

Reconstructing the Beginning of Menander's *Adelphoi* (B)¹

MARK DAMEN

Terence's succinct statement in the prologue to *Adelphoe* (6–11) that he has borrowed (*sumpsit sibi*, 10) a scene (*locum*, 10) from a play by Diphilos and inserted it into Menander's *Adelphoi* (B) gives rise to far more questions than the few it answers.² Why has he introduced new material into Menander's play? Where exactly does the *locus* from Diphilos begin and end? Were the plots so similar that Terence could add this scene verbatim without adapting either play, or did he have to adjust the original play to harmonize with the scene from Diphilos?

The answers to the first two questions become obvious on close inspection of Terence's text. The reason he introduced a scene of comic polemic into Menander's play, which focuses on the comparison of character types, is self-evident: the scene adds physical humor to a less energetic, more "psychological" comedy.³ Since *Adelphoe* 2.2–2.4 (209 ff.) contains developments in the plot essential to the general progress of Menander's play, the borrowed material is probably limited to *Adelphoe* 2. 1 (155–196).⁴ But the answer to the third question is more problematic. In the prologue Terence maintains that he has translated the scene from Diphilos *verbum de verbo* (11), but says nothing of his treatment of Menander's original. In light of the fact that he had been accused before of taking

¹ I rely largely on the work of Elaine Fantham, "Terence, Diphilos and Menander. A re-examination of Terence, *Adelphoe*, Act II," *Philologus* 112 (1968), 196–216 (henceforth, Fantham); R. H. Martin, *Terence Adelphoe* (Cambridge 1976), esp. pp. 242–45 (henceforth, Martin); and John N. Grant, "The beginning of Menander, *Adelphoi* B," *Classical Quarterly* n.s. 30 (1980), 341–55 (henceforth, Grant). Of earlier work I have found most helpful and insightful: H. Drexler, "Die Komposition von Terenz' *Adelphen* und Plautus' *Rudens*" *Philologus Suppl. Bd.* 26.2 (1934), 1–40; and O. Rieth, *Die Kunst Menanders in den Adelphen des Terenz*, (Hildesheim 1964), edited and with a postscript by K. Gaiser.

² See Martin's introductory comments, p. 242.

³ W. G. Amott, *Menander, Plautus, Terence* (Oxford 1975), pp. 49–50.

⁴ Fantham, 200; Grant, 342. It is possible that the scene from Diphilos ends at 190 and that 190–96 is Terence's suture stitching together the two Greek authors' material. If this is the case, Aeschinus' punning reference to freeing the *psaltria* (193–94) is Terence's free creation; see H. Lloyd-Jones, "Terentian technique in the *Adelphi* and the *Eunuchus*," *Classical Quarterly* 23 (1973), 281.

unwarranted freedoms with Greek originals,⁵ his failure to affirm that he has rendered both plays "word for word" raises the possibility that he was less than absolutely literal with Menander.

Building from previous reconstructions of Menander's original sequence of action underlying Terence's *Adelphoe* 155–287 (2.1–2.4),⁶ I will propose in this article a new reconstruction of the course of action in Menander. Comparison of the new reconstruction to known Menandrian sequences of action and the reconstitution of Menander's use of the three-actor limitation⁷ will, I hope, bring us closer to the original sequence of action which Terence changed in order to incorporate the *locus* from Diphilos' *Synpothneskontes*.⁸

I. Inconsistencies in Terence's *Adelphoe* Act II

A high number of "inconsistencies" in this sequence of action gives evidence that Terence remolded Menander's plot. These inconsistencies fall loosely into three categories: (1) those in the dialogue, (2) those in the exposition and the presentation and movements of characters, that is, the general course of the stage action (which I will call the "design of scenes"), and (3) those which make the stage action of the Greek original difficult or impossible to reconstruct from Terence's play.

1. *Inconsistencies in dialogue.* In 2. 1, the scene added from Diphilos, the young man Aeschinus threatens the pimp Sannio with court action over rights to the *psaltria*. He claims that, if Sannio refuses to sell her, he will assert her freedom in court (*nam ego liberali illam adsero causa manu*, 194). After this scene the subject of this case is never again mentioned. Aeschinus seems content to pay the girl's wholesale price (277). If the girl can be proven to be free, why does Aeschinus consent to pay at all? If she is not free, why does Aeschinus bring up the possibility of court action? This inconsistency is relatively minor, probably nothing more than a difference in the course of action the two Greek originals took, and Terence

⁵ *An.* 15 ff., *H.T.* 16 ff., *Eu.* 19 ff.

⁶ See notes 30–32.

⁷ Grant, 343 and note 5. W. G. Arnott, rev. of Rieth (note 1), *Gnomon* 37 (1965), 261, is less inclined to reconstruct the Greek author's use of the three-actor limitation from Roman adaptations; Pickard-Cambridge, *The Dramatic Festivals of Athens*² (Oxford 1968), p. 154, shows the same hesitation. But it is clear that Menander's comedies were performed by only three speaking actors and that Terence's scene 2. 4 requires four. The three-actor limitation is one guideline to a successful reconstruction.

⁸ Grant's statement of methodology for reconstruction is excellent (341): "Reconstruction starts with the gathering of clues in the Terentian play which may indicate changes from the original—inconsistencies, contradictions, awkwardness in the stage action. On individual points, however, it is often impossible to bring convincing arguments that a particular feature is Terentian or Menandrian. One works rather with a group of 'facts' and builds a reconstruction which best accounts for them all. Often more than one reconstruction is possible and the differences often depend on a decision made about one particular point which limits and directs the possible solution to other problems."

surely meant his audience to understand it as merely a young man's typical threat to a pimp.⁹

At the beginning of 2. 2 Syrus enters from Micio's house. Speaking back inside, he reassures someone, presumably Aeschinus, that he will take care of Sannio the pimp (209–10):

Tace, egomet conveniam iam ipsum: cupide accipiat faxo atque etiam bene dicat secum esse actum.

If Syrus is addressing Aeschinus inside, why does he offer comfort and reassurance to a character who has shown great boldness in dealing with Sannio? The Aeschinus who just walked offstage has no trouble and needs no help dealing with this pimp.¹⁰ This is a graver inconsistency than the first and must be due somehow to Terence's interweaving of the two plots and his rearrangement of the original action.

2. *Inconsistencies in the design of scenes: the exposition of the plot and the presentation and movements of characters.* The proper exposition which Terence promises in his prologue (22–24) never fully materializes.¹¹ Micio and Demea say all they can about the background of the story, but they do not know the details of the abduction which the audience must know to understand Aeschinus' and Ctesipho's motivations and movements prior to their first appearances on stage. The action that follows leaves several important questions unanswered.

What necessitated the abduction? What was Ctesipho's hurry? Why could not he or Aeschinus work out a peaceful resolution with Sannio? It is tempting to suppose that the same thing which later resolves the problem is also behind the abduction: Sannio is going to Cyprus on a business trip. Was Ctesipho's girlfriend to be sold abroad on that trip? In that case, the same situation which had earlier driven Ctesipho to despair later saves him, for, as Sannio himself realizes, if he takes his case to court after the time required for a trip to Cyprus, the judge will demand to know why he took so long to press charges and may throw the case out of court (228–35).

Also, to what extent was Syrus involved in abducting the *psaltria*? Micio says that no one connected with the abduction has come home (26–27). Since Terence's Syrus emerges from Micio's house at 2. 2, it would follow that he was not involved with the abduction and has stayed home

⁹ W. G. Arnott (above, note 7), 257, contrasts the "freedom" and the "trip to Cyprus" motifs. Grant, 352, doubts the seriousness with which Diphilos (or Terence) meant the audience to take Aeschinus' threat to free the *psaltria* by legal action. Lloyd-Jones (above, note 4), 281, believes that this is the only major inconsistency. See note 4, above.

¹⁰ Fantham, 205.

¹¹ This, however, does not mean that Terence has made changes in Act I also. The statement of the *Vita Terentii* ("Adelphorum principium Varro etiam praefert principio Menandri") could mean that Varro preferred Terence's use of language and choice of phrasing or words and not the scenic construction, cf. Grant, 354–55: "This surely does not refer simply to the omission of a prologue at the very beginning of the play."

through the night. However, he is later called the *impulsor* of the act (315, 560) and Micio thanks him for the *consilium*, which led to the abduction (368). Syrus seems to be somehow indirectly involved in the abduction.¹²

These questions would most easily be answered in an expository monologue. Arnott proposes that Terence replaced a "less spectacular . . . monologue simply reporting the abduction" with the lively scene from Diphilos.¹³ But a monologue by whom? Only Aeschinus knows the whole story, unless Syrus accompanied him on the assault against the pimp or learned about it from him later. On the surface it is evident only that, in adding the scene from Diphilos, Terence has seriously curtailed Menander's exposition of basic background information.

Besides the lack of satisfactory exposition there are at least three more anomalies in the design of scenes in Terence's second act. First, Ctesipho's character lacks a satisfactory introduction.¹⁴ When he enters at 254, neither he nor Syrus explains his connection with the story. How is the audience, who at this point believe that Aeschinus has abducted the girl for himself, to know that Ctesipho is the real reason behind his brother's rash act? They are left to gather Ctesipho's connection to the story from his praise of his brother (254–59) and his conversations with Syrus (260–64) and Aeschinus (266–76).

Second, Sannio's presence on stage through 2. 3 and 2. 4 poses another problem but may explain why Terence did not give Ctesipho a satisfactory introduction. If Terence has brought the pimp on before Ctesipho, whereas Menander had brought Ctesipho on before the pimp, Terence cannot fully acknowledge Ctesipho's involvement in the abduction without also involving Sannio in the scene.¹⁵ Why Sannio withdraws from the conversation for 24 lines (254–77), saying only eight words in aside (265–66), while Ctesipho, Syrus, and later Aeschinus converse about matters important to him, is hard to understand. The pimp has been aggressive and

¹² Grant, 344–45, thinks it is likely that Syrus assisted with the abduction. *Adelphoe* 210–11 ("quid istuc, Sannio quod te audio nescio quid concertasse cum ero?") seems to rule this out, since Syrus appears to have only just heard about the abduction. Grant correctly notes that, since Syrus has no place in Diphilos' abduction scene, Terence wrote lines 210–11 to make it seem as if Syrus were not involved in the abduction (as he was in Menander) and make the transition from 2. 1 to 2. 2 smoother. But later (315, 560) Terence reverts to the original situation and allows Syrus to take credit for helping in the abduction.

In Menander Syrus could have been present at the abduction and not have met Sannio, if he stayed outside the pimp's house and never came face to face with him. In this way he would have helped Aeschinus before and after his visit to the pimp's (as the engineer [*impulsor*] of the plan [*consilium*] to abduct the *psaltria* and later as a co-conspirator in hiding her in Micio's house) but not during the actual abduction. In this way he could pretend to have learned only recently about the matter, when he confronts Sannio (so 210–11 could in fact derive from Menander's play), and play the impartial mediator between Sannio and Aeschinus; see Fantham, 205–06.

¹³ W. G. Arnott (above, note 3), p. 49.

¹⁴ Fantham, 206–07.

¹⁵ Fantham, 206–07; Grant, 349–50.

excited throughout the early scenes. His sudden passivity, when Syrus says *paullisper mane* (253), does not develop well out of his earlier action.¹⁶

Third, as Syrus prepares to leave with Aeschinus for the forum to pay off the pimp and do the shopping (277), he is twice held back. First, Sannio wants reassurance that Aeschinus will return all the money that the girl cost (278–80). Second, Ctesipho begs Syrus to resolve the problem as soon as possible so that Demea his father does not find out about the abduction (281–87). Neither conversation develops logically out of the previous action.¹⁷

Sannio should have gotten an assurance of payment from Aeschinus earlier (2. 1) or later (2. 4) in the act. Syrus does not control the household finances or hold sway over the one who does. His assurance of payment is worthless to Sannio, unless Syrus can persuade Aeschinus to persuade Micio to pay the money. The logical connections are stretched, at best. It would simply make better sense if Aeschinus told Sannio at one of their two meetings that he will convince Micio to pay for the *psaltria*.

After 280, Ctesipho's fear that his father will find out about the abduction of the girl, while true to his nervous character, is not pertinent to the drama at this point, since there is less reason for him to suspect that Demea will find out about his love for a *psaltria*, if Sannio is paid and does not linger by Micio's house. Now that Sannio is going off to the forum with Aeschinus and will soon be paid, Ctesipho's fears should be allayed, not exacerbated.

3. *Difficulties in reconstructing the stage action of the Greek original.* If we knew nothing else about Terence's reworking of this act, we could see that he had added a character to 2. 4, since there are four speaking roles on stage. Menander's scene would be highly problematical, if not impossible, to reconstruct, if we did not know there was good reason to suppose that in adding a new scene Terence rearranged the original sequence of action. All four characters (Sannio, Syrus, Aeschinus, and Ctesipho) are integral to the action. No one is clearly Terence's contribution to "thicken up" this scene. But a successful reconstruction of Menander's original design of scenes must take into account that Menander used only three actors to play all the parts.

Because act breaks affect how the actors distributed roles and give insight into the playwright's conception of divisions in the dramatic action, we should also examine the possibility of an act break in the Greek original falling in or around this sequence of action.¹⁸ The traditional divisions of

¹⁶ H. Lloyd-Jones (above, note 4), 281, warns against overreading such inconsistencies: "... it is not strange that Syrus converses with Ctesipho while Sannio is present or that Aeschinus keeps Sannio waiting while he converses with his brother. . . ." Cf. Fantham, 206; Drexler (above, note 1), 24–25.

¹⁷ Fantham, 208: "The fact that in 284, Syrus has to repeat Aeschinus' orders and send Ctesipho indoors strongly suggests that there has been re-writing by Terence in this passage."

¹⁸ Grant, 354 and n. 27. Prescott, rev. of Duckworth's *Epidicus*, *Classical Philology* 36 (1941), 284, stresses that the problem of act divisions cannot be treated separately from that of distribution of roles.

acts in Terence's play do not correspond to the act breaks of the Greek original, so we must reconstruct the Greek act breaks by examining natural breaks in the plot. The best guidelines are long, offstage journeys requiring considerable time, of which there are fortunately several in this play.

In the middle of the drama, three act breaks are necessary:

- 1) Syrus goes shopping after 287 and returns at 364 (a break must fall at 287/288 or 354/355);
- 2) Demea leaves to search for Micio in the forum after 510 and returns at 537 (a break must fall at 510/511 or 516/517);
- 3) Syrus sends Demea on an intentionally misdirected tour of the city at 586, from which he returns at 713 (a break must fall at 591/592 or 712/713, or possibly 609/610).

A final break may follow these three, unless one precedes them, since the total number of act breaks must be four.

In the last act (as it is delimited traditionally) it is inconsistent that Syrus is drunk in 5. 1, but shows no sign of inebriation later in 5. 5 and 5. 9. Like Chremes' drunkenness in *Eunuchus* (4. 5) which vanishes later (5. 3), after an act break in the original, Syrus' return to sobriety makes it tempting to suppose that somewhere between 5. 1 and 5. 5 in the original there was an act break which gave Syrus time to recover his senses. A final act break after 854 not only allows Syrus time to sober up but also gives Demea a moment to rethink his philosophy of treating children sternly.¹⁹

The two first acts by Menander which have been recovered largely intact also argue for a later act break (at 854/855). *Aspis* opens with an act of 249 or more lines, containing five characters (including Tyche who speaks the prologue) and five scenes. The first act of *Dyskolos* contains 232 lines, seven characters (including Pan who speaks the prologue), and seven scenes. Clearly, Menander preferred to get the plot well under way before stopping for the first act break, and he often created suspense across act breaks by introducing but not resolving a new plot development.²⁰ The tension created by the neighbors' hearing the news of Aeschinus' abduction resembles that of Daos' overhearing Sostratos' conversation with Knemon's daughter and running for help at the first act break of *Dyskolos*. It is not therefore improbable that the first act of Menander's *Adelphoi* ran through as far as what is traditionally labelled 3. 2 (354) of Terence's adaptation, although this first act is longer than either attested: 354 (Terentian) lines (less 25 for Terence's own prologue), seven (speaking) characters, and eight scenes. The addition of the scene from Diphilos, the rearrangement of Menander's sequence of action and Geta's protracted abuse of Aeschinus and Syrus in his

¹⁹ Gaiser in Rieth (above, note 1) suggests that there was an act break in Menander after 854 (5.3/5.4). Cf. G. Duckworth, *The Nature of Roman Comedy* (Princeton 1952), p. 121 and note 51.

²⁰ E.g. *Dyskolos* Act 4/5, *Dis Exapaton* Act 2/3.

entrance speech (299–320) may account for some extra length in the Latin adaptation.

Terence's prologue (6–11) also supports a later act break. He states that Diphilos' scene came early in *Synapothneskontes* (*in prima fabula*, 9). If Terence knew that Menander's first act was continuous through the place where he has added the scene from Diphilos, his words may be a justification of his borrowing by an implicit claim that the new scene was added into Menander's *Adelphoi* in a place comparable to its original setting in Diphilos. He had done the same to an early scene in *Andria* with an early scene of Menander's *Perinthia*. In conclusion, I will assume that there was no act break in the sequence of action rearranged by Terence in order to incorporate the foreign scene.

A successful reconstruction of *Adelphoi* must eliminate all the inconsistencies noted above, or the reconstructor must show how any that are not removed would not seem inconsistent to Menander and cite examples of such inconsistencies in Menandrian plays. Before continuing I should discuss several guidelines which other scholars who have reconstructed this sequence of action have followed but which do not seem to me necessarily consistent with standard Menandrian practice.

Foremost of these is the assumption that Menander's design of scenes in this sequence was simple.²¹ Menandrian stage action tends to be fairly complex; that is, it often takes a roundabout way to a foregone conclusion. Any of his plays will show this. Menander circumvents the straightforward and obvious resolution of the plot often through some character trait in the central figure(s), such as Knemon's churlishness which prevents Sostratos' direct request for the hand of his daughter (*Dyskolos*) or Moschion's timidity which prevents him from confessing to his father that he has impregnated the girl next door and necessitates a complex ploy (*Samia*). In both cases personalities complicate a situation which could be resolved quickly and happily, if the characters were simply straightforward with one another. A successful reconstruction of this sequence in the *Adelphoi* should beware of oversimplifying at least as much as overcomplicating the problem. Since Menander's action tends to illuminate character, a reconstructor should also address to some extent the way in which his reconstruction demonstrates the character traits of the central figures in these scenes, particularly Ctesipho whose fate hangs in the balance throughout the sequence.

Another assumption which I consider invalid is that the Syrus-Sannio scene in Menander was the culmination of this sequence.²² It is neither the culmination of the action nor the resolution of the whole problem, but the *turning point* of this sequence which is itself the turning point in a series of events. The abduction is the first stage in procuring the *psaltria* for Ctesipho permanently. The second stage is forcing the pimp to sell her.

²¹ Amott (note 3), p. 49; Fantham, 210.

²² Fantham (214–15), Martin (p. 243) and Grant (354) reconstruct the Syrus-Sannio confrontation as the penultimate scene in the sequence.

The third is convincing Micio to pay for her. Aeschinus' words of encouragement (266–67) would mean little to the nervous Ctesipho, if the second and third stages were not complete. They make better sense left where they are in Terence, after Syrus forces the pimp to accept payment for her.²³ In general, this sequence should build toward and away from a *central* confrontation between Syrus and Sannio. It should show beforehand the importance of their confrontation (what hangs in the balance) and demonstrate afterward the resolution of this central problem (how the characters affected by the problem now stand).²⁴

A third invalid assumption made by some reconstructors is that Sannio's monologue in Terence (196–208) is based on his *opening* monologue in Menander.²⁵ If Terence has preserved Sannio's monologue from Menander with any fidelity, it is not likely to be an opening but a bridging monologue (one linking two scenes with Sannio) which originally followed his scene with Syrus. In this speech Sannio is a defeated man. He will accept the price of the girl at cost (202, 205). He has resigned himself to receiving no recompense for his injuries and even recalls words which Syrus has yet to say to him in Terence's version: "young men must be indulged" (206–207/214–219). This speech also reflects the final lines of his scene with Syrus in Menander's play (205/280) which Terence has displaced to the end of this sequence (see reconstruction below, p. 77). If it derives from Menander, Sannio's speech should not be his entrance monologue but should follow his capitulation to Syrus' terms (2. 2).

In order to clarify the final assumption with which I do not agree, I must address the often discussed problem of the most likely candidate for delivering the exposition of the plot in Menander's play.²⁶ An omniscient

²³ What the plot calls for and what Terence seems to have changed is the establishment of Ctesipho's fears before the Syrus-Sannio scene. Later in the play, during the only other appearance of Ctesipho on stage (4.1.–4.2), the plot follows similar lines: Ctesipho frets that Demea will find him in Micio's house (517–53) and Syrus keeps Demea from going inside by an elaborate series of lies (554–86).

²⁴ Donatus' commentary indirectly supports the assertion that Ctesipho was on stage in Menander's play before Sannio entered. In his commentary on lines 209–10, Donatus makes an uncharacteristic error. Discussing *tace* (209), he mentions that Syrus is speaking to Ctesipho(!). Ctesipho has not yet been introduced in Terence's play. Micio and Demea have mentioned that Demea has a son (46–47, 130–31, 138–39), but do not name him. Donatus' error may be an innocent, incidental confusion of Ctesipho and Aeschinus, but it may also be a confusion of the Greek and Roman plots. Fantham (205) is right that it fits the character of Ctesipho better to fret over the pimp's resistance to making the deal (*cupide accipiat faxo*, 209). If so, this is an indication that in Menander there was a scene with Ctesipho prior to Sannio's arrival and it is further evidence that the sequence should move from the establishment of Ctesipho's situation to the Syrus-Sannio scene to the resolution of Ctesipho's fears. But Lloyd-Jones (above, note 4), 280–81, warns against inferring from Donatus' mistake that Syrus must have had a dialogue with Ctesipho in the original.

²⁵ Fantham, 204–05, 209, 214–15; Martin, p. 243; Grant, 350–51, 354.

²⁶ Fantham, 211 ff.; Martin, p. 244; Grant, 352–53.

divine prologuist is possible, but not necessary.²⁷ Although there is a clear lack of exposition in Terence's play, Menander does not always inform his audience of the full and true situation at the beginning of the play. In *Samia* Moschion delivers a prologue which apprises the audience of the situation at home, but they must wait until the end of Act I and the arrival of Demeas, Moschion's father, to learn that Demeas already intends to marry him to the girl he has impregnated.

If the prologue of *Adelphoi* was not delivered by a deity, the fact that only Aeschinus knows the full story of the abduction, unless Syrus assisted him at some point, argues for a Ctesipho/Aeschinus scene early in this sequence. This has two advantages: a character who knows about the abduction narrates the story to a character who is eager to know about it, and the audience sees Aeschinus and the girl (and Syrus?) crossing the stage and entering Micio's house. It is an invalid assumption, however, that this information was brought out on the stage in Menander's play as it was in Diphilos'.²⁸ Nor is it necessary that Aeschinus deliver such information. A character who knows about the affair can relate it. Syrus would be a likely candidate, whether he actually assisted with the abduction or only met Aeschinus later at Micio's house, except that Micio in the scene before says that none of the servants who escorted Aeschinus returned to his house (26–27).

As the audience will soon discover, Micio's knowledge of what is going on under his own roof is somewhat incomplete. He is unaware why Aeschinus abducted the *psaltria*. He does not know that Aeschinus has raped the girl next door and that his adopted son is soon to be a father. He says, just before leaving for the market, that Aeschinus had recently mentioned marriage, but he does not understand that Aeschinus is thinking about the poor girl next door who will soon bear his child, and not about "cooling down his adolescent passions," as Micio thinks (150–53). If immediately after Micio's departure Syrus (or Aeschinus) were to enter from the house and explain to the audience (or Ctesipho) that Aeschinus and he have been inside all along waiting for Micio to leave,²⁹ the audience would see that

²⁷ Amott (above, note 3), p. 52: ". . . it is too easily forgotten that even when Menander uses divine prologues, his gods are not the sole expositors, and they have remarkably little to say about future events. So long as we lack papyri of the opening scenes of Terence's Greek models, it will be wiser to compare Menandrian and Terentian expository techniques in terms of content (what—and when—the audience is actually told) rather than of form (whether or not a divine prologue is used)."

²⁸ The fact that Terence has added a scene depicting that abduction argues strongly that Menander's play lacked this sort of scene, or Terence would not have needed to look outside Menander for such a scene. He would only have had to elaborate the original, as he feels free to do at the end of *Adelphoe* (934 ff.); cf. Donatus on 938. Grant, 342, argues that the abduction in Menander's play "took place in its entirety off stage and was completed before the play began."

²⁹ Compare Chaerea's departure from Thais' house in *Eunuchus* (549), after Thais' maid has left. He, like Syrus, has waited until the coast is clear to come out. This reconstruction also makes an interesting parallel with *Aspis*, where an opening dialogue misleads the audience who

Micio labors under several delusions. The true situation would stand in sharp contrast to Micio's assertion that pampered children trust indulgent fathers (51–54) and is surely an irony intentionally designed into the plot. In conclusion, there was, no doubt, some exposition in Menander's play between Micio's departure for the market and the beginning of the next sequence, but it need not be a divine monologue (Aeschinus and Syrus know the real situation) or even a monologue (exposition can come in dialogue, cf. *Perinthia*, *Eunuchus*, *Heauton Timorumenos*). Our best guide to the correct answer is what type of exposition flows most naturally from the opening scenes into the reconstructed sequence.

II. Reconstruction of Menander's Sequence of Action

Refining the work of Drexler, Rieth, and Gaiser, Fantham³⁰ suggests that Aeschinus first entered with the girl. After a monologue he went inside Micio's house. Ctesipho walked on stage and delivered a monologue. Syrus came outside and found Ctesipho and informed him of the successful abduction. Then the pimp came on stage. Martin also reconstructs an early Ctesipho-Syrus scene.³¹ Grant reconstructs an early Ctesipho-Aeschinus scene.³²

Before proceeding we should clear up two misconceptions about the movements and motivation of Ctesipho. There is no need for Syrus or Aeschinus to call Ctesipho from Demea's farm to Micio's house. His natural interest in the outcome of the affair will bring him in at his first opportunity. He left the farm just after Demea and probably shadowed his father most of the way. For this reason his arrival at Micio's house follows soon after Demea's in the scene before (1. 2).

There is also no need for Ctesipho to be told about the successful abduction. Surely in both Terence and Menander it is understood that he has found out the same way Demea did: the rumor is going around town. Ctesipho's joy at hearing the rumor (cf. 252–53) would make a humorous

learn the real situation in the next scene from a divine prologue (since no one in *Aspis* knows the full truth, unlike in *Adelphoi*).

³⁰ Fantham, 208–11.

³¹ Martin, p. 243, reconstructs Menander's sequence with five scenes:

- 1) Ctesipho-Syrus (=generally Terence's 2. 3)
- 2) Aeschinus-Ctesipho, 266b–76a
- 3) Sannio, 196b–208
- 4) Syrus-Sannio (=Terence's 2. 2)
- 5) Aeschinus-Syrus-Sannio, 265–66a, 276b–87 (less 277b); then Ctesipho joins the scene at 281.

³² Grant, 354, reconstructs Menander's sequence with four scenes:

- 1) Aeschinus-Ctesipho-Syrus-*psaltria* (mute), 267–76a, 254–59, 262–64;
- 2) Sannio, 196–98, 200, 228–35, 202–08;
- 3) Sannio-Syrus, much of 209–51;
- 4) Aeschinus-Syrus; Terence omitted the scene completely.

contrast with Demea's earlier rage at hearing the same news (79–83). Both characters would attract such information to themselves, since both are related to Aeschinus. The only thing Ctesipho does not yet know on his arrival at Micio's house is where Aeschinus and the *psaltria* are. A meeting between Aeschinus and Ctesipho is not necessary to convey that information. Syrus could tell Ctesipho (and the audience) where Aeschinus is and exactly what happened at Sannio's the night before.

An economical (but not overly economical) use of characters and scenes prior to Sannio's entrance would be a meeting between Ctesipho and Syrus who, if he were not present, at some point had learned about the abduction from Aeschinus. There is no need for a divine prologuist, since Syrus can deliver all necessary information. Terence's play does not preclude the possibility that Syrus knows about Aeschinus' impending fatherhood also. Through Syrus' exposition the Greek audience may appreciate any of the ironies to which they are accustomed.

In the light of the discussion above, I would propose the following general reconstruction of scenes in Menander's sequence of action:³³

1. Syrus/Ctesipho (? ; 254–264; ? ; 281–283; 209–210)
2. Syrus/Sannio (210–252; 278–280; 196–208)
3. Aeschinus/Sannio (265–266; ?)
4. Aeschinus/Ctesipho (266–277; 284–287)

In order to insert the scene from Diphilos Terence has displaced four subsections (underlined) of the Greek original and removed three altogether (the question marks in sections 1 and 3).

1. A short "prologue" by Syrus, providing some exposition, probably opens this sequence. Ctesipho enters (254–59) and converses with Syrus (260–64). Syrus tells Ctesipho that Aeschinus and the *psaltria* are inside the house already. Their dialogue will disclose the rest of the background information on the abduction which the audience must learn. Terence has omitted this exposition and substituted the scene from Diphilos, which demonstrates rather than relates the abduction.³⁴ Syrus and Ctesipho see Sannio coming. Ctesipho begs Syrus to chase the angry pimp away from Micio's house quickly (*quam primum* 282) before Sannio meets Demea and causes irreparable problems for Ctesipho (*ego tum perpetuo perierim*) (281–83). Syrus assures him that he can handle Sannio (209–10).

³³ The line numbers below should be taken as approximations of where Terence has spliced together pieces of Menander's play. Terence has probably combined some material translated directly from Menander, some inspired by Menander's text, and some freely invented. To what extent Terence's words reproduce Menander's at any point is a matter of speculation. I am suggesting here a reconstruction of only the general composition of the scenes and not Menander's exact wording.

³⁴ P. J. Enk, "Terence as an adapter of Greek comedies," *Mnemosyne* III 13 (1947), 84: "(Terence's added scene = 2. 1) does not relate, but demonstrates."

2. Sannio storms forward and Menander's Syrus proves his prowess in dealing with pimps much as Terence's does (210–52). Having forced Sannio to relinquish any claim of reparation for the beating, Syrus turns to go inside the house and send out Aeschinus, when the pimp calls him back and insists that he be paid at least the wholesale cost of the girl (278–80). Syrus assures him he will and goes inside. Sannio bemoans his fate but resigns himself to receiving no recompense for his beating (196–208).

3. Aeschinus comes out, having been sent by Syrus. He deals with the pimp brusquely and directly (265–66).³⁵ Terence has omitted this section, since Sannio and Aeschinus have already had a long scene together and Diphilos' portrait of the young man clashed no doubt with Menander's. After Aeschinus agrees to pay him, the pimp wastes no time leaving for the forum where he can meet Micio, finish his business quickly and set off for Cyprus. His last meeting with Aeschinus, which ended violently, and the potential for more violence from Aeschinus would motivate Sannio to beat a hasty retreat.

4. Aeschinus now addresses Ctesipho (266–77). The matter has been resolved, and Aeschinus' chastisement of Ctesipho's rash threat of suicide³⁶ rings truer at this point, where the threat that the pimp will demand the girl back and Ctesipho's worry that Demea will discover the real reason for the abduction are in fact diminished. Aeschinus urges Ctesipho to go inside and see the *psaltria* (284–287).³⁷ The sequence ends as Aeschinus, accompanied by Syrus, leaves for the market to pay off the pimp.

Terence has kept scene 4, the resolution, last in the sequence, as Menander no doubt had it. In this scene, the younger pair of brothers are compared, just as at the end of the previous sequence the older pair are (the fathers in 1. 2 and their sons in 2. 4). The conclusions of these sequences

³⁵ It is possible Terence has preserved the beginning of Menander's scene (borrowing only Aeschinus' entrance motivation 265–66), then cut directly to Menander's next scene. For another interpretation of this abrupt shift of focus, see Fantham, 207. Fantham, 209, sees an advantage in a reconstruction in which Aeschinus never deals with the pimp directly on stage. This may be overly sensitive to the presentation of a young man, who has raped and impregnated a young girl and recently committed a violent assault on an innocent man, and whose rashness and uncontrolled passions (especially for prostitutes 149), as the product of his adoptive father's leniency, are an important theme of the play. Aeschinus need not speak any longer with Sannio than to do the right thing after what was unquestionably an illegal and unprovoked assault.

³⁶ See Donatus on 275.

³⁷ Terence has given 284–86 to Syrus, where in Menander the lines probably belonged to Aeschinus. A final speech by Aeschinus reassuring Ctesipho that everything concerning the abduction is in order would make an interesting contrast with the next scene in which the audience learns almost immediately that Aeschinus will find trouble ahead because of his theft of the *psaltria*. The juxtaposition of Aeschinus' confident handling of his brother's business and the revelation of his mismanagement of his own affairs (2. 4 vs. 3. 1–2) is clearly an irony designed into the plot which gives the audience a glimpse of Aeschinus' future troubles and prepares them for the very different picture of a fearful Aeschinus they will see later in the play (4. 4–4. 5).

make an interesting contrast: the fathers argue over the correct way to raise children, by indulgence or discipline, and their sons display the results of their fathers' different philosophies. Both children are far from perfect. Aeschinus is rash, violent and prone to having his way at all costs; Ctesipho is cowardly and withdrawn, incapacitated by fear, especially of his own father (cf. 517–20). In consecutive sequences Menander demonstrates that neither philosophy brings about the intended result: indulged children do not confide in their parents and disciplined ones do not obey them.

This reconstruction eliminates all the difficulties discussed above. Ctesipho may have a satisfactory introduction, now that Sannio is not on stage. Background information may be given by a character who knows the situation and in front of no one who may not hear it. Ctesipho's final words in this sequence (281–87) which do not develop well from the situation on stage make better sense if we understand they have been displaced from the opening scene of this sequence, when Sannio's persistent presence at Micio's house might alert Demea to Ctesipho's true situation. Syrus' opening words spoken back inside to Aeschinus (?) also make more sense if they were spoken to Ctesipho as Syrus prepared to meet Sannio advancing. The *tace* (209) which Donatus mistakenly claims Syrus says to Ctesipho would indeed be Syrus' response to Ctesipho's plea that he get rid of the pimp (281–83). Also, in this reconstruction Sannio does not have to remain on stage silently, while matters of utmost importance to him are discussed and arranged, and Syrus is not held back to discuss matters which he cannot resolve and which should have been resolved already.

This sequence, the resolution of Ctesipho's affair, is balanced against a later sequence of the play, the resolution of Aeschinus' affair.³⁸ Because of the rumor that has spread after the abduction, Aeschinus' own troubles come to light and he is forced to confess his transgressions to Micio. The manner in which Menander designed this sequence is parallel to the earlier sequence as reconstructed above:

CTESIPHO'S AFFAIR

1. Syrus/Ctesipho
2. Syrus/Sannio
3. Aeschinus/Sannio
4. Aeschinus/Ctesipho

AESCHINUS' AFFAIR

1. Syrus/Ctesipho (517–539)
2. Syrus/Demea (540–591)
3. Micio/Hegio (592–609)
4. Micio/Aeschinus (610–712)

1. Ctesipho is anxious about his problems.
2. Syrus fends an intruder from the house.
3. An older relative rescues one of the younger brothers from potentially disastrous problems associated with a love affair.
4. The rescuer chastises the rescued.

³⁸ Martin, p. 245, points out the balance between the love affairs of Ctesipho and Aeschinus: "But all will be well, for the misunderstanding over Aeschinus' relationship to Bacchis will be the means of bringing about his marriage to Pamphila."

Both sequences begin with a dialogue between Ctesipho and Syrus. In the later sequence (the resolution of Aeschinus' affair) Ctesipho frets over the imminent arrival of Demea (517–53). If 281–83 of Terence's adaptation represents a piece of the dialogue in scene 1 of Menander's sequence, Ctesipho in the earlier sequence also worries about Demea's possible interruption of the action. Also, in these parallel scenes Syrus boasts of his ability to handle difficult characters (209–210/534–537). In scene 2 of each sequence Syrus successfully defends the doors of the house against a hostile intruder, Sannio and Demea, respectively. Each scene involves a beating. In the earlier, Sannio complains of his mistreatment at the hands of Aeschinus; in the later, Syrus complains to Demea of a fictitious beating at Ctesipho's hands (211–215 [and 244–245] /554–567).

Scene 3 of each sequence resolves in short order the central problem: in the earlier sequence Aeschinus promises to pay Sannio, the scene which Terence removed since it repeated the confrontation borrowed from Diphilos; in the later Micio clears the way for Aeschinus to marry the girl next door, Hegio's niece (265–266/592–609).³⁹ Both sequences end with the confrontation of the child in trouble and the older family member who has saved him from disaster. In both scenes 4 the older relative gently scolds his younger relation for not seeking help earlier: Aeschinus reprimands Ctesipho for not coming to him with his problem sooner; Micio plays an unkind trick on Aeschinus (he tells him that the girl next door, the mother of his child, is going to have to marry another man), forces a confession from Aeschinus and chastises him for ungentlemanly behavior and not seeking his (adoptive) father's aid earlier (271–276/639–695).⁴⁰ The closeness of the two sequences, which resolve parallel problems in the plot, the younger brothers' love affairs, argues for the correctness of this reconstruction of the earlier sequence.⁴¹

As a final test of the validity of this reconstruction, could Menander's limited number of actors have performed this sequence? If Ctesipho and Syrus begin the sequence and Ctesipho and Aeschinus end it, where is Ctesipho during the middle scenes, 2 (Syrus/Sannio) and 3 (Aeschinus/Sannio)? With three different actors playing the three roles in these middle scenes (Syrus, Sannio, and Aeschinus), the actor who plays Ctesipho must exit to take one of those parts. But the same actor can play Syrus and Aeschinus, since Sannio's bridging monologue allows an actor offstage the time to change mask and costume. If Syrus and Aeschinus are played by the same actor, the actor who plays Ctesipho need not leave the

³⁹ See Donatus on 351.

⁴⁰ W. E. Forehand, "Syrus' role in Terence's *Adelphoe*," *Classical Journal* 69 (1973), 53: "Aeschinus' scolding appears distinctly ironic when one considers how he has allowed his own problems to go unsolved for fear of facing his father."

⁴¹ Also, these sequences are bordered by confrontations between Micio and Demea (81–154/719–762).

stage at all. The following schema shows a possible distribution of roles in this sequence.

Scene	Actor 1	Actor 2	Actor 3	Mutes
1			Syrus ⁴²	
1		Ctesipho	Syrus	
2	Sannio	(Ctesipho)	Syrus	
2	Sannio	(Ctesipho)		
3	Sannio	(Ctesipho)	Aeschinus	(Syrus) ⁴³
4		Ctesipho	Aeschinus	(Syrus)

Ctesipho remains on stage but withdraws from the action through the middle scenes of this sequence. The pimp presumably does not know him, since Aeschinus has abducted the girl.⁴⁴ Ctesipho's silent presence casts a strange shadow over the drama. Every turn in the dialogue as Syrus and Aeschinus wrangle with Sannio would affect him deeply and add a tragic note to their comic haggling. His silence, contrasted with his great concern for a quick and happy resolution, would demonstrate the cowardice which his strict father has driven into him. As he does again later (538–53), he hovers in the background, too frightened to advance or retreat, and if he speaks at all, whispers panic-stricken pleas to Syrus or nervous asides to the audience.

Ctesipho is certainly not the only cowardly character Menander created. Thraso, the inept soldier of *Kolax* whom Terence has probably substituted for another soldier in *Eunuchus*,⁴⁵ is another memorable coward. The final sequence of *Eunuchus*, in which Thraso capitulates completely to others'

⁴² Presumably the two principal actors will play Micio and Demea in the previous scene, so if Syrus comes on stage directly after them, as I suggest, the third actor must play Syrus. Since Sannio has a larger part in the dialogue, I give his role to the first actor, and the role of Ctesipho to the second actor. This assignment is not conclusive.

⁴³ Since Terence's Syrus does not play a crucial role in the drama from Aeschinus' second entrance (265) to his departure for the market (277), it is likely that Syrus was played by a mute in scenes 3(?) and 4 of Menander's sequence. Also, if Syrus is a speaking role at the end of the sequence and the actor who plays Aeschinus has earlier played Syrus, as I suggest, it would be necessary for different actors to share Syrus' role in the same sequence, which seems unlikely.

⁴⁴ Grant, 349–50, plausibly reconstructs this part of the prehistory: Sannio (like Ballio in *Pseudolus*) has only recently acquired the *psaltria*, so he does not know Ctesipho and Ctesipho has only recently come to know him.

⁴⁵ Terence has certainly added Gnatho to the final sequence of *Eunuchus*. Whether or not he added Thraso also is harder to say (see W. Ludwig, "Von Terenz zu Menander," *Philologus* 103 [1959], 36–38; Gomme and Sandbach, *Menander: A Commentary* [Oxford 1973], pp. 420–21; Lloyd-Jones [above, note 4], 283–84; and K. Gilmartin, "The Thraso-Gnatho subplot in Terence's *Eunuchus*," *Classical World* 69 [1975–76], 263–67). For our purposes it does not matter whether he rewrote the ending or transferred it with only minor alterations from Menander. The "Ctesipho" sequence of *Adelphoi*, as reconstructed here, is remarkably similar to the final sequence of Terence's *Eunuchus*, and for that reason Terence has altered Menander's sequence of action.

wishes, bears a close resemblance to this reconstruction of the *Adelphoi* sequence:⁴⁶

<i>Eunuchus</i> (1025–1094)		<i>Adelphoi</i> (155–287)
Thraso (Parmeno)	Coward enters	Ctesipho/Syrus
Chaerea/Parmeno (Thraso)	Coward withdraws from the stage action	Sannio/Syrus (Ctesipho)
Chaerea (Thraso)	Coward remains silent through an opportunity for dialogue	Sannio (Ctesipho)
Chaerea/Phaedria (Thraso)	Coward still refuses to join the action	Sannio/Aeschinus (Ctesipho)
Thraso/Chaerea/Phaedria	Coward finally comes forward	Ctesipho/Aeschinus

In both plays, after the coward enters in the first scene, the characters in the second and third scenes do not acknowledge him. His presence adds another dimension to the stage action without necessarily adding a word to the text. In *Adelphoi* the audience watches Syrus' and Aeschinus' dealings with Sannio through Ctesipho's eyes whose love affair and life hang on Syrus' success; in *Eunuchus* they watch the happy outcome of the young men's love affairs through the eyes of a rival whose misery counterbalances their joy. The management of the cowards' actions in these sequences is so similar, although the resolution of their fates is quite different, that these scenes seem to be Menandrian variations on a theme.⁴⁷

⁴⁶ For the comparison of two similar sequences in Menander, see W. Goerler, "Menander, *Dyskolos* 233–381 und Terenz, *Eunuchus* 817–922," *Philologus* 105 (1961) 299–307.

⁴⁷ This parallel argues, I believe, that Terence's changes in the end of Menander's *Eunouchos* are relatively minor (the addition of Gnatho presumably displacing Chaerea as the mediator between Thraso and Phaedria). Terence's general plot development in this sequence is likely to be the same as Menander's. Besides the similar management of the coward, the use of the three actors is remarkably similar: one actor plays the coward throughout the sequence, (Ctesipho/Thraso), another dominates the central scenes and delivers the bridging monologue (Sannio/Chaerea), and the third first plays a helpful slave (Syrus/Parmeno) and then his master's son (Aeschinus/Phaedria), changing roles during the bridging monologue. The differences between the sequences (Chaerea is involved in the last scene of the sequence, whereas Sannio leaves before the last scene; the coward is a negative figure in *Eunuchus*, whereas he is positive in *Adelphoi*) arise from the different requirements of the plots, not the handling of the stage action in the sequences. The excellent way in which both sequences integrate character and action (or here, inaction) and the similarity of their design of scenes argue strongly that the sequences derive from one mind, skilled at writing action which develops naturally from the situation and the characters. All the evidence points to Menander; see Gomme and Sandbach (above, note 45), p. 27.

The similarity of these sequences may have contributed to Terence's decision to rewrite this sequence of *Adelphoi*. Only a year after he produced an adaptation of Menander's *Eunouchos*, it may have occurred to Terence that he should not repeat a sequence so close in structure to one crowning a recent success. While exploring the possibilities, Terence saw that a scene from Diphilos' *Synapothneskontes* which Plautus had fortuitously not used in his *Commorientes* would fit into *Adelphoi* (with minor alterations) and add some vigor to the action. This would not be the first time Terence had noticed a close resemblance between sequences in Menander's comedies (*An.* 10–12). So, as he had done before, he borrowed a scene from one comedy and inserted it into another, but with two important differences between this and his previous borrowings: in *Adelphoe* Terence splices together the work of different authors,⁴⁸ and his motivation is not just to "improve the Greek original" but to add variety to his own dramatic corpus. It is this attention to the independent Roman tradition of New Comedy which raises Terence's drama above mere imitation of Greek originals.

III. Conclusion: Terence's Changes

If this reconstruction is correct, how has Terence changed the original sequence of action? We should note first that he has not altered it radically. The unfolding of the plot (and to some extent the design of scenes also) remains in basically the same order. Aeschinus has rescued the girl and brought her home. With Syrus' help, he deals with the angry pimp and arranges to purchase the girl. Then he comforts his brother with the news of the happy outcome. Finally he and Syrus leave for the market to settle the deal. Terence has left the Syrus-Sannio scene second in the sequence and the Aeschinus-Ctesipho scene fourth.

The inclusion of the scene from Diphilos, however, precluded Menander's confrontation between Aeschinus and the pimp. In Menander this scene is likely to have come third in the sequence. By bringing Aeschinus on stage before Ctesipho, Terence has in effect exchanged the brothers' scenes (1 and 3). That is the fundamental difference between the Greek and Roman sequences. This shift of focus enhances the comic element in this sequence but distorts the presentation of Ctesipho's character. His long silence on stage in Menander demonstrates his timidity and Demea's ferocity. But it is not at all the same thing when Terence keeps Sannio silent on stage for two scenes. At best, we can say that his prior experience with Aeschinus motivates his fear of involvement in the stage action. But he is not a coward like Ctesipho, since he was not afraid to speak up in front of Aeschinus earlier in the same sequence, even when he was beaten for his protests. Terence's exchange of the brothers' scenes is quite effective in focusing attention on Aeschinus, the more interesting of the pair, but his exchange of silent characters is less felicitous, since his

⁴⁸ Fantham, 196.

Sannio remains silent on stage because the plot demands it, whereas Menander's Ctesipho is silent because the nature of his character demands it.

From this reconstruction of the Greek original it is not hard to reconstruct also Terence's reasons for displacing four pieces of dialogue (196–208, 254–64, 278–80, 281–83) from their original situations in Menander's sequence.⁴⁹ He has not really displaced 197–208, Sannio's monologue. He has left it between Sannio's two scenes, as Menander had it, but since he has brought Sannio on earlier than Menander had, he has moved the monologue up as well. His displacement of 254–64, the Ctesipho-Syrus scene, later in the sequence is part of his general exchange of the brothers' scenes (1 and 3). He has displaced 278–80 to the end of the sequence to serve as Sannio's exit line, so that the pimp does not have to leave the stage without saying anything after Terence has kept him on for so long "thickening up" the stage. At the end of the sequence Terence adds, almost as an afterthought, 281–83, which was in Menander a central feature of Ctesipho's character, his fear of his father. Menander probably established this motivation when Ctesipho first entered in scene 1 of the sequence, but Terence, who is less interested in the psychology of this character, includes it mostly as a bridge to Ctesipho's next appearance (4. 1), where his fear of Demea is central to the scene.⁵⁰

In conclusion, what is important in this study is not the reconstruction itself but the methodology used in reconstructing the original. In attempting to recover Menander's lost design of scenes, we must attend to Menander's style of constructing a sequence of action. This article outlines only one of several possible ways to reconstruct a lost sequence of action, but it moves us one step nearer to the original by following closely Menander's style of organizing dramatic action. I do not claim to have resolved a problem which only the recovery of Menander's original can settle, but this investigation opens a door for further debate on a methodological basis which, I hope, will prove profitable not only in recovering lost sequences of action but for wider analysis of Menandrian dramaturgy.⁵¹

Indiana University

⁴⁹ See reconstruction on p. 77.

⁵⁰ Grant, 349. Terence's 284–87 are probably in their original situation in Menander's sequence, but Terence had given 284–86 to Syrus (as a natural extension of Syrus' and Ctesipho's dialogue), where Menander gave them to Aeschinus (see note 37). Terence would have had to add only Syrus' reference to shopping (286), if he drew the speech from Aeschinus' final words to Ctesipho.

⁵¹ With deep gratitude for their assistance in writing this article, I would like to thank Professors Douglass Parker, M. Gwyn Morgan, W. Geoffrey Amott, Elaine Fantham, John Grant, Betty Rose Nagle, Timothy Long, James Halpom and Frances Titchener, and Ms. Fern Fryer and Ms. Virginia McGuffin. All errors which remain are my own.