, *Sphragis*, *Rhein. Mus.* 104 (1961) 3–46. 97–124 (= *Studien zur antiken Literatur und ihrem Fortwirken*, Heidelberg 1967, 27–78). Greek comic poets had no scruples about naming rivals (cf., e.g., Alexis fr. 179 K. on Araros), but the circumlocutory style of Terence's *maleuolus poeta* is present at an early date, cf. Eupolis fr. 78 K. on Aristophanes τῷ φαλακρῷ τοῦτῳ.

55 On the difficult problem of the word 'Trinummus' I can shed no light; for discussion and bibliography cf. J. Stein, *Am. Num. Soc. Mus. Notes* 12 (1966) 65–9.

56 V. 6–7 were deleted as a doublet of v. 4–5 by K. Dziatzko, *De Prologis Plautinis et Terentianis Quaestiones Selectae* (Diss. Bonn 1863) 25, and this case is certainly more striking than the

in particular, there is no good reason to doubt the genuineness of v. 1–5. Do these verses correspond to anything in Philemon?

Frantz<sup>57</sup> and Leo<sup>58</sup> argued that the allegorical prologue was modelled upon certain scenes in Attic Tragedy in which gods travel in pairs<sup>59</sup>, and specifically the Iris and Lyssa scene in the Herakles of Euripides. This postulated literary parentage might throw light upon the relevance of these characters to the play as a whole. The central apologia of Lesbonicus (v. 657–8), *scibam ut esse me deceret, facere non quibam miser: / ita ui Veneris uinctus otio aptus in fraudem incidi*<sup>60</sup>, clearly recalls Phaidra's apologia at Eur. Hipp. 380ff.<sup>61</sup>:

τὰ χρῆστ' ἐπιστάμεσθα καὶ γινώσκομεν,  
οὐκ ἐκπονοῦμεν δ', οἱ μὲν ἀργίας ὕπο,  
οἱ δ' ἡδονὴν προθέντες ἀντὶ τοῦ καλοῦ  
ἄλλην τιν'· εἰσὶ δ' ἡδοναὶ πολλαὶ βίου,  
μακραὶ τε λέσχαι καὶ σχολή, τερπνὸν κακὸν,  
αἰδώς τε·

Like Phaidra, Lesbonicus associates his harmful erotic attachments<sup>62</sup> and the failure to do what is known to be right with *otium* (ἀργία and σχολή<sup>63</sup>). Although the theme is a very common one<sup>64</sup>, it is likely that Philemon had this scene from Euripides in mind here; when in v. 667–73 Lysiteles describes the nature and power of Amor which has mastered Lesbonicus, he plays the role, *mutatis mutandis*, of the Nurse in Euripides who replies to Phaidra's speech of

other repetitions discussed by J. Blänsdorf, *Archaische Gedankengänge in den Komödien des Plautus* (Wiesbaden 1967) 144–53, and even than *Asinaria* 6–10. V. 6–7 are obviously tied to the *Trinummus* more closely than are v. 4–5, but this fact is ambiguous in its implications. Brix-Niemeyer-Conrad ad loc. suppose that after v. 5 the speaker pauses to receive the assent of the audience and then starts afresh, but at *Cas.* 3 and *Truc.* 4 this procedure is made explicit. V. 16–7 are virtually identical to Ter. *Adelphoe* 22–3 and, although this does not condemn them, it is a reasonable basis for suspicion.

57 *De Comoediae Atticae Prologis* (Diss. Aug. Trev. 1891) 56–7.

58 P. 201–2; cf. also P. Legrand, *Daos* (Lyon/Paris 1910) 509.

59 This was a normal practice, cf. Ed. Fraenkel, *Horace* (Oxford 1957) 198 n. 2; for this reason, and because Lucian himself is fond of personification, *Timon* 10 is no more than broadly relevant here.

60 *otio aptus A, captus otio Hermann.*

61 Zucker, op. cit. (n. 21) 16 n. 27, and Webster 128 observe *Hipp.* 380–1a, but not the continuation.

62 I see no good grounds for the view of E. Lehmann, *Der Verschwender und der Geizige*, *Gymnasium* 67 (1960) 73–90, that Plautus himself is responsible for the erotic part of Lesbonicus' activities.

63 By the end of the fourth century the distinction between ἀργία and σχολή often seems insignificant, cf. Demosth. 3, 35; 8, 53; Men. *Dysk.* 357. 366. 755; J. André, *L'Otium dans la vie morale et intellectuelle Romaine* (Paris 1966) 55.

64 There is a useful collection of material in A. Woodman, *Some Implications of Otium in Catullus* 51. 13–6, *Latomus* 25 (1966) 217–26.

analysis with a description of the power of Κύπρις (Hipp. 443ff.) which found its way into the anthological tradition (cf. Stobaios 4, 20, 5, IV p. 435 Hense). I would like to think that Philemon consciously gave an Euripidean form both to his prologue and to this central scene<sup>65</sup>. The intimate connection in ancient thought between the notions of “extravagance” (τρυφή, *luxuria*) and “idleness” (ἀργία, σχολή, *otium*) is well known<sup>66</sup>; the two ideas are often found together (Plat. Rep. 4, 422 a, Laws 10, 901 e), with the regular progression of wealth leading to extravagance and idleness (Plat. Rep. 4, 422 a, Laws 11, 919 b) which in turn lead to poverty, i.e. πένια, ἀπορία and *inopia*. A variant of this genealogy is one relevant to the case of Lesbonicus: ἔρωσ or *amor* is the result of τρυφή and *otium*. Theophrastos defined ἔρωσ as πάθος ψυχῆς σχολαζούσης (Stobaios 4, 20, 66, IV p. 468 Hense [= Theophr. 114 fr. W.]), and evidence for this commonplace is abundant<sup>67</sup>. This interpretation of the relevance of the prologue for the play as a whole also fits well with the possible influence of peripatetic ethics on the *Trinummus*, which Fantham has recently discussed: in the Aristotelean system ἀκρασία καὶ μαλακία καὶ τρυφή are opposed to ἐγκράτεια καὶ καρτερία (EN 7, 1145 a 35) and, like Lesbonicus, the ἀκρατής does not act in ignorance but knows that he is doing wrong (EN 7, 1151 a 21ff.), but he is also μεταμελητικός and thus curable (EN 7, 1150 b 30). In short, the links that bind the divine prologists to the main body of the play are strong ones, and are, I think, more likely to be the work of the original poet than of a later adapter.

If it is correct that in Philemon's Thesauros the goddess Τρυφή delivered a narrative prologue, then the extant Latin prologue still requires an explanation. It may be that Plautus reproduced in detail the Greek prologue and that remnants of the Plautine version are visible in the present text. More likely, I think, is the alternative, namely that Plautus omitted the narrative part of the prologue and kept only the dramatic appearance of the two figures. The extant text is, therefore, basically what Plautus wrote, together with certain later accretions. Unfortunately, the extant prologue of the *Asinaria* is too doubtful and that of the *Vidularia* too uncertain for further conclusions to be drawn from these plays

65 The question of how many of Philemon's audience appreciated the parentage of these scenes is one relevant to a consideration of Philemon's merits as a practical dramatist, but only marginally useful as a criterion by which to judge the existence of a tragic model. The neat contrast between model and imitation – the Nurse seeks to persuade Phaidra into sexual misdemeanour and Lysiteles seeks to persuade Lesbonicus out of it – means added enjoyment for those who see the point, and the others do not know what they are missing. I acknowledge, of course, the possibility in other cases of “unconscious” borrowing.

66 Cf. Fraenkel, *op. cit.* (n. 59) 211–3, and Woodman, *art. cit.* *passim*.

67 Cf., e.g., Diogenes apud Diog. Laert. 6, 51, Longus *Past.* 1, 17; in the *Dyskolos* Sostratos falls in love because Pan makes him do so, but he is just the sort of τρυφερός (cf. R. Kassel, *Zeitschr. f. Pap. u. Ep.* 12, 1973, 6) from whom such behaviour is to be expected, cf. v. 294–5. 755. Similarly, the servant's reproaches at Men. *Phasma* 28–43 reveal the type of well-to-do bachelor who is likely to fall in love with apparitions.

about the extent to which Plautus foreshadowed Terence's fondness for the expository dialogue<sup>68</sup>, but it seems likely that some of the Plautine plays which lack a prologue are examples of this same phenomenon<sup>69</sup>. If in Philemon's play the conversation between the two old men did, to any great extent, reproduce information contained in a prologue, then the omission of this prologue by Plautus was a relatively simple matter. The traces of this surgery are faint, but clear enough.

## 2. *Stasimus and the Talent Loan*

Stasimus' monologue in IV 3 is the subject of a lucid analysis by Eduard Fraenkel<sup>70</sup>. He observed that the monologue falls into two parts: v. 1008–27 concern the loss of a ring at a drinking bout, and v. 1028–58 are reflections on current *mores* prompted by Stasimus' experience in being cheated of a talent which he had lent to a friend. Plautus has closed a ring around the whole with references at the beginning and the end (v. 1009–11. 1058) to the beating that may be lying in store for Stasimus. Although the two parts of the monologue are quite distinct, the transition is eased by the fact that the lament over *mores* is a not unnatural outgrowth of the slave's experience at the hands of his boon companions. As Fraenkel notes, however, the first part of the monologue has absolutely nothing to do with the *Trinummus* and was presumably taken over by Plautus from another Greek play, whereas the second half not only corresponds to Stasimus' stated intention on leaving the stage at v. 728, but also is concerned with certain of the major themes of the play, notably *fides*<sup>71</sup> and the decline of *mores*. It seems an obvious conclusion that it is the second part of Stasimus' monologue which is taken from Philemon's *Thesaurus*<sup>72</sup>.

Despite these considerations, the very Roman colouring of the second part of the monologue is striking. I find it hard to believe that all this talk of *mores maiorum*, *leges*, *ambitio* and *honor* corresponded closely to anything in Phile-

68 About the prologues of Caecilius we can say nothing, despite the intelligent speculation of H. Oppermann, *Zur Entwicklung der Fabula Palliata*, *Hermes* 74 (1939) 113–29; cf. also Jachmann, *op. cit.* (n. 53) 609–10. If it is true that the Greek originals of the *Asinaria*, the *Trinummus* and the *Vidularia* all had narrative prologues, it seems more likely that Plautus did not translate these narratives than that his versions have all been lost in the course of transmission. The same might well be true of the *Truculentus*, but Abel's defence (p. 26) of the extant text is not wholly successful.

69 Turpilius was not necessarily imitating Terence when he used a dialogue in place of Menander's monologue for the opening of his *Epiclerus* (fr. I R.<sup>3</sup>).

70 P. 154–8 (= *Elementi* 146–50).

71 Cf. *supra* n. 20.

72 Stasimus has some of the characteristics of the *seruus currens*, but he is bearing no message; cf. *Amph.* 984ff. where, however, the play with the comic topoi is more than sufficient justification. It is not unlikely that in the *Trinummus* these characteristics were added by Plautus for comic effect.



mon<sup>73</sup>; this is not, of course, to exclude some Greek basis for these reflections upon which Plautus has expanded<sup>74</sup>, since happy memories of the “good old days” and a lament for the corrupt nature of modern ways is a commonplace of orators and comic poets at least as early as the fifth century B.C., and Mercator 836–41 suggests that it was well known to Philemon. The main themes of Stasimus’ monologue are most fully elaborated elsewhere in the play in the entrance monologue of Megaronides (v. 27–38) and the corresponding lecture of Philto to his son (v. 281–300); that these themes form a coherent pattern in the play perhaps suggests that they are the work of the original poet rather than of Plautus, as normally it is a lack of coherence which is regarded as the hallmark of Plautine material. Some of this monologue, however, is clearly not taken from Greek (e.g. v. 1037–40), and it would be useful to be able to cite Bacchides 540–51 as evidence of Plautus’ own interest in the subject of *mores* and false friends, but the origin of that passage is, unfortunately, uncertain<sup>75</sup>. At the very least, I think, Plautus has as good a claim as Philemon to the credit for fully working out this theme in the play<sup>76</sup>; his reasons for doing this may be the subject of historical speculation<sup>77</sup>. In short, Plautus appears to have taken a monologue from one Greek play and to have added it to a second monologue containing a considerable original element and to have included the whole in his adaptation of the Thesauros. He has attached this new unit to his play by the theme of the talent which Stasimus has lent and lost. This enormous sum has naturally aroused suspicion, and it has been combined with the harmless joke of v. 413 to support the thesis that Stasimus’ thefts are a major cause of his master’s poverty<sup>78</sup>. There seems, however, to be nothing of substance in this view<sup>79</sup>; it may be that Plautus has simply enlarged the sum named in the Greek play, since a slave could lend money at both Athens and Rome and other sums of money in Plau-

73 It seems very unlikely that v. 1037 reproduces a pun on the various senses of νόμος.

74 *Trin.* 1057–8 echoes a formula found at *Persa* 75–6 after a passage of, at least, Roman colour and perhaps more, despite J. Partsch, *Hermes* 45 (1910) 598–602, and U. Paoli, *Iura* 4 (1953) 174–81. Charmides’ aside at v. 1041–2 matches that of Euclio at *Aulularia* 523–4 during a section which has certainly been expanded by Plautus, cf. Fraenkel 137–40 (= *Elementi* 130–2).

75 Cf. E. Handley, *Menander and Plautus: A Study in Comparison* (Inaugural Lecture, London 1968) 17–8; H. Tränkle, *Mus. Helv.* 32 (1975) 118–23.

76 For v. 27–38 and v. 281–300 cf. Blänsdorf, *op. cit.* 203–5. 238–42.

77 Cf. T. Frank, *Am. Journ. Phil.* 53 (1932) 152–6, and D. Earl, *Historia* 9 (1960) 235–43; it is perhaps worthy of note that, although the theme of money lent and lost because of evil *mores* doubtless occurred in Greek Comedy (cf. Axionikos fr. 10 K.), it appears at Ter. *Phormio* 55–6 in the mouth of a character who may well be a creation of Terence himself, cf. Donatus on v. 35, Lefèvre, *op. cit.* 88–102, and F. H. Sandbach, *Bull. Inst. Class. Stud.* 25 (1978) 132.

78 Cf. Brix-Niemeyer<sup>4</sup> on v. 728, and E. Schild, *Die dramaturgische Rolle der Sklaven bei Plautus und Terenz* (Diss. Basel 1917) 75.

79 Cf. Langen 225–6 and Fraenkel 156 n. 3 (= *Elementi* 149 n. 1).



tus seem to have been greatly exaggerated<sup>80</sup>. Alternatively, the suggestion of H. J. Rose<sup>81</sup> that *talentum* here refers not to the Attic talent but to the Siculo-Italian talent, a very small sum of money, is very attractive and may well be correct. In either case, the role of Stasimus in the second half of the play perhaps requires a further examination.

At v. 717 Lysiteles and Lesbonicus leave the stage with their dispute still unsettled: Lesbonicus is resolved to give his farm as a dowry for his sister, and Lysiteles is equally resolved not to accept it. Stasimus remains on stage and it is clear that he believes that Lesbonicus will win the argument as he decides to collect a *talentum* which he had lent in the *forum* so that he will have money for the soldiering expedition which he is certain Lesbonicus will undertake, once all the property at home is exhausted. This may seem slightly odd as Stasimus has no apparent reason to believe that Lysiteles will move from his stated position; it is odder, I believe, that Stasimus' monologue at v. 718–26 is both a repetition and a parody of his monologue at v. 592–9 in which he expressed the view that, if the farm was lost, Lesbonicus would take off *in Asiam aut in Ciliciam*<sup>82</sup> to serve as a mercenary. In the second speech this is replaced by a vision in which Lesbonicus attaches himself *aliquem ad regem* and Stasimus is armed with a bow and arrows. The point of this second speech of Stasimus seems largely to be a series of jokes at the weakness of his master and to provide for the introduction of the *talentum*; in Bacchides 505 and 507–8 we have a clear illustration of Plautus' fondness for *παρὰ προσδοκίαν* jokes, and the suspicion that this speech in the Trinummus has been introduced by Plautus on the model of the certainly Greek v. 592–601<sup>83</sup> seems to me at least strong enough to be entertained.

It may be objected that this speech of Stasimus belongs to a familiar type and that this type is known to be Greek, cf. Adesp. 242, 13ff. Austin; Plaut. Epidicus 81ff.; Pseudolus 394ff.<sup>84</sup>; indeed Stasimus' *non sisti potest* (v. 720) with reference to the soldiers' boots of which he is thinking directly echoes Epid. 84. I do not think, however, that this objection is a decisive one. That Plautus should

80 Cf. Fraenkel, loc. cit., and A. Watson, *The Law of Persons in the Later Roman Republic* (Oxford 1967) 178–81; it is generally agreed that the dowries of Roman Comedy are unrealistically exaggerated, cf. Gomme-Sandbach on Men. *Epir.* 134ff.

81 *Class. Rev.* 38 (1924) 155–7, cf. G. Shipp, *Glotta* 34 (1955) 141–3. Rose's explanation, if correct, is not of course sufficient demonstration that these passages are Plautine, as Plautus might merely have substituted the Italian talent for a correspondingly small Greek sum.

82 The mention of Cilicia perhaps suggests the campaigns of Seleukos in 296/5 (cf. P. Grimal, *Rev. Et. Lat.* 46, 1968, 134), but the need for mercenaries in this part of the world was by no means limited to that period, cf. G. T. Griffith, *The Mercenaries of the Hellenistic World* (Cambridge 1935) 142–70.

83 V. 595–9 have a very close Greek parallel in Men. fr. \*159 Austin (perhaps from the *Karchedonios*).

84 On these passages cf. T. Williams, *Rhein. Mus.* 105 (1962) 193–207, and Ed. Fraenkel, *Mus. Helv.* 25 (1968) 231–4.

use familiar comic forms in passages of his own creation is only what we would expect<sup>85</sup> and, in any case, the Plautine material may begin at v. 719 rather than v. 717; it may, further, be significant that Trin. 718ff. differs from the other examples of this style in that the slave does not think up a plan of action with which to deceive, but uses the monologue to express despair.

In the above discussion I have suggested a rather moderate view, namely that v. 719–28 (or perhaps v. 717–28) are Plautus' own work, but it may be possible to carry speculation one step further and consider whether Stasimus' very presence as an eavesdropper in III 3 is a contribution of Plautus. V. 615–21 would make a very suitable «Abgangsmonolog» after Stasimus' conversation with Callicles, being exactly parallel to Grumio's lament at *Mostellaria* 76–83, a play which is quite probably adapted from an original by Philemon<sup>86</sup>. The unannounced entry of the two young men in the midst of a quarrel at v. 627 would be a thoroughly Greek technique (cf. Soph. Phil. 1222<sup>87</sup>, Eur. IA 303), and there is nothing in v. 622–6 which must come from Philemon. Stasimus is given only one bomolochic intervention in the course of the long debate (v. 705–10); this intervention may be based upon a Greek reference to competitions for actors, but there is no good reason why Plautus himself should not be responsible<sup>88</sup>. In short, although certain grounds for a decision on this question are lacking, there seem to be good reasons for believing that Plautus' hand can be detected here.

If the above reasoning is correct, then we can see Plautus preparing the way for his own additions with greater care than is often thought characteristic of him. It is also significant, I think, that these additions by Plautus grow from something already in his Greek model and are not simply random accretions<sup>89</sup>.

85 *Bacchides* 526–9 may be well paralleled from Greek Comedy.

86 Cf. Leo 136.

87 For Phil. 1218–21 cf. O. Taplin, *Gr. Rom. Byz. Stud.* 12 (1971) 40–4; in his edition Dawe casts doubt on the verses, but does not refer to Taplin's discussion.

88 This passage would be the earliest evidence for actors' competitions at Rome, but there is no evidence the other way, cf. Jocelyn, *Ennius* 23.

89 I am very grateful to H. D. Jocelyn for many helpful criticisms of previous drafts of this paper. F. H. Sandbach was also kind enough to comment upon an early version.