

DELAYED MEETINGS IN MENANDER, PLAUTUS
AND TERENCE

Robert L. Bush

Thesis submitted for the degree of
Master of Philosophy



ProQuest Number: 10097338

All rights reserved

INFORMATION TO ALL USERS

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.



ProQuest 10097338

Published by ProQuest LLC(2016). Copyright of the Dissertation is held by the Author.

All rights reserved.

This work is protected against unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code.
Microform Edition © ProQuest LLC.

ProQuest LLC
789 East Eisenhower Parkway
P.O. Box 1346
Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346

TEXT OF ABSTRACT

DELAYED MEETINGS IN MENANDER, PLAUTUS AND TERENCE

Comparison of recently discovered fragments of Menander's 'Dis Exapaton' and Plautus' adaptation 'Bacchides' shows that Plautus has made a number of changes to the original. Among them is the extension of the time it takes for one character, Pistoclerus, to meet another, Mnesilochus. Delays in meeting of this kind are the subject of this thesis and are analysed with a view to comparing how they are handled by Menander, Plautus and Terence.

Passages involving delayed meetings are classified according to reasons for delay, thus: i) Those arising because one character (or characters) fails to see another;

ii) Those arising because both characters (or groups of characters) fail to see each other;

iii) Those arising in spite of both characters (or groups of characters) seeing each other.

With regard to verisimilitude situation i) is not unlikely, ii) is less likely and iii) quite artificial. Broadly speaking, the majority of passages from each dramatist is covered by the first situation, though there is a somewhat higher proportion of artificial delays in Plautus.

Within each group passages are divided up according to length on the assumption that the longer delay lasts the more verisimilitude is strained. In this respect there is quite a significant difference between Menander and Terence on the one hand and Plautus on the other. Plautus' delays are on the whole longer and some

even exceed one hundred lines - a figure only remotely approached in the others. What is more, an analysis of the effects of delay passages shows that the content of Plautus' long delays (forty lines and over) is normally inorganic to the play as a whole and devoted to humour for its own sake, whereas even the longest delays in Menander have a relevant dramatic effect as do Terence's, with a few exceptions.

In the final chapter phrases used to bring about meeting are briefly analysed. Plautus is seen to use meeting as an opportunity to make jokes often by employing and exploiting formulas of meeting. Sometimes he uses a contrived, symmetrical style of speech. Menander is quite realistic in his handling of meetings, using brief phrases and sometimes dispensing with greetings altogether. Terence employs certain formulas but hardly ever exploits them for humorous effect. In this respect, as ⁱⁿ most others, he is closer to the more realistic Menander.

CONTENTS

<u>Chapter</u>		<u>Page</u>
	Introduction	6
I	<u>One Party Fails to See the Other</u>	15
	i) Talking Back	16
	ii) The Main Group	19
	a) Reasons for the Failure of one Party to see the other	19
	b) Reasons for the Failure of the Aside Character to bring about Meeting, and his Activity during Delay	24
	c) The Use of Aside Comments	30
	d) The Content and Function of Delay Passages between:	41
	1 - 10 lines	41
	10 - 20 lines	43
	20 - 40 lines	50
	iii) Delays lasting for more than Forty Lines	62
	Passages of Irregular Situation	76
	iv) <u>Servus Currens</u> Scenes	82
II	<u>Neither Party Sees the Other</u>	90
III	<u>Both Parties See Each Other</u>	106
IV	<u>Phrases Used to Bring About Meeting</u>	119
	<u>Appendix: The <u>Servus Currens</u> in Menander</u>	124
	List of Passages Examined	127
	Select Bibliography	137

PREFACE

Line references to Terence, Plautus and Menander are taken from Kauer and Lindsay, P. Terenti Afri Comoedia (Oxford, 1926), Lindsay, T. Macci Plauti Comoediae (2nd ed. Oxford, 1910) and Sandbach, Menandri Reliquiae Selectae (Oxford, 1972).

I am very grateful to Mr. J.C.B. Lowe for the encouragement and advice he has given me and for the patience with which he has read through the various drafts of this essay. Many sincere thanks.

Introduction

In attempting to discover what is Roman and what is Greek in the plays of Plautus and Terence, scholars have used basically three methods of approach. They have analysed the structure of the Roman plays, seeking internal inconsistencies as evidence of Roman adaptation. This work has occupied German scholars especially.¹ Another German, Eduard Fraenkel, has produced the standard study² of the second method of approach: analysis of details in the plays, allusive and stylistic, which appear to have meaning only in a Roman context and in the Latin tongue. American scholars, notably Harsh, Hough and Prescott, having attempted to invalidate many of Fraenkel's conclusions,³ pursued the third method of approach, one which they thought to

- 1 See, for example, Leo, Plautinische Forschungen zur Kritik und Geschichte der Komödie (2nd ed., Berlin, Jachmann, Plautinisches und Attisches (Berlin, 1931). Webster also, in his Studies in Menander (2nd ed., Manchester, 1960 ; hereafter SM²) and Studies in Later Greek Comedy (2nd ed., Manchester, 1970 - SLGC²) necessarily concerns himself with structural analysis in his attempt to reconstruct the Greek plays. See also Duckworth, The Nature of Roman Comedy (Princeton, 1952 - NRC) 202 ff. and refs., Beare, 'Recent Work on the Roman Theatre' CR51 (1937) 105-111 and Arnott, 'Menander, Plautus, Terence', Greece and Rome, New Surveys in the Classics (1975) which appeared too late to be taken account of in the text.
- 2 Plautinisches im Plautus (Berlin, 1922). The Italian translation by F. Munari, Elementi Plautini in Plauto (Florence, 1960 - Elem. Plaut.) is referred to throughout this essay.
- 3 See Harsh, 'Certain Features of Technique Found in both Greek and Roman Drama' AJP58 (1937) 282-293
Prescott, 'Criteria of Originality in Plautus' TAPA63 (1932) 103-125

be more reliable, namely, the study of dramatic technique.⁴ The Americans' work was carried out in the 1930s, as was Jachmann's, and the work of Leo and Fraenkel appeared even earlier (1912 and 1922). This means that all their findings antedate the very important Menander finds of the 1950s and 1960s. A comparative study which takes into account these recent Menander discoveries seems therefore to be worthwhile. For subject an area of dramatic technique has been studied, and the reasons for this lie in the nature of the pieces of Menander's newly found work. Only one fragment represents the original of a Roman adaptation, so there is little scope for direct comparison of the stylistic details and structure of specific plays. But the study of technique⁵ does not necessarily rely on direct comparison to be of use, and for this reason it is better suited to deal with such remains of Menander's work as we have.

The one fragment of Menander which does correspond to a Roman adaptation - the Dis Exapaton (cf. Bacchides 4 94ff.) - has proved to be very significant in the field of comparative studies. From an examination of the two passages it becomes clear that Plautus has made a number of changes in the original.⁶

4 See Harsh, 'A Study of Dramatic Technique as a Means of Appreciating the Originality of Terence', CW28 (1934-5) 161-165

Hiatt, Eavesdropping in Roman Comedy (Chicago, 1946 - hereafter 'Hiatt').

Hough, 'Plautine Technique in Delayed Exits', CP35 (1940) 39-48.
 Prescott, 'Link Monologues in Roman Comedy', CP34 (1939) 1-23 and 116-126.

5 Used in this essay to mean 'the manner of handling recurring situations'.

6 See Handley, Menander and Plautus: A Study in Comparison (London, 1968) - hereafter Menander and Plautus) for a discussion of the changes.

Among them is the substitution of Moschos' (= Plautus' Pistoclerus) entrance line (Dis. Ex. 102-3) by two short entrance monologues (Bacc. 526-33) which increase the delay before Pistoclerus meets Mnesilochus (Moschos meets Sostratos in Menander). Given this indisputable example of Plautus' originality, it seems of use to examine all such delays in meeting in Menander, Terence, and Plautus, and to compare the ways in which the three dramatists handle this particular situation. Such an examination is the subject of this essay.

The instances of delay are classified according to situations most likely to be encountered in everyday life. This makes it possible to see how far each dramatist, within the confines of stage conventions, adheres to 'realism' or departs from it. The categories of delay are as follows:

- i) Those which arise because one party fails to see another;
- ii) Those which arise because neither party sees the other;
- iii) Those which arise in spite of both parties seeing each other.

Bearing in mind the dimensions of the ancient stage, it is not improbable that, as in real life, one person should fail to see another, especially if the unseen person is deliberately concealing his presence. That neither party should see the other is less likely, though not impossible of course; so the situation cannot be described as in itself unnatural, although particular features may make it so. However, there is some validity in describing as intrinsically artificial a situation

in which both parties are well aware of each other's presence but still fail to meet, unless it be that one party is pretending not to see the other, in which case the situation is very like (i).

The following table shows how instances of delay are distributed among these categories in each of the three dramatists' work.⁷

	<u>MENANDER</u>	<u>TERENCE</u>	<u>PLAUTUS</u>
One Party fails to see the other ⁸	(36)85%	(67)89%	(140)76%
Neither Party sees the other	(3)7½%	(4)5½%	(25)13½%
Both Parties see each other	(3)7½%	(4)5½%	(19)10½%

7 The figures in brackets show the actual number of passages. Beside these are the percentages which these numbers represent. In tables elsewhere percentages only are given because the amount of extant work by which the dramatists are represented is so unequal that actual numbers of passages are meaningless for the purposes of comparison. However, the actual numbers of passages for each category can be seen by each dramatist's name in the 'List of Passages Examined' p. 127ff.

8 At the beginning of the essay there is a short section on passages in which a character emerges from a house and talks back to someone inside. One of these passages is of the situation 'Both See Each Other'. The rest belong to the first category. Because the passages are all so alike they are treated as a separate group in the first category. For the same reason there is a separate section on passages featuring the servus currens, six of which fall outside the first category, the majority inside. Figures for these two separate groups are:

	M	T	P
Talking Back	(11)26%	(11)15%	(26)14%
<u>Servus Currens</u>	(2) 4%	(5) 7%	(10)5½%

From these figures it is evident that the vast majority of passages in all three dramatists belong to the first and most natural type of delay situation. Furthermore, when it is realised that all the passages in Menander and Terence and most of Plautus' which come into the third category involve pretence, it will be seen that the tendency away from less natural situations is even more marked. Nevertheless, the figures do show a higher proportion of artificial situations in Plautus than in either Menander or Terence. This suggests the possibility that Plautus permitted artificial situations where the others did not and perhaps even altered original 'natural' ones. However for confirmation or refutation of this possibility a direct comparison of a number of originals and adaptations would be necessary.

In all three categories the likelihood is that the longer delay lasts, the more verisimilitude is strained. Therefore, within each category, passages are divided up according to length. Here, backed up by the evidence of Bacc. 526-29, conclusions can be stated with some degree of confidence, though the scanty nature of the remains of Menander's work precludes dogmatism. The tables of figures which appear in pages 15, 19, 82, 93 and 106 show that, compared with delays in Menander and Terence, a considerably higher proportion in Plautus extend beyond twenty, and often forty lines. In some cases his delays even go beyond one hundred lines, which is quite unparalleled in the works of the other two writers. Only in servus currens scenes and in examples of the category 'Both See Each Other' does Menander rival Plautus in length of delay,

and even this picture is somewhat distorted by the fact that, through lack of other comparable examples, the same two passages from Menander do service in each of these sections. Terence exceeds Plautus only in examples of the last section, and it so happens that verisimilitude in these examples is not greatly affected by the length of delay.

Within each section the reasons why one character fails to see another are examined and compared, and also the reasons why aside characters fail to bring about meeting sooner than they do. Menander is seen to give his characters convincing motivation in nearly every instance. Plautus is likewise explicit, but in Terence motivation is often lacking and frequently has to be inferred.

Delays in meeting inevitably involve situations in which one or more characters remain aside while the other party speaks. The passages are therefore also examined to see how each dramatist keeps the aside party occupied. Menander and Plautus nearly always make their aside characters eavesdrop on the main speech and in this way give them something to do during their spell in aside. However, in the situation in which neither party sees the other, this resource is not possible, and in the long delays of Plautus in this section aside characters often appear to have nothing to do. Even in delays of the first section Terence often leaves it unclear what his characters are meant to be doing, and, as with reasons for failure to see, inference is frequently called for.

Active aside characters will sometimes make aside comments and these are examined next to determine the extent and purpose

of their use by each of the dramatists. Menander's characters generally make short comments and few. Nowhere in his delays do asides remotely threaten the dominance of the main speech. Such aside comments have basically two functions: to present aside characters' reactions to the main speech and, more technically, to give aside characters something to do. With very few exceptions, Terence follows Menander's practice. So does Plautus in his short delays, but in long ones aside remarks sometimes achieve great prominence and on occasions actually rival the main speech in number of lines. The purpose of these asides is mainly to create comic effect, and while most have little relevance to the play as a whole, some do not have any connection even with the main speech.

Finally, the content and function of delay passages are examined. The intention in this is to see whether passages shown to be anomalies under previous examination are justified as such by dramatic considerations. For example, if a passage involves an unduly long delay, is there anything important about its content and function without which the play cannot progress, or without which the play as a whole suffers? In all three dramatists short delays are normally used to perform minor dramatic functions, such as the motivation of a character's entrance. In longer delays Menander normally introduces matter which is either useful in actuating the plot or is dramatically effective at the point where it occurs (e.g. well-timed light relief). Terence, with a few exceptions, is close to Menander in this respect. The dramatic effects are not

always the same (there is rather more suspense), but they are organic, like Menander's. Plautus, particularly in very long delays, often introduces matter which to the play as a whole, has scarcely any relevance at all. This material usually provides comic effect, but not always. There are a number of passages, such as Sosia's battle description in the Amphitruo (203ff.), which are not funny, but are purple patches of exciting narrative or vivid description. Quite a few of Plautus' long delays represent such a picture or idea which obviously attracted the writer despite its inorganic nature.

These conclusions, reached by an examination of various technical aspects of delay, are reinforced in the final chapter which deals with phrases used to bring about meeting. Menander's handling of the meeting process is, almost without exception, realistic: often characters simply meet and preliminary phrases of identification are dispensed with altogether; when questions are asked, they are asked to elicit answers. This is not so meaningless as it sounds, since in Plautus questions are frequently asked to set up a joke or to obtain a reply which sets up a joke. In Plautus, too, there are a number of stylised meetings in which one character's words are closely echoed by another's and in which sets of phrases closely balance in both style and content. Such artificiality is not seen in either Menander or Terence who, in this respect as in so many others, follows the practice of the Greek writer.

The findings of this essay tend to confirm long-held opinions on the relationship of the three dramatists to one another. On a broad view, the works of Menander and Terence are seen to contain artificial situations, inevitably when one takes into account the stage conventions of the time, but these situations are kept to within reasonable limits of length, and verisimilitude is not often strained. What is more, these inevitably artificial situations are nearly always used for dramatically organic purposes. Plautus, on the other hand, is seen to extend unnatural situations deliberately, and to use them for his own humorous and attractive, though largely inorganic, ends. The phrase Weismann used when comparing Plautus to Terence still holds good with the inclusion of Menander:⁹ "Plautus vividioribus coloribus pingit".

⁹ De Servi Currentis Persona Apud Comicos Romanos
(Geissen, 1911)

I. One Party Fails to See the Other

Delays in this section are due to the failure of one party, normally the entrant,¹ to see another party already on stage. Of the delays in Menander which come under this heading, approximately 97% last for between one and twenty lines, 3% last longer. In Terence, 84% last less than twenty lines, 16% more. In Plautus, 71% last less, 29% more. The accompanying table gives a more detailed breakdown of these figures.²

	<u>MENANDER</u>	<u>TERENCE</u>	<u>PLAUTUS</u>
1-10	80	66	55
10-20	17	18	16
20-30	-	6	12
30-40	-	5	7
40+	3	5	10

1 Passages which reverse roles are: Menander, Perik 774; Terence, Ad. 882; Plautus, Aul. 727; Capt. 781; Men. 273 and 704; Merc. 474. Hereafter, in lists of examples, Menander's passages will come first, Terence's second and Plautus' third.

2 These figures do not include servus currens passages since a few of them belong to subsequent sections. But they do include 'Talking Back' and passages of irregular situation. These last are included in all statistics of the opening chapter, but are discussed as a separate group on pages 76-81.

i) Talking Back

A frequently recurring device which causes delay situations is 'talking back': a character emerges from a house and talks back to those within before noticing the character who is already on stage.

In Menander there are eleven examples of this device,³ eleven also in Terence and twenty-six in Plautus.⁴ The instances from Menander and Terence are very short, none extending beyond five lines. The majority of examples from Plautus are short too, but eight are above five lines.⁵ Because the delay is normally so short the device is not very significant, but two points deserve mention. Of all delay situations 'talking back' is the most justifiable in terms of naturalness. When a character enters in this way he often gives the impression that he is continuing a conversation begun off-stage.⁶ His attention is accordingly directed off-stage which convincingly accounts for his failure to perceive what is happening on-stage.⁷ Moreover his face will most likely be turned in the direction of his remarks, making his failure to see the occupant of the stage all the more natural. The fact that the occupant of the stage is regularly the initiator of conversation seems to confirm this suggestion.

³ In addition to those included in the 'List of Passages Examined' Menander's Asp. 233 and 299, Dis.Ex. 102 and Dysk. 879 are also possibilities. See Gomme and Sandbach, Menander, A Commentary (Oxford, 1973 - hereafter 'Sandbach') on each of these passages (pp. 82, 88, 124 and 266-7 respectively). Terence's Ad. 719 and 924 and H.T. and other possibilities.

⁴ Truc. 95 I take to be talking back from 95-98. See Enk, Plauti Truculentus ii (Leyden, 1953 - 'Truc. ii') on 114, p. 37)

⁵ Cas. 309 and 780, Curc. 223, Men. 110, M.G. 156, Pers. 85, Stich. 58, Truc. 711

⁶ See Donati Commentum Terenti (Ed. P. Wessner, Leipzig, 1902-8 hereafter 'Donatus') vol. ii p. 128 on Ad. 635 and p. 235 on Hec. 243.

⁷ At Sam. 715 Niceratos' "Πᾶσι τὸ τοῦτο;" suggests he has only just noticed. See also Asp. 166-7, Terence's Ad. 890 ("sed eccum Demeam") and Plautus' Epid. 186.

Certain passages from each dramatist show no obvious technical function and it is these which reveal the conventional nature of the device most clearly (e.g. Epitrep. 430; H.T. 175; Pers. 405). More normally, however, the space of delay is used to perform some minor dramatic function, chiefly motivation of entrance (e.g. Dysk. 546;⁸ Sam. 421; Ad. 635; Hec. 76; Capt. 251; Cas. 165; Rud. 331). The dramatists may also do some character sketching (e.g. Dysk. 206; Sam. 301; Ad. 209; Hec. 243;⁹ Men. 110) or introduce comic elements (e.g. Asp. 233; H.T. 879; Cas. 780 (irony); Men. 466).

All three dramatists use the device on occasion to add, as it were, an extra dimension to the stage. In Menander's Samia we are reminded three times¹⁰ of the imminence of Moschion's marriage by means of 'talking back', and this makes us appreciate its vicissitudes on stage all the more. In Terence's Andria Glycerium, whose interest in the action is paramount but who never actually appears on stage, is addressed twice in 'taking back',¹¹ and twice¹² her childbirth is referred to in this way.¹³ Plautus' plays do not normally involve key characters who never appear on stage but Casina is an exception. In that play the title character is briefly glimpsed by means of the device.¹⁴

In eight cases from Plautus, the normal upper limit of five lines is exceeded (Cas. 309 (8 lines) and 780 (8); Curc. 223(6);

8 See Handley, The Dyskolos of Menander (Methuen, 1965) on 546-51 p.228.

9 See Carney, P.Terenti Afri Hecyra, Proceedings of the African Classical Associations, Supplement No. 2, 1963

(hereafter 'Carney') on 243 (p.56) and 623 (p.102).

See also Sandbach on Dysk. 204 (p.168) and Sam. 301 (pp. 574-5)

10 301, 421, 713.

11 684, 842.

12 228, 481. These passages do not involve delay.

13 See Also Hec. 243 and 623.

14 626-29.

Men. 110 (15); M.G. 156 (9); Pers. 85 (14); Stich. 58 (10); Truc. 711 (8)). The increase in most of these passages is so slight as to be of no importance. Nevertheless, three of them present certain interesting features. Pers. 85 is unique among examples of the device in that Toxilus does not talk back immediately on entry but only after seeing that by doing so he can lure Saturio into doing him a favour. It is the only example of 'talking back' used in a conscious attempt to convey an impression to the eavesdropper.¹⁵ The larger part of Stich. 58 has no particular function beyond some character portrayal and the humour of the threatened punishments.¹⁶ Once Antipho's officiousness subsides he leaves with the formulaic lines, 66-7, which, in at least two other cases (Capt. 251, Pers. 405) represent the whole of a speech spoken back. Men. 110,¹⁷ the longest example, is similarly inflated. Menaechmus I furiously denounces his busybody wife in high rhetorical style, and it is clearly for the sake of these rhetorical fireworks that 'talking back' is prolonged.

15 As such it comes within the category of 'Both Parties see Each Other' and is the only passage not covered by the situation of the present chapter. The unconscious conveying of an impression is quite common. An interesting example is And. 481ff., discussed by Handley 'The Conventions of the Comic Stage and Their Exploitation by Menander' in Ménandre (Fondation Hardt, Geneva, 1970) 18-20.

16 When a master in Menander shouts angrily at his slaves (Sam. 440ff.) his anger has a basis in the plot which Antipho's outburst lacks. See Sandbach on Sam. 439, p. 594.

17 This passage may not strictly be 'talking back' as the matrona is evidently standing in the doorway (127), but in effect it is the same as the other examples. See Fraenkel, Elem. Plant. 136-7 for a short discussion of the 'talking back' device and p. 137 for Plautine expansion in Men. 110ff.

(ii) The Main Group

Figures for the remaining passages of this section (excluding the instances of 'talking back' and servus currens scenes) are as follows:

1-10	72)	58)	45)
) 96) 81) 65
10-20	24)	23)	20)
20-30	-)	7)	15)
)))
30-40	-) 4	6) 19	8) 35
)))
40+	4)	6)	12)

Passages in which delay last for less than forty lines will now be examined to find out:

a) in what way, if any, each dramatist accounts for the failure of one party to see the other;

b) how each dramatist occupies the non-speaking party and motivates his failure to bring about a meeting sooner than he does;

c) to what extent and to what purpose asides are used;

d) what the function and content of each delay is.

Passages over forty lines will be treated separately.

a) Reasons for the Failure of One Party to see the Other

Owing to the lack of stage directions one is obliged to infer from the text and from the context of a situation the reason why one character fails to see another. Normally there are good, natural reasons to be found, common to all three dramatists. In one instance, Dysk. 546, Menander gives an explicit reason.

Getas has smoke in his eyes. When his eyes are clear (552) meeting takes place. Generally the reason is implicit. If a character has deliberately withdrawn, for whatever reason, the entrant will obviously not see him. This is as good a motivation over thirty lines as over three (e.g. Georg. 33; Most. 687). All three dramatists use expressions of withdrawal,¹ Plautus being easily the most prolific in this respect. Plautus also often uses expressions which, while not specifically announcing withdrawal, do suggest that this is what the character does, e.g. Poen. 822, "quid habeat sermonis auscultabo."² Koch³ thought such expressions peculiar to Plautus, but subsequent Menander finds have shown at least one fairly certain example in New Greek Comedy - Sam. 60. When, as is nearly always the case in Terence, there is no specific indication of withdrawal, one is forced to infer from the situation that this is what has happened. For example, one may imagine that a combination of apprehension and interest in what Bacchis is saying persuades Syrus to remain hidden for a while at H.T. 723ff.⁴ Moreover, the occurrence of such verbs as accedere

1 e.g. Georg. 33 'μεταστῆμεν'; Ad. 635 'concedam huc'; Bacc. 610 'huc concedam'.

2 cf. Trin. 842^a and Men. 465.

3 De Personarum Comicarum Introductione (Breslau, 1914 - hereafter 'Koch') 83-85.

4 cf. Eun. 81 and Bacc. 842

and adire confirms that the two parties are at some distance, and suggests, when other signs are lacking, that the user of such a verb has withdrawn.⁵

Very short delays may simply represent the length of time it takes for an entering character to get his bearings on stage (e.g. Ad. 265; Trin. 276); others, ranging between three and six lines, the time it takes for a character entering from the wing to reach a position from which he is able to address the occupant of the stage in a normal speaking voice (e.g. Dysk. 775; Eun. 971; Aul. 178). When the entrant's attention is distracted, his failure to see the occupant is natural. A character's attention may be distracted for a variety of reasons. He may be absorbed in his thoughts (e.g. Eun. 1002; Cas. 217^a; Truc. 95), or he may be under the influence of strong emotion (e.g. Dysk. 189; Ad. 789; Merc. 335; Poen. 1280). Two or more characters are quite likely to be so engrossed in conversation that they do not realise anyone else is there (e.g. Sam. 61; H.T. 562; M.G. 874; Poen. 961). There are five passages (Sam. 283; H.T. 242 and 381; Hec. 415; Poen. 1174) in which two such characters enter from the wing. Wing entrances, as noted above, usually involve a delay of between three and six lines, a length far exceeded in all these passages. One explanation which may account for their unusual length is that the entrants halt on their way across the stage

5. e.g. Ad. 460, Eun. 650. Epid. 126 supports this suggestion since Epidicus does withdraw (103). Koch 85, finds no parallel in Greek New Comedy for such expressions.

in order to converse more easily. Of these passages Hec. 415 and Sam. 283 are similar both in length and situation, but the remaining three all involve four speaking characters and produce delays of between twenty and thirty lines, neither of which features is paralleled in the surviving work of Menander.

As a rule, the failure of an entrant to see an on-stage character is well motivated in both long and short delays. Weak motivation in short delays is, in any case, unexceptionable, but weak motivation in longer delays may well strain credibility. In three long delays, Eun. 232; Bacc. 640; Cist. 671, there is no motivation, and it is not easy even to infer a reason. It is possible that at Bacc. 640 and Eun. 232 the occupants have withdrawn, but there is no evidence in the text for such an assumption. Even this possibility is ruled out at Cist. 671, since Lampadio and Phanostrata do not become aware of Halisca until line 695.⁶

Menander, then, always provides a realistic reason for the failure of one party to see another. Plautus and Terence generally do so, though sometimes the reason has to be inferred. The more frequent vagueness of Terence on this score may largely be attributed to the dearth in his plays of expressions stating or implying withdrawal. Menander's delays are comparatively short and so the necessarily artificial situation

6 The senex's failure to see the matrona at Men. 753 has no apparent motivation either, but it is probably the result of an exaggeratedly protracted journey across stage, illustrating lines 753-8.

in which one character fails to see another is kept within reasonable bounds. Terence, and more particularly, Plautus have far longer delays and if, in these, motivation is weak (as at Bacc. 640, Cist. 671 and Eun. 232), the danger of artificiality is inevitably enhanced.

b) Reasons for the Failure of the Aside Character to bring about Meeting, and his Activity during Delay

We have seen in what ways and to what extent each dramatist motivates the failure of an entrant to see the character already on stage. Now it is necessary to look at delays from the other side and see whether and how each dramatist accounts for the failure of the aside character to bring about meeting sooner than he does, and how he keeps this character occupied during the period of delay. In short delays awkwardness in the situation of the aside character is minimal, and for this reason the passages examined in this section are all above ten lines.

A character who shows interest in what is being said by the entrant will obviously be justified in remaining aside, and, by listening in, he will be well occupied during the period of delay. Interest may be indicated by a statement of intent to eavesdrop, or by aside comments, or both. Of the six passages above ten lines in Menander one, Sam. 369, is accounted for in this way, and employs both aside comments and the stated intention to eavesdrop (368¹). Of the nineteen passages in Terence, nine delays can be explained by the interest of the eavesdropper, but in only one, And. 235, is there an explicit statement of intent to eavesdrop. In one other passage a character expresses uncertainty about whether to approach or to continue listening (Ph. 737). In the main, aside comments are the only indication and indeed, sufficient indication (e.g. Ad. 450-3; H.T. 564;

1 cf. Sam. 60

Ph. 235, 236, 238 etc.). In contrast to Terence, Plautus very often indicates interest by a statement of intent to eavesdrop (e.g. Asin. 586-8; Ep. 103; Men. 570; Most. 1063²). Occasionally he seems to bend over backwards to show the eavesdropper's interest by giving him enthusiastic asides (e.g. Poen. 841; Trin. 1135³). On other occasions, though less often than with Terence, interest has to be inferred from asides or from the context of a situation (e.g. Asin. 880; Poen. 961).

Interest in what is being said is the commonest reason for the eavesdropper to hold back, but there are others. If he is afraid of the entering character, then he can hardly be blamed for not coming forward sooner than he has to (Dysk. 153; Ad. 540; Merc. 700). Likewise, he may be forgiven for not interrupting someone who enters in a state of high emotion (Dysk. 574; Eun. 292; Rud. 615⁴), or two characters who enter in conversation (Dysk. 691; Ph. 485; Cas. 814; Merc. 272). All of these are adequate reasons for the eavesdropper's reluctance to come forward.

Before moving on to those passages which are not so well motivated, it will be useful briefly to examine how the dramatists occupy their aside characters and to isolate passages in which the

2 See Koch 84

3 Cf. Aul. 496 and see below p.67

4 This may account for the otherwise unconvincing Amph. 882 ff. Iuppiter refrains from interrupting despite saying at 881, "nunc hanc adloquar".

aside characters are not well employed.⁵

Naturally, the uttering of aside comments is adequate employment, so this examination will be limited to passages in which they do not appear. In all ^{the} long delays of Menander, at the very least he makes his characters announce the entrance of the speaker (e.g. Dysk. 255), thus showing that they are aware of the speaker's presence, and in all but two passages, Sam. 283 and 641, the interest of the eavesdropper in what is being said is obvious. Terence uses announcement (e.g. Eun. 546 and 838), but less often. There is also one passage in Terence, Hec. 415, in which, as in Sam. 283 and 641, the eavesdropper can have little interest in what is being said. At Hec. 841 and And. 625 there is no announcement, and it is only because, in the first, Bacchis is waiting for Pamphilus and is therefore likely to notice when he arrives, and, in the second, it is Pamphilus who takes the initiative in greeting, that both passages are included in this section and not 'Neither sees the other'. Plautus generally gives his characters announcements (e.g. Bacc. 610-11, Cas. 874). Even when aside characters are obviously not listening in, activity is well accounted for (Asin. 880⁶). Two of his passages, Men. 753 and Merc. 335, present awkward problems and these will be discussed below.

5 In this connection see Prescott, 'Silent Roles in Roman Comedy' CP31 (1936) 97-119 and CP32 (1937) 193-209. In CP32, 208, he lists certain circumstances which mitigate the awkwardness of silent aside characters. Although I agree with Prescott that there is no awkwardness in the space of only a few lines, I think his lower limit of 40-50 vss. of senarii is a bit high.

6 See Prescott, CP32, 200-1 and 208, for the banquet as a mitigating circumstance.

It so happens that those passages which present problems in the activity of the aside character are those in which his failure to interrupt is not particularly well motivated, either. At Sam. 280 Demeas sees Parmenon arriving "εἰς καλὸν". Although he has need of the slave, Demeas makes no move to interrupt his conversation with ^{the} cook. If, as has already been suggested,⁷ the pair halt on their way across stage, then Demeas will be in no position to interrupt, but in that case, since he cannot eavesdrop even supposing the conversation holds any interest for him, what does he do? Later in the same play, 639, Moschion is waiting for the same Parmenon, to use him on an errand. He sees him coming and says that Parmenon is, "ὄν μάλιστα ἐβουλόμην." (640). Even so, he endures a monologue of seventeen lines in which he can have no interest whatsoever before he finally calls to his slave at 657. Sandbach⁸ seeks to justify the passage on the grounds of its interesting content, but this does nothing to mitigate the awkwardness of the situation. What can be said in partial vindication of both passages is that they are relatively short - fourteen and seventeen lines respectively.

Hec. 415 is similar to Sam. 283 in both situation and length (fifteen lines). Pamphilus has, if anything, more urgent need to engage his slave's attention (see 409ff), but he makes no

⁷ See p.21

⁸ On Sam. 641 p. 620-1

attempt to interrupt his conversation. At 809 in the same play Bacchis tells Parmeno to fetch his master and bring him to Philumena. It seems reasonable to expect, therefore, that she will be looking out for Pamphilus and will notice when he arrives with his slave. Yet she makes no announcement of his arrival, no comment on his conversation with Parmeno, and gives no indication of having listened in. It is possible that at 840 she enters Phidippus' house and reappears at 854, but there is no indication of this in the text. The activity of Pamphilus and Davos at And. 625 is subject to the same vagueness. Interest in what Charinus is saying may be inferred from the context, but the lack of any sign of it, announcement or aside comment, is strange.⁹

Plautus' Men. 753 resembles Hec. 841. Just as Bacchis sends sent for Pamphilus, so the matrona sends for her father and must be looking out for him. If he stops on his way from the wing, the matrona's failure to interrupt is natural enough, but then what does she do while he is speaking? The delay in this passage is somewhat longer than those in Menander and Terence (twenty-two lines). Merc. 335 is another strange passage. Demipho has announced the approach of his son at 330, saying that he needs to speak with him. Nevertheless, when Charinus comes onto the stage Demipho allows him a thirty line monologue, and at the end of it Demipho wonders what he can have

⁹ On Terence's vagueness see above, p. 22. See also Clifford, 'Dramatic Technique and the Originality of Terence' CJ26 (1930-1) 605-618.

been saying (364).¹⁰ This passage is considerably longer than any other problem passages discussed here.

Only in two passages from Menander are we confronted by any kind of awkwardness, and these are of no great length. Normally, Menander gives good motivation for his characters' failure to interrupt and he provides adequate employment for them while in aside. Terence is generally more vague. In two passages (And. 625 and Hec. 841) this vagueness creates real doubts about the very situation: are the aside characters aware of the speakers' presence, or not? Plautus, like Menander, is usually explicit.¹¹ But his two problem passages are longer than any in the other two dramatists and the awkwardness of them is proportionately magnified.

10 Demipho must not overhear what his son is saying. It may be objected that line 365 shows that Demipho has at least been watching his son. But this seems awkward anyway: why does he not approach and listen in?

11 On Plautus' explicitness see Handley, Menander and Plautus, 17

c) The Use of Aside Comments

Passages below forty lines will now be examined to compare the dramatist's use of aside comments, their length, content and function.

Of the eighteen delays in Menander lasting less than ten lines six, possibly seven,¹ contain asides; in Terence fifteen out of thirty-one; in Plautus eleven out of fifty. In delays of this length asides are used in pretty much the same way by all three writers. Nowhere does the proportion of aside comments to the whole delay assume significance. The highest proportion in Menander is about two lines in three (Dysk. 775), and, considering that Kallippides is probably not even within earshot when the remarks are made, perhaps the remarks are not asides at all. The next highest proportion is $\frac{3}{7}$ at Perik. 366. In Terence, $\frac{3}{5\frac{1}{2}}$ at H.T. 512 is highest, followed by $\frac{2}{4}$ at Ad. 789 and Hec. 451; in Plautus, $\frac{3}{5}$ (Men. 1060) and then $2\frac{1}{6}$ (Trin. 39). Most of these asides are simply comments made by the eavesdropper on the situation he sees before him (e.g. Dysk. 191.3; Ad. 265-6; Men. 1062-4). Occasionally the eavesdropper interprets or explains what he sees and hears (H.T. 679; M.G. 275), and sometimes passes humorous comments on the main speech: mild humour at Perik. 371-2 and And. 179, but a straight joke in Plautus' Curc. 160 and more obvious humour at Pers. 306.

1 Inc. Auct., Ghoran II, 109-110 may be an aside.

2 Only asides totalling more than one line are examined in this section.

In delays between ten and twenty lines three out of six passages in Menander have asides, nine out of twelve in Terence, nineteen out of twenty-two in Plautus.

The proportion of asides to the whole delay in Menander is slight. At Dysk. 153, Sostratos has no more than half a line (168) in seventeen, which expresses his trepidation, very natural under the circumstances. At Sam. 369, the asides of the cook amount to about two lines in seventeen, representing general comment on the quarrel between Demeas and Chrysis.³ Finally, at Dysk. 574, the asides of the cook occupy about three lines in thirteen and are clearly no more than incidental to the scene, though their callous humour does help to relieve the heavy woe of Simiche's speech. In no case are asides developed for their own sake.

The same is true of Terence's H.T. 562 and three passages of somewhat greater proportion: Ad. 447 ($3\frac{1}{2}/13$); Eun. 292 ($4\frac{1}{2}/12$) Ph. 728 (about $4/11$) (for a passage of much higher proportion, And. 404, see the discussion of irregular passages, pp.76-81). Although at Ad. 447 asides perform the useful function of showing that Demeas is quite in the dark about the true state of affairs, they are not developed once this has been done. The asides at Ph. 128 are as natural in their situation as those at Dysk. 189. Only at Eun. 292 do asides appear less than natural, and what is more, they rather awkwardly interrupt the flow of the main speech.

³ The asides are nevertheless important because they remind us of the cook's presence. For the significance of this see below p. 44 and note 9 p.44.

For asides which comment on the behaviour of the main speaker one might compare those of Perik. 366 and note that there Daos' remarks are made in single lines and not, as here, in blocks.⁴

The remaining passages from Terence all have two characters in aside. None of the passages between ten and twenty lines in Menander, and only two of those below ten lines, have two speaking aside characters. In neither of the two which have, Dysk. 775 and Sam. 532, is there the slightest attempt to develop an aside conversation. Nor is there in Terence's Ph. 485 or H.T. 723. Only at Ad. 540 is there the semblance of a conversation (549-553), but the humour of this scene comes from the picture of Ctesipho popping in and out of the house and from one line of irony (548), rather than from the conversation itself.

Plautus has nineteen delays with asides, four of which involve more than one eavesdropper. Those with only one do not differ greatly from examples in Terence and Menander, except that more often in Plautus asides are intended simply to produce a comic effect. The asides of Terence and Menander are, of course, not without humour,⁵ but the nature of it is different. Characteristic of Plautus is the straightforward joke made at the

4 Donatus i pp. 332-3, on Eun. 301, remarks on the importance of the aside, and the word rabies in particular, as assigning to Chaerea a nature capable of committing an act which is otherwise unlikely for one so young.

5 In approximately three-fifths of Plautus' asides there is a comic element. In about half of Terence's asides and in one of Menander's three passages there is something that is humorous.

main speaker's expense (e.g. Amph. 510-11; Most. 438-9).

Terence has only one comparable example, Ph. 247ff. Both Ad. 450ff. and Ad. 548 use irony, though of different kinds,⁶ and, like Menander's Dysk. 575, 581 and 583, they lack the jokiness of Plautus' asides.

In general, the proportion of asides to delay in Plautus is much the same as in Terence (e.g. Curc. 96 ³/14; Most. 431 ⁴/15; Poen. 961 ⁴/14⁷), but two passages have somewhat greater proportions: Amph. 882 (⁶/15) and Merc. 700 (⁶/13). The first resembles Eun. 292 in that Iuppiter, like Parmeno, interrupts the speaker with an extended aside, six lines long. The subject-matter is important compared with that of most asides, since it concerns Iuppiter's intentions and his reasons for them. However, there is no Menandrian precedent for an aside of that length. Merc. 700 contains first an explanatory remark (705-7), and then humorous applications of Dorippa's words to and by the eavesdropper himself, Lysimachus (708, 709). This kind of humour can be seen elsewhere in Plautus (e.g. Rud. and 1164), but only at Ph. 247⁸ in Terence; and even there it is used not in the form of quick rejoinders as in the Plautine examples, but in a block.⁹

6 A third kind of irony is seen at Merc. 274ff with characteristic Plautine crudity. See Fraenkel Elem.Plaut. 194 and note 1.

7 Fraenkel, Elem.Plaut. 211, has noted a Plautine element in these 8 On which, see below, 36. interpretative asides.

9 One other passage deserves mention, Cist. 305. Owing to gaps in the text the exact situation is unclear. Nevertheless, 'on-stage' character while Gymnasium is the entrant. The senex's asides take up no less than nine and a half of the twelve lines that survive. These asides, lascivious comments provoked by Gymnasium's speech, are plainly intended to be humorous, though at 316ff they do serve to show the senex's misconception of Gymnasium's identity.

* from the nature of the remarks it seems clear that the senex is

In none of the four passages (Cas. 814; Curc. 96; Men. 899; Poen. 1280) involving more than one eavesdropper is conversation developed to any length. Only at Cas. 814 do we see the beginnings of a conversation, but it is developed no more than Ad. 540. The asides of Curc. 96 and Cas. 814 produce characteristic comic effect (Curc. 110ff. ; Cas. 825ff. with its alliterative style), but those of Men. 899 (909) and Poen. 1280 (1292ff) are simply natural reactions to their respective situations.

To conclude on delays of twenty lines and under. The technique of the three dramatists is basically the same. By virtue of one or two passages which have abnormally high proportions of asides to delay, the average proportion in Terence and Plautus is greater than that in Menander, but not significantly so. More significant are the exceptional passages themselves. There is no Menandrian precedent for asides which interrupt a main speech to the extent of Amph. 891, Eun. 297 and Ph. 247. On the other hand, the presence of such cases in both Roman dramatists may suggest the possibility of a common source in Greek New Comedy.¹⁰ The comic element in the asides of Plautus is also important, but it is noteworthy that, like their Greek predecessor, neither Roman dramatist attempts to develop aside conversations for the sake of humorous effect.

¹⁰ The two longer interruptions, Amph. 891 and Phorm. 247, are from plays based on non-Menandrian originals.

Obviously caution is necessary when stating conclusions about comparative technique when Menander is represented by so few passages. All the greater need for caution, therefore, when dealing with passages between twenty and forty lines, for Menander is not represented at all. Terence has seven passages with asides (including Eun. 1025, an irregular passage, see 77,78), Plautus nineteen.

Of Terence's six regular passages three have an astonishingly low proportion of asides to delay: And. 236 (about $\frac{4}{31}$); Eun. 232 ($\frac{1\frac{1}{2}}{39}$); Eun. 771 ($\frac{2\frac{1}{2}}{21}$). The sole effect of the asides at Eun. 783 is to characterise Chremes as rather timid in comparison with Thais. Their conversation is not developed. Mysis' asides at And. 237, 240, 251 and 264 are simply natural reactions to what she hears, but they do also serve to show that she is listening in, and they give her something to do during her long spell of inactivity. Donatus makes this point with regard to the asides of Parmeno (Eun. 232ff¹¹) who is in the same situation as Mysis.

The proportion of asides is somewhat greater at H.T. 381 ($\frac{5}{25}$), considerably so at H.T. 242 ($\frac{13}{22}$). Both passages resemble Dysk. 775¹² in situation, but they are far longer. Another important difference is that in both H.T. passages the two parties consist of two characters each, whereas at Dysk. 775 Kallippides is alone. Nowhere in Menander are two sets of conversation held

11 Vol. i, p. 322, on Eun. 254.

12 See above, p. 21, for a possible explanation of the H.T. passages and p. 30 on Dysk. 775.

at the same time.¹³ The purpose of both H.T. passages is to portray the reactions of Clinia on seeing his beloved Antiphila: to show first, his anxiety, and then his enormous relief. Clearly at 242 ff. it is necessary for him to hear Syrus' speech from an aside position, otherwise he would not take the wrong end of the stick. The effect of the scene from 242 onwards is one of suspense, not humour. Finally Ph. 231, an important passage because it is the one instance among regular delay situations in which Terence develops the aside comments of his eavesdroppers for comic effect. Up to the moment when Phaedria steps forward (253), asides amount to about eight lines in twenty-three. At first they are short, humorous comments on what Demipho is saying, but later, at 247, Geta begins an extended parody of Demipho's words, one which seriously interrupts the flow of the latter's speech. There is nothing like this in the surviving Menander.

Of the twenty-one delays with asides in Plautus many show the same features as in short delays, and such as one expects to find in Menander and Terence: small proportions (e.g. Capt. 110, ⁴/23; Ep. 104, ²₁/22; Men. 110, ³/25; Truc. 95, ²/20), with unexceptional subject-matter. At Men. 571 (1¹/₂/39), for example, Peniculus and the matrona exchange comments (602f.) which are natural reactions to the situation and show that both have been following the soliloquy of Menaechmus I.¹⁴ But there is no question of a developed aside conversation.

¹³ See Sandbach 16-19. It should also be noted that Dromo speaks only eleven words at H.T. 242 and 245-6.

¹⁴ For the function of such asides cf. Men. 125-6 and, in spite of their humour, Poen. 839ff. 845f; Trin. 416, 422, 1134, 1135. See also p.35 for similar passages in Terence.

In passages with somewhat greater proportions the asides do have a more obvious effect, but they are still incidental to the main speech. For instance, although Charmides plays quite a big part at Trin. 843 ($8\frac{1}{2}/24$) with his humorous description of the sycophanta and observation of his movements, it is the sycophanta himself who provides the main comic effect. Much the same may be said of Most. 690 ($8/28$).¹⁵ The asides of Peniculus at Men. 466 ($7/20$) have a different effect. They serve to emphasise the general confusion and they present Peniculus' grievances which helps to explain his attitude on accosting Menaechmus II.

In five passages the eavesdroppers play a considerably greater part in their scenes: Asin. 591 ($10\frac{1}{2}/28$) and 880 ($12/30$); Bacc. 842 ($18/30$); Poen. 1174 ($14/40$); Pseud. 1103 ($12\frac{1}{2}/34$). All these passages have two eavesdroppers. The first of these, Asin. 880, provides a fitting conclusion to the play,¹⁶ but it is basically the situation, rather than the asides comments, which provides the humour, although the dramatist does not neglect opportunities to make jokes. One may compare Men. 571, essentially the same in situation, to see that similar opportunities are not always used. Bacc. 842 has the greatest of all ratios of asides to the whole delay ($18/30$), and this is not surprising since Chrysalus must convince his old master that

15 See Fraenkel, Elem. Plaut. 418-20, on Tranio's role.

16 See Hiatt, 40-2.

Cleomachus is Bacchis' husband. The scene, and indeed the outcome of the entire play, depend on the asides of Chrysalus as much as on the speech of Cleomachus. The asides are, in fact, so prominent that Cleomachus is forced to suspend his speech for nine lines at one point (850-858), and for eighteen lines in all.¹⁷ While in many respects unconvincing, Bacc. 842ff. is at least necessary to the play as a whole, which is more than can be said for Pseud. 1103. Ballio and Simo allow Harpax his say (1103-1123), but when he has finished Ballio launches into a discussion on the ways of pimps and their reprobate clients. Apart from their irrelevance, the two asides (in blocks of seven lines and four) pose an awkward problem for Harpax who must busy himself while the others talk, but without listening in to their conversation. Asin. 591 and Poen. 1174 both have two characters in each of the two parties. In situation, Poen. 1174 closely resembles H.T. 242 and 381, discussed above,¹⁸ but it differs widely in effect. The H.T. passages are quite without humour, but they do produce suspense and consequent relief. Poen. 1174 is nearly all humour. It begins in roughly the same manner as H.T. 381, but as soon as Agorastocles' joins in (1191ff) the tone of the passage becomes much less serious. His facetious remarks may well be compared

17 Hiatt, 25 n.1, criticises this scene for a) its lop-sided line distribution, b) the suspension of Cleomachus' speech and c) the fact that, although Chrysalus is relying on Cleomachus appearing (715ff, 814ff), he could not know that he would arrive just then. He says, "...it is obvious that the dramatist has dragged Cleomachus on stage only for the purpose of having him overheard."

18 p. 35-36.

with the sarcastic, but realistic, comments of Syrus at H.T. 400 and 402. To continue the comparison, after the exchanges of Clinia and Syrus (H.T. 397ff), it is not long before Antiphila catches sight of Clinia and meeting takes place, but before this can happen in the Poenulus passage, Agorastocles and Hanno indulge in more frivolities (1195-1200) and Agorastocles alone at 1206 and 1209-10. None of these aside remarks has much bearing either on the plot or on the main conversation of the two women: they are aimed purely at producing comic effect, and lack the dramatic consistency of the asides in H.T. Much the same goes for Asin. 591. The slaves Libanus and Leonidas exchange jokes arising from the words and conduct of the lovers Argyrippus and Philaenium. Although the humour of this scene is not entirely dependent on jokes, for the plight of the lovers is amusing in itself, they make a considerable contribution to it.¹⁹ It may be noted that, where Libanus' comment intrudes on the lovers' conversation (598ff) it will not have quite such an awkward effect on them as it would one person alone since they have the resource of a continued "inaudible" conversation. Distinctive as this passage is for the purely comic effect of its asides, a shorter passage from Terence, Ph. 231, bears comparison. An essential difference is, of course, that in the Asinaria passage, as in the Poenulus too, there are four speaking characters on stage at the same time.

Although the handling of asides of small proportion to delay is virtually the same in both Plautus and Terence, the differences in

19 See Fraenkel, Elem. Plaut. 206-8

the use of asides with greater proportions is striking. Terence uses them to create an effect of suspense and apart from Ph. 231, humour is almost entirely absent. In contrast, Plautus uses them, if not always to create a comic effect, at least to reinforce it; certainly in two passages (Poen. 1174 and Pseud. 1103) asides exist for their own sake. It is also important to note that in three passages where asides assume significance Plautus uses four speaking characters²⁰ (Asin. 591 and 880; Poen. 1174) and Terence does so twice (H.T. 242 and 381), though at H.T. the part played by Dromo is minimal.

²⁰ See p.35-36 and n. 13 p.36.

d) The Content and Function of Delay Passages

In this section the passages are examined to see how each dramatist uses the space of delay and, in longer passages, to see for what particular effects the delay situation has been extended.

There are eighteen passages with delays lasting ten lines and under in Menander, thirty-one in Terence and fifty in Plautus. Delays of this length, and particularly those at the lower end of the scale (1-5 lines), illustrate well the convention which has a character speak as he enters.¹ But despite the conventional nature of these passages nearly every one produces some effect or performs some function. Motivation of a character's entrance, which often entails explanation of his off-stage activity, is the most frequent (e.g. Dysk. 546; Inc. Auct. Ghoran II 105 and 160; Ad. 265; H.T. 829; Rud. 306). Plautus and Terence also use ^{the} space of delay to identify a hitherto unseen character (e.g. Hec. 727, Asin. 381, Rud. 259). In one or two passages it is difficult to see that anything is achieved (Dysk. 775; Eun. 727), but even when strict dramatic function is lacking incidental effects are noticeable in the majority of cases; for example, slight character touches (Dysk. 206; Eun. 81; Hec. 336²; more rare in Plautus, but one might consider Rud. 1045 and perhaps Truc. 893), indications of mood (Sam. 428) and comic effect (H.T. 512; Ph. 713; abundant in Plautus; Cas. 353, 720; Curc. 158, 769; Poen. 746, 1338).

1 See Hiatt 4 n.1

2 See Carney on 336, p. 67 for the motivation of Sostrata's entrance.

Passages in Menander which in some way contribute to the progress of the plot tend to be at the upper end of the scale. For instance, in a seven line delay at Sam. 532, Niceratos tells how he has discovered his daughter suckling the baby, and this leads to complications (cf. Dysk. 189, 259 and Perik. 366). On the other hand, although the information conveyed at Sam. 61ff. is clearly important to Chrysis, there is no obvious reason why she must be aside to hear it.

The only passage below ten lines in Terence which contributes to the progress of the plot is H.T. 614 where the ring, by means of which the plot is resolved, is introduced.³ In other, longer passages the effects Terence produces are less obvious, but nevertheless useful. For example, at Ad. 364 Syrus narrates off-stage action which reveals to Demea and to the audience something of thematic importance to the play - Micio's indulgent attitude. Bickford⁴ classifies H.T. 749 as 'comment', which indeed it is. But later in the play, when things go badly for Chremes, this little speech of his will be remembered, and the irony of it appreciated.⁵ Other longer passages do not differ significantly from the very short ones (And. 175, 607).

³ Hiatt classifies it as 'Futile Eavesdropping', 82 n. 1.

⁴ Soliloquy in Ancient Comedy (Princeton, 1922), 61. See below p.45 n.18.

⁵ For the effects of Eun. 549 and 840 see below p.45 and n.17 p.45.

Only in two passages, and these short ones (M.G. 272 (4½); Rud. 559(4)), does Plautus convey anything of importance.⁶ In delays at the upper end of the scale comic effect is usually present. Bacc. 235ff. is a good example. In four lines (235-38) Nicobulus motivates his entrance and if delay were to end here it would be just the same as the majority of short delays. But it does not. It continues for another four lines in the form of a humorous aside comment from Chrysalus⁷ (cf. Curc. 679; Trin. 39).

Menander has six passages of delay between ten and twenty lines, Terence twelve, Plautus twenty-two.

When delay exceeds ten lines in Menander some particular effect is usually detectable. In only one passage, Dysk. 691, is there no function or effect, but in the circumstances the failure of Sostratos to meet the others is perfectly natural. At Sam. 283, Parmenon and the cook engage in a conversation which can hardly be said to contribute to the action of the plot, but it does provide welcome relief after the long and largely

⁶ Classed by Hiatt respectively as information "of immediate value only" (p. 50) and of "lesser importance which does however add some complication" (p. 36).

⁷ See Fraenkel, Elem. Plaut. 25 and above p. 33-34 on the length of asides.

humourless monologue of Demeas.⁸ A similar effect is achieved by the presence of the cook at Sam. 369.⁹ It is hard to escape the conclusion that delay at Dysk. 153 is used, and prolonged deliberately, to draw the extremely effective contrast between Sostratos, hidden, irresolute and Knemon, shouting and angry. The effect of this contrast actually increases with the length of delay. At Dysk. 574 matter is introduced which is central to the plot and, in common with all these passages, this is done in an entirely realistic manner. There is only passage, Sam. 641, in which realism is sacrificed to effect.¹⁰

Except in the nature of his effects and in a few individual cases, Terence keeps close to the practice of Menander. Hec. 415, both in function and situation, is strikingly similar to Menander's Sam. 283. In each passage a light-hearted conversation carried on by two entrants provides relief from long foregoing monologues.¹¹ On one occasion, Ph. 485, matter which brings a new development in the plot is introduced. In two passages from Heauton Timorumenos, 562 and 723, an effect of suspense is created by keeping Syrus back for a while. In both

8 That Menander was conscious of the importance of timing in such matters is shown, with reference to cook scenes, by Handley, 'Conventions of the Comic Stage', 3ff.

9 See Sandbach on Sam. 368, pp. 582-3.

10 See Sandbach on Sam. 641, pp. 620-1 and above p.27.

11 See Carney on Hec. 65 (p. 37): "The subject-matter of the H(ecyra) not being intrinsically farcical Terence has had to insert (somewhat inorganic) passages of rather callous humour for the groundlings." And on Hec. 416 (p. 75): "With a fixed background of three houses a Roman playwright had to introduce such inorganic roles (i.e. Sosia) to produce something of the personalities of ordinary life."

cases the success of his plans seems to be in danger, but he pulls through, in the first by taking advantage of the opportunity to be rid of troublesome Clitipho, and in the second by placating Bacchis.¹² Ad. 447 shows Demea under a misapprehension and it also performs certain useful dramatic functions: motivation of entrance (Hegio's and Geta's) and indication of Hegio's relationship to Pamphila and her family.¹⁴ Ad. 540 is similar. A comic element is introduced,¹⁵ Demea's entrance is motivated and his off-stage activity is related.¹⁶

Three passages from the Eunuchus, 292, 549 and 840,¹⁷ are comparable with Menander's Dysk. 574. In all but Eun. 840 a character enters in a state of great emotion with news of what has happened off-stage. But there is a significant difference between the Eunuchus passages and that from the Dyskolos, for what Simiche says in the latter is vital in actuating the plot, whereas Chaerea, on each occasion, reveals no more than his own off-stage movements. Moreover, having done so in the space of delay at 292ff, his off-stage movements are all re-told and amplified in the ensuing dialogue. A similar thing happens at 557ff.¹⁸ Only at 840ff. is the substance of Chaerea's speech

12 Hiatt, 56 describes the deliberate arousal of fear by Bacchis as a 'Momentary Effect'.

13 Hiatt, 53, 'Momentary Effect'. Taken with Ad. 540 it seems likely that delay is prolonged to show just how deeply in the dark Demea is for most of the play. (438)

14 Identification of Hegio is not a function. That has already been done.

15 See above p.32 and n. 13 just above.

16 This is not always of concern to Terence. See Clifford, CJ26, 605-18 (summary on 609).

17 The last two passages, by reason of their length (nine and ten lines respectively), are just outside the limit of this section. But since they are all so alike in function and are all suspected of Terentian intervention it seems best to treat them together.

18 Bickford, Soliloquy 61, classes Eun. 549ff as 'Comment, i.e. exposition of matter which is either plain without the soliloquy or is made plain by other means (cf. Hec. 841). This seems equally applicable to Eun. 292 which he, however, classes as 'Development', i.e. useful exposition during the play.

not repeated. This passage serves the additional purpose of explaining why he still wears the eunuch's garb by which Thais and Pythias must recognise him.¹⁹ Of the three passages this last is, in function, the least dispensable, but in execution the most mechanical.²⁰

The awkwardness of And. 625 has been discussed already.²¹ Is there anything in the subject-matter which suggests why the dramatist sacrificed clarity of movement? Shipp's comment on the passage is worth quoting,²² "The trite moralising and the prosaic language of the monody are typical of earlier comedy as we know it in Plautus."²³ When compared to Dysk. 259 two important differences emerge. First, although Gorgias and Daos are silent throughout the speech of Sostratos, they have remarked on his presence (255ff), and can be imagined to listen attentively. Secondly, Sostratos says he has failed to contact Getas and this leads to his resolve to rely on his own resources. One result of this resolution is Sostratos' decision to go digging with Gorgias. Hence, the situation is clear and the content useful. Neither of these things can be said of And.

19 See 609ff and Donatus i p. 453 on Eun. 840. Hiatt, 79 n.1, classes this passage as 'Futile Eavesdropping'. I disagree for the reasons given above.

20 There is little emotion to justify it as a soliloquy (see Legrand, The New Greek Comedy (translated by J. Loeb, London 1917 - 'Legrand/Loeb') 328-334.

For the possibility of Terentian intervention in these passages see: Rand, 'The Art of Terence's Eunuchus' TAPA 63 (1932) 54-72.

Williams, Tradition and Originality in Roman Poetry (Oxford, 1968 - Trad. and Orig.) 290-1

Denzler, Der Monolog bei Terenz (Zurich, 1968) reviewed by Martin, Gnomon 42 (1970) 364-9 (see especially 365 and by Arnott, CR20 (1970) 185-6 who both cite:

Fraenkel, 'Zur romischen Komodie', Mus. Helv. 25 (1968) 235-242.

Boyance, 'Deux Remarques sur l' "Eunuque" REA 31 (1929) 314-320.

21 28-29

22 Andria (Melbourne, 1960, 2nd ed.) 171. For the likelihood of Terentian intervention see the review of Denzler by Martin, Gnomon 42 p. 366.

23 Marouzeau, Terence. Comedies, Texte et Traduction, Vol. I (Paris,

625. Even in Menander's most artificial passage, Sam. 641, it is made clear that Moschion is aware of Parmenon's presence, even though this introduces the difficulty of explaining why he then fails to address Parmenon.²⁴ Nevertheless, as Sandbach notes,²⁵ Parmenon's speech is worth some sacrifice to realism. This is more than can be said of Charinus'.

One passage in Plautus conveys information which is essential to the progress of the plot: Pseud. 594. Five others contain material which, for one reason or another, is useful for the eavesdropper to know: Amph. 882,²⁶ Cas. 814;²⁷ Merc. 700; Most. 1064; Rud. 1288. In all these passages, apart from the first, the comic element is very much to the fore. Three other passages describe off-stage action which the audience will find useful to know: Amph. 1009; Bacc. 612; Cas. 875. However, it is noteworthy that in the first two passages the useful information is actually conveyed in a very short time. If one compares Bacc. 612 to a passage of similar function in Menander,

24 See above, p.27.

25 On Sam. 641 pp 620-1

26 Hiatt, 83, classes this as 'Futile Eavesdropping'. However, from Alcumena's speech, Iuppiter learns to modify his behaviour and so afterwards tries to placate his 'wife'. Moreover, Alcumena's speech serves to characterise her as a wronged but still noble matrona.

27 Here the information is just the opposite of 'useful' to the eavesdroppers but nevertheless it aims at a deliberate effect. Hiatt, 29 n. 1 and 66. "The wrong impression is deliberately conveyed". See Williams, 'some Aspects of Roman Marriage Ceremonies and Ideals' JRS48 (1958) 17-18.

(note 23 contd.) 1947) p.171 n.2, is even more explicit: "La première partie est un couplet de Charinus aussi peu dramatique que possible: considérations générales, qui peuvent paraître oiseuses sur la moralité du siècle, présentées d'une façon très artificielle, avec des recherches d'expression..."

Dysk. 574, one sees that in Menander expressions of despair are limited to one line and the rest is information; at Bacc. 612 these proportions are reversed. Other passages, relating off-stage action, amount to little more than 'comment' in Bickford's terms.²⁸ (e.g. Cas. 563²⁹; Poen. 961). Four passages have little effect beyond the humorous one which comes from aside remarks (Amph. 499³⁰; Cist. 305; Merc. 272; Most. 431³¹). Three others derive their comic effect from the main speech (Cas. 217³²; Curc. 96; Pers. 470³³).

Finally, four passages which deserve a separate word: Men. 899; Rud. 615, 664, 839. In connection with the first three it is worth recalling Dysk. 574. There, by far the larger part of delay is given over to a description of the actual cause of distress. At Rud. 615 we are obliged to wait nearly twenty-seven lines before receiving like information (641), the intervening passage being devoted to cries for help and exhortations to put wickedness down. This outburst of Trachalio's has unmistakable echoes of tragedy and thus produces

28 See above p.45 n.18.

29 cf. Men. 571 and below p.56-57 for closely similar off-stage activity. See also Legrand/Loeb 330 for a criticism of the passage's naivete.

30 There is some characterisation (see Webster, SLGC² 91), but the main reason for holding back Mercury is undoubtedly to have him make the humorous comments at 506-7 and 510-11.

31 Cist. 305 should probably also be considered here because of the humorous effect of the senex's remarks. But the passage probably also has another, more organic function: to convey the senex's mistake concerning Gymnasium's identity (see Webster, SM² 93-4 and above p.33 n.9.

32 See above p.48 n.29 ref. to Legrand/Loeb.

33 Cf. Poen. 449ff as another example of this kind of wry, ironic, uniquely Plautine humour.

a comic effect. The seriousness of tragedy is again echoed at Rud. 664, but here overt humour is absent. A slight comic note appears at Rud. 839 (see 842-3 and 844-5), but otherwise there is little point in the content of this delay, unless one considers it useful to know that Plesidippus is now up-to-date in his knowledge of recent happenings.

It seems clear, then, that Menander sometimes deliberately prolongs the delay situation in order to achieve certain useful dramatic effects: thematic character contrast (Dysk. 153), welcome light relief (Sam. 283), development of plot (Dysk. 574). Terence follows this practice (development of plot, Ph. 485) but sometimes creates different dramatic effects: suspense (H.T. 562), emphasis of a misconception (Ad. 447 and 540). However, he also uses delay for the sake of mere comment (the Eunuchus passages), and on one occasion permits a delay which is inexplicable in its character movements and subject-matter (And. 625). In common with Menander and Terence, Plautus uses a delay to introduce important material (Pseud. 594), and conveys other useful information in other delays, but even in these the comic element is quite prominent (e.g. Merc. 700). In the majority of cases, although his delays perform the usual functions of motivating entrances and relating off-stage action, it is clear that the delay situation has been extended because of the comic effects that can be derived from it: either from comments or from the main speech itself. Such comic effects include parody of the idiom of tragedy (Rud. 615), irony (Pers. 470) or straightforward jokes (in Curc. 96 which is a humorous situation in itself). It is difficult to classify any passage from Plautus as mere comment since the comic element is hardly ever absent.

Delays between twenty and forty lines in this section occur nowhere in the extant Menander, seven times in Terence, twenty-five times in Plautus.

Two passages from Terence's Heauton Timorumenos involve two sets of conversations.³⁴ In the first, H.T. 242, Clitipho and Clinia are awaiting the arrival of Antiphila. Clinia is very apprehensive because he fears she has been corrupted since he went away. This idea was introduced at 175ff and amplified at 230ff. When Syrus and Dromo enter (242), talking of a troop of handmaids and of all the gold and garments which accompany the two young women, Clinia's worst fears seem to be confirmed. It is not until Clinia has expressed his anguish in an impassioned speech (256ff) that Syrus realises his misunderstanding and clears it up. Here delay is used as a deliberate device to prolong and reinforce Clinia's mistake, and so to produce an effect of suspense.³⁵

If any doubts linger in Clinia's mind about the truth of Syrus' report (274ff), then the conversation of Bacchis and Antiphila as they enter (381) serves to dispel them utterly.³⁶ While providing an opportunity for some moralising, the main function of the conversation is to characterise the two young women. In this way the passage finally resolves the suspense created in the previous scene.³⁷

34 See above, p.21-22 for the situation.

35 On the subject of suspense, see Duckworth, NRC (index 'suspense') and Frank, 'Terence's Contribution to Plot. Construction' AJP49 (1928) 309-22.

36 But Hiatt 81 "the eavesdropping is incidental".

37 See Norwood, the Art of Terence (Oxford, 1923) 45, who praises this episode for its effectiveness as an "interstice".

The setting and precise whereabouts of Chremes and Thais at Eun. 771 have been the subject of much discussion,³⁸ but the purpose of the delay material is quite clear: purely to create comic effect. It is the one notable piece of farcical humour in Terence the like of which is not found in Menander, but frequently in Plautus.³⁹

At Phorm. 231 there are two delays, one before Phaedria steps forward (253), and the other before Geta joins him (286). The first lasts for twenty-three lines, the second for a total of fifty-five. Up to the point where Phaedria comes forward the passage shows that Demipho is aware of what has happened while he has been away, and it portrays his angry reaction to the news. There is also some pertinent reflection on the ways of life to line 246, but lines 247-252 are devoted to comic effect. Here Geta parodies Demipho's reflections in an aside which is abnormally long for Terence.⁴⁰ Thereafter Phaedria's attempts to placate his uncle are presented in dialogue and Geta's aside comments are confined to shorter, more normal observations and remarks.

³⁸ See Duckworth, NRC95 and refs. If Chremes and Thais are on stage then there are eight on at the same time. The delay before the 'army' sees the 'besieged' is then seventeen lines, and before the first address twenty.

³⁹ Norwood, The Art of Terence 67, describes the scene as "a wretched fiasco, not of course merely for Thraso, but for Terence."

See also: Webster, SM² 17, 112, 163;

Williams, Trad. and Orig. 291-2, on Terence's originality here.

Rand, TAPA 63, pp. 66-7, on the question of the scene's existence in Menander's Εὐνοῦχος.

⁴⁰ See above, 36.

Finally, two passages of monologues: And. 236 and Eun. 222. At And. 236ff Terence introduces Pamphilus, shows that he now knows of the marriage and presents his reaction to it.⁴¹ Conveying useful information and characterising Pamphilus are the main functions of the passage; no particular effect is aimed at. Mysis' presence is not necessary for the performance of either function, but Denzler⁴² has shown that overheard monologues are far more common in Terence than in either Menander or Plautus⁴³ and he suggests that Terence may even have remodelled some monologues so as to have them overheard. He believes that in the present passage Mysis has been held over for that purpose. By having a monologue overheard a dramatist may do two things: show the emotional reaction of the listener to what he or she hears; break up the monologue by asides so as to reduce possible tedium. Both effects can be seen in the present passage, but since Mysis is a minor character only, it is more likely that she is introduced for the second reason.

41 See below, 59, for Pamphilus' Plautine counterparts with their more numerous expressions of woe. Monologues by adulescentes in Menander, while admittedly different in circumstance and effect, are generally shorter (e.g. Ep. 908; Sam. 120 and 616)

42 See Martin, Gnomon 42, 366.

43 Denzler's statistics for the monologues of adulescentes are:

Terence	18	overheard	10	not
Menander	1	"	18	"
Plautus	9	"	43	"

(cited by Martin, Gnomon 42, 365).

Eun. 232 is Terence's longest delay in regular delays of this section (thirty-nine). Gnatho's monologue has the dubious distinction of exciting disapproval from one of Terence's greatest admirers, Gilbert Norwood.⁴⁴ It is irrelevant and makes no contribution to the action of the play. Its sole purpose is to moralise and produce comic effect; far from helping the action along, it brings it to a halt.⁴⁵ It also forces Parmeno into an awkward role of virtual silence as he listens in, with only two short asides,⁴⁶ to a speech which can hold very little interest for him.

44 The Art of Terence, 45

45 Rand, TAPA 63, p. 62, makes an unconvincing attempt to justify the monologue: far from interfering with the action Terence is contrasting "two entities: the eternal talk of a rambling, senile egoist (i.e. the senex of 302) with the eternal talk of a smart and self-important egoist; he thus created two coincident acts of dramatic suspense - the suspense of the soldier's purpose by the talk of the parasite and the suspense of Chaerea's purpose by questions of the old man."

Even if Rand is right in his interpretation one may still wonder whether this incidental effect is worth the sacrifice of verisimilitude and the awkwardness of Parmeno as eavesdropper. Does the effect of suspense supposedly created by Gnatho's ramblings really outweigh the tedium and irrelevance of his speech?

46 See Donatus i p. 322 on Eun. 254 for the function of Parmeno's asides as relieving the tedium of a long uninterrupted monologue. See also Boyance REA 31, 316-17 and Martin on Denzler, Gnomon 42, 366 and 368. While it is true that Parmeno must see Pamhila so that he can tell Chaerea where she is, he could do this even if he were to arrive as late as line 265. See Webster, SM²⁶⁸.

In five of these six passages delay has clearly been prolonged for the sake of effects: suspense and characterisation in the H.T. passages, comic effect at Eun. 771 and Ph. 231 (at least in Geta's asides) and moralising at Eun. 232. In this last passage realism is sacrificed to effect. In the sixth passage, And. 236, there is no apparent effect, but the situation is fairly natural. There is the definite possibility, if Denzler is right, that a delay situation exists here simply because Terence wished to have Pamphilus' monologue overheard. (For the seventh passage, Eun. 1025, see pages 77-79.)

Two passages of delay in Plautus are necessary to the plot: Asin. 880 and Bacc. 842. Even so, opportunities for comic effect are not neglected.⁴⁷ One passage, Men. 466, is useful in actuating the plot.⁴⁸ Menaechmus II is on stage, fresh from the entertainments of Erotium's house, brandishing the robe which belongs to his brother's wife and which is the thread holding all the errors together.⁴⁹ Peniculus, exceedingly provoked by Menaechmus II's behaviour, proceeds to tell Menaechmus I's wife of the robe's whereabouts. Two points should be noted, however: a) Peniculus is already annoyed (see 446ff.); b) Peniculus already knows (110ff.) that Menaechmus I has the robe and so he is already in a position to inform.

47 See above, pp. 37-38, for a discussion of these passages.

48 Hiatt 38, "A scene of lesser importance which does, however, add complications of a sort."

49 See Webster, SLGC² 68-9 and Hiatt 38.

Six passages are devoted almost exclusively to comic effect: Asin. 591; Bacc. 640; Most. 313 and 690; Poen. 1174; Trin. 843. Three of these, Asin. 591, Most. 313 and Poen. 1174, have two sets of conversations. The humorous asides of Asin. 591 have already been discussed,⁵⁰ but these are not/only ^{the} comic element in the scene. The situation of the two lovers is in itself funny and the asides provide, as it were, a cynical commentary. There is a more farcical type of humour at Most. 313 where Callidamates enters with Delphium and indulges in some inebriated horse-play. The similarities and differences between Poen. 1174 and Terence's H.T. 242 and 381 have already been touched on.⁵¹ Where Terence creates suspense and then resolves it, Plautus aims at humour coming from aside comments. Both Poen. 1174 and H.T. 381 serve to characterise the young women, it is true, but even in this respect there is a significant difference. The contrast in character between Bacchis and Antiphila is the means by which suspense is finally resolved, i.e. the characterisation is functional. In the Poenulus it is merely incidental, presented for its own sake.⁵² At Most. 690 the dramatist derives comic effect from the actual motive for Simo's entrance, and this humorous speech of his receives a humorous aside commentary from Tranio.⁵³ In contrast, Chrysalus enters without motivation at Bacc. 640. Although comic

50 p. 39.

51 See above, 38-39.

52 On this passage and Poen. 210ff. see Webster, SM² 139

53 See Fraenkel, Elem. Plaut. 416-20

effect is the main element of Chrysalus' speech, his elation is stressed to meet the coming shock. Hiatt,⁵⁴ comparing And. 625, remarks that the mood of the entrant in each case is of prime importance. One might also compare Sam. 641 and note the disparity in length⁵⁵ (Bacc. 640, 27 lines; Sam. 641, 16½ lines) Trin. 843 is humorous in situation rather than in word-play or jest. The passage also appears to have functions of identification and explanation, but the sycophanta is identified by line 850 and his explanation (853ff) is no more than repetition of what we know from 762ff.

Akin to the foregoing passage are those in which the dramatist has clearly been attracted by a picture or idea which is not strictly germane to the plot and which contributes little or nothing to the action. At Men. 571 it is true that the matrona receives direct evidence that her husband has stolen a robe of hers, and this is necessary to the plot. However, this information is conveyed right at the end of Menaechmus I's monologue (598-601) in four lines, while the monologue itself lasts for thirty. The main bulk of the speech describes

54 71 n. 1.

55 See above, 27 and 37. See also Fraenkel, Elem. Plaut. 234-6, on the catechisms of dutiful slaves.

Menaechmus' off-stage action and a picture of the forum and its frequenters.⁵⁶ At Poen. 823 Syncerastus' speech shows us the inside of a leno's establishment and its clientele. Milphio, though he listens with interest (822, 841⁵⁷) learns nothing of importance. Truc. 95 is similar, though here the emphasis falls more upon the behaviour of the clientele. The tone is less comic, more moralistic and the passage itself differs from its Poenulus counterpart in having more dramatic relevance.⁵⁸ A different picture emerges from Men. 753, the picture of old age as the matrona's father hobbles onto the stage.⁵⁹ There is some moralising in this passage, too.⁶⁰ One fact of significance is given at Men. 110, namely that Menaechmus I has stolen a robe from his wife. We also learn that he is on less than amicable terms with her. But these facts are clearly subordinate to the rhetorical effects of 110-126, for the sake of which delay has been prolonged. Fraenkel⁶¹ shows that 'talking back' has here been elaborated into a canticum.

56 Fraenkel, Elem. Plaut. 152-4 and 336-8, takes the passage as a clear example of Plautine expansion. Cf. Cas. 563ff. and see above, p.47, and Webster, SLGC² 70.

57 See below, p.66-67, and Fraenkel, Elem. Plaut. 142-144 (especially 143 for the aside).

58 Fraenkel, De Media et Nova Comoedia Quaestiones Selectae (Göttingen, 1912) p. 87: "poeta... operam dat, ut a nobis, postquam adulescens questibus suis aures nostras implevit, audiatur et altera pars." See also Elem. Plaut. 134 and Enk, Truc. ii, p. 31 quoting Leo and Fraenkel.

59 The picture goes back to Greek tragedy - Euripides, Electra 487ff.

60 Bickford 55 "Development (moralising)".

61 Elem. Plaut. 137.

Three passages have no function or effect beyond characterisation: Capt. 110,⁶² Ep. 104;⁶³ Trin. 402, although none of them is entirely without humour. Capt. 110 may appear so, but there is irony in the situation; for the audience knows that Tyndarus, who will "fly like a bird" if given the chance, is Hegio's own son.

Four passages have scarcely any function or effect at all. At, Trin. 1125, as at Dysk. 691, the important characters begin to assemble for the reconciliation, but in neither passage is anything gained by delay. Lysiteles remains aside because he thinks Callicles and Charmides may say something important concerning him (1136). But his guess proves wrong.⁶⁴ At Poen 1280 Antamoenides enters in justified anger and reviews the events which have caused it.⁶⁵ Then, on seeing the others, he expresses his shock in a spate of rhetorical questions. Although little is achieved in this passage beyond motivation of entrance, it is fairly natural in situation and verisimilitude is stretched only by the rhetoric of 1296ff. The same may be said of Ep. 526-40, where Philippa's entrance speech is cast in the mould of Alcumena's (Amph. 633ff). The important function of the delay, to bring Philippa and Periphanes together, is performed after the two have seen each other (540ff). Even so, up to that point the situation is quite natural and resembles (in situation, though not in length) Terence's Ph. 739. Apart from reiteration (of the deceiving of Pyrgopolynics), delay at M.G. 874 is quite pointless.

62 See Lindsay, Captivi of Plautus, (Methuen 1900) pp. 149-50

63 See Duckworth, Epidicus (Princeton, 1940) on 106-8 (pp. 167-) 110 (p. 171); 121-3 (p. 177).

64 See below, 66-67 on Aul. 475.

65 On 1289-91 see Fraenkel, Elem. Plaut. 17.

The problems associated with Merc. 335 have already been outlined.⁶⁶ As in the case of And. 625,⁶⁷ there is little in the speech of Charinus (Demipho's son) to justify the length of delay and awkwardness involved, though he does present his dilemma in strong terms. The language and mood call to mind Eacc. 612, which was compared with Menander's Dysk. 574⁶⁸ and seen to invert the proportions of factual statement and expressions of despair. Another comparison which suggests itself is with Sam. 120. Supposing Demea to be on stage throughout Moschion's monologue (which is not certain because the text is defective⁶⁹) the resemblance between Merc. 335 and Sam. 120 is strong. There are two points of difference, however: i) Charinus' speech^{is} composed largely of expressions of despair, while Moschion's is tighter narrative; ii) Demeas, so far as one can judge from the defective text, cannot be convicted of that strangely inconsistent behaviour which Demipho exhibits in Mercator.⁶⁶ A further point of difference is the length of the passages. Even if all the fourteen missing lines⁷⁰ belong to Act two of the Samia, the length of delay amounts to twenty-three lines at most, compared with Mercator's thirty.

Williams⁷¹ has an interesting discussion of the final passage in this section, Pseud. 1103. Here Harpax returns from the inn looking for Ballio from whom he intends to collect Phoenicium.

66 See above, 28-29.

67 See above, 46.

68 See above, 47-48.

69 See Sandbach on Sam. 120, p. 557.

70 See OCT Menander p. 236.

71 Trad. and orig. 580.

His entrance monologue, which takes up the first part of the delay, is irrelevant to the play, though some attempts seem to have been made at 1116-20 to link 1103-1115 with the rest of his speech which is useful in motivating Harpax's entrance. Not only are lines 1103-1115 irrelevant, they are also inconsistent with the portrait of Harpax's character as presented at 594ff. and later in the present scene.⁷² In this connection Williams refers to Fraenkel's researches into cantica whose subject is the moral code of slaves, and to his conclusions that such passages are Plautine inventions. Thus far the delay resembles those discussed on page 56 which show the dramatist attracted by a certain picture or idea. However, delay continues, after Harpax concludes his speech, with a seven line aside conversation between Simo and Ballio, resumed, after a line break (1131), for four more lines to 1135. These asides are uncommonly long,⁷³ and have little to do with the matter in hand. The point of the scene is to make Ballio believe he has before him Pseudolus' trickster. But this function is deferred in order to introduce a further misunderstanding whereby Ballio takes Harpax for a prospective client. The sole purpose of this misunderstanding is to provide an opportunity for moralising and humour, deriving from the description of a pimp's clientele. This delay goes one better than those mentioned on page 56 in having two pictures instead of one, neither of which has much bearing on the matter in hand and both of which seem to have been grafted on to a very necessary scene.

⁷² Williams, Trad. and Orig. 580

⁷³ See above, 38.

The majority of Plautus' delays between twenty and forty lines are prolonged for effect. Two delays are vital to the outcome of the play,⁷⁴ thirteen either to comic effect or to the representation of a picture or idea which appealed to the writer. Comic effect is paralleled in Terence, but such representations as at Pseud. 1103 or Truc. 95 are not. On the other hand, Plautus does not produce the kind of effects that Terence does at H.T. 242 and 381, although three of his delays are devoted to characterisation. Apart from Terence's aberrations in the Eunuchus and for a few lines in the Phormio (247ff), Plautus is alone in prolonging delay for the sake of humour. The effects of Terence and Menander (in his longer delays) are generally more subtle and gauged to the prevailing tone of the play where delay comes. In the rare case where Menander fails to produce a particular effect (Dysk. 691) it so happens that delay is more natural than immediate meeting would be. This cannot be said for passages like M.G. 874, Merc. 335 or even Terence's And. 625.

74 One of these, Bacc. 842, is very contrived.

iii) Delays lasting for more than Forty Lines

When delay exceeds forty lines, the regular situation in which one party fails to see another must be extremely awkward unless there are very special circumstances.

Menander has one passage above forty lines, Terence three (two of which are irregular in situation, so see 76-81), Plautus thirteen (for Most. 547ff see 58.60 and for Stich. 196.9lf).

Pataikos and Glykera are examining recognition tokens when Moschion enters at Perik. 774. In his opening monologue Moschion airs his suspicions on the question of his birth and, on seeing Pataikos and Glykera¹ and following their conversation, he finds them confirmed. He is noticed at 827 whereupon meeting undoubtedly takes place. This makes a delay of fifty-three lines. Sandbach² points out various features of the passage, the metre, the echoes of tragedy and elements of parody, which all go to make this quite an unusual recognition scene. Whether the presence of an eavesdropper in such scenes was common or not is impossible to say since there are so few extant (at least, scenes which hinge on recognition tokens). Anyhow, the presence of Moschion in this scene has two effects. His language contrasts with the strong flavour of tragedy, as Sandbach remarks, and so acts as "a constant reminder that they (the exchanges of Pataikos and Glykera) are being conducted in a language that is not of the

1 He probably sees them at about 779. Sandbach (on 774-6, p. 519) thinks he makes a wing entrance, in which case 774-78 may represent the time he takes to reach a 'seeing' position (see above,

2 On 774-6 and 779ff (pp. 519-20) and on 783-4 (pp. 520-1)

workaday world to which he belongs.³ In the second place, we are permitted to see the effect of recognition on two characters at once, for whom it has a different significance. This situation is common both in comedy and tragedy and, depending on the nature of the scene, makes for humour or excitement.⁴ It is true that for this effect it is not strictly necessary for Moschion to be aside, but, on the other hand, it is fairly natural that at this point he should wish to listen in to, rather than take part in, the conversation, and, again, the contrast which he represents as a 'workaday' figure could become uncomfortably incongruous if he were more active in the scene. The obvious care with which Menander has constructed this unusual recognition scene points to delay having been deliberately prolonged.

The first part of Terence's one regular delay, Ph. 231, has been discussed on page 51. After Phaedria comes forward (253) Geta remains aside for a further thirty-one lines, making a total of fifty-five lines between Demipho's entrance and his meeting with Geta. Geta's long spell in aside is not as awkward as it might be. In the first place he has Phaedria's company for a long part of it, and after Phaedria goes Geta's interest in the conversation before him is obvious and is expressed in four aside comments (259, 268, 278, 285). In fact, it is the first, shorter part of the delay which is the more unusual, that and the situation itself in which one aside

3 On 779ff. p. 520

4 E.g. Plautus' Rud. 1129ff and Sophocles' O.T. 1054-1072

character stays back while the other goes forward. Sam. 451 appears to be the only other example of such a situation in New Comedy.

Six delays in Plautus are of roughly the same length as Perik. 774 and Ph. 231. They are: Aul. 475 (61 lines); Bacc. 405(51); Cist. 536(61); Pseud. 415(41); 790⁵(66); Truc. 775 (52). In three of these passages, Bacc. 405, Cist. 536, Truc. 775, eavesdroppers show approximately the same degree of involvement with the main speech as at Perik. 774.

At Truc. 775 six and a half lines of humourless asides indicate Diniarchus' horrified reaction to the gradual discovery of his responsibility for the child's birth. His failure to come forward is extremely well motivated by fear, repeatedly referred to (773f, 786, 818, 824). Apprehension keeps Melaenis back at Cist. 536 (see 535). The sound of Lampadio's voice as he relates his off-stage action (536-42) brings Phanostrata outside.⁶ The ensuing conversation is important both to Melaenis and to the subsequent action of the play, and information is conveyed with little embellishment. Melaenis obviously has keen interest in the conversation as her asides

5 Prescott, CP31, 111 and HSCP XXI (1910) 41-44, believes that the puer who speaks 767-789 is not the same as the puer addressed at 855-64 and who speaks 891-2. If he is right then there is no delay since, still according to Prescott, the puer delicatus of 767-89 departs after his monologue. In including this passage as a delay I have followed Kurrelmeyer, The Economy of Actors in Plautus (Graz, 1932) 21 (cited by Prescott) who assumes that there is only one puer in the play.

6 Plainly a piece of dramatic convenience, for the writer wishes to have Lampadio divulge his important information in dialogue.

show, even though they contain characterically Plautine humour.⁷ It is perhaps significant that in a similar situation (Menander's Ep. 442). Habrotonon has no aside comments. Mnesilochus, at Bacc. 405, has five lines in aside which expresses his indignation and sorrow that a friend should be held to blame for his own shortcomings. The object of this eavesdropping scene is to elicit from Mnesilochus expressions of loyalty which, when he enters on his misunderstanding (489ff), will turn to bitter resentment at the betrayal of his trust. In this way we are treated to a swift and ironic change of attitude and we also gain some insight into the impetuous nature of Mnesilochus. Such are the subtle effects characteristic of Menander and Terence. In all this Lydus' tirade against modern education is no more than a colourful digression.⁸

Pseudolus is not so intimately involved as the foregoing eavesdroppers at Pseud. 415. Nevertheless, from the conversation of Simo and Callipho he does learn that Simo is now on his guard⁹ and he remarks on this in an unusually long aside (422-26).¹⁰ The rest of the conversation turns on methods of education and serves to characterise Simo and Callipho. Later in the same play the puer, after delivering a dramatically useless monologue (767-789),¹¹ remains in silence for over one hundred lines, though he is addressed at 855. He announces the arrival of Ballio and the cook at 788, but gives no sign of any intentions to eavesdrop.

7 Compare Cist. 573 with Rud. 1161.

8 Cf. passages discussed above, 56.

9 See Hiatt, 47-9 and Prescott, CP34, 21

10 See Fraenkel, Elem. Plaut. 205-6, for the way Plautus has expanded this aside.

11 See Ernout, Plaute. Comedies, Texte et Traduction, Vol. VI (Paris, 1938) p. 68 n.1.

Indeed, it is difficult to see what interest the ridiculous and totally irrelevant conversation of Ballio and the cook can hold for him, and this makes his inactivity very awkward.¹² It is obvious that this cook scene exists solely for the humour it creates. Menander and Terence have similar scenes commonly used for light relief, but there is a great difference in the length of theirs and Plautus': Asp. 216-18 lines; Sam. 283-13 lines; Terence's Hec. 415-13 lines; Plautus' Pseud. 790-66 lines.

Although Megadorus' speech at Aul. 475 doubtless appeals to Euclio's thrifty nature, and although Euclio twice¹³ professes such keen interest in the speech that he cannot bring himself to end it, his involvement in the front speech is slight when compared with Moschion's and the three eavesdroppers mentioned on page 64. Prescott¹⁴ is doubtless right when he says that Euclio's asides serve to break up the monotony of the monologue. But this is not their sole purpose. Megadorus' moralising monologue, although it arises naturally out of the current events, is long-winded, and the bulk of it is as irrelevant to the plot

12 Prescott, CP 32, 196, observes that the silence of supernumeri, since it occurs frequently, cannot have upset Roman audiences all that much. However, if the puer speaks 767-789 he cannot be described as a supernumeri. Mr. Lowe suggests to me that the puer's monologue has possibly been added by Plautus instead of an act division in the original. In the Greek, he suggests, the puer will have returned with the slave-dealer from the market and there will have been no delay in meeting.

13 496 and 523-4.

14 CP 34, 19.

as the conversation of Pataikos and Glykera is vital.¹⁵ By putting into Euclio's mouth the rather blatant avowals of interest at 496 and 523-4,¹⁶ the dramatist, in addition to motivating Euclio's failure to come forward and giving him something to do during his long spell aside, attempts to justify the monologue in dramatic terms and to persuade the audience that it is interesting.

The case of Stasimus, in a delay of seventy-eight lines at Trin. 627, lends weight to this suggestion. At 625-6 he accounts for his subsequent activity by announcing his intention to eavesdrop, and his exclamation at line 705 clearly indicates that he has been listening in with keen attention. In the meantime, however, he is silent. Both Menander and Terence have examples of silent aside characters (e.g. Gorgias and Daos at Dysk. 259, Pamphilus at Hec. 415), but in such cases delay is comparatively short. The only character in Terence, Antipho at Ph. 606ff, who is aside for a long time is given if not long, at least regular asides. The lack of asides in the present passage may be taken as a pointer to the importance and interest of the young men's discussion: there is no need to draw attention to its interest. Insofar as the play represents the conflict of opposing attitudes to life this discussion, cast in the form of an agon, is climactic and quite intense, and this does much to relieve, if not remove the awkwardness of Stasimus' silence. Why is Stasimus there at all? Prescott¹⁷ says that he gets comfort from overhearing the dialogue and justifies his presence thus. Hiatt, however, describes ^{the eavesdropping} as 'futile'.

16 See above, 58. 17 CP 34, 22

15 Hiatt, 74-5, "Futile Eavesdropping". Fraenkel, Elem. Plaut., 130-2, shows Plautus' considerable expansion of this passage.

The remaining four delays extend considerably beyond one hundred lines: Amph. 153 (139); Most. 157 (135); Poen. 210 (123); Pseud. 133 (139). No delay of Menander or Terence in any section remotely approaches these great lengths.

In striking contrast to Trin. 627, the loquacity of the eavesdroppers at Poen. 210 is such that asides account for over one third of the total length of delay, 42½ lines in 123. Milphio calls Agorastocles out from his house at line 205 to look at the women who are on their way to Venus' temple. This provides a fair reason for the two men to stand and ogle without, for the time being, interrupting. Anterastilis and Adelphasium enter discussing respective modes of behaviour - a common topic of conversation among meretrices in New Comedy and one which lends itself well to character portrayal.¹⁸ Like Terence's H.T. 242 and 381 the passage requires four speaking parts, but it differs from those two passages in one important respect: whereas in Terence the asides arise naturally out of the front speech, those of Milphio and Agorastocles have, at best, only a slight connection with what the women say (248, 271, 324) and, for the most part, no connection at all (255, 289, 308). Moreover, individual asides are abnormally long: 324ff is five lines, 308ff five and a half, 255ff and 289ff eight, 271ff twelve. One of these, 289ff, also breaks the flow of the women's dialogue, for Anterastilis' words at 297 are clearly a direct response to line 288. Menander's longest aside appears to be at Fab. Inc. 2ff, five and a half lines, and this may simply fill the time it takes

¹⁸ See below, 70 and note 22 ref.

for Kleainetos to cross the stage.¹⁹ Terence has five asides of over four lines: Eun. 297 (4½); 1053 (7½); H.T. 256 (7); 397(5); Ph. 247(6). All, apart from the last, are natural reactions to the situation revealed by the front speech. Ph. 247 is the only example of a long aside devoted purely to comic effect, whereas there are at least three such in the Poenulus passage alone (255, 271, 289) all longer than Ph. 247.

Delay at Poen. 210 has clearly been prolonged with the result that comic effect, coming from the aside conversation, supplements the more dramatic function of character portrayal. In this, as in other respects, the passage has affinities with Poen. 1174 (see above p.55). Fraenkel²⁰ has shown that the content of the long asides points to Plautine authorship.

Asides are also a prominent feature of Most. 157. Philolaches gives no indication that he is aware of the presence of Philematium and Scapha until his first aside (161), and gives no reason for staying back. We must assume that his reason is the same as Agorastocles', i.e. he wishes to ogle his beloved. In neither passage is the dramatist at pains to give a natural motivation, and it seems likely that he has his eavesdroppers remain aside purely and simply to exploit the possibilities of

19 It is not clear whether Kleainetos comes from the house or the wing (see Sandbach on 19-22, p. 686-7). If from his house it seems very odd that, asking, "Τίς ὁ βούων ἐστίν....;" he should fail to accost the culprits on seeing them, or, if he does not see them immediately, take six lines to do so. To see who is there is his reason for coming out, after all. On the other hand six lines is about the time it takes for a wing entrant to reach those already on stage (see above, 21).

20 Elem. Plaut. 208-10 on the asides and 36-7, 134 and 161 on parts of the main speech.

humour which comes from their aside comments.²¹ Some characterisation of Philematium²² is achieved by way of a discussion on the relationship of men and women, particularly women of her own status, and Philolaches is a frequent point of reference. To this extent he is more closely involved with the front speech than his Poenulus counterparts and his comments, though generally jokes, do arise out of what the women say. Nowhere do the remarks reach great length (the longest, 161ff, is four and a half lines), nor do they seriously interrupt the dialogue but, as at Poen. 210ff, the primary effect of the passage is comic.²³

Whereas the main effect of the two passages just discussed comes from comments of the eavesdroppers, at Pseud. 133 it is the main speech, Ballio's canticum, which dominates. Asides number but twenty in one hundred and forty lines and once the canticum begins Calidorus and Pseudolus are silent for nearly sixty lines. Meanwhile Ballio presents, "...one of the greatest cantica Plautus ever wrote "which" has only the very slightest basis in the Greek play."²⁴ Much has been written on Plautus' handling of the

21 Williams, JRS 48, 27, puts it another way, "...it seems likely that the forced dialogue between Scapha and Philematium is only intended to give an opportunity for the amusing asides of Philolaches in 229f., 233f., and 237f."

22 See Webster SLGC² 133.

23 For Plautus' handling of the scene see Williams JRS 48, 27 and Trad. and Orig. 402-404. Also Fraenkel, Elem. Plaut. 35, 100, 168 for Plautine elements and 129n. 3 for a discussion of 273-281.

24 Williams, Trad. and Orig. 286.

canticum²⁵ and needs no repeating here, but it is worthwhile pointing out some problematic features which generally accompany long delays. Much of the passage is irrelevant to the plot of the play. By the end of the first scene we expect soon to hear of Phoenicium's fate at the hands of her owner, Ballio. In fact we have to wait for ninety-two lines before she is even mentioned (225ff). Calidorus and Pseudolus wait too, though there is no apparent reason why they should not approach Ballio about her straightaway. They remain silent for nearly sixty lines. Stasimus, at Trin. 627ff., is silent for a longer time and he does not have the resource of by-play,²⁶ but then the dialogue he overhears is important to him. Not until line 225 do Calidorus and Pseudolus hear anything that concerns them. At two points, 201 and 230, they engage in aside conversations of great length (eight and eleven lines respectively) at which points the problem of silence is transferred to Ballio. Moreover the aside at line 201ff. appears to break the flow of Ballio's speech in much the same way as Poen. 289ff. Pseud. 133 is reminiscent of those passages discussed on page 56 insofar as it is the representation (developed to a greater length than the earlier examples) of an attractive idea, but one which has no organic part in the play as a whole. Nothing in Terence or Menander matches it for style, length or irrelevance.

25 See, for example, Williams, Trad. and Orig. 286-8; Fraenkel, Elem. Plaut. 136-42 for a general analysis of the canticum, and 17, 28, 53, 71 for Plautine details and p. 217 on 243ff.

26 See Prescott, CP 32, 196.

Finally, Amph. 153-292.²⁷ This passage is made up of three sections: i) 153-175: Sosia admires his own bravery and complains about the thoughtlessness and lack of consideration of slave-masters.

ii) 180-262: After an aside from Mercury Sosia considers the dangers he may have brought on himself through his neglect to thank the gods for his safe return. His thoughts then turn to the war and he wonders what account of it he shall give to Alcumena. The detailed account fills lines 203-261, interrupted by one aside from Mercury (248 -9).

iii) 263-292: As he makes towards the house Sosia notices how long the night has been - a good occasion for night-prowlers to ply their trade. There are many asides from Mercury.

Mercury's part in this scene is interesting. At line 150 he announces his intention to drive Sosia away from the house but waits for nearly two hundred lines before even addressing him directly.²⁸ He makes no mention of withdrawal, but it must be assumed that this is what he does. His activity is not consistent throughout the three sections. In all Mercury has twenty-two asides. Throughout Section i he is completely silent; then he has a four line aside (176-179). In Section ii he speaks only three lines in eighty-two (185 and 248-9). In Section iii he speaks no fewer than fifteen lines in thirty (263-70;²⁹ 277-8, 284-6, 289-90). In the first two sections, then, Mercury has a

27 For 292ff see below, p.116, under 'Both see Each Other'.

28 From 263 we must infer that Sosia has stopped on his way across the stage and Mercury is only waiting for him to approach the house.

29 A very long aside - eight lines.

very limited role,³⁰ only eight lines in one hundred and seven. These aside. comments on Sosia's monologue have a faintly comical effect, but serve mainly to remind the audience of Mercury's presence and show that he is listening in (e.g. 247-8). In the third section Mercury's increased activity heralds the scene of bantering-at-a-distance, though, as yet, the asides still come in blocks and are not in the 'tit-for-tat' style of 292ff. All of them are dependent on what Sosia says.

Of all Plautus' long passages of delay only at Pseud. 133 does Ballio's "front" speech approach the domination of Sosia's here. However at Pseud. 133 there are two eavesdroppers who, during their long spell of silence, may be imagined to exchange glances and inaudible remarks. Mercury, being alone, is without this resource. Prescott³¹ describes the present scene as "largely a caricature" of a messenger speech³² in a Greek tragedy and feels that Mercury's silence "should have been easily tolerated by an audience used to the silence of such auditors in tragedy." He goes on to admit, however, that the passage is of great length and concludes, "Ordinarily a single listener would be difficult to manage during so long a soliloquy, but Mercury's puckish humour may have relieved the tension." I find this argument unconvincing and feel that the passage is merely awkward. Terence,

30 Webster, SLGC² 90, discussing Sosia's battle description, says, "Plautus may have expanded and to some extent Romanised his original; it seems, for instance, hardly likely that a Greek poet would have left Hermes on the stage during this long narrative which is not addressed to him." He suggests (94-5) that Hermes leaves the stage after his prologue.

31 CP32, 200

32 But see Webster, SLGC² 89-90, who takes the scene to be a parody of tragic recognition scenes.

it is true, does allow one of his characters to remain aside for over sixty lines (Antipho at Ph. 606)³³ but he has a great interest in what is being said, unlike Mercury.

It is difficult to ascribe any one function to the passage, but obviously comic effect is an important element of the scene. The comic effect of the first section does not come from asides but from Sosia, the figure he cuts - incongruous in his boastfulness and fear - and from the irony of which he is the object when he innocently mentions his fear of what later actually happens to him. When Mercury does have an aside (176-79) it is Sosia who takes the humour by his unconscious echo of Mercury's remark.³⁴ The battle description (186ff) is not particularly funny but it is a vivid, exciting narrative, a high spot to rank alongside Chrysalus' Troy canticum (Bacc. 925ff) and Ballio's hetairae parade (Pseud. 133ff). Like these, the battle description has no organic function in the plot, but exists for its own sake. Indeed, when considered from that angle there is little in the entire opening scene of Amphitruo that is necessary for what follows. At 263ff. humour reasserts itself and the passage begins to resemble those in which asides contribute significantly to the comic effect.³⁵

33 See above, 67.

34 179-80. The echo, emphasised by alliteration, is a mark of the lack of dramatic illusion in the entire scene.

35 This passage has been the subject of close scrutiny by those attempting to sift the Greek from the Roman. See Genzmer, Der Amphitruo des Plautus und sein griechisches original (Kiel, 1956), reviewed by Williams, JRS48 (1958) 220-1; Fraenkel, Elem. Plaut. 172-5 (for the beginning of Sosia's monologue), 134 and 200 (for details in the scene which are almost certainly Roman) and 332-5 (for Roman tragedy as a source for the style of Sosia's battle description). Reiss, 'Notes on Plautus' CQ35 (1941) 155-6. See also refs. above, p.73 notes 30, 31, 32. Though conclusions often conflict, that Plautus has contributed much of his own material to this scene is generally agreed.

Although it is unwise to draw firm conclusions from data which permits so little direct comparison of the three dramatists, it is still worthwhile to note certain points which do emerge. In the first place, delays lasting for more than forty lines occur far more frequently in Plautus than in either Terence or Menander. On average there is one such delay of regular situation in every two plays of Plautus, one in the six of Terence, and only one in all that remains of Menander's work. This delay of Menander's, Perik. 774, presents the following features: it lasts for 53 lines; during delay the true identity of the main characters is revealed, and for this reason it is indispensable; and finally, the eavesdropper, Moschion, is intimately involved in what is going on. The conclusion that delay has been deliberately prolonged for the sake of certain unusual effects is unavoidable. Ph. 231 falls into two distinct halves, two distinct delays, and in that respect is unlike anything in Menander or Plautus. The argument between Demipho and Phaedria is engaging, and Geta is no awkward eavesdropper, for he is interested in what is being said and expresses his interest by means of asides. Only the first half of the delay presents problems in the form of a long aside which interrupts Demipho's speech and which is unusual for Terence, since it is devoted purely to comic effect. Plautus' delays can be summed up as follows: seven are of comparable length with Perik. 774 and Ph. 231,³⁶ less than half can be described as indispensable.³⁷ The

³⁶ Three passages are more than twice the length of Perik. 774 and Ph. 231.

³⁷ At least one of these, Bacc. 405, contains irrelevant material - Lydus' speech on education.

rest contain matter which is largely irrelevant, and less than half the passages have an eavesdropper with roughly the same degree of involvement as Moschion. The rest have eavesdroppers who either have no involvement at all, or who play a great, but inorganic, part in their scenes. In the case of all but the indispensable passages delay has been deliberately prolonged either for purely comic effect, or in order to set forth an idea which obviously attracted the dramatist, but which has scarcely any function in the play as a whole.

Before moving on to servus currens scenes consideration must be given to a small group of passages in which the regular situation of one party failing to see another is somewhat complicated by the appearance on the scene of a third, and in one case, fourth party. Terence has five passages of this type.

In the first of these, And. 404, Simo enters and fails to see the on-stage characters, Davos and Pamphilus, until 416. Meanwhile a third party, Byrria, arrives on the scene and he eavesdrops on the conversation of the other three. He then departs (431), unseen throughout his stay. Later in the same play (957) it is the on-stage character, Pamphilus, who fails to see the entrant, Charinus. Before these two meet, Davos appears and addresses Pamphilus straightaway. At 974 Charinus steps forward and, finally, meeting takes place. At Eun. 394 Thraso and Gnatho fail to see the entrant, Parmeno. Before they have a chance to, Thais and Pythias arrive (454) and converse with the soldier and his parasite. At 461 Parmeno decides to come

forward and he meets all. Eun. 1025 is more complicated. Here, Thraso and Gnatho are unaware of Parmeno's presence and he of theirs. Chaerea enters (1031), seen by all, but seeing only Parmeno. These two talk and then Parmeno departs (1042). Now a fourth party enters, Phaedria, (1049), again seen by all but seeing only Chaerea with whom he converses. Finally, Thraso and Gnatho approach, and all four characters meet (1061). The last passage is Ph. 591. The situation is 'Neither Sees the Other' until Geta catches sight of the old men at 600. He decides to approach them, but before he does so Antipho enters, unseen but seeing all. Geta approaches the two old men (609) and Antipho remains aside, eavesdropping, until Geta is alone (682), when these two meet.

Some interesting points emerge from even a brief study of these passages. First of all, in four of the five passages (And. 957 is the exception) there are four speaking characters on stage at the same time - something which is without parallel in the extant Menander.³⁸ Secondly, four of these passages come from two plays (Andria and Eunuchus) which we know, from Donatus and from Terence himself,³⁹ to include characters not in the main original source. Thirdly, the passages exhibit unsatisfactory, or for Terence, unusual features of dramatic technique. For example, although Byrria's presence has little impact on And. 404ff, his entrance speech, short though it is, awkwardly holds up the action,

³⁸ Sandbach 16-19.

³⁹ See Donatus i, p. 118 on And. 301 and Terence, Eun. 30-1. See also Ludwig, 'The Originality of Terence' GRB 59 (1968) 173 and n.8, and Fantham, 'Women in New Comedy' Phoenix 29 (1957) 52n. 24.

and his appearance is motivated in a most mechanical way.⁴⁰ What is more, the whole twelve and a half line delay, apart from Simo's opening words and those at 416, consists of asides spoken by Pamphilus, Davos and then Byrria, when he enters. A proportion of eleven aside lines in twelve and a half is excessive even by Plautus' standards.⁴¹ Antipho's entrance at Ph. 606 is mechanical like Byrria's. Antipho, moreover, has the longest spell in aside of any character in Terence, seventy-six lines, a figure approached only at Eun. 394 (sixty-eight lines) which is another irregular delay.⁴² Finally, if the parts played by imported characters in the contaminated play Andria are excised, then the regular situation of 'One Party Fails to see the Other' is restored: And. 404, the entrant (Simo) fails to see two on-stage characters (Davos, Pamphilus); And. 951, the entrant (Davos) fails for a moment to see the on-stage character (Pamphilus). The situations in Eunuchus are a little more complicated, but on Webster's reconstruction of Eun. 394,⁴³ Parmeno does not arrive on stage until 462, and so there is no delayed meeting involving him. At Eun. 1025, if the parts of

40 Fantham, Phoenix 29, 52 n. 25, refers to the awkwardness of this passage in support of her suggestion that Byrria and Charinus in the Andria are "ad hoc" inventions, rather than borrowings.

41 See above, 37, on Bacc. 842 (18/30)

42 Denzler (see above p. 52 n. 43) has shown that overheard monologues are far more frequent in Terence than in either Menander or Plautus. The similarity to one another of the passages discussed in the text above, the fact that known "imported" characters play a part in these eavesdropping scenes, the presence of four speaking characters on stage at the same time, the unusual technical features that crop up, all these things suggest the possibility that Terence had a hand in making some of his dialogues overheard, too.

Thraso and Gnatho are removed, a situation in which two parties of entrants (Chaerea and then Phaedria) fail to see an on-stage character (Parmeno) is reached.

There are no exactly comparable situations in Menander. At Dysk. 206 Sostratos is making a re-entrance and so cannot really be described as a 'third party'. In fact, it is Davos' entrance in that passage which bears the strongest resemblance to those of Antipho and Byrria, and a comparison is instructive: his words convey no merely mechanical motivation of his entrance and the little speech itself, far from halting the action of the play, actually helps verisimilitude by allowing a convincing lapse of time for Sostratos to fetch the water.⁴⁴ Nor is Ep. 430 analogous. In the first place, Syriscus, the third party, comes and goes before the meeting of Onesimus and Habrotonon takes place. Then again, Syriscus becomes actively involved in the scene as soon as he enters: he is not merely an eavesdropper like Antipho, Byrria or, for that matter, Parmeno. Finally, it is obvious that Syriscus' entrance at this point has an important bearing on the progress of the play as a whole; more so, at any rate, than the entrances of Terence's characters.

One further point of difference between Ep. 430 and the Terentian passages is that its basic situation is 'Neither Sees the Other'. This is the case, too, with Plautus' Men. 966 and the beginning of Rud. 89. Men. 966 does pose some problems of

⁴⁴ See Sandbach on Dysk. 204, p. 168.

dramatic technique,⁴⁵ but these are not caused by the presence of the third party (the senex). Rud. 89 is virtually the same in situation as Ep. 430, the only difference being that Daemones (the third party) remains on stage to meet Plesidippus (the entrant). The end of Casina (937ff) has a third party in Chalinus, but, like Syriscus, his appearance is important - one could hardly imagine the play concluding without the re-emergence of this vital character to bait the unhappy Lysidamus. A fourth passage, Cist. 536,⁴⁶ appears, on the surface, to be closer to those from Terence until it is realised that Melaenis, the eavesdropper (in that function corresponding to Antipho, Eyrria and Parmeno) is actually the on-stage character and has not been grafted onto the scene in the way that Antipho and Byrria have. Moreover, she hears things of immense importance, not only to herself, but to the outcome of the plot. In this case the presence of the third party, Phanostrata, enables Lampadio to reveal his findings in dialogue. One passage from Plautus which does closely resemble those from Terence is Most. 532.⁴⁷ Tranio is on-stage character and sees the danista as he enters. Before the danista sees him, Theopropides appears on the scene and engages Tranio in conversation. At 562 Tranio makes away from his master towards the danista with whom he argues until 609 when Theopropides returns to the action.

45 See below, 96.

46 See above, 64.

47 See Prescott, CP32, 207

Theopropides' presence has two effects on the staging of this scene: i) It increases the length of time the denista has to hang around without seeing Tranio (28 lines); ii) it imposes on Theopropides himself an awkward spell of inactivity while Tranio argues with the denista (49 lines). If his entrance were deferred until the time he enters into the three-cornered conversation of 615ff, the situation would be regular and awkward spells of inactivity avoided. Nothing much would be lost, for the conversation of 547-62 is not pursued.⁴⁸

⁴⁸ See Fraenkel, "Two Poems of Catullus" *JRS* 51 (1961) 50-1 for the Roman practice of flagitatio in this scene.

iv) Servus Currens Scenes

Passages which present the figure of the running slave by and large fall into the category of 'One Party Fails to See the Other',¹ and for this reason they are treated here as a special case² of that category. A considerable amount of literature³ has been devoted to servus currens scenes, and the general characteristics and functions of them are so well documented that they do not require reiteration here. Nevertheless, it is worthwhile briefly examining the passages in the light of new Menandrian material which appears almost certainly in one, and I believe in two places,⁴ to provide a Greek precedent for the Roman scenes.

Figures for the length of delay in meeting in servus currens scenes are as follows:

	<u>MENANDER</u>	<u>TERENCE</u>	<u>PLAUTUS</u>
1-10 lines	-	40	30
10-20	-	40	10
20-30	50	20	30
30-40	50	-	-
40+	-	-	30

1 All of Terence's passages do. The situations in Menander's passages are unclear, but both probably come under 'Both See Each Other' (see below, 106 and Appendix). Six of Plautus' passages come under the present heading, two (Capt. 781 at first, and Most. 348) under 'Neither Sees the Other', two (Ep. 1 and 192) under 'Both See Each Other'.

2 'Special' because servus currens scenes are a convention in themselves.

3 See Duckworth, 'The Dramatic Function of the Servus Currens in Roman Comedy' in Classical Studies presented to Edward Capps (Princeton, 1936) 93-102.

4 See Anderson, 'A New Menandrian Prototype for the Servus Currens of Roman Comedy', Phoenix 24 (1970) 229-36. See also below, Appendix p. 124.

The normal situation of a servus currens scene is unnatural. A character bearing news fails, or pretends to fail, to see the person for whom the news is intended. The longer this situation lasts the more unnatural it becomes. Moreover, the eventual recipient of the news is generally slow to come forward,⁵ but this can partly be explained by two circumstances. Very often the asides of the recipients show that they do not hear or, at least clearly understand, what the slave is saying or why he is upset. (e.g. Asp. 403, Mis. 311; Ad. 308; Ph. 184; Asin. 285; Stich. 288).

The frequent occurrence of such aside remarks suggests that they are virtually a convention in themselves. The second circumstance is the emotional state of the entrant. This factor also helps to relieve the extreme artificiality of the entrant's failure to see, though in Plautus this failure is normally so contrived that it must be regarded mainly as a convention without natural motivation.

Asides play little part in the passages of Terence and Menander, though the eavesdropper is never completely silent and always has something to do. Plautus gives his eavesdroppers more to say but only at Asin. 267 do aside comments challenge the dominance of the front speech.

The number of lines given to the servus currens himself by Menander is greater than it is in Terence but smaller than in Plautus. At Asp. 399 Daos has approximately fifteen lines, while

⁵ This is not so in the two Menander passages.

Getas at Mis. 284 has approximately thirty-one. The longest speech in Terence is at Ad. 299, about twenty lines, with Ph. 179 about twelve lines, coming next. Plautus' longest speech is at Trin. 1008, about fifty lines, followed by Stich. 274, thirty-nine, Capt. 781, thirty-five, and Curc. 280, twenty-two.

To what extent do these speeches bear on the news which the slaves bring? Getas' at Mis. 284 bears closely since the bulk of his speech is devoted to a recitation of the off-stage conversation which is his news. Daos at Asp. 399, on the other hand, gives a broad hint in 400-403, but thereafter utters expressions of woe culled from tragedy. This has two effects: it provides amusement in hearing a slave quote tragedy, and it creates suspense by deferring delivery of news. Three of Terence's passages bear very closely on the slave's news and two of them (Eun. 643;⁶ Ph. 179) actually divulge it. The third, Ad. 299, is as closely connected to the news as possible, without actually revealing it. It is interesting to note that Geta's agitation is not so much a result of his haste as a reaction to the news he brings. And. 338 and Ph. 841 have more tenuous links with the news, but then both speeches are comparatively short (3½ and 4½ lines respectively).

In only one of Plautus' speeches, Most. 348ff,⁷ is the substance of the news revealed. The remainder have scarcely any bearing at all on the message, and the majority are aimed simply at producing

6 This passage is extremely well motivated too. Pythias is in a terrible state of indignation and agitation, while Phaedria is understandably confused, and even afraid (644).

7 Even here, once the news is revealed (353), the passage is given over to comic effect.

comic effect;⁸ even descriptions of the nature of the news are couched in amusingly exaggerated terms (e.g. Asin. 268ff; Capt. 768ff; cf. Ph. 841-2). Plautus' slaves are mainly preoccupied with the obstacles they have to surmount, including their own tardiness, in order to find the recipient (e.g. Capt. 790ff; Curc. 280ff; Merc. 115ff; Stich. 280ff). So often do passages of this nature occur that it is obvious they are stock elements of Plautus' servus currens scenes (Ph. 847ff. is the only passage in Terence which resembles them). Their relevance to the actual message is minimal, and in this respect they reflect the use of quotations at Asp. 399. Terence's passages are closer to Mis. 284.

The actual meeting of participants in servus currens scenes is by no means a simple process. The use of similar phrases in the meeting process by Plautus and Terence will be examined in a later chapter.⁹ It is enough to note here that in the Roman passages there is nearly always a delay even after both parties become aware of each other's presence (e.g. Ph. 847ff; Trin. 1059ff; Curc. 304ff). Menander's two passages belong to a different dramatic situation (Both See Each Other), and so it is dangerous to compare them, in this respect, with the Roman ones.

⁸ Duckworth, 'Dramatic Function of Servus Currens' 102, "If, as Schild believes, the use of the running slave in Terence reflects its use in Greek Comedy, then we are perhaps indebted to Plautus for his development of the suspense of uncertainty in his treatment of these particular scenes." However, Plautus' tendency to introduce comic effect wherever possible makes the question of whether he consciously employed comic devices in servus currens scenes to intensify suspense, or whether he used them for their own sake, at least a debatable one.

Trin. 1008 is an exception to the rule of comic effect. Stasimus' speech is not very funny. The introduction of his ring, irrelevant in itself, merely provides an opportunity to moralise.

⁹ pp. 119-123.

Nevertheless, it does appear that once the pretence of unawareness is dropped meeting takes place immediately.

Before leaving the subject of servus currens scenes it will be useful to recall conclusions reached by Duckworth in his study of the passages.¹⁰ After comparing the length of delay between meeting and delivery of news in the Roman passages and finding the delay to be, in general, far longer in Plautus, he suggests that Plautus is responsible for the development of suspense in such scenes.¹¹ Asp. 399 certainly seems to confirm this suggestion insofar as there is no delay whatsoever between meeting and delivery of news, but on the other hand, any delay in a situation where news is anticipated will help to create suspense. The delays of Asp. 399 and Mis. 284 are significantly long by Menander's standards,¹² and, apart from the humour of Asp. 399, it is difficult to see for what purpose these delays have been prolonged if it is not to create suspense.

Duckworth also distinguishes three types of passage:

i) Those in which the spectator has no foreknowledge of the message. Six passages from Plautus came under this heading,¹³ none from Terence. ii) Those in which the spectator has no foreknowledge but is told of the message immediately: One passage from Plautus and one from Terence.¹⁴ iii) Those in which

10 'Dramatic Function of Servus Currens' 101-2

11 See p. 85 n. 8

12 Compare the figures on pages 15 and 82.

13 Asin. 267, Capt. 768, Curc. 768, Ep. 1 Merc. 111, Stich. 274

14 Most. 348, Ph. 179.

the spectator has foreknowledge and suspense comes from the anticipation of the news' effect on the characters. One from Plautus, four from Terence¹⁵ and now Asp. 399¹⁶ come under this heading.

The extent to which each dramatist purposely prolongs delay for the sake of suspense is difficult to define. Menander's delays are uncharacteristically long and, Asp. 399 particularly inorganic. For these reasons, I think his main intention is to create suspense. Terence's delays are much shorter, but features such as the broken dialogue at Ad. 323ff., And. 346ff. and Ph. 198ff, suggest that he, too, was aware of the possibilities of creating suspense by deferring the actual delivery of news. Few of his delays between meeting and delivery appear to have any other effect. Plautus, on the other hand, so often uses all kinds of delay for comic purposes that the possibility of suspense being incidental to servus currens delays at least deserves consideration.

In conclusion, one may readily agree with Weismann's remark (quoted on page 4) made after a comparison of servus currens scenes in Plautus and Terence, but with the reservation that, in the light of Asp. 399, Menander was evidently not averse to a splash of colour in his own servus currens scenes.

From the study of passages in which one party fails to see another the following features emerge. Delays below ten lines

15 Trin. 1008; Ad. 299, And. 338, Eun. 643, Ph. 841
16 Mis. 284 is unclear.

are the commonest in all three dramatists, but are proportionately less frequent in Plautus (55% of his delays are below ten lines) than in either Terence (66%) or Menander (80%). In these short delays minor dramatic functions, such as motivation of entrance, are performed, though in the slightly longer delays from Plautus comic elements appear. Delays lasting between ten and twenty lines occur with roughly the same frequency in the three dramatists (M.17%; T. 18%; P.16%). Menander creates certain useful dramatic effects such as character contrast and plot development in his delays of this length. Terence follows the same practice generally, but he also creates suspense in one or two examples, while in others there is no function beyond mere comment. Although a few passages in Plautus contribute towards the development of the plot, the majority are devoted almost entirely to comic effect. Delays above twenty lines are extremely rare in Menander (3%), more frequent in Terence (16%) (but one third of these is irregular in delay situation), and quite common in Plautus (29%) (only one twelfth of his are irregular). Indeed, Plautus sometimes prolongs his delays to extreme length (four exceed one hundred lines). Menander's one delay has been prolonged deliberately to make an interesting and unusual recognition scene in which the eavesdropper plays a central role. Terence's passages all differ, for one reason or another, from passages of any length in Menander. For example, two (H.T. 242 and 381) involve four speaking characters; another (Eun. 232) consists of a moralising monologue quite unlike any monologue in Menander in its content and irrelevance. Moreover, there is no exact Menandrian parallel for Terence's irregular delays. Passages in

Plautus between twenty and forty lines have clearly been prolonged, with only two exceptions, for the sake of comic effect, or in order to represent an attractive, yet largely inorganic idea. Excessively long delays have the same characteristics in over half their number. Some involve four speaking characters, others eavesdroppers who are little more than lookers-on. Rarely does one come across such eavesdroppers in Menander, and only then in relatively short delays where the character's lack of activity is hardly noticeable.

II. NEITHER PARTY SEES THE OTHER

The situation in which two parties are both on stage but fail to see each other is bound to be somewhat artificial and, naturally, the longer such a situation lasts the more awkward it becomes unless some special reason is given to account for it in a realistic way.

Because of textual defects or the lack of clarity in characters' movements, it is not always obvious when a passage should be included in this category, or in the previous one. Before discussing ^{those passages which certainly do come under this} heading it is necessary to examine briefly some whose situation is unclear.

The problems in Menander arise chiefly from defects in the text.¹ So, at Ep. 218 it is impossible to tell whether Smicrines is already on stage or whether he enters at 222² and therefore impossible to tell what kind of delay takes place and how long it lasts. The same uncertainty surrounds Sam. 120. Is Demeas aware of his son's presence, or not? Certainly in the extant portion of the text there is no indication that he is, but comparison with Merc. 329ff.³ shows that this possibility cannot be ruled out. The problem at Asp. 491 is one of staging. Austin and Sandbach⁴

1 See above, 69 n.19, for a discussion of Fab. Inc. 20

2 See Webster, SM²37, for support of the first alternative.

3 See above, 59, and Sandbach on Sam. 120 (p. 557), for the likelihood of Demeas' unawareness.

4 Austin, Menandri Aspis et Samia ii (Berlin, 1970) on Asp. 499 (p. 44) and Sandbach on Asp. 491-508 (p. 102).

both agree that Daos is behind a door and if they are right, as seems most likely, then, strictly speaking, he is not on stage. This explanation makes both his and Kleostratos' failure to see each other natural enough and also means that the passage is outside this category.

The problems in Terence arise from the vagueness of his characters' movements. At And. 625, H.T. 230 and Hec. 336 there is no clear indication of situation. However, in each case the on-stage character greets the entrant/after the latter's ^{immediately} speech and for this reason the passages have been included in the previous section. So has Hec. 841, but only because Bacchis is expecting Pamphilus and therefore, one assumes, looks for and sees him when he comes. No other indication of her activity is given. Vagueness similarly veils the situation at And. 301. What does Pamphilus do at 300? Either he departs to return at 310, or he remains on stage throughout.⁵ Departure entails a silent re-entrance which is unusual, whereas continued presence means an awkward delay of the present type.

Plautus' Curc. 557 and Stich. 523 may be compared with Terence's passages in which the on-stage character initiates greeting. A more awkward passage is Stich. 155. Does Crocotium enter at 150,

⁵ Fairclough, Andria (Allyn and Bacon, 1901) p. 19 and Clifford, CJ26, 611, suggest departure and re-entrance round about l. 318. Fairclough has Charinus see Pamphilus while the latter is off-stage (310). Shipp, Andria p. 147, says, "Pamphilus apparently remains despite the awkwardness of having him hanging round doing nothing till l. 318. As the sub-plot was not in Menander the awkwardness is not his fault."

or not? If not, then the problem of her lack of activity⁶ from 155-195 is removed as is the silent entrance she must otherwise make. On the other hand, if she only enters at 196 we are left with a strange failure on her part to carry out Panegyris' command, the urgency of which is stressed at 154.⁷ Even after 196 the delay is dramatically inconsistent, for Crocotium has been sent to find Gelasimus but on seeing him holds back for forty-one lines. The possibility that the writer incurred these difficulties for the sake of the humour of Gelasimus' speech is strong.⁸ The final problem passage is Bacc. 925. Nicobulus certainly departs (932), but when does he reappear? He must come back before 978 because Chrysalus sees him standing by the door at that point. It is impossible to tell from the text how long delay lasts, but it certainly comes into the present category. Fraenkel has pointed out the many Plautine elements in Chrysalus' canticum⁹ and has drawn attention to the strangeness and inconsistency of 923-4 which supply Nicobulus with an excuse, albeit

6 Crocotium cannot eavesdrop as 196 makes it clear that only now does she see Gelasimus.

7 Nixon, Plautus (Loeb Classical Library 1916-38) vol. 5, p. 25, with no hint from the text, invents a slave-friend with whom Crocotium speaks from 155-196. Hiatt 75-6, takes delay from 155. Webster, SM² 143, thinks Crocotium arrives at 196 from "off-stage". Cf. Ernout vii p. 221, stage direction to line 154. Quite possibly an act division in the original covered Crocotium's trip.

8 See Leo, Plautinische Forschungen 149

9 Elem. Plaut. 57-67

a feeble one, to go off-stage while Chrysalus holds forth.¹⁰ Fraenkel suggests the possibility that in the original Nicobulus' monologue (913ff.) led straight into a dialogue with his slave.

Figures for the length of delay brought about by the failure of both parties to see each other are as follows:¹¹

	<u>MENANDER</u>	<u>TERENCE</u>	<u>PLAUTUS</u>
1 - 10	66 ² /3	100	44
10+ ¹²	33 ¹ /3	-	56

There is scarcely any awkwardness arising from the present situation in delays below ten lines, mainly because they are so short, but also because the failure of characters to see each other is generally well motivated, by wing entrances in particular (e.g. Sam. 399,¹³ Ph. 829; Merc. 741). One puzzle is H.T. 420. Chremes seems resolved by 419 to call on his friend Menedemus, but when the latter appears at 420 Chremes does not see him.

The dramatic functions of these passages are much the same

¹⁰ Elem. Plaut. 57 n. 2

¹¹ Some passages involve more than one type of delay (e.g. Ph. 591ff which is 'Neither Sees the Other' to 600 and 'One Party Fails to see the other to 609). These figures show only how long the situation 'Neither Sees the Other' lasts (i.e. Ph. 591-600). They do, however, include lines devoted to the process of meeting (e.g. Rud. 229ff).

¹² Menander's Ep. 430 ff certainly lasts for more than ten lines, but at exactly what point Habrotonon realises that Onesimus is on stage it is impossible to tell. This is why the figures stop at 10+. A more detailed breakdown of Plautus' delays shows the following:

10-20	31%	20-30	21%	30+	4%
-------	-----	-------	-----	-----	----

¹³ The fact that Chrysis is crying lends additional motivation to her failure to see Nicerates.

as in short delays of the previous section, i.e. motivation of entrance and relating off-stage activity (e.g. Sam. 399; Ph. 591; Ep. 337), creating comic effect (particularly in Plautus, e.g. Curc. 386; Merc. 741; Rud. 89) and introducing new characters (in a rather stilted way at And. 796).

Even though relatively short, there are two passages from Plautus, Aul. 808, Bacc. 530, which deserve a word to themselves. Common to both these passages is the artificial balance of phrases which first indicate the characters' awareness of each other (Aul. 811-3, Bacc. 534-5). This feature is important because it recurs in longer passages discussed below. Its appearance in these two passages is especially significant because Bacc. 530ff is known to be the result of Plautine adaptation¹⁴ and Aul. 808ff. is suspected of such.¹⁵

Menander's one long passage is Ep. 430. Onesimus has been on stage since 419. At 430 Habrotonon enters addressing her first words back inside, and continues by musing on her present plight. At 435 Onesimus resumes his track of thought, broken off at 429, but gives no hint that he has seen Habrotonon. She speaks again at 436 with no indication of having seen Onesimus. The latter's thoughts are eventually interrupted at 442 by the entrance of Syriscus who converses with Onesimus. During their conversation it is clear that Habrotonon becomes aware of their presence since

14 See Handley, Menander and Plautus 17.

15 Hough, 'Plautine Technique in Delayed Exits', CP 35 (1940) 42 and n.12, remarks on Lyconidis' awkward delayed exit at 802 and thinks it likely that Plautus has had a hand in the passage. One might also point out that in spite of Lyconidis' announced intention to await Strobilus (804-5) he fails to see him when he first arrives.

she plainly overhears what they say (464-5). Sandbach¹⁶ draws attention to the convention by which two characters can be on stage without seeing each other, and observes that in this passage Menander "does not allow the situation to continue long enough to strain the convention." The total delay before meeting is thirty-four lines, but the situation of 'Neither Sees the Other' probably lasts for no more than twelve. At line 442 Syriscus appears with the result that Onesimus' attention is directed away from Habrotonon, and quite possibly it is now that she sees the other two, but, naturally enough,¹⁷ says nothing. Menander, then, does permit artificial situations in his plays but, as Sandbach remarks, keeps them within reasonable limits.

The passages from Plautus fall into three groups: 1) Those which present problems of inactivity on the part of the non-speaker; 2) Those which exhibit striking signs of what Fraenkel¹⁸ calls "symmetry"; and 3) Those which come into neither category. The groups are not mutually exclusive.

The problems associated with Bacc. 925 and Stich. 155 have been discussed above.¹⁹ Whenever it is that Nicobulus returns to the stage, there will be some problem about activity since it is

16 On Ep. 435 p. 328-9

17 Gomme, 'Menander' in Essays in Greek History and Literature (Oxford, 1937) 255, defends Habrotonon's failure to interrupt on the grounds that she is inquisitive. He suggests as a reason for her eventual awareness the sound of Onesimus' excited voice.

18 Elem. Plaut. 217-8. See also above, 94, on Aul. 808 and Bacc. 530.

19 91-92.

clear that he does not listen to what Chrysalus is saying. Crocotium's lack of activity is even more awkward if she does not enter at Stich. 155 and remain. That this is a possibility to be considered is shown by Sophoclidisca's behaviour at Pers. 183. In the previous line she says she is on her way to meet Toxilus, but when he enters with Paegnium (183) she fails to see him. She has not left the stage, for at 197 she says, "cesso ire ego quo missa sum." Toxilus departs at 199 and at 201 Sophoclidisca sees Paegnium.²⁰ What she does in the meantime is a mystery. Her inconsistent behaviour and awkward lack of activity are brought about by the conversation of Toxilus and Paegnium which is no more than a string of flippant jokes and of no importance to the play as a whole. The situation at Men. 966 is just as odd. Menaechmus I has just got rid of his father-in-law and the doctor when Messenio appears, singing a canticum about the conduct of slaves.²¹ Meanwhile Menaechmus I is left with nothing to do until the senex reappears with his henchman, some thirty lines later. As in the case of Sophoclidisca - Menaechmus I's long spell of inactivity is the result of a dramatically irrelevant and characteristically Plautine main speech.

20 The two do not greet until 204. The intervening lines are a faint yet unmistakable echo of the symmetry at Aul. 811 and Bacc. 534 and of the passages discussed below.

21 See above, 60, and Fraenkel, Elem. Plaut. 332.

In the following passages the problem of the aside characters' activity^{is} less troublesome because in each there are two non-speakers. These have the resource of simulated conversation. At Cist. 671 Halisca enters in distress having just discovered the loss of the casket. Her distress may account for her failure to see Lampadio and Phanostrata, but there is no apparent reason why they should fail to see her, unless it be that they are absorbed in conversation. For the content and function of the passage it is interesting to compare Dysk. 189 and Dysk. 574 where entrants explain the cause of their distress. The economy of Menander's passages is in stark contrast to the embellishments of Plautus.²²

At Truc. 482 Stratophanes enters and characterises himself in a sixteen line monologue.²³ Enk's suggestion that Astaphium and Phronesium are "in interiore parte domus"²⁴ would remove all problems concerning the failure of both parties to see each other. However, in an analogous passage, Stich. 58, a similar solution has been attacked by Beare as most unlikely.²⁵ Beare resists any location for the sisters in Stichus other than on the open stage,

22 See the appeal to the audience (Duckworth, NRC 135 and n. 88) and repeated expressions of woe. It is worth pointing out also the manner of meeting which recalls that of certain servus currens scenes (e.g. Trin. 1059ff. and Terence's Ph. 847ff).

23 See Webster SLGC² 149. This characterisation is not consistent with Stratophanes' later behaviour (see Duckworth, NRC 264)

24 Truc. ii, p. 117.

25 The Roman Stage (Methuen, 1964, 3rd ed.) 283.

"perhaps a little to one side, while Antipho stands behind them, looking with surprise at the door which Panegyris has left open. The open door makes him realise that she must come out. When they hear his voice, they turn round and see him. The fact that for thirty lines they have failed to do so is nothing unusual in New Comedy." Despite similarity in situation the two passages differ in length. Also Truc. 482 does not have two sets of parallel speeches as Stich. 58 does. Such speeches have a Menandrian precedent in Ep. 430, but these are much shorter than those of the Stichus.²⁶ Like the speeches of Truculentus and Stichus, the conversation between Theopropides and Tranio at Most. 904 contributes little to the action of the play, though from it we do learn that Theopropides is now definitely willing to pay off money he believes to be owed on the house. While these two converse, Phaniscus and Pinacium have to suspend all audible expressions of bafflement at the lack of life in the so-called 'haunted house' for twenty-eight lines.²⁷ Nowhere in Menander or Terence are characters redundant for so long. Amph. 633 is an extremely odd passage.²⁸ Alcumena appears on stage at 633, at which point Amphitruo and Sosia abruptly withdraw

26 Stich. 58-67 is very long as an example of talking back (see 19)

27 See Duckworth, NRC 124, for ways in which they may divert themselves.

28 The situation of 'Neither Sees the Other' ends at 660 but the problems of 660ff are connected with those which precede and so it seems best to deal with the entire delay in one go.

from the action. She bemoans her plight in a monody²⁹ which lasts until 653. Then Amphitruo speaks, but he shows no sign of being aware of his wife's presence. Where have he and Sosia been, then, during Alcumena's monody and what have they been doing? "Hac" in line 628 presumably means towards Amphitruo's house.³⁰ Why, then, do Amphitruo and Sosia not see Alcumena as she enters? Duckworth³¹ invokes the "elasticity" of the stage, and visualises Amphitruo and Sosia making their way along the street from the harbour during Alcumena's monody. Although this solution is certainly more plausible than that offered by Prescott,³² it does make Amphitruo and Sosia take an improbably long time to cross the stage.³³ Such a solution would be more likely if Alcumena's monody did not continue so long, and that Plautus has expanded the monody has been suggested by Genzmer. At 654 Amphitruo returns to the action and at 660 is seen by his wife. At 664 Sosia finally sees Alcumena and tells Amphitruo so, but even now eight lines elapse before meeting takes place. These eight lines are devoted to jokes made by Sosia for which Amphitruo acts the stooge - a role

29 The monody's main function is to characterise Alcumena as a noble matrona.

30 For this is where Sosia saw Mercury, and it is into the problem of this amazing meeting that Amphitruo means to look. The injunction is repeated at 660 and has this meaning. The problem of line 629, where Sosia is told to go to the harbour, is a separate one. See Prescott, 'The Amphitruo of Plautus' CP8 (1913) 14-22 (especially 18-19) citing Leo, and Ernout i p. 44 n. 1 citing Ussing and Leo.

31 NRC 123.

32 CP8, 18-22. He argues that since Amphitruo is a specimen of the transition from Old to New Comedy and since scene-changing is Aristophanic, most probably the scene is changed here from harbour to home.

33 Even after twenty seven lines they have not reached the house (660 "sequere hac tu me")

which is hardly compatible with the character he cuts in the previous scene. Sosia links the traditional banquet to a returned traveller to Alcumena's pregnancy (664-7),³⁵ grumbles because he seems to have arrived back just in time to have to draw water for the child's birth and then, in an amazing about turn, rejoices at the prospect. Amphitruo, who has twice referred to the warm welcome he expects (654 and 658) endures all this for eight lines instead of straightaway greeting his wife.

The behaviour of all the characters is extremely odd. Why, for instance does Alcumena disappear from the action at 664 for twelve lines? Why does she not go to greet her husband? Much of the eccentricity can be obviated by removing suspected Plautine areas. If Alcumena's monody were reduced, a more probable length of time for Amphitruo's and Sosia's walk across stage would be reached, and if Sosia's jokes were excised, then Amphitruo could more naturally greet his wife straightaway.

In the foregoing passages, the fact that the non-speakers, unlike their counterparts of the previous section, do not have the resource of eavesdropping makes their activity during the course of the main speech something of a problem. It is seen again at Bacc. 1087, the first of those passages which show signs of symmetry in the meeting process. At 1084 Philoxenus explains that he has come to see whether Mnesilochus has carried out his commission. Then (1087) Nicobulus enters, ranting and raving and cursing his stupidity for seventeen lines. At the end of all

³⁵ See Hough, 'Miscellanea Plautina' TAPA 71 (1940) 190

this Philoxenus "seems to hear someone talking nearby" (1104), which is strange, since Nicobulus can hardly have whispered such an impassioned speech. The purpose of this strikingly stylised speech³⁶ is to show that Nicobulus has been undeceived, but it has the awkward side-effect of imposing inconsistency of conduct^{on} Philoxenus. The eventual meeting of the two old men is brought about in the formulaic and balanced manner already noticed at Aul. 811 and Bacc. 534-5. Moreover, it is interesting to see that Philoxenus' speech at 1076ff. balances, in subject and content, Nicobulus' own at 1087ff.

This feature of balance and symmetry can be seen in a more obvious form at Rud. 220 and Pers. 1. Although the tone of the first is that of tragedy, the overall effect is humorous. Part of the humour comes from the very fact that both Ampelisca and Palaestra would dearly love to see each other, but cannot; i.e. the situation of 'Neither sees the other' itself is used to create comic effect. But part of the humour comes also from the fact that Palaestra (like Philoxenus at Bacc. 1076) has just spoken (185ff) in exactly the same vein as Ampelisca does now.³⁷ The two speeches, despite their unequal length, closely balance one another. A third source of the scene's humour is the symmetrical form in which their meeting is cast. Fraenkel, who defines the characteristics of such symmetrical greetings,³⁸ and

³⁶ See Fraenkel, Elem. Plaut. 13 and 172. See also 69 for the imagery used in l.1095.

³⁷ For the tone and content of the two speeches cf. Amph. 633ff.

³⁸ Elem. Plaut. 217-19.

remarks on their likeness to operatic method, numbers the present case among his examples. The whole passage in all its elements, content, structure and situation, is extremely artificial. So is Pers. 1. The speeches of Toxilus and Sagaristio, which make only a slight contribution to the exposition of the play³⁹ correspond very closely in subject-matter, style, length and metre.⁴⁰ Moreover, Toxilus and Sagaristio meet in the same way, with the same balancing phrases, as characters do at Aul. 811, Bacc. 534, Bacc. 1104 and Rud. 229.

Merc. 842 does not have the same symmetrical patterning as the above passages, but in its own way, it is just as contrived. Eutyclus enters in something of the spirit of running slaves and he uses their excited, vague and artificial language.⁴¹ He is looking for Charinus, but can't see him. At 851 Charinus speaks, using equally rhetorical language,⁴² and even though he must speak his words in a firm, loud voice, Eutyclus fails to hear him (857). It is only at 864 that Eutyclus 'hears a certain voice flapping against his ears.' The entire passage in style and situation is artificial, and this artificiality is carried over into the meeting process: though Charinus is repeatedly summoned, he will not turn round. This motif is also reminiscent of servus currens scenes and has the same contrived effect of symmetrical meetings.

39 Lines 5-6 mention the need for money. The rest is poetic exaggeration.

40 See Fraenkel, Elem. Plaut. 10 and 218-19 and Duckworth NRC 372-3.

41 See 846 and 848-9 particularly.

42 See 852ff and Fraenkel, Elem. Plaut. 66.

Finally Amph. 1053 and Pers. 777. It is no surprise that Amphitruo fails to see Bromia in the first, since he is unconscious. And Bromia's obvious excitement goes a long way to explaining why she doesn't see him. Although the situation does not seriously offend realism, as do many of these passages discussed above, Bromia's canticum intended to relate off-stage action, is freely embellished with mock tragic features⁴³ and the richness of expression associated with Plautus.⁴⁴

The similarity of Dordalus' self-recriminations at Pers. 777 to those of Nicobulus at Bacc. 1087 has been noticed and discussed by Fraenkel.⁴⁵ From the point of view of dramatic technique the situation in Persa is less unsatisfying because the effect of the aside characters' silence is more easily mitigated than is Philoxenus' in the Bacchides. Prescott⁴⁶ plausibly suggests that silent banqueters are no problem at all. Moreover, their banqueting provides an adequate reason for their failure to see Dordelus as he enters from the wing.

43 1053-55 especially. Cf. Dysk. 189 and 574 and see above, 97, on Cist. 671ff. See also Webster, SLGC² 94 and Palmer, The Amphitruo of Plautus (Macmillan, 1906) on 1066 (Act. Vsc. 1.L.14) p. 235.

44 Fraenkel, Elem. Plaut. 335, suggests that the work of an earlier tragedian, perhaps Ennius, exerted influence on this passage.

45 Elem. Plaut. 13

46 CP 32, 200-1 and 208.

Despite the lack of comparable material in delays of this kind, it is worth reviewing the passages examined, provided one bears in mind that any conclusions must be tentatively made. On average Plautus has just over one such delay in each of his plays, Terence one in every two and Menander roughly the same. One third of Menander's delays lasts longer than ten lines, none of Terence's, nearly three-fifths of Plautus'. In no passage from Terence does the situation give rise to serious awkwardness simply because in each case delay is very short.⁴⁷ The situation at Ep. 430 is undeniably awkward, but even here Menander has kept delay within reasonable limits. The awkwardness of the passage does not lie in the inactivity of the non-speaker,⁴⁸ but rather in the interruption of each character's speech, i.e. in the existence of parallel monologues. On the other hand nearly one third⁴⁹ of Plautus' delays entail a degree of awkwardness in the non-speaker's activity, and in some cases this is attended by strange inconsistencies of conduct. More than one-fifth of his passages exhibit a form of symmetry, in some cases confined to the use of balancing phrases at the point of meeting, but in others embracing whole speeches. Although the use of certain formulaic phrases can be paralleled in Menander and Terence,⁵⁰ the symmetrical

47 H.T. 420 is a puzzle, but the situation only lasts for six lines.

48 It is obvious that Onesimus is entirely wrapped up in his thoughts. When Habrotonon falls silent (441) it is quite likely that she soon notices the other two and so the delay ceases to be one of the present kind.

49 Not including Bacc. 925 or Stich. 155.

50 See below, chapter 4.

feature seems to be a characteristic of Plautus alone. This suggestion is supported by a comparison of Bacc. 534-5 with its original, Dis. Ex. 102-3. Many of Plautus' delays (particularly those which create problems of inactivity for the non-speaker) are above twenty lines, and it is noticeable that a high proportion of speeches which cause delays of this kind contain matter of little relevance to the play as a whole and often are to be suspected of Plautine intervention.

III. BOTH PARTIES SEE EACH OTHER

The situation in which two parties are on stage at the same time and are both fully aware of each other's presence but still fail to meet is the most artificial of all delay situations. Some of the artificiality is relieved, however, if one of the parties, though quite aware of the other, pretends not to be. Then the situation is in effect 'One Party Fails to see the Other'. All the passages of Menander and Terence, and the majority of Plautus' involve pretence. To what ends pretence is used will be examined below. First, figures for this type of delay:

	<u>MENANDER</u>	<u>TERENCE</u>	<u>PLAUTUS</u>
1-10	$33\frac{1}{3}^2$	25	47
10-20	-	25	29
20-30	$33\frac{1}{3}$	25	6
30+	$33\frac{1}{3}$	25	18

The two passages from Menander, Asp. 399 and Mis. 284, are not absolutely certain examples of this kind of delay, but because there is a strong likelihood that the slaves in both passages are aware of the on-stage characters, and because Menander is otherwise unrepresented in this section, they have been included

1 As in the case of 'Neither Sees the Other' (p. 93, n. 11) these figures record only the length of time for which the present situation lasts plus the length of the meeting process.

2 Inc. Auct. Fab. b 4 has been included in the figures because it is fairly certainly a delay of this type. But so small is the fragment that context and situation are a matter of pure guesswork and so it has not been discussed in the text.

here. The passages have already been discussed³ and only features relevant in this context will be recalled here.

Both passages are long by Menander's standards as a glance at figures for other types of delay shows. If the slaves in both passages are pretending not to see the other characters, then failure to bring about meeting is motivated. But it is important to note that in both these passages the eavesdropper is a most reluctant one. Both Smicrines and Kleinias make frequent attempts to attract the speaker's attention and often express their exasperation when they fail. With speaker and eavesdropper in close proximity⁴ in at least one of the passages, the refusal of the speaker to acknowledge the other, though motivated, still makes for a rather artificial, if humorous, situation.

Suspense⁵ and amusement are the two main effects of each scene, the amusement in Misumenos coming from Getas' refusal to acknowledge Kleinias, in Aspis from Daos' quotations. Nevertheless these quotations, as Sandbach observes,⁶ do not fit in so well with the requirements of the play at this point since there is the danger that "they might well arouse suspicions that he (Daos) is only

3 82ff. See also Appendix. The passages are discussed there as prototypes of Roman servus currens scenes. It is debatable, to say the least, whether Menander and other Greek New Comedy writers recognised the servus currens as a stock character. For that reason it has seemed legitimate to include the passages here also.

4 See Appendix and Mis. 296

5 See above, 86.

6 p. 62.

play-acting". One would guess that this criticism does not apply in the case of Getas, since deception does not appear to be his aim. It must also be said that certainly in the Aspis, probably in Misumenos too, the success of the plot is not dependent on these delays. Daos could just as well dispense with his quotations and tell Smicrines straight that Chairestratos is dead. The same probably goes for Getas. The objection that by overhearing the news first Smicrines is more likely to be convinced of its truth, fails to Sandbach's criticism.

Terence has four passages with this kind of delay: And 744; Eun. 943; H.T. 723 and Ph. 355. Eun. 943 is the shortest (five lines). It is impossible to say exactly when Pythias arrives on stage after 923, but her intention from 943 is plain: to frighten Parmeno by a false report of what has happened inside. The report is given straight at 948ff, but Pythias' frenzy before that gives conviction to her tale. Bacchis has a similar intention at H.T. 723 and her threats gain force by being delivered indirectly. Like Parmeno, Syrus and Clinia are suitably impressed by the threats and so their failure to come forward is well motivated. This longer delay at H.T. 723 (fourteen lines) has an effect of suspense created through the fear that Syrus' plans are in danger.⁷ The characteristics of these two shorter passages are also to be seen in the two longer ones. At Ph. 348 (twenty-seven lines) Demipho and the advocati enter onto a stage already occupied by Geta and Phormio. They have been seen by

7 Hiatt 56, "Momentary Effect".

these last two, but do not see them until 355. In the meantime, Geta and Phormio begin a conversation whose effect is dependent on the impression being taken by the others that they have not been seen. Demipho understandably takes advantage of the apparently favourable situation to hear what Phormio has to say before he commits himself to the fray. Once again the tale conveyed to the eavesdropper, as an eavesdropper, gains in conviction. This, in fact, is the whole point of the delay. Within the inevitably artificial context, the situation is handled as naturally as possible, with all characters having a natural motivation for their actions. Much the same goes for Terence's longest delay: And. 744 (thirty-eight lines). It is vital to the success of Davos' plans (not to the outcome of the play because his plans are ineffective in the end) that he should convey to Chremes (by way of Mysis) that Pamphilus is a father and that the mother is an Athenian citizen, in such a way as to convince Chremes of his own shock on hearing the news. For this purpose, if Chremes is aside and Davos can maintain the impression that he has not seen him, the delivery of the information will appear all the more plausible for being given indirectly.⁸

Two significant points of difference from Menander's passages emerge from this examination of Terence's. In all of Terence's passages, long and short, there is some point in the pretence of

⁸ Quite how the scene was meant to be enacted is difficult to see, for Chremes has already approached and addressed Mysis just as Davos does now.

the speaker: in each case he or she is attempting to convey an impression (usually false) and to do so indirectly. Since this is the most convincing way. All speeches are geared to this need. Quite the reverse is the case at Asp. 399 where Daos, by his quotations, endangers the pretence, and at Mis. 284 where there appears to be no need for pretence at all. Secondly, all the eavesdroppers in Terence have good reason to hold back. Apprehension keeps them back in H.T. and Eun., the hope of obtaining valuable information in Ph. and And.; for one may not always expect to hear the truth, but one usually expects to overhear it. Again it is quite the reverse in Menander. His eavesdroppers do their utmost to attract the speaker's attention. All this is not to say that passages like Terence's do not occur in Menander, but it is to say that those like Menander's do not occur in Terence.

Plautus has six passages of pretence lasting less than ten lines: Asin. 407. Cist. 639;⁹ Ep. 192; M.G. 486, 1290 and Pseud. 960. All of them are closer to Terence's passages than to Menander's, since in all pretence has a point. In all three of them (Asin. 407; M.G. 1290 and Pseud. 960) the speaker is attempting to convey a false identity. This is actually achieved after meeting, but naturally deception is required from the moment both characters are on stage. In all six cases deception is helped by the deceiver starting off in feigned ignorance of the other character's presence. The passages being so short, there is no problem concerning the eavesdropper's failure

9 Possibly the timing of Alcesimarchus' entry is coincidence and his threats genuine, but more likely he is feigning to force the issue of his love.

to come forward, and anyway a natural reason is normally to be inferred (e.g. natural curiosity, Pseud. 960, fear M.G. 486). In no case are the eavesdroppers reluctant ones as Menander's are.

Three passages are above ten lines but below twenty: Cas. 621; M.G. 411 and Pers. 85. M.G. 411, although longer than the above passages, is just as well motivated. Philocamasius understandably ignores Palaestrio and Sceledrus because she is pretending to be someone who could not possibly know them. This deception is central to the first half of the plot as are those in the shorter passages, and it is as natural as the artificial situation permits. Sceledrus' incredulous bafflement provides a good reason for his failure to approach. Epidicus at Ep. 192 is, for the moment, not trying to convey false information, but to put the eavesdroppers in a receptive frame of mind for when it comes. Pardalisca is doing the same at Cas. 621. She does mention that Casina is running wild with a sword in her hand, but Lysidamus has to wait until the dialogue before finding out exactly what is happening and the reasons for Casina's supposed madness.¹⁰ Like other deceivers, Pardalisca uses her frantic entrance to give the subsequent tale conviction. However, her speech is a little less natural than those just discussed because it contains so many rhetorical

¹⁰ See Duckworth, NRC199, on the function of Casina's madness in the plot.

features.¹¹ The deception at Pers. 85 is somewhat unusual. Toxilus does not see Saturio at first, but when he does he decides not to let on. Instead, he uses the opportunity to enlist Saturio's help by enticement. So he shouts back into the house orders for the preparation of delicious foodstuffs, knowing that with such a feast in store the parasitus will have no will left to deny his favours. Saturio's help, as it turns out, ensures the success of Toxilus' schemes. Toxilus, then, uses pretence in order to 'soften up' the eavesdropper: to have promised the meal directly would have been inferior psychology.

Three passages in Plautus extend beyond twenty lines: M.G. 991 (48 lines in all); 1216 (51) and Pers. 549 (27). The last passage shows Toxilus' plan in action. It is the crux of the plot. The two main purposes of the scene are, i) to convince Dordalus that the girl is Persian; ii) to convince him that she is worth buying. As in all the Roman passages, the performance of Sagaristio and the virgo is convincing because, to Dordalus' eyes, it is unprompted. However, conveying false identity is here achieved in eleven lines. The rest of the delay is made up of an aside conversation between Toxilus and Dordalus in which the latter is urged to make the purchase. Side by side with Toxilus' advice stand jokes on Dordalus' wickedness as a pimp (561-2), and an exaggerated picture of his future happiness

11 Fraenkel, Elem. Plaut. 326, following Vahlen, suggests an Ennian fragment as the likely source for the style.

should he buy the girl (569-73). But for these two things, the passage does not differ significantly from the short and medium length delays.¹² At M.G. 991 Milphidippa's intention is to confirm the idea that her mistress, Acroteleutium, is madly in love with Pyrgopolynices. The clandestine nature of her mistress' love offers Milphidippa an opportunity to emphasise the reliability of what she says. As in Pers. 549 the aim is achieved quite quickly (by 999). Thereafter a humorous, but irrelevant, aside conversation takes place until Palaestrio finally meets Milphidippa, a meeting conducted in an amusingly cryptic manner. The soldier recalls his slave at 1021, but at 1025 Palaestrio is back with the young woman advising her how to deceive Pyrgopolynices, a passage which "adds nothing new and has no humorous value."¹³ It is only after Palaestrio returns to the soldier and tells him how to handle the young woman that all three finally come together. The total length of delay before this happens is forty-six lines, and thirty-eight after the only necessary material, Milphidippa's opening speech, is dealt with. The subsequent sections are largely redundant. Moreover, although Pyrgopolynices' inactivity during most of the scene after 1010 is, to some extent, motivated by his wish for Palaestrio to act as mediator (1008), Milphidippa is given an awkward stretch of silence from 999-1010.

12 See Webster SLGC² 82, for the moral tone of the virgo's replies and the reminiscences of tragedy.

13 Hammond, Mack and Moskalew, Miles Gloriosus (O.U.P. 1963) on l.1020, p. 165.

The final passage of pretence is also from M.G. 1216. Here, the deception is brought to its climax as Acroteleutium, with help from Milphidippa, plays the distraught lover for the soldier's benefit. Pretence is clearly vital to the success of the intrigue, and the failure of both parties is well motivated: Acroteleutium, when she openly looks at the men, swoons for love; Pyrgopolynices, all for approaching his hapless victim (1242), is restrained by Palaestrio by appeal to his sense of vanity (1242ff). Much of the delay is taken up with comic exaggeration, especially by Acroteleutium from 1248 onwards. Asides too, which, as at Pers. 549, involve the use of four speaking characters, are a rich source of the scene's humour.

On the subject of asides, it is interesting to see how the dramatists handle them in this type of delay. In Menander and Terence asides do not play a great part - eight lines in thirty-nine at Mis. 284 being Menander's largest proportion, about four in thirty-nine at And. 744 Terence's. In all passages asides are mainly interpretative or reactions to the main speech, and help to keep the eavesdropper active. They do no more than that. Asides in Plautus' short delays are of slightly, but insignificantly, longer proportion, and have much the same content as Menander's and Terence's. But those at M.G. 411 and Pers. 85 do significantly increase the length of delay. Those at M.G. 415 are normal reactions to the main speech, but at Pers. 93-98 Saturio, carried away by the mention of food, proceeds to give a long list of his own preferred delicacies.

In his longer passages, Plautus deviates quite considerably from the practice of the other two. At Pers. 549 asides occupy seventeen lines in twenty-seven, and fourteen lines of them are devoted to a conversation of humorous effect. At M.G. 991 they take up eleven and a half lines of the twenty line delay and ten of them are the conversation of Palaestrio and Pyrgopolynices which also contains humorous material.¹⁴ The asides at M.G. 1216 (fifteen in fifty one) are more widely dispersed and approach the practice of Terence and Menander more nearly than those of M.G. and Persa. At one point, however, where Palaestrio gives advice to the soldier (1242ff), the aside lasts for six lines.¹⁵

Plautus' five passages which come under this heading, but do not involve pretence, are: Amph. 292 and 664; Poen. 975 and 1296 and Truc. 352, Poen. 1296 and Truc. 352 are both ten lines and neither is particularly awkward in situation. Dimarchus' state of mind¹⁶ in Truc. provides sufficient reason for his reluctance to meet Phronesium, and in Poen. Antamoenides' anger on seeing Anterastilis in the arms of an old man is quite understandable. Perhaps he asks rather more rhetorical questions than one would expect, and 1296-99 are rather exaggerated,¹⁷ but the situation is basically unexceptionable.

14 See Fraenkel, Elem. Plaut. 46

15 See above, 33.

16 He has been kept waiting; he hasn't seen Phronesium for a long time; he knows of her affair with Stratophanes.

17 cf. Ennius' Andromacha 81-83.

Two passages are above ten but below twenty lines. Amph. 664 has already been dealt with under the previous heading¹⁸ and what was said need not be repeated here. Poen. 975 is part of a long delay beginning at 961.¹⁹ Agorastocles and Milphio have been on stage for fourteen lines discussing Milphio's discovery, when this slave notices Hanno. Their failure to approach him may naturally be explained by the fact that they are unacquainted with him, but his failure to approach them is puzzling, since at 960 he says that he will enquire of those coming out of the house where Agorastocles lives. A possible explanation is that, on hearing the word 'Carthaginiensis' (963), his interest is awakened and so he decides to listen to more. This may cover the conversation about the girls, but it is hard to see what interest he can have in the description of his own and his attendants' appearance.↗

↖ Up to the meeting (994), and, indeed, well beyond it, the passage aims to provide nothing but comic effect, first from Milphio's humorous descriptions, and then from his vaunted knowledge of Carthaginian and his attempts at translation.²⁰ Finally, Amph. 292. At this line Sosia sees Mercury after failing to do so for one hundred and forty lines.²¹ From this

19 See above, 48.

20 See Duckworth, NRC 354-5 and Webster, SM² 138, "The whole passage between Agorastocles' remark that Hanno is a Carthaginian and his greeting is Plautine intervention (978-1035)."

21 See above, 72.

point until the two meet at 341, the passage consists of no more than a string of jokes which look characteristic of Plautus.²² Both characters have their reasons for not bringing about meeting: Mercury intends the preamble to be a 'softening-up' process (295). Sosia is an easy prey, fear keeps him back. Nevertheless, such motivation does not detract from the artificiality of a situation in which two characters, close enough to hear each other's remarks, do not meet, but instead talk to each other by talking to themselves. Apart from producing a comic effect, the scene is quite useless. It is only matter arising from the face-to-face dialogue of 341ff that Sosia relates to Amphitruo later on (596ff).

Taken as a whole, these passages indicate a divergence in technique between Plautus and Terence on the one hand, and Menander on the other. In the delays involving pretence Plautus and Terence both use feigned ignorance to a purpose, though, since plots are different, purposes vary. Pretence in Menander seems arbitrary. Furthermore, the eavesdropper in Menander is such in spite of himself, whereas in the Roman writers the eavesdropper always has a good reason for holding back, be it fear or curiosity. In general, then, the Roman passages show more realistic motivation, and it is Menander's that appear artificial. But, as has already been said, this does not prove that Menander did not use pretence in the way the Romans did, for what remains of Menander's work is but a tiny fraction of his known output.

22 See Fraenkel, Elem. Plaut. 21 and 98 but also Prescott, TAPA 63, 103-125, for an attack on Fraenkel's methods there.

What it does prove is that Terence did not permit the situations of Aspis and Misumenos. Nor did Plautus, though in a couple of instances matter nor germane to the deception is introduced. But Plautus evidently did allow situations which are awkward in other ways. His delays without pretence, the longer ones, contain material which has virtually no bearing on the play as a whole, they are dramatically inconsistent (Amph. 664), show weak motivation (Poen. 975) and create unlikely situations (Amph. 133). In each there is more than a hint of matter characteristically Plautine.

IV. PHRASES USED TO BRING ABOUT MEETING

This chapter is not a comprehensive list of all those phrases used to bring about meeting or to express greeting, since that already exists, compiled by Koch.¹ It aims, rather, to show how these phrases are used by the three dramatists.

In the majority of Menander's passages the process of one character becoming aware of the other's presence takes hardly any time at all, and is often dispensed with altogether. In nearly 70% of his passages, characters plunge straight into dialogue and frequently omit to greet one another (e.g. Dysk. 199; Ep. 391). In those passages which do have phrases of meeting, τίς κἀλεῖ με, and its variants is, with one exception, regularly used. In each instance it is used realistically, simply as a question expecting a straight answer (e.g. Inc. Auct. Ghoran II 163; Mis. 212; Sam. 296). The only hint of contrivance comes at Inc. Auct. Fab. b.8. At Sam. 405 Niceratos sees Chrysis before he hears her, and on doing so uses the phrase "οὐ μὲν οὖν ἄλλη." which corresponds to the Latin "ha d alius est" and "is est". Like the others, this phrase is used for no other purpose than natural expression.

The Roman writers regularly use phrases in the meeting process. Terence quite often employs 'ecce' and its variants,² always naturalistically (e.g. Ad. 767; And. 183). He is equally naturalistic in his handling of the far more frequent "quis..?"

1 De Comicarum Personarum Introductione

2 Including "adest", "est" and "video".

(Menander's 'Τίς;') in such phrases as 'quis hic loquitur?' (e.g. Ad. 883; And. 344; Eun. 730), except in four cases. The first, Ph. 735 is exaggerated in its use of virtually every formulaic phrase known in Roman comedy³ and makes a joke by means of an unusual reply to the hackneyed 'estne?'. The other three cases all involve a servus currens and his irritated reaction to being summoned: Ad. 320; Ph. 195; Ph. 847. This last shows the humorous aspects of the meeting, the slave's surliness and irritation, in their most elaborate form. When first hailed Geta reflects that it is always the way to be called back when you're in a hurry. On being called again, he expresses annoyance and determination. At the third request his 'vapula' sets up a neat rejoinder from Antipho. Geta now realises that only a member of the family would threaten him so, and with the formulaic line 852 he turns to see Antipho. In addition to amusement these delays in the actual meeting process help to create suspense, since each servus currens has information to give. Finally, Terence's use of 'estne?' reflects Menander's use of "οὐ μὲν οὖν ἄλλῃ." except at Ph. 739, discussed above.⁴

Like Menander and Terence, Plautus uses formulas of statement (ecce', 'adest', 'video' etc.) in a realistic way (e.g. Aul. 536; Bacc. 667; Capt. 1005; Merc. 365; Truc. 917), unless they are used in combination with other formulas used for effect. It is in his use of 'quis...?' and its variants, including the more elaborate

3 "certe...video", "east ipsa", "conloquar", "quis hic loquitur?", "meum nomen nominat", "respice", "estne?"

4 This page.

'quoianam vox' and 'visus sum audire',⁵ that Plautus diverges from the practice of the other two dramatists. He uses 'quis' formulas in two ways. 1) Where 'quis hic loquitur?' etc. in Terence is regularly followed by immediate recognition of the person⁶ (indicated either by 'O!' and the vocative, or by going straight into dialogue) the question commonly receives an answer in Plautus.⁷ Occasionally the answer is a straight one and the phrase used realistically (e.g. Amph. 1076, M.G. 276), but in the majority of cases it is intended to amuse. Either the answer itself is funny (e.g. Capt. 133ff; Curc. 111 - 118; Pseud. 702) or it sets up a joke (e.g. Aul. 731ff; Cist. 705 ff; Ep. 201; Poen. 851ff; Rud. 98). 2) Like Terence, Plautus sometimes makes a character rebuff a summons, but unlike Terence, he does so in scenes other than servus currens ones. Merc. 864 is a good example of this feature and of the whole range of Plautine technique in bringing about meeting.⁸ Other examples⁹ are the three servus currens scenes, Pers. 272, Poen. 851, Trin. 1059 and Truc. 115. This process of meeting is generally somewhat longer in Plautus than in Terence: Plautus:- Merc. 864 (10+ lines); Pers. 272 (about 5); Poen. 851 (8); Trin. 1059 (11); Truc. 115 (8); Terence:- Ad. 320 (3); Ph. 195(2); Ph. 847(6). As with Terence's passages, those in Plautus produce suspense in addition to humour.

5 Also used by Terence. See Koch 69-70

6 As in Menander in the case of 'τίς,' phrases.

7 Though there are exceptions, e.g. Bacc. 773-4, Trin. 1093.

8 See the use of the elaborate "nescioquoia vox ad auris mi advolavit", the reply to "qui me revocat?" ("Spes, Salus, Victoria") and the balancing line 870.

9 Cas. 960 comes into this category but is unlike the other passages. Lysidamus realises he is done for if he comes face to face with Chalinus and so he makes to run away, pretending he has not heard the call.

'Estne?' 'Videone?' together with the confirmatory 'Certe is est' or 'hicquidemst' are frequently used in Plautus in those passages where phrases balance and a symmetrical effect is achieved. Most of these passages have already been discussed in the chapter 'Neither sees the Other',¹⁰ but three are outside that category: Curc. 229; Ep. 539 and Rud. 332. The first and last follow on talking back but are otherwise examples of that type of delay. Ep. 539 is unusual, for although Periphanes does see Philippa, it takes him some time to be sure of her identity. It is, in fact, the gradual recognition of each other which introduces the element of symmetry. The fact that all the rest are examples of 'Neither Sees the Other' is not surprising, since a correspondence of phrase is more likely to accompany a correspondence of situation. When both parties unconsciously echo each other's words, and sometimes very closely, the effect is bound to be extremely artificial. That this feature is uniquely Plautine is suggested by its absence in Terence and Menander, and more strongly by a comparison of Bacc. 534 with Dis. Ex. 102-3.

Menander then, uses phrases of meeting realistically except, possibly, in one instance.¹¹ Terence follows Menander's practice except at Ph. 735 and in three servus currens scenes where he has evidently indulged himself for the sake of humour and suspense.

10 See above, 94 and 100ff.

11 Inc. Auct. Fab. b8, which is possibly not Menandrian anyway. See Sandbach 739-40.

Plautus is the same as Terence in his use of 'ecce' etc. but diverges in his use of "quis?" phrases, which he exploits to create humour. He also is the same as Terence in his employment of ignored calls but permits them, unlike Terence, in scenes which do not involve a servus currens. On the evidence, he also extends them to greater length. Finally, the symmetrical style of certain passages, falling mainly into the category Neither Sees the Other, is unparalleled in the works of Menander and Terence, and appears to be a uniquely Plautine characteristic.

APPENDIXThe Servus Currens in Menander

At both Asp. 399 and Mis. 284 a slave emerges from a house with information useful to the eavesdropper. At Asp. 399 Daos is almost certainly aware of Smicrines' presence, although he pretends not to be.¹ Does Getas realise Kleinias is on stage at Mis. 284? Turner evidently thinks not.² At 296 Kleinias says: "σὺ μπεριπατήσω κ' αὐτὸς ὡς ἐμοὶ δοκῶ"³ translated by Turner as, "I think I'll fall in step beside him." It is possible that we have here a humorous situation in which Kleinias, just a step or two behind, is unable to make himself seen by the unsuspecting Getas, but this seems to conflict with line 312, for Getas can surely hardly fail to heard Kleinias' plea, if he is as near as line 296 suggests, unless he does so deliberately. It seems most likely that the slaves Daos and Getas, realising they have information of importance to the eavesdropper, lead the eavesdropper on, and deliberately fail to make things clear to him.

Be this so or not, both passages are reminiscent of servus currens scenes in Roman Comedy. Anderson⁴ recognises such a scene at Asp. 399 and makes six points of similarity with Roman Comedy in support of his claim.

1 Austin on Asp. 399, p. 38 and Sandbach on Asp. 399ff, p. 95, agree on this. See also Anderson, Phoenix 24, 233 and above, 107n.3.

2 New Fragments of the 'Misoumenos' of Menander', BICS, Supplement 17, 53.

3 BICS, Supp. 17, 51.

4 Phoenix 24, 232-3.

- i) Line 410 "πῶς τρέχεις;" shows that the slave is running.
- ii) The assumption is that Daos has seen Smicrines before he enters, and stages his tragic despair for him.
- iii) Suspense.
- iv) Daos appears to be so excited he doesn't see Smicrines.
- v) Daos does not actually divulge the disaster.
- vi) The quotations of tragedy draw out suspense as breathlessness and the talk of it do in Plautus.

Of these six points only two are missing from Mis. 284.

Point ii) is as hypothetical in Aspis as it is in Misumenos;

iii) Kleinias certainly is looking for information (see 283),

but does not find it; iv) same in Aspis and Misumenos;

v) cf. iii) and Sandbach's note to Mis. 284 "Geta's talk

bewilders rather than enlightens Kleinias". As for vi), the

quotations may be paralleled by Geta's talk of what he would have

done (313ff). In Terence's servus currens scene, Ad. 299, Geta,

at 311ff, expresses a similar sentiment when he wishes he could

get his own back on Aeschinus and his family. Breath lessness is

not paralleled, it is true, nor any reference to running.

Breath lessness, however, is not always an element of Roman

servus currens scenes (e.g. Eun. 643), and it is not outside the

bounds of possibility that the gaps at 287ff contain a reference

to running. Anyway, it seems most likely that the conventional

nature of servus currens scenes, the need to have a certain number

of stock elements, is a Roman development, and that the prototype

need by no means contain them all.

Asp 399 and Mis. 284 are undeniably alike, and neither can be explained merely in terms of entrance technique. The limits in

our knowledge of the Misumenos make the significance of this scene difficult to elucidate, particularly since no-one is clear even of Kleinias role,⁵ but whatever its significance to the plot, the scene, like Asp. 399 is clearly aimed to provide comic effect and suspense. Sic. 176ff, in function, resembles Mis. 284 (a messenger speech with quotation), but significantly differs in that Bleperus (?) and Smicrines (?) actually converse. There is no reason why Menander should not have arranged meeting at Mis. 284, unless he was aiming at deliberate effects.

5 See Sandbach pp. 440-1

LIST OF PASSAGES EXAMINEDI. One Party Fails to See the Other (pages 15-89)i) Talking Back (pages 16-18)

<u>MENANDER</u> (11.)		<u>TERENCE</u> (11.)		<u>PLAUTUS</u> (26)	
<u>Aspis</u>	164	<u>Adelphoe</u>	209	<u>Bacchides</u>	179
<u>Dyskolos</u>	206		635	<u>Captivi</u>	251
	546		889	<u>Casina</u>	309
<u>Epitrepontes</u>	430	<u>Andria</u>	684		780
	853		842	<u>Curculio</u>	223
<u>Perikiromene</u>	366	<u>Heauton</u>			384
<u>Samia</u>	198	<u>Timorumenos</u>	175	<u>Epidicus</u>	181
			879		337
	301	<u>Hecyra</u>	76	<u>Menaechmi</u>	110
	440		243		351
	713		623		466
<u>Sicyonius</u>	377	<u>Phormio</u>	51		1060
				<u>Mercator</u>	562
				<u>Miles</u>	
				<u>Gloriosus</u>	156
					1378
				<u>Mostellaria</u>	1064
				<u>Persa</u>	85*
					405
				<u>Poenulus</u>	615
				<u>Rudens</u>	331
					706
				<u>Stichus</u>	58
					523
				<u>Trinummus</u>	39
				<u>Truculentus</u>	95
					711

* Both see each other

One Party Fails to See the Otherii) The Main Group (pages 19-61)a) Delays of ten lines and under

<u>MENANDER</u>	(18)	<u>TERENCE</u>	(31)	<u>PLAUTUS</u>	(50)
<u>Aspis</u>	216	<u>Adelphoe</u>	254	<u>Asinaria</u>	381
<u>Dyskolos</u>	81		265	<u>Aulularia</u>	178
	189		364		727
	259		763	<u>Bacchides</u>	770
	546		883	<u>Captivi</u>	998
	775		889	<u>Casina</u>	353
	879	<u>Andria</u>	175		539
<u>Georgus</u>	35		607		720
<u>Incerti Auctoris</u>			740	<u>Curculio</u>	158
<u>Ghoran II</u>	105		904		557
	160	<u>Eunuchus</u>	81		679
<u>Misumenos</u>	208		549	<u>Epidicus</u>	437
			727		
<u>Perikiromene</u>	366		739		610
<u>Samia</u>	61		840	<u>Menaechmi</u>	273
	357		971		704
	428		1002		1060
	532	<u>Heauton</u>		<u>Mercator</u>	474
	568	<u>Timorumenos</u>	230	<u>Miles</u>	
	570		512	<u>Gloriosus</u>	272
			614		1137
			679		1284-1290
			749		1311
			805	<u>Mostellaria</u>	1122
			829	<u>Persa</u>	272
		<u>Hecyra</u>	336		302
			451	<u>Poenulus</u>	578

Continued..

	522		1063
	727		
<u>Phormio</u>	465	<u>Rudens</u>	259
			306
			559
			706
			1045
		<u>Stichus</u>	326
			579
			655
		<u>Trinummus</u>	39
			276
			1093
		<u>Truculentus</u>	256
			322
			669
			854
			893
			914

One Party Fails to See the Otherii) The Main Groupb) Delays of between ten and twenty lines

<u>MENANDER</u>	(6)	<u>TERENCE</u>	(12)	<u>PLAUTUS</u>	(22)
<u>Dyskolos</u>	153	<u>Adelphoe</u>	447	<u>Amphitruo</u>	499
	574		540		882
	691	<u>Andria</u>	404*		1009
<u>Samia</u>	283		625	<u>Bacchides</u>	612
	369		957*	<u>Casina</u>	217
	641	<u>Eunuchus</u>	292		563
		<u>Heauton</u>			814
		<u>Timorumenos</u>	562		875
			723		
		<u>Hecyra</u>	415	<u>Cistellaria</u>	305
			841	<u>Curculio</u>	96
		<u>Phormio</u>	485	<u>Menaechmi</u>	899
			728	<u>Mercator</u>	272
					700
				<u>Mostellaria</u>	431
					1064
				<u>Persa</u>	470
				<u>Poenulus</u>	961-975
				<u>Pseudolus</u>	594
				<u>Rudens</u>	615
					664
					839
					1288

*See pages 76-81

One Party Fails to See the Otherii) The Main Groupc) Delays of between twenty and forty lines

<u>MENANDER</u>	(0)	<u>TERENCE</u>	(7)	<u>PLAUTUS</u>	(25)
None		<u>Andria</u>	236	<u>Asinaria</u>	591
		<u>Eunuchus</u>	232		880
			771	<u>Bacchides</u>	640
			1025*		842
		<u>Heauton</u>		<u>Captivi</u>	110
		<u>Timorumenos</u>	242	<u>Casina</u>	937*
			381	<u>Epidicus</u>	104
		<u>Phormio</u>	231-253		526
				<u>Menaechmi</u>	110
					466
					571
					753
				<u>Mercator</u>	335
				<u>Miles</u>	
				<u>Gloriosus</u>	874
				<u>Mostellaria</u>	313
					532*
					690
				<u>Poenulus</u>	823
					1174
					1280
				<u>Pseudolus</u>	1103
				<u>Trinummus</u>	402
					843
					1125
				<u>Truculentus</u>	95

* see pages 76-81

One Party Fails to See the Otheriii) Delays lasting more than forty lines (pages 62-76)

<u>MENANDER</u>	(1)	<u>TERENCE</u>	(3)	<u>PLAUTUS</u>	(13)
<u>Perikiromene</u>	774	<u>Eunuchus</u>	394* ¹	<u>Amphitruo</u>	153
		<u>Phormio</u>	231-286	<u>Aulularia</u>	475
			591-682* ¹	<u>Bacchides</u>	405
				<u>Cistellaria</u>	536
				<u>Mostellaria</u>	157
					547-609* ¹
				<u>Poenulus</u>	210
				<u>Pseudolus</u>	133
					415
					790
				<u>Stichus</u>	196* ²
				<u>Trinummus</u>	627
				<u>Truculentus</u>	775

*¹ see pages 76-81
 *² see pages 91-92

One Party Fails to See the Other (a special case)iv) Servus Currens (pages 82-89)

<u>MENANDER</u>	(2)	<u>TERENCE</u>	(5)	<u>PLAUTUS</u>	(10)
<u>Aspis</u>	399 ³	<u>Adelphoe</u>	299	<u>Asinaria</u>	267
<u>Misumenos</u>	284 ³	<u>Andria</u>	338	<u>Captivi</u>	781 ¹
		<u>Eunuchus</u>	643	<u>Curculio</u>	280
		<u>Phormio</u>	179	<u>Epidicus</u>	1 ²
			841		192 ²
				<u>Mercator</u>	111
				<u>Mostellaria</u>	348 ¹
				<u>Persa</u>	272
				<u>Stichus</u>	274
				<u>Trinummus</u>	1008

1 Neither see each other

2 Both see Each Other

3 Unclear (see pages 82 and 106 and Appendix, p.124)

II Neither Party Sees the Other (pages 90-105)

<u>Length</u> <u>of</u> <u>Delay</u>	<u>MENANDER</u>	(3)	<u>TERENCE</u>	(4)	<u>PLAUTUS</u>	(23)	
1-10	<u>Epitrepontes</u>	382)	<u>Andria</u>	796)	<u>Aulularia</u>	808)	
) ²))	
	<u>Samia</u>	399)	<u>Heauton</u>)	<u>Bacchides</u>	530)	
			<u>Timorumenos</u>	420) 4))	
			<u>Phormio</u>	591)	<u>Casina</u>	591)	
)	<u>Curculio</u>	384)	
				829)))	
					<u>Epidicus</u>	337)	10
)	675)	
))	
					<u>Mercator</u>	741)	
)	805)	
))	
					<u>Rudens</u>	89)	
))	
					<u>Stichus</u>	523)	
10-20	<u>Epitrepontes</u>	430	-	-	<u>Amphitruo</u>	1053)	
))	
					<u>Bacchides</u>	1057)	
))	
					<u>Persa</u>	1)	
))	
)	183)	7
))	
)	777)	
))	
					<u>Rudens</u>	220 ¹)	
))	
					<u>Truculentus</u>	482)	
20-30	-	-	-	-	<u>Cistellaria</u>	671)	
))	
					<u>Menaechmi</u>	966)	
))	
					<u>Mercator</u>	842)	5
))	
					<u>Mostellaria</u>	904)	
))	
					<u>Stichus</u>	58)	
30+					<u>Amphitruo</u>	633	

1 See p. 93 n. 11

Unclear Passages

<u>MENANDER</u>	(3)	<u>TERENCE</u>	(5)	<u>PLAUTUS</u>	(5)
<u>Aspis</u>	491	<u>Andria</u>	301	<u>Bacchides</u>	925
<u>Epitrepontes</u>	218		625	<u>Curculio</u>	557
<u>Samia</u>	120	<u>Heauton</u>		<u>Stichus</u>	155-196
		<u>Timorumenos</u>	230		454
		<u>Hecyra</u>	336		523
			841		

III. Both Parties See Each Other (pages 106-114)

<u>Length</u> <u>of</u> <u>Delay</u>	<u>MENANDER</u>	(3)	<u>TERENCE</u>	(4)	<u>PLAUTUS</u>	(17)
1 -10	<u>Incerti Auctoris</u> <u>Fabula b.4</u>		<u>Eunuchus</u>	943	<u>Asinaria</u>	407)
					<u>Cistellaria</u>	640)
					<u>Epidicus</u>	192)
					<u>Miles</u>)
					<u>Gloriosus</u>	486) 8
						1284)
					<u>Poenulus</u>	1296-1305)
					<u>Pseudolus</u>	960)
					<u>Truculentus</u>	352)
10-20	-		<u>Heauton</u> <u>Timorumenos</u>	723	<u>Amphitruo</u>	664)
					<u>Casina</u>	621)
					<u>Miles</u>)
					<u>Gloriosus</u>	411) 5
					<u>Persa</u>	85)
					<u>Poenulus</u>	975)
20-30	<u>Aspis</u>	399	<u>Phormio</u>	355	<u>Persa</u>	549
30+	<u>Misumenos</u>	284	<u>Andria</u>	744	<u>Amphitruo</u>	153)
					<u>Miles</u>)
					<u>Gloriosus</u>	991) 3
						1216)

Select Bibliography

- Anderson, 'A New Menandrian Prototype for the Servus Currens of Roman Comedy', Phoenix 24 (1970) 229-36.
- Bickford, Soliloquy in Ancient Comedy (Princeton, 1922).
- Denzler, Der Monolog bei Terenz (Zurich, 1968) known through the reviews of Arnott, CR 20 (1970) 185-6 and Martin, Gnomon 42 (1970) 364-9.
- Duckworth, 'The Dramatic Function of the Servus Currens in Roman Comedy' Classical Studies Presented to Edward Capps (Princeton, 1936) 93-102.
- The Nature of Roman Comedy (Princeton, 1952)
- Fraenkel, Elementi Plautini in Plauto (translation by F. Munari, Florence, 1960).
- Gomme and Sandbach, Menander, A Commentary (Oxford, 1973)
- Handley, Menander and Plautus: A Study in Comparison (London, 1968).
- Hiatt, Eavesdropping in Roman Comedy (Chicago, 1946)
- Koch, De Personarum Comicarum Introductione (Breslau, 1914)
- Legrand, The New Greek Comedy (translation by J. Loeb, London, 1917)
- Prescott, 'Link Monologues in Roman Comedy' CP34 (1939) 1-23 and 116-121. 'Silent Roles in Roman Comedy' CP31 (1936) 97-119 and CP32 (1937) 193-209.
- Webster, Studies in Later Greek Comedy (2nd, ed., Manchester, 1970).
Studies in Menander (2nd ed., Manchester, 1960).
- Weismann, De Servi Currentis Persona apud Comicos Romanos (Geissen, 1911).
- Williams, 'Some Aspects of Roman Marriage Ceremonies and Ideals' JRS48 (1958) 16-29.
Tradition and Originality in Roman Poetry (Oxford, 1968)