

## Euclio, Cnemon, and the Peripatos

MIROSLAV MARCOVICH

## I. EUCLIO AND THE PERIPATOS

In Plautus' *Aulularia* II.4, Megadorus' slave Pythodicus (see *Appendix I*) presents a catalogue of typical incidents from daily life in order to describe, *more Theophrasteo*, the character of a super-miser, the *senex Euclio*. These incidents are supposed to prove Pythodicus' conclusion, put at the head of the catalogue (v. 297): "It is easier to squeeze water out of a pumice stone than money out of that old skin-flint" (*pumex non aequè est arduus atque hic est senex*).

The beginning of the catalogue is lost; the rest (lines 300-320) consists of the following eight motifs (*a* through *h*):

- 300 *Pythodicus*. Quin divom atque hominum clamat continuo fidem,  
De suo tigillo fumus si qua exit foras (*a*).  
Quin, cum it dormitum, follem obstringit ob gulam.  
*Anthrax*. Cur?  
*Pyth.* Ne quid animae forte amittat dormiens (*b*).  
*Anth.* Etiamne obturat inferiorem gutturem,  
305 \* ne quid animae forte amittat dormiens (*c*)?  
*Pyth.* Haec mihi te ut tibi med aequum est, credo, credere.  
*Anth.* Immo equidem credo.  
*Pyth.* At scin etiam quomodo?  
Aquam hercle plorat, cum lavat, profundere (*d*).  
*Anth.* Censen talentum magnum exorari pote  
310 Ab istoc sene, ut det qui fiamus liberi (*e*)?  
*Pyth.* Famem hercle utendam si roges, numquam dabit (*f*).  
Quin ipsi pridem tonsor unguis demperat:  
Collegit, omnia abstulit praesegmina (*g*).  
*Anth.* Edepol mortalem parce parcum praedicas.  
315 *Pyth.* Censen vero adeo esse parcum et miserum vivere?  
Pulmentum pridem † ei eripuit † milvus.  
Homo ad praetorem plorabundus devenit:  
Infit ibi postulare plorans, eiulans,  
Ut sibi liceret milvum vadariet (*h*).  
320 Sescenta sunt quae memorem, si sit otium.

(1) Scholars who have paid special attention to this passage, notably Günther Jachmann,<sup>1</sup> Friedrich Klingner,<sup>2</sup> Erich Burck,<sup>3</sup> Walther Ludwig,<sup>4</sup> Hans Dohm,<sup>5</sup> Giuseppe Torresin,<sup>6</sup> have failed to point out that motifs (b) and (g) simply do not do the job: they do not fit into the image of a miser but belong to the character of a *Deisidaimon*.

*Motif (b)*. It is a superstitious man, not a miser, who puts a bag over his mouth when he goes to bed, in order to prevent his living breath or soul from leaving the body during the night. When Gunthram, king of the Franks, once fell asleep, his soul left the body in the shape of a small reptile coming out of his mouth, according to Paulus Diaconus (*Hist. Langob.* III.34).<sup>7</sup>

*Motif (g)*. Again it is a superstitious man, not a miser, who carefully collects the parings of his nails in the barber shop and takes them home (to burn them or to bury them). They are part of a man's body and must not come into the possession of his potential enemy. Pythagorean *symbola* prescribe: 'Ἀπονυχίσμασι καὶ κουραῖς μὴ ἐπουρεῖν μηδὲ ἐπίστασθαι (Diog. Laërt. VIII.17); 'Ἀποκαρμάτων σῶν καὶ ἀπονυχισμάτων κατάπτυε. Παρὰ θυσία μὴ ὀνυχίου (Jamblichus, *Protrept.* 21, λβ' and κζ'). Throwing away nail trimmings is a tabu among many peoples.<sup>8</sup> Giving your nail clippings to the devil means making a treaty with him.<sup>9</sup> From thrown-away nail parings small devils make little caps for themselves,<sup>10</sup> or the devil king makes his chair out of them.<sup>11</sup> It is dangerous to cut finger nails on Friday and Sunday (at least in the United States:) it brings bad luck, or "der Teufel sammelt alle Abfälle, und hat er davon einen Sack voll . . .".<sup>12</sup>

(2) In 1878 J. L. Ussing<sup>13</sup> found a probable source of Plautus' motif (a): "Miser starts calling heaven and earth to witness (that he is bankrupt), the moment some smoke goes out of his chimney"; he referred

<sup>1</sup> *Plautinisches und Attisches* (Problemata, 3, Berlin, 1931 = *Studia Philologica*, 11, Rome, 1966), 130 ff.

<sup>2</sup> "Ueber eine Szene der plautinischen Aulularia (280-349)," *Studi Italiani di Filologia Classica*, N.S. 27-28 (1956), 165 ff.

<sup>3</sup> "Zur Aulularia des Plautus (Vs. 280-370)," *Wiener Studien* 69 (1956), 265 ff.

<sup>4</sup> "Aulularia-Probleme," *Philol.* 105 (1961), 55-61 and 253.

<sup>5</sup> *Magiros, Die Rolle des Kochs in der griechisch-römischen Komödie* (Zetemata, 32, Munich, 1964), 243-259.

<sup>6</sup> "Sull' Aulularia di Plauto," *Classica et Mediaevalia*, Dissertationes, 9 (Copenhagen, 1973), 167 ff.

<sup>7</sup> Cf. H. Bächtold-Stäubli, *Handwörterbuch des deutschen Aberglaubens*, VIII, 790 f.

<sup>8</sup> Stith Thompson, *Motif-Index of Folk-Literature*, C726.1.

<sup>9</sup> Bächtold-Stäubli, II, 1503 f. <sup>10</sup> Thompson, G303.25.5.1.

<sup>11</sup> G303.25.5. <sup>12</sup> B.-S., II, 1500.

<sup>13</sup> *Plauti comoediae* (Copenhagen, 1878), II, p. 587 (*Addenda*).

to the rhetor Choricus 32.73 (p. 360 Foerster and Richtsteig): ἢ καὶ τῶν Μενάνδρῳ πεποιημένων προσώπων Μοσχίων μὲν ἡμᾶς παρεσκεύασε παρθένοῦς βιάζεσθαι, Χαϊρέστρατος δὲ ψαλτρίδας ἔρᾶν, Κνήμων δὲ δυσκόλους ἐποίησεν εἶναι, Σμικρίνης δὲ φιλαργύρους, ὁ δεδιὼς μὴ τι τῶν ἔνδον ὁ καπνὸς οἴχοιτο φέρων. To be sure, there is a difference between Menander and Plautus here (pointed out already by Ussing: "Quamquam similia haec potius quam eadem sunt"). The miser Smicrines hates smoke because he fears that smoke, like a *thief*, may take away with it some of his house property, while the miser Euclio cries for the smoke being *wasted* (cf. motif *d*: "Crying for the water being thrown away after taking a bath"). Nevertheless, the similarity is so close that a single motif about smoke going out of the miser's chimney may be assumed, and the difference explained by Plautus' usual simplification.<sup>14</sup>

(3) While motif (*a*) is commonly assumed to belong to the Greek original of the *Aulularia* (Jachmann 128; Klingner 158 f.; Burck 270; Ludwig 253 f.), motifs (*c*), (*e*), and (*h*) are considered as Plautine expansion.

*Motif (e)*. P. Langen<sup>15</sup> pointed out that the cooks Anthrax and Congrio are not slaves but free men hired by Megadorus to cook (cf. *Aul.* 448 *Congrio*: Nummo sum conductus. 457 f. Coctum ego, non vapulatum, dudum conductus fui./ *Euclio*: Lege agito mecum, "Very well, take me to court"). Accordingly, lines 309 f. (Censen talentum magnum exorari pote/ Ab istoc sene, ut det qui fiamus liberi?) stand in absolute contradiction with this fact and must be considered as a Plautine addition.

*Motif (c)* also seems to be a facile Plautine expansion of motif (*b*), devised to increase the comic effect (*sales Plautinae*), as August Krieger once pointed out.<sup>16</sup> One immediately recalls the dilemma of Claudius' soul: which way to leave the body, through *superiorem* or through *inferiorem gutturem* (*Apocoloc.* 3.1: Claudius animam agere coepit nec invenire exitum poterat; 4.3: cum maiorem sonitum emisisset illa parte, qua facilius loquebatur).

As for *motif (h)*, "taking a stealing kite to court," Krieger thought it may well be a Plautine joke, as did Jachmann (57 n. 1; 130), Klingner 165, Dohm 151, and others. But this is not necessarily the case. Plautus may well have replaced a word like *ἰέραξ* by his familiar word *milvus* (cf. *Menaechmi* 212; *Poenulus* 1292; *Pseudolus* 851 f.), taking over the rest of the Greek motif. If Euclio is able to believe that the cooks would make a deal with the house *cock* (*Aul.* 470 f.: Credo edepol ego illi mercedem gallo pollicitos coquos,/ Si id palam fecisset), or that one can tell compliments

<sup>14</sup> *Contra* Ludwig 253 f.; W. G. Arnott, *Phoenix* 18 (1964), 232 n. 4.

<sup>15</sup> *Plautinische Studien* (Berliner Studien, V.1, Berlin, 1886), 108.

<sup>16</sup> *De Aululariae Plautinae exemplari Graeco* (Diss. Giessen, 1914), 24 n. 2.

to a raven (671 f.: ut ego illic aliquid boni/ Dicam), he may just as well be willing to sue a stealing bird of prey. In short, this fabulistic personification of birds may well go back to the Greek original of the play.

(4) One may now ask: who had introduced the inappropriate *Deisidamon*-motifs (b) and (g) into the catalogue describing a miser: Menander or Plautus? My answer is: Plautus, who took them from another Greek play (e.g., from Menander's *Δεισιδαίμων*).

(5) Euclio is a combination of two characters: (a) Miser (*φιλάργυρος*) and (b) Mistrustful man (*ἄπιστος*).<sup>17</sup> As a *φιλάργυρος* Euclio shows the Aristotelian "deficiency in giving money" (*ἔλλειψις τῆς δόσεως*, EN Δ 1, p. 1121 b 18), but not an "excess in taking money" (*ὑπερβολή τῆς λήψεως*). Hence he is not an *αἰσχροκερδής*, a kind of a Shylock or Harpagon, sordidly greedy of gain, but only a *φειδωλός, γλίσχρος, κίμβιξ, κυμνοπρίστης* (EN, p. 1121 b 22 and 27), a miser, niggardly, stingy, close-fisted, skin-flint, cheese-parer, etc. In short, Euclio combines the traits of Theophrastus' *Characters*, X: *Μικρολόγος*,<sup>18</sup> and XXII: *Ἀνελεύθερος*, with those of *Characters*, XVIII: *Ἄπιστος* (the characters XXX: *Αἰσχροκερδής*, and XVI: *Δεισιδαίμων*, being excluded).<sup>19</sup>

(6) There was a time when scholars (partly misled by the fact that Euclio is not an *αἰσχροκερδής*) denied to him even the trait of a miser, taking him only for an *ἄπιστος*: Euclio becomes a mistrustful man only after the discovery of the pot of gold. This trend started in 1873 with

<sup>17</sup> I do not find convincing either the attempt by Ludwig 253 f. to see the original of the *Aulularia* in a play of Menander called *Φιλάργυρος* (no such play is known), or that by T. B. L. Webster (*Studies in Menander*, Manchester U.P., 1950; 2nd ed. 1960, p. 121) and by Konrad Gaiser (*Wiener Studien* 79, 1966, 191-194) to see such an original in Menander's *Ἄπιστος* (Fr. 58 Körte-Thierfelder; Nos. 104 and perhaps 240 Austin).

<sup>18</sup> To judge by the testimony of Choricus 32.73, the name of Euclio in the Greek play was Smicrines, evidently linked with *σμικρολόγος* (cf. Schol. in *Odyssey* VII.225: *κομιδή γὰρ σμικρολόγος φαίνεται . . . ὡς παρὰ Μενάνδρῳ Σμικρίνης ἐν Ἐπιτρέπουσιν*).

Note also as a paradigm of greed both Smicrines in the *Aspis* (cf. vv. 123; 149; 351 Austin) and possibly Smicrines in the *Sicyonius* (cf. vv. 156 and 162-166 Kassel). I would side (though with great reserve) with W. Thomas MacCary ("Menander's Old Men," *TAPA* 102, 1971, 306-313) against A. W. Gomme and F. H. Sandbach (*Menander: A Commentary*, Oxford, 1973, 648): "it would indeed seem an unsuitable trait [sc. being close-fisted] in the man who will be discovered to be the hero's long-lost father." Gomme-Sandbach then suggest Smicrion or Smicrias for Sm[icrines].

Finally, see Julian, *The Caesars* 311 A (where Vespasian is called *ὁ σμικρίνης οὔτος*); Themistius *Orat.* 34.17, and R. A. Pack, *Class. Philol.* 30 (1935), 151.

<sup>19</sup> Alciphron (IV.19.6: *ἰδεῖν Μενάνδρον καὶ ἀκοῦσαι φιλαργύρων καὶ ἐρώντων καὶ δεισιδαιμόνων καὶ ἀπίστων*) is speaking of four different characters.

W. Klingelhöffer (*Progr. Gymn. Darmstadt*, p. 8 f.) and is best represented by the following scholars: Wilamowitz (1899),<sup>20</sup> M. Bonnet,<sup>21</sup> Fr. Leo,<sup>22</sup> A. Krieger (o.c., 86 f.), and more recently by T. B. L. Webster (o.c., 121), W. Beare ("Euclio . . . is perhaps at bottom just a poor old fellow, crazed by the sudden acquisition of wealth; he is not a Shylock or a Harpagon . . ."),<sup>23</sup> G. E. Duckworth ("Euclio is a poor man who has carried thrift to the point of meanness . . . But Euclio is not really a miser . . ."),<sup>24</sup> K. Abel,<sup>25</sup> and others. Accordingly, the passage under consideration (*Aul.* 288–320) was interpreted as a Plautine addition taken from another play (Bonnet, Leo), and as a "comic exaggeration" without functional significance in the play (Ph. E. Legrand,<sup>26</sup> P. J. Enk,<sup>27</sup> Duckworth, o.c., 143).

Enk (o.c., 281–290) was right in establishing the traits of a *μικρολόγος* or *φειδωλός* (*parce parcus*) for Euclio, but he failed to realize that a *μικρολόγος* too belongs to the Aristotelian class of *φιλοχρήματος* or *ἀνελεύθερος*, i.e. *φιλάργυρος* or miser (EN, p. 1121 b 15 ff.; EE, p. 1232 a 10 ff.), and that both epithets of Euclio, *avidus* (*Aul.* 9) and *aridus* (297) belong to the type of a *senex miser* (cf. Terence *Heaut.* 526: Sed habet patrem quendam avidum, miserum atque aridum; Plautus *Persa* 266 f.: Nam id demum lepitudumst, triparcos homines, vetulos, avidos, ardos/ Bene admordere).<sup>28</sup>

(7) It is the merit of Jachmann, Klingner, Burck and Ludwig to have reached the following conclusions: (a) *Aulularia* 288–320, describing Euclio as a miser, is an integral part of the play, and not a comic addition. According to Klingner (165 ff.), *Aul.* II.4 (280–349) makes one dramatic unity, in which the *smarter* cook Anthrax gets the richer kitchen (that of Megadorus), while the obedient cook Congrio must go into the empty kitchen of the miser Euclio (Burck then extended this dramatic unity to II.4–6: 280–370). In addition, line 335 (Huccine detrusti me ad senem parcissimum) presupposes line 297 of the passage under consideration (Jachmann).

(b) Euclio is indeed a hopeless, inborn, hereditary miser. His grandfather was so greedy that he chose to die without revealing the existence

<sup>20</sup> *Neue Jahrb.* 3 (1899), 517 ff. (= *Kleine Schriften*, I, 229 ff.); *Menander, Das Schiedsgericht* (*Epitrepontes*), Berlin, 1925, 135 f.

<sup>21</sup> *Mélanges Louis Havet* (Paris, 1909), 17–37.

<sup>22</sup> *Geschichte der röm. Lit.* (I, Berlin, 1913), 119 and n. 3.

<sup>23</sup> *The Roman Stage* (London, 1950; 3rd ed. 1964), 58.

<sup>24</sup> *The Nature of Roman Comedy* (Princeton U.P., 1952 = 1962), 143 and n. 13.

<sup>25</sup> *Die Plautusprologe* (Diss. Frankfurt a.M., 1955), 44.

<sup>26</sup> *Davos* (Lyons-Paris, 1910), 219.

<sup>27</sup> *Mnemosyne*, Tertia series, 3 (1935), 290.

<sup>28</sup> Referred to by Burck 270.

of the hoard of gold to his only son, thereby leaving him in poverty (*Aul.* 9–12):

Is quoniam moritur (ita avido ingenio fuit),  
 10 Numquam indicare id filio voluit suo,  
 Inopemque optavit potius eum relinquere  
 Quam eum thesaurum commonstraret filio.

And Euclio is a man of the same mould: pariter moratus, ut pater avusque huius fuit (22). Although he possesses a four-pound pot full of gold (809: quadrilibrem aulam, auro onustam), he pretends to be a *homo pauperum pauperrimus* (227) and refuses to give a dowry to his only daughter: Meam pauperiem conqueror./ Virginem habeo grandem, dote cassam atque inlocabilem,/ Neque eam queo locare cuiquam (190–192); At nihil est dotis quod dem (238; 255 f.; 257 f.). In acting this way he is breaking a socially established law: a girl is expected to bring a dowry to her husband, especially a poor girl who is going to be married to a man of higher social rank (as is Megadorus). Otherwise she may well be considered as a concubine, not as a wedded wife. Cf. *Trinummus* 689–691:

Sed ut inops infamis ne sim, ne mi hanc famam differant,  
 690 Me germanam meam sororem in concubinatum tibi,  
 Si sine dote <dem>, dedisse magi' quam in matrimonium<sup>29</sup>.

This was well pointed out by both Abel 43 and Ludwig 48; 58.

(8) In short, to be an *inborn miser* is Euclio's very *χαρακτήρ* (Menander Fr.66 K.-Th.), *ingenium* (Terence *Heaut.* 384; cf. *Aul.* 9: ita avido ingenio fuit),<sup>30</sup> or *τρόπος*, and this inborn character he cannot change. Although we do not have the conclusion of the *Aulularia*, we can be quite certain that at the end of the fifth act Euclio remains a miser. (a) Euclio's Greek brother, the old miser Smicrines in Menander's *Aspis* 143–146, eventually "returns to his previous state" without changing his greedy character:

μάτην δὲ πράγμαθ' αὐτῷ καὶ πόνους  
 πολλοὺς παρασχῶν γνωριμώτερόν τε τοῖς  
 145 πᾶσιν πώσας αὐτὸν οἶός ἐστ' ἀνήρ  
 ἐπάνεισιν ἐπὶ τάρχαϊα.

(b) According to Aristotle, EN Δ 1, p. 1121 b 12, miserliness is both *incurable* and more innate in men (than prodigality). It is incurable because of the *old age* and possible disability of a miser: 'H δ' ἀνελευθερία

<sup>29</sup> Cf. G. F. Schoemann and G. F. Lipsius, *Attisches Recht und Rechtsverfahren* (Leipzig, 1905), 472, and W. Erdmann, *Die Ehe im alten Griechenland* (Munich, 1934), 303; W. K. Lacey, *The Family in Classical Greece* (Cornell U.P., 1968), 109 f.

<sup>30</sup> *Χαρακτήρ* = "die angeborene Eigenart . . . , die dem Menschen das individuelle Gepräge verleiht," A. Körte, *Hermes* 64 (1929), 79 and 85.

ἀνίατος ἔστιν (δοκεῖ γὰρ τὸ γῆρας καὶ πᾶσα ἀδυναμία ἀνελευθέρους ποιεῖν) καὶ συμφυέστερον τοῖς ἀνθρώποις τῆς ἁσωτίας.<sup>31</sup>

(9) As for the second characteristic of Euclio, the mistrustfulness (ἀπιστία), it seems to be no more than an illness (a), and a curable one (b). (a) The ἀπιστία as an illness of Euclio: *Aul.* 67 f. quid ego ero dicam meo/ Malae rei evenisse quamve insaniam; 71 Nescio pol quae illunc hominem intemperiae tenent; 105 Discrucior animi (Euclio); 642 Larvae hunc atque intemperiae insaniaeque agitant senem; 653 Insanis. (b) Euclio cured from his ἀπιστία: *Aul.* Fr.IV Nec noctu nec diu quietus umquam eram: nunc dormiam.

We can only guess about the exact cause of Euclio's cure and about what moved him to give the pot of gold (or at least one half of it) to Lyconides as the dowry of his daughter (*Argumentum* I.15: Laetusque natam conlocat Lyconidi. *Arg.* II.9: Ab eo [sc. Euclione] donatur auro, uxore et filio [sc. Lyconides]). The most natural reason seems to me to be the simple fact that Lyconides had returned the gold to Euclio. The latter was ready, at any rate, to give one half of the gold to Lyconides upon its return (767: I, refer: dimidiam tecum potius partem dividam). Since the recovery of the gold through Lyconides (*Arg.* II.8: illic Euclioni rem refert) and Phaedria's betrothal to the latter coincide in time, the most likely assumption seems to be that Euclio now realizes his obligation to give a dowry to his daughter and, at the same time, to fulfil his promise to Lyconides (767) by rewarding him. And he acts accordingly. After all, God's will had to be fulfilled (25–57: Eius [sc. filiae] honoris gratia/ Feci thesaurum ut hic reperiret Euclio,/ Quo illam facilius nuptum, si vellet, daret).

Jachmann's explanation sounds too romantic to be appropriate to an inborn miser;<sup>32</sup> Ludwig's suggestion involving the goddess Tyche strikes me as too vague.<sup>33</sup> The most we can say is that it was Lyconides' honesty

<sup>31</sup> Cf. Aristotle *Rhet.* B 13, p. 1389 b 28: Καὶ ἀνελεύθεροι (sc. εἰσὶν οἱ πρεσβύτεροι). ἐν γὰρ τι τῶν ἀναγκαίων ἢ οὐσία, ἅμα δὲ καὶ διὰ τὴν ἐμπειρίαν ἴσασι ὡς χαλεπὸν τὸ κτήσασθαι καὶ ῥάδιον τὸ ἀποβαλεῖν.

<sup>32</sup> "Da geht ihm [Euclio] auf, es gibt doch noch anderes in der Welt als arm und reich und ihren Gegensatz, vor allem gibt es die Liebe der Menschen untereinander als ihre schönste und tiefste Beziehung. Diese Erkenntnis drängt ihm mit erwärmender Kraft zum Herzen und löst die eisige Erstarrung, in die seine Seele gefallen war" (138).

<sup>33</sup> "Wir dürfen vermuten, dass er [Euclio] sowohl durch den Schock des plötzlichen Verlustes als auch besonders durch die humane Rückgabe des Lyconides zu einer Einsicht gelangte, die ihn seinen Geiz überwinden liess: Gold ist ein Geschenk der Tyche, die es ebenso nehmen wie geben kann. Man soll es deshalb nicht nutzlos hüten, sondern auf edle Art verwenden und anderen davon mitteilen" (59 f.).

which moved Euclio to give up the gold and thus get rid of the *ἀπιστία* which was tormenting him, in the same way in which Gorgias' self-abnegation caused Cnemon's partial change to the better in the *Dyscolus* (713-717 and 722-726).<sup>34</sup> Whatever may have been its cause, Euclio's change was only partial. His essential character of a miser remains unchanged, as both Ludwig<sup>35</sup> and Gaiser<sup>36</sup> had suggested.

## II. CNEMON AND THE PERIPATOS

(1) Like Plautus' Euclio, Menander's Cnemon in the *Dyscolus* is a combination of two characters: (a) Misanthrope (cf. *Dysc.* 6 f.: *Κνήμιον, ἀπάνθρωπός τις ἄνθρωπος σφόδρα/ καὶ δύσκολος πρὸς ἅπαντας*), whose prototype is undoubtedly Timon (cf. Pherecrates' *Μονότροπος*; Aristophanes *Lysistrate* 805 ff.; Antiphanes' *Timon* and *Μισοπόνηρος*; Mnesimachus' *Δύσκολος*; again *Μονότροπος* by Ophelion and Anaxilas, etc.),<sup>37</sup> and (b) *Ἀυθάδης*,<sup>38</sup> or better *Ἵπερήφανος* (Görler 281).

Cnemon's stubbornness and arrogance (cf. Theophrastus' *Characters* XV and XXIV) are apparent in his disdain for everyone except himself (cf. *Char.* XXIV.1: "Ἔστι δὲ ἡ ὑπερηφανία καταφρόνησις τις πλὴν αὐτοῦ τῶν ἄλλων) and in his conceit. Therefore he neither accepts a help when offered nor is he ready to give it. Görler rightly referred to Ariston of Ceos, p. 53.2 Wehrli (ap. Philodemus *Περὶ κακιῶν* X, col. XIV.7 Jensen): *ὁ γὰρ ὑπερήφανος οὔτε συναπαλαμπτικός ἐτέρων, ἅμα μὲν ὑπ' οἰήσεως, ἅμα δὲ διὰ τὸ τοὺς ἄλλους ὑπερφροεῖν. . .*<sup>39</sup>

(2) But Cnemon is not a miser. True, like the miser Euclio (*Aul.* 95-97; cf. *Rudens* 133-135 and Libanius *Declam.* 31.34), or a *μικρολόγος* (Theophr. *Char.* X.13) and an *ἄπιστος* (*Char.* XVIII.7), Cnemon will lend nothing from his household:

<sup>34</sup> Cf. W. Schmid, "Menanders Dyskolos und die Timonlegende," *Rhein. Mus.* 102 (1959), 179 n. 72.

<sup>35</sup> "Eine sparsame Grundhaltung braucht Euclio deshalb nicht zu verlieren" (60).

<sup>36</sup> "Den Geiz, der ihm (Euclio) von Natur eigen ist, wird er wohl halten haben," *Wien. St.* 79 (1966), 194. I was not able to use A. Schäfer, *Menanders Dyskolos. Untersuchungen zur dramatischen Technik* (Diss. Berlin, 1965; Beiträge zur klass. Philologie, 14), 96-110.

<sup>37</sup> Cf. F. Bertram, *Die Timonlegende* (Diss. Heidelberg, 1906); W. Schmid, *Rhein. Mus.* 102 (1959), 157-182 and 263-266; W. Görler, "Knemon," *Hermes* 91 (1963), 268-287.

<sup>38</sup> Bertram 64; Schmid 171 n. 47; Th. Williams, *Untersuchungen zu Menander* (Diss. Vienna, 1960, typescript, p. 119); P. Steinmetz, "Menander und Theophrast," *Rhein. Mus.* 103 (1960), 185 f.

<sup>39</sup> Cf. Aristotle, *EN* A 7, p. 1097 b 8: *Τὸ δ' αὐταρκές λέγομεν οὐκ αὐτῷ μόνω, τῷ ζῶντι βίον μονώτην, ἀλλὰ καὶ γονεῦσι καὶ τέκνοις καὶ γυναικὶ καὶ ὄλωσι τοῖς φίλοις καὶ πολίταις, ἐπειδὴ φύσει πολιτικὸν ὁ ἄνθρωπος.*

505 Σίκων. αἰτούμενος χυτρώγαυλον ἦλθον.  
 Κνήμων. οὐκ ἔχω  
 οὔτε χυτρώγαυλον οὔτε πέλεκυν οὔθ' ἄλλας  
 οὔτ' ὄξος οὔτ' ἄλλ' οὐδέν, ἀλλ' εἴρηχ' ἀπλῶς  
 μὴ προσιέναι μοι πᾶσι τοῖς ἐν τῷ τόπῳ.

(*Dysc.* 505–508 Sandbach; cf. 470 ff.; 914 ff.). And again, like Euclio (*Aul.* 94 Tum aquam aufugisse dicito, si quis petet), Cnemon would not give even water to his neighbor (*Dysc.* 642 ἵνα μηδ' ὕδατος ἔχης μεταδοῦναι μηδενί). Like a μικρολόγος (*Char.* X.8), he would not let the neighbor go through his property (*Dysc.* 115). Finally, like the miser Euclio (*Aul.* 98–100; 103 f. Occlude sis/ Fores ambobus pessulis. Iam ego hic ero; 274), Cnemon wants the door locked when he is away (*Dysc.* 427 f.):

γραῦ, τὴν θύραν κλείσασ' ἀνοιγε μηδενί,  
 ἕως ἂν ἔλθω δεῦρ' ἐγὼ πάλιν.

But the reasons for the same behavior on the part of Euclio and Cnemon are different. Cnemon lends nothing from his household not because he is close-fisted or mistrustful, but because of his misanthropic philosophy: “Leave me alone.” This was well pointed out by Görler 280 (“Nicht darüber ärgert sich Knemon, dass er etwas von seinem Hausrat herausgeben soll, sondern darüber, dass er gestört wird, dass man an seine Tür klopft und ihn anspricht”), *contra* W. Schmid (168; 171 n. 47) and P. Steinmetz (186).

Moreover, Cnemon's daughter (195 f.) and her servant Getas (587 f.) are afraid that the old man may beat Simiche to death for losing the well-bucket (κάδος, 190; 576; 582; 626) and mattock (579; 582; 626). This does not mean, however, that Cnemon is a miser, but only a severe and strict householder (cf. 205 f.: the daughter will get a beating if the father catches her outside the house). The fact that such late authors like Alciphron (III.7.3) and Julian (*Misopogon* 349 C) call their *dyscolus* Smicrines, not Cnemon (Smicrines being linked with *σμικρολόγος*), proves nothing, as does not the fact that Lucian (*Dial. mort.* 8 = 18 MacLeod) calls his greedy will-hunter Cnemon, not Smicrines: theirs are late and free imitations of Menander.

Similarly, the fact that both Euclio (*Aul.* 385 f.) and Cnemon (*Dysc.* 449–451) limit their offerings to gods to some incense, meal cake or garlands does not make Cnemon a miser. For, again, their motives are different. The miser Euclio wants to save at all costs (cf. *Aul.* 371–384; Theophr. *Char.* X.12; Libanius *Declam.* 32.25 s.f.). But Cnemon desires to be a religious reformer: sacrifices are made to please only men, not gods; the latter are happy with a small offering:

ὡς θύουσι δ' οἱ τοιχωρύχοι  
κοίτας φέρονται, σταμνί', οὐχὶ τῶν θεῶν  
ἔνεκ' ἀλλ' ἑαυτῶν. ὁ λιβανωτὸς εὐσεβὲς  
450 καὶ τὸ πόπανον· τοῦτ' ἔλαβεν ὁ θεὸς ἐπὶ τὸ πῦρ  
ἅπαν ἐπιτεθέν.

(*Dysc.* 447-451 = Fr.117 K.-Th.; cf. Aelian *Rust. ep.*16).<sup>40</sup>

Finally, Cnemon cannot be a miser: he categorically rejects any kind of gain (τὸ κερδαίνειν, 719 f.).<sup>41</sup>

(3) If Cnemon is not a miser, then Blake's restoration of line 597 of the *Dyscolus* must be wrong (quite apart from its palaeographical improbability):<sup>42</sup>

595 Κνήμων. Δᾶον καλεῖς ἀνόσι', ἀηρηγκυῖά [με;]  
οὐ σοι λέγω; θᾶττον βιάδιζ' εἴσω. [τάλας]  
ἐγώ, τάλας τῆς ζ η μ ί α σ τῆς νῦν [ἐγώ,]  
ὡς οὐδὲ εἶς.

595 με E. A. Barber 596 τάλας R. P. Winnington-Ingram 597 ζημίας  
Blake: ερημισαο Π ἐγώ<sup>2</sup> Blake

"Good Lord! I've never seen such luck! The things I've lost today," translates Blake (line 597). But Cnemon is not much concerned about material loss (bucket and mattock). What bothers him is the loss of his beloved *isolation*, ἐρημία. Cf. 169 (Cnemon): ἐρημίας οὐκ ἔστιν οὐδαμοῦ τυχεῖν; 222 and 694; Libanius *Declam.* 27.26 εἰ δὲ δὴ καὶ κακόν, ὡς σὺ φῆς, ἡ ἐρημία. . . "Ἐρημία is a key word in relation to Cnemon," states Handley correctly.<sup>43</sup>

How then shall we read line 597? I suggest the following emendation:

[τάλας]  
ἐγώ, τάλας, <νῦν> τῆς ἐρημίας {τῆς νῦν} [στερεῖς]  
ὡς οὐδὲ εἶς.

The transmitted τῆς νῦν is a dittography of the correct <νῦν> τῆς (νῦν could have been easily dropped, as in line 695 *Etym. Genuïn.* = Fr.686a K.-Th.). Π is full of similar transpositions (Sandbach's text): 105 (φιλάνωθρωπός τις);

<sup>40</sup> Cf. Theophrastus *Περὶ εὐσεβείας*, Fr. 8.17 ff.; Fr. 12.69 ff.; Fr. 13.15 ff. ed. W. Pötscher (Leiden, 1964); Webster, *Studies in Menander*, 200; Schmid 173; Steinmetz 187 f.; especially E. W. Handley, *The Dyskolos of Menander* (Harvard U.P., 1965), 214-216, and K. Gaiser, "Menander und der Peripatos," *Antike und Abendland* 13 (1967), 30 f.

<sup>41</sup> As for the part of Cnemon as a "social reformer," cf. *Dyscolus* 743-745, in addition to the already cited passage 449-453. Compare also Megadorus' "social philosophy" at *Aulularia* 478 ff.

<sup>42</sup> *Menander's Dyscolus*. Edited by Warren E. Blake (Philol. Monographs of the APA, 24, 1966), 75 and 177.

<sup>43</sup> *The Dyskolos of Menander* 161. Cf. also *Menander, Dyskolos*. Kommentar von Franz Stoessl (Paderborn, 1965), 63; Gomme and Sandbach, *Menander: A Commentary*, 226 f.

114 (εκάθαιρε ταύτην); 288 (τι σοι); 365 (γαρ δη); 376 (ετι γαρ οικοδομησω); 397 (τις χαμαι); 505 (χυτρογαυλο[ν] αιτουμενος); 834 (μικρα πολλα); 841 (ημιν εστιν); 932 (γυναικας μισεις); 943 (χαμαι στιβας).

The reading of Walther Kraus:<sup>44</sup> ἐγώ, τάλας· {τῆς} ἐρημία 'σθ' ἧς νῦν [ἐρῶ] seems to me stylistically weak ('σθ' ἧς). On the other hand, scholars who read either τῆς νῦν ἐρημίας (G. P. Shipp; Hugh Lloyd-Jones, OCT 1960; F. H. Sandbach, OCT 1972) or ἐρημίας τῆς νῦν (Handley) have difficulty with explaining the meaning of the phrase ἡ νῦν ἐρημία, "the present isolation." J. M. Jacques' reading ([τάλας]/ ἐγώ, τάλας· τῆς νῦν ἐρημίας [ἐρῶ]/ ὡς οὐδέ ἐστι)<sup>45</sup> and interpretation ("Knemon loves the isolation he now enjoys, opposing it in thought to the human contact that would arise if he were to ask Daos for help") may make τῆς νῦν intelligible, but the words τάλας ἐγώ, τάλας are then unintelligible (*contra* Gomme-Sandbach 227). Finally, to assume that ἐρημία here would mean something different from "isolation" seems to me unlikely in view of the fact that ἐρημία is a "philosophical" key-word in the play (169; 222; 694): *contra* Stoessl 152 (the word should mean here "Verlassenheit, Hilflosigkeit"), and *contra* Gomme-Sandbach 226 f. ("... can it be that the present ἐρημία is the absence of his mattock?").

(4) As an ἀνθάδης or an ὑπερήφανος, Cnemon rejects any help coming from his fellow-citizens, while overestimating his own strength and despising the rest of the world (cf. Ariston of Ceos, above, II.1, and Theophrastus *Char.* XV.5): *Dysc.* 595; 599-601. For this character defect he will be punished by falling into the well and being almost drowned (626-628; 666-669; 695). His rejected stepson Gorgias and Sostratus, a complete stranger to him, will save his life (670 f.; 679-685; 722-726; 753).

Cnemon learned his lesson: τὰ κακὰ παιδεύειν μόνα| ἐπίσταθ' ἡμᾶς, ὡς ἔοικε (699 f.; i.e. πάθει μάθος). He is now *cured* of his antisocial ἀνθάδεια:

ἔν δ' ἴσως ἡμαρτον, ὅστις τῶν ἀπάντων ὥμῃν  
 αὐτὸς αὐτάρκης τις εἶναι καὶ δεήσεσθ' οὐδενός.  
 715 νῦν δ' ἰδὼν ὀξείαν οὐσαν ἄσκοπόν τε τοῦ βίου  
 τὴν τελευτήν, εὐρον οὐκ εὖ τοῦτο γινώσκων τότε.  
 δεῖ γὰρ εἶναι—καὶ παρεῖναι—τὸν ἐπικουρήσοντ' αἰεί.

(713-717; cf. 692-694; 724 ff.; 747 and Görler 283).

(5) A second fault of Cnemon as an ἀνθάδης consists in his stubborn refusal to take part in the all-night symposium in the shrine of Pan and the Nymphs: the first stage of the wedding celebrations for both his daughter

<sup>44</sup> *Menanders Dyskolos* (Vienna, 1960), 51 and 100.

<sup>45</sup> *Ménandre, Le Dyscolos* (Budé, Paris, 1963).

and his stepson (*Dysc.* 852–855; 867–870; 874–878; cf. Theophrastus *Char.* XV.10: *καὶ οὐτε ἕσαι οὐτε ῥῆσιν εἰπεῖν οὐτε ὀρχήσασθαι ἂν ἐθελήσε <ιεν>*). This impiety of Cnemon goes well with the ungodliness of an *αὐθάδης*, as Steinmetz 186 well pointed out. Compare *Characters* XV.11 (*δεινὸς δὲ καὶ τοῖς θεοῖς μὴ ἐπέυχεται*) with Cnemon's reluctance to greet even the god Pan (10–13).

Of this fault too Cnemon will have to be cured through suffering in the near future, as his old servant woman Simiche well puts it (875–878):

875 τάλας σὺ τοῦ τρόπου.  
*πρὸς τὸν θεόν σε βουλομένων [τούτων ἄγειν]*  
*ἀντεῖπας. ἔσται μέγα κακὸν πάλιν [τί σοι,]*  
*νῆ τῷ θεῷ, <καὶ> μεῖζον ἢ νῦν εὖ πά[ν].*

Cnemon will be brought to join the part *by force*: *φέρετε. κρεῖττον/ ἴσως ὑπομένειν ἔστι τάκει* (957 f.). This is *the cure*, as applied to Cnemon by the servant Getas and the cook Sicon. Cf. 885 (Getas): *τοῦτον δὲ θεραπεύσω τέως ἐγώ*; 902 f. *τὸ δ' ὄλον ἔστιν ἡμῖν/ ἄνθρωπος ἡμερωτέος* (cf. 122 *ἀνήμερόν τι πράγμα τελέως*); 932 f. (Sicon): *οὐκ ἔῤῥς κομίζεις/ εἰς ταῦτο τοῖς θύουσι σαυτόν· πάντα ταῦτ' ἀνέξει*; 945 (Getas): *μαλακὸς ἀνήρ*, and finally, triumphantly (958): *κρατοῦ<μην>*.

Another hint at Cnemon's punishment for not accepting an established religious custom (this time the sacrifices: cf. above, II.2 and note 40) can be found in 639–641:

οὐ δίδως  
 640 *λεβήτιον θύουσιν, ἱερόσυλε σύ,*  
*ἀλλὰ φθονεῖς*

(the reference is to 447; 472–475; 505–508) and in 662–664:

οὕτω γίνεται  
*ἀλυπτότατος γὰρ τῷδε γείτων τῷ θεῷ*  
*καὶ τοῖς ἀεὶ θύουσιν.*

(6) Euclio's *ἀπιστία* was envisaged as an illness, a mental disturbance (*Aul.* 67 f.: *quid ego ero dicam meo/ Malae rei evenisse quamve insaniam*). In the same way, Cnemon's *αὐθάδεια* is regarded as a "possession by an evil spirit" (88 *κακοδαίμωνων*), a "mental disturbance" (89 *μελαγχολῶν*; cf. Schol. in Aristophanes *Plutus* 372 *κακοδαίμωνας: μαινῆ*, and Gomme–Sandbach 149), or simply "sheer madness" (82 *μαίνεθ' ὁ διώκων, μαινεται*; 116 f. *μαινόμενον λέγεις/ τελέως γεωργόν*; 150 *οὐχ ὑγιαίνειν μοι δοκεῖ*, "he must be mad," Handley 157; cf. Plato *Lysis* 205 a 7 *οὐχ ὑγιαίνει . . . , ἀλλὰ ληρεῖ*

τε καὶ μαίνεται, quoted by Jean Martin<sup>46</sup>). Cnemon behaves like a rabid dog (467 f., Getas: μὴ δάκης. Cnemon: ἐγὼ σε νῆ Δία,| καὶ κατέδομαί γε ζῶντα; cf. *Satira* 384): hence the appropriateness of the proverb “fighting a dog in a well” (ἐν φρέατι κυνομαχεῖν), applied to him in 633 f.

(7) Cnemon’s antisocial αὐθάδεια, αὐτάρκεια or ὑπερηφανία can be cured; his δυσκολία cannot, no more than can Euclio’s innate miserliness. I think that there can be little doubt about the fact that Cnemon remains an incurable δύσκολος.

(a) Cnemon’s stepson Gorgias states (250–252; the text is lacunose, but the sense is clear): There is not a chance for making him (Cnemon) change his wretched way of life, either by force or by good advice. For (253 f.):

... ἀλλ’ ἐμποδὼν τῷ μὲν βιάσασθαι τὸν νόμον  
ἔχει μεθ’ αὐτοῦ, τῷ δὲ πείσαι τὸν τ ρ ό π ο ν.

(b) At the beginning of his *apologia pro vita sua* Cnemon himself states (711–714):

... οὐδ’ ἂν εἰς δύναϊτό με  
τοῦτο μεταπείσαι τις ὑμῶν, ἀλλὰ συγχωρήσετε.  
ἐν δ’ ἴσως ἡμαρτον, ὅστις τῶν ἀπάντων ὠόμη  
αὐτὸς αὐτάρκης τις εἶναι καὶ δεήσεσθ’ οὐδενός.

“Not one of you could possibly make me change my mind, but you will have to let me *have my way*. Probably, in *one thing* only was I wrong: I thought that I alone was a self-sufficient individual, in no need of anybody’s help.”

(c) Finally, Cnemon concludes (735): ἀλλ’ ἐμὲ μὲν, <ἂν ζῶ G. Zuntz>, ζῆν ἔἴθ’ ὡς βούλομαι, “let *me* live the way I want,” i.e. as a hard-hearted δύσκολος.

But we have proof that Cnemon does not change his basic behavior “leave me alone”: he will lend nothing from his household *after* his partial μεταβολή in 715–717, just as he did not lend anything before his “conversion.” In this respect his behavior in 917 (οὐδέν ἐστίν); 923; 924 f. and 930 remains the same as it was in 473–475; 481–485 and 505–508 (οὐκ ἔχω κτλ.).

Gomme and Sandbach are right in assuming that Cnemon does not change his basic character as δύσκολος. But I think they are wrong to deny a definite partial μεταβολή to Cnemon: cf. 713 ἡμαρτον and 717 δεῖ γὰρ εἶναι —καὶ παρεῖναι—τὸν ἐπικουρήσοντ’ αἰεί). After all, Cnemon *was* taught his lesson: τὰ κακὰ π α ι δ ε υ ε ι ν μόνα| ἐπίσταθ’ ἡμᾶς, ὡς ἔοικε (699 f.). Gomme

<sup>46</sup> *Ménandre, L'Atrabilaire*. Edited by Jean Martin (“Érasme,” Paris, 1961), 54.

and Sandbach, however, write: "But Menander does not say that he [Cnemon] was reformed, nor even suggest that he could be reformed. The old man's last words regard the good fellowship of the party as something to be 'put up with.' He goes there under duress, and there is nothing to indicate that he will not fall back into his self-chosen spiritual isolation as soon as he can, just as he did after he had in the previous act accepted the necessity of material help from Gorgias. That help was not to involve co-operation. He handed over everything to his adopted son, farm and daughter, and asked only to be left in peace" (p. 268).<sup>47</sup>

Consequently, the author of the *hypothesis* to the *Dyscolus* (wrongly attributed to Aristophanes of Byzantium) was wrong to conclude (v. 12) that Cnemon eventually had changed his character, "becoming sweet-tempered" (*πρᾶος γενόμενος*).

(8) We have seen (above, I.8) that Euclio could not change his ἠθικὸς χαρακτήρ of being a miser either because it was his inborn nature (*Aul.* 22) or because he was a *senex*, and, according to Aristotle, ἀνελευθερία ἀνάτος and δοκεῖ . . . τὸ γῆρας . . . ἀνελευθέρους ποιεῖν. What about Cnemon? Why could not he change his τρόπος of being a δύσκολος? I think the same Aristotelian theory holds good for him too. He could not change his character through additional education (252 οὐτ' ἂν μεταπέισαι νουθετῶν; 254 τῷ δὲ πείσαι; 712 μεταπέισαι): he is *too old* for that; he is a γέρων (30; 123; 247; 530; 575; 628; 661; 747; 852; 966).

According to Theophrastus, a παιδεία leading to a right way of life is possible only in a man's young age. In his old age, however, any change in life becomes difficult, even impossible. Steinmetz rightly refers to Theophrastus' fragment Περὶ παιδείας (ap. Stobaeus II.31.124 = II, p. 240.18–25 Wachsmuth): Καὶ μὴν καὶ πολλῶ γ' ἐπισφαλεστέρα τῆς διαιρέσεως ἡ ἐκτροπή τῷ μὴ τὴν ὀρθὴν βαδίζοντι· καὶ γὰρ βλάβαι μεγάλαι καὶ ἡ ἀναστροφή χαλεπή, μᾶλλον δὲ σχεδὸν ἀδύνατος. οὔτε γὰρ ὁ χρόνος δίδωσιν ἐξουσίαν μεταθέσεως, οὔθ' ἡ φύσις δύναται μεταμανθάνειν τὸ βέλτιον, ὅταν ἐντραφῆ τοῖς χείροσιν, ἀλλὰ προαιρεῖται <μὲν> καὶ ἕτερα γὰρ προκρίνει βελτίω, καταζῆ δ' ὅμως ἐν τοῖς εἰωθόσιν.<sup>48</sup>

<sup>47</sup> Cf. also Steinmetz: "Endet für ihn [Knemon] die Geschichte mit einem Happy End? Wird aus dem mürrischen Alten der freundlich lächelnde Grossvater seiner Enkel? Keineswegs! Im Gegenteil! . . . Er will weiter leben wie bisher . . ." (p. 189). "Im Schicksal und Verhalten Knemons wird also die Macht des τρόπος deutlich: Der τρόπος ist die festgewordene durch die Lebensumstände geprägte Eigenart des Menschen, die sein Verhalten bestimmt und die weder durch Gewalt noch durch Ueberredung geändert werden kann" (p. 190).

<sup>48</sup> *Annales Universitatis Saraviensis* 8 (1959), 230–235; *Rhein. Mus.* 103 (1960), 190 f.; Gaiser, *Antike und Abendland* 13 (1967), 34 f.

(9) A. Schäfer<sup>49</sup> believed that he had found another parallel between Theophrastus' fragment and Menander in "the taming of the human soul" (τὸ ἡμεροῦν). Cf. Theophrastus *Περὶ παιδείας*, II, p. 240.1-3 W.: Δοκεῖ γὰρ ἡ παιδεία, καὶ τοῦτο πάντες ὁμολογοῦσιν, ἡμεροῦν τὰς ψυχάς, ἀφαιρούσα τὸ θηριῶδες καὶ ἄγνωμον, ὅθεν καὶ τὰ ἥθη κοινότερα καὶ ὑγρότερα γίνεται, and *Dyscolus* 902 f. τὸ δ' ὄλον ἐστὶν ἡμῖν| ἄνθρωπος ἡμερωτέος (Kassel: *ημερωτερος* Π).<sup>50</sup> Gaiser 35 adopts Schäfer's suggestion.

I do not think, however, that the latter coincidence is conclusive, in view of the popularity, since Plato, of the verb ἡμεροῦν, meaning "to tame, civilize, humanize." Cf., e.g., Plato *Laws* II, 666 e 6 παιδεύει ψήχων τε καὶ ἡμερῶν; XI, 935 a 4 ὅσον ὑπὸ παιδείας ἡμερώθη ποτέ, πάλιν ἐξαγριῶν τῆς ψυχῆς τὸ τοιοῦτον; *Republic* VIII, 554 d 2 οὐ πείθων . . . οὐδ' ἡμερῶν λόγῳ; *Laws* IV, 720 d 8; X, 890 c 8.

#### CONCLUSION

(I.1-9) Euclio's ἠθικός χαρακτήρ is that of a miser (μικρολόγος, ἀνελεύθερος, though not αἰσχροκερδής). In addition, he shows characteristics of an ἄπιστος. The latter may have been envisaged, however, only as a mental disturbance. Now, through a personal accident (loss of his pot of gold) Euclio happens to be cured of the ἀπιστία (τὰ κακὰ παιδεύειν μόνα| ἐπίσταθ' ἡμᾶς, ὡς ἔοικε, *Dyscolus* 699 f.). His miserliness, however, remains incurable. Why? Either it is his inborn χαρακτήρ-ingenium (*Aul.* 22), or because he is a γέρων, and, according to Aristotle, *EN*, p. 1121 b 12, ἡ δ' ἀνελευθερία ἀνίατος and δοκεῖ . . . τὸ γῆρας . . . ἀνελευθέρους ποιεῖν.

(II.1-9) Similarly, Cnemon's τρόπος is that of a δύσκολος. In addition, he shows characteristics of an αὐθάδης, αὐτάρκης or ὑπερήφανος. These latter characteristics seem to be thought of, however, only as manifestations of a mental disturbance. Now, through a personal accident (falling into the well) and, in addition, by being subject to physical harassment, Cnemon happens to be cured of his antisocial ὑπερηφανία and αὐθάδεια. His basic δυσκολία, however, remains unchanged. Why? Probably because he is a γέρων, and, according to Theophrastus (*Περὶ παιδείας*), re-education in old age is almost impossible (ἡ ἀναστροφή χαλεπή, μᾶλλον δὲ σχεδὸν ἀδύνατος).

In believing that an old man cannot change his character, Menander

<sup>49</sup> Above, note 36, pp. 71-74.

<sup>50</sup> Cf. Aelian *Epist. rust.* 15 (Καλλιπίδης Κνήμωνι:) δεῖ δέ σε ὅμως καὶ μὴ βουλόμενον ἤ μ ε ρ ο ν ἡμῖν γενέσθαι . . . σὺ δὲ καὶ ἐμπῶν καὶ κοινωνήσας σπονδῶν ἔση τι καὶ πραότερος, and Menander, *Sententiae* 50 Jaekel: "Ἀπαντας ἡ παιδεύσεις ἡμέρους τελεῖ.

(and few people would doubt today Menandrian origin of the *Aulularia*) seems to have been influenced by the Peripatos. The Peripatetic influences upon Menander are *a priori* probable, but are difficult to pinpoint. Gaiser's recent comprehensive study "Menander und der Peripatos" (with full bibliography),<sup>51</sup> as opposed to A. Barigazzi's somewhat over-optimistic approach,<sup>52</sup> remains inconclusive in several points.<sup>53</sup> The reinterpretation of the characters of Euclio and Cnemon, suggested in this article, may help to clarify matters.

#### APPENDIX I: PYTHODICUS AND STROBILUS

(1) Megadorus' slave Strobilus I (mentioned in *Aulularia* 264; 334; 351; 354, and in the scene-inscriptions preceding lines 280; 327; 350) cannot be the same person as Lyconides' slave Strobilus II (mentioned in lines 697; 804; [812 del. J. Brix], and in the scene-inscriptions preceding lines 608; 628; 661; 667; 701; 808, and possibly 587 as well). The existence of two slaves in the play was noticed for the first time in the *editio Aldina* (of 1522), where the former slave is called Strobilus, the latter (against the meter) *Strophilus*. In the modern era, G. G. S. Köpke seems to be the first scholar to realize the difference between both slaves (in the introduction to his German translation of the *Aulularia*, Berlin, 1809, p. 7).

The decisive proof for the two-slave theory is to be found in 603 f. (Strobilus II speaking):

Nam erus meus amat filiam huius Euclionis pauperis:  
Eam ero nunc renuntiatum est nuptum huic Megadoro dari.

The speaker is standing in the middle of the stage. While pronouncing the words *huius Euclionis* he points with the finger to the door on the left side of the stage (as the audience sees it), and while pronouncing *huic Megadoro* he points to the door on the right. After reciting three more lines (605-607) he will sit down on the altar in stage center, in order to "spy" upon both houses (*et huc et illuc*).

From lines 603 f. it becomes clear: (a) That the person speaking cannot be a slave of Megadorus. He came to the stage from the right-wing entrance (not from the right door). He lives with his master Lyconides somewhere in Athens, and he clearly opposes *erus meus* to *hic Megadorus*.

(b) That the person speaking cannot possibly be Strobilus I. For if

<sup>51</sup> *Antike und Abendland* 13 (1967), 8-40.

<sup>52</sup> *La formazione spirituale di Menandro* (Turin, 1965).

<sup>53</sup> Cf. also Th. Gaiser, *Gymnasium* 75 (1968), 193-219, esp. 207 ff., and Gomme and Sandbach 377 (ad *Epitrepontes* 1084 ff.); 729 (ad *Papyrus Didot* II, v. 13).

Strobilus I and Strobilus II were one and the same person, we would expect in 604 *renuntiavi*, not *renuntiatum est*.<sup>54</sup> It is Strobilus I who is now arranging the wedding-banquet for his master Megadorus (280–362), and it is Strobilus II who claims to be a guardian angel of his young master Lyconides (597 *servum ratem esse amanti ero aequum censeo*).<sup>55</sup> It is then highly unlikely that he would conceal from Lyconides the fact that his beloved girl was going to marry his own uncle; rather, he would be the first to tell him this important news, as Köpke, Wagner, G. Goetz,<sup>56</sup> K. Dziatzko,<sup>57</sup> A. Krieger,<sup>58</sup> and others had pointed out.

Finally, I think that the phrasing *eam ero nunc renuntiatum est nuptum huic Megadoro dari* precludes the interpretation *Megadorus ero nunc renuntiavit*. Thus, it is not likely that Lyconides had heard the news from his uncle meeting him, e.g., in the *agora*.

Consequently, it is beside the point to refer to examples from Plautus, Terence and Menander of one single slave serving two masters, as do Davus in the *Andria*, Parmeno in the *Eunuchus*, Geta in the *Phormio*, Epidicus in the *Epidicus*, Parmeno in the *Samia*, Davus in the *Pericliomene*: *contra* Dziatzko 262 f.; Krieger 28 and 123; Webster, *Studies in Menander*, 123.

(2) Now, the name of the slave Strobilus II fits his role. Στρόβιλος means “cyclone, whirlwind,” and the thief Strobilus II has to be quicker than Euclio if he wants to snatch the pot of gold. Cf. 705 f.: *Nam ut dudum hinc abii, multo illo adveni prior, | Multoque prius me conlocavi in arborem*.<sup>59</sup> Apparently, speed is also characteristic of Strobilus of the play in *Adespota novae comoediae*, Fr. 244 Austin<sup>60</sup> (lines 86; 146; 355 f.). For in 348 f. we read: *τρέχειν Ὀλύμπια | ἐὰν διαφύγ[η]ς, εὐτυχῆς ἀνθρώπος εἶ*. Cf. also Menander *Samia* 555 f. *στρόβιλος ἢ | σκηπτὸς ἀνθρώπος τις ἐστί*, “turbo aeris aut procella est homo” (Austin).<sup>61</sup>

<sup>54</sup> Cf. G. Jachmann, *Berl. Philol. Woch.* 35 (1915), 1010 ff.; P. J. Enk, *Mnemosyne*, N.S. 47 (1919), 87.

<sup>55</sup> I keep lines 592–598 (against J. Brix) but transpose them after 602, as did W. Wagner, *De Plauti Aulularia* (Diss. Bonn, 1864), 27–29, and J. L. Ussing, above, note 13, p. 340.

<sup>56</sup> “Dittographien im Plautustexte,” *Acta Soc. Philol. Lips.* 6 (1876), 310 ff.

<sup>57</sup> “Zur Aulularia des Plautus,” *Rhein. Mus.* 37 (1882), 261–268.

<sup>58</sup> Above, note 16, pp. 25–41.

<sup>59</sup> Similarly already Ussing, 273: “huic autem [sc. Lyconidis servo] turbinis nomen optime convenit propter volubilem agilitatem, qua Euclionem sequitur et evitat.”

<sup>60</sup> *Comicorum Graecorum fragmenta in papyris reperta*, ed. Colinus Austin (Berlin, 1973).

<sup>61</sup> Cf. the name Dromo (Δρόμων) in *Aulularia* 398; *Asinaria* 441, and K. Schmidt, *Hermes* 37 (1902), 290 f.

Consequently, the name of Strobilus II should be considered as sound and kept in the text; *contra* Goetz (*Acta Soc. Philol. Lips.*); W. M. Lindsay (the OCT Plautus, 1904); K. Gatzert;<sup>62</sup> W. Ludwig.<sup>63</sup>

(3) Therefore the name Strobilus I must go. As Goetz (in his edition of the *Aulularia*, Teubner, 1881, p. VIII f.) and Dziatzko 267 had suggested, the original name of Megadorus' slave was *Pythodicus* (Georgius Merula, Venice, 1472, and cod.F: *Fitodicus* BJV), preserved in the inscription to II.6 (v. 363). Some post-Plautine *retractator* replaced Pythodicus<sup>64</sup> by Strobilus I in the seven places quoted above (1), but he forgot to do so in the last, eighth place as well (before line 363). To me this is the most likely explanation, and it is shared by A. Tartara,<sup>65</sup> Fr. Leo,<sup>66</sup> G. Jachmann,<sup>67</sup> P. J. Enk,<sup>68</sup> E. Burck,<sup>69</sup> and others.

(4) We can only guess why a *retractator* wanted to replace Pythodicus by Strobilus.<sup>70</sup> The simplest explanation seems to be that he took it for granted that Megadorus and Lyconides lived in the *same* house and therefore should have a single slave, Strobilus. And he deduced one common house for Megadorus and Lyconides by combining lines 330 and 334 (Megadorus' slave speaking): *Vos ceteri ite huc ad nos* and *Huc intro abi ad nos* (i.e., to Megadorus' house) with line 727 (Lyconides speaking): *ante aedis nostras*. It was not difficult for a *retractator* to reach such a conclusion, since many modern scholars, from C. M. Francken in 1877<sup>71</sup> to T. B. L. Webster in 1960, have shared the same view: "Lyconides is the nephew (and perhaps the adopted son) of Megadorus, lives in his house, and uses his slave Strobilus. That Eunomia lives in the same house is not certain" (Webster 123).

But this view is certainly wrong. The widow Eunomia (cf. 779) and her son Lyconides live in their own house somewhere in Athens off the stage. For, (a): From Eunomia's words to Megadorus: *te id monitum advento* (145) and from the fact that they say "Good-by" to each other (175 f.: *Vale./ Et tu, frater*), it becomes clear that Eunomia does not live in her brother's house but only came to pay a visit to him (so, correctly, Dziatzko 264;

<sup>62</sup> *De nova comoedia quaestiones onomatologicae* (Diss. Giessen, 1913), 64 ff. (reading *Strabelus* for *Strobilus* II).

<sup>63</sup> Above, note 4, p. 257.

<sup>64</sup> As for the name, cf. Pliny *NH* 34.85 and K. Schmidt (above, note 61), p. 204.

<sup>65</sup> *RFIC* 27 (1889), 193 ff.

<sup>66</sup> *Plauti comoediae*, I (Berlin, 1895), ad. v. 280.

<sup>67</sup> *B. Ph. W.* 35 (1915), 1012.

<sup>68</sup> *Mnemosyne*, N.S. 47 (1919), 89.

<sup>69</sup> *Wien. St.* 69 (1965), 265.

<sup>70</sup> Cf. A. Thierfelder, *De rationibus interpolationum Plautinarum* (Diss. Leipzig, 1929), 128 n. 1.

<sup>71</sup> In his edition of the *Aulularia* (Groningen, 1877), p. XIV f.

P. Langen;<sup>72</sup> Enk 91; Ludwig 259). (b): I think that Tartara 198 and Ludwig 262 are right in taking Lyconides' reference to his uncle's house in 727 (*ante aedis nostras*) to mean "the house of my uncle, a member of our family," in the same way in which in Terence's *Adelphoe* 910 Demca refers to the house of his brother Micio (912), in which he does not live, as to "our house" (*ad nos*).

(5) Scholars who do not accept the two-slave theory have difficulty with explaining the presence of *Fitodicus* in P at II.6. Certainly this is not a ghost-name created by scribal corruption, as is the case with *Geta* for the correct *Cyame* (Schoell) in *Truculentus* 577 (GETA being a corruption of CHIA *me*, cf. 583 *Chiame* BCD),<sup>73</sup> or with the famous *Stalitio* (hence *Stalino*) of P in *Casina* 960 (from *sta ilico*); 347 (from *licio*), hence in the scene-inscriptions (II.3 before line 217a, etc.).

Therefore, attempts at emendation of *Fitodicus* must be discarded as ludicrous. Here belong: Francken's conjecture *Puteodicus* (sc. Euclio),<sup>74</sup> Krieger's restoration *Fit odiosus servus* (for the transmitted *Fitodicus servus*, p. 37), and Ludwig's recent unfortunate transformation of *Fitodicus* into *Strobilus*.<sup>75</sup>

Finally, against the doubts expressed by A. Ernout about the authenticity of II.6 ("Est-ce une interpolation?"),<sup>76</sup> one may say that lines 363-370 reveal genuine Plautine style, and that the motif of a gluttonous cook can be paralleled in Diphilus Fr. 43.41.<sup>77</sup>

(6) One should not be afraid to accept as genuine names preserved in scene-inscriptions only. In the *Casina* the name of Lysidamas appears nowhere in the text, only in the inscriptions of the Ambrosian palimpsest,<sup>78</sup> and nevertheless it is accepted by everybody. Or, again in the *Casina*, A preserves the name even of a cook with a part of no more than six words: *Citrio* (fol. 213<sup>v</sup>),<sup>79</sup> i.e. *Chytrio* (*Χυτρίων*), as Leo had seen (in his edition of the *Casina*, III.6).

<sup>72</sup> Above, note 15, p. 106 f.

<sup>73</sup> Cf. F. Schoell, G. Goetz, G. Loewe, *Analecta Plautina* (Leipzig, 1877), 16 n. 35, and *Plauti Truculentus*, ed. P. J. Enk (Leiden, 1953), II, p. 135.

<sup>74</sup> *Mnemosyne*, N.S. 19 (1891), 341 ff.

<sup>75</sup> *Philologus* 105 (1961), 258; 106 (1962), 153. Supported by E. W. Handley (*Philol.* 107, 1963, 317) and by Dorothy Lange (*CP* 68, 1973, 63).

<sup>76</sup> In his edition of Plautus (Budé, Paris, 1932 = 1963), I, p. 170.

<sup>77</sup> Cf. H. Dohm (above, note 5), p. 19 n. 2.

<sup>78</sup> Six times: III.3 (v.563); III.4 (591); III.5 (621); III.6 (720). IV.2 (780); IV.3 (798). Cf. W. Studemund, in *Index lect. Gryphisw.* 1871-1872.

<sup>79</sup> Cf. Studemund's *Apographum* of A (Berlin, 1888).

(7) Finally, a *retractator* of Plautus' text seems to be at work in the *Stichus* as well. (a) *Pamphila*,<sup>80</sup> the name of the younger sister, attested only in A (*inscr.* ad I.1), may be the creation of a *retractator* who noted that her husband's name is *Pamphilus* (390), in addition to *Pamphilippus* (IV.1 and 2). (b) *Panegyris* is the name of the older sister (247; 331).<sup>81</sup> Contradicting himself, the scribe of A introduces as her name *Philumena* in the inscription to I.1, though he has the correct name *Panegyris* in 247; 331, and in *inscr.* ad II.3 (326a). Why? The name *Panegyris* is rare (H. Petersmann).<sup>82</sup> Some *retractator* felt that *πανήγυρις* could not possibly be a woman's name (as it is not in Philemon's *Πανήγυρις*, cf. *Πανηγυρισται* by Diodorus and Baton); so he replaced it by *Philumena*, known to him from Terence's *Hecyra* and *Andria* (cf. Menander Fr.489 K.-Th. *Φιλουμένη*; Crobylus Fr.5 Kock).<sup>83</sup>

APPENDIX II: *AULULARIA* 388-392 AND 640-641

- 388 *Euclio.* Sed quid ego apertas aedis nostras conspicio?  
Et strepitust intus. Numnam ego compilor miser?
- 390 *Congrio.* Aulam maiorem, si pote, ex vicinia  
Pete: haec est parva, capere non quit.
- Euclio.* Ei mihi,  
Perii hercle: aurum rapitur, aula quaeritur.

Each time Euclio leaves the house he makes certain that the door is closed and locked (104; 274). To his dismay, however, this time when returning home from the *agora* (273) he finds his door wide open and hears the noise of several people in the house. One thought only crosses his obsessed mind: "Burglars!" When he now hears the voice of the "chief-burglar" ordering "This pot is too small: it won't hold it all. Go and see if you can borrow a bigger one in the neighborhood [i.e., from the household of Megadorus]," Euclio finds his worst fears confirmed: "My God! It is true: *fures thesaurarii* (395)! Wretched me, I am lost! They are taking my gold, for they are looking for a *pot*."

This is the only possible way to interpret the words *aula quaeritur* (392), as did, e.g., A. Ernout ("On emporte mon or, on cherche une marmite").

<sup>80</sup> Her name *Pinacium* in P is a blunder (maybe deriving from line 284, cf. Lindsay), for it is the name of the young servant of Panegyris (cf. *Mostellaria*).

<sup>81</sup> *Contra* Fr. Ritschl, *Plauti Stichus* (Bonn, 1851).

<sup>82</sup> In his critical edition of the *Stichus* (Heidelberg, 1973), 85.

<sup>83</sup> Cf. G. Goetz, in *Acta Soc. Philol. Lips.* 6 (1876), 273; K. Schmidt (above, note 61), p. 201; Petersmann 85.

The text does not allow us to let Euclio imagine any other situation than this: The *fures thesaurarii* have found the pot of gold *buried* somewhere in the house (7; 437 f.; 467). They are not wasting their time unearthing it,<sup>84</sup> but are taking out the gold with their hands, putting it in another pot which was nearby. This, however, proves to be too small for all the gold, smaller than Euclio's pot, "a four-pound pot" (809: *Quadrilibrem aulam auro onustam*). That is why the "chief-burglar" orders one of his men to go and fetch a *bigger* pot in the neighborhood. It is to this bigger pot that Euclio refers with *aula quaeritur*.

Consequently, the words *aula quaeritur* cannot yield the sense: "They're after *my* pot!," as, e.g., Paul Nixon has it.<sup>85</sup> Nor is G. Torresin's recent interpretation any better; he assumes illogical behavior of Euclio under pressure: "se dunque il solo nome di *aula* deve far pensare ad una pentola per trasportare un tesoro, tanto vale dire che il solo nome di *aula* è sufficiente a suscitare l'idea di pentola dove sta il tesoro. 'Cercano la mia pentola' dunque. Certo è che quell'—*aula quaeritur* nè si riferisce all' *aulam maiorem* da prender in prestito dai vicini, nè a quella che *capere non quit*, della quale non si può dire che *quaeritur* perchè i ladri ce l'hanno in mano. Che cosa insomma Euclione immagini stia in concreto succedendo dentro casa non è chiaro da quella frase, ma tale è la costante natura dei suoi sospetti senza logica . . ."<sup>86</sup>

I think that scholars were mistaken in assuming that the word *aula* in this passage must denote Euclio's pot of gold. Euclio is, however, referring here to his own pot with the words *aurum rapitur*, in the same way in which he used the word *aurum* for his pot of gold at *Aul.* 63; 65; 110; 185; 188; 194; 201; 216; 265. By the words *aula quaeritur*, which serve as a proof that the gold is being taken, he refers only to *aulam maiorem*: *aulam pete* = *aula quaeritur*. The word *aula*, then, designating Euclio's pot of gold, occurs at 580 f. for the first time:

580 Edepol ne tu, *aula*, multos inimicos habes  
Atque istuc *aurum* quod tibi concreditum est.

But the audience has already had opportunity to *see* Euclio's pot (449; 464; 467; 471).

---

<sup>84</sup> W. Kraus, *Serta Philologica Aenipontana* (Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Kulturwiss., 7-8, Innsbruck, 1962), 189, prefers the explanation that the thieves had broken Euclio's pot of gold while digging it out.

<sup>85</sup> In the Loeb *Plautus*, I (1916), 275.

<sup>86</sup> Above, note 6, p. 177.

640 *Strobilus*. Non hercle equidem quicquam sumpsi nec tetigi.

*Euclio*.

Ostende huc manus.

*Strobilus*. Em tibi, ostendi: eccas.

*Euclio*.

Video. Age, ostende etiam tertiam.

The implication is clear: *Euclio* accuses *Strobilus* of being a super-thief, *non fur, sed trifur* (633). But the idea of a thief with *three* hands cannot be paralleled. *Ussing* (II, p. 345) remarks simply: "Ridicule." *Euclio*'s exaggeration, however, can be explained by *Aulularia* 554. Here *Euclio* complains that *Megadorus* has filled his house not with cooks but with thieves (551 f.: *qui mihi omnis angulos| Furum inplevisti in aedibus misero mihi*). A cook as a thief is a commonplace in comedy (*Aul.* 325 f.; 365; 445; *Laverna*; *Pseudolus* 790 f.; 850 ff.).<sup>87</sup> Each cook-thief has *six* hands, like *Geryon* the ἐξάχειρ (*Lucian Toxaris* 62; *Hermotimus* 74):<sup>88</sup> *Cum senis manibus, genere Geryonaceo* (554).

Therefore, when *Euclio* in 641 asks *Strobilus* to show him also his *third* hand, to make certain it is empty, he is actually implying that *Strobilus*, as a real *trifur*, must have more than two *furtificae manus* (*Pseudolus* 887), three, maybe even six. Lines 554 and 641 were brought together by *Bonnell Thornton* (1724-1768), in his English translation of the *Aulularia* (London, 1767).

*University of Illinois at Urbana*

<sup>87</sup> Cf. *Dohm* (above, note 5), pp. 129-133; 142 and 258.

<sup>88</sup> Cf. *Weicker*, in *RE* VII (1910), s.v. *Geryoneus*, pp. 1287 and 1295.